

EU-MIDIS II



Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

Muslims – Selected findings



EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY
FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(* The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Photo (cover & inside): © Adobe Stock [from left to right: Jasmin Merdan; oneinchpunch; Rawpixel.com]

More information on the European Union is available on the internet (<http://europa.eu>).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017

FRA – print: ISBN 978-92-9491-742-3 doi:10.2811/072254 TK-AN-17-101-EN-C

FRA – web: ISBN 978-92-9491-741-6 doi:10.2811/67149 TK-AN-17-101-EN-N

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged. For any use or reproduction of photos contained herein, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holder.

Printed by Imprimerie Centrale in Luxembourg

PRINTED ON ELEMENTAL CHLORINE-FREE BLEACHED PAPER (ECF)

Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

Muslims – Selected findings

Foreword

Do you remember the last time you applied for a job? You may have worried that your computer skills were insufficient, or fretted about a spelling error in your CV. However, if you are a Muslim or of Muslim origin living in the EU, your name may be enough to ensure that you never receive an invitation to a job interview.

This is just one of the findings of the second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. And while discrimination is a particular problem when looking for work and at work, it is by no means limited to this setting. Unequal treatment is also an everyday occurrence when trying to access public or private services, such as a doctor's practice or a restaurant. People who wear visible religious symbols, in particular women wearing a headscarf, are more likely to experience discrimination and harassment, ranging from inappropriate staring to physical attack.

These are just some of the findings contained in our survey report, which examines the experiences of more than 10,500 self-identifying Muslim immigrants and their descendants in 15 EU Member States. The findings of this survey show the general lack of progress in tackling discrimination and hate crime since 2008, when we carried out our first European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey.

This report provides a unique insight into the experiences and perceptions of the EU's second-largest religious group, representing about 4 % of the EU's total population. As the findings show, discrimination, harassment and violence can undermine positive attitudes and hinder meaningful participation in society. Furthermore, failing to combat discrimination and intolerance makes it harder to ensure the integration of the migrants and refugees who have been arriving at Europe's shores in recent years, with all the potentially harmful consequences.

The report provides policymakers with findings based on the most extensive dataset available on Muslims in the EU, focusing on issues ranging from citizenship, trust and tolerance, through discrimination and police stops based on an individual's ethnic background, to rights awareness. Taken together, the survey findings and the recommendations can provide a good basis to support the effectiveness of a wide range of measures in the areas of integration and non-discrimination, as well as internal security policy.

Michael O'Flaherty

Director

Country and target group codes

Country code	EU Member State	Country target group code	Target group
AT	Austria	AT - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
BE	Belgium	BE - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
		BE - NOAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa
CY	Cyprus	CY - ASIA	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Asia
DE	Germany	DE - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
		DE - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
DK	Denmark	DK - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
		DK - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
EL	Greece	EL - SASIA	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from South Asia
ES	Spain	ES - NOAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa
FI	Finland	FI - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
FR	France	FR - NOAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa
		FR - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
IT	Italy	IT - SASIA	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from South Asia
		IT - NOAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa
		IT - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
MT	Malta	MT - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
NL	Netherlands	NL - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
		NL - NOAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa
SE	Sweden	SE - TUR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey
		SE - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa
SI	Slovenia	SI - RIMGR	Recent immigrants
UK	United Kingdom	UK - SASIA	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from South Asia
		UK - SSAFR	Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa



Contents

FOREWORD	3
WHY IS THIS REPORT NEEDED?	7
1 KEY FINDINGS AND FRA OPINIONS	9
1.1. Living together in the EU: citizenship, trust and tolerance	9
1.2. Discrimination and rights awareness	11
1.3. Harassment and violence motivated by hatred	12
1.4. Police stops	14
2 WHAT DO THE RESULTS SHOW?	17
2.1. Living together in the EU: citizenship, trust and tolerance	17
2.1.1. Citizenship of Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants	18
2.1.2. Sense of belonging, attachment and social distance	19
2.1.3. Trust in public institutions	22
2.2. Discrimination and rights awareness	24
2.2.1. Overall discrimination rates	25
2.2.2. Experiences of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background	31
2.2.3. Reporting discrimination	34
2.2.4. Awareness of support organisations, equality bodies and laws addressing discrimination	36
2.2.5. Perceived discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin, skin colour, and religion or religious belief	39
2.3. Hate crime – harassment and violence	41
2.3.1. Experiences of harassment motivated by hatred	42
2.3.2. Experiences of physical violence motivated by hatred	46
2.3.3. Harassment and physical violence against respondents’ family or friends – incidents motivated by hatred	49
2.3.4. Attitudes towards violence	49
2.4. Police stops	51
2.4.1. Encounters with law enforcement	51
2.4.2. Differences in police stops by gender and age	53
2.4.3. Circumstances and nature of most recent police stop	55
2.4.4. Treatment by police	55
2.5. Effect of discrimination and victimisation on sense of belonging and trust in public institutions	56
ANNEX: EU-MIDIS II METHODOLOGY	59
REFERENCES	65

Figures and tables

Figure 1:	Muslims with residence permit valid for fewer than five years or without residence permit, by EU Member State (%)	19
Figure 2:	Feeling of attachment to country of residence, by gender, citizenship, EU Member State and target group (average value on 5-point scale)	20
Figure 3:	Level of acceptance of neighbours with different backgrounds (on scale from 0 to 10)	21
Figure 4:	Persons from general population in the EU who 'do not like' to have Muslims as neighbours, European Values Study (%)	22
Figure 5:	Trust in institutions among Muslims in 11 EU Member States, by type of institution (average value on scale from 0 to 10)	23
Figure 6:	Grounds for discrimination experienced in past 5 years in four areas of daily life (%)	26
Figure 7:	Discrimination based on three specific grounds in past 5 years in four areas of daily life, by target group (%)	26
Figure 8:	Discrimination based on three specific grounds in past 5 years in four areas of daily life, by EU Member State (%)	27
Figure 9:	Overall discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 5 years and past 12 months, by survey target group (%)	28
Figure 10:	Overall discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past five years and past 12 months, by target group and EU Member State (%)	29
Figure 11:	Discrimination due to ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months, among those who do/do not wear traditional or religious clothing, and by gender (%)	30
Figure 12:	Discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months and in past 5 years in different areas of life (%)	31
Figure 13:	Main reasons for most recent incident of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in different domains of life (multiple response) (%)	32
Figure 14:	Number of discrimination experiences based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months at work (%)	33
Figure 15:	Number of discrimination experiences based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months when looking for work (%)	34
Figure 16:	Muslim immigrants and their descendants who reported or filed a complaint about the most recent incident of discrimination based on their ethnic or immigrant background, by gender (%)	35
Figure 17:	Muslim immigrants and their descendants who reported or filed a complaint about the most recent incident of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background, by EU Member State (%)	35
Figure 18:	Awareness among Muslim immigrants and their descendants of organisations that offer support or advice to victims of discrimination (regardless of grounds of discrimination), by target group (%)	37
Figure 19:	Knowledge among Muslim respondents of at least one equality body (%)	38
Figure 20:	Awareness among Muslim immigrants and their descendants of laws prohibiting discrimination based on skin colour, ethnic origin or religion (%)	39
Figure 21:	Muslim respondents who believe discrimination on grounds of religion, ethnic origin or skin colour is very or fairly widespread in their country, by EU Member State (%)	40
Figure 22:	Prevalence of harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey (%)	43
Figure 23:	Prevalence of harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey, by aggregate Muslim groups (%)	44
Figure 24:	Respondents who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing (including a headscarf or niqab for women) in public and have experienced harassment due to their ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey (%)	45
Figure 25:	Backgrounds of perpetrators of most recent incidents of physical violence based on respondents' ethnic or immigrant background (%)	47
Figure 26:	Satisfaction with way police handled most recent incident of violence motivated by respondents' ethnic or immigrant background after reporting incident to police (%)	48
Figure 27:	Acceptance of responding with violence for self-defence (%)	50
Figure 28:	Acceptance of responding with violence to defend someone else (%)	50
Figure 29:	Acceptance of responding with violence when insulted because of one's ethnic or immigrant background (%)	50
Figure 30:	Acceptance of responding with violence when one's religion is insulted (%)	50
Figure 31:	Prevalence of police stops in past five years, by EU Member State and target group (%)	52
Figure 32:	Most recent police stop being perceived as ethnic profiling among those who were stopped in 5 years before the survey, by EU Member State and target group (%)	53
Figure 33:	Most recent police stop in past five years perceived as occurring due to ethnic or immigrant background, (a) among those who do/do not wear traditional or religious clothing and (b) by gender (%)	54
Figure 34:	Trust in the police, by EU Member State and target group (mean, on a scale of 0-10, where 0 means 'no trust at all' and 10 means 'complete trust')	56
Figure 35:	Trust in legal system and police, by victimisation experience in past 12 months (average value on scale from 0 to 10, triangles indicate some form of victimisation experiences, dots no such experience)	57
Table 1:	Respondents' experiences with specific discriminatory practices at work because of their ethnic or immigrant background in past 5 years (%)	31
Table 2:	Demographic characteristics of Muslim respondents	62
Table 3:	Main countries of birth of first-generation Muslim immigrants, by target group and country of residence	63

Why is this report needed?

Muslims represent the second largest religious group in the European Union. They face discrimination in a broad range of settings – and particularly when looking for work, at work, and when trying to access public or private services. Characteristics such as an individual's first and last name, skin colour and the wearing of visible religious symbols may trigger discriminatory treatment and harassment. Traditionally, Muslim women may wear a veil covering the head, face or body. This may be a hijab (which does not cover the face) or a niqab (which covers the face, but not the eyes) or a burqa that covers the face completely. These are just some of the findings outlined in this report. Based on the most extensive dataset in the European Union (EU), it presents findings on the experiences and opinions of Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants living in the EU.

Muslims are a diverse mix of ethnicities, religious affiliations, philosophical beliefs, political persuasions, secular tendencies, languages and cultural traditions. Based on estimates for 2010 from the Pew Research Center, around 20 million Muslims live in the EU, representing about 4 % of its total population – with considerable variations between and within EU Member States. The largest numbers of Muslims live in France and Germany, with around 4.7 million in each of the two countries making up for 46 % of all Muslims in the EU.

The results presented in this report show that the majority of the Muslims surveyed are strongly attached to their country of residence. They trust their country's public institutions, often more so than the general population. However, they continue to face barriers to their full inclusion in European societies. These include discrimination, harassment and violence motivated by hatred, as well as frequent police stops. Such negative experiences can over time reduce victims' trust in the police, judiciary and the parliament, and their attachment to the country in which they live.

These findings are based on FRA's survey of persons with an ethnic minority or immigrant background living in the EU – the second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS II) – conducted in 2015-2016. This report examines the views and experiences of first- and second-generation Muslim immigrants living in 15 EU Member States, focusing on discrimination and racist victimisation. It provides timely and relevant data that are currently not available in the European statistical system or major EU-wide surveys.

Combating social exclusion and discrimination, as well as promoting social justice and protection, are EU objectives in their own right. These are closely linked to key fundamental rights, such as equality and non-discrimination,

human dignity and the right to liberty and security and respect for private and family life. The European Agenda on Security states that the EU response to extremism "must not lead to the stigmatisation of any one group or community" and must draw on common European values of tolerance, diversity and mutual respect, while promoting free and pluralist societies.¹ The European Parliament reiterated its concerns about discrimination and violence against Muslims in December 2016, stating that excluding religious communities or discriminating against them can create a fertile ground for extremism.²

The European Commission's Coordinator on combating anti-Muslim hatred, who was appointed in December 2015, supports the publication of this report. The Coordinator acts as a dedicated contact point for Muslim communities and NGOs working in the field while contributing to the Commission's overarching strategy to combat hate crime, hate speech, intolerance and discrimination, as well as radicalisation and violent extremism.

EU-MIDIS II data can inform the design and assessment of EU policies on a wide range of issues – from immigrant integration, non-discrimination and hate crime to internal security and police-community relations. Member States can use the survey findings to develop national immigrant integration and internal security policies that target resources more effectively and are proportional and comprehensive, in line with the European Commission Action Plan for the integration of third-country nationals and the European Agenda on Security. This report does not focus on newly arrived Muslims to the EU – a group covered in qualitative research to be conducted by the agency.³ Nonetheless, its findings are also relevant for countries that continue to receive large numbers of Muslim immigrants and asylum seekers, as effective policy responses to immigration and integration need to be targeted and evidence based.

Collecting robust and comparable data on discrimination experiences of persons with ethnic minority or immigrant background is part of FRA's effort to promote evidence-based policymaking – with the ultimate goal of assisting EU institutions and Member States in developing effective and comprehensive policy responses to fundamental rights concerns. The agency has provided such evidence for more than 10 years. In 2009, FRA's first report⁴ on Muslims' experiences of discrimination revealed considerable barriers to integration, such as

1 European Commission (2015a).

2 European Parliament (2016).

3 FRA's research on 'Responding to a fundamental rights emergency' will look at the experiences of asylum seekers who entered the EU during the past couple of years, with respect to the situation in selected cities in six Member States.

4 FRA (2009).

high levels of discrimination and racist victimisation, affecting young people in particular, as well as low levels of rights awareness and knowledge of, or trust in, complaints mechanisms and law enforcement. These findings were based on the agency’s first European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS I).⁵

This report is the second based on the EU-MIDIS II survey results. The first report – published in November 2016 – summarised the experiences of Europe’s largest and most marginalised ethnic minority, the Roma.

A summary report that covers results for all groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS II will be published in December 2017. FRA’s data explorer tool will allow for quick online access to the full survey data.

EU-MIDIS II in a nutshell⁶

- **Coverage** – EU-MIDIS II collected information from over 25,500 respondents with different ethnic minority and immigrant backgrounds across the EU. This report analyses the responses of 10,527 respondents who identified themselves as ‘Muslim’ when asked about their religion (hereinafter ‘Muslim respondents’) in 15 EU Member States: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Together these countries host around 94 % of Muslims living in the EU, according to estimates from the Pew Research Center.⁷
- The **EU-MIDIS II sample** is representative for selected groups of immigrants born outside the EU (first generation) and for descendants of immigrants (second generation) with at least one parent born outside the EU. All respondents were 16 years or older at the time of the survey, and had been living in private households for at least 12 months before the survey. Persons living in institutional housing – such as retirement homes, hospitals or prisons – were not included in the sampling frames and therefore not surveyed.
- **Countries/regions of origin of Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants interviewed** include Turkey, North Africa, Sub Saharan Africa, and South Asia (in Cyprus Asia); in addition, the data on Muslims in Slovenia refer to recent immigrants who immigrated to the EU in the past 10 years from non-EU countries

(for a detailed list of the main countries of origin of first-generation Muslim immigrants, see Table 3 in the [Annex](#)).

- **Sample characteristics** – the average age of Muslim respondents is 38 years; 50 % are women and 50 % men; and slightly more than half are citizens of the Member State in which they live. Their socio-demographic profile varies considerably across countries of residence and countries/regions of origin, as shown in Table 2 in the [Annex](#) on EU-MIDIS II methodology.
- **Issues covered** – the survey includes questions on experiences of discrimination in different settings, such as employment, education, housing, health, when using public or private services; on experiences with police stops and criminal victimisation (including hate crime); on awareness of rights and redress mechanisms; and on societal participation and integration, including trust in public institutions and level of attachment to the country of residence. Respondents also provided information about basic socio-demographic characteristics for all household members, including themselves. This report presents findings drawn from selected questions related to discrimination, racism and bias-motivated hatred, police stops, integration and societal participation.
- **Comparison to EU-MIDIS I** – results are compared in this report in respect to important differences for comparable indicators. Improvements in the sampling methodology and the application of sample design weights restrict direct comparability of all the results (for details, see the [Annex](#)). Comparisons to the general population are also drawn where data exist.

On terminology

Bias motivation

This concerns violence and other offences motivated by negative, often stereotypical, views and attitudes towards a particular group of persons who share a common characteristic, such as sex, race, ethnic origin, language, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, gender identity or other characteristic, such as age or a physical or psycho-social impairment. In this report, bias motivation refers to incidents of harassment and crime motivated by hatred based on respondents’ religion or religious beliefs, their ethnic or immigrant background or their skin colour.

Ethnic or immigrant background

The findings presented here use, as generic term, ‘ethnic or immigrant background’ to include results for three grounds of discrimination asked about in the survey: skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious belief. For more details on the intersection of ‘religion’ and ‘ethnic origin’ as grounds for discrimination, see [Section 2.2](#) on ‘Discrimination and awareness of rights’.

5 EU-MIDIS I survey results published in 2009–2012 are available on FRA’s [webpage](#).
 6 For more details on the survey methodology, see the [Annex](#) (‘EU-MIDIS II: methodology’) and the EU-MIDIS II Technical Report [forthcoming in December 2017].
 7 FRA calculations are based on estimates from the Pew Research Center, which do not differentiate between Muslims *with* and Muslims *without* migration background. For more information, see the Pew Research Centre’s [webpage](#) on the topic.

1

Key findings and FRA opinions



The results show that, overall, the majority of first- and second-generation Muslim immigrants surveyed in 15 EU Member States feel attached to the country they live in; trust its institutions – often more so than the general public; and are comfortable interacting with people of different religious or ethnic backgrounds. However, the results show little progress in terms of discrimination and hate crime. Compared to 10 years ago – when the first wave of this survey was conducted – the proportion of Muslim respondents who experience discrimination remains high, especially when looking for work. Hate-motivated physical violence and harassment also persists.

- Nearly one in three Muslim respondents indicate that they suffer discrimination when looking for a job. This hampers their meaningful participation in society.
- Harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background was common for one in four Muslim respondents; of these individuals, nearly half suffered six or more incidents during the preceding year.
- Visible religious symbols, such as traditional or religious clothing, resulted in one in three Muslim respondents experiencing discrimination, harassment or police stops; rates were lower for those who did not wear traditional or religious clothing.
- Individuals' names, skin colour or physical appearance prompted discrimination against about half of the respondents when looking for housing, work or receiving healthcare.
- One out of 10 Muslim respondents reported the most recent incident of harassment motivated by hatred to either the police or other organisation or service. Only four out of 100 Muslim respondents who said they were discriminated against reported

this to an equality body, human rights institution or ombuds institution.

