Early Day Motions on minority issues:
Examining Jewish and Muslim parliamentary representation

Ekaterina Kolpinskaya

University of Nottingham

ldxek2@nottingham.ac.uk

Introduction

Fair minority parliamentary representation improves the quality of democracy and the state's performance by reducing socio-political exclusion, enhancing political participation and the awareness of politicians to produce more effective policies (Gutmann, 2003; Saward, 2011). In this ensuring fair minority representation in Parliament is essential for the UK's democratic development. Approaches to improving minority representation vary. Political parties aim to increase the number of minority MPs (House of Commons, 2009; OBV, 2008), and academics and minority politicians call for creating a more minority-friendly parliamentary environment that would allow MPs to perform as minority representatives (see *inter alia* Durose et al., 2011; Saalfeld and Bischof, 2013; Claire et al. (eds), 2013). Underpinning many such attempts is the assumption that increasing the number of MPs from minority backgrounds will improve the representation of minority interests. [1] There is little evidence, however, to suggest that this is the case.

This paper explores one side of the problem – whether or not minority parliamentarians address minority-related questions when they are not constrained by party discipline, and so actually improve the representation of minority interests when they are able. Drawing upon content analysis of the Early Day Motions tabled by Members of Parliament with Jewish and Muslim backgrounds and comparing them to other MPs, the study examines whether religious minority identity has any impact on the frequency with which minority background MPs engage with minority-related topics.

The analysis shows that the impact of religious minority background on the level of interest to minority-related issues is insignificant; rather MPs tend to sponsor minority-related motions triggered by important domestic and international events rather than consistently representing interest of a certain minority. There is no evidence that increasing the number of MPs from a religious minority background in the House of Commons has seen an increase in the representation of issues specifically relating to minority groups.

Research design

Research question is 'Do MPs with Jewish and Muslim minority backgrounds raise issues of minority concern in the Early Day Motions they sponsor?'

Jewish and Muslim minorities make an interesting case for comparison. There are similarities in the development and political engagement of both communities. Their areas of interest also overlap on issues related to the Middle East, discrimination on the grounds of religion, and xenophobia (Radcliffe, 2004). That is because being descendants of immigrants, they maintain strong connections with their countries of

---

[1] This question is drawn on the difference between symbolic and substantive political representation, whereby substantive representation imply engagement with minority-related issues and symbolic representation does not (Bird et al., 2011).

origin[2], giving them a 'minority based' interest in foreign affairs as well as domestic politics (Vertovec, 2009).

Both communities are formed on the basis of shared religious identity rather than anthropological characteristics such as ethnicity or race. Religious identity impacts on people's attitudes more than ethnicity because it instils a socio-cultural code and a system of values that affect behaviour more than anthropologically determined characteristics (Lazar et al., 2002; Sinno, 2009). The socio-cultural aspects of religion as opposed to the spiritual components are central to the notion of 'religious minority background' used in the study. This allows the inclusion of secular and non-religious MPs as well as practicing politicians in the analysis.

For the purpose of the research, religious minority background is defined as a socio-cultural code shared by practicing and secular politicians. Issues of minority concern include internal community matters and international issues specifically relating to minority groups. The analysis assesses whether or not behavioural tendencies derived from religious minority background have a significant impact on the representation of minority-related political issues by MPs from such a background, using the Jewish and Muslim cases as examples.

Research hypothesis

The hypothesis tested in each analysis is: 'MPs with religious minority backgrounds sponsor[3] EDMs on topics of interest to such a minority more frequently than MPs with a different or no religious background'.

It is based on the assumption that if minority parliamentarians are affected by their minority backgrounds, they will sponsor more motions on minority-related issues, providing expertise and valuable insights on the matters. Conversely, non-minority MPs would be expected to be less involved in discussing the topics of minority concern.

If, on the other hand, this hypothesis is rejected, it would suggest that minority MPs' behaviour is determined by institutional factors other than their religious identity, such as political parties (Strom, 1997). It would suggest that MPs from minority backgrounds are not substantially affected by their background when tabling EDMs, and that having such people in Parliament implies symbolic rather than substantive representation of minority issues.

---

[2] South Asia and the Middle East are the main regions of origin of the British Muslim communities (Baxter, 2006). Although there are not many Jews of the Israeli origin in the UK, Israel has been referred to as the country of origin for Jews and Judaism essential for their survival (Bayfield in Hudson, 2010: 9-15).

