

DISCRIMINATION IN EUROPE

(REPORT B)

**Alan Marsh
Melahat Sahin-Dikmen**

**Policy Studies Institute
London**

November 2002

DISCRIMINATION IN EUROPE

(REPORT B)

Contents

Summary

Introduction

Data

Chapter 1: Extent of perceived discrimination

- 1.1 Extent of discrimination personally experienced
 - 1.1.1 Creating summary incident variables
 - 1.1.2 Findings
 - 1.1.3 Variations by country
 - 1.1.4 Socio-demographic groups and the experience of discrimination
 - 1.1.5 Political views and the experience of discrimination
 - 1.1.6 Summary
- 1.2 Extent of discrimination witnessed
 - 1.2.1 Creating summary incident variables
 - 1.2.2 Findings
 - 1.2.3 Variations by country
 - 1.2.4 Socio-demographic groups and the witness of discrimination
 - 1.2.5 Political views and the witness of discrimination
 - 1.2.6 Summary

Chapter 2: Attitudes towards discrimination

- 2.1 Perceptions of equal opportunities in employment
- 2.2 Is discrimination right or wrong?
 - 2.2.1 Data reduction: an underlying dimension supporting or opposing discrimination
 - 2.2.2 A single measure
 - 2.2.3 The social and political context of attitudes towards discrimination

Chapter 3: Awareness of anti-discrimination legislation

- 3.1 Do you know your rights?
- 3.2 Would you complain if you were discriminated against?
- 3.3 How far would you take your complaint?

Appendix

Questionnaire Map

Country summaries: Extent of perceived discrimination in each country

Summary

This report presents findings on discrimination among European citizens. The analyses are based on data from the 57th Eurobarometer, commissioned by the Community Action Programme Against Discrimination and carried out in Spring 2002.

Extent of experienced discrimination

Few respondents reported personally experiencing discrimination on any of the six grounds explored. The most often cited ground for discrimination was age (5 per cent), followed by race or ethnicity (3 per cent), religion or beliefs, physical disability, learning difficulties or mental illness (2 per cent each) and sexual orientation (less than 1 per cent). Young people, the better educated and those on the Left of the political spectrum were more likely to report having experienced discrimination. There are some differences between European countries, but the actual number of respondents reporting discrimination on any ground is relatively low to allow statistical confidence in these differences.

The findings need to be taken with some caution: First, the survey design excluded non-EU citizens from the sample and this would have affected reports of discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity and religion. Second, the questionnaire does not allow identification of respondents' race or ethnicity, religion, disability status or sexual preferences, hence limiting our ability to extrapolate from the findings to the population of the European Union. Third, reports of discrimination is likely to be affected by a number of factors including the number of the potential victims within the sample, the legal, social and cultural factors that could impact on awareness and encourage or discourage reporting of incidents and also by personal attributes such as underlying political attitudes.

Extent of witnessed discrimination

The rates of witnessed discrimination are considerably higher than the rates of discrimination experienced. The most often cited ground for witnessed discrimination was race or ethnicity (22 per cent), followed by learning difficulties or mental illness (12 per cent), physical disability (11 per cent), religion or beliefs (9 per cent), age and sexual orientation (6 per cent each). Those who personally experienced discrimination, young people and respondents with leftist political views were significantly more likely to report witnessing discrimination. The Finnish, Swedish and Dutch respondents were significantly more likely to report having witnessed discrimination.

Since a single incident of discrimination would have been witnessed and could have potentially been reported by more than one respondent, reports of witnessed discrimination is not likely to be a reliable estimate of the extent of discrimination. Witness reports are also likely to be affected by a range of personal, social and cultural factors but, compared with the reports of experienced discrimination, these may be more of an indication of a higher level of awareness than a measure of the extent of discrimination.

Attitudes towards discrimination

Applicants with learning difficulties or those with a mental illness were thought to be the most disadvantaged group in the labour market; 87 per cent of respondents thought that they would have less chance than anyone else. Responses varied between 75 per cent in Greece and 94 per cent in Sweden. With 77 per cent of respondents saying they would have less chance, the next most disadvantaged group was thought to be those with a physical disability. 66 per cent in Italy, but 89 per cent in Finland shared this view. The third most disadvantaged group was thought to be the old applicants. 71 per cent thought those over 50 would have less chance and responses varied between 17 per cent in Greece and 83 per cent in Finland. Finally, the fourth most disadvantaged group was thought to be ethnic minorities with 62 per cent thinking that they would have less chance. Responses varied between 43 per cent in the UK and 89 per cent in Denmark.

Majority of European citizens oppose discrimination on all six grounds they were prompted to consider, with their anti-discrimination scores averaging an 80 per cent of the ideal score they would achieve if they said 'always wrong' to discrimination in all sites. In the case of discrimination against people with learning difficulties or mental illness, their anti-discrimination scores are lower (75 per cent) which may suggest a confusion in people's mind between selection by ability and discrimination solely on grounds of status as a disabled person.

Partial exceptions to this pattern of very strong opposition to discrimination are Belgium and Austria in the case of ethnic discrimination and Greece and Austria in the case of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. The one notable exception to this pattern of very strong opposition to discrimination is Germany, equally so in the former West Germany and the former East Germany. On every measure, and especially with respect to ethnic discrimination, scores in Germany were lower than elsewhere.

In every country, a similar gap between people's views on discrimination and their more cautious evaluation of the views of other people is visible, though varying in size. Italy and Spain showed the largest discrepancies of this kind, typically a gap of more than 20 points and Germany the smallest, typically less than 10 points.

Measured on a combined single scale of anti-discrimination that measures the degree of opposition to discrimination in all circumstances and on all grounds, all but three countries occupy the range between 80 and 90 per cent of the maximum score of 100. The European average is 82, ranging from 89 in Spain to 80 per cent in Belgium, dropping a little to 78 in Austria but then down to 71 in the former East Germany and to 68 in the former West Germany.

The young, better-educated and non-manually-employed women are more likely to oppose discrimination, older male manual workers with little education less so, but there is no clear evidence that the tendency to believe discrimination right or wrong, or to attribute such views to others, is socially determined to any great degree.

Those on the Left do have raised anti-discrimination scores compared to those on the Right but the difference is not large enough to indicate that views about

discrimination *in Europe as a whole* are mainly determined by traditional left-right ideological differences by the party political choices that they tend to represent. Those who said 'Don't Know' to the Left-Right scale gave scores close to the average on the anti-discrimination scale, those who refused to provide a Left-Right self-placement gave anti-discrimination scores lower than average. They were in fact closely in line with those who placed themselves on the far Right. They were also more likely than others to say they 'don't know' whether various acts of discrimination were right or wrong. This does not amount to hard evidence that there may be a groundswell of hidden opinion that is less opposed to discrimination than the more explicit questionnaire responses among the majority suggest, but it is suggestive of this and may provide the basis for further research.

Awareness of anti-discrimination legislation

More than one third of EU citizens said they knew their rights, should they be discriminated against or harassed in accessing commercial services and about half said they did not. Belgians, Austrians, East Germans and the Danish were the least likely to know their rights, while the Finnish were the most likely.

Those who experienced discrimination were not any more likely than those who did not experience discrimination to know their rights, but those who witnessed discrimination were more likely than those who did not witness discrimination. The better educated respondents and those in professional and managerial occupations were more likely to say that they knew their rights.

On average, 7 out of 10 respondents said they would complain if they were discriminated against, with the rates varying between 60 per cent in Austria and 81 per cent in Sweden. The same pattern of variation associated with higher education and occupational status persists, though the differences are smaller. Those who did not witness discrimination were more likely to say that they would complain than those who did witness discrimination. Those who said they knew their rights were more than twice as likely to say that they would complain.

About 80 per cent of those who stated that they would complain said, they would complain verbally, 37 per cent said they would complain in writing and 22 per cent said they would take it to court. In Luxembourg, Netherlands and Greece, about one in five said they would complain in writing, while more than 1 in 2 in Britain did. In Finland and Netherlands, less than 7 per cent said they would go to court, in France almost 50 per cent said they would take their complaint to court.

Introduction

The right of all individuals to equality before the law and to protection from discrimination is a fundamental right which is essential in order to allow any democratic society to function properly. It helps to achieve the objectives of promoting economic and social progress and a high level of employment by increasing economic and social cohesion. In Amsterdam, in June 1997, the Heads of State and Government agreed to strengthen the European Union's capacity to act in this area by introducing Article 13 of the Treaty establishing the European Community, which gives the Community specific powers to take action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

On 29 June and 27 November 2000, on the basis of proposals presented by the Commission in November 1999, the Council adopted three key instruments intended to prevent and combat discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, age, disability or sexual orientation:

- Directive 2000/43/EC prohibits discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin in a wider range of fields such as employment, education, provision of goods and services and social protection;
- Directive 2000/78/EC prohibits discrimination in employment and excludes all discrimination based on religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation;
- The Community action programme to combat discrimination (Council Decision 2000/750/EC). The Community Action Programme supports and supplements efforts at Community level and in the Member States to promote measures to prevent and to combat direct or indirect discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, whether based on one or on multiple factors

This Programme seeks, among other things, to improve the public understanding of issues related to discrimination by establishing a base of knowledge for the extent and impact of discrimination in Europe. By gathering evidence the Programme aims at promoting greater public consensus on the extent and impact of discrimination, on developing a comprehensive picture of discrimination by examining the prevalence of discrimination in key areas of social and economic life and on monitoring non-discrimination to achieve other social goals.

As part of this work, the European Community commissioned a Eurobarometer survey of people's views on discrimination in the member states of the European Union. For the sake of comparability and common understanding, the meaning of discrimination was explained to all respondents as treating differently, negatively and adversely people on grounds of their racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age and sexual orientation.

The questionnaire included questions on people's attitudes towards discrimination on the five grounds covered by the Community Action Programme against

Discrimination: **race** or ethnicity, **religion** or beliefs, **disability** (physical disability, learning difficulties or mental illness) **age** and **sexual orientation**. Each of the five designated grounds of discrimination is explored in the questionnaire in four key areas of social and economic life: work, education, housing and public and commercial services. And each is explored in terms of people's own experience of discrimination, their memories of seeing discrimination against others, their views about how right or wrong they feel discrimination to be, and the extent to which they thought others might share their view.