The following FRA opinions build on the key findings of the second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS II) on first- and second-generation Muslim immigrants. They should be read against the EU's Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy adopted in 2004 and, in particular, against the policy priorities set out in the European Commission 2016 Action Plan on the integration of third-country nationals. The latter includes actions to foster timely and full labour market integration, as well as entrepreneurship; actions in education, especially in early childhood education and care, as well as in civic education and non-formal learning; actions to ensure access to health care services and adequate and affordable housing; actions to foster active participation and social inclusion through social, cultural and sports activities and even political engagement; actions to tackle discrimination and promote a positive approach to diversity; and combating racism and xenophobia – in particular hate speech – by enforcing relevant EU and national legislation.⁸

1.1. Living together in the EU: citizenship, trust and tolerance

EU-MIDIS II shows that most Muslim respondents feel attached to the country they live in, trust its institutions and are comfortable interacting with people of different religious or ethnic origins. The majority of respondents (76 %) feel strongly attached to their country of residence. Overall, they indicate higher levels of

⁸ European Commission (2016b).

trust in public institutions than the general population did in the European Social Survey 2014 – particularly first-generation Muslims, who could be influenced by negative experiences with public institutions in their countries of origin. On average, respondents most trust the police and the legal system, followed by the national parliament. They are neutral towards the European Parliament and tend not to trust national politicians and political parties. However, on average, second-generation Muslims trust the police and the legal system less than first-generation Muslims do.

Just over half of Muslim respondents (53 %) hold citizenship of their country of residence and therefore enjoy the full set of rights for nationals or EU citizens. However, 15 % either hold a residence permit valid for fewer than five years or (temporarily) hold no residence permit. Having an insecure legal status can subject immigrants to particular risks, increasing their vulnerability to discrimination.

These findings suggest that meeting the EU’s goals set out in the European Commission’s 2016 Action Plan on the integration of third-country nationals will be a challenge. The EU acknowledges that migration is a permanent feature of European societies and recognises the importance of migrant integration for social inclusion and growth. However, effective measures to ensure the active contribution of immigrants – including Muslims – in the political, cultural and social life of European societies still need to be implemented. Many EU Member States have put into place a national integration action plan and/or strategy. FRA’s recent report on living together in the EU⁹ highlights, however, that these action plans and strategies often correctly expect immigrants to comply with the host societies’ legislation and values while rarely promoting their meaningful participation, especially that of youth, in the society in which they live. Creating a sense of belonging will contribute to building socio-economically thriving societies.

FRA Opinion 1

EU Member States should encourage the participation of immigrants and descendants of immigrants in relevant public consultation processes and bodies, as FRA recommended in its report ‘Together in the EU’. This will help improve the design and delivery of integration measures, and build on the high levels of trust immigrants and their descendants feel towards democratic institutions in the countries they live in. Consultations should be effective, meaningful and link to decision making. Specific measures to attract women and young people to participate in these procedures should also be included.

⁹ FRA (2017b).

FRA Opinion 2

All EU Member States should consider providing more favourable conditions for citizenship acquisition and naturalisation for descendants of immigrants who were born and/or educated in the country, as FRA recommended in its report ‘Together in the EU’. This would foster their sense of belonging, building on their strong attachment to the countries they live in and their high levels of trust in their democratic institutions.

Muslim respondents are generally open towards other groups of people in the sense of feeling comfortable with having neighbours of a different religion, the same or another ethnic background, or persons with disabilities. Nine out of 10 respondents say that they have friends with a different religious background, and almost all (92 %) tend to feel comfortable with having neighbours of a different religious background. Further underlining the Muslim respondents’ open attitudes towards other religions, almost every second respondent (48 %) indicates they would feel ‘totally comfortable’ with a family member marrying a non-Muslim person. Fewer Muslim respondents feel uncomfortable with a family member being married to someone of a different religion (17 %) than the general population, based on the latter’s responses in the Eurobarometer survey 2015, according to which 30 % would feel uncomfortable if their son or daughter were to have a ‘love relationship’ with a Muslim person.

However, 23 % of Muslim respondents feel uncomfortable with having lesbian, gay or bisexual people as neighbours – compared to 16 % of the general population indicating, in the European Values Study 2008, that they would not like to have “homosexuals as their neighbours”. Also, 30 % of Muslim respondents are uncomfortable with having transgender or transsexual persons as neighbours. In general, female Muslim respondents tend to be slightly more open, showing higher average comfort levels with different groups as neighbours, particularly LGBT persons – a gendered finding that is often replicated in other surveys conducted on the general population.

This calls for a consistent application of the Council of the EU’s Common Basic Principle referring to integration as a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants, including Muslims, and residents. In this respect, the February 2015 Paris declaration¹⁰ by the EU’s ministers responsible for education, and the Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, points to an urgent need to strengthen the key contribution that education makes to personal development,

¹⁰ Council of the European Union (2015).

social inclusion and participation, by imparting the fundamental values and principles that constitute the foundation of our societies. Similarly, the European Commission noted, in its 2016 Communication on the Action Plan on the integration of third-country nationals, that understanding and subscribing to the EU's fundamental values – the rights to equality and non-discrimination, as well as to freedom of religion – is an essential element of living together and participating in society. At the same time, these rights also protect immigrants, foster their inclusion into society and allow communities to thrive.

FRA Opinion 3

EU Member States should build on the results showing Muslims' openness to social interaction with people of a different religion, sexual orientation or gender identity. The results point to areas on which Member States could focus efforts – for example, on feeling 'comfortable' with LGBT people. Such efforts could be achieved through actions in education – such as those proposed in the Paris Declaration of EU education ministers – promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination.

EU Member States should eliminate segregation in schools and in residential areas, and introduce more ambitious civic education school curricula. Local authorities should encourage residents from both the majority population and from immigrant groups, especially women and youth, to join together in local activities such as sports, parents' groups, housing associations, etc., to strengthen their sense of belonging.

1.2. Discrimination and rights awareness

EU-MIDIS II results show that Muslim respondents face high levels of discrimination because of their ethnic or immigrant background – including skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious belief. Four out of 10 Muslim respondents (39 %) felt discriminated against in the five years before the survey because of their ethnic or immigrant background in one or more areas of daily life, and one in four (25 %) experienced this in the 12 months preceding the survey. Those who felt discriminated against reported that this happened, on average, at least five times a year, which shows that discrimination is a recurring experience.

When asked specifically about religious discrimination in their daily lives during the five years preceding the survey – whether when looking for work or at work, in access to housing and when in contact with school authorities as parents or guardians – nearly one in five

Muslims surveyed (17 %) reported such experiences in EU-MIDIS II. In 2008, in EU-MIDIS I, one in 10 Muslims (10 %) felt discriminated against on this basis. In EU-MIDIS II, second-generation Muslim respondents mention religious discrimination more often than first generation Muslim immigrants do (22 % and 15 %, respectively). These findings signal that much remains to be done before Muslims can fully enjoy their rights to non-discrimination and freedom of religion.

Muslim respondents' first or last names, and their skin colour or physical appearance, prompt discrimination in all areas of life, but especially when they look for work or housing. More than half of Muslim respondents (53 %) who looked for housing felt discriminated against because of their first or last names, and slightly less than half (44 %) of those who looked for work.

As in the previous survey, many Muslim respondents report experiencing unequal treatment in employment: 13 % of those who looked for work in the 12 months before the survey, and 9 % of those at work. In this context, Muslim women feel particularly discriminated against because of their clothing: 35 % of Muslim women who looked for work, compared with 4 % of Muslim men, mention clothing as a reason for discrimination; 22 % of Muslim women, compared with 7 % of Muslim men, mention it when at work. Around 12 % of Muslim respondents who were at work in the five years preceding the survey were not allowed to take time off for an important religious holiday, service or ceremony, and 9 % were prevented from expressing or carrying out religious practices and customs, such as praying or wearing a headscarf or turban.

Experiencing discrimination affects Muslims' social inclusion: those who felt discriminated against and/or experienced harassment or violence show lower levels of trust in the country's legal system and the police. They also expressed lower levels of attachment to their country of residence.

This suggests that, although non-discrimination is a requirement anchored in Article 10 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU), Article 21 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and specific EU legislation such as the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) and the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC), much needs to be done to ensure the effective and practical enforcement on the ground. The EU's third Common Basic Principle on Integration, for example, specifically mentions that "employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the participation of immigrants, to the contributions immigrants make to the host society, and to making such contributions visible". At international and regional level, the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination is linked to the rights to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

These rights are enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR); the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

FRA Opinion 4

This survey provides rich evidence that individuals' first/last names and skin colour constitute major reasons for discrimination. EU Member States should therefore focus their efforts in enforcing EU and national anti-discrimination laws on grounds of racial or ethnic origin. To implement the law effectively, Member States should ensure that sanctions for those breaching anti-discrimination laws are effective, proportionate and dissuasive, as required by the Racial Equality Directive, and repeatedly called for by FRA.

FRA Opinion 5

EU Member States should combat direct and indirect discrimination based on religion or belief in employment and occupation, as required by EU law, and promote practices accommodating religious needs.

FRA Opinion 6

The EU should ensure that the proposed Equal Treatment Directive is adopted swiftly, as FRA has repeatedly recommended. This will help guarantee equal protection against the many and pervasive forms of discrimination that ethnic and religious minorities, such as Muslims, regularly face across many areas of life.

EU-MIDIS I found that 79 % of Muslim respondents did not report their experiences with discrimination. Similarly, most Muslim respondents surveyed in EU-MIDIS II did not report such incidents to any organisation or office where complaints can be made, or at the place where the discrimination occurred. On average, only 12 % of Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against reported the incident. Muslim women report such incidents more often (15 %) than Muslim men (10 %). Respondents who did report discrimination incidents mostly addressed their employer (39 %), followed by the police (17 %) and trade unions (16 %), since many of these incidents were related to work. Only 4 % of all Muslim respondents who reported a discrimination incident filed a complaint or reported the incident to an equality body, which could be explained by the very low awareness level about these bodies' existence. Similar to the findings of EU-MIDIS I, according to which 80 % of Muslim respondents were not aware of any organisation that offers support or

advice to discrimination victims, the majority of Muslim respondents (72 %) covered in this report were also not aware of any such organisation, while most (65 %) did not recognise any of the equality bodies in their country.

These findings suggest that clear gaps persist in the practical implementation of the EU's equal treatment legislation, namely in terms of public awareness of organisations providing independent assistance and support to victims of discrimination. Although Article 10 of the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) obliges Member States to ensure that provisions adopted pursuant to the directive, together with those already in force, "are brought to the attention of persons concerned by all appropriate means throughout their territory", rights awareness among the public, especially of persons who are at particular risk of discrimination, remains low. In this respect, one should take into account the judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in the *Achbita* (Case C-157/15) and *Bouagnaoui* (Case C-188/15) cases which, when interpreting the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC), held that an internal rule of an undertaking which prohibits the visible wearing of any political, philosophical or religious sign does not constitute direct discrimination.

FRA Opinion 7

EU Member States should strengthen equality bodies and raise awareness of anti-discrimination laws and redress possibilities, targeting particularly groups more likely to be victims of discrimination, such as Muslims, as FRA has repeatedly recommended. EU Member States should also empower equality bodies and allocate sufficient resources to allow them to help discrimination victims. EU Member States should enhance the effectiveness and powers of equality bodies by providing them with binding decision-making powers and the ability to monitor the enforcement of sanctions issued by courts, such as employment tribunals, where they exist.

1.3. Harassment and violence motivated by hatred

EU-MIDIS II shows that over one quarter (27 %) of Muslim respondents experienced harassment because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months preceding the survey, with another 2 % having been physically assaulted on this basis in that period.

Some Muslim respondents (1 %) experienced physical assault by a police officer because of their ethnic or immigrant background during the 12 months preceding the survey (2 % did so in the preceding five years).

Generational differences can be observed. About one fifth (22 %) of first-generation respondents say they experienced harassment motivated by hatred, compared to more than one third (36 %) of second-generation Muslim respondents.

Concerning the experiences of Muslim women, EU-MIDIS II shows that just under one third (31 %) of Muslim women who wear a headscarf or niqab in public experienced harassment because of their ethnic or immigrant background, compared to just under one quarter (23 %) of women who do not wear a headscarf or niqab. More than one third (39 %) of all Muslim women who wear a headscarf or niqab in public experienced inappropriate staring or offensive gestures in the 12 months before the survey because they did so, with more than one fifth (22 %) experiencing insults or offensive comments. Two percent were physically attacked.

In the majority of instances, the respondents identified the perpetrator(s) of harassment and violence motivated by hatred as someone they did not know and as someone without a minority ethnic background. Only in a few cases (3 % to 5 %) did the respondents identify perpetrators as being members of an extremist or racist group. Just under one half (48 %) of Muslim women in the survey identify the perpetrator(s) as being someone from another ethnic minority group, compared to just over one in four (26 %) for Muslim men. The same pattern can be observed among second-generation Muslim respondents, who identify nearly four in 10 perpetrators (38 %) as someone from another ethnic minority group, compared to nearly three in 10 for first-generation respondents (28 %).

As found in other FRA surveys, non-reporting remains an issue of concern, with just under one tenth of respondents (9 %) reporting harassment to any relevant authority. The reporting rate for physical attacks is also low, with less than a quarter of respondents (23 %) reporting such attacks to the police or other organisation. The majority of incidents perpetrated by police officers (70 %) were also not reported. The main reason Muslim respondents give for not reporting incidents is that nothing would change or happen as a result of reporting (47 %).

This is consistent with findings of other victimisation surveys. FRA's research has consistently shown that victims of hate crime are reluctant to report incidents to the police – sometimes because they do not know where to turn for help, sometimes because they simply do not believe reporting will make a difference. Victims can also suffer from feelings of fear, guilt or shame. This means many cases of racist harassment and violence are not investigated or prosecuted. As a result, offenders go unpunished, and victims are prevented from gaining redress and experiencing justice being served.

Those who do report incidents are often dissatisfied with the police's handling of the matter. The majority of Muslim respondents (81 %) who reported a physical assault to the police were dissatisfied, while only 13 % said they were satisfied with how the police dealt with their case. This contrasts with findings of FRA's survey on violence against women in the EU, which show that 66 % of women were satisfied with the way police handled the most serious incident of physical violence perpetrated against them by someone other than their current or previous partner.

Hate crime can affect anyone in society, and affects not only the individuals targeted, but also their families, their communities and the entire society. It is the most severe expression of discrimination and a core fundamental rights abuse. Since 2008, the EU has put in place criminal law provisions in the form of the Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia, offering protection against incitement to hatred and hate crime targeting a person or persons belonging to a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin.¹¹ This protection is complemented by the provisions of the Victims' Rights Directive, which establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of hate crime, among others, to meet obligations under the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.¹² To strengthen the implementation of the Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia, the European Commission also created, in June 2016, the EU's High Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance, which brings together all EU Member States, the European Commission and FRA, as well as intergovernmental and civil society organisations. The group's initial priorities include countering online hate speech and improving methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime.¹³

11 Council of the European Union (2008), [Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA](#) of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ 2008 L 328.

12 [Directive 2012/29/EU](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA, OJ 2012 L 315 (Victims' Rights Directive).

13 See the European Commission's [webpage on the group](#).

FRA Opinion 8

EU Member States should establish minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, in line with the Victims' Rights Directive. They should ensure individual assessments are carried out, particularly for victims who have suffered from hate crime.

EU Member States should ensure that information about victim support services and victims' rights is accessible and available to victims, as FRA recommended in its report on Victims of crime in the EU: the extent and nature of support for victims. In addition, medical service providers should be trained to deal with victims in an informed and sympathetic manner to encourage victims to report their experiences.

FRA Opinion 9

Law enforcement in EU Member States should strengthen outreach and cooperation activities with ethnic minority communities, local authorities and non-governmental organisations to more effectively tackle hate crime. This can foster confidence in the police, especially among minority groups, such as Muslims, who are more likely to be victims of hate crime because of their religion, skin colour or ethnic background.

In designing such activities, authorities should take particularly into account that many women, as well as second-generation immigrants, identify in the survey someone from another ethnic minority group as perpetrators of hate crimes. Women's fear of crime, especially fear of gender-based violence, can also affect Muslim women; this needs to be recognised and responded to not only at the level of the EU and Member States, but also at the local level because of the negative impact it has on women's everyday lives, as FRA pointed out in its report on violence against women.

FRA Opinion 10

Law enforcement in EU Member States should encourage victims and their communities to report hate crimes. They should support initiatives that improve reporting of hate crime, such as online reporting tools and third-party reporting tools engaging civil society.

FRA Opinion 11

EU Member States should strengthen the effective protection of victims' rights. This should include, for example, victim support services that combine understanding of non-discrimination policies, expertise in criminal justice and the rights of hate crime victims, with adequate capacities to support victims effectively.

FRA Opinion 12

The results presented in this report show that there is a need for EU surveys, such as EU-SILC and LFS, to include relevant questions and representative samples of ethnic minorities and immigrants to systematically capture their experiences of hate crime and discrimination. In this respect, the European Commission could draw inspiration from the Istanbul Convention, of which the EU along with its Member States is a full party; the convention encourages parties to conduct regular population-based surveys to assess the prevalence of and trends in all forms of violence against women covered by it.

EU Member States should consistently provide the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) with data on hate crime that ODIHR has been mandated to report on, as requested in the Council Conclusions of December 2013 on combating hate crime in the EU.

