CEPS
INSTEAD

Immigration as a Threat:
The Effect of Gender Differences
Among Luxembourg
Residents with and without a
Migration History

Marie VALENTOVA
Aigul ALIEVA

L'European Values Study (EVS) est une enquête réalisée au Luxembourg en 2008 auprès d'un échantillon représentatif de la population résidante composé de 1610 individus âgés de 18 ans ou plus.

Au niveau national, cette enquête fait partie du projet de recherche VALCOS (Valeurs et Cohésion sociale), cofinancé par le FNR dans le cadre du programme VIVRE. Au niveau international, elle est partie intégrante d'une enquête réalisée dans 45 pays européens qui a pour objectif d'identifier et d'expliquer en Europe les dynamiques de changements de valeurs, et d'explorer les valeurs morales et sociales qui sous-tendent les institutions sociales et politiques européennes (www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu).

Plus d'infos : http://valcos.ceps.lu.

Fonds National de la
Recherche Luxembourg

Immigration as a Threat: The Effect of Gender Differences Among Luxembourg Residents with and without a Migration History[*]

Marie Valentova, Aigul Alieva
CEPS/INSTEAD

Abstract: Anti-immigration sentiments have been extensively studied in recent years. Empirical studies showed that the out-group size together with the general economic condition of the host country determines the extent and the intensity of the anti-immigrant perception. While nearly all studies concluded that men and women differ in their perceptions, there is no explanation for this behaviour. Gender differences were the main focus of this paper, and we looked at two related issues. First, in our analysis, we sought a more detailed explanation of the particular reasons that foster this negative perception. Secondly, while the majority of studies focused exclusively on perceptions of the native population, we included the perceptions of the non-native populations separately and looked at the differences among three groups, with gender being the primary focus both between and within groups. We found that both gender and immigration history mediates the threat perception in Luxembourg.

Key words: gender, threat, attitudes, immigration, EVS

JEL codes: J15, J16, I39

European societies differ greatly in the extent of their exposure to immigration throughout their histories, whether it came via a colonial past, labour migration, or a humanitarian migration (Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller 2009). While some societies remained highly homogeneous for an extended period of time, others have been subject to a longer migratory exposure. In general, a constellation of particular historical, political, and economic factors shapes the overall environment in the recipient country. The empirical studies showed that the overall perception of immigration varies across Europe and found little evidence of converging trends over time (Bart Meulemann, Eldad Davidov, and Jaak Billiet 2009; Moshe Semyonov, Rebeca Raijman, and Anastasia Gorodzeisky 2006). While the anti-foreigner sentiments arise in all societies, this phenomenon does not happen at the same pace and in a linear fashion. A dramatic increase in anti-immigrant sentiments was observed between 1988 and 2000, especially in Greece, Portugal, and Ireland. In other cases, like France, Spain, and Luxembourg, the increase was less striking (Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006). Furthermore, empirical studies show that the rise of anti-immigrant sentiments takes a curvilinear shape: it grows linearly until a certain level is reached and then remains stable or somewhat decreases (Meulemann, Davidov, and Billiet 2009; Silke Schneider 2008; Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006). In northern Europe and Switzerland, the attitude towards newcomers is becoming more open while southern and Eastern Europeans are exhibiting the opposite tendency (Meulemann, Davidov, and Billiet 2009). The literature reveal several main groups of predictors of anti-immigrant sentiments among the native population: macro level factors related to overall economic conditions and the size of the immigrant population in the recipient country; factors related to the socio-economic, ethno-cultural profile of immigrants; and the socio-demographic, labour market and economic individual characteristics of the native population. A great deal of the literature on attitudes toward immigrants deals with the effect of threats against both individuals and groups on the perception of immigrants. However, what has been substantially missing in the empirical results is a more detailed analysis of the impact of gender differences in perceptions toward immigrants and explanations for gender's effect. No studies explicitly focus on analyses of how men and women differ with respect to the main determinants that drive anti-immigrant

sentiments. There is no empirical evidence related to how different kinds of immigration-related threats moderate anti-immigrant feelings among men and women.

The main aim of the present paper is to fill in this gap in the literature and examine gender differences in the perceptions of immigrants in Luxembourg. As we assume that there is a causal relationship among specific threats related to immigration (job competition, cultural intimidation, criminality, concerns about rising welfare dependency, out-group's size) and the fact that people see immigrants as a general threat to their society, we see specific threats as important predictors of the perception of a general threat. Thus, we first examine how different *specific threats* affect a respondent's perception that immigrants pose a *general* threat to a society. Second, we examine how important the role that these specific threats play is in explaining the perception that immigrants pose a general threat men and women in Luxembourg. In other words, do men and women differ with respect to the effects of specific threats on the general threat. In the analyses, we account for the migratory backgrounds of residents and distinguish between natives and inhabitants with a migrant history.

Here it needs to be noted that we deal with group-level threats for the host society and threats perceived by individuals. In other words, respondents (natives, first- and second-generation immigrants) express their attitudes concerning threats that concern the future of their host society not themselves as private persons.

The present paper contributes to the existing literature on anti-immigrant attitudes and gender in several ways:

Firstly, it is one of the first attempts to test the effect of this exhaustive list of specific threats on citizens' general perception of immigrants. Most of the studies focus on only one, two or a maximum of three kinds of threats. Moreover, we examine the effect of these threats from a gender perspective.

Secondly, the present paper does not provide information only about gender differences in the perception of immigrants but sheds light on gender differences in the motives behind these attitudes, as we assume that men and women have different drivers behind their anti-immigrant sentiments.

Thirdly, we conducted our analyses on the data collected in Luxembourg, a country with the largest share of the immigrant population in Europe and a relatively long immigration history. According to the latest official statistics, immigrants represent approximately 44% of the total population (STATEC 2009). The number of immigrants is slowly reaching the point where it will equal the number of natives, and it has tripled over the last 50 years (STATEC 2009). The vast majority of foreigners living in Luxembourg come from the EU-25 countries. The largest group of immigrants is Portuguese, followed by French and Italians. Thus, Luxembourg has a relatively low number of immigrants from outside Europe, in particular from developing countries (STATEC 2009).

A relatively long immigration history coupled with a high number of the population with a foreign background gave us the opportunity to study the gender differences within the immigrant sub-population. This means that we were able to examine gender differences in anti-immigrant attitudes and their motives separately for natives and residents with a migrant history (first- and second-generation immigrants).

The analyses were based on the European Value Study data from 2008, which is the most up-to-date source of information regarding values and attitudes. The dataset contains a rich and detailed battery of questions about immigration and integration issues as well as socio-demographic background variables.

The paper is structured as follows. The first section outlines the findings of previous studies with a focus on the threat theory and gender differences in attitudes toward immigrants. We elaborate on these findings and develop our working hypotheses. In the next part of the paper, we describe our data and variables and provide the reader with the results of a basic descriptive analysis. The second section is dedicated to the principal analyses that were conducted in two steps. In the first step, we analyzed the gender differences in threat perception among men and women separately, and we also looked at how one's migratory background moderates the level of perceived threat for male and female respondents. We assume that women and men with and without a migratory background use different reasoning to explain their antipathy/sympathy towards immigration. In the second step, we looked at differences between men and women within each group: native population and first- and second-generation immigrants. These analyses will give us a general understanding of different causes of negative

sentiments toward immigration from a gender perspective while controlling for the key socio-demographic and economic individual predictors of attitudes towards immigrants. In the concluding part, we summarised the empirical findings to find out whether and how different genders perceived immigration in Luxembourg.

