



Paterson, Ian (2017) *Love thy neighbour? The impact of political religious elite discourse on immigration attitudes*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/8642/>

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten:Theses  
<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/>  
theses@gla.ac.uk

**Love thy neighbour? The impact of political and religious elite  
discourse on immigration attitudes**

**Ian Paterson, MA (Hons), MSc**

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**School of Social and Political Sciences**

**College of Social Sciences**

**University of Glasgow**

**September 2017**

## **Abstract**

Over the last three decades, and most recently during the Brexit debate, migration has increasingly been framed as a security issue in the UK and beyond. Amidst what has become a divisive and at times toxic debate on migration, the importance of developing a nuanced understanding of the security-migration nexus, particularly regarding the construction of immigration attitudes, is more pressing than ever. While research has determined a series of variables that impact on immigration attitudes, the influence of elite cues has been underexplored and restricted to political elites and political parties. Moreover, the analysis of the content of migration cues espoused by UK elites has been underdeveloped. Drawing on and extending the Copenhagen School's securitization theory and applying a mixed-methods approach, the aim of this thesis is to contribute to our understanding of how immigration attitudes are shaped. Using discourse analysis, the central migration frames from the four largest UK-wide parties (Conservatives, Labour, Liberal Democrats and UKIP) are identified, between 2005-2015. The thesis then expands on this limited set of actors to include a previously neglected, but potentially highly influential group – religious elites – and conducts a discourse analysis of elite migration messaging for the two largest UK faiths (Anglicanism and Catholicism). Unsurprisingly political elite cues present migration in predominantly negative terms (securitizing frames). This is in contrast, however, to the predominantly positive migration cues (desecuritizing frames) from religious elites. Nevertheless analysing discursive constructions of migration alone cannot determine whether these elite cues are having any effect on public attitudes. Therefore, quantitative analyses using data from the European Social Survey are introduced to connect elite discourse to immigration attitudes – in securitization parlance, to 'bring in the audience'. The findings from the statistical analyses broadly support the argument that elite cues can influence immigration attitudes, and therefore contribute to the de/construction of security issues. Overall this thesis enriches our understanding of the drivers of immigration attitudes, the discursive de/construction of migration as a security issue and the role of non-traditional elite actors in the de/construction of migration as a security issue. More broadly, the thesis also speaks to the strengths and limitations of securitization theory both theoretically and methodologically.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
List of Tables .....	7
Acknowledgment .....	8
Declaration.....	10
List of Abbreviations .....	11
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	12
1.1 Introduction .....	12
1.2 An Outward Looking Nation? Contextualising Contemporary UK Migration Politics.....	14
1.3 Empirical, Methodological and Theoretical Gaps: Situating the Thesis in the Literature .....	16
1.3.1 If Security Means Everything, it Means Nothing: Securitization Theory to the Rescue? .....	16
1.3.2 Widening the Analytical Net: UK Political and Religious Elites .....	17
1.3.3 Love Thy Neighbour? .....	19
1.3.4 Message Received? ‘Bringing the Audience Back In’ to Securitization Theory .....	22
1.3.5 Research Questions.....	23
1.4 Summary of Findings and Thesis Contributions.....	24
1.5 Roadmap: Chapter Overview .....	26
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework .....	28
2.1 Introduction .....	28
2.2 Situating Securitization: Security Studies and the Copenhagen School .....	29
2.3 Defining Securitization Theory.....	30
2.4 Extending Securitization Theory: Widening the Analytical Net .....	32
2.4.1 No Room at the Inn: Previous Neglect of Religious Elite Actors.....	33
2.4.2 ‘Is There Any Room in the Stable at Least?’ Insights from Framing Theory .....	34
2.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour? .....	37
2.4.4 Defining Religiosity.....	38
2.5 Extending Securitization Theory: ‘Bringing the Audience Back In’ .....	40
2.6 Bringing which Audience(s) Back In? .....	45
2.7 Conclusion .....	46
Chapter 3: Methodology and Analytical Framework.....	48
3.1 Introduction .....	48
3.2 The Case of the UK .....	49
3.2.1 The Period of Analysis.....	51
3.3 The ‘Obvious Method’ to Study Security: Outlining the Design of the Discourse Analysis ....	52
3.3.1 Source Selection.....	52
3.3.2 Us vs. Them: Defining De/Securitizing Discourses.....	57
3.3.3 Analytical Framework: Structuring the Discourse Analysis .....	60

3.3.4 Nuts and Bolts: The Analytical Process .....	70
3.4 Copy That? Connecting Elite Discourse with the Audience .....	70
3.4.1 The Data .....	71
3.4.2 The Independent and Dependent Variables .....	71
3.4.3 The Control Variables.....	71
3.4.4 The Models.....	75
3.5 Conclusion .....	76
Chapter 4: 'We are by Nature a Tolerant Country': Political Elite Discourse on Migration .....	79
4.1 Introduction .....	79
4.2 Identitarian Axis .....	81
4.2.1 Introduction .....	81
4.2.2 Conservatives .....	82
4.2.3 Labour .....	84
4.2.4 Liberal Democrats .....	86
4.2.5 UKIP .....	88
4.2.6 'The Securitization of Tolerance': Help or Hindrance? .....	90
4.3 Securitarian Axis.....	91
4.3.1 Introduction .....	91
4.3.2 Conservatives .....	91
4.3.3 Labour .....	93
4.3.4 Liberal Democrats .....	94
4.3.5 UKIP .....	95
4.4 Economic Axis .....	97
4.4.1 Introduction .....	97
4.4.2 Conservatives .....	98
4.4.3 Labour .....	100
4.4.4 Liberal Democrats .....	101
4.4.5 UKIP .....	103
4.5 Political Axis .....	105
4.5.1 Introduction .....	105
4.5.2 Conservatives .....	106
4.5.3 Labour .....	107
4.5.4 Liberal Democrats .....	109
4.5.5 UKIP .....	110
4.6 Conclusion .....	111
Chapter 5: Love Thy Neighbour? Religious Elite Discourse on Migration .....	116
5.1 Introduction .....	116

5.2 Thou Shalt...? Guiding Principles.....	118
5.2.1 Guiding Principles: The Catholic Church .....	118
5.2.2 Guiding Principles: The Anglican Church .....	120
5.3 Any Room at the Inn? Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration .....	121
5.3.1 Introduction .....	121
5.3.2 Identitarian Axis .....	122
5.3.3 The Political Axis .....	129
5.3.4 The Economic Axis .....	131
5.3.5 The Securitarian Axis.....	134
5.3.6 Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse Summary .....	136
5.4 Any Room at the Inn? Catholic Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration .....	136
5.4.1 Introduction .....	136
5.4.2 Identitarian Axis .....	136
5.4.3 The Political Axis .....	139
5.4.4 The Economic Axis .....	140
5.4.5 The Securitarian Axis.....	142
5.4.6 Catholic Church and Church Elite Summary .....	143
5.5 Conclusion.....	143
Chapter 6: Message Received? Analysis of Public Opinion regarding Immigration .....	147
6.1 Introduction .....	147
6.2 Data and Variables .....	150
6.3 Bringing in the Audience: Political Elites.....	151
6.3.1 Introduction .....	151
6.3.2 Labour .....	152
6.3.3 Liberal Democrats .....	152
6.3.4 UKIP.....	153
6.3.5 Remaining Parties .....	155
6.3.6 Religious Denomination.....	155
6.3.7 Other Demographics.....	156
6.3.8 Non-Demographics .....	156
6.3.9 Political Elite Cues Summary.....	157
6.4 Bringing in the Audience: Religious Elites.....	158
6.4.1 Introduction .....	158
6.4.2 Cross National Bivariate Analysis .....	158
6.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour? Multivariate Analyses – Religious Elite Discourse and the Audience .....	163
6.5 Conclusion.....	170

Chapter 7: Conclusion .....	174
7.1 Introduction .....	174
7.2 Summary of Main Findings .....	175
7.2.1 Rhetorically De/Securitizing Migration in the UK (And Beyond?): The Discourse Analysis .....	175
7.2.2. From De/Securitizing Moves to De/Securitizations? The Statistical Analyses.....	180
7.3 Implications.....	182
7.4 As One Door Closes... Limitations and Avenues for Further Research .....	184
Appendix .....	189
Survey Data: Questions and Scales .....	189
Tables from Chapter 6: Bivariate and Multivariate Analyses .....	190
References .....	214

## List of Tables

Table 3.1: Political Elite Discourse Analysis Sources – Actors and Platform

Table 3.2: Anglican Elite Discourse Analysis Sources – Actors and Platform

Table 3.3: Catholic Elite Discourse Analysis Sources – Actors and Platform

Table 4.1: Summary of Discourse Analysis of Political Elites

Table 5.1: Four Axes – Hegemonic Frames from the Anglican Church and Church Elites in the UK

Table 5.2: Four Axes – Hegemonic Frames from the Catholic Church and Church Elites in the UK

Table 6.1: Cross-National Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7)

Table 6.2: Cross-National Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Split by Survey Round

Table 6.3: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Denomination

Table 4: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Split by Round, Split by Denomination

Table 6.5: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Citizenship

Table 6.6: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Split by Survey Round, Split by Citizenship

Table 6.7: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Citizenship, Split by Denomination

Table 6.8: UK Bivariate Correlations (Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity), Split by Survey Round, Split by Citizenship, Split by Denomination:

Table 6.9 - Regression to Explore Political Elite Discourse

Table 6.10 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Anglican

Table 6.11 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Catholic

Table 6.12 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Islam

Table 6.13 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: ‘Other’ Denominations Combined

Table 6.14 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Round 7 with Contact for each Denomination

Table 6.15 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Cumulative

Table 6.16 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Cumulative, with Contact



## Acknowledgment

There are several acknowledgements that I am obliged and delighted to make.

First, I would like to extend a sincere thanks to my PhD supervisors Dr Georgios Karyotis and Professor Lauren McLaren. Your expertise, guidance and support throughout the process have been invaluable. The enthusiasm for the research, belief in my abilities and the degree of patience you have maintained has been inspiring – and is deeply appreciated. Beyond the thesis, the level of interest and care you have shown in developing my academic capabilities for my career going forward has been wonderful, and I am thoroughly grateful for it. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have had you both as my supervisors. I look forward to the day when I can return the favour.

Second, it is essential I pay homage to all of the people in the Politics subject area at the University of Glasgow who have fostered a friendly, supportive and engaging research environment. I would also like to thank several people individually. First, a special thanks to Dr Mo Hume who has been exceedingly helpful in her role as head of the PGR programme. Second, to Dr Ana Langer and Dr Ty Solomon for running the Research Clusters that have been so valuable in allowing me to develop as a researcher and hone my critical faculties. Third, to all of those involved in Politics 2A, especially Dr Karen Wright and Dr Karen Siegal, both of whom have offered me humbling support and guidance. Fourth, to Dr Cian O'Driscoll who was a great source of inspiration and support in enabling me to undertake my PhD in the first place, and has been an excellent five-a-side companion throughout. Last, I would like to thank my fellow PGR's, and especially Dr Kate Spence, for making my research process a thoroughly enjoyable one.

Next, I have to thank my friends. Senay Habtemariam and Conor Campbell, besides providing an uncanny ability to help me develop my ideas and knowledge through incisive analysis, questioning and discussion, have both managed to keep me laughing all the way through. The Dysart Rovers - Paul, Iain and Wayne - have been able to keep me motivated by helping me enjoy myself and recharge and for that I am sincerely grateful.

Last, I want to declare my overwhelming gratitude to my family. The support of my Mum, Dad, Brother and Nana has been the bedrock for the entirety of my academic exploits to date. Without their belief, support and generosity I would not have had the opportunity to undertake this research and pursue my passion. My older brother Ross has been an ever present source of advice, calm, and inspiration throughout my life - his role in helping me grow and believe in myself will never be forgotten. I cannot hope to convey

how grateful and humbled I am for everything you as a family have done for me. Although I will never be able to repay this debt, I will endeavour to make it all worthwhile.

### **Declaration**

I declare that, except where explicit reference is made to the contribution of others, that this dissertation is the result of my own work and has not been submitted for any other degree at the University of Glasgow or any other institution.

Ian Paterson

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## List of Abbreviations

AC – Archbishop of Canterbury

AW – Archbishop of Westminster

BNP – British National Party

CoE – Church of England

CS – Copenhagen School

ESS – European Social Survey

EU – European Union

GE – General Election

PC – Plaid Cymru

SNP – Scottish National Party

UK – United Kingdom

UKIP – United Kingdom Independence Party

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1.1 Introduction

### 1.2 An Outward Looking Nation? Contextualising Contemporary UK Migration Politics

### 1.3 Empirical, Methodological and Theoretical Gaps: Situating the Thesis in the Literature

#### 1.3.1 If Security Means Everything, it Means Nothing: Securitization Theory to the Rescue?

#### 1.3.2 Widening the Analytical Net: UK Political and Religious Elites

#### 1.3.3 Love Thy Neighbour?

#### 1.3.4 Message Received? 'Bringing the Audience Back In' to Securitization Theory

#### 1.3.5 Research Questions

### 1.4 Summary of Findings and Thesis Contributions

### 1.5 Roadmap: Chapter Overview

## 1.1 Introduction

Beginning in the 1980s and intensified by the events of 9/11, migration has increasingly been securitized in Western democracies (Balzacq, 2011; Bigo, 2006b; Doty, 2007; Faist, 2002; Huysmans, 2000, 2006; Karyotis, 2012). Economic austerity following the 'Great Recession' has fostered protectionist, nationalist, anti-immigration rhetoric and policy across European states. The refugee crisis has had a monumental impact on the very identity of the European Union (EU) and European 'society' with the principle of free movement being placed under considerable strain. Continent-wide, right-wing anti-immigration parties have been making political gains. In the United Kingdom (UK) migration has soared in salience, being at, or close to the summit, in terms of what voters view as the most important issue facing the country: over the last decade, in a survey tracking opinion on the 'most important issue facing Britain today', Ipsos Mori (2014) have found that the public have almost continually ranked immigration first or second. In the 2014 European Parliament Elections, the anti-immigration UK Independence Party (UKIP) topped the poll with 27.49% of the vote, before achieving a sizeable vote share of 12.6% in the 2015 General Election (BBC, 2014a)<sup>1</sup>. Most recently, the UK voted for Brexit in the 2016 referendum on EU membership, where migration and border control were at the epicentre of the referendum debate. The incapacity to 'control borders' due to the principle of free movement was critical, with immigration (20%) cited as the second most

---

<sup>1</sup> This was a particularly impressive showing as the first-past-the-post electoral system severely handicaps smaller political parties whose vote share is not geographically concentrated and thus actively discourages people to vote for them. Yet, over 3.88 million votes were cast for UKIP even though this translated into just one parliamentary seat (3,881,099 votes per seat). To contextualise this vote-to-seat ratio, the Conservative's 11.33 million votes and 36.9% of the vote turned into 331 seats (34,243 votes per seat) whilst the SNP's 1.45 million votes 4.7% vote share transferred into 56 seats (25,972 votes per seat).

important issue in driving voting intentions marginally behind the economy (21%) (NatCen, 2016).

At the level of discourse, from 2005 onwards migration messaging has been hardening, with ‘moderate’ and mainstream opposition to migration adopting the rhetoric of the political Right (Hampshire, 2005). The ‘UKIPification’ of UK migration discourse is captured by several notable examples, including the Conservative Party’s controversial illegal immigrants ‘Go Home’ vans in 2013, Labour’s ‘controls on immigration’ mugs released as part of their 2015 General Election campaign and the Liberal Democrats’ mantra that ‘the freedom to move is not the same as the freedom to claim [benefits]’ – whilst Nigel Farage’s controversial statements on HIV ‘health tourism’ in 2015 and the party’s ‘Breaking Point’ poster unveiled during the 2016 Brexit referendum debate underscore the tone set by UKIP. To give just one more example that is indicative of how restrictive migration discourse has become, the UK newspaper with the highest circulation, *The Sun*, published a piece in early 2015 authored by the Right-wing polemicist and celebrity commentator Katie Hopkins, in which she referred to migrants as ‘vermin’ and ‘cockroaches’ whilst advocating the use of British navy gunships to sink the boats of migrants crossing the Mediterranean.

Amidst what has become a divisive and at times toxic debate on immigration, the importance of developing a nuanced understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond), particularly regarding the construction of immigration attitudes, is more pressing than ever. More precisely, drawing upon and extending the Copenhagen School’s (CS) securitization theory and by analysing the UK case for the period between 2005-2015, the thesis intends to develop a better understanding of the relationship between migration and security in two respects: one, at the level of discourse, where previous research has often been limited to political<sup>2</sup> elite actors; and two, the link between migration discourse and public opinion toward migration, where prior research has often focused upon discourse *or* public opinion toward migration. This is the central aim of the thesis. Prior to outlining the specific research questions and the theoretical and analytical framework for addressing said questions, it is first necessary to briefly contextualise contemporary UK migration politics.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this thesis, ‘political’ elites will be used as a label for politicians and political parties. Traditional security actors refer to these political elites and those who operate in the security realm. Other societal actors that are outside of this, namely religious elites, will be referred to as non-traditional security actors or non-political actors based on the above reference point.

## 1.2 An Outward Looking Nation? Contextualising Contemporary UK Migration Politics

It is a common trope in UK political discourse to refer to Britain as an ‘outward looking nation’. An internet search demonstrates the ubiquity of the phrase and others of its nature in political speeches and media analyses. Consistently, the tone is one of pride in Britain’s ‘internationalist’ past that has been ‘open to the world’ – yet a brief sketch of UK migration politics belies this image and the extent to which ‘Britain’ has been comfortable with this ‘outward looking’ identity (McLaren and Johnson, 2007).

Historically, the legacy of empire has ensured migration has been a prominent, challenging and fiercely contested issue in UK politics. Gary Freeman (1979: 38) asserts that ‘one may interpret much of post-war immigration policy in Britain as an attempt to remove rights of citizenship too generously extended during the colonial period’, evidenced by the three pivotal acts that defined UK policy: the 1948 British Nationality Act (BNA); the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act; and the 1981 BNA. The debates surrounding these acts, centring on a tension between liberals and restrictionists – of which the restrictionists continually triumphed (Paul, 1997) – symbolise a deeper tension at the heart of the UK’s political identity between the ‘outward looking nation’ and the inward-focused ‘island nation’. The hysteric and overtly racist reaction to the arrival of the *Empire Windrush* in 1948, Peter Griffiths’ infamous campaign slogan in the 1964 Smethwick by-election, Enoch Powell’s ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech delivered in 1968, and Margaret Thatcher’s reference to Britain being ‘swamped’ by migrants during the 1979 General Election campaign are oft-cited examples that exemplify how toxic the migration debate has been at times in UK.

The 1981 BNA was particularly significant in that, for the first time, British citizenship was entwined with membership of the United Kingdom as a political entity – marking the end of the legislative process designed to tackle the colonial legacy on citizenship rights (Hansen, 2000). In short, the 1981 BNA provided a capacity for administrative restriction meaning previous concerns over numbers of New Commonwealth (namely, non-white) immigrants had been largely assuaged, further evidencing the dominance of restrictionist migration politics<sup>3</sup>. With one door closed,

---

<sup>3</sup> Prior to 1962, the key tension underpinning UK migration policy centred on the desire to keep close ties with the ‘Old’ Commonwealth (Canada, Australia, New Zealand) and preventing the inward migration of ‘New’ Commonwealth ‘citizens’ (argued to be a synonym for ‘coloured’ citizens, see Paul, 1997). Despite pressure from both the public and backbenchers, and even after the 1958 race riots, government maintained a highly liberal formal policy. Yet, discrete administrative and regulative measures to reduce New Commonwealth migration were commonplace (Spencer, 1997). From 1962, however, a consensus had

however, the mid-1980s saw another open that could potentially facilitate large-scale primary immigration: asylum. For consecutive British governments, asylum became another ‘loophole’ (Joppke, 1999: 128) to be closed. Whilst the New Labour administrations (1997-2001, 2001-2005, 2005-2010) are identified with a liberal policy on economic immigration – although this was moderated, particularly in the run up to, and following, the 2005 General Election (Schain, 2008: 142-3) – this was supplemented with exceedingly draconian asylum measures, including the establishment and operation of prison-like detention centres (Hampshire, 2005: 184). Moreover, the rhetorical commitment to multiculturalism present in the first half of New Labour’s rule has been argued to have been undermined and largely disposed of in the latter half (Schain, 2008).

The period toward the end of New Labour’s second term and into their third term in 2005 marked a crucial juncture in UK migration politics. There was increasing support for both the extreme Right-wing British National Party (BNP) and the Right-wing anti-immigration UKIP, whose messages of Britain being ‘full up’ were widely believed by the public. Indeed, a 2004 Yougov poll showed just over two thirds of respondents agreed that Britain was currently ‘an overcrowded island’ (cited in Hampshire, 2005: 188). These messages were assisted by the UK’s relatively high net migration figures. Whereas in 1997 annual net migration summed to 47,000, from 2005-2015 the average migration figure stood at 250,000, peaking at 330,000 in 2015 (Migration Watch, 2017).

In the discursive realm migration frames were hardening, with Hampshire (2005: 188) arguing that the degree to which alarmist migration rhetoric permeated the public debate is underlined by the fact that even mainstream opposition to immigration adopted this terminology. The 2005 General Election was particularly significant and can be regarded marking a sea change in UK migration politics. The Conservative opposition made a deliberate attempt to politicise the issue of migration, making it one of the central lynchpins of their campaign. It was in this context that New Labour’s move toward a more restrictive migration stance emerged (Schain, 2008). The 2009 European Parliament Elections saw the BNP gain close to one million votes and have two MEPs elected, whilst UKIP received approximately 2.5 million votes resulting in the election of 13 MEPs (*BBC*, 2009). Even in the 2010 UK General Election, where the first-past-the-post voting system severely disadvantages smaller parties, the BNP and UKIP received around 500,000 and one million votes respectively (*BBC*, 2010).

---

developed across both the Labour and Conservative parties that formal restrictive measures were necessary (Layton-Henry, 1992).



As the BNP began a sharp decline following the 2010 General Election, UKIP soared. UKIP became the first party outside of Labour and the Conservatives to win a nation-wide election since 1906, achieving 27.49% of the vote in the 2014 European Parliament Elections. As mentioned above, flanked by UKIP, Labour and the Conservatives also adopted increasingly hard-line positions prior to the 2015 General Election. In the context of the ever-increasing net migration figures, David Cameron pledged the Conservative Party to reduce net migration ‘from the hundreds of thousands, to the tens of thousands’. Yet UKIP continued to rise, achieving a vote share of 12.6% in the 2015 election, before helping to cement the fulfilment of their *raison d’être* as a political party in 2016: exit from the European Union.

As this exceedingly brief sketch of UK migration politics demonstrates, in both a historic and contemporary sense, migration has been at the centre of modern UK politics. The 2005 General Election arguably marked a shift in UK migration politics and as the polling makes clear, over the last decade – and epitomised by the Brexit debate – migration has been a highly salient issue (Ipsos Mori, 2015; also see Chapter 3). Therefore, trying to develop a deeper understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK is paramount. Moreover, as will be made clear in the following sections, the previous under-exploration and ignoring of UK elite political and religious discourse respectively, alongside a severe lack of attention directed toward the relationship between elite discourse and public attitudes, makes the selection of the UK as a case a timely enterprise.

### **1.3 Empirical, Methodological and Theoretical Gaps: Situating the Thesis in the Literature**

#### **1.3.1 If Security Means Everything, it Means Nothing: Securitization Theory to the Rescue?**

In recent decades, debates over the definition of ‘security’ between the ‘traditional’ and ‘new security thinking’ approaches have been at the epicentre of the sub-discipline of Security Studies (see Walt, 1991). Rooted in realism, the traditional state-military conceptualisation of security has been argued to be both too narrow and too shallow (Buzan, 1983). The end of the Cold War brought these criticisms into sharp focus as the realist paradigm, most favoured during the bi-polar conflict, appeared ill-equipped to explain the post-Cold War world. However, widening and deepening ‘security’ beyond the state-military conceptualisation to incorporate a plethora of new issues (for example, climate change, poverty, international terrorism, HIV/AIDS, demographic issues, large-scale population movements etc.) presented the subsequent challenge of keeping the term

analytically meaningful. In other words, the quandary was to prevent security referring to everything and therefore nothing (see Paris, 2001). Securitization theory, devised by the Copenhagen School (CS), has been one of the most influential alternatives in redefining security (Balzacq, 2011).

In the CS's social constructionist approach, security is a 'speech act' – it does not refer to objectively 'real' phenomena but is instead constructed through discourse (Buzan et al., 1998). It is not a case, however, of simply mentioning the word 'security'. Instead a phenomenon must be designated an 'existential threat' and this designation must be accepted by a significant audience (Buzan et al., 1998: 25). It is only once said audience have accepted the presentation of an issue as an existential threat that the issue has been 'securitized'. Without this acceptance, the issue has only been the subject of an attempt at securitization – a 'securitizing move' (Buzan et al., 1998: 25). By conceptualising 'security' as a process as opposed to a list of objective 'things', the CS's definition of security technically allows any issue to be securitized, facilitating deepening and widening, yet the term is kept analytically meaningful (see Chapter 2 for a more in-depth account of the mechanism of securitization and securitization theory more broadly).

