What Determines Religious and Racial Prejudice in Europe? The Effects of Religiosity and

Social Trust

Abstract: This paper analyzes the effects of different dimensions of religion and social trust on religious and ethnic prejudice in Europe. By including both individual and country-level variables, this paper uses the latest wave (from year 2008) from European Values Survey (EVS) data. The sample is based on 37 European countries that are currently members or potential members of the European Union (EU). Our results suggest that out of different religion measures, religious denomination is a significant predictor of both religious and racial prejudice. Specifically, individuals with no religious affiliation have the highest religious prejudice and Muslims have the highest racial prejudice. In addition, individual level of generalized trust is associated with less religious and racial prejudice. Mean level of generalized trust at the country level is associated with less religious prejudice, whereas it does not have any effect on racial prejudice. Overall these results give some support for social identity theory and intrinsic religious orientation with regards to the effects of religious affiliation and some support for social integration theory with regard to the effects of generalized trust at both individual and country levels.

"Each Member State shall take the measures necessary to ensure that the following intentional conduct is punishable: (a) publicly inciting to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin"

EU Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, Article 1

1. Introduction

European Union (EU) has been founded on the principles of not only economic union but also of cultural coexistence. One of the goals is to create a strong multicultural and peaceful society. It is therefore made unlawful for the people living in the member states to express hatred towards each other based on race or religion (Article 1 above). However given the very diverse ethnic and religious cultures hosted by EU, the individual experiences and attitudes of the people could be different than the official government positions. It is our goal in this research to specifically analyze the effects of different dimensions of social trust and religiousness on differences in religious and ethnic prejudice between and within countries in Europe.

Prejudice has been conceptualized as an attitude, consisting of negative feelings, beliefs and behavioral intentions toward other social groups (e.g. Dovidio et al., 2000; Jackman, 1977). This paper is mainly interested in attitudes against neighbors who are from a "different" religion or race. This specification of prejudice makes no distinction between say attitudes of Christians against Muslim neighbors and attitudes of Jews against Christian neighbors, as well as between attitudes of different racial and ethnic groups.

One general pattern we see from prior studies is that most prior studies have been conducted in the USA, and have mainly focused on anti-black prejudice. In Europe, the number of studies on prejudice has increased considerably since the 1970s (Strabac and Listhaug, 2008), and it is religious and racial prejudice that is the main focus of interest in this paper. There are good reasons for this increased interest in prejudice and inter-ethnic hostilities in Europe. Pettigrew (1998) argues that since the economic recession in the early 1970s, immigration from developing countries has been perceived as a major problem and as a result of this, four reactions

have emerged, which are prejudice, discrimination, political opposition and violence. By the 1980s, immigrants in Europe started experiencing a hostile reaction from sectors of the native populations that felt especially threatened. As a result, throughout Western Europe, extreme right-wing groups seized on this threat as their central issue. These threats were exacerbated in countries which experienced unemployment and economic recession. However there has been a debate over this issue. Goodwin (2013) argues that there is little convincing evidence of a direct relationship between wider economic- for example, level of unemployment- and support for the far right. He argues that Austria for instance, has one of the lowest unemployment rates in Europe, yet opinion polls suggest that the Austrian far right is attracting sufficient support to join a governing coalition next year. According to Goodwin, the people who support the far right are those who experience group conflicts and mainly distrust mainstream politics.

With this massive immigration in Europe, exploring religious and racial prejudice has become even more important. Most of the studies conducted using European data have focused on anti-immigrant or anti-Muslim prejudice. We use data of 37 countries from European Values Study (EVS) 2008 and apply logistic regression modeling to look at prejudice against anyone who belongs to a religion or race that is different than one's own. This study uses individual and country specific variables. In this paper, we are concerned with two main questions: 1) Do different dimensions of religiosity have an effect on religious and racial prejudice? And 2) Do different dimensions of trust have an effect on religious and racial prejudice?

The paper is organized as follows. We talk about the main theories on prejudice and review the relevant literature in the next section. Then we present our data and talk about the creating of our variables in Section 3. Section 4 talks about the analytical strategy and presents the logistic regression results. We conclude the paper and discuss our findings in the last section.

2. Literature Review

Considering the complex nature of prejudice, it can not be defined and measured easily. The most known definition is probably Allport's (1979, p.9) definition of ethnic prejudice as "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization." Although different research and theories of prejudice suggest different starting points for the formation of prejudice, this study adopts Allport (1954)'s eclectic approach which suggests the importance of "multiple approach", which includes historical, sociocultural and situational analysis as well as the importance of psychology, ,phenomenology, and actual group differences that are needed to understand prejudice. Based on this approach, no single theory of prejudice is adequate. Allport summarizes: "By far the best view to take toward this multiplicity of approaches is to admit them all. Each has something to teach us. None possesses a monopoly of insight, nor is any one safe as a solitary guide. We may lay it down as a general law applying to all social phenomena that multiple causation is invariably at work and nowhere is the law more clearly applicable than to prejudice" (p.212). Following this eclectic approach, this study considers the importance of micro-level (individual) and macro-level (contextual) determinants of prejudice. There are both individual-level and group-level theories of prejudice which we define in the next section.