The data analysed in this report are from the 57th Eurobarometer survey (EB57), which was carried out in Spring 2002 in all fifteen European Union countries. Our first report (Report A) presented question-by-question all the findings on the extent of reports of discrimination against respondents and their witness of discrimination against others, their attitudes towards discrimination, their guesses about how their fellow citizens feel about it, and respondents' likely reactions to discrimination if they encountered it themselves. This second report creates summaries of these measures to allow an exploration of the social location of these experiences and attitudes among Europeans, and briefly, their relation to political ideology.

It is important to note that Eurobarometer surveys interview only EU citizens. They do not have to be in their country of origin, but they do have to be EU citizens. This means that a high proportion of the likely victims of discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity, religion, actually or potentially, who live in European countries were excluded from the survey. This exclusion will have affected both the estimates of discrimination itself and the distribution of attitudes towards discrimination compared to a random survey of everyone habitually resident in Europe.

Data

This study is based on an analysis of data from the 57th Eurobarometer survey, which was carried out in Spring 2002, in all 15 European Union countries. A set of questions on people's perceptions of discrimination was included in the 57th wave of the Eurobarometer and responses to those questions constitute the basis of our analysis.

Questions analysed in this report

The findings presented in this report are based on a sub-section of the EB57; Question 30 – Question 56. Respondents were asked;

- whether, during the past two years, they felt they had been discriminated against and, if they had, on what ground (see below)
- whether during the past two years, they had witnessed someone else being discriminated against
- whether they felt such discrimination could be right or wrong
- whether they would expect other people to feel such discrimination could be right or wrong
- about their wider perceptions of equal opportunities in employment, and
- about their awareness of anti-discrimination legislation

The questions asked about the incidence of discrimination were framed in successively different contexts. Respondents were asked whether they had witnessed or experienced discrimination, in the following locations:

At work

In seeking work

In primary school

In secondary school

At university or high school

In seeking housing

In accessing various services, such as in restaurants, shops or from insurance companies.

For each of these areas, they were then asked to indicate separately on what ground they were discriminated against and on what ground they witnessed someone being discriminated against. The five key grounds of discrimination assigned to this Action Programme were directly prompted to respondents. In the case of discrimination on grounds of disability, physical and mental impairment were prompted as separate questions:

Race or ethnicity

Religion or beliefs

Physical disability

Learning difficulties/Mental illness

Age

Sexual orientation

The following four grounds were coded into the data only if the respondent mentioned any of them spontaneously:

Financial reasons
Gender
Nationality, and
'Other' grounds

In this way, the Eurobarometer survey asked for four kinds of response (experience, witness, attitudes and others' attitudes) for six types of 'victim category' in seven sites of discrimination. These 108 questions (plus several more peripheral questions) form the basis for this report, each reported separately for each of the 15 nations of the European Union. This matrix approach to the design is illustrated in the 'Questionnaire Map' enclosed in the Appendix.

It should be noted, on the other hand that the matrix is not entirely symmetrical. Not all the questions on the perceived extent of discrimination and attitudes towards discrimination were applied in the same way across all of these areas or grounds of discrimination. The following are examples:

1. With respect to experience and witness questions, the prompted 'victim categories' differ for housing compared to work and education. With respect to attitude questions, they differ for housing and services compared to work and education (See the Questionnaire Map in the Appendix).
2. The experience of discrimination at work included 'the chances of promotion' but reports of seeing others' experiencing discrimination were asked solely 'at work', not mentioning the chances of promotion.
3. For discrimination at work, reports of discrimination were asked as: 'have you witnessed **in writing or** in person' But for education, housing and services they were asked only: 'have you witnessed in person'.
4. Respondents were asked: 'do you thought it is right/wrong to refuse a job **or training**' but were asked 'do you thought people would consider it right/wrong to refuse a job', not mentioning training.

Question orders also differed. For example questions about discrimination at work were asked 'witness first - experience next'. For education, services and housing they were asked 'experience first, witness next'.

The questionnaire did not ask respondents their ethnicity, religious affiliations, sexual orientation or disability status, which means that it cannot be ascertained whether respondents belong to any of these likely victim groups. It included questions about the age, gender, education level, occupation and political affiliations of respondents and variations in respondents' experience of discrimination by these background characteristics are explored in this report.

It should also be noted that the grounds that were spontaneously mentioned by respondents are not included in this analysis. Clearly, reports of discrimination on prompted and spontaneously mentioned grounds are not comparable. Prompting people specifically about their experiences of discrimination on a particular ground is

likely to prompt their memories and this may potentially lead to higher incident reportage rates. The count of spontaneous responses indicating discrimination by gender, for example, cannot be taken as a reliable measure of discrimination on grounds of gender. It takes a quite different type of response to say 'No, not on any of the grounds you mention, but I have experienced sexual discrimination or harassment'. The full-range of findings on the spontaneously mentioned grounds of discrimination are provided in Report A.

Chapter 1: Extent of perceived discrimination

In this chapter we present the findings on the extent of discrimination. Our findings are based on questions that asked respondents about their personal experiences and any acts of discrimination they may have witnessed.

1.1 Extent of discrimination personally experienced

Respondents were asked about their personal experiences of discrimination; whether they personally felt discriminated against or harassed ‘at work’, ‘while looking for a job’, ‘in primary school’, ‘in secondary school’, ‘at university’, ‘in obtaining housing’ and ‘in accessing public and commercial services’. For each of these domains, they were asked to indicate on what ground they thought they were discriminated against and were prompted to consider race or ethnicity, religion or beliefs, physical disability, learning difficulties or mental illness, age and sexual orientation as possible grounds for discrimination. These questions, as they appeared in the survey, are listed below:

Q.31. In the past two years, have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed at work because of your

Q34. In the past two years, have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed while looking for a job because of your

Q41a. Did you ever personally feel discriminated against or harassed when you were in primary school because of your

Q41b. Did you ever personally feel discriminated against or harassed when you were in secondary school because of your

Q41c. Did you ever personally feel discriminated against or harassed when you were at university or other high school because of your

Q45. In the past two years, have you personally felt discriminated against in places like restaurants, banks, insurance companies or shops because of your

Q47. In the past two years, have you personally felt discriminated against in respect of getting housing/accommodation because of your

Race or ethnicity

Religion or beliefs

Physical disability

Learning difficulties or mental illness

Age

Sexual orientation.

Asking respondents about their experiences of discrimination on six grounds and across seven sites produces 42 questions and Report A provides full details of responses to each of these questions for each of the 15 member states of the European Union.

This type of questioning generates specific and detailed information about occurrences of discrimination on a range of grounds and in a number of key spheres of public life; for example, discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity at work or discrimination on grounds of age in accessing services. Obviously, this information would be useful in examining discrimination on a particular ground and in a specific area, especially if there is a policy interest. However, if the objective of the survey is to estimate, on a more general level, how widespread discrimination is, we need to reduce some of this detail.

This means that to be able to say how prevalent race discrimination is for example, we would need to create a single variable that measures the extent of race discrimination regardless of where or in how many sites it took place. Thus, the aim of the analysis in this chapter is to summarise this comprehensive data so that we have an overview of how much discrimination was reported.

1.1.1 Creating summary incident variables

The data offer two opportunities to summarise European citizens' experience of discrimination: by grounds or by sites. That is to say, we can scan across the seven sites asked about and award a score to a respondent who has been discriminated against on grounds of ethnic origin. Then do the same for religion, age, and so on. Or, we can scan across the six grounds of discrimination and see if anyone has been discriminated against at work, then in seeking work, then housing, and so on. The first approach was chosen because first, it makes more explicit sense to record discrimination by ground and second, repeated discrimination on one ground in more than one site was common. For example, 41 per cent of those complaining of race discrimination did so in more than one context.

Six scores were created, each recording simply whether or not respondents reported any discrimination on grounds of race, religion, physical disability, mental disability, age and sexual orientation.

1.1.2 Findings

Chart 1 illustrates the extent of perceived discrimination for each discrimination ground explored in this survey. The figures represent respondents who reported having experienced discrimination, as a proportion of the whole sample. By any standard of comparison, reports of actual discrimination were rare.

The most often cited ground for discrimination was age, with slightly over 5 per cent of respondents saying that they suffered age discrimination in at least one of the sites asked about. This was followed by discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity (3 per cent), religion or beliefs, physical disability, learning difficulties or mental illness (2 per cent each) and sexual orientation (less than 1 per cent).

It appears that, relatively small number of respondents reported discrimination on any of the grounds explored in this survey. What do these rates suggest about the scale of discrimination?

In a survey that is based on a sample of the whole population, the magnitude of the extent of discrimination on a given ground can be interpreted in relation to the size of the likely victim group within the wider population. Take the example of racial or ethnic discrimination. In the British case, only about six per cent of a random sample will be Black, Asian or otherwise statistically 'non-white' to attract the kinds of discrimination measured in the questionnaire. If 2.7 % of such sample say they have experienced discrimination on ethnic grounds and if we can assume everyone who says this is an ethnic minority member, then 45 per cent of the ethnic minority population is reporting discrimination. A recent survey in the UK of a much larger sample of ethnic minority members came up with a similarly high figure; 35 per cent (Survey commissioned by BBC, results published on BBC website on 20/5/2002). The same argument can be applied to other groups. However, this information is not easily available for all likely victim groups or in all EU member states. This makes it difficult to evaluate the magnitude of the extent of discrimination reported in the survey and to estimate the scale of discrimination within the wider population.

The BBC poll quoted above interviewed large numbers of ethnic minorities and its' findings indicate that the rate of reported discrimination is higher among ethnic minorities than it is among the whole population. In fact, surveying the likely victim groups, not the whole population, could produce a more 'accurate' picture of the scale of discrimination. The Swedish case provides a good example. The findings of this survey suggest that 3 per cent of Swedish respondents reported experiencing discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity. In a study commissioned by the Swedish Ombudsman against Ethnic Discrimination (Lange, 1996), a sample of racial and ethnic minorities were interviewed and the survey covered a wide range of public spheres in which discrimination could take place. The findings suggested that half of all minorities experienced some form of discrimination and some groups reported even higher rates of discrimination.