Nevertheless, despite the CS's theoretical innovation in redefining the concept of security, securitization theory suffers from several theoretical weaknesses, two of which are to be addressed in this thesis. The first relates to an overemphasis on traditional security actors, namely political elites. The second weakness refers to the neglect of the 'audience' and the previous under-exploration of the connection between elite discourse (de/securitizing moves) and public attitudes (acceptance/rejection of said moves).

### **1.3.2 Widening the Analytical Net: UK Political and Religious Elites**

Theoretically there are not any specific criteria one must meet in order to become a securitizing actor. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1992) notion of 'cultural capital', for Wæver (1995: 57) however, '[s]ecurity is articulated only from a specific place, in an institutional voice, by elites.' It is postulated that elites possess greater quantities of cultural capital, endowed via status, authority, or 'expertise', that acts to 'legitimise' security moves. However, to date, there has been an empirical overemphasis on political elite actors. As the set of actors most influential to shaping public debate on migration (Statham and Geddes, 2006)<sup>4</sup>, this focus on political elite messages is understandable. Indeed, to contextualise

---

<sup>4</sup> Statham and Geddes' (2006) analysed the role of the 'organised public' (see Freeman, 1995) alongside elite political actors in British immigration politics. They conclude that non-political elite actors (including

any understanding of the effects of elite cues in the UK, a nuanced understanding of the dominant political parties and elite political actors is essential.

However, other sets of elite actors have the potential to wield considerable influence in the process of security (Doty, 2007; Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010). Religious elites are one previously neglected group which are likely to be highly influential and are in need of further attention (for example, see Dannreuther 2010, 2012). Not only is migration now established in the so-called ‘moral’ realm (alongside abortion and gay marriage) where religious elites and organisations are taking public positions (Knoll, 2009), the centrality of religion to identity imbues religion/religiosity with a substantial potential to shape attitudes (Wellman and Kyoto, 2004) and therefore impact on the de/construction of security issues. Even in the highly secular UK, close to one million individuals attend a religious service per week for both the Anglican and Catholic faiths respectively, implying that religious elites may have a non-trivial influence over some sectors of the British public. Indeed, religion/religiosity has long been accounted as a key determinant of prejudice towards out-groups (Adorno et al., 1950; Allport, 1954). To date, the majority of relationships connect high religiosity with increased prejudice (Batson et al., 1993; Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005), yet findings lack uniformity, with religion/religiosity at times associated with reduced prejudice (Knoll, 2009; Lubbers et al. 2006). Overall, it is posited that ‘we know relatively little about the impact of religiosity and the role of religious group cues in shaping attitudes towards immigration’ (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015: 218) – a lacuna this thesis attempts to fill.

To be more precise, the justification for widening the analytical net beyond solely political elite actors to included religious elites is based upon the assumption that religious elites possess an extensive quantity of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1992) – especially for those who share their identity (Druckman, 2001; Slothuus and de Vreese, 2010) – meaning they have the possibility of strongly affecting public attitudes. This is because, for those of faith, the authority of religious elites can be interpreted as transcendental in that their utterances can be viewed as direct interpretations of God's wisdom and desires (Lausten and Wæver, 2000). The potential power religious elites may wield as de/securitizing actors is rooted in the assumptions and empirical findings from framing theory. Gamson and Modigliani (1987: 143) argue that a ‘frame suggests what the controversy is about, the

---

religious groups) play a relatively minor role and that ‘immigration policy is determined “top-down” in a relatively autonomous way by political elites’ (Statham and Geddes, 2006: 266). A more complete defence of the need to focus on political elites to contextualise the cues of other sets of elite actors is given in Chapter 3.

essence of the issue.’ In short, framing involves the portrayal of an issue in one particular way, excluding other forms of representation. A number of mediating and moderating factors have been identified that impact on the capacity for frames to create framing effects – where frames ‘cut through’ and influence attitudes (Chong and Druckman, 2007a). One of the most significant contextual moderators is the role played by source characteristics (Druckman, 2001). Pivotal is whether the source is viewed as credible (Druckman, 2001), but ‘credibility’ is inherently subjective – stronger framing effects are found when there is an ideological alignment between source and recipient (Hartman and Weber, 2009; Slothuus, 2010). Moreover, strong frames rely on cultural references (myths, narratives and metaphors) that can resonate with an audience. Which cultural references are available to actors varies and the potential for certain references to exert a strong pull on attitudes depends on the extent to which the source and recipient share an identity. Overall, the framing literature suggests that elites, both political and religious, can have a potentially powerful influence on ‘their’ audiences.

### **1.3.3 Love Thy Neighbour?**

Yet, what kind of migration cues are espoused by UK elites has been either ignored, as in the case of religious elites, or under-developed, with respect to political elites. Regarding religious elite actors, Wuthnow (2011: 1) quips that a ‘close reading of the social science literature prior to the 1980s would suggest that religious people rarely spoke and probably were completely mute’ – an anomaly it is asserted has still not been addressed sufficiently. This is supported by the severe neglect of religious elite cues as a factor in explaining the effects of various dimensions of religiosity (Knoll, 2009). Indeed, Djupe and Calfano (2012) argue that scholars have likely exhausted the analysis of the typical measures of religiosity, religious attachment and religious belief. The authors conclude that in order to progress our understanding there is an urgent need to ‘focus on information provision from, especially, religious elites’ (Djupe and Calfano, 2012).

Turning to the securitization literature, the only study, to the knowledge of the author, which accounts for religious elite cues, is that of Karyotis and Patrikios (2010). However, in this article which concentrates on Greece, the authors draw upon just a few public displays of action by the Orthodox Church and several interventions from the Archbishop. There is no systematic exploration of discursive strategies or an attempt to explore which aspects of migration the Church sought to securitize. In (again to the knowledge of the author) a unique instance, Statham and Geddes (2006) show that ‘Churches’ in the UK provide positive cues regarding immigration and asylum. This was

established through a content analysis of UK newspapers to analyse societal actors' 'claims-making' in relation to immigration and asylum. Yet, not only was the period of analysis (1990-2004) prior to the analytical period in this thesis (2005-2015), but all churches were grouped together, masking any potential distinction between faiths. Moreover messages were coded as positive, neutral or negative meaning no attempt was made to analyse how religious elites were framing migration, in relation to which aspects of migration they were choosing to focus on and which rhetorical devices/strategies they employed. Thus, in the UK, what religious elites have been saying with regards to migration (especially from 2005 onwards) has been ignored. Therefore, conducting a thorough and nuanced analysis of religious elite migration discourse will illuminate how this potentially important set of elite actors have been 'cuing their audience' and unpack precisely whether and how they have been contributing to the UK security-migration debate.

The Anglican and Roman Catholic faiths have been chosen as the religious groups most prudent to analyse due to their numerical preponderance - 59% of UK residents identified as Christian in the 2011 census (Office for National Statistics, 2012), the largest two constituencies being Anglicans and Catholics<sup>5 6 7</sup>. More important for this thesis is the

---

<sup>5</sup> The 2011 UK census demonstrated that whilst 25% of the population of England and Wales identified as having no religion, 59% (approx. 33.2 million) identified as Christian (Office for National Statistics, 2012). Somewhat different figures are given by The British Social Attitudes Survey (NatCen, 2011). Here, 50% of the entire UK population identify as having no religion. Yet, from the remaining 50% who are religious, Anglicanism (20%, approx. 12.66 million) and Catholicism (9%, approx. 5.9 million) constitute by far the largest proportions (all Non-Christian combined = 6%). A report from the National Secular Society (2012) argues that the disparity is rooted in a methodological problem where the religious affiliation question in the 2011 Census was leading. This thesis is not placed to adjudicate on the 'real' figures. Even taking those of the British Social Attitudes Survey the number of affiliates is substantial.

<sup>6</sup> Attempts were made to include the third largest faith group, Islam, in the analysis. Yet, several issues made this unfeasible. First, as a faith, the lack of 'hierarchy' (see Dannreuther, 2010) made identifying 'elites' far more problematic. More serious, however, was that the number of respondents identifying as Muslim in the UK in the ESS data set was very low, making any attempts to link elite discourse to immigration attitudes impossible. Despite this, during the statistical analyses, Islam and a combination of 'Other' religions were investigated as a form of control to account for any potential effects arising from 'religiosity' in and of itself (see Chapter 3 and 6).

<sup>7</sup> To ensure the research project remained feasible, for the Anglican faith attention has been restricted to elite actors (and Church publications) from the Church of England. This has been deemed prudent as the Church of England is the 'mother church' of the global Anglican Communion and therefore also carries jurisdiction over those who identify as Anglican in other parts of the UK (Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland). For the Catholic faith attention has been restricted to elite actors (and Church publications) from the Catholic Church in England and Wales as this is by far the largest Catholic organisation in the UK. According to the 2011 UK census, approximately 4.2 million of the UK's 5.7 million Catholics reside in England and Wales (Office for National Statistics, 2012). Subsequently, analysis of elite actors belonging to the Catholic Churches in

number of those attending religious services and being exposed to elite messaging – of which, during the period of analysis (2005-2015) the average weekly attendance for both the Anglican Church and Catholic Church stood at approximately 820,000 and 780,000 respectively<sup>8</sup>. These are substantial minority cohorts that have the potential to be significantly affected by elite messaging.

In addition to analysing religious elite discourse on migration, this thesis analyses the discourse of UK political elites during the same 2005-2015 time frame. Aside from the crucial role a discourse analysis of political elites plays in contextualising the messaging of religious elites, a previous lack of empirical investigation, particularly in the UK, makes a nuanced analysis of political elite discourse highly valuable in itself. There has been a plethora of scholarship that has analysed the securitization of migration across Europe. However, these principally concentrate on practices and policy, and when discourse is analysed, it is analysed in a general way and tends to concentrate on the EU (Bigo, 2002, 2006a; Huysmans, 2000, 2002; Neal, 2009). Whilst there are several studies that focus on the securitization of migration in a number of countries, such as Canada (Ibrahim, 2005) and Greece (Karyotis, 2012), there are no studies, to the knowledge of this author, that focus on the full range of migration discourse of political elite actors in the UK through a securitization lens – with the closest exception being Huysmans and Buonfino (2008) who analyse one dimension of the securitization of migration in detail: the terror-migration nexus. In the literature that does concentrate on UK immigration politics, historical studies of migration politics (Hampshire, 2005; Hansen, 2000; Joppke, 1999; Layton-Henry, 1992; Paul, 1997) have been supplemented with studies that have tended to focus on the role and development of migration policy (i.e. Bale, 2011; Geddes and Scholten, 2016; Hampshire and Bale, 2015; Mulvey, 2010). In the few studies that have focussed on discourse the analysis has either been limited to one political party (Smith, 2008), speech (Capdevila and Callaghan, 2008) or has focused upon discourse via the media (Baker et al., 2008; Statham and Geddes, 2006). Thus, a systematic analysis of the discourse of the main UK-wide parties, especially through a securitization lens, is missing. In this thesis, an analysis of the

---

Scotland and Northern Ireland has been excluded. The selection of elites and discourse will be further explained in Chapter 3.

<sup>8</sup> These figures are acquired from a report entitled *Church attendance in Britain, 2005-2015*, authored by *British Religion in Numbers* which draws upon data from *Religious Trends* by Peter Brierley. The data are clustered at five year intervals. The averages are calculated by dividing the combined totals of the three figures provided for 2005, 2010 and 2015 for each Church.

four largest<sup>9</sup> UK-wide parties (Conservatives, Labour, Liberal Democrats and UKIP) over a ten year period is conducted to extract a broad understanding of how these actors frame migration, what aspects of migration they focus upon and which rhetorical devices/strategies they have used, to assist in unpacking how migration discourse in the UK is constructed. With Statham (2003) demonstrating that the ‘perceived government policy position sets normative limits of public understanding of asylum and immigration issues’, this is a pressing enterprise.

#### **1.3.4 Message Received? ‘Bringing the Audience Back In’ to Securitization Theory**

The second weakness of Securitization theory that is addressed in this thesis is centred on a previous neglect of the effects of security discourses. In short, with security conceptualised as a speech act, the CS present discourse analysis as the ‘obvious method’ to study security (Buzan et al., 1998: 176). Yet, the de/construction of security for the CS is argued to be ‘an essentially intersubjective process’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 30) played out between the de/securitizing actor and the audience receiving the message. To be clear, a securitization relies on an issue being declared an existential threat and this declaration being *accepted* by a significant audience (Buzan et al., 1998: 25). This acceptance (or lack of) is therefore of vital importance. However, discourse analysis is not particularly well equipped to investigate questions of audience acceptance/rejection. Discourse analysis is vital in that it facilitates a sophisticated understanding of the content of elite messaging, thus enabling hypotheses to be drawn regarding the likely effects of said messaging. Yet, it cannot begin to explore these hypotheses.

Several scholars have proposed incorporating quantitative methods to bridge the gap between elite discourse and the audience (Hansen, 2011; Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010; Wilkinson, 2011). Karyotis and Patrikios (2010) used statistical analysis alongside discourse analysis in an attempt to gauge whether the audience internalised the de/securitizing frames of elite actors – however this study is unique. Interestingly, the neglect of attention to the link between immigration attitudes and elite discourse is not exclusive to securitization research. To date, in the broad immigration attitudes literature, many individual-level and contextual factors have been explored as potential drivers of immigration attitudes (for example, Quillian, 1995; Semyonov et al., 2006; Sniderman et al., 2004). Rationalist self-interest theories emphasising the importance of material resources (for example, Bobo, 1983; Quillian, 1995) have been challenged by theories of

---

<sup>9</sup> Largest defined in terms of vote share at the 2010 and 2015 UK General Elections (BBC, 2010, 2015).

symbolic politics, where attitudes towards non-tangible ‘cultural’ resources are argued to underpin hostility, or lack thereof, towards migrants (Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993; Sides and Citrin, 2007). Evidence supporting both theoretical positions can be found in the literature (McLaren and Johnson, 2007; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schneider, 2008; Semyonov et al., 2008). However, despite having the potential to be an important driver of immigration attitudes, elite cues have not been explored to any great extent. Elite cues have at times been examined as a factor in attitude formation in general, for example toward EU integration (Hooghe and Marks, 2005; McLaren, 2001). But in the realm of immigration attitudes, attention towards the effects of elite cues has been minimal (Hellwig and Kweon, 2016). In the handful of studies that have included elite messaging in the analysis, cues have been shown to play a significant role in shaping immigration attitudes in specific contexts (Hellwig and Kweon, 2016; Jones and Martin, 2017; Weldon, 2006). Yet, even the limited analysis of the impact of elite cues on immigration attitudes has so far been restricted to the political sphere, with a focus on political elites and political parties (Hellwig and Kweon, 2016; Jones and Martin, 2017). Finally, mirroring the broad immigration attitudes literature, in the scientific study of religion<sup>10</sup> literature mentioned above, the role played by elite discourse has been ignored, to the extent that religious actors have appeared ‘mute’ (Wuthnow, 2011: 1).

This thesis builds on both the calls to broaden the methodological net in securitization research and the empirical findings that have begun to show the fruitful nature of this enterprise, via the incorporation of survey evidence. The introduction of survey evidence aims to ‘bring the audience back in’ to the securitization process by tracking the relationship between elite discourse (de/securitizing moves) and public opinion (audience acceptance/rejection of said moves).

### 1.3.5 Research Questions

To restate, the security-migration nexus in the UK requires a deeper understanding. At the level of discourse, religious elite messaging in the UK has been completely ignored whilst political elite interventions are at present under-researched. Previous scholarship in securitization studies has severely neglected the relationship between elite discourse (de/securitizing moves) and audience acceptance/rejection of said discourse (the full

---

<sup>10</sup> The ‘scientific study of religion’ is a phrase that will be used throughout this thesis following the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion (publisher of the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*). The phrase denotes the multi-disciplinary approach to the study of religion (sociological, psychological, anthropological, political scientific etc.) that attempts to understand ‘both micro-level analysis of individuals’ experience with religion and macro-level analysis of religious organizations, institutions, and social change’.



process of de/securitization). Similarly, the effect of elite discourse as a specific explanatory variable in shaping immigration attitudes has been overlooked, and when included, the lens has been restricted to political elites and political parties. Whilst a focus on the political sphere is necessary to contextualise any cues from other elite actors, a sole focus on political elites may ignore the influential role of other actors and therefore fail to generate a comprehensive understanding of what is driving immigration attitudes. Religious elites are one such neglected group that have the potential to significantly affect attitudes – especially for their flock – and therefore impact on the de/construction of security issues.

Thus, this thesis seeks to unpack the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond) by exploring the content of elite cues and whether they appear to be influencing public opinion regarding migration – to ‘bring the audience back in’ to securitization analysis. As such, two research questions are addressed.

1. How have political and religious elites framed the issue of migration in the UK, between 2005-2015?
2. Controlling for all other relevant factors, to what extent does the migration messages of political and religious elite actors’ impact upon immigration attitudes.

#### **1.4 Summary of Findings and Thesis Contributions**

This section outlines the key findings and contributions made by the thesis. Findings can be divided into those derived from the discourse analysis and those derived from the statistical analyses of the potential effects of discourse on public attitudes.

Beginning with the discourse analysis, for the political elites, unsurprisingly, securitizing threat frames are found to be predominant. Alongside the (expected) differences between parties, importantly the analysis also uncovered variation within parties. There is variation over time and, perhaps more crucially, there is variation (at the same time) across the key discursive battlegrounds of migration discourse (identity, economics, security and politics) – underscoring the intricate nuance of migration discourse and bolstering the case for adopting a holistic analytical framework (the four axes model, see Chapter 3) to ensure a robust analysis. A comparative analysis between the elite religious and political actors as a whole reveals a remarkable disparity. Desecuritizing non-threat frames dominate the discourse of religious elites of both the Anglican and Catholic faiths and there is a clear attempt from the religious actors to restrict their focus to issues of ‘morality’ and identity, largely avoiding nitty-gritty debates over economics and

security. A slight deviation emerges between the discourse of the Anglican and Catholic elites, argued to potentially be underpinned by a divergence in the emphasis placed upon viewing migration in instrumental terms. Finally, three other points of significance emerge from the discourse analysis relating to: the challenge of desecuritizing migration; the battle to define *the* British identity; and the identification of several rhetorical devices which may act as useful heuristic tools to guide future research. All of the above findings will be explored in detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

Turning to the findings derived from the statistical analyses, the conclusions from the discourse analysis enabled hypotheses to be drawn regarding the potential relationship and effects of elite cues on the immigration attitudes of ‘their’ respective audiences. First, for the political elites findings were in line with those derived from the discourse analysis: UKIP supporters hold the most negative immigration attitudes, followed by the Conservatives, then Labour, whilst the Liberal Democrat identifiers have the most positive attitudes respectively. The theoretical assumption of securitization as a ‘top-down’ process lends support to the idea that elite cues are influencing the attitudes of their audiences. Yet, unfortunately the confidence in which this causal inference can be asserted is reduced due to limitations with the data, specifically an inability to control for level of exposure to elite messaging (this will be expanded upon in Chapters 3 and 6). However, the finding that elite messages broadly align with the attitudes of their audience provides a platform for further studies to explore this relationship in greater depth. In short, future research can unpack this theoretical claim in an empirical sense.

For both the Anglican and Catholic denominations, the preponderance of desecuritizing non-threat migration messages resulted in the expectation that those who have greater exposure and receptiveness to such cues, using church attendance as a proxy (see Knoll, 2009; Kartotis and Patrikios, 2010), will have more positive immigration attitudes. For Anglicans, there is support for this hypothesis. Greater levels of church attendance for Anglicans consistently relate to more positive immigration attitudes. Importantly, this relationship holds even when all of the most powerful control variables identified in the immigration attitudes literature have been introduced (such as education, intergroup contact and party identification) and in spite of the highly securitized discursive terrain identified in the discourse analysis of political elite actors – the set of actors identified by Statham and Geddes (2006) as dominating the UK migration agenda. Crucially, the two other measures of religiosity included as controls to gauge the effects of religiosity in and of itself, frequency of prayer and how religious a person feels, fail to

generate any effects. This supports the notion that there does not appear to be anything about religion or religiosity itself which is driving immigration attitudes and instead the impact of religion is very likely to be connected to elite messaging. In contrast, no support is found for the hypothesis for Catholics. Chapter 6 and the Conclusion discuss this difference in results

Overall, the findings of the thesis demonstrate that in order to effectively unpack the security-migration nexus, expanding the analytical net beyond the political sphere and trying to connect elite cues to public attitudes in order to ‘bring the audience back in’ to the securitization process (i.e. tracking whether there appears to be acceptance/rejection of securitizing moves) is essential. Specifically, the findings in this thesis underpin the argument that it may be very difficult to completely understand the construction of migration (and other phenomena) as a security issue, especially in terms of what is driving public attitudes, without accounting for elite cues – a practice which to date is currently under-explored in both the securitization literature and broad immigration attitudes literature. In addition to the empirical findings regarding the discourse of previously under-researched (political) and ignored (religious) elite actors in the UK summarised above, these theoretical and methodological contributions are central to this thesis.

### **1.5 Roadmap: Chapter Overview**

The thesis proceeds in a number of integrated steps. Chapter 2 details the theoretical framework utilised in the research, drawing upon Securitization theory, the literatures that explore drivers of immigration attitudes, the effects of religiosity on attitudes towards immigrants/out-groups, and framing theory. After identifying the gaps in the literature that are addressed in the thesis, Chapter 3 outlines the methodology. Here the mixed-methods approach is operationalised, synthesising discourse analysis and survey analysis. The next three chapters are empirical. The discourse analysis of the political and religious elites is explored in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively. In both cases, analysis demonstrates the prevailing migration frames (threat or non-threat) for each set of actors (the four political parties and two religious denominations) alongside a nuanced analysis of the discursive focus and strategies employed. As the group of societal actors that dominate the public sphere, the exploration of political elite discourse provides a contextual framework to compare the messages of religious elites. Overall, the discourse analysis enables the formation of hypotheses regarding the potential effects of elite messaging on immigration attitudes. Chapter 6 tests these key hypotheses using statistical analyses of public opinion data. The conclusion summarises the key findings and pinpoints the central

implications that arise from the empirical, methodological and theoretical contributions made in the thesis.

\*\*\*

‘There is nothing so practical as a good theory’ (Lewin, 1951) – it is to theory that the next Chapter turns.

## Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Situating Securitization: Security Studies and the Copenhagen School
- 2.3 Defining Securitization Theory
- 2.4 Extending Securitization Theory: Widening the Analytical Net
  - 2.4.1 No Room at the Inn: Previous Neglect of Religious Elite Actors
  - 2.4.2 'Is There Any Room in the Stable at Least?' Insights from Framing Theory
  - 2.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour?
  - 2.4.4 Defining Religiosity
- 2.5 Extending Securitization Theory: 'Bringing the Audience Back In'
- 2.6 Bringing which Audience(s) Back In?
- 2.7 Conclusion

### 2.1 Introduction

This thesis aims to develop our understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond) both in terms of the discursive de/construction of migration as a threat and in terms 'bringing the audience back in' to securitization research via an analysis of the relationship between elite discourse and the construction of immigration attitudes. To date, securitization research has severely neglected the connection between elite messaging and audience acceptance/rejection of such moves. This neglect, however, is not unique to securitization studies. In the broad immigration attitudes literature, the influence of elite cues as a driver of immigration attitudes has also been overlooked. When included in the analysis, 'elites' have been restricted to those acting in the political sphere. Whilst this set of actors often dominate the public debate (Statham and Geddes, 2006) and therefore cannot be side-lined from any analysis, other sets of elite actors have the potential to influence attitudes and therefore impact on the de/construction of security issues. Religious elites are one such group. With migration often presented through the lens of security (Doty, 2007; Huysmans, 1995), and a broad acceptance amongst scholars that migration has been characterised by security politics across Europe (Bigo 2006b, Huysmans, 2000), the theoretical framework principally draws upon and extends the Copenhagen School's (CS) securitization theory. The framework is also developed by drawing on the broad immigration attitudes literature, the scientific study of religion literature and framing theory.

Whilst this chapter is labelled 'theoretical framework', the research design adopted in this thesis means there is a fundamental overlap between theory, methodology and method, with theory at the heart of methodological and methods related decisions. Thus, several dimensions of the theoretical framework are developed in more detail in the following chapter. This chapter proceeds in a number of steps. Following a brief diversion

to situate securitization theory within the sub-discipline of Security Studies, securitization theory is outlined, whilst the two theoretical limitations to be addressed in this thesis are identified: an over-emphasis on traditional (largely political) elite actors and subsequent under-exploration of other potentially influential societal actors; and the incapacity of discourse analysis to account for the role of the audience and consequently generate a holistic understanding of the de/securitizing process. Each weakness is addressed in turn and contextualised within key theoretical debates, whilst insights from the other three literatures are synthesised to establish the theoretical framework in full. Addressing each of these two theoretical limitations are central contributions made by this thesis.

