Xenophobia in Spain:
A comparative empirical analysis between two Autonomous Communities

Gonzalo Herranz de Rafael

University of Almería

Spain

Correspondence: Gonzalo Herranz de Rafael. Universidad de Almería. Ctra del Sacramento s/n. Almería
España.

Gonzalo Herranz de Rafael.

Resumen

El artículo es un estudio cuantitativo sobre la xenofobia en España durante los años noventa. Analiza la xenofobia existente en dos comunidades autónomas españolas: Andalucía y Cataluña, con diferentes estados de modernización. Se usan dos modelos de correlación de Pearson´s para intentar medir ambos niveles de xenofobia. Los resultados muestran que los mayores o menores niveles de modernización no explican en sí mismo los niveles de xenofobia.

Palabras Clave: Xenofobia, España, Andalucía, Cataluña

Abstract

This article is a quantitative study on xenophobia in Spain during the nineties. It comparatively analyses the level of xenophobia that exists in two Spanish Autonomous Communities; Andalusia and Catalonia, which are at different stages of modernisation. Using two models of Pearson´s correlations we try to analyse the level of xenophobia in both regions. This states that the greater or smaller level of modernization reached by a society is not sufficient in itself to explain the greater or smaller level of xenophobia.

Keywords: Xenophobia, Spain, Andalusia, Catalonia

1. Introduction

This study analyses the level of xenophobia existing in the Autonomous Communities of Andalusia and Catalonia during the nineties. Although both regions share the same model of development within a pre-established model of modernisation they present numerous differences as has been shown in previous studies (See Gobernado Arribas, 1996). Modernisation is a continuous, long term and unfinished process of social change. In this article we assumed that the total implementation of modernisation within the territory of any state is only possible on a theoretical level, that is, solely speculatively.

So as to compare Andalusia and Catalonia we look at the differentiating factors in each region and take into account the political and socio-economic indicators. In doing so we should bear in mind three differentiating factors that link theoretical and empirical principles and which affect xenophobia and racism in a more marked way.

Among these factors we may discern that firstly, while Andalusia has traditionally been a region of emigration, Catalonia has been one of immigration. Secondly, while "nationalism" in Catalonia has played an important role in politics as well as in economic and in socio-cultural fields, due to it being an Autonomous Community which has maintained a high level of nationalism in much the same way as has happened in the Basque country and Galicia, Andalusia has never had the same level of nationalistic conscience at any point in recent history. Consequently, the presence of nationalism in Andalusia is purely residual. Thirdly, there are higher standards of education in Catalonia than in Andalusia, a constant factor being that the higher the standards of education, the lower the level of xenophobia in that particular region or that its effects are les felt as we will shortly see. Finally, our starting point and main aim is to describe and analyse why modernity is understood to disperse or lighten opinions and attitudes as regards xenophobia in the same way that modernity mediates in respect of opinions and attitudes as regards religion.

2. Theoretical Expectations

Xenophobia is considered as the behaviour or attitude developed by a social or ethnic (ethno phobic) group when confronted by fear or prejudice toward other groups (ethnic, social or national) that are considered as foreigners. Etymologically, xenophobia comes from two Greek words: *Xeno,* which means 'foreigner' or 'guest', and *Phobia*, understood as 'afraid of' or 'prevent against'. Racism is understood as an ideology, which promotes behaviour or attitudes of hate and rejection toward persons with different physical features to those of the main racial group.

Racism and xenophobia may be understood if placed within the context of the immigration and multiculturalism experienced since the nineteen nineties in Spain as a whole, and specifically in the Autonomous Communities of Andalusia and Catalonia.

In a Weberian sense a race expresses itself almost exclusively when a racial conscience based on a common background appears. Racism, in most of its manifestations has been expressed as an ideology which may or not evolve into political parties or social movements. Both interpretations, biological and cultural, clearly illustrate that racism does not refer to conflict between different groups based solely on differing skin colour.

Xenophobia is a collective manifestation of fear towards foreigners; a preventive attitude structured during the process of socialisation. This behaviour or attitude will be more or less active, violent or non-violent, depending on the context experienced by that collective group, in group form or as a society[1].

Xenophobia manifests itself through actions or vocal expressions, albeit spontaneous at times, towards or against an unknown ethno-cultural group which produces confusion or uncertainty and fear amongst those experiencing it. They may serve as scapegoats in times of political or socio-economic crisis. Other more sociological situa-

---

[1] K.W. Deutsch (1981:97-98) says with respect to the relationship between ethnicity and culture, "Ethnicity involves the known ancestry, descent or extraction; the concentration of childhood experiences, family associations, associations with friends, and the probability of mixed marriages (...) In essence, culture is the distribution of similar thoughts or cross references to facts, preferred images and basic orientations, derived, in part, from childhood learning. We can dem-

tions may be added, the ones provoked by rapidly changing social contexts. The need for greater integration and identification with the group grows in accordance with the growth of greater secularisation, and there is a significant loss of community values as opposed to individual ones or there is increased belief in a culture based on money, success and consumption.

The interrelationship between xenophobia and racism as an empirical reality and its differentiation leads us to a new level of analysis; the presence of xenophobia within the context of today's current multiculturalism. Xenophobia is the behaviour or attitude of rejection towards foreigners and if such behaviour or attitude is predetermined in the intra-group through the process of socialisation as an additional element of the acquired culture, then multiculturalism and the conflictive inter-group or inter-ethnic group have been a constant in the historic evolution of mankind[2].

In the contemporary world, the process of European expansionism throughout the different continents of the world during the 16th to 20th centuries led to a policy of replacement of cultures where western civilisation was imposed. European domination during those four centuries produce new ways of life and culture together with other processes closer to our time such as the economical, technical, financial, and IT globalisation, which in turn caused a new order in political, economic, cultural and social aspects of life. The effect of modernisation upon the economic and demographic policies is forcing a new migratory wave to emerge.

---

onstrate how the probability of ethnicity can lead us to a probability in culture. Both go together, but can be distinguished one from the other".

[2] There exist various studies about the ethnic composition of the nation-States which clearly reflect the multicultural situation of the States. The first of these, reported upon by Nielsson (1989), dates from 1971, and deals with a total of 161 of the 165 existing States, in accordance with U.N. statistics for that year. According to Nielsson, there are 575 ethnic categories wherein 175 live in different States. Of those 575 categories, 400 live in only one State, with the remaining 175 (30 per cent) dispersed amongst various other States. On the other hand, 123 of the same are dispersed in 2 or 3 States (where 70 per cent of them are dispersed exclusively by 2 States) and 67 of these (40 per cent) reside in the main State. Finally, the 16 remaining ones are very much dispersed, wherein 5 of them, denoted as Tran regional, are the most dispersed, and therein the Jews are the most significant case, since they are dispersed in over 40 countries. The second of them, where the ethnic composition of the contemporary States is reflected, is brought out by Connor (1998) in 1972: of a total of 132 States only (9.1 per cent) are homogeneous from an ethnic stand point; 25 States (18.9 per cent) rely upon an ethnic group which represents more than 90 per cent of the population; 25 States have the major ethnic group representing between 75 to 89 per cent of the population; in another 31 States (23.5 per cent) the major ethnic group represents between half to 3/4 of the population; with the major group in the final 39 States (29.5 per cent) representing a little less than half of the population.

