European Muslims’ Experiences of Discrimination in Public Institutions

Pamela Irving Jackson
Justice Studies Program
Department of Sociology
Rhode Island College
Providence, RI 02908
pjackson@ric.edu

Peter Doerschler
Department of Political Science
Bloomsburg University
Bloomsburg, PA 17815
pdoersch@bloomu.edu

December 9, 2012

Data for this study were provided from the European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and the European Social Survey. The authors would also like to thank the Fulbright Program, Bloomsburg University and Rhode Island College for their support of the project. The paper reflects the authors’ views, not necessarily those of their institutions.
European Muslims’ Experiences of Discrimination in Public Institutions

Abstract

Using data from the European Social Survey, 2002-2008, this paper examines the multiple discrimination experienced by Muslims in four European states: France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. We compare these results to those from the Eurobarometer and EU-MIDIS. In its 2012 report, Amnesty International underscores the problem of discrimination against Muslims in Europe. “Multiple discrimination” is a special focus of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. Discussion of the need for a “‘Horizontal Directive’” (EU-MIDIS, 2010 (5): 5) and the “Genderace” project of the 7th Framework Programme both highlight the problem of multiple discrimination and the “intersectionality” (Genderace, 2010: 272) of axes of discrimination. The Genderace report (2010: 32) uses the term intersectionality “to define a situation . . . in which several grounds of discrimination interact concurrently.” This report follows the European Commission’s 2007 study, in which the problem of multiple discrimination and the significance of intersectionality on the impact of discrimination are investigated. We examine over time discrimination faced by Muslims on the basis of their religion, race, nationality, ethnicity and gender, and discuss policy changes warranted by the data to enable European Muslims to fully utilize their talents and abilities to the benefit of Europe and its member-states.
European Muslims’ Experiences of Discrimination in Public Institutions

Prominent human rights organizations have underscored the hostility and discrimination directed at Muslims in European states and resulting barriers to the development and use of their talents on behalf of Europe. On the basis of its investigation, *Choice and Prejudice: Discrimination against Muslims in Europe*, Amnesty International (2012: 4), for example, recently warned that “Muslims in Europe face discrimination in several areas of life because of their religion, their ethnic origin or their gender, or a combination of these grounds. Discrimination . . . . blights their individual prospects, opportunities and self-esteem and can result in isolation, exclusion and stigmatization.” In addition, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2010: 3), in its “Data in Focus Report” on *Multiple Discrimination* defined the concept “as meaning discrimination on more than one ground” and published a special report summarizing related survey results from both the European Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS) and a Special Eurobarometer investigation. Furthermore, the EU Seventh Framework Program funded the GendeRace project (2008-2010) and its report concluding that despite the existence of several EU and national processes for responding to bias claims “through action and conflict resolution . . . multiple-discrimination based on racialized identities and gender remains inadequately addressed” (EU Seventh Framework Program, 2010: 7). The report (EU Seventh Framework Program, 2010: 7) describes “identities as multiple, often characterized by the intersectional experience . . . [and] advances the view that social relations based on gender and racialized identities or ethnicity influence the perception and use of antidiscrimination laws.”

The Report of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe (COE Group) (Council of Europe, 2011: 15) cites “the increase of negative attitudes to Muslims in Europe . . . confirmed by opinion polls carried out by the Pew Global Attitudes Project”, between 2005-2010 in some states, and unfavorability attitudes reaching close to 50%. Also noted in the COE Group’s report are the results of
the EU’s Fundamental Rights Agency study (EU-MIDIS 2009, 3) detailing discrimination against Muslims in Europe. Organizations and reports with a greater security emphasis indicate that what is perceived as Muslims’ lack of integration into their European member-state will foster extremism on the part of some members of the religious minority. These reports also underscore hostility toward Muslims and discrimination against them on the part of non-Muslim Europeans (Congressional Research Service, 2011: 11; Eurislam, 2009: 27). Central to the hostility toward Muslims is the assumption that Muslims do not accept the authority of European states and that Islam does not belong in Europe. But recent research undermines concerns about European Muslims’ support for agencies of authority in their member-state and, instead, suggests the insecurity of the religious minority in Europe (cf. Jackson and Doerschler, 2012).

