Religion and Ethnic Minority Attitudes in Britain toward the War in Afghanistan

Ben Clements
University of Leicester

Abstract: Public opinion research has demonstrated that minority religious and ethnic groups hold distinctive preferences on foreign policy issues, including military interventions in the Cold War and post-Cold War eras. There has been little scholarly research in Britain into the attitudes of minority groups on foreign policy issues. This article uses a nationally-representative survey of the ethnic minority population in Britain to examine the sources of public opinion towards the war in Afghanistan. Using multivariate analysis, it finds strong effects for religious affiliation, religiosity and political alienation. There is also evidence of a "gender gap" and age-related differences. The paper contributes to the literature on the impact of religion on public opinion and foreign policy and to analysis of the political attitudes of minority groups in Britain.

INTRODUCTION

Existing public opinion research in the United States has demonstrated that minority groups — defined by religion or ethnicity — differ from each other and from the majority population in their attitudes on foreign policy issues (Boussios and Cole 2010a; 2010b; Burris 2008; Holsti 2004; Jones 2003; Nincic and Nincic 2002; Mueller 1994; 1973; Wittkopf 1990). This is particularly the case for military interventions occurring during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods. Even though

Britain has been a major contributor to military interventions in the post-Cold War era — including Iraq in 1991 and 2003, the Balkans in the 1990s, and Afghanistan in 2001 — there has been little scholarly research into the nature and determinants of foreign policy attitudes held by religious and ethnic minorities. In contrast, there is existing research into the domestic policy preferences, voting behavior and political participation of minority groups in Britain (Studlar 1986; Saggar and Heath 1999; Saggar 2000; Sobolewska 2005; Heath et al. 2011).

This article contributes to the wider literature on public opinion and foreign policy by examining the influence of religious factors on attitudes toward the war in Afghanistan in Britain among the ethnic minority population. It uses a nationally-representative survey — based on a large sample of the ethnic minority population in Britain — to examine the sources of opposition to the war in Afghanistan, including the relative impact of group attachments based on religious affiliation and ethnic background. Assessing the role of these influences is important as to "a large degree, ordinary citizens interpret politics through the lens of social groups" (Berinsky 2009, 129). It builds upon the few studies that have examined public attitudes toward recent military interventions (Clarke et al. 2009; Clements 2011; 2012) in the wider British population. Particularly relevant to the issue of support for Britain's role in Afghanistan and the international war against terrorism, it builds on existing research into the perceptions and attitudes of Muslims (Field 2007; 2011; 2012). Muslims are a growing religious minority in the United Kingdom (Britain and Northern Ireland), projected to increase from 4.6 percent of the population in 2010 (2.9 million people) to 8.2 percent in 2030 (5.6 million people) (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life 2011, 162). Census estimates from 2001 showed that after Christians, Muslims form the second largest individual religion (Peach 2006, 632). Other minority religious faiths in Britain are also growing in size, so it is clearly important to deepen scholarly understanding of their political attitudes and behaviors.

The article is structured as follows. The first section reviews existing findings from public opinion research into the foreign policy attitudes of religious and ethnic minority groups. The second section discusses the data source, measurement of dependent and independent variables, and the analytical procedures. The third section presents the results from the model estimations and discusses the main findings. Finally, conclusions are drawn and areas for further research highlighted.

MINORITY GROUPS AND PUBLIC OPINION TOWARDS FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

Exiting research into public opinion toward foreign policy attitudes has found that social group memberships or attachments, such as ethnic group or religious affiliation, are important factors in underpinning mass support or opposition for overseas military interventions. As well as domestic issues, Berinsky (2009, 127) argues that "beliefs about those groups to which individuals feel loyalty or hostility also structure their attitudes in the realm of foreign policy." Individuals can use social groups as reference points for understanding an issue that may affect their political choices; these group attachments will vary in their importance depending on the issue at hand; and the influence of group attachment can be heightened by the use of "cues" in the wider political environment (Berinsky 2009, 130). The investigation of social group differences in pro- or anti-war sentiment was commonplace in earlier research into public opinion toward the wars in Vietnam and Korea, and has been undertaken in relation to more recent conflicts (Boussios and Cole 2010a; 2010b; Burris 2008; Nincic and Nincic 2002). Do such social group differences in attitudes toward military interventions exist in public opinion in Britain, in relation to religion and ethnicity? We might expect social group attachments to affect public opinion among minority groups toward the war in Afghanistan, where Britain has committed military forces alongside NATO allies as part of the wider fight against terrorism since 2001. In particular, what are the attitudes of Muslims, who have often perceived the war on terrorism as tantamount to a war on Islam, compared to those from other religious traditions; and of those from Asian or Asian British backgrounds (particularly Pakistani) relative to other ethnic groups? To help inform the analysis undertaken here, existing findings are reviewed in relation to religious affiliation and ethnic group.

Religious affiliation has been a prominent explanatory variable in recent analyses of public opinion toward the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (Guth 2009a). In particular, a growing body of research has shown that different aspects of religious identity, including belonging, behavior and beliefs (Leege and Kellstedt 1993), influence contemporary foreign policy attitudes in the United States (Froese and Mencken 2009; Guth 2009a; 2009b; Jelen 1994). Religious minorities differ from each other in their attitudes on foreign policy as well as from mainstream religious traditions. In relation to religious minorities, Muslims have shown greater opposition to the war against terrorism and the interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Pew Research Center's (2007, 49) Muslim Americans survey, found that 75.0 percent of Muslims thought that invading Iraq was the wrong decision (compared to 47.0 percent of Americans in general). In both 2007 and 2011, 48 percent of Muslims thought the use of military force in Afghanistan was the "wrong decision," compared to 29 percent (2007) and 35 percent (2011) of the general United States population (Pew Research Center 2011, 73). When asked if the United States-led war on terrorism was a sincere effort to reduce international terrorism, the majority of Muslims in the United States said it was not (55.0 percent) (Pew Research Center 2007, 49), thought this fell to 41.0 percent in 2011. In a survey of Muslim-Americans, Patterson, Gasim and Jangsup (2011, 9) also found that few supported the war in Iraq. Moreover, when asked if the Iraq War was important for the security of the United States, more than 90 percent disagreed. Muslim-Americans were generally in agreement that their civil rights have suffered since the attacks of September 11 (Patterson, Gasim and Jangsup 2011, 9).

