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Abstract

Extreme right-wing political parties and movements are growing in number and size all over Europe and in their tail, an increased political focus on immigration and its pros and cons. Sweden is no exception to the European trend and the Swedish extreme right-wing political party, Sverigedemokraterna, became the third largest political party in the latest elections for the Swedish parliament in 2014.

The objective of this study is to contribute to the current debate on rising right-wing party affiliation through an analysis of the reasons for extreme right-wing voting behavior of immigrants in Sweden. Through a case-study based on six in-depth interviews with immigrants voting for Sverigedemokraterna, the study looks into issues regarding social group identification as the issue of identification with or repudiation of the ‘outgroup’ appears, from previously conducted research, to be a key issue. An analysis of policy documents of Sverigedemokraterna, previously conducted research and finally an interview conducted by a Swedish anti-racist organization is also included in the case-study.

The study shows that the reasons behind immigrant extreme right-wing voting behavior present substantial similarities with other highly represented groups of extreme right-wing voters in that voting is, in line with Realistic Conflict Theory, encouraged by a perceived socio-economic threat emanating from an identified ‘outgroup’.

Further, the study validates the assumption of ‘in-’ and ‘outgroup’ identification as being a key issue in determining motives behind extreme right-wing voting. The key explanatory factor of the voting behavior of the studied group indeed shows to be the rejection of an identification with a homogenous group of ‘immigrants’.

Finally, the study shows that the rejection of an identification with a homogenous group of ‘immigrants’, removes the theoretical base for assuming that immigrants should be expected to show favorable attitudes towards the group of immigrants in general.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Political parties and movements of the extreme right-wing have been and are growing in number and size all over Europe, accompanied by an increased attention in the political discussion to the issue of immigration and its pros and cons. The examples of these parties and movements are numerous. The French right-wing party, the *Front National*, had an important impact on the development of the European extreme right wing early on by showing that it is possible to reach success in regular national and local elections with a nationalist political agenda (Expo and Svenska Dagbladet, 2014). In the elections for the European Parliament in 2014, the same party received the largest amount, 24,86 percent, of the French votes (EU-valet 2014a). Similarly, in the same elections, with 26,6 percent of the votes, the Danish extreme right-wing party *Dansk Folkeparti* received the largest amount of votes from the Danish population (EU-valet 2014, 2014b). Finland presents yet another example of an upcoming extreme right as the extreme right wing party *Sannfinländarna* became the second largest political party in the country in the national elections of 2015 with 17,7 percent of the votes (Yle, 2015). In the opinion of most of their non-sympathizers, the right-wing parties focus heavily on the cons of immigration and often adhere to a xenophobic discourse (Fores, 2010).

In parallel to the growing extreme right on the official political scene, extreme right wing xenophobic movements are growing. An example of this is the anti-Islamist movement PEGIDA¹ that was founded as a Facebook group in Germany in 2014 and has been growing in size and spreading to other European countries (BBC, 2015).

Much to the surprise of the outside world, Sweden, up until recently seen as an inclusive country with a solid social democratic base and a strong sense of international solidarity among its population, is no exception to this European trend. The nationalist right-wing party the *Sverigedemokraterna*, with roots in the Nazi movements in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Lodenius, 2009), entered the Swedish parliament in 2010 with 5,7 percent of the votes and became

---

¹ Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes (Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the West, translation of the author)
Sweden’s third largest party in the elections for national parliament in September 2014 with 12.86 percent of the votes from the Swedish population in an election with a participation of 85.81% of the eligible voters\(^2\) (Valmyndigheten, 2014).

Although the party emphasizes not to be a ‘one issue party’, the issue of immigration plays a dominant role in the politics of *Sverigedemokraterna*. In their political statement on immigration they describe a recent tendency of an extremely large immigration from distant countries and cultures and that “[…] the overall net impact of mass immigration from distant countries is still strongly negative, both economically and socially” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2014a; my translation). The party is, according to its policy document *Sverigedemokraternas principprogram 2011*, a “[…] social conservative party with a nationalist foundation […]” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.3; my translation) that “[…] defines the nation in terms of culture, language, identity and loyalty” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.10; my translation).

1.2 Literature Review

The rapid growth of the *Sverigedemokraterna* has in many ways taken the public opinion by surprise as the party is perceived as standing for values that are seen as being unlike those that have previously been taken for granted in Swedish politics (SVT, 2014). With the surprise comes of course the wish and need to understand and to explain.

In 2014, Political Scientist Anders Sannerstedt, from Lund University, Sweden analyzed data from the yearly survey of the SOM\(^3\) Institute of Gothenburg University with the purpose of mapping out which groups sympathize with the *Sverigedemokraterna* and came up with the result that sympathizers of *Sverigedemokraterna* correspond fairly well to the average Swede, but that there is a slight dominance of manual workers within this group. Further, Sannerstedt found that an important part of the *Sverigedemokraterna* sympathizers consists of people with a non-

---

\(^2\) Eligible voters for parliamentary elections being all Swedish citizens of 18 years or older, living or having once lived in Sweden, citizens of EU countries, Norway and Iceland, of 18 years or older, living in Sweden and non-Swedish citizens of 18 years or older, having lived in Sweden during a minimum of three years prior to the elections (Valmyndigheten, 2014).

\(^3\) Samhälle, Opinion, Medier
Swedish background\(^4\), the strongest support to be found within the group of individuals with a European background and/or a non-Swedish citizenship (Sannerstedt, 2014).

The *Statistiska Centralbyrån*\(^5\) (2014) has presented data showing an increase in the group of men living in Sweden, but born outside of Sweden that sympathized\(^6\) with *Sverigedemokraterna* from 1,6 percent in 2010 to 7,3 percent in 2013 (SCB, 2014). In 2013, the number of people living in Sweden, but born outside of the country was approximately 1,5 million (Migrationsinfo.se, 2015). Assuming that approximately half were men, this means that more than 50 000 men with a non-Swedish background, living in Sweden sympathized with *Sverigedemokraterna* in 2013. High numbers of sympathizers with a non-Swedish background for a nationalist party with a reduced immigration on top of its agenda inevitably raise the question about the motivation behind the choice of party sympathy of this group of people.

On a European level, a number of studies have been made within the area of extreme right-wing voting behavior, focusing on the one hand on the underlying reasons for this voting behavior and on the other on which social categories vote for political parties of the extreme right-wing (Della Posta, 2013; Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002). Other studies have targeted attitudes towards immigration and its impact on voting behavior and on immigration policies (Fetzer, 2000; Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013). The theories used in these studies can, very simplified, be grouped into two categories, the first category consisting of theories explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior and/or negative attitudes towards immigrants/immigration with an experienced fear of an ‘outgroup’, the fear in these cases experienced as stronger the closer a group is to the outgroup. Theories belonging to this group are *Competitive Threat* (Della Posta, 2013), *Economic Self-Interest* (Fetzer, 2000), *Realistic Group Conflict Theory* (Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013) and *Realistic Conflict Theory/Theory of Economic Interests* (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002).

\(^4\) ‘People with a non-Swedish background’ here comprises the two groups of, on the one hand, persons with non-Swedish citizenship living in Sweden and on the other, persons with Swedish citizenship living in Sweden, but having been raised in a country other than Sweden.
\(^5\) Statistics Sweden
\(^6\) SCB defines a ‘sympathizer’ of SD as a person having responded ‘SD’ to either of the three questions: 1. Is there any political party which is closer to you than another? 2. Which party? And otherwise: 3. But which party do you sympathize mostly with? (SCB, 2014)
The second category of theories consists of theories predicting that closeness, both physical closeness and closeness in the sense of resemblance, to an outgroup/minority/marginalized group will provoke identification with this group, prevent unfavorable attitudes towards the group and consequently prevent e.g. immigrants from voting for the extreme right-wing and its anti-immigration policies. The theories brought up in this study within this category are *Intergroup Contact Theory* (Della Posta, 2013) and *Theory of Marginality* (Fetzer, 2000).

1.3 Research Problem

The research of Sannerstedt (2014) shows that there is a substantial number of individuals with a non-Swedish background sympathizing with the Swedish extreme right-wing party *Sverigedemokraterna*. Current research based on the theories explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior and/or negative attitudes towards immigrants/immigration with an experienced fear of an ‘outgroup’ (Della Posta, 2013; Fetzer, 2000; Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013; Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002), provides no or little explanations to immigrant extreme right-wing voting behavior, other than in cases where immigrants are included in other groups identified as frequent extreme right-wing voters, such as manual workers or persons with a low educational level. Further, current research based on theories predicting that closeness to an outgroup/minority/marginalized group will provoke identification with and prevent unfavorable attitudes towards the group (Della Posta, 2013; Fetzer, 2000), rather concludes that this closeness prevents immigrants from extreme right-wing voting, in this case, due to a favorable attitude towards the ‘outgroup’. Hence, in the two groups of theories providing explanatory models from two different perspectives, the individual’s relation to the ‘outgroup’ plays an important role. However, in the research mentioned above, where the term ‘outgroup’ plays an important role and is frequently used, the rationale behind the choice of including or excluding groups in or from the ‘outgroup’ is rarely explicit.
1.4 Research Objective and Relevance

The objective of this research is to contribute to the current debate on and enhance the knowledge about rising right-wing party affiliation by analyzing the reasons for extreme right-wing voting behavior of immigrants in Sweden. It will, in particular, look into issues regarding social group identification as the issue of identification with or repudiation of the ‘outgroup’ appears to be a key issue. In addition to examining extreme right-wing voting behavior through a case-study on immigrant extreme right-wing voters, the study will therefore, also within the frame of the case-study, look into the role of social identity and in particular the relation between identification with ‘in-’ or ‘outgroup’ in the choice of political affiliation.

The relevance of this research is linked to the commonly highlighted view of extreme right-wing parties that immigration has a negative impact, both socially and economically, on the society in the party’s own nation, i.e. that immigration is defined as a threat to the party’s own nation’s society. The Swedish Sverigedemokraterna is no exception (Sverigedemokraterna, 2014a; 2014b). When defining a group in society as a social and economic threat, conflicts between groups feeling threatened and groups experienced as threatening can be expected. In order to prevent such conflicts, it is of importance to obtain a picture as coherent as possible with reality of the potentially conflicting groups and to understand the procedure behind the formation of the groups. Research published so far has contributed substantially to this through mapping of extreme right-wing voters, i.e. the group experiencing a threat from immigration, and has come to conclusions that some groups in society, e.g. manual workers and persons with a lower educational level are more prone to vote extreme right-wing than other groups. Explanations for the motives behind the choice of party affiliation of these groups have also been provided. However, little attention has been given to the group of immigrant right-wing voters and to the motives behind this group’s voting behavior. Further, with the knowledge that the group of immigrant extreme right-wing voters exists comes the knowledge that a perception of belonging either to the threatened group or to the group perceived as a threat also exists within the group of immigrants and consequently that conflicts within groups of immigrants may occur. In this specific case it is therefore, as for all potentially conflicting groups, important to understand the reasons behind the choice in order to prevent or to deal with conflicts correctly. Further, as immigrants voting for parties holding anti-immigration as, in most cases, their key issue, presents a somewhat conflicting picture with the one of immigrants
as a homogenous group, representing the ‘threat’, investigating the motivation behind this groups’ choice of party affiliation is of particular interest as it can contribute to a more complete picture of extreme right-wing voting.

1.5 Research Questions

The research will attempt to answer the following questions:

- Why do immigrants vote for extreme right-wing political parties?
- What is the relation between the social identity of extreme right-wing voting immigrants and their voting behavior?
- How do extreme right-wing voting immigrants identify themselves in relation to the ‘outgroup’ identified by the extreme right-wing political party?