1.4. Police stops

EU-MIDIS II finds that of all Muslim respondents 16 % were stopped by the police in the 12 months preceding the survey and 7 % say that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background. Of those Muslim respondents the police stopped in that period, 42 % believe this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background. On average, the police stopped young Muslim respondents more often than those who are older, and men more often than women. Among the different groups of Muslims surveyed, Muslim respondents from North and Sub-Saharan Africa more frequently say that they were stopped by the police because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background.



Muslim men and women who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing in public were, in the five years preceding the survey, more often stopped by the police because of their ethnic or immigrant background (39 % stopped) than those who do not wear such clothing (29 % stopped). In this context, the findings also show gender differences: nearly one in two Muslim men (47 %) who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing in public believe they were stopped by the police because of their ethnic or immigrant background, compared with one in five Muslim women (20 %) who do so.

Law enforcement based on equality and non-discrimination is a cornerstone of democratic societies including increasingly diverse communities. Law enforcement has a duty to treat everyone respectfully; they should not only fight crime, but also address the needs and rights of victims, witnesses and their wider communities. It should be taken into account that the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in its judgment in *S.A.S v. France* (No. 43835/11, 2014) and subsequent judgments in *Belcacemi and Oussar v. Belgium* (No. 37798/13, 2017) and *Dakir v. Belgium* (No. 4619/12, 2017), held that the French and Belgian laws and decrees banning the wearing of clothing that fully or partially conceals the face in public places are not in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). In another case, the UN Human Rights Committee expressed its views under Article 5, Paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (108th session) concerning Communication No. 1928/2010 submitted by Mann Singh. The committee concludes that the regulation of the State Party (France) requiring persons to appear bareheaded in their passport photographs is a disproportionate limitation that infringes freedom of religion and constitutes a violation of Article 18 of the Covenant.

The practice of discriminatory ethnic profiling – police stops based solely or mainly on an individual’s personal characteristics rather than their behaviour – is unlawful and can have damaging effects on community relations and public cooperation with law enforcement, undermining trust in law enforcement. Embedding fundamental rights considerations into the design of security measures can help limit their potentially adverse effects on the rights of individuals and reduce the risk of alienating entire communities with measures that could be perceived as discriminatory, as FRA has shown in 2015.¹⁴ Social alienation brought about by experiences of discrimination, including discriminatory treatment by authorities, could provide fertile soil for grievances to flourish, which may be exploited by those intent on radicalising vulnerable individuals. EU-MIDIS II results reveal that Muslim respondents have a high level of trust in the police, compared with the general population. However, this finding needs to be read alongside the very low reporting rates for hate crime incidents, which could indicate a lack of confidence in the ability of criminal justice responses to tackle such incidents effectively.

FRA Opinion 13

The data from this survey present the most comprehensive findings across the EU on Muslims’ experiences of police stops. They should therefore be taken into account in the design of the work of the EU Agency for Law Enforcement Training CEPOL and, specifically, the police and law enforcement Working Group of the Commission’s Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). This would ensure that evidence on the negative impact of potentially discriminatory stops on Muslims is addressed in police training, together with practices of community policing that foster trust in law enforcement.

¹⁴ FRA (2015).

2

What do the results show?



2.1. Living together in the EU: citizenship, trust and tolerance

KEY FINDINGS

- Some 53 % of the Muslim respondents hold citizenship of their country of residence and therefore enjoy the full set of rights for nationals or EU citizens. However, 15 % of the respondents either hold a residence permit valid for fewer than five years or (temporarily) hold no residence permit.
- The majority of Muslim respondents (76 %) feels strongly attached to their country of residence.
- Overall, Muslim respondents indicate higher levels of trust in democratic institutions than the general population did in the European Social Survey 2014. On average, Muslim respondents most trust the police and the legal system: on a 10-point scale – where 10 means ‘complete trust’ – results regarding the police are similar to those for the general population, with, on average, 6.6 points for Muslim respondents and 6.5 points for the general population. For the legal system, the averages are 6.6 for Muslims and 5.4 for the general population. This is followed by the national parliament (5.7 for Muslims and 4.5 for the general population). Muslims are neutral towards the European Parliament (5.0 for Muslims and 3.9 for the general population). They tend not to trust national politicians (4.4 and 3.4) and political parties (4.3 and 3.5) – in that respect, levels are similar to those of the general population surveyed in the European Social Survey.
- The Muslims surveyed in EU-MIDIS II are generally open towards other groups of people in the sense of feeling comfortable with having neighbours of different religions, the same or other ethnic backgrounds, or persons with disabilities. For example, almost all respondents (92 %) tend to feel comfortable with having neighbours of a different religious background.
- However, almost one in four Muslim respondents (23 %) feels uncomfortable with having lesbian, gay or bisexual people as neighbours, and one in three (30 %) with having transgender or transsexual persons as neighbours.
- In general, female Muslim respondents tend to be slightly more open than male Muslim respondents, showing higher average comfort levels with neighbours of different religious, ethnic or other backgrounds, in particular LGBT persons.
- EU-MIDIS II survey results point to Muslim respondents’ open attitudes towards other religions, with almost every second (48 %) indicating they would feel ‘totally comfortable’ with a family member marrying a non-Muslim person.
- Fewer Muslim respondents expressed discomfort about someone from their family being married to a person of a different religion (17 %) than the general population did in the Eurobarometer 2015; 30 % of the latter say they would feel uncomfortable if their son or daughter were to have a ‘love relationship’ with a Muslim person.
- Nine out of 10 Muslim respondents have friends with a different religious background.

This section looks at issues relating to the societal participation of immigrants and their descendants, with a special focus on citizenship, sense of belonging and trust in institutions – often discussed in relation to successful immigrant integration into European societies. It is important to highlight that feelings of belonging are multi-dimensional, not stable and depend on immigrants' environments. Such feelings are most notably influenced by discrimination and victimisation experiences, as well as by the public discourse, the media and policy.

This section examines how Muslims' discrimination and victimisation experiences affect their level of attachment to the societies they live in and their trust in institutions. Low levels of discrimination and victimisation are seen as a core outcome of successful societal integration for all its members. The Zaragoza indicators on immigrant integration¹⁵ – agreed by the EU Member States in 2010 to monitor integration – stress the importance of employment, education and social inclusion. In addition to these core elements, which are monitored in many EU Member States¹⁶, the thematic policy areas 'welcoming society' and 'active citizenship' focus on active political participation, trust in public institutions and sense of belonging, to be monitored alongside discrimination experiences.¹⁷

2.1.1. Citizenship of Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants

More than half of Muslims covered in this report are citizens of their country of residence and therefore enjoy the same political rights as nationals in their country and in the European Union. The number of citizens is much higher among descendants of immigrants ('second generation'), with 86 % holding citizenship of the survey country – compared to 38 % of first generation immigrants. In most of the survey countries, slightly more Muslim women hold citizenship of the country than Muslim men (56 % versus 50 %).

Some 77 % of national citizens among the second generation obtained their citizenship at birth; the remaining 23 % did so later, through naturalisation. Among first-generation immigrants, 10 % obtained citizenship of the country of residence at birth;¹⁸ the remaining 90 % mainly acquired citizenship through naturalisation procedures foreseen by national legislation. Most of the Muslim immigrants who obtained citizenship through

naturalisation acquired citizenship in the past 10 years since 2006 (36 %) or between 1996 and 2005 (35 %).

Altogether, 0.4 % of the Muslims covered in this report indicate that they are stateless (1 % among those without citizenship of the survey country). The proportion of stateless persons is noteworthy among Muslim immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa in Malta, at 55 % – but also among Muslims from Sub-Saharan Africa in Sweden and Finland, where approximately one in 10 (10 %) indicate that they are stateless.¹⁹

Security of residence for Muslim immigrants

Among Muslim immigrants who are foreign citizens, around 5 % indicate that they do not need a residence permit for the survey country because they are EU citizens. Of all non-naturalised Muslim respondents, 2 % are in the process of renewing their residence permit and 87 % hold a valid residence permit. However, among those Muslims with valid residence permits, only about 45 % have one with unlimited validity. Of those who have a residence permit with limited validity, an approximately equal share hold a permit valid either for more than five years or for less than one year: about 37 % and 38 %, respectively. The remaining 25 % of the Muslim respondents with a residence permit hold a permit that is valid between one and five years. At the time of the interview, 5 % of Muslim respondents with foreign or no citizenship indicated that they did not hold a residence permit or did not know if they hold a residence permit.

All in all, most of the Muslims covered in this report have a secure residence status, either by holding citizenship of the country of residence, citizenship of another EU country, or by having a residence permit that is unlimited or valid for more than five years. However, almost 15 % of all Muslim respondents either hold residence permits that are valid for fewer than five years or do not have a residence permit at all. Specifically, 13 % hold a residence permit with limited validity and 2 % do not hold a residence permit. The share of respondents with no or temporarily limited residence rights is particularly high in Malta, Spain, Greece, Cyprus and Italy (Figure 1). Higher shares of respondents without residence permits are found in Greece (12 %), Malta (8 %), Sweden (6 %), Italy (5 %) and Spain (4 %). Security of residence is strongly related to the length of stay in a country; immigrant respondents with limited or no residence permits on average stay in the country for much shorter time periods.

Residence status and access to citizenship are important for immigrants and descendants of immigrants for a variety of reasons, including very pragmatic and

¹⁵ Council of Europe (2010).


¹⁶ FRA (2017b).

¹⁷ Huddleston, T., Niessen, J., Tjaden, J. D. (2013).

¹⁸ First-generation immigrants who hold citizenship of the destination country since birth are mainly found in France and the United Kingdom. This was either because one or both parents were French or British citizens or because it was possible due to citizenship regulations related to the respective country's former colonies or outside territories.

¹⁹ Low number of respondents for this statistic do not allow an exact estimate.

Figure 1: Muslims with residence permit valid for fewer than five years or without residence permit, by EU Member State (%)^{a,b}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.

^b Composite indicator based on questions about whether or not respondents currently have a residence permit and length of permit's validity.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

instrumental considerations. However, they are also important for individuals' active political participation and not least for their emotional attachment and feelings of belonging to the country in which they live. Previous studies on naturalisation show that the main reasons for immigrants and their descendants to seek naturalisation include access to rights, residence security, facing fewer problems when travelling, being acknowledged as a full member of society, being more equally treated, experiencing less bureaucracy in procedures, and having better opportunities on the job market. Out of all Muslim respondents without citizenship of their country of residence, one in five (20 %) previously applied for citizenship, with half still awaiting a decision. The majority of applicants whose previous applications got rejected or who withdrew them still wish to acquire citizenship in the future.

More than one third and up to half of the Muslim respondents without citizenship who experienced any form of discrimination in different areas of life asked about in the survey believe that citizenship was the main reason they faced discrimination. This is particularly true in the area of education, when in contact with the child's school, and when looking for housing, but also in the areas of work, when looking for work, and healthcare. However, not all forms of perceived discrimination by non-citizen respondents are necessarily unlawful, given that there are often legally defined differences for third-country nationals. For example, in some countries, third-country nationals cannot be

members of political parties or face restricted access to employment. However, the respondents' experiences could also be linked to or include acts of illegal discrimination. In general, respondents perceive citizenship to be an important marker for discrimination and differential treatment.


2.1.2. Sense of belonging, attachment and social distance

Muslims feel strongly attached to their country of residence

EU-MIDIS II asked respondents about their feelings of attachment to their neighbourhood, their village, town or city, their country or region, their country of residence, and the European Union. The majority of Muslim respondents tend to feel strongly attached to all of these. They feel most strongly attached to their country of residence and least to the European Union. On a 5-point scale – where 1 means “not attached at all” and 5 “very strongly attached” – the average level of attachment to the country of residence is 4.1 (Figure 2).

Some 76 % of Muslim respondents selected a value of 4 or 5, indicating a tendency to feel strongly attached. Only about 2 % mention not feeling attached at all to their country of residence; the percentage of individuals who do so varies across the 15 EU Member States, ranging from fewer than 1 % in Finland to 8 % in the Netherlands.

Figure 2: Feeling of attachment to country of residence, by gender, citizenship, EU Member State and target group (average value on 5-point scale) ^{a,b,c}



Notes:

- ^a Out of all Muslim respondents with valid answers (n = 10,489); weighted results.
- ^b Question : “On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 equals ‘not at all attached’ and 5 ‘very strongly attached’, please tell me to what extent do you feel attached to [COUNTRY]?”
- ^c Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

The feeling of attachment is somewhat higher among Muslim respondents who hold citizenship of the survey country. The level of attachment is highest among Muslims surveyed in Finland (4.6), Sweden (4.4), the United Kingdom (4.3), France (4.3) and Belgium (4.2); and lowest in Italy (3.3), the Netherlands (3.4), Austria (3.5) and Greece (3.6). Among the different target groups, Muslims who are recent immigrants (covered in Slovenia) and Muslim immigrants from Asian countries (covered in Cyprus) show the lowest average level of attachment to their country of residence (Figure 2).

The overall feeling of attachment to the survey country tends to be slightly higher among descendants of immigrants – but not in France or the Netherlands, where second-generation immigrants feel slightly less strongly attached than first-generation immigrants do.

Many Muslims show open attitudes towards most other groups


The Muslims surveyed are not particularly segregated in the sense that they have friends with different backgrounds. Four in five Muslim respondents have friends with other ethnic minority backgrounds (79 %) and from the majority population (84 %). Almost nine in 10 have friends of a different religion (88 %) – that is, non-Muslim friends. Those with friends from different religious

backgrounds tend to feel slightly more attached to their country of residence.

The Muslims surveyed in EU-MIDIS II are generally open towards other groups of people in the sense of feeling comfortable with having neighbours of different religions, other ethnic backgrounds, or persons with disabilities (Figure 3). However, the level of acceptance is lower regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or transsexual people. Respondents were asked to indicate how comfortable they would feel with different groups of people being their neighbours, on a scale from 0 to 10. There is a very strong acceptance of people with a different religion, the same ethnic or immigrant background, people with another or no ethnic minority background, and disabled persons – with average values of 8.8 regarding people with another ethnic minority background and 9.0 regarding people with a different religion. Some 92 % tend to feel comfortable with having neighbours of a different religious background, meaning they selected a value of six or higher; only 2 % tend to feel uncomfortable, with values between 0 and 4. The remaining respondents are neutral.

The average values – on a scale from 0 to 10 – of feeling comfortable with gay, lesbian or bisexual people and transgender or transsexual persons are comparatively low: at 7 and 6.5, respectively. Of all Muslim

Figure 3: Level of acceptance of neighbours with different backgrounds (on scale from 0 to 10) ^{a,b}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n = 10,527); weighted results.

^b Question: “[U]sing a scale from 0 to 10, please tell me how you would feel about having someone from one of the following groups as your neighbour? 0 means that you would feel ‘totally uncomfortable’ and 10 means that you would feel ‘totally comfortable’.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

respondents, 23 % tend to feel uncomfortable with having lesbian, gay or bisexual people as neighbours and 30 % with having transgender or transsexual persons as neighbours. On average, 16 % of the general population indicate that they would not like to have “homosexuals as their neighbours”, ranging from 5 % in Spain to 40 % in Cyprus.²⁰ In general, women are slightly more comfortable with having different groups as neighbours – particularly lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or transsexual persons, with a difference of about 1 point (Figure 3).

It is important to highlight that there is a low acceptance of Muslims in the general population (Figure 4). Based on data collected from the European Values Study in 2008, on average, in the 15 countries covered in this report, one in five persons do not like to have Muslims as their neighbours. Particularly strong negative attitudes towards Muslims can be found in Cyprus (36 %), Austria (31 %), Malta (31 %) and Slovenia (29 %). Comparatively less negative views and higher rates of acceptance can be found in France (7 %) – although it should be noted that attitudes may have changed since 2008.

The more recent Eurobarometer 2015 results corroborate the existence of anti-Muslim sentiment in the European Union. Its results show that, across the EU-28, 71 % of


the general population would feel comfortable or indifferent if one of their colleagues were a Muslim person. This proportion is lower compared with other groups, such as Buddhist persons (81 %), Jewish persons (84 %), atheist persons (87 %) or Christian persons (94 %). The strongest negative sentiment towards having a Muslim as a colleague is found in the Czech Republic: only 27 % would feel comfortable or indifferent. The highest level of acceptance at 89 % can be found in Sweden.

When looking at the general population’s comfort level regarding intimate relationships with others, Eurobarometer 2015 found that one in three (30 %) would feel uncomfortable if their son or daughter were to have a ‘love relationship’ with a Muslim.²¹ A similar question in EU-MIDIS II finds that 17 % of Muslim respondents would feel uncomfortable if someone from their family were to be married to a person with a different religion. The highest proportion of Muslim respondents who feel ‘totally uncomfortable’ with marrying people with a different religion are in the Netherlands (33 %) and Denmark (25 %). Overall, the survey results indicate that almost every second Muslim respondent (48 %) feels ‘totally comfortable’ with a family member marrying a non-Muslim person.

²⁰ FRA calculations, based on European Values Study (EVS) (2016). The results are not directly comparable due to the use of a different response scale in EU-MIDIS II.

²¹ European Commission (2015b).

Figure 4: Persons from general population in the EU who ‘do not like’ to have Muslims as neighbours, European Values Study (%)^{a,b}



Notes: ^a N = 21,038.

^b Question: “On this list are various groups of people. Could you please sort out any that you would not like to have as neighbours? Muslims.” Percentages indicate the share of people who mentioned Muslims.

* The average is the unweighted average, which does not take into account the total population size of the countries; every country is given equal weight.

Source: *European Values Study, 2008 (EVS (2016): European Values Study 2008: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2008); GESIS Data Archive, Cologne; ZA4800 Data file Version 4.0.0)*

2.1.3. Trust in public institutions

Research has shown that trust in public institutions among first- and second-generation immigrants is influenced by several factors, including the quality and performance of institutions in the country of origin, the quality and performance of institutions in the country of residence, individual socialisation, and the level of involvement and expectations. Given the many aspects involved in what determines trust in institutions, it is not easy to interpret the general level of trust of immigrants and descendants of immigrants. Nevertheless, trust is an important outcome indicator of integration, showing the level of confidence in the main public institutions of a democratic society.


