

Gender matters in prejudice and discrimination of Muslim women and Muslim men

Edwin Poppe & Iris Andriessen

Survey studies on prejudice and discrimination towards ethnic or religious minority groups have paid relatively little attention to gender differences (see e.g., Hosoda et al., 2003; Spanierman et al., 2012), while research on gender stereotypes and attitudes does not tend to focus on ethnic or religious outgroups (see e.g., Reid & Comas-Diaz, 1990). Although gender studies have shown that men are generally evaluated more negatively than women (e.g., Eagly & Mladinic, 1994), there are hardly any studies on differences in attitudes or behavior towards males and females of ethnic or religious minority groups. To address this gap, we use theoretical and empirical insights from gender studies and social psychology to derive and test hypotheses about gender differences in attitudes towards male and female Muslim minority members in the Netherlands. In addition, we will examine gender differences on a behavioral measurement. The focus is on youngsters in the Netherlands, in correspondence to the scholarly attention of Maykel Verkuyten (see e.g., Verkuyten, 2006; Verkuyten et al., 1984).

Previous research has shown that attitudes towards Muslims are rather negative in the Netherlands among the general population (Gijsberts & Lubbers, 2009; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007) and among youngsters (Velasco Gonzalez et al., 2008; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2001), and more negative compared to other minority groups (Spruyt & Elchardus, 2012). Yet, it is unknown whether this relative negative attitude towards Muslims in general holds similar for Muslim men and Muslim women, and among Dutch male and female youngsters, and

whether gender matters for various measures of intergroup relations. More specifically, we focus on gender differences in various attitudinal measures such as the feeling thermometer, social distance, and willingness to have contact with Muslim men and Muslim women, and on gender differences in a behavioral measurement, namely reactions of employers on an internship application of young Muslim, versus Dutch native, men and women. Internships are an important step for youngsters on their way to the labor market as about half of the youngsters get a job at the company of the internship, and internships provide a realistic idea about a profession and future career (Kuijpers & Meijer, 2013).

Theories and earlier findings on gender differences in attitudes and behavior towards male and female outgroup members

From a few theoretical perspectives, it may be argued that attitudes towards Muslim men are more negative than attitudes towards Muslim women among the Dutch majority group. According to the ‘out-group male target hypothesis’, derived from social dominance theory (Pratto et al., 1994), negative attitudes are directed more towards out-group men than towards out-group women (Navarrete et al., 2010) because fear of being dominated by an out-group is related more to males than to females (cf. ‘the male warrior hypothesis’, McDonald et al., 2012). A study on prejudice towards a racial minority group in the US confirmed that out-group men were evaluated more negatively than out-group women (Navarrete et al., 2010).

Alternatively, social role theory (SRT; Eagly et al., 2000) argues for the ‘women are wonderful effect’ (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989). Women would be evaluated more favorably than men because they are perceived as being more caring and communal due to their traditional domestic and child caring roles. A study by Eagly and Karau (2002) suggested that women are viewed more favorably than men as long as they remain in these traditional roles. However, traditional roles for females may also be perceived as resulting from male dominance and gender inequality more generally. This ‘women as victims effect’ might be particularly relevant for western attitudes towards Muslim men and women. On the basis of their large-scale cross-national research, Norris and Inglehardt (2004, p.155) concluded that ‘The most basic fault line between the West and Islam ... involves issues of gender equality and sexual liberalization’. Western liberal values of gender equality and individual freedom are perceived to be contradictory to the dominance of Muslim men over women, exemplified in their control over the female body and sexuality and in cultural-religious practices such as gender segregation, enforced arranged (early) marriages, and forced veiling (Fernandez, 2009; Spruyt & Elchardus, 2012). Studies in the Netherlands indicated that

native Dutch people dislike the dominant position of Muslim men and the related perceived oppression of Muslim women (Gijsberts & Lubbers, 2009; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). In sum, we expect that attitudes towards Muslim men are more negative compared to attitudes towards Muslim women (Hypothesis 1).