1.6 Methodological and Theoretical Considerations

According to John W. Creswell (2014), the purpose of qualitative research is to investigate and acquire knowledge about how individuals or groups understand a social or human problem. As the purpose of this research is to study immigrant extreme right-wing voters’ own perception of the motivation behind their choice of political affiliation and their social identification, the orientation of the research corresponds well to this description. Hence the research will be conducted as a qualitative study. A quantitative element will, however, be included. The overall purpose for the study is to complement the existing research as to the reasons behind right-wing voting in general. In order to acquire the in-depth qualitative knowledge needed, the case of immigrant extreme right-wing voters in Sweden and consequently the form of case study has been chosen for this study (Creswell, 2014).

Berth Danermark (2001), writes about ‘abduction’ as “[…] redescription or recontextualization […] i.e. to observe, describe, interpret and explain something within a new context […] (Danemark, 2001, p91). The present study will endeavor to shed more light on the issue of extreme right-wing voting behavior through looking at the findings through the lenses of
two theories offering different perspectives, *Realistic Conflict Theory* (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000) and *Theory of Marginality* (Fetzer, 2000). As for the specific study of the social identity a similar approach has been chosen. For this purpose, the study will look at the issue through the glasses of *Acculturation Theory* (Berry, 2005) and *Social Identity Theory* (Rodriguez, 2015). In other words, the study aims at observing, describing, interpreting and explaining issues in a new context and will hence follow an abductive approach.

As stated above, the case of extreme right-wing voting of immigrants in Sweden was chosen as the case for the study. As the aim for the study is to acquire an enhanced knowledge as to the motivation behind extreme right-wing voting, the most adequate and effective strategy to achieve the goal was to go to the source, i.e. to interview persons of this category. Therefore, the primary data consists of in-depth semi-structured interviews with Swedish extreme right-wing voters with a non-Swedish background. In order to complement this data, an interview, also with an individual belonging to the target group, conducted by the anti-racist Swedish organization *Expo* (Poohl, 2007) was included in the research. Further, policy documents from the Swedish extreme right-wing party *Sverigedemokraterna* (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011; 2014a; 2014b) as well as earlier research results within the area were analyzed and used in the research.

1.7 Structure

After the present introduction, chapter two will present the theoretical and analytical framework of the research. Following this chapter, which will be introduced by an overview of the current research debate, chapter three will present the methodological framework used in the research. In chapter four, the research findings will be presented, followed by chapter five, containing the analysis of the findings from the previous chapter. Finally, chapter six will present the conclusions of the research.
2 Theoretical and Analytical Framework

2.1 Research Debate

In order to place the present case study into a larger context and to part from a relevant theoretical base, it is crucial to bring in earlier research within the area into the context. The following section will therefore provide an overview on the research debate related to extreme right-wing voting behavior and to attitudes towards immigration, an issue often associated with extreme right-wing voting.

Several studies have been conducted in order to determine which social categories vote for extreme right-wing parties as well as for the reasons, both individual and contextual, behind the voting behavior of the determined categories (Della Posta, 2013; Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002; Sannerstedt, 2014). Other studies have looked at the impact of immigration on attitudes of nativism and on voting behavior in different countries (Fetzer, 2000; Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013). Few studies have focused on immigrant voting behavior. Oliver Strijbis’ study on the voting behavior of individuals’ with a migration background in Switzerland is an exception. In his article Migration Background and Voting Behavior in Switzerland: A Socio-Psychological Explanation, Strijbis (2014) studies the voting behavior of persons with an immigrant background by dividing this category into members of an outgroup, persons originating from (post-) communist countries, guest workers, highly educated persons and naturalized persons (Strijbis, 2014, p.624). Other variables that Strijbis introduces in his study are occupation, religious denomination, language of the respondent, age, sex, attitudes towards migration, policy preferences and party identifications (Strijbis, 2014, pp.619-620). Strijbis proposes the hypothesis, a hypothesis that he also confirms in his study, that individuals belonging to outgroups together with guest workers are significantly more prone to voting for the left than for the right (Strijbis, 2014). Strijbis provides a list of which groups he includes in the ‘outgroup’, this list comprising of immigrants with migration backgrounds from former Yugoslavia, Turkey, developing countries, and all Muslims with migration backgrounds (Strijbis, 2014, p.619). However, the study neither provides an explanation for the reason for this choice, nor does it look into the defined outgroup’s

---

7 Measured as the language in which the interview was conducted (Strijbis, 2014, p.620).
members’ own identification as belonging to an ‘ingroup’ or an ‘outgroup’. Further, Strijbis finds that persons with origins in Eastern Europe, i.e. (post-) communist countries, are more likely to vote for the center-right than for the left. Strijbis additionally tests the hypothesis that naturalized persons, i.e. immigrants having obtained a Swiss passport, are more prone to voting for the right than natives, but does not find any support to this hypothesis in his study (Strijbis, 2014).

At first glance results contradicting the above, can be found in the research of Anders Sannerstedt, Political Scientist from Lund University who in his article *Sverigedemokraternas sympatisörer* (Sannerstedt, 2014) looked into social categories supporting the Swedish extremist right-wing party *Sverigedemokraterna*. In his research, Sannerstedt analyzed data from the yearly survey done by the SOM Institute at Gothenburg University in 2014 and painted a picture of the sympathizers for *Sverigedemokraterna* as to gender, educational level, social and demographic background, etc. The sympathizer for *Sverigedemokraterna* is, according to Sannerstedt, a person who answers “*Sverigedemokraterna*” to the question “Which political party do you like?” Hence, his definition neither necessarily excludes people not voting for *Sverigedemokraterna* nor does it necessarily include all voters of *Sverigedemokraterna*. According to Sannerstedt, the sympathizers for *Sverigedemokraterna* correspond reasonably well to the average Swede, although the group is slightly dominated by young, low-skilled, working class male from smaller towns. However, considering that the *Sverigedemokraterna* is a nationalist party as well as a party that holds the issue of immigration as being one of its main focuses, a more surprising finding in Sannerstedt’s analysis is that the party also has support among people with a non-Swedish background. According to Sannerstedt, the support for *Sverigedemokraterna* among people with non-Swedish citizenship is even higher than the support among Swedish citizens (Sannerstedt, 2014). Sannerstedt’s findings show that the sympathizers of *Sverigedemokraterna* with a non-Swedish background primarily come from a European background and that only very few with a non-European background would consider voting for *Sverigedemokraterna*, Muslims being represented only by a half percent of the group of non-Swedish sympathizers for *Sverigedemokraterna* (Sannerstedt, 2014). Worth emphasizing when comparing Strijbis (2014) results with the research of Sannerstedt is that Strijbis chose to delimit his study of the likelihood to vote for the right to

---

8 ‘People with a non-Swedish background’ here comprises the two groups of, on the one hand, persons with non-Swedish citizenship living in Sweden and on the other, persons with Swedish citizenship living in Sweden, but having been raised in a country other than Sweden.
immigrants having obtained a Swiss passport, whereas Sannerstedt (2014), in addition to immigrants with a Swedish passport having been raised outside Sweden, also looked at immigrants with a non-Swedish passport living in Sweden. Although providing important quantitative information stating that a substantial proportion of immigrants in Sweden sympathize with Sverigedemokraterna, Sannerstedt’s research, however, provides little explanation for the motivation behind these persons’ choice of sympathy.

A number of studies have been published, where existing theories have been tested. A first example is Daniel J. Della Posta, who, in his article, *Competitive Threat, Intergroup Contact, or Both? Immigration and the Dynamics of Front National Voting in France* argues that the two theories of competitive threat and of intergroup contact can coexist in the sense that their respective influence works on different levels. According to Della Posta, *competitive threat*, i.e. high levels of immigration causing higher numbers of votes for the *Front National*, affects the regional level, whereas *intergroup contact*, i.e. high numbers of immigrants causing lower numbers of votes for the *Front National*, affects the town or city level (Della Posta, 2013).

In his article *Economic self-interest or cultural marginality? Anti-immigration sentiment and nativist political movements in France, Germany and the USA*, Joel S. Fetzer (2000) studies reasons for unfavorable attitudes towards immigration based on two theories, the *Theory of Economic Self-Interest* and the *Theory of Marginality*. In his study, Fetzer comes to the conclusion that there is little evidence that supports economic self-interest, i.e. the theory that “each citizen casts his vote for the party he believes will provide him with more benefits than any other” (Fetzer, 2000, p.7) as being the cause of nativism and to an increased opposition to immigration. However, his study does show that being part of the group of manual workers increases the likelihood of voting for political parties opposing immigration. As to the analysis based on the *Theory of Marginality*, Fetzer concludes that persons who consider themselves belonging to minorities and being marginalized show a lower rate of nativism and a higher tolerance towards immigration. (Fetzer, 2000).

Another study on the causes of opposition towards immigration and support for restrictive immigration policies was made by the two researchers Alexandra Filindra and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz (2013) within the states of New England. Based on *Realistic Group Conflict Theory*, the two researchers tested the influence of individuals’ economic situation on attitudes
towards immigration and towards policies restricting immigration. They conclude that in cases where people are presently experiencing economic deprivation or expect material loss in the future, i.e. where people show a pessimistic view of the present and/or the future, there is a positive correlation between increased immigration and a favorable attitude towards restrictive immigration policies (Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013).

In the articles Individual and contextual characteristics of the German extreme right-wing vote in the 1990s. A test of complementary theories (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000) and French Front National voting: a micro and macro perspective (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2002), the two Dutch researchers Marcel Lubbers and Peer Scheepers study the “who”, “why” and “where” of extreme right wing voting in Germany and in France. The two researchers aim at determining which attitudes, social as well as political, encourage extreme right-wing voting behavior of specific social categories\(^9\). Further they investigate the importance of contextual circumstances for such voting behavior. Lubbers and Scheepers choose to base their studies on dominant theories used to analyze right-wing voting (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002). By looking into who votes for extreme right-wing parties and why as well as in which context, Lubbers and Scheepers settle that their analysis corresponds to the theoretical voting behavior model, the funnel of causality, used by Meyer (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2002).

In their first study, the study on Germans’ voting for the German extreme right-wing party the Republikaner, four theories are used, the Theory of Economic Interests, Social Disintegration Theory, Theory of Psychological Interests and finally a Theory on Protest Voting. In the study on the French voting for the corresponding party, the Front National, the researchers add one more theory, Kitschelt’s Welfare State Hypothesis, to the four theories from the study on the German situation (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002).

Through testing hypotheses set for each theory, Lubbers and Scheepers (2000) come to the conclusion that for the German case, based on the Theory of Economic Interests and in line with Realistic Conflict Theory, manual workers and persons with a lower educational level perceive immigrants as an ‘outgroup’ competing with them for limited resources, making these two categories more inclined to vote extreme right-wing. Lubbers and Scheepers find that both the
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\(^9\) The social categories are grouped by occupation, educational level, income, deprivation level, denomination, age, mobility and gender (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002).
experienced scarcity of resources in the present and the fear of a deprivation in the future have strong effects on the likelihood of voting extreme right-wing within these categories (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000). As for the results of their analysis based on the Social Disintegration Theory, in examining whether disintegrated groups are drawn to extreme right-wing parties, the researchers find that there is a higher proportion of non-religious people prone to voting for the Republikaner rather than for other parties. However, they come to the conclusion that it is not the expected search for a substitute for an absent integration in the church in the form of nationalism that is the cause of the likelihood for voting for the Republikaner, but rather non-conformism, individual freedom and rejection of compromises in politics. Further, according to the findings of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000), the Theory of Psychological Interests and its stressing of the importance of ‘law and order’ provides explanations to why manual workers and persons with a lower educational level are prone to voting extreme right-wing. However, the theory fails, according to the researchers, to correspondingly explain extreme right-wing voting for other groups, such as e.g. white collar workers. As to Protest Voting, Lubbers and Scheepers conclude that this theory, much for the same reasons as the theory of economic interests, i.e. perceived deprivation or fear of deprivation in the future, can explain why persons with a lower educational level would vote extreme right-wing. However, the researchers also find that no group would opt for the extreme right-wing based only on protest voting (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000).