On average, Muslim respondents tend to trust most the police and the country’s legal system, followed by trust in the national parliament. They are on average neutral towards the European Parliament and tend to distrust

politicians and political parties at the national level. The average values on a scale from 0 to 10 – where 0 means “no trust at all” and 10 “complete trust” – are shown in [Figure 5](#). The ranking of the average levels of trust in institutions is almost exactly the same among the general population and the Muslim respondents covered in this report – but mostly lower for the general population, except for trust in the police, which is about the same. [Figure 5](#) shows the average levels of trust among Muslim respondents and the general population for 11 EU Member States. Among the Muslim respondents, on a 10-point scale, trust ranges from 4.3 for political parties to 6.6 for the legal system and the police.²² For the general population, these values range from 3.4 and 3.5 for politicians and political parties, respectively, to 5.4 for the legal system and 6.5 for the police.²³ This means that, on average, first- and second-generation Muslim immigrants trust the legal system and political institutions more than the general population.

²² The 11 Member States had to be selected because this information was unavailable for 4 countries in the ESS.

²³ FRA calculations based on ESS Round 7 (2014).

Figure 5: Trust in institutions among Muslims in 11 EU Member States, by type of institution (average value on scale from 0 to 10) ^{a,b}



Notes: ^a EU-MIDIS II (11 Member States), n = 8,333; ESS 2014 (11 Member States), n = 21,238. The 11 EU Member States include AT, BE, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, UK, NL, SE and SI. The remaining four countries – CY, IT, EL and MT – are not included in the overview for better comparison with ESS data, as ESS did not cover these countries in the 2014 wave. The results including all 15 countries covered in this report yield the same result, with minor differences of not more than 0.1 for the average value reported above.

^b Question: “Please tell me on a scale of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the [COUNTRY] institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016; and European Social Survey, 2014 (ESS Round 7)

The level of trust in the legal system is higher among Muslims than the general population in most countries – but not in Denmark and the Netherlands, where trust among first- and second-generation immigrants is somewhat lower than the national average in the European Social Survey. The second generation shows a lower level of trust in the legal system than the first generation in several but not all countries surveyed. The difference between first- and second-generation

Muslims is largest in France, where first-generation immigrants show higher levels of trust in the legal system than the general population, and second-generation Muslims show slightly lower levels of trust than the generation population. These patterns are even more pronounced when it comes to trust in the police. The last section of this report will look more closely into what influences the level of trust.

2.2. Discrimination and rights awareness

KEY FINDINGS

- In the five years preceding EU-MIDIS II, four out of 10 Muslim respondents (39 %) felt discriminated against because of their ethnic or immigrant background – including skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious belief – in one or more areas of their daily lives. One in four (25 %) experienced this in the 12 months preceding the survey.
- Some 17 % of Muslim respondents indicate having felt discriminated against on grounds of religion or religious belief in the five years before the survey, compared with 10 % in EU-MIDIS I in 2008. Specifically, in EU-MIDIS II, 19 % of Muslim women and 16 % of men felt discriminated against on this ground.
- Second-generation Muslim respondents feel discriminated against based on religion or belief, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and age, more often than first-generation Muslim respondents do (religion: 22 % among second generation versus 15 % of first generation; ethnic origin: 30 % versus 25 %; age: 9 % versus 5 %, respectively).
- As in EU-MIDIS I, among the Muslim groups surveyed, respondents from North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa report the highest levels of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background – both in the five years before the survey (46 % and 45 %, respectively) and in the 12 months before the survey (30 % and 28 %, respectively).
- Substantial differences in experiences of discrimination can be found between Muslim women and men among respondents from certain countries and regions, and living in particular EU Member States.
- Clothing is primarily relevant for Muslim women with respect to discrimination in employment and healthcare. For example, 35 % of Muslim women – compared with 4 % of men – cite the way they dress as the main reason for discrimination when looking for work; 22 % cite this as triggering discrimination when at work.
- Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against reported that, on average, this happened at least five times a year, showing that discrimination is a recurring experience.
- Similar to the findings of EU-MIDIS I, according to which 79 % of Muslim respondents did not report their experiences of discrimination, most Muslim respondents surveyed in EU-MIDIS II did not report such incidents to any authority. On average, only 12 % of respondents who felt discriminated against reported it anywhere. Women report such incidents more often (15 %) than men (10 %).
- The minority of respondents who did report discrimination incidents mostly addressed their employer (39 %), followed by the police (17 %) and trade unions (16 %), since many incidents were related to work. Only 4 % of all Muslim respondents who reported an incident filed a complaint or reported the incident to an equality body, which could be explained by the very low awareness level about their existence.
- On average, 17 % of Muslim respondents think that no law prohibits discrimination, and 14 % do not know whether such legislation exists. This means that one in three do not know that they have, and can claim, a legal right to non-discrimination. Furthermore, and similar to the findings of EU-MIDIS I, the majority of respondents (72 %) are not aware of any organisation that offers support or advice to discrimination victims. Most (65 %) did not recognise any of the equality bodies in their country.

The Racial Equality Directive offers comprehensive protection against discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, and the Employment Equality Directive offers more limited protection on grounds of religion or belief. Nonetheless, the results show that, in the EU Member States covered by this survey, Muslims with different ethnic and migration backgrounds continue to face

discrimination in a number of settings, and many do not know their rights or where to turn when they are not treated equally.

Many also experience discrimination on more than one ground, so-called multiple or intersectional discrimination.²⁴

²⁴ For more information on multiple discrimination, see Chapter 2 of FRA (2017a).

2.2.1. Overall discrimination rates

On terminology

Measuring discrimination in EU-MIDIS II

The survey asked respondents if they felt discriminated against on one or more grounds – skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, religion or religious beliefs, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, and ‘other’ grounds – in different domains and activities:

- when looking for work;
- at work;
- in education or when in contact with school personnel of children;
- in access to healthcare;
- housing;
- when using public or private services (such as public transport, administrative offices, when entering a night club, restaurant or hotel, and when being in or entering a shop).

The discrimination rates were calculated for both the 12 months preceding the survey and the five years preceding the survey.

Respondents who indicated that they experienced discrimination based on at least one of three specific grounds – namely, skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious beliefs – were asked further details about the incident, applying the generic term ‘ethnic or immigrant background’. Therefore, results based on information covered in these subsequent questions cannot be further disaggregated along the three individual grounds.

In addition, respondents were asked if, in the past five years, they experienced a range of discriminatory situations because of their ethnic or immigrant background at work, in access to housing, and when in contact with school personnel as parent or guardian.

In EU-MIDIS I, 10 % of Muslims indicated feeling discriminated against based on religion during the five years preceding that survey. By contrast, 17 % of respondents in EU-MIDIS II reported experiencing religious discrimination. On average, 27 % of all Muslim respondents mention encountering discrimination based on ethnic origin or immigrant background, followed by religion or religious belief (17 %), skin colour (9 %), age (7 %), and sex/gender (2 %) (Figure 6). More Muslim women than men indicate experiencing discrimination based on sex/gender (4 % and 1 %, respectively). For other grounds, there are no substantial differences between men’s and women’s experiences – except that more Muslim men indicate encountering discrimination based on skin colour (11 % compared with 7 %), and that more Muslim women mention being discriminated against based on religion (19 % compared with 16 %).

There are small but noteworthy differences between first- and second-generation respondents in terms of feeling discriminated against on the grounds of religion or religious beliefs, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and age. On average, second-generation Muslim respondents mention religion more often as discrimination ground than first-generation respondents (22 % versus 15 %). The same is true for ethnic origin (30 % versus 25 %) and age (9 % versus 5 %). However, results vary across different countries/regions of origin and countries of residence.²⁶

Looking at discrimination from the perspective of respondents’ countries/regions of origin (Figure 7), the aggregated results show that, for all groups other than Muslims from Sub-Saharan Africa, ethnic origin or immigrant background is the main discrimination ground, followed by religion or religious beliefs. Muslims from Sub-Saharan Africa indicate that they mostly experience discrimination based on skin colour (29 %).


Discrimination based on different grounds

As in EU-MIDIS I, this survey asked respondents about their experiences with discrimination, during the past five years, in four areas of life – when looking for work, at work, in access to housing and when in contact with school authorities (as parent or guardian).²⁵ Respondents could indicate up to eight different grounds of discrimination.

²⁵ Multiple grounds were also asked about in the area of health, but, due to a routing mistake, this domain cannot be considered for this analysis. Results for this domain are considered in the 12-month overall rate of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background. Multiple grounds were not asked about for the category “other public or private services”, which includes education, public transport, public administration, restaurant or bar, and shop.

²⁶ Second-generation Muslim respondents are on average younger (majority: 16 to 44 years old).


Figure 6: Grounds for discrimination experienced in past 5 years in four areas of daily life (%) ^{a,b,c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination on different grounds in at least one of four domains of daily life asked about in the survey ('past 5 years': n=9,240); weighted results.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Domains of daily life considered for analysis: looking for work, at work, education (as parent or guardian), housing.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 7: Discrimination based on three specific grounds in past 5 years in four areas of daily life, by target group (%) ^{a,b,c,d}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination on different grounds in at least one of four domains of daily life asked about in the survey ('past 5 years': n=9,240); weighted results, sorted by the ground 'ethnic origin or immigrant background'.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Domains of daily life considered for analysis: looking for work, at work, education (as parent or guardian), housing.
^d Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 8 looks at discrimination from the perspective of the respondents' country of residence. It shows that Muslim respondents in all countries other than Malta identify ethnic origin or immigrant background as the main ground for encountering discrimination. In Malta, 32 % indicate skin colour as the main discrimination ground. Skin colour is also mentioned by 25 % of respondents in Greece and by 21 % in Italy – which is expected, as the countries/regions of origin of those surveyed in these countries influence the results. For example, in Italy, 39 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa indicate skin colour as a ground for discrimination – almost two times higher than the country average based on responses of Muslims from three different countries/regions of origin. By contrast, Muslims in the Netherlands (30 %) and in Italy (25 %) mostly mention the ground religion or religious beliefs.


Among all respondents, Muslim respondents from North Africa who are living in the Netherlands and in Italy report the highest levels of discrimination based on religion or religious belief during the five years preceding the survey (31 % in both countries). This is followed by 28 % of Muslim respondents from Turkey in the Netherlands and 27 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in Denmark.

The results point to an intersection of the grounds religion and ethnic origin, as 70 % of all Muslim respondents who indicate religion as ground for discrimination also felt discriminated against because of their ethnic origin or immigrant background. By contrast, only 46 % of all Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against because of their ethnic origin or immigrant background indicated that they also experienced discrimination based on religion – a finding that could indicate that the majority of Muslim respondents perceive religion as a dimension or element of their ethnic or immigrant background.

Comparing rates of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background

This section summarises further results relating to the most relevant ground for discrimination for Muslim respondents in EU-MIDIS II – ethnic or immigrant background. As previously noted, this incorporates three grounds: ethnic origin or immigrant background, religion or religious beliefs and skin colour. The survey collected more detailed information concerning such discrimination in up to 10 areas of life.

Figure 8: Discrimination based on three specific grounds in past 5 years in four areas of daily life, by EU Member State (%)^{a,b,c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination on different grounds in at least one of four domains of daily life asked about in the survey ('past 5 years': n=9,240); weighted results, sorted by the ground 'ethnic origin or immigrant background'.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Domains of daily life considered for analysis: looking for work, at work, education (as parent or guardian), housing.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016


The level of perceived discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background remains high among Muslim immigrants and their descendants. A look at the overall discrimination in up to the 10 areas of daily life covered by EU-MIDIS II shows that, on average, 39 % of all Muslim respondents felt discriminated against because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the five years preceding the survey; and 25 % did so in the 12 months preceding the survey (Figure 9). In EU-MIDIS I, one in three Muslim respondents (30 %) stated that they felt discriminated against because of their ethnicity (with respect to nine areas of life).

Discrimination rates among target groups

As in EU-MIDIS I, Muslim respondents from North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa report the highest levels of discrimination for both reference periods: for the five years before the survey, 46 % and 45 %, respectively; and for the preceding 12 months, 30 % and 28 %, respectively (Figure 9).²⁷

There are, however, notable differences between the same target groups in different countries (Figure 10). For example, Muslim respondents from North Africa are more likely to feel discriminated against in the Netherlands (49 %), Italy (33 %) and France (31 %), and least likely so in Spain (20 %). There are also substantial differences between Muslim respondents from different countries/regions who live in the same EU country, which could be explained in terms of differences in characteristics – for example, skin colour. The most striking difference in the 12-month rate of perceived discrimination is observed in Germany between Muslims from Sub-Saharan Africa and from Turkey: 18 % of Muslim respondents from Turkey felt discriminated against in the preceding 12 months, in contrast to 50 % of those from Sub-Saharan Africa. In the Netherlands, the 12-month discrimination rate based on ethnic or immigrant background differs by 10 percentage points between Muslims from Turkey and from North Africa (39 % versus 49 %, respectively).

Figure 9: Overall discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 5 years and past 12 months, by survey target group (%)^{a,b,c,d,e}




- Notes:
- a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of the domains of daily life asked about in the survey ('past 5 years': n=10,467; 'past 12 months': n=10,498); weighted results, sorted by 12-month rate.
 - b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - c Domains of daily life asked about in the survey: looking for work, at work, education (self or as parent), health, housing, and other public or private services (public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop).
 - d Discrimination experiences in 'access to health care' were asked about only for the past 12 months, which explains the different sample sizes (n) for the two reference periods.
 - e Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

27 FRA (2009).

Figure 10: Overall discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past five years and past 12 months, by target group and EU Member State (%) ^{a,b,c,d}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of the domains of daily life asked about in the survey ('the past 5 years': n=10,467; 'the past 12 months': n=10,498); weighted results, sorted by 12-month rate.

^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

^c Domains of daily life asked about in the survey: looking for work, at work, education (self or as parent), health, housing, and other public or private services (public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop).

^d Discrimination experiences in 'access to health care' were asked about only for the past 12 months, which explains the different sample sizes (n) for the two reference periods.

^e Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016


Gender differences within and across target groups

On average, there is no difference in the discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background perceived by Muslim women and men during the 12 months preceding the survey (25 % and 24 %, respectively). However, there are some substantial gender differences within and across target groups. For example, the rate for Muslim women from Turkey in Austria is more than twice as high as that for men (38 % versus 16 %). Muslim women from Sub-Saharan Africa in Finland and Italy also experience this form of discrimination more than men of the same target group (43 % versus 33 % in Finland, and 31 % versus 20 % in Italy). In contrast, more Muslim men in the Netherlands feel discriminated against than Muslim women do, independently of country of origin (from North Africa: 54 % for men and 44 % for women; from Turkey: 48 % for men and 30 % for women). In Belgium, Muslim men with North African background report higher rate of discrimination compared to women (34 % versus 26 %), but no substantial gender differences are observed for Muslims from Turkey (20 % and 22 %, respectively).

The results show no substantial differences in discrimination against Muslim women who usually wear a headscarf (or niqab) outside the house and those who do not – for either reference periods (the past 12-months: 26 % and 24 % respectively; the past 5 years: 40 % and 39 %). Some evidence suggests that this might be due to less exposure to discrimination as a result of more limited social interaction, such as when working or looking for work. For example, the results show that Muslim women who usually wear a headscarf (or niqab) outside the house are in employment to a lesser extent than women who do not do so (29 % and 40 %, respectively, for self-declared main activity status ‘in paid work or self-employed’).

However, results show (Figure 11) that both male and female Muslim respondents who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing when out in public slightly more often felt discriminated against based on their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months before the survey (28 % for males; 27 % for females) than Muslim respondents who do not wear such clothing (22 % for males; 23 % for females).

Figure 11: Discrimination due to ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months, among those who do/do not wear traditional or religious clothing, and by gender (%)^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of the domains of daily life asked about in the survey (male: n=6,129; female n=4,368); weighted results.
 - ^b Domains of daily life asked about in the survey: looking for work, at work, education (self or as parent), health, housing, and other public or private services (public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop).
 - ^c Question: “Do you wear traditional or religious clothing when out in public that is different to the type of clothing typically worn in [COUNTRY]? This includes for example, specific traditional or religious clothing, symbols, headscarf or turban”.
 - ^d Question only asked to Muslim women: “Do you usually wear a headscarf or niqab outside the house?”.


Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.2.2. Experiences of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background

The highest 5-year rate of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background across different domains is found in employment and in access to public and private services (Figure 12). 31 % of all Muslim respondents who looked for a job in the five years preceding the

survey felt discriminated against on this basis. Among those who did so, 13 % experienced this in the year before the survey. When in contact with public or private services – such as administrative offices, public transport or when accessing a shop, restaurant or bar – 23 % and 17 % of Muslim respondents felt discriminated against during the five years and 12 months before the survey, respectively.

Figure 12: Discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months and in past 5 years in different areas of life (%)^{a,b}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in the particular domain; weighted results, sorted by 12-month rate.
^b Domains of daily life summarised under 'other public or private services': public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Discriminatory situations at work

The survey also asked respondents if they experienced any discriminatory situations at work because of their ethnic or immigrant background (Table 1). Some of these are linked to religious practices. For example, around 12 % of Muslim respondents who were at work in the five years preceding the survey say that they were not allowed to take time off for a very important religious holiday, service or ceremony; 9 % note that they were prevented from expressing or carrying out religious practices and customs, such as praying or wearing a headscarf or turban. In addition, 7 % of Muslim respondents say that they were given tasks below their qualifications, and 5 % that they were denied a promotion because of their ethnic or immigrant background. 2 % of the Muslim respondents surveyed indicate that they were fired, dismissed, or laid off because of their ethnic or immigrant background during the five years before the survey, and 1 % were not allowed to join a trade union.