Theories of Prejudice

Individual (Micro-Level) Theories

Relative deprivation theory, which was first proposed by Davis (1959), concludes that when a deprived person compares himself with a non-deprived person (who is within the same in-group), the resulting state is called "relative deprivation." Relative deprivation intensifies prejudices about an outgroup, especially when in situations of economic hardship, and is

expressed as aggression. Specifically, Kunovich (2004) argues that individual differences, such as social structural characteristics of individuals (labor market position, education, and income) have significant impact on prejudice. Lower social class (specifically lower levels of income and education) is associated with higher levels of prejudice (Carvacho et al. 2013). The unemployed is also found to have more anti-immigrant prejudice (Kunovich, 2004). In addition, prior research focusing on these individual characteristics consistently finds that men and older adults have shown to be more prejudiced than their counterparts (Stewart, von Hippel and Radvansky 2009; von Hippel, Silver and Lynch, 2000). Married individuals and those whose both parents are citizens are more prejudiced, whereas those who have ever lived abroad are less prejudiced (Kunovich, 2004).

In addition to these individual characteristics, prior research on religion and prejudice within the psychology of religion literature has generally been concerned with types of religiosity that predict prejudice or tolerance. Allport and Ross proposed that (religiously) intrinsically motivated individuals internalize religious values related to "humility, compassion, and love of neighbor" (1967:p.441), and thus are not prejudiced, whereas more extrinsically religious individuals are utilitarian in their social attitudes as well as their religion, and thus endorse prejudiced ideologies that promote their group's interests. Research generally demonstrated that an intrinsic orientation was related to positive outcomes and that an extrinsic orientation was inversely related to positive outcomes (Park et al. 1990; Rowatt and Kirkpatrick 2002; Salsman et al. 2005). Specifically, as an example of extrinsic orientation, religious fundamentalism, has been consistently linked with prejudice (Hunsberger, 1996; Kirkpatrick, 1993) because people who have a fundamentalist approach to religion arguably share right-wing authoritarian personality dynamics that promote animosity towards outgroups (Altemeyer 1996;

Altemeyer ad Hunsberger 1992). As an example of intrinsic orientation, frequency of church attendance has been linked with less prejudice (Allport and Ross, 1967) and some cross-cultural research has also replicated this pattern (Eisinga et al. 1990). This finding, however, is not consistent in prior literature. In an extensive review of (mostly American) studies of association between prejudice and indicators of religiosity conducted between 1940 and 1990, Batson et al. (1993) conclude that within this framework of analysis ''. . .the more religious an individual is, the more prejudiced he or she is likely to be'' (p. 296). Most European studies find no or very weak relationship between religiosity and prejudice (Hunsberger and Jackson 2005; Scheepers et al. 2002; Konig et al. 2000; Duriez and Hutsebaut, 2000).

Intergroup (Macro-Level) Theories

According to Realistic Group Conflict theory, prejudice is caused by intergroup conflict. When two groups compete for limited resources or the same goal (e.g., limited number of jobs), it causes frustration and therefore conflict, prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice and intergroup tension are exacerbated when groups are, or perceive themselves to be, in conflict with other groups for valued resources such as money or power (e.g., Sherif 1966). Thus, when religious groups compete for resources such as political representation, negative attitudes toward out-groups may be exacerbated.

Prejudice towards another group can arise from perceived threat of that group. Group Threat Theory differentiates between two kinds of perceived threats, namely "realistic" and "symbolic" threats. Increased competition in the labor market and other resources in the economy could be examples of realistic threat. Symbolic threats on the other hand involve the perceptions that prejudiced group might disrupt the cultural and religious values of the dominant group. Several researchers analyze the causes of prejudice by focusing on these two possible

explanations (Schlueter et. al., 2008; Tolsma et. al., 2008; Savelkoul et. al., (2011); Hooghe et. al., 2012). However all of these researchers focus on one or two countries or several regions within the same country. Furthermore they only consider the prejudice of citizens against immigrants. Prejudice of the minorities against citizens cannot be captured by this specification. According to group-threat theory indicated by the relative size of immigrant populations and the state of the economy, the presence of a large minority population is expected to produce prejudice. Where group threat theory suggests that the presence of a large minority population living near whites arouses economic and/or political threat among whites, thus resulting in prejudice (Blalock, 1967; Quillian 1995), intergroup contact theory proposes that the presence of a large minority population living near whites may lead to more frequent interactions between minorities and whites (Sigelman, Welch, Combs and Bledsoe, 1996; Quillian 1996). Depending on its quality among other things, this contact is associated with reduced prejudice (Allport [1954] 1979).

Social identity theory (Tajfel 1981) proposes that we see ourselves as belonging to categories (e.g., racial group, gender) and compare the groups we are in (in-groups) to other groups that we do not belong to (out-groups). Our self-esteem is increased by regarding our own group as superior to others, which leads to a biased view of in- and outgroup members, causing prejudice. Tajfel proposes that mere identification with a group is enough to cause hostility to other groups. Those who have strong social identity are expected to be less socially integrated. According to social integration theory, a society characterized by high levels of social trust could achieve the integration of immigrants more easily than a society with lower levels of social trust. Moreover, higher interpersonal trust at both individual and regional levels were the strongest predictors of anti-immigrant attitudes (Herreros and Criado, 2009; Rustenbach, 2010). In

addition to individual characteristics, all of these theories suggest the importance of considering contextual and country-level determinants of prejudice.

