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Abstract

BACKGROUND
The consequences of immigration for gender equality is of high public concern. A key issue is to what extent the children of immigrants adopt the more gender-egalitarian work–family attitudes and practices prevalent in the societies where they have grown up.

OBJECTIVE
This study examines the support for gender-equal work–family practices among second-generation immigrants in Norway, a country with high gender-equality ambitions. We analyze attitudes toward the role of both genders in the family and the labor market among descendants of Sri Lankan, Vietnamese, Turkish, and Pakistani origin, and make comparisons with the majority population and same-age immigrants.

METHOD
Cross-sectional data (N = 1,049/586 for descendants/immigrants) comes from the Survey on living conditions among persons with an immigrant background 2016 in Norway.

RESULTS
Second-generation immigrants embrace the ideas of the working mother, shared breadwinning, and shared care to the same extent as the majority population, but express somewhat more support for the homemaker role. There are few consistent dividing lines among descendants, although women express more gender-egalitarian attitudes than men, and men of Pakistani origin are less supportive than other male descendants. Religiosity and the composition of the friendship network matter for some groups. Descendants express slightly more gender-egalitarian work–family attitudes than same-age immigrants.

¹ Corresponding author. Senior Researcher, Institute for Social Research, Munthes gate 31, 0260 Oslo, PO Box 3233 Elisenberg, NO-0208 Oslo, Norway. Email: hege.kitterod@samfunnsforskning.no.
² Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Social Research, Munthes gate 31, 0260 Oslo, PO Box 3233 Elisenberg, NO-0208 Oslo, Norway. Email: mna@socialresearch.no.
CONTRIBUTION
This study reveals that second-generation immigrants in Norway express overwhelming support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, suggesting that exposure to a gender-egalitarian institutional and cultural context is important in shaping gender-role attitudes post migration.

1. Introduction

Gender relations constitute one of the focal points in discussions about migration and integration in Europe, where migration from ‘culturally distant’ countries is often portrayed as a threat to European notions of gender equality (Phillips 2010). Immigrant families’ gendered division of labor raises larger concerns about socioeconomic integration and the sustainability of the welfare state, on one hand, and cultural integration to ‘our’ gender-equality ideals on the other (e.g., NOU 2011). As both gender and family are issues central to people’s identities, they are often understood as domains particularly resistant to change (Goldscheider, Goldscheider, and Bernhardt 2011; Prieur 2002). A key issue is thus to what extent gender-role attitudes change after migration from more gender-traditional to more gender-egalitarian contexts – and to what extent the children of immigrants embrace the more gender-egalitarian work–family practices prevalent in the societies where they have grown up.

Children of immigrants – the so-called second generation3 – represent an interesting vantage point for examining the conflicting dualities of continuity and change following migration. They tend to be positioned between diverse normative reference points and encounter different, sometimes contradictory, understandings of gender in the family and in society at large. This tension might be particularly present in Scandinavian countries, where there is clear normative and institutional support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, in contrast to the male-breadwinner model that is dominant in many of the immigrant-sending countries (Goldscheider, Goldscheider, and Bernhardt 2011; Kavli 2015; Nadim 2015).

In the present paper, we first ask whether children of immigrants typically support the gender-equality ideals held by the majority of the Norwegian population. We analyze the attitudes of second-generation immigrants from Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Turkey, and Pakistan, comparing their level of support for the dual-earner/dual-carer model with that of the majority population. Second, we examine the dimensions along which their gender-role attitudes vary, investigating the significance of factors such as
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3 We use the terms ‘second-generation immigrant’ and ‘descendants’ interchangeably to refer to Norwegian-born children of immigrants.
country of origin, gender, religion, compositions of network groups, and educational attainment. Third, we compare the descendants’ attitudes with those of same-age immigrants.

The study is based on the Survey on living conditions among persons with an immigrant background 2016 (LKI 2016), conducted by Statistics Norway. The survey provides high-quality data on immigrants and their children in Norway. It allows us to analyze more origin countries than previous studies of gender-role attitudes among the second generation (e.g., Kavli 2015), thus enabling more variation with respect to parental work–family practices. It also provides more recent data than earlier studies, with a larger and more representative sample.

Besides the unique quality of the data, one major contribution of this study is that it analyzes attitudes toward the role of both genders in the family, whereas survey questions on gender-role attitudes typically focus on women’s roles in the workforce and in the home (Breidahl and Larsen 2016; Knight and Brinton 2017). Furthermore, to capture the nuances of gender-role attitudes (cf. Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011; Knight and Brinton 2017), we analyze a number of gender-equality measures separately in addition to creating an index, which is commonly done in studies on gender attitudes (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Davis and Greenstein 2009; Khoudja and Fleischmann 2015).

Most second-generation immigrants in Norway are still quite young, and a large fraction of our sample have yet to establish families or enter the labor market. Still, we believe it is important to study their support for egalitarian work–family practices. Knowledge about people’s attitudes is essential in itself, and attitudes may predict future behavior (Corrigall and Konrad 2007; Goldscheider, Goldscheider, and Bernhardt 2011).

1.1 Gender-role attitudes: Trends and determinants

Most Western countries have witnessed growing support for gender equality, including gender-egalitarian family values since the early 1970s, when such opinions began to be systematically captured in large-scale surveys (Inglehart and Norris 2003). However, there was an unexpected stagnation, even turnaround, in support for gender equality during the 1990s in the United States. Exploring trends in the United States from 1977 to 2008, Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman (2011) suggest the rise of “egalitarian essentialism” as a new cultural frame, mixing aspects of gender equality and traditional motherhood roles. Renewed support for stay-at-home mothering does not reflect a return to the family values of the 1950s but is instead combined with a feminist rhetoric of choice and equality.
In the same vein, Knight and Brinton (2017) demonstrate the complexity of gender-role attitudes in the European context through an analysis of changes in gender-role attitudes in 17 European countries. They find that people can combine support for traditional and nontraditional family roles for women and that there is not necessarily a conflict between gender-egalitarian and gender-essentialist attitudes. Although such constellations are less prevalent in Nordic countries than in other European nations, the authors find all the distinct constellations in all countries.

There are two main types of explanations for people’s gender-role attitudes: interest-based and exposure-based explanations (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004). According to interest-based explanations, people are more likely to express gender-egalitarian beliefs if they benefit from gender equality. For instance, because women are more likely to benefit from gender-egalitarian arrangements than men, they tend to hold more gender-egalitarian ideas. Exposure-based explanations hold that exposure to gender-egalitarian ideas and contexts will promote the development of egalitarian beliefs. The exposure may take place through socialization, in education, during employment, through people’s contact with peers, in particular neighborhoods, and so forth.