Theoretical Framework, Previous Findings, and Hypotheses

Perceived Threats and Attitudes towards Immigrants

The threat theory (Hubert Blalock 1967; Herbert Blumer 1958; Lauren M. McLaren 2005; Lincoln Quillian 1995) posits that as an area becomes ethnically diverse, the political, economic, and social powers of locals might be threatened by immigrants. This might lead to negative attitudes toward newcomers. Walter G. Stephan, Oscar Ybarra, and Guy Bachman (1999); Walter G. Stephan, Oscar Ybarra, Carmen Martinez Martinez, Joseph Schwarzwald, and Michal Tur-Kaspa (2000) distinguish four main forces behind negative out-group attitudes: realistic and symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes. Realistic threats arise when members of in-groups feel threatened by out-group members with respect to political and economic power. Symbolic threats are related to the endangered symbolic and cultural domination of the in-group. Intergroup anxiety concerns interactions with out-group members. Negative stereotypes are simplified and standardized images of out-groups held in common by those in the in-group. Meulemann, Davidov, and Billiet (2009) argued that the level of threat and, consequently, the negative perceptions of immigrants are affected mainly by the size of the minority group and the economic conditions of a country.

The discourse on anti-immigrant attitudes is significantly shaped by the *labour market competition* hypothesis which puts the *actual* or *perceived* job competition as one of the main causes of those sentiments. The assumptions are straightforward: natives with a certain level of skills will oppose the immigration of those with the same skills because they are direct competitors in the same occupational field. The opposition will be less pronounced in cases where the skills of newcomers are different from their own. Moreover, natives will fear that immigrants who accept a similar type of job for lower wages will depress wages for everyone in the particular sector. Some researchers have also found that the native population whose situation

is more vulnerable (low education, unemployed) with low skills tends to be more negative about immigration for economic reasons, while empirical results do not support this argument (Christian Dustmann and Ian Preston 2000). Studies have diverged significantly in their findings. Recent studies suggested that the immigration has a very small "actual" effect on wages and employment or unemployment status of the native population (Sarah Bridges and Simona Mateut 2009; Jens Hainmueller and Michael J. Hiscox 2002; Schneider 2008). Other studies show that economic competition together with the concerns about potential welfare dependency remains strongly present in shaping the attitudes and exhibits a strong effect, albeit not the most significant (Bridges and Mateut, 2009; Dustmann and Preston 2000; Ira N. Gang, Francisco L. Rivera-Batiz, Myeong-Su Yun Gang 2002; Anna Maria Mayda, 2004).

Both job competition and welfare dependency are directly linked to the economic condition of the country. Empirical studies have convincingly shown that wealthier countries score lower on the perceived immigration threats contrary to their less well-off neighbours (Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006).

There is a growing agreement that despite the importance of economic motives, other features connected to cultural, ethnic, and racial differences significantly determine the attitudes (Dustmann and Preston 2000; Schneider 2008). In Europe in general, native populations are less likely to favour the immigration of groups made up of a different race. However, in times of economic downturn, they perceive same-race immigrants to be direct competitors, thus changing the attitudes towards different-race incomers (Bridges and Mateut 2009). Nevertheless, different-race immigrants are more often perceived as having a negative impact on a country's culture. It is foreign cultures and religious practices with which Europeans are unfamiliar that might cause them to feel somewhat suspicious about the newcomers, who also display symbolic differences (McLaren 2003). However, as the empirical evidence following the inter-group contact theory suggests, the level of perceived threat diminishes as both groups have more chances for interaction and become more familiar with the unknown culture.

A perceived threat can be directly related to the size of the out-group. When the group is large, the perceived level of threat can rise due to the increased competition in the labour market and because its members pose a cultural threat. However, large groups provide more

opportunities for inter-group contacts and that might lead to a decreased threat perception (Schneider 2008).

The Effect of Gender Differences on Attitudes toward Immigrants

Empirical studies have demonstrated significant differences between men and women in their attitudes about immigration (Bridges and Mateut 2009; Jack Citrin, Donald P. Green, Christopher Muste, and Cara Wong 1997; Dustmann and Preston 2000; Gang, Rivera-Batiz, and Yun 2002; Hainmueller and Hiscox 2002). While few studies provided evidence that men are less open towards immigration, researchers more frequently reported that women felt less positive about it. The feminist literature contains explanations about the differences in values, behaviour, ad attitudes that are not the result of socialization in childhood but arise from "…performing different social roles, being involved in different types of networks, and confronting different opportunity and reward structures" in adulthood (Janet Saltzman Chafetz 2006: 614).

Those who accept the labour market competition hypothesis have argued that women are less often confronted with the direct competition for jobs, which would lead more women to have pro-immigration views compared to men. In reality, female attitudes towards immigration are more negative than those of men. They believe that immigration has negative effects on the economy and culture (Bridges and Mateut 2009: 14), and they are more concerned about jobs and welfare (Dustmann and Preston 2000). Furthermore, researchers have also reported that, compared to men, they more strongly oppose the arrival of newcomers from richer countries not poorer ones, and they have less antipathy towards the different-race immigrants (Dustmann and Preston 2000: 29-30). The reasons behind such differences have not been thoroughly explored until now.

Research on attitudes towards immigration revealed that the number and intensity of contacts with members of the non-native population helps to explain why some individuals have less negative views on immigration than others. Those who are in contact with non-natives on a daily basis, such as at work, and those who have close friends among immigrants will display less concern about immigration and vice versa. Applying this argument to women's attitudes, might partly explain their different attitudes. Women are less often employed than men, and although

they do not face direct competition for jobs, their inactivity in the labour market means they probably have less contact with immigrants. Their networks more often include other women in similar situations. Furthermore, we might assume that highly-educated women, who also more often tend to be active in the labour market, might share more positive attitudes towards non-natives in contrast to their less-educated counterparts. Another potentially important explanation might be found in their family members and children. One of the studies found that members of larger families with children below 15 years of age were able to dissolve their fears and anxiety. In this way, mothers can overcome their lack of contact with the foreign-born through their children, if they are not directly confronted with such situations, e.g., at the workplace.

How the foreign-born perceive other newcomers is not completely clear. So far, studies have shown that they are more supportive of immigration than the native population (Bridges and Mateut 2009; Hainmueller and Hiscox 2002). In this regard, they share common experiences, and their sentiments are based on this commonality. While foreign-born men and women were studied in one group, we assume that there were differences between them, and we categorised them according to the duration of their residence in the recipient country.

The position of female migrants in Europe is not altogether favourable. The majority of women arrived through family reunification programmes or marriage. More often than not, they have less education than male immigrants. They also have higher unemployment rates, work on precarious jobs, and receive less legal support (Castles and Miller 2009). Because the majority of female newcomers will enter similar jobs, migrant women who are already residing in the host country will see them as direct competitors for jobs. They might also fear that a growing out-group will invoke more negative feelings on the part of the native population, but, more importantly, their presence might lead to legal limitations regarding access to jobs, services, and support from the state. However, in countries like Luxembourg, which has a permanent need for new labourers and enjoys high economic prosperity, the perceived threat by immigrant men and women can be low. A majority of Luxembourg nationals who are active in the labour market work as state employees (SESOPI, 2007).

On the other hand, we also expected the first- and second-generation immigrants to differ with regard to particular parameters that form their feelings of being threatened. For example, given official labour market statistics, the unemployment rate of foreign-born women is twice as

high as the unemployment rates of native-born females (9 and 4%, respectively) while the difference between foreign-born and native-born men was much smaller (3 and 5%, respectively) (OECD, 2008). While they share common migration experiences, the second generation was born and brought up in the host society, and their view might actually be closer to the views of the native population, rather than to the newcomers.

