



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/CES/GE.30/2006/19
25 August 2006

Original: ENGLISH
ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

STATISTICAL COMMISSION

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

Group of Experts on Gender Statistics

Fourth session
Geneva, 11-13 September 2006
Item 6 of the provisional agenda

GENDER AND MINORITIES

Ethnic minorities, gender and discrimination in European Social Survey (ESS)*

Submitted by Statistics Netherlands**

SUMMARY

1. Discrimination experienced by ethnic minority women in different European countries is the main subject of this paper. The data of the European Social Survey (ESS) are used to find answers to several related questions. Firstly, how many women belong to the group of ethnic minorities according to various criteria? Secondly, to what degree do ethnic minority women experience discrimination as measured in the ESS? Thirdly, do they experience multiple discrimination, which is partly caused by gender discrimination? Although the analysis of the ESS data provides promising results, its sample characteristics and the measurement of perceived discrimination do not allow us to give final answers.

* This paper has been prepared at the invitation of the secretariat.

** The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the policies of Statistics Netherlands.

I. INTRODUCTION

2. “One of the main problems of ethnic minority women is that many still have to cope with the multiple discrimination they meet”. Statements like this can easily be found in many writings on the social situation of ethnic minorities¹. They reflect the politically correct position in many countries. But when one considers the statement as a hypothesis, it is in fact a sentence in which many research problems are concentrated.

3. How should the concept ‘ethnic minority’ be defined and measured? And the same questions arise with respect to ‘discrimination’. And when should it be called ‘multiple’? In which forms and under which conditions do they ‘meet’ it and how might the researcher assess this. And what is specific of the situation of women compared to men? In comparison with those conceptual questions, the elementary questions ‘how many?’ and ‘still more or still less?’ seem rather basic and mainly statistical by nature, but they are of course core questions. Some issues are more political, like ‘is it really a major problem in all countries?’ and ‘how should these problems be coped with?’ These questions will, for that reason, be left aside in this paper.

4. Various questions on the conceptual and theoretical level should be answered, and quite a lot of measurement problems should be solved before a decisive conclusion can be drawn in empirical support of the statement. In this paper some of these research problems will only be touched upon. The international survey data from the European Social Survey project (ESS) prove to be very useful for the empirical elements in the exploration of these problems. In the next section this data source will be introduced. Section 3 will focus particularly on empirical information on ethnic minorities, where we will consider if the definitional criteria work out differently for women than for men. In section 4 the next step will be made to the concept of ‘discrimination’ and its measurement in the ESS. The survey results on discrimination, especially as experienced by ethnic minority women, will be described in section 5. This is attempted by answering various questions, representing different approaches: a) do ethnic minority women experience more discrimination in general? b) do ethnic minority women experience more discrimination on ethnic grounds? c) to what degree does experienced gender discrimination contribute to experienced multiple discrimination? d) to what degree does experienced discrimination on various grounds still differ for women and men after adjustment for the effect of some relevant factors? In the last section, the exploratory analyses of discrimination in this paper will be evaluated.

II. EUROPEAN SOCIAL SURVEY

5. The European Social Survey (ESS) is a biennial multi-country survey covering over 20 nations. The first round was fielded in 2002/2003, the second in 2004/2005. The project is funded jointly by the European Commission, the European Science Foundation and academic funding bodies in each participating country, and is designed and carried out to exceptionally

¹ ‘Googling’ on the keywords ‘gender’ and ‘multiple discrimination’ provides many statements like this, but very few references to empirical research.

high standards. The data are freely available for non-profit purposes. More information can be found on the ESS-website <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>

6. The ESS-questionnaire includes two main sections, each consisting of approximately 120 items; a 'core' module which will remain relatively constant from round to round, plus two or more 'rotating' modules, repeated at intervals. The core module aims to monitor change and continuity in a wide range of social variables, including media use, social and public trust; political interest and participation; socio-political orientations, governance and efficacy; moral, political and social values; social exclusion, national, ethnic and religious allegiances; well-being, health and security; demographics and socio-economics.

7. Taking together 2002 and 2004 26 countries have participated in the ESS and most of them did so in both years. Comparing the participants to the EU member states data are available for all member states except Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania and Malta and furthermore Switzerland, Israel, Iceland, Norway and Ukraine participated.

8. Sampling and data collection in the ESS have been carried out according to a standardised design. The target population of the ESS consists of the residential population 15 years and above. The data have been weighted to correct for selectivity caused by the sampling design. Next to this, the data were weighted to produce results for the total set of data from all countries in which each country was counted proportionally to its population size. For this reason² the weights of countries participating only in either 2002 or 2004 were made twice as large (including some small correction for population growth).