In the United States, Guth (2009a, 20) has found that there are distinctive preferences on foreign policy issues between, on the one hand, evangelicals and, on the other, religious minorities (including Muslims) and secularists. Furthermore, Jews and Muslims in the United States hold differing views toward Israel and predominantly Muslim countries (Guth 2009a, 16). In terms of the underlying dimensions structuring foreign policy attitudes, it has also been shown that Black Protestants, Jews, and other religious groups are less likely to support "militant internationalism" (characterized by support for a strong military and willingness to use force to protect national interests) but score more highly on "cooperative internationalism" (emphasizing the importance of international cooperation and working through international institutions) (Guth 2011a). Muslims were among the religious minority groups who scored low on the "militant internationalism" scale (Guth 2009b).

In Britain, existing research has shown that Muslims are more likely to have negative views of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts and toward the broader war on terrorism. Recent aspects of British and United States foreign policy have evidently shaped the perceptions of young Muslims (Abbas 2007, 291). Muslims were strongly opposed to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and tended to perceive the "war on terror" to be a war against Islam (Field 2007; 2011; 2012). The evidence from polling data shows that "young British Muslims consistently interpreted it [the war on terrorism], more than their elders, as a war against Islam" (Field 2011, 8). Evidence from the British Election Study (BES) 2005

face-face survey (pre-election wave) shows that Muslims overwhelmingly disapproved of the war in Iraq (about 80.0 percent disapproved, 17.0 percent approved, with 3.0 percent unsure). The corresponding figures for the full BES sample also showed a majority — though not such an overwhelming one — disapproved of the Iraq war (68.0 percent). Recent polling of Muslims in Britain also found high levels of opposition to the United States and United Kingdom military operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan (76.0 percent were against), as well as opposition toward political intervention in those countries (BBC News 2009). More specifically, since the Sunni tradition predominates in Afghanistan, we might expect Sunni Muslims in Britain to be most likely to disapprove of the conflict.

While the public opinion data shows differences *between* religious groups, there might also be differences *within* religious traditions based on varying levels of religiosity, as has been found in existing research into public opinion and foreign policy (Nelsen, Guth, and Highsmith 2011). Previous research has shown that religion plays a more important part in the lives of Muslims in Britain compared to members of other religious traditions (Modood et al. 1997, 310). We might expect that more devout Muslims — those with higher levels of religiosity — would have distinctive views on this topic compared to their co-religionists, and be more likely to disapprove of Britain's involvement in Afghanistan. Specifically, opposition would be particularly pronounced among more devout Sunni Muslims in Britain. The following hypotheses are tested in relation to religious affiliation and religiosity:

HYPOTHESIS 1: Muslims are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan than members of other religious traditions or those who are not religious.

HYPOTHESIS 1A: Muslims with higher levels of religiosity are less likely to approve of the war.

Existing research into public opinion and foreign policy has also found attitudinal differences in relation to ethnic background. In the United States, blacks historically have been more "dovish" or "isolationist" (Wittkopf 1990) in their attitudes and thus less supportive of military intervention overseas (Nincic and Nincic 2002). These include Korea (Hamilton 1968; Mueller 1971), Vietnam (Verba et al. 1967; Hamilton 1968; Mueller 1973; Lunch and Sperlich 1979), the 1991 Gulf War

(Mueller 1994; Holsti 2004), and the 2003 invasion of Iraq (Holsti 2004; Jones 2003). Across differing ethnic groups in United States society, Burris (2008, 465) observes that "the sharpest racial differences have usually been between whites and blacks, with other racial groups occupying an intermediate position in terms of their support for the use of military force." As well as historical differences between blacks and whites in foreign policy attitudes, research into the 1991 Gulf War argued that there were other ethnic groups with a special interest in that issue who would have differing preferences, in particular Arab-Americans and American Jews (Wilcox, Ferrara, and Allsop 1993).

More recent research in the United States shows differences in view by ethnic group on foreign policy issues. Evidence from The Baylor Religion Survey (2006) conducted in 2005, found that just 12.6 percent of blacks agreed that the 2003 Iraq War was justified compared to 48.0 percent of whites (Berinsky 2009, 37). Berinsky (2009, 244–245) found that blacks were less likely to hold positive evaluations of the Iraq War — in terms of whether the United States was right to use military force against Iraq, whether the war has been worth fighting, and whether the war will be successful — than whites. Kam and Kinder's (2007, 328) study of attitudes in the United States found that being black was associated with less support for military action in Iraq and less agreement with the mission in Afghanistan being worth it. Huddy, Feldman, and Weber (2007, 149) also found that blacks were less likely to be supportive of an aggressive foreign policy, with other ethnic groups more supportive of "overseas military intervention."

Compared to religious affiliation, there is less evidence pertaining to the attitudes of minority ethnic groups in Britain toward overseas military interventions. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the attitudes of ethnic minority groups, and identify any inter-group variation, in relation to military interventions prior to those undertaken as part of the war against terrorism. In relation to recent conflicts, one study of the wider population found that individuals from a white ethnic background were more likely to approve of Britain's role in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan than those from a non-white ethnic group (Clements 2011). While interesting, this finding raises some of the issues with using general social surveys, in terms of measurement limitation and limited group-disaggregation, to analyze variation in attitudes across minority groups.

However, evidence from the British Election Study's Continuous Monitoring Survey — based on a pooled dataset of monthly

cross-sectional surveys undertaken between 2004 and 2011 — shows that
ethnic groups differ in their views of Britain's involvement in the wars in
Afghanistan and Iraq. Table 1 shows that, for both wars, those from a
Pakistani background were mostly likely to disapprove or strongly
disapprove: 83.3 percent for Iraq and 87.2 percent for Afghanistan. The
corresponding figures for those from a white ethnic background
are lower: at 64.6 percent (Iraq) and 58.1 percent (Afghanistan). The
levels of disapproval for the other minority groups vary somewhat,
though those against (disapproving or strongly disapproving) comprise a
majority in each case. In terms of comparing attitudes toward the
wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, disapproval is higher across all groups for
the conflict in Iraq. Based on the evidence presented here, there is
clear evidence of differences between ethnic groups in their degree of dis-
approval of Britain's role in both wars, which warrant further
investigation.[1]

Table 1. Public opinion toward the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan by ethnic group

	Strongly approve / approve (%)	Disapprove / strongly disapprove (%)	Don't know (%)
War in Iraq			
White background	28.2	64.6	7.2
Mixed background	26.7	62.7	10.6
Indian	20.1	68.6	11.1
Pakistani	5.8	83.3	10.8
Other Asian	12.4	74.7	12.9
Black	15.0	74.4	10.6
Other ethnic group	20.2	68.3	11.4
War in Afghanistan			
White background	31.1	58.1	10.7
Mixed background	28.9	60.2	10.8
Indian	33.1	55.9	11.0
Pakistani	10.6	87.2	2.1
Other Asian	31.9	59.6	8.5
Black	23.8	54.3	21.9
Other ethnic group	22.3	60.1	17.6

Source: BES CMS. Weighted data.