Although the two perspectives imply a range of predictions as to which characteristics should entail support for gender-egalitarian ideas – such as gender, age, education, employment, family structure, and religion – their predictive variables are for a large part overlapping. Moreover, the determinants have gradually become less important (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004), which is consistent with a convergence in the support for gender equality and the diffusion of such attitudes across different social strata in a given country. In line with the exposure-based explanations, a large body of literature suggests that people’s work–family orientations are highly structured by the cultural and institutional context of a given country (Gornick and Meyers 2008; Pfau-Effinger 1999), which may also be true for immigrants. For instance, Breidahl and Larsen (2016) demonstrate that immigrants adapt rather quickly to the prevailing views in the host country on women’s paid work, and Norris and Inglehart (2012) find that Muslims who move to Western countries gradually absorb much of the host culture, including support for gender equality.

1.2 Gender-role attitudes and the second generation

Gender norms and attitudes are often understood as particularly resistant to change after migration, as they are central to people’s identities and might be perceived as particularly threatened in a new cultural context and thus particularly important to pass on to the next generation (Prieur 2002; Röder and Mühlau 2014; Spierings 2015).
However, children of immigrants typically grow up in a societal context far removed from that of their parents’ childhoods. They have access to cultural understandings of gender and family other than those communicated by immediate family, as well as to markedly different institutional opportunity structures than their parents had. Following exposure-based explanations for gender-role attitudes, socialization outside the family is potentially decisive for attitude formation.

Existing studies of gender attitudes find traces of generational change between immigrants and their children. In the United Kingdom, Heath and Demireva (2014) find that while Pakistani immigrants are characterized by strong support for complementary gender roles, British-born Pakistanis are almost on par with the British majority population in their beliefs. Similarly, in Germany, Diehl, Koenig, and Ruckdeschel (2009) find that Turkish immigrants are less supportive of gender equality than native Germans, and although second-generation Turks are not on par with native Germans, they are more supportive of gender equality than Turkish immigrants.

Also in Norway, there is evidence of generational change in gender-role attitudes. Kavli (2015) finds that second-generation Pakistanis are more supportive of the employment of mothers of young children than Pakistani immigrants but still less so than the native Norwegians. In a qualitative study of second-generation Pakistani families, Nadim (2014) reveals that the young women distance themselves from the housewife role of their mothers. Instead they are oriented toward paid work and express positive attitudes toward the use of public childcare for their children.

Studies of gender-role attitudes among immigrants generally find significant differences between various origin groups. In Norway, immigrants from Pakistan appear particularly traditional when it comes to gender roles, whereas for instance immigrants from Vietnam are close to the majority population in their beliefs (Kavli 2015). The role of religion in gender-role attitudes is somewhat contested. According to Inglehart and Norris (2003), Islam may deter the development of gender-egalitarian attitudes among immigrants in Western countries. Diehl, Koenig, and Ruckdeschel (2009) find that high religiosity negatively impacts the approval of gender equality for second-generation immigrants with a Muslim upbringing in Germany, while Scheible and Fleischmann (2013) find only a weak association between Islamic religiosity and gender egalitarianism among second-generation Turks and Moroccans in Belgium.

Nevertheless, country-of-origin differences in gender-role attitudes are also reflected in immigrants’ work–family practices. For instance, while immigrant women from Sri Lanka have nearly the same employment rates as native Norwegian women, women from Pakistan and Turkey show lower employment rates compared to both native and other immigrant women. Furthermore, there are large gender gaps in employment in Pakistani and Turkish immigrant groups, indicating a clear gender-complementary organization of labor (Statistics Norway 2017). This suggests that
children of immigrants from certain origin countries are more likely than others to have grown up with a homemaker mother and a working father.

1.3 The Norwegian context

Norway stands out in international comparison with strong gender-equality ideals and practices (Esping-Andersen 2009; Gornick and Meyers 2008). Policy elements that support the dual-earner/dual-carer family, such as long parental leave and high quality subsidized childcare, have been strengthened in recent decades (Ellingsæter, Kitterød, and Lyngstad 2017). The dual-earner/state-carer model (Pfau-Effinger 1999) has gained strong support, as attitudes toward working mothers and the use of formal daycare for young children have become far more favorable (Ellingsæter, Kitterød, and Lyngstad 2017). Nordic countries are also famous for their policies aimed at mobilizing fathers as caregivers (Brandth and Kvande 2013).

The female employment rate in Norway is high, including for mothers of small children (Statistics Norway 2019). The housewife role has nearly vanished, and full-time housewives are now overrepresented among those with limited labor market resources and non-Western immigrants (Kitterød and Rønsen 2013). At the same time, there has been a considerable increase in fathers’ family-work in recent decades (Kitterød 2016). The vast majority of children now attend a kindergarten from the age of one, but immigrant children’s enrollment is still lower than those of the majority population (Statistics Norway 2018a). There has been substantial immigration from countries without a comparable history of gender equality, contributing to a greater heterogeneity of gender norms and practices (Kavli 2015; Nadim 2015).

Norwegian-born children of immigrants now account for 3% of the total population in Norway, while immigrants account for about 14% (Statistics Norway 2018b). The first large-scale wave of immigrants arrived in the late 1960s, consisting mainly of young male labor migrants from Pakistan, Morocco, Turkey, and India. When unskilled labor migration from outside Nordic countries was stopped in 1975, immigration from the abovementioned countries carried on through family reunification and formation. From the late 1970s, Norway received a large number of immigrants who fled from war or persecution. Refugees from Vietnam arrived for the most part in the late 1970s and early 1980s, while those from Sri Lanka arrived between 1983 and 1990 (Brochmann and Kjeldstadli 2008).

The second generation in Norway make their work–family decisions in a context that offers better opportunities for balance compared to many other national contexts, and one where there are explicit expectations that women work after becoming mothers and that men become involved fathers. The extent to which they support the prevailing
egalitarian family norms in Norway is therefore a pertinent question. Using high-quality survey data, we first examine to what extent the gender-equality attitudes of second-generation immigrants differ from those of the majority population. We then explore along what dimensions their gender-role attitudes vary and, lastly, whether they differ from similar-age immigrants.

1.4 Research questions – what do we expect?

Regarding our first research question, we consider it an open question whether the gender-equality attitudes of children of immigrants are approximating the gender-equality attitudes found in the majority population. We might assume that with exposure to the prevailing gender-egalitarian norms and work–family practices in Norway and an institutional context that supports the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, young descendants are inclined to support gender-egalitarian work–family practices to the same extent as the majority population. However, a significant proportion of the descendants in our survey are likely to have been raised in a male-breadwinner/female-homemaker family, and previous research reveals that even in the highly gender-egalitarian Nordic countries, descendants of Turkish (Goldscheider, Goldscheider, and Bernhardt 2011) and Pakistani (Kavli 2015) origin express more traditional gender beliefs than the majority population.