[3] There is no difference in whether to refer to proposing an EDM as 'sponsor' or 'table' which is why these terms are used interchangeably.

<u>Data</u>

Early Day Motions are used as the data source. Early Day Motions are often seen as the least important form of parliamentary behaviour, subordinate to voting, Parliamentary questions, and work in committees and parliamentary groups. They neither result in an immediate legislative proposal, nor have a substantial effect on passing legislation (Norton, 2001). However, the motions are important campaigning tools and a means to reflect the individual attitudes and insights of Members (Childs and Withey, 2004: 554).

Analysis of EDMs allows exploration of backbench opinions and lobbying potential for groups of MPs when party discipline is loosened (Childs and Withey, 2004; Finer, Berrington and Bartholomew, 1961). Being a personal political statement, an EDM gets support from fellow MPs who co-sponsor and/or sign it (House of Commons, 2010). This study focuses on the motions sponsored by MPs with Jewish, Muslim and non-minority backgrounds rather than all the EDMs signed by them.

Signing an EDM is a sign of support that carries less weight compared to tabling the motion. The latter implies a higher level of commitment to the issue raised, because proposing an Early Day Motion is more time consuming and labour intensive. Minding how busy MPs can be, the investment of time in sponsoring an EDM shows a strong desire to attract the attention of the House to a certain issue. With regard to minority-related motions, the content of the EDMs sponsored by minority MPs is more telling than the content of the EDMs signed by them.

The analysis in this paper draws on 5160 EDMs sponsored by 38 Jewish, 11 Muslim and 25 randomly selected non-minority MPs between 10 July 1997 and 30 April 2012. 1862 EDMs were sponsored by non-minority MPs, and 3102 and 196 by MPs with Jewish and Muslim backgrounds, respectively. The starting point of the research is the 1997 General Election when the first Muslim MP was elected. The study finishes with the 2010/2012 session.

The motions are collected from the Parliament's database available at http://www.parliament.uk/edm/. Each EDM constitutes a coding unit. It is tested against the keywords that indicate the presence of minority issues in the text.

Methodology

Drawing upon the content of the Early Day Motions sponsored by MPs with Jewish, Muslim and non-minority background in 1997-2012, the paper explores:

(1) whether politicians with a certain minority background raise issues of concern for a respective minority, including community- and countries of origin-related topics;

(2) how often they raise these issues in comparison to politicians with different religious backgrounds.

The analysis is conducted in two stages. Relational computer-aided dictionary-based content analysis is applied to study the EDMs tabled by the selected MPs. The 'keyword-in-context' search of the EDMs gives the number of references to minority-related topics, including British Muslim, British Jewry, South Asia, and the Middle East (y) [4].

The content analysis output (y) is then re-coded in STATA, merged with the MPs' biographical data and declared to be a time series cross-sectional (TSCS) data. To test the hypotheses, the number of references (y) is regressed against the MPs' biographical data (x) per session (t). Prais-Winsten regression with standard errors search and cluster robust inference is applied to account for serial correlation within the TSCS data, get robust standard errors and test statistics (Wooldridge, 2013, Becketti, 2013).

The model includes the number of references to minority-related issues[5] (y) regressed against religious identity[6], ethnicity[7], country of birth[8] and share of minority population in the constituency[9] (x) coded as dummy variables. It is tested for autocorrelation of standard errors using the Durbin-Watson test and cluster robust interference.

Local polynomial smoothers graphically represent the distribution of the mean averages of the number of references to minority-related issues across parliamentary sessions. The main reason for using the mean averages rather than actual numbers is the uneven distribution of references and the number of the EDMs across MPs with different background and sessions (Table 1).

Table 1. Number of the EDMs sponsored

Religious Background	1997/2001	2001/2005	2005/2010	2010/2012	Total
Jewish	244	273	1943	643	**3103**
Muslim	7	16	117	56	**196**
Non-minority	96	111	1366	289	**1862**

The TSCS regression analysis allows controlling for the uneven distribution of references across time. Graphical depiction of the references, however, requires smoothing the data. Use of the absolute numbers is misleading due to variations in the number of MPs with different religious background and the number of the EDMs they sponsored.