The next question is whether Dutch men and Dutch women differ in their attitudes and behavior towards Muslim men and Muslim women. According to the 'out-group male target hypothesis', gender differences in negative attitudes towards male out-groups are the result of differential underlying motives such as aggression and striving for dominance for men and fear of sexual coercion for women (Navarrete et al., 2010). Social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) argues that people, in order to achieve or maintain a positive social identity, have less positive negative attitudes towards out-groups compared to their in-group and when out-groups differ on two categories rather than only one, both categories may be used to identify with and to differentiate out-groups from the in-group (Brown & Turner, 1979). Studies on cross-categorization effects (Crisp & Hewstone, 2007) confirmed that double out-group members (i.e. other gender and religion) are evaluated more negatively than single out-group members (i.e. same gender and other religion). In other words, Dutch women, compared to Dutch men, may be more positive towards Muslim women due to the shared gender category, whereas Dutch men may be more positive towards Muslim men compared to Dutch women. However, given the underlying competing motives (such as aggression and striving for dominance) with respect to attitudes and behavior towards outgroup males, we assume that the shared gender category does not imply a strong common identification in the case of men. If we apply these general theoretical notions to the case of Muslim outgroups from a Dutch native perspective, we expect that attitudes towards Muslim women are more positive among Dutch women than among Dutch men (Hypothesis 2). Furthermore, we will explore whether attitudes towards Muslim men differ between Dutch women and Dutch men.

In addition, we will examine gender differences on a behavioral measurement by focusing on reactions of real life employers towards internship job applications of (fictitious) Muslim female and male students. On basis of the outgroup male target hypothesis (Navarrete et al., 2010), we expect that the underlying motives for more negative attitudes towards male outgroup members, such as the fear of domination, may also result in relatively more negative behavior towards male outgroup members such as discrimination, compared to female outgroup members. Some previous studies on discrimination on the labour market in the Netherlands indicated that female applicants from an ethnic minority group are more likely to be invited for a job interview than male applicants (e.g. Andriessen

et al., 2010). We will examine whether this also holds for a group of youngster who apply for an internship, for their intermediate level of vocational education. In sum, we expect that Muslim men are more discriminated compared to Muslim women (Hypothesis 3).

Method and results

Various data sets will be used in this chapter. Most of the data sets have already been used by scholars resulting in various publications on prejudice and discrimination towards Muslims in the Netherlands. The part of the data measuring prejudice and discrimination towards male and female Muslims has not received much attention yet.

Prejudice towards Muslim women and men

Study 1 was part of a survey collected among adolescents from several secondary schools by several social science students, supervised by Verkuyten and Poppe, in 2006. The questionnaire addressed various societal topics including attitudes towards Muslim immigrants living in the Netherlands (see for more details of methods, Velasco Gonzalez et al., 2008). In total 379 adolescents participated, all indicated that they considered themselves Dutch on an open question about their ethnic origin, and the age ranged from 13 to 17 years ($M=14.81$, $SD=.85$) among which 201 (53%) were females. Prejudice towards Muslim men and Muslim women were assessed by means of the well-known 'feeling thermometer' (Abelson et al., 1982). The wording of the instruction was: "Use the 'feeling-thermometer' to indicate whether you have positive or negative feelings about Muslims living in the Netherlands. You may mark any degree between 0 and 100. Fifty degrees represents neutral feelings. Markings above 50 degrees indicate positive or warm feelings, and markings below 50 degrees indicate cold or negative feelings". The feeling thermometer is a reliable and valid (Alwin, 1997) global measure of out-group attitudes which has been frequently used in studies in which multiple social groups are compared (see e.g., Verkuyten & Thijs, 2010).

The data analysis of Study 1 showed various gender differences in prejudice towards Muslim men and Muslim women. Multivariate within-subject analysis of variance showed a significant main effect of gender of target: feelings towards Muslim men were more negative ($M=33.19$; $SD=21.43$) than feelings towards Muslim women ($M=48.18$; $SD=21.43$). As the interaction effect of gender of target and gender of participant was also significant (see notes in Table 1 for details of results of analysis), follow up tests were conducted to examine whether the gender of target effect is significant for the Dutch male participant group and for

the Dutch female group. The so-called simple effect analysis revealed that both participant groups had more negative feelings towards Muslim men than towards Muslim women, and that this difference in gender of target was particularly strong for Dutch women. These findings are in line with Hypothesis 1.