As for our second research question – along what dimensions the second-generation’s gender-role attitudes vary – we are particularly interested in the significance of respondents’ origin country and gender. We expect respondents of Pakistani and Turkish origin to be less supportive of the dual-earner/dual-carer family model than those of Sri Lankan and Vietnamese origin because they are less likely to have been exposed to this family model in childhood. While female employment rates among Pakistani and Turkish immigrants are substantially lower than in other immigrant groups, work participation among female immigrants from Vietnam and Sri Lanka is substantially higher, with immigrant women from Sri Lanka being almost on par with majority women (Statistics Norway 2017).

Regarding possible gender differences, our expectations are less clear. Previous international studies provide strong evidence that women hold more gender-egalitarian work–family attitudes than men (Davis and Greenstein 2009). In the Norwegian context, however, the dual-earner/dual-carer family model has been framed as advantageous for both men and women. It is emphasized that men benefit from having a close relationship with their children and from the opportunity to share the burden of breadwinning with their partner (Brandth and Kvande 2013). This could imply
dedicated support for the gender-equal family model from both men and women, including among descendants.

In addition, we explore the significance of determinants such as the importance of religion, the share of friends in Norway without an immigrant background as a proxy for the exposure to Norwegian life outside the family context, and the respondent’s educational attainment, capturing exposure to gender-egalitarian beliefs. We expect a negative relationship between the importance of religion in the descendants’ lives and their support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model (cf. Diehl, Koenig, and Ruckdeschel 2009; Inglehart and Norris 2003). This connection is particularly expected for descendants of Turkish and Pakistani origin, a vast majority of whom have been raised as Muslims (Enes 2018). We also expect a positive association between the share of friends in Norway without an immigrant background and respondents’ educational level on one hand and support for the gender-equal family model on the other.

Regarding our third research question, we might assume that descendants express more support for gender-egalitarian work–family practices compared to same-age immigrants because they have grown up and been socialized in the gender-egalitarian Norwegian context. However, considering that immigrants may rather quickly adopt the prevailing gender norms in the host country (Breidahl and Larsen 2016), immigrants too may now favor gender-equal family roles. Moreover, a large proportion of the immigrants in our sample arrived at Norway at quite a young age and may therefore take the dominant family model in the country more or less for granted.

2. Data and analytical method

2.1 Survey data

In order to analyze the gender-role attitudes of descendants and same-age immigrants, we use the Survey on living conditions among persons with an immigrant background 2016 (LKI 2016), conducted by Statistics Norway. The second-generation sample consisted of Norwegian-born individuals aged 16 to 39 years with parents born in Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Turkey, and Pakistan. These constitute the origin groups in which most people have reached or are approaching adulthood. The first-generation sample consisted of people aged 16 to 74 years with at least two years of residence in Norway, from 12 different countries. In the current paper, we include immigrants in the same age and origin groups as the second-generation sample.
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4 The data has been organized and made available for us by Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). Neither Statistics Norway nor NSD is responsible for the analyses or conclusions presented in the current paper.
Respondents were interviewed face to face or by telephone, and the survey data was linked with public register data. The net sample of descendants includes 1,049 respondents and the net sample of immigrants includes 4,058 respondents, of which we include 586 in our analyses. The overall response rate was 52.8% for descendants and 54.4% for immigrants, a reasonable result for this type of survey, though the response rate varies somewhat across origin groups. In the analyses we use weights calculated by Statistics Norway adjusting for gender, age, place of residence in Norway, and country of origin (Holmøy and Wiggen 2017), but the number of observations is reported unweighted.

In order to create a comparison group in the majority population, we use the Norwegian part of the World Values Survey/European Value Survey (WVS/EVS) 2008, conducted by Statistics Norway, with a response rate of 56.4%. In the analyses, we include respondents in the age group 18 to 39 years with two parents born in Norway, amounting to 366 respondents. Because the gender-role attitudes of the majority population were measured eight years before those of the descendants in the LKI 2016 survey, the figures are not strictly comparable. We can assume that the majority population would express even stronger support for gender-egalitarian work–family roles in 2016 than in 2008. Still, we believe that their attitudes in 2008 constitute a reasonable comparison basis for assessing the extent to which descendants support the prevailing gender-role attitudes in Norway.

### 2.2 Dependent variables

To capture the respondents’ gender-role attitudes, four questions (statements) from the Norwegian part of the WVS/EVS 2008 were included in the 2016 LKI survey:

1) **Working mothers:** “A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.”

2) **Homemaking role:** “Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay.”

3) **Shared breadwinning responsibility:** “Both the man and the woman should contribute to the household income.”

4) **Shared care responsibility:** “Men should take as much responsibility for home and children as women.”

For each statement, the respondent was asked to indicate whether they agree strongly, agree slightly, disagree slightly, or disagree strongly. “Don’t know” was not explicitly mentioned as a response category, but was still allowed as a spontaneous answer.
These questions, in particular the first three, are widely used in analyses of people’s attitudes toward gender-egalitarian/complementary work–family practices (Davis and Greenstein 2009). In the first part of the analysis, we look at each question separately in order to capture nuances of gender-role attitudes (see Tables 1 and 2). In the ensuing multivariate analyses, we created an index based on the first, third, and fourth statements (working mothers, shared breadwinner responsibility, and shared care responsibility). We coded the answers from −2 to 2 so that positive values reflect answers that point in favor of a gender-equal family model. Observations with “Don’t know” were coded as 0 (neither agree nor disagree). We then added together the coded scores on each statement and divided the sum by three. The index ranges from −2 to 2 (with a total of 13 values), with higher scores reflecting more gender-equal attitudes. The second statement (homemaking role) was not included in the index because factor analyses suggest that it does not capture the same underlying idea of gender equality as the other statements.

2.3 Independent variables

The descendants’ country of origin and their gender constitute our principal independent variables. In addition, the stated importance of religion, their share of friends with immigrant or Norwegian background, and their educational attainment constitute our explanatory variables. The two latter variables are used as proxies for their exposure to the prevailing work–family norms in Norway. As for educational attainment, we used the highest level attained or currently pursued in case respondents regarded themselves as students. We control for the mother’s educational attainment, the respondent’s relationship status, whether the respondent has children below 20 years of age living in the household, respondent’s age and age squared, whether the respondent is a student or not, and the respondent’s employment status.

