

**On Fragile Grounds:  
A replication of "Are Muslim immigrants different in  
terms of cultural integration?"**

Mahmood Arai, Jonas Karlsson and Michael Lundholm

December 19, 2008

# Introduction

## Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

- ✓ This study is a replication of “Are Muslim Immigrants Different in terms of Cultural Integration?” by Alberto Bisin, Eleonora Patacchini, Thierry Verdier and Yves Zenou, published in Journal of European Economic Association, 6, 445-456, 2008.

# Their claims

Introduction

**Their claims**

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

In the abstract of their paper they write:

“... Muslims integrate less and more slowly than non-Muslims. ... We also find no evidence that segregated neighbourhoods breed intense religious and cultural identities for ethnic minorities, especially for Muslims.”

“... On the contrary, ... intense identities in our data are more prominent in relatively mixed neighbourhoods.” (p. 446)

# Our concerns

Introduction

**Their claims**

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important  
variables

Attitude towards  
inter-marriage

Importance of racial  
composition in  
schools

Conclusions

2. The measures of cultural values capture ethnic and religious attributes in different degrees for different groups.

# Our results

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important  
variables

Attitude towards  
inter-marriage

Importance of racial  
composition in  
schools

Conclusions

- ✓ In their paper the number of observations is 5963 which is 314 percent of the number of observations in the relevant sample of the original data (1901).
- ✓ Implementing their variable definitions we loose 57 percent of the original sample and have only 818 observations.
- ✓ Using the remaining sample and running their specifications, we find no results that support their claims.

# What we wanted to do, what we did and what we didn't

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

✓ We wanted to:

✗ replicate their study,

✗ check the robustness of their results

✓ What we do

✗ document the replication and report and comment results using their variable definitions etc

✓ What we didn't do:

✗ almost no sensitivity checking

# Data

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important  
variables

Attitude towards  
inter-marriage

Importance of racial  
composition in  
schools

Conclusions

- ✓ Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities 1993-1994
- ✓ UK Data Archive (UKDA) via Athens.

# Sample

```
> t(table(FNSEM$ethnic,exclude=c()))
```

```
      white caribbean indian african asian pakistani bangladeshi chinese <NA>
[1,]  2980      1215   1278          733    1190          594    216    1
```

✓ Remove Whites

# Sample (cont.)

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

**Sample**

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

```
> table(FNSEM$s6, exclude=c())
```

-1	1	2	8	9	<NA>
144	6675	1320	27	41	0

✓ Remove non-religious (s6=2)

# Sample (cont.)

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

**Sample**

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

```
> table(FNSEM$a1e, exclude=c())
```

-1	1	2	3	4	5	6	<NA>
144	4800	380	1709	620	378	176	0

✓ Remove singles (a1e=3)

# Sample (cont.)

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

- ✓ One of three possible questionnaires (green (category 1), yellow (category 2) and pink (category 3)) were used.
- ✓ Questions involved in the study are in the green questionnaire.

```
> table(FNSEM$question, exclude=c())
```

```
 -1      1      2      3 <NA>
144 2617 2579 2867      0
```

- ✓ Remove pink and yellow (question=2,3)

# Religious affiliation vs. importance of religion

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important variables

Attitude towards inter-marriage

Importance of racial composition in schools

Conclusions

```
> RowTable(U$s7,U$s9)
```

	1	2	3	4	<NA>	
hindu	0.03	0.06	0.45	0.44	0.01	1
sikh	0.01	0.08	0.41	0.50	0.00	1
muslim	0.01	0.02	0.17	0.79	0.01	1
christian	0.03	0.13	0.32	0.52	0.01	1
buddhist	0.00	0.41	0.35	0.18	0.06	1
confucian	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1
jain	0.00	0.14	0.57	0.29	0.00	1
parsi/zorastrian	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.33	0.00	1
rastafarian	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	1
jewish	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1
other	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	1
na	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
<NA>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1

