

Utrecht University



Universiteit Utrecht

Ode to Joy - Bringing Out the Colors of the Rainbow:

Effects of Europeanisation on Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians in Finland
and the Netherlands

Master Thesis

Utrecht University. Sociology: Contemporary Social Problems

Emmi Määttänen

6323065

Supervisor: Wenda Doff

June 2020.

Abstract

Both Finland and the Netherlands are members of the European Union and initially appear to be quite modern with similar societal sentiments. However, this is not the case when examining attitudes of acceptance towards gays and lesbians. As each country has an entirely different historical, geographical, political, and linguistic relationship with Europe, it begs the question: to what extent does Europeanisation explain the differences in attitudes towards gays and lesbians in Finland and the Netherlands? In the context of Europeanisation, I use the multi-faceted lens of otherness, universalism/cultural relativism, and legitimation theory to examine this problem. Applying this variegated theoretical approach to the 2018 European Social Survey (ESS) allows me to dive deeper into questions such as: is there a higher level of Europeanisation found in the Netherlands than in Finland? How does Europeanisation impact the acceptance of gays and lesbians in society? Finally, does social class act as a moderator for Europeanisation upon the effects of these attitudes? To answer these questions, I utilised variables measuring attitudes and sociodemographic factors of Dutch and Finnish respondents from the ESS9. The analyses used included, but were not limited to, a categorical regression analysis, and they were conducted using IBM SPSS. Against expectations, Finland scored higher on items aiming to measure the construct of Europeanisation. Otherwise the results supported my hypothesis that the level of Europeanisation increases positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Furthermore, we could conclude that different socioeconomic factors can provide alternative/supporting explanations for Europeanisation and attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Based on these results and the discussed theories, I give recommendations for future policy regarding civil rights realisation of gays and lesbians.

Keywords: Europeanisation, European Union, Sexual Minorities,
Cultural Relativism, Universalism

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. BACKGROUND	8
2.1. Europe and Finland	8
2.2. Europe and the Netherlands	9
2.3. LGBT+	11
2.3.1. Definition and issue	11
2.3.2. LGBT+ Rights in the European Union	11
2.3.3. LGBT+ in Finland	12
2.3.4. LGBT+ in the Netherlands	13
3. THEORY	14
3.1. Europeanisation	14
3.1.1 Background	14
3.1.2. Mechanisms	15
3.1.3. General Outcomes	15
3.1.4. Outcomes on Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians	16
3.1.5. Social class	16
3.1.6. Other Sociodemographic Factors	17
3.2. Universalism vs. Cultural Relativism	17
3.3. Legitimation Theory	19
4. METHODOLOGY	19
4.1 Data	19
4.2. Measures	20
4.2.1. Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians	20
4.2.2. Europeanisation	21
4.2.3. Moderator: Social Class	23
4.3. Statistical Analysis	25
5. RESULTS	26
5.1. Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians	26
5.2. Europeanisation	27
5.3. Europeanisation and Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians	28
5.3.1. Finland	28
5.3.2. The Netherlands	30
6. DISCUSSION	33

6.1. Strengths and Limitations	34
7. CONCLUSION	35
8. POLICY RECOMMENDATION	36
REFERENCES	37
APPENDICES	41

1. INTRODUCTION

Sexual orientation and gender identity are still widely used as a justification for gross human rights violations across the world. These minorities, also referred to as LGBT+, continue being subjected to mistreatment from hate speech to discrimination in different areas of life, and persecution to serious physical threat (Rainbow Europe, 2020). Although the situation within the European Union is not as drastic as in many other places around the world, within its borders there are still sexual and gender minorities struggling with discrimination and unequal rights in comparison to heterosexual citizens (ILGA Europe, 2019, Rainbow Europe 2020; European Commission, 2019).

The European Union has taken a variety of actions to tackle these issues, from legislation to anti-discrimination projects (European Commission, 2020). Regardless of this European-level pressure, attitudes towards sexual and gender minorities and the realisation of their rights vary largely between member states, with Western and Northern European countries showing most positive attitudes (Rainbow Europe, 2020; European Commission, 2019). However, among the Nordic countries there is a surprising laggard, Finland. This Nordic country that is often praised for its high standard of living and outstanding educational system, has been an unfortunate late adopter of laws aiming to improve equality of LGBT+ communities (ILGA Europe, 2019). Furthermore, its citizens show lesser acceptance of sexual and gender minorities in comparison to other Western/Northern countries (Rainbow Europe, 2020; European Commission, 2019; SETA, 2019). These differences are especially stark when compared to the Netherlands, which is often regarded as one of the trailblazers of LGBT+ rights and acceptance (ILGA Europe, 2019). Finland and the Netherlands are in many other ways similar, progressive countries, so why do they differ so distinctively in this matter?

The level of Europeanisation has been suggested to explain variance in progressive attitudes, including acceptance of the LGBT+, among European countries (Mole, 2016; Heidenreich, 2019; Kajevska, 2016). What is referred to as Europeanisation in the context of this research, is the degree of adoption of a European identity and the integration of values, laws, and

policies of the European Union (Grazioni & Vink, 2013; Fligstein, Polyakova & Sandholtz, 2011). In other words, greater vertical involvement with the European Union and stronger horizontal connections with the other member states leads to what is considered a higher level of Europeanisation. Based on this assumption, Finland should be less Europeanised than the Netherlands; it has had a significantly shorter history with the European Union in comparison to the Netherlands, which is one of its founding members (European Union, 2020b; Government of the Netherlands, 2020). Furthermore, unlike the Netherlands, Finland is geographically further removed from the European core, leading to lesser connections throughout history.

Scholars in the fields of Sociology and Political Science have argued that the more Europeanised a nation is, the less likely its citizens are to hold nationalistic, conservative or traditionalist views (Mole, 2016; Kajevska, 2016). Instead, it is believed to foster a ‘European Cosmopolitan identity’, a type of an intertwinement of the national, regional and European. As this identity is born from exposure to other European countries, it is often associated with greater likelihood of tolerance towards other people and ideas (Skey, 2012; Beck & Grande, 2007; Heidenreich, 2019). The most commonly used example is the acceptance of different cultures and ethnicities, but it could also be linked to attitudes towards ‘new’ ways of doing family or relationships, that differ from the traditional (Mole, 2016; Bilić, 2016).

In this research, I seek to examine whether this mechanism of European exposure and tolerance of ‘otherness’ is at play in the context of Finland and the Netherlands; two countries that at first glance seem to both be highly modern European Union member countries, but that differ in terms of LGBT+ friendliness, and connection to Europe. While there is some existing research on the impacts of Europeanisation on attitudes towards issues of value systems and tolerance of ‘otherness’, little attention has been paid to its effects on acceptance towards sexual and gender minorities. Furthermore, previous studies have focused mainly on the Eastern and Southeastern countries of Europe, such as Latvia or Macedonia; these pieces of research have shed interesting light on the roles European integration and policy-implementation play in promotion of LGBT+ rights (Mole, 2016; Bilić, 2016; Kajevska, 2016). By examining these

effects in the central Western and Northeast peripheral Europe I hope to add dimension to existing knowledge. Therefore, my research question is:

To what extent does Europeanisation explain the differences in attitudes towards gays and lesbians in Finland and the Netherlands?

As is apparent from the phrasing of the research question, this research will only be focusing on attitudes towards gays and lesbians. As will be explained in the Background section, the LGBT+ community consists of a variety of sexual orientations and gender identities, many of which the general public is still largely unfamiliar with. The choice to narrow down was made based upon the scope of this study and in hopes to gain more focused information. Furthermore, I will provide a detailed look into the general situation of LGBT+ people in Finland and the Netherlands respectively, answering my explanatory sub-question: *‘How is the current situation of gays and lesbians in Finland and the Netherlands?’* Furthermore, I aim to shed light upon the circumstances that have shaped Europeanisation in these two countries by answering my second sub-question: *‘What factors have contributed to Europeanisation in Finland and the Netherlands?’*

After going through this essential background information, the theory of Europeanisation will be discussed further and hypotheses will be drawn upon this theory. I will also expand beyond the direct effects of Europeanisation, and examine alternative and/or supporting explanations for attitudes towards gays and lesbians. For this, I will be looking into demographic factors, such as education, income, age and religiousness, and see whether they have significant direct and moderating effects.

To analyse my main research questions and my explanatory sub-questions, European Social Survey data set of the year 2018 is employed (ESS 9, 2018). The dataset was chosen for its large-scale cross-sectional information on demographics and attitudes in Europe, which makes it suitable for this comparison. In the Methods section of this paper I will go into detail on how the European Social Survey does not measure attitudes towards LGBT+ in a way that takes into account the diversity and extent of different sexual orientations and gender minorities, but

focuses only lesbian women and gay men. While this might be problematic inclusion-wise for such a large-scale institution, it does not affect this research.