An overview of the variables and their definitions are provided in Supplementary Table 1, which gives descriptive statistics for the independent variables, broken down by country of origin and gender. We note that the sample is approximately gender balanced and that descendants of Pakistani origin make up about 50% of the sample while those of Sri Lankan background constitute the smallest percentage. Descendants of Sri Lankan and Vietnamese origin are typically somewhat younger than those of Turkish and Pakistani background, reflecting their parents’ later arrival to Norway. They are also less likely to be married or cohabiting, to have children, and to be gainfully employed, but more likely to be students. Moreover, they have somewhat
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5 The scale reliability coefficient is 0.512, which is somewhat lower than we would prefer. Still, the three statements clearly fall into one single factor.
better educated mothers, relatively fewer friends with an immigrant background, and a lower score on the importance of religion.

### 2.4 Method of analysis

In order to answer our research questions, we undertake bi- and multivariate analyses. Comparisons between the descendants and the majority population are based on bivariate analyses only, while possible dividing lines among descendants, as well as comparisons of descendants and same-age immigrants, are explored in a multivariate framework. As for the dependent variable, we use the additive index described above, with higher scores reflecting more gender-egalitarian attitudes. We use OLS-models to explore possible dividing lines among descendants. Higher positive estimates indicate stronger support for gender-egalitarian practices. We analyze the entire sample of descendants as well as women and men separately (Table 4). We also provide results from separate analyses for each gender within each single country (Table 5), although small sample sizes make attaining statistical significance difficult. Results for the control variables (the mother’s educational attainment, the respondent’s relationship status, children in the household, age, and student and employment status) are not shown in the paper, but some results are reported in the supplementary material (Supplementary Table 2) while the rest are available from the authors, as are results from models with interaction terms.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Comparison of descendants and the majority population

Frequencies for the various statements on gender-egalitarian practices are reported in Table 1 for descendants and for the majority population in the corresponding age group. The main picture is one of striking similarity between descendants and majority as well as overwhelming support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model in both groups. In both groups, roughly two-thirds strongly agree that a working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work, while only a small minority slightly or strongly disagree. However, whereas almost nobody in the majority group responded “Don’t know,” this applies to 7% of the descendants (despite this not being an explicitly available response category).
Table 1: Frequencies for attitudes toward gender roles among descendants (16 to 39 years) and the majority population (18 to 39 years)

|                        | Descendants |            | Majority |            |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|----------|------------|
|                        | All Women   | Men        | All      | Women      | Men        |
| Working mothers        |             |            |          |            |            |
| Agree strongly         | 64          | 69         | 60       | 66         | 72         | 60         |
| Agree slightly         | 16          | 16         | 17       | 27         | 25         | 29         |
| Disagree slightly      | 9           | 7          | 10       | 6          | 3          | 10         |
| Disagree strongly      | 4           | 2          | 6        | 1          | 0          | 2          |
| Don’t know             | 7           | 6          | 8        | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Homemaking role        |             |            |          |            |            |
| Agree strongly         | 33          | 31         | 35       | 10         | 11         | 9          |
| Agree slightly         | 21          | 21         | 22       | 32         | 29         | 35         |
| Disagree slightly      | 15          | 16         | 13       | 33         | 31         | 34         |
| Disagree strongly      | 16          | 20         | 12       | 22         | 28         | 18         |
| Don’t know             | 15          | 12         | 19       | 3          | 2          | 5          |
| Shared breadwinning responsibility | | | | | |
| Agree strongly         | 76          | 80         | 73       | 61         | 62         | 60         |
| Agree slightly         | 13          | 12         | 13       | 32         | 33         | 31         |
| Disagree slightly      | 4           | 3          | 5        | 4          | 4          | 5          |
| Disagree strongly      | 1           | 0          | 2        | 3          | 1          | 4          |
| Don’t know             | 6           | 5          | 7        | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Shared care responsibility |             |            |          |            |            |
| Agree strongly         | 82          | 87         | 78       | 83         | 80         | 84         |
| Agree slightly         | 11          | 9          | 12       | 16         | 18         | 14         |
| Disagree slightly      | 2           | 1          | 3        | 2          | 2          | 1          |
| Disagree strongly      | 1           | 0          | 1        | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Don’t know             | 4           | 3          | 5        | 0          | 0          | 0          |
| Observations (N)       | 1,049       | 528        | 521      | 366        | 178        | 188        |

Sources: The Survey on living conditions among persons with an immigrant background 2016 (Descendants) and WVS/EVS 2008 (Majority).

Nevertheless, descendants are clearly more likely than the majority population to hold that being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay. Whereas only 10% in the majority group strongly support this statement, this applies to as much as one-third of the descendants. This may suggest that although descendants clearly endorse a gender-equal family arrangement, which is the prevailing norm in Norway, they still believe that women should be able to choose to stay at home rather than work for pay. While there are now few stay-at-home mothers in Norway, being a housewife may still be highly valued in some immigrant groups, and descendants are more likely to have...
been raised by a homemaker mother. We further note that the proportion in the “Don’t know” category is higher among the descendants than among the majority, perhaps indicating a stronger ambivalence about the question.

As for the two questions that most directly tap support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, descendants express at least as strong support as the majority group. The proportion that strongly agrees that “Both the man and the women should contribute to the household income” may be even higher among descendants than in the majority population (76% versus 61%). Considering that we have more recent data for the first than the latter group, we cannot conclude with certainty that descendants express more support than the majority for women’s duty to earn an income, but the results demonstrate that they endorse the dual-earner norms at least to the same extent as the majority population. Furthermore, the vast majority in both groups, above 80%, agree strongly that men should take as much responsibility for home and children as women. Considering that a fairly large proportion of the descendants, particularly those of Turkish and Pakistani origin, are likely to have grown up in a household with clear gender-complementary family practices, the overwhelming support for men’s expanded domestic role is striking.