Based on the available evidence from existing research and survey data, the following hypothesis is tested:

HYPOTHESIS 2: Those from an Asian or British Asian — Pakistani background are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan than those belonging to other ethnic groups.

As well as examining group attachments based on ethnic background and religious tradition, when analyzing the domestic or foreign policy attitudes of minority groups — who are more likely to be socially and economically marginalized — it is also important to examine their engagement with the political process or general feelings of "political alienation" (Nincic and Nincic 2002). In Britain, a general sense of political alienation, underpinned by "a broader social alienation and exclusion," has clearly shaped the political role of minority groups in society (Saggar 2000, 98). As Nincic and Nincic (2002, 555) observe, political alienation "implies a sense of non-participation, a lack of impact upon political and policy developments. A person who does not feel represented by the political system may be less likely to support major national policies — *particularly those that, like military intervention, involve costs and risks*" (emphasis added). Similarly, Allison (2011, 673) observes that:

> Those who do not trust the government or do not feel they are heard and represented are less likely to support what the government does. The effect of trust on policy opinion is especially acute for policies involving few to no directly tangible benefits, but real or perceived costs …

Accordingly, it might be expected that those who feel less engaged with the political process in Britain — as manifested in lower levels of institutional trust or political efficacy — are less likely to approve of the country's role in the war in Afghanistan. The war represents an overseas commitment that has entailed considerable expenditure on the country's military forces since 2001 as well as monetary contributions via bilateral and multilateral development assistance, with increased military deployments and casualties in recent years. The following hypotheses are tested in relation to political alienation:

HYPOTHESIS 3: Those with lower levels of political trust are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan.

HYPOTHESIS **4:** Those with lower levels of political efficacy are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan.

As well as examining the role played by ethnic group, religion affiliation, and political alienation, this analysis builds on well-established findings from the wider literature. It examines the impact of other important sociological factors that have been found to affect public opinion on foreign policy issues in existing studies. Studies have repeatedly shown the existence of a "gender gap" in foreign policy attitudes, with women less "hawkish" in relation to military involvement abroad (Bendyna et al. 1996; Burris 2008; Clarke et al. 2009; Eichenberg 2003; Nincic and Nincic 2002). Research also demonstrates the role of age-related or generational effects in relation to foreign policy attitudes, though the findings are less clear-cut compared to those for gender (Holsti 2004). Foreign policy attitudes also differ by level of education (Wittkopf 1990; Holsti 2004). The analysis also assesses the impact of political predispositions on foreign policy attitudes, such as partisanship and left-right ideology, which represent "relatively stable and enduring political beliefs and attitudes" (Page 2006, 239). These political predispositions can act as accessible "cues" structuring views on foreign policy issues (Holsti 2004; Page 2006).

DATA AND METHOD

The data source for this analysis is the Ethnic Minority British Election Study (EMBES) focusing on the 2010 British General Election, and running alongside the main BES. The BES series provides an authoritative source of data on political attitudes, voting behavior, and democratic participation. The EMBES has some important features for the type of analysis undertaken here. First, the large sample size enables robust analysis of those from different ethnic backgrounds and religious faiths, including differentiating between traditions within the Muslim and Christian faiths. This is in contrast the much more limited analyses that can be undertaken with other social surveys, where there are smaller numbers of cases for minority ethnic and religious groups (see similar concerns discussed in Wilcox, Ferrara, and Allsop (1993, 355); Burris (2008, 465)), often necessitating a dichotomous majority-minority measure of ethnic group background. While there is some opinion polling evidence specifically

relating to the view of Muslims on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (Field 2007; 2011), there is little information on the opinions of other religious and ethnic minorities in conventional opinion polls, which often use samples sizes of 1,000 or less. Moreover, breakdowns by ethnic group or religious tradition are often not available in the public domain, if such information was collected. Second, as the EMBES collects data pertaining to a wide range of analysis variables — building on the BES studies — it enables the influence of ethnic group and religious affiliation to be robustly assessed when accounting for a range of other explanatory factors found in the wider literature.

The EMBES 2010 consists of a post-election wave — involving a face-to-face interview and a self-completion section — and a mail-back questionnaire. Fieldwork was conducted from May to August 2010. The participants are adults aged 18 years and older. The total number of respondents (unweighted) is 2,787. The data are appropriately weighted to make the sample representative of the wider population from which it was drawn.[2]

Principal Independent Variables

A detailed classification of ethnic group and religious affiliation is available in the EMBES survey. However, some of the groups contained small numbers of cases that did not lend themselves to robust statistical analysis. Accordingly, a revised set of categories, involving some combining of groups, is used for the analysis undertaken here. The descriptive statistics for the ethnic group and religious affiliation variables used in the analysis are given in Table 2. Ethnic background is measured as a series of dummy variables representing the major ethnic minority groups in British society (White 2002). These are mixed background or other ethnic group, Asian or Asian British — Indian, Asian, or Asian British — Pakistani, Asian, or Asian British — Bangladeshi, black, or black British — Caribbean, and black or black British — African. The mixed background or other ethnic group category contains those who reported their ethnic category as any mixed background, Chinese, any other Asian/Asian British background, and any other black/black British background.

