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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cross-National Variation in Values: Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Turkey, by Age Groups

Compared to the older age groups, the younger age groups (1) are more supportive of social individualism; (2) have more favorable attitudes toward gender equality; (3) are more strongly in favor of secular politics only among Lebanese, Pakistanis, Tunisians, but are less so among Turkish; (4) are more strongly in favor of secular politicians among Iraqis, Lebanese, Pakistanis, Saudis, and Tunisians; (5) are more favorable toward secular nationalism in Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, but less so in Turkey; (6) are generally more liberal; (7) are less religious, (8) display a higher level of religious tolerance in Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Turkey; and (9) are less supportive of political violence against Americans in Iraq and Pakistan, but more so in Tunisia and Turkey.

These findings reveal three interesting patterns. First, these relationships are most significant among the Pakistani respondents. The size of the correlation coefficients between age groups and different values is considerably larger among Pakistanis than it is among respondents from the other six countries, except for interfaith intolerance where it is largest among Tunisians and Lebanese. This is remarkable, as it shows that the gap between younger and older age groups in Pakistan is much wider than it is in other countries, with the younger age group being considerably more in favor of social individualism, gender equality, secular politics, secular politicians, secular nationalism, and liberalism, and less religious, more religiously tolerant, and less supportive of political violence. On the level of mass belief system, we may thus argue that the younger Pakistanis may provide a stronger social basis for the development of secular politics and liberal values in the country.

Second, in Egypt, by contrast, there is a much narrower gap between the older and younger age groups than other countries, showing no significant connection between age groups and different components of secularism, interfaith intolerance, and political violence. Finally, among the seven countries, Turkey displayed inconsistent relationships between age groups and value orientations. That is, while younger age groups tend to be more supportive of social individualism, gender equality, and liberalism and are less religious and more religiously tolerant, they are less supportive of secular politics and secular nationalism and more supportive of political violence than the older age groups.

Trends in Values and Variation by Age Groups: Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey

The analysis of the available longitudinal data from Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey has shown that these countries experienced varied changes in values and the extent of these changes differed among different age groups:

Social individualism is measured in terms of preference for love, rather than parental approval, as a more appropriate basis for marriage. Data on this measure for at least two points in time were available for Iran in 2000 and 2005; Iraq in 2004, 2006, 2011; and Saudi Arabia in 2003 and 2011. Accordingly, among Iranians and Iraqis, there has been a significant increase in the percentage of the respondents who considered love as the basis for marriage in the interval between the first and the last surveys. There was no such increase among the Saudi respondents.
Across the three countries, however, a much higher percentage of those aged 18-24 showed an increase in preference for love as the basis for marriage than other age groups. As result, the gap between the youngest and oldest age groups considerably expanded in these countries. Among the Saudis this gap widened dramatically.

**Gender equality:** Trend in attitudes toward gender equality varies by country. Among Egyptians, these attitudes turned less favorable toward women; among Iranians, Iraqis, and Saudis more favorable, and among Turkish no significant changes. Trend in gender equality by age groups, however, is different for different countries. Among Egyptians, the conservative trend toward gender inequality was higher among 18-24 years olds than other age groups; among Iranian and Turkish respondents, the rate of change was higher among those aged 45+ than among other groups; among Iraqis there was no significance differences in trend among age groups; and among Saudis, this trend was positive for those under age 55, but negative among 55+.

**Secular politics:** In Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, there has been a significant increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics. The magnitude of change was much greater among Egyptians and Saudis than in the other two countries. The change was greater among older age groups than it was among younger age groups in Egypt, much less among those aged 55+ in Iraq, and there were no significant age differences in Saudi Arabia.

**Democracy:** In contrast to the increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics, there is a decrease in the overall percentage of Egyptians, Iraqis, and Turkish citizens who strongly agreed with democracy as the best form of government, except among Iranians, who reported an increase in support for democracy and Saudis whose attitudes remained relatively unchanged between the first and latest surveys. Where there is a significant association between support for democracy and age, it is consistently positive, meaning that older people showed stronger favorable attitudes democracy, $r^2 = .041$ for Egypt 2001; .095 and .060 for Iran 2000 and 2005, respectively; and .097, .058, and .058 for Turkey 1996, 2001, and 2005, respectively.

In terms of the magnitude of change among age groups, the youngest Egyptians and the oldest Iraqis demonstrate the greatest decrease in support for democracy, while there is no discernible pattern in the magnitude of change by age among Turkish respondents. Among Iranians, all but those aged 25-34 show a dramatic increase in support for democracy, with the greatest increase occurring among the oldest Iranians. Lastly, there is little change in support for democracy among younger Saudis, but greater increase in support among those aged 35+.

**National identity:** there has been a significant shift away from religion and toward nation as the basis of identity across Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey in the past decade. The percent increase in national identity among Egyptians was highest for the youngest and oldest age group, 589%, and 600%, respectively. Among Iranian respondents, the change in identity is more dramatic for the older age groups 45-54 and 55+; 44% and 51%, respectively, as opposed to 13% for the younger age groups. For Iraq and Saudi Arabia, there is no discernible pattern between magnitude of increase in national identity and age. Similar to Iran, in Turkey, the percent increase in national identity is much higher among the older age groups, 45-54 and 55+, 43% and 48%, respectively, as opposed to below 23% for the younger age groups.

**National pride:** Findings from the five countries for which trends data are available have shown some changes in national pride. Among Egyptian and Turkish respondents, the percentage of the people who expressed being “very proud” to be the citizens of their country went up between the first and latest surveys. Among Iranian, Iraqi, and Saudi respondents, on the other
hand, it declined between the beginning and ending surveys. Generally, the older age groups tend
to have stronger feelings of national pride than the younger age groups.

The change in national pride by different age groups depends on the country. Among
Egyptians, this change was the same across almost all age groups. Among the Saudis, there was
a larger decline in national pride among those aged 35+ between 2003 and 2011. Among
Iranians, on the other hand, the decline in national pride was greater among the younger age
groups than it was among older. Finally, among the Turkish respondents, the increase in national
pride among the younger age groups, although higher, did not offset age-group differences in
pride and the older age groups still had significantly stronger feelings of national pride.
MIDDLE EASTERN YOUTH AND THE ARAB SPRING: A CROSS-NATIONAL ANALYSIS

Scholars and analysts widely claimed that the youth played a crucial role in the making of the revolutionary movements dubbed the Arab Spring (Chaaban 2009; Hvistendahl 2011; LaGraffe 2012; Campante and Chor 2012; Hoffman and Jamal 2012). There has been little empirical evidence, however, to substantiate this claim and to document how much the younger age groups differ from the older in value orientation in different Middle Eastern countries. In this paper, we analyze the data from the values surveys carried out in the region since in the past decades in order to assess cross-national variation and trend in the values and perceptions of the youth in several Middle Eastern countries. Based on this analysis, we also assess the extent to which the Arab Spring signifies the ushering in of a new cultural episode in the region.

CULTURAL EPISODES IN THE CONTEMPORARY MIDDLE EAST

Despite the extensive structural transformation the Middle Eastern societies have experienced since the nineteenth century, no lasting consensus has transpired among the ordinary public and the intellectual elite on some of the most fundamental principles of social organization. This transformation involved the decline of the traditional order, the development of capitalism and the incorporation of the system of domestic production into the world economy, population growth and urbanization, the rise and expansion of mass education, the emergence of new social classes, the formation or reconstitution of new nations, and the development of the modern state with massive military and bureaucratic structures. Yet, there was no wide agreement in these societies on the role and status of religion in society, the relationship between religion and politics, form of government, basis of identity, orientations toward other nations, the West in particular, and the social status of women. The wanting consensus might have at least in part contributed to endemic political instabilities in the region.

As a result, the countries in the region experienced a succession of markedly different cultural episodes since the breakdown of the traditional order in the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries. These episodes began or ended with acrimonious debates and serious political confrontations leading to mass political upheavals, revolutions, or military coups. In this paper, we assess the extent to which the revolutionary movements that have marked the Arab Spring indicate the beginning of yet another cultural episode in the region and whether this cultural shift is more conspicuous among the youth.

Diversity of Discourses and Cultural Episodes in the Middle East

Beginning in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Islamic modernism was the first major cultural response to Western modernity in the region. Its objective was to reconcile the sociopolitical teachings of Islam and the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. The harbingers of this movement endorsed the separation of religion and politics, participated in the movement for the construction of the modern state, displayed favorable attitudes toward the West, and interpreted the religious teachings on gender relations in a manner favorable to women. One key factor that might have contributed to the favorable reception of Western political model by Muslim reformers is the presence of a discursive space in the Islamic political thought that rested on the differentiation of authority between the ulama in charge of religious authority and the sultan in charge of politics. However, given that the ruling monarch was too incompetent in defending the nation against foreign invaders and his power too arbitrary, it was not farfetched for these reformers to recognize the utility of substituting monarchical absolutism with parliamentary democracy.
These reformers either led or were strongly affiliated with the emerging nationalist movements for the construction of the modern state, which culminated in the Constitutional Revolution in Iran in 1906, the Egyptian nationalist revolution in 1919, the Turkish War of Independence in 1919-1923, the anti-colonial struggles in Algeria, Lebanon, and Syria in the first half of the twentieth century—all giving birth to the formation of the modern secular state. Territorial nationalism and parliamentary politics in Middle Eastern countries, however, failed to establish a stable government. In Arab countries, the nationalist governments were challenged by two supranational ideological movements. One was the Islamic fundamentalism of the Society of the Muslim Brothers that was founded in Egypt in 1928 and its affiliated organizations in other Arab countries. The other was pan-Arab nationalism.

Islamic fundamentalism and pan-Arab nationalism represented two diverse ideological responses to modern liberal pro-Western governments that came to power in the first half of the twentieth century in Arab countries and both reflected different ways of shuttering individual liberty in political thoughts. The intellectual leaders of pan-Arab nationalism called for the liberation of all Arabs, which were perceived to be subjugated to the post World War I political establishments created by the Europeans’ arbitrary division of their lands into disparate states. What mattered to these leaders most was an enthusiastic struggle against the West and its allies in Arab societies and for the formation of a unified Arab state, whose borders would extend from the Fertile Crescent, to central Arabia, and to the Arabian coastlands from the Gulf of Aqaba to the Gulf of Basra (Dawn 1973, 1988) In this struggle, the idea of individual liberty did not feature prominently, if at all. Whereas liberal Arabist Abdul Rahman al-Kawakibi tried to demonstrate the deleterious effects of despotism on individual character and the utility of freedom for the creation of a better society in the late nineteenth century, such harbingers of pan-Arab nationalism as Sati’ al-Husri subordinated the idea of freedom to the notion of national emancipation and individual self-sacrifice for the liberation of the Arab land. Likewise, dismayed by overly secularist policies of the nationalist politicians in Egypt and the domination of parliamentary politics by landowners and merchants, the Muslim Brothers opted to forgo the idea of individual liberty for an Islamic government.

Pan-Arab nationalism, however, was appropriated by the military in several Arab-majority countries and constituted the official ideology of the state in countries like Egypt, Iraq, Libya, and Syria, where the military managed to successfully overthrow the existing political orders between 1952 (Egypt) and 1969 (Libya). However, the failure of the military rulers to form a unified Arab state, the Arab defeat in six-day war with Israel in 1967, state authoritarianism, and non-transparency undermined the popularity of the military governments. The identification of the increasingly unpopular military governments with pan-Arab nationalism in turn undermined the universalistic appeal of pan-Arab nationalist discourse from the 1970s on.