# Attitude towards inter-marriage

Introduction

Their claims

Our results

What we do

Data

Sample

Two important  
variables

Attitude towards  
inter-marriage

Importance of racial  
composition in  
schools

Conclusions

What you mind very much if ...

```
> RowTable(U$s7,U$Attitude.Towards.Inter.Marriage)
```

	FALSE	TRUE	<NA>	
hindu	0.67	0.23	0.10	1
sikh	0.55	0.34	0.11	1
muslim	0.47	0.39	0.14	1
christian	0.92	0.04	0.04	1
buddhist	0.82	0.18	0.00	1
confucian	1.00	0.00	0.00	1
jain	0.71	0.14	0.14	1
parsi/zorastrian	1.00	0.00	0.00	1
rastafarian	1.00	0.00	0.00	1
jewish	1.00	0.00	0.00	1
other	0.70	0.20	0.10	1
na	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
<NA>	0.75	0.25	0.00	1

# Importance of racial composition in schools

- Introduction
- Their claims
- Our results
- What we do
- Data
- Sample
- Two important variables
- Attitude towards inter-marriage
- Importance of racial composition in schools
- Conclusions

```
> RowTable(U$Religion,  
+          U$Importance.of.Racial.Composition.in.Schools)  
  
          FALSE TRUE <NA>  
muslim      0.85 0.06 0.10 1  
non-muslim  0.93 0.02 0.05 1  
<NA>       0.50 0.25 0.25 1
```

## Appendix: Tables

Table 1: Religious affiliation (absolute (#) and relative (%) numbers), before (columns 1 and 2) and after (columns 3 and 4) removal of NA compared with Bisin et al. (2008) (columns 5 and 6).

Religious affiliation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Before		After		Bisin et al.	
	$n = 1901$		$n = 818$		$n = 5963$	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
hindu	359	18.88	149	18.22		
sikh	288	15.15	86	10.51		
muslim	852	44.82	330	40.34	2369	39.73
christian	357	18.78	232	28.36		
buddhist	17	0.89	9	1.10		
confucian	1	0.05	1	0.12		
jain	7	0.37	3	0.37		
parsi/zorastrian	3	0.16	2	0.24		
rastafarian	2	0.11	1	0.12		
jewish	1	0.05	0	0.00		
other	10	0.53	5	0.61		
na	0	0.00	0	0.00		
NA's	4	0.21	0	0.00		
All non-Muslims	1045	55.09	488	59.66	3594	60.27

NOTE: The row names shows exactly how the original data is coded, so that e.g., 'NA's' are true missing values whereas 'na' is coded as religious affiliation 'na'. On the last line non-Muslims are calculated excluding na and NA.

Table 2: Weighted and Unweighted Means for Muslims and non-Muslims before and after removal of NA compared with Bisin et al. (2008).

	Muslim					Non-Muslim				
	W e i g h t e d		U n w e i g h t e d			W e i g h t e d		U n w e i g h t e d		
	Before	After	Before	After	Bisin et al.	Before	After	Before	After	Bisin et al.
Importance of Religion	0.79	0.81	0.80	0.85	0.79	0.49	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.42
Attitude Towards Inter Marriage	0.45	0.39	0.45	0.39	0.70	0.19	0.15	0.21	0.17	0.37
Importance of Racial Composition in Schools	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.65	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.33
Age at Arrival	22.49	20.73	22.36	20.32	39.18	22.31	17.85	22.83	18.71	42.57
Age	40.42	42.01	40.18	40.56		44.40	43.98	44.90	44.59	
Female	0.50	0.47	0.50	0.45	0.47	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.48
Born in the UK	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.21	0.13	0.18	0.12	0.16	0.28
Arranged Marriage	0.65	0.63	0.65	0.63	0.22	0.27	0.18	0.30	0.22	0.12
Discrimination	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.16	0.17	0.38	0.41	0.35	0.39	0.19
Children	3.12	3.41	3.23	3.43	2.17	2.37	2.32	2.44	2.36	1.68
Years Since Arrival	19.78	19.27	18.99	18.79	26.43	24.19	20.68	24.06	20.95	27.08
No British Education	0.80	0.79	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.56	0.50	0.59	0.53	0.52
British Basic Education	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.06	0.30	0.36	0.29	0.35	0.13
British Higher Education	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.16
Foreign Education	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.22	0.25	0.26	0.24	0.28	0.25	0.29
Employee	0.19	0.21	0.19	0.22	0.38	0.40	0.42	0.40	0.42	0.59
Manager	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.04