Prior Research on Prejudice

Religious Prejudice

Because the various dimensions or aspects of religiosity tend to be intercorrelated or confounded with one another, it is difficult to tease the effects of different dimensions in assessing the empirical relationships between religiosity and other variables. One prominent example of this problem in the research literature concerns the relationship between religious belief and prejudice. It has long been observed that different aspects of religiousness may relate to prejudice not only to varying degrees, but in opposite directions (Laythe et al. 2002). This issue has also been brought up in Allport's research which stated that "the role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice" (1959: 444). Overall, some religious orientations are associated with increased prejudice, while others are not (Strabac and Listhaug, 2007). Specifically, religious orientation such as religious fundamentalism is linked with increased prejudice where those with higher church attendance are less prejudiced (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005).

In addition to religion, our study focuses on the effect of social trust on religious prejudice. Interpersonal trust at both individual and regional levels are found to be one of the strongest predictors of anti-immigrant attitudes (Herreros and Criado, 2009; Rustenbach, 2010). Bergmann (2008) finds that historical and socio-cultural factors are an important source of anti-Semitism in Europe. Tam et. al (2008) talks about the inter-religious conflict in Northern Ireland between Catholics and Protestants. They find that trust among other explanations (intergroup

forgiveness, changes in intergroup emotions and increase in empathy) is an important source of inter-group prejudice between these two religions in Ireland.

Strabac and Listhaug (2008) focus on anti-Muslim prejudice in Europe. The authors use EVS 1999 data and code anti-Muslim prejudice as a dichotomous variable by using the answers given to the question on whether or not they want Muslim neighbor. They find that prejudice against Muslims was more widespread than prejudice against other immigrants. They also control for country level variables such as percentage of Muslims in a country, per capita GDP and mean unemployment. They find that contrary to the group threat theory, the percentage of Muslims in a country is not significantly correlated with anti-Muslim prejudice.

Most prior research on religious prejudice focus on the views of respondents on specific religious group. This is an important characterization, however it does not consider prejudice, if any, towards other religious group than the one not mentioned. The main religious denominations encourage tolerance (and thus less prejudice) against all the religions. Therefore we should analyze the respondents' levels of prejudice against people from any religion, not just one specific religion.

Ethnic Prejudice:

There is many research that focus on prejudice against immigrants and ethnic minorities. Quillian (1995) applies multilevel modeling to test group-threat theory on prejudice against immigrants and racial minorities in 12 European countries. The author combines individual level covariates with country level variables and create an index of racial prejudice. He finds that group-threat explains most of the variation in average prejudice scores, however his sample only includes the citizens of those countries. Thus the results only reflect the views of the citizens and not the minority groups. Scheepers et. al. (2002) measure the prejudice against ethnic minorities

in 11 European nations. The authors use a survey conducted in these countries that ask the respondents about their views on immigrants. The authors combine response to three such questions to create an ethnic prejudice variable and then look at the effects of different religiosity measures on ethnic prejudice. They find that Catholics and Protestants support ethnic prejudice more than non-religious people. Also church attendance increases the prejudice against ethnic minorities.

Wagner et. al. (2006) shows that, in a German district, as the proportion of foreign population increases, ethnic out-group rejection decreases. It is however not possible to generalize this finding to wider Europe since this study only analyzes a specific region in one country. Similarly, Hamberger and Hewstone (1997) and Pettigrew (1997) show that having close friends of immigrants reduces the prejudice of dominant group members. Vala et. al. (2008) focuses on prejudice against Africans in Portugal and they find that Portugese people associate immigrants with negative cultural differences. Finally Billiet and de Witte (2008) analyze the Belgian attitudes towards immigrants and they find that degree of prejudice is related to political movements and political reasoning in Belgium.

Extension of Prior Research

Our analysis will depart from previous literature in several ways. First, we use the most recent wave from European Values Survey (EVS) data which includes information on 37 European countries to analyze the prejudice against people from other religion and race measured by willingness to accept them as a neighbor. To the best of our knowledge this is the most comprehensive cross-country analysis in Europe on religious and racial/ethnic prejudice. Second, contrary to Reeskens (2012) we do not collapse different groups into one category but instead focus on "other religion" and "other races" separately. This allows us to identify

differences between religious and racial/ethnic prejudice in Europe. Also, contrary to Strabac and Listhaug (2008) we do not focus only on prejudice against a specific religion. We do analyze prejudice against anyone from "another" religion or race. Finally, we utilize both individual level and country specific variables.

Based on theories and prior research on prejudice, we formulate the following four hypotheses:

Hypotheses:

1) Individual-level social structural variables are expected to affect prejudice. Specifically, those who are employed, with higher education, in high occupations will have less ethnic and religious prejudice.

2) Based on extrinsic religious orientation, dimensions of religiosity such as religious dogma is associated with more ethnic and religious prejudice, whereas based on intrinsic religious orientation, such as the frequency of church attendance and importance of God are associated with less ethnic and religious prejudice.

3) Based on group-threat theory, higher population density, higher mean level of immigrants and higher unemployment rate of a country are associated with more ethnic and religious prejudice, whereas more economic development is associated with less ethnic and religious prejudice.

4) According to social integration theory, higher mean level of trust both at individual and country-level are associated with less ethnic and religious prejudice.

3. Data and Variables

Sample

European Values Study is a large-scale cross-national survey that collects information on values of people living in Europe. The survey has been conducted every nine years since 1981 by increasing the number of participating countries each year. The survey's main goal is to

investigate how Europeans think about life, family, work, religion, politics and society. There are around one thousand respondents from each country in each wave. The last wave of the survey includes 47 countries some of which are not part of European Union but are located in the region.