The findings from univariate analyses of variance showed that the feelings towards Muslim women were generally less negative among female Dutch participants compared to male Dutch participants, in line with Hypothesis 2. Furthermore, the relatively more negative feelings towards Muslim men did not differ between Dutch male and female participants.

Table 1: Feelings towards Muslim women and men

Gender target group	Gender participant group				F-value
	Dutch women		Dutch men		
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
Muslim women	50.92	(19.78)	45.08	(21.76)	8.11**
Muslim men	31.69	(21.87)	34.89	(20.86)	1.62

Note. Values range between 0 and 100; a higher score indicates more positive feelings. *N* (Study 1)=382 (*N* women=202; *N* men=180); * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. Analysis of variance: Main effect gender target: $F(1, 380)=251.51^{***}$. Interaction effect gender target x gender participant: $F(1,380)=23.67^{***}$. Simple main effects: Dutch females: $F(1,380)=228.68^{***}$; Dutch men: $F(1,380)=56.94^{***}$.

Study 2 was part of a survey among adolescents in secondary schools in 2013. The participants attended the highest level of secondary school in 2 cities in the middle of the Netherlands. Participants who indicated that they did not consider themselves to be Dutch ($N=10$) were excluded from analyses. The remaining number of participants was 122: 62 Dutch adolescent girls and 60 Dutch adolescent boys. Age ranged from 15 till 18 years ($M=16.07$; $SD=.47$). Prejudice towards Muslim women and Muslim men was measured by the feeling thermometer, similar to Study 1.

The data analysis of Study 2 indicated that the feelings towards Muslim men were more negative ($M=43.19$; $SD=18.76$) than the feelings towards Muslim women ($M=50.49$; $SD=17.53$), in line with Hypothesis 1. The findings from univariate analyses showed that the feelings towards Muslim women were less negative among Dutch women compared to Dutch men (see Table 2), in line with Hypothesis 2. The more or less negative feelings towards Muslim men did not differ between Dutch women and men.

Table 2: Feelings towards Muslim women and men among Dutch women and men

Gender target group	Gender participant group				F-value
	Dutch women		Dutch men		
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
Muslim women	54.48	(19.78)	46.00	(21.76)	8.22**
Muslim men	45.48	(17.05)	40.83	(20.27)	1.88

Note. Values range between 0 and 100; a higher score indicates more positive feelings. N (Study 2)=122 (N women=62; N men=60); * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$. Analysis of variance: main effect gender target: $F(1, 120)=27.88^{***}$. Interaction effect gender target x gender participant: $F(1,120)=2.32$; $p>.05$.

Social distance towards Muslim women and Muslim men

Social distance towards Muslim women and Muslim men was measured in Study 3 collected by 2 students at the department of Interdisciplinary Social Science at Utrecht University for their bachelor theses (den Bakker, 2020; Nikkessen, 2020). Fellow students and friends were approached via social media platforms (i.e. Facebook and WhatsApp) and invited to fill in an online survey about attitudes towards certain groups in the Netherlands if they were Dutch and between 18 and 30 years of age. In total, 163 people participated: 114 young female and 49 male participants. The average age of the participants was 21.60 ($SD=1.84$). The majority of the participants indicated to be students (74.4%) and were highly educated (97.3%). Prejudice was measured by the so-called social distance measurement based on the original social distance scale from Bogardus (1924). The question wording was adapted to suit the living situation of people between 18-30 years: suppose you live in a house with fellow people and the room next to you becomes available. How would you like it to live together in a house with a Muslim man? A similar question followed with respect to living together in a house with a Muslim woman. The answers given on a five-point scale ranging from (1) *very negative* to (5) *very positive* were recoded in a reverse score in line with social distance: a higher score means more social distance.