The categories used for religious affiliation are as follows: no religion; Hindu; Sikh; Muslim — Sunni; Muslim – Other; Christian — Catholic; Christian — Pentecostal; Christian — other. The "Christian — other" category includes Anglicans Baptists, Methodists, those belonging to other

Table 2. Revised ethnic group and religious affiliation categories[a]

Ethnic group categories	% of EMBES sample	Unweighted base	Religious affiliation categories	% of EMBES sample	Unweighted base
Mixed background / other ethnic group	3.3	*132*	No religion	9.6	*363*
Asian or Asian British — Indian	34.9	*575*	Hindu	14.6	*234*
Asian or Asian British — Pakistani	21.6	*666*	Sikh	10.2	*164*
Asian or Asian British — Bangladeshi	8.6	*269*	Muslim — Sunni	33.3	*936*
Black or Black British — Caribbean	13.9	*573*	Muslim — Other	6.6	*204*
Black or Black British — African	17.7	*517*	Christian — Catholic	7.6	*206*
			Christian — Pentecostal	8.1	*257*
			Christian — other	10.1	*369*
	100.0	*2,732*		100.0	*2,733*

Source: EMBES 2010. Weighted data.
[a]Excluding the small number of cases classified as belonging to some "other" religion.

denominations (such as Orthodox or Seventh Day Adventist) and those who do not belong to a particular denomination. The "Muslim — other" category includes Shi'a Muslims, those affiliated with some other tradition and those who do not belong to any particular tradition. Because the "other religion" category in the EMBES sample contained only 26 respondents, it was omitted from the analysis.

The analysis does not only examine religious tradition or "belonging," it also examines the impact of religiosity. A data reduction analysis of three indicators of religious commitment was undertaken (perceived salience of religion, religious activities undertaken with other people, religious activities undertaken alone — see the Appendix for question wording). Those who reported having no religious affiliation — and were not therefore asked the religiosity indicators — were scored as the lowest value on each item. An exploratory Principal Components factor analysis showed that these three items loaded onto a single dimension.[3] The factor scores from the data reduction analysis are used as the religiosity variable in the analysis. In order to examine for the effects of religiosity within each religious affiliation category, a series of interaction terms are used in the analysis.

To tap into feelings of political alienation among minority groups in Britain, two indictors are used. First, an indicator measuring political trust. This is a composite scale, consisting of two items asking about level of trust in the "Parliament at Westminster" and "British politicians generally" (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$). Second, a measure of self-assessed political efficacy is also used (Whiteley et al. 2010), which asked about each respondent's perceived level of influence on "politics and public affairs."

Other Independent Variables

The analysis includes standard demographic variables: gender (a dummy variable) and age (a continuous variable). To account for the differing spatial patterns of ethnic minority populations (White 2002), controls are also included for a respondent's geographical context (a series of dummy variables based on regional location). Marital status is measured as a dummy variable.

It is important to examine the effects of political predispositions since their exclusion could lead to omitted variable bias and variance being mistakenly attributed to prior sociological factors. Party identification is measured as a series of dummy variables based on the long-standing

BES question. Those who responded unsure or don't know are coded as "no party." It is preferable to use this more durable measure of party support than voting intention or reported vote choice. Left-right ideology, traditionally the most important ideological dimension structuring British politics (Sanders 1999; Clarke et al. 2004) is measured via a "proxy" indicator of attitudes towards increasing (or decreasing) taxation and public spending. More details on the measurement of the independent variables are given in the Appendix.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is a question asking about approval or disapproval of Britain's involvement in the war in Afghanistan. In line with other studies in this area, the question represents a "retrospective endorsement of military actions that had already been undertaken" (Burris 2008, 448).[4] The question wording and response options for the approval-disapproval question are as follows: "Please indicate whether you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove of Britain's involvement in the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan. Strongly approve. Approve. Neither approves nor disapproves. Disapprove. Strongly disapprove. Don't know. Do not want to answer." The distribution of responses to this question is shown in Table 3. Overall, a majority of disapproves of Britain's participation in the Afghanistan war (52.7 percent). A small minority (16.9 percent) approves of Britain's involvement to some degree while a similar proportion has a neutral stance (16.5 percent). The remainder of the sample offer "don't know" responses or refuse to say (15.0 percent). In the interests of wider comparison, the corresponding distributions for ethnic minority respondents and those from a white British ethnic background from the British Election Study 2010 (in-person survey, post-election wave) are shown. For both groups in the BES 2010, smaller proportions had no opinion or were less likely to choose the neutral option (less than 3.0 percent in both cases), while approval of the war in Afghanistan was somewhat higher than in the EMBES sample.

Analytical Procedures

Linear regression is used as the statistical estimation technique, with the dependent variable scored from 1 through to 5, with higher values

Table 3. Approval or disapproval of Britain's involvement in the war in Afghanistan

	EMBES[a]		BES: Ethnic minority groups		BES: White British ethnic background	
	%	*Unweighted base*	*%*	*Unweighted base*	*%*	*Unweighted base*
Strongly approve	4.1	*113*	3.5	*8*	1.6	*57*
Approve	12.8	*352*	18.1	*49*	21.2	*545*
Neither	16.5	*452*	11.0	*37*	12.0	*302*
Disapprove	25.3	*692*	30.3	*95*	34.8	*940*
Strongly disapprove	27.4	*749*	34.5	*108*	28.7	*867*
Don't know / refused	13.8	*380*	2.6	*8*	1.7	*50*
Total	100.0	*2,738*	100.0	*305*	100.0	*2,761*

Sources: EMBES 2010 and BES 2010 in-person survey (post-election wave). Weighted data.
[a]Excluding the small number of cases classified as belonging to some "other" religion.

representing approval of the war in Afghanistan (mean: 2.31; standard deviation: 1.11). Higher scores therefore indicate approval of the war in Afghanistan. In order to maximize the cases available for analysis, missing data for the dependent variable are assigned the mean score.

The models are estimated using a sequential approach, whereby the explanatory factors are grouped into blocs that contain variables of a similar type. The approach assumes that variables within each given block are caused by those variables in the block or blocks that precede it (Miller and Shanks 1996). Adapting and simplifying Miller and Shanks's (1996) multi-stage approach, three blocks of explanatory factors are employed. The explanatory variables in the first block comprise *fixed personal traits* — gender, age group, and ethnic group — which are determined outside of the model and are treated as exogenous. The second block consists of *acquired social characteristics* — religious affiliation, religiosity, educational attainment, marital status, and region. The third and final block consists of *political predispositions* — party identification, left-right ideological beliefs, political trust and political efficacy — which can be affected by the social and demographic factors in the first two blocks of variables. In order to maximize the cases for analysis, mean value imputation was used for the scale items used as independent variables. Using list-wise deletion would inevitably reduce the numbers of cases available for analysis — based on only those respondents giving substantive responses to all questions, who are unlikely to be representative.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results report the unstandardized coefficients (*B*), standardized coefficients (*Beta*) and the standard errors (in parentheses). Model fit statistics (Adjusted R^2) are shown at the bottom of Table 4. In Table 4, Model 1 includes the *fixed personal characteristics*; Model 2 adds the *acquired social characteristics*; and Model 3 includes the *political attitudes*. Each block of variables added to the model specification increases the proportion of variance explained by a modest amount, but the levels explained are generally low (Model 1: 5 percent; Model 2: 10 percent; Model 3: 12 percent).