III. ETHNIC MINORITIES

9. Various criteria are used to define and classify ethnic minorities. Many explanations of differences between countries or regions in this respect can be traced back to their historical background. This might explain why, especially in western European countries, the differentiation according to ethnic or cultural background is often used as equivalent to foreign background. The use of criteria like citizenship or country of birth might still be useful (for the time being) in several western European countries, when focussing on the social problems related to the situation of recently immigrated groups of the population (Bisogno, 2005; Franco, 2005). While this might apply rather well to the western European countries³, this would be very inadequate in other countries, such as countries in Eastern Europe or the USA. Citizenship and country of birth are not adequate criteria to classify ethnic minorities in countries where they

² This step, in which the possible changes between 2002 and 2004 in the countries participating in only one of these years, were ignored, was preferable to various alternatives. Without this weighting procedure more questionable selectivity in the totals might have been caused because the situation in countries participating twice would contribute twice as much to the aggregated results. Another alternative would have been to use only the data of countries participating twice, which would have meant a loss of almost 15% of all records as well as some interesting countries.

³ Analysis of data on the social position of ethnic minorities showed that citizenship has hardly any explanatory value in addition to foreign background (Oudhof, 2006)

have been living for many generations (like the Roma in Eastern Europe or the Afro-Americans in USA) or where they might even be the original inhabitants (Morning, 2004).

10. So far there is hardly any comparable information available on the relative size of the population groups. Unfortunately, this gap in statistical knowledge will not be solved by the ESS. Apart from limited possibilities to estimate small populations because of its modest national sample sizes, specific sampling frames and selective non-response, there is another major obstacle arising from the population coverage by the ESS: in countries in which any minority language is spoken as a first language by 5% or more of the population, the translation of the questionnaire into that language was required. Conversely, it follows that an unknown number of small minority groups that do not speak one of the main languages will probably not have participated in the ESS-survey. Such systematic bias is fatal for any objective to estimate the size of minority populations.

11. In spite of this, it is nevertheless very attractive to focus on some related research questions while keeping in mind the limitations on drawing conclusions. Main reason for this attractiveness is the fact is that the ESS is rather unique because it contains several questions which make it possible to confront three different classifications of ethnicity for these 26 countries in Europe.

12. The first classification criterion is citizenship, which is the most traditional criterion in EU-statistics. We will differentiate between people who are citizens in the respective countries and those who are not.

13. The second classification criterion is native/foreign background, derived from country of birth of the people themselves in combination with country of birth of the parents. The three classes are native background, western foreign background, and non-western background⁴. In addition an extension is possible between first generation (foreign born), second generation (= born in the country) with one foreign-born parent, second generation with two foreign-born parents.

14. The third classification distinguishes between people who do and who do not belong to an ethnic minority group in the country, as measured by a direct question.

⁴ The classification is similar to the definition and method used in the Netherlands: persons are considered as having foreign background, when one of their parents is foreign born. One has a native background when both parents are born in the country of residence. After classifying someone as having a foreign background, the specific country (or continent) of origin is derived from the country of birth of the person. The country of origin for the second generation is derived from the country of birth of the mother, if applicable; if not, the country of birth of the father is used to assign second generation persons to a specific country. Western background is defined by Europe, Northern America and Oceania as continent of birth, while non-western background is defined by Africa, Asia and Latin America.

15. All three criteria are measured in the ESS, which makes it possible to describe their relative size (table 1). About 13 percent of the total number of respondents⁵ in the ESS-countries have a foreign background: 4% has a non-western and 9% a western background. One must be aware that each measure is relative to specific countries: having a Belgian background in the Netherlands implies that one counts as having a western background. Considering the criterion of citizenship: only 3% will be considered as foreigner, while 4% of the total of all people in these samples identify themselves as ‘belonging to some ethnic minority group’.

Table 1. Percentages persons belong to minority groups by various criteria, sex and country