In terms of the findings on the prevalence of racial or ethnic discrimination and discrimination on grounds of religion, a further limitation is imposed by the survey methodology. Eurobarometer is a poll of the citizens of European Union member states. This means that a high proportion of the likely victims of discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity, religion, actually or potentially, who live in European countries were excluded from the survey. This exclusion will have affected both the estimates of discrimination itself and the distribution of attitudes towards discrimination compared to a random survey of everyone habitually resident in Europe.

There is also the issue of definition. It is obviously difficult to determine, with any degree of certainty, what respondents understood by discrimination and what type of incidents they may have considered to be discriminatory. This is further complicated in this survey by the inclusion of the terms discrimination and harassment together in most questions. (See the section on 'Data' for further details). Although we cannot know how the respondents interpreted these questions, potentially these two terms might have different connotations. For instance, discrimination may be interpreted more narrowly as differential treatment of someone on the basis of their membership of a particular social group (e.g. ethnic minorities, women), while harassment may have a wider coverage ranging from verbal taunts to physical violence. It is not possible to know how the different wording of the questions and the inclusion of the

term harassment may have affected the response patterns and precisely for this reason, this presents one with a further complication in interpreting the findings.

Reports of discrimination are also likely to be affected by respondents' underlying dispositions and attitudes and likely to depend on an awareness of discrimination as an issue; an acceptance that it takes place, an ability to recognise it and a willingness to report it. This awareness, in turn, would be affected and formed by personal, social and legal contexts in each country. Existence of legislation, or an open discussion of the subject may sensitise citizens to the issue, raise awareness and create a social and cultural climate that encourages reporting of incidents both by victims and those who witness it. On a more personal level, attitudes towards discrimination are also likely to be affected by respondents' political disposition and this may be more so for discrimination against certain groups such as the racial or ethnic minorities or religious minorities. (This issue is further explored in the following chapter).

In summary, measuring the extent of discrimination accurately and in an 'objective' manner is far from simple, but it must be noted that, what is examined in this report are the experiences of respondents which they 'subjectively' defined and reported as discrimination and the survey methodology imposes further limitations on the precision of the measurement and the interpretation of findings.

1.1.3 Variations by country

Charts 2 to 7 present the findings on the extent of discrimination for each of the 15 member states of the European Union. A country summary for each member state is provided in the Appendix.

These findings indicate some interesting differences between countries. A warning with regards to the percentages however, seems appropriate here. We have already noted that relatively small number of people reported experiencing discrimination on any of the six grounds explored and the 'affirmative' response rate is particularly low in the case of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. Out of a total of 16,000 European citizens, the actual numbers of respondents reporting discrimination on each ground are as follows:

Race or ethnicity	= 440
Religion or beliefs	= 321
Physical disability	= 279
Mental impairment	= 227
Age	= 837
Sexual orientation	= 81

Numbers such as these are thinly spread across fifteen nations so the actual numbers in each country will be very small.

The British, Swedish and the Finnish were the most likely to complain of age discrimination (8 per cent). By contrast, about 3 per cent of respondents in Portugal and Austria reported age discrimination.

The Dutch were the most likely to report discrimination on grounds of race (7 per cent), followed by Luxembourg (6 per cent) and France (5 per cent). By contrast, in Spain, Italy, Finland, Ireland and East Germany about 1 per cent of respondents said they suffered racial or ethnic discrimination. These proportions, remember, will be determined as much by the proportion of ethnic minority members who are European citizens found in each national sample as they will by the proportion of such ethnic minority members who reported discrimination.

Compared with most other countries, discrimination on grounds of religion was reported by about twice as many respondents in the UK, in Luxembourg and France (4 per cent). In Ireland, Spain, Denmark, Italy and Portugal about 1 per cent of respondents said they suffered discrimination because of their religion.

Against a European average of 2 per cent, Luxembourg stands out with 6 per cent of respondents reporting discrimination because of a physical disability. By contrast, less than half a per cent in Ireland did.

In Denmark, Luxembourg and the UK the rates of discrimination on grounds of a learning difficulty or a mental illness are slightly higher (3 per cent) than the European average (2 per cent). By contrast, with less than half a per cent, the rates in Italy, Belgium and Austria are well below this rate.

In all countries except Netherlands, less than 1 per cent of respondents reported discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. The differences between countries are too small to allow a meaningful comparison, but it is interesting to note that Netherlands, a country perhaps most closely associated with liberal attitudes to sex, has the highest number of respondents who reported discrimination because of sexual orientation. It is possible that this higher rate of discrimination is more of a reflection of a cultural openness about the issue than it is an indication of comparatively higher actual incident rates.

1.1.4 Socio-demographic groups and the experience of discrimination

Using the six summary measurement variables, we are able to look at the distribution of discrimination across socio-demographic groups.

Men-Women

Chart 8 presents the findings on the extent of discrimination personally experienced by men and women.

There is no significant difference between men and women in terms of their susceptibility to discriminatory practices on any of the grounds explored. Any difference that exists is very small. In terms of discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity and religion, the difference is less than 1 per cent, with men being slightly more likely to suffer discrimination. This could perhaps reflect the population structure of ethnic minorities as more male balanced. There is also a difference between men and women in terms of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, but again this is only less than one per cent.

Age

Charts 9 to 14 presents the findings on the experience of discrimination by the age of respondent. The overall trend seems to be that on most discrimination grounds, the younger the respondent, the more likely he or she is to report discrimination. However, the difference between age groups varies by the ground of discrimination.

Young people (15 to 24 and 25 to 34 age groups) are five times more likely to report experiencing racial or ethnic discrimination than older people (55-64 and 65+ age groups). This may perhaps be a reflection of the fact that ethnic minority populations are younger and therefore those in the sample are also likely to be young. However, because the ethnic origin of respondents is not known, this cannot be ascertained.

For discrimination on grounds of religion or beliefs, the difference between the young and the old is slightly reduced, but young people are still up to twice as likely to suffer from discrimination.

Discrimination on grounds of physical disability was reported by most age groups at roughly equal rates (2 per cent) except for the 65+ , who were half as likely to do so. People between the ages of 15 and 44 were twice as likely to report discrimination because of a mental impairment than those over 45.

An intriguing finding comes from reports of discrimination on grounds of age. Those aged 15-24 were 5 times more likely than those aged 65+ and about twice as likely as any other age group, to report age discrimination. This is interesting, because age discrimination is usually understood to refer to the differential treatment of older people, rather than the young. An exploration of the site composition of age discrimination indicates that those over 65 are the least likely to report discrimination in any site. Those between the ages of 45 and 64 are the most likely to report discrimination while looking for a job (about 5 per cent of all respondents aged 45 to 64 who were looking for a job in the past two years). Respondents aged 15-24 also have a relatively high discrimination report rate in job search (3.7 per cent). They are also the most likely to report discrimination in accessing services. While about 5 per cent of the youngest respondents report discrimination in accessing services, less than 1 per cent of those aged between 45 and 64 do. (Note that this is a proportion of all respondents while the 'discrimination in job search' figures exclude those who were not looking for a job) . This seems to suggest that high discrimination rates reported by young respondents are largely due to their experiences in accessing services. This is likely to include the application of different premiums by insurance companies, restrictions on access to banking facilities or restrictions on access to various venues such as pubs or clubs.

Finally, few respondents reported discrimination because of their sexual preferences, but once again, young people were twice as likely to do so.

Education level

Charts 15 to 20 compare the experiences of respondents by their education level.

In general, the higher the education level, the more likely a respondent was to report discrimination. Those who were currently students were the most likely to report discrimination on any ground.

Current students were twice as likely as those who left full-time education at or before the age of 15 to report discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity and religion.

The differences between groups is somewhat reduced in terms of their experiences of discrimination on grounds of disability. Those who left school between the ages of 16-19 also stand out with the highest proportion of respondents reporting discrimination on grounds of learning difficulties or a mental illness, though of course such groups more rarely go on to higher education.

Discrimination on grounds of age was most often reported by those who are currently in full-time education, followed by those who left full-time education aged 20 or over.

The key point to note is that those who are currently students stand out with the highest reported rates of discrimination. An examination of the location of the discrimination experienced by this group reveals that they were most likely to be reporting discrimination in accessing commercial services and housing. In fact, about 82% of current students are between the ages of 15 to 24 and we already saw that young people were more likely to report discrimination specifically in these areas. Those who left full-time education aged 20 or over were slightly more likely to report discrimination in all sites than those who left at an earlier age.

Occupation

Charts 21 to 26 present the findings on the extent of discrimination reported by respondents in different occupations.

Overall, the differences between the experiences of respondents from different occupational backgrounds are not large. They were equally likely to report discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity and religion. They were also equally likely to report discrimination on grounds of disability, with two minor exceptions; the self-employed were half as likely as others to report discrimination on grounds of physical disability and manual workers were twice as likely to report discrimination on grounds of a mental impairment.

In terms of discrimination on grounds of age, differences between groups are not large, except for a contrast between the self-employed and the service sector employees; those working in the service sector were more than twice as likely as the self-employed to report age discrimination.

Although the differences are relatively small, those working in the service sector were also the most likely to report discrimination because of their sexual preferences. The differences between occupation groups is likely to reflect the fact that certain sectors such as the service jobs tend to be the less monitored than others throughout Europe and that is likely to effect both the occurrences and reportage of incidents of discrimination.

1.1.5 Political views and the experience of discrimination: The Left– Right scale

Respondents were asked to indicate their political views, by placing themselves on a horizontal 10-box scale, whose ends are labelled 'LEFT' and 'RIGHT'. [Charts 27 to 32](#) compare the experiences of respondents by their position on the Left-Right scale.

In terms of racial or ethnic discrimination, discrimination on grounds of sexual preferences and age discrimination, those on the Left were about twice as likely as those on the Right to report discrimination. In terms of discrimination on grounds of religion, those on the Left were three times more likely to say that they suffered discrimination. The Left and the Right are closest in their experience of discrimination on grounds of disability, but there are still small differences. Those on the Left were more likely to report discrimination on grounds of a physical disability and those in the centre were more likely to report discrimination on grounds of a mental impairment.