It is clear that the fixed personal characteristics have substantive effects in Model 1. Gender and ethnic group have significant effects. Men are more likely to support involvement in Afghanistan compared to women, underlining the well-established "gender gap" found in the analysis of

Table 4. Linear regression models of approval for the war in Afghanistan

Variable	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3	
	B (SE)	Beta	B (SE)	Beta	B (SE)	Beta
Fixed personal characteristics						
Constant	2.253*** (0.127)		2.322*** (0.147)		2.599*** (0.190)	
Gender	0.183*** (0.041)	0.082	0.203*** (0.042)	0.091	.0200*** (0.041)	0.090
Age	−0.001 (0.001)	−0.013	−0.005** (0.002)	−0.067	−0.006*** (0.002)	−0.086
Asian or Asian British — Indian	0.223 (0.120)	0.095	0.048 (0.129)	0.021	−0.026 (0.129)	−0.011
Asian or Asian British — Pakistani	−0.379*** (0.123)	−0.140	−0.141 (0.132)	−0.052	−0.184 (0.131)	−0.068
Asian or Asian British — Bangladeshi	−0.322* (0.135)	−0.081	−0.082 (0.143)	−0.021	−0.163 (0.142)	−0.041
Black or Black British — Caribbean	0.118 (0.128)	0.037	0.030 (0.128)	0.009	0.012 (0.127)	0.004
Black or Black British — African	0.107 (0.125)	0.037	0.064 (0.127)	0.022	−0.023 (0.126)	−0.008
Acquired social characteristics						
Hindu			0.214* (.102)	0.068	0.185 (0.102)	0.059
Sikh			0.001 (.108)	0.000	−0.030 (0.108)	−0.008
Muslim — Sunni			−0.288** (.099)	−0.122	−0.350*** (0.098)	−0.148
Muslim — other			−0.226 (0.121)	−0.050	−0.293* (0.121)	−0.065
Christian — Catholic			0.090 (0.102)	0.021	0.063 (0.102)	0.015
Christian — Pentecostal			0.219 (0.118)	0.053	0.162 (0.117)	0.040
Christian — other			0.123 (0.095)	0.033	0.088 (0.094)	0.024
Hindu * religiosity			0.077 (0.073)	0.020	0.051 (0.072)	0.013
Sikh * religiosity			0.099 (0.091)	0.020	0.058 (0.091)	0.012
Muslim — Sunni * religiosity			−0.295*** (0.059)	−0.110	−.0267*** (0.059)	−0.099
Muslim — other * religiosity			−0.167 (0.105)	−0.032	−0.152 (0.104)	−0.029
Christian — Catholic * religiosity			−0.131 (0.108)	−0.023	−0.149 (0.108)	−0.026
Christian — Pentecostal * religiosity			0.097 (0.136)	0.017	0.084 (0.135)	0.015
Christian — other * religiosity			−0.160 (0.090)	−0.033	−0.157 (0.090)	−0.033
Marital status			0.267*** (0.049)	0.119	0.247*** (0.048)	0.110
Left education — aged 15 or lower			0.023 (0.093)	0.007	0.033 (0.093)	0.010

41

Left education — aged 16		−0.005 (0.085)	−0.002	0.048 (0.085)	0.016
Left education — aged 17 or 18		0.020 (0.083)	0.007	0.053 (0.083)	0.018
Left education — aged 19 or 20		0.100 (0.093)	0.025	0.116 (0.093)	0.029
Left education — 21 or over		0.040 (0.072)	0.017	0.058 (0.072)	0.025
Region — Southern England		0.215* (0.089)	0.052	0.213* (0.088)	0.051
Region — Wales and Scotland		0.410*** (0.122)	0.066	0.441*** (0.121)	0.071
Region — London		−0.060 (0.060)	−0.027	−0.023 (0.060)	−0.010
Region — Midlands		0.007 (0.063)	0.003	0.035 (0.062)	0.014
Political attitudes					
Labor identifier				0.169* (0.068)	0.075
Conservative identifier				0.108 (0.090)	0.029
Liberal Democrat identifier				0.143 (0.090)	0.038
Other party identifier				0.142 (0.088)	0.039
Tax and spend scale				0.015 (0.008)	0.033
Political trust scale				−0.058*** (0.009)	−0.124
Political efficacy scale				−0.005 (0.007)	−0.013
Weighted N	*2,736*	*2,733*		*2,733*	
F	*22.65****	*10.75****		*10.61****	
Adjusted R Square	*0.05*	*0.10*		*0.12*	

Note: $p \leq 0.05 =$ *; $p \leq 0.01 =$ **; $p \leq 0.001 =$ ***

Reference categories: mixed background or other ethnic group; no religion; still in full-time education; region — lives in Northern England; does not support a political party.

Source: EMBES 2010. Weighted data

wider populations. Specifically, in the wider British population, men were more supportive of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan compared to women (Clarke et al. 2009; Clements 2011). In relation to age, older people are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan, though the effect is not statistically significant in Model 1. In relation to ethnic background, those from an Asian or Asian British — Pakistani background are less likely to approve of the war compared to the reference category (those of a mixed background or some other ethnic group. This provides clear support for Hypothesis 2. There is a similar effect for those who are Asian or Asian British — Bangladeshi (though only significant at the 0.5 level). The greater test, though, is whether these significant direct effects remain when additional blocks of explanatory variables are added to the model.

Model 2 adds the acquired social characteristics to the fixed demographic traits, which increases the proportion of explained variance. As has often been found in public opinion and foreign policy research (Nincic and Nincic 2002; Burris, 2008), there is still a "gender gap" present in Model 2, with men more likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan. Interestingly, age now has a significant effect, with older people less approving of the war in Afghanistan (cf. Clements 2011). In Model 2, being married — compared to other forms of relationship status — is positively-related to approval of the war in Afghanistan (significant at the most demanding level).