Furthermore, this study aims to provide recommendations for future policy-making in acceleration of sexual minority rights in the context of the European Union. To do this, I will shed further light upon the mechanisms behind the cultural and legal integration across Europe, using the theories of universalism, cultural relativism and legitimacy. Taking these aspects into account is valuable in any attempt of policy-implementation across the different national and/or cultural identities of Europe (Kajevska, 2016; (Reichert, 2006). Consequently, based upon these considerations and the results of this study, I aim to answer my policy question: “*How can the conditions of European gay and lesbian citizens be further improved?*”

2. BACKGROUND

This section aims to highlight the historical, geographical, political or linguistic differences between Finland and the Netherlands, and the issues around acceptance of LGBT+, in particular gays and lesbians.

2.1. Europe and Finland

Although Finland is today by all means a European country, its history is arguably less tied to the European core due to its difficult geographical position and history (Vares, 2010; Mead 1991). Finland’s location at the European Northeast corner from the viewpoint of the ‘core of Europe’ can be disadvantageous in terms of mobility and trade (Vares, 2010). On land, Finland is only connected to the rest of European countries through Russia and its Northeast parts in Lapland (Vares, 2010). Furthermore, while many European countries are connected through the same language family, making communication that much easier, Finland stands rather alone; Finnish and other Finno-Ugric languages (Hungarian and Estonian), have little to nothing in common with the surrounding majority language families (Mead, 1991).

When it comes to historical factors, Finland's connection to the rest of Europe has fluctuated. The area known as today's Finland, previously called 'Österland', was part of Sweden for nearly 700 years, and its coastal towns acted as important overseas trade-points (Vares, 2010). However, in 1809 Finland was annexed by the Russian Empire and subjected to 'Russification', an effort of cultural assimilation and adoption of Russian identity (Vares, 2010; Mead 1991). This reduced Finland's connections to the rest of Europe and even after it won its independence in 1917, it was kept on a tight leash to Russia in terms of domestic policy and politics with the rest of Europe (Yle, 2018).

A turning point in the Russo-Finnish relations was when Finland joined the European Union in 1995. It marked the end of the 'neutral mentality' between East and West, and to Finland's politics, that so far had refrained from any criticism towards Russia (Yle, 2018; Pursiainen & Saari, 2002). The European Union acted as an anchor that started connecting the peripheral Finland to the Western Europe (Pursiainen & Saari, 2002). For approximately ten years, Finnish politics was very EU-positive, strengthening the connection to other member states and adopting a more European identity.

Since the European debt crisis in 2009, the honeymoon period started to wear off, and the public opinions of the European Union have started to cool. History professor Louis Clerc of Helsinki University describes the growing attitude towards the European Union as following: "There is now a certain distance from a certain Europe; described as being too bureaucratic, too 'southern', foreign to the considerations of many people, undemocratic, and dominated by 'great powers'" (Yle, 2018).

2.2. Europe and the Netherlands

The Netherlands has a very different tie to Europe than Finland for a variety of reasons. Geographically one can access most other European countries without having to cross water. Furthermore, its geographical position is rather central, with little distance to most 'core European countries' (Luiten, & Prak, 2006). Historically, this has allowed for smooth mobility and trade, leading to stronger connections and more shared culture with other European

countries. Furthermore, because of its location on the coast, the Netherlands has been, and still is a hub for international trade, bringing together people from around Europe (Luiten, & Prak, 2006). Linguistically Dutch is part of the (West) Germanic language family, mitigating the problem of language barrier with other countries, which can further increase the feeling of ‘belonging’ with the rest of Europe (Luiten & Prak, 2006).

When it comes to contemporary history, the Netherlands has always been at the core of the European Union. With Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Luxembourg, it was one of the founding members of the European Coal and Steel Community (1951), a union aimed to economically and politically unite post-war Europe (Government of the Netherlands, 2020). During the Cold War (1947 – 1991) and the East-West dichotomy, the Netherlands had a clear side among the West, unlike Finland (Fligstein, Polyakova & Sandholtz, 2011). Throughout the latter half of the 20th century, the promotion of ‘European values’ grew strong; in contrast to the Eastern tendency to collectivism and traditionalism, individualism and social change were emphasised. It should also be noted that the idea of ‘European values’ was popularized by Dutch researchers Jan Kerkhofs and Ruud de Moor (Kropp, 2017), who amidst promotion of these values studied their progression. In 1992, the European Union was founded at the Maastricht Treaty, to continue European integration (Fligstein, Polyakova & Sandholtz, 2011).

Therefore, it is clear that the Netherlands has had a strong position in Western Europe and the building of the European Union. It is an active agent in promoting and integrating value assimilation; whereas Finland is a passive agent in that it only adopts these changes instead of contributing (Luiten, & Prak, 2006; Fligstein, Polyakova & Sandholtz, 2011). How this affects the value outcomes will be further explained in the Theory section.

2.3. LGBT+

2.3.1. Definition and issue

The variety of identities and orientations under the LGBT+ community (often also referred to as LGBT/LGBTIQ/etc.) is large, and definitions are rather non-rigid. In general, the combination of letters refers to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex, Queer or other

non-heteronormatively identifying people across these groups (ILGA Europe, 2020b). Whereas heterosexual persons are sexually and/or romantically exclusively attracted to the opposite gender, people of sexual minorities can be attracted to for example (but not limited to) persons of their own gender (gay/lesbian), persons of both their own gender and other genders (bi), or persons of other any gender (pan) (ILGA Europe, 2020b).

This is a large group to consider, so in order to narrow down the scope of this research, I will focus only on issues faced by sexual minorities, more specifically lesbian women and gay men. Definitions of other preferences, such as pansexuality, are still less familiar to the general public (ILGA Europe, 2019). Further justification for this choice and availability of data will be explained in the Methods section.

2.3.2. LGBT+ Rights in the European Union

The European Union lists the following items as its core values: human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, rule of law and human rights (European Union, 2020a). These values are reflected in its laws and policies, promoting equal treatment to its diverse population, and protecting them against discrimination. This ties strongly to ideas of ‘universalism’ that followed World War II and the consequences of each country being able to determine and pursue their own values (Reichert, 2006). The theory of universalism, opposing cultural relativism and their implications on policy will be discussed further in the Theory section.

In the 2007 treaty of Lisbon, the European values are listed as following: “[R]espect for freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights including the rights of persons belonging to minorities”, invoking “a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail” (EUR-Lex, 2008). In line with this, The European Union prides itself on its extensive promotion of the rights of its sexual minorities citizens. Much has been done, especially since the inclusion of sexual orientation into Article 19 of Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (EUR-Lex, 2012), stating that the European Parliament: “may take appropriate action to combat

discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation”.

There has been increased pressure on member states to ensure the equal rights of their citizens of sexual minorities (ILGA Europe, 2016). In 2015, the European Commission introduced a list of six actions to improve the situation of sexual minorities in the region. The actions include 1) improving rights and ensuring legal protection of sexual minorities people and their families in key areas of European Union competence, 2) monitoring and enforcing existing rights of sexual minorities and their families under European Union law, 3) fostering diversity and non-discrimination, 4) supporting key actors responsible to promote and advance equal rights for sexual minorities people, 5) providing data for policy makers on sexual minorities challenges and 6) external action in enlargement, neighbourhood and third countries (European Commission, 2015).

Despite this European-level push, the acceptance of these communities and the realisation of their rights differs largely across the union (ILGA Europe, 2016). Generally it is the Western and Northern European member states that seem to show most advancement in regards to equal marital laws, adoption rights and gender change laws (Rainbow Europe, 2020). Furthermore, attitudes tend to be most inclusive of sexual minorities in these countries as well (Eurobarometer, 2019).

2.3.3. LGBT+ in Finland

Finland is a surprising laggard among the progressive countries of Western and Northern Europe. It has been falling behind when it comes to both laws and attitudes towards sexual minorities. For instance, same-sex sexual activity was punishable by law between 1894 and 1971, with maximum two years in prison. Even after its legalisation, the promotion of homosexuality remained illegal until 1999. Furthermore, homosexuality was only removed from the list of illnesses ten years later and conversation therapy is still a legal practice today. Marriage was only made possible between same-sex couples in 2017, after a citizens’ initiative passed in Parliament

with a close vote of 101–90 in 2014. Joint adoption of children was also legalised in the same year (SETA, 2020).

Today same-sex couples enjoy equal legal rights to heterosexual couples, and the law largely protects them against hate speech and discrimination. But although Finland now scores fourth place on European LGBT+ on the realisation of LGBT+ rights and meets 69% of the actions and policies mandated by ILGA Europe (2020), public attitudes seem to lag slightly behind (Jalonen, 2018; Syrjinta.fi, 2020; European Commission, 2019). In comparison to Finland's Nordic neighbors, acceptance of sexual minorities appears much less inclusive, especially in terms of same-sex couples' parental rights (Rainbow Europe, 2020).

Furthermore, while laws protecting rights of sexual minorities are improving, rights of gender minorities still fall behind. For instance, sterilisation is still required for gender re-assignment and recognition of one's gender (SETA, 2019). Although gender minorities will not be examined in this research, considering their situation in Finland is illustrative of the atmosphere LGBT+ rights in general.