It could perhaps be argued that this finding is somewhat surprising, because in these questions, respondents were asked to report their personal experiences. Attitudes to discrimination may be expected to be influenced by political ideology, but the actual experiences of individuals would not necessarily be expected to differ by their political views. Nevertheless, this may suggest that those on the left perhaps are more likely to acknowledge that discrimination exists and therefore more able to recognise and report it. They are also likely to be younger and as we have seen already, younger people are more likely to report discrimination.

1.1.6 Summary

Few respondents reported personally experiencing discrimination on any of the grounds explored. We have argued that reports of discrimination are likely to be affected by a number of factors including the number of the likely victims within the sample and the population, the legal, social and cultural context in each country and also by personal factors such as underlying political attitudes and awareness of discrimination as an issue. The survey design excluded some of the potential victim groups from the survey and it also imposes limitations on our ability to extrapolate from the findings. An exploration of the variation in the experiences of discrimination by socio-demographic characteristics of respondents reveals that young people, those who stayed the longest in education and those on the Left of the political spectrum were more likely to report having experienced discrimination.

1.2 The extent of witnessed discrimination

Apart from their personal experiences, respondents were also asked whether they witnessed someone else being discriminated against or harassed 'at work', 'in primary school', 'in secondary school', 'at university', 'in obtaining housing' and 'in accessing public and commercial services'. For each of these domains, they were once again asked to indicate what they thought the ground of discrimination was. They were prompted to consider race or ethnicity, religion or beliefs, physical disability,

learning difficulties or mental illness, age and sexual orientation as possible grounds for discrimination. These questions are listed below:

Q.30. In the past two years, have you witnessed (in person or in writing) someone being discriminated against or harassed at work because of his/her

Q43a. Have you ever personally witnessed someone being discriminated against or harassed when you were in primary school because of his/her

Q43b. Have you ever personally witnessed someone being discriminated against or harassed when you were in secondary school because of his/her

Q43c. Have you ever personally witnessed someone being discriminated against or harassed when you were at university or other high school because of his/her

Q45. In the past two years, have you personally witnessed someone being discriminated against in places like restaurants, banks, insurance companies or shops because of his/her

Q47. In the past two years, have you personally witnessed someone being discriminated against in respect of getting housing/accommodation because of his/her

Race or ethnicity

Religion or beliefs

Physical disability

Learning difficulties or mental illness

Age

Sexual orientation.

Note that respondents were not asked about their witness of discrimination in job search, presumably on the assumption that this is not likely to be witnessed by anyone other than the job applicant and the recruiting employer. Furthermore, many of those who are victims of discrimination in recruitment can remain unaware of it. Asking respondents about their witness of discrimination on six grounds and across six sites produces 36 questions and Report A provides full details of responses to each of these questions for each of the 15 member states of the European Union.

1.2.1 Creating summary incident variables

Following the same procedure described earlier, six summary measures were constructed that simply counted across the six sites any report that the respondent had witnessed discrimination. Such a summary measure was constructed for each of the six grounds of discrimination; race or ethnicity, religion or beliefs, physical disability, mental impairment, age and sexual orientation.

1.2.2 Findings

Chart 33 illustrates our findings on the extent of discrimination witnessed, for all European Union citizens. Such reports are more frequent than actual incidents of discrimination.

On average, 22 per cent of European citizens said they witnessed race discrimination, 9 per cent reported witnessing discrimination on grounds of religion or beliefs, 11 per cent because of a physical disability, 12 per cent because of learning difficulties or a mental illness, 6 per cent because of age and 6 per cent because of sexual preferences.

These findings indicate that a higher proportion of respondents said they witnessed discrimination than experienced. However, in interpreting these rates, one needs to be careful not to read this as evidence of ‘hidden’ discrimination unreported by victims. We need to remember that each act of discrimination is always likely to have more witnesses than victims. This may be particularly so for reports of discrimination at work, as respondents were asked about incidents they witnessed ‘in writing or in person’, which could potentially include incidents reported in newspapers or on television.

The limitations of the data about incidents personally experienced by respondents have been discussed in the previous section. Despite these limitations, as a report of actual incidents reported by victims themselves, it is a measure of the extent of discrimination among the wider population. Rates of discrimination witnessed however, could perhaps be more of an indicator of awareness at societal level and the cultural or political dispositions that encourage or discourage reporting of incidents, but it cannot be seen as a measure of ‘discrimination’.

There is some evidence to suggest that respondents were likely to report witnessing discrimination on more than one ground, which may suggest an underlying sensitivity and awareness of discrimination. *Figure One* provides the correlation coefficients between respondents’ likelihood of witnessing discrimination on all six grounds.

Figure 1: Pearson’s correlation coefficients between respondents’ likelihood of witnessing discrimination on each ground

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Race or ethnicity	-					
2. Religion or beliefs	.39	-				
3. Physical disability	.29	.29	-			
4. Mental impairment	.27	.26	.38	-		
5. Age	.22	.25	.26	.24	-	
6. Sexual orientation	.30	.31	.32	.26	.25	-

All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level.

This suggests that if a respondent reported witnessing discrimination on one ground, it is quite likely that he or she also reported witnessing discrimination on other grounds.

The correlation between witnessing discrimination on grounds of ethnicity and religion (.39) and between physical disability and mental impairment (.38) is higher, as it would perhaps be expected.

To this extent then, perhaps it should be recognised that it is difficult to unravel what reports of having witnessed discrimination may mean, apart from confirming that discrimination is recognised by quite a high number of people and that it may reflect an underlying awareness of discrimination in respondents. This view also seems to be supported by the evidence that (as presented in the following sections) young people, those with higher education levels and respondents with leftist political views are more likely to report witnessing discrimination as these are the social groups that would generally be expected to be more aware of discrimination as an issue.

A further point in support of this argument could be the relationship between the experience and the witness of discrimination. It would perhaps be expected that those who experienced discrimination on a given ground would be, in a way, sensitised to the issue and be more likely to notice and recognise incidents involving others. The evidence supports such expectation. Respondents who personally experienced discrimination were between 3 and 11 times more likely than those who did not experience it to say that they had witnessed discrimination. The gap between those who personally experienced discrimination and those who did not is largest with regards to discrimination on grounds of sexuality (i.e. those who personally suffered were 11 times more likely to have witnessed it) and smallest with regards to racial or ethnic discrimination (i.e. respondents who experienced it were 3 times more likely to have witnessed it). In other words, while about 5 per cent of those who did not experience sexual discrimination reported witnessing it, 20 per cent of those who did not experience racial or ethnic discrimination reported witnessing it.

This may also suggest that while having experienced discrimination sensitises all victim groups, witness reports are also likely to be affected by the '*visibility*' of discrimination. While it is easier to identify a racially or ethnically minority person and attribute an unfair treatment to this characteristic, a person's sexuality is not observable in the same way. And this is likely to have a subtle but important impact on reports of witnessed discrimination, especially for some victim groups.

We now turn to exploring the differences between member states.

1.2.3 Variations by country

In terms of discrimination witnessed, there are some interesting differences between countries. Charts 34 to 39 present the findings on the extent of discrimination witnessed for each of the six grounds, for each of the 15 member states of the European Union.

Percentage of respondents who said they witnessed racial or ethnic discrimination varied between 15 per cent in Italy and East Germany and 35 per cent in Netherlands. Netherlands is closely followed by Finland and Sweden with 31 per cent each.

While 3 per cent of Italians, Portuguese and the Irish said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of religion, 15 per cent in Sweden, 14 per cent in Netherlands and 13 per cent in Finland said so.

Respondents in Finland were also the most likely to report seeing discrimination on grounds of physical disability (26 per cent). This contrasts with about 4 to 5 per cent in Spain, Portugal, Ireland and Greece. A similar picture emerges with regards to discrimination on grounds of learning difficulties or a mental illness. While 5 per cent in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Belgium and France said they witnessed it, 29 per cent in Finland, 27 per cent in Sweden and 24 per cent in Denmark did.

In terms of age discrimination, there are only small differences between countries. With a European average of 6 per cent, similar number of respondents in each country said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of age. Finland, however, stands out once again, with about three times as many respondents reporting that they witnessed age discrimination.

Respondents from Netherlands were the most likely to have witnessed discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation (11 per cent). The Netherlands is followed by Sweden (10 per cent), Finland (9 per cent) and Luxembourg (8 per cent).

The key message of this country comparison seems to be that respondents from Finland, Sweden and Netherlands have consistently higher witness report rates than elsewhere in Europe. It is difficult to interpret this finding without looking into the country specific social and legal context in detail, but it is an interesting and very clear pattern that calls for further research.

1.2.4 Socio-demographic groups and the witness of discrimination

Men and Women

Chart 40 presents the findings on the witness of discrimination for men and women.

We saw in the previous section that, there are no significant differences between men and women in terms of their experience of discrimination. The difference between their witness of discrimination is greater. Men seem to be more likely to say that they witnessed discrimination, but the differences are not greater than 2 to 3 per cent on most grounds. The largest difference is in their reports of race discrimination; compared with 20 per cent of women, 25 per cent of men said they witnessed race discrimination.

Age

Charts 41 to 46 presents the findings on the witness of discrimination for different age groups.

On average, 8 per cent of 65+ and 14 per cent of 55 to 64 year olds said they witnessed racial or ethnic discrimination, while 35 per cent of 15 to 24 year olds and 31 per cent of 25 to 34 year olds did.

In comparison with 3 per cent of over 65s, more than four times as many 15 to 24 year olds said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of religion.

In comparison with 5 per cent of over 65s, 16 per cent of 15 to 24 year olds and 14 per cent of 25 to 34 year olds said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of physical disability. Similarly, more than 3 times as many 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 year olds reported witnessing discrimination on grounds of mental impairment as those over 65 did.

While 10 per cent of respondents aged 15 to 24 and 8 per cent of 25 to 34 year olds said they witnessed age discrimination, only 3 per cent of those over 65 did.

Finally, 15 to 24 year olds were 10 times more likely to report witnessing discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation than those over 65.

Education level

Charts 47 to 52 present the findings on the extent of discrimination witnessed, by respondents' education level.

In general, the longer the time spent in full-time education, the more likely a respondent was to report having witnessed discrimination. Respondents who are currently full-time students were the most likely to say that they witnessed discrimination. They were about 3 times more likely than the least educated to report race discrimination, discrimination on grounds of religion and physical disability and marginally less likely (2.5 times) to report discrimination on grounds of mental illness or learning difficulties and age. The difference between the least educated and the current students is greatest in terms of their witness of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation; current students were 5 times more likely to report witnessing it.