Furthermore, colonial and expansionist policies carried out by the majority of European countries especially in Africa and Asia, redesigned ethnic-cultural borders in order to create new fictitious ones to their liking. These are now forcing, together with another set of factors including poverty and the demographic growth. This globalize tendency creates an opposite force, wherein processes of closer identification, collective ideologies, and religion take on a much greater force. That is why Castell (1997:29) can state this apparent nonsense: "In a world of global flux of riches, power and images are in search of an identity, collective or individualistic, attributed or created, becoming the fundamental source of social significance".

There are four main models, which satisfactorily explain the phenomenon of multiculturalism, though none of them has established itself as dominant. These models are those of Huntington, Rex, Kymlicka and Sartori. Huntington and Rex accept the multiculturalism as an enriching factor, and Kymlicka with his liberal model and Sartori with religious problem reject it as a non acceptable position needing a compulsory integration.

Xénophobie and immigration

Immigration is, along with nationalism, one of the various central issues in the Western world of the 21st century. Both problems have been a source of social conflict since the beginning of contemporary times. They have been more pronounced perhaps in this century as a result of technological advances, modes of transport, and the suppression of the poor in many areas of the world. In effect, one of the factors which most influence the perpetuation of the life cycle of the poor is their birth-rate, which is forcing many developing countries to accept significant immigration.

In the case of Spain, circumstances have been different and these have eased the change in status from a country predominantly of emigration to one of immigration. As Corkill (2001:831) accurately states applying the Pull and Push model to Spain and Portugal, "Both 'push' and 'pull' factors have been at work in shaping the new international migration patterns. Principle among the 'push' factors has been the growing social and economic crises in South America, and religious conflicts in the Maghreb and sub-Saharan Africa. The 'pull' factors include the growing prosperity experienced in

Spain and Portugal since being admitted into the EU has increased job opportunities and a desire to send remittances home to their families".

This new situation arising from immigration creates the need to reply to new conditions in group relations. These actions may be orientated toward the integration or the assimilation of a conflictive nature; which, according to the ideal Weberian position would be the following[3]. 1)The integration into or assimilation, in Spain's case, to Western culture; 2) shared tolerance, both by the majority as for the minority; 3) shared intransigence, and finally 4) full integration or a multi-ethnic society. The interaction of perfect relationships would occur in the case of complete bi-directional integration, a situation that could be defined as utopic[4].

RELATIONSHIPS OF GROUPS IN IMMIGRATION

_____

INTEGRATION AND ASSIMILATION   SHARED TOLERANCE

   A) BI-DIRECTIONAL

   B) UNI-DIRECTIONAL

_____

SHARED   COMPLETE INTEGRATION OR

INTRANSIGENCE   MULTI-ETHNIC SOCIETY

_____

The first case, uni-directional assimilation, would be the most ethnocentric example and the one that had its peak in the majority of European countries during their periods of colonisation and decolonisation in their respective hemispheres of influence. This may be seen nowadays in the United States of America with the influx of immigra-

---

[3] Though in a different context, this typology is inspired by the works of K.W. Deutsch (1981) where he shows the process which led tribes to form their nations.
[4] This ideal of society is the one that Sabater (1993) calls mixed race, which is the ultimate expression of multi-culturalism.

tion predominantly from Latin America, and on a smaller scale in Russia, with immigrants coming in from poorer republics of the former USSR.

The two most widespread inter-group situations that are different to other European societies which could most clearly affect Spanish society would be, firstly, shared tolerance, where the indications or signs of xenophobia would be weak or hardly discernible, and secondly, shared intransigence. This is initially less visible in the case of Spain, where the actions and attitudes of racism, xenophobia, and ethnophobia complement each other. Finally the complete integration or a multi-ethnic society would arise in which the example of bi-directional integration would become a utopia, for it would then be a perfect society, the ideal aim for the coming decades.

To close we recall Laclau's thoughts on the subject. He observes that the new ideological configuration which underlies conflicts between minorities and the majority which are provoked in effect by immigration involve universality and individualist factors that should be redefined. "The universe is symbolic of a lost totality, and the individual only exists in that contradictory moment which asserts a differential identity and is simultaneously cancelled through its environment of indifference", As he pointed out, "the building up of differential identities totally closed or opposed to what is outside them is not a viable political or progressive alternative" [5].

3. Hypotheses and Methodology

As Díez Nicolás (1998) points out in his analysis on xenophobia and immigration, "it confirms the low level of Spanish people's xenophobia "where the number of people who are considered to be extremely xenophobic has diminished over the last eight years from 7 per cent to 5 per cent. If, as was stated before, xenophobia is influenced by a culture learned or cultivated by individuals something which becomes evi-

---

[5] And also for example, the attitudes or views of the immigrants from North Africa or from Jamaica in Western Europe where, "it would be reactionary politics to abstain from all participation in Western Europe Institutions and trying to justify this attitude by stating that theirs is culturally different and that the European Institutions do not concern them as such...the logic behind apartheid is not only a discourse made by the dominant groups; it can also be, as stated before, permeated in those who are oppressed" (Laclau, 1995:46).

dent when two different groups interact in whatever territorial context[6], then the social structure will be the determining pedestal for explaining and understanding the different views or attitudes towards xenophobia in the two autonomous communities which are the object of this analysis.

We have already pointed out that Andalusia and Catalonia are two societies that are in different stages of modernisation. There are appreciable differences so it may be stated that Catalonia is in a more advanced stage than Andalusia. As a consequence they have different levels of xenophobia and racism, within that narrow margin which the Spanish nation has as a whole.   The general hypothesis expressed in this analysis is that the more modern a society the lower its rate of xenophobia. Conversely, the more traditional or underdeveloped a society is, the greater its rate of xenophobia will be. If there is a predominant nationalistic conscience, then the tendency will be opposite to the cited general hypothesis above.

In Andalusia, the situation is different because it is, comparatively speaking, in a less developed phase of modernity than Catalonia even though it is a modern society. Its culture is prone to emigration. Not having developed a nationalistic conscience. This happens as long as the level of competition for the few resources available between the majority groups and the minorities is not too high.

This tendency does not have to prevail in all cases because, in contrast, as the contacts increase between culturally diversified people, antagonism grows among them. The advances in communications, transport and urbanisation tend to enhance the ethnic/cultural conscience of the minorities, in as much as it contributes to increase the perception of the differential factors as the overall knowledge of other similar or distinct ethnic groups. In accordance with the aforementioned comments, the following can be pointed out:

---

[6] The territorial environment where the inter-group relationships occur have a great significance for two reasons, amongst others; because the territory is a part of the culture of the group, and secondly because it sets the limits of the hierarchy between the groups in terms of minorities and majorities.