	% western background		% non-western background		% not citizen of country		% belonging to ethnic minority group		sample size (unweighted)	
	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
Total	9	9	4	4	3	3	4	4	41017	46888
AT Austria	14	16	2	2	4	4	6	5	2083	2430
BE Belgium	12	12	5	4	6	4	3	3	1837	1811
CH Switzerland	25	25	2	5	12	12	6	6	1929	2252
CZ Czech Republic	9	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	2058	2319
DE Germany	13	13	2	2	5	5	5	4	2788	3001
DK Denmark	7	7	2	2	2	2	2	3	1484	1505
EE Estonia ²	34	33	1	1	21	15	22	20	818	1171
ES Spain	2	2	4	5	4	6	3	3	1667	1724
FI Finland	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	1908	2114
FR France	12	10	10	8	4	4	5	4	1520	1789
GB United Kingdom	6	7	10	9	3	3	8	6	1820	2127
GR Greece	12	10	4	4	6	5	4	4	2164	2808
HU Hungary	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	1455	1728
IE Ireland	6	7	1	1	3	3	2	2	1930	2402
IL Israel ¹	35	37	29	35	1	1	11	9	1143	1351
IS Iceland ²	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	271	299
IT Italy ¹	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	548	659
LU Luxembourg	49	47	3	4	34	35	5	6	1580	1604
NL Netherlands	7	7	6	6	2	3	5	5	1825	2420
NO Norway	7	7	2	2	4	3	3	3	2017	1779
PL Poland	5	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	1865	1961
PT Portugal	0	1	4	4	3	2	1	1	1451	2112
SE Sweden	14	15	4	3	3	3	3	2	1995	1948
SI Slovenia	10	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	1371	1557
SK Slovakia ²	8	8	0	0	0	0	7	5	743	734
UA Ukraine ²	17	16	1	1	1	0	4	6	747	1283

¹ only in 2002

² only in 2004

⁵ One might add here: who are sufficiently able to express themselves in one of the main languages in the countries

16. Looking at corresponding figures of the separate countries in table 1, it becomes clear that the variation in the samples is very large. Some high percentages can be explained rather easily from recent historic developments, like the large shares of people with a foreign background (western as well as non-western) in Israel and the high percentages of persons with a western background and non-citizens in Estonia (that is Russians)⁶. Likewise does it seem plausible to connect the high percentages of persons with a foreign background in Luxembourg and Switzerland at least partly to the relative large number of international organisations established in these countries (considering also the high number of non-citizens)? It is somewhat more speculative to relate the high percentages of non-westerners of Western European countries like UK, France and other countries to their colonial past in addition, of course, to more recent immigration flows.

17. The variation should not only be explained at the population level. Another factor to be considered as a possible explanation for the variation in the samples is the fact that in some countries, like UK or France, more people with a foreign background could participate in the survey because serious language problems might be less common there than in many other European countries⁷. Especially the Eastern European countries have few people with a non-western background. Note that these countries have sizable percentages of people who feel they belong to a minority group in combination with zero percentages of non-citizens. Apart from some remarkable exceptions (Israel, Switzerland) no significant differences between women and men occur.

18. Even more interesting than comparing the relative size of the separate groupings according to the three criteria might be to inspect the crossings of those criteria, which would reveal the size of their overlap. These will be explained only on the aggregate level of all weighted countries. Of course, these crossings would also be possible for each of the countries, but this would go too far in this paper⁸.

⁶ Sometimes respondents mention states that no longer exist as their own or their parents' country of birth, like former Soviet Union or former Yugoslavia. In the coding process these were treated in the same way as existing countries. Especially for countries like Estonia, which were part of these former states, this complicates the interpretation of data on foreign background.

⁷ This might be another, more indirect effect of the historical relations of some countries.

⁸ The 2008 edition of the Labour Force Survey will provide a good opportunity to go deeper into the crossings of the dimensions 'foreign background' and 'citizenship', but the dimension 'belonging to an ethnic minority group' will probably not be measured. Ethnic minorities with a native background will not become visible in the LFS, unless individual countries themselves will include such questions in the LFS-questionnaire.

Table 2a. Shares of population belonging to specific ethnic grouping according to background

		share		weighted numbers in sample	
		male	female	male	female
Type of background: regional	Type of background: generation				
Native background		86.2	86.2	34121	39265
Western background	first generation	3.9	4.3	1527	1951
	second generation with only foreign mother	1.7	1.7	666	770
	second generation with only foreign father	1.9	2	769	902
	second generation with two foreign parents	1.5	1.4	592	640
non-Western background	first generation	2.5	2.2	990	997
	second generation with only foreign mother	0.3	0.4	125	161
	second generation with only foreign father	0.5	0.4	206	192
	second generation with two foreign parents	0.8	0.8	328	371
unknown		0.7	0.6	282	301
Total population		100	100	39606	45550

NB: 100% = total in sample

Table 2b. Shares of persons belonging to ethnic minority group according to background

		share ethnic minority group	
		male	female
Type of background: regional	Type of background: generation	%	
Native background		1.9	1.6
Western background	first generation	21	19
	second generation with only foreign mother	2	4
	second generation with only foreign father	3	6
	second generation with two foreign parents	13	7
	total	12	12
non-Western background	first generation	44	35
	second generation with only foreign mother	9	13
	second generation with only foreign father	13	9
	second generation with two foreign parents	28	31
	total	34	29
Total population		4.2	3.8

