Gender Attitudes of Muslim Migrants in Western and Northern Europe
Final Report

Veronica Kostenko
LCSR junior research fellow
Research Question

• Do Muslim migrants in Western and Northern Europe retain their conservative attitudes towards women, or is this problem exaggerated?
Who are migrants and Muslims? Operationalization of terms

- Migrants – those who were born in countries other than where they live.
  - those whose both parents migrated. (D. Massey)
- Muslims – self – reported to belong to Islam.
Migrants and Muslims in Europe

Migrants
12.2%, N=2021

Muslims
2.5%, N=406
Level of Religiosity among European Migrants
Theoretical Basis

- Revised Assimilation Theory (A. Portes, R. Rumbaut, M. Zhou)
- Revised Modernization Theory (R. Inglehart, C. Welzel)
- Women empowerment (R. Inglehart, P. Norris)
Hypotheses I

From Assimilation Theory we hypothesize:
• That migrants should be relatively close in their views and attitudes to local population, especially when we include 2nd generation migrants

From Modernization Theory:
• Younger, more educated, less religious people with higher levels of post-materialist values, who never experienced survival dangers would be more egalitarian

From Women Empowerment literature:
• Islam is a negative predictor for gender egalitarianism
Hypotheses II

- Higher levels of *education and social status* would lead to support of gender egalitarianism
- **Migrants** are more conservative than local population of Europe
- Gender attitudes of **Muslims** are far less liberal than of other denominations
- More **religious** people are more traditionalist in their gender attitudes
- **Values of conservation** would contribute to less gender equality support
Recent literature on the topic

- Patriarchal values (C. Welzel & A. Alexander, 2009, 2012)
- Integration of Muslim population (Laurence, 2007)
Data and Methods

- ESS (4\textsuperscript{th} wave, 2010)
- Cross-country comparison
- European migrants subsample
- Countries that have significant number of recent migrants in the subsample (8 states: Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, Spain, France, UK, the Netherlands, and Sweden)
Why Gender Equality?

• An important issue (human rights)
• Gender egalitarianism is a strong predictor of further social changes and empowerment (R.Inglehart, P.Norris, 2003)
• Relationship between gender equality support and democracy (Rizzo, Abdel-Latif, Meyer, 2007)
Gender Equality Index

- From 0 to 1 where 1 stands for very liberal

a) Women should be prepared to cut down on paid work for sake of family;
b) Men should have more rights to job than women when jobs are scarce.
Gender Equality Index: Migrants and Locals in Europe
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Independent Variables

- Age (7 categories)
- Gender
- Education
- ISEI
- Degree of religiosity
- Values (Schwarz scale)
- Religious denomination
- Migrant status (1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation migrants)
- Country (dummy variables)
OLS Modeling: Muslims and Migrants (M&M)

- Model 1: Age, gender, country dummies, M&M
- Model 2: + Education and ISEI
- Model 3: + Degree of religiosity and attitude to gays
- Model 4: + Schwarz values
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1a</th>
<th>Model 1b</th>
<th>Model 2a</th>
<th>Model 2b</th>
<th>Model 3a</th>
<th>Model 3b</th>
<th>Model 4a</th>
<th>Model 4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.00***(-.30)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.31)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.25)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.25)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.18)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.15)</td>
<td>-.00***(-.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Migrant</td>
<td>-.08***(-.10)</td>
<td>-21***(-.13)</td>
<td>-.06***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.17***(-.10)</td>
<td>-.03***(-.04)</td>
<td>-.10***(-.06)</td>
<td>-.03***(-.04)</td>
<td>-.09***(-.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Muslim</td>
<td>Migrant Status</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Migrant status</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Migrant status</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Migrant status</td>
<td>Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.07)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
<td>.03***(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>.04***(.05)</td>
<td>.04***(.05)</td>
<td>.05***(.06)</td>
<td>.05***(.06)</td>
<td>.06***(.06)</td>
<td>.05***(.07)</td>
<td>.05***(.07)</td>
<td>.05***(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>-.05***(-.07)</td>
<td>-.06***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.05***(-.07)</td>
<td>-.06***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.05***(-.07)</td>
<td>-.06***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.07***(-.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-.04***(-.06)</td>
<td>-.03***(-.05)</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>.03***(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>.05***(.06)</td>
<td>.05***(.06)</td>
<td>.06***(.08)</td>
<td>.06***(.08)</td>
<td>.04***(.05)</td>
<td>.04***(.05)</td>
<td>.03***(.04)</td>
<td>.03***(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>.01*** (.02)</td>
<td>.02*** (.03)</td>
<td>.02*** (.03)</td>
<td>.02*** (.03)</td>
<td>.02*** (.03)</td>
<td>.03*** (.04)</td>
<td>.03*** (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>.09***(.11)</td>
<td>.05***(.12)</td>
<td>.09***(.12)</td>
<td>.09***(.12)</td>
<td>.08***(.11)</td>
<td>.08***(.11)</td>
<td>.09***(.11)</td>
<td>.09***(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>.17***(.22)</td>
<td>.17***(.22)</td>
<td>.18***(.24)</td>
<td>.18***(.24)</td>
<td>.17***(.22)</td>
<td>.16***(.22)</td>
<td>.16***(.22)</td>
<td>.16***(.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.03***(.19)</td>
<td>.03***(.19)</td>
<td>.03***(.17)</td>
<td>.03***(.17)</td>
<td>.03***(.16)</td>
<td>.03***(.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEI</td>
<td>-.01***(-.09)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.10)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.08)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.07)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01***(-.12)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.12)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.11)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards gays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05***(.20)</td>
<td>.05***(.20)</td>
<td>.05***(.18)</td>
<td>.04***(.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation(( f1 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-05***(-.20)</td>
<td>-05***(-.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence(( f2 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04***(.12)</td>
<td>.04***(.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement(( f3 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to change(( f4 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01***(-.02)</td>
<td>-.01***(-.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16409</td>
<td>16706</td>
<td>14902</td>
<td>15180</td>
<td>14716</td>
<td>14990</td>
<td>13959</td>
<td>14213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²adj</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1) Model a has migration status as explanatory variable, model b includes religious affiliation (Muslim – non-Muslim instead). Not enough cases to them simultaneously
2) Coefficients are put in the following way: b coefficient stands first, asterisks show significance, and standardized coefficients appear in the parentheses.
3) *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1
4) Standard errors are not shown as for all the coefficients in all the models they are lower than 0.01
Results 1

- Age (young) and education (higher) have the strongest positive effects for gender egalitarianism
Results II

- Migrants are a little more conservative gender-wise than local population.
- Degree of religiosity is a stronger predictor of gender inequality support than denomination.
- Effect of Islam is a bit stronger than effect of migration per se.
- Islam has medium-size robust anti-egalitarian effect in gender issues.
Results III

• European countries differ significantly in their support of gender equality among both local and migrant population. Sweden and the Netherlands are the most egalitarian, Switzerland and Germany – the least gender equality supportive.

• Other values, like conservation and attitudes towards gays explain large portion of variance.
Thanks for your attention