Catalonia may be seen as:	Andalusia may be seen as:
a. a society with a high level of modernisation	a. a society with a medium level of modernisation.
b. a society traditionally of immigration	b. a society traditionally of emigration
c. a society wherein various ethnic, social, and cultural minorities coexist.	c. a society with very few ethnic, racial, or national minorities.
d. a society that is politically and socially homogeneous	d. a society that is politically and socially homogeneous
e. a society with a high degree of nationalistic conscience	e. a society with a very low degree of nationalistic conscience

To resume, we can affirm that it is more logical that the effect of modernisation dilutes the xenophobic sentiments and attitudes than the effects of tradition. However it appears that in the latter it has a greater explanatory value than modernisation indicators such as urbanisation or industrialisation, have. It seems clear that the national identity can have a higher explanatory value of xenophobic sentiments than the type of habitat that one lives in. To analyse xenophobia in the Autonomous Communities of Andalusia and Catalonia, we chose to employ an objective indicator of xenophobia as used by Díez Nicolás (1998), which is widely accepted as valid[7].

---

[7] The questions used to compile said index and a scale of 15 points that varies from 0 for not xenophobic at all to 14 for very xenophobic measured via five statements to agree/disagree with given to those interviewed, were the following:
- a) Workers from other countries should only be admitted when there are no Spaniards to cover those posts.
- b) The economic situation of the Spanish economy is sufficiently difficult without having to financially assist immigrants.
- c) No matter what others think, we would all be bothered if our children had schoolmates of other races.
- d) Immigration from abroad will eventually mean that Spain loses its identity.
- e) Citizens of whichever country should have the right to settle in any other country, without limitation.

We carried out an analysis to understand in greater depth which variables best explain this incidence of xenophobia in the two Autonomous Communities studied. To do this, correlated analyses was prepared and prior to that, two models or examples of multiple regressions were also created, wherein the rate of xenophobia was used as the dependent variable.

For the first model for example, the independent variables used were those which best defined xenophobia as inferred in the varied relations. These include socio-economic family status, ideological identification, habitat, last occupational status at the time of the interview, national identification scale of materialism-post materialism, educational level of those interviewed, localist/universalist identification, and finally, the social position of the interviewed[8]., With the exception of the socio-economic status of the family all of the aforementioned variables have been recodified. For the second model, we decided to select another set of variables as predictors of the attitudes, feelings, and opinions of the Andalusian and Catalonian people in respect of the more numerous different ethnic and social immigrant groups, such as are Arabs and Muslims, South Americans, and black African people[9]. 1) opinion about the total number of exist-

Those who answered 'I fully agree' or 'I agree' to statements a, b, c, d, or 'fully disagree' or disagree' to e, were given one point. In the same way, a point was given to those interviewees who would forbid their daughter to have a relationship with a man of any of the following social groups: gypsies, Moroccan or black Africans, South Americans, or East Europeans. Finally, a point was given to those who considered a bother living in a neighbourhood with south Americans, gypsies, Moroccans or black Africans. The index of xenophobia compiled in this way can vary between 0 (not xenophobic at all) and 14 (very xenophobic) points. Subsequently, the 14 values were arbitrarily grouped into four categories: 'Not xenophobic at all (0), a little xenophobic (1-2), somewhat xenophobic (3-6), and very xenophobic (7-14).

Data for the compilation of the index of xenophobia were collected from 1991-1995 by the CI-RES (Centre for Research into Social Trends) La Realidad Social en España 1990-1991, 1991-1992, 1992-1993, 1993-1994, 1994-1995 and 1995-1996. Fundación BBV (Banco Bilbao Vizcaya), Fundación Caja de Madrid and Fundación BBK. Data for 1996 are unedited and are from the Archivo de Datos de ASEP (Sociological, Economic and Political Analysis). Data for 1997 collected by ASEP and are property of IMSERSO (Institute of the Spanish Ministry for Work and Social Affairs). Each one of the years quoted, had its correspondent survey of 1200 interviewees carried out by the aforementioned organisations. Interviewees were over 18 years of age, categorised by size of Autonomous Community and municipality.

[8] In this first model, the same independent variables have been used as those in Díez Nicolás' work, principally because they are the major explanatory forces with respect to xenophobia. Similarly, the same recodification was selected for each of the variables singled out.

[9] In reality, there exist eloquent discriminatory remarks between the different ethnic groups of immigrants depending upon the country and then the region that they settle in, a fact which on the other hand corroborates the negative effect which is caused by the proximity and treatment amongst different ethnic or national groups. As the IOE (1994:13) group affirms, "we commit an error when speaking of xenophobia, in general, as if in the indigenous or autochthonous population there exist phenomena of intolerance towards all foreigners without distinction. The scarce

ing immigrants, 2) the beneficial/detrimental effects of immigration on the culture of the Region being analysed 3) the evaluation of the Arabs and Muslims/ South Americans/ and black African people, and 4) the reaction or attitude considering the feelings of affection by family members toward groups of immigrants, in particular those who are Arab or North African, South American, and black African[10]. Finally, we should bear in mind that the scale of xenophobia varies from 0 to 14 points, with the lower values established for those who are "Non"-xenophobic and the higher values for those who are "Very" xenophobic. This method of measurement should be applied to the remainder of the scales of the different variables being used.

4. Results

The description of xenophobia in Andalusia and Catalonia

Díez Nicolás, states that Spain as a whole, compared to the rest of Europe still has the lowest number of immigrants, both in absolute or relative terms. The presence of immigrants has risen slowly but steadily from 1991 to 1997, so much so that it is foreseen that there will be an increase in the level of xenophobia. However we can also see, in accordance with this data, that the level of xenophobia has apparently diminished, and in any case has not increased. In fact, there exists empirical evidence in both Europe and America's bitter history where a causal relationship is not established between an increase of immigrants and xenophobic attitudes, but on the contrary, to a will

studies performed demonstrate that public opinion discriminates the foreigners in all senses of the word; it distinguishes diverse "classes", and negatively qualifies some of them.

[10] The variables used make reference to the questions from the survey that corresponds to the one made by C.I.R.E.S. in 1995. Question 15 therein asks the following: "In general terms, what would you say with respect to the number of persons we have in Spain of other nationalities, races, religions, or culture? Do you think there are a lot, or too many, ort not too many nor a lot?" Question 16 asks the following: "Do you think it is very good, good, bad or very bad for our culture for people to migrate here from other cultures? Question 17 goes on to state: "I will now read you a list of people from various parts of the world. From a scale of 0 to 10, tell us how you feel about each one, where 0 means very bad and 10 means very good." Question 24 of the survey reads, "If your daughter were to fall in love with a gypsy, North African, South American, Eastern European, of an inferior social class, much older, Asian, much too young), what would be your reaction or view towards this relationship?" Question 25 asked: "In your opinion, has the presence in Spain of immigrant workers of less developed countries contributed to the lowering of salaries of Spaniards, to increase them or have had no effect on salaries at all?" Questions 26 and 26a said, "to continue, have you ever had a prolonged conversation with persons of the following groups, Arabs or North Africans, South Americans, or black African people), and would you say that the image you had of them was enhanced, got worse, or remained the same after the conversation?".

to integrate and cooperate[11]. The socio-demographic profile of the Andalusians and Catalonians with respect to their attitudes or views towards xenophobia varies in each of the regions, and to a lesser degree within each region.