---

[4] See Appendix 1 for full analytic schedule.
[5] Community affairs (British Jewry & British Muslims); foreign affairs (South Asia, Israel & Middle East)
[6] Jewish/non-Jewish, Muslim/non-Muslim, Christian/non-Christian
[7] White or South Asian
[8] UK or Overseas born
[9] Constituencies are defined as 'Jewish' (5 per cent of population and over), 'Muslim' (10 per cent or population and over), and 'White' (2001 and 2011 Census)

Discussion

TSCS regression analyses

The results of the regression analyses contradict the hypothesis in almost all cases. There are no statistically significant correlations between religious minority identity and the number of references to issues of concern for Jewish and Muslim minorities, including community affairs and the Middle East. The data resoundingly rejects, therefore, the main research hypothesis of this study. Being from a Jewish or Muslim background does not have a significant impact on the engagement of Jewish or Muslim MPs with minority issues. This does not mean that these MPs never provide their opinions and expertise in relation to such issues – but it indicates that they do not promote or represent such issues any more or less than an MP from a non-minority background[10].

TSCS local polynomial smoothers

The regression analyses do not find any evidence to support the research hypothesis. Engagement of minority MPs with minority-related topics is statistically insignificant. However, they raise such topics occasionally. It is interesting to find out which topics attract their interest the most and if there are any patterns between these topics and the religious identities of the MPs.

To account for uneven distribution of the references across sessions and identity groups, the mean averages rather than the actual numbers are used. The numbers of references for each group and topic are the output of the relational content analysis. Mean averages indicate the areas of interest to MPs with Jewish, Muslim and non-minority background (Table 2). Local polynomial smoothers are used to graphically represent their distribution between 1997 and 2012 (Figure 1 and 2[11]).

Table 2. References to minority-related issues, mean average

	MPs with Jewish background	MPs with Muslim background	MPs with non-minority background
British Jewry	0.15	0.03	0.13
British Muslims	0.34	0.19	0.20

[10] The only exception to this finding is in matters relating to South Asia. In this case the correlations between Jewish and Muslim religious identity and the number of references are statistically significant (F = .0206 and .000 respectively). The model suggests that, an MP with a Muslim religious and South Asian ethnic background, who is born overseas and represents a constituency with over 10 per cent of Muslim population, is likely to sponsor more motions on topics connected to South Asia than MPs without such a background. However, it is not true for Muslim parliamentarians with other ethnic backgrounds, or representing 'White' constituencies.

[11] Figure 1 shows the dynamic of referring to community affairs. It includes issues of interest for British Jewish and Muslim communities connected to faith schools, faith-based NGOs, places of worship, community cohesion and interfaith dialogue.

Figure 2 demonstrates the distribution of references to South Asia, Israel and the Middle East, drawing upon important political, socio-economic and cultural events, history, and geography of these areas.

Israel & Middle East	0.49	0.08	0.28
South Asia	0.34	0.18	0.15

Despite the fact that overall mean averages for MPs' references to minority-related issues are quite small, there are some indications of emerging trends. In particular, MPs with all religious background express interest in British Muslims and to an extent South Asia. The Middle East attracts the attention of MPs with Jewish and non-minority backgrounds, but almost none from the Muslim parliamentarians. Issues connected to the UK's Jewish communities are occasionally mentioned by the Jewish and non-minority politicians, but hardly ever by Muslim MPs.

Table 2 shows that MPs with Jewish backgrounds are sponsoring the minority-related EDMs the most. They have a clear interest in the Middle East and to an extent in the issues related to the UK's Muslim communities and South Asia. Muslim parliamentarians, by contrast, barely reflect on Muslim-related topics and hardly ever mention the Middle East. It is different from non-minority MPs whose interest in the region is almost twice as high comparing to South Asia. They also frequently address Muslim community issues.

The distribution of references to minority-related issues shows limited a connection between the minority identity of the MPs and their interest to minority issues - with two notable exclusions. First, MPs with a Jewish background are far more engaged with Middle Eastern issues than other identity groups. Second, of all minority-related topics, Muslim MPs tend to address those connected to South Asian Muslims. These cases, however, cannot prove that minority MPs are more likely to sponsor minority-related motions. Non-minority MPs engage with these issues at the same level, whereas Jewish MPs raise Muslim-related topics almost twice as often as Muslim MPs.