In this paper, we examine the nature, level and growth of discrimination against Muslims in France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom—four nations where the size of the Muslim population and state involvement in European policy-making have increased the visibility of Muslim communities and the salience of apparent differences between them and their non-Muslim neighbors in the state. Elsewhere we carefully examine the practical and theoretical importance of differences among these nations in the situation and origin of their Muslim population groups, in the national model of minority integration, and in the relationship between religion and the state (cf. Jackson and Doerschler, 2012). Space limitations in this conference paper do not permit a reprise of that discussion. Here we focus on Muslims’ experiences of discrimination in public institutions and the extent to which these experiences reflect instances of multiple discrimination, the intersectionality of two or more traits toward which discrimination is directed, and the vulnerability of specific groups within the Muslim population.
Data relating to European Muslims’ Experiences of Discrimination in Public Institutions

and Muslims’ sense of security in Europe. European Social Survey, European Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU MIDIS). The European Social Survey enables examination of the attitudes of Muslims in comparison to non-Muslims without using ethnicity or nationality as a proxy for religious affiliation. (See Jackson and Doerschler (2012) and Jackson (2009) for discussion of the problem of ethnicity/nationality proxy for religion.) The European Social Survey was funded through the European Commission’s Framework Programs, the European Science Foundation, and national funding bodies in each of the 30 participating countries.

EU-MIDIS data were gathered by Gallup-Europe for the European Agency for Fundamental Rights. EU-MIDIS results provide preliminary evidence of the unfairness experienced by Muslims in Europe in some of the key areas of life examined by European studies of well-being. (See, for example, Stiglitz and Fitoussi, 2009; Gjoksksi, 2010; de Jonge, 2009; and for a review, Jackson and Doerschler, 2012: 121-141). The results presented in the EU-MIDIS sub-report on Muslims are more important for their focus on experiences of discrimination in general and instances of ethnic bias by justice officials than for the findings themselves. They represent quasi-official recognition of the need to examine both the marginalization of Muslim minorities in European societies and the crystallization of inequality between Europe’s core non-Muslim groups and its Muslim minorities, deemed to be culturally peripheral. An additional EU-MIDIS report focuses on multiple discrimination, providing information on the extent to which respondents (Muslim women, for example) experienced discrimination based on more than one personal characteristic (such as their religion, gender and ethnicity) (http://www.fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/EU_MIDIS_DiF5-multiple-
In the EU-MIDIS report on Multiple Discrimination data from the *Special Eurobarometer 296* are utilized in conjunction with EU-MIDIS data (FRA EU-MIDIS Data in Focus Report 2010 (5): 8) to compare perceptions of the minority and majority population on the prevalence of religious and other types of discrimination.

We have also fully examined other data sources (including studies initiated by Statistics Netherlands, the *European Commission on Racism and Intolerance* and the German Ministry of the Interior’s *Survey of Muslim Life in Germany*) elsewhere (Jackson and Doerschler, 2012) and mention them only briefly here due to space limitations. In this paper we further examine evidence concerning trends in discrimination against Muslims and the policy implications of these findings.

**Findings on Discrimination experienced by Muslims in four European States.**

In its report, *Racist Violence in 15 Member States*, the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (2005) provides examples of anti-foreigner violence and reviews single state studies then available regarding discrimination against ethnic groups likely to be Muslim. Due to the lack of data at the time, EUMC was not able to provide a systematic analysis of discrimination against Muslims in Europe. Joachim Brüß (2008) investigated Muslims’ perceptions of discrimination in samples (drawn in 2004) of Turkish Muslims in Berlin, Bangladeshi Muslims in London, and Moroccan Muslims in Madrid. (The French research contingent “decided not to launch the survey, as they could not define a satisfactory sampling frame for Paris because of missing information for the Muslim population” (Brüß, 2008: 892).)
Brüß (2008: 886) found that in Berlin “30 percent of Turkish Muslims indicated that they felt treated respectfully and in a friendly way by the receiver society . . . In contrast, in London 93 percent of Bangladeshi Muslims . . . felt respectfully treated”. In London, age differences were evident in perceptions of discrimination: young Bangladeshi Muslims saw themselves as “belonging to a discriminated minority . . . reported being stopped by the police more often . . . [and] felt that they were treated disrespectfully by the receiver society . . .” (Brüß, 2008: 886-7). Brüß’ (2008: 889) multivariate analysis suggests that disrespectful treatment and verbal attacks were key factors influencing respondents’ perceptions of being a member of a group that is discriminated against on the part of Bangladeshi Muslims in London and Turkish Muslims in Germany respectively.

Brüß discusses the implications of these results for the social mobility of Muslims in the receiver states. In his words:

“severe and persistent forms of social exclusion can probably be tackled more thoroughly by taking Muslims’ experiences seriously . . . more knowledge is needed to explore . . . the structure and meaning of everyday interaction between Muslims and host societies across Europe” (Brüß, 2008: 891).