Taking into account the scarce percentage of xenophobic reactions or attitudes and sentiments in Spain in the 1990's, the xenophobic groups in Andalusia would be, above all, 1) those over 65 years of age (35.9 per cent), and constitute almost the same percentage for those in the 50 to 64 age group which stands at (34.8 per cent), 2) those with a low level of education[12] (86.4 per cent), 3) those who live in urban areas (45.9 per cent), and 4) those with a low social status (65.5 per cent). They automatically associate themselves with left wing ideologies (58.65 per cent), and they identify themselves as equal to Spaniards and Andalusians[13] (60.4 per cent). They are essentially materialistic[14] (90.5 per cent) and they logically hold a highly accentuated local identity (71.3 per cent)[15]. Andalusia maintains both a very homogeneous society and attitude towards

[11] As accurately stated by Kymlicka (2003:185): "The western countries with the highest rates of immigration: USA, Austria and Canada, pride themselves on their history as far as integration of immigrants is concerned. These countries have now more than one hundred and fifty years experience in mass immigration and have managed to integrate a large number of immigrants from all over the world without any serious threat to their unity, stability or prosperity.

[12] The variable 'level of education' in all the surveys and for each year has the following categories: 1. less than primary schooling, unable to read; 2. Less than primary schooling, able to read; 3. Primary schooling complete, school certificate; 4. Vocational training grade 1; 5. vocational training grade 2; 6. Elementary school diploma; 7. Advanced diploma; 8. Middle school studies (two-year colleges or associates degree); 9. Graduates or advanced grade skilled workers. This variable was recodified at a later stage to 1-7 low; 8 Mid-range; 9, Upper.

[13] The variable 'feeling' and 'nationalist identity' had the following categories: 1. Only feel to be from the Autonomous Community (Basque, Catalan, Andalusian etc.); 2. Feel more Basque, Catalan etc. than Spanish; 3. Feel equally Basque, Catalan, etc. as Spanish; 4. Feel more Spanish than Basque, Catalan, etc; 5. Only feel Spanish. Changed subsequently to the following categories: 1-2 nationalist, 3 same, 4-5 Spanish.

[14] The scale Materialism vs. Post-materialism was introduced by Inglehart (1991) to demonstrate the cultural change in values in advanced industrialized societies. The scale measures the emphasis of citizens to reach determined objectives, from maintaining national order (materialist indicator) to advancing toward a society in which ideas are more valuable than money (post-materialist indicator). Within the logic of the scale, xenophobic attitudes would be included in materialistic values and the least xenophobic in post-materialist.

[15] The variable 'spatial identification' has the following categories: 1. Village or City, 2. Province; 3. Autonomous Community; 4. Spain; 5. Europe; 6. The West; 7. The World. Subsequently the following three categories were recodified: 1-3 local; 4 national; 5-7, supranational. On the other hand, the constant factor in Spain is that of localist identification as the most significant in all of the research studies that have been conducted in this respect (see Herranz, 1998). Research carried out by Díez Medrano and Gutierrez (2001) analysing the identity of the Spanish with their Autonomous Community, Region, Spain or Europe. The conclusion was that the greatest identification was with Spain (average 7.9) and to a lesser extent with Autonomous Community or Region (average 7.7) in third place with Europe (average 6.3). This greater localism of the Spanish is justified by, among other things, by expectation of benefits from European integration or the strong nationalism existing in Catalonia or the Basque country.

xenophobia. Those Andalusians who said "not", "a little", or "somewhat" xenophobic are similar to those who defined themselves as "very" xenophobic, with the exception of the 30 to 40 year-old group, although in very insignificant percentages.

The case of Catalonia is different, although there have not been many changes with respect to Spain and Andalusia. The "very" xenophobic in Catalonia were; 1) the mature age group, 50 to 64 years of age (31 per cent), with a low education level (71.8 per cent), 2) those who live in metropolitan habitats (38.3 per cent), 3) those of low social status (46.6 per cent), and 4) those with inclinations to the left (38 per cent). Although only 2.7 points fewer than those declaring to be politically right wing (35.3 per cent), those who identify themselves as Spaniards (34.9 per cent), are materialistic (80 per cent), and those who logically consider themselves very localist (61.1 per cent) than other superior key regions.

Conversely, if we consider as an established fact that the least xenophobic are: the youngest ones, with the highest level of education, socio-economic family status and social position, ideologically and politically positioned to the left and post-materialistic, the resultant profile would best represent that found in Catalonia than in Andalusia.

Regression analysis for measured indicators

An analysis of multiple regressions in two clearly differentiated models was made, wherein both had as a dependent variable, the rate of xenophobia. As it can be seeing in Tables with respect to the correlations for Andalusia and Catalonia, the rate of xenophobia is directly correlated in Andalusia to age, family economic status, and ideological identification. We can see this other way round with a materialistic/post-materialistic position, education, geographic identification of localism/universalism and social position. In the case of Catalonia, xenophobia correlates directly with ideological identification, age, and family socio-economic status. The opposite is seen for education, the materialistic/post-materialistic position, the social position, and geographic identification of localists/universalists.

Table 1. *Pearson's Correlation, Spain.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
A	r	1	-0.224**	-0.139**	-0.124**	-0.017	-0.170**	0.127**	0.010	-0.061**	0.152**	0.176**
	n	9623	9594	6087	9623	2617	2423	9493	9320	9623	9623	9623
B	r			-0.011	0.464	-0.153	0.200	0.179	-0.026	0.168	-0.369	-0.377
	n			6068	9594	2615	2414	9464	9293	9594	9594	9594
C	r				-0.085	0.059	-0.142	-0.031	0.85	-0.057	0.002	0.138
	n				6087	1649	1767	6019	5921	6087	6087	6087
D	r					-0.174	0.153	0.187	0.050	0.394	-0.420	-0.242
	n					2617	2423	9493	9320	9623	9623	9623
E	r						-0.010	-0.042	-0.025	-0.060	-0.025	-0.121
	n						1055	2593	2568	2617	2617	2617
F	r							0.82	-0.019	0.075	-0.159	-0.229
	n							2388	2342	2423	2423	2423
G	r								0.245	0.151	-0.129	-0.080
	n								9219	9493	9493	9493
H	r									-0.048	-0.012	0.044
	n									9320	9320	9320
I	r										-0.107	-0.036
	n										9623	9623
J	r											0.319
	n											9623
K	r											1
	n											9623

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01
* The correlation is significant at level 0.05

NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Level of education inter-viewed (recodified), C. Ideological Autopositionment (recodified), D. Social Position (recodified), E. Occupational Status last interviewed, F. Postmaterialism (recodified), G. Space Identification (recodi-fied), H. Nationalistic sentiment (recodified), I. Locality (recodified), J. Family socio-economic status, K. Age of interviewee (recodified).

Gonzalo Herranz de Rafael.