Lubbers’ and Scheepers’ (2002) study on the French’s likelihood for voting for the Front National shows that all the tested theories are important to explain extreme right-wing voting behavior in France. The researchers conclude that Front National voters’ attitudes are more authoritarian, nonconformist and unfavorable towards out-groups than voters for other parties. They do not, however find a stronger correlation between nationalistic attitudes or political dissatisfaction within the group of voters for the Front National than within groups voting for other parties. Further, Lubbers and Scheepers find that social categories which contain larger and increasing numbers of immigrants, i.e. manual workers with routine tasks, are more unfavorable towards out-groups and also are more likely to vote extreme right-wing than other categories. They do not find any direct effect on voting behavior from unemployment. They do, however, find an indirect effect through the fact that unemployment causes unfavorable attitudes towards out-groups which in turn increases the likelihood for voting for the Front National. In their study on contextual circumstances, Lubbers and Scheepers find a direct correlation between the number of immigrants
in a region and the number of persons likely to vote for the extreme right-wing. Interestingly however, when studying the attitudes towards out-groups, they find that people living in regions with a high proportion of immigrants are not more unfavorable towards out-groups than people living in regions with lower number of immigrants. Lubbers and Scheepers describe this phenomenon as a paradox that needs further attention (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2002).

2.2 Choice of Theories

From the research debate above, two groups of theories looking at the issue from two quite different perspectives can be identified. The first group consists of theories explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior and negative attitudes towards immigration as a reaction to a perception of immigration as being a real or perceived economic threat, implying that the closer a person is to being affected by the perceived threat, the more likely he or she should be to vote extreme right-wing. The theories belonging to this group are *Competitive Threat* (Della Posta, 2013), *Economic Self-interest* (Fetzer, 2000), *Realistic Group Conflict Theory* (Filindra and Pearson-Merkowitz, 2013) and finally *Realistic Conflict Theory* together with *Theory of Economic Interests* (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002). The second group consists of theories stating that closeness to a minority/a marginalized group/an outgroup prevents right-wing voting and unfavorable attitudes towards immigrants through identification with the minority/marginalized group/outgroup. *Intergroup Contact Theory* (Della Posta, 2013) and *Theory of Marginality* (Fetzer, 2000) belong to this group.

This study will look into immigrant extreme right-wing voting behavior from the perspectives of the two groups of theories present in the existing research debate. As stated above, the theories of each group, although having been given different names, are quite similar in content. For the clarity of the study, however, one theory out of each group has been chosen: *Realistic Conflict Theory* (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002) and *Theory of Marginality* (Fetzer, 2000).

As the issue of the relation between ‘in-’ and ‘outgroups’ appears to be a key issue in explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior in the current debate, the present research will look into the issue of social identity and of identification with or refutation of the ‘outgroup’. For this
The present research will explore whether theories used in previous research on extreme right-wing voting behavior in general can also explain immigrant extreme right-wing behavior. Further, and based on the author’s identification of a possible research gap, theories that the author believes to be best suited to shed light on this identified gap will be used. As a result of this, theories based on different epistemological positions will be used in the analysis, for example, *Realistic Conflict Theory* (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000; 2002), which is drawn from previous research, represents a realistic epistemological position, whereas *Social Identity Theory* (Rodriguez, 2015), used to clarify the ‘in-’ and ‘outgroups’ relations in connection with extreme right-wing voting behavior, represents the social constructivist epistemological position of the author.

Below follows a brief description of, on the one hand, the two theories explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior from two different perspectives and on the other, the two theories to be used as the analytical framework in the analysis of the self-concept of immigrant extreme right-wing voters, i.e. this group’s social identity.

2.3 The Two Theories of Right-Wing Voting Behavior and of Attitudes towards Immigrants/Marginalized

2.3.1 Realistic Conflict Theory

The assumption of *Realistic Conflict Theory* is that competition over limited resources may cause conflict between groups of individuals and that outgroups are often perceived as threats and thus targeted in these conflicts. In the case of a worsened economic situation, the competition and conflicts would increase, especially where the threat emanating from the ‘outgroup’ consists of or is perceived as a real socio-economic threat to the own group. As the political discourse of extreme right-wing parties generally targets immigrants as an outgroup, directly or indirectly causing limited resources, the theory could explain on the one hand increased voting for extreme right-wing parties in general during times of economic difficulties and on the other, why manual workers and
persons with a lower educational level tend to be more likely to vote extreme right-wing than other socio-economic groups. This, as these two socio-economic groups could be expected to feel more threatened by immigration than other groups in society (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000).

2.3.2 Theory of Marginality

According to Joel S. Fetzer (2000), Theory of Marginality argues that “experiencing marginality or oppression oneself creates sympathy for other marginalised or oppressed groups, even if they do not belong to one’s own group.” (Fetzer, 2000, p.7). In other words, according to this theory, if the group of immigrants is defined as the ‘outgroup’, i.e. a marginalized group, identifying oneself with this group would create a sympathy for, rather than feeling threatened by, other members of this marginalized group.

2.4 Analytical Framework of Social Identity

2.4.1 Social Identity Theory

The purpose of Social Identity Theory is to “explain when and how individuals transform their group affiliations to secure a favorable self-concept” (Rodriguez, 2015, p.1). Thus, the concept of ‘self-esteem’ is central for this theory. The theory is based on the assumption, on the one hand, that every individual is driven by the aim to attain and to retain a positive self-image and on the other, that individuals naturally sort or group themselves as well as others into different categories based on occupation, cultural and/or religious background, political affiliations, etc. According to Social Identity Theory, this categorization creates ‘ingroups’ and ‘outgroups’, where the individual will identify him- or herself with the ‘ingroup’ and dissociate him- or herself from the ‘outgroup’. Further, the theory holds that a person belonging to one group, will inevitably compare this group to others, the purpose of the comparison being to settle the own group as being the superior one or at least to settle it as being the group that stands out in the comparison due to its positive characteristics. If through this comparison an individual comes to the conclusion that his or her group comes out as the superior one, belonging to this group will add positively to the self-esteem
and the individual’s group membership will become an important part of his or her self-image. However, if the comparison leads to the opposite, i.e. that the group comes out as the inferior one, the negative effects that this will have on the individual’s self-esteem will motivate the individual to change his or her group affiliation (Rodriguez, 2015).

2.4.2 Acculturation Theory

In current research, there are various theories aiming at explaining individuals’ reactions when cultures meet. Although surely each theory has a consistent use of its own definitions, when comparing theories, the use of terminology is far less consistent and the same term is often used for different or slightly different phenomena. The three concepts ‘acculturation’, ‘assimilation’ and ‘interculturation’ are examples of such terms that are sometimes synonymous, but in other cases refer to quite different phenomena (Berry, 1997). For clarity, in this study, one set of terminology from one of these theories, Acculturation Theory (Berry, 1997; 2005) has been chosen.

In his article Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation, the Canadian researcher in applied psychology John W. Berry (2005) defines ‘acculturation’ by citing the three researchers Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, who already in 1936 stated that “acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Berry, 2005, p701). The theory describes four acculturation strategies: assimilation, integration, separation/segregation and marginalization.

Assimilation strategy is used by an individual who has an interest in participating in the dominant culture and has no interest in keeping his or her original cultural identity. Integration occurs when an individual is interested in both maintaining his or her original cultural identity and in taking part in the dominant culture, the larger social network. Separation/segregation describes the strategy of a person who wishes to keep his or her original cultural identity and does not wish to participate in the dominant culture. Finally, marginalization occurs when a person has either little possibility or interest in either keeping the original cultural identity or in participating in the dominant culture (Berry, 1997).
2.4.3 Application of Theories

As stated above, the issue of in- or outgroup identification appears from the existing research debate to be a key issue in extreme right-wing voting behavior. Therefore Acculturation Theory (Berry, 1997; 2005) and Social Identity Theory (Rodriguez, 2015) will be used to analyze the ‘in-’ and ‘outgroup’ identification of on the one hand the interviewees participating in this research and on the other of the Swedish extreme right-wing party Sverigedemokraterna. The two theories Realistic Conflict Theory (Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000) and Theory of Marginality (Fetzer, 2000) will be used as lenses for the analysis of the motives behind the voting behavior.
3  Methodological Framework

The following section will present an overview of the methodological framework used in the present study. It will provide an insight in the study’s design, the procedures for data collection, analysis and interpretation, the limitations and delimitations of the study and finally the ethical considerations that have been made.

3.1 Design

Based on the current research debate, the research departs from the assumption that enhanced insight in the issue of extreme right-wing voting behavior of immigrants could add relevant data to the process of explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior in general. Further and still based on the current research debate, it parts from the assumption that an increased understanding of the social identification within the group of immigrants voting for extreme right-wing parties plays a key role in complementing the existing picture of the extreme right-wing voter.

John W. Creswell defines qualitative research as “[…,] an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2014, p.4). This research will study the motivation of immigrant extreme right-wing voters as well as their social identification, i.e. the individuals’ own perceptions of the issues. The purpose of the study is, as mentioned above, to complement the existing knowledge about extreme right-wing voting behavior. Consequently, the study will be conducted as a qualitative case study (Creswell, 2014). As such, it will be an interpretative study with explanatory elements (Mikkelsen, 2005). A quantitative element will also be included in the analysis of the collected data.

The research will follow an abductive approach. The interviewees’ perception of their own social identity will be analyzed through the lens of firstly, Acculturation Theory (Berry, 1997; 2005) with the purpose of understanding the individuals’ acculturation strategies and secondly, through the lens of Social Identity Theory (Rodriguez, 2015) with the purpose of acquiring the general understanding of the individuals’ identification in relation to ‘in’- and ‘outgroups’. The findings will then be analyzed through the lenses of, on the one hand, Realistic Conflict Theory
(Lubbers and Scheepers, 2000) and on the other, Theory of Marginality (Fetzer, 2000) in order to create an increased understanding of the motivations of immigrant extreme right-wing voters. The two theories are chosen in order to provide an understanding of the issue from two quite different perspectives.

3.2 Data Collection, Analysis and Interpretation

3.2.1 Collection of Data

The choice of immigrant voters for the Swedish extreme right-wing party Sverigedemokraterna as a case study for this research was mainly influenced by the fact that official statistics as well as earlier quantitative research conducted in Sweden had shown significant numbers of extreme right-wing voting immigrants in Sweden.

The primary data collection was conducted as a field study during which six in-depth semi-structured interviews were made with immigrants having voted for Sverigedemokraterna in the last election for the Swedish parliament. In addition to gathering general background information as to sex, age, country of origin, occupation etc. of the interviewees, the interviews were based on a total of 35 open-ended questions grouped into three categories. Further, the interviewees were encouraged to provide additional views or information. When searching for interviewees, the author strove to achieve diversity in the group as to country of origin, occupation and age as well as an approximate balance between men and women. Hence, the procedure for sampling was what Mikkelsen (2005) defines as purposive sampling. The technique used to reach the interviewees was that of snowball or chain sampling (Mikkelsen, 2005). As voting for an extreme right-wing political party is by many perceived as a quite sensitive issue, consequently very few persons openly announce this political affiliation. Therefore, snowball sampling turned out to be the most beneficial path to identify persons fitting the target group to ask for an interview. However, although all individuals were clearly informed that they would be guaranteed confidentiality, finding individuals that were willing to participate in an interview turned out to be a challenge due to this fear of being publically exposed as an extreme right-wing voter. Fear of
being stigmatized as a person voting for *Sverigedemokraterna* and risking to lose ones employment as a consequence was mentioned as a reason\(^{10}\).