The data analysis revealed that Dutch women indicated to maintain more distance towards Muslim men than towards Muslim women; Dutch men did not differ in social distance towards Muslim men and women (see Table 3 for details of results of analysis). The finding of Dutch women is in line with Hypothesis 1.

Subsequently, the findings from the univariate analysis showed that the relatively negative feelings towards Muslim men did not differ between male and female Dutch participants, whereas the feelings towards Muslim women were generally less negative among female Dutch participants compared to male Dutch participants (see Table 3). This latter finding supports Hypothesis 2.

Table 3: Social distance towards Muslim men and Muslim women

Gender target group	Gender participant group				F-value
	Dutch women		Dutch men		
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
Muslim women	2.32	(.95)	2.96	(.84)	14.19***
Muslim men	2.71	(1.05)	3.02	(.88)	3.29

Note. N (Study 3)=163 (N women =114; N men=49). The values range from 1 (*very negative*) to 5 (*very positive*). Value range is from 1 to 5, higher values means more social distance. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Analysis of variance: main effect of gender target: $F(1, 161)=16.86^{***}$; Interaction gender target x gender participant: $F(1,161)=9.02^{**}$. Simple main effects analysis: Dutch women: $F(1,161)=42.02^{***}$; Dutch men: $F(1,161)=.043$ $p > .05$.

Willingness for contact with Muslim women and Muslim men

The gender differences in the more general measures of prejudice in terms of (negative) feelings and social distance towards outgroups may also hold for conative intergroup attitudes such as willingness for positive intergroup contact. A first measurement of willingness for intergroup contact in Study 3 was adapted from previous studies (Awale et al., 2018; Esses & Dovidio, 2002). Before answering questions about their willingness to have contact, participants read about the following situation: “Mohammed and his wife Fatima have recently moved into your neighborhood. They have two young children and are both Muslims. Mohammed works at the municipality, Fatima takes care of the children”. Subsequently, participants were asked 6 questions on their willingness to have contact with Mohammed, on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not willing*) to 7 (*completely willing*) and thereafter the same 6 questions with respect to Fatima. For example, to what extent would you be inclined to... ‘greet Mohammed as a neighbor’, ‘become good friends with Mohammed’. Cronbach’s alpha for willingness to have contact with Muslim men (i.e. Mohammed) was .907 and with Muslim women (i.e. Fatima) .902, indicating that the items were internally consistent. The mean sum scores for the scales willingness for contact with Muslim men and women were calculated by summing up the six items and dividing it by the amount of items. A higher score indicated a higher level of willingness for intergroup contact with Muslim men and/or women.

Multivariate analysis of variance indicated that the willingness to have contact with Muslim men ($M=5.21$; $SD=1.11$) was not significantly lower than towards Muslim women ($M=5.31$; $SD=1.04$). This finding is not in line with Hypothesis 1. Subsequently, the findings from the univariate analysis showed that the willingness to have contact with Muslim men did not differ between male and female Dutch participants, whereas the willingness to have contact with Muslim

women was higher among female Dutch participants compared to male Dutch participants (see Table 4). This latter finding supports Hypothesis 2.

Table 4: Willingness to have contact with Muslim women and Muslim men

Gender target group	Gender participant group				F-value
	Dutch women		Dutch men		
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
Muslim women	5.43	(1.03)	5.05	(1.02)	4.66*
Muslim men	5.23	(1.13)	5.14	(1.07)	.28

Note. N (Study 3)=163 (N men=49; N women=114). The values range is from 1 to 7, higher values means more willingness to have contact. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Analysis of variance: main effect gender target: $F(1, 161)=2.03$, $p > .05$; Interaction gender target x gender participant: $F(1,161)=14.96$, $p < .001$). Simple main effects analysis: Dutch women: $F(1,161)=23.29$ ***; Dutch men: $F(1,161)=2.13$, $p > .05$.

Finally, participants in Study 3 indicated their willingness to work or study together with a Muslim man and Muslim woman on a five-point scale ranging from (1) *very negative* to (5) *very positive*.