While Brüß cites several limitations to his study, his results underscore the significance of discrimination for Muslims’ sense of marginality: Disrespectful treatment, discrimination by police and non-official members of the host society, and verbal hostility directed at Muslims increase their perception of being in a minority group that is discriminated against and are
likely to reduce their optimism about the extent to which they can contribute to their European state.

We further examine Muslims’ experiences of discrimination in Europe using information from two large scale studies with data collected more recently than those gathered by Brüß: the European Minorities and Discrimination Study (EU-MIDIS, commissioned by the European Agency for Fundamental Rights), and the European Social Survey (2002-2008). The EU-MIDAS (2009-2:5) Data in Focus Report on Muslims analyzes respondents’ experiences of discrimination on the basis of ethnicity in nine areas: when looking for work, at work, looking for a house or apartment, by healthcare or social service personnel, by school personnel, at a café or restaurant or bar, entering or in a shop, or in opening a bank account or getting a loan. Summarizing the study as a whole, FRA reports that: “overall, 51% of Muslims compared to 20% of non-Muslim ethnic minorities surveyed in the 14 EU-Member states in which Muslims were surveyed believe discrimination on grounds of religion or belief to be “very” or “fairly” widespread” (FRA EU-MIDAS 2009 02:10).

EU-MIDIS did not gather data on Muslims in Britain (possibly because the British Census does, in contrast to those of the other of our three states); but Germany, France and the Netherlands were among the Member States in which Muslim minority groups were surveyed. FRA (EU-MIDIS 2009 (02): 10) indicates that “on average the majority of all Muslim respondents considered discrimination on the grounds of both ethnic or immigrant background and religion or belief to be widespread in their country. However, the responses of different
Muslim groups in individual countries vary.” We look at some of these differences below for
the states in our examination. Table 5.1 summarizes key results.