Table 1: Respondents' experiences with specific discriminatory practices at work because of their ethnic or immigrant background in past 5 years (%)

At work	
Not allowed to take time off for a very important religious holiday/service/ceremony	12
Prevented from expressing or carrying out religious practices and customs, such as praying or wearing a headscarf or turban	9
Given tasks below respondent's qualifications	7
Denial of promotion	5
Fired, dismissed or laid off	2
Not allowed to join a trade union	1

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016


Main reasons for discrimination in different domains

When Muslim respondents were asked about the main reason for the most recent discrimination incident they encountered due to their ethnic or immigrant background in five life domains, they could choose among eight different reasons (Figure 13). The results show that two are particularly relevant for Muslim respondents in all domains – their first or last name and their skin colour or physical appearance. First or last names are most relevant when looking for housing (53 %) or for work (44 %). Skin colour or physical appearance is most frequently mentioned by respondents regarding the use of health care services (46 %) and at the work place (43 %). In the context of looking for work, all eight reasons play a role. However, every ninth (12 %) Muslim respondent who felt discriminated against because of their ethnic background when looking for work mentions the reputation of their neighbourhood or residential address as a reason for the discrimination – a factor pointed to that often only in this particular domain of life. Respondents’ citizenship is ranked third in the area of housing, where it is cited as a reason for

discrimination by every fourth (25 %) Muslim respondent. Every fifth respondent (21 %) cites citizenship as a basis for discrimination when looking for work. Citizenship is also mentioned as a reason for discrimination at the workplace by 17 % of Muslim respondents.

Due to very low numbers, target group-based comparisons are only possible in two areas: when looking for work and when at work. For Muslim respondents with Sub-Saharan African backgrounds in Denmark, France, Finland, Malta, Italy, and Sweden, skin colour or physical appearance is the most relevant reason for discrimination when they look for work or at the work place. Muslims from South Asia in Italy and Greece, and Muslims from Turkey in Austria and Germany, also mention skin colour as the main reason they felt discriminated against when looking for work. In contrast, Muslim immigrants or descendants of immigrants from North Africa in the Netherlands, Belgium, and France who felt discriminated against when looking for work indicate their first or last name as the main reason. Meanwhile, Muslims from North Africa residing in Italy who felt discriminated against mention their country of birth as the main reason in both areas of employment.

Figure 13: Main reasons for most recent incident of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in different domains of life (multiple response) (%)^{a, b, c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents who gave information about the most recent discrimination incident based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of five domains of daily life ('looking for work': n=1,747; 'at work': n=1,522; 'health': n=329; 'housing': n=750; 'school authorities': n=245); weighted results.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Question: "Last time you felt discriminated against because of your ethnic or immigrant background when [DOMAIN], in your opinion what were the main reason for this?"

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016


Muslims from Turkey in Germany who felt discriminated against at the work place and Muslims from North Africa in Spain who experienced discrimination when looking for work indicate their citizenship as the most important reason for discrimination.

When looking at differences between the sexes in terms of identifying the main reasons for discrimination in the two areas of employment – looking for work and at work – the following emerges: Muslim men more often mention skin colour (looking for work: 51 % for men and 26 % for women; at work: 49 % for men and 36 % for women), first or second name (looking for work: 50 % for men and 37 % for women; at work: 36 % for men and 23 % for women), and accent or the way one speaks the country’s national language (at work: 20 % and 9 %, respectively) than Muslim women do. However, these reasons are relevant for both men and women across all five areas. By contrast, clothing is primarily relevant for Muslim women; in respect to employment, for example, this reason is substantially more often mentioned by Muslim women than men (35 % versus 4 % when looking for work, and 22 % versus 7 % at work). With respect to health care services, clothing is only mentioned by Muslim women.

Frequency of discrimination experiences

The survey asked respondents to indicate how often in the past 12 months they felt discriminated against because of their ethnic or immigrant background in five domains of life (looking for work, at work, health, housing, and when in contact with school authorities). On average, Muslim respondents noted at least five incidents a year, which shows that discrimination is a recurring experience for many Muslims (mean values vary – for example, between 2.3 incidents for immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa in Italy to 6.2 incidents for immigrants from North Africa and their descendants in Belgium). The frequency of discriminatory incidents differs across the five areas of life. Muslim respondents most frequently face discrimination at work and when looking for work (Figure 14 and Figure 15). 10 % of all Muslim respondents indicate having felt discriminated against because of their ethnic or immigrant background at work on a daily basis, and 17 % felt discriminated against more than 10 times (Figure 14). What leads a respondent to deem a discrimination experience a daily experience would require an in-depth analysis, as this may arise either from one incident that affects the person every day or from a number of incidents that lead to a constant feeling of being discriminated against on a daily basis.

Figure 14: Number of discrimination experiences based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months at work (%)^{a,b,c}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against based on ethnic or immigrant background in the past 12 months at work (n=739); weighted results.

^b Question: “How many times has this happened to you in the past 12 months when at work?”

^c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 15: Number of discrimination experiences based on ethnic or immigrant background in past 12 months when looking for work (%)^{a,b,c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against based on ethnic or immigrant background in the past 12 months when looking for work (n=829); weighted results.
^b Question: “How many times has this happened to you in the past 12 months when looking for work?”
^c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.2.3. Reporting discrimination

Reporting of incidents of discrimination quite low, particularly among Muslim men

Reporting of discriminatory incidents remains low among Muslim immigrants and their descendants. EU-MIDIS I found that 79 % of Muslim respondents did not report the incidents of discrimination they encountered. On average, EU-MIDIS II results indicate that only 12 % of Muslim respondents who felt discriminated against because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the five years before the survey reported the most recent incident or filed a complaint with an authority. The reporting level is even lower among Muslim men; across all countries and target groups, only 10 % reported the latest discriminatory incident. By contrast, 15 % of Muslim women reported or filed a complaint about the most recent incident of discrimination (Figure 16). No substantial differences in reporting the latest incident of discrimination can be observed between first- and second-generation Muslim respondents.


In terms of differences between Member States (Figure 17), the survey shows that reporting of the latest discriminatory incident is highest among Muslim immigrants and their descendants in Finland and the Netherlands, where almost every third or fourth incident

is reported (31 % and 25 %, respectively). Only every fifth incident is reported in both Sweden and Denmark (19 % each).

Most reports or complaints about latest incident made to employer

Across all domains of daily life, nearly half of all reports or complaints about the most recent incident are linked to an incident that happened at work (46 %). Every fifth reported incident happened when in contact with administrative offices or public services (20 %). 15 % of the reports concern an incident experienced when in contact with school authorities. Among all Muslim respondents who reported the most recent incident of discrimination across all domains of life, by far the most incidents were reported to an employer (39 %), followed by the police (17 %) and trade unions, labour unions or staff committees (16 %). These results reflect the reporting rates as most reports are made when an incident happens at work. Reporting to equality bodies occurs at a much lower rate: only 4 % of Muslim respondents who reported an incident filed a complaint with, or reported the incident to, such an entity. However, the authorities/institutions to which respondents turn to file complaints vary across the different domains of life covered by the survey.


Figure 16: Muslim immigrants and their descendants who reported or filed a complaint about the most recent incident of discrimination based on their ethnic or immigrant background, by gender (%) ^{a, b, c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents at risk of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of the domains of daily life asked about in the survey (n=4,881, of which n= 3,025 men and n=1,856 women); weighted results.
^b Domains of daily life asked about in the survey: looking for work, at work, education (self or as parent), health, housing, and other public or private services (public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop).
^c Question: “Last time you felt discriminated against because of your ethnic or immigrant background at [domain], did you report or make a complaint about the incident?”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 17: Muslim immigrants and their descendants who reported or filed a complaint about the most recent incident of discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background, by EU Member State (%) ^{a, b, c, d}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents who experienced discrimination based on ethnic or immigrant background in at least one of the domains of daily life asked about in the survey (‘the past 12 months’: n=698); weighted results.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Domains of daily life asked about in the survey: looking for work, at work, education (self or as parent), health, housing, and other public or private services (public administration, restaurant or bar, public transport, shop).
^d Question: “Last time you felt discriminated against because of your ethnic or immigrant background at [domain], did you report or make a complaint about the incident?”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

In the two areas of employment (looking for work and at work), most complaints are made to the employer (when looking for work: 32 %, at work: 67 %); the labour union or staff committee (at work: 28%); the police (when looking for work: 17 % and at work: 11 %); and community organisations like church/faith-based minority groups (when looking for work (15 %)).

The low reporting rates prevent a detailed analysis of respondents' level of satisfaction with the way their complaints were handled. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that, although the highest reporting rates are in employment, Muslim respondents on average feel somewhat dissatisfied with the way their complaint was handled by an employer, trade/labour union/ staff committee. This is also the case with the police's handling of complaints involving incidents relating to entering a night club, bar or restaurant, or in public transport. Similarly, respondents were not satisfied with how municipalities dealt with their complaints when discrimination was experienced at administration offices or public services.

Not effective and not worth doing: reasons for not reporting discrimination

Across all domains of daily life asked about in the survey, and similar to the findings of EU-MIDIS I,²⁸ most Muslim respondents who did not report discrimination incidents to any organisation or authority failed to do so because they think nothing would happen or change (e.g. housing: 41 %; in education: 40 %; at administrative offices or public services: 40 %), or because they see the incident as too trivial or not worth reporting (e.g. in education: 44 %; public transport: 42 %; in a night club, bar or restaurant: 34 %). The third reason given by respondents – across all domains – is that these types of incidents happen all the time (e.g. in night club/bar/restaurant, on public transport, and in or when entering a shop: 27 %). The two most common reasons for not reporting differ when only in the context of children's schools: in this domain, respondents are most concerned about negative consequences (42 %) and, secondly, that there is no proof of the incident (27 %). The latter also arises as the fourth relevant reason across many domains. Another reason respondents cite as keeping them from reporting the most recent incident is the wish not to create trouble (e.g. health-care: 21 %; housing, and at administrative offices or public services: 17 %).

²⁸ FRA (2009), p. 8f.

2.2.4. Awareness of support organisations, equality bodies and laws addressing discrimination


The survey examined respondents' level of awareness of organisations that offer support and advice in the case of discrimination by asking whether they recognise one or more of up to three preselected equality bodies (in Germany, of up to four bodies). In addition, the survey asked respondents about their awareness of any organisations in their country of residence that offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against for whatever reason.

On average, most Muslim respondents (72 %) surveyed in EU-MIDIS II are not aware of any organisations that offer support or advice to discrimination victims in their country of residence (Figure 18).²⁹ This result is similar to the findings of EU-MIDIS I,³⁰ according to which 80 % of Muslim respondents were not aware of any such organisation. It could also explain the low reporting rates. However, results vary across target groups and countries – between 98 % among recent Muslim immigrants in Slovenia being unaware of such organisations, and 55 % of Muslims with Sub-Saharan African background in Sweden not knowing about them. Among Muslims from North Africa in Spain and recent immigrants in Slovenia, almost none of the respondents knew of such a support service or organisation. In contrast, Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in Sweden (44 %) and Muslim immigrants from Asia in Cyprus (37 %) show the highest awareness levels of such organisations in their country of residence. In Belgium, Muslims with North African background on average seem more aware of support organisations than those from Turkey (30 % and 21 %, respectively).

²⁹ The average rate reported in the 2009 EU-MIDIS Data in Focus Report 2: Muslims was 80 %. Although no direct and exact comparisons between the two numbers can be made (due to slightly different compositions of countries and target groups in the two analyses), this result shows that, on average, most Muslim respondents remain unaware that support organisations are available in case of discrimination in the countries in which they live. For Roma respondents, EU-MIDIS II results revealed that an average of 82 % were unaware of this – showing that, on average, Muslim respondents are slightly more aware of such organisations than Roma respondents. See FRA (2016), p. 41.

³⁰ FRA (2009).

Figure 18: Awareness among Muslim immigrants and their descendants of organisations that offer support or advice to victims of discrimination (regardless of grounds of discrimination), by target group (%)^{a,b,c,d}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results, sorted by 'Yes'.
^b Question: "Do you know of any organisation in [COUNTRY] that offer support or advice to people who have been discriminated against - for any reason?"
^c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^d Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Overall, the majority (65 %) of Muslim respondents are not aware of any equality body in their country, although results vary by country (Figure 19). The best known equality bodies are in Denmark (64 %), Cyprus (61 %) and the United Kingdom (52 %), where more than half of the respondents are aware of at least one equality body. In Belgium (49%) and Finland (47%), almost half of Muslim respondents are aware of at least one such body. In other countries, the proportion of respondents who know the equality bodies is low – for example, in Austria (21 %), Malta (8 %), Slovenia (6 %) and Spain (5 %).

On average, more men (38 %) than women (32 %) are aware of at least one equality body, but differences between males and females vary on the individual country level. The difference between awareness levels among Muslim men (60 %) and women (45 %) is particularly prominent in the United Kingdom. By contrast, in Belgium, the Netherlands and Austria, notably more Muslim women than men know at least one equality body.

Figure 19: Knowledge among Muslim respondents of at least one equality body (%) ^{a,b,c}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results, sorted by 'Total'.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Question: "Have you ever heard of [name of equality body]?"

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

When asked about anti-discrimination legislation in their countries of residence, Muslim respondents on average show a high level of awareness, although results differ considerably across target groups and countries (Figure 20). On average, most Muslim respondents (69 %) know that discrimination based on skin colour, ethnic origin or religion is unlawful in the country in which they live. 17 % of all Muslim respondents think that there is no such law, while 14 % do not know whether such legislation exists.

The highest awareness of anti-discrimination legislation is found among respondents from Turkey in Sweden (82 %), from Sub-Saharan Africa in France (81 %), the United Kingdom (80 %) and Denmark (78 %), and for North Africans in France (79 %) and the Netherlands (78 %). The lowest awareness levels are found among Muslims from Sub-Saharan Africa in Malta (18 %), Muslims from South-Asia in Italy (21 %), and recent Muslim immigrants in Slovenia (29 %).

Figure 20: Awareness among Muslim immigrants and their descendants of laws prohibiting discrimination based on skin colour, ethnic origin or religion (%) ^{a,b,c,d}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results, sorted by 'Yes'.
^b Question: "As far as you are aware, is there a law in [COUNTRY] that forbids discrimination based on skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?"
^c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^d Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.


Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.2.5. Perceived discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin, skin colour, and religion or religious belief

Respondents were asked to assess how widespread discrimination based on skin colour, ethnic origin, and religion or religious beliefs is in their countries of residence. More than one out of two Muslim respondents

consider discrimination on any of these three grounds to be fairly or very widespread (Figure 21). On average, discrimination based on religion or religious beliefs is considered to be even more widespread (58%). However, the proportion of Muslim respondents who experienced discrimination in the five years before the survey is considerably lower than the proportion of those who perceive discrimination based on religion, ethnic origin or skin colour to be widespread in their society.

Figure 21: Muslim respondents who believe discrimination on grounds of religion, ethnic origin or skin colour is very or fairly widespread in their country, by EU Member State (%)^{a,b,c,d}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.
^b Question: “For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very rare, fairly rare, fairly widespread, or very widespread in [COUNTRY]?”
^c The response categories ‘very widespread’ and ‘fairly widespread’ are pooled together for this analysis.
^d Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Muslim respondents in this survey and the general population have notably different perceptions of discrimination based on ethnic origin or religion. Based on results from the Special Eurobarometer 437 on discrimination in the EU in 2015,³¹ the proportion of the general population that thinks discrimination on the ground of ethnic origin is widespread in their country is higher than that of Muslim respondents in the fifteen EU Member States surveyed by EU-MIDIS II. A similar

pattern emerges regarding discrimination based on religion or religious beliefs. The proportion of the general population in all surveyed countries that considers such discrimination to be widespread is the same or even higher than that of Muslim respondents in EU-MIDIS II – except in Austria (Muslim respondents: 56%; general population: 51%) and Finland (Muslim respondents: 38%; general population: 35%).

31 European Commission (2015b).

2.3. Hate crime – harassment and violence

KEY FINDINGS

- Some 27 % of Muslim respondents experienced harassment because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months before the survey, and 45 % of those individuals experienced six or more incidents during that period. And 2 % of respondents say they were physically attacked because of their ethnic or immigrant background during the same period.
- More second-generation respondents experienced hate-motivated harassment in the 12 months before the survey (36 %) than first-generation respondents did (22 %).
- Overall, Muslim women who wear headscarves (or the very few who wear niqabs) in public are more likely to experience bias-motivated harassment than those who do not – 31 % compared with 23 %.
- Some 39 % of Muslim women who wear a headscarf or niqab in public say they experienced, in the 12 months before the survey, inappropriate staring or offensive gestures due to this religious symbol; 22 % experienced verbal insults or offensive comments; and 2 % were physically attacked.
- In nine out of 10 cases (91 %), respondents did not report the most recent incident of bias-motivated harassment to the police or other organisation; 43 % explained that this was because ‘nothing would happen or change by reporting it’. Some 77 % of bias-motivated physical attacks were also not reported to the police or other organisation.
- Only 3 out of 3,763 Muslim respondents who indicate that they were harassed reported the incident to an equality body, human rights institution or ombudsperson institution.
- The overwhelming majority of respondents who reported the most recently experienced bias-motivated physical assault to the police (81 %) say that they were either very or somewhat dissatisfied with the way police handled the matter; 13 % say they were satisfied. In FRA’s survey on violence against women in the EU, 66 % of women indicated that they were satisfied with the way police handled the most serious incident of physical violence perpetrated by someone other than their current or previous partner.
- The perpetrators of both bias-motivated harassment and violence were in the majority of instances not known to the victim, and did not have an ethnic minority background. Some 3 % to 5 % of respondents say that the perpetrators of the bias-motivated incidents they experienced may have been members of an extremist or racist group.
- The proportion of women who identify the perpetrator of the most recent incident as being from another ethnic minority group is much higher than for men (48 % compared with 26 %). Similarly, more second-generation respondents than first-generation respondents indicate that the perpetrator was from another ethnic minority group; specifically, 38 % of second-generation respondents and 28 % of first-generation respondents do so.
- Some 2 % of Muslim respondents say they experienced physical assault by the police because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the five years preceding the survey (1 % in the 12 months preceding the survey). The majority of these incidents (70%) were not reported.
- Around half of Muslim respondents do not support using physical violence to prevent getting physically hurt themselves or to prevent someone else getting physically hurt (53 % and 49 %, respectively). The overwhelming majority finds that it is never acceptable to use physical violence because someone insulted them due to their ethnic or immigrant background or their religion (86 % and 87 %, respectively).