The distribution of references across parliamentary sessions (Figure 1 and 2) show that interest in minority-related topics is triggered by important domestic and international events, such as the 7/7 London bombings, the Second Lebanon War, the assassination of Benazir Bhutto and the introduction of the state of emergency in Pakistan (EDM 64 2007-08). These events affect both community and foreign affairs (DeHanas et al., 2010; O'Toole et al., 2013).

For instance, after the 2005 terrorist attacks, MPs with Muslim (0.63), Jewish (0.84) and non-minority (0.52) backgrounds expressed a lot of concern regarding social cohesion, combating extremism and Islamophobia[12]. A week after the attacks, Keith Vaz's motion was backed by all the Muslim MPs, urging the Government to ensure 'that nothing imperils the diverse and multicultural character of the UK' (EDM 589 2005-06). Intending

---

[12] Starting from the 1997 Runnymede Trust report on Islamophobia, a number of NGOs and research centres such as the Muslim Council of Britain and European Muslim Research Centre (EMRC) expressed concern over misrepresentation of Muslims and growing Islamophobia in the UK (Runnymede Trust, 1997; MCB & EMRC, 2009-2011).

to mitigate xenophobia in society the parliamentarians called on the Government 'to bring in tighter regulation to tackle all forms of religious and racial discrimination (EDM 934 2005-06; EDM 1523 2005-06; EDM 955 2010-12).

The attacks were committed by Muslims of South Asian origin, which raised concerns over stability and democratic development of the region and its impact on UK internal security, as expressed in the EDMs (EDM 64 2007-08; EDM 2549 2005-06; EDM 1565 2007-08). From the mid-2000s Muslim MPs' interest in South Asia remained relatively high (mean references – 0.18 to 0.63), as did the level of engagement of MPs with Jewish and non-minority backgrounds – 0.23 to 0.81 and 0.16 to 0.52 respectively.

The MPs' interest in the Middle East followed the same pattern – significant events in the region increased the number of references. Since the Iraq War the average number of references to Israel and the Middle East remained above 0.31 among the MPs with Jewish background. Furthermore, the debates over the status of Palestine in the United Nations and UNESCO (EDM 2357 2010-12/2357; EDM 2135 2010-12) increased the mean average of references to 2.05 in the 2010/12 session. That was twice as high as the level of engagement of non-minority MPs. Of all minority-related issues, the Middle East attracted the most attention from parliamentarians with a Jewish background. The content of the motions indicates strong opinions on the matters, but with no consistency in attitudes the MPs (EDM 1641 2006-07).

Muslim parliamentarians, on the other hand, did not sponsor a single motion on that matter in eight of fourteen parliamentary sessions between 1997 and 2012. A slight increase of interest from 0.27 mentions on average to 0.36 followed the start of the Second Lebanon War, when the Muslim MPs expressed concerns over the humanitarian situation in the Palestinian Territories (EDM 1784 2002-03; EDM 2498 2005-06; EDM 2648 2005-06; EDM 1142 2005-06), and called for open and fair negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians (EDM 457 2008-09; EDM 1841 2006-07). The number of motions was small, and none of them were tabled after Mohammad Sarwar's resignation in 2010.

Finally, the number of references to minority-related issues does not increase with the number of minority MPs in the House. For instance, Muslim parliamentarians raised Muslims-related issues most frequently in the 2005 Parliament with four Muslim MPs in the House. Nine Muslim politicians were elected in 2010, but the frequency of references to British Muslims and South Asia dropped by half and by two thirds respectively. This rejects the assumption that a growing number of minority politicians necessarily improve representation of minority interests.

Conclusion

The analyses in this study clearly demonstrate that Jewish and Muslim MPs are no more or less likely to raise issues relating to these minority backgrounds than other MPs. Such MPs do not sponsor a disproportionate number of EDMs relating to issues of concern for their minority group, demonstrating that increasing the number of MPs from Jewish and Muslim backgrounds in the House of Commons should not be expected to improve the representation of Jewish and/or Muslim issues in Parliament. Rather, these issues are a matter of common debate that engages politicians in their personal capacity and expertise. There is no evidence to suggest that a religious minority background creates a bias that encourages MPs to engage with these issues.

This finding is perhaps not surprising as parliamentarians must be seen as rational policy-makers who operate in a highly constrained working environment – they arguably should not be expected to push hard for such minority issues given their other obligations as MPs (such as to their party or other constituents, for example). However, this study has shown that this remains true even in low-cost parliamentary activities when party discipline is loosened, and where there is a greater opportunity for self-expression.