Multivariate analysis of variance indicated that the willingness to work or study together with Muslim men ($M=3.66$; $SD=1.05$) is lower than towards Muslim women ($M=3.79$; $SD=.97$), in line with Hypothesis 1. Subsequently, the findings from the univariate analysis showed that the relatively lower willingness to work with Muslim men did not differ between male and female Dutch participants, whereas the willingness to work with Muslim women was higher among female Dutch participants compared to male Dutch participants (see Table 5). This latter finding supports Hypothesis 2.

Table 5: Willingness to work together with Muslim women and Muslim men

Gender target group	Gender participant group				F-value
	Dutch women		Dutch men		
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
Muslim women	3.91	(.84)	3.49	(.79)	6.12**
Muslim men	3.73	(.87)	3.49	(.82)	1.95

Note. N (Study 3)=163 (N women =114; N men=49). The values range from 1 (*very negative*) to 5 (*very positive*), higher values means more willingness to work together. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Analysis of variance: main effect: gender target: $F(1, 161)=5.04$ *; Interaction gender target x gender participant: $F(1,161)=5.04$ *). Simple main effects analysis: Dutch women: $F(1,161)=16.77$ ***; Dutch men: $F(1,161)=.00$; $p > .05$.

Discrimination of Muslim men and Muslim women in applying for an internship

Discrimination towards young Muslim men and women was measured in Study 4 by means of a correspondence test, a form of a field experiment (Andriessen et al., 2021). Discrimination was assessed by means of reactions of employers to 144 matched pairs of fictitious resume applications for an internship for students at intermediate level of vocational education in sectors such as IT, health and wellbeing, construction and technology and business services. The pairs of resume applications were similar in level of education, age and work-related skills, but different in terms of gender (male vs female) and ethnic/religious background (Muslim vs native Dutch). Both variables were manipulated via the names of the fictitious students: Kevin van Loon (Dutch male), Wendy de Koning (Dutch female) Yusuf zcan (Muslim men) and Samira Tahiri (Muslim women). In addition, religious background was manipulated via descriptive part in the application resume: volunteer work in a mosque such as helping with Quran-lessons and helping to organize at Iftar meals (for the Muslim applicants) or in a religiously neutral setting (for the Dutch control group) such as organizing a tournament in a sports club or helping with homework in a community centre. Furthermore, all the resume applications mentioned that the student was born in the Netherlands and had completed all previous education in Dutch schools (see for more details (Andriessen et al., 2021). Reactions of employers were assessed by collecting the written responses to personal email accounts of the fictitious students and by call-backs to voicemail boxes connected to mobile telephone numbers) and coding them as a positive reaction (i.e. invitation for an interview, request to send more information, request to contact the company at a later time, any attempt to get into contact with the student) or a negative one (i.e. rejection or no reaction). The coding corresponds to previous studies (e.g., Pager, 2007) in which the positive reactions are labelled as call-backs.

Most of the positive reactions in Study 4 concerned invitations for an interview (>80%), while most of the negative reactions concerned rejections (60%). The majority of all the 286 reactions of employers were negative (67%), on applications of fictitious Muslim students (67%) as well as on applications of native Dutch students (67%). Hence, this finding indicates that Muslim and native Dutch students have generally equal chances to be invited for an internship. Table 6 presents the findings on positive reactions (call-backs) by including gender of the fictitious applicants. The findings showed that employers reacted positively in about 39% of the applications of Muslim women, which is similar to the call-back rate for native Dutch women, and in about 23% of the applications for Muslim men, which does not differ from the call-back rate of 27% for Dutch men (see Table 6 for more details of the analysis). In other words, the findings

indicated that the chances of a positive reaction did not differ between Muslim and native Dutch students. It does matter, however, whether the application concerned a male or female student: female students had a significant higher chance of getting a positive reaction than male students, and this was the case for Muslim and native Dutch students. In sum, the finding suggests that being a Muslim or native Dutch does not matter as a selection criteria for internships for employers, it is gender of the applicant that matters.