2.3.4. LGBT+ in the Netherlands

The Netherlands is generally considered a country that is highly friendly towards sexual minorities and a trailblazer in terms of ensuring equal rights for sexual and gender minorities (European Commission, 2019; Rainbow Europe 2020); it was already in the early 1800's that homosexuality was legalised. Furthermore, same-sex couples have been able to marry and adopt since 2001 (ILGA, 2016). In terms of attitudes, as many as 97% of Dutch people express that sexual minorities should have equal rights (Rainbow Europe, 2020). It should be noted that Dutch policies are also very progressive in terms of gender minorities, in comparison to Finland, for instance in terms of gender reassignment (European Commission, 2019).

3. THEORY

3.1. Europeanisation

Up to this point I have provided background on the historical, political, geographic and linguistic ways in which Finland and the Netherlands differ. Furthermore I have explained the different bond each country has with Europe and the European Union. This bond is the cornerstone of the theory of 'Europeanisation'.

3.1.1 Background

The roots of studying European integration go back to the 1950's, to the initial debates about the nature of the process (Jacquot & Woll, 2003). The most prevalent early theories aimed at explaining the European regime and international cooperation, consisting mostly of opposing views of neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism (Haas, 1958; Hoffman, 1966). In the 1990s the focus shifted towards comparative research on policy implementation. In 2003, Europeanisation was defined by Radaelli (2003) as:

“-- processes of (a) construction (b) diffusion and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, “ways of doing things” and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies”.

Initially, the concept of Europeanisation was mostly utilised for research in political and legal sciences, and the focus was mostly on the top-down influence of the European Union on its member states (Grazioni & Vink, 2013). The addition of a horizontal dimension, as mentioned by Radaelli (2003), at the turn of the century brought the concept of Europeanisation into the field of Sociology (Grazioni & Vink, 2013). Since, it has been employed for explaining topics such as value shifts and migration, but also the everyday life of European citizens, from employment to leisure and relationships (Flockhart, 2006; Heidenreich, 2019).

3.1.2. Mechanisms

In short, the theory of Europeanisation refers to the adoption of a European identity or the laws and values of the European Union (Jacquot & Woll, 2003; Grazioni & Vink, 2013). It illustrates more than just compliance to European level ordinance, but rather a long process that takes place over an extended period of time, through decades or generations. To put it figuratively, it resembles how water can shape and mold stone over time.

The strength of this ‘molding’ is dependent upon the exposure, which for Finland and the Netherlands was illustrated to be very different in the Background section of this research paper. Furthermore, this integration can be horizontal or vertical (Grazioni & Vink, 2013). The latter often happens top-to-bottom, with European level policies and laws imposed upon member countries. However, it can also come from the initiative of domestic authorities and citizens as voters in European Union elections. Horizontal integration, on the other hand, can happen laterally through transnational relationships and interdependence, for instance through trade and travel (Heidenreich, 2019). The vertical and horizontal processes are not mutually exclusive, but essential in understanding the multidimensional and increasingly complex processes of integration (and disintegration) in Europe (Heidenreich, 2019).

Based on these mechanisms and the extent they apply to Finland and the Netherlands (discussed in the Background sections 2.1 and 2.2.), I have formed my first hypothesis: *H1: The level of Europeanisation is higher in the Netherlands in comparison to Finland.*

3.1.3. General Outcomes

The outcomes of these integration processes are further discussed by Heidenreich (2019) from a ‘cognitive-cultural’ approach. It places ‘the European space’ between the national and international, and suggests citizens come to possess an identity that is an intertwinement of the regional, national and European. Additionally, the author argues citizens participate in transnational community building, through collective decision-making, trade dependencies and

exchange and adoption of values, norms and attitudes (Beck & Grande, 2007; Heidenreich, 2019)

3.1.4. Outcomes on Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians

How does Europeanisation then relate to acceptance of sexual minorities? According to Heidenreich (2019), a flexible ‘European region Cosmopolitan identity’ can manifest as a higher ability of connecting and dealing with otherness or difference (Skey, 2012; Beck & Grande, 2007; Heidenreich, 2019). Additional existing research shows that persons with a Cosmopolitan mindset and exposure to heterogeneous populations tend to have a more of a ‘live and let live’ attitude towards people with different lifestyles to theirs (Skey, 2012; Mole, 2016). This could then also suggest better acceptance of also ‘others’, such as sexual and gender minorities.

Furthermore, as argued by Heidenreich (2019), the European transnational community have come to share common values through their interactions and interdependencies. To reiterate section 2.3.2.; the values of the European Union stand for a society of pluralism, tolerance, non-discrimination and equality. Based on these mechanisms of identity and value adoption, I state my second hypothesis: *H2: Higher levels of Europeanisation lead to better acceptance of gays and lesbians.*

3.1.5. Social class

The mechanisms behind Europeanisation have been criticised by scholars like Kuhn (2011). Kuhn argues that the adoption of European identity and values is not as simple or straightforward, but greatly depends upon one’s social class. Kuhn (2011) points out that much of the cross-border interactions and ‘European community building’ happen only among the upper social classes. Additionally, the lower social classes with less Cosmopolitan lifestyles, and consequently less European collective values, might see European integration as a threat to traditions and certainties upheld by the nation-state (Heidenreich, 2019). As illustrated above, citizens who hold traditional values, the European level promotion of rights of sexual and gender minorities, might appear as a threat to the nuclear family and belief in two genders (Mole, 2016).

Based upon this point of criticism, it is necessary to look into the ways social class might moderate the effects Europeanisation has on attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Therefore, my third hypothesis is: *H3: Social class moderates the effects Europeanisation has on attitudes towards gays and lesbians.*

3.1.6. Other Sociodemographic Factors

On top of social class, it is important to take into consideration other sociodemographic factors that might explain attitudes towards gays and lesbians. For instance, existing literature suggests that younger age groups tend to be more tolerant towards diversity and ‘others’, such as sexual minorities and immigrants (Janmaat & Keating, 2017; Olander, 2005). Older persons might be less willing to adopt unfamiliar ways of doing or seeing things, and rely on traditional values instead. For this reason it is useful to examine whether age could be used as an alternative explanation for attitudes towards gays and lesbians. (Janmaat & Keating, 2017) (Wilson et al., 2014).

Furthermore, other possible explanations for preference for conservative values and lesser acceptance for ‘new values’ could be found from a person’s religiousness. Religions often uphold traditional values, that determine the ways in which for example gender and family are realised (Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014). Although these beliefs are not as rigid nowadays, gender roles and heteronormativity tend to still be more persistent among religious persons in comparison to non-religious persons (Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014; Wilson, West, Stepleman, et al., 2014; (The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2005). Therefore, the level of one’s religious involvement could serve as an alternative explanation for acceptance of gays and lesbians.

3.2. Universalism vs. Cultural Relativism

To further expand on the factors that might affect the ways in which values and identities are adopted and integrated, we will take a look into universalism and cultural relativism. In the light of the consequences of World War II, it was apparent that it could have detrimental effects, when every country gets to determine and pursue their own values. Therefore, in 1948 the United

Nations General Assembly adopted the ‘Universal Declaration of Human Rights, outlining the concept and implementations of human dignity, liberty and dignity (Reichert, 2006).

At the core of human rights is the idea that these rights belong to everyone, regardless of the status a person may hold in society. These internationally agreed upon values regulate the ways states should treat populations across different social strata inside and outside their borders. It is argued, that without some level of common agreement on state conduct upon its citizens, social life would be hopeless (Reichert, 2006).

However, universalism does not go without criticism. For instance, critics note its similarities to the colonialist tradition of spreading ‘one superior ideology’ chosen by few powerful groups across other societies. It raises important questions on whether some values and norms truly have a universal authority over others (Reichert, 2006; Donnelly, 1984).

Cultural relativism was born to oppose the colonialist idea of cultural superiority; instead, it argued that all cultures have value in itself. It states that no international value system should be superior to local cultural, religious and traditional values (Reichert, 2006). In its time it was a revolutionary approach, and it still has value today in aspects of cultural studies. For instance it can be used to bring attention to the importance of preservation of certain cultural products, like art, clothing, cuisine, etc. However, it raises confusion when discussing human rights. For example, should gay men and lesbian women be allowed to be treated as lesser citizens because a local religion dictates so? Should the European Union therefore not try to intervene, if within its borders non-heterosexual persons were persecuted?

Thus, uncritical acceptance of cultural relativism can be problematic. However, this can be avoided by examining the societal structures that have molded these values and norms; analysing the prevalent culture can give valuable information about the best ways of approaching human rights for all citizens (Reichert, 2006; Donnelly, 1984).

3.3. Legitimation Theory

Further light upon value integration and implementation of laws and policies can be shed using theory around legitimacy. Legitimacy is the justification, on which persons or institutions can

impose laws and rules upon others. Force alone cannot act as an efficient, long-lasting base for rule, but it must rely on respect and willingness to comply - legitimacy (Tyler, 2003).