NB: 100% = total belonging to ethnic minority group + not belonging in each group

Table 2c. Shares non-citizens within population groups according to background and belongingness to minority groups

			share non-citizens	
			male	female
Type of background: regional	Type of background: generation	Belonging to ethnic minority group	%	
yes	1			0.6
no	0.2			0.2
Western background	first generation	yes	55	60
		no	37	33
	second generation with only foreign mother	yes	*	*
		no	0	1
	second generation with only foreign father	yes	*	*
		no	2	2
	second generation with two foreign parents	yes	33	29
		no	12	8
	total	yes	48	47
		no	16	16
non-Western background	first generation	yes	36	41
		no	27	36
	second generation with only foreign mother	yes	0	0
		no	0	0
	second generation with only foreign father	yes	0	0
		no	0	0
	second generation with two foreign parents	yes	2	5
		no	10	3
	total	yes	28	30
		no	16	20
total population		yes	23	22
		no	2	2

NB: 100% = total citizens + non-citizens in each background group

* too small number of observations

19. The overlap of criteria will be considered step by step. In table 2a the more detailed version of the foreign background criterion is used, which shows the contrast between first and second generation. The majority of people with a western background (circa 5%) is born in the country of residence, and belongs to the second generation. The largest group among those with a non-western background is formed by the first generation, i.e. the immigrants.

20. For all population groups defined by the background criterion, the relative shares of those who consider themselves as belonging to an ethnic minority group have been assessed (table 2b). Among people with a native background 1.5% women and 1.9% percent men qualify themselves as belonging to an ethnic minority group. Among people with a foreign background those shares are much higher, especially among the non-western group. It is also very interesting to observe that the first generation shows the highest percentage of self-assessment as ethnic minority group, followed by the second generation with two foreign parents, and next by the second generation with one parent who is born in the country.

21. The crossing with citizenship as the third criterion is added in table 2c. Almost all people with a native background also have citizenship in the respective countries. There are many non-citizens, particularly among the first generation consisting of people born elsewhere, and this is more so when people report that they belong to an ethnic minority group. Their shares of non-citizens are higher among those with a western than with a non-western background. Among the second generation with two foreign-born parents, the same differences in non-citizen shares exist at a lower level. Almost everyone in the second generation with only one foreign-born parent has citizenship. The fact that second generation people with two foreign-born parents are more often citizens of the country of residence follows largely from the *ius solis* principle in a number of countries (France, UK) according to which birth entitles people to citizenship of the country of birth. Second generation children are generally also entitled to citizenship in the country of birth in countries that use the *ius sanguinis* principle when one parent is born in the country. The differences between women and men do not vary consistently. The share of those who qualify themselves as belonging to a ethnic minority group in the first generation non-westerners is relatively high among men (table 2b), while the share of non-citizens in the first generation with non-western background is relatively high among women. (table 2c).

22. Considering the size of the population with a native background in combination with the non-negligible share of the total population that qualify themselves as belonging to as ethnic minority group, one might conclude that one out of seven persons in the residential population aged over 15 would be qualified as ethnic minority or foreigner by any of the three criteria. This conclusion should be qualified immediately as an underestimate resulting probably from the language-specific selectivity of the response.

IV. DISCRIMINATION: DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT

23. The elementary notion of discrimination is to characterize it as a violation of the basic principle that all persons should be treated equally in equal circumstances. Craig (2005) summarizes the assessment of discrimination by four essential elements: 1) an individual or group is in comparison, treated or affected differently than the comparator, 2) the difference is disadvantageous to the individual or group, 3) the difference in treatment or effect is causally

linked to a characteristic of the individual or group protected by antidiscrimination legislation, and 4) there is no exception or justification permitting the difference in treatment or effect. Several grounds of discrimination are explicitly mentioned in the EU legislation, in the article 13 directives in particular: ethnic origin, religion and belief, sexual orientation, disability, age and gender. Thus, whatever reason should be used to justify different outcomes between persons in comparable situations, the aforementioned grounds are explicitly unacceptable as such (Makkonen, 2005). Discrimination can become manifest in various ways: 1) directly or indirectly, depending on the criteria that cause differential outcomes or 2) culpable or systemic, depending on the possibility to assign responsibility (Olli & Olsen, 2005).

24. Compared to other subjects in social science, the definitional problems of discrimination are rather complicated by the intrinsic relations of the concepts with legal discussions. This might also continue to affect the discussions on the statistical measurement of discrimination, especially when the measurement is focused on the assessment of objective discrimination, considering the unjustified inequality of outcomes of specific groups (Olli & Olsen, 2005). Various research designs and measurement instruments have been used to assess discrimination, varying from experimental research in laboratory setting or in field settings (often called situation testing) via analyses of data on inequality of outcomes to collecting data on subjective experiences of discrimination. Observational data might be just as useful as data sources like surveys or registers (National Research Council, 2004).