In order to provide a broader perspective to the research, an interview with an immigrant having voted for *Sverigedemokraterna*, conducted by the anti-racist Swedish organization *Expo* (Poohl, 2007), was added to the in-depth interviews. The addition of the interview conducted by Expo (Poohl, 2007) to the research was primarily motivated by the inclusion of interview material conducted by a person other than the researcher, hence minimizing the possible effect of the researcher’s potential bias on the research result. This particular interview was chosen due to its similarity in questions asked in the in-depth interviews, hence facilitating the comparability between the in-depth interviews conducted by the author and the interview conducted by Expo (Poohl, 2007).

Three policy documents of *Sverigedemokraterna* were analyzed: I. the statement of principles of the party, *Sverigedemokraternas principiprogram 2011* (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011), II. the party’s policy on immigration, *Invandringspolitik* (Sverigedemokraterna, 2014a) and III. the party’s policy on economics, *Ekonomisk politik* (Sverigedemokraterna, 2014b). The three policy documents were chosen with the purpose of acquiring a broader understanding, and in particular an understanding from the perspective of the political party targeted in this research, of the relation immigrant – extreme right-wing politics. Finally, the results from earlier research presented in chapter two, were included as an important part of the research.

3.2.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The six in-depth interviews were recorded and transcribed into a total of 34396 words. Based on Creswell’s (2014) advice on coding and interpreting data in qualitative case studies, the transcribed interviews were firstly categorized according to the settings, i.e. country of origin, type of occupation, educational background, number of years in Sweden of the interviewees, political history, voting behavior of family and friends, etc. The transcribed material of the in-depth

\(^{10}\) Several interviewees described a fear of being stigmatized; that once you are publically known as a *Sverigedemokrat*, there is ‘no turning back’. Three of the interviewees also referred to knowing persons actually having lost their employments, due to their political affiliation with *Sverigedemokraterna*.  
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interviews and the interview done by Expo (Poohl, 2007) were then coded into main categories relevant for the research questions: ‘the interviewees’ political affiliation and their views on society today’ and ‘identity related findings’. The material was then coded into subcategories which will each be presented in a separate subchapter in chapter four. Based on the coded material, themes were identified. An analysis of the usage of inclusive or exclusive language for Swedish/Swede(s) or immigrant(s) was then done based on the transcribed in-depth interviews. This was done through counting the total number of times the pronouns ‘we’, ‘one’ and ‘they’ were used by the interviewees to denominate Swedish/Swede(s) or immigrant(s). Finally, the policy texts (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011; 2014a; 2014b) were coded under the two categories ‘policy related to immigration’ and ‘the party’s views on national identity’.

3.2.3 Limitations and Delimitations

Exposing extreme right-wing voting can be a sensitive issue in general and for individuals with an immigrant background it is likely that the issue of exposing extreme right-wing voting could be even more of a sensitive issue, as the social status and not the least the situation on the labor market might be or could at least be experienced as being negatively affected by an exposure of such a political affiliation. This fear of exposure experienced by the target group of the research limited the interview data collection of this study. Firstly, the actual identification of immigrant extreme right-wing voters was hindered by this fear of exposure. Secondly, even when identified, only approximately one third of the persons contacted were willing to participate in an interview. Thus, despite the efforts in finding persons willing to participate, the given timeframe of the present research only permitted to reach six persons who accepted and participated in interviews. However, by using primary data, secondary data, opting for long in-depth interviews with the interviewees and by including earlier research results into the study, the reliability of the research has been secured.

The study is a qualitative case study on immigrant extreme right-wing voting in the Swedish context. Hence, it does not aim at providing answers to extreme right-wing voting behavior in general. It does, however, aim at providing results that might contribute to further research in the area.
3.3 Ethical Considerations

Exposure of extreme right-wing voting could be a sensitive issue for all extreme right-wing voters, but probably even more sensitive for the targeted group in this study: extreme right-wing voters of an immigrant background. Therefore, it was of outmost importance that all the interviewees were ensured confidentiality. However, as stated above, ensuring confidentiality turned out not to be sufficiently convincing for a substantial number of individuals fitting the description of the target group, as they declined to participate in an interview, by fear of losing their employments or by fear of being stigmatized. Several of the persons that did participate in the interviews described a situation where, once it becomes publically known that you are a person voting for Sverigedemokraterna, there is “no turning back”. They also described having heard of persons that had actually lost their jobs because of their political affiliation with Sverigedemokraterna.

When conducting face-to-face interviews, there is always a risk that bias of the researcher influences the responses. In order to limit this effect, the interviews were conducted with predetermined open-ended questions rather than through the use of an interview guide with issues and topics to be covered (Mikkelsen, 2005). This was done in order to limit the influence of the researcher’s personal reactions to responses from the interviewees on the continuing interview. Further, interview material from the Swedish anti-racist organization Expo (Poohl, 2007) was added to the research.
4 Findings

4.1 Interviews

The findings from the interviews, both the in-depth interviews made by the author and the interview made by Expo (Poohl, 2007), were gathered into three main categories: I the interviewees’ background, presented in section 4.1.1, II issues related to the interviewees’ political affiliation and to their views on society today, presented in sections 4.1.2 – 4.1.5 and finally, III identity related issues, presented in sections 4.1.6 – 4.1.9.

4.1.1 Interviewees’ Background

The persons who participated in the in-depth interviews conducted by the author were born in/have origins from: Finland, Iceland, Iran, Russia, Poland and Serbia. All hold Swedish citizenships. Four of the interviewees hold double citizenships. One, the Icelandic interviewee, however points out that his double citizenship is due to the fact that one cannot lose the Icelandic citizenship. The interviewee with Serbian background, who for the moment only holds a Swedish citizenship, points out that she had lost her Yugoslavian citizenship during the war, but has, partly for patriotic reasons, reapplied for a Serbian citizenship, which is about to enter into force in the very near future. The interviewees are aged between 33 and 51 years. The number of years spent in Sweden vary from 15 to 48. Three of the interviewees are female, three male. Out of the six interviewees, four hold university degrees, two work as officials in politics, one in public administration, one as a clerk, one as manager in the private sector and finally one is a student. The person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007) was born in Greece. At the time of the interview he was 71 years old and had then spent 45 years in Sweden. Before retiring, he was a manual worker.

11 Although a very small sample, the country representation of the interviewees corresponds fairly well with the country representation in total among Swedish immigrants. In terms of the overall picture of immigration, Sweden was in 2014 the country within Europe that received the highest number of asylum applicants relative to its population (Eurostat, 2015). However, the most common country of origin among immigrants in Sweden is Finland. Further, 50 percent of people living in Sweden but born outside of the country originate from a European country (Migrationsinfo.se, 2015).
As to earlier voting behavior and voting behavior of friends and family, out of the persons interviewed by the author of this paper, four voted for other conservative parties before voting for Sverigedemokraterna, one did not vote earlier due to the fact that she could not find any party that corresponded to her opinions and values and finally one earlier voted for Socialdemokraterna (the Social Democrats). This interviewee, however points out that the sole reason for this was that joining Socialdemokraterna was, in the area where he lived at the time, the only way to become active within politics. He emphasizes that he has always been conservative. When asked about the voting behavior of friends and family, one interviewee, the woman with Serbian origins, gives a homogenous picture where the entire family, i.e. including the parents born in Serbia, votes for Sverigedemokraterna. The interviewee from Iran gives the more general response that family and friends vote conservative. Two of the interviewees answer that there are probably persons in their surrounding voting for Sverigedemokraterna, but that voting for this party is something that people are afraid of bringing out in the open as revealing such a political affiliation might cause you to lose your job. Two of the interviewees describe a situation where family members disapprove or strongly disapprove of their choice of political affiliation. However, this information is, from both interviewees, given in the sense that they seem satisfied with the fact that so few disapprove rather than bringing the issue up as a problem.

As regards to with which groups of people, Swedish persons, persons from the country of origin or persons from several countries, the interviewees generally socialize with, five of the interviewees state that they socialize with persons from several countries. One interviewee states that she mainly socializes with Swedes and with persons from the country of origin.

The following four sections will present findings related to the interviewees’ political affiliation and to their views on society today.

4.1.2 Interviewees’ Views on the Politics of Sverigedemokraterna

One aspect is frequently brought forward and brought forward by all interviewees, including the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007), as a positive aspect of Sverigedemokraterna. It relates to the size of Sweden as a country in relation to the size of its immigration and that Sverigedemokraterna has realized a problem that the other parties have failed to identify or
neglected. Examples of statements by the interviewees supporting this view are: “[…] one (Sverigedemokraterna) prioritizes its own people […] We cannot be the world’s social welfare office, but we must also look out for our own” (Interviewee No. 2, annex 3)\textsuperscript{12}, “One (Sverigedemokraterna) has an immigration policy that is adapted to the size of Sweden” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3), “It goes without saying that if one takes in too much in too short a time, it will not work” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3), “We can’t have that many coming, so that's the positive thing about our immigration policies that we (Sverigedemokraterna) want to do something about it.” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3), “One should think of introducing a preliminary stop and look into how many one should take in, in order to take care of its own and to be able to take care of those that already arrived” (Interviewee No. 6, annex 3), “The question is whether we don’t overuse our resources ending up in things getting wrong for everyone” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3), “The current immigration politics create problems. Sverigedemokraterna wants to prevent these problems” (Interviewee No. 4, annex 3).

Another frequently mentioned aspect, highlighted by all but one interviewee, also in this case, including the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007), relates to Sverigedemokraterna as seeing the truth and daring to bringing it out in the open. The following statements are examples of interviewees’ support for this view: “Sverigedemokraterna offered a new perspective of the reality” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3), “Sverigedemokraterna permits to speak openly, especially about immigration” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3), “Sverigedemokraterna sees the truth in what is going on” (Interviewee No. 4, annex 3), “SD\textsuperscript{13} politicians don’t talk like politicians. They give answers, they stand up for what they believe in and don’t adapt to what is politically correct” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3), “Sverigedemokraterna dares to take on and highlight certain issues that others might see, but don’t dare to take on for different reasons” (Interviewee No. 6, annex 3).

Four of the interviewees refer to that the party stands for core values and ideas that correspond to the ones of the interviewees as a strong motivator for their choice of political affiliation.

\textsuperscript{12} The interviews were conducted in Swedish. All quotations are translated by the author. In order to respect the confidentiality of the interviewees, the full transcribed material in Swedish cannot be published.

\textsuperscript{13} Sverigedemokraterna
Other aspects that are mentioned by two interviewees respectively as aspects motivating their choice to vote for *Sverigedemokraterna* were wanting to cast a vote for a conservative party and *Sverigedemokraterna* offering fellowship and solidarity.

Finally, one of the interviewees refer to *one specific issue*, the issue of abortion, as the determining issue motivating his choice to vote for *Sverigedemokraterna*.

### 4.1.3 Society’s Responsibility and Immigrants’ Responsibilities

There is less unanimity in the responses within this subject than than in the responses presented above. As to society’s responsibility the opinions are quite evenly distributed. Two of the interviewees state that society should *give people who come an honest chance to create a life in Sweden*, to get a job, a place to live, learn the language etc. Two state that society should make/have the right to *make more demands on people coming*, at least on those that plan on staying permanently. These demands would include learning the language, making yourself available on the Swedish labor market, accepting how things are done in Sweden etc. Two respond that society’s responsibility towards immigrants *does not differ from responsibilities related to any other group* in society.

As to immigrants’ responsibility towards society half of the interviewees state that *immigrants should make efforts to become part of the society*. Also in relation to immigrants’ responsibilities, two interviewees state that this responsibility *does not differ from responsibilities of any other group* in society. Finally, one interviewee states that *immigrants should show some gratitude for having been given the possibility to come* to Sweden.