3.2 Differences across origin groups?

In Table 2, frequencies for the various statements on gender-egalitarian family practices are reported for female and male descendants from each country of origin. The results suggest that despite a widespread support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model among descendants from the four origin counties, the support is somewhat weaker among those of Pakistani or Turkish origin than those of Sri Lankan or Vietnamese origin. This is also the impression from the average scores on the gender-equality index (ranging from –2 to 2) presented in Table 3. Although scores on the gender-equality index are high in all origin groups, descendants of Pakistani origin stand out with the lowest score, particularly among the male descendants. Whether there are different patterns in gender-egalitarian beliefs across origin groups is explored in more detail in the multivariate analyses of the gender-equality index, presented in Tables 4 and 5. As for country of origin, we use Sri Lanka as reference.
Table 2: Frequencies for attitudes toward gender roles among descendants, by country of origin and gender

|                         | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
|                         | All | Women | Men | All | Women | Men | All | Women | Men | All | Women | Men |
| Working mothers         |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |
| Agree strongly          | 67  | 73    | 60  | 69  | 72    | 64  | 67  | 70    | 65  | 60  | 65    | 57  |
| Agree slightly          | 18  | 15    | 22  | 16  | 14    | 18  | 15  | 13    | 16  | 16  | 17    | 15  |
| Disagree slightly       | 5   | 5     | 8   | 6   | 11    | 9   | 11  | 8     | 9   | 7   | 11    |     |
| Disagree strongly       | 1   | 1     | 0   | 2   | 3     | 2   | 4   | 1     | 6   | 6   | 2     | 9   |
| Don’t know              | 9   | 5     | 13  | 5   | 5     | 5   | 6   | 5     | 8   | 9   | 8     |     |
| Homemaking role         |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |
| Agree strongly          | 24  | 25    | 24  | 27  | 26    | 28  | 37  | 37    | 37  | 33  | 39    |     |
| Agree slightly          | 23  | 25    | 21  | 24  | 23    | 25  | 22  | 21    | 22  | 19  | 18    | 20  |
| Disagree slightly       | 15  | 15    | 15  | 18  | 17    | 19  | 11  | 12    | 11  | 14  | 18    | 11  |
| Disagree strongly       | 20  | 24    | 14  | 18  | 22    | 13  | 18  | 23    | 13  | 13  | 16    | 11  |
| Don’t know              | 18  | 11    | 26  | 13  | 10    | 16  | 13  | 8     | 17  | 17  | 15    | 19  |
| Shared breadwinning responsibility |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |
| Agree strongly          | 86  | 88    | 83  | 84  | 84    | 78  | 81  | 76    | 69  | 74  | 65    |     |
| Agree slightly          | 8   | 7     | 10  | 9   | 9     | 12  | 9   | 15    | 16  | 16  | 16    |     |
| Disagree slightly       | 1   | 2     | 1   | 5   | 4     | 5   | 5   | 1     | 5   | 2   | 8     |     |
| Disagree strongly       | 0   | 0     | 0   | 1   | 1     | 2   | 2   | 2     | 2   | 1   | 0     | 2   |
| Don’t know              | 5   | 3     | 7   | 2   | 2     | 2   | 5   | 4     | 5   | 9   | 8     | 10  |
| Shared care responsibility |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |
| Agree strongly          | 86  | 91    | 81  | 88  | 87    | 90  | 82  | 83    | 79  | 87  | 72    |     |
| Agree slightly          | 8   | 6     | 11  | 7   | 7     | 6   | 11  | 12    | 9   | 13  | 9     | 16  |
| Disagree slightly       | 1   | 1     | 2   | 2   | 3     | 2   | 3   | 2     | 4   | 2   | 0     | 4   |
| Disagree strongly       | 0   | 0     | 1   | 0   | 1     | 0   | 1   | 2     | 1   | 1   | 0     | 2   |
| Don’t know              | 4   | 2     | 6   | 2   | 2     | 2   | 2   | 2     | 3   | 5   | 4     | 6   |
| Observations (N)        | 261 | 143   | 118 | 266 | 143   | 123 | 259 | 119   | 140 | 263 | 123   | 140 |
Table 3: Support for gender-equal family roles, measured by score on gender-equality index. Descendants, average, and standard deviation

|        | All | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan |
|--------|-----|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| All    | 1.53| 1.68      | 1.63    | 1.55   | 1.43     |
|        | (0.66)| (0.50)   | (0.57)  | (0.69) | (0.71)   |
| Women  | 1.63| 1.74      | 1.65    | 1.57   | 1.60     |
|        | (0.58)| (0.46)   | (0.58)  | (0.68) | (0.57)   |
| Men    | 1.43| 1.60      | 1.62    | 1.53   | 1.29     |
|        | (0.72)| (0.53)   | (0.58)  | (0.69) | (0.77)   |

In Table 4, we present results from OLS-regressions with the gender-inequality index (based on Statements 1, 3, and 4) as the dependent variable. In line with the bivariate analysis, the multivariate OLS-results suggest that descendants of Pakistani origin are somewhat less supportive of the dual-earner/dual-carer family model than those of a different origin. Separate analyses for each gender reveal no clear differences across female descendants of different origin. For men, however, those of Pakistani origin are clearly less likely to support gender-egalitarian work–family practices than those of a different origin. An additional model with interaction terms between the respondent’s gender and country of origin (not shown) reveals a statistically significant stronger relationship between origin country and gender-equality attitudes for men than for women.

Table 4: Results from OLS-regressions of support for gender-equal family roles (index score). Descendants, by gender. Standard errors in parenthesis

|                                | All   | Women     | Men     |
|--------------------------------|-------|-----------|---------|
|                                | $B$   | $t$       | $B$     | $t$    | $B$     | $t$    |
| **Country of origin** (ref: Sri Lanka) |       |           |         |        |         |        |
| Vietnam                        | $-0.069$ | 0.96     | $-0.044$ | 0.53   | $-0.040$ | 0.35   |
|                                | (0.071)  |          | (0.084)  |        | (0.114)  |        |
| Turkey                         | $-0.047$ | 0.60     | $-0.088$ | 0.92   | 0.027    | 0.22   |
|                                | (0.079)  |          | (0.095)  |        | (0.123)  |        |
| Pakistan                       | $-0.162$ | 2.37     | $-0.058$ | 0.71   | $-0.212$ | 1.96   |
|                                | (0.068)  |          | (0.082)  |        | (0.108)  |        |
| **Gender** (ref: men)          |       |           |         |        |         |        |
| Women                          | 0.202 | 4.92      |         |        |         |        |
|                                | (0.041) |         |          |        |          |        |
| **Importance of religion**     |       |           |         |        |         |        |
|                                | $-0.016$ | 2.24     | $-0.009$ | 1.00   | $-0.025$ | 2.29   |
|                                | (0.007)  |          | (0.009)  |        | (0.011)  |        |
Table 4:  (Continued)

| Share of friends with immigrant background (ref: more than half) | All | Women | Men |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|
|                                                               | B   | t     | B   | t   |
| No good friends in Norway                                    | -0.458 | 4.09 | -0.795 | 5.27 | -0.175 | 1.07 |
|                                                               | (0.112) |       | (0.151) |       | (0.163) |       |
| About half                                                    | 0.179 | 3.65 | 0.179 | 2.96 | 0.143 | 1.86 |
|                                                               | (0.049) |       | (0.060) |       | (0.077) |       |
| Less than half                                                | 0.075 | 1.44 | -0.060 | 0.95 | 0.212 | 2.58 |
|                                                               | (0.052) |       | (0.063) |       | (0.082) |       |
| **Education** (ref: primary school)                           |     |       |     |       |     |       |
| Secondary school                                             | 0.111 | 2.00 | 0.057 | 0.79 | 0.161 | 1.99 |
|                                                               | (0.055) |       | (0.073) |       | (0.081) |       |
| University                                                   | 0.057 | 0.85 | 0.091 | 0.03 | -0.000 | 0.00 |
|                                                               | (0.066) |       | (0.088) |       | (0.098) |       |
| Unknown                                                      | 0.136 | 1.65 | 0.068 | 0.65 | 0.177 | 1.43 |
|                                                               | (0.082) |       | (0.106) |       | (0.124) |       |
| Constant term                                                | 2.39 | 3.898 | 1.27 |       |
| R²                                                            | 0.118 |       | 0.153 |       | 0.164 |       |
| Observations (N)                                              | 1,049 | 528   | 521  |       |