According to Max Weber, legitimacy is based upon one of three types of authority: 1) rational, which relies on rules and law; 2) traditional, e.g. inherited rule; 3) charisma. The jurisdiction of European Union is clearly based upon rational authority, but some scholars argue that it is not that simple. Burgess (2002) summarises the problem by asking: “How European is the European Union?” and “Who speaks in and through the treaties emitted by the EU?” (Burgess, 2002). He highlights the constant negotiation of the power, and brings attention to how the inhabitants of the member states might have a hard time accepting the rule of something so ambivalent as ‘Europe’. Therefore, a stronger connection to Europe among citizens should hypothetically lead to better acceptance of laws and policies implemented on a European-level, which ties us back to Europeanisation.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Data

The European Social Survey (ESS) was chosen to be the most fitting for the purpose of this research. It is a social scientific effort aiming to chart attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of different European populations (ESS, 2018). It is valuable for its large sample sizes, ensuring sufficient representation of European countries, which allows high-quality national and international comparisons and analysis. The European Social Survey is conducted every second year, and participants are asked to each answer an extended amount of questions, regarding all areas of their lives to offer cross-sectional insights on the European citizens (ESS9, 2018). As the ESS is conducted and published every 2 years, the dataset of 2020 will not be published in time for this research, therefore the newest available dataset ESS9 of 2018 was chosen for this research. This choice was made with confidence, as attitude changes take a long time (as

explained in the Theory section) and the two year difference will not show drastic differences (Jacquot & Woll, 2003).

The year 2018 dataset included the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Citizens of Finland (n=1755) and the Netherlands (n=1673) will naturally be selected for the analysis.

The European Social Survey (2018) consists of different themes, which are constantly reviewed for usefulness and additions. The 2018 dataset included the following themes: media and social trust, subjective well-being, timing of life, justice and fairness in Europe, politics, gender and household, socio-demographics, human values. For the purpose of this study, themes containing survey items in connection to Europeanisation, sexual minority rights and sociodemographic details were chosen. This will be further explained in the following section.

4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians

To measure the attitudes towards gays and lesbians, three items (all from the theme ‘Politics’) were selected as dependent variables. As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire is phrased to only consider lesbians and gays, while in the questionnaire development documents (ESS9, 2018) emphasise the importance of looking into people’s attitudes towards sexual and gender minorities in Europe. Although this seems like a point of improvement for future survey rounds, this information is sufficient for the scope of this research.

‘Live Life as They Wish’. Participants were asked whether they think gays and lesbians should be free to live their lives as they wish. This item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from ‘Strongly agree’ to ‘Strongly disagree’.

Attitude Towards Gay or Lesbian Family Members. Participants were asked whether they would feel ashamed, if their family member was gay or lesbian. This item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from ‘Strongly agree’ to ‘Strongly disagree’.

Attitude Towards Adoption Rights. Participants were asked whether they think gays and lesbians should have the same adoption rights as heterosexual couples. This item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from ‘Strongly agree’ to ‘Strongly disagree’.

The variables will first be analysed independently, then combined into a composite overall score. This way more detailed data can be gathered for policy recommendations.

4.2.2. Europeanisation

As discussed in the Theory section, Europeanisation does not simply mean compliance to laws and policies, but is rather a longer process of changing values and identities over time (Mole, 2016; Jacquot & Woll, 2003). For the same reason, measuring attitudes towards sexual minorities among citizens might provide more accurate information about the actual situation, than simply looking into implementation of laws and policies that aim to protect these minorities (Mole, 2016). Therefore, a micro-level analysis, using variables measuring attitudes, is chosen.

As Europeanisation is a multidimensional concept, I will create a composite variable to measure it as comprehensively as possible. Based upon the conceptual framework discussed in the Theory section, three different indicators are selected: a) attitude towards further European integration, b) trust in European Parliament and c) emotional attachment to Europe. The variables chosen from the ESS 2018 dataset reflecting these three indicators are as following:

European Unification. This variable aims to represent the earlier discussed connectedness to the rest of Europe, and the intertwined identity of the regional, national and European. Based upon this assumption, a respondent possessing such identity will report a more positive attitude towards unification.

Participants were asked whether they think the European unification should be continued further on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being ‘Unification gone too far’ and 10 ‘Unification to go further’.

Trust in European Parliament. As discussed in the Theory section, the ‘European level community’ is partly built upon collective decision-making. I wish to illustrate this on a micro-level through citizen confidence in authorities that represent their opinion at the highest unit of the European Union. Furthermore, based upon the assumption that the European Parliament aims to comply with European Union values, persons who do not share these values might have lesser trust in the decision-makers.

Here participants were asked how much they personally trust the European Parliament on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being ‘No trust at all’ and 10 ‘Complete trust’.

Emotional Attachment to Europe. In order to further illustrate the ‘European Cosmopolitan identity’ and a feeling of belonging to a ‘European community’, an indication of emotional attachment was chosen.

Participants were asked how emotionally attached they feel to Europe on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being ‘Not emotionally attached at all’ and 10 ‘Very emotionally attached’.

These three variables are found under themes ‘Politics’ and ‘Subjective well-being’. These variables will be combined to represent an independent composite variable ‘*Level of Europeanisation*’ (lv1_eur).

4.2.3. Moderator: Social Class

In accordance with scholarly criticism on oversimplification of Europeanisation and the emphasis of effects of social class, education and income will also be taken into account, first separately and then combined as variable ‘social class’. as a moderator variable.

The education systems between European countries differ largely (also between Finland and the Netherlands), but the European Social Survey has conveniently created a unification of

all systems. For the purpose of this research, this variable was further condensed into 8 values (see Table 1) from what was originally near 20 values (see Appendix 3).

Unfortunately detailed information about individual net income was not available, so household net income was chosen instead. The ESS9 dataset has categorised household income in deciles for comparison purposes across European countries (Appendices 1 and 2).

Table 1. Social Class: Highest Level of Education & Household Net Income

Item	<u>Finland</u>		<u>The Netherlands</u>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Education	1750		1658	
Less than lower secondary	181	10.3	118	7.1
Lower secondary	154	8.8	388	23.2
Lower-tier upper secondary	583	33.3	487	29.1
Upper-tier upper secondary	103	5.9	22	1.3
Advanced vocational	184	10.5	83	5.0
Lower tertiary education	277	15.8	217	13.0
Higher tertiary education	247	14.1	332	19.8
Doctorate	21	1.2	11	.7
Household Net Income*	1634		1391	
J 1st decile	128	7.3	79	4.7
2nd decile	100	5.7	78	4.7
3rd decile	112	6.4	90	5.4
4th decile	159	9.1	99	5.9
5th decile	164	9.3	135	8.1
6th decile	185	10.5	121	7.2
7th decile	178	10.1	169	10.1
8th decile	210	12.0	184	11.0
9th decile	217	12.4	195	11.7
10th decile	181	10.3	241	14.4

Note. *See Appendices 1 and 2 for country-specific explanations

4.2.4. Control Variables: Age & Religion

To explore alternative explanations for attitudes towards gays and lesbians, age and religion were included as control variables. In the ESS9 dataset, age was measured from 15 to 99. To simplify this, it was arranged into six categories. Religion was measured on a 5-Point Likert scale ‘How religious are you?’, which was left as is.

Table 2. Control Variables: Age & Religion

Item	<u>Finland</u>		<u>The Netherlands</u>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Age	1755		1673	
-25	212	12.1	248	14.8
26-35	225	12.8	216	12.9
36-45	258	14.7	241	14.4
46-55	276	15.7	321	18.6
56-65	325	18.5	292	17.5
66+	459	26.2	364	21.8
Religiousness*	1755			
1	296	16.9	533	31.9
2	294	16.8	244	14.6
3	319	18.2	268	16.0
4	480	27.4	349	20.9
5	366	20.9	279	16.7

Note. * ‘How religious are you?’; 5-point Likert scale with 1 = ‘Not at all’ and 5 = ‘Very religious’

4.3. Statistical Analysis

The analysis is conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (23). First, descriptive statistics are produced for all relevant variables. The results are presented in Table 1 (education & income), Table 2 (age and religion), Table 3 (attitudes towards gays and lesbians) and Table 4 (europeanisation).

As mentioned earlier, a composite variable '*Level of Europeanisation*' (lvl_eur) was made of variables measuring attitudes towards European unification, emotional attachment to Europe and trust in European Parliament. Before doing so, a factor analysis is conducted on these three variables to determine the extent of their loading on the construct, and to make sure there is no multicollinearity between the variables. This proved sufficient confirmation for the use of these variables, with fairly strong correlations and a determinant = .69 confirming the variables are related. Using a cutoff point of .8 for correlation, no multicollinearity was detected. It should be noted that exploratory factor analysis was also conducted to examine whether other variables indicating Europeanisation could be found from the ESS9 dataset, but no better fitting variables were detected.