25. The measurement instrument of discrimination in the ESS can be positioned somewhere between measuring discrimination experiences and attitude measurement. All respondents were asked the following question: "Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country". If the answer was affirmative, the follow-up question was: "On what grounds is your group discriminated against?" which could be coded in the following answering categories: colour or race/ nationality/ religion/ language/ ethnic group/ age/ gender/ sexuality/ gender. Mentioning any ground would be followed by the question: "What other grounds?" No questions refer directly to the respondent's own experiences of discrimination. It's justified to wonder whether these questions can be considered as a valid measure of discrimination and thus to what degree the outcome can be interpreted as indicators of the level of discrimination. This issue will return in the last section.

V. DISCRIMINATION: RESULTS

26. The ESS data files can give a good picture of the discrimination experiences of various social categories that might be considered as risk populations in this respect. In this paper, results will be presented mainly at the level of data aggregated over countries without going into the details. As announced in the introduction, the attention will focus on the discrimination experiences of women in ethnic minorities. But this focus can imply several different views on the data, as will become clear in the next subsections.

A. Discrimination in general

27. The answers to the first question in the ESS questionnaire, on the self-assessment whether the respondent belongs to a group that is subject to discrimination (table 3), show that 6.5% of men and 5.4% of women consider themselves as belonging to some target group of

discrimination. These figures refer to discrimination in general, without any further specification of possible grounds. Breaking down the figures by the criteria to define ethnic minorities brings large differences to light. Each of the three criteria raises the percentage of perceived membership of a discriminated group, but the self-assessment as to whether one belongs to an ethnic minority group turns out to be the most influential. Over 40% of non-citizens belonging to an ethnic minority, who also have a foreign background (western as well as non-western), gives an affirmative answer on this indicator of discrimination. Even among ethnic minorities with a native background and in possession of citizenship one finds high percentages of discrimination group membership. Fewer women than men describe themselves as a member of a discriminated group in spite of the fact that discrimination in general includes gender implicitly as one of the possible grounds. This holds also for women in almost all ethnic minorities according to all criteria, except for non-citizen women with a western background.

Table 3. Percentages persons by discrimination ground and various criteria of ethnic grouping

			member of discriminated group		colour or race		nationality		ethnic group	
			male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
Type of background	Belonging to ethnic minority group	Citizenship	%							
Native background	no	citizen	4.5	4.0	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1
		non-citizen	14.1	10.6	6.3	0.0	1.3	2.7	0.0	0.0
	yes	citizen	32.5	21.0	6.5	6.1	8.0	4.5	10.1	4.4
		non-citizen*
Western background	no	citizen	7.9	6.4	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7
		non-citizen	10.9	12.6	0.4	0.9	6.6	4.8	1.2	0.7
	yes	citizen	31.4	21.5	9.2	2.1	8.0	6.3	12.2	7.2
		non-citizen	32.3	43.7	3.8	1.5	23.1	39.3	3.1	5.3
non-Western background	no	citizen	19.0	12.1	8.2	3.7	3.4	3.1	5.0	1.7
		non-citizen	28.7	15.9	8.6	3.7	18.1	8.6	0.7	2.1
	yes	citizen	40.8	33.0	23.6	23.7	11.2	5.9	10.6	9.9
		non-citizen	44.0	35.9	33.0	20.8	15.7	22.9	10.1	10.2

* too small number of observations

B. Discrimination on specific ethnicity-related grounds

28. The level of discrimination perceived by ethnic minority women can also be studied from another viewpoint by using the specification of grounds of discrimination. Considering the aspect of ethnicity, three separate grounds were selected as the most relevant ones. For each of these grounds the same question can be posed: do women in ethnic minorities experience more discrimination than other women or than men in ethnic minorities?

29. It's not surprising that the percentages on each of the specific discrimination grounds in the total population are lower (about 1%) compared to discrimination in general, because the starting question covers all possible grounds. It becomes also clear that there is large variation in the discrimination indicator in relation to all three grouping criteria. The effect of belonging to an ethnic minority group is very influential at the level of perceived discrimination on the ground colour/race and ethnic group. For differences in the level of nationality-based discrimination, citizenship turns out to be the most relevant determinant.

30. Comparison of the male and female percentages shows more variation between the sexes, which is not easy to interpret. This might be the result of country-specific clusters, but the possibility should not be excluded that the volatility is caused by the small numbers of observations, even on this high level of aggregation (see also table 1).