The decline of pan-Arab nationalism, however, paralleled a general decline of secular ideologies in the Middle East, and Islamic fundamentalism gained popularity as a dominant oppositional discourse. The Iranian Revolution of 1979 and formation of a religious regime in the country gave further impetus to the fundamentalist movements in other part of the Middle East, including the formation of Front Islamique du Salut (FIS) in Algeria, the Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Taliban in Afghanistan, the National Islamic Front in the Sudan, Hamas in Gaza Strip, al-Shabaab in Somalia, and Boko Haram in Nigeria. Also included are the multitudes of other Islamic extremist and suicide terrorist groups that have frequently emerged in the region, primarily since the horrific terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 (e.g., Ahmed 1964, Mitchell 1969, Sivan 1985, Kepel 1984, Roy 1994, Moaddel 2005).
Despite the rise of radical Islamic groups in the past decades, it appears that on the level of public opinion and mass belief system, the Arab Spring represents a departure from the ideology of radical Islamism and the rise of a new cultural episode in the region. To be sure, what has transpired in the Arab world has been far from the conditions of peace and political stability with a prospect of flourishing democracy and economic prosperity—the perceived goals of the Arab Spring. The military overthrow of the democratically elected yet ineffectual and authoritarian Egyptian president, Mohamed Morsi of the Society of the Muslim Brothers, and the ensuing violence between the followers of the ousted leader and those supporting the military, which left thousands dead or injured; the inauguration of a weak government in Libya and Tunisia and the subsequent rise of armed radical Islamic groups, the murder of American diplomats in Libya and the assassinations of several Tunisian secular politicians and members of the security forces; the intensification of the tragic civil war in Syria during which well-over one hundred and sixty thousand individuals have thus far perished and millions have fled to neighboring countries as refugees, resulting in a humanitarian crisis in Syria and in the refugee camps—all signify the ushering in of an era of uncertainty and conflicts that cannot be described as something analogous to the rebirth of nature in the spring.

It is certainly hard to summarize the distinctive features of the post-revolutionary events, let alone predict its future course, particularly before the dust settles and a clearer configuration of political and social forces appears in the theatre of political action. Nonetheless, the value orientations of the ordinary Middle Eastern publics provide clues on whether they primarily support secular politics or an Islamic government, a democratic or an authoritarian political system. An analysis of trends in their values will provide information concerning possible direction of change—toward national or religious identity, gender equality, democracy, and secular politics. We use data from the values surveys carried out in the region to make this assessment. The appendix to this paper provides information about the sampling procedures and the data used in this analysis. Our objective is to explore the extent to which the Arab Spring represents a major shift in people’s values and on what sets of values this shift has been more dramatic among the younger age groups.

The Arab Spring as a New Cultural Episode

A distinctive feature of the diverse cultural episodes that emerged in the Middle East between the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the Arab Spring of late is that each episode began with ideological reflections on significant sociopolitical issues by identifiable intellectual leaders who resolved these issues in a coherent discursive framework. The territorial nationalist movements in the first half of the twentieth century were an outcome of the work of nationalist-cum-secular intellectual leaders in the nineteenth century, the pan-Arab nationalist politics of 1950s-1960s was produced in the interregnum of the two World Wars, and the discourse of Islamic fundamentalism was mainly formulated in the 1950s through the 1970s.

The Arab Spring, by contrast, appeared as spontaneous movements of disgruntled individuals without having a coherent ideology or recognizable political leadership. The movements were sparked by the action of one man: Mohammed Bouazizi, a street vendor in Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia, who on December 17, 2010, set himself on fire in protest of the confiscation of his wares and the humiliation that he felt was inflicted upon him by the municipal agents. Bouazizi’s tragic death days later created such an uproar among his fellow Tunisians that it forced president Zein al-Abedin Ben Ali to flee the country. Then, like a wildfire, popular protests spread from one country to the next until almost the entire region was engulfed. On
January 14, 2011, protests broke out in Jordan’s capital and other major cities, triggered by deteriorating economic conditions and inspired by events in Tunisia. On January 16, 2011, two days after the fall of Tunisian president Ben Ali, a 32-year-old mother of three in Yemen in a message posted on Facebook called on the people to celebrate the Tunisian uprising, leading to a chain of political upheavals in the country that several months later forced President Ali Abdullah Saleh to step down. On January 25, 2011, a computer-savvy Egyptian reached out to the youth on Facebook to organize a protest rally in his country against police brutality, the state of emergency laws, lack of free elections and freedom of speech, and corruption in high places, leading to the overthrow of President Hosni Mubarak. On February 15, 2011, thousands of Libyans protested after the Libyan government arrested human-rights attorney Fathi Terbii in Benghazi, Libya, leading to armed rebellion against Colonel Gadhafi, who was eventually captured and killed. On February 20th, massive and peaceful demonstrations erupted in Rabat and Marrakesh in Morocco, where people expressed their grievances. On February 14, 2011 inspired by the upheavals in Tunisia and Egypt, an anti-government rally was organized in Bahrain during which a protester was killed. And, on March 13, 2011 Syrian security forces opened fire on people who had gathered in Deraa’s main mosque in southern Syria to deliberate about how to respond to the arrests of a few students who wrote anti-regime graffiti on their school walls. Demonstrations with varying levels of intensity have also erupted in such other places as Bahrain, Iraq, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia.

These anecdotal evidences suggest that the calls to protests were made by ordinary individuals and that known organizations or individuals were conspicuously absent in leading these movements. In fact, in places like Egypt, the Muslim Brothers, as the most organized and experienced opposition group, did not played a crucial role in the sit-in at the Tahrir Square that eventually forced President Hosni Mubarak out of office. Nor was the Arab Spring shaped primarily by such past ideologies as pan-Arab nationalism, Arab socialism, or Islamic fundamentalism. In fact, according to the public perception of the goals of the Arab Spring, the available survey data from Egypt, Lebanon, and Tunisia indicates that the great majority of the respondents considered “freedom and democracy” or “economic equality and prosperity” as its goals—59% and 24% of Egyptians, 52% and 15% of Lebanese, and 56% and 20% of Tunisians, respectively. In other words, in Egypt and Tunisia, the two countries that experienced a revolutionary change, there has been a degree of consensus on the goals of the revolution among the respondents, as 83% of Egyptians and 76% of Tunisians mentioned freedom and economic prosperity. The minority of the respondents who had different perceptions were divided into smaller categories with less than 10% of the sample falling in each category (Figure 1).

Therefore, the post-revolutionary conflicts in both countries cannot be attributed to the fact that the revolution had different meanings to different sections of the population. We may, however, speculate that such conflicts were either shaped by varying organizational interests of the contenders for power or simply reflected a misreading of what constituted the demands of the public. If, for example, a large percentage of the public voted for an-Nahda in Tunisia or the Muslim Brothers in Egypt, they did not vote for the establishment of the Islamic government. Rather, it may be argued, it was because these organizations were among the better known components of the revolutionary movements and were thought by the public to be in a more effective position to implement policies that would create a responsive democratic government and foster economic development.
Figure 2 shows the distribution of the responses of those who considered freedom or economic prosperity as the goals of the Arab Spring by age groups. Accordingly, while Egyptian and Tunisian respondents did not differ much by age groups, a higher percentage of 18-24 year old among Lebanese (73%) considered freedom and prosperity as its goes than those who were in older age-groups (between 63% and 66%).
The events of the Arab Spring may signify a new cultural episode insofar as these events are associated with significant changes in people’s value orientations toward some of the key principles of social organization, including (1) social individualism, (2) gender equality, (3) secular politics, (4) basis of identity, (5) religiosity and religious intolerance, and (6) attitudes toward outsiders. Orientations toward these principles decide the nature of the episode; whether people primarily believe in the principles of liberal nationalism, ethnic nationalism, or Islamic fundamentalism. Such principles in liberal nationalism, for example, rest on individual autonomy, gender equality, the separation of religion and politics, the territorial nation as the basis of identity, and religious tolerance and peaceful attitudes toward outsiders. Islamic fundamentalism, by contrast, endorses patriarchal institutions and the idea of gender inequality, the unity of religion and politics in an Islamic government, religion as the basis of identity, and religious intolerance and sectarianism.

In the section below, we measure these principles and assess cross-national variations in values across seven Middle Eastern countries. In the following section, we consider these measures in order to evaluate the nature of the trends in values in the countries for which longitudinal survey data are available.

**CROSS-NATIONAL VARIATION IN VALUES BY AGE GROUPS**

Cross-national variation of values is reflected in differences in observable measures of social individualism, gender equality, secular politics, basis of identity, liberalism, religiosity and religious intolerance, and attitudes toward outsiders. These measures served as vehicles of data collections from nationally representative samples drawn from the adult population of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Turkey in 2011-2013. We use these measures in order to compare and contrast the seven countries in five age groups; 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, and 55 and older.

**Components of Social Individualism**

The development of liberal democracy is said to have been associated with the extent to which the autonomy of the individuals in making choices is recognized in society. In the
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democratic West, this autonomy is recognized *de jure*. In many Middle Eastern societies, the institution of patriarchy and the values supporting patrimonialism are still variably dominant and play a significant role in dictating individual behavior. It appears, however, that those societies in the Middle East that are more democratic and secular tend to show more widespread support for individualistic values than those that are more authoritarian and religious.

Individualism may be reflected in a variety of social practices, ranging from egalitarianism in politics to independence as favorable quality for children to have to individual choice in marriage and in style of dress. Data on several indicators of social individualism are available across the seven countries. These includes preferences concerning the basis for marriage, attitudes toward women’s right to dress as they please, and the extent to which the characters that enhance independence are considered favorable qualities for children to have.

These items are measured as follows and results are reported in Table 1 toward the end of this section:

1. **Basis for marriage**: The recognition of the right of the individual in the selection of one’s mate, which Deutsch dubbed as “the Romeo and Juliet revolution,” is considered a cornerstone of individualism (Deutsch 1981; Huntington 1996). To evaluate cross-national variation in this form of individualism, respondents were asked: “In your view, which of the following is the more important basis for marriage: (1) parental approval, or (2) love?” In order for this variable to have the same range of four as the other components of social individualism, it is recoded into “1” and “4,” where love is coded as “4,” and parental approval as “1.”

2. **Woman dresses as she wishes**: Do you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree that it is up to a woman to dress as she wishes. Responses to this variable are recoded so that higher values indicate stronger agreement.

3. **Child qualities**: Respondents were asked to select five from a list of ten favorable qualities for children to have. From this list, we have combined responses to four of these qualities that are compatible with liberal values as follows: respondents who selected “independence” or “imagination” received a value of “1” for each of these two selected measures, and respondents who did not select “religious faith” or “obedience” received a value of “1” for each measure not selected. A sum was then calculated: Child qualities = sum (selected “independence”, selected “imagination,” not selected “religious faith”, not selected “obedience”), resulting in a variable with a possible range between “0” and “4”, which was further condensed into the range “1” to “4”, with the following formula: 

   \[(\text{childquality} + 1) \times (3/4) + (1/4)\].

An index of social individualism is constructed as a linear combination of the three indicators: basis for marriage, women’s right to dress as they please, and child-qualities index. A higher value on this measure indicates stronger social individualism.

\[
\text{Social individualism} = \text{mean (child qualities, woman dresses as she wishes, basis for marriage)}
\]

Respondents from the seven countries vary in their preferences of favorable child qualities for children to have, as shown by the differences in child-quality index reported in

---

1 This question was excluded from the Tunisian questionnaire, and the social individualism index we created includes only variables on Basis for marriage and Women’s dress for Tunisian respondents.
Figure 3. According to this figure, Lebanese with the mean index of 2.5 are the most supportive of individualistic values as favorable qualities for children, while Egyptians and Pakistanis are the least supportive, each with mean index of 1.71. In between are Turkish, 2.25, Saudis, 2.11, and Iraqis, 1.79. Except for Egypt and Iraq, the child-quality index and age groups are significantly negatively linked. As shown in Table 1, \( r^2 \) is -.004 (not significant) for Egypt, -.012 (not significant) for Iraq, -.099 for Lebanon, -.346 for Pakistan, -.058 for Saudi Arabia, and -.185 for Turkey.