## **2.2 Situating Securitization: Security Studies and the Copenhagen School**

Throughout the 1980s and accelerated by the unexpected collapse of the Cold War order, debates over the definition of ‘security’ between the ‘traditional’ and ‘new security thinking’ approaches have been at the core of the sub-discipline of Security Studies (Walt, 1991). In the Cold War era, ‘security’ was typically viewed as synonymous with military statecraft (Baldwin, 1997, Dannreuther, 2013). This traditional state-military conceptualisation of security was underpinned by realist theory, the dominant paradigm in Security Studies and International Relations more broadly. The foundations of realist theory, namely Hobbesian international anarchy forcing self-interested states into power seeking behaviour, security dilemmas and war, appeared to both effectively describe and explain the Cold War system (see Waltz, 1959; Walt, 1991). Yet, the realist paradigm was argued to be both too narrow and too shallow (Buzan, 1983). Too narrow in the sense that many non-military threats not previously grouped under the rubric of ‘security’ were arguably as ‘threatening’, including transnational crime and terror (Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008), ecological degradation (resource depletion, climate change etc.) (McDonald, 2013), economic instability (Buzan et al., 1998), energy resources (Dannreuther, 2011, 2017) demographics pressures (United Nations, 2000), HIV/AIDS (Sjöstedt, 2011), and large-scale migration (Weiner, 1992). Too shallow in the sense that security for the state does not necessarily equate to security for those within the state, underpinning the argument that the lens of security should be focussed below the level of the state to concentrate upon communities and individuals (see Paris, 2001). The end of the Cold War significantly strengthened these critiques and underlined the limitations of the realist theory (Booth, 2005, Wyn Jones, 1999).

However, by widening and deepening the conceptualisation of ‘security’, concerns arose regarding the analytical usefulness of the term. In other words, the challenge was to prevent security referring to everything and therefore nothing (Paris, 2001). The CS’s<sup>11</sup> Securitization theory has been one of the most influential and significant efforts to redefine security (Balzacq, 2011).

### 2.3 Defining Securitization Theory

Drawing on Austin’s (1962) speech act theory, the CS adopts a social constructionist approach: security does not refer to something objectively ‘real’ but is brought into being through discursive action (Buzan et al., 1998). Security is thus a ‘speech act’ where ‘[b]y uttering “security,” a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it’ (Wæver, 1995: 55). Explicitly mentioning the term ‘security’ is not necessary. Instead, the CS states that ‘[w]hat is essential is the designation of an existential threat requiring emergency action or special measures and the acceptance of that designation by a significant audience.’<sup>12</sup> An ‘issue is securitized only if and when the audience accept it as such’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 25). Buzan et al. (1998: 25) note that ‘[i]f no signs of such [audience] acceptance exist, we can talk only of a securitizing move, not of an object actually being securitized’. The CS’s definition then facilitates a deepening and widening of security (as technically any issue can be securitized), yet the term is kept analytically useful as security is no longer a list of ‘things’ but is instead conceptualised as a process.

It is important to note that the CS does not view the security process as something that is to be maximised. Securitizing an issue constitutes a transfer from the political realm, characterised by deliberation, transparency and an absence of excessive speed, to the realm

---

<sup>11</sup> Following CASE (2006) this study acknowledges that ‘schools’ are rarely as rigid and monolithic as labels suggest. The term ‘CS’ is utilised for simplicity and efficiency. In line with other scholars (Stritzel, 2007; McDonald, 2008), references to the CS will principally draw upon the two most thorough conceptualisations of securitization theory: Ole Wæver’s (1995) *Securitisation and Desecuritisation* and Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde’s (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*.

<sup>12</sup> Whether a successful securitization requires emergency measures to be implemented or merely that they are ‘possible to legitimize’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 25) (the CS at times state both contradictory positions) forms a key debate in securitization research (Balzacq et al., 2016; Floyd, 2016). Whilst this thesis does not engage directly with this debate, using public opinion data to determine the impact of elite discourse may offer one way of conceptualising ‘success’. This would fit with attempts to theorise security as having different dimensions of success i.e. moving along a continuum from rhetoric to public acceptance and finally to emergency measures (see, for example, Roe, 2008; Salter, 2008, 2011; Vuori, 2008).

of panic politics and emergency measures, arguably circumventing the openness and accountability that is supposed to underpin the role of the legislator in a liberal democracy (Aradau, 2004, Roe, 2012)<sup>13</sup>. As such, the CS conclude that applying the ‘problematic... mind-set’ of security and the logic of ‘threat-defense’ mean that ‘in the abstract desecuritization is the ideal’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 29). Yet, for certain issues, speed, focussed attention and generous resource allocation may make securitization an attractive option – climate change/the environment (Trombetta, 2011; von Lucke et al., 2014) and HIV/AIDS (Elbe, 2006; Sjöstedt, 2011) are two issues that have been discussed in this context, although in both cases this is fiercely contested. However, for the issue of migration, securitization is widely seen as normatively dangerous as divisive notions of ‘us’ and ‘them’ are triggered and made salient (Bigo and Guild, 2005; Buonfino, 2004; Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Huysmans, 1995)<sup>14</sup>.

Desecuritization is defined as the opposite of securitization (Roe, 2004: 282). It is the process by which an issue is relegated from the securitized to the politicised realm (or even to the non-politicised realm where the issue moves out of the public sphere). However, it is important to acknowledge at this juncture that, in comparison to its antithesis, the desecuritization process ‘has received comparably scant attention’ (Aradau, 2004: 389). A scarcity of empirical analysis is supplemented by a lack of clear guidance on how to study desecuritization (but see Hansen, 2012; Huysmans, 1995). An absence of consensus over whether desecuritization is desired (see above and also Booth, 2005, 2007; McDonald, 2008; Wyn Jones, 1999) or is even possible in certain instances (for example, as in the case of minority rights, see Roe, 2004, 2008) is problematic. Floyd (2007) suggests a consequentialist approach, where the desirability of desecuritization is not known a priori and is beholden to the consequences of adopting one course of action over another. However, even if, after concluding on the available evidence as to what the likely consequences will be desecuritization is sought, guidance for how to desecuritize the issue remains underdeveloped. A more broad discussion of the most thorough attempts to theorise desecuritization, namely those of Hansen (2012) and Huysmans (1995), is

---

<sup>13</sup> It is argued the CS has a ‘Schmittian’ understanding of security. Security for the CS plays the same role as the ‘political’ for Schmitt in terms of moving beyond democratic decision making and into the realm of the exception that is rooted in a friend/enemy binary (see Williams, 2003).

<sup>14</sup> Conceiving the link between migration and security as inherently dangerous is not without challenge. It is argued that whilst criticisms of the most egregious practices/consequences of securitizing migration are correctly challenged, migration remains a legitimate target of security analysis due to the integral nature of security considerations reading the movement of peoples – particularly when viewed from, although not limited to, an international relations perspective (see for example, Dannreuther, 2013).



provided in Chapter 3, along with an outline of how the concept of is operationalised in this thesis.

To sum up, the CS's theoretical innovation in redefining the concept of security offers an expedient means to move beyond the narrow state-military conceptualisation of security whilst preventing the meaning of security becoming so broad that it in effect becomes meaningless. Yet, securitization theory suffers from several theoretical weaknesses – two of which are to be addressed in this thesis. The first relates to an overemphasis on traditional security actors, principally political elites. This limitation will be discussed further in the following four subsections which make the case for expanding the analytical net beyond traditional security actors in general and why religious elites in particular require more attention. The second weakness refers to the neglect of the audience and the previous under-exploration of the connection between de/securitizing moves and public attitudes (acceptance/rejection). This limitation will be detailed, drawing on key debates within securitization theory as well as literature that focuses on the construction of immigration attitudes more broadly and literature that attends to the role of religiosity in driving opinion.

## **2.4 Extending Securitization Theory: Widening the Analytical Net**

The first weakness of securitization theory is that there has been an empirical overemphasis on traditional security actors (and especially political elites) (Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010). Theoretically there are not any specific criteria one must meet in order to become a securitizing actor. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1992) notion of 'cultural capital', for Wæver (1995: 57) however, '[s]ecurity is articulated only from a specific place, in an institutional voice, by elites' - as elites possess greater quantities of cultural capital that support security moves. The CS's tendency to concentrate on political elites has been criticised and shown to have both theoretical/empirical shortcomings (see Doty, 2007; Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010) and normative limitations (for example, Hansen, 2000; McDonald 2008)<sup>15</sup>. On the theoretical/empirical side, for example, Doty's (2007) study of

---

<sup>15</sup> On a normative basis, this focus is argued to marginalise and ignore the security articulations of non-elite, non-state actors, 'presenting them at best as part of an audience that can collectively consent to or contest securitizing moves, and at worst as passive recipients of elite discourses' (McDonald, 2008: 574). Hansen (2000) underlines this point, arguing that viewing security as a speech act actively contributes to the silencing of marginalised groups, in her case women threatened by so-called 'honour killings' in Pakistan. Relatedly, with the CS's negative understanding of security and a qualified preference for desecuritization, a lack of attention is therefore given to marginalised, less powerful actors who may attempt to argue that security, understood in non-statist, non-exclusionary, non-military terms, should be encouraged (McDonald, 2008). Here the Welsh School's notion of emancipatory security is an obvious example (see Booth, 2005, 2007; Wyn Jones, 1999).

irregular migration on the US-Mexican border demonstrated the capacity for securitizations to arise ‘from below’, challenging the ‘top-down’ view of security construction. Karyotis and Patrikios’ (2010) study of the securitization of migration in Greece found that religious elites were able to entrench the issue as one of security, despite contrary attempts from political actors. Moreover, Dannreuther’s (2010) study of the discursive construction of ‘Islam’ in Russia finds that political elite, academic and Muslim elite discourses each play an important role in the presentation of an ‘official’ Islam that is ‘loyal’ to the Russian state and an ‘unofficial’ Islam that is a threat to the state. Subsequently any analysis that focused solely upon the discourse of political elite actors would have generated an incomplete understanding. Lastly, a central challenge to the CS’s theorisation of security from the so-called Paris School has shown that the nebulous nature of security decision-making often dictates a consideration of the role played by networks of ‘security professionals’ that operate outside of the public realm (see Bigo, 2008; Case Collective, 2006).

To sum up, an overemphasis on political elites has contributed to an incomplete and oversimplified understanding of how security issues are de/constructed. It is not possible to address all of the limitations outlined above. As such, this thesis seeks to contribute to securitization research by widening the analytical net to focus on one set of non-traditional security actors. Consequently, the thesis will focus on religious actors in addition to political elites. (To reiterate, the inclusion of the latter is rooted in the necessity of having a nuanced understanding of the messaging of the set of actors who dominate UK migration politics (Statham and Geddes, 2006) to contextualise the discourse of the former – not to mention the current empirical neglect of a holistic discourse analysis of UK political elite actors across the major dimensions of the security-migration nexus and a lack of attention paid toward the relationship between political elite cues and public opinion). Chiefly drawing on framing theory, it is anticipated that religious elites are a potentially powerful but previously neglected set of societal actors in the de/construction of security in terms of influencing public attitudes. The next three subsections unpack this argument in detail.

#### **2.4.1 No Room at the Inn: Previous Neglect of Religious Elite Actors**

In line with a general neglect of religion across the discipline of International Relations (Appleby, 1999; Dannreuther, 2010; Fox and Sandler, 2004), religion has also been largely ignored in securitization research as a whole. In the first pioneering study of securitization and religion, Lausten and Wæver (2000) outlined the powerful potential that

---

religion held as a referent object and highlighted the vast quantities of capital religious elites could potentially command as ‘messengers of God’. A handful of other studies have built upon this work. First, using the case of those practicing *Fulan Gong* and the quasi-religious system of *qigong*, Vuori (2011) demonstrates how a securitization of a particular referent object (Chinese state and society) can be bolstered by framing religious activities as threatening. Second, Croft (2012) shows how the ontological security of British Muslims has been diminished by a construction of Britishness which relies on the securitization of the Muslim as Other. Similarly, Mavelli (2013) explores the ‘securitization of Islam’ and ‘the Muslim’ more broadly. Yet, what these studies all share is a focus on ‘religion’ or religious identity as a referent object of security, rather than the influence of religious elites in shaping the attitudes of their followers in relation to other security issues.

One study that does account for the role of religious elites is Karyotis and Patrikios’ (2010) study of the securitization of migration in Greece referenced above. The authors outline how the de/securitizing capacities of elite religious actors can outweigh actors within the political sphere, who are the usual choice for securitization analysis. When political elite actors sought to dampen down their securitizing discourses, the religious elite did not follow suit. For those more exposed to the religious elite messages or predisposed to ‘hearing’ said messages (where religiosity is high), the discourse of the political elite had little effect in shaping their attitudes. Despite several limitations to Karyotis and Patrikios’ study (namely the lack of a systematic exploration of Church discourse and discursive strategies or an attempt to explore which aspects of migration the Church sought to securitize) this is a clear demonstration of the potential power religious elites hold as de/securitizing actors in specific contexts and subsequently underlines the case for the need to increase the level of attention given to religious elite actors.<sup>16</sup>

#### **2.4.2 ‘Is There Any Room in the Stable at Least?’ Insights from Framing Theory**

For those of faith, religion is widely accepted as being at the core of their identity and can therefore exert a strong influence over attitudes (Brewer et al., 2010; Wellman and

---

<sup>16</sup> Karyotis and Patrikios’ (2010) study also illuminates the complexity of the desecuritization process. The actors who were responsible for the initial securitization (the political elite) effectively lost control of the issue and had a limited capacity to reverse this discourse. Frankenstein’s monster had escaped (Grayson, 2003). For those with a normative agenda (although not of interest to this group exclusively), the potential for non-traditional societal actors to wield such influence presents both an opportunity and a cause for concern – this will be unpacked in greater detail in Chapter 6 and the Conclusion. Overall, it further bolsters the case for focussing on previously under-researched security actors.

Kyoto, 2004) – including prejudicial attitudes towards out-groups (Allport, 1954). The potential power religious elites have as de/securitizing actors is rooted in the assumptions and empirical support from framing theory regarding the importance of source characteristics.

Entman (1993: 52) argues that

[t]o frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.

Similarly, Gamson and Modigliani (1987: 143) posit that a ‘frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue.’ In short, framing entails addressing an issue in one particular way, excluding other forms of representation<sup>17</sup>. For example, when asked to discuss migration, an actor may select to present the crux of the issue as relating to identity, economics, security or politics, at the expense of each other or alternatives, and emphasise migration in a positive or negative sense in each case.

A number of mediating and moderating factors have been identified that influence the capacity for frames to create framing effects – where frames penetrate to influence attitudes (Chong and Druckman, 2007a). Mediating factors include such phenomena as whether an individual is motivated to engage in evaluation or whether the considerations are available and accessible in an individual’s mind (Chong and Druckman, 2007a). Moderators exist in both individual and contextual forms. Individual-level moderators include political knowledge<sup>18</sup> (Nelson et al., 1997) and values (Shen and Edwards, 2005)<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> To clarify what this study means when it talks of framing, it is helpful to explicitly outline what framing is not. Framing is not agenda setting, despite the two often being confused (Borah, 2011). Agenda setting refers to the salience of an issue. It does not involve how the issue is presented. In short, agenda setting is not interested in what features of an issue are highlighted, merely that the issue is frequently included in coverage/debate (Borah, 2011: 250). This distinction is neatly captured by Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007: 14) who assert that the difference between agenda setting and framing is ‘the difference between *whether* we think about an issue and *how* we think about it’. With migration at the heart of British political debate, epitomised by the importance with which the British public view the issue of migration (see section 3.2) ‘whether’ the public are thinking about the issue is not in question. Hence, this thesis is concerned with ‘how’ the public are being cued to think about migration.

<sup>18</sup> Interestingly, what effect political knowledge creates has generated intense debate and conflicting results. Some studies (Kinder and Sanders, 1990; Schuck and de Vreese, 2006) have found high political knowledge to act as a barrier against framing effects, whereas others (Krosnick and Brannon, 1993; Nelson et al., 1997) have shown polarised results.

Contextual moderators have been developed in an attempt to make framing more ‘real.’ These phenomena aim to bolster the classic experimental design that has characterised much of the framing literature, due to the criticism it received for being limited in its capacity to recreate how frames are consumed ‘in real life.’<sup>20</sup> One of the most significant contextual moderators is the role played by source characteristics (Druckman, 2001a)<sup>21</sup>.

Numerous empirical studies have shown that the source of the frame can significantly impact upon the strength of framing effects (Hartman and Weber, 2009; Joslyn and Haider-Markel, 2006). A central factor is whether the source is credible (Druckman, 2001). However, ‘credibility’ is often a subjective quality – stronger framing effects are found when there is an ideological alignment between source and recipient (Hartman and Weber, 2009; Slothuus, 2010). The stronger effects from partisan sponsorship may be rooted in ‘motivated reasoning’: individuals’ feelings toward the source (positive or negative) make them (more or less) predisposed to internalise the frame (Slothuus and de Vreese, 2010). Importantly, effects are stronger if there is a partisan conflict on an issue as powerful group identities are triggered (Slothuus and de Vreese, 2010). Whilst Slothuus and de Vreese’s (2010) study related to conflict between parties, if (and/or the extent to which) the central frames of Anglican/Catholic elites are in opposition to the dominant messages in the political sphere, this may make it more/less likely that Anglicans/Catholics will internalise the frame. Equally, strong frames rely on cultural references (myths, narratives and metaphors) that can resonate with an audience. Certain myths or narratives are deeply embedded within a society’s culture and are widely recognised and understood. It is not just what the myth or narrative is about that is

---

<sup>19</sup> Here there is a clear overlap with the immigration attitudes literature, where different individual-level characteristics have been shown to drive attitudes (for example, McLaren, 2003; Scheve and Slaughter, 2001; Semyonov et al., 2008; Weldon, 2006). The standard individual level moderators that are utilised in immigration attitudes research and that are employed in this study are outlined in Chapter 3.

<sup>20</sup> Overwhelmingly, framing effects have been measured in one-sided experimental settings (Chong and Druckman, 2007b). One group of participants would be provided with a specific frame whilst another group would consume an alternative. The classic study is that of whether a hate group (i.e. the Ku Klux Klan) should be allowed to hold a rally. A majority of one-sided studies have reported that contradictory frames have a statistically significant framing-effect when compared with one another (Chong and Druckman, 2007b). In the case above, framing the issue as one of free speech increased the likelihood of participants favouring allowing the rally. Framing the issue as one of public disorder saw participants more inclined to back banning the rally. Making framing ‘more real’ has seen a focus on issue characteristics (Iyengar, 1991), competitive framing (Chong and Druckman, 2007b; Sniderman and Theriault, 2004), interpersonal communication (Druckman and Nelson, 2003) and source characteristics (Druckman, 2001).

<sup>21</sup> The significance of accounting for source characteristics (i.e. contextual factors outside of pure rhetoric) is rooted in the Internalist/Externalist debate in securitization research discussed in detail in section 2.5.

understood – the ‘excess meaning’ is also comprehended: ‘by mentioning one or more of these powerful concepts the array of related ideas, social history, policy choices, heroes, and villains may be activated’ (Hertog and Mcleod, 2001: 143). Which myths, narratives or metaphors are powerful is issue, context, and crucially source dependent (Desrosiers, 2015; Gamson and Modigliani, 1987, 1989). Moreover which cultural references are available to actors varies and the potential for certain references to exert a strong pull on attitudes are contingent upon the extent to which the source and recipient share an identity.

Overall, these findings and insights from the framing literature demonstrate the power that elites, both religious and political, can potentially have on ‘their’ audiences. And as outlined in the Introduction (and expanded upon in Chapter 3), despite being one of Europe’s least religious countries, close one million Anglicans and Catholics respectively attend church weekly in the UK.

### **2.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour?**

What cues religious elites will provide, and subsequently what effect they may have on the attitudes of their flock however, is unclear. Again, analysis of the discourse of religious elites in the securitization literature (with the exception of Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010) is missing. Moreover in the UK immigration politics literature, attention has been exceedingly limited, with Statham and Geddes’ (2006) unique study of various societal actors ‘claims making’ regarding immigration being an exception. Yet Statham and Geddes’ study was not designed to explore framing beyond notions of ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ (i.e. it did not explore which aspects of migration elites were choosing to focus on and which rhetorical devices/strategies they adopted/were absent), did not distinguish between faiths, and the analytical period (1990-2004) ran prior to that of this thesis. Overall, what cues religious elites in the UK have been delivering with regards to migration is unknown.

Whether religion is a force of intolerance and exclusion (Brewer et al., 2010), a source of peace and unity (Little, 2007) or has a Janus-face (Appleby, 1999; Philpott, 2007) has been the subject of debate since time immemorial. Allport (1954: 444) states that:

The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes and unmakes prejudice.

While the creeds of the great religions are universalistic, all stressing brotherhood, the practice of these creeds is frequently divisive and brutal.

The sublimity of religious ideal is offset by the horrors of persecution in

the name of these same ideals. ...Churchgoers are more prejudiced than average; they are also less prejudiced than average.

To date, studies that have sought to explore the role of religion and religiosity in shaping attitudes have produced mixed results. The out-groups most commonly under inspection tend to be homosexuals, political dissidents, and ethnic minorities. Reviewing the literature on religion and prejudice towards various out-groups between 1940 and 1990, Batson et al. (1993) show that in 37/47 cases there is a positive relationship between religiosity and prejudice, whilst the inverse relationship arose just twice. A more recent review between 1990-2003 again found the vast majority of relationships to be in line with this trend (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005). Whilst findings are not universal, Allport's conclusion seems overly optimistic: more often than not, religion is associated with increased prejudice.

For immigration attitudes in particular, findings are also somewhat mixed. Scheepers et al.'s (2002) cross-national study of attitudes towards ethnic minorities in eleven European countries found that in all cases the religious are more prejudiced than the non-religious. Similar results linking religion/religiosity and increased prejudice are found in studies focused on the Netherlands (Eisinga et al., 1990; Tolsma et al., 2008; Van Dalen and Henkens, 2005), Greece (Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010) and the U.S (McDaniel et al., 2011). In contrast, in a cross-national inquiry on Euroscepticism, Boomgaarden and Freire (2009) found that religiosity depresses anti-immigration attitudes. Similar effects were found by Lubbers et al. (2006) regarding opposition to the opening of Asylum Seeker Centres in the Netherlands and in Knoll's (2009) analysis of immigration policy preferences in the U.S. Thus whilst the majority of literature shows religiosity to be associated with prejudice toward out-groups, including immigrants, the results are not uniform.

#### **2.4.4 Defining Religiosity**

However, religion and religiosity are not unitary concepts. 'Religion' is very often conceptualised as a multifaceted phenomenon comprised of three components: Behaviour, Belief and Belonging, the so-called '3B's' (Smidt et al., 2009; Wald and Smidt, 1993). The social Behaviour element captures participation in organised religious communities, including church attendance. The Belief aspect refers to the framework of core beliefs, values and symbols that underpin the understanding of the 'Divine' and that particular religion's God. The Belonging component is typically viewed to encompass membership of a major religious denomination/tradition, fostering shared values, beliefs, symbols and

myths between adherents (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015). The necessity of separating these different elements of religion is demonstrated by their differing effects on public attitudes (Ben-Nun Bloom and Arikan 2012a, 2012b). Whilst studies and results have varied widely, relying on insights from Social Identity theory, the Behaviour and Belonging components are expected to trigger in-group-out-group discrimination and prejudice. In contrast, within all of the world's major religious traditions, there can be found sections where qualities such as benevolence, charity, solidarity and compassion are preached (Allport, 1954; Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015). But, studies have demonstrated that these attitudes often lack a universalism and are constrained to the in-group: love thy neighbour if thy neighbour is similar to us (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015; Saroglou et al., 2004; Schwartz and Huismans, 1995).

This thesis, however, is not designed to explore the effects of religion or which facets of religiosity are driving immigration attitudes. Instead, attention is focused upon the previously ignored role of elite cues. Djupe and Calfano (2012: 776) state that:

We have probably learned as much as we can from the typical measures of religiosity, broad religious attachments and religious beliefs. Instead, this literature needs to bear witness to how religious contexts shape the sociology and psychology of how people interact with and think about out-groups... This dictates a focus on information provision from, especially, religious elites who report conveying just the values we inquire about with some frequency.