Table 6: Estimated probability of getting a positive reaction Muslim and native Dutch male and female students

Gender	Religious/ethnic background			
	Muslim		Native Dutch	
	<i>EP</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	<i>EP</i>	(<i>SD</i>)
Female	3.91	(.84)	3.49	(.79)
Male	3.73	(.87)	3.49	(.82)

Note. N (Study 4)=286, (N Muslim=143, N native Dutch=143). Logistic regression analysis: main effect gender: $b=-2.24$ ($SE=1.06$), $p<.05$.; main effect of ethnic/religious background: $b=.07$ ($SE=.80$), $p>.05$. interaction effect ethnic/religious background x gender: $b=0.63$, $p>.05$. Several control variables were included such as distance in kilometers from the student's home address to the internship location, company size, sector.

Discussion

The present study examined gender differences in prejudice towards Muslims among Dutch youngsters and discrimination towards young Muslim men and women among employers in the Netherlands. The findings showed gender differences on various measurements of intergroup relations. Firstly, prejudice and discrimination were generally larger towards Muslim men compared to Muslim women. Dutch youngsters in 3 studies, collected in 2006, 2013 and 2020, had relatively more negative attitudes towards Muslim men in terms of general feelings, preferred to maintain more social distance and indicated to be less willing to work together with Muslim men. There was no gender difference on one measure of intergroup relations: the willingness to have contact with Muslim men did not differ from the willingness to have contact with Muslim women. This measurement, however, refers more to an interpersonal context namely of a neighboring family on which the willingness to have contact did not appear to differ with respect to the husband and his wife. Furthermore, the findings of the field experiment indicated that Muslim men were more discriminated compared to Muslim women in applying for and internship. However, a similar gender difference appeared to be the case for a Dutch control group. Hence, it was gender that mattered in call-

backs for internships, in a similar way for Muslims and native Dutch applicants. However, the sample size was rather small, and it might be that the difference between call-backs for young Muslim men (about 23%) and young Dutch men (about 27%) is significant in a larger sample of companies, or that the recruiter(s) involved in the selection procedure were mainly female. Future studies may involve a larger sample and include gender and ethnicity of the recruiter(s) involved in the selection procedure in order to test the interaction effect of gender of target and recruiter in understanding discrimination of Muslims male and female students.

Second, the findings indicated that the relatively more negative attitudes towards Muslim men did not differ between native Dutch men and women, whereas prejudice towards Muslim women was lower among Dutch women compared to Dutch men. Hence, the female participants in our studies had, compared to male participants, more warm feelings towards Muslim women, preferred to maintain less social distance and were more willing to have contact and work together with Muslim women. The findings on intergroup attitudes show the importance of attending to gender of both target and participants in studies on prejudice towards particular ethnic or religious outgroups such as Muslims in the Netherlands. Acknowledging the limitations of the present study, we argue that the present study opens up an avenue for future studies on prejudice and discrimination towards ethnic or religious groups.

Future studies may examine whether these gender effects can be generalized to other target groups, participant groups, and across different measurements of prejudice and of discrimination in labor market or other sectors such as housing, education or leisure activities such as invitations for night clubs. For instance, studies may focus on different target groups and examine whether the differences between male and female members of target group apply to other religious outgroups with traditional or patriarchal norms and values (e.g., certain Christian groups) or are more universal in line with the “outgroup male target hypothesis” (Navarrete et al., 2010). Furthermore, future studies may be conducted among different participant groups than the adolescents and young adults of our study for whom gender roles and norms might be particular salient (see e.g., Horn, 2007; Pleck et al., 1994) and for whom attitudes towards outgroups such as religious outgroups and same-sex and other-sex groups develop (Poteat et al., 2007). Finally, future studies may use different evaluative measurements than the affective thermometer feeling in our study. For instance, by distinguishing evaluative content dimensions such as competence and warmth or morality (see e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Phalet & Poppe, 1998) which are seen as the basic dimensions in the intergroup literature, or hostile and benevolent forms as commonly used in the sexism literature (see e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996).