In this paper we utilize the last wave of the survey that was conducted in 2008. We focus only on the countries that are current members of the European Union, candidate countries of the EU and potential candidate countries[1]. Our final data includes 37 countries with total of at least 27,000 observations. Beyond religion and trust related variables, we also use demographic variables and country level aggregate variables in our models. The list of the variables along with their descriptive statistics can be found in Table 1.

In our sample 34% of the respondents are found to have religious prejudice whereas only 16% have racial prejudice. These numbers vary considerably among individual countries (Table 2). Turkey has the highest level of religious prejudice (68.7%) followed by Estonia (64.7%). Northern Cyprus takes the lead in racial prejudice with 55% followed by Turkey with 42%. Hungary ranks the last in both categories with 9.6% of respondents having religious prejudice and only 1.1% having racial prejudice. Other descriptive characteristics can be found on Table 1. We now talk about the creation of our dependent variables.

Dependent Variables:

We will have two different dependent variables both of which are binary. The first one measures the level of prejudice against neighbors from a "different" religion, and the second one measures the prejudice against neighbors from "other races." The question on neighbors is particularly important because individuals could have different attitudes when thinking about

---

[1] The list of these countries are taken from http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/

people living in their country as opposed to people living next door. In this paper we only focus on religious and racial dimensions.

The dependent variables are created in the following manner. There are three questions about accepting neighbors from various religions. The options are "Muslims", "Christians" and "Jews". The responses to these questions are matched with the religious denomination of the respondents. In the master file of EVS 2008, there are 9 different religious affiliations that could be chosen by the respondents. Muslim and Jew are two of the options. There is no single "Christian" option, but respondents can choose from Protestant, Roman Catholic and Orthodox options. Therefore we coded anyone who chooses these options as a Christian[1]. Then, if anyone has chosen an answer of not wanting a neighbor who belongs to a certain religious group other than his/her own, that respondent is given a value of 1 for *religious prejudice*. Otherwise the value is 0. For those respondents whose religious affiliation is other than the three main categories mentioned above (including the no-religion category), we look at whether or not they declared neighbors from any one of the three categories as unwanted. *Racial prejudice* is created by using the responses to another question. If the respondents answer affirmatively to the question "do you not want people from other races as neighbors?" then *racial prejudice* variable is coded as 1, otherwise it is coded as 0. The means of these variables are shown on Table 1.

Independent Variables:

Given the benefit of large sample size, we use several individual and country level independent variables that were utilized by the previous researchers. We also introduce some new variables that could potentially be important correlates of religious and racial prejudice. There are two main sets of independent variables in our analysis. The first set controls for the

different religious aspects of the respondents and the second set measures trust and confidence levels on various issues. Both of these dimensions have been found to be correlates of prejudice. These variables along with their descriptions and mean values are shown in Table 1.

The religions of the world all promote understanding and tolerance in their official documents. However the individual practices may not conform to such preaching. Therefore we control for religious denomination and religiosity of the respondents. First we create dummy variables indicating the self-reported religious denomination of the respondent. There are five different categories: *protestant, muslim, catholic, orthodox and no religion*. Apart from the religious origin, we also create three other variables to control for different aspect of religion in one's life. *Religious dogma* is an index created by summing up answers given to five different questions about respondent's belief. The Cronbach's alpha of five items used in this index is 0.88. The questions ask about respondent's belief in "God","Life After Death", "Hell", "Heaven" and "Sin". Answer categories are "yes" (value of 0) and "no" (value of 1). Thus higher values of this index indicate lower belief in these notions. *Importance of god* variable is constructed by using the responses to the question "How important is god in your life?" where the higher numbers indicate more importance. Finally we create a variable to measure *frequency of attendance* to religious services by using the response to the question "Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often do you attend religious services these days?" Higher numbers for this variable indicate more frequent attendance. All of these variables are intended to capture the different aspects of religion in respondents' life.

The second set of variables control for trust and confidence of the respondents. Torpe and Lolle (2011) show that there is a strong correlation between generalized trust and trust towards people from another religion and nationality. *Generalized trust* is measured by the question "In

general do you think that most people can be trusted or you can't be too careful in dealing with them?" We also include *confidence in EU* and *confidence in the office of religious affairs* in one's country as other trust related measures. Confidence measures are created as dummy variables by using responses to the question "How much confidence do you have in [the European Union] and [the church/mosque]?"

Following Reeskens (2012) and Strabac and Listhaug (2008) we include the following individual level control variables in our estimation. These variables are *age, gender, education, immigrant status, marital status and employment status.* One additional control variable is the *size of the city* the respondent is living in. It could be argued that neighbor's religion and race are more important in small cities where there is more interaction among the neighbors. Definitions and specific categories of these variables are explained in detail on Table 1.

Finally, we include some country level variables that could be potential correlates of religious and racial prejudice. These variables are per capita GDP, unemployment rate, population density, mean generalized trust in that country, share of immigrants in respondent's country and dummy variables to indicate four geographic locations in Europe. Some of these variables have also been used by Strabac and Listhaug (2008) to explain anti-Muslim prejudice in Europe. The variable capturing average level of generalized trust in the country is unique to our study. We construct this variable by measuring the percentage of respondents in each country in our data set who said that they "trust people in general". Similarly share of immigrants is also calculated by using the EVS 2008 data. Other variables are obtained from outside sources.