The Racial Equality Directive³² recognises harassment as a form of discrimination, defining it as “unwanted conduct related to racial or ethnic origin [, which] takes place with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person and of creating

an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment” (Article 2). The Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia³³ provides protection against incitement to hatred and hate crime targeting a person or persons belonging to a group

³² Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ 2000 L 180 (Racial Equality Directive).

³³ Council of the European Union (2008), Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ 2008 L 328.

defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. In particular, its Articles 4 and 8 oblige EU Member States to take the necessary measures to prosecute offences with a racist and/or xenophobic motivation and that such motivation may be taken into consideration by the courts as an aggravating circumstance in the determination of the penalties. Moreover, the Victims' Rights Directive prescribes that "victims who have suffered a crime committed with a bias or discriminatory motive" receive an individual assessment to identify specific protection needs they may have (Article 22).³⁴ These assessments must take a person's ethnicity, race and religion into account.

In June 2016, the European Commission set up a High Level Group on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and other forms of intolerance to step up action to tackle hatred and intolerance more effectively. FRA was assigned the coordination of a specific subgroup to assist Member States in developing effective methods for recording and collecting hate crime data. The relevant legislation, including the Council Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia,³⁵ does not contain provisions for collecting and publishing such data. Official data on incidents of criminal victimisation motivated by anti-Muslim hatred have to date been published by nine EU Member States: Austria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Poland and Sweden.³⁶

FRA's 2012 report *Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims' rights*³⁷ highlighted the need to broaden the scope of hate crime data collection to make hate crime visible in the EU, as only few EU Member States collect and publish data covering a range of bias motivations. The report also noted European Court of Human Rights rulings expressing the need for states to 'unmask' the motivation behind racist offences as well as crimes committed because of the victim's religious beliefs.

2.3.1. Experiences of harassment motivated by hatred

The survey results presented in this report refer to harassment experienced by select groups of Muslim respondents because of their 'ethnic or immigrant background'; this is used as a generic term and includes results for three bias indicators asked about separately in the survey: skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious belief. Respondents were asked about five forms of harassment: offensive or threatening comments in person; threats of violence in person; offensive gestures or inappropriate staring; offensive or threatening e-mails or text messages (SMS); and offensive comments made about them online.

Prevalence and frequency of harassment motivated by hatred

Overall, about one in four Muslim respondents (27 %) reported experiencing harassment due to their ethnic or immigrant background at least once in the 12 months before the survey. This ranges from almost half of all Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in Germany (48 %) and Finland (45 %), to 13 % to 14 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in the United Kingdom and Malta, respectively (Figure 22).

Regarding the frequency of these experiences, the survey finds that, overall, 45 % have experienced six or more incidents; 36 % have experienced two to five incidents; and 19 % have experienced one. Results vary across different countries/regions of origin and countries of residence. The majority of victims of bias-motivated harassment among Muslim respondents from Turkey living in the Netherlands (60 %) and those from Sub-Saharan Africa in Sweden (58 %), as well as those from North Africa in Belgium (58 %), experienced six or more incidents in a year. Overall, there are no notable differences between the percentage of Muslim men and women who experienced six or more incidents of bias-motivated harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

34 Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA, OJ 2012 L 315 (Victims' Rights Directive).


35 Council of the European Union (2008), Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ 2008 L 328.

36 See Chapter 3 on Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance in FRA (2017a).

37 FRA (2012).



Figure 22: Prevalence of harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey (%) ^{a,b,c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n = 10,527); weighted results.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Prevalence of harassment motivated by hatred for specific respondent groups


Among the different groups of Muslim respondents, the highest proportion of individuals indicating that they have experienced, in the 12 months before the survey, harassment due to their ethnic or immigrant background are Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa (32 %), followed by Muslims from Asia (28 %) (Figure 23).

A look at the results for each respondent group shows that, in Denmark, Muslim women from Sub-Saharan Africa reported higher rates than men (women – 46 %, men – 27 %), while no difference is observed in the country between women and men for Muslim respondents from Turkey. On the other hand, Muslim men from Turkey in the Netherlands, from Sub-Saharan Africa in

Sweden, and from North Africa and South Asia in Italy report higher rates of bias-motivated harassment than women. These differences point to the need for more in-depth research to explore how Muslim men and women are affected by harassment in different ways.

More second-generation respondents (36 %) report bias-motivated harassment in the 12 months before the survey than first-generation respondents do (22 %). This may partly be explained by the younger age of second-generation respondents compared to the first generation, as harassment experiences tend to be more common among younger people. Rates decline with age – perhaps reflecting different situations that people face in various stages of their lives. Second-generation immigrants may also be better attuned to recognising harassment – for instance, thanks to better knowledge of the local language.

Figure 23: Prevalence of harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey, by aggregate Muslim groups (%)^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of all Muslim respondents ($n = 10,527$); weighted results.
 - ^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parenthesis. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^c Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.
 - ^d Two of the groups presented in the bar chart are based, respectively, on interviews from one country only: 'Recent immigrants' (interviews from Slovenia) and 'Asians and their descendants' (interviews from Cyprus).

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Impact of traditional or religious clothing

Male and female respondents were asked whether they wear traditional or religious clothing in public (see also Section 2.2.1 on gender differences in the prevalence of discrimination). In addition, women were asked if they wear a headscarf or niqab,³⁸ and if they experienced three certain kinds of harassment or violence because they did so.


Almost one third of Muslim respondents (29 % of men and 31 % of women) who at least sometimes wear

traditional or religious clothing in public reported experiencing harassment due to their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months before the survey (Figure 24).

Some 39 % of Muslim women respondents who indicate that they wear a headscarf or a niqab outside the house say that, in the 12 months before the survey, they experienced inappropriate staring or offensive gestures because they did so. For the same reason, 22 % experienced verbal insults or offensive comments; and 2 % were physically attacked.

³⁸ A niqab is a veil that covers the face, but not the eyes.

Figure 24: Respondents who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing (including a headscarf or niqab for women) in public and have experienced harassment due to their ethnic or immigrant background in 12 months before the survey (%)^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n = 10,527); weighted results.
 - ^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parenthesis. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^c Question: “Do you wear traditional or religious clothing when out in public that is different to the type of clothing typically worn in [COUNTRY]? This includes for example, specific traditional or religious clothing, symbols, headscarf or turban”.
 - ^d Question only asked to Muslim women: “Do you usually wear a headscarf or niqab outside the house?”.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Type of harassment experienced

The most common forms of harassment due to ethnic or immigrant background are offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, with 21 % experiencing this in the 12 months before the survey. This is followed by offensive or threatening comments in person (18 %). Other forms of harassment – such as threats of violence and cyber-harassment – are less common. Younger respondents more often experience both in-person harassment, such as offensive or threatening comments, gestures or threats of violence, and cyber-harassment than older Muslims.

Perpetrators of harassment motivated by hatred

When asked to identify perpetrator(s), three in four respondents who experienced bias-motivated harassment say that the perpetrator of the most recent incident was someone they did not know (75 %); 14 % indicate that it was someone at work or in an educational setting; and 3 % say that it was a member of a right-wing extremist/racist group. In EU-MIDIS I, most respondents also identified the perpetrators of harassment as individuals whom they did not previously know.

The survey also asked harassment victims if the perpetrator of the most recent incident had the same ethnic or immigrant background as them, another ethnic minority background, or whether the perpetrator was someone belonging to the majority population. In most cases (75 %), the respondents perceived the perpetrator to be someone without an ethnic minority background; 21 % identified the perpetrator as someone from another ethnic minority group; and for 6 %, the perpetrator was from the same ethnic minority group as themselves. (Respondents could indicate all that applied – the sum of the percentages for the three categories therefore exceeds 100 %.) These results concerning the background of the perpetrator(s) are similar to those of EU-MIDIS I.

The results vary across different EU Member States. For example, in Sweden, 53 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa and 40 % of Muslim respondents from Turkey who experienced harassment indicate that the perpetrator of the most recent incident had an ethnic minority background other than their own. In Denmark and Finland, 90 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa who experienced harassment indicate that the perpetrator of the most recent incident did not have an ethnic minority background. When interpreting these results, one should keep in mind that

EU Member States differ in terms of the size and number of ethnic minority groups in the country, which may be reflected in the respondents' experiences of harassment and the extent to which persons with other ethnic minority background are identified as perpetrators.

Reporting harassment motivated by hatred and reasons for not reporting

Overall, nine in 10 Muslim respondents (91 %) did not report the most recent incident of harassment they experienced to either the police or any other organisation or service. Muslim women are slightly more likely to have reported the incident (11 %) than Muslim men (6 %). There is no difference in terms of age or between first- and second-generation respondents in respect to reporting harassment.

In addition to the police, EU Member States have equality bodies that can handle complaints related to harassment, in so far as this requirement of the Racial Equality Directive has been transposed into national legislation. The results show that, among the 3,763 Muslims who in the survey reported details of their most recent experience of bias-motivated harassment, only three contacted an equality body, human rights institution or other relevant ombuds institution to report the incident.

The most often-cited reasons for not reporting the most recent incident of bias-motivated harassment was that nothing would happen or change by reporting it (43 %). 41 % of respondents who experienced bias-motivated harassment did not report the incident anywhere because they thought it to be minor; 13 % said that reporting would have been too bureaucratic; 9 % that they were able to deal with the problem themselves; and 8 % that they would not be believed or taken seriously.

Of those who reported the most recent harassment incident to the police, 62 % were very or somewhat dissatisfied with the way the police handled the matter. Men who reported harassment to the police are more likely to feel dissatisfied compared with women (76 % compared with 53 %).

2.3.2. Experiences of physical violence motivated by hatred

In EU-MIDIS II, respondents were asked whether they had experienced a physical attack, such as somebody hitting, pushing, kicking or grabbing them. The following results on physical violence refer to incidents that respondents perceived to have taken place due to their 'ethnic or immigrant background', which is used as an umbrella term to include bias related to skin colour, ethnic origin or immigrant background, and religion or religious belief.

Prevalence and frequency of violence motivated by hatred

Overall, 2 % of all Muslim respondents experienced physical violence due to their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months before the survey, and 5 % did so in the five years preceding the survey – with important variations depending on the country/region of origin and country of residence involved. Muslim respondents from Asia in Cyprus and from South Asia in Italy report the lowest rates for the 12 months before the survey – close to zero – while the highest rates are reported by Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in Germany (8 %), Denmark (7 %) and Malta (7 %).

The average proportion of Muslim men who experienced a physical attack in the 12 months before the survey because of their ethnic or immigrant background is 6 %, compared to 3 % for Muslim women. There are no differences in the prevalence of bias-motivated violence towards individuals who wear traditional or religious clothing in public (including women who wear headscarves or niqabs). For differences between age groups and members of the first and second generation, a pattern similar to bias-motivated harassment can be seen – that is, rates are higher for younger respondents than for older ones, and higher for the second generation.

On average, in the five years before the survey, 2 % (n=197) of all Muslim respondents experienced a physical assault by a police officer that they attribute to their ethnic or immigrant background. A third of these cases occurred in the 12 months before the interview (1 %). The majority of these incidents (70%) was not reported to any authority. The most often-cited reasons for not reporting a discriminatory physical assault by the police were that nothing would happen or change (52 %), because respondents do not trust or are afraid of the police (37 %), perceive procedures to be too bureaucratic and time consuming (21 %), or fear retaliation or being treated poorly (21 %).

Perpetrators of violence motivated by hatred

The survey allowed respondents to indicate several categories of perpetrators – for example, in cases where two or more perpetrators were involved in the most recent incident. Half of the victims of bias-motivated violence do not know the perpetrators, while 16 % say that the perpetrator was someone at work or in an educational setting. Respondents also identified other perpetrators: 9 % pointed to a police officer or border guard; 8 % to an acquaintance, friend or relative; 7 % to a neighbour; and 8 % say it was 'another person'. Some 5 % of respondents say that the perpetrator was a member of a right-wing extremist/racist group.



Regarding the perpetrators' ethnic background, 64 % of Muslim respondents, on average, say that the perpetrator of the most recent incident of physical assault they experienced did not have an ethnic minority background (Figure 25). One in three victims of physical assault (33 %) say that the perpetrator had an ethnic minority background other than their own; and 10 % indicate that the perpetrator had the same minority background as themselves.³⁹


The proportion of Muslim women who identified the perpetrator of the most recent incident as being from another ethnic minority group is much higher than for men (48 % compared with 26 %). This is also the case for second-generation respondents: 38 % of second-generation respondents indicate that the perpetrator was from another ethnic minority group – compared with 28 % for the first generation.

Reporting violence motivated by hatred and reasons for not reporting

Overall, only a minority (23 %) of respondents reported the most recent incident to any organisation or service, including the police (14 %), while 77 % did not report the incident anywhere. Other FRA surveys that asked respondents about reporting incidents of violence to the police provide evidence of similarly high levels of non-reporting. For example, the agency's survey on violence against women⁴⁰ shows that only 13 % of women contacted the police following the most serious incident of physical violence involving a perpetrator other than their partner.

Notably, out of the 534 Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants who in the survey described the most recent incident of bias-motivated violence they experienced, none had contacted either a national

Figure 25: Backgrounds of perpetrators of most recent incidents of physical violence based on respondents' ethnic or immigrant background (%) ^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes:
- ^a Muslim respondents who experienced physical violence due to their ethnic or immigrant background (n = 515); weighted results.
 - ^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parenthesis. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^c The categories do not add up to 100 % because respondents could select all categories that apply – for example, to describe incidents with multiple perpetrators of different ethnic backgrounds.
 - ^d Question: “Think about the person(s) who did this to you. Were they of the same ethnic or immigrant background as you? Were they of another ethnic minority background than you? Was it someone who doesn’t have ethnic minority background?”.

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

³⁹ The sum is higher than 100 % because respondents could select more than one category; this shows that some incidents may have involved several perpetrators.

⁴⁰ FRA (2014), p. 59.

equality body, human rights institution or an ombudsman to report the incident.

Muslim women and men are equally likely to report incidents of bias-motivated violence to the police or other organisation or service. In contrast, while 29 % of victims of bias-motivated violence among first-generation Muslim immigrants say they reported the most recent incident, the rate of reporting among second-generation immigrants is 18 %. Further analysis taking into account the respondents' age group is hindered by the low number of cases available for analysis.


Among those who did not report the most recent incident of physical assault to the police or other organisation, 43 % say this was because nothing would happen or change by reporting it; 23 % because they were able to deal with it themselves or with the help of family and friends; and 18 % did not consider the incident significant enough or did not find it worth reporting because such incidents happen all the time.

Of those who did not report the incident, 11 % indicate that a lack of trust in the police was a factor in the decision not to do so. The reasons Muslim respondents give for not reporting incidents to the police are

broadly similar to those indicated by Muslim respondents in EU-MIDIS I – but also by other respondents in FRA surveys, including women, Jews, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons interviewed about their experiences with violence. These results reflect a widespread conviction among those who do not report violent incidents that reporting them to the police would not necessarily provide an immediate benefit, and that they find other, informal ways of dealing with what has happened. The results show that victims also weigh the likely benefits of reporting against the time that it would take to report, as well as the hassle or inconvenience involved.

The overwhelming majority of respondents who reported the most recent incident of bias-motivated physical assault they experienced to the police (81 %) say that they were either very or somewhat dissatisfied with the way police handled it; 13 % say that they were satisfied (Figure 26). To put this in context, in FRA's survey on violence against women in the EU, 66 % of women indicated that they were satisfied with the way police handled the most serious incident of physical violence involving a perpetrator other than their current or previous partner.

Figure 26: Satisfaction with way police handled most recent incident of violence motivated by respondents' ethnic or immigrant background after reporting incident to police (%)^{a,b,c}



Notes: ^a Muslim respondents who reported to the police the most recent incident of bias-motivated physical assault (n = 82); weighted results.
^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parenthesis. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
^c Question: "You mentioned that you contacted the police. To what extent were you satisfied with how the police handled your report or complaint?"

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.3.3. Harassment and physical violence against respondents' family or friends – incidents motivated by hatred

Personal experience affects one's feelings of safety and belonging, but these can also be influenced by hearing about the experiences of others, especially close family members and friends. Overall, 27 % of Muslim respondents know of a family member or friend who was, in the 12 months before the survey, insulted or called names because of their ethnic or immigrant background. The highest proportion is in the Netherlands: 52 % for Muslim respondents from Turkey and 50 % for those from North Africa.

A look at respondents' awareness of family members or friends being insulted or called names compared with their own personal experiences reveals some notable differences. For example, in the Netherlands, 18 % of Muslim respondents from Turkey personally experienced offensive or threatening comments due to their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months before the survey – but 52 % say they know of a family member or a friend who was insulted or called names for these reasons during that time period. Differences between personal experiences and awareness of other people's experiences are found among respondents from North Africa in Belgium and in the Netherlands; respondents from Turkey in Belgium, Denmark and Germany; and respondents from South Asia in Greece.

2.3.4. Attitudes towards violence

EU-MIDIS II asked respondents about their attitudes towards physical violence. While there is no direct link between attitudes supporting violence and actual engagement in violence, the survey set out to identify any patterns regarding supporting physical violence in a variety of situations by asking four questions (see [Figures 27 to 30](#)):


- Is it acceptable for someone to use physical violence to stop themselves being physically hurt?
- Is it acceptable for someone to use physical violence to stop someone else being physically hurt?
- Is it acceptable for someone to use physical violence because someone has insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background?
- Is it acceptable for someone to use physical violence because someone has insulted their religion?