The seven countries also vary in terms of attitudes toward Women’s being free to dress as they wish. Figure 4 shows that those who strongly agree or agree are highest among Tunisians (56%), followed by Turkish (52%), Lebanese (50%), Saudis (47%), Iraqis (27%), Pakistanis (22%), and Egyptians (14%). The difference between the youngest and oldest age groups varies by country; it is 5% among Egyptians, 11% among Iraqis, 9% among Lebanese, 35% among Pakistanis, 3% among Saudis, 4% among Tunisians, and 6% among Turkish. Correlation coefficients (\( r^2 \)) between age group and attitudes toward women’s freedom to dress as they wish, reported in Table 1, are -.025 (not significant) for Egypt, -.048 for Iraq, -.070 for Lebanon, -.255 for Pakistan, -.028 for Saudi Arabia (not significant), -.034 for Tunisia (not significant), and -.065 for Turkey.
Likewise, the seven countries vary considerably in preference for love as the basis for marriage, as shown in Figure 5. On this measure, Lebanon is the most individualistic (69%), followed by Turkey (54%), Saudi Arabia (46%), Iraq (31%), Egypt (29%), Tunisia (26%), and Pakistan (7%). Considering variation by age groups, a higher percentage of the respondents in the younger age groups than in the older age groups consider love as the basis for marriage. The difference between the youngest and oldest age groups is significant across the seven countries. This difference is highest among Saudis (45%), followed by Lebanese (34%), Turkish (28%), Iraqis (27%), Egyptians (23%), Pakistanis (14%), and Tunisians (10%). Table 1 reports the correlation coefficients between preference of love versus parental approval as the basis for marriage and age groups are significant and negative across the seven countries; that is, $r^2 = -0.186$ for Egypt, $-0.197$ for Iraq, $-0.212$ for Lebanon, $-0.194$ for Pakistan, $-0.328$ for Saudi Arabia, $-0.112$ for Turkey, and $-0.198$ for Tunisia, again indicating that the younger age groups are more supportive of individual choice in the selection of spouse than the older age groups.
Finally, all these measures are used to construct the social-individualism index and the results are reported in Figure 6 and Table 1. The results in Figure 6 indicate that Lebanon with the index value of 2.68 is the most socially individualistic country, followed by Turkey, 2.46, Saudi Arabia, 2.31, Tunisia, 2.23, Iraq, 1.89, Egypt, 1.76, and Pakistan 1.61. While it was expected that such countries that are more democratic and open as Lebanon, Turkey, and Tunisia would be more supportive of individualistic values than less democratic countries, the relatively high score for social-individualism index among Saudis is paradoxical. The Saudis, as will be shown in the following sections, are quite conservative in terms of attitudes toward gender inequality and religious fundamentalism. However, the social-individualism index for the Saudi respondents is much higher than it is for Egyptian, Iraqis, or Pakistanis, and is similar to Tunisians, who are relatively more socially liberal and politically secular.

One plausible explanation for this paradox may be related to varying levels of existential security is connected to the differences in the economic conditions between these countries. Under a prosperous economy, where there is more secure employment and income stability than under dire economic conditions, people are in a more favorable subjective condition to think and reflect about marriage and love. They are also financially better situated to make independent decisions. As a result, in relatively economically well-off countries like Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, people tend to favor individualistic values. Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, and Tunisia, on the other hand, are facing poor economic conditions, which tend to generate the feeling of insecurity. Such conditions may prompt individuals to fall back on tradition and seek refuge in the protective hierarchical structures of family relations (Inglehart et al. 2006; Inglehart and Welzel 2005).

There is also considerable variation across the age groups within the seven countries. Generally, however, the younger adults are more individualistic than the older. The difference in individualism by age is most dramatic among Pakistani respondents. This difference between the youngest and the oldest age categories for Pakistan is .74, followed by Saudi Arabia as a

---

2 Because Tunisia had no data on child-qualities index, its overall measure of social individualism is not quite comparable with the other six countries.
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The correlation coefficients between the social-individualism index and age groups show that they are all significant and negative, meaning that the younger age groups tend to be more individualistic than the older age groups. The strength of this correlation, shown in Table 1, is highest among Pakistanis ($r^2 = -.382$), followed by Saudis (-.252), Turkish (-.246), Lebanese (-.202), Iraqis (-.166), Egyptians (-.152), and Tunisians (-.099).

Table 1 below summarizes all the measures of social individualism across the seven countries. One of the most interesting findings, as shown in this table, is that the magnitude of correlation coefficients between the social-individualism index and age is highest among Pakistani respondents. This means that the gap between the younger and older age groups is much wider among Pakistanis than it is among respondents from other countries. Saudi Arabia also shows a relatively higher correlation between this index and age groups, but among Saudis this association is largely due to the large gap in preferences love as the basis for marriage between the youngest and oldest age groups.

Based on these findings, we speculate that generational differences in social individualism would be one of the major dimensions of clashes of values in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, as the youth in these two conservative societies appear to differ considerably with the older age groups on issues related to individual choice in child qualities, style of dress, and marriage.
Table 1
Measures of social individualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child qualities</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child qualities index

| Mean       | 1.71 | 1.79 | 2.50 | 1.71 | 2.11 | 2.25 |
| N          | 3,131 | 2,948 | 3,013 | 3,523 | 1,617 | 2,992 |
| r² with age group | -.004 | -.012 | -.099 | -.346 | -.058 | -.185 |

Women's dress

| Strongly agree | 5% | 5% | 17% | 4% | 18% | 29% | 12% |
| Agree         | 9% | 22% | 32% | 18% | 29% | 27% | 40% |
| Disagree      | 36% | 38% | 34% | 39% | 28% | 25% | 36% |
| Strongly disagree | 50% | 35% | 17% | 39% | 25% | 18% | 12% |
| N             | 3,117 | 2,919 | 2,990 | 3,515 | 1,608 | 3,050 | 2,969 |
| r² with age group | -.025 | -.048 | -.070 | -.255 | -.028 | -.034 | -.065 |

Love marriage

| Love       | 29% | 31% | 69% | 7% | 47% | 26% | 54% |
| Parental approval | 71% | 69% | 31% | 93% | 53% | 74% | 46% |
| N          | 3,126 | 2,935 | 2,888 | 3,347 | 1,552 | 2,996 | 2,945 |
| r² with age group | -.186 | -.197 | -.212 | -.194 | -.328 | -.112 | -.198 |

Social individualism index

| Mean       | 1.76 | 1.89 | 2.68 | 1.61 | 2.31 | 2.23 | 2.46 |
| N          | 3,143 | 2,986 | 3,027 | 3,523 | 1,629 | 2,978 | 3,011 |
| r² with age group | -.152 | -.166 | -.202 | -.382 | -.252 | -.099 | -.236 |

a <.001, b <.01, c <.05

Gender Equality

The social status of women has been one of the most hotly contested issues among intellectual leaders of different persuasions in the modern period. An early proponent of women’s right, John Millar considered the status of women as the test of civilization. “The condition of the women,” he said, “is one of the most remarkable circumstances in the manners of nations. Among the rude people, the women are generally degraded; among civilized people
they are exalted” (Millar 1781: 309). As the Muslim world encountered Western modernity in the nineteenth century, the social status of women in Islam became the subject of considerable debates and ideological warfare among diverse intellectual leaders, political activists, and ruling elite. The institution of male domination, the maltreatment of women as well as such practices as female infanticide, gender segregation, early marriage, and polygamy were among the most visible targets of polemics and criticisms of Islam and traditional cultures of Muslim-majority countries not only by Westernizers and followers of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, but by Christian evangelicals as well. Intellectual debates and back-and-forth arguments among proponents and opponents of greater freedom for women contributed to the rise of Islamic feminism most notably in the work of Indian scholar Sayyid Mumtaz Ali (1860–1935) and Egyptian scholar Qasim Amin (1865–1908).

The emergence of nationalism and a cultural shift toward secularism in the first quarter of the twentieth century promoted, and was reinforced by, the rise of women’s movements for equality in different Middle Eastern countries (Safran 1961, Reid 1975, Vatikiotis 1980, Shaarawi 1987, Nashat and Tucker 1999, Charrad 2001). These movements also provided the context favorable to the rise of state feminism, or feminism from above. Feminism from above, consisting of a series of policies designed to promote and enforce Western-style dress among women, expand female education, and integrate women in the sociopolitical realm, became one of the key components of the developmental policies implemented by the modern national states, which were formed in the Middle East, most notably Egypt, Iran, and Turkey. In the last quarter of the twentieth century, however, the status of women and the idea of gender equality came under persistent attack by the harbingers of the Islamic fundamentalism. They rejected the idea of gender equality and defended gender segregation and the institution of male domination in the family, politics, and the labor market. In places like Saudi Arabia and Iran under the Islamic Republic, women were reduced to second-class citizens.

In Western democratic countries, the issue of gender equality is officially resolved and discrimination against women is made illegal, although in reality there are still systematic biases against them and their reproductive rights hotly debated. In the contemporary Middle East, on the other hand, gender inequality in politics, the labor market, education, and the family is tolerated, practiced, and even sanctioned by the state. However, attitudes toward gender equality widely vary among individuals in the region. To assess variation in such attitudes, we first analyze attitudes toward gender equality in different spheres of social life in the seven Middle Eastern countries. We then create a gender-equality index and assess its variation across the five age groups in these countries. We consider five survey questions asked in Likert-scale format: Do you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree that (I) a wife must always obey her husband (obedience); (II) men make better political leaders than women do (political leadership), (III) when jobs are scarce, men should have more rights to a job than women (job market), (IV) university education is more important for boys than it is for girls (university education), and (V) it is acceptable for a man to have more than one wife (polygamy)? These variables are averaged in order to create a single gender-equality index:

\[
\text{Gender-equality index} = \text{mean (obedience, political leadership, job market, university education, polygamy)}
\]

A higher value on this index indicates stronger support for gender equality, and the index varies between 1 and 4.
Table 2 below shows cross-national variation in attitudes toward gender relations in these five areas. On wife obedience, 5% of Egyptians, 11% of Iraqis, 38% of Lebanese, 8% of Pakistanis, 21% of Saudis, 22% of Tunisians, and 30% of Turkish citizens either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “a wife must always obey her husband.” Thus, it appears that even in Lebanon, the most liberal country in the region, with the exception of Israel, the majority of the respondents endorse male authority in the family. On this measure, the Saudis appeared to be less conservative than Egyptians, Iraqis, and Pakistanis. On political leadership, although respondents across the seven countries have expressed less preferential attitudes toward men as political leaders than men having authority over women, the majority still consider men as better political leaders. That is, the percentage who strongly disagree or disagree that “men make better political leaders than women do” is 17% among Egyptians, 24% among Iraqis, 44% among Lebanese, 29% among Pakistanis, 21% among Saudis, 45% among Tunisians, and 46% among Turkish citizens. Likewise, in a tight job market, respondents overwhelmingly give priority to men over women. A minority among them strongly disagrees or disagrees that “when jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women”—14% of Egyptians, 21% of Iraqis, 33% of Lebanese, 15% of Pakistanis, 22% of Saudis, 27% of Tunisians, and 44% of Turkish citizens.

The majority of the respondents, however, disagree with the idea of gender inequality in university education, except among the Saudi public, where only 43% strongly disagree or disagree with the statement that “university education is more important for boys than it is for girls”, and among Pakistani respondents, who are evenly divided, with 50% disagreeing with gender inequality in the educational realm. In all other countries, fully 65% of Egyptians, 72% of Iraqis, 74% of Lebanese, 80% of Tunisians, and 71% of Turkish citizens do not support gender inequality with regards to education. And, lastly, the majority of respondents do not support a man having more than one wife, with levels of disapproval ranging from 50% of Saudi citizens to 93% of Turkish citizens disapproving of polygamy.

We may tentatively argue that variation in attitudes toward gender equality may be a function of the extent to which an increase in equality would be at the expense of a decline in men’s power in the family, politics, and the labor market. In these fields, there may be a stronger resistance to gender equality than we see in education, where an increase in female education does not necessarily mean a direct and concomitant decline in men’s power, but rather may increase the economic well-being of everyone.
## Table 2
Measures of gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wife must always obey her husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men make better political leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>2,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men should have more right to a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>2,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A university education is more important for a boy than for a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>2,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is acceptable for a man to have more than one wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>2,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>2,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$ with age group</td>
<td>-.048$^b$</td>
<td>-.132$^a$</td>
<td>-.079$^a$</td>
<td>-.335$^a$</td>
<td>-.111$^a$</td>
<td>-.065$^b$</td>
<td>-.091$^a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a < .001$, $^b < .01$, $^c < .05$
Figure 7 below shows variation in the gender-equality index by country and age groups. According to this figure, Turkish respondents with the index value of 2.73 have the most egalitarian attitudes and Saudis with the index value of 2.05 have the least egalitarian, and in between are Lebanon (2.58), Tunisia (2.50), Iraq (2.22), Pakistan (2.20), and Egypt (2.07).