This suggests that minority politicians do not necessarily engage with issues of minority concern, or at least are raising these topics as frequently as non-minority politicians. As the result, representation of minority interests does not benefit from being exclusively delivered by MPs with a certain minority background. On the contrary, politicians with diverse religious backgrounds, who are willing to and capable of engaging with issues of minority concern, can improve minority representation.

So why don't minority politicians represent exclusively minority interests? Firstly, party and parliamentary constraints favour a certain type of behaviour, and therefore, encourage self-censorship of the Members on sensitive issues. That is demonstrated by the comparatively rare engagement of Muslim MPs on Muslim-related issues. They stand out due to their ethnic and religious backgrounds, and do not want to be seen as single-issues MPs driven by ethnicity or religious beliefs rather than the reason.

Secondly, the question can be asked as should minorities represent minorities given their primary duties are to the party and constituency that select and elected them? The analysis shows that non-minority MPs raise minority-related issues. Therefore, representation of interests is delivered by MPs regardless their religious background. As the result, minority MPs are needed as role models and to improve descriptive representation. Substantive representation, on the other hand, should be represented by either non-minority Members or both minority and non-minority politicians rather than exclusively by the latter.

Finally, the findings of this analysis give rise to several further questions which should form the basis of future research. Finding that increasing the number of MPs from Jewish and Muslim backgrounds does not improve the frequency or intensity of representation of Jewish/Muslim oriented political issues raises questions about the representation of other minority issues as well, such as those relating to women, young people, or gay people. This research would suggest that increasing the number of female, young or gay MPs in the House of Commons should not necessarily be expected to improve the representation of women's, young people's or gay people's issues in Parliament, as the same institutional constraints which prevent Jewish and Muslim MPs from promoting Jewish and Muslim issues any more than non-minority MPs would apply there as well. Given the importance attached to improving the representation of women in Parliament through selecting more female MPs by political parties – particularly the Labour Party which has used all-women short-lists to ensure more women are elected to Parliament for some time – this would be a particularly salient piece of research and should be prioritised as an avenue of further study.

Further questions can also be asked regarding why MPs from minority backgrounds are so constrained once in the House of Commons to the extent that they do not increase the representation of minority issues in Parliamentary business. This study speculates that institutional constraints – particularly those stemming from party loyalty – are key in this context, however there is a clear need for further research to establish this as fact. Such a study would constitute a significant step forward in understanding how the representation of minority issues can be improved in Parliament.

In laying the groundwork for such future research, this study has demonstrated that there is a clear distinction between substantive representation of minority-specific issues and symbolic representation delivered through increasing the number of minority-background MPs in the House of Commons. Its findings are of particular importance for any concerned about the representation of issues of salience to minority communities or under-represented social groups – whether Jewish, Muslim, women, gays or young people for example -, and for political parties. They show that if political parties are serious about improving the representation of minority issues and communities in Parliament, they will have to go much further than simply ensuring that more people from such backgrounds make it into the House of Commons.

Appendix 1. Content analysis schedule

Content Analysis Step-by-Step Schedule

1. Data selection and sampling
2. Data synchronisation and coding
3. Development of analytic tools

4. Relational computer-aided content analysis
5. Statistical analysis of the output as time series cross-sectional data in STATA

Step1. Data Selection & Sampling

Coding units:

- 5160 Early Day Motions

Units of analysis:

- 38 MPs with Jewish background
- 11 MPs with Muslim background
- 25 MPs with non-minority background (control group)

This selection is determined the research question – if religious minority background impacts on parliamentary behaviour of religious minority MPs. References to minority-related issues in the EDMs indicate the influence of MPs' religious minority background in low-cost parliamentary activities[13].

Therefore, sampling is applied to select MPs. All EDMs tabled by selected MPs are coded for content analysis.

The sample of MPs includes all 38 Jewish and 11 Muslim politicians elected to the House of Commons between 1997 and 2010 and equals to population (Table 3).

Table 3. Number of MP with religious minority background

Parliament	MPs with Jewish background	MPs with Muslim background
1997-2001	22	1
2001-2005	23	2
2005-2010	25	4
2010-	26	9

Source: Janner and Taylor, 2008; OBV 2008; OMV, 2010

A control group of 25 non-minority MPs is selected using stratified random sampling (Lynch, 2012). Including a contrast group aims to avoid construct validity and indicate the difference (if any) between the frequency of raising minority-related issues by minority and non-minority MPs.