While there are virtually no studies in the literature on attitudes of the foreign-born towards immigration or on gender differences, this work has a more exploratory nature. Therefore, we framed rather broad hypotheses concerning the gender and generational differences, as outlined below.

1.   We assume that within female and male sub-groups, the perceived general threat and the effects of specific immigration-related threats can explain why these perceptions differ, depending on their migratory backgrounds, i.e., on being native, first-, and second-generation respondents.

2.   We assumed that there are differences between men and women in their perceptions of immigration as a future threat for a society when we look separately at native, first-, and second-generation groups.

Data and Methodology

Our analyses are based on the 2008 European Values Study (EVS) from Luxembourg. EVS is a large-scale, cross-national, cross-sectional, and repeated research program on basic human values. Luxembourg participated in the last two waves of the survey. As only the 2008 wave included an extended module on immigrants, the analyses are based only on that wave. The analyses were conducted on a weighted representative sample of 1610 residents of Luxembourg who were older than 17 years of age.

In countries like Luxembourg where the proportion of residents with foreign nationality is high, the migratory background of residents should be taken into account, and analyses should not include only natives but also residents with a migration history. Therefore, we distinguished three groups of residents based on their migrant backgrounds: native population, second-generation migrants, and first-generation migrants. Nationals were defined as people born in the

country and whose parents were also both born in the country. In the context of this study, we did not consider individuals born abroad to at least one Luxembourg national to be natives. This category of respondents represented 2.6 % of the sample. We defined first-generation immigrants as residents born outside Luxembourg to foreign-born parents. Second-generation immigrants were defined as individuals born in Luxembourg with at least one parent born outside the country (Miroslav Kucera 2008; Patrick Simon 2005; Min Zhou 1997). Due to the small number of second-generation immigrants in our sample, we did not distinguish between residents with two foreign-born parents and those with only one.

EVS data show that first-generation immigrants represented approximately 37% of the sample. Second-generation immigrants represented approximately 17% of the sample, and the remaining 46% of respondents were natives. These figures revealed that 54 % or residents of the country have a migrant history, i.e., they are first- or second-generation immigrants. This unique composition of the population allowed us to compare gender difference in attitudes toward immigrants among the three groups of residents.

Table 1 Respondents by Gender and Migratory Background in Luxembourg (N=1568)

Migratory background		Male	Female	Total
Natives	N	375	346	721
	%	52.0	48.0	100.0
First-generation immigrants	N	304	282	586
	%	51.9	48.1	100.0
Second-generation immigrants	N	119	141	260
	%	45.8	54.2	100.0
Total	N	798	769	1567
	%	50.9	49.1	100.0

Notes: 42 cases were excluded from the analyses as they did not fit any of the three categories of residents. These cases represent individuals who were not born in the country to at least one parent born in the country.
Source: EVS 2008

The EVS questionnaire contained a battery of questions about people's perceptions of immigrants. On one side, there were items that covered specific threats that immigrants may pose to a host society: competition for available jobs, crime, cultural threats, welfare system abuse, and overpopulation. On the other side, there was a statement measuring general threats, i.e., the fact that a respondent perceives immigrants as a future threat to the society.

We assumed that there is a causal relationship between items measuring attitudes toward specific threats related to immigrants and a general threat. Therefore, perceived specific threats were used as predictors of perceived general threats. This approach helped us to understand which specific problems were commonly related to the presence of immigrants in a country (specific threats) that affected general anti-immigrant sentiments (general threats).

To answer our research questions, we ran a set of binary logistical regressions in which the dependent variable was a general perceived threat that would occur in the future, and key independent variables were attitudes toward particular threats related to immigration (jobs, crime, welfare system, cultural, customs and traditions, out-group size). Depending on the question, we introduced to the model relevant interaction terms that allowed us to measure how the effect of a specific threat is moderated by the gender or the migratory background of Luxembourg residents. A significant interaction term indicated that the effect of a specific threat differed among those of different genders or migrant histories.

The exponent of the logistical coefficient Exp(B) - further only odds ratio - for interaction terms between qualitative predictors (in our case, gender or migratory background) and continuous variables (attitudes toward specific threats) represented the ratio of the multiplicative factor by which the predicted odds change given a 1-unit increase in specific threat variables for one category of qualitative predictor divided by the corresponding multiplicative factor for the reference category in the above category (James Jaccard 2001).

To obtain correct estimates of the effect of particular aspects of immigration on perceptions of threats and how these effects were moderated by gender and migratory background of respondents, in each presented model we controlled for selected socio-demographic, economic individual characteristics and integration related variables.

General Threat - Dependent Variable

A dependent variable was used to measure the general threat related to immigrants and was based on the following EVS question: "In the future the proportion of immigrants will become a threat to society". Respondents could express their opinion on a 10-point scale where 1 = Strongly agree and 10 = Strongly disagree. For the purposes of this study, we re-categorized the variable into a dichotomous variable. Value 1 aggregate responses from 1 to 4 represented agreement with the statement. Value 0 of the new variable stood for all other categories of responses (5-10) that represented a neutral stance or disagreement. The categories "don't know" and "no answer", which accounted for 4% of responses, were excluded from the analyses.[1]

This approach, where variables of a more general threat were dichotomized and taken as a dependent variable and further explained by other immigration-related variables had been used in other studies dealing with attitudes toward immigrants, for example in Mayda (2009) and Bridges and Mateut (2009).

The EVS data presented in Table 1 reveal that the groups of residents adopt rather different attitudes toward the future threat-dependent variable. It appears that natives exhibit the most negative attitudes toward the issue compared to residents with a migrant history. Almost half of natives agreed that the immigrants will become a general threat to a society. Natives were followed by second-generation immigrants; about 42% of them were concerned about a general threat related to immigrants. First-generation immigrants adopted the least negative attitudes toward a general threat. Among them, about 27% reported that immigrants in the future may endanger a society.

As the main interest of this paper is the effect of gender, we focused on gender differences in relation to the perception of a general threat. The presented figures suggest that in the case of residents with a migratory background, women tended to perceive immigration as a general treat slightly more often than their male counterparts. Among natives, it was men who were more often concerned about this issue than women. However, the outcomes of an additional test (Chi

---

[1] To test whether the missing cases somehow influenced the results, we ran a set of models in which we kept the missing values. The results did not differ significantly from those obtained from the models excluding the missing cases.

Square test) [2] revealed that at a bivariate level, there are no significant gender differences in the perception of a general threat. This held true for all three groups of residents.

Table 2 General Threat by Gender and Migratory Background, per cent (N=1516)

		In the future, the proportion of immigrants will become a threat to society		
		Disagree	*Agree*	*Total*
Native	Male	48.8	51.2	100.0
	Female	53.3	46.7	100.0
	Total	50.9	49.1	100.0
First-generation immigrants	Male	73.7	26.3	100.0
	Female	70.8	29.2	100.0
	Total	72.3	27.7	100.0
Second-generation immigrants	Male	60.5	39.5	100.0
	Female	55.2	44.8	100.0
	Total	57.7	42.3	100.0

Notes: 52 cases missing on general threat variable
Natives: Chi Square = 1.421, p>0.05; first generation: Chi Square= 0.601, p>0.05; second generation: Chi Square = 1.206, p>0.05
Source: EVS, 2008

Specific Threats - Key Explanatory Variables

The key independent variable which's effect on the dependent variable will be of particular interest to us are those measuring attitudes toward particular threats related to immigrants. The formulations of the questions clearly show that we deal with group threats (question refer to a host country and its institutions) and not individual ones:

- Immigrants take jobs away from natives in a country (10-point scale) – job threat

- A country's cultural life is undermined by immigrants (10-point scale) – cultural threat

- Immigrants make crime problems worse (10-point scale) – crime threat

---
[2] Results of the test are not presented here and can be obtained upon request.