Table 5.1 about here

In Germany thirty-one percent of self-identified Turkish Muslim respondents indicate
that they have been *discriminated against in one of the nine areas in the past twelve months*
(close to the 30% overall average for Muslim minorities). The number of incidents of
discrimination reported by Turkish Muslims in Germany was 5.8, below the fourteen state
overall average of 7.7 (EU-MIDAS, 2009-2: 6). Forty-five per cent of Turkish Muslims in
Germany reported that they were unaware of a law forbidding “discrimination against people
on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background when applying for a job” compared to 37
% of Muslims in the survey overall (EU-MIDAS, 2009-2: 10). Twenty-four percent of Turkish
Muslims surveyed in Germany indicated that they had been *stopped by the police* in the past
twelve months (compared to 25% of Muslims in the comparative survey overall). Thirty-seven
percent of Turkish Muslims surveyed in Germany *perceived ethnic profiling* when stopped by
the police in the last 12 months (compared to 40% of Muslims in the comparative survey
overall). Thirty-six percent of Turkish Muslims surveyed in Germany perceived ethnic profiling
when they were *stopped by the border control* (similar to the 37% average for Muslims in the
comparative survey overall). The EU MIDAS (2009-2) survey results suggest that Turkish
Muslims perceive blocked access in many areas of social interaction and endeavor in Germany
and that this is true for other categories of Muslims in the other European states examined.
In France, where self-identified Muslims in the North African and Sub-Saharan African respondents provided the Muslim sub-sample, 25% and 26% of respondents respectively reported discrimination in the past twelve months in the nine areas examined by the survey, indicating that there had been 4.1 and 6.2 discriminatory incidents respectively. Twenty-one percent of North African and 15% of Sub-Saharan African Muslims in France reported no awareness of a law forbidding “discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background when applying for a job” compared to 37 % of Muslims in the survey overall (EU-MIDAS, 2009 02: 10). Higher numbers of those identified as Muslims in France had been stopped by the police in the last twelve months than in Germany: 44% of North African respondents in France and 37% of Sub-Saharan African respondents indicated they had been stopped by the police (in contrast to 24% of Turkish Muslim respondents in Germany, as noted above). The French Muslims surveyed were much more likely than those in Germany to have perceived ethnic profiling when stopped by the police in the last twelve months: 66% of French Sub-Saharan Africans and 44% of French North Africans perceived ethnic profiling (in contrast to 37% of Turkish Muslims surveyed in Germany, as noted above). These figures suggest a contentious relationship between Muslim minorities and the police in France, a picture that has received considerable support in the last decade, but especially after the riots near Paris in 2005. Interestingly, though, Muslims identified as Sub-Saharan Africans or North Africans in France were not more likely than Turkish Muslims in Germany to perceive ethnic profiling when stopped by the border control: 30% of Sub-Saharan African and 32% of North African Muslim respondents in France indicated that they perceived ethnic profiling by border control, in contrast to 36% of Turkish Muslim respondents in Germany (as noted above).
EU-MIDIS Muslim respondents in the Netherlands were members of Turkish and North African ethnic groups. They indicated **having experienced discrimination in the last twelve months** in one of the nine areas examined at a rate of 29% and 30% respectively, close to the Muslims surveyed in Germany, but 4-5% more likely to report discrimination than those in France. Turkish and North African respondents in the Netherlands reported 5 and 7.2 incidents of discrimination in the last twelve months. The two groups also differed in their **awareness of laws forbidding discrimination** on the basis of ethnicity and immigrant background with applying for a job: Fifty percent of North African Muslims surveyed in the Netherlands reported that no such law existed, while 33% of Turkish Muslims surveyed in the Netherlands thought there was no such law. The French Muslim groups surveyed were most likely to be aware of such laws (with only 15%-Sub-Saharan Africans or 21%-N. Africans indicating there was no such law), suggesting that anti-discrimination efforts have reached them in France, more effectively than they have reached Muslim minorities in either the Netherlands or Germany. Muslims in the North African and Turkish groups surveyed in the Netherlands were less likely than French Muslims surveyed to report that they had been **stopped by the police** (26% of North Africans and 27% of Turkish in the Netherlands, compared to figures 10-18% higher for the Muslim groups surveyed in France, as noted above). Thirty-nine % of North African and 15% of Turkish Muslim respondents in the Netherlands perceived **ethnic profiling when stopped by the police**, the difference between them perhaps reflecting the greater visibility of North Africans. Thirty-five percent of North African and 31% of Turkish Muslims surveyed in the Netherlands **perceived ethnic profiling** when stopped by the border control, placing them close to the Muslim respondents from the selected ethnic groups in France and Germany, as noted above.
Regarding rights awareness, forty-five percent of Turkish Muslims in Germany reported that they were unaware of a law forbidding “discrimination against people on the basis of their ethnicity/immigrant background when applying for a job” (compared to 37 % of Muslims in the survey overall). In the Netherlands, 50 percent of North African Muslims were unaware of such a law. French Muslims had the highest rate of rights awareness, with between 15-21% unaware.

Data from the ESS (2002-2008) in Table 5.2 permit us to compare Muslims and non-Muslims in their perceptions of discrimination. In the UK, for example, Muslims are over 16% more likely than non-Muslims to say that they are a member of a group discriminated against in their country of residence.

In Germany, the difference is 29%, with Muslims again more likely than non-Muslims to indicate that they are in a group that faces discrimination. Slightly greater differences exist between Muslims and non-Muslims in France (33% difference) and the Netherlands (37% difference) in likelihood of reporting membership in a group that is the target of discrimination.

Religious discrimination is the greatest source of difference between Muslims and non-Muslims in the UK and Germany: In the UK, Muslims are 23.6% more likely than non-Muslims to report being a member of a group that faces religious discrimination. In Germany, the difference between the two groups is over 16%, with Muslims more likely to report religious discrimination of their religious group. Dutch Muslims are 29% more likely than non-Muslims to report that they are in a group that is the target of religious discrimination, while French
Muslims are 15% more likely than non-Muslims to indicate religious discrimination of their group.

