

Attitudes towards refugees: solidarity, indifference and refusal

HAS CSS Institute for Minority Studies
Solidarity with refugees in the European
Civil Society

06. October 2016

Research questions

- 1. Size of the population taking part in philanthropic activities
- 2. What are the attitudes behind taking or not taking part? What are the ideological frameworks, framework-patterns behind?
- 3. Satisfaction with or critique of public actors according to their performance during the „refugee crisis”
- Methodology: Tárki Omnibusz, sample size: 1000 persons, representative of 18+ population, according to gender, age, education and settlement type. Data collection: October 2015.

Operationalization and frequencies

The size of philanthropy, activity types:

- Have you heard that there have been Hungarian citizens and organisations that helped (on voluntary basis, with philanthropic purposes) refugees or migrants crossing Hungary?
(yes: 90,8% - no: 8,2% - DK/NA: 1,1%)
- Is there anybody among your personal acquaintances who took part in this work?
(yes: 7,1% - no: 91,8% - - DK/NA: 1,2%)
- Is there anybody among your personal acquaintances who...
 - A. Donated in kind (food, cloths, blankets, tent etc.) (yes: 5%)
 - B. Donated money? (yes: 2,1%)
 - C. volunteered? (yes: 4,7%)
 - D. Offered shelter in their homes (yes: 0,1%)
- Have you in person given aid to migrant or refugee persons travelling through Hungary?
(yes: 3,5% - no: 96,4%)
- If yes:
 - A. Donated in kind (food, cloths, blankets, tent etc.) ? (yes: 2,5%)
 - B. Donated money? (yes: 1%)
 - C. volunteered? (igen: 0,8%)
 - D. Offered shelter in their homes? (igen: 0%)

Relation to own helping behaviour

<i>What has been the major cause of your not giving help?</i>		
I would have helped, if I had the chance to do so.	268	27,7
I have not, because I refuse the support of migrants.	179	18,5
I have not, because I consider the support to be the duty of the state (or the church, or aid organisations).	209	21,6
I have not, because I did not consider the issue.	273	28,2
DK/NA	38	3,9
Total	967	100,0

Structural background of helping attitudes (binary logistic regression)

		Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)		Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
			Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
Region (ref: Central Hungary)	Central Transdanubia	1,09	0,65	1,85	0,98	0,55	1,75
	Western Transdanubia	1,53	0,89	2,63	1,66	0,94	2,95
	Southern Transdanubia	0,8	0,44	1,48	0,9	0,48	1,69
	Northern Hungary	2,92**	1,68	5,08	3,26**	1,82	5,83
	Northern Great Plain	0,69	0,4	1,2	0,69	0,39	1,21
	Southern Great Plain	1,28	0,79	2,08	1,27	0,77	2,1
Settlement size (ref:>20000)	<1000	2,63**	1,43	4,83	2,28**	1,18	4,37
	1-2000	0,69	0,36	1,33	0,62	0,31	1,25
	2-5000	1,19	0,74	1,9	1,34	0,82	2,18
	5-10000	0,67	0,35	1,26	0,69	0,35	1,34
	10-20000	1,12	0,74	1,71	1,19	0,78	1,83
Age group (ref: 65+)	Gender	0,98	0,72	1,33	1,09	0,79	1,5
	18-24	0,52	0,22	1,24	0,55	0,22	1,4
	25-34	0,56	0,27	1,16	0,73	0,34	1,58
	35-44	0,64	0,32	1,31	0,71	0,33	1,5
	45-54	0,73	0,36	1,47	0,91	0,44	1,9
	55-64	0,61	0,36	1,04	0,67	0,38	1,17
Education (ref: higher education)	Less than 8 grades	0,34**	0,19	0,58	0,34**	0,19	0,6
	Vocational without A-levels	0,41**	0,25	0,66	0,45**	0,27	0,74
	Vocational + A-levels	0,58*	0,36	0,94	0,69	0,42	1,13
	A-levels without vocational	0,33**	0,19	0,58	0,38**	0,22	0,69
Employment (ref: active)	unemployed	1,31	0,62	2,78	1,31	0,61	2,82
	pensioner	0,94	0,53	1,68	0,98	0,54	1,78
	Other inactive	1,01	0,53	1,92	0,9	0,45	1,79
Financial-material status (ref: highest)	Fin-mat (1)	2,04	0,9	4,62	1,92	0,83	4,44
	Fin-mat(2)	1,34	0,62	2,9	1,15	0,53	2,52
	Fin-mat(3)	2,22*	1,07	4,63	1,91	0,9	4,05
	Fin-mat(4)	1,91	0,97	3,76	1,62	0,81	3,22
	Fin-mat(5)	1,53	0,77	3,03	1,32	0,66	2,65
Party preference (ref: FIDESZ)	MSZP				2,06*	1,14	3,73
	Jobbik				1,01	0,59	1,73
	Small Left/liberal opp.				2,51**	1,37	4,6
	No answer				1,2	0,82	1,77
Religiosity (ref: Not religious)	Does not know				1,09	0,56	2,1
	Religious, own way				1,13	0,77	1,66
	Religious				1,12	0,59	2,13
	Constant	0,67			0,37		