The differences in prejudice and discrimination towards Muslim men and women calls into question whether the overall group of Muslims can be considered as a psychological meaningful group (cf. Clausell & Fiske, 2005). Our findings warrant that future studies on religious or ethnic out-groups should focus on attitudes and discrimination towards both gender subgroups, instead of focusing on Muslims in general. For instance, survey studies measuring attitudes towards immigrant groups (e.g., European Social Survey, European Value Studies) may include separate questions about males and females of a particular ethnic or national group.

In order to examine explanations of prejudice towards each gender subgroup of a particular ethnic or religious group, theoretical insights from the fields of gender studies and intergroup relations should be integrated. For instance, it could be interesting to examine whether the explanatory variables derived from social role theory of prejudice and social dominance theory have similar effects on prejudice towards each gender subgroup of a particular ethnic or religious group. Furthermore, it may be investigated whether other intergroup relations explanations of prejudice towards Muslims such as symbolic threat, national identification and intergroup contact (see e.g. Velasco Gonzalez et al., 2008), are similar in predicting prejudice towards Muslim men and Muslim women. Moreover, future studies may focus on the intersectionality of social identifications (Cole, 2009; Frable, 1997) by including social identification with the gender category in addition to ethnic or national or religious category and may experimentally manipulate salience of one of these social identifications (see e.g., Huang & Liu, 2005) in order to examine its effect on prejudice towards male and females of a particular ethnic, religious or national out-group.

Finally, scholars may examine in a longitudinal way whether certain consequences of (perceived) prejudice and discrimination will be different for Muslim men and women. These studies could focus on health outcomes (Paradies et al., 2015; Williams & Mohammed, 2009), well-being (Pascoe & Richman, 2009), social ties (Andriessen et al., 2020) and trust in institution such as justice, police and politics (Andriessen et al., 2020). Based on our findings it might be suggested that Muslim men in particular are more likely to develop more health problems, lower well-being, less ties with natives and lower trust in national institution in the Netherlands.

In sum, the findings of the present study have important implications for the field of inter-ethnic relations. Scholars should pay more attention to gender in prejudice and discrimination towards ethnic or religious out-groups by focusing on gender of target group and of participants.

References

- Abelson, R. P., Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., & Fiske, S. T. (1982). Affective and semantic components in political person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(2), 619-630. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.42.4.619>
- Alwin, D. F. (1997). Feeling thermometers versus 7-point scales, Which are better? *Sociological Methods & Research*, 25(3), 318-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124197025003003>
- Andriessen, I., van Rooijen, M., Day, M., van den Berg, A., Mienis, E., & Verweij, N. (2021). *Ongelijke kansen op de stagemarkt*. Verwey-Jonker Instituut
- Andriessen, I., Hoegen-Dijkhof, J., van der Torre, A., van den Berg, E., Pulles, I., & Iedema, J. (2020). *Ervaren discriminatie in Nederland II*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Andriessen, I. (2019). Nederland inside out. In: S. J. Beugelsdijk, P. de Hart, P. van Houwelingen & M. Versantvoort (red.). *Denkend aan Nederland*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Andriessen, I., van der Ent, B., van der Linden, M., & Dekker, G. (2015). Op afkomst afgewezen. Onderzoek naar discriminatie op de Haagse arbeidsmarkt. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Andriessen, I., Nievers, E., Faulk, L., & Dagevos, J. (2010). *Liever Mark dan Mohammed? Onderzoek naar arbeidsmarktdiscriminatie van niet-westerse migranten via praktijktests*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Awale, A., Chan, C. S., & Ho, G. T. S. (2018). The influence of perceived warmth and competence on realistic threat and willingness for intergroup contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(5), 857-870. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2553>
- Brown, R. J., & Turner, J. C. (1979). The criss-cross categorization in intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18(4), 371-383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1979.tb00907.x>
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 64(3), 170-180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>
- Clausell, E., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). When do subgroup parts add up to the stereotypic whole? Mixed stereotype content for gay male subgroups explains overall rating. *Social Cognition*, 23(4), 161-181. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.23.2.161.65626>
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2007). Multiple social categorization. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 163-254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(06\)39004-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)39004-1)
- Den Bakker, M. (2020). *Willingness for intergroup contact with Muslims in the Netherlands: Are personal values, previous contact experiences and positive outgroup stereotypes determining factors?* Utrecht: bachelor theses Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, Utrecht University.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573>
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes towards women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15(4), 543-558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167289154008>
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Erlbaum.
- Esses, V. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(9), 1202-1214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672022812006>
- Fernandez, S. (2009). The crusade over the bodies of women. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 43(3-4), 269-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313220903109185>