Sampling of non-minority MPs has an element of randomisation, yet is stratified. They are characterised by the following qualities: (1) white ethnic background, (2) Christian or secular religious background, (3) represent constituencies with significant Jewish/Muslim

---

[13] Less constrained by the party discipline and parliamentary procedure

minority population and predominantly white constituencies, and (4) be elected from the Labour, Conservative or Liberal Democrat parties in 1997-2010.

The sample reflects on religious background, party identification and a type of constituency with regard to minority population of an MP. Overall, it includes seventy-four MPs.

<u>Step 2. Data Synchronisation and Coding</u>

The data include all EDMs tabled by the selected MPs and organised by MP.

The EDMs are collected from the Parliament's database http://www.parliament.uk/edm/. In total, 5160 EDMs were tabled between 10 July 1997 and 30 April 2012[14] by MPs with Jewish and Muslim background and non-minority MPs. 1862 EDMs were sponsored by non-minority MPs, and 3102 and 196 by MPs with Jewish and Muslim background, respectively.

EDMs are coded manually by number and date tabled and saved as txt. files suitable for reading in the Yoshikoder content analysis software. Each file includes the EDM body text, information about its sponsors and a total number of signatures.

The main limitation of the data is that motions are unevenly distributed across parliamentary sessions, Members and minorities with the number of motions varying from zero to hundreds. For instance, the number of the EDMs tabled by Jewish and Muslim MPs in the 2005 Parliament was seven times more than in the previous two parliaments together; and Muslim MPs sponsored ten times fewer EDMs than Jewish politicians.

<u>Step 3. Development of Analytic Tools (conceptual dictionary)</u>

The main analytic tool for the relational content analysis is a conceptual dictionary. Constructing a conceptual dictionary is a data-driven, deductive-inductive process of selecting key concepts and indicators, testing them on sub-samples on the data, and correcting the dictionary.

For the purpose of the research the dictionary identifies the key issues related to Jewish and Muslim minorities in Britain and indicators to them. The issues are coded as dictionary concepts (or themes), whereas indicators (or keywords) are entries of lower hierarchy that define them. Each unit of text analysis is searched electronically for each indicator that refers to a certain concept. Variations of spelling and transliteration are considered too.

---

[14] Dates of the first and last EDMs tabled in the 1997/1998 and 2010/2012 parliamentary session respectively.

Importantly, the indicators do not unpack the meaning of the concepts, but identify them in the text, due to there is no attitudinal element to the analysis.

The concepts and indicators are compiled from the materials featured in the records of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights; Runnymede Trust; Muslim Council of Britain, The Board of Jewish Deputies, and prior research[15].

Overall, six concepts defined by 1082 indicators have been selected:

- British Jewry – 232 indicators

- British Muslims – 307 indicators

- Israel & Middle East – 384 indicators

- South Asia – 159 indicators[16]

The indicators reflect on Jewish and Muslim minority-specific and general concerns.

'British Jewry' and 'Israel & Middle East' are targeted on the Jewish minority, whereas 'British Muslims', 'Israel & Middle East,' and 'South Asia' - on the Muslim communities. Together they create an instrument for text analysis that grasps different sides of what being a member of religious migrant-origin minority in Britain imply from entering the country as a migrant to settling down, integrating and building up relations with the host society whilst maintaining ties with the countries of origin.

The dictionary is tested on samples of data (EDMs only) to ensure that indicators are relevant and point at the respective concepts. Altering the dictionary is essential due to technical differences in language used by politicians, researchers and activists on minority-related issues which are often sensitive. Also, there are spelling variations caused by transliteration of words from Arabic, Yiddish and Hebrew, changes of the English language over time, and discreet manner of MPs' political self-expression.

Pilot studies are conducted on EDMs tabled during parliamentary debates on the invasion in Iraq in 2002/2003, following the 7/7 bombings, and on the EDMs tabled by randomly chosen MPs, including Robert Halfon, Sadiq Khan, Glenda Jackson, etc. The pilot testing have been very useful and eliminated several concepts such as 'Crusade', for instance, which is used differently by the politicians and community leaders. Apparently, in the EDMs context it indicates 'a national crusade for good parenting' (EDM 391 1997-98). On the other hand, some indicators such as 'Palestin*' work incredibly well (EDM 304 2010-12).