-        Immigrants are a strain on a country's welfare system (10-point scale) – welfare system threat

-        For the greater good of society is better if immigrants maintain their distinct customs and traditions. (10-point scale) – symbolic threat

-        Today in Luxembourg, there are too many immigrants (5-point scale) – out-group size threat

Table 3 Key Independent Variables – Mean Values depending on Gender and Migratory Background

		Natives		First generation		Second generation	
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Jobs	Male	5.00	3.02	3.70	2.84	4.38*	2.63
	Female	4.84	2.82	3.54	2.73	5.21*	3.06
Culture	Male	4.81*	3.03	3.81	2.91	4.42	2.72
	Female	4.20*	2.86	3.69	2.92	4.55	2.79
Crime	Male	6.57	2.65	4.99	2.88	6.48	2.68
	Female	6.77	2.51	5.24	2.94	6.41	2.68
Welfare system	Male	6.26	2.75	4.68	2.86	6.02	2.88
	Female	6.55	2.53	5.06	2.96	6.13	2.80
Customs and traditions	Male	6.39	2.83	6.29*	2.65*	6.17	2.78
	Female	6.51	2.66	5.82*	2.71*	6.10	2.58
Out-group size	Male	3.25*	1.33	2.88*	1.30*	3.17*	1.21
	Female	3.44*	1.16	3.10*	1.37	3.47*	1.30

Notes: * gender difference p<0.05, results of independent sample t-test
Source: EVS 2008

The table above reveals that all three groups of residents were most concerned by the crime threat, the fact that immigrants maintain their distinct customs and traditions, that immigrants are a strain on the welfare system, and that there are too many immigrants in Luxembourg. If we go item by item, we can see that competition in the labour market is the most negatively perceived problem by second-generation females followed by male natives. With respect to cultural threats, the most concerned were male natives, followed by second-generation female immigrants. Crime, the welfare system, and symbolic threats were most negatively seen

by native women followed by native men. The out-group size threat appears to be the most pronounced among female natives and second-generation female immigrants.

Focusing on gender differences in the mean scores for each group of residents separately, we observe that among natives the gender gap is statistically significant in cases of cultural and out-group size threats. Concretely, men tended to adopt a more anti-immigrant stance with respect to a cultural threat while women felt more endangered by the number of immigrants in Luxembourg. First-generation immigrant women and men differed in their attitudes toward the maintenance of customs and traditions and the number of immigrants. Among these residents, women were more concerned by the out-group size threat while men felt more endangered by immigrants' customs and traditions. Among second-generation immigrants, it was women who adapted a significantly more negative stance than their male counterparts regarding problems related to competition for available jobs and the size of the immigrant group in the country.

Table 4 Association between General Threat and Specific Threat Variables, Spearman Correlation Coefficients

	Natives		First-generation		Second-generation	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Jobs	0.467***	0.309***	0.193***	0.307***	0.293***	0.507***
Culture	0.415***	0.223***	0.328***	0.454***	0.364***	0.193*
Crime	0.540***	0.538***	0.436***	0.506***	0.485***	0.405***
Welfare system	0.573***	0.572***	0.417***	0.527***	0.355***	0.510***
Customs and traditions	0.195***	0.250***	0.094	0.017	0.167	0.027
Out-group size	0.502***	0.466***	0.450***	0.362***	0.558***	0.541***

Notes: * $p<0.05$;** $p<0.01$;*** $p<0.001$.
Source: EVS, 2008

Table 4 presents Spearman correlation coefficients regarding relationships between the general threat variable and each of the specific threats depending on respondent's gender and migratory background. Roughly speaking, the data suggest that the strongest association exists between the general threat and crime, out-group size threat, and the welfare system threat. Looking at the difference in the strength of associations between men and women, we observe that the most notable gender gaps can be found between general threat and jobs and cultural threats since the difference in the magnitude of the correlation coefficients between men and

women exceeds value 0.1. More precisely, second-generation immigrant women associated labor market threats with the general threat more strongly than their male counterparts (gender gap in the magnitude of correlation coefficients = 0.214). Similarly, even though it is weaker, there is a tendency among first-generation immigrants (gender gap = 0.114). This seems to corroborate our hypothesis 2 a., which states that first-generation women will find the job-related threat more important. Among natives, it was men who were more concerned by the labor-market-related consequences of migration (gender gap = 0.158). Regarding the associations between cultural and general threats, we observe that the gender gap is the largest among natives. Native males linked the general threat with culture more often than females (gender gap = 0.192). A similar phenomena can be observed among second-generation immigrants (gender gap = 0.171). The inverse relationship between cultural and the general threat was identified among first-generation immigrants. In this group of residents, women related the general threat with the cultural consequences of immigration more strongly than men. However, the findings presented above should be interpreted with caution as they were obtained only at the bivariate level.

Control Variables

While estimating the effect of specific threats for men and women and residents with different migratory backgrounds, we controlled for other important determinants of anti-immigrant attitudes elaborated in the literature.

Age is an important predictor of attitudes toward immigrants. Older individuals tend to be less likely to report pro-immigrant attitudes than their younger counterparts (Thomas J. Espenshade and Katherine Hempstead 1996; Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006). The presence of children under the age of 15 in a household has a positive effect on attitudes toward immigrants (Gang, Rivera-Batiz, and Yun 2002). Semyonov et al. stated that, in general, socially and economically vulnerable people are more threatened by the presence of migrants and more likely to adopt more discriminatory and exclusionary attitudes toward newcomers. Those who face more direct competition from immigrants in the labour market tend to have a more negative attitude toward them (Gang, Rivera-Batiz, and Yun 2002). With respect to human capital, numerous studies) have confirmed that less-educated individuals are more likely to have negative attitudes toward immigrants (Justin Allen Berg 2009; Dustmann and Preston, 2000; Nikolaj

Malchow-Møller, Jakob Roland Munch, Sanne Schroll, and Jan Rose Skaksen 2006; Mayda, 2004; Kevin O'Rourke and Richard Sinnott 2006). Usually, people with less schooling have low-skilled jobs, which put them in a generally more vulnerable job market position. This makes them more likely to adopt a negative point of view toward immigrants (Dustmann and Preston 2000; Malchow-Møller, Munch, Schroll, and Skaksen 2006). Wealthier individuals have a more positive attitude toward immigrants (Sanoussi Bilal, Jean-Marie Grethner, and Jaime de Melo 2001; Carroll Doherty 2006). Retired people show a negative attitude toward immigrants (Dustmann and Preston 2000; Gang, Rivera-Batiz, and Yun 2002; Mikael Hjerm 2007; Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006).

Another set of controls is related to the level of integration in the host country. Juan Díez Medrano (2005), Noah Lewin-Epstein and Asaf Levanon (2005), and Xavier Escandell and Alin Ceobanu (2009) found that the stronger the identification, attachment, or sense of belonging to a country by a respondent (the stronger the "us" feeling in a national sense), the more negative his or her perceptions of newcomers. According to Marcel Coenders and Peer Scheepers (2008), people belonging to Protestant and Catholic denominations in Germany showed more resistance to social integration of immigrants than non-religious people. Jeffrey C. Dixon (2006) pointed out that frequent close interactions between natives and foreigners may yield positive intergroup sentiments. The theory suggests that natives with greater exposure to foreign groups adopt less stereotypical stances than their counterparts who live in an ethnically homogenous environment. The most powerful and influential contacts in value and attitude formation are core networks, i.e., contacts with people who have emotionally close ties with the individual (Peter V. Marsden 1987).