Next, the first hypothesis was tested using a two-sample T-test, examining the differences between (composite) of Europeanisation in Finland and the Netherlands.

Categorical regression analysis (CATREG) is used to explore the second hypothesis: '*Higher levels of Europeanisation lead to better acceptance of gays and lesbians*'. The choice for this type of regression analysis was made based on the type of variables used in the analysis; the ordinal nature of Likert scale makes them unfit for most regression analysis methods, with many required assumptions being left unfulfilled. The categorical regression tool of SPSS however processes and scales nominal and ordinal data. In the analysis, it treats the quantified categorical variables similarly to numerical variables, allowing them to be analysed for the best fitting model. The only assumptions are that the response variables must contain a minimum of three valid cases, and they must exceed the amount of predictor variables, plus one. Considering the nature of the data used for this research, and the confirmation of the assumptions being met, categorical regression analysis is deemed a good fit for this research.

Independent composite variable '*Level of Europeanisation*' is tested against dependent composite '*Attitudes towards gays and lesbians*', and the other three dependent items measuring views of gays and lesbians. Categorical regression analysis is also equipped to test control variables '*Age*' and '*Religion*' against the dependent variables.

The last hypothesis is tested using moderators '*Highest level of education*' and '*Household net income*'. Prior to testing for the moderator effect using X , the direct relationship

between both education and income is tested against all items of attitudes towards gays and lesbians. The moderation is tested using the Baron and Kenny (1986) three step model of moderation. In step one, the effect Europeanisation was regressed on attitudes towards gays and lesbians. In the second step, the effect of Europeanisation is regressed on item ‘Education level’. In the final step, the interaction item (‘Education level’) was introduced between the effect of Europeanisation and attitudes towards gays and lesbians. The moderation effect is confirmed when the effect of interaction term is statistically significant. The same process was repeated using the item ‘Household Net Income’. All moderation tests, but also the direct effects, were tested first on Finland, then the Netherlands, using a country dummy variable.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians

As expected, the attitudes towards gays and lesbians were higher among the Dutch respondents.

Table 3. Attitudes towards gays and lesbians

<u>Finland</u>	(1	2	3	4	5)*	M	SD	N
‘Live life as wish’	35	77	182	645	796	4.2	.94	1735
‘Ashamed if’	933	535	150	61	48	1.7	.96	1727
‘Adoption’	173	319	306	452	480	3.4	1.33	1730
Composite**	46	172	556	788	95	3.9	.94	1709
<hr/>								
<u>The Netherlands</u>								
‘Live life as wish’	14	24	54	529	1031	4.5	.70	1652
‘Ashamed if’	1115	418	48	49	17	1.4	.78	1647
‘Adoption’	38	125	158	578	741	4.1	1.02	1640
Composite**	3	22	155	531	916	4.4	.73	1627

Note: * Number of responses per 5-point Likert scale item; 1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree
 ** Measures combined attitudes towards gays and lesbians; 1 = Very negative; 5 = Very positive

5.2. Europeanisation

Against the assumption of lower Europeanisation based on the historical, geographic and political factors examined earlier in this paper, Finland scores slightly higher on most items measuring Europeanisation (see Table 4 below). An especially surprising item is the ‘Emotional attachment to Europe’. A Two-Sample T-test was conducted in order to determine the statistical differences of these results. Based on the outcome, it was clear I could not confirm my hypothesis ‘*The level of Europeanisation is higher in the Netherlands in comparison to Finland*’.

Table 4. Europeanisation (per item)

<u>Finland</u>		1	2	3	4	5	M	SD	N
Composite*	46	172	556	788	95	4.1	2.0	1750	
European unification**							5.2	2.1	1717
Emotional attachment***							6.5	3.1	1735
Trust in EP****							5.4	6.5	1686
<hr/>									
<u>The Netherlands</u>									
Composite*	44	180	581	674	61	3.3	.84	1540	
European unification**							5.5	2.2	1598
Emotional attachment***							5.7	2.0	1662
Trust in EP****							5.3	5.7	1592

Note: * Measures combined score for Europeanisation; 1 = Very low; 5 = Very high

** Original 10-point-Likert scale; 0 = Unification gone too far; 10 = Unification to go further

*** Original 10-point-Likert scale; 0 = Not emotionally attached at all; 10 = Very emotionally attached

**** Original 10-point-Likert scale; 0 = No trust at all; 10 = Complete trust

5.3. Europeanisation and Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians

A categorical regression analysis utilising all items of Europeanisation in explaining three separate items of attitudes towards gays and lesbians in both Finland and the Netherlands yields the following results:

5.3.1. Finland

When it comes to Finnish respondents (see Table 5) and the direct effect of Europeanisation on attitudes towards gays and lesbians, 5.0% of the variance is explained by the model using both independent and dependent composite variables. A positive and significant coefficient indicates that a higher level of Europeanisation indeed leads to better attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Taking a more detailed look into the individual items of the dependent variables, we see that Europeanisation had the strongest positive effect on attitudes towards adoption rights of gay and lesbians couples, with 6.0% of the variance significantly explained. Furthermore, we observe a positive, significant relationship between level of Europeanisation and respondents' attitudes on item 'Gays and lesbians should live life as they wish'.

Table 5: Categorical Regression Analysis (Finland)

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	R²	Standard. Beta	F	Sig.
Composite					
Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.050	.225	63.155	.000*
	‘Free to Live’	.028	.168	26.78	.000*
	‘Ashamed if’	.029	-.171	30.448	.000*
	‘Adoption’	.060	.246	72.227	.000*
Control: Age	Composite LG	.117	-.342	249.169.000*	
	‘Free to Live’	.073	-.270	137.442.000*	
	‘Ashamed if’	.088	.297	171.669.000*	
	‘Adoption’	.094	-.307	188.689.000*	
Control: Religion	Composite LG	.073	-.273	137.424.000*	
	‘Free to Live’	.067	-.260	128.441.000*	
	‘Ashamed if’	.043	.207	84.000	.000*
	‘Adoption’	.054	-.232	95.792	.000*

Note: *Significant at $p < .05$

Lastly, respondents with higher level of Europeanisation seemed to be less likely to report shameful feelings towards hypothetical close gay or lesbian family members; these results are significant with $p < .05$, although weak. Based on these results, for Finland I can confidently accept my hypothesis '*Higher levels of Europeanisation lead to better acceptance of gays and lesbians*'.

My first control variable, age, had a rather strong negative correlation with attitudes towards gays and lesbians among the Finnish respondents. The model using the composite variable significantly accounted for 11.7% of the variance. When it comes to the respective attitude items, religiousness had the strongest negative impact on views of adoption rights. The effect was the same towards attitudes on gay and lesbian life styles, albeit less strong. Religiousness also significantly increased feelings of shame towards hypothetical gay or lesbian family members.

The other control variable, religion, also proved to negatively impact attitudes towards gays and lesbians among Finnish respondents, with the composite variable model explaining 7.3% of the variance. Higher religiousness significantly correlated with worse views of gays and lesbians when it came to both lifestyles and adoption rights. Furthermore, it increased feelings of shame towards hypothetical gay or lesbian family members.

The moderation effect (Table 7) of social class using first 'Education level' as a moderator brought about a variation change of .014, which was significant with $p < .05$. 'Household Net Income' brought the variation change of .001, also significant. Based on these results, the hypothesis '*Social class moderates the effects Europeanisation has on attitudes towards gays and lesbians*' can be accepted.

Table 7: Regression Analysis with Moderation (Finland)

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	Adj. R2	R2 Change	Standard. Beta	t	Sig.
<u>Education</u>						
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.044		.209	8.616	.000
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Education	.028		.166	6.850	.000
CE*Education	Composite LG	.059				.000
Model 1*		.044	.044	.191	7.840	.000
Model 2**		.058	.014	.121	4.979	.000
		.000				
<u>Income</u>						
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.044		.209	8.616	.000
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Income	.015		.124	4.941	.000
CE*Income	Composite LG					.000
Model 1*		.044	.044	.211	8.538	.000
Model 2***		.058	.014	.191	8.417	.000

Note: *Predictors: Level of Europeanisation

**Predictors: Level of Europeanisation, Highest level of education

***Predictors: Level of Europeanisation, Household Net Income

5.3.2. The Netherlands

Examining the results of Dutch respondents (Table 6) in comparison to the Finnish, a smaller portion (1.6%) of the variance can be explained with the model using the composite variables. Nevertheless, the relationship is significant and positive, indicating that a higher level of Europeanisation corresponds with a better view of gays and lesbians. Examining the individual items of attitudes, it is apparent that the correlation between level of Europeanisation and attitude ‘Gays and lesbians free to live life as they wish’ is insignificant. Similarly to Finnish respondents, but in a weaker effect, respondents with higher levels of Europeanisation reported less feelings of shame towards family members, and more positive attitudes towards adoption rights. Although the results were less substantial than for the Finnish model, they support my hypothesis ‘Higher levels of Europeanisation lead to better acceptance of gays and lesbians’.