The first three of the variables above are compiled from EUROSTAT[2] and the numbers are for the year of 2007. Since EVS was conducted in 2008, we used the country level variables

corresponding to the previous year. The mean generalized trust and percentage of immigrants in respondent's country are constructed by using EVS 2008 data and then respondents in each country are assigned the corresponding values. Laurence (2011) shows that level of ethnic diversity in neighborhoods could have different outcomes on social cohesion. We cannot control for regional ethnic diversity but rather calculate overall diversity in a country. We also create four dummy variables (north, south, east, west) to control for the impact of different geographic locations. It could be argued that countries that are in close vicinity could share common traditions. Thus we use these region dummies to control for such effects.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

4. Analytical Strategy and Results:

Before we analyze the results of logistic regression, Table 2 shows the average religious and racial prejudice by country. In order to analyze the determinants of racial and ethnic prejudice we use logistic regression. Logistic regression allows us to model the probability of choosing a state among two alternatives. We model the probability of not accepting a neighbor from a different religion or race. In other words the tables below tell us how the probability of prejudice changes as the independent variables change. Mood (2010) suggests that it is inaccurate to report the odds ratios when using logistic regression with multiple countries. Thus we report the marginal effects in our tables. We also calculate the clustering (by country) corrected standard errors. We interpret the findings below.

We have two models for each of the two dependent variables. Model 1 tests the effects of individual specific variables on religious and racial prejudice. Model 2 adds the effects of country specific variables to individual specific variables. Different models allow us to compare

different countries within Europe. The numbers represent the marginal effects of a unit change in the mean values of the independent variables for continuous variables. For discrete independent variables the values shown are the differences in the probabilities between two categories.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

Religious Prejudice:

The results for religious prejudice are shown in Table 3. We can see in our Model 1 that Protestants (omitted category) are the least prejudiced people against neighbors who belong to another religion. Muslims, Orthodox and non-religious people are, respectively, 22.8%, 10.9% and 70.7% more likely to be prejudiced against neighbors from another religion compared to Protestants. There is no significant difference between a Catholic and a Protestant. There is however no significant effect of other religion related variables.

Those who trust people in general are 10% less likely to have religious prejudice than those who don't trust. The effect of this variable remains significant even after adding the country level control variables. Trust in EU is only found to be significant and negative predictor of religious prejudice after adding country level correlates. Other trust measures are not found significant correlates of religious prejudice.

Model 2 shows the results after adding the country level correlates. It is interesting to see that some of the results become insignificant after adding these effects. For example, after adding country level variables Orthodox no longer differ in their prejudice compared to Protestants. These results indicate that an Orthodox who lives in the same country with a Protestant do not have different religious prejudice level. This shows that religious denomination within Christianity is not a major cause of prejudice within countries but the same is not true for

Muslims. Also population density and average trust in the country are found to be significant correlate of religious prejudice. Those who live in more densely populated countries with less generalized trust are more likely to have religious prejudice. People from northern European countries seem to have more prejudice than those from southern countries.

[INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]

Ethnic Prejudice:

The results for ethnic prejudice are shown in Table 4. Once again the members of major religious dominations are more likely to have ethnic prejudice than Protestants in Europe. However, the effect still remains significant for Muslims and non-religious respondents even after adding the country level control variables. The result implies that a Muslim respondent is 15.7% more likely to have racial intolerance than a Protestant respondent living in the same country. Other religion variables are not significant predictor of ethnic prejudice.

One interesting finding is the difference in magnitude between religious and ethnic prejudice of those who have no religion. Non-religious people have higher levels of prejudice compared to Protestants, however they are only 6.1% more likely to be racially prejudiced compared to 71.3% more likely to be religiously prejudiced than Protestants. Non-religious people are much less prejudiced against neighbors from another race than from another religion. Religious dogma of the respondent seems to have mild effect on racial prejudice but the effect is very modest.

Once again only generalized trust is significant correlate of ethnic prejudice. Those who in general trust other people are 3-4% less likely to have ethnic prejudice than their counterparts. Trust in EU and religious authority are both insignificant. Interestingly the country level measure

of generalized trust is not significant for racial prejudice. Population density seems to be positively correlated with ethnic prejudice whereas none of the other country level variables are found to be significant predictor of ethnic prejudice.

Some other variables that are significant correlates of prejudice are gender, immigrant status and education of the respondent. Females, immigrants and higher educated respondents are less likely to have both religious and racial prejudice. Among these variables, immigrant status is not a significant predictor of racial prejudice but immigrants are found to significantly less racial prejudice once country-specific variables are included. The effects of gender and education are significant and in the expected direction for both models predicting religious and racial prejudice.

[INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]

Discussion and Conclusion:

The aim of this study was to analyze the individual correlates of religious and racial prejudice among 37 current and potential member countries of the European Union using 2008 EVS data. Perhaps, the most important finding is that there is greatest support for social integration theory which suggests that generalized trust at both individual and aggregate level is a significant predictor of religious prejudice, whereas generalized at the individual level (but not at aggregate level) is a significant predictor of racial prejudice. To our knowledge, this is the first statistically significant evidence about significant importance of generalized trust on religious and racial prejudice in Europe based on a large cross-national sample, and we hope that the finding will contribute to scholarly discussions in the field. Our results have several implications. The results suggest that non-religiosity is associated with higher religious and racial prejudice.