Table 3: Table 2 continued. Weighted and Unweighted Means for Muslims and non-Muslims before and after removal of NA compared with Bisin et al. (2008).

	Muslim					Non-Muslim				
	W e i g h t e d		U n w e i g h t e d			W e i g h t e d		U n w e i g h t e d		
	Before	After	Before	After	Bisin et al.	Before	After	Before	After	Bisin et al.
Self Employed	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.14
OUT OF LABOUR FORCE	0.50	0.49	0.52	0.48		0.33	0.29	0.36	0.32	
Unemployed	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.08
No Parents	0.65	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.34	0.64	0.65	0.66	0.66	0.32
Parents Physical Contacts	2.69	2.72	2.80	2.88	3.05	2.75	3.02	2.83	2.97	3.87
Parents Telephone Calls	2.10	2.51	2.28	2.85	3.38	3.34	3.34	3.15	3.26	4.74
Parents Letters	0.47	0.41	0.48	0.42	0.67	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.37
English Spoken at Home with Older	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.43	0.53	0.42	0.52	0.08
DO NOT SPEAK WITH OLDER	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.02		0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	
English Spoken at Home with Younger	0.46	0.46	0.41	0.40	0.20	0.77	0.81	0.75	0.79	0.25
DO NOT SPEAK WITH YOUNGER	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
English Spoken at Work	0.46	0.53	0.41	0.47	0.19	0.79	0.85	0.77	0.82	0.27
DO NOT SPEAK AT WORK	0.45	0.39	0.48	0.44		0.16	0.11	0.18	0.14	
English Spoken With Friends	0.50	0.55	0.46	0.51	0.22	0.79	0.86	0.77	0.83	0.27
DO NOT SPEAK WITH FRIENDS	0.12	0.07	0.12	0.06		0.04	0.02	0.05	0.02	
Household Income	216.19	215.48	195.40	194.94	200.74	334.66	333.83	307.69	313.46	330.26
Ward Density Own Ethnicity	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.11
Ward Unemployment Rate	16.07	15.72	17.97	18.05	16.57	12.19	12.35	13.44	13.52	12.60
Discrimination Own Ethnicity	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.34	0.37	0.34	0.36	0.18

Table 4: Regression Results for Muslims 330 and non-Muslims 488 to be compared with Table 2 in [Bisin et al. \(2008\)](#). Heteroskedasticity corrected (HC1) Standard Errors are in parentheses. P-values < 0.05 are marked with \*.