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 878-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Frable, D. E. (1997). Gender, racial, ethnic, sexual, and class identities. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 139-162. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.139>
- Gijsberts, M., & Lubbers, M. (2009). Wederzijdse Beeldvorming. In M. Gijsberts & J. Dagevos (Eds.), *Jaarrapport Integratie 2009* (pp. 254-290). Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Hosoda, M., Stone, J., & Stone-Romero, J.F. (2003). The Interactive Effects of Race, Gender, and Job Type on Job Suitability Ratings and Selection Decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(1), 145-178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02077.x>
- Kuijpers, M., & Meijers, F. (2013). Loopbaanleren in het vmbo en mbo. *MESO Focus, 89*, 99-110.
- McDonald, M. M., Navarrete, C. D., & van Vugt, M. (2012). Evolution and the psychology of intergroup conflict: the male warrior hypothesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 367*(1589), 670-679. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0301>
- Navarrete, C. D., McDonald, M. M., Molina, L. E., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: An outgroup male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(6), 933-945. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017931>
- Nikkessen, M. (2020). *Intergroup anxiety, empathy and gender in the contact-prejudice relation*. Utrecht: bachelor theses Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, Utrecht University.
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. E. (2004). *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pager, D. (2007). The use of field experiments for studies of employment discrimination: Contributions, critiques, and directions for the future. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 609*(1), 104-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716206294796>
- Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one, 10*(9), e0138511. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138511>
- Pascoe, E. A., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(4), 531-554. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0016059>
- Phalet, K., & Poppe, E. (1997). Competence and morality dimensions of national and ethnic stereotypes: A study in six Eastern-European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*(6), 703-723. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199711/12\)27:6%3C703::AID-EJSP841%3E3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199711/12)27:6%3C703::AID-EJSP841%3E3.0.CO;2-K)
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741-763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Reid, P. T., & Comas-Diaz, L. (1990). Gender and ethnicity: Perspectives on dual status. *Sex Roles, 22*, 397-408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00288160>
- ROA. (2018). *Factsheet: MBO Stages en de migratieachtergrond van studenten*. Maastricht University.
- Sniderman, P., & Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When Ways of Life Collide. Multiculturalism and its discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton University Press.

- Spanierman, L. B., Beard, J. C., & Todd, N. R. (2012). Whitemen's fears, whitewomen's tears: Examining gender differences in racial affect types. *Sex Roles, 67*, 174-186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0162-2>
- Spruyt, B., & Elchardus, M. (2012). Are anti-Muslim feelings more widespread than anti-foreigner feelings? Evidence from two split-sample experiments. *Ethnicities, 12*(6), 800-819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796812449707>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-48). Brooks/Cole.
- Velasco Gonzalez, K., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing Integrated Threat Theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*(4), 667-685. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X284443>
- Verkuyten, M. (2006). *Opgroeien in etnisch-culturele diversiteit*. ERCOMER.
- Verkuyten, M., Masson, K., & de Jong, W. (1984). *Hebben allochtone jongeren problemen? Onderzoek naar sociaal-emotionele en identiteitsproblemen bij allochtone jongeren in een oude stadswijk te Rotterdam*. Erasmus University.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2001). Ethnic and gender bias among Dutch and Turkish children in late childhood: The role of social context. *Infant and Child Development, 10*(4), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.279>
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2010). Religious group evaluations among Christians, Muslim and nonreligious early adolescents in the Netherlands. *Journal of Early Adolescents, 30*(1), 27-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431609342984>
- Williams, D. R., & Mohammed, S. A. (2009). Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence and needed research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 32*, 20-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-008-9185-0>