

Errata Corrige: "Are Muslim Immigrants Different in terms of Cultural Integration?"

Alberto Bisin* Eleonora Patacchini† Thierry Verdier‡
Yves Zenou§

First version: July 23, 2008; This version December 28, 2008

Abstract

We are thankful to Michael Lundholm and Mahmood Arai for pointing us towards a coding error which invalidates the regressions in our paper. Correcting the code leads to a decrease in sample sizes. However, a slight redefinition of the variables and of the specification allows us to re-produce the empirical analysis in our paper. Although the results are now less clear-cut and we lose statistical significance, our previous findings are essentially confirmed.

Key words: religious identity, assimilation, Muslims.

JEL Classification: A14, J15

*New York University, Department of Economics, 269 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10003, USA. E-mail: alberto.bisin@nyu.edu

†La Sapienza, Università di Roma, Facoltà di Scienze Statistiche, P.le Aldo Moro, 5 - 00185, Roma, Italy. E-mail: eleonora.patacchini@uniroma1.it

‡PSE, 48 boulevard Jourdan, 75014 Paris, France and CEPR. E-mail: verdier@pse.ens.fr

§Stockholm University, Department of Economics, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden, E-mail: yves.zenou@ne.su.se.

1 Definition of variables and model specification

A labelling error in the code used in the empirical analysis of our paper on *"Are Muslim Immigrants Different in terms of Cultural Integration?"* invalidates its empirical results. The error affected our sample selection procedure, mistakenly categorizing some Whites in the ethnic minority sample. The number of Muslims and non-Muslims after the correction is reduced, respectively, from 2,369 to 2,019 and from 3,594 to 2,639. Unfortunately, sample sizes decrease further in the regression analysis because of missing values in variables. To preserve sample sizes, and hence to be able to reproduce the empirical analysis in our paper, therefore, we are forced to exclude a few of the variables containing numerous missing values, to re-classify some variables more coarsely, to use interactions more efficiently. We believe these changes are not substantial. We list them here in detail.

1. We eliminate some controls (those for which missing value or multicollinearity problems are more severe), namely "No parents", "Parents' physical contacts", "Parents' telephone calls", "Parents' letters", "English spoken at home (younger)", "Discrimination of own ethnicity".
2. We redefine the education variables as 4-category instead of 5-category dummies, with a slightly different classification of the groups. Instead of using "No British education", "British basic education" (i.e. O-levels), "British high education" (i.e. A-levels and above, including any non-school diploma and University diploma) and "foreign education" (i.e. any overseas qualification) we construct the following variables: "Ukhigher," a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports having O-level or A-level education, and 0 otherwise; "Ukdegree," a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports having any non-school diploma (including trade apprenticeship) or university diploma; "Foreign education," a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports having any overseas qualification. The reference group thus now includes British elementary education (i.e. up to secondary school without having O-levels) as in the published paper, but also no British education.
3. We redefine the labour market status variables more coarsely as follows. We define "Employed" a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports being in paid work; "Employee" a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent, asked whether she/he is employee or self-employed,

declares being employee; and "Manager," a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports being a manager (in an establishment with more than 25 employees or with less than 25 employees or with number of employees unknown) as type of employment. In the published paper the question describing the type of employment was instead also used to define the other categories (i.e. not only for "Manager").

4. We use "House owner" instead of "Household income" as proxy for income. We define "House owner" as a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent reports she/he owns or is buying his/her accommodation.
5. We redefine our measure of "Attitude towards intermarriage" as a dummy taking value 1 if the respondent answers "yes" to the question "would you personally mind if a close relative were to marry a white person?". In the published paper, the measure of "Attitude towards intermarriage" we had used was a dummy having value 1 for those respondents who, after declaring they would *mind* if a close relative were to marry a white person, also state they would mind *very much*.
6. We use "Attitude towards religious composition in school" as our third proxy for ethnic identity, instead than "Attitude towards racial composition in school". Precisely, we use the following question: "If you were choosing a school for a child, would you prefer a school for children of your own religion, or would you prefer a school for children of any religion? The answer is coded as a dichotomous variable, taking value 1 if the individual would prefer a school for children of only her/his religion, and 0 otherwise.
7. We add the interaction between being Born in the U.K. and the Time spent in the UK, defining "Time spent in the U.K." as "Years since arrival" if the respondent is not born in the U.K. and "Age" if the respondent is born in the U.K. By so doing we also account for the effect of age for the natives, which was not considered by the specification in Table 2 of the published paper. We also add a squared term on both variables to increase the model's fit.¹

Table 1 here replaces Table 1 in the published paper. Our comments on the summary statistics in Table 1 remain essentially unchanged. Tests for equality in means remain statistically significant (at least at the 5%

¹The code and final data set are attached and will be available to interested readers upon request.

statistical level) in all but one case (i.e., for the variable "English spoken with friends").