Table 2. *Pearson's Correlation, Andalusia.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
A	r	1	-0.196**	0.101**	-0.070**	-0.021	-0.242**	-0.078**	0.029	-0.042	0.128**	0.187**
	n	1650	1643	960	1650	455	414	1640	1625	1650	1650	1650
B	r			0.121	0.452	-0.150	0.268	0.199	0.077	0.182	-0.358	-0.336
	n			954	1643	455	414	1633	1619	1643	1643	1643
C	r				-0.010	0.184	-0.035	0.020	0.169	0.061	-0.099	0.064
	n				960	228	279	954	950	960	960	960
D	r					-0.178	0.173	0.140	0.098	0.394	-0.356	-0.170
	n					455	414	1640	1625	1650	1650	1650
E	r						0.088	-0.087	0.053	-0.025	0.043	-0.042
	n						181	453	449	455	455	455
F	r							0.004	0.031	0.121	-0.136	-0.311
	n							413	408	414	414	414
G	r								0.211	0.058	-0.143	-0.073
	n								1618	1640	1640	1640
H	r									-0.009	-0.055	0.063
	n									1625	1625	1625
I	r										-0.082	-0.023
	n										1650	1650
J	r											0.294
	n											1650
K	r											1
	n											1650

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01
* The correlation is significant at level 0.05

NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Level of education inter-viewed (recodified), C. Ideological Autopositionment (recodified), D. Social Position (recodified), E. Occupational Status last interviewed, F. Postmaterialism (recodified), G. Space Identification (recodi-fied), H. Nationalistic sentiment (recodified), I. Locality (recodified), J. Family socio-economic status, K. Age of interviewee (recodified).

Table 3. *Pearson's Correlation, Catalonia.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
A	r	1	-0.225**	0.232**	-0.122**	-0.010	-0.222**	-0.112**	0.023	-0.049	0.110**	0.168**
	n	1538	1532	974	1538	418	390	1515	1499	1538	1538	1538
B	r			-0.008	0.448	-0.131	0.262	0.090	-0.177	0.146	-0.318	-0.387
	n			969	1532	417	389	1509	1493	1532	1532	1532
C	r				-0.100	-0.017	-0.163	-0.075	-0.045	-0.079	-0.007	0.150
	n				974	282	296	967	958	974	974	974
D	r					-0.135	0.240	0.152	-0.038	0.406	-0.384	-0.261
	n					418	390	1515	1499	1538	1538	1538
E	r						0.031	-0.076	-0.038	-0.009	0.001	-0.044
	n						174	411	412	418	418	418
F	r							0.086	-0.092	0.014	-0.164	-0.226
	n							381	380	390	390	390
G	r								0.321	0.128	-0.085	-0.079
	n								1480	1515	1515	1515
H	r									0.052	0.090	0.045
	n									1499	1499	1499
I	r										-0.034	0.009
	n										1538	1538
J	r											0.326
	n											1538
K	r											1
	n											1538

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01
* The correlation is significant at level 0.05
NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Level of education interviewed (recodified), C. Ideological Autopositionment (recodified), D. Social Position (recodified), E. Occupational Status last interviewed, F. Postmaterialism (recodified), G. Space Identification (recodified), H. Nationalistic sentiment (recodified), I. Locality (recodified), J. Family socio-economic status, K. Age of interviewee (recodified).

In effect, it has been noted that in both regions, the same variables appear to coincide as being the best predictors of xenophobia. We may also observe in general terms that the more the ideological identification advances towards right wing positions, the greater the family economic status and the age of the persons, the greater the rate of xenophobia. On the contrary, the closer the people are to a post-materialistic position, and have a higher level of education, identifying themselves with more universalist values (Europe or the world) than localist (town or city), and having a higher social standing, then the lower the rate of xenophobia in that society.

In Table 4, we can see the first model of a multiple regression analysis, for the sample cases as a whole and for the cases of Andalusia and Catalonia[16].

---

[16] It was conveniently thought to present an aggregate model since two Autonomous Communities were being analysed. This model is composed of the eight questionnaires carried out on

Table 4. Model 1. *Regression of the rate of xenophobia*

	Spain	Andalusia	Catalonia
Total Regression Quotient (R)	0.241	0.418	0.278
Constant	2.910	2.148	3.052
Standardised regression quotients β:			
• Level of education (recodified)	-0.22	-0.416	-0.185
• Ideological auto-positioning (recodified)			
• Social position (recodified)	-	0.228	-
• Occupational status, last interviewed (recod.)			
• Post-materialism (recodified)	-	0.301	-
• Identification of space distribution (recodified)	-0.296	-0.104	-
• Nationalist sentiment (recodified)			
• Habitat (recodified)	-0.190	-0.402	-0.318
• Family socio-economic status (recodified)	-0.208	0.102	-
	-	0,210	-
	-0.122	-	-0.164
	-	0.166	-
R squared	0.046	0.095	0.008

Source: Author's data. Sample compiled from information derived from C.I.R.E.S., ASEP and IMSERSO. The dashes indicate a statistic of insignificant value.

As one can observe, in the case of Andalusia, the level of education, the scale of materialism/post-materialism, the social position and the ideological identification are the best predicators of xenophobia[17]. These shows appreciable differences compared to the rest of the variables; nationalistic sentiment, family socio-economic status, interviewed last occupational status and identification of space distribution for localism and universalism.

Nationalistic conscience, family socio-economic status, and geographic identification of localism/universalism are directly related to xenophobia. We can see this in the first case, where the more we approach a position which is more Spanish in nature, the greater the level of xenophobia in the Autonomous Communities of Andalusia. We also observe that the more one moves on the identification scale from more localist positions (town/city) to more universalist ones (Spain/ Europe/ world), the greater the value of the existing xenophobia[18]. Finally, the last occupational status of the person

"The views of the Spaniard towards immigrants". Of the eight, six correspond to CIRES (1991-1995) and October 1995, one to ASEP (1996), and the eighth one to IMSERSO (1997), with a total aggregate number of 9,600 questionnaires (See, Díez Nicolás, 1998).

[17] In this sense, Andalusia coincides with the first of the three models at the national level which Díez Nicolás used in his study of xenophobia.

[18] The identification of localism/universalism in Andalusia has a different tendency to the one expressed by the national Spanish one, wherein for Spain a reverse tendency is formed, where the positions that are more localist are the ones that get higher values of xenophobia.

interviewed correlates negatively to xenophobia, therefore the lower the occupational status the higher the values of xenophobia will be. In the case of Catalonia, though less evident, the materialistic/post-materialistic positions, the educational level, and the habitat, when correlated negatively, are the best indicators, all of them in inverse correlation, of the rate of xenophobia in this region.

The first model may be summed up in the following way:

A. In Andalusia, those with a tendency to occupy the most xenophobic positions would be the following: people who place themselves more to the ideological right, with a middle or high social position, with a greater family socio-economic status, and who have a nationalistic conscience much closer to a Spanish way of thinking.

B. In Andalusia, the tendency to position oneself as non-xenophobic may be found amongst: people with a high level of academic studies and with values very close to the post-materialistic ones.

C. We can observe the opposite in Catalonia where the tendency to explain xenophobia would be those positioned at a less xenophobic level: people with high levels of academic studies who live in metropolitan areas, and who especially sustain post-materialistic values.

D. With respect to the constant utilised for Andalusia (2.148), we see that if the remainder of the variables had a value of zero, the Andalusians could be included in the group categorised as a "little" xenophobic.

E. In the case of the constant used in the first model for Catalonia (3.052), we see that if the rest of the variables had a value of zero, then the Catalonians would be in the "somewhat" xenophobic category.

F. Each variable in the model offers different ways of explaining xenophobia. If we were to choose the level of education as the most influential variable in both communities.

G. G. Another variable, which appears to explain xenophobia in a satisfactory manner in Andalusia and Catalonia, is the materialism/post-materialism scale.