C. Multiple discrimination and gender

31. Another way to look at the discrimination experiences of ethnic minority women is to study to what degree they are subject to multiple discrimination: could it be that ethnic minority women are subject to discrimination as women as well as on other grounds, and might this make a difference compared to the level of discrimination experience by men. In the preceding paragraphs it became already clear that the percentages of women assessing themselves as member of a group discriminated against were lower than the percentages of men. Thus, the question on the effect of gender as ground of discrimination can be reformulated as follows: is the level of discrimination of women even lower without regarding gender-based discrimination?

Table 4. Mean scores of multiple discrimination in relation to gender as ground by various criteria of ethnic minority

			mean multiple discrimination, incl. gender		gender		mean multiple discrimination, excl. gender	
			male	female	male	female	male	female
Type of background	Belonging to ethnic minority group	Citizen-ship	%					
Native background	no	citizen	5	5	0.1	0.9	5	4
		non-citizen	14	11	0.0	0.0	14	11
	yes	citizen	45	28	0.5	0.9	44	27
		non-citizen*
Western background	no	citizen	9	8	0.1	1.2	9	7
		non-citizen	13	14	0.0	1.6	13	12
	yes	citizen	44	33	0.1	2.4	44	31
		non-citizen	45	61	0.0	0.1	45	61
Non-Western background	no	citizen	34	19	1.6	1.8	32	17
		non-citizen	49	23	0.0	0.0	49	23
	yes	citizen	72	58	1.1	4.1	71	54
		non-citizen	78	84	0.0	2.5	78	81
Total			8	7	0.1	0.9	8	6

* too small number of observations

32. In order to measure this effect of gender, two measures of multiple discrimination were constructed. The first measure is the number of grounds mentioned (including gender), and the second one is the number of grounds mentioned excluding gender. The results of this exercise can be seen in table 4, which shows the mean values of both multiple discrimination measures⁹ next to the supplementary values of only the discrimination ground gender. The total mean value of the multiple discrimination score of men is one point higher than the value of women. As might be expected, the percentages of men who mention gender as one of the discrimination grounds of the group they belong to are much lower than those of women. But the share of gender as ground of discrimination is rather small, also for women, compared to the total scores of all discrimination grounds. Ethnic minority women (and men) are generally more inclined to perceive gender discrimination than other women, but this does not apply to the citizenship criterion. Summarising, the conclusion is that the differences in multiple discrimination between men and women are smaller when gender as a discrimination ground is included, but even then men are still more often inclined to see themselves as part of a discriminated group than women.

D. Discrimination and gender: multivariate approach

33. In the preceding paragraphs the discrimination experiences of various female and male ethnic groups have been considered from different angles. More than once the results raised new questions how the variation might be explained. In this paragraph the results will be reported of some first attempts to shed more light on the possible explanatory factors. Multivariate analysis might provide more insight into the individual importance of each of the possibly relevant factors, which then might be interpreted as due to some specific causal influence. As this paper concentrates on both the ethnic and gender aspects of discrimination, related discrimination grounds are analyzed as dependent variables in logistic regressions: race or colour, ethnic group, nationality and gender¹⁰. The following independent variables were used in this exploratory analyses: 1) foreign background in which the components western/ non-western as well as first/second generation were combined, using native background as reference category; 2) citizenship; 3) belonging to an ethnic minority group; 4) gender; 5) level of education: at least higher secondary level versus lower levels; 6) country of residence (using the Netherlands as reference) and 7) year of measurement (2002 or 2004).

⁹ Of course other grounds like disability, religion or age are also contributing to this multiple discrimination measure. In order to make it easier to compare or relate the mean values to percentages the values were multiplied by 100.

¹⁰ The dichotomous character of both variables follows from the questions as explained before. People assessing themselves as a member of a group discriminated against on the basis of race, colour or gender versus people without mentioning this as a basis for discrimination.