The general population surveys used to compare certain aspects covered in this report, such as trust in public institutions or acceptance of other groups, do not include questions on attitudes towards violence. In this respect, this report therefore compares the results for Muslim respondents with results for those EU-MIDIS II respondents who did not identify as Muslim in the 15 EU Member States covered.

The results show that 45 % of Muslim respondents do not consider physical violence acceptable to avoid getting physically hurt, compared with 41 % of non-Muslim respondents. Meanwhile, 49 % of Muslim respondents do not consider it acceptable to use physical violence to prevent someone else from getting physically hurt, compared with 44 % of non-Muslim respondents. The overwhelming majority of both Muslim and non-Muslim respondents finds that it is never acceptable to use physical violence because someone insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background (86 % and 89 % respectively) or their religion (87 % and 94 %). On average, the use of physical violence is more acceptable to Muslim men than Muslim women, and more to second-generation – and therefore younger – Muslim respondents than those from the first generation, especially when used for self-defence.

EU-MIDIS II findings show that the only statistically significant difference between Muslim and non-Muslim respondents concerns acceptance of physical violence because someone has insulted their religion: 11 % of Muslim respondents consider physical violence 'sometimes or always' acceptable in this context, compared to 4 % of non-Muslim respondents. A more advanced analysis reveals that Muslim respondents who were victims of violence motivated by hatred in the 12 months preceding the survey are significantly more likely to deem physical violence acceptable, always or sometimes, because someone insulted their religion. However, both Muslim and non-Muslim respondents who experienced discrimination or harassment because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months preceding the survey are more likely to find physical violence acceptable, always or sometimes, because someone insulted their religion.

Figure 27: Acceptance of responding with violence for self-defence (%) ^{a,b}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.

^b Question: “Do you think it is acceptable for someone to use physical violence in the following situations? (1) Using physical violence to stop themselves being physically hurt, (2) Using physical violence to stop someone else being physically hurt, (3) Using physical violence because someone has insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background, (4) Using physical violence because someone has insulted their religion.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 28: Acceptance of responding with violence to defend someone else (%) ^{a,b}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.

^b Question: “Do you think it is acceptable for someone to use physical violence in the following situations? (1) Using physical violence to stop themselves being physically hurt, (2) Using physical violence to stop someone else being physically hurt, (3) Using physical violence because someone has insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background, (4) Using physical violence because someone has insulted their religion.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 29: Acceptance of responding with violence when insulted because of one’s ethnic or immigrant background (%) ^{a,b}




Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.

^b Question: “Do you think it is acceptable for someone to use physical violence in the following situations? (1) Using physical violence to stop themselves being physically hurt, (2) Using physical violence to stop someone else being physically hurt, (3) Using physical violence because someone has insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background, (4) Using physical violence because someone has insulted their religion.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

Figure 30: Acceptance of responding with violence when one’s religion is insulted (%) ^{a,b}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.

^b Question: “Do you think it is acceptable for someone to use physical violence in the following situations? (1) Using physical violence to stop themselves being physically hurt, (2) Using physical violence to stop someone else being physically hurt, (3) Using physical violence because someone has insulted them for their ethnic or immigrant background, (4) Using physical violence because someone has insulted their religion.”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.4. Police stops

KEY FINDINGS

- Of all Muslim respondents, 16 % were stopped by the police in the 12 months preceding the survey and 7 % say this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background.
- Of those Muslim respondents the police stopped in the 12 months before the survey, 42 % say this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background – although results vary among EU Member States.
- In the five years preceding the survey, 29 % of all Muslim respondents were stopped by the police and 9 % say that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background.
- Of those the police stopped in the past five years, 32 % believe that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background – again with significant variations between EU Member States.
- Muslim respondents from North and Sub-Saharan Africa indicate being stopped by the police more frequently than other Muslim groups surveyed.
- On average, young Muslim respondents indicate being stopped more often than those who are older; and Muslim men are stopped much more often than Muslim women.
- Muslim men and women who at least sometimes wear traditional or religious clothing in public more often say the police stopped them due to their ethnic or immigrant background during the five years before the survey (39 %) than those who do not wear such clothing (29 %).

Policing practices across the European Union vary – both in terms of the frequency of police stops and police behaviour during such stops. Perceptions of disrespectful behaviour or discriminatory treatment can undermine the legitimacy of the police and thus its effectiveness. It is important to monitor and assess practices, such as police stops, to ensure that their benefits outweigh the risks to police-community relations. Nevertheless, only a handful of EU Member States⁴¹ collect such data systematically or undertake some level of research on law enforcement practices, including police stops, and how they affect different groups. As FRA pointed out in 2010,⁴² these kinds of data, gathered anonymously, provide essential evidence for identifying potentially discriminatory practices.

Police and judicial cooperation among EU Member States has recently been strengthened to deliver on the European Agenda on Security, which acknowledges that security and respect for fundamental rights are complementary policy objectives.⁴³ In this regard, the agency highlighted that embedding fundamental rights considerations into the design of security

measures can help limit their potentially adverse effects on the rights of individuals, reducing the risk of alienating communities with measures that could be perceived as discriminatory.⁴⁴

2.4.1. Encounters with law enforcement

The results concerning police stops refer to contacts between law enforcement and Muslims surveyed in EU-MIDIS II. Respondents were also asked if they thought that they had been stopped by the police because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background and about the way they were treated by the police, including any experiences of physical assault by the police.

On average, about one third of all Muslims interviewed (29 %) has been stopped by the police in the five years before the survey, with significant variations between EU Member States. On average, about one tenth of all Muslims interviewed (9 %) say that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background (Figure 31). Of those stopped, 32 % believe that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background – but, again, with significant variations between Member States (Figure 32).


⁴¹ The United Kingdom is an exception; in England and Wales – under Sections 5, 50 and 55 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) of 1984 – there is a statutory requirement for Chief Police Officers to collect and publish statistics. These provisions cover stops and searches of persons or vehicles, road checks, detention of persons, and intimate searches of persons. In Scotland, as part of Police Scotland's Stop and Search Improvement Plan, an enhanced national database was rolled out on 1 June 2015.

⁴² FRA (2010).

⁴³ European Commission (2015a) and European Commission (2016a).

⁴⁴ FRA (2015).

Figure 31: Prevalence of police stops in past five years, by EU Member State and target group (%) ^{a,b,c,d,e,f}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n= 10,527); weighted results.
 - ^b The total percentage of respondents who were stopped by the police in the past 5 years is calculated by adding together two figures: the percentage figure of those who were stopped by the police in the past 5 years and perceived that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background, and the percentage figure of those who were stopped by the police in the past 5 years, but did not consider that this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background.
 - ^c Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^d Question: 'In the past 5 years in [COUNTRY] (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been stopped, searched, or questioned by the police?'
 - ^e Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.
 - ^f Some bars do not add up to 100 %; this is due to rounding of numbers.


Sources: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

When asked about the 12 months preceding the survey, 16 % of all Muslim respondents say that they have been stopped by the police during that time; of those stopped, 42 % say this was because of their immigrant or ethnic minority background. The increase in the proportion of individuals who believe that the police stop was discriminatory could be attributed to the fact that recent incidents are easier to recall. However, it may also reflect changing practices in police stops, possibly related to the increased focus on security across the EU.

The results suggest that fewer Muslims were stopped during the year preceding EU-MIDIS II (16 %) than during the year before EU MIDIS I; in that first survey, on average, 25 % of all Muslim respondents reported being stopped by the police during that time frame. Of those stopped, 40 % believed that this was because of their immigrant or minority status – a similar share to those who indicate in EU-MIDIS II that they believe they were stopped for this reason (42 %).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ FRA (2009), p. 13.

Figure 32: Most recent police stop being perceived as ethnic profiling among those who were stopped in 5 years before the survey, by EU Member State and target group (%) ^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of Muslim respondents who were stopped by the police in the 5 years before the survey (n=3,140); weighted results.
 - ^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^c Questions: 'In the past 5 years in [COUNTRY] (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been stopped, searched, or questioned by the police?'; 'Do you think that THE LAST TIME you were stopped was because of your ethnic or immigrant background?'
 - ^d Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Sources: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

On average – and similarly to findings of EU-MIDIS I – Muslim respondents from North and Sub-Saharan Africa indicate having been stopped more often, and they more often perceive these stops as discriminatory. Of those Muslim respondents the police stopped, 73 % and 69 % from North and Sub-Saharan Africa in Italy, respectively, and 64 % from North Africa in the Netherlands believe they were stopped because of their ethnic or immigrant background. By contrast, this proportion is much lower among Muslim respondents from Turkey (for example, 21 % in Belgium, 16 % in Germany and 14 % in Austria).

2.4.2. Differences in police stops by gender and age

A look at gender differences reveals that the police stops Muslim men more often than Muslim women (45 % of men stopped in the five years before the survey, compared with 12 % of women). Of those stopped, on average, 37 % of Muslim men and 15 % of Muslim women believe that the last police stop was of a discriminatory nature.


The survey asked respondents if they wear, when out in public, traditional or religious clothing that is different to the type of clothing typically worn in the country in which they reside. Female Muslim respondents were also asked if they usually wear a headscarf (or niqab) outside the house. Among all female Muslim respondents, 41 % usually wear a headscarf outside the house, but only 1 % wear a niqab. The small number of Muslim women wearing a niqab prevents any further breakdown along target groups.

Regarding police stops, wearing at least sometimes traditional or religious clothing in public affects Muslim

men more than Muslim women (Figure 33). Around half of Muslim men (47 %) who wear such clothing believe they were stopped because of their ethnic or immigrant background, compared with 20 % of women who do so.

Young respondents are more frequently stopped by the police. In the five years before the survey, the police stopped 36 % of young Muslim respondents aged 16 to 24 years and 35 % of those aged 25 to 34 years. Stops were less frequent for older age groups. Perceptions about the extent of ethnic profiling when last stopped by the police do not differ significantly across age groups or between first- and second-generation respondents.

Figure 33: Most recent police stop in past five years perceived as occurring due to ethnic or immigrant background, (a) among those who do/do not wear traditional or religious clothing and (b) by gender (%)^{a,b,c,d,e}



- Notes:
- ^a Out of Muslim respondents who were stopped by the police in the past 5 years (n=3,140; gender split: male: n=2,603; female n=537); weighted results.
 - ^b Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.
 - ^c Question: ‘In the past 5 years in [COUNTRY] (or since you have been in [COUNTRY]), have you ever been stopped, searched, or questioned by the police?; ‘Do you think that THE LAST TIME you were stopped was because of your ethnic or immigrant background?’
 - ^d Question: “Do you wear traditional or religious clothing when out in public that is different to the type of clothing typically worn in [COUNTRY]? This includes for example, specific traditional or religious clothing, symbols, headscarf or turban.”
 - ^e Question only Muslim women were asked: “Do you usually wear a headscarf or niqab outside the house?”

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.4.3. Circumstances and nature of most recent police stop

The survey interviews were conducted during a time period that included major terrorist attacks in Belgium and France,⁴⁶ which prompted an increase in police surveillance and identity checks. Similarly, migration flows through Greece and Italy also spurred increased police and border checks.

During the five years before the survey, a majority (63 %) of both first- and second-generation Muslim respondents were stopped while in a private car; such incidents may have involved vehicle-related police stops, as 56 % were asked for their driving licence or vehicle documents. However, nearly one in five (22 %) were stopped by the police on the street while on foot, and 5 % say they were stopped while traveling on public transport.⁴⁷

The results indicate that certain groups are stopped on the street more often than others. Half of both first- and second-generation Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in Italy (53 %), and nearly half from North Africa in the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, and Spain recalled that they were last stopped by the police on the street (40-42 %). This proportion rises to 80 % of Muslim respondents from South Asia in Greece, which could be related to intensive immigration checks.

The results show that, when stopped by the police, most Muslim respondents were asked for their identity papers (67 %), driving licence or vehicle documents (56 %), or other questions (49 %). A quarter of those stopped (24 %) say the police searched them or their car. 14 % of all stopped Muslim respondents were fined during the most recent police stop, 12 % received some form of advice or warning from the police, and 5 % say they were arrested or taken to a police station.

With regard to identity checks, almost all Muslim immigrants from South Asia in Greece (96 %) and immigrants from North and Sub-Saharan Africa and their descendants in Italy (94 % and 98 %, respectively) were asked for ID cards, passports or residence permits during the last police stop, which can be explained by the migration flows during that period in both countries. More than eight in 10 Muslim immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa and Turkey who live in Belgium (83 % and 86 %, respectively) were asked to

provide their identity papers during the last police stop. Again, this result must be viewed in light of increased police surveillance after the terrorist attacks in Brussels.

An analysis of the survey data on the most recent police stops shows the highest so-called 'hit rate' resulting from police stops – i.e., the proportion of stops and searches that resulted in law enforcement sanctions, such as a fine, apprehension, or traffic ticket – among Muslims respondents of Turkish origin in Austria: half (50 %) reported being fined, while the majority were asked for their driving licence or vehicle documents (84 %) or identity papers (54 %). However, though many Muslim respondents from Turkey were sanctioned as a result of their most recent stops in Austria, only 14 % considered the stop to have been discriminatory.

2.4.4. Treatment by police


A majority (60 %) of Muslim respondents who were stopped by the police during the past five years preceding the survey, a majority (60 %) note that they were treated respectfully (26 % 'very respectful', 34 % 'fairly respectful'). One in four (24 %) respondents said the way police treated them was 'neither respectful, nor disrespectful'. Meanwhile, 16 % said that the police treated them disrespectfully (7 % 'fairly disrespectfully' and 9 % 'very disrespectfully').

As results presented in [Section 2.1.3](#) show, on average, Muslims respondents tend to trust the police and the country's legal system the most, compared with other institutions asked about in the survey. [Figure 34](#) shows that levels of trust in the police vary among different Muslim target groups and EU Member States. For example, the lowest levels of trust in the police are observed among Muslim respondents in the Netherlands and Italy. In both countries, Muslim respondents of North African origin express lower levels of trust in the police (mean values of 4.9 and 5.3, respectively), as do Muslims with Turkish origin in the Netherlands (mean value of 5.1) and Muslim respondents of Sub-Saharan African origin in Italy (mean value of 5.3). Muslims surveyed in France and Belgium also tend to manifest lower levels of trust in the police than the average in the selected EU Member States. By contrast, Muslim respondents with Sub-Saharan African backgrounds in Finland and recent Muslim immigrants in Slovenia express the highest levels of trust in the police (mean values of 8.4 and 7.8, respectively).

46 On 22 March 2016, three suicide bombings in Brussels, Belgium – at the airport and at a metro station – resulted in 32 deaths and more than 300 injuries. On 14 July 2016, a lorry was driven into crowds in Nice, France, resulting in 86 deaths and 434 injuries.

47 No further breakdowns by target group about stops in public transport are possible due to fewer than 20 unweighted observations per cell.

Figure 34: Trust in the police, by EU Member State and target group (mean, on a scale of 0-10, where 0 means 'no trust at all' and 10 means 'complete trust')^{a, b, c}



Notes: ^a Out of all Muslim respondents (n=10,527); weighted results.
^b Some bars have the same value but look slightly different; this is due to rounding of the numbers.
^c Acronyms for target groups refer to immigrants from [country/region] and their descendants: TUR = Turkey, SSAFR = Sub-Saharan Africa, NOAFR = North Africa, SASIA = South Asia, ASIA = Asia, RIMGR = recent immigrants from non-EU countries.

Sources: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

2.5. Effect of discrimination and victimisation on sense of belonging and trust in public institutions

KEY FINDINGS

- Respondents who felt discriminated against and/or experienced harassment or violence because of their ethnic or immigrant background show lower levels of trust in the legal system and the police, as well as a lower level of attachment to their country of residence.
- Second-generation respondents show lower levels of trust in the police and the legal system than first-generation respondents do.

As previously noted, feelings of belonging and attachment are related to context and cannot be viewed as static or stable; they are multidimensional and change over time. Feelings of exclusion or alienation can be grounded in subjective perceptions about the migration process, but are also developed in reaction to experiences with exclusion.

Respondents who indicate having been victims of discrimination, harassment or violence because of their ethnic or immigrant background show considerably lower levels of attachment to the survey country than

those who have not experienced such maltreatment. Among those who experienced discrimination, harassment or violence during the five years preceding the survey, 71 % tend to feel (strongly) attached to the survey country – compared with 81 % of those without such experiences.⁴⁸ Among persons who experienced discrimination, harassment or violence because of their ethnic or immigrant background in the 12 months

⁴⁸ The percentage comprises those respondents who indicated the values 4 or 5 on the 5-point scale, where 5 means 'very strongly attached' and 1 'not at all attached'.


preceding the survey, the percentage of those who feel (strongly) attached to the country of residence is more than 10 points lower than for those without any victimisation experiences (68 % versus 81 %).

The negative association between experiences of discrimination, harassment and violence based on ethnic or immigrant background and respondents' level of attachment to their country of residence does not disappear when taking into consideration other potentially related characteristics of respondents. When including information about gender, age, country of residence, target group and citizenship in the statistical calculations, the negative impact of victimisation experiences remains, underscoring the robustness of the findings.⁴⁹

Similarly, experiences with discrimination, harassment and victimisation have a strong effect on the level of

trust in the country's legal system and in the police. As noted above, respondents' levels of trust were measured on a scale from 0 to 10, where 10 means complete trust. Individuals who experienced any form of discrimination, harassment or violence consistently show lower levels of trust in the legal system and the police. Figure 35 shows the average levels of trust in the police and the legal system among respondents with victimisation experiences, broken down by the type of victimisation encountered during the 12 months preceding the survey. When tested in a multivariate regression analysis, the effect victimisation experiences have on the level of trust also holds true when considering information on other characteristics, including age, citizenship, country of residence, gender, generation and target groups. Among these characteristics, being a second-generation immigrant also, on average, results in lower levels of trust.