Given the above arguments, we used the following controls:

- Socio-demographic factors: age, presence of children, composition of household, education religion

- Economic predictors: labour market status, experience with unemployment during the last five years, dependence on social security during the last five years, categorized net household income[3]

---

[3] Original 14 categories were regrouped into 5 income categories. Since the number of missing on this question was rather high (18%), they were included in a 6th separate category, similar to that used by Coenders and Cheepers

-        Integration variables: intensity of contacts with native-born[4] and foreign residents,[5] proficiency in Luxembourgish language,[6] origins of spouse/partner,[7] attachment to the country.[8]

Descriptive analyses of control variables are available in the appendix, but here we provide a very broad overview of differences between men and women. We found that among natives, men had more contacts with foreigners than women. Women more often stay at home (as housewives) and are less active in the labour market than men. Men in general are higher educated: more of them have postsecondary degree. First-generation women have better proficiency in Luxembourgish language than men. They reported more frequent contacts with Luxembourgers. Women were more likely to be housewives (similar to others) and also were less likely to be active in the labour market. Women were more likely to benefit from social security during the past 5 years. These women more frequently had a secondary-education while more men had a post-secondary education. The second-generation men had more frequent friendship contacts with other foreigners than women. Women were more likely to be housewives and more likely to be retired than men. Women were more likely to have a lower-secondary education, and men were more likely to have a post-secondary education.

(2008). Income categories: 1 = less than 1500 Euro, 2 = 1500-2500 Euro, 3 = 2500-4000 Euro, 4 = 4000-6250 Euro, 5 = 6250 and more, 6 = missing

[4] Among your friends, how many have contact with Luxembourgers? Responses: 1 = much, 2 = to a certain extent, 3 = not so much, 4 = not at all.

[5] Among your friends, how many have contact with foreign nationals (Portuguese, French, Germans, Belgians, Italians)? Responses: 1 = much, 2 = to a certain extent, 3 = not so much, 4 = not at all. A composite variable of friendship contacts with foreigners was constructed by calculating the average of five independent items concerning each nationality (Portuguese, French, Germans, Belgians, Italians). This average represents intensity of friendship contacts with the most frequent immigrant groups in Luxembourg. The lower the value, the more intense contacts.

[6] Do you have difficulties speaking and understanding Luxembourgish? 1 = No difficulty at all, 2 = some difficulty, 3 = much difficulty, 4 = no knowledge

[7] Was your partner/spouse born in Luxembourg? 1=yes, 2=no, 3= other (no answer or no spouse)

[8] How do you feel regarding Luxembourg? Responses: 1 = I feel as though I don't belong in the country; 10 = I feel as though I belong in the country.

Analyses

Perceived General Threat Separately by Gender

In the first logistic regression models, we examined whether migratory backgrounds moderate the effect of specific threats on the dependent variable. As the main aim of the paper was to examine the differences between men and women with respect to the main drivers behind a perception of a general threat, we ran regression models separately for female and male Luxembourg residents. Models included all control variables, variables for specific threats, and migratory backgrounds. In a follow-up step, we added to the previous one the interaction effects between each specific threat variable and migratory background. The existence of significant interactions indicates that a migrant background moderates the effect of a concern about a specific threat on the general threat, which means that it is plausible to analyze gender differences related to specific motives leading to general anti-immigrant attitudes separately for natives and first- and second-generation immigrants.

Women

The results presented in Model 1 of Table 5 suggest that when controlling for all selected socio-economic and integration variables, women perceive the following issues as main drivers behind the general threat: crime, social system and out-group size. The odds ratios reveal that residents who agree most strongly with the statements that immigrants contribute to crime, endanger the social system of a country, and that there are too many immigrants in Luxembourg have higher odds of perceiving immigrants as a general threat. It is also apparent that in the subsample of women, migration background does not have a direct effect on their perception of a general threat.

Looking more closely at the interactions (Model 2), we confirmed our assumptions that the effect of some specific threats is moderated by migratory background. In concrete terms, they were: job, cultural, and out-group size threats. The magnitude of odds ratios for interaction terms suggested that, regarding job and out-group size, threats' multiplicative factors are higher for second-generation female immigrants than for native women, which indicates that the feeling that immigrants pose a general threat is more strongly driven by these two factors for the first group than for native women. It also appears that, compared to native women, first-generation female

immigrants see a cultural threat as a more important determinant of a general threat. On the contrary, among the second-generation female immigrants, this factor played a less important role in the probability that they would feel generally threatened by newcomers.

Table 5 Binary Logistic Regression: The Effect of Specific Threats by Migratory Background, Women

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Log. (relative odds)		*Odds ratio*	*Log. (relative odds)*		*Odds ratio*
	Coeff. (B)	*Std. error of B*	*OR [Exp(B)]*	*Coeff. (B)*	*Std. error of B*	*OR [Exp(B)]*
Native						
First generation	.129	.410	1.138	-.417	1.720	.659
Second generation	.053	.341	1.055	.539	1.986	1.714
Job	.064	.053	1.066	-.029	.078	.972
Culture	.079	.050	1.082	.035	.069	1.035
Crime	.278	.061	1.321***	.303	.091	1.354***
Welfare system	.476	.065	1.610***	.587	.110	1.798***
Customs, traditions	.017	.049	1.017	.094	.068	1.099
Out-group size	.381	.121	1.463**	.342	.196	1.408
Job by native						
Job by first generation				.061	.130	1.063
Job by second generation				.522	.171	1.686**
Culture by native						
Culture by first generation				.315	.119	1.370**
Culture by second generation.				-.350	.165	.705*
Crime by native						
Crime by first generation				.076	.154	1.079
Crime by second generation				-.301	.174	.740
Welfare system by native						
Welfare system by first generation				-.092	.174	.912
Welfare system by second generation				-.163	.179	.850
Symbolic by native						
Symbolic by first generation				-.152	.127	.859
Symbolic by second generation				-.262	.166	.769
Out-group size by native						
Out-group size by first generation				-.096	.282	.908
Out-group size by second generation				.826	.393	2.284*
Constant	-7.987	1.651	.000	-8.396	1.886	.000
-2 Log likelihood	490.941			448.286		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.443			0.478		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.598			0.646		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, sig.	0.011			0.083		

Notes: $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$; *** $p<0.001$.
N= 644.
Control variables included in the models but not presented in the table.
Source: EVS, 2008.

Men

As occurred in the case of women, men's perception of a general threat is significantly affected by attitudes toward the following threats: crime, welfare system, and out-group size (see Model 1 Table 6). Contrary to women, among men, the cultural variable was a significant predictor of a perceived general threat. With respect to the moderating effect of a migratory background, the data revealed that a migratory background intervened in the effect of the welfare system and out-group size threats. The odds ratios for the interaction terms presented in Model 2 show that with respect to the welfare system threat multiplicative factor for second-generation male immigrants is about 65% of that expressed by native males. This means that the welfare system threat is less important for the second- generation males compared to their native counterparts. It also became apparent that with respect to the out-group threat, second-generation immigrants exhibited a significantly higher multiplicative factor than natives, which implies that perception of a general threat among second-generation migrant men is driven significantly more strongly by this motive than occurs among native men.