Note: The following controls are included: mother’s education, children, age, age squared, relationship status, and student and employment statuses.

To sum up, our analyses indicate that although the majority of descendants in all origin groups embrace the dual-earner/dual-carer family model in Norway, this model has somewhat less support among male descendants of Pakistani origin compared to their counterparts of a different origin.

3.3 More support from female than male descendants

Interest-based explanations of gender-role attitudes would predict that female descendants are more in favor of a gender-equal family model than male descendants. The frequencies presented in Tables 1 and 2 suggest a slightly stronger support from women than for men for most items. The average scores on the gender-equality index reported in Table 3 also suggest stronger support for gender equality from women, although the pattern varies across origin groups. The multivariate analyses (Table 4) reveal that even when relevant factors are accounted for, female descendants are clearly more likely than male descendants to support the idea of gender-equal family practices.
However, analyzing possible gender differences among descendants from the four origin countries separately (Supplementary Table 2), we find that the dual-earner/dual-carer family model receives more support from women than from men among descendants from Sri Lanka and Pakistan but not among those from Vietnam and Turkey. An additional model with interaction terms between the respondent’s gender and country of origin (not shown) reveals a statistically significant stronger relationship between gender and gender-egalitarian beliefs for descendants of Pakistani origin than for their counterparts of different origins. However, the gender difference among Sri Lankan descendants is not clearly stronger than the corresponding difference among Vietnamese and Turkish descendants, but it is important to keep the limited sample size in mind when interpreting these results.

To sum up, although the vast majority of both male and female descendants in Norway express strong support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, the support is stronger among women than men, but the gendered patterns vary across origin groups.

### 3.4 Other dividing lines?

We now turn to the question of whether the descendants vary in their support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model according to other dimensions, namely the importance of religion, the share of friends with an immigrant background, and educational attainment. We report results from multivariate analyses (OLS) for all descendants, for women and men separately (Table 4), and for women and men within each origin group (Table 5). We also report some results from models with interaction terms (not shown). As before, it is important to keep in mind that the modest sample size in some of the analyses (N = 118–143, Table 5) makes reaching statistical significance at conventional levels difficult.

In line with our expectations, the multivariate analyses reveal some negative associations between the importance of religion and the support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model among the descendants, but the pattern varies across groups. The analyses reported in Table 4 reveal a strong negative relationship between religion and gender-egalitarian attitudes in the model including all descendants. However, the association is clearly stronger for men than for women. An additional model with an interaction term between gender and religion (not shown) substantiates this finding. Separate analyses for women and men of different origins (Table 5) suggest that the association between religion and support for gender equality varies across groups. For female descendants, the relationship seems to be strongest among those of Sri Lankan origin, while for men, those of Pakistani origin stand out with the
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strongest relationship. Additional models with interaction terms between religion and country of origin (not shown) reveal a clearly stronger negative association between religion and support for gender equality for male descendants of Pakistani origin than for those of a different origin, while the interaction terms for women do not reach statistical significance at conventional levels.

Consistent with our expectations, the multivariate analyses provide some evidence for an association between the share of nonimmigrant friends in Norway and support for gender-equal family roles, although results vary across gender and origin country. According to the analyses reported in Table 4, among female descendants, the small group with no good friends in Norway are the least likely to express gender-egalitarian attitudes. As for male descendants, those who report that less than half of their friends have an immigrant background stand out with the most gender-egalitarian attitudes. For female descendants, there is a rather consistent pattern across origin groups of less support for gender-equal family roles within the group with no good friends in Norway (Table 5). However, and contrary to expectations, in some groups (Sri Lanka and Turkey), those who report that less than half of their friends have an immigrant background express less support for gender-equal family roles compared to when a larger share of their friends have an immigrant background. For male descendants, we observe less support for gender-egalitarian beliefs within the small group with no good friends in Norway, compared to the reference group (more than half of the friends have an immigrant background) for those of Sri Lankan origin. For those of Turkish and Pakistani origin, we observe the expected pattern of more support for a gender-equal family model among those who report that less than half of their friends have an immigrant background, compared to the reference group. The coefficients are quite large, although not statistically significant at conventional levels.

Turning to the importance of the respondent’s educational attainment, we observe some patterns in line with our assumptions, but the pattern varies across gender and origin groups. The analyses reported in Table 4 reveal a positive, although quite modest, connection between educational attainments and gender-egalitarian beliefs for both genders. Looking at different origin groups, the analyses reported in Table 5 suggest that higher educational attainment may be particularly important for female descendants of Pakistani origin and male descendants of Vietnamese and Pakistani origin. However, additional models with interaction terms between education and country of origin (not shown) reveal no clear differences across origin groups in the connection between education and gender-egalitarian attitudes for either gender. It is important to keep in mind, though, that the descendants in our sample are still quite young and many have yet to finish their education.
Table 5: Results from OLS-regressions of support for gender-equal family roles (index score). Descendants, by gender and country of origin.