Occupation groups

Charts 53 to 58 present the findings on the witness of discrimination for key occupation groups.

Professionals & managers and the service sector employees were more likely than the other respondents to report witnessing discrimination on all grounds.

Compared with 18 per cent of manual workers, 27 per cent of professionals & managers and the service sector employees said they witnessed racial or ethnic discrimination.

Compared with manual workers and the self-employed, twice as many professional & managerial employees reported witnessing discrimination on grounds of religion.

Service sector employees were the most likely (16 per cent) to witness discrimination on grounds of physical disability. Professional & Managerial employees were the most likely (17 per cent) to witness discrimination on grounds of a learning difficulty or a mental illness.

The differences between occupation groups are smaller in terms of their witness of discrimination on grounds of age and sexual orientation. Nevertheless, professional & managerial and service sector employees were slightly more likely to report witnessing discrimination on grounds of age and sexual preferences.

1.2.5 Political views and the witness of discrimination: The Left-Right Scale

Charts 59 to 64 present the findings on the extent of discrimination witnessed, by respondents' political views.

Those on the Left were more likely to say that they witnessed someone being discriminated against, on all grounds. The reports of those who refused to declare their political views or who said they don't know their position on the Left-Right scale were similar to those placing themselves at the Right end of the scale. For a further discussion of the responses by those who refused to declare a position on the Left-Right scale, see Chapter 2 below.

Compared with 29 per cent of those at the Left end of the scale, 17 per cent of those at the Right end of the scale said they witnessed race discrimination. Those immediately to the Left of the centre were also more likely to report witnessing discrimination (30 per cent) than those at the Right end of the scale.

Compared with the 6 per cent of the respondents at the Right end of the scale, 14 per cent of those on the Left said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of religion.

Compared with the 9 per cent of those on the Right, 16 per cent of those on the Left said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of physical disability and 10 and 16 per cent respectively, reported witnessing discrimination on grounds of mental impairment. Those placing themselves immediately to the Right of centre were more likely to report witnessing discrimination against the mentally impaired than they were to on other grounds (14 per cent). Those on the Left were also more likely to report witnessing discrimination on grounds of age and sexual orientation than those on the Right.

1.2.6 Summary

Reports of witnessed discrimination present us with a puzzle. The rates of witnessed discrimination are considerably higher than the rates of discrimination experienced. The temptation is to interpret this as evidence of 'hidden discrimination' especially because so few respondents reported *experiencing* discrimination. However, since a single incident of discrimination would be witnessed and could have potentially been reported by more than one respondent, we have argued that reports of witnessed discrimination is not likely to be a reliable estimate of the extent of discrimination. We have also argued that reports of witnessed discrimination may be an indication of a higher level of awareness of discrimination and related issues on the part of the individuals who reported having witnessed discrimination against others. Those who personally experienced discrimination, young people and respondents with leftist political views were significantly more likely to report witnessing discrimination. This seems to support the view that noticing and reporting discrimination against

others is likely to be influenced by individuals' underlying awareness of the issue. However, as discussed with regards to the findings on the extent of experienced discrimination, witness reports are also likely to be affected by a range of personal, social and cultural factors. Neither with regards to experienced nor witnessed discrimination, low report rates could necessarily mean low *actual* incident rates. Lack of awareness, for example, could lead incidents to go unnoticed or unreported.

The survey presents another opportunity for a more reliable analysis of underlying attitudes towards discrimination. Respondents were asked direct questions about their views on discrimination; do they approve of discrimination and would they expect other people to approve of it? They were also asked about their knowledge of anti-discrimination legislation. Their responses are analysed in the next chapter.

Chapter II: Attitudes towards discrimination

In this chapter, findings on attitudes towards discrimination are presented.

2.1 Equal opportunities in employment

In this section, we look at respondents' views on equal opportunities in employment. Respondents were asked the following question:

(Q3601 –Q3607) 'Do you think that with the same skills or qualification, the following people would have less chance, the same chance or more chance than everyone else of getting a job, training or a promotion?'

A person from another ethnic origin

A person with minority religious beliefs

A physically disabled person

A person with learning difficulties/mental illness

A person under 25

A person over 50

A homosexual (a gay or lesbian person)

Note that respondents were only asked about equal opportunities in employment, not in any other area that featured in the 'experience' and 'witness' questions. On **age** discrimination, they were prompted for discrimination against people 'under 25' and 'over 50' separately. Also, this time, they were asked about discrimination against 'ethnic minorities' without referring to 'race'.

Charts 65 to 71 present the responses to the above question. The figures represent the full range of responses, as a proportion of the total number of respondents in each country, excluding non-response.

A person from another ethnic origin

Sixty two per cent of respondents believed that a person from another ethnic origin, with the same skills or qualifications, would have less chance than everyone else of getting a job, training or promotion. The British were the least likely (43 per cent) to think that race or ethnicity would matter in this way and the Danish were the most likely (89 per cent) to think so. Thirteen per cent in Greece and 9 per cent in the UK thought that being of a minority racial/ethnic origin would improve an applicant's chances in the labour market.

A person with minority religious or other beliefs

Thirty seven per cent of respondents believed that a person with minority religious or other beliefs, with the same skills or qualifications, would have less chance than everyone else of getting a job, training or promotion. While 22 per cent in Italy and Ireland thought that membership of a religious minority would reduce their chances of employment, 61 per cent in Sweden and 52 per cent in Denmark thought so. Five per cent in Greece and 4 per cent in the UK thought that a person with minority religious or other beliefs would have more chance.

A physically disabled person

Seventy seven per cent of respondents believed that a physically disabled person, with the same skills or qualification, would have less chance than everyone else of getting a job, training or promotion. There were few differences between countries, but the Swedish (87 per cent) and the Danish (86 per cent) were the most likely to think that a physical disability would reduce an applicant's chances in the labour market. In contrast, however, 11 per cent in Greece and 9 per cent in Italy thought that being a physically disabled person would *increase* an applicant's chances.

A person with learning difficulties or a mental illness

Eighty seven per cent of respondents said that they believed that a person with learning difficulties or a mental illness, despite having the same skills or qualification, would have less chance than everyone else of getting a job, training or promotion. The Swedish were the most likely (97 per cent) to think that having a learning difficulty or a mental illness would reduce the chances of getting a job or being promoted and the Greek (75 per cent) are the least likely. In fact, 7 per cent of Greek respondents thought that it would improve an applicant's chances.

A person under 25

One third of the respondents thought that young people have *more* chance of getting a job, training or being promoted and half thought this would make no difference. The French compared to others were more likely (36 per cent) to think that being young would be a disadvantage in the labour market.

A person over 50

With the exception of Greece and Ireland, more than two thirds of respondents believed that being old is a disadvantage in the labour market and would reduce the chances of getting a job, accessing training opportunities and being promoted. In Ireland half the respondents thought being old would have a negative impact. But in Greece, 17 per cent felt age to be a disadvantage and more, 23 per cent of Greek respondents, thought it would increase an applicant's chances¹.

A homosexual (a gay or a lesbian person)

About two third of respondents thought that an applicant's sexual preferences would *not* effect their chances in the labour market and a gay or a lesbian person would have the same chance as everyone else of getting a job, training or being promoted. The Finnish and Greek respondents were more likely to think that this would be a disadvantage with over 50 per cent of them saying that they would have less chance. Just 3 per cent of the British and 3 per cent of the Greek believe that a gay or a lesbian person would have more chance than everyone else.

Summary

Applicants with learning difficulties or those with a mental illness were thought to be the most disadvantaged group in the labour market; 87 per cent of respondents thought that they would have less chance than anyone else. Responses varied between 75 per cent in Greece and 94 per cent in Sweden. With 77 per cent of respondents saying they would have less chance, the next most disadvantaged group was thought

¹ Greece is so far out of line in their replies to this question, there may be a case for re-checking the Greek data, or the translation of this item in the Greek questionnaire.

to be those with a physical disability. 66 per cent in Italy, but 89 per cent in Finland shared this view. The third most disadvantaged group was thought to be the old applicants. 71 per cent thought those over 50 would have less chance and responses varied between 17 per cent in Greece and 83 per cent in Finland. Finally, the fourth most disadvantaged group was thought to be ethnic minorities with 62 per cent thinking that they would have less chance. Responses varied between 43 per cent in the UK and 89 per cent in Denmark.

2.2 Is discrimination right or wrong?

Respondents were asked to say to what extent they thought it 'right' or 'wrong' to discriminate against each of the groups dealt with in this enquiry. They were asked to say whether they themselves thought it 'always right', 'usually right', 'sometimes right and sometimes wrong', 'usually wrong' or 'always wrong'. Using the same categories they were then asked to say what view they thought other people would take. These two questions were repeated for four 'domains' of discrimination: seeking work or training, promotion at work, seeking accommodation or housing, and public services such as restaurants, banks and so on. Specifically, they were asked:

(Q3701–Q3707) ‘ Do you think that it is right or wrong to refuse a job or a training /a promotion to an applicant because he or she is.....

(Q3801–Q3807) ‘Do you think that in general people consider it right or wrong to refuse a job or a promotion to an applicant because he or she is.....

*a person from another ethnic origin
a person with minority religious/other beliefs
a physically disabled person
a person with learning difficulties/mental illness
a person under 25
a person over 50
a homosexual (a gay or a lesbian person)*

and....

(Q53a1–Q53a9) ‘ Do you think that it is right or wrong to deal with customers in a different way in a restaurant, etc./ to refuse a housing/accommodation etc. based on his/her ...

(Q54a1–Q54a9) ‘Do you think that in general people consider it right or wrong to deal with customers in a different way in a restaurant, etc./ to refuse a housing/accommodation based on his/her....

*racial/ethnic origin
religion or beliefs
physical handicap
learning difficulties/mental illness
age
sexual orientation (homosexual, etc.)*

financial reasons
gender
nationality

The terms of questioning differed a little between examples but this was a comprehensive sampling of public attitude towards discrimination. The companion report to this provides the full details of responses to each of the 64 questions generated by this matrix of questions for each of the 15 nations of the Union. If we are to probe further the structure, meaning and social distribution of these attitudes, then a means of data reduction will have to be used.