Importantly, ethnic background does not have any significant effects when religious-based variables are accounted for. The results for religious affiliation in Model 2 provide clear support for Hypothesis 1, as Sunni Muslims are much less likely to approve of the war compared to those of no religion (the reference category). The only other significant effect is for Hindus, who are more likely to approve of the war (but at the 5 percent level). The findings for Sunni Muslims from this analysis nuance the evidence from opinion polls of Muslims' attitudes towards foreign policy issues (Field 2007; 2012). Beyond the stand-alone impact of affiliation, the interactions between affiliation and religiosity are significant in the case of Sunni Muslims. Those Sunni Muslims for whom religion is particularly important in their lives and who take part religious activities more often are less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan. This finding provides confirmation of Hypothesis 1a. It is a moot point as to whether similar relationships for religious identity would have been evident for the attitudes of the ethnic minority population in Britain towards the earlier wars in Iraq of 1991 and 2003.

Looking at the other variables, education does not have a significant impact in Model 2, which contrasts with findings from studies of attitudes in the wider British population (Clements 2011). It should be acknowledged, though, that the measure used here is arguably not as sensitive a measure of educational attainment as is the highest qualification held by an individual, which would allow for a more finely-grained classification. The effects for regional controls show that those living in Scotland or Wales, or in Southern England, are more likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan than those residing in Northern England. The addition of acquired social characteristics increases the explanatory power of the model.

Measures of political attitudes are added in Model 3, slightly increasing the overall proportion of variance explained. The effects for gender, age, marital status, and region present in Model 2 all remain in this more robust test, both in terms of the direction of the relationship and level of statistical significance. Similarly, the strong effects for Sunni Muslims and for the interaction with religiosity are present in Model 1 (though the dummy variable for Hindus is no longer statistically significant). How do the political attitudes perform? In contrast to analysis of attitudes towards the interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan in the wider population (Clements 2011), the party identification variables — an accessible heuristic for structuring foreign policy opinions (Wittkopf 1990; Holsti 2004) — perform poorly as predictors within the ethnic minority population. The only significant result is for Labor Party partisans, who are more likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan compared to those who do not support a party (at the 5 percent level). Britain's involvement in Afghanistan started in late-2001 and continued for the best part of a decade under a Labor government, so it is perhaps to be expected that their partisans 'stayed the course' and were more likely to express approval. It is an interesting question whether this was also the case for ethnic minority attitudes towards the conflict in Iraq, a divisive political issue during and after the invasion in 2003 and which sustained clearer elite-level cues, with the Liberal Democrats clearly positioned as the anti-Iraq war party (Whiteley, Seyd, and Billinghurst 2006; Whiteley et al. 2005, 146–147). It may be that partisan affiliations held greater sway on attitudes toward the Iraq war amongst the ethnic minority population. Some minor parties also took up strong anti-war positions; in particular, the Respect Party, "born in the context of protest against the war in Iraq" (Webb 2005, 767), campaigned strongly on this issue at the 2005 general election, winning their only parliamentary seat in an east London constituency with a high proportion of Muslim constituents.

Muslim voters also switched to the Liberal Democrats in other constituencies to register opposition to the invasion of Iraq (Curtice, Fisher, and Steed 2005, 239–240). Accounting for partisanship, ideological beliefs do not have a significant impact in Model 3, at least using the proxy measure of attitudes toward taxation and public expenditure.

In relation to the political (dis)engagement and alienation of minority groups, political trust has a strong effect in Model 3. Those who distrust political institutions and politicians are less likely to approve of the Afghanistan war. This provides clear support for Hypothesis 3. In contrast, there is no significant effect for political efficacy, though the effect is signed in the expected direction. There is no support for Hypothesis 4. There is some evidence that those more likely to be disengaged from the political process, in this case, showing greater levels of distrust of governing institutions, are less likely to support Britain's role in the Afghanistan war. This finding is instructive in the context of Nincic and Nincic's (2002) findings in relation to minority groups and political alienation and expectations about support for foreign policy initiatives, which over time can be costly in terms of military expenditure and lives lost. Moreover, Allison (2011, 686) showed that political alienation decreased support for the Iraq War in the United States, but that this relationship was gender-specific and only held for women. This finding should serve to encourage further investigation of how political disengagement and alienation affects attitudes amongst ethnic minorities on domestic policy issues in Britain.[5]

Overall, the evidence shows that sociological variables and political attitudes had strong direct effects on approval of the war in Afghanistan. Some of these findings underline well-established insights from the wider public opinion and foreign policy literature, including the existence of a "gender gap" in relation to military interventions (Clarke et al. 2009; Clements 2011; 2012). As in the wider British population, amongst ethnic minorities men were more supportive of military action in Afghanistan than women. However, the effects for some variables did not support findings from existing studies (the role of education). Religious affiliation had important stand-alone effects while religiosity had a significant effect when interacted with religious tradition. While Sunni Muslims were much less likely to approve of the war in Afghanistan, this effect was more pronounced for the more devout Sunni Muslims. Even when accounting for the impact of political attitudes, social characteristics — gender, age, religious-based factor and marital status — retained strong *direct* effects on attitudes towards the war in Afghanistan. It is evidently not the case that their impact is mainly indirect; in other words, their influence is not primarily mediated

through attitudinal factors more proximate to the dependent variable. In fact, the sorts of political predispositions through which the influence of social group attachments may be mediated – such as partisanship and ideological beliefs – had weak effects overall.

CONCLUSION

This analysis makes an important contribution to the wider literature on religion and public opinion on foreign policy and to research into the political attitudes of minorities in Britain (Saggar 2000; Saggar and Heath 1999; Sobolewska 2005; Heath et al. 2011). The findings point the way toward widening the scope of public opinion research into the foreign policy attitudes of minority groups in Britain. For example, do minority groups in Britain possess distinctive opinions toward the European integration process (Dowley and Silver 2011)? Future research could also examine the attitudes of minority groups in Britain on those issues where states can exercise "soft" power, including political-diplomatic and trade-economic issues, (Page 2006). Moreover, do Muslims in Britain possess different views on Middle East issues and towards the state of Israel (cf. Guth 2011b) compared to adherents of other religious traditions; and what is the interrelationship of religiosity and affiliation on such issues?

   The focus on a single foreign policy issue is a limitation of this analysis. The lack of similar survey data for minority groups — containing suitable measures of ethnicity and religion — prevents a similar analysis of minority attitudes toward the Iraq War. The BES and EMBES surveys also do not allow scholars of public opinion research to examine the impact of more deep-rooted foreign policy beliefs, for example attitudes towards the "cooperative internationalism" dimension, on specific issues (Guth 2009b). Another limitation of this analysis was that while it provided a robust assessment of the effects of affiliation and religiosity, it could not examine the impact of religious belief or doctrine, which would have provided a more nuanced analysis of the effects of religious identity on public opinion.