Table 6   Binary Logistic Regression: The Effect of Specific Threat by Migratory Background, Men

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio	Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio
	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]
Native						
First generation	-.198	.382	.820	-2.049	1.646	.129
Second generation	-.450	.330	.637	-.280	1.691	.756
Job	.055	.046	1.057	.083	.068	1.087
Culture	.103	.044	1.108*	.123	.065	1.131*
Crime	.257	.057	1.293***	.238	.095	1.268*
Welfare system	.281	.054	1.325***	.393	.090	1.482***
Customs, traditions	.032	.043	1.032	.041	.061	1.042
Out-group size	.822	.116	2.275***	.543	.161	1.722**
Job by native						
Job by first generation				-.075	.100	.928
Job by second generation				-.032	.140	.968
Culture by native						
Culture by first generation				-.059	.109	.942
Culture by second generation.				.022	.136	1.022
Crime by native						
Crime by first generation				.089	.130	1.093
Crime by second generation				.089	.171	1.093
Welfare system by native						
Welfare system by first generation				.011	.131	1.011
Welfare system by second generation				-.437	.155	.646**
Symbolic by native						
Symbolic by first generation				-.054	.109	.947
Symbolic by second generation				.094	.118	1.098
Out-group size by native						
Out-group size by first generation				.766	.272	2.151**
Out-group size by second generation				.441	.340	1.554
Constant	-9.039	1.539	.000	-8.877	1.716	.000
-2 Log likelihood	540.303			520.946		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.445			0.460		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.601			0.621		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, sig.	0.226			0.401		

Notes: $* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001$.

N= 709.

Control variables included in the models but not presented in the table.

Source: EVS, 2008.

From the above figures, we deduced that migratory background has an impact on how men and women reason concerning their general anti-immigrant stances. In particular, we observed that for both sexes, it is the second-generation immigrants who differ from natives with respect to drivers behind a perceived general threat. Thus, in further analyses, we treated different groups of residents separately.

Gender and Perceived General Threat Depending on Migratory Background

We split the original sample depending on migratory background and examined whether men and women have different reasons for perceiving immigrants as a general threat separating natives and first- and second-generation immigrants. In other words, we analyzed whether the effects of specific aspects of immigration on the general threat are moderated by gender. This was done by estimating models, including interactions between each specific threat variable and gender. A significant interaction term indicates that there is a generalized gender difference in the effect of concerns about a specific threat on one's general anti-immigrant attitude.

Natives

The outcomes of the logistic regression model before introducing interaction terms showed that gender does not affect the perception of a general threat at a statistically significant level. The odds of men feeling that society can be endangered by the proportion of immigrants were not significantly higher than women having those feelings.

With respect to specific threats, natives' perceptions of a general threat were driven by the following factors: crime, welfare system, symbolic, and out-group size problems. Job and cultural threat did not affect whether natives felt generally threatened by immigrants. The fact that there was no job threat could be explained by the particular position of natives in the labour market (a great proportion of them work in steady jobs in the public sector, and unemployment rates among natives are lower than those of foreigners residing in the country). The insignificant effect of a cultural threat can be interpreted by looking at the multicultural and multilingual history of this small country that has a long- lasting experience with migration inflows and an economically and culturally driven need for openness.

Focusing on results related to interaction terms, the data revealed that there is no significant interaction between gender and specific threats. This means that native males do not differ significantly from their female counterparts with respect to the effects of these variables. Thus, it can be concluded that there were no gender differences among the native population regarding threat-related determinants of a perceived general threat caused by immigrants. However, we should keep in mind that natives adopt a stronger anti-immigrant stance compared to residents with migratory backgrounds (see Tables 2 and 3).

Table 7 Binary Logistic Regression: the Effect of Specific Threats by Gender, Natives

| | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | |
| | Log. (relative odds) | | Odds ratio | Log. (relative odds) | | Odds ratio |
	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]
Female	-.140	.274	.870	-.564	1.337	.569
Job	.023	.052	1.023	.045	.069	1.046
Culture	.079	.048	1.082	.151	.068	1.163*
Crime	.290	.069	1.336***	.262	.099	1.300**
Welfare system	.499	.074	1.647***	.433	.096	1.542***
Customs, traditions	.100	.047	1.105*	.097	.064	1.102
Out-group size	.461	.126	1.585***	.488	.166	1.629**
Job by sex				-.025	.109	.975
Culture by sex				-.154	.101	.857
Crime by sex				.040	.139	1.041
Welfare system by sex				.174	.150	1.190
Customs, traditions by sex				-.007	.095	.993
Out-group size by sex				-.047	.256	.954
Constant	-11.981	3.621	.000	-11.465	3.547	.000
-2 Log likelihood	489.037			484.272		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.469			0.473		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.625			0.630		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, sig.	0.045			0.100		

Notes: * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$; *** $p<0.001$.
N=649.
Control variables included in the models but not presented in the table.
Source: EVS, 2008.

First Generation Immigrants

The picture changes when we focus on first-generation immigrants. Among them, we observed that gender has a significant effect on the perception of a general threat. While controlling for all control variables and key independent variables, first-generation migrant women had lower (0.40) odds of perceiving immigrants as a future threat for a society than their male counterparts. With respect to the effect of specific threats, the perception of a general threat among first-generation migrants is affected by cultural, crime, welfare system, and out-group size. The factors that did not influence general anti-immigrant stances in this group of residents were job and symbolic threats. This implies that among foreign-born residents, job competition and customs and traditions of immigrants do not contribute to the feeling that immigrants represent a danger to a host society. This might seem to contradict some of the premises of the threat theory, which claims that individuals in similar positions will oppose the inflow of immigrants. One of the possible explanations for this finding might be a relatively high demand for labourers in Luxembourg which means there are relatively low unemployment rates, especially for the male population, including foreigners residing in Luxembourg. As first-generation immigrants are still linked in one way or another to their home country, the role of original customs and traditions might be still rather important for them. Thus, they see them as rather natural and consider it necessary to keep them, and they do not consider them as harmful to the host society.

With respect to interactions, a significant difference between men and women was found only in the case of the effect of cultural and out-group size threats. The odds ratios in Model 2 of the table below indicate that the multiplicative factor for women is higher than for men when considering a cultural threat and lower for out-group size attitudes. This suggests that women's general anti-immigrant sentiments are more strongly driven by cultural threats than those of men while men's general anti-immigrant attitudes are less affected by the out-group size threat. With respect to the effect of the remaining specific threats, no gender differences were identified at statistically significant levels.

Table 8 Binary Logistic Regression: The Effects of Specific Threats by Gender, First-Generation Immigrants

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio	Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio
	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]
Female	-.931	.380	.394*	-.110	1.922	.896
Job	-.014	.059	.986	-.017	.081	.983
Culture	.203	.062	1.225***	.034	.092	1.034
Crime	.337	.069	1.401***	.347	.091	1.414***
Welfare system	.360	.072	1.433***	.413	.104	1.511***
Customs, traditions	-.060	.065	.942	-.068	.094	.934
Out-group size	.764	.153	2.147***	1.271	.235	3.565***
Job by sex				.063	.134	1.065
Culture by sex				.340	.133	1.406**
Crime by sex				.028	.153	1.028
Welfare system by sex				.081	.168	1.084
Customs, traditions by sex				-.013	.143	.987
Out-group size by sex				-1.001	.300	.368***
Constant	-11.785	2.261	.000	-12.89	2.665	.000
-2 Log likelihood	298.178			274.701		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.416			0.444		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.607			0.648		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, sig.	0.398			0.865		

Notes: $*p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001$.

N= 482.

Control variables included in the models but not presented in the table.

Source: EVS, 2008.

Second-Generation Immigrants

When controlling for all other factors, gender appears to be a significant predictor of a perceived general threat among second-generation immigrants. As in the case of first-generation immigrant women, they have lower odds of considering immigrants as general future threats to a society (odds ratio = 0.20).