In terms of the differences in attitudes toward gender equality across the different age groups, there are considerable variations within each of the seven countries. Considering the difference between the youngest and oldest age groups, Pakistani respondents again displayed the largest amount (.71), followed by Saudi Arabia (.20), Lebanon (.18), Iraq (.17), Turkey (.13), Tunisia (.10), and Egypt (.06). The correlation coefficient between the gender equality index and age groups are -.335 for Pakistan, -.132 for Iraq, -.111 for Saudi Arabia, -.091 for Turkey, -.079 for Lebanon, -.065 for Tunisia, and -.048 for Egypt, which are all statistically significant, showing that the younger age groups are more favorable toward gender equality than the older age groups. As shown, this difference is highest among Pakistanis and lowest among Egyptians.

![Figure 7](image)

**Secularism and the Secular State**

In latter part of nineteenth-century, when the nationalist movements for the construction of the modern state started to gain momentum, the question of the separation of religion and politics was not a serious issue among Middle Eastern intellectual leaders and political activists. One important reason for the wide acceptance of secular politics is rooted in development in political theory in historical Islam. Although the utility of secular politics for the construction of a better society—more democratic, prosperous, and egalitarian—was demonstrated in the forerunners of the Enlightenment, secular politics was not exclusively a Western invention. In fact, in different historical periods, prominent Muslim theologians-cum-political theorists relaxed some of the alleged principles of the caliphate in favor of recognizing the sultan’s discretionary power, in various interpretations of these principles by first Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Mawardi (972–1058), then Imam Muhammad al-Ghazali (1058–1111), next Taqi al-Din Ahmad Ibn Taymiyya (1263–1328), and finally Abd al-Rahman Ibn Khaldun (1333–1406), which amounted to a de
facto admission of the reality of secular politics. Consistent with these changes were the efforts of the Islamic modernists of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth who led the political movement for the construction of the national state based on the modern constitution and the principle of rational rule making.

In the second part of the twentieth century, on the other hand, the separation of religion and politics became one of the most contentious issues between the Islamic fundamentalists and the followers of secular ideologies. Bestowing upon themselves as the sole interpreters of the faith, the fundamentalists claim that the Islamic conception of authority rests on the unity between religion and politics. For them, the idea of secular politics is yet another example of the Western cultural invasion of the Muslim world. As Ayatollah Khomeini (1981: 38), a harbinger of Shi’i fundamentalism, stated, “this slogan of the separation of religion and politics and the demand that Islamic scholars not intervene in social and political affairs have been formulated and propagated by the Imperialists; it is only the irreligious who repeats them.”

One may consider the outbreak of the Iranian Revolution in 1979 and the rise of political Islam in the past decades as indicative of the fundamentalists’ victory in the cultural warfare against their secular nemeses. Findings from comparative values surveys in the seven countries, however, indicate the existence of considerable supports for secularism among the public in these countries.

To assess the status of secularism in the public perception, we divided orientations toward secularism into two categories: secular politics, or the extent to which the public decidedly supports secular politics, and secular politicians, or the extent to which the public does not consider the religiosity of politicians as a qualifying factor for holding important public office.

(a) **Secular Politics**

This construct taps into the extent of public support for secular government. It is based on the average of the responses to three questions:

1. “Do you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree that (Study Country) would be a better place if religion and politics were separated” (separation of religion and politics).

2. “Would it be (1) very good, (2) fairly good, (3) fairly bad, or (4) very bad for (Study Country) to have an Islamic government where religious authorities have absolute power [for Muslim respondents], to have a Christian government where religious authorities have absolute power [for Christian respondents]” (no religious government).

3. The third indicator (shari’a/Christian values unimportant) asks whether respondents consider it (1) very important, (2) important, (3) somewhat important, (4) least important, or (5) not at all important for a good government to implement only the shari’a law (for Muslim respondents) or only the laws inspired by Christian values (for Christian respondents). To maintain consistency, the range of the last variable was converted from 1-5 to 1 to 4 by multiplying this variable by .75, then adding .25 (that is, 1*.75 +.25=1, and 5*.75 + .25 = 4).

   Answers to the first question were recoded so that higher values indicate stronger support for the separation of religion and politics. A secular-politics index is constructed by averaging responses to these questions. The secular-politics index ranges between 1 and 4; and a higher value indicates stronger support for secular politics.

\[
\text{Secular-politics index} = \text{mean (separation of religion and politics, no religious government, Shari’a/Christian values unimportant)}
\]
Two of the three questions on secular politics were not allowed to be included in the Saudi survey. For the other six countries, however, there are considerable variations. According to Table 3, except in Pakistan, the majority of the publics from the other five countries favor the separation of religion and politics. Like other issues, however, these countries vary in terms of the public support for secular politics: 51% of Egyptian, 69% of Iraqi, 80% of Lebanese, 9% of Pakistani, 72% of Tunisian, and 76% of Turkish respondents strongly agree or agree that their country would be a better place if religion and politics are separated.

In terms of attitudes toward Islamic government, Egypt is the only country in which a clear majority, 59%, considered that it is very good or fairly good to have such a government. This fact also explains the success of the Muslim Brothers and other Islamic groups at the polls in the country in 2011. This percentage dropped to 49% for Iraqis, 31% for Lebanese, 33% for Pakistanis, 38% for Tunisians, and 34% for Turkish citizens. Except for Egypt and Iraq, only a minority of the respondents were favorable to an Islamic government. The relatively low support for an Islamic government among Pakistani respondents, despite having conservative orientations on other issues, may be a result of the resonance of such a government with the Taliban-style system of rule. Finally, those who favored the implementation of the shari’a laws consisted of 56% of the respondents among Egyptians, 48% among Iraqis, 24% among Lebanese, 74% among Pakistanis, 68% among Saudis, 27% among Tunisians, and 19% among Turkish citizens.
Table 3
Measures of secular politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study country</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Study country] will be a better society if religion and politics are separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having (an Islamic govt/a govt inspired by Christian values) where religious authorities have absolute power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly good</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly bad</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for a good govt to implement only the laws of the shari'a?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td>2,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular politics index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r^2 with age group</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.127^a</td>
<td>-.320^a</td>
<td>-.091^a</td>
<td>.063^b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a<.001, ^b<.01, ^c<.05

Figure 8 shows cross-national variation in secular-politics index by age groups. According to this figure, the Pakistani respondents have displayed the highest gap in orientations toward secular politics between the youngest and the oldest age categories (.69), a pattern of significant age difference that was also observed in terms of the indices of social individualism and gender equality. The next highest difference is among Lebanese (0.32), followed by Tunisian (.24) and Iraqi (.16) respondents. In Egypt and Turkey, this difference is reversed, -.04 and -.15, respectively. Among Egyptians, however, this difference is not statistically significant. The correlation coefficient between secular-politics index and age groups is -.320 for Pakistan, -.127 for Lebanon, -.091 for Tunisia, -.017 for Iraq (not significant), .026 for Egypt (not significant), and .063 for Turkey. In Turkey, the older generations coming of age when secularism was popular appear to have stronger support for secular politics than the younger generations, who might have come under the influence of the ruling Islamic-oriented Justice and Development Party.
Secular Politicians

This construct measures support for secular politicians in contrast to those who are religious. It is a combination of two indicators—two of which are in the Likert-scale format: “Do you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree that:
1. It would be better for [STUDY SITE COUNTRY] if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office [religious politicians]
2. Religious leaders should not interfere in politics [religious leaders not interfere in politics]” The answer categories for this item were recoded so that higher values indicate a stronger agreement with the statement that religious leaders should not interfere in politics.

Secular-politicians index = (religious politicians, religious leader not interfere in politics)

Higher values indicate that respondents are less favorable to politicians who have strong religious beliefs and are more strongly in favor of religious leaders not interfering in.

Table 4 below shows cross-national variation in attitudes toward religious politicians, interference of religious leaders in politics, and secular-politician index. According to this table, 59% Egyptians, 67% Iraqis, 75% Lebanese, 63% Pakistanis, 69% Saudis, 72% Tunisians, and 75% Turkish strongly agree or agree that religious leaders should not interfere in politics. There is, however, more support for the involvement of religious people in politics; that is, except in Lebanon where 58% strongly disagreed or disagreed that “it would be better for the country if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office,” only a minority strongly disagreed or disagreed in other six countries; 35% Egyptians, 29% Iraqis, 4% Pakistanis, 20% Saudis, 32% Tunisians, and 45% Turkish.
Table 4
Measures of secular politicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders should not interfere in politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be better for if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>2,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular politicians index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$ with age group</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.130a</td>
<td>-.293a</td>
<td>-.058c</td>
<td>-.076a</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a <.001, b <.01, c <.05

The religiosity of politicians when contrasted with politicians’ commitment to national interests as qualifying criterion for public office loses considerable significance in public perception in the seven countries, except for Pakistanis (see Figure 9). That is, 79% over 21% for Egyptians, 81% over 19% for Iraqis, 86% over 14% for Lebanese, 57% over 43 for Saudis, 84% over 16% for Tunisians, and 71% versus 29% for Turkish favored the politicians who committed to national interests over the politicians with strong religious views. This priority is reversed for Pakistanis, 43% versus 57%, which is consistent with their views about the shari’a.
Figure 10 shows variation in the secular-politician index across the seven countries for the five age groups. As this figure shows, for some of these countries the younger generations are more secular. For example, in terms of the difference between the youngest and oldest age groups, Pakistan is on top with the difference in the index is .77, following by Lebanon, .33, Tunisia, .18, Iraq, .20, and Saudi Arabia, .06. Among Egyptian and Turkish respondents, this difference is negative but negligible. The correlation coefficient between this index and age group is -.293 for Pakistan, -.130 for Lebanon, -.076 for Tunisia, -.058 for Saudi Arabia, -.041 for Iraq, .013 for Turkey (not significant), and .024 for Egypt (not significant), indicating that younger age groups are more in favor of secular politicians than the older age groups, except for Turkey and Egypt where this relationship is not significant.
Liberalism index

A liberalism index is created by averaging all these four indices of social individualism, gender-equality, secular politicians, and secular politics:

\[
\text{Liberalism index} = \text{mean (social individualism, gender-equality index, secular-politicians index, secular-politics index)}
\]

Higher values on this measure indicate stronger liberal orientations and vary between 1 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Liberalism index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r^2) with age group</td>
<td>-.074(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) < .001, \(^b\) < .01, \(^c\) < .05

Comparing the seven countries in terms of the liberalism index in Table 5 indicates that Lebanon with the index of 2.79 is the most liberal and Pakistan with 1.96 is the least liberal country. In between are Turkey, 2.74, Tunisia, 2.56, Iraq, 2.29, Saudi Arabia 2.26, and Egypt 2.15. Across the seven countries, the youngest age group is more liberal than the oldest, as is shown in Figure 11. This difference is the highest among Pakistanis (.72), followed by Lebanese (.33), Iraqis (.25), Saudi Arabia (.26), Tunisia (.20), Turkey (.14), and Egypt (.10). The correlation coefficients between liberalism index and age groups are negative and significant across all the seven countries, indicating that the younger groups have stronger liberal orientations than the older. The value of \(r^2\) is -.074 for Egypt, -.148 Iraq, -.193 for Lebanon, -.439 for Pakistan, -.221 for Saudi Arabia, -.130 for Tunisia, and -.121 for Turkey.
Secular Identity and Territorial Nationalism

The basis of identity—whether it is the nation, ethnicity, or religion—has also been one of the contested issues in the contemporary middle east. In territorial nationalism of the early twentieth century, which produced the nationalist regimes in Egypt, Iran, and Turkey between 1919 and 1925, the nation is considered the basis of identity. The pan-Arab nationalism which constituted the official ideology of the military regime that seized power through military coups in Egypt, Iraq, Libya, and Syria between 1952 (Egypt) and 1969 (Libya) rested on the Arab identity. In the Islamic fundamentalist regimes, Islam is considered the basis of identity.

Basis of identity is measured in terms of a choice between several entities with which people primarily identify. These include whether people define themselves in terms of their nationality, ethnicity, or religion. Questions on identity were asked in two different ways. One rests on self-described individual identity: “Which of the following best describes you: (1) I am an Egyptian, Iraqi, Lebanese…, above all; (2) I am a Muslim (Christian [for Christian respondents]), above all; and (3) I am an Arab, Kurd, Berber…, above all” The other was self-described communal affiliation or how respondents related to the world: “People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Please tell me which of these five statements comes closest to the way you feel: (1) I see myself as a citizen of the world, (2) I see myself as a citizen of COUNTRY, (3) I see myself as a citizen of the Islamic umma (world-wide Christian community [for Christian respondents]), or (4) I see myself as a citizen of the Arab, Berber, or Kurdish community?” Both questions allowed for the specification of another option if volunteered by the respondent.