---

[15] Kosmin and Levy. 1983; Alderman, 1983; Alderman, 1998; Linehan, 2000; Endelman, 2002; Sajid, 2005; Werbner, 2005; Baxter, 2006; Field, 2007; Modood, 2007; Bunzl, 2007; Field, 2009; Radcliffe, 2004; Abbas, 2011; Bleich, 2011; Abbas (ed.), 2011; Linehan, 2012; Woodhead and Catto (eds), 2012, etc.
[16] The indicators capture the roots of words and phrases in order to consider variation in spelling, cases, etc. Therefore, in practice 1287 indicators point at several times more words and phrases during the analysis.

<u>Step 4. Relational Computer-Aided Content Analysis</u>

Relational computer-aided dictionary-based content analysis is used in the study. It searches for frequency of references to minority issues in the EDMs tabled by the MPs in the sample. Frequency of references is defined by the number of hits with minority-related concepts summed by MP.

The analysis is computer-aided and conducted using the Yoshikoder software. It is a cross-platform multilingual program for dictionary-based content analysis. It applies the constructed dictionary performing content analyses in different languages including Arabic, Yiddish and Hebrew. Significant advantage of the software is that it produces xml. and csv. outputs suitable for reading in statistical packages such as SPSS and STATA.

The analysis tests EDMs against the dictionary concepts (or themes). The output includes the number of references to each category summed by MP and saved as xml. files.

References

Abbas, T. (ed.) (2011) *Islamic Radicalism and Multicultural Politics: The British Experience*. London and New York: Routledge.

Alderman, G. (1983) *The Jewish Community in British Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Alderman, G. (1998) *Modern British Jewry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baxter, K. (2006) 'From Migrants to Citizens: Muslims in Britain', *Migrants & Minorities*, 24(2): 166-182.

Becketti, S. (2013) *Introduction to Time Series Using Stata*. College Station, Texas: A Stata Press Publication StataCorp LP.

Bird, K., Saalfeld, T., Wust, A. (eds) (2011) *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities. Voters, parties and parliaments in liberal democracies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bleich, E. (2011) 'What Is Islamophobia and How Much Is There? Theorizing and Measuring an Emerging Comparative Concept', *American Behavioural Scientist* 55(12): 1581-1600.

Bunzl, M. (2007) Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Hatreds Old and New in Europe. Chicago: Paradigm.

Childs, S., Withey, J. (2004) 'The Substantive Representation of Women: The Case of the Reduction of VAT on Sanitary Products', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 59 (1): 10-23.

Claire, A., Redclift, V., Hussain., A. (eds) (2013) *The New Muslims*. London: Runnymede Perspective.

DeHanas, D.N., Modood, T., Meer, N. (2010) *Muslim Participation in Contemporary Governance. A Brief Introduction*. Muslim Participation in Contemporary Governance Working Paper No.1.

Available at: http://www.bris.ac.uk/ethnicity/projects/muslimparticipation/documents/ workingpaper1.pdf (Accessed 31 January 2013).

Durose, C., Gains, F., Richardson, L., Combs, R., Broome, K., Eason, C., (2011) *Pathways to Politics, Research Report 65*, Equality and Human Rights Commission. Available at: www.equalityhumanrights.com (Accessed 10 March 2012).

EDM 1142 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/1142 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 1523 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/1523 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 1565 2007/08. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2007-08/1565 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 1641 2006/07. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2006-07/1641 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 1784 2002/03. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2002-03/1784 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 1841 2006/07. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2006-07/1841 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 2135 2010/12. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2010-12/2135 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 2357 2010/12. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2010-12/2357 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 2498 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/2498 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 2549 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/2549 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 2648 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/2648 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 304 2010/12. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2010-12/304 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 391 1997/98. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/1997-98/391 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 457 2008/09. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2008-09/457 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 589 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/589 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 64 2007/08. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2007-08/64 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 934 2005/06. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2005-06/934 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

EDM 955 2010/12. Available at: http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2010-12/955 (Accessed 02 February 2013)

Endelman, T.M. (2002) *Jews of Modern Britain, 1656-2000*, University of California Press.

