

beyond the academic guild. I hope, in time, it finds the wide readership it deserves.

Samuel Tranter  
Durham University



**Why Muslim Integration Fails in Christian-Heritage Societies**, Claire L. Adida, David D. Laitin, and Marie-Anne Valfort, Harvard University Press, 2016 (ISBN 978-0-674-50492-9), xv + 264 pp., hb £35.95

The central thesis of this engagingly written and closely argued book is that Muslims qua Muslims experience significant discrimination when they attempt to integrate into a Christian heritage society. The study is based on the experience of Senegalese Christians and Muslims in France and suggests that both the Muslim immigrants and the host population bear joint responsibility for the failure of Muslims to integrate into Christian heritage societies. The book is thus focused around two questions: do Muslim immigrants from Muslim-majority countries experience discrimination on the basis of their religion; and if so, why does the host population in the Christian-heritage country discriminate?

Part One introduces the study. Chapter 1 outlines the problem, asking whether Muslims experience statistically significant disadvantage in the labor market of France on the basis of their religious faith. Chapter 2 discusses anti-Muslim discrimination in the French labor market and its consequences. The main aim of this chapter is to establish the existence of the problem, which was done in three ways. First, through a 'voting game', with half the players from district nineteen in Paris and half-Senegalese Christians and Muslims. Players could observe each other's looks, manners, dress and first names, but nothing else. Only one, non-Senegalese, participant wore clothing or jewelry which signified religious affiliation. Players spoke to each other, and subsequently were asked to vote as to whom they would most like to be their leader. The evidence was that leaders were chosen in parallel with shared religious affiliation. A second, 'correspondence test' used identical resumes, submitted with one of two types of names: a Senegalese Christian or a Senegalese Muslim. The Muslim received far fewer invitations to interview, suggesting discrimination was taking place. Third, average incomes of Muslim and Christian Senegalese families were compared, and the former was found to be an average of €400 per month lower than for Christians. The authors conclude on the basis of this evidence that Muslims do indeed experience discrimination on the basis of their religion.

Part Two sets out the research strategy. Chapter 3 explains why Senegal was chosen; in essence it is because Muslims and Christian

of similar socioeconomic backgrounds migrated to France at similar times from a population with roughly equal proportions of Christians and Muslims. This means the comparison will solely be between religion, not ethnicity or education or social status. What the researchers do not discuss in detail at this point is the religious makeup of the host country: France's policy of *laïcité* arguably is as significant a causal factor, and is not identical to, for example, the situation in England where there is an established church. Chapter 4 outlines how the sample was chosen, drawn from Senegalese Christians and Muslims as well as those with French parents and grandparents (dubbed rooted French or FFFs). The chapter includes an honest discussion of any biases in the selection process, which the authors argue mean their participants would be more open to migration than the norm within France. Chapter 5 outlines the research the team carried out. They conducted their first set of fieldwork in 2009 and the second in 2010, and each time participants played a series of five games to investigate how FFFs interacted with the Senegalese Christians and Muslims.

Part Three asks why there is religious discrimination in France. Chapter 6 outlines Muslim characteristics that feed rational Islamophobia. They outline three main factors: religious norms, gender norms, and mastery of French. With regard to religious norms, fears about proselytization and fears about religious belief intruding on workplace harmony and productivity were the central concerns. Regarding gender concerns, the issue was that Muslim views did not fit with those of wider society. Chapter 7 discusses evidence of non-rational Islamophobia. On the basis of the different games outlined in Chapter 5, the authors argue in this chapter that their FFF participants were predisposed to be more positive towards Christian rather than Muslim Senegalese participants. They suggest three significant findings: First, the FFF participants were discriminating against Muslims, even if they did not expect those particular individuals to be hostile towards them; second, FFF participants sought out those of the same religion; and third, as the number of Muslims increased, so too did FFF distaste. They term this final observation the 'Hortefeux effect', whereby individuals seek to limit the number of Muslims with whom they have to interact. Chapter 8 argues that FFFs and Muslims are locked in a discriminatory equilibrium, a vicious circle whereby both FFFs and Muslims in France are acting negatively towards one another in ways that are mutually reinforcing. The movements are that, first, Muslim immigrants display behaviors that feed into French discrimination against them in the labor market; second, rooted French exhibit unprovoked discrimination against Muslims; and third, Muslims, perceiving more hostility in France,

separate more from their host society than other migrants do. The chapter focuses on the third of these points, arguing on the basis of the games discussed in Chapter 5, that the Senegalese Muslim participants expected FFF participants to be less generous to them than the Senegalese Christian participants did.

Part Four tackles the theme of looking beyond, looking ahead. Chapter 9 discusses whether the findings can be extrapolated to the situation beyond France. Working primarily on the basis of two surveys (the European Social Survey and the Detroit Arab American Study), the authors argue that their findings are not unique to France. Such surveys are not conclusive, the authors recognize, and add further evidence from a small-scale study of migrants from Lebanon and Bosnia-Herzegovina, two other countries which have roughly equal proportions of Muslims and Christians. They conclude that it is not just France which is locked in a discriminatory equilibrium: the same is true of other European nations as well as the USA. Chapter 10 asks what can be done to solve this problem. They propose simultaneous intervention at three levels. First, work with individual citizens, based on 'nudge theory', to challenge religious discrimination and suggest that names which are not obviously Muslim may be advantageous to Muslim children. Second, work with institutions to encourage diversity training, in particular, tackling the non-rational elements of Islamophobia. Third, work at the level of the state, encouraging even the most assimilationist of states to accommodate to the realities of diversity.

The book also contains an appendix, which explains why France was chosen as the site for the fieldwork and the challenges the authors faced in developing the work. *Why Muslim Integration Fails* answers the questions it poses itself in a clearly argued, logical manner. It does not say anything especially controversial or groundbreaking, but it does document the failure and provide a balanced explanation. The proposed solutions are those of academics rather than hardened politicians; a greater engagement with *Realpolitik* would have strengthened the final chapter considerably. But overall, the case is well made and persuasively argued. Anyone interested in why Muslims are struggling to integrate in Western Europe will find food for thought here.

Tom Wilson  
St Philip's Centre, Leicester, UK