In both regions, as the situation advances to positions of post-materialism the lower the level of xenophobia are found. Although in Andalusia, whether the values are materialistic or post-materialistic, they would be positioned as "a little" xenophobic, while in Catalonia the materialists would be found in the category of "somewhat" xenophobic and the post-materialistic ones in the "a little" xenophobic category.

In the second model, as stated before, new predictable elements were introduced in relation to some attitudes, opinions, sentiments, etc. towards immigrants of specific ethnic or social groups which are present in great numbers as a result of immigration to Andalusia and Catalonia.

As can be seen in Tables 5 and 7, with respect to the correlations for Andalusia and Catalonia, the rate of xenophobia is directly correlated in Andalusia with the perception of the total number of people there are of other nationalities, cultures, religions, etc.; These maybe consequences of personal relationships with people of ethnic, social or nationalistic minorities and the attitudes or views towards them[19]. Conversely, there would be assessments made of particular ethnic, social or national minorities (Arabs, North Africans, South Americans, and black African people). We would also assess 1) the perception of the influence of the immigrants on salaries, 2) the consequences derived from conversations with these aforesaid people, and finally 3) the evaluation of the effects of immigration on the culture of the habitat the immigrants are live in.

In the case of Catalonia, xenophobia correlates directly with the perception on the number of people of other nationalities, cultures, religions, etc. These may also be the consequences of personal relationships with persons of ethnic, social, or national minorities and the attitudes or views towards them. Conversely we should consider the following in the assessment of certain ethnic, social, or national minorities (Arabs, North Africans, South Americans, and black African people), 1) the perception of the influence of the immigrant on salaries, 2) the consequences derived from conversations with them, and finally, 3) the evaluation of the effects of immigration on the culture of the habitat the immigrants live in.

Curiously, and contrary to what has occurred in the correlations of the previous model, Andalusia and Catalonia coincide in having a high incidence of correlationship, not only in the direct sense, but also in the reverse or opposite sense among the different attitudes toward the ethnic, social or nationalistic minorities of immigrants and the rate of xenophobia.

---

[19] An ethnic minority can be defined as "a group which is numerically inferior to the rest of the population in a particular society, which is not politically dominant and which is reproduced as an ethnic category" (Hylland,1993:121).

Table 5. *Pearson's Correlation, Spain.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A	r	1	-0.235**	-0.280**	-0.338**	0.258**	0.463**	0.467**	0.391**	-0.274**	-0.152**	-0.131**	-.105*	-0.344**
	n	9623	9112	9181	9181	8963	9307	9327	9315	7748	2099	1740	2696	9250
B	r			0.648	0.704	-0.21	-0.293	-0.288	-0.225	0.174	0.127	0.06	0.047	0.265
	n			9019	9005	8567	8851	8865	8860	7404	2065	1698	2620	8822
C	r				0.763	-0.205	-0.227	-0.238	-0.271	0.182	0.12	0.068	0.106	0.259
	n				9086	8634	8925	8940	8944	7475	2054	1703	2655	8895
D	r					-0.225	-0.315	-0.331	-0.269	0.188	0.106	0.08	0.077	0.294
	n					8623	8918	8932	8928	7461	2055	1703	2632	8885
E	r						0.185	0.193	0.178	-0.234	-0.087	-0.105	-0.088	-0.376
	n						8702	8718	8708	7335	1996	1655	2568	8728
F	r							0.927	0.776	-0.154	-0.139	-0.083	-0.068	-0.244
	n							9295	9274	7521	2047	1701	2634	8968
G	r								0.769	-0.155	-0.126	-0.09	-0.059	-0.247
	n								9290	7537	2050	1706	2638	8985
H	r									-0.136	-0.123	-0.078	-0.072	-0.219
	n									7529	2053	1708	2646	8978
I	r										0.049	0.023	0.036	0.221
	n										1838	1563	2458	7544
J	r											1	1	0.149
	n											1154	1395	2065
K	r												1	0.148
	n												1271	1709
L	r													0.129
	n													2653

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01

* The correlation is significant at level 0.01

NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Assessment of Arabs and Muslims, C. Assessment of South Americans, D. Assessment of Africans of negroid race, E. Perceptions of persons of other nationalities, F. Reaction: Daughter in love with Black African, H. Reaction: Daughter in love with South American, I. Influence of immigrants on wages, J. Consequences of dialogues with Arabs of the North, K. Consequences of dialogue with Africans, L. Consequences of dialogue with South Americans, M. Evaluation of effects of immigration on culture.

Table 6. *Pearson's Correlation, Andalusia.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A	r	1	-.369**	-.309**	-.351**	0.272**	0.480**	0.483**	0.411**	-.302**	-0.090	-0.049	-.026**	-.360**
	n	1650	1573	1567	1573	1513	1614	1617	1615	1288	359	254	327	1562
B	r			0.694	0.750	-0.173	-0.306	-0.297	-0.209	0.212	0.115	0.061	0.053	0.28
	n			1549	1554	1460	1546	1548	1548	1244	352	249	321	1503
C	r				0.800	-0.151	-0.249	-0.252	-0.251	0.230	0.060	-0.039	0.052	0.28
	n				1550	1455	1540	1542	1542	1243	346	249	322	1497
D	r					-0.187	-0.299	-0.305	-0.248	0.223	0.060	-0.030	0.059	0.31
	n					1460	1546	1548	1548	1247	351	250	322	1503
E	r						0.182	0.189	0.137	-0.220	-0.028	-0.004	-0.025	-0.32
	n						1486	1487	1486	1219	341	243	316	1464
F	r							0.936	0.794	-0.199	-0.116	-0.112	-0.082	-0.25
	n							1612	1611	1268	351	246	319	1533
G	r								0.776	-0.192	-0.144	-0.144	-0.097	-0.27
	n								1612	1268	352	247	319	1534
H	r									-0.136	-0.133	-0.146	-0.091	-0.23
	n									1269	352	247	319	1534
I	r										0.048	-0.082	0.026	0.25
	n										303	222	285	1247
J	r											1	1	0.15
	n											186	205	355
K	r												1	0.08
	n												153	250
L	r													0.17
	n													324

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01

* The correlation is significant at level 0.01

NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Assessment of Arabs and Muslims, C. Assessment of South Americans, D. Assessment of Africans of negroid race, E. Perceptions of persons of other nationalities, F. Reaction: Daughter in love with Black African, H. Reaction: Daughter in love with South American, I. Influence of immigrants on wages, J. Consequences of dialogues with Arabs of the North, K. Consequences of dialogue with Africans, L. Consequences of dialogue with South Americans, M. Evaluation of effects of immigration on culture.