Yet, to this point it is argued that 'we know relatively little about the impact of religiosity and the role of religious group cues in shaping attitudes towards immigration' (Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015: 218). Djupe and Calfano (2012: 769) show that 'exposure to inclusive religious values encourages people to reduce the sense of threat they feel toward the group they most dislike, which fuels tolerance of their political presence.' This would indicate that even though Belonging and Behaviour can theoretically foster in-group/out-group prejudice, Behaviour (church attendance) may offer a platform to prime Beliefs (via elite messages) that may foster tolerance.<sup>22</sup> Citing Tajfel (1970), Djupe and Calfano (2012)

---

<sup>22</sup> Echoing Knoll (2009), it cannot be conclusively argued that any difference in attitudes detected does not arise from the Belief element (i.e. 'love thy neighbour') – independent of 'cuing'. Whilst this may indeed be a factor, to uncover the role of Belief would require assumptions to be made about the appropriate political application of the religious doctrine. In short, for the issue of migration, it is unlikely that the appropriate political application that 'should' be derived from the belief will be unanimously agreed upon by religious adherents. It is not possible to determine whether 'loving thy neighbour' means backing open borders, a



emphasise the ease with which a sense of threat/dislike can be manipulated (one is also drawn to Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment). From this it is 'suspect[ed] that clergy are especially important cue givers who can prime inclusion or exclusion and thus weaken or reinforce in-group identities' (Djupe and Calfano, 2012: 771). This suspicion is supported by the framing literature outlined above that demonstrates the important role played by source and the significance of their identity overlapping with that of the audience (Hartman and Weber, 2009; Slothuus, 2010). Overall, religious actors and the 'official position' of the Church could be highly influential as part of the de/securitizing process in shaping public attitudes (namely persuading the audience to accept/reject the issue as one of security). Moreover, the previous neglect of elite cues may be one key factor underpinning the inconsistency regarding the effects of religion and religiosity on attitudes towards immigrants and out-groups. Thus it may not be religion that is fully responsible for 'making and unmaking prejudice', as Allport suggests. Rather, religious elites may make tolerance or intolerance by framing various out-groups and issues in an inclusive or exclusive sense.

To summarise the discussion above regarding the first weakness of securitization theory to be addressed in this thesis – an overemphasis on traditional security actors – incorporating an analysis of religious elites in addition to political elite actors assists with generating a more holistic understanding of the de/construction of security issues. This expansion of focus beyond the traditional sphere makes a theoretical contribution to securitization theory as research has demonstrated that other elite actors have the potential to, and have previously, influenced the de/securitization process. Moreover, focusing on religious elites also engages with the calls from the scientific study of religion literature to incorporate (religious) elite cues in order to better understand the effects of religion and religiosity in shaping attitudes. Last, on an empirical basis in the UK (especially from 2005 onwards) what cues religious elites have been providing with regards to migration has been thoroughly under-researched. Overall, the focus on religious elites as a previously overlooked group is a key contribution of this thesis.

## **2.5 Extending Securitization Theory: 'Bringing the Audience Back In'**

The second weakness of securitization theory that is addressed in this thesis is that the CS present discourse analysis as the 'obvious method' to study security (Buzan et al.,

---

guest-worker program as a path to citizenship, encouraging potential migrants to respect immigration laws and procedures, or encouraging potential migrants to stay and 'improve their current home countries'. Instead, it is necessary to analyse how certain beliefs are being primed/how are they used in relation to framing migration.

1998: 176). This marginalises the audience and subsequently prevents an analysis of the full de/securitization process.

To recap, the CS defines the de/construction of security as an intersubjective process conducted between the de/securitizing actor and the audience receiving the message (Buzan et al., 1998: 30). The critical feature that separates an attempt to securitize an issue and an issue being said to have been securitized is the behaviour of the audience: an ‘issue is securitized *only if and when the audience accept it as such*’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 25) (emphasis added). However, discourse analysis is not best placed to investigate questions of audience acceptance/rejection. Discourse analysis appears only to be able to explore de/securitizing moves and cannot grapple with the process of de/securitization in full. Hence a central argument made in this thesis centres on the need to move beyond discourse analytical methods to dissect this relationship in detail.

The lack of clarity over how to analyse security can be traced to a lack of clarity over how the CS define security. This necessitates a more precise dissection of the definition of the securitization process outlined above. In one instance the CS appear to conceive of security purely as a speech act: ‘[b]y uttering “security,” a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it’ (Wæver, 1995: 55). Yet in another instance the CS posit that ‘[w]hat is essential is the designation of an existential threat requiring emergency action or special measures and the acceptance of that designation by a significant audience.’ These two definitions appear to contradict one another with the first placing the capacity to de/securitize in the power of the elite actors and the latter placing the emphasis on inter-subjectivity with the power shared between elite actors and a facilitating audience. Recall however that it is also stated by the CS that if the audience do not accept the designation of an issue as an existential threat then this merely represents a securitizing move and the issue cannot said to have been securitized – undermining the former view of security outlined by Wæver.

Unpacking this confusion further, the first of the above definitions conceives security as a ‘self-referential practice’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 24). This is argued to rely on an ‘internalist’ or ‘philosophical’ reading of security (see Balzacq, 2005, 2011; Stritzel, 2007). In short, the philosophical position attributes a far greater power to language. Security utterances are performatives in that they actually do things, meaning the conditions of securitizing a referent object by designating a threat are said to be ‘internal to

the act of saying security' (Balzacq, 2011: 1). An actor brings 'security' into being through her own rhetorical acts. In contrast, the latter definition is affiliated with an 'externalist,' 'sociological' or 'pragmatic' reading (Balzacq, 2005, 2011; Stritzel, 2007). The 'sociological' position is viewed as placing far greater emphasis on practices, power relations and context. Discursive practices are still viewed as important in the process of threat construction but it is merely recognised that many threats develop through non-discursive practices<sup>23</sup> (see Balzacq, 2005, 2011; Bigo, 2002; Case Collective, 2006; Stritzel, 2007, 2012). Here, securitization is conceptualised as intersubjective, conducted between securitizing actors and audiences, in specific places, contexts and times.

For Balzacq (2005: 2011), the tension between the two positions emerges from the CS's flawed understanding of Austin's speech act theory, a theory pivotal to the CS's conceptualisation. Austin (1962) purports that a speech act consists of three facets: locutionary (the utterance of an expression that contains a given sense and reference); illocutionary (the act performed in articulating a locution); and perlocutionary (the consequential effects designed to impact upon the target audience in terms of feelings, beliefs, thoughts or actions). Habermas (1984: 289) simplifies this as: 'to say something, to act in saying something, to bring about something through acting in saying something.' It is posited that the CS have conflated the illocutionary act with the perlocutionary act. Whilst the illocutionary act is in effect the speech act, the perlocutionary act is 'the casual response of a linguistic act' (Balzacq, 2011: 5). If securitization relies on audience acceptance as an intersubjective process, the perlocutionary effect is central (Balzacq, 2011: 6). The lack of clear focus is argued to lead to a 'failure to properly incorporate audience and context'<sup>24</sup> (Balzacq, 2005: 178). By specifying a focus on the perlocutionary

---

<sup>23</sup> A particularly robust strand of criticism of the internalist view of securitization has risen from those who have adopted a political sociology approach (Case Collective, 2006). This approach views security as a 'kaleidoscope of practices' (Balzacq, et al. 2010) rejecting the artificial distinction between linguistic and behavioural aspects of social practice (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 107). This conjecture is supported by a plethora of empirical studies that have demonstrated the ways in which non-discursive practices have impacted upon the framing of security. Examples of these include the role played by: visual images (Williams, 2003; Möller, 2007); forms of governmentality (Bigo, 2006a, 2006b; Huysmans 2006; Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008); policy tools (Balzacq, 2008); security practices (Basaran, 2008); and performative violent acts (Hansen, 2000).

<sup>24</sup> To be clear what is meant by context, Balzacq (2011: 36-37) makes a useful distinction. Building upon the work of Schegloff and Wetherell, Balzacq introduces the concepts of proximate and distal context. Proximate context refers to the immediate features of an actor's intervention, for example where the action takes place and for what occasion (whether the setting is a meeting, summit, interview etc.). Second, distal context refers to less immediate features, such as the ethnic or social class of participants, or the cultural setting within which the act takes place (Wetherell, 2001).

tangent, Balzacq (2005: 178) proposes relabelling the process a ‘pragmatic act’. The pragmatic act consists of two intertwined levels: the agent and the act. Within the level of the agent, there is the securitizing actor and the audience. For the securitizing actor, factors such as the power position or the identity of who is attempting to ‘do’ security become crucial (or in other words their cultural capital). For the audience, important is who the target audience(s) are and who are the main opponents or alternative voices within the relevant social field. In terms of the level of the act, included is both the traditional rules governing speech acts stressed by the CS, namely grammatical and syntactical, *and* context. It is in this level of context that analysis can explore which heuristic tools are used to mobilise the audience, including analogies, metaphors, emotions or stereotypes (Balzacq, 2005). Thus the pragmatic act, or latterly the sociological approach, inserts into securitization theory both context and non-linguistic features. The need to account for context and the differing degrees of social capital actors have to support their de/securitizing moves is congruent with the framing literature outlined above (Druckman, 2001b; Hartman and Weber, 2009).

In response to this critique of the philosophical approach, Hansen (2011) argues that the philosophical position does not exclude context. On the contrary, Hansen (2011: 160) posits that the insistence that viewing security as a self-referential practice constitutes ignoring the context/audience is based upon a misunderstanding of the poststructuralist view of discourse: it incorrectly ‘presupposes a decoupling of the speech act from the discursive structures through which “context” is constituted.’ In this reading, ‘external’ factors (such as context, source characteristics, and power relations) are very much integral to the analysis of security as a speech act.

It appears then that both ‘camps’ are in agreement that a pure focus on rhetoric, devoid of any contextual understanding is insufficient. Hence this study accounts for ‘external’ factors, namely the cultural capital political and religious actors possess and the subsequent greater likelihood of fellow ideologues (those who share an identity with the source) internalising frames from this source. Yet, whether philosophical or sociological, the important point is that speech acts, even accounting for external contextual factors, only constitutes the attempt by an actor to de/construct an issue as security (a securitizing move). To analyse the securitization process in full, it is essential to understand how this rhetoric features in an intersubjective process with the relevant audience.

To better incorporate the audience into the securitization process, Hansen (2011: 360) suggests that the audience, as enmeshed in discourse, may have their opinion ‘detected through surveys, polls or elections.’ Something similar is posited by Wilkinson (2011: 100) who argues that an externalist, sociological understanding of securitization explicitly ‘allows for a mixed methods approach that can accommodate both qualitative and quantitative data collection/generation methods such as surveys, various types of interview, discourse and textual analysis, participant observation and ethnographic methods.’ Indeed, in Karyotis and Patrikios (2010) study tracking attitudes to immigration in Greece referred to previously, statistical analyses were used alongside discourse analysis in an attempt to gauge whether the audience internalised the de/securitizing frames of elite actors.

This infusion of discourse and public attitudes data has some precedent in scholarship looking at public attitudes more broadly (unlike in the scientific study of religion literature mentioned previously, i.e. Knoll, 2009). For example, several studies have demonstrated that elite cues can effect public attitudes regarding European integration (Hooghe and Marks, 2005; McLaren, 2001; Steenbergen et al., 2007; Vossing, 2015)<sup>25</sup>. Hence there is recognition that public attitudes can be shaped from ‘top-down’ processes, as theorised by the CS. For immigration attitudes specifically, there have been a handful of studies that have attempted to account for the effects of elite cues. Hellwig and Kweon (2016) infuse a cross-national study of 21 European countries with a longitudinal analysis in Denmark. They demonstrate that ‘elite preferences on immigration have a strong effect on the attitudes of *their* supporters in the electorate’ (Hellwig and Kweon, 2016: 712) (my emphasis). Jones and Martin (2017) analysed how elite cues shaped opinion on immigration in the 2010 U.S House Elections. Alongside demographic contextual factors, ideological/identity alignment (party affiliation) moderated the effect of elite cues. Overall, findings from studies that have attempted to analyse elite cues have demonstrated that party affiliation/ideological alignment (i.e. who the source is) is pivotal. This finding is consistent with the framing research outlined earlier. However, all of the above studies are united by a focus upon traditional security actors – political elites and political parties.

---

<sup>25</sup> Weldon (2006) analyses the relationship between tolerance of ethnic minorities and how the dominant ethnic tradition or culture of a state is institutionalized in the form of laws and policies regarding citizenship. These ‘institutional’ or ‘structural’ cues may offer another way of thinking about elite influence. This aligns closely with the ‘practice-based’ view of security principally conceptualised by the so-called Paris School (see Case Collective, 2006). However, this thesis concentrates on discursive cues and does not investigate the shaping of public attitudes, and therefore de/construction of security, through practices.

Thus both the immigration/broad attitudes literatures share the above limitation with securitization theory: neglect of the discourses of other elite actors that can potentially wield a strong influence over public attitudes. Again, one of the central aims of this thesis is to widen the analytical net to unpack the attitudinal effects of elite cues more precisely, and in doing so, garner a more precise understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK and beyond.

To summarise the discussion of the second limitation of securitization theory that is at the centre in this thesis – an insufficient engagement of the audience – discourse analysis, whilst fully equipped to analyse de/securitizing moves from elite actors, is not overly well equipped to assess whether these attempts have been accepted/rejected by the audience. This study endeavours to address this limitation, building on the above calls and empirical findings. As such, survey evidence is introduced in the attempt to ‘bring the audience back in’ to the securitization process by tracking whether public opinion is in/out of line with elite de/securitizing frames<sup>26</sup>.

## 2.6 Bringing which Audience(s) Back In?

Yet, which ‘public’/‘audience’ the analyst should concentrate on is unclear. The concept of the audience in securitization theory has been ‘radically underdeveloped’ (Williams, 2011: 213) with Wæver (2003: 26) himself acknowledging that what is meant by the audience ‘requires a better definition and probably differentiation.’ This is due to the fact that the audience is rarely the entire population. Hence, several scholars have proposed disaggregating the audience (for example, Balzacq, 2005; Léonard and Kaunert, 2011; Roe, 2008; Vuori, 2008). All of these proposals agree that depending on the issue, actor and context, what the actor is aiming to achieve, and/or who the actor is principally trying to engage, the relevant audience differs (Balzacq et al., 2016; Klüfers, 2014). To

---

<sup>26</sup> Despite the support for the theoretical requirement to move beyond discourse analysis alone outlined above – and the effective infusion of statistical models and discursive analysis mentioned above regarding securitization and immigration attitudes – it may be objected (likely on epistemological grounds) that as discourse analysis is prescribed by the CS as the ‘obvious method’ to study security, it follows that security analysis is in some way inextricably tied to qualitative analysis. Indeed, securitization research is to date dominated by qualitative analysis. However, this thesis follows the argument of Barkin and Sjöberg (2015: 854) that ‘[m]ethods are tools that can be used for a variety of tasks’ and that methods should be driven by theory and therefore selected based on appropriateness to effectively answer/explore specific research questions. In short, to speak of epistemologies as inherently ‘qualitative’ or ‘quantitative’ is fallacious. For example, critical theory is often, either explicitly or implicitly, assumed to be a purely qualitative enterprise (but exceptions do exist, for example, Sjöberg and Peet, 2010). But, as Barkin and Sjöberg point out, ‘when Cynthia Enloe asks ‘where are the women’, she is in part making a feminist claim on quantitative methods.’ It is therefore argued that a pragmatic adoption of quantitative methods may, depending on the question and theoretical premises that are to be explored, be highly effective in the analysis of the social construction of phenomena, including security issues.

give one example, Salter (2008) proposes disaggregating the audience into different ‘settings’. This ‘dramaturgical’ approach posits that each setting is characterised by specific power dynamics.

In each of these different settings, the core rules for authority/knowledge (who can speak), the social context (what can be spoken), and the degree of success (what is heard) vary. This goes far beyond linguistic rules towards norms and conventions of discourse, as well as bureaucratic politics, group identity, collective memory and self-defined interest (Salter, 2008: 322).

Salter offers four settings: popular, elite, technocratic and scientific. It is argued that different settings endow certain actors with various degrees of de/securitizing potential, or in other words, that their capital is relative. To emphasise this point, ‘[i]mams and ministers [in the eyes of some] have an authority to name cultural and moral threats to society within the setting of popular politics, but there is a different stage presence about scientific truths’ (Salter, 2008: 331). Overall, the important point is that disaggregating the audience enables the synthesis of insights from framing theory and empirical research on the impact of elite cues (for example, Hellwig and Kweon, 2016). Most notably, the significance of the role the source plays and the likelihood that certain actors and their frames (i.e. what cultural references are employed, either explicitly or implicitly) will have greater resonance for with those share an identity.

Hence in this thesis it is recognised that political and religious elites whilst conscious of engaging a wider audience are 1) predominantly addressing ‘their’ audiences, namely party supporters or those of the same religious denomination and 2) in line with the framing literature, are also likely to have the most influence on the attitudes of said audiences.

## **2.7 Conclusion**

In sum, this thesis aims to develop a more nuanced understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond) by first, unpacking the discursive attempts to de/construct migration as a security issue and second, exploring the potential effects of said attempts to influence immigration attitudes. The role of elite cues as an explanatory variable has been neglected, and when included in analyses, has been restricted to political elites and political parties. As the set of actors most influential in shaping public debate on migration, political elites cannot be excluded. Yet, other sets of elite actors can potentially

wield just as much power in influencing attitudes in specific contexts. Religious elites are one such overlooked group. To unpack the potential effects of elite cues, alongside the broad immigration attitudes literature, the scientific study of religion literature and framing theory, this thesis primarily utilises and extends the CS's securitization theory. Despite the CS's theoretical innovation, securitization theory suffers from several limitations – two of which are addressed in this thesis.

The first limitation of securitization theory relates to an over-emphasis on traditional security actors and principally political elites. Again, whilst as a highly influential group political elites cannot be ignored, failing to account for the role played by other sets of elite actors in addition, has been shown to have theoretical and empirical limitations. Drawing on insights from framing theory, it is posited that religious elites are a prime, previously neglected group of elite societal actors with the power to be influential in the de/construction of security in terms of shaping public attitudes. The focus on religious elites also has consequences for studies of religion/religiosity more broadly. To date, the role of religion/religiosity and prejudice has produced mixed results, despite a dominant trend linking the two. There is a nascent recognition that the standard models for assessing the impact of religiosity on attitudes (the 3B's) have been exhausted and that there is a pressing need to account for the effects of elite cues – the previous failure to do so perhaps underpinning the past inconsistency in results regarding religiosity and increased/reduced prejudice. Widening the analytical net beyond traditional elite actors, and specifically focusing on religious elites, is a key contribution of this thesis.

The second limitation of securitization theory is that discourse analysis, prescribed by the CS as the 'obvious method' to study security (Buzan et al., 1998: 176), is ill-equipped to analyse the entire securitization process. In short, it is effective at analysing the attempts of elite actors to frame an issue as one of security (securitizing moves) or otherwise (desecuritizing moves), but cannot unpack whether the audience has accepted or rejected such attempts. Hence this thesis, building on previous research that has analysed the effects of elite cues on public attitudes in addition to calls to employ mixed-methods in securitization research, introduces survey analysis in an attempt to investigate whether elite cues have 'cut through' to 'their' audience. This operationalisation of both discourse analysis and statistical techniques to connect elite de/securitizing moves and the audience – necessitating a disaggregation of the audience and an account of source characteristics – makes a theoretical and methodological contribution to securitization theory and is another central contribution of this thesis.



## **Chapter 3: Methodology and Analytical Framework**

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 The Case of the UK
  - 3.2.1 The Period of Analysis
- 3.3 The ‘Obvious Method’ to Study Security: Outlining the Discourse Analysis
  - 3.3.1 Source Selection
    - 3.3.1.1 The Political Elites
    - 3.3.1.2 The Religious Elites
  - 3.3.2 Us vs. Them: Defining De/Securitizing Discourses
  - 3.3.3 Analytical Framework: Structuring the Discourse Analysis
    - 3.3.3.1 The Four Axes Model
    - 3.3.3.2 The Identitarian Axis
    - 3.3.3.3 The Economic Axis
    - 3.3.3.4 The Securitarian Axis
    - 3.3.3.5 The Political Axis
    - 3.3.3.6 Not Us and Them but ‘We’: Huysmans’ Desecuritizing Strategies
  - 3.3.4 Nuts and Bolts: The Analytical Process
- 3.4 Copy That? Connecting Elite Discourse with the Audience
  - 3.4.1 The Data
  - 3.4.2 The Independent and Dependent Variables
  - 3.4.3 The Control Variables
  - 3.4.4 The Models
    - 3.4.4.1 Models Exploring Political Elite Discourse
    - 3.4.4.2 Models Exploring Religious Elite Discourse
- 3.5 Conclusion

### **3.1 Introduction**

When instructing analysts in the study of security the Copenhagen School (CS) state the following:

The obvious method is discourse analysis, since we are interested in when and how something is established by whom as a security threat.

The defining criterion of security is textual: a specific rhetorical structure that has to be located in discourse (Buzan et al., 1998: 176).

Yet, as outlined in the previous chapter, discourse analysis alone is insufficient. Discourse analysis is equipped to explore the various attempts of actors to rhetorically de/construct security issues. However, it is not overly well equipped to analyse the second half of the security process, whether the audience accept or reject the actor’s attempts. In reference to the broad immigration attitudes literature (and the scientific study of religion), the weakness is reversed: the attitudes of the audience are analysed in the absence of a key attitudinal driver – elite discourse.

Having justified the need to adopt a mixed methods approach in the previous chapter, this chapter sets out how the methodology and analytical framework are

operationalised, although again the theory and methodology underpinning this thesis are inherently linked and overlap considerably. The chapter is constructed of several integrated parts. The first section outlines the cases of analysis. Here, the rationale underpinning the selection of the UK as a case as well as the decision to focus on the four largest UK-wide parties and the two largest faith groups (Anglicanism and Catholicism) will be discussed. The second part sketches the strategy of discourse analysis adopted in the thesis. This includes the analytical technique, discussion of the sources analysed and the analytical framework operationalised to structure the analysis. The third section lays the foundation for the quantitative portion of the thesis. Alongside an overview of the survey data that is utilised, drawing upon the broad immigration attitudes literature the rationale underpinning the construction of the statistical models will be illustrated. Last, a short conclusion will summarise the synthesis of both the qualitative and quantitative methods.

### 3.2 The Case of the UK

The principal aim of the thesis is to deepen our understanding of the security-migration nexus in two ways: first, by exploring the content of under-explored (as in the case of UK political actors) or previously ignored (as in the case of UK religious actors) elite migration discourses; and second, to ‘bring the audience back in’ to securitization theory by connecting elite cues (de/securitizing moves) to immigration attitudes. This has clear implications for the CS’s theory of security, as outlined in detail in the previous chapter. The level of detail regarding discourse analysis of political and religious elite actors of several parties and faiths makes a large-N or multiple case-study approach unfeasible for a project of this size. Despite this, Yin (2009: 47) argues that a single, critical case is well-equipped to ‘confirm, challenge or extend the theory’. With confirmation/extension of securitization theory at its heart, the UK has been selected as a critical case (Yin, 2009)<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> Whilst the label ‘critical case’ is deemed most appropriate from the typology of case-types provided by Yin (2009) (as the thesis is explicitly designed to extend securitization theory by trying to ‘test’ the theoretical assumption that elite securitizing moves impact upon relevant audiences), the boundaries between types of cases are not rigid and can overlap. Thus whilst the second research question fits Yin’s definition (by explicitly testing theory), the first research question focusing on the discursive de/construction of migration as a threat may fit the description of a typical case, where the UK is similar to many West European liberal democracies. However, regardless of what label is applied, the UK case is deemed ‘intrinsically’ valuable (see Bryman, 2008; Stake, 2005) in that it 1) helps deepen our understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK, at a time when understanding the nuances of UK migration politics is arguably more pressing than ever and 2) it enables the empirical exploration of the relationship between elite discourse and public opinion, helping to reintroduce the audience into securitization research, and providing a theoretical and methodological blueprint for further research in Security Studies and the study of public (immigration) attitudes more broadly.

With the first research question relating to UK discourse, why the UK is selected as the ‘case’ may seem self-evident. However, it is necessary to justify why the first research question focuses on the UK in the first place. The UK presents itself as an obvious candidate to select due to the degree to which migration has continually been at the centre of British politics – in both a historic and contemporary sense – as outlined in the Introduction. To briefly recap on more recent years, migration has been a highly salient issue in the UK. Over the last decade the UK public has consistently placed migration first or second in a list of ‘the most important issues facing Britain today’ (Ipsos Mori, 2014). This increase in salience has been accompanied by unprecedented increases in annual net migration. During the period of analysis net migration reached an annual average of 250,000. Comparing this to figures in 1997 (48,000) and the 1970s and 180s (below 50,000 and years of negative net migration) (Migration watch, 2017) captures the significance of this last decade.