Structural background of helping attitudes

- Binary logistic regression.
- Outcome variable: helped/would have helped vs. rejects helping + not everyday people's duty + did not consider
- M1: region, settlement size, gender, age-group, education level, employment status and financial-material status
- M2: M1+ political attitudes (party-preference), religiosity

Results – M1:

- Age-group, employment status, gender was not related
- **Region:** The odds of support are 3 times higher in Northern Hungary than in Central Hungary (including Budapest);
- **Settlement size:** the odds of support is 2.3 times higher in settlements with less inhabitants than 1000, compared to settlements with a population 20.000 or higher
- The strongest association - **education:** higher education (at least B.A level degree) is the most important structural factor behind aid-support. The odds of support is 66% lower among those with less than 8 grades; 55% lower among those with a vocational degree, without A-levels; 40% lower among respondents with both A-levels and a vocational degree; and again, 62% lower among those possessing only A-levels, without vocational degree or higher education diploma.
- **material-economic position:** compared to the highest, 6th category, the odds of support are significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) in the 3rd lowest category (OR: 2,22). While in the lowest category and the 4th lowest category there is a tendency of association ($p < 0.1$), with an odds ratio of 2.

Results – M2:

- Religiosity: not associated with support of helping
- **Party preference:** strongly associated. The voters of MSZP, the socialist party have an odds 2 times higher than the voters of the ruling FIDESZ to support the idea of help; the voters of smaller left/liberal opposition parties (DK, LMP, Együtt) have an odds 2.5 higher than FIDESZ voters. Radical right voters, and those hiding their preferences do not differ significantly from FIDESZ voters.

Structural background of rejecting attitude (binary logistic regression)

		Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)		Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
			Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
Region (ref: Central Hungary)	Central Transdanubia	0,57	0,30	1,10	0,67	0,33	1,36
	Western Transdanubia	1,33	0,71	2,49	1,19	0,61	2,33
	Southern Transdanubia	0,22**	0,09	0,53	0,20**	0,08	0,50
	Northern Hungary	0,18**	0,08	0,44	0,18**	0,07	0,44
	Northern Great Plain	0,75	0,42	1,35	0,79	0,43	1,46
	Southern Great Plain	0,28**	0,14	0,56	0,30**	0,15	0,60
Settlement size (ref:>20000)	<1000	1,24	0,60	2,59	1,14	0,52	2,51
	1-2000	1,57	0,72	3,43	1,68	0,75	3,75
	2-5000	0,35**	0,16	0,76	0,28**	0,12	0,62
	5-10000	0,55	0,24	1,28	0,47	0,20	1,11
	10-20000	2,35**	1,45	3,79	2,27**	1,38	3,72
	Gender	1,68**	1,14	2,48	1,48	0,98	2,23
Age group (ref: 65+)	18-24	1,00	0,31	3,23	1,17	0,34	4,05
	25-34	2,79*	1,01	7,71	2,85	0,96	8,41
	35-44	1,35	0,49	3,73	1,39	0,47	4,08
	45-54	1,35	0,49	3,72	1,31	0,45	3,83
	55-64	0,96	0,42	2,18	1,00	0,42	2,41
Education (ref: higher education)	Less than 8 grades	2,84**	1,33	6,07	3,18**	1,44	7,02
	Vocational without A-levels	5,28**	2,72	10,22	5,29**	2,63	10,66
	Vocational + A-levels	2,01*	1,02	3,96	2,17*	1,06	4,44
	A-levels without vocational	3,34**	1,71	6,53	2,98**	1,48	6,03
Employment (ref: active)	unemployed	0,76	0,31	1,86	0,72	0,29	1,82
	pensioner	0,54	0,23	1,24	0,48	0,20	1,17
	Other inactive	0,95	0,46	1,97	1,09	0,52	2,29
Financial-material status (ref: highest)	Fin-mat (1)	1,06	0,38	2,97	1,46	0,50	4,25
	Fin-mat(2)	1,26	0,51	3,12	2,05	0,79	5,32
	Fin-mat(3)	0,85	0,35	2,08	1,08	0,42	2,77
	Fin-mat(4)	0,99	0,44	2,19	1,31	0,57	3,04
	Fin-mat(5)	1,75	0,79	3,89	2,17	0,93	5,06
Party preference (ref: FIDESZ)	MSZP + Small left/liberal				0,28**	0,13	0,58
	Jobbik				1,30	0,73	2,30
	No answer				0,53**	0,33	0,84
Religiosity (ref: Not religious)	Does not know				2,00	0,91	4,43
	Religious, own way				1,67*	1,02	2,73
	Religious				1,85	0,75	4,58
	Constant	0,04			0,03		