Table 7. *Pearson's Correlation, Catalonia.*

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A	r	1	-.374**	-.304**	-.351**	0.344**	0.420**	0.414**	0.326**	-.290**	-.161**	-.213**	-.155**	-.366**
	n	1538	1490	197	1501	1453	1524	1525	1526	1252	493	426	583	1492
B	r			0.641	0.67	-0.265	-0.308	-0.293	-0.223	0.208	0.080	0.067	0.037	0.22
	n			1480	1483	1412	1476	1477	1478	1222	486	420	572	1452
C	r				0.76	-0.225	-0.186	-0.196	-0.217	0.214	0.035	0.046	0.065	0.22
	n				1491	1419	1483	1484	1485	1226	484	420	575	1459
D	r					-0.245	-0.269	-0.285	-0.231	0.195	0.094	0.104	0.096	0.23
	n					1422	1487	1488	1489	1226	485	421	574	1463
E	r						0.184	0.191	0.185	-0.211	-0.094	-0.142	-0.056	-0.41
	n						1440	1441	1442	1197	473	410	555	1423
F	r							0.917	0.757	-0.142	-0.140	-0.098	-0.113	-0.18
	n							1523	1523	1241	488	425	577	1482
G	r								0.737	-0.125	-0.119	-0.100	-0.088	-0.16
	n								1524	1242	488	425	578	1483
H	r									-0.135	-0.114	-0.094	-0.114	-0.18
	n									1242	489	425	577	1484
I	r										0.120	0.084	0.091	0.21
	n										427	378	527	1227
J	r											1	1	0.19
	n											286	331	483
K	r												1	0.19
	n												331	414
L	r													0.11
	n													568

** The correlation is significant at level 0.01
* The correlation is significant at level 0.01
NOTE: The variables utilized are the following: A. Rate of xenophobia, B. Assessment of Arabs and Muslims, C. Assessment of South Americans, D. Assessment of Africans of negroid race, E. Perceptions of persons of other nationalities, F. Reaction: Daughter in love with Black African, H. Reaction: Daughter in love with South American, I. Influence of immigrants on wages, J. Consequences of dialogues with Arabs of the North, K. Consequences of dialogue with Africans, L. Consequences of dialogue with South Americans, M. Evaluation of effects of immigration on culture.

As can be seen in Table 8, these variables appear to explain better and in greater detail, the rate of xenophobia in Andalusia as well as in Catalonia than those noted previously.

Table 8. Model 2. *Regression of the rate of xenophobia*

	Spain	Andalusia	Catalonia
Quotient of Regression (R)	0.560	0.548	0.624
Constant	2.609	2.797	3.114
Standardised regression quotients β:			
• Perception of number of immigrants	0.105	0.106	-
• Evaluation of the effects of immigration on culture			
• Assessment Arabs/Muslims/South American/Blacks African people	-0.130	-	-0.215
• Influence of immigrants on wages			
• Consequences of dialogues with Arabs/Muslims/South Americans/Blacks/ African people	-	-	-
	-0.117	-0.204	-0.145
	-	-	-
	0.190	-	0.195
R square	0.312	0.285	0.379

Source: Authors data. Sample compiled from information derived from C.I.R.E.S., ASEP, and IM-SERSO. The dashes indicate a statistic of insignificant value.

The variable which best predict the level of xenophobia in Andalusia is: the opinion as to whether or not the presence of the immigrant in Spain has affected the increase in xenophobia, and whether a decrease has had an effect on wages. These then produce a reverse effect, that is, the more existent the level of xenophobia then the opinion that the presence of the immigrants has influenced in the decrease of the same will be more generalised. The second variable makes reference to the perception Andalusians have about the number of people of other races, cultures and nationalities living in Spain, coming the conclusion that the most xenophobic ones appreciate the fact that there were far too many of these others in the 1990's in Spain.

In Catalonia, in contrast to Andalusia, the variable which best explains and predicts the level of xenophobia is the evaluation of the effects of immigration on the culture of the land. This produces a reverse relationship in which it is evident that the xenophobic positions will worsen immigration's effect on the majority's culture[20]. We should also add that there is a strong nationalistic conscience among the people there.

---

[20] A good reference for this position can be found in a statement made by the President of the Generalitat, Jordi Pujol, ex-president of the Catalonian Community, who turned down the idea that a mixed culture would be the desired solution for his Community, since the strong waves of

Secondly, there is an existing attitude against relationships and/or the sentiments of the effect of a family member towards particular groups of immigrants: Arabs and North Africans, South Americans and black African people. This contributes in establishing the point that the higher the rate of xenophobia the greater the reaction towards of forbidden relationships or sentiments[21].

We can summarise the second model in the following way:

A. The variables that best explain and predict xenophobia in Andalusia are the quantitative types such as: the tendency to lower salaries because of the presence of ethnic or social groups of immigrants, as well as the perceived tendency that there are many or far too many ethnic or national groups of immigrants that actually live in Spain, and more specifically in Andalusia.

B. In Catalonia, the variables which are highly considered are those which are more qualitative than quantitative. The first mentioned being the ones that have a negative influence which imprints the effects of immigration on the culture of the majority, and the prohibition of relationships with people of other cultural minority groups (North Africans, South Americans and black African people).

C. Keeping in mind the constant in the second model for Andalusia (2.797), we see that if the rest of the variables had a value of zero, the Andalusians would be closer to the category of "somewhat" xenophobic rather than to "a little" xenophobic.

---

migrations brought along with it "the alteration of the national identities and the absence of a paradigmatic collective", in the Spanish newspaper ABC, dated 24-V-2001, p.23.

[21] The 24th question in the CIRES questionnaire about "The Spaniard's views towards immigration" (1995 version), asks the following: "If your daughter fell in love with an Arab, a North African, a South American, or a black African person, which of the following reactions would best describe your sentiment or attitude?

☒ I would let her do as she wanted 1
☒ I would make the suggestion that she take into consideration the difference in cultures before proceeding...2
☒ I would make the suggestion that she keep in mind the reaction of her friends and family before continuing with the reltionship....................3
☒ I would counsel her not to continue.....................................4
☒ I would prohibit her to continue..5
☒ Other, what?..6
      No comment...9

D. With respect to the constant for Catalonia in the second model (3.114), we see that if the rest of the variables had a value of zero the Catalonians would be in the category of "somewhat" xenophobic.

E. In the previous model (1), the academic or educational level and the position of materialism/post-materialism were the variables which best explained the rate of xenophobia in both Andalusia and Catalonia. In the second model, the level of coincidence occurs in the perception of the influence the immigrants have on the variations in salaries. If the equation of multiple regressions were applied[22], then we would need to contemplate decrease, no effect or increase in Andalusia. They would be categorised as "a little" xenophobic, although for those Andalusians who position themselves with the diminishing of wages, the effect would be closer to the position of "somewhat" xenophobic than to "a little" xenophobic. The Catalonian case is different from the Andalusian one because the three categories are closer to the "somewhat" xenophobic than to the "a little" xenophobic category.

F. In the case of Andalusia, it is interesting to note the influence of the variable pertaining to the number of existing immigrants. In effect, as can be observed in the equation[23], those who do not think there are many, those who think there are a lot but not too many or those who think there are too many find themselves in the position of "somewhat" xenophobic, although increasing in level at the same time as the perception of existing immigrants increase.

G. In Catalonia, of the variety or views chosen to explain xenophobia, the most appropriate is the evaluation of what effects the presence of immigration has on culture.

---

[22]For the numerical categories: 1. decrease, 2. no effect, 3. increase; in Andalusia it would be: 2.593; 2.309; and 2.185.cIn Catalonia they would be: 2.969; 2.824; and 2.679.

[23] For this variable, the categories are: 1...not too many; 2.....many, but not too many; 3....too many; and the values were respectively: 2.903; 3.009; and 3.115.

5. Conclusions

We may conclude by saying that xenophobia is the behaviour or attitude of rejection to all that is foreign, which is learned as another element of the group's culture, and therefore, can be redirected through intercultural processes.