Findings from the seven-country surveys have shown that a great majority of the respondents either identified with religion or with the territorial nation. Therefore, in the following two figures, we report only the contrast between the respondents’ identification with nation and religion. Except for Pakistan and Tunisia, the percentage of respondents who recognized nationality as the basis of their identity is higher than those who considered religion. That is, 52% of Egyptians define themselves as Egyptian above all, while 47% as Muslim above all. The corresponding figures are 57% versus 36% among Iraqis, 60% versus 29% among Lebanese, 48% versus 46% among Saudis, and 44% versus 39% among Turkish, respectively. For Pakistanis and Tunisians, this order is reversed. Fully 70% of Pakistanis defined themselves as Muslim above all, while 28% as Pakistani above all. Likewise, 59% of Tunisians defined themselves as Muslims above all, 31% as Tunisian above all.
Figure 12 displays two interesting features. One is that the majority of Saudis, whose country is the bastion of conservative Islam, identify with the nation rather than with the religion. The second is that a clear majority of Tunisian respondents, despite having relatively liberal orientations on many other issues, see themselves first and foremost as Muslims rather than Tunisians. It is not quite clear as to why Tunisian national identity is weaker than it is in most other countries. The second survey question on identity, which taps into the contrast between one’s recognition of national community and supranational religious community, tells a similar story: compared to other nations, Tunisians are much less likely to recognize their nation as the basis of their identity. The disparity between the Tunisian respondents who see themselves as citizens of Tunisia and those as citizens of the Islamic umma (or world-wide Christian or Jewish communities for Christian or Jewish respondents, respectively) is 46% versus 43% respectively, which is much smaller than it is for other countries, where the disparity is much greater: 61% versus 36% for Egyptians, 70% versus 15% for Iraqis, 59% versus 19% for Lebanese, 65% versus 24% for Saudis, and 62% versus 23% for Turkish, respectively.

Figure 13 displays the percentage of respondents identifying with the nation versus with the supranational religious community.
We created a secular-nationalism index by first coding those who identified with religion or the religious community as “0”, and those otherwise as “1” in each of the two variables, and then averaging the two variables, so that a higher value indicates stronger identification with secular nationalism.

**Secular-nationalism index = mean (individual identity, communal affiliation)**

Figure 14 shows variations in the secular-nationalism index across the seven countries by age groups.

According to this figure, more people in all these countries except Tunisia define themselves in national secular than in religious terms. It also shows that more Lebanese and Iraqis with the index values of .76 and .75, respectively, define themselves in national secular terms than the public from other countries. They are followed by Turkey, .69, Saudi Arabia, .66, Egypt, .59, Pakistan, .53, and Tunisia, .49. These countries also vary considerably by age groups. The largest difference between the youngest and oldest groups is among Pakistanis (.27), followed by Lebanon (.15), Iraq (.07), and Saudi Arabia (.05), indicating the youngest generation is more secular. This difference is negligible among Egyptian (-.01), but is reversed among Tunisian and Turkish respondents (each -.05). The correlation coefficient between secular nationalist identity and age group is -.209 for Pakistan, -.098 for Lebanon, -.046 for Iraq, -.032 for Saudi Arabia (not significant), .021 for Egypt (not significant), .033 for Tunisia (not significant), and .059 for Turkey.

**National Pride**

National identity and national pride are quite different and a high level of national identity does not necessarily mean a stronger feeling of national pride. While national identity tends to correlate positively with attitudes toward gender equality and secular politics, and
negatively with religiosity and religious fundamentalism; national pride is often linked to conservative and religious values. Generally, people in democratic countries tend to have a much lower national pride than (1) those in less democratic and more conservative countries, and (2) those in countries which had a fairly strong past imperial experience. As shown below, the percentage of the respondents who expressed being “very proud” to be the citizens of their countries is 90% among Egyptians, 64% among Iraqis, 35% among Lebanese, 83% among Pakistanis, 66% among Saudis, 76% among Tunisians, and 77% among Turkish.
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In terms of age categories, there is no significant difference in national pride among Egyptian, Iraqi, Pakistani, and Saudi respondents. The difference between the youngest and oldest age groups is, however, significant among the more secular and liberal countries. Among Lebanese, national pride is significantly higher among the youngest age group than it is among the oldest; 43% versus 28%, respectively. It is just the opposite among Tunisian, 65% versus 83%, and Turkish respondents, 71% versus 87%, respectively.

![Figure 16](image2)
Table 6
Measures of National Pride and National Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very proud</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very proud</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all proud</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which of the following best describes you?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim/Christian above all</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER above all</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>2,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you relate to the world?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as a citizen of the Islamic/Christian community</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as (Other)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index of Nationalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>3,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>r^2 with age group</strong></td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.098a</td>
<td>-.209a</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.059b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a <.001, ^b <.01, ^c <.05

**Religion and Religiosity Index**
Religion is certainly an important factor in the life of the great majority of the public of the seven countries. However, there is considerable variation in religiosity among the individuals in these countries. To assess this variation, an index of religiosity is constructed, using three variables:

1. **Mosque attendance**: Apart from such religious holidays as feasts of Eid, about how often do you go to a mosque [Church (for Christian respondents)/synagogue (for Jewish respondents)] these days? (1: never, once a year or rarely, (2) once a month, (3) once a week, and (4) more than once a week?

2. **Self-described as religious**: On the scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all religious and 10 is very religious, to what extent do you consider yourself a religious person on this scale?

3. **Trust in mosques/churches**: How much trust do you have in mosques/churches? (4) a lot, (3) some, (2) only a little, (1) none at all.3

3 In Turkey, two questions about trust were included in the questionnaire. First, respondents were asked about their confidence in the Diyanet; and then asked about their confidence in other religious institutions. In this analysis, we report the average of these two variables for Turkish respondents.
A religiosity index is constructed by first recoding self-described as religious into four categories and then averaging the three variables.

Religiosity index = mean (mosque attendance, self-described as religious, trust in mosque/churches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of religiosity</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosque/church attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never, rarely</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over once a week</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>2,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-described religiosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,057</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust in mosque/church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a little</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiosity index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>2804</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>2723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r^2 ) with age group</td>
<td>.093a</td>
<td>.107a</td>
<td>.173a</td>
<td>.265a</td>
<td>.097a</td>
<td>.255a</td>
<td>.232a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a <.001, ^b <.01, ^c <.05 \)

The figure below shows the distribution of the religiosity index by country and age groups. As this figure shows, Egyptians appeared most religious (3.12) and Lebanese least religious (2.38). In between are Saudis (3.03), Tunisians (2.75), Iraqis (2.72), Pakistanis (2.71), and Turkish (2.56). Across the seven countries, the youngest age group is less religious than the oldest. This difference is highest among Pakistanis (-.62), followed by Tunisians (-.43), Lebanese (-.41), Turkish (-.40), Iraqis (-.22), Saudis (-.19) and Egyptians (-.14). The correlation coefficient between religiosity index and age group is .093 for Egypt, .097 for Saudi Arabia, .107 for Iraq, .173 for Lebanon, .232 for Turkey, .255 for Tunisia, and .265 for Pakistan, indicating that younger age groups are less religious than older age groups.
Religious Intolerance

This construct assesses the extent to which respondents are intolerant of the faiths other than their own. The construct is measured by answers to three survey questions asked in Likert-scale format. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that:

1. Non-Muslims/Non-Christians should be prohibited from practicing their religion in (STUDY SITE COUNTRY).
2. Our children should not be allowed to learn about other religions.
3. The followers of other religions should not have the same rights as mine.

The mean for interfaith intolerance is the average of the responses to at least two of these questions, with the variables recoded so that “1” is “strongly disagree” and “4” is strongly agree, and higher values indicating greater intolerance. The results in Figure 18 show that Tunisia is the most tolerant (1.91) and Saudi Arabia the least tolerant society (2.96). In between are Lebanon (1.96), Pakistan (2.00), Egypt (2.17), Iraq (2.20), and Turkey (2.24).
As Figure 19 shows, the difference in religious intolerance between the youngest and oldest groups varies by countries. The largest difference is among Tunisians (-.35), followed by Saudi (-.32), Lebanese (-.31), Pakistani (-.29), Iraqi (-.09), Turkish (-.07), and Egyptian (-.02) respondents. The correlation coefficients between the intolerance index and age groups show that except for Egypt and Iraq, this relationship is significant and positive across the other five countries, indicating a strong relationship between age groups and religious intolerance. The $r^2$ is .021 for Egypt (not significant), .011 for Iraq (not significant), .134 for Lebanon, .121 for Pakistan, .111 for Saudi Arabia, .151 for Tunisia, and .050 for Turkey.
Table 8
Measures of interfaith intolerance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree Non-Muslims</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our children should not be</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed to learn about other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>2,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The followers of other religions should not have the same rights as mine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Intolerance Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>2,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$ with age group</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.134(^a)</td>
<td>.121(^a)</td>
<td>.111(^a)</td>
<td>.151(^a)</td>
<td>.050(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a<.001,\; ^b<.01,\; ^c<.05\)

Western Culture

Like, secular politics and gender equality, Western culture has also been the subject of considerable debate in the Middle East. In the nineteenth century, the dominant view of the West was derived from the seminal idea of the century—progress toward a civilized order. The West was considered to be at the pinnacle of the worldwide movement toward civilization. In the second half of the twentieth century, the West was variously identified with a repressive and exploitative economic system in different leftist perspectives or culturally decadent in Islamic fundamentalism. Western cultural invasion thus became a rallying cry of conservative and fundamentalist groups as well as those who have been preoccupied with the notion of preserving the authenticity of one’s culture against the perceived onslaught of the West.

Findings from the seven-country surveys have shown that some of the respondents displayed strong alarmist attitudes toward Western culture. The percentage of those who said that Western cultural invasion is very important is 69% among Egyptians, followed by 56% Saudis, 54% Iraqis, 49% Turks, 43% Lebanese, 41% Tunisians, and 12% Pakistanis.
Table 9
Measure of attitudes toward Western culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is the problem of cultural invasion by the West in your country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least important</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>2,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r² with age group</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.058b</td>
<td>.208a</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.104a</td>
<td>.085a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a <.001, b <.01, c <.05

There is little age difference among Egyptian or Iraqi respondents. However, among the Lebanese the youngest age group is more concerned with Western cultural invasion than the oldest (6%), while it is just the opposite among Pakistani (18%), Saudi (8%), Tunisian (13%), and Turkish (15%) respondents. The correlation coefficient between attitudes toward Western cultural invasion and age groups is .208 for Pakistan, .104 for Tunisia, .085 for Turkey, .042 for Saudi Arabia (not significant), .028 for Iraq (not significant), .013 for Egypt (not significant), and -.058 for Lebanon.

Figure 20
Cultural invasion by the West is a very important problem
**Political Violence**

Several survey questions measure attitudes toward political violence, asking whether respondents strongly approve, somewhat approve, somewhat disapprove, or strongly disapprove violence against US military troops and US civilians. Strongly approve is coded as 4, somewhat approve as 3, somewhat disapprove as 2, and strongly disapprove as 1. Using this scale, higher values indicate stronger approval of violence.

1. Attacks on U.S. military troops in Iraq or Afghanistan?
2. Attacks on U.S. civilians working for U.S. companies in Europe?
3. Attacks on U.S. civilians working for U.S. companies in Islamic countries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of political violence</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attacks on US military troops in Iraq or Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat approve</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disapprove</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks on US civilians working for US companies in Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat approve</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disapprove</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks on US civilians working for US companies in Islamic countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat approve</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disapprove</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>2,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Political violence index | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 1.84 | 1.79 | 1.99 | 1.77 | 1.99 | 1.79 | 1.38 |
| N | 2,994 | 2,722 | 2,885 | 3,486 | 1,616 | 2,811 | 2,920 |
| $r^2$ with age group | -.044c | .044c | .015 | .097a | -.002 | -.065b | -.080a |

According to Table 10, approval of attack against U.S. troops is highest in Pakistan with 66% of the respondents strongly approve or somewhat approve. Next to Pakistan is Tunisia, with 58%, followed by Lebanon 56%, Egypt 49%, Saudi Arabia 41%, Iraq 38%, and Turkey 10%. A much smaller percentages of the respondents support violence against U.S. civilians working for U.S. companies in Europe, or against U.S. civilians working for U.S. companies in Islamic countries. These percentages range between 1% among Pakistanis and 26% among Saudis, between 1% among Pakistanis and 22% among Saudis, respectively.
A political violence index is constructed by averaging the three variables, and the distributions by age and country are shown in Figure 21 below. On average, Turkish respondents having the index value of 1.38 are least supportive of political violence and Saudis and Lebanese most supportive, both having an index value of 1.99. In between are Egyptians, 1.84, Iraqis and Tunisians, both 1.79, and Pakistanis, 1.77.