2.2.1 Data reduction: an underlying dimension supporting or opposing discrimination

This is an unusual example of attitude measurement in the sense that the 'target attitude' is an extreme case. That is to say, at least from the point of view of the Programme, in an ideal European world everyone would answer 'always wrong' to every question. You would perhaps still expect some respondents to mistake selection for discrimination. They might therefore concede that it may be 'right' to exclude young people from some employment on the ground of inexperience or that people diagnosed with learning difficulties would not be selected for highly skilled jobs. But generally people would understand 'discrimination' as uniformly unfair and tend to say that it was 'always wrong' in all the 32 cases put to them. In a completely ideal world they might also say that they had confidence that all their fellow European citizens shared this view. With this point in mind, we sought to create an index that measured the extent to which people's responses fell short of a complete rejection of discrimination. In moving towards such a single measure, quite a lot was learned about the nature of people's views too.

Consistency across domains

The first step was to determine the extent to which people answered consistently across the four domains of discrimination they were asked to consider. And the simple answer is that they did. *Figure Two* shows the average product-moment correlation and reliability coefficients between people's responses for each victim group they rated in common across all four domains.

People's responses to discrimination in four social domains were used to calculate the correlation coefficients in *Figure Two*. The range column shows the minimum and maximum correlation coefficients between people's responses to discrimination in four social domains (i.e. seeking work, promotion, housing and services). The average column indicates the mean of these coefficients. The correlations between peoples' views of discrimination across four sites were calculated separately for each victim group. In the same way, the correlation coefficients between people's guesses of other peoples' views were calculated.

The coefficients in *Figure Two* tell us that there is a very high probability that someone who scored above or below the mean in saying, for example, how right or wrong they felt it was to discriminate against people of a different ethnic origin in employment, will give a similar score above or below the mean in the context of

housing or services. This means that there is a single underlying tendency for people to endorse or oppose discrimination against people of different ethnic origins across the four domains and this justifies adding together those four scores into a single 'ethnic discrimination' score. A well-established literature on ethnocentrism would lead us to expect this since such responses would have their origins in a single underlying disposition that is tolerant or intolerant of members of other ethnic groups. However, the same is true of the other five victim group ratings given. Again this might be expected for religious discrimination or in a generalised antipathy to homosexuals, for example, but perhaps less so for discrimination against disabled people or on grounds of age. This raises the possibility that there is also an underlying dimension of attitude that is related to the rights and wrongs of discrimination *of itself*. For example, the minority who do endorse discrimination may feel that a greater civil right is infringed by anti-discrimination law and practice – a right of freedom perhaps to exercise personal choice in whom one employs, offers a tenancy to or serves. Others may feel that 'political correctness' has gone far enough and that people they feel are undeserving are being granted privileges. We will return to this question below. Meanwhile we look at some variations associated with attitudes towards the five victim groups included in the survey.

Figure Two *Correlation coefficients between attitude measures in each domain of discrimination: Seeking Work, Promotion, Housing, Services.*

	Average	Range	Reliability (Alpha)
Respondents' own views			
<i>ethnic origin</i>	0.58	0.53-0.69	0.85
<i>minority religious/other beliefs</i>	0.60	0.53-0.70	0.86
<i>a physically disabled person</i>	0.47	0.36-0.60	0.78
<i>learning difficulties/mental illness</i>	0.47	0.31-0.63	0.76
<i>age</i>	0.52	0.38-0.75	0.87
<i>sexual orientation</i>	0.61	0.54-0.73	0.86
Respondents' estimate of other people's views			
<i>ethnic origin</i>	0.58	0.48-0.69	0.84
<i>minority religious/other beliefs</i>	0.57	0.49-0.71	0.85
<i>a physically disabled person</i>	0.52	0.41-0.70	0.81
<i>learning difficulties/mental illness</i>	0.51	0.38-0.68	0.81
<i>age</i>	0.54	0.41-0.76	0.88
<i>sexual orientation</i>	0.58	0.48-0.73	0.85

The six minority scales

A scale was calculated by adding together the extent to which respondents thought discrimination on grounds of ethnicity was right or wrong in the four cases of

recruitment, promotion, housing and services. This adds together four scores ranging from 1 to 5 to a scale between 4 and 20. To keep faith with the idea of a shortfall from an 'ideal' set of responses, individuals' scores were re-calculated as a percentage of a maximum score.² The same was done for the five other sets of four scores for discrimination on grounds of religion, physical disability, mental impairment, age and sexual orientation. This whole procedure was then repeated for the scores given by respondents when asked to say to what extent other people might think it right or wrong to discriminate against the same groups in the same contexts. Chart 72 shows these two sets of scores together for all European citizens.

The overall messages of Chart 72 are clear:

- Europeans, on average, fell less than 20 per cent short of a scale position (i.e.100) that would oppose all discrimination against five of the six minorities they were asked to consider. This indicates a widespread opposition to discrimination in each case. In the case of ethnic discrimination, for example, three-quarters the population occupied a range from 68 to 100 and a third recorded a 'perfect' score of 100.
- In the case of discrimination against people with learning difficulties or mental illness, this average shortfall grew to about a quarter, though still indicating a considerable weight of opposition. This result is likely to be connected to a confusion remaining in many people's minds between selection solely by ability, which is fair and not discriminatory provided equal access to opportunity and training has taken place, for example, and discrimination solely on the ground of status as a disabled people, which is unfair.
- In each of the six cases, respondents felt that other people were more likely to take a view that favoured discrimination compared with their own view. This gap was greatest for ethnic discrimination, averaging 15 points, and least for mental health, averaging 11 points. But these differences are large for scales like these. Almost a third (29 per cent) thought that others would typically have exactly their own view on ethnic discrimination, for example. Just 10 per cent felt that others would be more opposed to discrimination while 61 per cent thought others would be less opposed and more inclined to concede that there were times when it was right to discriminate against other ethnic groups. The proportion predicting a 'perfect' score of 100 among others fell to 13 per cent compared to the 39 per cent who took such a position themselves.

Six charts (Chart 73 through 78) show the six sub-scales of opposition to discrimination on grounds of ethnicity, religion, physical disability, mental impairment, age and sexual orientation separately for each of the 15 member countries of the European Union³. Again, the overall messages from these charts seem clear:

² Scales score= $\frac{((a+b+c+d)-4)}{16} \times 100$.

³ The reason for the ordering of the countries Spain through to the former West Germany, is related to their overall score that is explained later in this chapter.

- The European average scores reported above are typical of the majority of countries, with scores out of 100 averaging between 80 and 90. This may seem an obvious statement but averages can conceal a wide range of differences between countries. In this case, strong opposition to discrimination is common to most countries.
- Partial exceptions to this pattern of very strong opposition to discrimination are Belgium and Austria in the case of ethnic discrimination and Greece and Austria in the case of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation.
- The one notable exception to this pattern of very strong opposition to discrimination is Germany, equally so in the former West Germany and the former East Germany. On every measure, and especially with respect to ethnic discrimination, scores in Germany were lower than elsewhere. Quite why German respondents differed from other nations is a question taken up in a later section below.
- In every country, a similar gap between people's views on discrimination and their more cautious evaluation of the views of other people is visible, though varying in size. Italy and Spain showed the largest discrepancies of this kind, typically a gap of more than 20 points and Germany the smallest, typically less than 10 points.

2.2.2 A single measure

It was suggested earlier that the high level of association between respondents' views about discrimination in employment, housing and services arose from an underlying view for and against discrimination itself, as well as a generalisation of their feelings towards each of the victim groups whose liability to discrimination they considered. A better test of such an underlying dimension would be a high level of association between people's views about each victim group. Figure Three provides all the coefficients between respondents combined scores for the six victim groups considered, first for their own views and then for their estimates of other people's views.

People's responses to discrimination against each victim group (i.e. their scores on each one of the six minority scales) were used to calculate the correlation coefficients in Figure 3. The coefficients indicate the degree of correlation between people's attitudes towards discrimination against all six victim groups. In the same way, the degree of correlation between their expectations of other people's views was calculated. Finally, the degree of association between what they think and what they expect other people would think was calculated.

The results overwhelmingly support the presence of a single underlying dimension towards discrimination. It is a rule-of-thumb of attitude research that, given the amount of 'noise' present in survey data, a correlation coefficient greater than 0.60 indicates that you have asked the same question twice, more or less. Evidence for this is sometimes obtained simply by asking the same question twice in a single questionnaire. The correlation is usually between 0.60 and 0.80, which range brackets the values of most of these paired-associations in our data. The correlation between

believing it right or wrong to discriminate on the grounds of ethnicity and religion is more than 0.90, which means you have certainly asked the same underlying question twice.

This may be quite an important finding. It is possible to argue that the repetitive nature of the questioning used induced a response-set among respondents which caused them to generalise their responses along the lines of 'right-or-wrong' views of discrimination from one group to another. But the countervailing pressures were also quite great. Take the classic case of white people with racist views, for example. They would certainly want to discriminate against other religions, perhaps against the disabled or homosexuals too. But would they want to discriminate on grounds of age? Most older and younger people in Europe are white. There is clearly some mechanism at work here that binds together people's views and their prediction of other **people's** views, that is informed by a response in principle to the fairness and acceptability of discrimination. This principle is separate from their views of the most likely victims of discrimination.

Figure 3 *Correlation coefficients between the six attitude measures*

Respondent believes discrimination is right or wrong.....

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Ethnicity	-					
2. Religion	.90	-				
3. Physical disability	.74	.77	-			
4. Mental disability	.67	.67	.82	-		
5. Age	.72	.76	.78	.68	-	
6. Sexual orientation	.77	.79	.71	.64	.74	-

Respondent believes others think discrimination is right or wrong.....