Figure 5:1 depicts the ESS (2002-2008) results for all four states from the last table, regarding perceptions of Muslims and non-Muslims on the source of discrimination. The graph also displays the relative importance of religion, race and nationality as the source of the discrimination experienced by Muslims in each state. We compared the states in terms of Muslims’ and non-Muslims’ experiences of religious discrimination above. Regarding race as a trigger of discrimination against Muslims, in the UK Figure 5.1 indicates that Muslims are 12% more likely than non-Muslims to indicate racial discrimination against their group. In France, Muslims are 23% more likely than non-Muslims to report that their group faces racial discrimination, while the difference is 12% for the Netherlands. Nationality is the trigger of discrimination cited most often by Muslims in Germany, with Muslims about 22% more likely than non-Muslims to indicate discrimination on the basis of the nationality of their group. In France and the Netherlands, the differences were 15% and 22% respectively. The visibility of race in France and nationality in Germany to those who discriminate may reflect the states’ expectations for integration by their largest minorities, who are the legacy of guestworker recruiting from North Africa (in France) and Turkey (in Germany). While state policy is not drafted to promote discrimination, indications that visible minorities are not measuring up to official standards for integration can be utilized by those who discriminate to justify their behavior.
Figure 5.2 shows an increase in the discrimination faced by Muslims in Europe during the first decade of the 21st century. The graph demonstrates the difference in Muslims’ experience of discrimination between 2002-2008, ranging from an increase of over 11% in France to a smaller increase of 2.7% in the UK. Increases in Muslims’ perceptions of discrimination for the Netherlands and Germany are 6.7% and 4.2% respectively. Growth in the pervasiveness of discrimination faced by Muslims in Europe reflected in these data may well have been triggered in part by the securitization of police and immigration policies related to Muslim minorities in Europe during this decade. In France, Germany and the Netherlands, the first decade of the twenty-first century saw the development of immigrant integration contracts reflective of perceptions of a threat posed by non-western minorities, especially Muslims, to European culture (cf. Huysmans, 2006; Guiraudon, 2008). The French reaction to perceptions of a “Muslim threat” may have been most evident, with the highly publicized 2004 ban on headscarves in public schools (followed up later by the niqab or Islamic face-veil ban that went into effect in April, 2011), and the widespread belief that the 2005 riots reflected a failure of Muslim integration, rather than the socio-economic and political exclusion of the religious minority. (See, for example, The Washington Post, November 8, 2005, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/07/AR2005110700295_pf.html).

The multivariate results examining the impact of Muslim religious identification on respondents’ reported membership in a discriminated group are shown in Table 5.3, with
results from the cumulative file containing respondents from all four years of ESS administration (2002, 4, 6, 2008) and individually for 2002 and 2008. (We present beginning and endpoint data in this section to demonstrate that while discrimination against Muslims grew during the decade, it was already significant early in the twenty-first century.) In all four states, Muslims are significantly more likely than non-Muslims to report that their group is discriminated against in both 2002 and 2008, even when we control for respondent’s age, gender, income, citizenship, religiosity, unemployment, education, ideology, and satisfaction with government.

Data from two different data sources, gathered in multiple European states, over several different time periods during the last decade, present a consistent picture of discrimination against Muslims in key areas of life including employment, healthcare, housing, school, shopping and social life. The data also suggest that discrimination has increased throughout the decade. The results urgently call for programs to reduce the discrimination faced by Muslims. In its special report on multiple discrimination discussed below FRA points out that Muslims are particularly vulnerable to discrimination triggered by more than one aspect of their identity.

Multiple Discrimination. “Multiple discrimination” is a special focus of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (See EU-MIDIS (5) 2010:


both highlight the problem of multiple discrimination and the “intersectionality” (Genderace, 2010: 272) of axes of discrimination. The GendeRace report (2010: 32) cites Kimberle Crenshaw (1989) as coining the term intersectionality “to define a situation in which there is a specific type of discrimination, in which several grounds of discrimination interact concurrently. For instance, minority women may face specific types of discrimination, not experienced by minority men, because they are exposed to specific types of prejudices and stereotypes.” This report (European Union Seventh Framework Program, 2010) follows the European Commission’s (EC) 2007 study, “Tackling Multiple Discrimination: Practices, Policies and Laws” (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&furtherPubs=yes&langId=en&pubId=51), in which the problem of multiple discrimination and the significance of intersectionality on the impact of discrimination are examined. The 2007 EC report examines EU case law on this topic and compares it to the related legal terrain in Canada, Australia and the United States.

Questionnaires were given to representatives from European member-state ministries, Equality Bodies and NGOs in preparation for related round-table discussions. The report ends with a series of recommendations for policy changes at the European and national levels. These recommendations urge research, legislative change, awareness raising, and the promotion of “multiple ground NGOs” promoting the interests of groups whose members are the targets of

EU-MIDIS-05 (2010), the *Data in Focus Report on Multiple Discrimination*, compares EU-MIDIS results regarding experiences of multiple discrimination to the findings from the European Commission’s *Special Eurobarometer* on discrimination (Number 296). Identical questions were asked in the two surveys, but, as the EU-MIDIS Multiple Discrimination report notes (EU-MIDIS-05: 10), “data collection for EU-MIDIS was mainly carried out in urban areas while the *Eurobarometer* surveys are based on nationwide samples of respondents; therefore the results have to be cautiously interpreted as reflecting the locations where the two surveys were conducted.”