Figure 21 shows variation in the political-violence index by age groups. The relationship between these age groups and political violence is positive among Iraqis and Pakistanis, having correlation coefficients of .044 and .097, which indicates that older age groups are more supportive of political violence against Americans than younger age groups. This relationship is, however, just the opposite in Tunisia, \( r^2 = - .065 \), and Turkey, \( r^2 = - .08 \), meaning that the younger age groups are more supportive of political violence against Americans.

### Summary of Variation in Attitudes by Age

The table below summarizes the relationship between age groups and values orientations. As shown in this table, age is significantly linked to sociopolitical and cultural values across the seven countries. That is, compared to the older age groups, the younger age groups (1) are more supportive of social individualism; (2) have more favorable attitudes toward gender equality; (3) more strongly in favor of secular politics only among Lebanese, Pakistanis, Tunisians, but less so among Turkish; (4) more strongly in favor of secular politicians among Iraqis, Lebanese, Pakistanis, Saudis, and Tunisians; (5) more favorable toward secular nationalism in Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, but less so in Turkey; (6) generally more liberal; (7) are less religious, (8) display a higher level of religious tolerance in Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Turkey; and (9) are less supportive of political violence against Americans in Iraq and Pakistan, but more so in Tunisia and Turkey.

These findings reveal three interesting patterns. First, these relationships are most significant among the Pakistani respondents. The size of the correlation coefficients between age groups and different values is considerably larger among Pakistanis than it is among respondents from the other six countries, except for interfaith intolerance where it is largest among Tunisians.
and Lebanese. This is remarkable, as it shows that the gap between younger and older age groups in Pakistan is much wider than it is in other countries, with the younger age group being considerably more in favor of social individualism, gender equality, secular politics, secular politicians, secular nationalism, liberalism, less religious, more religiously tolerance, and less supportive of political violence. On the level of mass belief system, we may thus argue that the younger Pakistanis may provide a stronger social basis for the development of secular politics and liberal values in the country.

Second, in Egypt, by contrast, there is a much narrower gap between the older and younger age groups than other countries, showing no significant connection between age groups and different components of secularism, interfaith intolerance, and political violence. Finally, among the seven countries, Turkey displayed inconsistent relationships between age groups and value orientations. That is, while younger age groups tend to be more supportive of social individualism, gender equality, and liberalism; are less religious and more religiously tolerant, they are less supportive of secular politics and secular nationalism and more supportive of political violence than the older age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>-0.152&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.048&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.074&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.093&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.044&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>-0.166&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.132&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.041&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.046&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.148&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.107&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.044&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>-0.202&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.079&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.127&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.130&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.098&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.193&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.173&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.134&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.058&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-0.382&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.335&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.320&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.293&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.209&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.439&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.265&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.121&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.208&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.097&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>-0.252&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.111&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.058&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.221&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.097&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.111&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>-0.099&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.065&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.091&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.076&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.130&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.255&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.151&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.104&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.065&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-0.236&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.091&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.063&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.059&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.121&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.232&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.050&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.085&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.080&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub><.001, <b><.01, <.05</sub>
TRENDS IN VALUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE ARAB SPRING

A full assessment of trends in values requires longitudinal survey data on all the different measures of liberalism, religiosity, religious tolerance, attitudes toward Western culture, and political violence for at least three points in time must be available for a representative sample of the Middle Eastern countries. The available survey data do not adequately meet all these requirements. While data for Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey are available, which can represent the Middle East as a whole, for the most part these data are limited to two points in time and cover only a subset of all the variables discussed in the previous section. Nonetheless, they include enough information to make a reasonable estimate of the depth and breadth of trend in values among the citizens of these countries in the past decade.

Social Individualism

For social individualism, the only available measure is related to the question concerning preference for love or parental approval as a more appropriate basis for marriage. Data on this measure for at least two points in time are available from the surveys in Iran in 2000 and 2005; Iraq in 2004, 2006, and 2011; and Saudi Arabia in 2003 and 2011. Table 12 shows changes in responses to this question by the five age groups and the year of the survey for each of the three countries. The data on this table reveals several interesting facts about these changes. First, on the national level, support for love as the basis for marriage has considerably increased among Iranians from 55% to 76% between 2000 and 2005 surveys; and among Iraqis, from 27% in 2004 and 28% in 2006 to 31% in 2011. Among Saudis, it dropped an insignificant amount, from 49% in 2003 to 47% in 2011. Second, the correlation coefficients between age groups and preference for love as the basis for marriage has remained negative across all the surveys, indicating that younger age groups are more individualistic than the older age groups. Third, the magnitude of this relationship has increased among Iranians from -.031 (not significant) in 2000 to -.157 in 2005; among Iraqis from -.080 in 2004, to -.116 in 2006, and to -.197 in 2011; and among Saudis from -.080 in 2003 to -.328 in 2011. This increase in the size of the correlation coefficients thus shows a widening gap between the younger and older age groups between the surveys.

Table 12
Trends in social individualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r² with age groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>-.157a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>-.080a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>-.116a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>-.197a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>-.080c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>-.328a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a <.001, b <.01, c <.05
To assess changes in aggregate respondents’ preference between the surveys, a percentage change is calculated, using the following formulate:

\[
\text{Percentage change} = \frac{\text{last survey} - \text{first survey}}{\text{first survey}} \times 100
\]

The results, shown in the figure below, indicate the percentage increase in support for love as the basis for marriage is quite dramatic among those aged 18-25 across the three countries. This increase is 49% among Iranians, 39% among Iraqis, and 23% among Saudis. While support for this individualistic value has increased across all age groups among Iranians, for respondents age 35 and above, this change is reversed among Iraqis and Saudis. The trend toward conservative-cum-patriarchal values among Saudis age 45 and above is even more dramatic; those who considered love as a more appropriate basis for marriage dropped sharply by 49% and 61% for 45-54 and 55+ age groups. On this measure, the gap between the younger and older generations in Saudi Arabia considerably widened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>(2000-2005)</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>(2004-2011)</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>(2003-2011)</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22**

Change in endorsement of love marriage

**Gender Equality**

Trend in attitudes toward gender equality varies by country. Among Egyptians, these attitudes turned less favorable toward women; among Iranians, Iraqis, and Saudis more favorable, and among Turkish no significant changes. Trend in gender equality by age groups, however, is different for different countries. Among Egyptians, the conservative trend toward gender inequality was higher among 18-24 years old than other age groups; among Iranian and Turkish respondents, the rate of change was higher among 45+ than among other groups; among Iraqis there was no significance differences in trend among age groups; and among Saudis, this trend was positive for 18-54 groups, but negative among 55+.

For all these countries, except Iran, a gender-equality index is constructed and used in order to assess trends in values toward gender equality. In Saudi Arabia and Turkey, this index is based on responses to two questions-both in Likert-scale format: Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that (1) men make better political leaders than women do; and (2)
university education is more important for boys than it is for girls. In Egypt and Iraq, an index is created using these two variables as well as a third: (3) a wife must always obey her husband. A higher value of this index indicates stronger support for gender equality. Responses to these questions are available for at least three points in time for Egypt, Iraq, and Turkey; and two points in time for Saudi Arabia. For Iran, however, the response categories for the first two variables were four and five in the 2000 and 2005 surveys, respectively. Since responses from these two variables are not quite comparable, only the third variable—wife obedience—where the question had five response categories in both surveys (strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, strongly disagree) is used for evaluating trend toward gender equality among Iranians between the 2000 and 2005 surveys.\(^4\)

Table 13 shows responses to these questions in Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey for different years. As shown in this table, among Egyptians, the percentages of those who strongly disagreed or disagreed with “men make better political leader,” “university education is more important for boys,” and “wife obedience” declined between the 2001 and 2011 surveys. For the first question, these percentages were 15% in 2001, 28% in 2002, 8% in 2008, 17% summer 2011, and 12% fall 2011. Likewise, responses to the second question declined in this period; from 68% in 2001, it went up to 80% in 2002, and then dropped to 62-63% the subsequent surveys in 2008, summer 2011, and fall 2011. Finally, on wife obedience, those who strongly disagreed or disagreed dropped from 21% and 22% in 2001 and 2002, respectively, to 6% in summer 2011 and 4% in fall 2011. Among Iraqis, on the other hand, these percentages increased significantly between the 2004 and 2011 surveys; from 10% in 2004 and 2006 to 25% in 2011 among those who strongly disagreed or disagreed with “men make better political leaders;” and from 54% and 51% in 2004 and 2006, respectively, to 71% in 2011 among those who strongly disagreed or disagree with “university education is more important for boys”; but showed no significant change—11%, 9%, 11%, respectively, in the three subsequent surveys—among those who strongly disagreed or disagreed with wife obedience. Among Saudis, these percentages decreased between 2003 and 2011 surveys from 25% to 21%, respectively, among those who strongly disagree or disagree with “men make better political leaders;” but increased from 39% to 43% among those who disagreed with “university education is more important for boys.

Finally, in Turkey, while the percentages of those who strongly disagreed or disagreed with “men make better political leader” remained by and large the same between 42% and 39% in 1996, 2001, and 2007, it increased to 46% in 2013. The percentage of those who had the same attitudes toward “university education is more important for boys” remained more or less the same in 1996 and 2013, 73% and 71% respectively, although it increased to 75% in 2001 and 81% in 2007.

\(^4\) Although the item measuring wife obedience in Iran used response categories “1” through “5”, for ease of comparison we have rescaled responses into a “1” through “4” scale using the following formula: 1*.75 + .25 = 1, through 5*.75 + .25 = 4.
### Table 13
Trends in gender equality components (% Disagree or strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men make better political leaders</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University education is more important for a boy than for a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wife must always obey her husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>A wife must always obey her husband (Mean; 1 = Strongly agree; 4 = Strongly disagree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Men make better political leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University education is more important for a boy than for a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wife must always obey her husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>Men make better political leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University education is more important for a boy than for a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Men make better political leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University education is more important for a boy than for a girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 reports the gender-equality index for these countries in different years. As shown, this value for Egypt increased from 2.12 in 2001 to 2.34 in 2002, then dropped to 1.93 in summer 2011 and 1.87 in fall 2011. Among Egyptians, although the youth tended to be more egalitarian in attitudes toward women in 2001 ($r^2 = -.121$), in the subsequent surveys there was no significant difference in this index between the younger and older age groups.

In Iraq, on the other hand, this value increased from 1.80 in 2004 to 2.17 in 2011. In all the three surveys, the younger age groups were more supportive of gender equality than the older age groups ($r^2 = -.046, -.051, \text{ and } -.101,$ for 2004, 2006, and 2011 surveys, respectively). Likewise, there has also been an increase in the value of the gender-equality index in Saudi Arabia between 2003 and 2011 surveys from 1.97 to 2.03. The younger age groups were more equalitarian than the older only in the 2011 survey ($r^2 = -.112$). For Turkey, there was an increase in the gender equality index between 1996 and 2013 surveys, from 2.60 to 2.69. However, in all years, the younger age groups had stronger egalitarian attitudes toward women than the older age groups.

Among Iranians, on average, those who were less favorable toward wife obedience significantly declined between the two surveys; the mean for wife-obedience variable increased from 2.24 to 2.32. The correlation coefficient between attitudes toward wife obedience and age group was of significant magnitude in both years (-.211 and -.146), indicating the younger groups are more favorable toward gender equality in the family than older groups.