### 4.1.4 Challenges to Our Society

Both when asked specifically about the challenges that our society is facing today and when asked other questions, such as for example aspects of *Sverigedemokraterna* that influenced the choice of political affiliation, the interviewees list a number of problems that, in their view, society needs to deal with. The most frequently stated problem is that *our society is in need of a structural change*, that it is on its way of ruining itself and that it needs to take a grip on itself. One of the interviewees explains this as “The largest problem in Sweden today is the fragmentation of society. Society is
falling apart. We are losing the core values that one has had for generations […]” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3). The second most frequent problem brought up is, according to these interviewees, the today badly functioning integration of immigrants in our society, explained by one interviewee as “One wants to open up the country without preparing it and this will create a deterioration into a slum” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3) and by another as “Immigrants that come are forced to live in ghettos” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3). The same interviewee states that “We import a lot of people that haven’t even gone through nine years of schooling” and means that this impairs the possibility of a successful integration. This identified problem is as to its frequency in appearance in the interviews closely followed by the problem of increased costs for immigration, leading to an unfair resource distribution. One of the interviewees develops this thought and stats that “Nobody seems to know how to handle a situation like this. There will be more racism in society, because the one who doesn’t know so much about this will of course blame it on the immigrants, instead of blaming it on the politicians who have created this situation” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3). The interviewees also emphasize that politicians and not the immigrants themselves are to be blamed for the problems related to immigration. The fourth most important problem area judged by its frequency in appearance is problems within education, health care, elderly care as well as problems with criminality and unemployment. This problem is generally brought forward in quite straight forward manners, such as, the following example stated by one interviewee: “Apart from the increasing criminality, Sweden’s largest challenges are within elderly care, health care and education” (Interviewee No. 6, annex 3). Another stated that “The elderly are suffering” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3) and yet another one that “We have elderly that don’t have enough to eat” (Interviewee No. 4, annex 3). Finally, three problem areas are mentioned by only one interviewee each. These areas are that we can expect larger groups of refugees in the future, due not only to wars, but to the climate crisis, that our society provides too many allowances and that the salary differences are too small and finally that Sweden is on its way of being Islamized.

With regard to which groups of society are the most exposed to the problems society is facing, the most frequent answer is the elderly and the children. However, one interviewee also mentions women wearing burqas or niqab as the potentially most exposed group as they “probably have lots of eyes on them” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3).
As to challenges for Europe and for the world, the problems brought forward by the interviewees are quite diverse. Only one problem, the fact that Europe is facing similar problems with immigration as Sweden is mentioned by two of the interviewees. All other problems brought up: power is transferred further away from the people in Europe, financial crisis, problems related to liberalization, fear of an upcoming war with Russia, problems related to IS, to Boku Haram, to globalization, climate crisis and finally that hunger remains a problem in the world, are all mentioned by one interviewee only.

4.1.5 Solutions to Our Society’s Problems

In contrast to the view of the most important problems in Europe and in the world, the interviewees’ view of the solutions needed to resolve the problems of our society are quite homogenous. All interviewees, including the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007), refer to a temporary stop to or a decrease in immigration as a necessary or possible measure for our society to overcome its problems. Examples of how the interviewees express this point of view are: “We have to stop at the moment. Cut down to 90 %” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3), “The first thing to do is to put a break on the intake of immigrants” (Interviewee No. 2, annex 3), “One could start by decreasing immigration” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3), “We need to close the borders” (Interviewee No. 4, annex 3), “We could cut down the number of immigrants and send the others to other countries” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3) and “It might be the moment to think about how many one should take in” (Interviewee No. 6, annex 3).

The second most frequent solution referred to and highlighted by three of the interviewees as well as by the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007) is closely related to the solution referred to above, namely that society should take care of the people that are already in Sweden, regardless whether these people were born in Sweden or not. The third possible solution referred to is to take in more homogenous groups of immigrants. One of the interviewees presents this as “The best integration model would probably be to have fairly homogenous groups coming” (Interviewee No. 5, annex 3). Another refers to another Scandinavian country which, according to the interviewee, chooses immigrants with higher education or that are craftsmen in order to facilitate the integration process.
Finally, three possible solutions are mentioned by one interviewee each: to help people in their home regions, to create an open debate climate and to look over the whole system.

The following four sections will present identity related findings from the interviews.

4.1.6 Who is a Swede?

When asked to define who can be categorized as a ‘Swede’, who can be considered as ‘Swedish’, four of the interviewees describe ‘Swedishness’ as something that comes from each person’s perceptions of him- or herself, that everyone who wants to become Swedish, can become Swedish and that he/she who feels Swedish is Swedish. Some examples that illustrate this line of thought of the interviewees are “If you want to become a part of the Swedish society, if you see yourself as Swedish, you are Swedish” (Interviewee No. 1, annex 3), “Everyone who wants to become Swedish, can become Swedish. It’s about wanting to be part of society” (Interviewee No. 2, annex 3), “It’s up to each person to decide upon his or her identity” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3) and “You are Swedish when you feel Swedish” (Interviewee No. 6, annex 3).

One of the interviewees has the opinion that someone who is born in Sweden is Swedish, but that it is “a personal issue” (Interviewee No. 4, annex 3).

Finally, one of the interviewees states that you are Swedish when the Swedish language, history, sports’ achievements etc. mean more to you than the equivalent of any other country.

4.1.7 Who is an Immigrant?

As to the matter of defining who is an immigrant, three of the interviewees give a simple and clear answer, that a person who has moved from one country to another is an immigrant. However, when going deeper into the subject, a reaction among four of the interviewees is that the effort of defining this concept is either useless or problematic. Examples of statements, made by the interviewees that illustrate this point of view are: “How one chooses to define oneself is not important […] I don’t feel any need to define it as a particular group, it's not a special group. It can be anyone”
(Interviewee No. 2, annex 3), “Politicians shouldn’t give people different identities [...] some people are disturbed by this concept [...] Immigrant is a rather bad concept, since it allows people to not adapt to society by coming up with the excuse that they are immigrants” (Interviewee No. 3, annex 3). Closely related to the view of ‘immigrant’ as being a useless or problematic concept, was the view of two of the interviewees, that one cannot define ‘immigrants’ as one group, that immigrants are in fact several groups. Examples of statements from the interviewees supporting this point of view are: “Immigrants can certainly be divided into different groups [...] But, there are various categories of immigrants. You could take the Nordic immigrants, Norway, Denmark, Finland, which is from the outside a relatively homogeneous group, at least in the view of other immigrants [...] but per definition, they are as much immigrants as I. Then you have the European immigrants who may be divided into Western and Eastern Europe, which also has a certain hierarchy” (interviewee No. 5, annex 3), “It becomes something like three blocks here. There are Swedes, then there are Christians, then there are Muslims. There is one country and there will be three blocks in this country” (interviewee No. 4, annex 3) and “I do not think one can define the group of immigrants as a group. It is very heterogeneous” (interviewee No. 5, annex 3).

Finally, two of the interviewees present the point of view that being an immigrant or not, is something that should be decided by the person him- or herself.

4.1.8 Swedish, ‘Home Country-ish’ or Both

The interviewees’ own perception of being Swedish, ‘home country-ish’, i.e. Finnish, Iranian, Polish etc. or both is evenly distributed among the interviewees of the in-depth interviews. Two, the interviewees with origins in Iceland and in Iran, feel mostly Swedish. Two of the interviewees feel mostly or entirely ‘home country-ish’, the interviewee with origins in Russia and the interviewee with origins in Poland. This interviewee expresses feeling completely Polish, a fact that appears important for this interviewee to communicate. The final two of the interviewees, with origins in Finland and in Serbia feel equally Finnish/Serbian and Swedish. Not surprisingly, the interviewee from Island, a Nordic country expectedly close to Sweden in culture, values and norms, is one of the two persons feeling mostly Swedish, but worth noting is that neither the interviewee with origins in Finland, nor the interviewee born in Sweden with Serbian origin feel Swedish or
mostly Swedish, but both Finnish/Serbian and Swedish. The person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007) expresses feeling both Greek and Swedish. All interviewees regard themselves as immigrants, partly immigrants or as persons with an immigrant background.

As to whether the interviewees experience being considered as immigrants or Swedish by the surrounding society, three of the interviewees express being perceived as immigrants, two of them referring to their accents when speaking Swedish as a ‘give-away’. However two of these interviewees also state that they experience being perceived as more Swedish than what they really are by some groups in society. Two of the interviewees express being perceived as Swedish by the surrounding society, one of which expresses dissatisfaction with this fact. This is due to the fact that this person feels more ‘home country-ish’ than Swedish himself. Conversely, one of the two interviewees expressing feeling mostly Swedish themselves, claims to be perceived as an immigrant by the surrounding. Hence, only one interviewee experiences feeling mostly Swedish as well as being perceived as Swedish by the surrounding society. Finally, one interviewee expresses not being sure of the perception of society in this regard.

4.1.9 Integrated or Assimilated

As regards to the interviewees’ view of themselves as being assimilated or integrated, four of the interviewees, the interviewees with origins in Finland, Iceland, Iran and Poland believe to have fully assimilated into the Swedish society. The interviewee with origins in Russia believes to have started an assimilation process. Finally, the interviewee with origins in Serbia hopes to be assimilated, but rather uses the term ‘integrated’ as “[...] assimilated might be an expression that gives a somewhat negative connotation, that you erase your own background or your own identity”. This interviewee further clarified the relevance in using the latter term by pointing out a belonging to a different church than the Swedish and by the usage of a different language at home than Swedish. Also the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007) describes himself as being integrated.

Apart from the definition provided above by the interviewee with origins in Serbia, two other interviewees volunteer definitions of the concept assimilation. One interviewee defines assimilation as adapting to the customs of the country that you arrive to, absolutely not to erase
your identity. Another defines being assimilated as not having a completely different culture that clashes with the Swedish culture and the Swedish society.

Related to the perceived degree of assimilation of the interviewees are statements pronounced during the interviews indicating the interviewees’ successful adaptation to the Swedish society. One interviewee declares paying taxes, working, behaving appropriately and not misbehaving. Another expresses taking pride in having the bills payed on time. A third interviewee illustrates belonging to a group of immigrants with better conditions that “[…] in principle came with resources”.

4.2 Inclusive or Exclusive Language in Relation to Swede/Swedish and to Immigrant

From the in total 34396 words of transcribed material from the in-depth interviews an analysis was made to determine whether the interviewees use an inclusive or exclusive language when talking about Swedes/Swedish and immigrants. Three pronouns, ‘we’, ‘one’ and ‘they’ and their respective denotation, Swedes/Swedish or immigrant, were counted.

The four charts below (figure 1) show the result of the interviewee group as a whole and illustrate: I the relation between the usage of the pronouns ‘we’, ‘one’ and ‘they’ as denominations for Swedish/Swede(s), II the relation between the usage of the pronouns ‘we, ‘one’ and ‘they’ as denominations for immigrant(s), III the number of times the pronoun ‘we’ is used for Swedish/Swede(s) in relation to immigrant(s) and finally VI the number of times the pronoun ‘they’ is used for Swedish/Swede(s) in relation to immigrant(s).
Figure 1: Inclusive or Exclusive Language Usage in Total from Interviews

As seen in figure 1:I, there is an almost equal usage of the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘one’ among the interviewees as denomination for Swedish/Swede(s). When looking at the usage of the more neutral ‘one’ in its context, it appears frequently to be used with the purpose of avoiding an identification as either ‘we’ or ‘they’, but also often to talk about Swedes, in particular non Sverigedemokrat politicians, who have taken decisions, according to the interviewees, not favorable for the Swedish society. As to the choice of pronoun to denominate ‘immigrant(s), there is a clear domination of ‘they’, followed in frequency by ‘one’, here almost exclusively appearing to be used in order to avoid identification as either ‘we’ or ‘they’. ‘We’ as pronoun for ‘immigrant(s) is twice as frequent as ‘they’ for ‘Swedish/Swede(s).