The *Eurobarometer 296* results provide a glimpse of the general population’s perceptions of the prevalence of discrimination in Europe. Overall, FRA (2010-EU-MIDIS-5: 8) explains:

“more respondents from the majority population, who were interviewed for *Special Eurobarometer 296*, considered discrimination to be widespread (emphasis in text) across all six grounds asked about. Strikingly, 62% of the general population thought that discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin was widespread in comparison with 55% of the ethnic minority and immigrant respondents, and 45% of the majority population in comparison with 33% of minority interviewees considered that discrimination on the basis of religion or belief was widespread” (emphasis ours).
Neither EU-MIDIS-5 (2010) nor Eurobarometer 296 permits us to compare the perceptions of Muslims in Europe to what FRA refers to as the “general population” (phrase used in quote above) examined in Eurobarometer 296. We can, however, consider (as EU-MIDIS-5, 2010: 9 does), the degree to which the minorities surveyed in EU-MIDIS perceive the extent of discrimination in Europe to be greater than does the Eurobarometer’s “general population”. This comparison suggests that the majority and the minority population most likely to be Muslim do not differ greatly about the level of discrimination in their Member state. For example, in Germany 56% of Eurobarometer’s general population indicated that discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant origin was very or fairly widespread, while 52% of the Turkish population in Germany did. The French North African and Sub-Saharan African populations were 88% and 87% in agreement with this statement, not far from the 76% figure for the French general population surveyed by Eurobarometer. In the Netherlands, EU-MIDIS (2) (2009: 9) found that the Turkish population had the most self-identified Muslims. In EU-MIDIS (5) (2010: 9), 61% of Turkish respondents in the Netherlands indicated that discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant origin is very or fairly widespread, less than the Eurobarometer’s general population in the Netherlands, 79% of whom agreed with the statement. In the UK, 69% of the Eurobarometer’s general population agreed with the statement; there was no Muslim ethnic group sampled for EU-MIDIS in the UK.

Overall, these comparisons underscore the agreement between majority and minority group members in perceptions of how widespread the discrimination is against those groups most likely to be Muslim. These results on the agreement regarding the extensiveness of
discrimination against Muslim minorities provide a political basis for both national and European action to reduce it.

Specifically regarding multiple discrimination, EU-MIDIS reports that for the fourteen Member States involved in its study, 14% of the ethnic minority and immigrant respondents (clustered in urban areas) were discriminated against on multiple grounds, and 23% of respondents were discriminated against on one ground. The *Eurobarometer* results, based on nationwide surveying of majority group members in the EU-27, are somewhat lower: Only 3% reported having been discriminated against on multiple grounds, and 12% on one ground (EU-MIDIS-05: 10). Citing these discrepancies as evidence, FRA reports that the findings “indicate that minority respondents interviewed in EU-MIDIS experienced what they considered to be discrimination on the basis of a single ground and on multiple grounds more often than the majority population interviewed in *Special Eurobarometer* survey 296” (EU-MIDIS-05: 10).

Examining those EU-MIDIS respondents who reported having been discriminated against on multiple grounds, FRA (EU-MIDIS-05: 13) reports that for both males and females, 93% were discriminated against on the basis of *ethnic or immigrant origin*. For this same group of respondents reporting multiple discrimination, “*religion or belief*” was a trigger for discrimination for 72% of males and 56% of females. *Age* was next in importance as a trigger for discrimination in this group (30% of males, and 29% of females), with “other reasons” (21% males, 15% females), “disability”: (13% males, 9% females), and “sexual orientation” (11% males, 9% females) following in importance.
FRA offers the following explanation of the importance of these findings on multiple discrimination for Muslim respondents, highlighting the salience of religion as an aspect of personal identity.

“In particular, Muslim respondents indicated that religion was either ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ important in their lives—91% of North Africans and 85% of Turkish respondents indicated this to be the case—while 90% of Sub-Saharan Africans, coming from a mixture of different religious backgrounds, also indicated that religion was important to them. This suggests that identity—encompassing factors such as ethnicity and religion—can be experienced as intersectional discrimination by many minority ethnic groups in Europe, meaning that different grounds of discrimination interact and are hard to distinguish from each other. This interpretation is useful to keep in mind when looking to understand high levels of reported discrimination on multiple grounds by specific aggregate groups . . . “ (EU-MIDIS-05, 2010: 12).