Regarding the effect of specific threats, we observed that an anti-immigrant general stance among second-generation immigrants was mainly due to a welfare system threat and out-group size problems. Other specific threats do not have a statistically significant effect on the general threat variable. This can be explained by the rather small sample size for this subgroup of Luxembourg residents. Nevertheless, the magnitude of odds ratios for these variables were very close to 1, which means that the odds of perceiving immigrants as a general threat do not increase much with an increase of 1-unit of these specific threats, maybe, with the exception of the job threat. Focusing on how gender moderates the effects of specific threats, the odds ratios of interaction terms revealed that a perceived general threat among women is driven more strongly by job and welfare system threats than among second-generation immigrant men. On the contrary, men exhibited higher multiplicative factors for cultural and symbolic variables. These findings suggest that second-generation women are more concerned than their male counterparts about the labour market and welfare system aspects of immigration while men's general perception of immigrants is driven more strongly by symbolic threats. A possible explanation for these results can be found by examining the composition of the second-generation immigrants. EVS data showed that the second-generation women exhibited lower educational attainment not only when compared to the second-generation men but also in comparison to the native and first-generation female sub-population. These women also stayed at home as housewives more often compared to other women, which would also mean that they have less contacts with foreigners. This finding is in line with previous empirical evidence that low education and rare contacts will shape the attitudes in a more negative manner. However, a more detailed analysis should be conducted in further research.

Table 9 BinaryLogistic Regression: The Effect of Specific Threats by Gender, Second-Generation Immigrants

	Model 1 Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio	Model 2 Log. (relative odds)		Odds ratio
	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]	Coeff. (B)	Std. error of B.	OR [Exp(B)]
Female	-1.631	.762	.196*	1.872	3.409	6.502
Job	.229	.139	1.257	-.028	.194	.972
Culture	.058	.129	1.059	.348	.207	1.416
Crime	.092	.135	1.097	.513	.284	1.669
Welfare system	.603	.161	1.827***	.256	.262	1.292
Customs, traditions	-.048	.126	.953	.279	.215	1.322
Out-group size	1.092	.313	2.982***	1.476	.547	4.373**
Job by sex				.683	.303	1.980*
Culture by sex				-.741	.314	.477*
Crime by sex				-.545	.376	.580
Welfare system by sex				.579	.339	1.783*
Customs, traditions by sex				-.816	.346	.442*
Out-group size by sex				.343	.853	1.409
Constant	-1.263	3.848	.283	-2.720	4.825	.066
-2 Log likelihood	116.075			95.671		
Cox & Snell R Square	0.569			0.607		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.763			0.814		
Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, sig.	0.827			0.000		

*Notes: *p<0.05;** p<0.01; ***p<0.001*
N= 220.
Control variables included in the models but not presented in the table.
Source: EVS, 2008.

Conclusions

The main aims of the present paper were to analyze the gender differences in perceiving immigration as a threat to the host society. In particular, we were interested in the effect of specific immigration-related threats on the perception of a general threat. We also included respondents with a migratory background, in contrast to all the studies focusing exclusively on native populations. We argued that men's and women's threat perception will differ depending on their migratory backgrounds. As nearly half of the Luxembourg residents have a migrant history, the gender effects were analyzed separately for three groups of residents: natives and first- and second-generation immigrants.

It appears that all men and women, including those with or without a migrant history, are concerned about the effect of immigration on the level of crime and social assistance dependency. A growing proportion of the foreign-born in Luxembourg is an additional reason to feel more concerned, especially among the male population. When looking at three groups in absolute terms, we found that natives are more concerned about a general threat that immigrants may pose to a society. They were followed by the second- and first-generation immigrants, respectively. These findings fell into the expected framework: while the overall economic condition of the country is favourable, the concerns over immigration drift away from concerns over job competition and towards societal concerns, such as security and potential exploitation of the state's monetary support.

The outcomes of our first binary logistic regression analyses with men and women being studied separately revealed that men expressed more similar views on why immigration is a threat. There were only two differences among them. The first-generation immigrant men were more concerned than natives about the proportion of foreigners in Luxembourg, a finding that we can link to a perceived threat of job competition. And the second-generation men are less concerned about welfare system misuse by foreigners than the natives. Women, on the other hand, showed more differences. The second-generation women, compared to native-born women, saw a greater threat for the society from the growing number of immigrants and competition in the labour market, but they were less concerned about immigration threatening the culture of Luxembourg. The first-generation women were more often concerned about a cultural threat coming from immigration than the respective native group. This finding is not altogether

surprising – the reflections provided by all respondents referred not to an individual threat but to a societal threat.

To sum up, foreign and native female and male populations are not altogether homogenous groups in terms of their demographic and socio-economic composition, and this was the main reason we looked at them differently. Our results confirmed that the perception of a threat is not similarly expressed and we suggest that these differences be studied in more detail.

In the second set of logistic regression analyses, we looked at gender differences according to immigration status. For the native population, we found no statistically significant differences between men and women. This indicates that the effects of attitudes toward specific threats on a general perceived threat do not vary notably between men and women.

The comparison of immigrant groups revealed more varied results. For instance, first-generation female respondents stressed the importance of a cultural threat, while for male respondents of the same group, it was the growing number of immigrants that drove their perception of immigration as a threat for Luxembourg. The EVS data revealed that among second-generation immigrant women, the labour market and welfare state aspects were more significant than they were for their male counterparts while the perceived general threat among men in this group was motivated by symbolic and cultural threats.

Table 10 Summary of Empirical Findings

		Job	Culture	Crime	Welfare	Customs	Out-group
	Within-gender						
Women	All			+++	+++		++
	1st generation vs. native		++				
	2nd generation vs. native	++	-				++
Men	All		+	+++	+++		+++
	1st generation vs. native						++
	2nd generation vs. native				--		
	Between-gender						
Women vs. men	Native						
	1st generation		++				---
	2nd generation	+	-		+	-	

Up until now, the empirical analysis has largely dealt with the issue of attitudes of those in the native population towards immigrants. Different theoretical approaches have been applied to this question. Ethnic group conflict theory, labour market competition, out-group size, and contact theory are some of the theoretical frameworks that were used in an attempt to explain the existing sentiments towards immigrants. Application of these theories brought up very interesting empirical findings that men and women do not perceive immigrant and related threats in a similar way. While this finding was repeatedly reported in various studies, the question about what drives these differences between men and women remained untouched. In our work, we attempted to show where and how men and women differed in their views. We believe that it would be promising to further extend assumptions of existing theories to explain gender differences. For instance, we observed that the second-generation females thought that the threat to a society lies in the growing number of foreigners, and we suggested that perhaps a contact theory can explain this finding. A very large proportion of these women are housewives, which means they have much less contact with foreigners compared to people in other groups. This and other observations can be explained on an individual basis, but a systematic theoretical study of what drives gender differences is crucial. The presented results refer to a very specific situation in Luxembourg and suggest a further line of enquiry. Further comparative studies are also needed to test the robustness of theoretical assumptions and empirical findings on existing gender differences.

References

Allport, G. W. 1954. *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday.

Berg, J. A. 2009. "Core networks and white's attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(1), 7-31.

Bilal, S., Grether, J. M., & de Melo, J. 2001. *Attitudes toward immigration: A trade-theoretic approach*. CEPR Workshop on Globalization, Regional Integration and Development. Venice, Italy.

Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York:

John Wiley & Sons.

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." Pacific

Sociological Review 1:3–7.

Bridges, S., & Mateut, S. 2009. "Attitudes towards immigration in Europe." Sheffield, Department of Economics, University of Sheffield, *Sheffield Economic Research Paper Series*, 2009008.

Castles, S., & Miller, M. 2009. *The age of migration. International population movements in the modern world.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Citrin, J., Green, D. P., Muste, C., and Wong, C. 1997. "Public opinion toward immigration reform: The role of economic motivation." *The Journal of Politics*, 59(3), 858-881.