Table 6: Categorical Regression Analysis (the Netherlands)

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	R²	Standard. Beta	F	Sig.
Composite					
Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.016	.125	28.360	.000*
	‘Free to Live’	.004	.063	1.080	.340
	‘Ashamed if’	.010	-.101	15.408	.000*
	‘Adoption’	.020	.140	25.516	.000*
Control: Age	Composite LG	.025	-.159	43.407	.000*
	‘Free to Live’	.012	-.110	10.453	.000*
	‘Ashamed if’	.008	-.090	.766	.465
	‘Adoption’	.048	-.219	89.570	.000*
Control: Religion	Composite LG	.105	-.324	152.618.000*	
	‘Free to Live’	.085	-.296	120.978.000*	
	‘Ashamed if’	.059	.244	90.000	.000*
	‘Adoption’	.088	-.297	114.959.000*	

Note: *Significant at $p < .05$

Looking into the control variables, the results significantly indicate that an increase in a respondent's age correlates with worse attitudes towards gays and lesbians. This was true for the composite variable, but also the individual items of attitudes. Age had the strongest negative effect on attitudes towards adoption rights of gay and lesbian couples, with 4.8% of the variance explained. The other two items were less strong, but statistically significant.

My other control variable, religion, also proved to correlate with attitudes towards gays and lesbians; the more religious a respondent reported being, the more negative were their views on gays and lesbians. The model using the composite variable significantly and strongly explained 10.0% of the variance in attitudes. The individual items followed a similar pattern, with more religiousness leading to worse attitudes to adoption rights, family members and freedom to live life as wished.

Table 8: Regression Analysis with Moderation (the Netherlands)

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	Adj. R2	R2 Change	Standard. Beta	t	Sig.
<u>Education</u>						
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.009		.093	3.632	.000
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Education	.034		.185	7.338	.000
CE*Education	Composite LG					.000
Model 1*		.008	.008	.066	3.579	.000
Model 2**		.027	.020	.144	2.527	.012
<u>Income</u>						
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Composite LG	.009		.093	3.632	.000
Composite Europeanisation (CE)	Income	.009		.097	3.524	.000
CE*Income	Composite LG					.000
Model 1*		.005	.006	.077	2.780	.006
Model 2***		.014	.009	.068	2.436	.001

Note: *Predictors: Level of Europeanisation

**Predictors: Level of Europeanisation, Highest level of education

***Predictors: Level of Europeanisation, Household Net Income

The moderation effect of social class using item ‘Education level’ brought about a variation change of .020, and ‘Household Net Income’ a variation change of .009. Both moderation models were significant with $p < .05$. With these results, the hypothesis ‘*Social class moderates the effects Europeanisation has on attitudes towards gays and lesbians*’ can be accepted.

6. DISCUSSION

The results of this research provide support for my hypothesis '*Higher levels of Europeanisation lead to better acceptance of gays and lesbians*'. For Finland, the effects were positive for all three dimensions of attitudes; respondents who scored higher on the construct Europeanisation reported more acceptance of gay and lesbian lifestyle, and homosexual couples' adoption rights. Furthermore, they were less likely to be ashamed if their close family member was gay or lesbian. Europeanisation also had an effect on Dutch respondents' attitudes, but not to as strong of a degree as in Finland and not across all items of attitude. This suggests that higher degrees of adoption of European identity and integration of its values can indeed make an individual more accepting of diversity and 'otherness', and in the case of this paper, gays or lesbians.

I provided a detailed look into the situation of LGBT+ in both Finland and the Netherlands and concluded that the first does lag behind in terms of realisation of LGBT+ civil rights and attitudes towards them. The responses of the ESS9 dataset fell in line with these summaries; Dutch respondents had significantly better attitudes towards gays and lesbians across all items.

When it comes to my hypothesis '*The level of Europeanisation is higher in the Netherlands in comparison to Finland*', the results were surprising. Against expectations of the degree of Europeanisation built upon the analysis of historical, geographic, political and linguistic factors, Finland ended up scoring slightly higher on most items measuring Europeanisation. Finnish respondents reported higher emotional attachment to Europe, and stronger trust in the European Parliament, but were slightly less in favor of further European unification. Based on these results, there was no support for the hypothesis on stronger Europeanisation in the Netherlands.

Interesting findings were made for alternative and supplementary explanations using sociodemographic factors, such as education, household income, age and religiousness. The first two, representing social class, had a moderating effect on the effect Europeanisation had on

attitudes towards gays and lesbians for both Dutch and Finnish respondents. These results supported my hypothesis '*Social class moderates the effects Europeanisation has on attitudes towards gays and lesbians*', suggesting that social class can play a role in the degree of one's Europeanisation. This supports the scholarly criticism on the simplicity of assumed mechanisms behind Europeanisation; not every citizen has the same opportunities to spend time outside their home country and cultivate a 'European Cosmopolitan identity'.

The other two sociodemographic items, age and religion, also yielded significant results, confirming the assumption that younger persons and non-religious persons tend to be more tolerant towards 'otherness' and non-traditional ideas. Interestingly, the effect of age was stronger in Finland. Perhaps the views between generations are starker in Finland, with the later generations having experienced a only more 'Western' Finland after it joined the European Union in 1995?

6.1. Strengths and Limitations

The first point of strength includes the extensive and comprehensive nature of the data of the European Social Survey. The sample sizes are large, and the range of themes and sociodemographic data make it easy and reliable to use.

The second strength of this research is that it fills a gap in literature; previous studies on Europeanisation and LGBT+ issues have mostly focused on Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Additionally, little research existed on Europeanisation and more general value outcomes. Filling this literature gap could be useful in future policy-making for acceleration of the realisation of LGBT+ civil rights. However, the weakness of this study is that it only focuses on gays and lesbians; sexual minorities, let alone the LGBT+ community as a whole, include a range of preferences and identities. While considering only gays and lesbians for this research was intentional, future studies should expand the scale. This is also a point of criticism to the European Social Survey.

Lastly, a weakness of this research arises from the ambivalent nature of Europeanisation as a concept. No single agreeable definition of it exists, so measuring it as a construct is not

fool-proof. While the results gained from this study support the idea of Europeanisation's effects on one's values, including more items into the composite could have further mitigated its elusive nature and further strengthened the conclusions.

7. CONCLUSION

Overall, the results yielded in this research answer my research question '*To what extent does Europeanisation explain the differences in attitudes towards gays and lesbians in Finland and the Netherlands?*'. It provides support for the theory of Europeanisation, and the mechanisms behind the value and identity integrations, at least in the context of Finland and the Netherlands. Furthermore, answering my explanatory sub-question '*How is the current situation of gays and lesbians in Finland and the Netherlands?*' in combination with the results of the analysis have contributed to valuable information about LGBT+ issues in Europe. Interesting shaping factors in regards to Europeanisation were also discussed answering my other sub-question '*What factors have contributed to Europeanisation in Finland and the Netherlands?*'. While the effect of the factors could not be confirmed, they still provide useful information about the different cultural backgrounds within Europe. Lastly, this study has certainly evoked more questions on the topic, which could be uncovered with future research that delves deeper into the factors contributing to Europeanisation and/or considers the LGBT+ community more inclusively. The topic is most certainly very relevant, since many there is still much to be done with realisation of equal rights of the LGBT+ citizens of Europe.

8. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Lastly, I will address my policy question '*How can the conditions of European gay and lesbian citizens be further improved?*'. Based on the results gained from this research, it is apparent that persons with higher levels of Europeanisation exhibited better attitudes towards gays and lesbians in both Finland and the Netherlands. As discussed in this paper, Europeanisation reflects

the degree of adoption of a European identity and the integration of European values. However, social class can moderate this effect, as is also evident from the conclusions drawn from this study; persons with lower levels of education and income score lower on Europeanisation, and therefore the effect on attitudes towards gays and lesbians is moderated. Furthermore, age and religiousness affects the attitudes towards these sexual minorities. Therefore, I recommend that future policy takes these sociodemographic factors into account. Promotion of rights of sexual minorities should focus on social classes and demographics that are least likely to have exposure to ‘otherness’ and hold negative attitudes towards them. These groups, as discovered, include older age groups, persons who are highly religious and persons with lower education and income. More exposure and knowledge is needed to normalise homosexual lifestyles among these groups.