Slightly more men than women reported multiple discrimination (53% of men, 47% of women) on all of the grounds examined, except with regard for gender. Women were almost twice as likely as men to report having been discriminated against on the basis of gender (44% of women vs. 24% of men). But men experienced greater levels of multiple discrimination than women, and FRA stresses the importance of this finding for economically active males. FRA indicates that “most respondents who said they had been discriminated against indicated that this occurred most often when looking for work and when at work” (EU-MIDIS-05: 12), and that “respondents who are more exposed to multiple discrimination tend to come from socially disadvantaged backgrounds . . . since as many as 46% of them were located in the lowest
income quartile recorded in the survey . . . with 21% of the unemployed reporting discrimination on more than one ground compared with 12% of those who were employed. . . .” (EU-MIDIS-05: 13). In addition, FRA reports that “[w]hen looking at the age of respondents reporting discrimination on the basis of ethnicity /immigrant origin for the different areas of everyday life asked about, a pattern of heightened exposure to discrimination emerges among younger respondents. . . younger people, namely those in age categories 16-24 and 25-34 years, generally experience higher levels of discrimination . . . [especially with regard to ethnicity/ethnic origin](EU-MIDIS-05: 15).

While all of the findings in the EU-MIDIS study (2010-05) on multiple discrimination do not apply exclusively to Muslims, the religious minority is singled out by FRA as particularly vulnerable to experiencing discrimination triggered by several sources (religion, ethnicity, gender, age), and Muslim youth are the subject of a related study by FRA (2010b). In the next section we look within the Muslim population at those demographic groups of Muslims seen as most vulnerable to dissatisfaction in Europe to consider the extent to which these personal characteristics influence the sense of being in a group that is discriminated against.

*Perceptions of membership in a group that is discriminated against among Muslims deemed “vulnerable”. Table 5.4 continues the examination (using ESS data) begun in the preceding table (5.3) by investigating respondents’ reported membership in a group that is discriminated against. While Muslims were significantly more likely than non-Muslims to*
indicate membership in a group that is discriminated against throughout the first decade of the twenty-first century (as reported in Table 5.3 above), Table 5.4 allows us to begin assessing the impact of this perception within the Muslim population. Young Muslims (15-29) are more likely than others to indicate that they are in a group targeted by discrimination: 11% more likely in France, 13% more likely in Germany, close to 13% more likely in the Netherlands, and close to 9% more likely in the UK. These differences underscore the critical importance of member state and European efforts to reduce barriers imposed by discrimination and thereby smooth the path toward full involvement in the society not only for Muslims in general, but particularly for those under 30. It is unlikely that they can fully develop their talents and contribute their abilities to states in which they are the target of discrimination.

There is considerable variation among the states in our study with regard to the relationship between high religiosity and perception of being in a group that faces discrimination. Muslims who are highly religious in France, are ten percent less likely to report that they are in a group targeted by discrimination. In fact, the least religious are most likely to report discrimination in France by a wide margin: they are over 21% more likely than other Muslims to feel part of a group that is discriminated against. The reasons for this finding are not clear, but one possibility is that in France, the politicization of religious symbols in the public arena has been interpreted by the least religious Muslims as directed at stigmatizing Islam in France. More religious Muslims in France may be less concerned about their place as citizens in the state than are the least religious. Those Muslims who are highly religious in France may feel that the doors are open to practicing Islam, while for the least religious French Muslims the practice of Islam may seem less important than the right to display one’s religious
identity in the civic arena. This explanation receives further support in the findings for the other three states, none of which have gone as far as France in legally suppressing expressions of religious group membership in public institutions. In the UK, for example, there is no difference between highly religious Muslims and others in their sense of being in a group that is highly discriminated against, a finding that may reflect the relatively open policy toward religiously identifying garb still in place in the UK, despite recent political controversy over face veils in the public arena. In Germany and the Netherlands, highly religious Muslims are more likely to feel that they are in a group that is the target of discrimination: Highly religious Muslim respondents are 7 percent more likely in Germany and close to 16 percent more likely in the Netherlands to make this claim. In both Germany and the Netherlands, there is considerable discussion of religiosity as leading toward “seductive fundamentalism” (cf. Heitemeyer et. al., 1998; Sarrazin, 2010) and “parallel societies” (De Wijk, 2006; Jackson and Parkes, 2007-8). But neither of these states has a uniform policy banning religious garb for all school children and face veils in any public institutions, and this lack of uniformity may soften the sense of discrimination among less religious Muslims in these states, in contrast to their counterparts in France.