	7	8	9	10	11	12
7. Ethnicity	-					
8. Religion	.91	-				
9. Physical disability	.78	.81	-			
10. Mental disability	.75	.74	.87	-		
11. Age	.70	.76	.78	.70	-	
12. Sexual orientation	.78	.80	.76	.73	.77	-

Association between own beliefs and the beliefs of others:

	Self/others
13. Ethnicity	.50
14. Religion	.52
15. Physical disability	.50
16. Mental disability	.56
17. Age	.57
18. Sexual orientation	.54
Combined scores	.53

Technically, this finding means that we may add together all these scores into a single measure. Using all the data available we obtain two scores, one representing respondents' own views and one their prediction of others' views, ranging in value between 32 and 160. This score is then re-expressed as a percentage of the maximum score.⁴ Chart 79 shows the distribution of these two scores by each member country, ordered by the mean score on the anti-discrimination scale. All but three countries occupy the range between 80 and 90 per cent of the maximum score of 100, which

⁴ Scales score= $((a+b+c+d)-32)/128*100$.

emphasises the widespread belief among European citizens that discrimination of all kinds is at least ‘usually wrong’. If someone uniformly said ‘usually wrong’ in answer to every question they were asked in this sequence in the questionnaire, they would get a score of 75 per cent of the maximum. The European average is 82, ranging from 89 in Spain to 80 per cent in Belgium, dropping a little to 78 in Austria but then down to 71 in the former East Germany and to 68 in the former West Germany.

These national differences are larger than these mean differences suggest. For example, among all Europeans, half exceeded a score of 85 and 15 per cent scored a ‘perfect’ 100. In Spain, 65 per cent exceeded a score of 85 and 34 per cent scored a ‘perfect’ 100. In the former West Germany, just 29 per cent exceeded a score of 85 and only 4 per cent scored a ‘perfect’ 100. Why are the German scores so out of line with the rest of Europe? There may be a number of reasons:

- First, Germans may actually be less prepared to say that discrimination is wrong. Perhaps decades of entertaining *Gastarbeiters* while withholding from them full citizenship rights conditioned Germans to suppose that what was intended as a fair-minded deal for migrant workers was an allowable form of discrimination. But this was a long time ago and does not seem likely. There is some evidence of unease about migration in Germany. A poll published in *Handelsblatt* on May 3rd 2002 indicated that 46 per cent of Germans were against allowing further immigration and a similar number felt they already had too many. But such sentiments are not uncommon elsewhere and have recently been reflected in electoral choices in countries like the Netherlands and Denmark, whose scores on this anti-discrimination scale are as high as any in Europe. And why would Germans more than others find age discrimination more acceptable? We must keep open the possibility that the principle of discrimination is actually more acceptable in Germany than elsewhere, but there is no obvious reason in common knowledge of that country that would suggest why this should be so and quite a lot opposed to it.
- Second, it may be a question of language. The first objection to this thesis is that the Austrian case, though giving responses lower than elsewhere in Europe are still much higher than the German result. The authors are not linguists but what advice had been taken so far does suggest that at least some of the difference may lie in the translation of the questionnaire. It is not a question of the expression of degree: ‘Immer’ and ‘Meistens’ mean ‘Always’ and ‘usually’ (or perhaps ‘mostly’) in English, for example. And the shift of German opinion occurs right across the distribution, category-to-category. But the translation of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ may be problematic. We hasten to say that we do not imply that German cannot distinguish between right or wrong, but ‘gerecht’ and ‘ungerecht’ do have legalistic overtones that right and wrong do not have in English. And it may be that the Austrian result was influenced by their choice of “richtig/falsch” rather than ‘gerecht’ and ‘ungerecht’.⁵ Though ‘gerecht’ and ‘ungerecht’ may be the better translation and, again, the French-speaking countries chose ‘Juste/Injuste’ which is similarly legalistic. The Austrian polling agency believed that the question was difficult for German-speakers to understand, though the context of

⁵ It would be a very good idea to select a few of the key questions from this attitude sequence and re-run them in the next Eurobarometer survey in Germany and Austria, transposing the two translations.

discrimination as negative and unfair treatment was clearly explained at the beginning of the interview, as it was in other countries. The proportion of respondents spontaneously answering ‘Don’t know’ to these questions was higher in the German-speaking nations than elsewhere. These were typically between 11 and 13 per cent in Austria and 10 to 12 per cent in Germany, though still 5 to 6 per cent in Spain, for example.

For comparison, Chart 80 re-orders the countries according to the extent they believe others will oppose discrimination.

2.2.3 The social and political context of attitudes towards discrimination

Socio-demographic factors

Sex

Chart 81 compares the discrimination opposition scores of men and women.

Women are slightly more opposed to discrimination, averaging a score of 83.0 out of 100 compared to 81.7 among men. This gender gap in favour of women of about 1.5 points is fairly even across the 15 member states but is noticeable large in Finland at 4.9 and almost vanishes in Belgium at 0.2. In contrast there were no sex differences in the extent to which people think others might oppose discrimination.

Age

Chart 82 shows the variation of discrimination opposition score by age.

Anti-discrimination scores fall across the age range but, surprisingly perhaps, by only small amounts, falling less than three points from 83.8 among those under 24 to 81.0 among those over 64 years old (Figure 13). This fall is largest in Austria - almost ten points from 80.1 to 71.5 - while in Sweden, in the former East Germany and in Luxembourg, the slope is reversed. In Luxembourg it rises from 85 to 92 points from the youngest to the oldest age group. Thus, opposition to discrimination is not at all the sole property of the young.

Education

Chart 83 shows the variation of discrimination opposition score by respondent’s education level.

The relationship between the age at which respondents ceased full-time education and their anti-discrimination score is also surprisingly slight. Scores rose from 81.5 among those with the least education, leaving school at 15 or earlier, up to 84.1 among those going on to higher education. Even more surprisingly perhaps, current students, who combine both youth and higher education, score only slightly higher at 84.9. This gap in favour of higher education is greatest in Greece (79.3 rising to 86) and absent in Sweden. Estimates of other people’s views on discrimination did not vary at all by respondents’ years of education (Figure 14).

Occupation

Professional and managerial employees recorded anti-discrimination scores slightly higher than other workers but the gap between them and manual workers was still only about two points (83.2 compared with 81.1 – [Chart 84](#)). This gap was larger in Italy, Belgium and the former East Germany, exceeding five points in each case, and reversed in Luxembourg (86.9 compared with 88.6). People employed in the service sector were slightly less likely to attribute anti-discrimination views to others.

Summary

Overall, then, there is no clear evidence that the tendency to believe discrimination right or wrong, or to attribute such views to others, is socially determined to any great degree. Young better-educated non-manually-employed women are more likely to oppose discrimination, older male manual workers with little education less so. But a view that is basically opposed to discrimination is the chief characteristic of all social groups.

Strangely the one background characteristic measured in the questionnaire that was more strongly associated with respondents' anti-discrimination scores was the interviewers' assessment of how co-operative they were ([Chart 85](#)). Anti-discrimination scores fell from an average of 84.5 among those whose co-operation was judged 'excellent' down to 76.1 among those judged 'poor'. This adds force to the view that there was a minority of respondents who were uncomfortable being asked these questions about discrimination. The greater their reluctance the greater their tendency not to answer these questions or, if pressed perhaps, to give responses more in favour of discrimination.

The 'Left-Right' dimension

The 'Left-Right Self-anchoring Scale' has been in use in cross-national surveys for 30 years (see for example Klingemann and Inglehart 1975 and Barnes et al 1979). Respondents are asked to place themselves on a horizontal 10-box scale whose ends are labelled 'LEFT' and 'RIGHT' – a scale incidentally that provides no actual mid-point. Figure 11 shows how Europeans as a whole placed themselves on this scale and, superimposed upon this, the anti-discrimination score out of 100 given by people placing themselves successively in each of the ten boxes from left to right. Added to these are the same data for two more categories: those who (a) refused to answer and (b) said they were unable to answer, i.e. 'Don't Know'.

People distributed themselves on the left-right scale in a familiar way, with the majority occupying the middle categories. Two-thirds of Europeans who gave a reply placed themselves in one of the four middle categories, a fifth further to the left and the remaining ten per cent further to the right. The mean is therefore slightly to the left (4.2, counting the ten boxes as 0 through 9). It is furthest to the left in Spain at 3.6 and furthest to the right in the former West Germany at 5.4, which of course marks the range of the highest and lowest scores on the anti-discrimination scale too. But it would be wrong to suppose that there is therefore a very strong link between left-right

self-placement and views about discrimination since, for example, the former East Germany is to the left at 3.7 but has the second-lowest anti-discrimination score.

Chart 86 shows clearly, those on the left do have raised anti-discrimination scores compared to those on the right but the difference is limited to about seven percentage points. This is a significant difference but it is not large enough to indicate that views about discrimination *in Europe as a whole* are mainly determined by traditional left-right ideological differences by the party political choices that they tend to represent. There were however some interesting within-country differences. In 10 of the 15 countries, those placing themselves on the two categories furthest to the left scored between six and ten points higher on the anti-discrimination scales compared with those placing themselves in the two categories furthest to the right. This scale of difference conforms to most people's idea about the significance of political ideology and the need for opposition to discrimination. Again it should be stressed that the right in these countries still had scores that reflected, on balance, opposition to discrimination rather than support, though in Germany a right-ist score of 60 indicated that this balance had become more even, for or against. In Spain, the former East Germany and Belgium, the difference was larger with the left leading the right in opposition to discrimination by 12 to 13 points out of 100. This reflects a greater polarisation of political opinion of this kind in these three countries.

There is however a curious and intriguing finding associated with the Left-Right Scale. Whereas those who said 'Don't Know' to the Left-Right scale gave scores close to the average on the anti-discrimination scale, those who refused to provide a Left-Right self-placement gave anti-discrimination scores lower than average. They were in fact closely in line with those who placed themselves on the far Right. They were also more likely than others to say they 'don't know' whether various acts of discrimination were right or wrong. Again, this does not amount to hard evidence that there may be a groundswell of hidden opinion that is less opposed to discrimination than the more explicit questionnaire responses among the majority suggest. Or indeed that the Left-Right scale now under-estimates the potential occupancy of the extreme Right when people are asked questions by interviewers. But it is suggestive of this and may provide the basis for further research.

Chapter 3: Awareness of anti-discrimination legislation

In this chapter, we look at the extent of respondents' awareness of anti-discrimination legislation and their access to redress if they feel themselves victim of discrimination.

Respondents were asked two questions on this issue. First, they were asked whether they knew their rights if they were discriminated against. This first question does not specify any site or ground. Second, they were asked whether they would complain if they were discriminated against, specifically, in accessing commercial services and if they would complain, what means they would use – verbal, written or legal.