However, as discussed, it is important to take into account the universal and cultural factors here. While the European Union holds rational authority over the member states in many ways, there needs to be respect and willingness to cooperate to achieve most effective policy-results. The ambivalent nature of the concept of a ‘collective Europe’ or ‘European authority’ might not sit well with some citizens. While the European Union should make sure LGBT+ rights are realised in its member states, implementing simple and uniform top-down policy might not be the best way to go. Therefore, it could be best for the European Union to support national LGBT+ rights organisations that best know how to operate in their respective countries. In other words, while LGBT+ rights are universal human rights, employing cultural relativism can expose underlying culture/country-specific obstacles and opportunities that slow down realisation of equal rights. Furthermore, fostering the efforts of national-level organisations mitigates the legitimacy issues of the authority of the European Union. If future policy-makers take these points into account, effective, multidimensional policy can be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Alexandre-Collier, A. (2015) Reassessing British Conservative Euroscepticism as a Case of Party (Mis)Management. In: Tournier-Sol K., Gifford C. (eds) *The UK Challenge to Europeanization*. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2007). Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(1), 67–85.
- Bilić, B. (2016). Europe ♥ Gays? Europeanisation and Pride Parades in Serbia. *LGBT Activism and Europeanisation in the Post-Yugoslav Space*. Palgrave Studies in European Political Sociology. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Burgess, J. (2002). What's So European About the European Union? *European Journal of Social Theory*. 5(4), 467-481.
- Donnelly, J. (1984). Cultural relativism and universal human rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*. 6(4). 400-419.
- Grazioni, P. & Vink, M. (2013). *Europeanization: Concept, Theory and Methods*. The Member States of the European Union, Edition: Second Edition, Chapter: 2. Oxford University Press, pp.31-54
- Fligstein, N., Polyakova, A. & Sandholtz, W. (2011). *European Integration, Nationalism, and European Identity*. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. UC Berkeley.
- European Commission. (2020). *Policies: Gender equality strategy*. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/gender-equality/gender-equality-strategy_en
- European Commission. (2019). *Eurobarometer on Discrimination 2019: The social acceptance of LGBTI people in the EU*.
- ESS Round 9: *European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018)*. Data file edition 1.2. NSD Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS Data for ESS ERIC.
- EUR-Lex. (2012). *The Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union*. Official Journal of the European Union.
- EUR-Lex. (2008). *Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union*. Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from:

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:0013:0045:EN:PDF>

European Union. (2020a). About the EU: Goals and Values of the EU. Retrieved from: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief_en

European Union. (2020b). Member Countries in Brief. Retrieved from: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries/member-countries_en

Flockhart, T. (2006). Europeanisation: the myths and the facts. *Public Policy Research (Online)*, 13(2), 86-91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1070-3535.2006.00426.x>

Government of the Netherlands. (2020). The Netherlands: EU member state. Retrieved from: <https://www.government.nl/topics/european-union/the-netherlands-Eu-member-state>

Haas, E. B. (1958), *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950–1957*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Heidenreich, M. (Ed.). (2019). *Horizontal Europeanisation*. London: Routledge.

Hoffmann, S. (1966), 'Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe', *Daedalus*, 95/3: 862–915

ILGA Europe. (2019). *State Sponsored Homophobia: A World Survey of Sexual Orientation Laws. Criminalisation, Protection and Recognition*.

ILGA Europe (2020a). Resources: Glossary. Retrieved from: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/glossary>

ILGA Europe (2020b). What we do: Anti-discrimination Law. Retrieved from: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/what-we-do/our-advocacy-work/anti-discrimination-law>

Jacquot, S., Woll, C. (2003). Usage of European Integration - Europeanisation from a Sociological Perspective. *EIoP European Integration Online Papers*. 7 (12), Pp.1-18.

Jalonen, J. (2018). *PITÄISIKÖ SEKSUAALIVÄHEMMISTÖILLÄ OLLA OIKEUS ELÄÄ HALUAMALLAAN TAVALLA?* [master's thesis]. University of Turku.

Janmaat, J. G., & Keating, A. (2017). Are today's youth more tolerant? Trends in tolerance among young people in Britain. *Ethnicities*, 19(1), 44-65. doi:10.1177/1468796817723682

Kuhn, T. (2015). *Experiencing European integration: Transnational lives and European identity*. OUP Oxford.

- Kropp, K. (2017). The cases of the European Values Study and the European Social Survey-European constellations of social science knowledge production. *Serendipities: Journal for the Sociology and History of the Social Sciences*, 2(1), 50-68.
- Luiten, J. & Prak, M. (2006). *Towards an economic interpretation of citizenship: The Dutch Republic between Medieval communes and modern nation states*. International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam.
- Manners, I. (2009). *The Concept of Normative Power in World Politics*. Danish Institute of International Studies. Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Mead, W. (1991). Finland in a Changing Europe. *The Geographical Journal*, 157(3), 307-315.
- Mikołajczak, M., & Pietrzak, J. (2014). Ambivalent Sexism and Religion: Connected Through Values. *Sex Roles*, 70(9-10), 387-399. doi:10.1007/s11199-014-0379-3
- Kajevska, M. (2016). *Growing Oppression, Growing Resistance: LGBT Activism and Europeanisation in Macedonia*. LGBT Activism and Europeanisation in the Post-Yugoslav Space. Palgrave Studies in European Political Sociology. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Mole, R.C.M. (2016) Nationalism and Homophobia in Central and Eastern Europe. In: Sloopmaeckers K., Touquet H., Vermeersch P. (eds) *The EU Enlargement and Gay Politics*. Gender and Politics. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- OECD. (2018). *How's Life in Finland?*
- Pursiainen, C. & Saari, S. (2002). *Et Tu Brute! Finland's NATO Option and Russia*. UPI Report. Nordregio – Nordic Centre for Spatial Development, Stockholm.
- Radaelli, C. (2003). The Europeanization of public policy, in: K. Featherstone and C. M. Radaelli (Eds) *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 27–56.
- Rainbow Europe (2020). *Rainbow map*. Retrieved from: <https://www.rainbow-europe.org/>
- Reichert, E. (2006). Human Rights: An Examination of Universalism and Cultural Relativism. *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, 22(1), 23-36.
- SETA. (2019, January 1). *Translakikampanja kutsuu lääkäreitä vetoamaan translain uudistamiseksi*. Retrieved from: <https://seta.fi/2019/01/07/laakarivetoamus/>

- SETA. (2020). Sateenkaarihistoria Suomessa. Retrieved from:
<https://seta.fi/ihmisoikeudet/sateenkaarihistoria-suomessa/>
- Skey, M. (2012). We Need to Talk about Cosmopolitanism: The Challenge of Studying Openness towards Other People. *Cultural Sociology*, 6(4), 471–487.
- The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2005). Attitudes of Young People Toward Diversity [Fact sheet].
https://circle.tufts.edu/sites/default/files/2019-12/FS_AttitudesTowardDiversity_2007.pdf
- Tyler, T. (2003). Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283-357. Retrieved June 25, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/1147701
- Vares, V. (2010). Creating a State and National Identity. Finland and Europe: 1918-1922. *Valahian Journal of Historical Studies*. Editura Cetatea de Scaun
- Wilson, C. K., West, L., Stepleman, L., Villarosa, M., Ange, B., Decker, M., & Waller, J. L. (2014). Attitudes Toward LGBT Patients Among Students in the Health Professions: Influence of Demographics and Discipline. *LGBT Health*, 1(3), 204-211.
doi:10.1089/lgbt.2013.0016
- Yle. (2018, May 9). Finland and the European Union: “It’s Complicated”. Retrieved from:
https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/news/finland_and_the_european_union_its_complicated/10197162

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Monthly Household Net Income Finland (ESS9, 2018)

	Source data		Income deciles
01	less than 1157 EUR -1157 -1157	J	less than 1157 EUR
02	1157-1448 EUR	R	1157-1448 EUR
03	1449-1854 EUR	C	1449-1854 EUR
04	1855-2267 EUR	M	1855-2267 EUR
05	2268-2716 EUR	F	2268-2716 EUR
06	2717-3271 EUR	S	2717-3271 EUR
07	3272-3926 EUR	K	3272-3926 EUR
08	3927-4648 EUR	P	3927-4648 EUR
09	4649-5814 EUR	D	4649-5814 EUR
10	5815 EUR or more	H	5815 EUR or more

Appendix 2: Annual Household Net Income the Netherlands (ESS9, 2018)

	Source data		Income deciles
01	13,100	J	<13000
02	17,200	R	13.000-17.000
03	20,300	C	17.000-20.000
04	24,100	M	20.000-24.000
05	28,300	F	24.000-28.000
06	32,800	S	28.000-33.000
07	39,200	K	33.000-39.000
08	45,900	P	39.000-46.000
09	58,300	D	46.000-58.000
10		H	58.000 of meer

Appendix 4: Original Education Categories Optimised Across All Countries (ESS9, 2018)