As regards the relation between the usage of ‘we’ or ‘them’ (figures 1:III and 1:IV) to denominate ‘Swedish/Swede(s), i.e. when removing the neutral ‘one’ from the analysis, there is a clear domination of ‘we’ with 89% of the cases. The situation is substantially the reverse regarding the usage of ‘we’ or ‘them’ to denominate ‘immigrant(s), where ‘they’ is used in 80% of the cases and ‘we’ in 20%.
When looking at the usage on an individual level, one can see a pattern where there is a generally somewhat higher identification with ‘Swedish/Swede(s)’ in the language usage of the interviewees from Iran, Iceland and Finland and a slightly lower in the group consisting of the interviewees from Russia, Poland and Serbia. The table below (table 1) shows the results per interviewee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen pronoun for Swedish/Swedes per interviewee in percent of total during interview</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>They</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen pronoun for immigrant(s) per interviewee in percent of total during interview</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>They</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'We’ when talking about Swedes or immigrants per interviewee in percent of total during interview</th>
<th>'We’ about Swedes</th>
<th>'We’ about immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'They’ when talking about Swedes or immigrants per interviewee in percent of total during interview</th>
<th>'They’ about Swedes</th>
<th>'They’ about immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Inclusive or Exclusive Language Usage per Interviewee
4.3  Sverigedemokraterna’s Views on Immigration and National Identity

In order to answer the research question concerning how extreme right-wing voting immigrants identify themselves in relation to the ‘outgroup’ identified by the extreme right-wing political party, the perspective of Sverigedemokraterna on immigration and on national identity was taken into the research. Data was collected from policy documents gathered from the party’s official website (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011; 2014a; 2014b). The findings are presented below in two sections, the first one covering Sverigedemokraterna’s policy related to immigration and the second covering the party’s views on national identity.

4.3.1  Policy Related to Immigration

In their policy on immigration and in their Principiprogram (Program of Principles, my translation), (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, 2014a), Sverigedemokraterna advocates that Sweden should limit the number of refugees received in the country and that the country should allocate temporary residence permits to refugees in favor of permanent permits in order to facilitate a quick return to the country of origin once the situation there has calmed down. One also argues that by limiting the number of refugees received in Sweden and shifting focus from reception of refugees in Sweden to aid given to regions neighboring the refugees’ countries of origin, one will be able to both aid a larger number of refugees and increase welfare in Sweden. Further the party declares that the limited immigration should hold in particular for immigration from distant countries. They highlight that large numbers of immigrants, defined by Sverigedemokraterna as “mass immigration” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.17, translation of the author) threaten Sweden’s economic and social welfare.

“[…] the effect of mass immigration from distant countries is strongly negative both economically and socially.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.17, translation of the author)

Sverigedemokraterna’s economic policy also refers to immigration by arguing that a cultural diversity in a country has a negative impact on the country’s economic growth.

“Great cultural and demographic changes within a state will affect all aspects of the economy and the ability to create growth. Social capital is both the economy’s base and its lubricant. A
responsible economic policy must therefore be geared to, in long-term, preserve and strengthen a high level of social capital.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2014b, translation of the author)

4.3.2 National Identity

The motive of Sverigedemokraterna for limiting immigration and in particular limiting immigration from distant countries is for the country not to jeopardize its national identity. The party’s policy documents present numerous examples of how it is important to limit immigration in order to preserve the national identity. The following three citations illustrate this standpoint of the party:

“Sverigedemokraterna advocates a long-term responsibility and limited immigration, in particular from countries where the culture and the core values strongly deviate from the Swedish.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.12, translation of the author)

“The more an immigrant’s original identity and culture differs from the one of the Swedish nation and the larger the group of immigrants is, the more difficult the assimilation process becomes.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.12, translation of the author)

“[… ] immigration must be kept at such a level, and be of such a character that it does not pose a threat to our nation’s identity and to our country’s welfare and security.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.17, translation of the author)

However, the party accepts a limited number of persons who do not perceive themselves as being Swedish, as long as these persons live according to Swedish laws, norms and traditions, i.e. persons that are not assimilated, but integrated into society. The party states that it accepts:

“[… ] that there will always be a certain percentage of citizens who do not perceive themselves as Swedish.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.12, translation of the author)

and sees

“[… ] no major problem with that as long as this group is limited, accepts Swedish laws, norms and traditions and does not contribute to increased segregation and antagonism.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.12, translation of the author)
As to who Sverigedemokraterna regard as assimilated into the Swedish nation, the party provides the following definition:

“[…] the person who talks fluent Swedish, considers him- or herself to be Swedish, lives according to the Swedish culture, sees Swedish history as his or her own and feels a stronger loyalty with the Swedish nation than with any other nation.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.11, translation of the author)
5 Analysis

In order to answer the research questions presented in chapter 1, the findings were analyzed in two main steps: 1. Analysis regarding identity issues, 2. Analysis regarding voting behavior. For each step of the analysis, two theories were used, for the first step, Acculturation Theory and Social Identity Theory and for the second step, Realistic Conflict Theory and Theory of Marginality. The following four sections will present the analysis as a whole, starting with the analysis through Acculturation Theory.

5.1 Analysis through Acculturation Theory

In this section, the interviewees’ strategies in dealing with the meeting between the culture of their country of origin and the Swedish culture will be analyzed. The definitions chosen for this analysis are the definitions given by John W. Berry (1997) in his Acculturation Theory. The analysis of the interviewees’ acculturation strategies will then be compared with Sverigedemokraterna’s view on the level of acculturation required for a person to call him- or herself part of the Swedish nation.

5.1.1 Interviewees’ Acculturation Strategies

Four of the interviewees state during the interviews that they are fully assimilated into the Swedish society and one states being on the way of becoming assimilated. However, all but one of the interviewees show a clear interest in keeping their original cultural identity as well as being fully functioning in the Swedish society. As Berry’s (1997) definition for the concept assimilation includes having no interest in keeping the original cultural identity, according to this definition only one of the interviewees is assimilated in the Swedish society.

Interestingly, the only interviewee from the in-depth interviews conducted by the author who claims not to be assimilated, but integrated is the interviewee whose parents moved to Sweden. The interviewee motivates this by stating to be part of the Swedish society, but not wanting to give up the culture of the country of origin. The person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007) also claims to be integrated and refers to the same motivation. All interviewees either work
or study in Sweden, they speak Swedish, although three of them with accents, and they socialize with Swedes. Some are married to Swedes. They all highlight the importance of becoming part of the society of the receiving country. When being asked about immigrants’ responsibilities towards society, the most frequent answer is indeed that immigrants should try to become part of society. If applying Berry’s (1997) definition of integration, stating that the concept describes the situation where a person is interested in both keeping his or her original cultural identity and in taking part in the dominant culture, it is safe to say that all interviewees except the assimilated interviewee are integrated into the Swedish society.

Berry (1997) also talks about separation/segregation as an acculturation strategy. This strategy that implies that a person wishes to keep his or her original cultural identity, but does not wish to take part in the dominant culture, does not appear at any point within the interviews as a chosen strategy by the interviewees themselves. However, it appears frequently as a disapproved strategy by the interviewees when talking about immigrants and immigration. References to a badly functioning integration in Sweden, to a society that should demand that immigrants make efforts to learn the language and adapt to the Swedish culture, to the advantage of taking in more homogenous groups, in order to facilitate integration, are examples of this. In other words, assimilation and integration are seen as positive strategies by the interviewees, separation/segregation as negative.

The fourth acculturation strategy mentioned by Berry (1997), marginalization, meaning that a person cannot or does not wish to keep either the original cultural identity or to take part in the dominant culture, does not appear at any point in the interviews.

5.1.2 Interviewees’ Acculturation Strategies in Relation to the Acculturation Requirements of Sverigedemokraterna

The definition of assimilation of Sverigedemokraterna of who is assimilated into the Swedish nation corresponds fairly well to Berry’s (2007) definition of assimilation. When looking at the three first requirements of Sverigedemokraterna in order for a person to call him- or herself assimilated; speaking fluent Swedish, considering oneself to be Swedish and living according to the Swedish culture, all interviewees correspond to the first requirement of speaking the language,
although three with an accent. When it comes to considering oneself Swedish, if what is meant by this by *Sverigedemokraterna* is considering oneself being exclusively Swedish, only two of the interviewees meet the requirement. As to living according to the Swedish culture, if *Sverigedemokraterna*’s meaning of this is functioning in the Swedish society, all interviewees qualify. However, when it comes to the final requirement, that in order to be assimilated, a person should see “[..], Swedish history as his or her own […]” and feel “[…] a stronger loyalty with the Swedish nation than with any other nation.” (Sverigedemokraterna, 2011, p.11, translation of the author), only one of the interviewees qualifies. This for the same reason as when analyzing through the definition of Berry (1997) as Berry’s ‘no interest in keeping the original cultural identity’ corresponds to this final criteria of *Sverigedemokraterna*.

5.2 Analysis through Social Identity Theory

As mentioned in chapter 2.4.1, the purpose of *Social Identity Theory* is to “explain when and how individuals transform their group affiliations to secure a favorable self-concept” (Rodriguez, 2015, p.1). This section will look into with which group or groups, if any, the interviewees identify themselves as well as with which group or groups, if any, they dissociate themselves. Based on *Social Identity Theory*, the definition of the group/groups with which a person identifies him- or herself will be ‘ingroup’ and the group/groups with which a person dissociates him- or herself will be ‘outgroup’. It will further look into the ‘ingroup’ and ‘outgroup’ perspective of Sverigedemokraterna and analyze whether this perspective corresponds to the perspective of the interviewees.

5.2.1 Ingroup and Outgroup from the Perspective of the Interviewees

From the search through the transcribed data from the in-depth interviews with the purpose of determining whether the interviewees use an inclusive or exclusive language when referring to Swedish/Swede(s) and to immigrant(s), it is clear that an inclusive language in favor of Swedish/Swede(s) and an exclusive, or by using the terminology of *Social Identity Theory*, a dissociative language dominates when referring to immigrants. When looking at the relation
between the usage of ‘we’ for Swedish/Swedes and for immigrants, one can see that in 89% of the times that the interviewees talk about Swedish or Swedes, the pronoun ‘we’ is used. Consequently, in 11% of the times, ‘we’ is used for talking about immigrants. When looking at the relation between the usage of ‘they’ for Swedish/Swedes and for immigrants, the balance is nearly the opposite with ‘them’ being used only 20% of the times for Swedish/Swedes and 80% for immigrants.

The findings from the analysis of inclusive or exclusive language in relation to Swedish/Swede(s) and to immigrants corresponds with the collected data based on the interviewees’ own perceptions with the only slightly contradicting fact that a couple of the interviewees seem to identify themselves somewhat less with Swedish/Swedes than what the language analysis shows. However, all interviewees emphasize the importance of being part of the Swedish society and are themselves convinced to have accomplished this successful adaptation. All interviewees bring forward that, in their view, Sverigedemokraterna’s politics on immigration is adapted to the present size of Sweden’s population and that the party wants to ‘take care of its own’. The fact that the interviewees bring this forward as a positive and attractive aspect of the politics of Sverigedemokraterna indicates that the interviewees include themselves in the party’s ‘own’ that are ‘taken care of’. Using the terminology of Social Identity Theory, the findings suggest that the ‘ingroup’ that the interviewees identify themselves with is the group of integrated/assimilated immigrants, part of the ‘ingroup’ consisting of all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society.