This finding continues to exist even after we control for country level correlates. This finding is supported in some prior research (Village 2011; Allport 1950; Allport and Ross, 1967), however, this finding is not consistent in some other research which suggested that more religiosity is associated with more prejudice (Batson et al. 1993). Specifically, Allport and colleagues found that those who were religiously affiliated without practicing tended to be the most prejudiced group, while those who attend religious services frequently showed lower levels of prejudice than the religiously unaffiliated. Village (2011) also found that religion had a direct and negative influence on prejudice. The negative effect of religion on prejudice might be due to the conceptualization of religion in this study. One approach we used is to consider religious affiliation, which is probably a measure of intrinsic religious orientation. In supplementary analyses (not shown here), when we change the reference category of religious affiliation, the results suggest that those with no religious affiliation are shown to have the highest religious prejudice whereas Muslims have the highest racial prejudice. Considering that Arab Americans and Muslims are the latest to feel targeted (especially in Europe), and the increasing Islamophobia after the terrorist attacks in United States as well as in Madrid and London, we can conclude that the prejudice against Muslims is more widespread than the prejudice against other immigrants, which is consistent in some prior research (Strabac and Listhaug 2008). Feeling discriminated might cause Muslims to have more racial prejudice against other ethnic and racial groups. Thus, it should be a priority for regional governments to make these minority choices welcome within the country they are living in. Otherwise hesitance could potentially turn into hatred and other violent actions.

Other measures of religiosity such as religious dogma, frequency of church/mosque attendance and importance of god are found not to be significant correlates of religious

prejudice. Similar results are found for racial prejudice although religious dogma is found to have some, but modest effect on racial prejudice once country level variables are controlled for. Our results are consistent with the results of Strabac and Listhaug (2008) who used the same religiosity measures and predicted anti-Muslim prejudice.

Generalized trust is found to be an important predictor of both religious and racial prejudice. This is consistent with the findings of Torpe and Lolle (2011) who suggest that the traditional survey question to measure social capital is not capturing the trust in strangers as "people one meets for the first time" but as "people of different nationality and religion". Generalized trust appears once again when we control for country level variables. Those who live in countries with higher levels of social capital (as captured by average generalized trust in that country) are less likely to be prejudiced against neighbors from another religion but not towards those who are from a different race. This result indicates that one of the effective ways of fighting against prejudice would be to promote social capital both at the individual level and at the aggregate level. This is an important implication for the policy makers interested in reducing religious and racial prejudice across the EU.

Another implication is the strong influence of trust on prejudice both at individual and aggregate level. An effective way to reduce prejudice across Europe would be to tackle the issue of social capital. Improving trust among residents will have a direct impact on reducing the religious and racial prejudice. Making it punishable to incite hatred towards people from different religion or race (Article 1) is not going to be enough to get rid of prejudice. The root of the problem lies in the individual.

Several extensions of this work are possible. Some of the countries used in this analysis are also available in other EVS waves and World Values Study waves. Therefore a time series

comparison among countries could be carried out and changes in prejudice levels can be analyzed. Also other country level variables such as crime rates and government spending on education could be added to this analysis. Finally, the specific correlates of non-acceptance for people who belong to the same religion can also be analyzed. We found in our data set that almost none of the Christians had religious prejudice against other Christians, but prejudice among Muslims against each other is noteworthy. We hope to explore some of these extensions in future work.

REFERENCES

Bergmann, W. (2008). Anti-semitic attitudes in Europe: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(2), 342-362.

Billet, J., and De Witte, H. (2008). "Everyday racism" as a predictor of "political racism" in Flemish Belgium. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64 (2), 253-267.

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (1998). Support for ethnic discrimination in the Netherlands, 1979–1993: Effects of period, cohort, and individual characteristics. *European Sociological Review,14*, 405–422.

Delhey, J., Newton, K., and Welzel C. (2011). How General Is Trust in "Most People"? Solving the Radius of Trust Problem. *American Sociological Review*, 76(5), 786-807.

Hamberger, J., and Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European Nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 173-190.

Hooge, M., Meeusen, C., and Quintelier, E. (2012) The Impact of Education and Intergroup Friendship on the Development of Ethnocentrism. A Latent Growth Curve Model Analysis of a Five-Year Panel Study Among Belgian Late Adolescents, *European Sociological Review*, Advance Access published December 21, 2012.

Laurence, J. (2011) The Effect of Ethnic Diversity and Community Disadvantage on Social Cohesion: A Multi-Level Analysis of Social Capital and Interethnic Relations in UK Communities. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 27(1), 70-89.

Mood, C. (2010). Logistic Regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do, and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*, Volume 26(1), 67-82.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2012). The New Religious Intolerance. *The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a Response to a Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-Immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 60, No. 4, August 1995, 586-611.

Reeskens, T. (2012). "But…Who are Those "Most People" That Can Be Trusted?" An Evaluation of the Relation Between Generalized Trust and Social Tolerance Across 29 European Societies." *Paper Presented for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association*, Chicago, IL.