Code	Label
0	Not completed ISCED level 1
113	ISCED 1, completed primary education
129	Vocational ISCED 2C < 2 years, no access ISCED 3
212	General/pre-vocational ISCED 2A/2B, access ISCED 3 vocational
213	General ISCED 2A, access ISCED 3A general/all 3
221	Vocational ISCED 2C >= 2 years, no access ISCED 3
222	Vocational ISCED 2A/2B, access ISCED 3 vocational
223	Vocational ISCED 2, access ISCED 3 general/all
229	Vocational ISCED 3C < 2 years, no access ISCED 5
311	General ISCED 3 >=2 years, no access ISCED 5 *
312	General ISCED 3A/3B, access ISCED 5B/lower tier 5A
313	General ISCED 3A, access upper tier ISCED 5A/all 5
321	Vocational ISCED 3C >= 2 years, no access ISCED 5
322	Vocational ISCED 3A/3B, access 5B/lower tier 5A
323	Vocational ISCED 3A, access upper tier ISCED 5A/all 5
412	General ISCED 4A/4B, access ISCED 5B/lower tier 5A
413	General ISCED 4A, access upper tier ISCED 5A/all 5
421	ISCED 4 programmes without access ISCED 5
422	Vocational ISCED 4A/4B, access ISCED 5B/lower tier 5A
423	Vocational ISCED 4A, access upper tier ISCED 5A/all 5
510	ISCED 5A short, intermediate/academic/general tertiary below
520	ISCED 5B short, advanced vocational qualifications
610	ISCED 5A medium, bachelor/equivalent from lower tier tertiary
620	ISCED 5A medium, bachelor/equivalent from upper/single tier
710	ISCED 5A long, master/equivalent from lower tier tertiary
720	ISCED 5A long, master/equivalent from upper/single tier tertiary
800	ISCED 6, doctoral degree
5555	Other

Appendix 4: Syntax

* Encoding: UTF-8.

```
DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet1.  
RECODE cntry ('FI'=1) (ELSE=0) INTO finnish.  
VARIABLE LABELS finnish 'Finnish'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE cntry ('NL'=1) (ELSE=0) INTO dutch.  
VARIABLE LABELS dutch 'Dutch'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
FACTOR  
/VARIABLES eutf atcherp trstep  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/ANALYSIS eutf atcherp trstep  
/PRINT INITIAL CORRELATION SIG DET KMO EXTRACTION ROTATION  
/PLOT EIGEN  
/CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25)  
/EXTRACTION PC  
/CRITERIA ITERATE(25) DELTA(0)  
/ROTATION OBLIMIN  
/METHOD=CORRELATION.
```

```
COMPUTE lvl_eur=(eutf+atcherp+trstep).  
EXECUTE.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=lvl_eur  
/ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

```
RECODE lvl_eur (0 thru 5=1) (6 thru 11=2) (12 thru 17=3) (18 thru 23=4) (24 thru 30=5) INTO  
lvl_euro.  
VARIABLE LABELS lvl_euro 'Level of Europeanisation (5 point composite)'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE freehms (1=5) (2=4) (3=3) (4=2) (5=1) INTO free_to_live.  
VARIABLE LABELS free_to_live 'Gays and Lesbians Free to Live as Wish'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE hmsacld (1=5) (2=4) (3=3) (4=2) (5=1) INTO adoption.  
VARIABLE LABELS adoption 'Gays and lesbians right to adopt'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
RECODE hmsfmsh INTO shame.  
VARIABLE LABELS shame 'Ashamed if close family member gay or lesbian'.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
COMPUTE att_gl=(shame + free_to_live + adoption).  
EXECUTE.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=att_gl  
/ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

FILTER OFF.
USE ALL.
EXECUTE.

RECODE cntry ('FI'=1) ('NL'=2) (**ELSE=0**) **INTO** fi_nl.
VARIABLE LABELS fi_nl 'FI and NL'.
EXECUTE.

T-TEST GROUPS=fi_nl(1 2)
/MISSING=ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES=lvl_euro
/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

RECODE att_gl (**Lowest thru** 4=1) (**5 thru** 7=2) (**8 thru** 10=3) (**11 thru** 13=4) (**14 thru** 15=5) **INTO**
atd_gl.
VARIABLE LABELS atd_gl 'Attitude towards gays and lesbians (5 point composite)'.
EXECUTE.

RECODE agea (**Lowest thru** 25=1) (**26 thru** 35=2) (**36 thru** 45=3) (**46 thru** 55=4) (**56 thru** 65=5) (**66 thru**
Highest=6) **INTO** age_cat.
VARIABLE LABELS age_cat 'Age (categorised)'.
EXECUTE.

RECODE edulvlb (800=8) (**Lowest thru** 129=1) (**212 thru** 229=2) (**311 thru** 323=3) (**412 thru** 423=4) (**510**
thru 520=5) (**610 thru** 620=6) (**710 thru** 720=7) **INTO** edu.
VARIABLE LABELS edu 'Highest level of education'.
EXECUTE.

USE ALL.

COMPUTE filter_\$=(finnish = 1).

VARIABLE LABELS filter_\$ 'finnish = 1 (FILTER)'.

VALUE LABELS filter_\$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.

FORMATS filter_\$ (f1.0).

FILTER BY filter_\$.

EXECUTE.

CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl lvl_euro

/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI)

/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE)

/MAXITER=100

/CRITITER=.00001

/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA

/INITIAL=NUMERICAL

/PLOT=NONE

/REGULARIZATION=NONE

/RESAMPLE=NONE.

CATREG VARIABLES=free_to_live lvl_euro

/ANALYSIS=free_to_live(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI)

/MISSING=free_to_live(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE)

/MAXITER=100

/CRITITER=.00001

/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA

/INITIAL=NUMERICAL

/PLOT=NONE

/REGULARIZATION=NONE

/RESAMPLE=NONE.

CATREG VARIABLES=shame lvl_euro

/ANALYSIS=shame(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI)

/MISSING=shame(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE)

/MAXITER=100

/CRITITER=.00001

/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA

/INITIAL=NUMERICAL

/PLOT=NONE

/REGULARIZATION=NONE

/RESAMPLE=NONE.

```
CATREG VARIABLES=gl_adoption lvl_euro
/ANALYSIS=gl_adoption(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=gl_adoption(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl edu
/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH edu(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) edu(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl hincome
/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH hincome(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) hincome(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl age_cat
/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=free_to_live age_cat
/ANALYSIS=free_to_live(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=free_to_live(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=shame age_cat
/ANALYSIS=shame(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=shame(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=gl_adoption age_cat
/ANALYSIS=gl_adoption(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=gl_adoption(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl religious
/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```



```
CATREG VARIABLES=free_to_live religious
/ANALYSIS=free_to_live(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=free_to_live(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=shame religious
/ANALYSIS=shame(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=shame(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```
CATREG VARIABLES=gl_adoption religious
/ANALYSIS=gl_adoption(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=gl_adoption(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.
```

```

USE ALL.
COMPUTE filter_$=(dutch = 1).
VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'dutch = 1 (FILTER)'.
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).
FILTER BY filter_$.
EXECUTE.

```

```

CATREG VARIABLES=atd_gl lvl_euro edu hincome age_cat religious
/ANALYSIS=atd_gl(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI) edu(LEVEL=ORDI) hincome(LEVEL=ORDI)
age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI) religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=atd_gl(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE) edu(LISTWISE) hincome(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE)
religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.

```

```

CATREG VARIABLES=free_to_live lvl_euro age_cat religious
/ANALYSIS=free_to_live(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI) age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=free_to_live(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.

```

```

CATREG VARIABLES=shame lvl_euro age_cat religious
/ANALYSIS=shame(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI) age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI) religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=shame(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.

```

```

CATREG VARIABLES=gl_adoption lvl_euro age_cat religious
/ANALYSIS=gl_adoption(LEVEL=ORDI) WITH lvl_euro(LEVEL=ORDI) age_cat(LEVEL=ORDI)
religious(LEVEL=ORDI)
/MISSING=gl_adoption(LISTWISE) lvl_euro(LISTWISE) age_cat(LISTWISE) religious(LISTWISE)
/MAXITER=100
/CRITITER=.00001
/PRINT=R COEFF ANOVA
/INITIAL=NUMERICAL
/PLOT=NONE
/REGULARIZATION=NONE
/RESAMPLE=NONE.

```

```
USE ALL.  
COMPUTE filter_$=(cntry = 1).  
VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'cntry = 1 (FILTER)'.  
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.  
FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).  
FILTER BY filter_$.  
EXECUTE.
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT edu  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER edu.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT hincome  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER hincome.
```

USE ALL.

```
COMPUTE filter_$=(cny = 2).  
VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'cny = 2 (FILTER)'.  
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.  
FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).  
FILTER BY filter_$.  
EXECUTE.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT edu  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER edu.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT hincome  
/METHOD=ENTER atd_gl.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER hincome.
```

USE ALL.

```
COMPUTE filter_$=(cntry = 2).  
VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'cntry = 2 (FILTER)'.  
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.  
FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).  
FILTER BY filter_$.  
EXECUTE.
```

USE ALL.

```
COMPUTE filter_$=(cntry = 1).  
VARIABLE LABELS filter_$ 'cntry = 1 (FILTER)'.  
VALUE LABELS filter_$ 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.  
FORMATS filter_$ (f1.0).  
FILTER BY filter_$.  
EXECUTE.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER edu.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT hincome  
/METHOD=ENTER lvl_euro.
```

REGRESSION

```
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT atd_gl  
/METHOD=STEPWISE lvl_euro  
/METHOD=ENTER hincome.
```