In different ways and at some point of each interview, the interviewees all identify new immigrants, and in some cases in particular new immigrants from distant cultures, as a problem. They all also emphasize that the responsibility for creating the problem does not rest upon the individuals that come, but that when large new groups of immigrants and in particular large groups of immigrants from distant cultures are taken in to the country, it becomes impossible for these people to become part of society. Consequently, society will contain a segregated group, unable to assimilate or even to integrate into society, very much unlike the above mentioned integrated group of immigrants. Based on the findings, and using the terminology of Social Identity Theory, this group of new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society can be identified as the ‘outgroup’ dissociated from the group of all persons functioning in the Swedish society.
The division itself of the group of ‘immigrants’ into more than one homogenous group is also supported in the interviews through the fact that interviewees on the one hand find the concept ‘immigrant’ as being useless or problematic and on the other pointed out that ‘immigrants’ is not one group, but many.

5.2.2 Ingroup and Outgroup Perception of Sverigedemokraterna in Relation to the Perception of the Interviewees

Being a nationalist party, the obvious delimitation of Social Identity Theory’s ‘ingroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna is the Swedish nation. The perception of this ‘ingroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna is similar to the ‘ingroup’ perception of the interviewees in the sense that it does not exclude immigrants per se. For Sverigedemokraterna you are part of the Swedish nation if you are born into it or if you have chosen to become part of it, if you have chosen to assimilate into the Swedish nation. By being assimilated into the Swedish nation, Sverigedemokraterna mean speaking fluent Swedish, considering oneself to be Swedish, living according to the Swedish culture, seeing Swedish history as one’s own and feeling a stronger loyalty with the Swedish nation than with any other nation. As was seen from the analysis through Acculturation Theory (Berry, 1997) above, only one of the interviewees matches the requirement for being regarded as assimilated into the Swedish nation by Sverigedemokraterna, hence only this one interviewee can be regarded as an obvious member of the ‘ingroup’ identified by the party. However, Sverigedemokraterna open a window also for integrated, i.e. not assimilated persons into the ‘ingroup’ the Swedish nation as they state that this category of inhabitants can be accepted into the Swedish nation, provided that the group is limited in size. Through identification with this limited group of integrated persons, all interviewees can be included in the perceived ‘ingroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna.

The policy documents of Sverigedemokraterna (Sverigedemokraterna 2011; 2014a; 2014b) show an emphasis on the danger of the threat to the Swedish national identity. Hence, persons in Sweden or entering Sweden that do not hold a Swedish national identity, i.e. that are not assimilated to the Swedish nation, appear from the documents to consist of the most important part of the party’s identified ‘outgroup’.
The ‘outgroup’ perceived by the interviewees, i.e. the group of new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society, hence differs somewhat from the ‘outgroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna, who include all persons that are not assimilated into the Swedish nation into their ‘outgroup’. In other words, in contrast to Sverigedemokraterna, the interviewees do not include integrated persons, persons who function in the Swedish society, but want to keep their original national identity into their ‘outgroup’.

5.3 Analysis through Realist Conflict Theory

According to the research of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002) on French and German extreme right-wing voting, the two authors come to the conclusion that Realistic Conflict Theory can explain extreme right-wing voting behavior. However, the explanation of the two researchers lies within the group of extreme right-wing voters experiencing a threat from the perceived ‘outgroup’ immigrants. In the following sections, it will be analyzed whether extreme right-wing voting behavior of immigrants themselves can be explained by Realistic Conflict Theory. The analysis will start by examining the interviewees’ possible perception of socio-economic threat and continue by looking into the concept of ‘outgroup’ in relation to Realistic Conflict Theory.

5.3.1 Perception of Socio-Economic Threat

Even if there is some diversity in the answers from the interviewees as to the challenges that the Swedish society of today is facing, the majority of the interviewees’ answers are in some way related to immigration or rather to immigration politics as the interviewees are all careful in pointing out that the problem is caused by bad political decisions and not by the immigrants themselves. These immigration politics-related answers are the answers that were grouped by the author within the categories increased costs for immigration and unfair resource distribution, badly functioning integration, an expected increased number of refugees due to the climate crisis and finally that Sweden is becoming Islamized. Also the more vaguely described answers, grouped by the author under the category structural problems of the Swedish society, often appears to include the problem of immigration, even if this is not stated as explicitly as for the categories.
mentioned above. As to the solutions proposed by the interviewees to society’s problems, the answers are considerably less diverse, the by far most frequently proposed solution being a temporary stop or a decrease in immigration. In this sense, if considering that one sees decreasing or stopping immigration as the most highly prioritized solution to society’s problems, it should be safe to conclude that not opting for this solution, i.e. not decreasing or stopping immigration, would be perceived as having a negative impact on society.

Apart from society’s structural problems, the two most frequently mentioned problems badly functioning integration and too high costs for immigration and an unfair resource distribution, are both related to the issue of Sweden accepting too large groups of new immigrants. The interviewees who talk about the badly functioning integration describe a situation of a society with an increased segregation, growing slum areas and increased social exclusion and criminality and explain the problematic situation with the impossibility of integrating large numbers of new immigrants in a small population in a short time period.

Similarly, the interviewees talking about too high costs for immigration and unfair income distribution leading to elderly not having enough to eat, deterioration of the Swedish schools, deterioration of the Swedish health and elderly care, explain the situation with the too large intake of immigrants.

In line with Realistic Conflict Theory, the research of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002) concludes that the groups of manual workers and persons with a lower educational level fear immigration more than other groups due to an expected competition over limited resources and that this fear gives incentives to extreme right-wing voting within these groups as extreme right-wing parties generally target immigrants as an ‘outgroup’.

From the findings of the present research, one can conclude that the interviewees, just as the manual workers and the poorly educated within Lubbers’ and Scheepers’ (2000; 2002) research, do perceive immigration as a socio-economic threat to the Swedish society. One can also conclude that, although, as presumably for other extreme right-wing voters as well, not being the sole motivation for the choice of party affiliation, it is a contributing factor.

Consequently, looking at the findings this far through the lens of Realistic Conflict Theory, the theory appears to hold for explaining the voting behavior of the interviewees of the
present research. However, the paradox of immigrants perceiving immigration as a threat still needs to be explained in order to fully accept *Realistic Conflict Theory* as a theory capable of explaining immigrant extreme right-wing voting behavior. One explanation appears to be in the characteristic of the socio-economic threat itself. In the research of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002), immigration in general is specified as the socio-economic threat. However, in the present research, the interviewees do not perceive immigration in general as a socio-economic threat to the Swedish society, but rather identify a threat of a continued intake of large groups of immigrants.

A second explanation appears to be found in the delimitation of the concepts ‘ingroup’ and ‘outgroup’, which will be analyzed in the following section.

5.3.2 Outgroup Perception

In the studies of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002) on German and French extreme right-wing voting, the two authors refer to *Realistic Conflict Theory* and conclude that groups that perceive immigrants as an ‘outgroup’ competing with them for limited resources are more inclined to vote for extreme right-wing parties than other groups. Examples of such groups are, according to Lubbers and Scheepers, manual workers and persons with a low educational level.

If looking superficially at the group analyzed in this research, only one interviewee, the person interviewed by Expo (Poohl, 2007), fits the description of manual worker and/or person with a low level of education. None of the interviewees who participated in the in-depth interviews fit into this description. Further and more importantly, all interviewees belong to the group immigrants, according to the research of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002), defined as the ‘outgroup’, i.e. the group competing with the ‘ingroup’ for limited resources. Consequently, if accepting ‘immigrants’ as a homogenous group including all immigrants and identified by all extreme right-wing voters as the ‘outgroup’, *Realistic Conflict Theory* would fail to explain immigrant extreme right-wing voting. Nonetheless, as seen from the analysis through *Social Identity Theory* (Rodriguez, 2015) above, the interviewees do see immigrants as the ‘outgroup’, however not all immigrants, but the group of ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’, thus including themselves in the ‘ingroup’ of ‘all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society’. With this clarification of the perception of the concepts ‘ingroup’ and ‘outgroup’ of the
interviewees, moving them from the ‘outgroup’ ‘immigrants’ in general of the research of Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002) to their own perceived ‘ingroup’ of ‘all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society’, the result of the analysis through Realistic Conflict Theory changes from failing to succeeding in explaining the voting behavior of the group.

Hence, the present research shows that immigrant extreme right-wing voting can indeed be explained by Realistic Conflict Theory in the sense that a socio-economic threat from an ‘outgroup’ is perceived and that this perceived threat, if not solely, so partly motivates the choice of political party affiliation. However, one issue remains to be clarified in relation to Realistic Conflict Theory. According to this theory, extreme right-wing voting increases where the threat coming from the ‘outgroup’ is perceived as a real socio-economic threat to the own group. In line with this, Lubbers and Scheepers (2000; 2002) found that manual workers and persons with lower levels of education are more likely to vote extreme right-wing than other groups in society, due to a feared competition with immigrants for jobs and other scarce resources. As five of the interviewees of the in-depth interviews have white collar employments, one is a university student and half of the group hold university degrees, there is no reason to assume that this group would personally feel more threatened economically by immigration. Mere competition for jobs and limited resources therefore fails to explain why this group would be more inclined to vote extreme right-wing than other groups.

The explanation could lie in who society includes into its perceived ‘outgroup’. All interviewees either see the concept of ‘immigrants’ as useless or problematic, or claim that one should not define immigrants as a homogenous group. For all, not being included in the general concept ‘immigrants’, other than when rather mechanically defined as ‘a person having moved from one country to another’, appears important. All interviewees also hold that if Sweden continues to take in large groups of immigrants, these immigrants will not be able to adapt to the Swedish society, a situation that will create a number of problems in society, problems that by society may be blamed on immigrants as a perceived ‘outgroup’. A concern that is brought forward in the interviews is a fear of a coming situation where these problems, caused by too much resources spent on immigration and too little on other necessary functions of the Swedish society, will provoke increased racism in society. This, due to the fact that all people in society will not
understand the true cause of the problem, bad political decisions, and will instead blame immigrants.

One could presume that even though fully integrated and well-functioning in society, by being immigrant per se, thus possibly included in the general group of ‘immigrants’ by society, one’s social status would be more threatened by increased immigration than that of a person with a Swedish background. In other words, fear of being identified with the ‘outgroup’ by society could explain an increased extreme right-wing voting behavior among immigrants. However, even though the present research presents some findings supporting this explanation, there is not enough evidence for considering it more than a hypothesis that would need further attention before being held as a fact.

5.4 Analysis through Theory of Marginality

Theory of Marginality argues that “experiencing marginality” (Fetzer, 2000, p.7), i.e. identifying oneself with a marginalized group, leads to sympathy for other marginalized, both within the own group and for other marginalized groups. When Fetzer (2000) uses the theory to study reasons for unfavorable attitudes towards immigrants, defined as a marginalized group by the researcher, he comes to the conclusion that identification with minorities or in the terminology of Theory of Marginality, marginalized groups, correlates with more favorable attitudes towards immigrants and consequently prevents rather than encourages voting for political parties opposing immigration. When applying this to the present study, as the group of interviewees do belong to the group ‘immigrants’ and as they obviously do vote for a political party opposing immigration, one might come to the conclusion that the theory is proven to be wrong, that identification with marginalized groups cannot be said to create favorable attitudes towards immigrants. However, this supposes the existence of a homogenous, marginalized group of ‘immigrants’. As has been shown in previous chapters, this image does not correspond to the perceived image of the extreme right-wing voting immigrants themselves.

The analysis through Social Identity Theory shows that the interviewees do not identify themselves with a general, homogenous group of ‘immigrants’. As they on the contrary rather identify themselves with the group of ‘all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society’,
they do not, in fact, identify themselves with any marginalized group at all. The group of ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’ can on the other hand, by using the terminology of the *Theory of Marginality*, be labeled as marginalized. However, as no identification with this group or any other marginalized group exists within the group of interviewees, not finding favorable attitudes towards immigration within this group does not contradict the *Theory of Marginality*.