Ideologies and reasoning related to helping

To what extent do you agree on a scale 0 to 10 :	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
a. Helping persons in need is a duty based on religious conviction.	4.58	970	3,078
b. Helping persons in need is a universal human duty.	6.42	993	2.79
c. One need to help to show abroad that sympathy is also there in Hungarians.	2,75	976	2,942
d. Helping refugees is an evident and unambiguous affair that might be openly endorsed.	4,76	981	2,997
e. Refugees should not be helped, we have to look after our own needy.	6,02	983	3,109
f. They should not be helped, because it contradicts the government's policy.	3,47	917	3,169
g. They do not need help, they have enough money if they could make it here.	5,67	919	3,052
h. They should not be helped as they get more and more numerous and more and more dangerous.	6,29	949	3,119

Motivation patterns - attitude clusters: inconsistencies

	Humanist anti-aid N=180	Conformist N=225	Secular humanist N=173	Devoted humanitarian N=144	Cruel anti-aid N=106
a. Helping persons in need is a duty based on religious conviction.	4,38	5,84	2,67	6,81	1,04
b. Helping persons in need is a universal human duty.	6,99	6,33	6,04	8,76	1,77
c. One need to help to show abroad that sympathy is also there in Hungarians.	1,35	5,72	1,29	3,19	0,7
d. Helping refugees is an evident and unambiguous affair that might be openly endorsed.	2,98	5,72	4,47	8,19	0,72
e. Refugees should not be helped, we have to look after our own needy.	8,69	6,07	4,03	2,37	9,35
f. They should not be helped, because it contradicts the government's policy.	2,93	5,14	1,81	0,78	8,22
g. They do not need help, they have enough money if they could make it here.	7,62	5,8	3,77	2,08	9,66
h. They should not be helped, because they are becoming more and more numerous and more and more dangerous.	8,75	6,24	4,96	1,97	9,81

Satisfaction and critique of public actors

How did they fulfill their duties regarding problems related to migrants/refugees? (rate 0 to 10)	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
a. Hungarian police	7,35	956	2,433
b. The Hungarian prime minister and the government	6,1	976	2,935
c. The Hungarian immigration authorities (Office of Immigration and Nationality, and the refugee centers)	5,74	854	2,542
d. The European Union	3,83	961	2,629
e. Classical aid organisations, including international aid organisations and church related aid organisations	5,85	923	2,396
f. Newly formed civic organisations, volunteers	6,35	862	2,315
g. Leaders of main Hungarian churches	4,67	820	2,497
h. Local governments affected by the issue	6,33	886	2,16
i. Radical right opposition	4,61	808	2,85
j. Left opposition	3,59	841	2,661

Critique and satisfaction with public actors

- Latent factor structure- 2 factors:
 - state actors (police, prime minister + government, immigration authorities)
 - European Union, classical aid organisations, newly formed civic organisations and volunteers
- Implications:
 - Satisfaction with European Union associated with satisfaction with supportive civic actors: EU perceived also as an actor showing solidarity (also suggested by regression analysis)
 - There is a narrow space to differentiate between supportive actors
 - 2 independent dimensions of satisfaction with state policy and satisfaction with supportive actors: a great proportion of respondents satisfied with both groups of actors!