In the following sections responses to these questions are analysed.

3.1 Do you know your rights?

Respondents were asked the following question:

Q56. Do you know your rights if you are discriminated against or harassed?

Table 1 presents the responses to this question. Note that 'It depends' responses were recorded only if respondents spontaneously said this.

Table 1.

Q56. Do you know your rights if you are discriminated against or harassed?

	Yes	No	It depends (spontaneous)	DK	Total (N)
Spain	35	52	8	6	1000
Luxembourg	32	49	18	2	600
UK	33	53	12	2	1305
Denmark	29	62	7	2	999
Sweden	37	51	9	3	1000
France	30	57	11	3	1004
Italy	43	38	14	6	994
Portugal	32	53	11	4	1000
Netherlands	34	50	11	5	995
Finland	70	17	10	3	1039
Ireland	40	39	17	3	1000
Greece	53	40	5	1	1001
Belgium	26	61	10	4	1016
Austria	29	48	16	8	1025
East Germany	29	46	17	7	1014
West Germany	30	47	14	8	1040
EU average	37	48	12	4	16032

Notes:

1. Row percentages are based on weighted sample.
2. Total (N) column shows the sample size for each country.

More than a third of European citizens (37 per cent) said that ‘knew their rights’ should they be discriminated against or harassed, almost half (47 per cent) said they did not and the remainder were unsure or thought it depended on the circumstances. There were some large differences between countries. Finland (70 per cent), Greece (53 per cent), Italy (43 per cent) and Ireland (40 per cent) had a higher proportion of respondents who said they knew what they could or could not do if they were discriminated against or harassed. Belgians (26 per cent), Austrians (29 per cent), East Germans (29 per cent) and the Danish (29 per cent) were the least likely to know their rights if faced with discrimination.

Compared with those who experienced none, the minority of respondents who said they had experienced discrimination were only marginally more likely (by a few percentage points) to say that they knew their rights. The difference between those who experienced discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and those who did not, rises to 10 percentage points. This is an important point to note as it seems to suggest that ‘victims’ of discrimination may be no more aware of their rights than the average citizen which is likely to discourage them from seeking means of redress.

The difference between those who reported that they witnessed discrimination and those who did not is greater and this is about ten percentage points for most discrimination grounds. Once again, the difference between those who said they witnessed discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and those who said they did not was higher at fifteen percentage points. This may seem to confirm the suggestion that reports of witnessing discrimination may be an indication of awareness and it seems that those who witnessed discrimination are also the ones more likely to know their rights.

Variation in the extent to which people knew their rights was associated with education: 47 per cent of Europeans who left school after the age of 19 said they knew their rights compared with 30 per cent of those with only the minimum amount of schooling up to 15 years. Correspondingly, 48 per cent of professional and managerial workers knew their rights compared with 32 per cent of manual workers. This European-wide 17-point knowledge gap in favour of the better-educated was largest in Ireland (30 points) and Portugal (32 points) and smallest in Belgium (11 points).

3.2 If you were discriminated against, would you complain?

Respondents were then asked whether they would complain if they were discriminated against in accessing various commercial services:

Q55. If you were discriminated against in a restaurant, bank, etc., would you be willing to complain?

Table 2 presents part of the responses to this question. In the questionnaire, the ‘Yes’ responses were broken down and respondents were asked to indicate the type of action they would take, if they had said ‘Yes’. Table 2 presents the proportion of respondents who said ‘Yes’ to any one of these alternative forms of redress.

The next section looks at the types of action respondents would take, focusing only on those who said ‘Yes, I would complain’.

Note that ‘It depends’ responses were recorded, only if respondents spontaneously said so.

Table 2

Q55. If you were discriminated against in a restaurant, bank, etc., would you be willing to complain?

(row percentages)

	Yes	No	It depends (spontaneous)	Don't know	Total (n)
Spain	79	9	9	5	1000
Luxembourg	73	10	16	2	600
UK	80	9	8	2	1305
Denmark	71	15	11	3	999
Sweden	81	10	7	2	1000
France	69	16	12	4	1004
Italy	73	9	12	5	994
Portugal	65	15	13	6	1000
Netherlands	61	23	13	3	995
Finland	72	13	12	4	1039
Ireland	72	11	12	5	1000
Greece	73	17	9	2	1001
Belgium	62	24	9	5	1016
Austria	60	22	14	5	1025
East Germany	63	12	18	8	1014
West Germany	63	16	14	7	1040
EU average	70	14	12	4	16032

Notes: Row percentages are based on weighted sample.

Table 2 shows that, seven out of ten respondents said they would complain if they were discriminated against in restaurants, banks or in accessing other similar services. The proportion of respondents willing to complain varied between 60 per cent in Austria and 81% in Sweden. The British were also among the most likely to say that they would complain. Austrians were followed by the Dutch (61 per cent), East Germans (63 per cent), Belgians (62 per cent) and West Germans (63 per cent) who next to Austrians, were less likely to say that they would take action if they were discriminated against. This is an interesting confirmation of a *relative* degree of personal acceptance of the fact of discrimination in countries where opposition to discrimination was weakest.

The same pattern of variation associated both higher education and occupational status with a greater willingness to complain, though the differences were smaller than for the simple knowledge of one’s rights. For example, 76 per cent of professional workers would complain compared with 67 per cent of manual workers and 76 per cent of the best educated compared with 63 per cent of those with only minimum schooling. This 13 point gap between the best and worst educated in their

willingness to complain varied a lot between countries. It was small in Sweden (5 per cent) and Luxembourg (8 per cent) but larger in Denmark Ireland and Finland (20 per cent) and much larger in the former West German (27 per cent) and Austria (28 per cent).

Men compared to women were only a little more likely to complain (72 per cent compared to 68 per cent). This sex difference was fairly consistent across countries. Exceptions were Austria and the former East Germany where men had a lead of 10 and 12 per cent over women and in Finland, Belgium and Ireland where there were no sex differences.

There were few differences across the age distribution with older and younger respondents equally prepared to protest in the face of discrimination, declining only a little to 60 per cent among the over 64s.

There were no differences between those who experienced discrimination and those who did not, except for discrimination on grounds of age. Those who did not experience age discrimination were more likely (a difference of about 5 per cent) to say that they would complain than those who experienced age discrimination. Interestingly, respondents who said they did not witness discrimination were also more likely, to say that they would complain, than those who did witness discrimination.

3.3 How far would you take your complaint?

Respondents who said they would complain if they were discriminated against in accessing commercial services, were asked to indicate how far they would be prepared to take their complaint, by indicating the actions they would take:

- Yes, I would complain verbally
- Yes, I would complain in writing
- Yes, I would take it to the courts

Table 3 presents the range of ‘Yes’ responses. Note that respondents could indicate more than one of these actions. Therefore the row percentages can add to more than 100 per cent.

Just under 80 per cent of European citizens, who said they would complain at all, said if they suffered discrimination, they would complain verbally, 37 per cent said they would complain in writing and 22 per cent said they would take it to court. Some of the differences between countries are striking though. While about 58 per cent in France and Belgium said they would complain verbally, as many as 89 per cent in Sweden said so.

In Luxembourg, Netherlands and Greece about 22 per cent said they would complain in writing, while 57 per cent of the British did.

In Finland and Netherlands, less than 7 per cent said they would go to court. By contrast, in France, almost 50 per cent, in Belgium 40 per cent and in Spain 38 per cent said they would take their complaint to court.

Table 3.
How far would you be willing to take your complaint?

(row percentages)

	complain verbally	complain in writing	take it to court	Total
Spain	71	39	38	795
Luxembourg	73	22	32	460
UK	81	58	25	1080
Denmark	85	53	17	744
Sweden	89	45	17	827
France	58	32	50	696
Italy	74	42	26	725
Portugal	63	42	17	641
Netherlands	85	22	7	606
Finland	87	26	7	767
Ireland	87	37	12	734
Greece	84	23	22	731
Belgium	58	27	40	634
Austria	80	29	15	619
East Germany	79	42	15	648
West Germany	82	38	14	673
EU average	78	37	22	11380

Notes:

1. *Row percentages are based on weighted sample.*
2. *Total (N) column shows the number of respondents in each country who said 'Yes, I would complain'.*
3. *Base (11380) is the total number of respondents who said they would complain.*
4. *Respondents were allowed more than one answer. Row percentages will add up to more than 100 per cent.*

As you might expect, those who said they knew their rights were more than twice as likely to protest if they believed themselves the victim of discrimination in a public place: 43 per cent compared to 20 per cent would complain. (*Table 4*). In Austria the effects of knowledge on predicted behaviour were large: 43 per cent of those aware of their rights would complain compared with only 6 per cent of those unaware. In Ireland too this gap was 49 per cent compared with 12 per cent, in the former East Germany 39 compared with 9 per cent.

Table 4.

Willingness to complain by whether or not respondents think they know their rights if discriminated against.

Column percentages

	Do you know your rights if you are discriminated against or harassed?				
<i>If you were discriminated against in a restaurant, bank, etc., would you be willing to complain?</i>	Yes	No	Depends	Don't Know	All
Yes	43	20	26	13	36
No	43	70	46	50	48
Depends	11	6	23	7	12
Don't know	3	4	5	29	4

Bibliography

Banton, M. (1994), *Discrimination*, Open University Press, UK.

Barnes, Samuel H. and Max Kaase *Political Action*, Sage Publications, 1979.

Enzenhofer, E. et al. (2001), *Attitudes towards minority groups in the European Union – A special analysis of the Eurobarometer 2000 survey on behalf of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia*, by SORA, Vienna.

Jowell et al. (1998), *British and European Social Attitudes – How Britain Differs* (SCPR, 15th Report), Ashgate, England.

Lange, A. (1996), *Immigrants on Discrimination*, CEIFO Publications/No.73, Sweden.

Vuori, K. (1997), *Anti-discrimination training activities in Finland*, International Migration Paper, No.18, Geneva, ILO.

Zegers de Beijl, R. (2000), Documenting discrimination against migrant workers in the labour market, A comparative study of four European countries, *ILO, Geneva*.

Racism and Xenophobia in Europe, Findings from Eurobarometer 47.1 (1997) presented at the Closing Conference of the European Year Against Racism in Luxembourg, 18 & 19 December 1997.