### Table 14
Trends in gender equality (1 = strongly agree; 4 = strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r² with age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: Gender equality index (wife obed., men better leaders, U Ed more important for boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>-.121&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-.009&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>-.027&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>-.045&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran: Wife obedience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>-.211&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>-.146&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq: Gender equality index (wife obed., men better leaders, U Ed more important for boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>-.046&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>-.051&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>-.101&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA: Gender equality index (men better leaders, U Ed more important for boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>-.018&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>-.112&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey: Gender equality index (men better leaders, U Ed more important for boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>-.108&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>-.071&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>-.088&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>-.049&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><.001, <sup>b</sup><.01, <sup>c</sup><.05
Figure 23 shows the difference in the gender-equality index between the latest and earliest surveys among the five age groups for different countries. The positive value indicates an increase in support for gender equality for each age group. In Egypt, the decline in support for gender equality was greater among the younger two age groups than the older, -17% and -13% versus -10% and -12%, in Iran the increase in support for gender equality was lower among younger age groups than older, 1% and 4% versus 6% and 9%, in Iraq there was negligible variation among age groups, in Saudi Arabia the increase was slightly greater among the youngest age group, at 7%, but negligible or negative among older age groups, and finally, in Turkey, this support was lower among younger age groups than it was among the oldest age groups.

Considering these changes, we may conclude that younger age groups have developed stronger inequalitarian attitudes toward women than the older age groups among Egyptians. Among Iranian and Turkish respondents, older age groups developed significantly more egalitarian attitudes. In Iraq, all age groups developed more egalitarian attitudes similarly. Finally, in Saudi Arabia, the younger age groups have become more egalitarian, while the older less egalitarian in their attitudes toward women.

**Secularism and Secular Politics**

In Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, there has been a significant increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics. The percent changes were much higher among Egyptians and Saudis than the other two countries. The percent changes was higher among older age groups than it was among younger age groups in Egypt, much lower among 55+ in Iraq, no significant age differences in Saudi Arabia,

As was the case for gender-equality variables, the available data on the indicators of secular politics varies by country and year, as shown in Table 15. Responses to the following questions measure indicators of secular politics:

i. Do you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree that COUNTRY would be a better place if people with strong religious beliefs held public office?
ii. Do you consider it (1) very important, (2) important, (3) not very import, or (4) not at all important for a good government to implement only the laws of the sharia?

iii. Do you (4) strongly agree, (3) agree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree COUNTRY would be a better place if religion and politics were separated?

iv. Do you (4) strongly agree, (3) agree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree that religious leaders should not interfere in politics?

v. Is it (1) very good, (2) good, (3) bad, or (5) very bad to have an Islamic government [a government inspired by Christian values for Christian respondents] where religious authorities have absolute power.

In all these variables, higher values indicate stronger support for secular politics. Table 15 shows the availability of the data by variable, country, and year.

According to this table, among Egyptians the average unfavorable responses to the question on people with strong religious beliefs holding public office has increased from 1.48 in 2001, to 1.63 in 2002, and to 2.2 in 2011. These average responses also increased concerning unfavorable attitudes toward the sharia from 1.63, to 1.81, and to 2.09. Support for secular politics has also increased on average from 2.41 in 2007 to 2.65 in summer 2011, and to 2.67 in fall 2011. Considering these changes as well as the shift in the basis of identity from Islam to Egypt (see the following section), we may reasonably argue that there has been a change in the orientations of Egyptians toward secular politics.

In terms of age, findings have shown that only in 2001 were the younger age groups less favorable toward politicians with strong religious view and the sharia than the older age groups ($r^2 = -.051, -.045$, respectively). In the fall 2011 survey, on the other hand, the older age groups displayed a stronger support for the separation of religion and politics than the younger age groups ($r^2 = 0.111$). Among Egyptians, therefore, the relationship between age and attitudes toward secular politics remains inconclusive.

For Iraq, more complete data are available on these variables, as shown in the table. In constructing trends toward secular politics, if five variables are used, then the secular-politics index for only the 2004, and April 2006, and 2011 surveys can be meaningfully compared. The value of this index was 2.33 in 2004, 2.72 in April 2006, and 2.57 in 2011, as shown in column total, indicating an increase in support for secular politics in 2004-2011. If the trend is viewed considering measures of secular politics based on three variables (B) and one variable (C), then the column total, while still indicating an increase in support for secular politics from 2.33 in 2004 to 2.58 in 2013, shows a trend that has an inverted U-shape; from value of 2.33 in 2004, it increased to 3.06 in 2008 and 2011, than it dropped to 2.58 in 2013.

The relationship between age groups and secular politics was significant in only the 2010 and 2013 surveys, which was based on only one variable (separation of religion and politics), showing that the younger age groups are more supportive of secular politics than the older age groups ($r^2 = -.054, -.131$, respectively).

In Saudi Arabia, support for the sharia declined significantly as mean unfavorable attitudes toward the implementation of the sharia increased from 1.33 to 1.82 between the 2003 and 2011 surveys. In terms of age, in both years the younger age groups were less in favor of the sharia than the older age groups. And in Turkey, the mean index based on two variables—the undesirability of having people with strong religious views in public office and those who believed that religious leaders shown not interfere in politics—increased from 2.65 to 2.78 between 2007 and 2013 surveys. Among Turkish respondents, there was no significant relationship between age and attitudes toward secular politics.
Table 15
Trends toward secular politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R² with age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Egypt: Better if strong religious beliefs hold public office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001*</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>-0.051b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Egypt: A good government implements only the shari’a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001*</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-0.045c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002*</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011*</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Egypt: Better if religion and politics separate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>.111a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iraq:

A: 5 variables (Shari’a, separation of religion/politics, Islamic govt, religious people held office, religious leaders interfere in politics)

B: 3 variables (Shari’a, separation of religion/politics, Islamic govt)

C: 1 variable (Separation of religion/politics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2004</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2006-Apr</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2006-Oct</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2008</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2010</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>-.054c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2011</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2013</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>-.131a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KSA: A good government implements only the shari’a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003*</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011*</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>-.085b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turkey: 2 variables (Religious people held office, religious leaders interfere in politics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a <.001, \ b <.01, \ c <.05\]

*In computing means, all variables which used response categories “1” to “5” (i.e., a Likert scale with a middle category) were rescaled into variables ranging from “1” to “4” using the formula: 1*.75 + .25=1, through 5*.75 + .25 = 4. Surveys in which variables were rescaled using this formula are noted with a “*”. In the case of Iraq, where the only variable which used a “1” to “5” range was “A good government implements only the shari’a” in all survey years, the item was rescaled into “1” to “4” but not indicated as such with a “*” in Table 15.
Figure 24 shows the increase in mean among Egyptians for each of the three secular politics variables available. Means increased across time among all age groups, but the largest increases can be seen among the oldest age groups in each of the survey items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better if strong religious beliefs held public office (2001-2011) (0.98)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good govt implements only the shari‘a (2001-2011) (0.91)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better if religion and politics are separate (2007-2011) (0.71)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Iraq, data is available using all five secular politics variables. Figure 25 shows the increase in the mean secular politics index (Iraq A in Table 15 above) between 2004 and 2011, where the difference is similar among all age groups in Iraq except among the oldest age group, where there is very little increase. In Saudi Arabia, the only available variable is “a good government implements only the shar‘a”, where there is no discernible pattern and all age groups increased attitudes toward secular politics by a magnitude of between 30% and 40%. Lastly, Turkey also shows little variation among different ages, with only a slight increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics across the entire population.
Democracy

In addition to items on secular politics, data is available for one survey item concerning democracy: “Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that democracy may have problems but it is the best form of government?” Table 16 shows a decrease in the overall percentage of Egyptians, Iraqis, and Turkish citizens who strongly agreed with the statement, while Iranians reported an increase in support for democracy and Saudis remained relatively unchanged overall. Where there is a significant association between support for democracy and age, it is consistently positive, meaning that older people showed stronger favorable attitudes toward democracy, $r^2 = .041$ for Egypt 2001; .095 and .060 for Iran 2000 and 2005, respectively; and .097, .058, and .058 for Turkey 1996, 2001, and 2005, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age Group 18-24</th>
<th>Age Group 25-34</th>
<th>Age Group 35-44</th>
<th>Age Group 45-54</th>
<th>Age Group 55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$r^2$ with age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>.041c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>.095a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>.060b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>.097a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>.058b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>.058b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26 shows the magnitude of change among age groups. The youngest Egyptians and the oldest Iraqis demonstrate the greatest decrease in support for democracy, while there is no discernible pattern in the magnitude of change by age among Turkish respondents. Among Iranians, all but those aged 25-34 show a dramatic increase in support for democracy, with the greatest increase occurring among the oldest Iranians. Lastly, there is little change in support for democracy among younger Saudis, but greater increase in support among those aged 35+.

---

5 There was a significant amount of missing data in the Iraq 2004, Iran 2000, and Saudi Arabia 2003 surveys. For these three countries, we report the percentage of those respondents who answered “strongly agree”, as a percentage of all respondents in the survey, without excluding those for whom data to this question was missing. However, the $r^2$ was calculated by excluding missing cases and recoding responses so that the highest value, “4”, indicates strong agreement with the statement, while the lowest value, “1”, indicates strong disagreement.
National Identity

Consistent with changes in attitudes toward social individualism, gender equality (except among Egyptians), and secular politics, there is evidence indicating changes in people’s definition of the basis of identity from religion to nation. This change is reflected in responses to the question of whether respondents primarily define themselves as (1) Egyptian, Iranian, Iraqi, Saudi, or Turkish; (2) Muslim [Christian for Christian respondents]; or (3) Arab or Kurd. Table 17 reports these responses for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey in different years. According to this table, there has been a significant shift away from religion and toward nation as the basis of identity across Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey in the past decade. Among Egyptians, in surveys in 2001, 2002, and 2007, only a small percentage of Egyptians defined themselves as Egyptian above all (the majority considered themselves as Muslim above all), 10%, 6%, and 12%, respectively. This percentage dramatically increased to 52% in summer 2011 and 56% in fall 2011. This increase may suggest the formation of national identity within the context of collective struggles against an authoritarian, nonresponsive, and nontransparent state. The other countries for which data are available have also experienced a rise in national identity in the past decade: the percentage of those who defined themselves as Iranians above all increased from 35% in 2000 to 43% in 2005. Among Iraqis, those considering selves as Iraqis above all also increased from 24% and 28% in 2004 and 2006, respectively, to between 55% and 63% in 2007-2008 surveys, and then to 47%, 57%, and 46% in 2010, 2011, and 2013, respectively. Among Saudis, this percentage has changed dramatically, from 17% in 2003 to 48% in 2011. Finally, Turkish identity has also increased among Turkish respondents from 34% in 2001 to 44% in 2013.

The relationship between national identity and age groups varies across the five countries. In Egypt, this relationship is significant and positive only in 2007 and summer 2011 ($r^2 = .133$, .037, respectively), indicating that more Egyptians among older age groups adhere to...
national identity than younger age groups. The same is true in Iran in 2005 ($r^2 = .049$) and Turkey in 2013 ($r^2 = .065$). Among Iraqis in 2013, this relationship is significant and negative ($r^2 = -.071$), meaning that the younger age groups are more nationalistic than the older age groups.6

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends in national identity (% Reporting “Above all, I am NATIONALITY”)</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r² with age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 2001</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Summer</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Fall</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran 2000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq 2004</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-07</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-07</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7,758</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA 2003</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey 2001</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a < .001, b < .01, c < .05

Figure 27 shows the difference between the last and the first survey in support for national identity. The correlation coefficient between these differences and age groups shows that for Egypt this relationship is .20, for Iran, .90, for Iraq, .11, for Saudi Arabia, -.41, and for Turkey, .96.

6To calculate $r^2$, the variable measuring “nationality” was coded as follows: “1” = “Above all, I am NATIONALITY”; “0” = “Above all, I am RELIGION/ETHNICITY/OTHER”.
Figure 27 shows the difference in percentages of the respondents adhering to national identity between the latest and earliest surveys for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey. As this figure shows, the percent increase in national identity among Egyptians was highest for the youngest and oldest age group, 589%, and 600%, respectively. Among Iranian respondents, the change in identity is more dramatic for the older age groups 45-54 and 55+, 44% and 51%, respectively, as opposed to 13% for the younger age groups. For Iraq and Saudi Arabia, there is no discernible pattern between magnitude of increase in national identity and age. Similar to Iran, in Turkey, the percent increase in national identity is much higher among the older age groups, 45-54 and 55+, 43% and 48%, respectively, as opposed to below 23% for the younger age groups.