NOTES

   1. Due to a lack of relevant measures, we cannot use the CMS to look at the relationship between religious affiliation and approval of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.
   2. The EMBES dataset and accompanying documentation were obtained from the BES 2009/10 project website (http://www.bes2009-10.org/).

3. The factor loadings of the three items were: *perceived salience of religion*: 0.89; *religious activities with others*: 82; *religious activities alone*: .88 (Eigenvalue: 2.24; percentage of variance: 74.56).

4. Several other questions in the EMBES survey asked about the war in Afghanistan, including current and longer-term evaluations of the conflict and the negative or positive implications of British involvement. These items tended to elicit higher proportions of missing data ("don't know" or refusal to answer) compared to the approval-disapproval question, analysis of which lies outside the scope of this article.

5. Model 3 was re-run including the scale items without mean value substitution (tax and spend, political trust and political efficacy). The two sets of estimations are generally the same in terms of the results for the independent variables (signs, magnitudes and, in most cases, levels of statistical significance). The exceptions are that the dummy for living in Southern England is no longer statistically significant while more of the partisanship variables become statistically significant. The Labour Party dummy is now statistically significant at the highest level and the dummies for Conservative Party and Liberal Democrat partisans are only just significant at the p.05 level (full details available on request).

REFERENCES

Abbas, Tahir. 2007. "Muslim Minorities in Britain: Integration, Multiculturalism and Radicalism in the Post-7/7 Period." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28:287–300.

Allison, Rachel. 2011. "Race, Gender, and Attitudes Toward War in Chicago: An Intersectional Analysis." *Sociological Forum* 26:668–691.

Baylor Religion Survey. 2006. *American Piety in the 21st Century: New Insights to the Depth and Complexity of Religion in the US*, Waco, TX: Baylor Institute for the Study of Religion.

BBC News. 2009. "UK Muslims split on Taliban fight." http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/uk/8119273.stm (Accessed on April 28, 2011).

Bendyna, Mary E., Tamara Finucane, Lynn Kirby, John P. O'Donnell, and Clyde Wilcox. 1996. "Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Gulf War: A Test of Competing Hypotheses." *The Social Science Journal* 33:1–22.

Berinsky, Adam J. 2009. *In Time of War: Understanding American Public Opinion from World War II to Iraq*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Boussios, Emanuel G., and Stephen Cole. 2010a. "Americans' Attitudes toward War: Trend Analysis of Public Opinion for the Iraq War." *Journal of Applied Security Research* 5:208–226.

Boussios, Emanuel G., and Stephen Cole. 2010b. "Do Individual Characteristics Matter? An Analysis of Americans' Opinions toward the Korean, Vietnam, Persian Gulf, and Iraq War." *Journal of Applied Security Research* 5:279–305.

Burris, Val. 2008. "From Vietnam to Iraq: Continuity and Change in Between-Group Differences in Support for Military Action." *Social Problems* 55:443–479.

Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2009. *Performance Politics and the British Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clements, Ben. 2011. "Examining Public Attitudes towards Recent Foreign Policy Issues: Britain's Involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan Conflicts." *Politics* 32:63–71.

Clements, Ben. 2012. "A Micro-Level Analysis of Support in Britain for the War in Afghanistan." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2012.00527.x.

Curtice, John, Stephen Fisher, and Michael Steed. 2005. "Appendix 2: The Results Analysed," In *The British General Election of 2005*, eds. Kavanagh Dennis, and David Butler. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 235–259.

Dowley, Kathleen M., and Brian D. Silver. 2011. "Support for Europe among Europe's Ethnic, Religious and Immigrant Minorities." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 23:315–337.

Eichenberg, Richard C. 2003. "Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Use of Force by the United States, 1990–2003." *International Security* 28:110–141.

Field, Clive D. 2007. "Islamophobia in Contemporary Britain: The Evidence of the Opinion Polls, 1988–2006." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 18:447–477.

Field, Clive D. 2012. "Revisiting Islamophobia in contemporary Britain, 2007–10." In *Islamophobia in the West: Measuring and Explaining Individual Attitudes*, ed. Helbling, Mark. London: Routledge, 147–161.

Field, Clive D. 2011. "Young British Muslims since 9/11: A composite attitudinal profile." *Religion, State and Society* 39:159–175.

Froese, Paul, and F. Carson Mencken. 2009. "A U.S. Holy War? The Effects of Religion on Iraq War Policy Attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 90:103–116.

Guth, James L. 2011a. "Religion and American Attitudes on Foreign Policy, 2008: Testing Theories of Religious, Cultural and Ideological Influence." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal.

Guth, James L. 2011b. "Religious Factors and American Public Support for Israel: 1992–2008." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association Seattle, Washington.

Guth, James L. 2009a. "Religion and American Public Opinion: Foreign Policy Issues." In *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Politics*, eds. Smidt Corwin, Lyman Kellstedt, and James L. Guth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 243–265.

Guth, James L. 2009b. "Militant and Cooperative Internationalism among American Religious Publics, 2008." Presented at the Annual BISA Working Group Conference on US Foreign Policy, University of East Anglia.

Hamilton, Richard F. 1968. "A Research Note on the Mass Support for 'Tough' Military Initiatives." *American Sociological Review* 33:439–445.

Heath, Anthony F., Stephen D. Fisher, David Sanders, and Maria Sobolewska. 2011. "Ethnic Heterogeneity in the Social Bases of Voting at the 2010 British General Election." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 21:255–277.

Holsti, Ole R. 2004. *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, and Christopher Weber. 2007. "The Political Consequences of Perceived Threat and Felt Insecurity." *Annals* 614:131–153.

Jones, Jeffrey M. 2003. "Blacks Showing Decided Opposition to War." http://www.gallup.com/poll/8080/Blacks-Showing-Decided-Opposition-War.aspx (Accessed on April 16, 2011).

Jelen, Ted G. 1994. "Religion and Foreign Policy Attitudes: Exploring the Effects of Denomination and Doctrine." *American Politics Quarterly* 22:382–400.

Kam, Cindy D., and Donald R. Kinder. 2007. "Terror and Ethnocentrism: Foundations of American Support for the War on Terrorism." *Journal of Politics* 69:320–338.

Leege David C., and Lyman A. Kellstedt. eds. 1993. *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Lunch, William L., and Peter W. Sperlich. 1979. "American Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam." *The Western Political Quarterly* 32:21–44.