On the other hand, multi-cultural society is being converted into the future paradigm of coexistence, where two contradictory tendencies merge: globalisation and the sublime identity.

Xenophobia can best be explained, though only partially, within the context of modernisation. While in the more modern societies there exists the possibility of differentiating between xenophobic and non-xenophobic people, in the less developed societies the tendency towards these attitudes or views are more homogeneous among the population and are hardly discernible.

The rate of xenophobia in Spain is minimal, as in the cases of the two Autonomous regions studied. However there are some differences or variations between them, and within each other. From a descriptive perspective, the most xenophobic in Andalusia are the older people, who have a low level of education, live in urban centres, have a low social position, are primarily of a leftist ideology, and who identify themselves as both Spaniards and Andalusians. They tend to have materialistic values and more often than not, identify themselves as coming from their town or city above all. In the case of Catalonia, the profile would be the same except for the ideological identity, where its positioning on the right almost coincides with the one on the left, the nationalistic identification being towards the Spanish ways and those who live in a metropolitan habitat.

Contrary to what happens in Andalusia, where the very xenophobic do not differ from the "somewhat", "a little" or "non" xenophobic, the structure of the "little" or "non" xenophobic would be younger people in Catalonia, between the ages of 30 and 49, with a mid-level education, who live in urban zones, of a middle class social position, and identify themselves as both Catalonians and Spaniards, and who have post-materialistic values. From an explanatory point of view, the different variables used,

correlate in the same way in Andalusia as in Catalonia with respect to xenophobia. Conversely, the closer to post-materialism they are, and the higher the educational level, the more they identify themselves with values which are more universalistic than localistic, and occupy a higher social position, then the xenophobic levels will be lower

The first model of multiple regressions denotes that for the case of Andalusia, the best predictors of xenophobia are: the materialism/post-materialism scale and one's ideological identification. For Catalonia, the ones which hold the record for having the best explanatory and prediction level are: materialistic/post-materialistic position, the level of education and the habitat. However, the second model uses as a prediction variable those that are more related with attitudes, opinions and sentiments towards xenophobia and which have resulted in having a higher explanatory value than in the first model.

The variables that best explain xenophobia in Andalusia are: the influence the immigrants have on the behaviour of wages and the perception of the number of existing immigrants. In Catalonia, the variables are: the evolution of the effects of immigration on the culture of the land.

Definitively, xenophobia is made up of cultural elements which are ideologically of an ethnocentric nature. This is seen to be influenced and explained in a very clear manner by a set of variables more related to attitudes and emotions than ones of a socio-demographic nature. Whilst stating this we should bear in mind the scarce existing levels of xenophobia in Spain in general, and in Andalusia and Catalonia in particular.

Referencias

Alvarez Dorronsoro, I. (1993): *Diversidad cultural y conflicto nacional*. Madrid: Talasa.

Castles, S. y Miller, M. J. (1998): *The age of migration. International population movements in the modern world*, Macmillan.

Castell, M. (1997): *La era de la información*. Madrid: Alianza.

Colectivo IOÉ (1994): "La inmigración extranjera en España", in J. Contreras, (Comp). *Los retos de la inmigración*. Madrid: Talasa.

Connor, W.(1998): *Etnonacionalismo*. Madrid: Trama.

Corkill, D. (2001): "Economic migrants and the labour market in Spain and Portugal", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 24, nº 5, pp.828-844.

Del Campo, S.; Navarro, M. y Tezanos, F. (2001): *La cuestión regional española*. Madrid: Edicusa.

Deutsch, K.W. (1981): *Las naciones en crisis*. México: F.C.E..

Díez Medrano, J. y Gutierrez, P.(2001): " Nested identities: national and European identity in Spain", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.24, nº5, pp.753-778.

Díez Nicolás, J. (2000). www.insersomigracion.upco.es/Libro/Menu-Actitudes.htm

Garcia Ferrando, M. (1982): *Regionalismo y autonomía en España*. Madrid: CIS.

García Ferrando, M.; López Aranguren, E. y Beltrán, M. (1994): *La conciencia nacional y regional en la España de la autonomías*. Madrid: CIS.

Geertz, Cl. (1987): *La Interpretación de las culturas*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Gobernado Arribas, R. (1996): "Niveles educativos y estratificación social", in Gobernado Arribas (Coord.). *Análisis comparativo de las estructuras sociales de Andalucía y Cataluña*. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga.

Gobernado Arribas, R. (Coord.) (1996): *Análisis comparativo de las estructuras sociales de Andalucía y Cataluña*.

Herranz, G. (1998): "An empirical survey on the nationalistic identifications in the spain in the 1990´s" *Nation and Nationalism*, Vol. 4, pp. 35-59.

Hidalgo Tuñón, A. (1996). "Xenofobia", in F.J Blasquez Ruiz (Dir). *10 palabras claves sobre racismo y xenofobia*. Navarra: Verbo Divino.

Huntington, S.P. (1997): *El choque de civilizaciones*, Barcelona: Paidós.

Hylland Eriksen, T. (1993): *Ethnicity and nationalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Inglehart, R. (1991): *El cambio cultural en las sociedades industriales avanzadas*. Madrid: CIS.

Jimenez Blanco, J. (1977): *La conciencia regional en España*. Madrid: CIS.

Kymlicka, W. (2003): *La política vernácula. Nacionalismo, multiculturalismo y ciudadanía*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Laclau, E. (1995): "Universalismo, particularismo y el tema de la identidad", *Revista Internacional de Filosofía Política*, nº 5, pp.38-52.

Lamo de Espinosa, E. (1995): "Fronteras culturales", in Lamo de Espinosa, E.(Ed). *Culturas, Estados, Ciudadanos*. Madrid: Alianza.

López Aranguren, E. (1983): *La conciencia regional en el proceso autonómico español*. Madrid: CIS.

López Aranguren, E. y García Ferrando, M. (1991). "Nacionalismo y regionalismo en la España de las autonomías", in J. Vidal Beneyto, (Comp). *España a debate. La sociedad*. Madrid: Técnos.

Nielsson, G.P. (1989):"Sobre los conceptos de etnicidad, nación y estado", in A. Pérez Agote (Dir). *Sociología del nacionalismo*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.

Rex, J. (1995): "La metrópolis multicultural: La experiencia británica", in E. Lamo de Espinosa (Ed). *Culturas, estados, ciudadanos*. Madrid: Alianza, pp.197-224.

Rex, J. (1997): "The concept of Multicultural society", in Guibernau, M.; Rex, J.(Eds). *The ethnicity reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 205-220.

Sabater, F. (1993):"La heterofobia como enfermedad moral", in VVAA, *Racismo y xenofobia. Búsqueda de las raíces*, Madrid: Fundación Rich.

Sartori, G. (2001): *La sociedad multiétnica. Pluralismo, multiculturalismo y extranjeros*. Madrid: Taurus.

Sartori, G. (2002): *La sociedad multiétnica. Extranjeros e islámicos*. Madrid: Taurus.

Smith, A.D. (2000): *Nacionalismo y modernidad*, Madrid: Istmo.

Wieviorka, M. (1992): *El espacio del racismo*. Barcelona: Paidós.