Savelkoul, M., Scheepers, P., Tolsma, J. and Hagendoorn, L. (2011) Anti-Muslim Attitudes in The Netherlands: Tests of Contradictory Hypotheses Derived from Ethnic Competition Theory and Intergroup Contact Theory. *European Sociological Review*, Volume 27(6), 741-758

Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., and Hello, E. (2002). Religiosity and Prejudice Against Ethnic Minorities in Europe: Cross-National Tests on a Controversial Relationship. *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 43:3, pp. 242-265.

Schlueter, E., Schmidt, P. and Wagner, U. (2008) Disentangling the Causal Relations of Perceived Group Threat and Outgroup Derogation: Cross-national Evidence from German and Russian Panel Surveys. European Sociological Review, Vol. 24(5), 567-581.

Strabac, Z. and Listhaug, O. (2008). Anti-Muslim Prejudice in Europe: A multilevel analysis of survey Data from 30 countries. *Social Science Research*, 37, 268-286.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Cairns, E., Marinetti, C., Geddes, L., and Parkinson, B. (2008). Post-conflict reconciliation: Intergroup forgiveness and implicit biases in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(2), 303-320.

Tolsma, J., Lubbers, M. and Coenders, M. (2008) Ethnic Competition and Opposition to Ethnic Intermarriage in the Netherlands: A Multi-Level Approach. *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 24(2), 215-230.

Torpe, L. and Lolle, H. (2011) Identifying Social Trust in Cross-Country Analysis: Do we Really Measure the Same? *Social Indicators Research*, 103(3), 481-500.

Vala, J., Lopes, D., & Lima, M. (2008). Black immigrants in Portugal: Luso-tropicalism and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 287–320.

Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2008). Prejudice and Group Related Behavior in Germany. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 303–320.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Definition of All Variables

Variable	Definition	Mean
Dependent Variables:		
Religious Prejudice	Binary Variable=1 if the respondent choose any religion category other than his/her own religion as unwanted as a neighbor	0.34
Racial Prejudice	Binary variable=1 if the respondent answers YES to "Would you not like to have people of different races as neighbors?"	0.16
Independent Variables:		
Religion Variables		
Muslim	Dummy=1 if the respondent self-selected his/her religious affiliation as Muslim	0.11
Catholic	Dummy=1 if the respondent self-selected his/her religious affiliation as Catholic	0.33
Protestant (*Reference Category*)	Dummy=1 if the respondent self-selected his/her religious affiliation as Protestant	0.11
Orthodox	Dummy=1 if the respondent self-selected his/her religious affiliation as Orthodox	0.16
No Religion	Dummy=1 if the respondent self-selected his/her religious affiliation as No-Religion or Free Church	0.25
Religious Dogma	Index of five questions (Range 0-5)	2.14
	Do you believe in God (Yes=0, No=1)	0.21
	Do you believe in Life after Death (Yes=0, No=1)	0.46
	Do you believe in Hell (Yes=0, No=1)	0.60
	Do you believe in Heaven (Yes=0, No=1)	0.49
	Do you believe in Sin (Yes=0, No=1)	0.38
Importance of God	How important is God in your life? (Range 1-10) (Yes=0, No=1)	6.38
Frequency of attendance	How often do you attend religious services? (Range 1-7)	3.41
Trust and Social Values Variables		
General Trust	Dummy=1 for generalized trust	0.68
Trust in EU	Dummy=1 if EU is trusted	0.10
Trust in Office of Religion Affairs	Dummy=1 if Church/Religious Affairs Office is trusted	0.56
Control Variables		
Employment Status	Dummy=1 for employed	0.50

Male	Dummy=1 for Male respondents	0.45
Age less than 30 (*Reference Category*)	Dummy=1 if Age of respondent 18-30	0.22
Age 30-44	Dummy=1 if Age of respondent 31-45	0.26
Age 45-59	Dummy=1 if Age of respondent 46-60	0.26
Age more than 60	Dummy=1 if Age of respondent 60+	0.26
Immigrant	Dummy=1 for Immigrants	0.08
Married	Dummy=1 for Married	0.56
ISCED 0-2 (*Reference Category*)	Dummy for Education=1 if ISCED is 0-2	0.33
ISCED 3-4	Dummy for Education=1 if ISCED is 3-4	0.45
ISCED 5-6	Dummy for Education=1 if ISCED is 5-6	0.21
City Size	The size of city (ranges 1-8)	4.25
Country Level Variables:		
North	Dummy=1 if the country is in Northern Europe[2]	0.22
South (Reference Category)	Dummy=1 if the country is in Southern Europe	0.43
East	Dummy=1 if the country is in Eastern Europe	0.17
West	Dummy=1 if the country is in Western Europe	0.18
Mean General Trust	Percentage of people in a country who trust people in general (according to EVS survey in 2008)	28%
Ratio of Immigrants	Percentage of Immigrants in a country	8%
Per Capita GDP (in 2007)	Per Capita GDP in a country ($)	$14,752
Unemployment Rate (in 2007)	Unemployment rate in a country (%)	9.92
Population Density (in 2007)	Number of People per Square km	152

---

[2] The classification of the regions were done according to United Nations' Statistics Division classification http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm We included Cyprus, Kosovo and Turkey in "south" region.