Hence, by redefining the marginalized group of ‘immigrants’ according to the findings from this research into ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’, the *Theory of Marginality* is not proven to be falsified as appeared to be the case when using the more general definition of ‘immigrants’ as marginalized group. Further, the analysis shows that it cannot be assumed with support from the *Theory of Marginality*, that because a person is an immigrant, he or she will automatically have a favorable attitude towards immigration.
6 Conclusion

The objective of this research was to look into motivations behind extreme right-wing voting behavior and to mainly focus on issues regarding social group identification as the issue of identification with or repudiation of the ‘outgroup’ appears to be a key issue in the current debate on the rising right-wing party affiliation. Therefore, the study included an analysis of the role of social identity and in particular the relation between identification with in- or outgroup in the choice of political affiliation. Immigrant extreme right-wing voters in Sweden were used as case study for the research.

The research aimed at answering three questions: 1. Why do immigrants vote for extreme right-wing political parties?, 2. What is the relation between the social identity of extreme right-wing voting immigrants and their voting behavior?, and finally 3. How do extreme right-wing voting immigrants identify themselves in relation to the ‘outgroup’ identified by the extreme right-wing political party?.

6.1.1 Reasons for Extreme Right-Wing Voting Behavior of Immigrants

When taking a first look at immigrants voting for extreme right-wing parties, i.e. political parties that in general oppose immigration, one could be tempted to believe that this particular group of voters all have other motives behind their voting behavior than the issue of immigration and that they in fact oppose this particular standpoint of their party of choice. This interpretation of reality is also supported by Theory of Marginality as this theory states that persons identifying themselves with a marginalized group will have favorable attitudes towards not only the own marginalized group, but also towards others. Based on this theory, earlier research has indeed concluded that identification with a marginalized group will generate a favorable attitude towards immigrants, in this research considered being a marginalized group.

Yet, the present case study shows that not only do the interviewed extreme right-wing voting immigrants not oppose the party’s immigration policy, but fully support it. The findings and the analysis through Realistic Conflict Theory show that, very much like manual workers and poorly educated, shown in earlier research to be highly represented within extreme right-wing
voting groups, the interviewed group does perceive immigration as a socio-economic threat to the Swedish society. The *Realistic Conflict Theory* analysis further concludes that, although the perception of immigration as being a socio-economic threat was not, as most probably for non-immigrant extreme right-wing voters as well, the unique motivation for the choice of party affiliation, it was indeed a contributing factor.

6.1.2 The Relation between the Social Identity of Extreme Right-Wing Voting Immigrants and their Voting Behavior

The assumption made in the objective that the identification with or repudiation of an ‘outgroup’ is of importance for the voting behavior of extreme right-wing voters is validated by the present research. As seen above, *Theory of Marginality* holds that identification with one outgroup, labeled ‘marginalized’ in the terminology of the theory, will create sympathy for another marginalized group and *Realistic Conflict Theory* holds that an ‘outgroup’ being perceived as a socio-economic threat will encourage extreme right-wing voting. However, the research shows that the relation between the interviewed group’s voting behavior and its social identification lies in the perceived characteristics of the ‘in-’ and ‘outgroup’ of the interviewees, rather than whether the group identifies itself with a presupposed homogenous ‘outgroup’ immigrants or not. The analysis through the lens of *Social Identity Theory* shows that the interviewees reject an identification with a homogenous group of ‘immigrants’. Instead, the ‘ingroup’ to which the interviewees identify themselves consists of ‘all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society’. The ‘outgroup’, which in line with *Realistic Conflict Theory* is perceived as a socio-economic threat to the Swedish society, that is identified by the interviewees consists of ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’.

The analysis through *Theory of Marginality* based on the results of the findings and the analysis through *Social Identity Theory* shows that by redefining the marginalized group of ‘immigrants’ to ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’, the theory no longer necessarily predicts favorable attitudes towards immigration among all immigrants.
From the results above, it can be concluded that ‘in-’ and ‘outgroup’ identification and in particular the perceived characteristics of these two groups, influences as well as contributes to explaining extreme right-wing voting behavior of immigrants.

6.1.3 Immigrants’ Identification of Themselves in Relation to the ‘Outgroup’ Identified by the Extreme Right-Wing Political Party

The analysis through Acculturation Theory shows that only one of the seven interviewees can be considered as assimilated into the Swedish society, but that the remaining group is integrated, i.e. fully functioning in the Swedish society, but wanting to keep their culture of the country of origin. As seen above, the Social Identity Theory analysis concludes that the ‘ingroup’ identified by the interviewees is ‘all persons fully functioning in the Swedish society’. The Social Identity Theory analysis of ‘ingroup’ identified by Sverigedemokraterna shows a narrower group consisting only of persons fully assimilated into the Swedish nation. However, the party is willing to accept into the nation, to the ‘ingroup’, a limited number of integrated, i.e. not fully assimilated persons. Consequently, the Social Identity Theory analysis of the ‘outgroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna shows to consist of all persons not assimilated to the Swedish nation, with the exception of a limited number of integrated, not assimilated persons. The ‘outgroup’ perceived by the interviewees hence differs from the ‘outgroup’ of Sverigedemokraterna in that it limits its members to ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’, all persons integrated into and fully functioning in the Swedish society being excluded.

6.1.4 Suggestions for Further Research

In their research on French extreme right-wing voting, Lubbers and Scheepers (2002) found a paradox consisting of a correlation between a high number of extreme right-wing votes in regions with high number of immigrants on the one hand and on the other people living in regions with high number of immigrants not showing more unfavorable attitudes towards ‘outgroups’ than people living in regions with lower numbers of immigrants. As the present research shows that the ‘outgroup’ of the immigrant voters interviewed consists of new immigrants, unable to take part in
the Swedish society rather than the homogenous group of immigrants, there is a possibility that a similar closer look at the characteristics of the ‘outgroup’ could contribute to explain the paradox of Lubbers’ and Scheepers’ research. Were it to be found that the ‘outgroup’ that influences extreme right-wing voting were, as in the present research, ‘new immigrants, unable to take part in the Swedish society’, this could explain how high number of immigrants in a region could easily provoke a fear of more coming in, competing for jobs and other resources. It could also explain how immigrants living closely to the extreme right-wing voters as part of society, could be considered as part of the ‘ingroup’, i.e. not provoking unfavorable attitudes. At this state, however, this is obviously merely a hypothesis that would need considerably more research in order to be either verified or falsified.

The present research illustrates that a redefinition of ‘in-’ and ‘outgroups’ based on the studied group of immigrants’ own perceptions of the two concepts indeed showed to be a key factor behind the explanation of the group’s voting behavior. Through these findings, a possible new angle is identified for further research dedicated to reasons behind extreme right-wing voting behavior in general.

As stated in section 3.2.3, the present research was limited by the number of interviews obtained within the limited timeframe. Thus, further studies containing more interviews with interviewees from different backgrounds are needed in order to clarify the reasons behind immigrant extreme right-wing voting behavior.
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ANNEX 1, Intervjufrågor

**Bakgrund**
1. Ursprungsland
2. Man/kvinna
3. Ålder
4. Sysselsättning
5. Antal år i Sverige
6. Medborgarskap/Typ av uppehållstillstånd om ej svensk medborgare
7. Anledning till flytt till Sverige
8. Hur länge har du röstat på/sympatiserat med SD?
9. Hur röstade du innan?
10. Hur röstar din familj? Dina vänner?

**Politisk åskådning**
11. Varför SD? Vad lockade dig?
12. Vilken är den största fördelen med SD?
13. Vad har du för åsikt om andra partier?
14. Finns något hos SD som du inte håller med om?
15. Vilka positiva och negativa aspekter ser du i SD invandringspolitik?
16. Vilken är din syn på Sveriges nuvarande invandringspolitik?
17. Vad har samhället för ansvar gentemot invandrare?
18. Vad har invandrare för ansvar gentemot samhället?
20. Vilket/vilka är det/de största problemet/problemen vårt samhälle har att hantera?
21. Vilka samhällsgruppers (om några) världstånd är mest hotad? Varför tror du det?
22. Vilka samhällsgrupper (om några) utgör det största hotet för välståndet? Varför tror du det?
23. Vilken/vilka ser du som lösningen/lösningarna på detta/dessa problem?
Identitetsrelaterade frågor

24. Vem är enligt dig ”svensk”? Stämmer den bilden, enligt dig med den bild som SD har av vem som är svensk?

25. Vem, enligt dig, tillhör gruppen ”invandrare”? Stämmer den bilden, enligt dig med den bild som SD har av vem som är invandrare?

26. Ser du dig själv som invandrare?

27. Tror du att man generellt i samhället uppfattar dig som invandrare?

28. Ser man dig som invandrare inom SD?

29. Hur bemöts du av övriga partisyrer som SD-anhängare och utlandsfödd?

30. Hur bemöts du av allmänheten som SD och icke svenskt född?

31. Hur blev du mottagen när du invandrade till Sverige?

32. Anser du dig själv vara integrerad? Assimilerad?

33. Anser du dig vara svensk, XX eller båda?

34. Hur ser du på din situation och roll i Sverige i framtiden?

35. Vilka umgäns du oftast med? Främst svenskar? Vänner och/eller släktingar från hemlandet?

Vänner från andra länder?
ANNEX 2, Interview questions – translation into English

**Background**

1. Country of origin
2. Male/Female
3. Age
4. Occupation
5. Number of years in Sweden
6. Citizenship/Type of residence permit if not Swedish citizen
7. Reason for moving to Sweden
8. How long have you voted for/sympathized with SD?
9. How did you vote before?
10. How does your family vote? Your friends?

**Political Views**

11. Why SD? What attracted you?
12. What is the main advantage/attraction of SD?
13. What is your opinion on other parties?
14. Is there anything in SD that you disagree with?
15. What are the positive and negative aspects you see in SD’s immigration policy?
16. What is your view on Sweden’s current immigration policy?
17. What responsibilities does society have towards immigrants?
18. What responsibilities do immigrants have towards society?
19. How do you see the situation in Sweden today, on the whole? In Europe? In the World?
20. What is/are the biggest problem(s) our society has to deal with?
21. Which societal groups’ (if any) wellbeing and prosperity are the most threatened? Why do you think so?
22. Which societal groups (if any) represent the greatest threat to wellbeing and prosperity? Why do you think so?
23. What do you see as the solution(s) to this/these problem(s)?
Identity Related Issues
24. Who according to you is "Swedish"? Does your image of who is Swedish correlate with the image that SD has of who is Swedish?
25. Who, according to you, belongs to the group “immigrants”? Does your image of who is an immigrant correlate with the image that SD has of who is an immigrant?
26. Do you see yourself as an immigrant?
27. Do you think people in general in society perceive you as an immigrant?
28. Are you considered an immigrant in SD?
29. How are you, an SD supporter born outside of Sweden, received by the other party supporters of SD?
30. How are you treated by the public as an SD supporter born outside Sweden?
31. How were you received when you immigrated to Sweden?
32. Do you consider yourself to be integrated? Assimilated?
33. Do you consider yourself to be Swedish, XX or both?
34. How do you look at your situation and role in Sweden in the future?
35. Who do you mostly socialize with? Mostly Swedish people? Friends and/or relatives from your country of origin? Friends from other countries?
### ANNEX 3, Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee nr</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Male/female</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 April 2015</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Finnish and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 May 2015</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Icelandic and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 May 2015</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 May 2015</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Russian and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13 May 2015</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Polish and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 May 2015</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish (has applied and is waiting for a Serbian citizenship in addition to the Swedish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>