	Importance of Religion		Inter Ethnic Marriage		Ethnic Composition of Schools	
	Muslims	non-Muslims	Muslims	non-Muslims	Muslims	non-Muslims
(Intercept)	0.92*	0.94*	0.83*	0.27	0.04	-0.02
	(0.30)	(0.26)	(0.37)	(0.26)	(0.18)	(0.04)
Age at Arrival	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Female	-0.04	0.11*	0.14	0.05	-0.04	-0.01
	(0.08)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.01)
Born in the UK	-0.24	0.26	-0.23	0.08	-0.03	-0.04
	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.03)
Arranged Marriage	0.11	-0.08	0.09	0.20*	-0.06	0.01
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Discrimination	-0.09	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.01)
Children	0.02*	0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.01*	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Years Since Arrival	-0.01*	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
No British Education	0.01	-0.14	-0.06	0.04	0.08	0.01
	(0.12)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.01)
British Basic Education	0.05	-0.12	-0.13	-0.09	0.00	0.00
	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.01)
British Higher Education	-0.16	-0.13	-0.19	0.01	-0.02	0.00
	(0.18)	(0.08)	(0.15)	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.01)
Foreign Education	0.00	0.05	-0.15*	-0.01	0.01	-0.02
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.02)
Employee	-0.14	-0.04	0.01	0.02	-0.04	-0.04
	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.02)
Manager	-0.29	-0.06	0.09	-0.01	-0.17*	-0.03
	(0.24)	(0.12)	(0.22)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.02)

Table 5: Table 4 continued. Regression Results for Muslims 330 and non-Muslims 488 to be compared with Table 2 in [Bisin et al. \(2008\)](#). Heteroskedasticity corrected (HC1) Standard Errors are in parentheses. P-values < 0.05 are marked with \*.

	Importance of Religion		Inter Ethnic Marriage		Ethnic Composition of Schools	
	Muslims	non-Muslims	Muslims	non-Muslims	Muslims	non-Muslims
Self Employed	0.00 (0.13)	-0.06 (0.10)	0.11 (0.15)	0.06 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.09)	-0.05 (0.03)
Unemployed	-0.07 (0.08)	0.07 (0.10)	0.12 (0.10)	0.07 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.02)
No Parents	-0.07 (0.05)	0.09 (0.05)	0.04 (0.07)	0.06 (0.04)	0.09* (0.03)	0.00 (0.01)
Parents Physical Contacts	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)
Parents Telephone Calls	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01* (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Parents Letters	-0.02 (0.03)	0.07* (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.00)
English Spoken at Home with Older	-0.34* (0.12)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.10)	-0.09 (0.07)	0.00 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.03)
English Spoken at Home with Younger	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.20* (0.09)	0.11 (0.08)	0.03 (0.09)	0.02 (0.05)	0.02 (0.03)
English Spoken at Work	-0.04 (0.08)	-0.19 (0.13)	-0.08 (0.14)	0.03 (0.12)	0.10 (0.06)	0.04 (0.03)
English Spoken With Friends	-0.04 (0.07)	0.06 (0.09)	-0.12 (0.10)	-0.16 (0.09)	-0.02 (0.07)	0.02 (0.02)
Household Income	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Discrimination Own Ethnicity	0.26 (0.41)	0.13 (0.39)	0.07 (0.43)	-0.28 (0.31)	0.10 (0.24)	0.20 (0.10)
Ward Density Own Ethnicity	0.13 (0.32)	-0.41 (0.29)	-0.01 (0.30)	0.36 (0.24)	0.10 (0.19)	-0.06 (0.06)
Ward Unemployment Rate	0.01* (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Adjusted R-square	0.20	0.09	0.18	0.18	0.05	0.08

NOTE: All estimated models include 7 UK-region dummies, and the variables DO . NOT . SPEAK . WITH . OLDER, DO . NOT . SPEAK . AT . WORK, and

# Conclusions

- Introduction
- Their claims
- Our results
- What we do
- Data
- Sample
- Two important variables
- Attitude towards inter-marriage
- Importance of racial composition in schools
- Conclusions**

- ✓ The ? paper rests on fragile grounds.
- ✓ Their claims about differences between Muslims and non-Muslims, and their conclusion that strong Religious/Ethnic identities are found in mixed neighbourhoods does not hold.
- ✓ There is no systematic relation between ethnic minorities' views on religion, inter-ethnic marriage or ethnic profile of schools and the density of their own ethnic minority in their neighbourhood.
- ✓ However, we hesitate to draw inference from these results since the great loss of observations (57 percent) implies that the remaining sample is most likely not representative.