Table 2. Average Religious and Racial Prejudice by Country (In percentages)

Country	Religious Prejudice	Racial Prejudice
Albania	53.9%	33.5%
Austria	37.2%	17.2%
Belgium	24.7%	5.4%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	26.5%	13.7%
Bulgaria	29.2%	20.0%
Croatia	21.8%	11.6%
Cyprus	40.7%	16.4%
Northern Cyprus	59.7%	55.0%
Czech Republic	57.0%	21.6%
Denmark	12.8%	3.9%
Estonia	64.7%	23.8%
Finland	27.9%	8.7%
Macedonia	15.5%	3.4%
France	36.9%	4.1%
Germany	21.9%	10.1%
Greece	23.6%	8.9%
Hungary	9.6%	1.1%
Iceland	23.0%	8.7%
Ireland	27.7%	14.7%
Italy	29.5%	26.8%
Kosovo	39.1%	13.5%
Latvia	55.3%	14.5%
Lithuania	26.6%	12.2%
Luxembourg	31.1%	21.1%
Malta	36.6%	24.8%
Montenegro	30.6%	12.3%
Netherlands	34.3%	10.9%
Poland	31.1%	11.9%
Portugal	21.2%	12.1%
Romania	26.6%	18.1%
Serbia	37.5%	17.9%
Slovakia	29.9%	14.3%
Slovenia	41.1%	28.2%
Spain	17.0%	3.9%
Sweden	20.4%	5.6%
Turkey	68.7%	42.0%
United Kingdom	21.1%	5.8%

Table 3. Religious Prejudice

	Model 1	Model 2
MUSLIM	0.228*	0.165*
	(0.093)	(0.083)
CATHOLIC	0.059	0.025
	(0.040)	(0.038)
ORTHODOX	0.109**	0.056
	(0.039)	(0.043)
NO RELIGION	0.707***	0.704***
	(0.027)	(0.030)
RELIGIOUS DOGMA	-0.004	0.000
	(0.005)	(0.005)
IMPORTANCE OF GOD	0.001	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.003)
FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE	-0.001	-0.003
	(0.006)	(0.005)
GENERALIZED TRUST	-0.101***	-0.080***
	(0.016)	(0.016)
TRUST IN RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY	0.032	0.024
	(0.018)	(0.015)
TRUST IN EU	-0.032	-0.039*
	(0.020)	(0.020)
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	0.004	0.003
	(0.016)	(0.015)
MALE	0.039***	0.041***
	(0.008)	(0.008)
AGE 30-44	-0.010	-0.008
	(0.014)	(0.014)
AGE 45-59	-0.016	-0.016
	(0.016)	(0.016)
AGE 60+	0.014	0.016
	(0.023)	(0.023)
IMMIGRANT	-0.092**	-0.091***
	(0.032)	(0.015)
MARRIED	0.005	0.006
	(0.014)	(0.013)
ISCED 3-4	-0.052	-0.044
	(0.032)	(0.032)
ISCED 5-6	-0.089***	-0.090***

	(0.026)	(0.023)
CITY SIZE	-0.005	-0.006*
	(0.003)	(0.003)
NORTH		0.172*
		(0.083)
EAST		0.012
		(0.052)
WEST		0.009
		(0.075)
LOG(GDP)		0.013
		(0.023)
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE		0.001
		(0.002)
POPULATION DENSITY		0.000*
		(0.000)
AVERAGE TRUST		-0.612***
		(0.175)
RATIO OF IMMIGRANTS		-0.023
		(0.225)
N	27745	27745

***p<0.001, **p< 0.01, *p<0.05. Standard errors are robust and corrected for clustering at country level.

Table 4. Racial Prejudice

	Model 1	Model 2
MUSLIM	0.243***	0.157**
	(0.060)	(0.050)
CATHOLIC	0.052	0.026
	(0.027)	(0.020)
ORTHODOX	0.099**	0.032
	(0.035)	(0.029)
NO RELIGION	0.067**	0.033*
	(0.024)	(0.015)
RELIGIOUS DOGMA	0.004	0.005*
	(0.003)	(0.002)
IMPORTANCE OF GOD	0.002	0.001
	(0.002)	(0.002)
FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE	0.002	0.001
	(0.002)	(0.001)
GENERALIZED TRUST	-0.046***	-0.031**
	(0.009)	(0.010)
TRUST IN RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY	0.012	0.011
	(0.008)	(0.007)
TRUST IN EU	-0.011	-0.015
	(0.008)	(0.008)
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	-0.001	-0.002
	(0.008)	(0.008)
MALE	0.014*	0.014**
	(0.005)	(0.005)
AGE 30-44	-0.006	-0.004
	(0.011)	(0.010)
AGE 45-59	-0.001	0.002
	(0.010)	(0.010)
AGE 60+	0.021	0.025*
	(0.013)	(0.012)
IMMIGRANT	-0.031	-0.035***
	(0.018)	(0.008)
MARRIED	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.007)	(0.006)
ISCED 3-4	-0.029*	-0.024*
	(0.011)	(0.010)
ISCED 5-6	-0.051***	-0.045***
	(0.009)	(0.009)
CITY SIZE	-0.005*	-0.004
	(0.003)	(0.002)

NORTH		-0.003
		(0.044)
EAST		0.006
		(0.027)
WEST		-0.053
		(0.037)
LOG(GDP)		-0.017
		(0.015)
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE		-0.002
		(0.002)
POPULATION DENSITY		0.000*
		(0.000)
AVERAGE TRUST		-0.158
		(0.116)
RATIO OF IMMIGRANTS		0.194
		(0.109)
N	34438	34438

***p<0.001, **p< 0.01, *p<0.05. Standard errors are robust and corrected for clustering at country level.