European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2006) *Muslims in the European Union: Discrimination and Islamophobia*. Available at http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/156-Manifestations_EN.pdf (Accessed 15 October 2011)

European Muslim Research Centre (EMRC) at the University of Exeter (2009-2011) *Reports on Hate Crimes*. Available at http://centres.exeter.ac.uk/emrc/publications.php (Accessed 20 June 2012)

Field, C.D. (2007) 'Islamophobia in Contemporary Britain: the Evidence of the Opinion Polls, 1988-2006', *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 18(4): 447-477.

Field, C.D. (2009) *Religious Statistics in Great Britain: An Historical Introduction*. Manchester: Institute for Social Change, University of Manchester.

Finer, E.S., Berrington, H.B., Bartholomew, D.J. (1961) *Backbench Opinion in the House of Commons 1955-1959*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Gutmann, A. (2003) 'Religion and State in the United States: A Defence of Two-Way Protection' in *Obligations of Citizenship and Demands of Faith: Religious Accommodation in Pluralist Democracies*, edited by Nancy L. Rosenblum. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 127-164.

House of Commons (2009) *Speaker's Conference (on Parliamentary Representation) Final Report*. London: The Stationery Office.

House of Commons (2010) *Early Day Motions*. London: House of Commons Information Office.

Hudson, L. (ed.) (2010) *Zionism: A Jewish Communal Response from the UK*. London: Board of Jewish Deputies.

Janner, G., Taylor, D. (2008) *Jewish Parliamentarians*. London: Vallentine Mitchell & Co Limited.

Kosmin, B.A., Levy, C. (1983) *Jewish Identity in an Anglo-Jewish Community: The Findings of the 1978 Redbridge Jewish Survey*. London: Research Unit, Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Lazar, A., Kravetz, S. & Frederich–Kedem, P. (2002) 'The Multidimensionality of Motivation for Jewish Religious Behaviour: Content, Structure, and Relationship to Religious Identity', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41: 509–519.

Linehan, T. (2000) *British Fascism, 1918-1939: Parties, Ideology and Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Linehan, T. (2012) 'Comparing Antisemitism, Islamophobia, and Asylophobia: the British Case', *Studies of Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 12/2: 366-386.

Lynch, G. (2012) *Sampling*. Materials of the Contemporary Methods in the Study of Religion School, University of Kent, February 2013.

Modood, T. (2007) *Multiculturalism as a Civic Idea.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Norton, P. (2001) 'Playing by the Rules: The Constraining Hand of Parliamentary Procedure', *The Journal of Legislative Studies,* 7(3): 13-33.

OMV (2010) *Muslim Vote 2010.* Available at: http://www.muslimvote.org.uk/ (Accessed 11 April 2011).

O'Toole, T., DeHanas, D., Modood, T., Meer, N., Jones., S. (2013) *Taking Part : Muslim Participation in Contemporary Governance* Report. Bristol: University of Bristol. Available at: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/ethnicity/projects/muslimparticipation/documents/mpcgreport.pdf (Accessed 20 February 2013).

Operation Black Vote (2008) *How to Achieve Netter BME Political Representation*. London: Government Equalities Office.

Radcliffe (2004) 'A Muslim Lobby at Whitehall? Examining the Role of the Muslim Minority in British Foreign Policy Making', *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 15(3): 365-386.

Runnymede Trust (1997) *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All.* London: Runnymede Trust Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia.

Saalfeld, T., Bischof, D. (2013) 'Minority-Ethnic MPs and the Substantive Representation of Minority Interests in the House of Commons, 2005-2011', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 66(2): 305-328.

Sajid, I.A. (2005) 'Islamophobia: A New Word for an Old Fear', *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 12(203): 31-40.

Saward, M. (2011) *The Representative Claim* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Sinno, A.H. (ed.) (2009) *Muslims: In Western Politics*. Indiana University Press.

Strom, K. (1997) 'Rules, Reasons and Routines: Legislative Rules in Parliamentary Democracies', in W.Muller and T.Saalfeld (eds.), *Members of Parliament in Western Europe: Roles and Behaviour*. London: Frank Cass.

Vertovec, S. (2009) *Transnationalism*. London, New York: Routledge.

Werbner, P. (2005) 'Islamophobia: Incitement to Religious Hatred – Legislating for a New Fear?' *Anthropology Today* 21(1): 5-9.

Woodhead, L., Catto, R. (eds) (2012) *Religion and Change in Modern Britain*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wooldridge, J.M. (2013) *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach* (5th edition). South-Western: Cengage Learning.