The importance of the politicization of religious identity fostered by recent French policies may also be reflected in the gender differences in identification with a group that is discriminated against. In France, Muslim male respondents are about 13 percent more likely than women to feel part of such a group. Despite the fact that the dress codes apply to Muslim women, Muslim men are more likely to feel victimized by discrimination. This is not the case in the other three states. There is no difference between men and women in perceptions of
discrimination in Germany; in the Netherlands, Muslim women are about 20 percent more likely to feel part of a group targeted by discrimination, and in the UK 9% more likely. One of the unintended consequences of recent state policy implementing Muslim dress codes in public in France might be the sense of alienation of Muslim men, who are more likely than those in the other states to feel that their group is discriminated against. In addition, the French policy permitting random police checks for identity documentation targets young minority men, no doubt contributing to Muslim young men’s sense of being part of a group that is discriminated against.

In three of the four states, citizenship is not a protective factor in reducing the impact of discrimination. In France, for example, Muslim citizens are 16% more likely to feel part of a group targeted by discrimination; in the Netherlands, they are 16% more likely, and in the UK, 19%. Only in Germany, does citizenship appear to provide protection from the sense of discrimination. This is a positive sign for Germany, especially in light of their recently more open citizenship policies implemented in 2001, enabling Muslims of immigrant background to choose that option for themselves and their children. Birth in the member state does not appear to reduce the sense of discrimination for Muslims; Muslims born in the state are between 5% -25% more likely to feel part of a group facing discrimination than those born elsewhere. In the UK, those born abroad are least likely to feel part of a targeted group, but those born in the UK are closer to their peers in the other three member states in feeling part of a group that is discriminated against. In Germany, the difference between groups is smallest, only 5%, but still in the direction of those born in the state more likely to claim discrimination of their group.
This look at perceptions of discrimination within the Muslim population provides several important clues for policy-makers regarding the impact of state policy toward Muslims. Policies focused on keeping manifestation of religious identity out of the public arena, and the associated hostility toward those at whom such policies are targeted may serve to exclude Muslims from full membership in European states. To some extent, the impact that these policies have on non-Muslims may be the heart of the problem: Such policies may send a signal that Muslims do not belong, making interactions between Muslims and non-Muslims more likely to reflect that attitude.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muslims in: Ethnicity of Muslim respondents:</th>
<th>Germany Turkish</th>
<th>N. African</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan African</th>
<th>Netherlands Turkish</th>
<th>N. African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Discrim in one of 9 areas</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unaware of law against employment discrim.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Stopped by police</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Perceived ethnic profiling during police stop</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Perceived ethnic profiling during border patrol stop</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No data on Muslims in the United Kingdom were gathered for EU-MIDIS.
Table 5.2 Percentage of Muslims Identifying with Discriminated Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a group discriminated against in this country</td>
<td>41.6 (219)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>33.5 (254)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of Respondent’s Group: Religion</td>
<td>15.8 (221)</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>16.7 (269)</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of Respondent’s Group: Color or Race</td>
<td>24.4 (221)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3 (269)</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of Respondent’s Group: Nationality</td>
<td>15.4 (221)</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>22.3 (269)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Muslins</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination of Respondent’s Group: Ethnicity</td>
<td>10.0 (221)</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>10.0 (269)</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: ESS 2008-2002
Note: Number of respondents indicated in parentheses
Figure 5.1. Comparing Muslims' and Non-Muslims' Discrimination (ESS 2002-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2 Percentage of Muslims Claiming Membership in Discriminated Group (2002, 2008)

Data: ESS
Table 5.3 Effects of Muslim ID on Respondents' Reported Membership in Discriminated Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.33 ***</td>
<td>.30 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7012)</td>
<td>(4540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>.34 ***</td>
<td>.21 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2066)</td>
<td>(1734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.22 ***</td>
<td>.13 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1489)</td>
<td>(1381)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.37 ***</td>
<td>.32 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7873)</td>
<td>(6471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>.43 ***</td>
<td>.35 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1769)</td>
<td>(1494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.36 ***</td>
<td>.31 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2355)</td>
<td>(2192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, figures represent unstandardized OLS coefficients

1 Full models control for R’s age, gender, income, citizenship, religiosity, unemployment, education, ideology, satisfaction with government
Table 5.4 Percentage of Muslims in Vulnerable Groups Claiming Member of Discriminated Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high (7-10)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low (0-3)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sothers</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: ESS 2008-2002
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