|                      | WOMEN   | MEN        |
|----------------------|---------|-----------|
|                      | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan |
| Importance of religion | -0.040  | 3.07     | -0.007 | 0.47     | 0.002     | 0.10     | 0.009 | 0.35     | -0.009 | 0.56     | -0.001 | 0.04     | 0.012 | 0.48     | -0.042 | 1.66     |
|                      | (0.013) | (0.015)  | (0.024) | (0.026)  | (0.016)   | (0.019)  | (0.024) | (0.026)  |
| Share of friends with immigrant background (ref: more than half) |                      |         |        |          |           |         |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |          |
| No good friends in Norway | -0.406 | 1.25     | -1.347 | 3.34    | -0.233   | 0.70     | -0.969 | 3.18    | -0.727 | 2.14     | 0.263  | 0.43     | 0.387 | 1.23     | -0.147 | 0.47     |
|                      | (0.324) | (0.403)  | (0.332) | (0.304)  | (0.304)   | (0.339)  | (0.611) | (0.315)  | (0.315) | (0.315)  |
| About half | 0.036 | 0.35     | 0.046 | 0.34    | 0.195    | 1.23     | 0.290  | 2.31    | -0.254 | 1.86     | 0.008  | 0.05     | 0.275 | 1.75     | 0.147  | 0.90     |
|                      | (0.104) | (0.134)  | (0.158) | (0.127)  | (0.137)   | (0.161)  | (0.157) | (0.163)  |
| Less than half | -0.233 | 2.15     | -0.082 | 0.66    | -0.338   | 1.78     | 0.046  | 0.33    | -0.185 | 1.40     | 0.029  | 0.19     | 0.290 | 1.67     | 0.314  | 1.65     |
|                      | (0.108) | (0.125)  | (0.190) | (0.137)  | (0.132)   | (0.152)  | (0.173) | (0.190)  |
| Education (ref: primary school) |                      |         |        |          |           |         |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |          |
| Secondary school | -0.001 | 0.01     | 0.091 | 0.52    | -0.138   | 0.67     | 0.151  | 1.02    | -0.040 | 0.23     | 0.311  | 1.92     | 0.034 | 0.20     | 0.223  | 1.32     |
|                      | (0.137) | (0.174)  | (0.206) | (0.148)  | (0.174)   | (0.162)  | (0.171) | (0.169)  |
| University | 0.058 | 0.26     | -0.048 | 0.21    | -0.141   | 0.59     | 0.237  | 1.40    | -0.248 | 1.03     | 0.083  | 0.40     | 0.017 | 0.08     | 0.027  | 0.14     |
|                      | (0.220) | (0.224)  | (0.240) | (0.169)  | (0.242)   | (0.207)  | (0.215) | (0.191)  |
| Unknown | -0.117 | 0.79     | 0.047 | 0.19    | 0.534    | 1.78    | -0.004 | 0.02    | 0.074  | 0.34     | 0.442  | 1.90     | 0.076 | 0.29     | 0.236  | 0.88     |
|                      | (0.148) | (0.048)  | (0.300) | (0.225)  | (0.217)   | (0.232)  | (0.265) | (0.268)  |
| Constant term | 4.033 | 4.659    | 0.650 | 4.844   | 1.097    | 1.464   | 0.642  | 1.357   |          |          |        |          |        |          |
| R² | 0.158 | 0.155    | 0.211 | 0.278   | 0.173    | 0.149   | 0.094  | 0.277   |          |          |        |          |        |          |
| Observations (N) | 143   | 143      | 119   | 123     | 118      | 140    | 140    |          |          |        |          |        |          |

Note: The following controls are included: mother’s education, children, age, age squared, relationship status, and student and employment statuses.
To sum up the analyses of possible dividing lines in descendants’ support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, we find that regarding the share of friends with an immigrant background and the importance of religion in people’s lives, some results are in line with our assumptions, but there is no consistent pattern across genders and origin groups. As for the respondents’ educational attainment, we observe a positive relationship with gender-egalitarian attitudes in some groups, but the associations are often quite weak.

3.5 Comparison of descendants and same-age immigrants

We now turn to the question on whether descendants express more gender-egalitarian work–family attitudes than same-age immigrants (16 to 39 years). Same age-immigrants are typically somewhat older than the descendant group, as documented in Supplementary Table 3. They are also more likely to be married or cohabiting, to have children, and to be gainfully employed, but less likely to be students. In addition, they have relatively more friends with an immigrant background and a higher score on the importance of religion.

Comparing the two groups’ scores on the gender-equality index (reported in Table 6 for immigrants and Table 3 for descendants), we note that the immigrants’ average score is somewhat lower than that of the descendants (1.44 versus 1.53), which suggests somewhat less support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, although immigrants, too, express overwhelmingly positive attitudes. In Table 7, we report results from multivariate OLS-regressions comparing descendants’ and same-age immigrants’ (reference group) gender-egalitarian beliefs. Positive coefficients reflect more gender-egalitarian attitudes for descendants. We report results from models for all and separately for each gender and each origin group. The results suggest that even when several relevant factors are accounted for, descendants are somewhat more likely than same-age immigrants to support the idea of gender-egalitarian family practices. This may be particularly so for men of Sri Lankan and Vietnamese origin and women of Pakistani origin, but the small sample sizes make it difficult to draw clear conclusions about differences between groups. Even though immigrants may be somewhat less enthusiastic about gender-egalitarian family practices than are descendants, the main picture is one of strong support from both groups, which suggests that both first- and second-generation immigrants now take the dominant family model in Norway more or less for granted.

---

6 Results from the full models, including the controls, are available on request.
Table 6: Support for gender-equal family roles, measured by score on gender-equality index. Immigrants 16 to 39 years, average and standard deviation

|        | All | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan |
|--------|-----|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| All    | 1.44| 1.62      | 1.52    | 1.60   | 1.22     |
|        | (0.73)| (0.54) | (0.72) | (0.59) | (0.82)   |
| Women  | 1.53| 1.66      | 1.61    | 1.73   | 1.27     |
|        | (0.68)| (0.54) | (0.70) | (0.51) | (0.75)   |
| Men    | 1.34| 1.66      | 1.61    | 1.73   | 1.27     |
|        | (0.77)| (0.54) | (0.70) | (0.51) | (0.75)   |

Table 7: Results from OLS-regressions of support for gender-equal family roles (index score), comparing descendants and similar-aged immigrants (reference). Standard errors in parenthesis

|        | All | Sri Lanka | Vietnam | Turkey | Pakistan |
|--------|-----|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| B      | 0.067| 0.123    | 0.024 | -0.070 | 0.166 |
|        | (0.042)| (0.087) | (0.096)| (0.076)| (0.087) |
|        | 0.071| 0.080    | -0.122| -0.134 | 0.297 |
|        | (0.055)| (0.121)| (0.136)| (0.100)| (0.109) |
|        | 0.045| 0.228    | 0.242 | -0.006 | -0.026 |
|        | (0.064)| (0.127)| (0.149)| (0.117)| (0.139) |
| All (N)| 1,635| 376      | 414    | 429    | 416     |
| Women  | 840  | 206      | 232    | 205    | 197     |
| Men    | 795  | 170      | 182    | 224    | 219     |

Notes: The following controls are included: country of origin, gender, religion, friends with immigrant background, education, mother’s education, children, age, age squared, and relationship status, and student and employment status.