Table 5. Odds ratios of logistic regressions for four discrimination grounds

	race/color	ethnic group	nationality	gender
	<i>odds ratio</i>			
native background (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
2,00 west first gen	1.726	3.125	2.687	0.801
3,00 west sec gen foreign mother	1.774	1.197	1.405	1.390
4,00 west sec gen foreign father	1.471	1.041	0.902	<u>1.741</u>
5,00 west sec gen both parents foreign	2.976	3.481	2.185	<u>1.811</u>
6,00 non-west first gen	8.869	2.923	2.328	0.872
7,00 non-west sec gen foreign mother	4.003	1.378	0.922	0.996
8,00 non-west sec gen foreign father	7.268	4.012	0.745	2.208
9,00 non-west sec gen both parents foreign	15.498	4.761	1.919	2.238
citizen (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
non-citizen	1.545	0.701	5.091	0.800
not belonging (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
belong to ethnic minority group	11.953	29.118	11.388	1.776
male (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
female	0.747	0.826	0.786	9.604
lower education (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
higher education	0.697	0.842	0.833	3.157
NL Netherlands (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
AT Austria	0.794	0.827	0.843	1.989
BE Belgium	1.134	0.588	0.556	0.503
CH Switzerland	0.398	0.549	0.322	0.858
CZ Czech Republic	<u>1.657</u>	1.022	0.205	1.072
DE Germany	0.197	1.008	0.368	0.582
DK Denmark	1.034	0.992	0.365	0.169
ES Spain	1.483	1.646	0.846	<u>1.799</u>
FI Finland	<u>0.400</u>	0.427	0.185	1.008
FR France	2.399	1.271	<u>0.628</u>	<u>1.932</u>
GB United Kingdom	3.512	1.017	0.757	3.577
GR Greece	0.428	<u>0.443</u>	<u>1.446</u>	1.088
HU Hungary	2.285	1.756	0.436	0.141
IE Ireland	0.728	0.706	0.468	1.157
IL Israel	<u>0.609</u>	1.994	4.202	<u>1.912</u>
IT Italy	0.212	0.587	<u>0.308</u>	0.333
LU Luxembourg	0.304	0.090	0.343	<u>0.408</u>
NO Norway	0.605	1.353	0.211	1.122
PL Poland	0.000	0.081	0.154	0.649

PT Portugal	0.754	0.826	0.310	0.222
SE Sweden	0.567	0.873	0.553	4.499
SI Slovenia	0.717	1.447	0.209	0.736
EE Estonia	0.000	0.060	0.452	0.719
IS Iceland	1.253	<i>3.442</i>	0.211	9.507
SK Slovakia	2.899	<i>2.364</i>	<i>0.393</i>	0.724
UA Ukraine	0.794	1.088	0.039	0.072
year=2002 (ref.cat.)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
year=2004	0.989	0.609	1.002	0.874
Constant	0.004	0.002	0.008	0.000
Nagelkerke R2	0.290	0.279	0.323	0.141

bold = $p \leq 0.01$

italic = $p \leq 0.05$

34. Considering the Nagelkerke R^2 , the logistic regressions can explain the variation in the perceived membership of discrimination groupings rather well, especially regarding ethnicity-related grounds. Particularly people with a non-western background mention race/colour as discrimination ground, especially when they are second generation and have two foreign-born parents. Foreign background is somewhat less important for the explanation of ethnic group and nationality as perceived grounds. It is understandable that belonging to some ethnic minority group is the biggest factor explaining the ethnic group as ground for discrimination¹¹. The same holds for the relevance of citizenship for the explanation of nationality as a ground¹², while the substantial role of belonging to a minority group here (as well as race/colour) is worth mentioning.

35. Women are less inclined to perceive themselves as part of a group discriminated against because of race/colour or ethnic group, which confirms the conclusions mentioned before. More highly educated people also see themselves less often as belonging to a minority group that is discriminated against. The odds ratio for 2004 shows that ethnic group is less often mentioned then compared to 2002. Race/colour and nationality show no significant difference.

36. A small number of countries (France, UK, Hungary and Slovakia) show relatively high levels of people who see themselves as members of race/colour related discriminated groups compared to the Netherlands as reference country. However, we can't rule out the possibility that the low odds ratios of some countries should be explained from the low number of risk populations in the samples (e.g. countries with hardly anyone who has a non-western background

¹¹ Particularly the fact that the terminology in the grouping question and this basis for discrimination are very similar, might partly explain this strong relation

¹² This is all the more so because in some countries nationality is identical to citizenship, while in other countries (especially in Eastern Europe) the concept should be interpreted more as referring to cultural identities within countries, which are sometimes also experienced as similar to ethnic minorities.

as shown in table 1). The discrimination ground ethnic group shows less significant differences between the countries. The large number of countries with significant lower odds ratios than the Netherlands (with Israel as exception) catches the eye; maybe specific policy issues in the Netherlands in the research period (e.g. discussions during election campaigns on the minority policy) could partly explain this.

37. The results of the regression on gender as ground of discrimination differ very much from those of the other three grounds. Women of course mention this discrimination ground much more often than men. People belonging to ethnic minorities defined by self-assessment mention gender more often as ground of discrimination (or maybe as one of the grounds). The same holds for the definition by foreign background, but among them only the second generation, western as well as non-western.