Furthermore, this period has also featured a growth in far-Right anti-immigration politics. This is first evidenced by the electoral success of the BNP and UKIP in particular, the latter of whom were pivotal in securing the holding of a referendum on Britain’s membership of the EU. (Again, immigration (20%) was cited as the second most important issue in driving referendum voting intentions, marginally behind the economy (21%) (NatCen, 2016)). The success of anti-immigration politics however is also captured beyond ‘material’ success. At the level of discourse, Centrist/Centre-Left parties have struggled to cope with the political terrain and have moved to adopt Right-wing migration rhetoric/framing (see Bale, 2014; Hampshire, 2005) – a phenomena argued by Bale (2014) that this is not unique to parties in the UK. In this context, exploring the migration discourses in the UK from of the dominant set of elite actors (political elites) and a currently neglected but potentially important set of elite actors (religious elites) is highly valuable in extending our understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK.

The second focus of the thesis (namely the second research question) relates to the relationship between elite discourse and the attitudes of ‘their’ audiences. Due to the context of UK migration politics outlined above making the exploration of elite discourse much needed, it follows that the UK makes an interesting case to explore this relationship. The rationale of a case study approach is to enable a thorough appreciation of context (see Bryman, 2008; Stake, 2005). Again, the level of detail required to establish ‘context’ (in this case elite migration messaging across several parties and faiths) make a single case the most appropriate choice. The case study design of this thesis however paves the way for

similar studies focussing on other states (and the parties/faiths most relevant). Case studies are frequently (and legitimately) criticised for their inability to provide generalisability. For example, imagine this thesis found that Catholics who attend church frequently and are subsequently exposed to securitizing messages then report more negative immigration attitudes compared to those who attend infrequently or not at all and are therefore not being exposed to the same negative messaging. This does not mean that this exact relationship will hold in all circumstances where Catholics are frequently exposed to securitizing discourses. Context matters. And indeed, as argued above, as a case, the UK is intrinsically valuable in helping to unpack the construction of immigration attitudes and the security-migration nexus *in the UK*. However, it is argued in this thesis that it is possible to construe a degree of theoretical generalisability. More precisely, even though the exact nature of effects between elite cues and public opinion will differ from context to context, the theoretical premise (backed by the empirical findings of the UK case) that elite cues of both traditional and non-traditional security actors can – and are perhaps likely when there is strong identity alignment – impact on the attitudes of ‘their’ audiences does generalise and is instructive beyond this single case.

### **3.2.1 The Period of Analysis**

The analysis begins in 2005 and ends shortly after the conclusion of the 2015 General Election. The decision to begin the analysis in 2005 rests on the significance of the 2005 General Election campaign. To reiterate, the 2005 election saw the Conservative opposition politicise immigration, placing the issue at the centre of their election campaign. It was during and after this campaign that Labour’s rhetorical commitment to multiculturalism and a liberal immigration policy (although the asylum policy adopted was consistently draconian, see Hampshire, 2005; Schain, 2008) began to wane and retreat (Schain, 2008: 142-3). Ending the analysis shortly after the conclusion of the 2015 General Election enabled sources to be drawn from the election campaign – a period in which a party’s position on issues is carefully outlined. In relation to the statistical analysis there is a slight limitation of data. The data source used (the ESS) has not yet released (and was not close to releasing at the time of analysis in 2015/16) data for Round 8, 2016. The last survey round available was conducted throughout 2014. This means that elite messages from the last few months of the analytical period (Jan-May 2015) are not able to be explicitly ‘connected’ to public attitudes. However, this is not deemed problematic due to the consistency of elite positioning – this will be made clear in Chapters 4 and 5.

### 3.3 The 'Obvious Method' to Study Security: Outlining the Design of the Discourse Analysis

#### 3.3.1 Source Selection

Securitization theory denotes 'security' to be constructed in an intersubjective process between elite actors and a societal audience (Buzan et al., 1998). In this context, the CS (Buzan et al. 1998: 177) states the following:

Since the security argument is a powerful instrument, it is against its nature to be hidden. Therefore, if one takes important debates, the major instances of securitization should appear on the scene to battle with each other for primacy; thus, one does not need to read everything, particularly not obscure texts.

Subsequently, elite interventions (speeches, writings etc.) that fail to reach (deliberately or otherwise) a large audience are not considered. Therefore the elite de/securitizing acts that are selected for analysis centre on 'major instances'. This also assists in generating fairness and analytical rigour: 'It is better to have a limited set of texts and a complete representation of securitization instances than a large set from which the authors pick at liberty' (Buzan et al., 1998: 178).

##### 3.3.1.1 *The Political Elites*

As outlined in Chapter 2, a key contribution made in this thesis is widening the analytical net to focus on a previously under-explored and ignored (for securitization research and elite cues and immigration attitudes research respectively) set of elite actors who are likely to be influential in the de/construction of security via shaping public attitudes. Yet, previous research has demonstrated that in the UK, political elite actors are overwhelmingly dominant in driving discourse on migration (Statham and Geddes, 2006). However, despite analysis of specific dimensions of the security-migration nexus in the UK (Huysmans and Buonfino, 2008) and analysis of UK immigration politics/policy (Bale, 2011; Hampshire and Bale, 2015; Mulvey, 2010) and discourse (Capdevila and Callaghan, 2008; Smith, 2008), a comparative and nuanced discourse analysis of the four main UK-wide parties is missing. Thus, an analysis of political elite cues is not only essential to contextualise the discourses of other sets of elite actors and to fully understand the significance of any effects that may/may not arise from the cues of said other elites. It is also necessary in and of itself to further unpack and understand the security-migration nexus in the UK.

Analysis of political elites concentrates on the four largest UK-wide parties (Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and UKIP). The sources considered for political elite actors are restricted to ‘major instances’ where parties make careful and deliberate attempts to outline their position on migration. It was also important to ensure comparison between parties was as fair as possible. As such it was deemed prudent to restrict analysis to party manifestos and interventions from party leaders<sup>28</sup> (speeches on migration; party conference addresses; and ‘set piece’ pre-election debates). The leader is selected for fairness in that each party has one nominated ‘spokesperson’. Moreover, focussing on the leader (as opposed to party-wide analysis or a senior-figure analysis) is logical in that the leader’s messages are exceedingly likely to be representative of the party position or prevailing ‘party line’ meaning they are likely the cues the audience will mostly be exposed to. This rationale also underpins the inclusion of party manifestos: each party produces one, generating comparable fairness, and messages are carefully constructed and indicative of the ‘party line’. The 114 documents acquired are summarised in Table 3.1. In addition to the manifestos and annual conference speeches, the speeches on immigration were found through internet searches of party website archives in addition to the use of internet search engines. All leaders names were entered alongside words such as ‘(im)migration’/‘asylum’/‘refugees’ for each month during 2005-May 2015. Media coverage of these ‘major instances’ was plentiful – this coverage was utilised to ensure all relevant speeches/set-piece migration interventions had been accrued through the archival search. Again, if certain speeches/statements could not be found through a relatively thorough internet search this is not problematic as ‘obscure texts’ (Buzan et al., 1998: 177) are not thought to be crucial to understanding elite discourse on a topic and thus are to be avoided.

---

<sup>28</sup> During 2005-2015, the Conservatives have had two leaders. Michael Howard led until suffering electoral defeat to Labour in May 2005. Howard was replaced by David Cameron who was party leader for the remainder of the period of analysis after electoral success in 2010, forming a coalition with the Liberal Democrats and then winning a majority Conservative government in 2015. Labour have had three leaders during this period. Tony Blair’s premiership ended with his resignation in June 2007. Blair was succeeded by Gordon Brown who led the Labour party until suffering electoral defeat in May 2010. Ed Miliband followed Brown and led for five years until he too resigned following electoral failure in May 2015. The Liberal Democrats have also had three leaders: Charles Kennedy (until January 2006); Menzies Campbell (January 2006 - October 2007); and Nick Clegg (December 2007 - May 2015). Lastly, UKIP have had several leaders: Roger Knapman (until September 2006); Nigel Farage (September 2006 – November 2009); Lord Pearson of Rannoch (November 2009 - September 2010); and Nigel Farage (November 2010 - 2016). Despite this, Nigel Farage has spent by far the most years at the apex and can be seen to have embodied UKIP as a party. It is for this reason that Farage is selected as the UKIP ‘spokesperson’ for the entire analytical period.

Table 3.1: Political Elite Discourse Analysis Sources - Actors and Platform

	Manifestos	Conferences	Migration-Specific Speeches	Election Debates/Specials	Totals
<b>Political Party</b>					
Conservative	3	11	19	5	38
Labour	3	11	10	6	30
Liberal Democrat	3	16	4	7	29
UKIP	3	9		5	17
<b>Party Leaders</b>					
Michael Howard		1	14		15
David Cameron		10	5	5	20
Tony Blair		3	3		6
Gordon Brown		3	1	3	7
Ed Miliband		5	6	3	14
Charles Kennedy		2			2
Menzies Campbell		4			4
Nick Clegg		9	4	7	20
Nigel Farage		9		5	14
<b>Totals</b>	12	46	33	9	114

### 3.3.1.2 The Religious Elites

Principally drawing on framing theory, the previous chapter outlined why religious elites were potentially highly influential actors in terms of shaping the attitudes of ‘their’ audience and therefore in the de/securitization of security issues. The Anglican and Roman Catholic faiths have been chosen as the religious groups most prudent to analyse due to their numerical preponderance. Figures from the 2011 census show that 59% (approx. 33.2 million) of the population of England and Wales identified as Christian (Office for National Statistics, 2012). Somewhat different figures are given by The British Social Attitudes Survey (NatCen, 2011), a discrepancy argued by the National Secular Society (2012) to be underpinned by a methodological limitation in the 2011 Census relating to a leading question on religious affiliation. In this instance, 50% of the entire UK population identify as having no religion. Yet, from the remaining 50% who are religious, Anglicans (20%, approx. 12.66 million) and Roman Catholics (9%, approx. 5.9 million) constitute by far the largest proportions of the population, with a combination of all non-Christians

accounting for only 6% (approx. 3.7 million). However, this research is not interested solely in affiliation. Church attendance figures are critical. In this regard, during the period of analysis the average weekly attendance for the Anglican Church and Catholic Church stood at approximately 820,000 and 780,000 respectively<sup>29</sup>. These are sizable societal constituencies that have the potential to be significantly affected by elite messaging.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Again these figures are acquired from a report entitled *Church attendance in Britain, 2005-2015*, authored by *British Religion in Numbers* which draws upon data from *Religious Trends* by Peter Brierley.

<sup>30</sup> Attempts were made to include the third largest faith group, Islam (4.8% 2011 census: Office for National Statistics, 2012), in the analysis. Yet, several issues made this unfeasible. First, as a faith, the lack of 'hierarchy' (see Dannreuther, 2010) made identifying 'elites' far more problematic. An attempt was made to analyse the discourse of some of the largest Islamic organisations (for example umbrella groups such as the Muslim Council of Britain, the Association of British Muslims, the British Muslim Forum, and Imams Online, among others). However, the archival material available from these organisations was limited, often only available from 2012/3 onwards. More serious, however, was that the number of respondents identifying as Muslim in the UK in the ESS data set was very low, making any attempts to link elite discourse to immigration attitudes impossible. Despite this, during the quantitative analysis, Islam and a combination of 'Other' religions were investigated as a form of control to account for any potential effects arising from 'religiosity' in and of itself (see Chapter 6).

From the limited discursive analysis of the largest Islamic organisations, the striking finding was the lack of space dedicated to migration. For example, the Muslim Council of Britain's (2015) document, *Fairness not Favours: British Muslim Perspectives at the 2015 General Election*, did not even mention migration. In the very few instances when migration was addressed, the Muslim organisations almost universally avoid self-identifying as 'Other'. Messages do not speak of 'we' in relation to British Muslims and migrants. Rather there is a consistent attempt to ensure that notions of 'we' and 'our' are framed so as to place British Muslims within the in-group that is 'British' (i.e. not a migrant or not *really* British because they are Muslim). Naturally there is a recognition that being 'Muslim and British' is a minority identity and that there is a 'British Muslim community', however, this is not framed in an exclusive way. Rather, essentialist understandings of British identity, values and 'our way of life' are constantly challenged. In a deconstructive fashion, *the* British identity is argued to be a myth, and exist only in the sense that it is constantly evolving in an intersubjective process between all citizens. This perhaps compliments Croft's (2012) analysis that British identity relies on the securitization of Muslims as 'Other' in that Muslim organisations are perhaps trying to undermine this exclusive conceptualisation of Britishness.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, a lot of attention is dedicated to the issue of Islamism and terror. There is a consistent and strident effort to frame Islamism and Islamist terror as both unIslamic (to de-toxify the identity of 'Muslim') and a threat to all citizens. In other words, the us/them divide was reassigned from non-Muslim Brits vs. Muslim Brits to non-Islamist British Citizens (including Muslims) vs. Islamists. Whilst not migration-specific, it may be extrapolated that the efforts to ensure British Muslims are viewed as British and not 'Other' may contribute to both the lack of attention given to migration as an issue and of the clear intention not be labelled as 'migrant' (i.e. not *really* British). The small number of interventions into the migration debate by 'elite' Muslim organisations may also be viewed as interesting in terms of an asecuritization approach to the securitization. Theoretically silence can be a powerful tool to prevent securitizations emerging (Hansen, 2000, 2012). It may also dampen securitizations by limiting the number of desecuritizing attempts that accidentally result in strengthening security discourse. Alternatively, with securitizing discourses dominant in the UK, the failure to consistently and loudly challenge the prevailing security-threat discourse can be argued to have either strengthened securitizing discourses or at best have done nothing to reduce their dominance. Evidently, further research is required.



In terms of source section, analysis again, following the CS, concentrated on ‘major instances’. Sources analysed included official documents from each Church outlining the faith’s position on migration as well as public interventions (public speeches/homilies and media pieces) from senior Church officials (Archbishops, former Archbishops and senior Bishops). The 28 documents for the Anglican faith and 33 documents for the Catholic faith are summarised in Table 3.2 and Table 3.3 respectively. Parallel to the political elites, sources were identified through internet searches of Church website archives in addition to the use of internet search engines. For the internet searches, key figures were identified (the Archbishops and any migration spokespersons) and their names were entered alongside words such as ‘(im)migration’/‘asylum’/‘refugees’ for each month during 2005-May 2015. The same process was conducted with the ‘Church of England’/‘Catholic Church of England and Wales’ and ‘Anglican Bishop’/‘Catholic Bishop’ replacing the names of particular individuals. Again, media coverage of these ‘major instances’ was utilised to ensure all relevant speeches/set-piece migration interventions had been accrued through the archival search. Once more, if certain interventions were not found, this was not deemed problematic.

Table 3.2: Anglican Elite Discourse Analysis Sources - Actors and Platform

	<b>Official Church Publications (election advice, migration policy)</b>	<b>Media Pieces (Newspaper/Radio)</b>	<b>Public (Homilies/Statements)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Anglican Church	8			8
Collective Bishops		1		1
Nicholas Baines (Bishop of Leeds)		1		1
George Carey (AC <sup>31</sup> 1991-2002) <sup>32</sup>		6	1	7
Michael Nazir-Ali (Bishop of Rochester)		2		2
David Walker (Bishop of Manchester)		2		2
Justin Welby (AC 2013-Present)		1	1	2
Rowan Williams (AC 2002-2012)		1	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>28</b>

<sup>31</sup> Archbishop of Canterbury, head of the Church of England.

<sup>32</sup> A report produced by the Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration, of which Carey is a signatory, is also assigned to Carey.

Table 3.3: Catholic Elite Discourse Analysis Sources - Actors and Platform

	Official Church Publications (election advice, migration policy)	Media Pieces (Newspaper/Radio)	Public (Homilies/State ments)	Total
Catholic Church	4			4
Collective Bishops		1		1
William Kenney (Auxiliary Bishop of Birmingham)			2	2
Bernard Longley (Archbishop of Birmingham)			1	1
Patrick Lynch (Bishop of Southwark)		1	8	9
Cormac Murphy-O'Connor (AW 2009-Present)		3	4	7
Vincent Nichols (AW <sup>33</sup> 2000-2009)		5		5
Patrick O'Donoghue (Bishop of Lancaster)		2	1	3
Peter Smith (Archbishop of Southwark)			1	1
<b>Total</b>				33

### 3.3.2 Us vs. Them: Defining De/Securitizing Discourses

Constructing migration as a security issue rests in the CS's concept of 'societal' security. 'At its most basic, societal identity is what enables the word "we" to be used' (Wæver, 1993:17). As Wæver (1993: 23) outlines,

societal security concerns the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats. More specifically, it is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom.

For the CS, the society in question is usually a state-level entity (as opposed to individuals or the global-level, where the society would be humankind)<sup>34</sup>. It is recognised that individuals have multiple identities. However, it is argued that 'the closer one comes to war in either literal or metaphorical forms, the more there will be a hierarchy: In these

<sup>33</sup> Archbishop of Westminster, head of the Catholic Church of England and Wales.

<sup>34</sup> This is not inevitable, merely a result of history which has ensured that states are the political communities which dominate (Wæver, 1993). Some securitizations can look to secure referent objects above the middle, state level. Universal ideas such as religions or political ideologies are two such examples. Buzan and Wæver (2009) refer to these as macrosecuritizations. Macrosecritizations can co-opt other securitizations, for example the 'Global War on Terror' (Buzan, 2007) incorporates the securitizations of drugs, crime, WMD's etc.

conditions national identity is usually able to organise the other identities around itself' (Wæver, 1993: 22).

The most oft-cited challenge to the conception of societal security comes from McSweeney (1996, 1999) who argues that it reifies identity and society in a manner that is analytically untenable and political irresponsible. By defining society in terms of identity, McSweeney posits that the CS's concept of societal security views society as having one single, unitary identity. Not only is this argued to obscure the variety and fluidity of identity within a society, the idea of societal security equalling the protection of identity works to foster exclusive identities and exacerbate intergroup conflict/intolerance. Although McSweeney's case appears powerful, Williams (1998, 2003) argues that his critique misses the point. The CS is not denying the existence of a multiplicity of identities in society – to do so would be simply false. A securitizing move with notions of existential threat and a Schmittian friend/enemy logic attempts to suppress multiple identities. Williams (2003: 519-20) captures this clearly, noting that a

successful securitisation of an identity involves precisely the capacity to decide on the limits of a given identity, to oppose it to what it is not, to cast this as a relationship of threat or even enmity, and to have this decision and declaration accepted by the relevant group.

Thus the CS is not arguing that society has an objectifiable singular character, rather that this (false) image is what is conveyed by securitizing actors who desire to unify a society/relevant audience.

Thus 'societal security' suppresses identities into a simplified and unitary form. Hence the discourse analysis in this thesis sought to trace whether political and religious elites framed migrants/migration as a threat (a securitizing discourse) or a non-threat (a desecuritizing discourse) to 'us' as Britain/British. Borrowing from Gamson and Modigliani (1987: 143), was 'the essence of the [migration] issue' presented as threatening or not?

This binary 'coding' of a discourse as being security or otherwise is at its root based on simplicity. It is less difficult to identify whether a message is positive or negative on the whole, as opposed to interpreting *how* positive or negative<sup>35</sup>. Moreover, even if a

---

<sup>35</sup> To move beyond this security/non-security binary, the concept of riskification has been introduced to buttress securitization research (see Corry, 2012; von Lucke et al., 2014). Whilst securitization concentrates on notions of threat with direct causes of harm, risk security is focussed on the conditions of possibility for

discourse does not appear overtly securitizing, but is in itself not positive (i.e. drawing on notions of negativity/threat), this does not mean a discourse is not securitizing. Here it is worth quoting Hansen (2012: 533) at length:

One should keep in mind that speech itself is not transparent or devoid of power and that ‘the security speech act is not defined by uttering the word *security*’. Securitising actors may reconstitute an issue such that it avoids the high-pitched notes of radical, barbaric, blood-thirsty Others, while still situating it within a modality of securitisation. To give an example, immigration discourse might be couched in ‘civilised’ terms where ‘immigrants’ are not ‘threats’, but for instance ‘better helped in their own environments’. Yet, the institutional structures and ways in which anti-immigrant control is practiced might reveal a much more ‘securitized’ political terrain. Such cases of ‘strategic self-moderation’ raise the question why securitising actors appropriate this form of discourse rather than a more linguistically overt securitisation. One answer would be, that there are certain ‘civilising tropes’, that the audience in question is less likely to rebel against – or at least securitisation actors believe this to be the case.<sup>36</sup>

Across Europe, empirical research has demonstrated that migration (in terms of ‘institutional structures’, policy and ‘practices of control’) is very much entrenched in ‘securitized terrain’ (Basaran, 2008; Bigo, 2002). In the UK, for example, legislation to process asylum seekers has legitimised the use of prisons and the construction of purpose built detention centres (Hampshire, 2005). Therefore, if a discourse frames migration in a negative sense (threat, risk, problem), this thesis interprets this as strengthening the securitization of migration (i.e. securitizing moves/frames). In contrast, discourses that frame migration in a positive sense, avoiding/challenging notions of threat/risk/problem, are viewed as challenging the securitization of migration (desecuritizing moves/frames)<sup>37</sup>.

---

harm (Corry, 2012). Whilst the notion of ‘risk’ offers a promising path to generate more nuanced analysis, this theoretical limitation is not addressed in this thesis.

<sup>36</sup> These ‘civilising tropes’ are in line with van Dijk’s (1993) analysis of racism in elite discourse where it is argued that discursive strategies such as ‘positive self-presentation’, ‘disclaimers and the denial of racism’, or notions of ‘firm, but fair’, mask prejudice.

<sup>37</sup> Another potential objection to the binary securitizing/desecuritizing approach to ‘coding’ is rooted in the concept of ‘asecurity’. Asecurity refers to an absence of security (Wæver, 1998). In the context of migration,

### 3.3.3 Analytical Framework: Structuring the Discourse Analysis

#### 3.3.3.1 *The Four Axes Model*

It is posited that the ‘threat’ posed by migration is articulated around four axes: Identitarian, Securitarian; Economic, and Political (see Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Karyotis, 2007). Each axis percolates around a different referent object: societal/national identity (Identitarian); border security/sovereignty and individual safety from crime (Securitarian); economic security, covering both labour (employment, wages and the macro-economy) and welfare (Economic); and political stability (Political). Ceyhan and Tsoukala (2002: 23-4) note that ‘the rhetorical arguments put forward in almost all anti-immigration discourses are more or less similar, with various strategies of argumentation according to different contexts and public policies’. However, as noted above, a detailed discourse analysis that tries to systematically account for these various dimensions of de/securitizing migration for the main UK-wide parties is under-developed and completely missing for religious elites. Moreover, an analysis of UK actors will enable an exploration of which ‘strategies of argumentation’, to use Ceyhan and Tsoukala’s phrase, feature in UK migration discourse. Answering this question will develop and deepen the understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK (and potentially beyond).

Thus the four axes model is utilised as an analytical framework to structure the discourse analysis and to locate which aspect of migration an actor utilised to de/securitize the issue. A brief exploration of the dynamics of each axis will provide a solid basis to

---

this could be interpreted to mean where messages appear to neither reinforce nor challenge migration as an object of security. However, asecurity is not deemed relative to this thesis. The vast majority of sources selected for analysis are those which engage with the issue of migration directly – with the exception being the conference speeches and General Election manifestos which were included for comparable fairness and based on the assumption that key issues, including migration, were likely to be addressed (and indeed, only a handful of the latter type of source did not mention migration). As such, drawing on a social constructionist view of discourse, discourses cannot be neutral. They must, however marginally, either support or challenge the securitization of migration. Here the concept of the ‘order of discourse’ from Fairclough’s (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis* is useful (see Jorgenson and Philips, 2002). If all possible discursive interventions amount to ‘discourse’ the order of discourse refers to discourses operating in the same discursive field. For example, when analysing the link between migration and crime, golf is not relevant to the conversation (it could be if, for instance, migrants were for some reason related to a spree of golf related crime – but ‘golf’, as in the game, is not relevant) and therefore a speech about golf in no way supports or challenges the securitization of migration. Alternatively, discourses related to migrant offending rates do operate in the same discursive terrain and therefore will inevitably support or challenge the securitization of migration. Again, as the vast majority of sources selected for analysis discuss migration directly they are not neutral – metaphorical ‘golf-related’ interventions by elites (i.e. speeches on non-migration related topics and all other ‘asecurity’ messages of this type) have been bypassed.

critically examine the rhetorical interventions of the political and religious elites in the following chapters.

### **3.3.3.2 The Identitarian Axis**

For the security-migration nexus, societal security is recognised as the central monolith (Wæver, 1993) that underpins, transcends and is foundational for each of the other three axes<sup>38</sup>. In the case of societal security, identity is ascribed as the referent object (Buzan et al., 1998; Wæver, 2003). By altering the demographic equilibrium and challenging traditional 'identities' migration is deemed to deunify and destabilise the host society (Ibrahim, 2005: 164). This conjecture relies upon the adoption of fixed, essentialist identities of both the migrant and the indigenous population (Huysmans, 1995). In short, a culturally harmonious and homogenous 'us' is contrasted with a culturally homogenous and dangerous 'them'. Thus securitizing discourses portray the question over the future of the political community as one regarding acceptance or rejection of migration. As Huysmans (2000: 758) notes however, 'it is not a free choice because a choice for migration is represented as a choice against (the survival of) the political community'. Overall, the relationship between the society's ('our') identity and the migrants' ('their') identity is constructed in a 'conflictual way' (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002: 29).