2 Results

Table 2 here replaces Table 2 in the published paper. Because of the reduced sample sizes, we lose variance and hence statistical significance of some estimated coefficients. However, where statistically significant, the estimates confirm our previous findings: Muslim immigrants seem to follow a slower and different integration pattern than non-Muslims. So, for instance, our proxy of income is positively correlated with ethnic identity for Muslims and negatively for non-Muslims; higher levels of education seem to be associated with a lower ethnic identity only for non-Muslims; the percentage of own ethnic group residents in the ward is negatively correlated with ethnic identity for Muslims and positively for non-Muslims. Time spent in the U.K. does not seem to be related to ethnic identity for Muslims (the estimated coefficients of Years since arrival – for first generation - and Age - for second generation- are never statistically significant for Muslims) and if any correlation is to be found for Born in the U.K., it appears to be positive for Muslims rather than negative (although it is not statistically significant). For non-Muslims, on the contrary Born in the U.K. is negatively correlated with ethnic identity; and the Time spent in U.K. seems to be related with the attenuation of identity after a large enough number of years spent in the U.K. (the quadratic functions both in Years since arrival and Age have statistically significant coefficient estimates implying a positive correlation for small values of the time spent in U.K. and a negative correlation for large values).

Table 1: Description of data

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Explanation of the variable</i>	<i>n.obs.</i>	<i>Muslim</i>		<i>Non-Muslim</i>		<i>n.obs.</i>
			<i>Mean</i>	<i>St.dev.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St.dev.</i>	
Importance of religion	In the text	1032	0.75	0.43	1338	0.44	0.50
Attitude towards inter-marriage	In the text	1034	0.47	0.50	1340	0.27	0.44
Attitude towards religious composition in schools	In the text	1029	0.27	0.44	1329	0.13	0.33
Age	Respondent's age in years	2019	36.74	14.52	2639	41.00	15.61
Age at arrival	Respondent's age in years at arrival in the UK	1961	20.00	10.77	2588	22.13	11.54
Female	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent is female.	2019	0.48	0.50	2639	0.55	0.50
Born in the UK	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent is born in the UK	2019	0.14	0.35	2639	0.24	0.43
Arranged Marriage	Dummy variable taking value one if the husband/wife of the respondent has been chosen by the parents.	2019	0.23	0.42	2639	0.10	0.30
Discrimination	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent had been insulted or threatened in the last year for reasons to do with race or colour.	2019	0.09	0.29	2639	0.11	0.32
Children	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent has children.	2019	0.74	0.44	2639	0.68	0.46
Years since arrival	Number of years since respondent's arrival in UK.	1961	16.83	11.25	2588	18.77	13.52
British degree	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent has a UK degree.	2019	0.11	0.31	2639	0.30	0.46
British high education	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent has a UK O-level (or equivalent) or above qualification.	2019	0.10	0.30	2639	0.24	0.43
Foreign education	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent has a qualification achieved abroad.	2019	0.21	0.40	2639	0.24	0.43
Employed	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent is employed.	2019	0.27	0.44	2639	0.52	0.50
Manager	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent is a manager.	2019	0.01	0.11	2639	0.04	0.19
Employee	Dummy variable taking value one if the respondent is an employee	2019	0.38	0.49	2639	0.66	0.47
English spoken at home	Dummy variable taking value one if English is the language normally spoken at home with family members (who are older) by the respondent.	2019	0.05	0.21	2639	0.09	0.29
English spoken with friends	Dummy variable taking value one if English is the language normally spoken with friends (outside work) by the respondent.	2019	0.25	0.43	2639	0.27	0.44
English spoken at work	Dummy variable taking value one if English is the language normally spoken at work by the respondent.	2019	0.20	0.40	2639	0.25	0.43
House owner	Dummy variable taking value one if the household owns (or is buying) the accommodation	2019	0.67	0.47	2639	0.74	0.44
Ward density of own ethnicity	Percentage of residents of the respondent's ethnic group in the ward	2019	15.34	11.27	2639	12.49	9.76
Ward unemployment rate	Ward unemployment rate	2019	16.66	4.44	2639	13.36	5.10

Table 2: The development of an identity¹Dependent variable: (1) Importance of religion, (2) Attitude towards inter-marriage,
(3) Importance of religious composition in schools