4. Discussion and conclusion

The consequences of immigration for gender equality is a topic of public concern. The gender-role attitudes of second-generation immigrants in Norway is an interesting vantage point from which to study long-term processes of continuity and change following migration, as they capture the encounter between the children of immigrants from countries characterized by gender-traditional family practices and values, and a national context with widespread political and public support for a family model where women and men share domestic and breadwinning responsibilities.

In the present paper, we ask, first, whether the second generation appears to be embracing the gender-equality attitudes found in the Norwegian majority population,
second, along what dimensions their gender-role attitudes vary, and, third, whether they express more gender-egalitarian beliefs than same-age immigrants. We analyze the attitudes of young descendants from four origin countries, namely Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Turkey, and Pakistan. Furthermore, we explore the significance of country of origin and gender, as well as the possible role of the importance of religion in people’s lives, the share of friends with immigrant backgrounds, and people’s educational attainment. We examine the support for four items to capture the gender-role attitudes of the second generation: (1) working mother, (2) homemaking role, (3) shared breadwinning responsibility, and (4) shared care responsibility. We created an index based on the first, third, and fourth item in order to explore possible dividing lines in support for gender equality among descendants and make comparisons between descendants and same-age immigrants.

The main picture is one of striking similarity between the second generation and Norwegian natives, as the second-generation respondents express an overwhelming support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family. Like the majority population, the bulk of immigrant descendants are very enthusiastic about the ideas of the working mother, shared breadwinning responsibility, and shared care. However, descendants express somewhat more support for the homemaking role than the majority population. This implies that they view full-time homemaking as a more valuable and legitimate practice than does the majority population, which might reflect that they more often have been raised by a stay-at-home mother. Thus, although the second generation is highly supportive of a gender-egalitarian family arrangement, our analysis reveals noteworthy nuances in their gender attitudes, which is consistent with the contention that even in a country like Norway, with high gender-equality ambitions, there may be groups that combine support for traditional and nontraditional family roles for women (Knight and Brinton 2017).

We find few consistent patterns when exploring the importance of a number of determinants that are thought to be connected to descendants’ gender-equality attitudes. In line with our expectations, male descendants of Pakistani origin are slightly less enthusiastic about the dual-earner/dual-carer family model than men of a different origin. However, among female descendants there are no clear differences in support across origin groups. We also find that female descendants express slightly more gender-egalitarian beliefs than their male counterparts, particularly among those of Pakistani origin. However, and importantly, male Pakistani descendants also hold largely positive attitudes toward gender-equal family practices.

We find some evidence of a negative connection between the importance of religion and the support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model, but the pattern varies across gender and country of origin. Religion appears to be a more important factor for the gender beliefs of male compared to female descendants. For men, the
negative relationship between religion and support for gender-equal family practices is particularly strong for those of Pakistani origin, which may lend support to the claim that Muslim religiosity is particularly negative for gender-equality attitudes (cf. Inglehart and Norris 2003). However, there is also a negative relationship between religion and gender-egalitarian beliefs among Sri Lankan women, who have mainly been raised as Hindus or Christians (Enes 2018).

Consistent with our expectations, exposure to Norwegian life, in terms of having native Norwegian friends, appears related to the gender-attitudes of the second generation. Having more friends without an immigrant background is related to support for the dual-earner/dual-carer family model. Yet the pattern is not consistent across groups. Moreover, there is clear evidence that the small group of female descendants with no good friends in Norway is less supportive of gender-egalitarian beliefs than those who have at least some good friends in the country. Having few good friends in Norway may point to loneliness as well as little exposure to Norwegian life. Overall, the modest relationship between support for gender-equal family practices and the share of friends in Norway may suggest that the share of friends without an immigrant background is not a good proxy for descendants’ exposure to Norwegian life. An alternative interpretation may be that the second generation is subject to a massive exposure to the gender-equal family roles in Norwegian daily life and in public discourse, regardless of the composition of their friendship groups.

As for the importance of descendants’ educational attainment, there is some evidence of a positive relationship between education and the support for gender-equalitarian work–family practices, but the pattern varies across groups and the association is generally quite weak. In interpreting these results, it is important to remember that the descendants in Norway are still quite young and many have yet to finish their education.

To conclude, our study demonstrates that the second generation in Norway expresses extensive support for a family model where both parents have both caring and breadwinning responsibilities, suggesting that they to a large extent have adopted the dominating gender-egalitarian views in their country of residence. An important contribution of our study is that we demonstrate massive support not only for women’s paid work but also for men’s domestic role, among both male and female descendants of different origins. Although the support varies somewhat across groups, the analyses reveal few consistent patterns, implying that most young descendants, like the majority population, now take the idea of gender-equal family roles as a matter of fact. The widespread support for gender-egalitarian work–family practices suggest that exposure to the Norwegian institutional and cultural context is important in shaping descendants and immigrants’ gender-role attitudes. The results imply that interest-based explanations are less relevant in understanding the second generation’s gender attitudes,
as there are relatively small variations within the second-generation group. In the Norwegian context, gender equality is strongly emphasized as beneficial for both genders, and this might blur traditional dividing lines predicted by interest-based explanations.

As for the homemaking role, it remains to be seen whether the somewhat larger support among descendants than in the majority population reflects a pattern of “lagged adaptation” (Gershuny, Bittman, and Brice 2005), where descendants’ support for the housewife role will decline over time, or whether it rather reflects a multidimensionality in the second generation’s gender attitudes, consistent with patterns found in the wider population of the United States (Cotter, Hermsen, and Vanneman 2011) and in several European countries (Knight and Brinton 2017).

The massive support for the gender-equal family model among descendants in our study is at odds with Kavli (2015), who finds that although descendants of Pakistani origin expressed more support for working mothers than Pakistani immigrants, they were still more skeptical than the majority population. However, Kavli’s study poses more concrete questions to capture support for working mothers, differentiating between full-time and part-time work and between mothers of children of different ages. Nadim (2014) argues that the question for second-generation Pakistani families in Norway is not whether mothers’ should work but how they can best combine paid work with their care responsibilities. Thus, it may be that the gender-equality measures employed in the present paper are not suited to uncover the actual nuances in people’s support for the gender-equal family model in the current Norwegian context. While this is a methodological shortcoming, it also underscores an important insight from this study: There is a strong support for both parents’ responsibilities for employment, economic provision, and care among the second generation in Norway, to the extent that an equal-sharing family arrangement appears to be taken for granted in the same way as it is in the majority population. This is largely the case for young immigrants as well. As more descendants reach adulthood, the possible role of demographic and socioeconomic factors for their gender-egalitarian beliefs may be more thoroughly examined in future research.
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