Framing security in the Shmittian sense of defining one's self in relation to the other as Buofino (2004: 26) suggests is not only detrimental to society but is based on questionable foundations. This Orientalism, or fear of the Other, is argued to have a plethora of roots, largely linked to the processes of Europeanisation and globalisation which have undermined the concept of societal homogeneity (Statham, 2003: 165). Society, as composed of 'imagined communities' (Anderson, 1991) is far from homogenous, whilst the societies of the UK and Europe are a product of continuous migrations, inter-community reproduction and cultural syncretism (Lohrmann, 2000: 8). Rather than the culture of the host country and the culture of migrant populations being insulated from one another, the cultures have been evolving together (Huysmans, 2001: 197). However, the migrant-threat relationship is socially constructed as opposed to

---

<sup>38</sup> The significance of identity, as opposed to 'real' security concerns over resources or other finite phenomena, is exemplified by Weiner's (1992) acknowledgement that it is often not the case of how many migrants are at the door, but is instead a case of who is knocking. The UK government's infamous and hysteric reaction to the arrival of the *Empire Windrush* containing 492 (black Jamaican) subjects of the Crown, and their simultaneous active encouragement (via the 'Westward Ho!' initiative) of the immigration of tens of thousands of (white) European aliens, is case in point (see Joppke, 1999; Paul, 1997; Schain, 2008).

objectively 'true'. As Wæver (1995:70) asserts, "'society" never speaks, it is only there to be spoken for'. Despite society being comprised of individual's with multiple and competing identities, actors can try to suppress these differences to ensure that a certain identity is framed as the most significant. This is at the heart of McSweeney's critique and Williams' reply (see section 3.3.2).

Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the identitarian axis focuses upon whether 'our' (i.e. British) identity is framed as being threatened by migration (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

### **3.3.3.3 The Economic Axis**

The second axis centres on economics. In keeping with the analysis above, notions of 'us' and 'them' underpin economic discourses. Discourses of economic threat are posited to be of greater concern to those deemed to be in the working classes as this group are likely to be most exposed to direct competition from new arrivals (Buonfino, 2004). For analytical clarity this thesis further divides this axis into the 'labour' and 'welfare' strands. For the former, grievances raised against the migrant Other relating to competition for jobs, wage compression and causing urban deterioration are well established (Karyotis, 2007). In terms of welfare, the securitizing discourses are framed around the image of an indigenous deserving 'we' being exploited by a foreign undeserving 'them'. This exclusion is not trivial. Huysmans (2000: 767) argues that 'access to social and economic rights [are] crucial in the governance of belonging in the welfare state.' In times of economic hardship, widespread in Europe since the 2007 'Great Recession', scarcity of jobs and resources can raise competition and tensions. A major part of the wider securitization of migrants as a 'problem' economically percolates around what Huysmans (2000) labels 'welfare chauvinism'. This chauvinism is a product of two prevailing discourses. Initially, welfare is posited as a 'magnet' that sucks migrants into the host state. Secondly, migrants are viewed as illegitimate recipients of welfare. This is in part down to the 'magnet' frame that casts migrants as profiteers, but also arises from a general Otherness and lack of belonging. The welfare chauvinism frame can manifest in the moderate sense migrants being viewed as a barrier to the state providing for its 'own' people first, to a more extreme position where migrants are depicted as freeloading fraudsters (Huysmans, 2000).

Evidently migrants are not framed as an economic asset. There are, however, repeated examples of migrants filling labour gaps and benefiting host economies (Borjas, 1995, 1999). As Ceyhan and Tsoukala (2002: 24) argue, migrants are 'a cheap and easily

exploitable labor force [that] allows the achievement of certain short-term economic goals, such as reduction of production costs, increase of exports, and the economic survival or even the development of many firms.’ How ethical this instrumental economic argument is, is debateable. Equally, it appears to suggest that if the macro economy benefits, everyone benefits. Again as Buonfino (2004: 33) notes, certain discourses are posited to be more potent in specific socio-economic groups. In short, gains at the macroeconomic level may be good for capital, but for the economically disadvantaged amongst the host society (namely, unskilled workers and the unemployed) who are more likely to have to compete with new arrivals who tend to be predominantly unskilled, those gains are not automatically felt. An arguably more progressive, if still instrumental case made for viewing migrants as economic assets as opposed to a burden, comes from a report produced by the Population Division of the United Nations. The report concluded that in the context of increasingly ageing societies EU states would have to import 700 million migrants by 2050 to sustain current levels of welfare spending, meaning that pulling up the draw bridge may have detrimental effects in the long term (United Nations, 2000).

In sum, analysis of discourses operating on the economic axis concentrates upon whether migration is framed as threatening economic wellbeing of Britain/British citizens (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

#### **3.3.3.4 The Securitarian Axis**

The third axis is the securitarian. Again, the binary identitarian notions of 'us' and 'them' are paramount in underpinning securitizing frames. The 'threat' on this occasion is toward the sovereignty of the state and toward the personal security of individuals, as migrants are cemented into the 'criminal-migrant thesis' (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002: 25).

Beginning with the threat toward the sovereignty of the state, it is posited that with globalisation and the porous nature of territorial boundaries, state authorities are concerned about the loss of border control (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002: 25). Border control is ubiquitous within migration discourse and is said to be important in two regards. Firstly, borders are significant in that they define the legal jurisdiction of a state (Anderson, 1996). Secondly, borders are imbued with substantial symbolic power in that they can be associated with mythic notions of nationhood, shared history and shared identity (Anderson, 1996). These are powerful concepts in demarcating identity in terms of who is 'us' and who is 'Other'.



Turning to the threat to personal security, the criminal-migrant thesis posits that migrants are substantially more prone to engage in criminal activities than the indigenous persons of the host population. It is argued that crime discourses are predominantly a concern of the middle and upper classes (Buonfino, 2004). The basis for the criminal-migrant thesis is argued by Huysmans (2000) to lay in the progressive 'Europeanisation' of security following waves of integrative measures including the Schengen Treaties, Europol, and most significantly the Single European Act. Blossoming from these integrative measures is the so-called 'security problematique' (Huysmans, 2000: 760). The prevailing discourse of this 'problematique' is that the free movement of goods, capital, services and people, enhances the capacity for the free movement of 'undesirables', specifically criminals, organised criminals, illegal immigrants and terrorists. Margaret Thatcher's proclamation that '[w]e joined Europe to have free movement of goods... not... to have free movement of terrorists, criminals, drugs, plant and animal diseases and illegal immigrants', epitomises this discourse (cited in Tesfahuney, 1998: 506). By amalgamating migration with illegal activities and terrorism, a security continuum exists where migration and crime become fused together (Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008). Moreover, the presumption of migrants as being criminals, deviants and persons to be regarded with suspicion, has aided the discourses of 'false'/'bogus' as opposed to 'genuine' asylum seekers as distinctions between migrants, refugees and asylum seekers are blurred (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Tsoukala, 2005). Taken as a whole the criminal-migrant thesis fosters 'suspicion, stigmatisation, and fear of resident ethnic minorities and migrants among the population' (Buonfino, 2004: 47-8). This fear and exclusion has been exacerbated by the dramatic proliferation of (in)security following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (Bigo and Tsoukala, 2008; Faist, 2002; Karyotis, 2007)<sup>39</sup>.

Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the securitarian axis zeroes in on whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining UK sovereignty/border control and personal safety from crime (including 'terror') (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

---

<sup>39</sup> Empirically, this criminal-migrant thesis is not wholly inaccurate at surface level. Admittedly there is a higher percentage of migrants in prison populations than their share of the population should merit. This correlation, however, is argued to be anomalous with Lohrmann (2000: 8) arguing that the evidence suggests the criminal-migrant thesis is 'misjudged and overestimated' (see also Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Tsoukala, 2005).

### 3.3.3.5 *The Political Axis*

Lastly, migration can be securitized on the political axis. Weiner (1992) demonstrated how a politically based securitization can be founded upon issues of state stability where migrations may not only be a product of conflict but can induce conflict. For example, migrants can exert political pressure on the host government in how it relates to the sending state. Equally, the sending state could mobilise the migrant population to promote its interests within the host state. In the context of securitizing moves in the UK, however, domestic political securitizations are of greater significance.

Rather than a 'strategy' for securitizing migration akin to the other three axes, the political axis is largely explanatory<sup>40</sup>. In short, the political axis grapples with why securitizing migration is attractive and is 'winning' the discursive battle for understanding the issue: why does securitization trump economisation or cosmopolitanism, or any other discourse that could be used to frame migration? Buofino (2004: 38) answers that '[i]n a society governed by insecurity, public opinion needs to be reassured by governments.' In short, there is a far greater quantity of political capital to be accrued from the securitization discourse (Ibrahim, 2005). As a consequence, the securitization of migration is entrenched even further. With the security discourse becoming hegemonic, mainstream political parties compete to appear 'tougher' than one another on the issue of migration. Failure to appear 'tough', it is theorised, will provide ammunition for the political Right and far-Right to attack the mainstream parties and gain popular support (Karyotis, 2007) – although this theorisation is not unchallenged and has been shown not to be 'inevitable' (Bale et al., 2010). This line of thinking is reminiscent to Joseph Heller's notion of 'Catch-22'<sup>41</sup>: to stop the political Right, we must move our policies to the Right, if not the Right will increase in

---

<sup>40</sup> Karyotis (2007) includes discursive strategies centred on border control and sovereignty/legitimacy within the political axis; however this thesis follows Ceyhan and Tsoukala (2002) in viewing these discourses through the securitarian axis.

<sup>41</sup> Catch-22 is a 1961 novel by Joseph Heller set during the Second World War that follows the fictional 256<sup>th</sup> U.S Army Air Force squadron where, '[t]here was only one catch and that was Catch-22, which specified that a concern for one's safety in the face of dangers that were real and immediate was the process of a rational mind. Orr was crazy and could be grounded. All he had to do was ask; and as soon as he did he would no longer be crazy and would have to fly more missions. Orr would be crazy to fly more missions and sane if he didn't, but if he was sane he had to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn't have to; but if he didn't want to he was sane and had to.' Catch-22 is the ultimate double-bind where the situation that is desired to be avoided (in this instance, flying) is unavoidable. In the context of migration, assisting the far-Right/xenophobia is to be avoided. Failure to 'deal' with the issue (it is argued) gives the far-Right a monopoly, boosting their power and influence. 'Dealing' with the issue (it is argued) moves policy to the Right and entrenches/strengthens the link between migration and threat, making xenophobia likely to proliferate. Catch-22.

influence, dragging policy Right. The result is to assist a Right-wing agenda in terms of policy and strengthening the securitizing ‘threat’ frames attached to migration. The irony of this contradictory manoeuvring can be seen in contemporary European and UK politics where trying to placate the Right and moving the centre ground on immigration to the Right has not ameliorated the threat of extreme politics, demonstrated by the growth in Right and far-Right politics across the UK and Europe (Dannreuther, 2013)<sup>42</sup>. The response of certain European states to the so-called ‘migrant crisis’ is case in point.<sup>43</sup>

Despite the intensity of the rhetoric around the level of border control argued to be necessary and desirable, a parallel intensity of policy is not found. This Strange case of Dr Policy and Mr Rhetoric is argued to arise from competing pressures (Boswell, 2007; Buonfino, 2004; Statham, 2003). First, in line with the economic case for increasing immigration outlined in the section focussing on the economic axis above, the business lobby has an interest in ensuring migration remains liberal and unrestricted. The second issue is neatly captured by Statham (2003) who notes that there is a

particular contradiction within liberal nation states: ...the universal principle that they should respect and protect human rights by offering asylum to aliens fleeing persecution [is put] in direct competition with the principle that they should primarily serve the interests of the national community of people from who sovereignty derives – a group with a self-image of common descent and ethnicity enshrined in a shared nationhood.

The same point is made by Laclau (2001) who asserts that democracy ‘requires unity, but is only thinkable through diversity.’ Hence, the constraints activated by the norms embedded in democracy prevent the severity of the political rhetoric being matched at the policy level – underlining the political motivations underpinning the preference for political actors adopting the security frame.

---

<sup>42</sup> Another way of describing the ‘Catch-22’ would be that the political Right, assisted by the Centrist/Centre-Left ‘toughening’ of language and policy, has been effective in moving the Overton Window to a position where a securitized vision of migration (i.e. migrants/migration is a threat) has been embedded as the obvious, sensible and natural way to approach migration as an issue.

<sup>43</sup> An additional force driving the securitization of migration is argued to come from the ‘professionals of security’, such as national police and security forces as well as international organisations such as Europol and EU security agencies. Bigo (2002, 2006a) has shown the important role such organisations have played in the securitization of migration in Europe, as a means to attract more resources and bolster their bureaucratic position. This ‘practice’ based approach the securitization, however, is not one addressed in this thesis.

However, despite a previous understanding of the political axis as largely explanatory in that it underpins why the other three axes are used to securitize migration, this thesis finds some discourses that are unique to the political axis. These centre on notions of 1) a state's political culture (democracy) being undermined by migrants who hold undemocratic views and 2) the destabilising effects migration can have by providing a platform for far-Right politics to flourish. (This finding will be developed in full in the chapters dedicated to the discourse analysis.) As such, analysis of discourses operating on the political axis centres on whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining 'our' political culture (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

### **3.3.3.6 Not Us and Them but 'We': Huysmans' Desecuritizing Strategies**

As mentioned in Chapter 2, there has been a poverty of empirical analysis and lack of clear guidance on the analytical process for studying desecuritization. Indeed, Aradau (2004: 389) remarks that when measured against securitization, desecuritization 'has received comparably scant attention.' As such it is necessary to further outline the strategic framework for interpreting desecuritizing discourses. Two of the most thorough attempts to theorise desecuritization are provided by Hansen (2012) and Huysmans (1995).

Beginning with the former, Hansen (2012) offers four forms of desecuritization: change through stabilisation, where an issue is framed in non-security terms, but where the original conflict remains in the background; replacement, where one securitized issue is replaced by another; rearticulation, where an issue moves from the security realm to the politicised, following a resolution of the threats/dangers at the root of the securitization; and silencing, where desecuritization equates to depoliticisation in that the issue moves out of public discourse. Rearticulation is the form of desecuritization most relevant to the issue of migration: 'Rearticulation refers to desecuritizations that remove an issue from the securitized by actively offering a political solution to the threats, dangers, and grievances in question' (Hansen, 2012: 542). Rearticulation differs from both change through stabilisation and replacement as there is, respectively, no conflict looming in the background and no replacing securitization to fill the void. At its centre, rearticulation involves moving beyond the (Schmittian) Friend/Enemy distinction and can deconstruct exclusive notions of Selves and Others, Us and Them.

Huysmans' (1995) strategies of desecuritization, whilst being more narrow in scope, incorporate the relevant parts of Hansen's (namely, rearticulation) and are more instructive in the context of this thesis as they are specifically tailored to the issue of

migration. As such, Huysmans' strategies of desecuritization are utilised in this thesis. Three avenues to desecuritize migration are outlined.

First, there is the 'objectivist' strategy. For objectivists, security has an objective content which can be located if looked for carefully. Migrants<sup>44</sup> are not part of this objective content: it is a falsity that exists at a subjective level 'in the head of the people' (Huysmans, 1995: 65). Hence, the strategy is based upon convincing society that this threat is illusory: in short, educating the public that migrants are not a threat in relation to the economic and criminal axes, centring on the publication of statistics and the deployment of sound arguments (note the incapacity, or at least extreme difficulty, to 'objectively' prove migration does not threaten identity, the foundation at the centre of the us/them binary which underpins securitizing moves on the other three axes). The major disadvantage of the objectivist strategy is that it may unintentionally reify migration as a threat. Whilst disseminating polarised information to the securitizing actors, the objectivists are still operating within the dichotomous us/them discourse and the 'essence of the issue' still rests on a discursive link between a 'problem' (crime, economic competition etc.) and migrants – this is exacerbated by the unitary migrant phenomenon. Clear parallels can be drawn between the pit-falls of the objectivist strategy and the classic constructivist normative dilemma of writing security (see Huysmans, 2002).

The second strategy presented is 'constructivist.' In this case, security is not understood as something 'out there'. Security is viewed as socially constructed through practices in particular spatial and temporal contexts. The task then is not to study societal security, but rather the construction of societal (in)security. The analyst's task is to

---

<sup>44</sup> Rather than referring to migrants, Huysmans (1995: 61) speaks of 'the migrant' as it is argued this better captures the dynamic with which migration is securitized. As Huysmans (1995: 61) asserts: 'In the [security] drama, he or she is only one, meaning that the differences between migrants are silenced. In the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion, the natives overcome the differences among migrants by putting them all into one category: the migrant. (Hence, I do not write 'migrants' in this paragraph but 'the migrant'.) Certain categories of foreigners are united as the cultural other. They are put into this one box, united as the cultural other to be distrusted. Differences between them, for example differences of sex, wealth, culture, religion etc., are hidden inside the box, which is labelled 'migrant or 'refugee' or 'asylum seeker'. In a certain sense this is a Pandorean box: if it could be opened, the unity of the other would be fragmented in a free flow of differences; differences of colour, gender, religion, language etc. In that flow the migrant would end his/her role in the security drama, with the opening of the box, the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion (which is constitutive of the security construct) would fade away.' To echo Williams (1998, 2003) critique of McSweeney, the point is not that migrants do have a unitary identity, but that they are constructed in this light. This thesis does not follow Huysmans' terminology for purely practical reasons – referring to migrants is the most common way of writing and will therefore assist with clarity. However, this thesis does utilise Huysmans' analysis of migrants as a Pandorean Box with a unitary identity – henceforth referenced to as Huysmans' 'unitary migrant phenomenon'.

understand how it is that specific issues are securitized in unique contexts. By not thinking in the native/migrant dichotomy, only seeking to understand this process, it is said this does not (re)produce migrants as a Pandorean Box. The assumption which underlies this approach is that by understanding how a threat is constructed, this can be used to inhibit the potential potency of moves which entrench securitization. This technique is also deemed problematic. Huysmans notes that the fluidity of understanding and the complexity of causation render implementation of such procedures difficult. Additionally, although Huysmans appears to disagree, it is difficult to see how a (re)production of the native/migrant dichotomy would be avoided altogether. For example, any analysis that seeks to understand the securitization of migration must make the discursive link between migration and threat and therefore continue (however marginally) to keep this understanding challenging to be internalised as the hegemonic or common sense view of the issue (see Laclau and Mouffe, 1985).

The third, ‘deconstructivist’ strategy, is the one favoured by Huysmans. The guiding principle here is that the analyst is not looking upon the world from the outside, but is rather fully immersed within it. The deconstructivist is a story teller whose actions contribute to the (re)production of the social world. Desecuritizing ‘stories’ attempt to portray the ‘threat’ in a way that may weaken the discursive link between ‘subject’ and ‘threat’. This method involves the deconstruction of the ‘migrant’ as a unified being through identity fragmentation. Expanding identity past ‘migrant’ to subcategories such as ‘women, black, worker, mother, etc. – just like the natives are’ (Huysmans, 1995: 67) is postulated to breakdown the exclusory notions of ‘us’ and ‘them’. In short, the Pandorean Box view of migrants is undermined as unity and continuity are replaced by a focus on disunity and discontinuity<sup>45</sup>. Although preferred by Huysmans, he acknowledges the flaw in this approach. By continually deconstructing ‘identities’, at its logical extreme a deconstructivist strategy does not allow *any* identity. This position is untenable if Huysmans agrees that identity is an ‘inescapable’ part of the social world (Connolly, 1991), which he does<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> A similar point is made in the framing literature. Rather than challenging dominant frames on the grounds of truth and falsity (the objectivist strategy), individuals or groups can reframe the issue to place more weight on alternative aspects, altering what is construed as important (see Hertog and McLeod, 200)

<sup>46</sup> A neat example of this is the case of ‘minority rights’. Roe (2004) argues that whilst desecuritization of the individually defined migrant through the deconstruction of unitary identities may be possible and desirable, this is not the case for minority rights which rely on a more homogenous notion of collective identity. In conclusion, Roe (2008: 290) asserts that ‘the desecuritization of minority rights may be logically impossible.’

Thus when desecuritizing frames are identified, analysis draws upon Huysmans' strategies to enable a deeper understanding of the potential strengths and pit-falls of different approaches.

### **3.3.4 Nuts and Bolts: The Analytical Process**

Having laid out the structural framework and the theoretical premises underpinning key conceptualisations, a brief sketch of the analytical process will be instructive – and assist in summarising central points from the above sections<sup>47</sup>. In short, the thesis followed the CS's instructions to avoid sophisticated linguistic analysis or quantitative textual methods. Instead, the CS argue that '[t]he technique is simple: Read, looking for arguments that take the rhetorical form defined here as security' (Buzan et al., 1998: 177). As such, once the relevant sources were identified and collated into their relevant party or faith, each was analysed in turn. A careful reading was guided by the conceptualisations of securitizing and desecuritizing discourses outlined above to identify the general 'tone' (or 'tones') of the intervention. Attention was paid toward which axes were utilised and which strands of argument were operationalised for each axis. To gain a broad sense of the discursive terrain, again for each party/faith, documents were separated into those that were predominantly securitizing, desecuritizing or mixed. Next, for each batch, all documents were reanalysed, with attention focused on just one axis at a time. This facilitated the identification of patterns, relationships between interventions/discourses and recurrent/key (as well as absent) frames/discursive strategies. This initial analysis enabled an adequate understanding of each party/faith's general pitch regarding migration (securitizing or desecuritizing) enabling the formation of hypotheses to explore the relationship of these elite cues with the attitudes of 'their' audiences. To ensure a thorough appreciation of the nuances of the discourse itself, the final part of the process was repeated several times. The fruits of this analysis are detailed in Chapters 4 and 5.

## **3.4 Copy That? Connecting Elite Discourse with the Audience**

The previous section has outlined the methodological approach to, and methods and analytical framework for, conducting the discourse analysis. The next task is to detail how

---

Thus, in many cases the migrant, for whom desecuritization is sought, may also be part of a collective minority, whose identity may need to be protected (securitized).

<sup>47</sup> It is important to emphasise the word 'brief'. The description which follows is an exceedingly simplified and streamlined summary designed to move beyond the abstract vision of the analytical process outlined above.

the quantitative analysis is operationalised to enable the exploration of the second research question designed to explore the relationship between elite cues and immigration attitudes.

#### **3.4.1 The Data**

The data used for the quantitative analyses come from the European Social Survey (ESS), Rounds 3-7 (2006-2014).

#### **3.4.2 The Independent and Dependent Variables**

To capture the dependent variable, immigration attitudes, following McLaren (2012a) and others, three questions that are designed to tap into both the economic and cultural dimensions of threat regarding immigration, and that appear consistently in each round of the survey, have been combined into a single ‘Immigration Attitudes Index’<sup>48</sup>.

Two measures are utilised to capture the key independent variable: elite cues. Firstly, for the models analysing religious elite discourse, following Karyotis and Patrikios (2010) and Knoll (2009) church attendance is used as a proxy for exposure to elite cues. To better ensure church attendance is capturing elite cues, two other measures of religiosity (frequency of prayer and how religious a person feels) are included to identify whether any effects may be rooted in religion/religiosity in and of itself. Secondly, for the models analysing political elite discourse, it is possible to control for party identification, however there is not a variable within the ESS data set that can be used to control for the level of exposure to political elite cues (i.e. in the respect that frequency of church attendance is utilised to account for exposure to religious elite cues). As such, analysis of political elite cues and public attitudes of party supporters is somewhat restricted to the relationship between them, with a reduced capacity to infer the direction of influence. Again however, the CS theorise that security is a ‘top-down’ process – an assumption which is incorporated and assessed in the analysis of the relationship between political elite cues and the attitudes of their supporters.

#### **3.4.3 The Control Variables**

The literature exploring drivers of immigration attitudes has identified a series of individual-level factors (both demographic and non-demographic) that are essential to take into account (McLaren, 2001; Quillian, 1995; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schneider, 2008; Semyonov et al., 2006, 2008). A brief outline of each of the controls included in the analysis follows below.

---

<sup>48</sup> All questions and subsequent scales that are used in all statistical analyses are listed in the appendix.



## Gender

The effects of gender in relation prejudice have been inconsistent. Several studies analysing various targets of prejudice, including immigrants, have found no effects (e.g. Espenshade and Hempstead, 1996; Scheve and Slaughter, 2001). Polarised to these findings, numerous studies have found significant gender differences with men being more prone than women to express prejudiced attitudes about a variety of groups, including foreigners and immigrants (Semyonov et al., 2006). Yet, on occasion women have been found to display more intolerance than men (Chandler and Tsai, 2001). Overall, the effects of gender on prejudice/intolerance are complex and varied.