Variable	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Muslim	Non-Muslim	Muslim	Non-Muslim	Muslim	Non-Muslim
	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)	Marginal effect (<i>p</i> -value)
Age at arrival	0.0011 (0.6637)	0.0087*** (0.0000)	-0.0003 (0.9090)	-0.0005 (0.7429)	0.0002 (0.9196)	0.0000 (0.9712)
Age	-0.0292 (0.7034)	0.0748** (0.0422)	-0.1414 (0.2180)	0.0483 (0.2375)	0.0083 (0.9225)	0.0549** (0.0271)
Age ²	0.0005 (0.7559)	-0.0013** (0.0447)	0.0025 (0.3165)	-0.0010 (0.1991)	-0.0002 (0.9005)	-0.0008* (0.0802)
Female	0.0503 (0.2100)	0.0683** (0.0461)	0.0571 (0.2470)	0.0141 (0.6046)	-0.0008 (0.9831)	0.0286 (0.1412)
Born in the UK	0.0956 (0.9075)	-0.7384** (0.0253)	0.8402 (0.1746)	-0.3092 (0.4466)	0.0240 (0.9802)	-0.5004** (0.0222)
Arranged marriage	0.0925** (0.0176)	0.1041** (0.0297)	0.1560*** (0.0009)	0.3060*** (0.0000)	0.1076*** (0.0054)	0.0457 (0.1119)
Discrimination	0.0237 (0.6841)	0.0191 (0.7155)	0.1210* (0.0807)	0.0885** (0.0437)	-0.0072 (0.9007)	0.0554* (0.0841)
Children	0.0718 (0.1600)	-0.0216 (0.6471)	0.1817*** (0.0047)	0.0668* (0.0891)	-0.0035 (0.9494)	0.0267 (0.3333)
Years since arrival	-0.0134 (0.1397)	0.0031 (0.7301)	-0.0033 (0.7373)	0.0179** (0.0122)	0.0099 (0.2293)	0.0105* (0.0529)
Years since arrival ²	0.0002 (0.2455)	0.0000 (0.8441)	-0.0000 (0.9419)	-0.0004*** (0.0045)	-0.0002 (0.2487)	-0.0002* (0.0710)
British degree	-0.0137 (0.7983)	0.0637 (0.1167)	0.0008 (0.9906)	-0.0573* (0.0770)	-0.0554 (0.3713)	0.0320 (0.2005)
British high education	-0.0196 (0.7424)	-0.0677 (0.1426)	-0.0361 (0.6407)	-0.0808** (0.0373)	0.0105 (0.8749)	-0.0357 (0.1549)
Foreign education	-0.0407 (0.3699)	-0.0367 (0.4048)	-0.0764 (0.1397)	0.0396 (0.2859)	-0.0012 (0.9788)	-0.0028 (0.9175)
Employed	-0.0187 (0.7080)	-0.0394 (0.3559)	0.0355 (0.5807)	-0.0794** (0.0194)	0.0792 (0.1374)	-0.0144 (0.5414)
Manager	0.0299 (0.8358)	-0.0566 (0.5368)	0.1403 (0.3939)	-0.0227 (0.7724)	-0.0992 (0.4003)	-0.0272 (0.5809)
Employee	-0.0937** (0.0203)	-0.0099 (0.8012)	-0.0281 (0.5809)	-0.0382 (0.2388)	-0.0400 (0.3586)	0.0186 (0.4125)
English spoken at home	-0.2190*** (0.0009)	-0.0473 (0.3191)	-0.0373 (0.6362)	-0.0265 (0.4739)	-0.1194** (0.0483)	0.1030*** (0.0014)
English spoken at work	0.1197** (0.0108)	-0.0066 (0.9006)	-0.0312 (0.6204)	0.2049*** (0.0000)	-0.0948* (0.0585)	-0.0310 (0.3610)
English spoken with friends	-0.0465 (0.3060)	0.0127 (0.8012)	-0.1423*** (0.0091)	-0.0850* (0.0550)	-0.1400*** (0.0029)	-0.0630* (0.0539)
House owner	-0.0391 (0.3759)	0.0283 (0.5176)	0.1085** (0.0200)	-0.0220 (0.5113)	0.0241 (0.5424)	-0.0560** (0.0415)
Ward density of own ethnic group	-0.0026 (0.1989)	-0.0019 (0.3068)	-0.0030 (0.1645)	0.0040*** (0.0064)	-0.0051*** (0.0054)	-0.0012 (0.2774)
Ward unemployment rate	0.0022 (0.6600)	0.0094** (0.0190)	-0.0004 (0.9360)	0.0050 (0.1082)	0.0024 (0.6122)	0.0008 (0.7377)
N. Obs.	996	1315	998	1315	993	1306

¹Marginal effects at the sample means; results weighted for population proportions; regional dummies are included; * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%