38. Contrary to the results for ethnicity-related grounds, which were mentioned more often by less well educated people, the more highly educated show higher levels of gender as discrimination ground. The differences between the countries are also rather surprising: particularly in some countries (Sweden, Island, UK) where gender is an important policy issue and relatively much progress seems to have taken place in reducing inequalities between women and men, have high scores on the gender discrimination indicator, while the odds ratios are very low in Denmark which is rather similar in gender policy.

CONCLUSION

39. The European Social Survey is especially designed to measure internationally comparable attitudes and opinions on various policy issues, like prejudice on ethnic issues. Sadly, it contains only a few questions that might be related to experienced discrimination because of one's ethnic background. Nevertheless, the results of those few questions proved to be a rich source of information on the subject.

40. The ESS questionnaire contains some questions on the social background of the people in the sample, which made it possible to describe the relative size and the overlap of ethnic and foreign subgroups in the samples according to different definitional criteria in 26 countries, including almost all EU member states. Sadly, it is not possible to interpret these as valid estimates of the subpopulations in the countries, because particularly the language-related selectivity of the samples caused a systematic bias of the data. Nevertheless, it is valuable to have information on the relations among these criteria as background information to interpret the effects of grouping criteria. It would be very important to have data sources available that provide valid internationally comparable data on the various classification criteria. This would unveil very important information for discussions on policy issues with respect to the position of minorities. Such information would also be very useful to decide on the design of research projects that require internationally comparable measurement of such ethnic subpopulations.

41. The ESS data also made it possible to give a general statistical description on ethnicity related discrimination and to show the strength of the association between measures of discrimination on various grounds and various criteria to define and classify minorities. Some doubts on the validity of the measure of discrimination as referring to actual discrimination experiences might be justified. The question on discrimination in the ESS questionnaire refers to

self-assessment (...describing yourself as a member...) in combination with an opinion or attitude (...of some group that is discriminated against...). It is not referring directly to personal experiences with discrimination, but the self-identification element makes it more than just an opinion. This suggests that the answer might stem from very different sources, not only personal experiences or perceived experiences, but also fear, prejudice or only intensified attention to the issue in policy or media. This may explain the high score on gender discrimination in Sweden or Iceland. Although the relatively high numbers of affirmative answers to this question have the advantage that less statistical technical problems arise, this is at the same time its weakness, when it can not be interpreted as a valid indicator of the risk of discrimination. For validation purposes it might be useful to add one or more small questions to respondents on the frequency of their own personal discrimination experiences.

42. This paper focussed only on a few elements of perceived discrimination on ethnic grounds in relation to some personal characteristics. But the ESS is offering a lot more information, which could be used in further work. Examples might be a) information on discrimination on other grounds, possibly related to other relevant personal characteristics; 2) the position of ethnic minorities, however defined, might be described in more detail (e.g. at the EU level) although the selectivity of the samples should be kept in mind then; and 3) analyses might be possible on both subjects in which data on specific countries are analysed in more depth, if necessary supplemented by information from other national sources.

LITERATURE

- Bisogno, Enrico, 2005, A more comprehensive approach to defining stocks relevant for international migration, paper presented at the 28th CEIES seminar Migration Statistics, Riga 9 and 10 June 2005
- Craig, R. (2005) Systemic Discrimination in Employment and the Promotion of Ethnic Equality, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Franco, Ana, 2005; Using the European Union Labour Force Survey to get information on migrants and their descendants, paper presented at the 28th CEIES seminar Migration Statistics, Riga 9 and 10 June 2005
- Makkonen, Timo, 2005, Data as an Opportunity to Promote Equal Rights, in: Simo Mannila (ed), Data to Promote Equality, Proceedings of the European Conference, Finnish Ministry of Labour, Helsinki
- Morning, Ann, 2004, Ethnic Classification in International Context, a Cross-national Comparison of 1995-2004 Census Items, New York University, New York.
- National Research Council. (2004). Measuring Racial Discrimination. Panel on Methods for Assessing Discrimination. Rebecca M. Blank, Marilyn Dabady, and Constance F. Citro, Editors. Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press
- Olli, Eero, & Birgitte Kofod Olsen (ed.), 2005, Towards Common Measures for Discrimination: Exploring possibilities for combining existing data for measuring ethnic discrimination, Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination/ Danish Institute of Human Rights, Oslo/Copenhagen
- Oudhof, Ko, 2006, Citizenship as well as foreign background? Results of a research project to assess the added explanatory value of citizenship (on dutch: Naast herkomstgroepering ook nationaliteit? Rapportage van een onderzoek naar de toegevoegde verklarende waarde van nationaliteit). Internal rapport, Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg.