## Age

As Chandler and Tsia (2001: 181) assert, ‘studies have produced mixed results with respect to age and immigration attitudes.’ When effects are found, often increased age is associated with greater levels of intolerance (Chandler and Tsai, 2001; Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993; Quillian, 1995; Semyonov et al., 2006), yet age has not always produced effects (Crepaz and Damron, 2008; Scheve and Slaughter, 2001; Van Dalen and Henkens, 2005; Weldon, 2006). This may infer that the relevance of age is determined by the influence of other variables, such as higher levels of education (than previous generations) (Ford, 2011).

## Economics

Drawing on rational choice theories of competition (Quillian, 1995) it is postulated that individuals in the lowest (working) classes and individuals who are most vulnerable in socioeconomic terms (i.e. manual labourers/unemployed, low income) are likely to hold more negative attitudes towards immigrants (Semyonov, et al. 2006). Although effects are not found universally (i.e. Hainmuller and Hiscox, 2010; McLaren, 2003; Sides and Citrin, 2007), there is empirical support for this hypothesis (Kunovich, 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schneider, 2008; Semyonov et al., 2008).

A high quantity of respondents failing to report their income in the ESS surveys makes accounting for income problematic. As such a control is included that centres on the respondent’s satisfaction with their household income. This is arguably a more incisive control as it helps capture subjective feelings of vulnerability/threat which raw income data may obscure. This also underpins the inclusion of a variable controlling for a respondent’s economic satisfaction at the country-level (McLaren, 2012b), tapping into perceptions of threat/vulnerability at the level of the group (see Bobo, 1983). A control for unemployment is also introduced to further account for economic vulnerability.

## Education

Research has consistently shown a negative correlation between higher levels of education and intolerance towards immigrants (Day, 1989, 1990; Starr and Roberts 1982). Whether this results from greater levels of education ‘bestow[ing] a more enlightened perspective that is less vulnerable to narrow appeals of intergroup negativism’ or that ‘education produces a more sophisticated cognitive style that may inject education-related response biases into many commonly used measures of attitudes’ (Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993: 195), is disputed (Jackman, 1978; Sullivan et al., 1982). However, the persistence of education as a powerful predictor of immigration attitudes is not in dispute.

## Citizenship

Citizenship was included to control for the potential biasing effects arising from non-citizens who are by definition migrants of some form. It also enables analysis of whether citizenship matters in terms of generating effects in relation to immigration attitudes.

## Social Trust and Life Satisfaction

Social trust has been identified as a factor that can impact on immigration attitudes, with more trusting and satisfied individuals tending to have more positive immigration attitudes (Herreros and Criado, 2009; McLaren, 2012b; Sides and Citrin, 2007). Thus a control was included to account for a respondent’s level of social trust and life satisfaction.

## Ideology

The language of ‘Left’ and ‘Right’ help to simplify where political parties broadly position themselves and have been ascribed as a useful summarising device for individuals in Western Europe (Inglehart and Kingemann, 1976; Knutsen, 1998). In relation to immigration, those situated on the political Right have been shown to be persistently more likely to hold more intolerant attitudes and discriminatory views than those on the Left (see for example, Scheve and Slaughter, 2001; Semyonov et al., 2006; Weldon, 2006). The significance of ideology on immigration attitudes has been shown to vary dependent on the contemporary political milieu. A lack of party consensus on an issue has been associated with a greater role for ideology in predicting immigration attitudes (Burns and Gimpel, 2000; McLaren, 2001). Across Europe, recent domestic and supranational elections have highlighted that the political consensus around the EU and free-movement is being eroded. Thus in contemporary studies of immigration attitudes in Europe, this political division points to a more pronounced role for ideology.

### Political Awareness

In relation to immigration attitudes, political awareness has proven an important indicator (Gabel, 1998; Janssen, 1991). Following Zaller (1992), political awareness refers to a general as opposed to issue-specific attentiveness to politics. It is postulated that differing degrees of cognitive mobilisation amongst individuals has substantive consequences for the way information is addressed and how attitude or policy preferences are formed. It is argued that if issues are met with (political) elite consensus which transcends ideological divisions then the most politically aware individuals will infuse the elite positions into their own belief systems (Zaller, 1992). Contrastingly, if elite cues diverge along ideological lines, an individual's own ideological position (Left-Right) will affect whether the message is accepted or rejected. Empirical support has been found for this argument regarding internal vs. external EU immigration (McLaren, 2001) and regarding the EU in general (Gabel, 1998; Janssen, 1991). Tests of general political knowledge are recognised as the most appropriate method to account for political awareness (Zaller, 1992). Unfortunately, no 'tests' feature in the ESS data set. As such, in this thesis general attentiveness to politics and current affairs (self-declared interest in politics and number of hours consuming political TV programming) is used as a proxy.

### Intergroup Contact

Intergroup Contact Theory blossomed from Allport's (1954) influential work on the 'contact hypothesis'. The crux of the hypothesis is that direct contact between members of different groups can reduce intergroup hostility and prejudice. Whilst intuitively convincing, and with the support of a wealth of differing studies, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) provided emphatic evidence to substantiate the prejudice-reducing effects of contact. Pettigrew and Tropp's 'monumental meta-analysis' (Hewstone and Swart, 2011: 375) included 515 studies. The results revealed a highly significant negative relationship between contact and prejudice in general (mean  $r = -.22$ ,  $p < .000$ )<sup>49</sup>. Individual examples are too numerous to cite but Pettigrew's (1997) study of contact effects on prejudice in France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and West Germany is particularly pertinent to this research. Analysis concluded that in-group members who had out-group member friends

---

<sup>49</sup> Analysis of why contact appears to 'work' has pointed to: a reduction in the reactivity of the stress-related hormone cortisol (Page-Gould et al., 2008); a decrease in feelings of threat and anxiety during intergroup meetings (Blascovitch et al., 2001); a narrowing of the differences in neural processing between own and other-race faces (Walker et al., 2008); and increasing empathy toward out-groups (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). Importantly, the prejudice-reducing effects involved with contact of one out-group have also been shown to extend to uninvolved out-groups (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), the so-called 'secondary transfer effect' (Wright et al., 1997). Moreover beneficial effects of 'imagined contact' also find empirical support (Crisp et al., 2011, Harwood et al., 2011; Turner and Crisp, 2010; West et al., 2011).

were far more liberal regarding immigration policy, extending immigrants' rights and believing that the presence of immigrants is a good thing. Hence, in this thesis, a respondent's quantity of friends of a different race/ethnicity (None, A few or Several) is utilised as a control.

#### **Religious Denomination (Political Elite Discourse Models Only)**

Previous research has found attitudinal differences between those of different faiths (i.e. Knoll, 2009). Some research has demonstrated that effects disappear once a control is introduced for belonging to the 'dominant' faith (Gorodzeisky and Semyonov, 2016). As outlined more broadly in the previous chapter the effect of religion on intolerance towards a variety of outgroups including immigrants has produced contradictory results. As such, it is deemed prudent to control for religious faith (or none). This is only necessary in the models exploring political elite cues as the models analysing religious discourse concentrate on each faith independently making this control unnecessary.

#### **3.4.4 The Models**

Below is a brief outline of the quantitative analyses and the rationale underpinning their inclusion and design.

##### ***3.4.4.1 Models Exploring Political Elite Discourse***

The multivariate analysis uses linear regression to explore the relationship between political elite discourse and the attitudes of 'their' audience. The linear regression was composed of three models (Table 6.9). In Model 1 the political parties are entered: Conservatives, Labour, Liberal Democrats, UKIP, Greens, Plaid Cymru, SNP, an amalgamation of 'Other' parties and finally not feeling close to any party. Model 1 therefore enables an initial comparison between the immigration attitudes of those who identify with each political party. Next, Model 2 introduces the demographic controls whilst Model 3 enters the remaining non-demographic variables. Once more, whilst the model – due to a lack of an appropriate variable in the data set – is unable to explicitly explore the causal direction (i.e. that it is elite cues driving any relationship), securitization theory supports the notion that effects derive from top-down processes. At the very least the model enables an exploration of whether elite cues and the attitudes of 'their' audiences align.

##### ***3.4.4.2 Models Exploring Religious Elite Discourse***

Prior to testing for the effects of religious elite cues it was important to gather a general view of the relationship between religiosity and immigration attitudes in the UK

and to compare this cross-nationally – especially due to the previously contrasting and varied relationship between religiosity and intolerance outlined in the previous chapter. As such, bivariate correlations were investigated for the UK and 30 other European countries. Next, the relationships were explored for the UK only, this time splitting the data to account for religious denomination. This enabled an initial picture to be gathered of how various dimensions of religiosity, without controls, appeared to be relating to immigration attitudes.

Regression analysis was then introduced to explore whether, after controlling for all other potentially relevant factors, religious elite discourse appears to have an effect on the immigration attitudes of ‘their’ audience. To reiterate, to capture the effects of discourse, following Karyotis and Patrikios (2010) and Knoll (2009) church attendance is used as a proxy for exposure to elite messaging. The lack of data (discourse) collected from the Muslim faith made it impossible to make predictions on the subsequent impact of discourse on the attitudes of adherents to Islam. However, to investigate whether, rather than specific elite cues, church attendance in and of itself or indeed any other measure of religiosity was in some way driving the immigration attitudes of the religious in general regardless of faith, Islam has been included in the analysis. All other minority faiths in the UK have been combined into the category of ‘Other Religion’ for the same purpose<sup>50</sup>.

A separate but identical linear regression was carried out for each faith group. The regressions were split by ESS round (Round 4, 5 6 and 7) to uncover any unexpected variation over time and divided into four models. Model 1 contains the three measures of religiosity: frequency of church attendance; frequency of prayer outside of religious services; and how religious an individual feels. Model 2 introduces party identification, Model 3 enters the demographic controls and Model 4 the remaining non-demographic controls.

### 3.5 Conclusion

In sum, this chapter has outlined the methodology and methods adopted in this thesis. This first section detailed the rationale underpinning the selection of the UK as a case and the period of analysis. The level of detail required to conduct a discourse analysis and the necessity of analysing several political parties and religious faiths makes a single

---

<sup>50</sup> These include: Church of Ireland; Baptist; Methodist; Presbyterian/Church of Scotland; United Reformed Church/Congregational; Free Presbyterian; Brethren; Other Protestant; Greek or Russian Orthodox; Other Eastern Orthodox; Other Christian; Hindu; Sikh; Buddhist; Other Eastern Religions; Jewish; and Other non-Christian.

country case study the most appropriate choice. Moreover with the historic and contemporary salience and controversy regarding migration in the UK, the selection of the UK is timely. The period of analysis (2005-2015) begins at a critical juncture in UK politics whilst closing the analysis after the 2015 election ensures ‘major instances’ of migration framing during the election campaign are included. Extending the analysis beyond this point would be redundant as ESS data is not available on attitudes, making any analysis of the effects of elite cues impossible.

The second section detailed the methodology and method of discourse analysis. Drawing on the CS’s securitization theory, the repository of sources for analysis is composed of ‘major instances’ of elite discourse. Furthermore, as the concept of ‘societal security’ suppresses identities into a simplified and unitary form, a case has been made for the focus of the discourse analysis centring on whether political and religious elites framed migrants/migration as a threat (a securitizing discourse) or a non-threat (a desecuritizing discourse) to ‘us’ as Britain/British. In short, the key question is whether ‘the essence of the [migration] issue’ (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989) is presented as threatening or not? This binary ‘coding’ of a discourse as being security or otherwise is justified on the grounds of analytical precision: it is less difficult to identify whether a message is positive or negative on the whole as opposed to interpreting *how* positive or negative. Therefore, if a discourse frames migration in a negative sense (threat/risk/problem) this thesis interprets this as strengthening the securitization of migration (i.e. securitizing moves/frames). In contrast, discourses that frame migration in a positive sense (avoiding/resisting notions of threat/risk/problem), are viewed as challenging the securitization of migration (desecuritizing moves/frames).

The analytical framework for the discourse analysis is based upon the four axes model (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Karyotis, 2007). Underpinned by exclusionary identities of ‘us’ and ‘them’, each axis is focused on a different referent object for which migration can potentially be framed to threaten. The political axis, whilst previously explanatory, is developed in this thesis as specific discourses have been identified during the analysis which uniquely concentrates on the security of the UK’s political culture. To assist with the analysis and interpretation of desecuritizing frames, Huysmans’ desecuritization strategies are utilised.

The second half of this chapter outlined the methodology and methods related to the quantitative analysis. The first section detailed the data set, key independent and

dependent variables, as well as the necessary control variables identified in the broad immigration attitudes literature. The second section laid out the way in which the statistical models have been constructed to enable an effective exploration of this thesis' second research question regarding the relationship between elite cues and public attitudes. It is to the content of these elite cues that this thesis now turns.

## **Chapter 4: ‘We are by Nature a Tolerant Country’: Political Elite Discourse on Migration**

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Identitarian Axis
  - 4.2.1 Introduction
  - 4.2.2 Conservatives
  - 4.2.3 Labour
  - 4.2.4 Liberal Democrat
  - 4.2.5 UKIP
  - 4.2.6 ‘The Securitization of Tolerance’: Help or Hindrance?
- 4.3 Securitarian Axis
  - 4.3.1 Introduction
  - 4.3.2 Conservatives
  - 4.3.3 Labour
  - 4.3.4 Liberal Democrat
  - 4.3.5 UKIP
- 4.4 Economic Axis
  - 4.4.1 Introduction
  - 4.4.2 Conservatives
  - 4.4.3 Labour
  - 4.4.4 Liberal Democrat
  - 4.4.5 UKIP
- 4.5 Political Axis
  - 4.5.1 Introduction
  - 4.5.2 Conservatives
  - 4.5.3 Labour
  - 4.5.4 Liberal Democrat
  - 4.5.5 UKIP
- 4.6 Conclusion

### **4.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to systematically explore how migration has been framed. More specifically, the chapter analyses the de/securitizing moves of political elites from the four largest UK-wide political parties in the UK (Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and UKIP) during 2005-2015. The value of analysing the discourse of political elite actors is three-fold.

Firstly, this will provide detailed empirical analysis of exactly how the actors who dominate UK migration discourse (Statham and Geddes, 2006) discuss migration. This will not only illuminate whether elites broadly framed migration as a security threat or not, but will unpack nuances regarding which dimensions of migration elites utilise to frame migration (i.e. which axes) and the rhetorical strategies employed. Further, it will enable differences and similarities to be uncovered both between parties and within parties. As



noted previously, the lack of a nuanced discourse analysis of various dimensions of the security-migration nexus in the UK is a gap this thesis seeks to fill.

Secondly, the discourse analysis enables a hypothesis to be established to explore the relationship between elite cues and public opinion<sup>51</sup>. And thirdly, with one of the central contributions of the thesis being to widen the analytical net to focus on non-tradition security actors, an initial analysis of political elite actors is vital in two further interconnected respects. First, in terms of discourse analysis, it will enable a comparison of messaging between political and religious elites regarding the selection and salience of axes, frames and discursive techniques. It will uncover whether different sets of elite actors address migration in line with one another or whether the contextually specific cultural capital held by different elite actors creates disparity. Second, in terms of exploring the relationship between religious elite cues and the attitudes of their ‘flocks’, the extent to which the religious elite discourse differs from the prevailing discourse of political elites may have consequences for the ease/difficulty that messages from the former can penetrate past the latter to influence attitudes.

To briefly summarise the chapter findings, securitizing threat frames dominated in the messages of political elites. In terms of predominance of securitizing messages, UKIP had by far the most securitizing messages, followed by the Conservatives and then Labour. Last, the Liberal Democrat messages differed from the other three parties in that the relationship between securitizing and desecuritizing messages was more equal, although still chiefly securitizing.

In addition to this broad picture, several more intricate findings emerge. As perhaps expected, there were crucial differences identified between parties, outlined above. But importantly, there was also variation within parties. There is variation over time, underlining and highlighting constantly evolving party-positioning on the issue of migration. And, perhaps more significantly, there is variation (at the same time) across

---

<sup>51</sup> To reiterate, it is not possible to try and connect the cues of political elites to public attitudes in the same respect as it is possible for religious elites. This is because, whilst it is possible to control for party and religious ID (i.e. Conservative, Labour, Anglican, Catholic etc.) there is no variable in the data akin to attendance at religious services for political elites that can account for level of exposure to political elite cues. The CS theorise that security is an elite driven process, which would suggest that any relationships uncovered are ‘top-down’ – an assumption that is delicately incorporated into the analysis. Yet, even without this theoretical assumption the discourse analysis of political elites still enables contextual quantitative analysis. Despite being somewhat restricted regarding the inferring of the direction of causality, it facilitates an analysis of whether party messaging and the attitudes of party supporters align or appear to be disconnected. This will be explored in full in Chapter 6.

axes and within different dimensions of axes. The analysis demonstrated that no axes were consistently marginalised with the salience of each axis (and even dimensions within each axis) changing over time. Yet, on balance it would be fair to say that the economic and identitarian axes were more prevalent than the securitarian and political. This highlights the complexity of migration discourse and bolsters the case for utilising the four axes framework to offer an effective means of analysing migration discourse, ensuring all of the major discursive battlegrounds are accounted for. Another key finding is the apparent affirmation of Huysmans' (1995, 2002) concerns over the difficulty of trying to desecuritize migration, especially using objectivist strategies that attempt to show migration is not a 'real' threat. Continuously, desecuritizing attempts were encumbered with securitizing baggage though the reinforcement of the discursive link between migration and threat and reifying the us/them binary. The implications of this are explored below. A final key finding relates to the centrality of messages centred on the impact migration has on the self-understood identity of Britain as 'tolerant': the 'securitization of British tolerance'. This finding is important in helping to gain a deeper understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK and beyond and will be elaborated upon below.

The four axes model is utilised as a structural framework. After a short recap of what each axis entails, all axes are further divided into four sections, each focussing on the discourse of one party. To reiterate, the discourse analysis concentrates on whether migration has been framed as a 'threat' (securitizing moves) or non-threat (desecuritizing moves). Again, to enable fair comparison, analysis has been restricted to major interventions from party leaders and party manifestos. To conclude, a brief summary of the empirical findings will be supplemented with the potential implications arising from the findings and the formalisation of a hypothesis necessary for the quantitative analyses in the following chapter.

## **4.2 Identitarian Axis**

### **4.2.1 Introduction**

To recap, the identitarian axis rests on Wæver's (1993) concept of societal security, meaning that the referent object is identity. In brief, securitizing discourses present migration as a threat to 'our way of life'. Hence, analysis of the discourse of political elite actors situated within the identitarian axis focuses on whether migration is framed as a threat (securitizing frames) or otherwise (desecuritizing frames) to 'our way of life'.

#### 4.2.2 Conservatives

The identity axis was prominent in the discourse of Conservative leaders throughout the analytical time frame. Two main themes emerged: the effect migration has on the broad ‘way of life’ in the UK; and the specific impact migration has on the self-understood identity of Britain as ‘tolerant’.

##### **“Our” way of life’**

Beginning with the relationship between migration and ‘the British way of life’ in general, Conservative messages were predominantly securitizing. In an indicative example, when discussing societal integration in his 2006 Conference speech, Cameron (2006) states that

...every child in our country, wherever they come from, must know and deeply understand what it means to be British. The components of our identity – our institutions, our language and our history.

Moreover, particularly during the Howard era, there was an emphasis on the necessity of limiting immigration to maintain good ‘community relations’. Repeatedly, the report from the government’s Community Cohesion Panel was cited which stated that the ‘pace of change is simply too great at present’ (Howard, 2005d). In the extracts above, ‘our’ identity and the ‘components’ of such are framed in an exclusive, unalterable way. This can be viewed to reify notions of incompatibility and threat, entrenching the securitizing us/them dichotomy that underpins societal security.

However, it was common that all of these securitizing messages were preceded by potentially desecuritizing statements about how immigration has ‘enriched our nation’ (The Conservative Party, 2010) or brought ‘cultural benefits’ (Howard, 2005b; Cameron, 2007b). Whilst the benefits of cultural diversity are asserted, a non-threat frame, again these usually arose as caveats to threat-centred frames. Overall the securitizing us/them dichotomy and notions of cultural incompatibility/threat are dominant.

##### **“Them” changing “Us”’: The Securitization of British Tolerance**

The second sense with which the identity axis featured centred on the impact of migration upon the self-understood identity of the host society. The key tension revolved around the constitution of *the* British identity as tolerant. Discourses sought to protect this ‘tolerant’ identity for the UK against an identity of ‘intolerance’ that it is (wrongly, in the opinion of the actors) argued may underpin a desire to restrict migration.

This tension was present throughout the discourse of both Conservative leaders. Several examples will help illuminate the way in which the identities were asserted in this antagonistic conflict. First, Howard (i.e. 2005b, 2005j) emphasised the idea of Britain having a proud history of tolerance and generosity alongside ‘an enviable record of racial integration’ (Howard, 2005b, 2005h). Next, in a speech centred on immigration, Cameron (2014b) spent several paragraphs outlining Britain’s historic welcoming of Jewish communities, the Ugandan Asians in the 1970s and in the 1940s ‘welcoming... West Indians who docked at Tilbury on the Windrush.’<sup>52</sup> Last, during the first Prime Ministerial Debate Cameron (*The Sky News Debate*, 2010) stated that,

I was in Plymouth recently, and a 40 year old black man made the point to me. He said, ‘I came here when I was six, I’ve served in the Royal Navy for 30 years. I’m incredibly proud of my country. But I’m so ashamed that we’ve had this out-of-control system with people abusing it so badly.’ If we don’t address immigration properly, we’re letting down immigrant communities, as well as everybody else.

The explicit mention of the speaker’s ethnicity and immigrant status tries to overcome accusations that a desire to restrict immigration comes from racism or from a prejudiced, native ‘us’. By promoting this frame through the voice of a black immigrant, it acts to protect the ‘tolerant’ identity of native Britons. The mention of migrants ‘abusing’ the system is also important, in that it paints restrictionist sentiment as just. Thus Cameron attempts to make the tolerant identity ‘true’ by trying to undermine potential accusations that a desire to restrict migration is rooted in intolerance by framing frustration with immigration as justified/rational due to the ‘abusive’ behaviour of migrants. Migrants, by inducing concern in the natives over immigration, may force the natives into (arguably) intolerant, restrictive policy/attitudes, undermining the traditional British identity of ‘tolerance’. As a consequence of these messages, migration is framed as a threatening a key dimension of British identity.

To summarise Conservative discourses on the identitarian axis, despite desecuritizing non-threat frames being presented, securitizing frames were dominant, both

---

<sup>52</sup> Historical analysis of the *Empire Windrush* affair has shown that far from ‘welcoming’ the subjects who arrived, the response from both government and public was hostile, fearful and racist (Paul, 1997; Schain, 2008). However, like security, identity is also socially constructed. Thus Cameron can exploit a myth of tolerance so as to enable current restrictive moves to appear just and the not undermine the ‘tolerant’ British identity he is trying to promote.

in terms of migration impacting on ‘our way of life’ and the self-understood British identity as tolerant.

#### 4.2.3 Labour

Turning to the Labour Party, the messages of Labour leaders can also be grouped into the two categories above: the general sense in which migration impacts on ‘our way of life’; and the specific consequences it has for the British identity of ‘tolerance’.

##### “‘Our’ way of life”

In a speech entitled *Managed Migration and Earned Citizenship*, Gordon Brown (2008a) stresses the importance of migrants adopting ‘British values’ in order to make sure ‘migration benefits us as much socially and culturally as it does economically.’ Similarly, Brown states that there is a need to ‘manage immigration in a way that is good for Britain – for our citizens, our way of life, our society’ and that Britain is ‘enriched by change but anchored in enduring ideals.’ Whilst there is acknowledgement that Britain is ‘enriched’ by migration, a desecuritizing frame, the overall message is securitizing, where ‘our’ ways are undermined or threatened by migration<sup>53</sup>.