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. 2008. "Changes in resistance to the social integration of foreigners in Germany 1980-2000: Individual and contextual determinants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(1), 1-26.

Díez Medrano, J. 2005. "Nation, citizenship and immigration in contemporary Spain." In UNESCO: National identity and attitudes toward migrants. Findings from the ISSP. *International Journal in Multicultural Societies*, 7(2).

Dixon, J. C. 2006. "The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact prejudice." *Social Forces*, 84, 2179-2204.

Doherty, C. 2006. *Attitudes toward immigration in red and blue.* Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://pewresearch.org/pubs/24/attitudes-toward-immigration-in-red-and-blue (accessed April 2010)

Dustmann, C. , & Preston, I. 2000. "Racial and economic factors in attitudes to immigration." Bonn, Institute for the Study of Labour, *IZA Discussion Paper*, 190.

Escandell, X., & Ceobanu, A. 2009. "Dual national identification and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policies in the pluri-national states of Belgium and Spain." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(1), 44-69.

Espenshade, R. J., & Hempstead, K. 1996). "Contemporary American attitudes toward U.S. immigration." *International Migration Review*, 30, 535-570.

Gang, I., Rivera-Batiz, F., & Yun, M. S. 2002. "Economic strain, ethnic concentration and attitudes toward foreigners in the European Union." *IZA Discussion Paper* 578. Retrieved from http://ftp.iza.org/dp3650.pdf (accessed April 2010)

Hainmueller, J., &Hiscox, M. J. 2007. "Educated preferences: Explaining attitudes toward immigration in Europe." *International Organization*, 61, 399-442.

Hjerm, M. 2007. "Do numbers really count? Group threat theory revisited." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(8), 1253-1275.

Jaccard, J. 2001. *Interaction effects in logistic regression.* London: Sage.

Kucera, M. 2008. The educational attainment of second-generation immigrants in Canada: Analysis based on the General Social Survey. *HRSDC Learning Research Series,* Quebec. MPRA paper no. 14036. Munich: MPRA. Retrieved from http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/14036/ (accessed April 2010)

Lewin-Epstein, N., & Levanon, A. 2005. National identity and xenophobia in an ethically divided society. In UNESCO: National Identity and attitudes toward migrants. Findings from the ISSP. International Journal in Multicultural Societies, 7(2).

Malchow-Moller, N., Munch, J. R., Schroll, S., & Skaksen, J. R. 2006. Attitudes toward immigration—Does economic self interest matter? Centre for Economic and Business Research, Discussion Paper 11.

Marsden, R. V. 1987. Core discussion networks of Americans. American Sociological Review, 52, 122-131.

Mayda, A. M. 2004): Who is against Immigration? A cross-country investigation of individual attitudes toward immigrants. Bonn, Institute for the Study of Labour, IZA Discussion Paper, 1115.

McLaren, L. M. 2003. Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. Social Forces, 81(3), 909-936.

Meuleman, B. 2009. The influence of macro-sociological factors on attitudes toward immigration in Europe. A cross-cultural and contextual approach. Doctoral thesis). Catholic University of Leuven.

Meuleman, B., Davidov, E., & Billiet, J. 2009. Changing attitudes toward immigration in Europe, 2002-2007: A dynamic group conflict theory approach. Social Science Research, 38, 352-265.

OECD. 2008. International migration outlook. Paris: OECD

O'Rourke, K., & Sinnot, R. 2006. The determinants of individual attitudes toward immigration. European Journal of Political Economy, 22(4), 838-861.

Quillian, L. 1995. Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. American Sociological Review, 60, 586-611.

Saltzman Chafetz, J. 2006. Handbook of the sociology of gender. New York: Springer.

Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., & Coenders, M. 2002. Ethnic exclusionism in European countries. Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic threat. European Sociological Review, 18(1), 17-34.

Schneider, S. L. 2007. Anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe: Outgroup zize and perceived ethnic threat. European Sociological Review, 24(1), 53-67.

Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., & Gorodziesky, A. 2006. The rise of anti-foreigner sentiment in European societies, 1988-2000. American Sociological Review, 71(3), 426-449.

Sesopi 2007. Chiffres-clés sur la population du Luxembourg. [Population of Luxembourg : key figures]. Luxembourg: SESOPI Centre Intercommunautaire.

Simon, P. 2005. Une "question de la seconde génération" en France? Le rôle de l'école dans la formation d'une identité minoritaire. [A question of the second-generation in France. The role of school in formation of a minoritarian identity]. Retrieved from http://seminaire.samizdat.net/UNE-QUESTION-DE-LA-SECONDE,129.html (accessed April 2010)

STATEC 2009. Luxembourg in figures. Luxembourg: STATEC.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. 1999. Prejudice toward immigrants. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29(11), 2221–2237.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. 1998. Prejudice towards immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. Journal of Cross-

Cultural Psychology, 29, 559–576.

Zhou, M. 1997. Growing up American: The challenge confronting immigrant children and children of immigrants. American Review of Sociology, 23, 63-95.

Appendix

Table11 Descriptive statistics for Control Variables, Pooled Sample (N=1568)

	N	Missing	Mean	Std.Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Age	1568	0	46.1522	16.17534	18.00	88.00
Friendship contacts with foreigners	1559	9	2.6143	.65842	1.00	4.00
Friendship contacts with Luxembourg residents	1567	0	1.43	.782	1	4
Attachment to the country	1559	9	8.06	2.496	1	10
Proficiency in Luxembourg language	1568	0	1.6023	1.00635	1.00	4.00
Job	1541	26	4.4254	2.93332	1.00	10.00
Culture	1546	22	4.2330	2.93303	1.00	10.00
Crime	1537	31	6.0536	2.81579	1.00	10.00
Welfare system	1517	51	5.7786	2.86764	1.00	10.00
Customs, traditions	1540	28	6.25	2.718	1	10
Out-group size	1510	58	3.2093	1.29898	1.00	5.00

Source: EVS, 2008

Table 12 Descriptive statistics for control variables, pooled sample, 1568

Variables	Percentage of sample
Migratory background	
Native	46.0
First generation	37.4
Second generation	16.6
Sex	
Men	51.0
Women	49.0
Children	29.5
No	70.5
Yes	
Composition of household	
One-person household	12.9
Couple without children	26.3
Couple with children	42.4
Single-parent household	4.1
Other	14.2
Education	
Primary	24.5
Lower secondary	14.0
Higher secondary	34.4
Postsecondary	27.1
Labour market status	
Active: independent	26.2
Active: private employee	5.6
Active: civil servant	9.6
Active: worker	18.5
Active: unemployed	2.7
Retired	18.7
Housewife	12.8
Student	5.9
Unemployed longer than 3 months during the last five years	
Unemployed longer than 3 months during the last five years	
Yes	10.7
No	88.2
Dependent on social security during the last five years	
Yes	5.9

Variables	Percentage of sample
Migratory background	
Native	46.0
First generation	37.4
Second generation	16.6
Sex	
Men	51.0
Women	49.0
Children	29.5
No	70.5
Yes	
Composition of household	
One-person household	12.9
Couple without children	26.3
Couple with children	42.4
Single-parent household	4.1
No	93.7
Missing	0.4
Origins of spouse/partner	
Born in Luxembourg	40.7
born outside Luxembourg	29.6
No spouse	29.7
Income	
less than 1500	4.4
1500-2500	13.6
2500-4000	27.2
4000-6250	23.2
6250 and more	136
Other: missing	18.0

Source: EVS, 2008

CEPS
INSTEAD