Figure 35: Trust in legal system and police, by victimisation experience in past 12 months (average value on scale from 0 to 10, triangles indicate some form of victimisation experiences, dots no such experience)^{a,b}



Notes: ^a Based on all Muslim respondents (n = 10,498 for discrimination, and n=10,527 for harassment and violence).
^b Question: "Please tell me on a scale of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the [COUNTRY] institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust."

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016

49 This result was tested by analysing the level of attachment in a multivariate regression analysis.

Annex: EU-MIDIS II methodology

The findings presented in this report are based on interviews, in 15 EU Member States, with immigrants and descendants of immigrants who indicated that they are Muslim when asked about their religion. The sub-sample of Muslims is part of FRA's EU-MIDIS II survey, which collected data on immigrants and ethnic minorities' experiences and opinions regarding discrimination, victimisation, social inclusion and integration in all 28 EU Member States.

Target groups of immigrants and descendants of immigrants (often referred to as first- and second-generation immigrants) were identified by asking potential respondents about their country of birth and their parents' country of birth. Clearly defined countries and regions of origin were used for the different groups covered in each of the countries. To be considered a member of one of the target groups of immigrants and descendants of immigrants, respondents either had to be born in one of the selected countries of origin ('first generation') or one or both of their parents had to be from one of these countries ('second generation').

Groups to be surveyed in each of the countries were selected based on multiple criteria, including the size of the target population, feasibility of carrying out a survey with the respective target population, the group's risk of experiencing 'racially', 'ethnically' or 'religiously' motivated discrimination and victimisation, their vulnerability for being at risk of social exclusion, and comparability with previous FRA surveys.

For purposes of the survey, immigrants and descendants of immigrants encompass the following:

- **'Immigrants'** include persons who were **not** born in an EU Member State or an EEA/EFTA country (Liechtenstein, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland); have their usual place of residence in the territory of the EU Member State where the survey was conducted; and had been living in the survey country for at least 12 months preceding the survey.
- **'Descendants of immigrants'** are persons who were born in one of the current 28 EU Member States or EEA/EFTA countries; whose usual place of residence was in the territory of the EU Member State where the survey was conducted; and who had at least one parent **not** born in an EU or EEA/EFTA country (Liechtenstein, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland).
- In some EU Member States, EU-MIDIS II interviewed **'Recent immigrants'** – namely, persons who immigrated to an EU Member State in the 10 years

before the survey (i.e. **after** 2004), whose usual place of residence is in the territory of the EU Member State where the survey was conducted, and who had been living in the survey country for at least 12 months before the interview. The country of birth of 'recent immigrants' can be any country other than the EU-28 and other than the EEA/EFTA countries.

EU-MIDIS II covered the following groups under the concept 'immigrants and descendants of immigrants':

- Immigrants from Turkey and their descendants (in 6 EU Member States);
- Immigrants from North Africa and their descendants (in 5 EU Member States);
- Immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa and their descendants (in 12 EU Member States);
- Immigrants from South Asia and Asia and their descendants (in 4 EU Member States);
- Recent immigrants from other non-EU/EFTA countries (in 2 EU Member States);

For this report, the results were analysed for persons aged 16 years and older, who self-identified with one of the five groups listed above and:

- who are of Muslim religion;
- whose usual place of residence is in the EU Member State surveyed;
- who had been living in private households in the EU Member State surveyed for at least the previous 12 months.⁵⁰

EU-MIDIS II collected information from 25,515 respondents living in 22,690 households. Among these, 11,220 respondents indicated that they are Muslim. For the purpose of the detailed analysis of Muslims by country and target group, respondents from those countries and target groups were selected where at least 100 respondents were included in the sample. This led to a final sample of 10,527 respondents for this report, from six different groups of origin in

⁵⁰ In a small number of countries, persons who were not living in private households were also included in the sample. For example, in Malta, the target population (immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa and their descendants) was very small; without including persons living in institutional homes, the coverage of this population would have been incomplete.

15 EU Member States – Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Denmark, Greece, Spain, Finland, France, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Sweden, Slovenia and the United Kingdom. The detailed sample sizes of Muslim respondents are shown in Table 1, ranging from 101 immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa in Germany to 839 immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey in Germany.⁵¹

The percentage of Muslims differs within the groups covered. Across all the 24 target group and country combinations, the percentage of Muslims is 74 %. In 11 of the 24 country-target groups, the percentage of Muslims is above 90 % – up to 98 % for immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Turkey in Austria, from North Africa in Spain, and from Turkey in the Netherlands. Lower percentages of Muslims can be found among immigrants and descendants of immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa in the United Kingdom and in Germany – at 16 % and 20 %, respectively.

Ipsos MORI, a large international survey company based in the United Kingdom, undertook the fieldwork for EU-MIDIS II under the supervision of FRA staff, who monitored compliance with strict quality control procedures.

The main interview mode for EU-MIDIS II was Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) – that is, face-to-face interviews administered by interviewers using a computerised questionnaire. The English source questionnaire, developed by FRA, was translated into 22 EU languages as well as into Arabic, Kurdish, Russian, Somali, Tamazight and Turkish.

Interviewers were specially trained for the survey, including cultural and ethical training. Wherever possible or necessary, interviewers with the same ethnic background and/or gender conducted the interviews to increase responsiveness among the target groups.

Sampling

Most of the target groups in EU-MIDIS II can be considered as ‘hard-to-reach’ for survey research – in terms of being relatively small in size and/or dispersed – and due to the absence of sampling frames of the target groups. Whenever possible, a sample was drawn from a sampling frame covering the target population. However, the opportunities to sample the target population are hugely different across Member States due to different availability of sampling frames and distribution of the target group in the countries (i.e. list of persons

⁵¹ The total sample of Sub-Saharan Africans in Germany was much higher, but excluding all non-Muslim respondents led to a lower sample of only 101 Muslim respondents.

that can be used to make a controlled representative selection of the target group).

Advanced and new sampling methodologies had to be developed and employed in most countries, and the best possible design was chosen for each target group in each of the countries. For some target groups in some countries, a combination of different methods was used to ensure better coverage of the target population. Detailed description of sampling methods used will be published in the technical report of the survey.

In general, in some countries, national coverage had to be reduced for reasons of efficiency. This means that in multi-stage sampling, areas with lower densities of the target population of immigrants and descendants of immigrants (i.e. not only Muslims) were excluded because screening of the target population would not have been possible. In most countries, areas with densities below a certain threshold had to be excluded. These thresholds vary from areas with fewer than 2.7 % in Cyprus up to 10 % in France.

Weighting

The survey results presented in this report are based on weighted data to reflect the selection probabilities of each household and individual based on the sampling design. The weights also account for the differences in the (estimated) size of the target population in each of the countries.

Where possible, the sample was post-stratified to the regional distribution and population characteristics of the covered target population.⁵² In Finland and the Netherlands, the sample was also adjusted to the gender and age distribution. The sample in the Netherlands was furthermore adjusted according to generation (first- or second-generation), country of origin for immigrants and descendants of immigrants from North Africa, and age.

Sampling error

All sample surveys are affected by sampling error, given that the survey interviews only a fraction of the total population. Therefore, all results presented are point estimates underlying statistical variation. Small

⁵² External information and data sources for post-stratification are limited. Therefore, in most countries only region and urbanity were used for post-stratification. For example, in Malta, there is a very low percentage of women among the target group. In the absence of detailed population statistics on the target group in Malta it is still assumed that women were slightly under-represented in the sample, but cannot be adjusted for.



differences of a few percentage points between groups of respondents have to be interpreted within the range of statistical variation and only more substantial differences between population groups should be considered as actual differences in the total population. Results based on small sample sizes are statistically less reliable and are flagged in graphs and tables – for example, numbers shown in graphs are put in brackets – and not interpreted substantially. These include statistics that are based on samples between 20 and 49 respondents in total. Results based on fewer than 20 respondents are not shown. Results based on cell sizes with less than 20 persons are flagged as well.

Muslims in the EU-MIDIS II survey

According to estimates for 2010 from the Pew Research Center, about 20 million Muslims live in the EU – irrespective of their migration and citizenship status, and their country of origin – corresponding to about 4 % of the total EU population. Most Muslims in the EU live in France and Germany, with around 4.7 million in each of the two countries making up for a little more than 46 % of all Muslims in the EU. Other countries with significant numbers of Muslims are the United Kingdom and Italy (with 3 and 2.2 million, respectively); as well as Bulgaria, the Netherlands and Spain (all around 1 million).

Comparing the estimated size of the Muslims covered in EU-MIDIS II with the general estimate for all Muslims, the share of Muslims covered in this analysis is almost half (45 %) of all Muslims in these countries and around 42 % of all Muslims in the EU. However, the percentage of Muslims covered by EU-MIDIS II within countries varies and is particularly high in France (75 %), Belgium (56 %) and Germany (54 %).

The average age of the Muslim respondents is 38 years; 50 % are women and 50 % are men, and slightly more than 50% of the Muslim respondents covered in this analysis hold the citizenship of the Member State they reside in. Around two thirds of Muslim respondents are first-generation immigrants who have lived in the country on average 24 years. Table 2 shows, however, that the selected socio-demographic characteristics of the Muslim respondents varies considerably across the countries and target groups considered in this analysis.

The variation in the average age is indicative of respondents' length of residence in the survey country (first generation only) and acquisition of its citizenship. In the Netherlands, more than 80 % of first- and second-generation immigrants from North Africa and Turkey are Dutch citizens. The same is true for first- and second-generation immigrants from Turkey in Sweden and Belgium. Among the Muslim immigrants from South Asia in Greece, from Sub-Saharan Africa in Malta, and recent immigrants in Slovenia, the share of national citizens is the lowest – ranging from 0.2 % to 2 %.

Over one third (36.5 %) of the Muslim respondents who are first-generation immigrants indicate that they migrated to the EU for family reasons, such as joining a family member or marriage. Around one third (29 %) came to work. A quarter of all Muslim respondents say that they immigrated as children with their parents (26 %). About 7 % came to study and 5 % had asked for asylum.

The proportion of women among Muslim respondents varies significantly within target groups and across countries, constituting a very low proportion among immigrants from South Asia (4 %) in Greece and from Sub-Saharan Africa in Malta (6 %) – but accounting for almost 58 % of Muslim respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa in the UK.

Table 2: Demographic characteristics of Muslim respondents

Country – target group	Average age (years)	Women (%)	Citizenship of country (%)	First generation immigrants (%)	Average years of residence of first generation	Number of respondents
AT - TUR	36	51	63	66	22	564
BE - NOAFR	37	46	76	52	24	680
BE - TUR	36	45	83	51	27	602
CY - ASIA	36	38	28	86	12	104
DE - SSAFR	36	36	37	89	16	101
DE - TUR	39	48	38	63	31	839
DK - SSAFR	34	30	62	86	18	428
DK - TUR	39	52	60	62	30	369
EL - SASIA	35	4	0	99	12	467
ES - NOAFR	35	55	19	96	14	771
FI - SSAFR	30	42	66	85	14	198
FR - NOAFR	40	51	60	66	25	749
FR - SSAFR	34	52	59	68	16	308
IT - NOAFR	35	42	14	98	13	777
IT - SASIA	34	39	9	100	9	301
IT - SSAFR	36	42	19	95	13	192
MT - SSAFR	28	6	2	100	5	353
NL - NOAFR	38	49	90	60	29	641
NL - TUR	37	49	89	60	30	604
SE - SSAFR	32	46	60	86	12	221
SE - TUR	36	46	84	63	22	322
SI - RIMGR	33	45	2	100	6	226
UK - SASIA	38	51	81	68	21	595
UK - SSAFR	35	58	77	76	17	115
Average	38	50	53	68	24	Total 10,527

Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016



Table 3: Main countries of birth of first-generation Muslim immigrants, by target group and country of residence

Country target group	Country of birth	n	%
CY - ASIA	Other	62	63.3
CY - ASIA	Syrian Arab Republic	36	36.7
BE - NOAFR	Morocco	397	91.1
BE - NOAFR	Other	39	8.9
ES - NOAFR	Morocco	721	97.2
ES - NOAFR	Algeria	21	2.8
FR - NOAFR	Algeria	220	43.9
FR - NOAFR	Morocco	214	42.7
FR - NOAFR	Tunisia	63	12.6
FR - NOAFR	Other	4	0.8
IT - NOAFR	Morocco	529	69.2
IT - NOAFR	Tunisia	107	14
IT - NOAFR	Egypt	83	10.8
IT - NOAFR	Algeria	34	4.4
IT - NOAFR	Other	12	1.6
NL - NOAFR	Morocco	272	94.4
NL - NOAFR	Other	16	5.6
AT - TUR	Turkey	400	100
BE - TUR	Turkey	316	100
DE - TUR	Turkey	556	100
DK - TUR	Turkey	239	100
NL - TUR	Turkey	259	100
SE - TUR	Turkey	213	100
SI - RIMGR	Bosnia and Herzegovina	144	63.7
SI - RIMGR	Kosovo	42	18.6
SI - RIMGR	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	25	11.1
SI - RIMGR	Other	15	6.6
EL - SASIA	Pakistan	297	64
EL - SASIA	Bangladesh	165	35.6
EL - SASIA	Other	2	0.4
IT - SASIA	Bangladesh	181	60.9
IT - SASIA	Pakistan	101	34
IT - SASIA	Other	15	5.1

Country target group	Country of birth	n	%
UK - SASIA	Pakistan	265	64.5
UK - SASIA	Bangladesh	143	34.8
UK - SASIA	Other	3	0.7
DE - SSAFR	Other	90	100
DK - SSAFR	Somalia	353	95.7
DK - SSAFR	Other	16	4.3
FI - SSAFR	Somalia	128	74.9
FI - SSAFR	Other	43	25.1
FR - SSAFR	Other	89	41.2
FR - SSAFR	Senegal	54	25
FR - SSAFR	Mali	41	19
FR - SSAFR	Comoros	32	14.8
IT - SSAFR	Senegal	114	60.6
IT - SSAFR	Other	74	39.4
MT - SSAFR	Somalia	297	84.1
MT - SSAFR	Other	56	15.9
SE - SSAFR	Somalia	131	66.8
SE - SSAFR	Other	65	33.2
UK - SSAFR	Somalia	49	52.7
UK - SSAFR	Other	44	47.3

Note: ^a Countries of birth with fewer than 20 observations per country of residence and target group are summarised as 'other'.


Source: FRA, EU-MIDIS II 2016



References

- Council of Europe (2010), *Declaration of the European ministerial conference on integration*, Zaragoza, 15 -16 April 2010.
- Council of the European Union (2015), *Declaration on promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education* – Informal meeting of European Union Education Ministers, Paris, 17 March 2015.
- ESS Round 7 (2014), *European Social Survey Round 7 Data: Data file edition 2.1. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway - Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC*.
- European Commission (2015a), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: The European Agenda on Security*, COM(2015) 185 final, Brussels, 28 April 2015.
- European Commission (2015b), *'Special Eurobarometer 437: Discrimination in the EU in 2015'*.
- European Commission (2016a), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: delivering on the European Agenda on Security to fight against terrorism and pave the way towards an effective and genuine Security Union*, COM(2016) 230 final, 20 April 2016.
- European Commission (2016b), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals*, COM(2016) 377 final, Strasbourg, 7 June 2016.
- European Parliament (2016), Resolution of 13 December 2016 on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union in 2015 (2016/2009(INI)), P8_TA-PROV(2016)0485, Strasbourg, 13 December 2016.
- European Values Study (EVS) (2016), *European Values Study 2008: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2008)*, GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA4800 Data file Version 4.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.12458.
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (2009), *EU-MIDIS, European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey: Muslims*, Data in focus report, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union (Publications Office).
- FRA (2010), *EU-MIDIS, European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey: Police stops and minorities*, Data in focus report, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- FRA (2012), *Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims' rights*, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- FRA (2014), *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey: Main results*, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- FRA (2015), *Embedding fundamental rights in the security agenda*, FRA Focus 01.
- FRA (2016), *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey: Roma-Selected findings*, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- FRA (2017a), *Fundamental Rights Report 2017*, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- FRA (2017b), *Together in the EU: Promoting the participation of migrants and their descendants*, Luxembourg, Publications Office.
- Huddlestone, T., Niessen, J., Tjaden, J. D. (2013), *'Using EU indicators of immigrant integration: Final report for Directorate-General for Home Affairs'*, Brussels.

The first report based on the EU-MIDIS II survey results – published in November 2016 – summarised the experiences of Europe’s largest and most marginalised ethnic minority, the Roma.



Note that a summary report of the results for all groups surveyed in EU-MIDIS II will be published in December 2017 and FRA’s online data explorer tool will allow for quick access to the full survey data, see <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/>.

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- one copy:
via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
from the European Union’s representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or
calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

(*). The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

HELPING TO MAKE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS A REALITY FOR EVERYONE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Muslims living in the EU face discrimination in a broad range of settings – and particularly when looking for work, on the job, and when trying to access public or private services. The report examines how characteristics – such as an individual's first and last name, skin colour and the wearing of visible religious symbols like a headscarf, for example – may trigger discriminatory treatment and harassment.

These are just some of the findings outlined in this report, which examines the experiences of more than 10,500 Muslim immigrants and descendants of Muslim immigrants in 15 EU Member States. In addition to discrimination – including police stops based on ethnic background – it explores issues ranging from citizenship, trust and tolerance, through harassment, violence and hate crime, to rights awareness.

The report is based on data collected in FRA's second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey, which surveyed around 26,000 people with immigrant or ethnic minority backgrounds living in the EU. It provides a unique insight into the experiences and perceptions of the EU's second largest religious group, representing about 4 % of the EU's total population. Taken together, the survey findings and the recommendations can provide a good basis to support the effectiveness of a wide range of measures in the areas of integration and non-discrimination, as well as internal security policy.

FRA - EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria
Tel. +43 1580 30-0 – Fax +43 1580 30-699
fra.europa.eu – info@fra.europa.eu
facebook.com/fundamentalrights
linkedin.com/company/eu-fundamental-rights-agency
twitter.com/EURightsAgency



Publications Office

ISBN 978-92-9491-741-6