A more in-depth analysis of the data may be necessary to explain the pattern of cross-national variation in national identity by different age groups shown in Figure 27. Here, it may be plausible to relate this variation to the differential effects of the head-to-head collision of territorial nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism on age groups in varying national-historical context the past decades. We speculate the rise of national identity in Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey reflects opposition to political Islam that has been in different ways the dominant ideology. The rate of change in Iran and Turkey was higher among the older age groups because the latter experienced their formative years (12-27) during the period when secular ideologies were the dominant discourse. Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, did not have a secular cultural episode in the past and, as a result, the shift toward national identity among Saudis has been by and large uniform across the different age groups. The change toward national identity was constant because its development transpired under foreign domination, which might have uniformly affected all age groups.

Except for a short period under the Mohamed Morsi presidency and the Muslim Brothers, Egypt has always been under secular rule in the modern period. Nonetheless, political Islam had grown and become quite a powerful force in the country in the past decades and managed to expand its social influence, including in shaping people’s definition of identity, as an overwhelming majority of Egyptian in 2001-2007 period identified with the religion rather than with the nation. The rise of national identity among Egyptians appears to have been an outcome
of Egyptian collective struggle against the authoritarian rule of President Hosni Mubarak and reflect the fact that secular Egyptians led the revolutionary struggle. Therefore, we may speculate that the higher percentage changes toward national identity among the older age groups may reflect that their formative experience under the domination of secularism, the lower such percentage changes among 25-34 and 35-44 age groups reflecting the effect of the rise of political Islam during their formative years, and finally, the higher percentage changes among the youngest age group 24-25 may reflect a higher participation of the members of this group in movement against President Mubarak.

**National Pride**

National identity is a cognitive measure of people’s identification with different bases of their political community—whether it is the nation, ethnicity, or religion. National pride, on the other hand, is affective; it estimates attachments to the nation. In this paper, the construct is measured in terms of the degree to which people express (1) very proud, (2) proud, (3) not proud, or (4) not proud at all of being the citizens of their country. The two measures tap into different aspects of collective solidarity. National pride is often associated with conservative and traditional values. Cross national variation in national pride tends to be associated with variation in democracy. For example, national pride is much lower among the citizens in democratic countries than it is non-democratic countries. It is higher in countries that had imperial experience in the past than those which had no such experience. National identity, under the current context of the contemporary Middle Eastern societies, where modalities of Islamic fundamentalism is in conflict with territorial nationalism, is tied to favorable attitudes toward liberal values (Moaddel 2013). Thus, a decline in national pride may be interpreted as an indication of a trend toward liberal values.

Findings from the five countries for which trends data are available have shown some changes in national pride. Among Egyptians, the percentage of the people who expressed being “very proud” to be the citizens of their country fluctuated between 73% and 90% between 2001 and 2011; but it dropped among Iranians, from 92% in 2000 to 64% in 2005, among Iraqis from between 77% and 82% in 2004-2007 to 64% in 2011, and among Saudis from 73% in 2003 to 66% in 2011. Among Turkish, with some up-and-downs, it increased from 67% in 1990 to 77% in 2013 (Table 18 and Figure 28).

The relationship between national pride and age groups has been either positive for some countries in some years ($r^2 = .079$ for Egypt in 2002; = .074 and .127 for Iran in 2000 and 2005, respectively; =.083 for Saudi Arabia in 2003; = .201, .151, .095, and .173 for Turkey in 1990, 1996, 2001, and 2013, respectively) or remained statistically insignificant. Therefore, it is plausible to argue that generally the older age groups tend to have stronger feelings of national pride than the younger age groups.
Table 18  
Trends in national pride (% Very proud to be NATIONALITY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r²  with age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>.079⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>.074⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-06</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-07</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7,896</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-07</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>.083⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>.201⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>.095⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2,971</td>
<td>.173⁹⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<.001, <.01, <.05

Figure 28 shows the changes in national pride between the earliest and latest surveys for different age groups by country. Among Egyptians, this change was the same across all age groups except for the 45-54. Among this age group, however, national pride was a bit higher in 2001 than it was among other age groups. Therefore, the smaller increase among this group may be a result of the leveling off in national pride across all age groups among Egyptians in 2013. The same is true among Saudis, as older Saudis expressed stronger feelings of national pride in 2003, but a greater decline in national pride among 35+ between 2003 and 2011 equalized this feeling across the five age groups. This fact explains why the correlation coefficient between age groups and national pride was significant in 2003 but not so in 2011. Among Iranians, on the other hand, the decline in national pride was greater among the younger age groups than it was among older, and thus the strength of the relationship between national pride and age groups increased between the 2000 and 2005 surveys. Finally, among the Turkish respondents, the increase in national pride among the younger age groups although higher, did not offset age-group differences in pride and the older age groups still had significantly stronger feelings of national pride.
In sum, national pride generally increased among Egyptian and Turkish respondents between the two surveys. We speculate that this increase, however, reflects different processes; a successful overthrow of an authoritarian government among Egyptians and a newly acquired regional prestige and power as a result of impressive economic development and stable parliamentary politics among Turkish. In Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, this decline may reflect an increase in awareness of the shortcomings in the political, religious, and economic institutions of the country during the period between the two surveys. The enhanced awareness of such problems may naturally reduce the strength of the people’s feeling of national pride.

**SUMMARY**

The foregoing analysis of the available longitudinal data from Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey has shown that these countries experienced varied changes in values and the extent of these changes also differed among age groups:

**Social individualism** is measured in terms of preference for love, rather than parental approval, as a more appropriate basis for marriage. Data on this measure for at least two points in time were available for Iran in 2000 and 2005; Iraq in 2004, 2006, 2011; and Saudi Arabia in 2003 and 2011. Accordingly, among Iranians and Iraqis, there has been a significant increase in the percentage of the respondents who considered love as the basis for marriage in the interval between the first and the last surveys. There was no such increase among the Saudi respondents. Across the three countries, however, a much higher percentage of those aged 18-24 showed an increase in preference for love as the basis for marriage than other age groups. As result, the gap between the youngest and oldest age groups considerably expanded in these countries. Among the Saudis this gap widened dramatically.

**Gender equality**: Trend in attitudes toward gender equality varies by country. Among Egyptians, these attitudes turned less favorable toward women; among Iranians, Iraqis, and Saudis more favorable, and among Turkish remained stable. Trend in gender equality by age groups, however, is different for different countries. Among Egyptians, the conservative trend toward gender inequality was higher among 18-24 year olds than other age groups; among Iranian and Turkish respondents, the rate of change was higher among those 45+ than among
other groups; among Iraqis there was no significance differences in trend among age groups; and among Saudis, this trend was positive for those aged 18-54, but negative among those 55+

Secular politics: In Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, there has been a significant increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics. The magnitude of change was much higher among Egyptians and Saudis than the other two countries. The degree of change was greater among older age groups than it was among younger age groups in Egypt, much less among those 55+ in Iraq, no significant age differences in Saudi Arabia.

Democracy: In contrast to the increase in favorable attitudes toward secular politics, there is a decrease in the overall percentage of Egyptians, Iraqis, and Turkish citizens who strongly agreed with democracy as the best form of government, except among Iranians who reported an increase in support for democracy and Saudis whose attitudes remained relatively unchanged between the first and latest surveys. Where there is a significant association between support for democracy and age, it is consistently positive, meaning that older people showed stronger favorable attitudes democracy, $r^2 = .041$ for Egypt 2001; .095 and .060 for Iran 2000 and 2005, respectively; and .097, .058, and .058 for Turkey 1996, 2001, and 2005, respectively.

In terms of the magnitude of change among age groups, the youngest Egyptians and the oldest Iraqis demonstrate the greatest decrease in support for democracy, while there is no discernible pattern in the magnitude of change by age among Turkish respondents. Among Iranians, all but those aged 25-34 show a dramatic increase in support for democracy, with the greatest increase occurring among the oldest Iranians. Lastly, there is little change in support for democracy among younger Saudis, but greater increase in support among those aged 35+

National identity: There has been a significant shift away from religion and toward nation as the basis of identity across Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey in the past decade. The percent increase in national identity among Egyptians was highest for the youngest and oldest age group, 589%, and 600%, respectively. Among Iranian respondents, the change in identity is more dramatic for the older age groups 45-54 and 55+; 44% and 51%, respectively, as opposed to 13% for the younger age groups. For Iraq and Saudi Arabia, there is no discernible pattern between magnitude of increase in national identity and age. Similar to Iran, in Turkey, the percent increase in national identity is much higher among the older age groups, 45-54 and 55+, 43% and 48%, respectively, as opposed to below 23% for the younger age groups.

National pride: Findings from the five countries for which trends data are available have shown some changes in national pride. Among Egyptian and Turkish respondents, the percentage of the people who expressed being “very proud” to be the citizens of their country went up between the first and latest surveys. Among Iranian, Iraqi, and Saudi respondents, on the other hand, it declined between the beginning and ending surveys. Generally, the older age groups tend to have stronger feelings of national pride than the younger age groups.

The change in national pride by different age groups depends on the country. Among Egyptians, this change was the same across almost all age groups. Among the Saudis, there was a larger decline in national pride among 35+ between 2003 and 2011. Among Iranians, on the other hand, the decline in national pride was greater among the younger age groups than it was among older. Finally, among Turkish respondents, the increase in national pride among the younger age groups although higher, did not offset age-group differences in pride and the older age groups still had significantly stronger feelings of national pride.
APPENDIX A
DATA AND METHODS

Data for these analyses come from several separate data collection efforts. The data examining cross-national variation were collected as part of a comparable, nationally representative six-country values survey of citizens, aged 18 and above, in Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia in 2011 and in Turkey in 2013. The survey instrument consisted of more than 250 items about major aspects of human life and replicated key batteries from the values surveys carried out by several members of this research team. It also included some of the items used in the World Values Surveys. The data from Tunisia which is analyzed comparatively alongside these six countries was from a separate nationally representative values survey conducted in 2013 that focused solely on Tunisia, but replicated about 120 of the items in the six country survey. It thus allows systematic comparison of Tunisia with these six countries and the rest of the world on some of the issues related to religion, politics, and gender.

The questionnaires used in these seven countries took approximately one hour to complete, and surveys were conducted through face-to-face interviews. Samples in all countries were nationally representative of the adult population. Table 19 below shows provides the demographic characteristics of the samples from the surveys in all seven countries as well as the overall response rate achieved in the data collection. In Saudi Arabia, we drew an oversample of residents from the primarily Shi’a city of Hafouf. We have calculated a population-based weight based on Saudi census data to account for the excess Hafouf sample, and all analyses reported for Saudi Arabia in this paper have been conducted using the population-based weight included in the dataset. For more information on these survey projects and associated methodology, see www.mevs.org.
Table 19
Demographic characteristics of survey respondents in cross-national analyses
(percentages reported with the exception of average age, in which mean is reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>KSA</th>
<th>Tunis</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25-34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35-44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45-54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim (no sect)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Permamentl</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle class</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample size</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey dates</td>
<td>June-Aug</td>
<td>Jan-Feb</td>
<td>Mar-July</td>
<td>May-Sept</td>
<td>Jan-Feb</td>
<td>Mar-May</td>
<td>Apr-June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Muslim sect was not reported in Saudi Arabia but 25% of respondents were from a predominantly Shi’a city, and 75% were from predominantly Sunni cities. Population-based weights are used in reporting values in this table.
Data used in the analyses section on trends in values comes from several sources: 1) the comparative data collected in 2011-2013 and discussed above; 2) values surveys conducted under the auspices of the World Values Survey; 3) several surveys in Iraq carried out in between 2006 and 2013 by the by Iraq-based Independent Institutes for Administration and Civil Society Studies; 4) a DHHS survey carried out in Egypt in April 2007; and 5) a values survey carried out in Egypt in the Fall of 2011 by the Egyptian Research and Training Center. All the surveys used multistage probability sampling procedures, broken down into urban and rural areas in proportion to their size, with roughly equal male and female respondents. The interviews, which required approximately one hour on average to complete, were conducted face-to-face in respondents’ residences. Table 20 below provides survey dates and sample size for all other surveys from which data was used (in addition to the data detailed in Table 19 above). For more information on these surveys, see www.mevs.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Survey dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>July – December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>January – February 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>January - February 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>June - August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>November - December 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>March - April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,945</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>December 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>January – February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>April – May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>December 1996 – January 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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