Miller, Warren E., and J. Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Modood Tariq, Richard Berthoud, Jane Lakey, James Nazroo, Patten Smith, Satnam Virdee, and Sharon Beishon. eds. 1997. *Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Mueller, John E. 1971. "Trends in Popular Support for the Wars in Korea and Vietnam." *American Political Science Review* 65:358–375.

Mueller, John E. 1973. *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Mueller, John E. 1994. *Policy and Opinion in the Gulf War*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Nelsen, Brent F., James L. Guth, and Brian Highsmith. 2011. "Does Religion Still Matter? Religion and Public Attitudes toward Integration in Europe." *Politics and Religion* 4:1–26.

Nincic, Miroslav, and Donna J. Nincic. 2002. "Race, Gender, and War." *Journal of Peace Research* 39:547–568.

Page, Benjamin I. 2006. *The Foreign Policy Disconnect: What Americans Want from Our Leaders But Don't Get*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Patterson, Dennis, Gamal Gasim, and Jangsup Choi. 2011. "Identity, Attitudes, and the Voting Behavior of Mosque-Attending Muslim-Americans in the 2000 and 2004 Presidential Elections." *Politics and Religion* 4:289–311.

Peach, Ceri. 2006. "Muslims in the 2001 Census of England and Wales: Gender and economic disadvantage." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29:629–655.

Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. 2011. *The Future Global Muslim Population Projections for 2010-2030*. http://pewforum.org/uploadedFiles/Topics/Religious_Affiliation/Muslim/FutureGlobalMuslimPopulation-WebPDF-Feb10.pdf.

Pew Research Center. 2007. *Muslim Americans. Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream*. http://pewresearch.org/assets/pdf/muslim-americans.pdf (Accessed on April 14, 2011).

Pew Research Center. 2011. *Muslim Americans. No Signs of Growth in Alienation or Support for Extremism*. http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/Muslim-American-Report.pdf (Accessed on April 14, 2011).

Saggar, Shamit. 2000. *Race and Representation: Electoral Politics and Ethnic Pluralism in Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Saggar, Shamit, and Anthony Heath. 1999. "Race: Towards a Multicultural Electorate?" In *Critical Elections: British Parties and Voters in Long-term Perspective*, eds. Evans Geoffrey, and Pippa Norris. London: Sage, 102–123.

Sanders, David. 1999. "The Impact of Left-Right Ideology." In *Critical Elections: British Parties and Voters in Long-term Perspective*, eds. Evans Geoffrey, and Pippa Norris. London: Sage, 181–206.

Sobolewska, Maria. 2005. "Ethnicity as Political Cleavage: Social Bases of Party Identity and Relevance of Political Attitudes." http://www.crest.ox.ac.uk/papers/p107.pdf (Accessed on April 28, 2011).

Studlar, Donley T. 1986. "Non-White Policy Preferences, Political Participation and the Political Agenda in Britain." In *Race, Government and Politics in Britain*, eds. Layton-Henry Zig, and Paul B. Rich. London: Macmillan.

Verba, Sydney, R. A. Brody, Edwin B. Parker, Norman H. Nie, Nelson W. Polsby, Paul Ekman, and G. S. Black. 1967. "Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam." *American Political Science Review* 61:317–333.

Webb, Paul. 2005. "The Continuing Advance of the Minor Parties." *Parliamentary Affairs* 58:757–775.

White, Amanda. 2002. *Social Focus in Brief: Ethnicity 2002*. London: Office for National Statistics.

Whiteley, Paul, Harold D. Clarke, David Sanders, and Marianne C. Stewart. 2010. "Government Performance and Life Satisfaction in Contemporary Britain." *The Journal of Politics* 72:733–746.

Whiteley, Paul, Patrick Seyd, and Antony Billinghurst. 2006. *Third Force Politics. Liberal Democrats at the Grassroots*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wittkopf, Eugene R. 1990. *Faces of Internationalism: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wilcox, Clyde, Joseph Ferrara, and Dee Allsop. 1993. "Group Differences in Early Support for Military Action in the Gulf: The Effects of Gender, Generation and Ethnicity." *American Politics Quarterly* 21:343–359.

APPENDIX: MEASUREMENT OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Gender: Coded as 1 if male, 0 if female.

Age group: Coded as a continuous variable ranging from 18 through to 97 (mean: 39.06; standard deviation: 14.98).

Ethnic group: Coded as a series of dummy variables (Asian or Asian British — Indian; Asian or Asian British — Pakistani; Asian or Asian British — Bangladeshi; Black or Black British — Caribbean; Black or Black British — African; mixed background or other ethnic group). Mixed background or other ethnic group is the reference category.

Religious affiliation: Coded as a series of dummy variables (Hindu; Sikh; Sunni Muslim; Muslim — other; Catholic; Pentecostal; Christian — other; no religion). Those with no religion form the reference category.

Religiosity: Factor scores from a data reduction analysis of three scales (using Principal Components). The importance of religion scale is scored from 1 to 5 while the participation in religious activities scales are scored from 1 to 6. Higher scores denote greater importance of religion and more frequent participation in religious activities, respectively.

Marital status: Measured as a dummy variable (scored as 1 if married, 0 if other).

Educational attainment: Measured as a series of dummy variables which denotes the age at which full-time education was completed (aged 15 or under; aged 16; aged 17 or 18; aged 19 or 20; aged 21 or over; still in full-time education). Those still in full-time education form the reference category.

Region: Measured as four dummy variables (Wales and Scotland, Northern England — north-west, north-east and Yorkshire, Midlands — east and west, eastern England, London, Southern England — south-west and south-east). Scotland and Wales are combined because relatively few respondents in the EMBES sample live in either country. Those living in Northern England form the reference category.

Party identification: Measured as dummy variables (Labor, Conservative, Liberal Democrat, other party, no party). Those who do not support a party are the reference category.

Tax and spend: A single-item scale ranging from 1 to 11 (mean: 6.31; standard deviation: 2.46). Higher scores denote preferences for higher taxation and public expenditure.

Political trust: A scale, based on two items asking about the "Parliament at Westminster" and "British politicians generally," ranging from 1 to 11 (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$; mean: 6.00; standard deviation: 2.37). Scoring is reversed so that higher values represent lower levels of trust.

Political efficacy: A single-item scale ranging from 1 to 11 (mean: 8.33; standard deviation: 2.80). Scoring is reversed so that higher values represent lower levels of political efficacy.