After assuming the leadership in 2010, Ed Miliband’s messages regarding the impact of migration on ‘our way of life’ in general were, contrary to Brown, largely desecuritizing. In his one major speech designed to address migration on the identitarian axis directly, the dominant frame surrounds the notion that ‘[s]ocial, cultural and ethnic diversity has made Britain stronger’ (Miliband, 2012b). Miliband (2012b) does state that in relation to identity there is ‘anxiety about the pace of change.’ Again however, Miliband adopts a desecuritizing strategy. Identity is discussed in an inclusive way, using anecdotes that demonstrate that in contemporary Britain ‘[t]he reality [is] our multiple identities. One Nation doesn’t mean one identity. People can be proudly, patriotically British without losing their cultural roots’ (Miliband, 2012b). Rejecting both assimilation and separation as strategies to overcome the ‘anxiety’, Miliband argues that governments must do more to help with integration. The message is that ‘us’ and ‘them’ are not incompatible but harmony can be helped or hindered depending on how active or laissez-faire the

---

<sup>53</sup> In the second of the 2010 Prime Ministerial Debates when discussing the EU, Brown (*The Sky News Debate*, 2010) outlines the duality of migration stating that ‘there are a million people from Britain who are in the European Union, staying in homes and staying in countries of the European Union.’ This in some way opens up Huysmans’ (1995) Pandorean box by placing the category of ‘Brit’ into the list that makes up the ‘migrant’. Acknowledging that some British people are also migrants therefore begins to undermine the rigid us/them dichotomy. However, this desecuritizing move, without caveats, was unique.

government is respectively with regards to facilitating integration<sup>54</sup>. In this instance, phrases such as ‘our common life’ (Miliband, 2012b) refer to the totality of the population (native and migrant) rather than solely the native ‘us’. In the lead up to the 2015 election there is stress on the importance of migrants learning English, but the general framing of this message avoids securitization as the capacity of the English language as a means to ‘forge a common identity’ (Miliband, 2015) remains central.

**“Them” changing “Us”: The Securitization of British Tolerance**

Turning to the second theme, the tension over Britain’s ‘tolerant’/‘intolerant’ identity, a struggle to assert the ‘tolerant’ identity is consistent and can be seen to increase in salience<sup>55</sup>. Again, several indicative examples are useful in underlining exactly how these identities were put forward. Blair (2005a) states that ‘we will never maintain the tolerant, diverse nation of which we can be so proud, unless we have strict controls that keep it so’ and that

the British people are a tolerant and decent people. They did not want immigration made a divisive issue in course of the [2005 general] election campaign. But they do believe there are real problems in our immigration and asylum system... (2005c)

In a similar vein, Blair (2005b) asserts that ‘we are a tolerant, decent nation. That tolerance should not be abused. But neither should it be turned on its head.’ Equivalent sentiments are put forward by Brown (i.e. 2008a; *The First Election Debate*, 2010) and Miliband (2014a, 2014b; *The ITV Leader’s Debate*, 2015; *Question Time Special*, 2015) where message that concerns about immigration are not rooted in ‘prejudice’, concerns are in fact ‘real’, and that Labour’s previous approach to immigration was ‘wrong’ were common. Evidently, there is a sustained attempt to entrench a notion of British identity being homogenously tolerant. But, it is clear that this tolerance is contingent on ‘strict controls’ and lack of ‘abuse.’ Thus Britain’s ‘tolerant’ identity is said to be threatened not by the fact that some British citizens are prejudiced, but because migrants’ exploitation of this tolerance makes intolerance justified – a securitizing threat frame.

---

<sup>54</sup> This is linked directly to Miliband’s central economic frame of migrants being exploited by employers acting illegally. In short, it is argued that anxiety of fear of the Other from some of the British public is due to the behaviour of native individuals, not because migrants are inherently threatening.

<sup>55</sup> This increase in saliency may be explained by the general increased saliency of migration over the last decade. Having to continually ‘deal’ with immigration and take a ‘tough’ stance opens the door for accusations of intolerance/prejudice (Labour’s 2015 election ‘controls on immigration’ mug perhaps being case in point) – something a continued emphasis that Britain is in fact tolerant may be an attempt to mitigate.

Overall, Labour's messages on the identitarian axis were mixed regarding the first theme in which migrants threaten 'our' ways, with there being a securitizing/desecuritizing divide between Brown and Miliband. In terms of the second theme, the specific impact migration has on the British identity of tolerance, securitizing threat frames are consistent.

#### 4.2.4 Liberal Democrats

The discourses of Liberal Democrat Leaders can also be grouped in the same two themes.

##### **“‘Our’ way of life”**

In terms of general impact on 'our way of life', messages are predominantly desecuritizing. For example, Charles Kennedy (2005a) states that 'I believe that our country is a richer, more vibrant society precisely because it is a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society. Let that be the starting point for any debate over immigration and asylum' - sentiments echoed in Kennedy's 2005 Conference address (2005b). It is important to note that although Kennedy talks of 'our society', this 'our' is not explicitly referring to an exclusive 'us', but extends to include different races and ethnicities – as this is what 'our society' is comprised of.

Nick Clegg made consistent attempts to challenge notions of clashing identities in two ways. The first was an emphasis on his love for the 'diversity' of Britain (i.e. *The European Union: In or Out*, 2014), rejecting the idea that a lack of cultural uniformity challenges societal security, but rather that it is part of the societal identity. The second took the form of repeated statements that many Brits also lived elsewhere, particularly in the European Union (i.e. *Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader's Debate*, 2014; Clegg, 2014a, *The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015; *Question Time Special*, 2015). In short, Clegg (mirroring the message of Brown) was stating that in many cases Brits are also migrants. Thus the categorisations of 'us' and 'them' lose some of their rigidity, very slightly opening Huysmans' (1995) Pandorean Box. This deconstructivist strategy is used even more explicitly in Clegg's second main message. Clegg (i.e. 2013) discussed his own history and that of Nigel Farage (*The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015) to posit that for millions of other Brits, when they trace their ancestry they find that it contains 'Other' influences. Indicative of these messages is where Clegg (2014b) states that

[o]ur heritage is a glorious patchwork of different cultures and influences. My mother is Dutch. My father's mother a Russian émigré.

My wife, Spanish. I am like millions of British citizens whose roots can be traced around the globe.

Whilst not a textbook following of Huysmans' (1995: 67) strategy to open up the migrant's identity (into 'women, black, worker, mother etc. – just like the natives are') it effectively achieves the same goal through again destabilising the 'us' by making it intertwine with the 'them'.

The messages that lean more towards securitizing moves in terms of 'our way of life' largely concentrate on increasing the number of migrants who speak English (i.e. Clegg, 2013, 2014a, *The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015). A series of 'tough' measures for increasing the English language are framed in a way to assist with integration and to ensure migrants are 'empowered' (Clegg, 2014a), similar to Miliband. Interestingly, the stick to accompany the 'empowering' carrot is that migrants who do not learn English will not receive benefits or will have to pay their own interpretation fees. Thus, even though the frame highlights cultural difference, the explicit securitizing message is situated on the economic axis. Overall then, despite minor securitizing frames, the dominant message is one of desecuritizing non-threat.

### ***“Them” changing “Us”: The Securitization of British Tolerance***

Turning to the tension over *the* British identity as 'tolerant' or 'intolerant', there is a disparity between the discourses of the Kennedy and Clegg eras, whilst Campbell was silent on the issue. The 2005 election manifesto states that '[f]or centuries Britain has had a proud record of granting safe refuge to those fleeing persecution' (The Liberal Democrats, 2005). This 'tolerant' frame is not in competition with potentially contradictory frames (i.e. the need for 'strict controls' or the 'being intolerant of our tolerance being abused'), thus avoiding introducing sentiments that this tolerance is under threat in any way in the sense that Labour and the Conservatives in particular were prone to during the 2005 General Election. Therefore whilst asserting the same 'tolerant' identity, unlike other party leaders, Kennedy does so in a way that avoids securitizing qualities. In contrast, it is used in a way that in effect places the blame on any threat posed to the tolerant identity onto those who are using/promoting securitizing rhetoric and policy.

For Clegg there are the usual repetitions of Britain being 'tolerant', 'open' and 'welcoming' alongside a claim that Brits are 'by *nature*, a tolerant people' (Clegg, 2013)



(my emphasis)<sup>56</sup>. Accompanying these sentiments are consistent attempts to convey public concerns over immigration as ‘not racist/prejudiced’ and ‘real’ (Clegg, 2014a; *The ITV Leader’s Debate*, 2015). To legitimise these concerns further, assertions that the reason that the innate ‘tolerance’ of the British public is being tested is due to a rational rejection of migrant threat/exploitation. This is captured by the messages of ‘tolerant Britain, zero tolerant of abuse’ (Clegg, 2013), that Britain is ‘open for business but not open to abuse’ (*The ITV Leader’s Debate*, 2015) and the need for the migration system to ensure ‘fair play’ (Clegg, 2013). Thus Clegg is attempting to make the tolerant identity hegemonic by portraying concerns over immigration as intolerance of abuse, not intolerance of migration.<sup>57</sup> By presenting the behaviour of migrants as potentially undermining Britain’s tolerant identity, Clegg’s discourse is securitizing.

To summarise, the discourses of Liberal Democrat leaders were mixed, but predominantly desecuritizing. Desecuritizing frames were preeminent regarding the theme of the impact of migration on ‘our way of life’. Yet, in terms of the specific ‘tolerant’ identity, in the latter portion of Clegg’s leadership messages were securitizing.

#### 4.2.5 UKIP

The identity axis was prominent in the messages of UKIP leaders, with securitizing moves being dominant and uncontested. UKIP did not follow the pattern of the other three parties in terms of percolating around the same two themes. For UKIP, the ‘tolerant’ identity frame was minimal. Instead, attention focussed upon the impact of migration on ‘our way of life’.

#### “‘Our’ way of life”

Messages largely concentrated around two facets: one stressing the extent to which British culture has already been eroded and how this is causing social tensions and the other pinned upon ‘toughening’ up rules/procedure/policy to promote British culture in response to competing migrant culture. Beginning with the former, the 2010 General Election manifesto claims that former New Labour staff had admitted that a policy of lax border controls was ‘a deliberate attempt to water down the British identity’ (UKIP, 2010). Migration is argued to have made certain places in the UK ‘unrecognisable...where you

<sup>56</sup> But interestingly, Clegg’s messages are not fully consistent. The 2015 manifesto (The Liberal Democrats, 2015) states that there is a need to ‘start to rebuild an open, tolerant Britain.’ This admission that intolerance has begun to exert itself more broadly undermines his assertion that Brits are tolerant ‘by nature.’

<sup>57</sup> This also assists the securitization of migration on the economic and securitarian axes by constructing an image of some migrants as ‘chancers’ or ‘exploiters’.

don't hear English spoken in many places' (Farage's 2014 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b]) and that this has generated social tensions (i.e. Farage's 2007 [Videos from the Underground, 2012] and 2014 [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b] annual conference addresses). One indicative example came during the *European Union: In or Out* (2014) debate where Farage stated that

the real impact and the real upset up-and-down this country, the shock if you like, is that immigration on this scale has changed fundamentally the communities, not just of London, but of every city and every market town in this country.

Contrary to other party leaders there are no caveats in the form of positive or desecuritizing messages about the social or cultural contribution from migration. The impact on 'our way of life' is framed in an exclusively negative way, meaning the very presence of migrants with their 'Other' culture is a threat.

Turning to the second main facet, there is a consistent and emphatic message of 'toughening' rules to prevent British culture being undermined. A non-exhaustive list includes: the introduction of a 'Britishness test' to help migrants 'assimilate fully into our society' (UKIP, 2005); implementing the need for migrants to sign a 'Declaration of British Citizenship promising to uphold Britain's democratic and tolerant way of life' (UKIP, 2010); and a rejection of multiculturalism with an active policy to reverse its effects (UKIP, 2010, 2015). These messages construct an image of migrants as at present being different to 'us' and holding different, threatening views (i.e. intolerance). Moreover, once again there is an absence of competing caveats or desecuritizing frames.

### ***The Absence of the Securitization of British Tolerance***

The final area to address is the fissure that exists between the discourses of the UKIP leaders and that of the leaders of the other three political parties in relation to *the* British identity. The tension over British identity (tolerance vs. the desire to restrict immigration being underpinned by intolerance) is a minimal feature of UKIP's messaging. There is the occasional reference to the fact that Britain 'has always had a great record of harmony and integration' (*The European Union: In or Out*, 2014) and that 'Britain is a compassionate, caring nation. In the course of our island's history we have welcomed millions of people to these shores and we are proud of that record' (UKIP, 2015). Moreover, there are declarations that a desire to limit/restrict immigration is 'not racist' (i.e. Farage's 2013 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2013]) and that it is about

‘space not race’ (UKIP, 2015). Note, however, that these messages only begin to appear, however meagrely, in the last few years of analysis. This period (2012 onwards) saw UKIP emerge into the ‘mainstream’ as the fourth largest UK-wide party. This move into the mainstream was accompanied by an attempt to professionalise the party and rid the party of its image as populist and xenophobic.<sup>58</sup>

Yet, these messages were exceedingly sparse. There is not the same continual emphasis on the ‘proud history’ and ‘tolerance’ of the British people that are ubiquitous in the messaging of the other party leaders. It could be interpreted that UKIP either one, do not care to the same degree that their discourse may be constructing the British identity as one that is intolerant, or two, that UKIP are more confident that a desire to limit/reduce/control immigration is not in any way indicative of intolerance. Overall, UKIP’s intervention into establishing *the* British identity is minimal. Ironically, as a result UKIP do not securitize migration on this particular facet of the identitarian axis unlike, with the exception of Kennedy, all other leaders.

To summarise, on the identitarian axis the discourse from UKIP leaders was securitizing in that migration was consistently framed as a threat – with competing frames/caveats absent. In contrast to the other three parties, the space dedicated to the tension over British ‘tolerance’ is minimal.

#### 4.2.6 ‘The Securitization of Tolerance’: Help or Hindrance?

The centrality of ‘British tolerance’ to the migration discourse of UK political elites is important in several respects. First, it demonstrates and deepens our understanding of how self-understood identities – in this case ‘tolerance’ – interact with and underpin discourses of threat (Campbell, 1998; Connelly, 1991). As Connelly (1991: 64) argues ‘identity requires difference in order to be, and it converts difference into otherness in order to secure its own self-certainty.’ As a result, comprehending the discursive battle to define ‘us’ is critical in unpacking the security-migration nexus in that it is inseparable from responses to ‘them’. Yet, in the UK-context, the empirical effects of this ubiquitous ‘tolerance’ trope are unclear.

In one sense, the fact migration is framed as threatening ‘our’ identity is an archetypal securitizing message and would therefore likely assist with the broader securitization of migration. A second effect may be equally problematic. Securitizing

---

<sup>58</sup> For example, speaking in 2014, Farage labelled the 2010 UKIP manifesto as ‘drivel’ and ‘nonsense’ (BBC, 2014b).

actors may be able to utilise the frame to shield rhetoric or policy from being labelled ‘intolerant’. This strategy of positive self-presentation, reversing the ‘moral’ position (i.e. we need to be intolerant or it will lead to more intolerance) and ‘disclaimers’ against accusations of intolerance mirrors the strategies/tactics outlined by van Dijk (1993) of how racism is made ‘legitimate’. Thirdly, asserting that Britain is by nature tolerant may prevent a reflexive and critical understanding of British migration policy, migration discourse and public attitudes toward migration as the growth of far-Right/xenophobic/racist politics is framed as anomalous. However, an alternative analysis could portray the securitization of tolerance as a normatively useful meme. Here Katzenstein’s conceptualisation of norms may be helpful. Katzenstein (1996: 5) defines norms as ‘collective expectations for the proper behaviour of actors with a given identity’. It is argued norms can have both constitutive and regulative effects: ‘Norms thus either define (or constitute) identities or prescribe (or regulate) behaviour, or they do both’ (Katzenstein, 1996: 5). Thus constant assertions of the audience (British citizens) being ‘tolerant’ may socialise (regulate in Katzenstein’s terminology) the audience to hold more tolerant views. In turn this may actually make the audience more tolerant (i.e. constitutive effects). Experimental techniques may be one potential avenue to further investigate these types of seemingly paradoxical discourse – this suggestion is fleshed out in the conclusion of this chapter and the concluding chapter.

### **4.3 Securitarian Axis**

#### **4.3.1 Introduction**

For the securitarian axis, the referent objects are the sovereignty of the state and the personal security of individuals or the collective ‘us’. Regarding state sovereignty, securitizing discourses are centred on ‘border control’ and their legal and symbolic significance in demarcating who is ‘us’ and who is Other. Personal security concerns are underpinned by the criminal-migrant thesis, which fuses migration and crime (including ‘terror’). Analysis of discourses operating within the securitarian axis examines whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining UK sovereignty/border control and personal safety from crime (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

#### **4.3.2 Conservatives**

The extent to which the securitarian axis featured in the discourse of Conservative leaders differed greatly between the Michael Howard and David Cameron eras. Beginning with Howard, both the criminal-migrant thesis (in the form of the genuine/bogus asylum

seeker distinction and the terror-migration nexus) and a lack of border control were at the centre of the Conservative's 2005 General Election campaign. In terms of the bogus/genuine asylum discourse, messages percolated around notions of a 'British sense of fair play' being exploited and abused. There are consistent references to 'genuine' asylum seekers (for example, Howard, 2005b, 2005h, 2005i) that effectively stress that many asylum seekers are not 'genuine' and are therefore exploiting the system. An illustrative example of how this was frequently infused into wider notions of criminal or 'bad' behaviour comes where Howard (2005c) states that

Fair play matters. People want a government that upholds the rules – not one that turns a blind eye when they are bent and abused. And let's be clear. Our asylum system is being abused – and with it Britain's generosity.

Critical here is the use of 'our' when referring to the asylum system and 'Britain's generosity.' This explicitly separates the rule abiding 'us' from the deceitful 'them'. Integrated into these messages on asylum was the notion of 'border control.' Securitizing phrases around the need to 'secure our borders' (for example, Howard 2005j, 2005k) were commonplace whilst the introduction of 24hour surveillance at the major British ports and the establishment of a British Border Control Police Force were key electoral pledges.

Continuing with Howard and turning to (frequent) instances where discourses of border control and asylum seekers were centred on the terror-migration nexus, messages largely concentrated on the same issues. An example comes from a campaign speech where Howard (2005e) states that

Britain's lack of border controls poses a grave danger to our national security. There are over a quarter of a million failed asylum seekers living in our country today. No-one knows who they are, or where they are. There are no checks on people coming into or leaving our country...It is only through a combination of tough anti-terror laws and strict border controls that we will defeat the terrorist threat.

Here, and mirrored in numerous other speeches a lack of 'border control', asylum and then terrorism are all enmeshed in the same discourse (for example, Howard 2005a, 2005j, 2005h). By presenting the relationship between border control, asylum and terrorism as 'fact', Howard's messages entrench the securitizing migration-terror nexus.

After succeeding Howard, the extent to which the securitarian axis features in Cameron's discourse is peripheral prior to the 2010 General Election, before assuming a slightly more prominent role after this point. When the criminal-migrant thesis became more central in Cameron's discourse post-2010 it was linked to the economic axis, particularly the public services strand with an emphasis on 'welfare scrounging'. The crux of issue was framed around 'bogus colleges' and 'sham marriages' (i.e. Cameron, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2013b, 2014a; *The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015). Again, the point is not that non-existent colleges and fraudulent marriage pacts were made (they were). The point is that with the unitary migrant phenomenon (Huysmans, 1995) any discursive link between migrants as 'deviants' who exploit the system can potentially reify the securitizing discourse that all migrants are a threat. It is important to note that there were also the more traditional depictions of migrants as 'criminals' who can 'abuse free movement' (The Conservative Party, 2015) and notions of 'border control' (i.e. Cameron, 2007a, 2007b; *The First election Debate*, 2010), however these formed a small part of Cameron's migration discourse.

Summarising the Conservative leaders' messaging on the securitarian axis, securitizing threat frames are consistent. However, it is important to note that after being ubiquitous in the first half of 2005, the presence of the securitarian discourses were limited in comparison with the other axes, and the economic and identitarian axes in particular.

#### 4.3.3 Labour

For the Labour leaders, the securitarian axis featured in the discourses of Blair and Brown, before decreasing in salience under Miliband. When Blair and Brown operated within the securitarian axis, the issue of border control was linked specifically with the criminal-migrant thesis as illegal immigration, organised crime and general migrant criminality were framed as undermining British sovereignty over borders (for example, Blair, 2005a, 2005d, 2006a, 2006b). There was a general stress on toughening the border controls and migration-focused security practices to prevent illegal immigration (for example, Brown, 2007a, 2008a; *The Sky News Debate*, 2010; *The Prime Ministerial Debate*, 2010). These include the introduction of biometric ID cards, general increased scrutiny at border points and more stringent deportation rules for migrants who commit crimes. Occasionally this broad rhetoric was accompanied by explicit references to serious criminality. For example Blair (2005b), when criticising the Conservative voting record on migration policy, stated that the Conservatives 'voted to allow child abductors, thieves and bomb hoaxers to remain as refugees when the [Labour] government wanted to exclude

anyone sentenced to prison for two or more years from lodging an asylum claim.’ Similarly, Brown (2007a) said that ‘any newcomer to Britain who is caught selling drugs or using guns will be thrown out. No-one who sells drugs to our children or uses guns has the right to stay in our country.’ Accounting for the unitary migrant phenomenon, these messages that bracket migration alongside ‘illegal’ immigration, serious crime and highly emotive threats to personal safety, assist securitizing threat discourses.

Throughout Miliband’s five years as leader, the securitarian axis was not as prominent. Explicit mentions of the criminal-migrant thesis were rare, arising on just a few occasions (Miliband, 2014a, 2015). More common, although still peripheral in comparison to the economic and identity axes, were messages relating to ‘securing our borders’ (Miliband, 2015) and ‘tough’ enforcement of migration rules through the introduction of extra border staff and ‘proper exit and entry checks’ (Miliband, 2014d). These messages underpin discourses of migrants as a non-belonging threat. Equally, they support a notion of migrants as persons who will look to cheat the system in order to exploit the host state (again, this is not to say it does not happen, merely that pointing it out may be assist securitizing discourses).

Overall, the messages on the securitarian axis were present in the discourses of Blair and Brown and minimal in comparison for Miliband. Despite variations in saliency the framing is consistently securitizing.

#### **4.3.4 Liberal Democrats**

Turning to the Liberal Democrat leaders, the securitarian axis is almost totally absent until Clegg’s tenure. The only exception was the 2005 election manifesto, which stated that the asylum system will ensure ‘that those who need help get it, whilst those who don’t can’t abuse the system’ (The Liberal Democrats, 2005). This is a reinforcement of discourses that frame migrants as exploiters. Yet, it is important to note that this securitizing message is relatively unique and heavily outweighed by the plethora of desecuritizing messages on the other axes.

Clegg’s discourse, however, was securitizing. There were consistent reminders around the importance of border controls and keeping track of who is coming in and who is leaving. These messages were supplemented with continuous ‘tough’ measures for the immigration system in order to prevent abuse (i.e. Clegg, 2013, 2014a; The Liberal Democrats, 2015.). Integral to these messages was the party slogan of ‘tolerant Britain, zero tolerant of abuse’ (Clegg, 2013). Focussing on the ‘abuse’ of the system assists with

entrenching the criminal-migrant thesis. A particular instance where the criminal-migrant thesis was discussed helps to illuminate how this blurs into the political (and even identity) axis(es). Prior to the 2010 General Election Clegg outlined a policy for Earned Citizenship. Clegg (*The Sky News Debate*, 2010) stated that previous ‘chaos’ in the system had resulted in

lots of people coming here illegally, who are now still living, for years and years and years, in the shadows of our economy. I’d rather get them out of the hands of criminal gangs, so we can go after the criminal gangs, into the hands of the tax man, if they want to play by the rules, pay their taxes, speak English.

This is quite a complex message which outlines that although many illegal migrants work in the black economy, they are not to be blamed as their illegal status pushes them toward criminal gangs where they are exploited. Whilst this appears as an attempt to desecuritize migration on both the securitarian and particularly the economic axis, the infusion of migration and criminality is again problematic. Indeed, by 2013 Clegg (2013) admitted that

Despite the policy’s aims, it was seen by many people as a reward for those who broke the law. And so it risked undermining public confidence in the immigration system. The very public confidence that is essential to a tolerant, open Britain. That is why I am no longer convinced this specific policy should be retained in our manifesto for the next General Election.

This indicates that Clegg is aware his original message entangled migrants, as opposed to the criminal gangs, with ‘threat’<sup>59</sup>.

To summarise, from being largely absent pre-Clegg, Clegg’s messaging within the securitarian axis bolstered securitizing discourses. This is despite a portion of his messaging arguably being designed to desecuritize the issue.

#### 4.3.5 UKIP

Both strands of the securitarian axis featured heavily in the discourse of UKIP leaders. Beginning with the sovereignty strand, a lack of control over borders was a central

---

<sup>59</sup> This can also be interpreted as securitizing frame in the context of the political axis: it is necessary to appear ‘tough’, even if the party does not think restrictive migration policy/discourse is sensible (i.e. populist politics), to prevent the public turning to populist politics. Catch-22.



message. These messages were almost universally framed in the context of the EU and the principle of free movement. As such, the typical message stressed that EU membership removed British sovereignty over immigration numbers and had therefore effectively created a ‘borderless Britain’ (Farage’s 2014 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b]). Consistent declarations over ‘mass’ and ‘uncontrolled’ immigration were supplemented with utterances that stressed the need to ‘regain control of our borders’ (Farage’s 2013 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2013]). A final feature of the sovereignty frame was the frequent use of hyperbolic rhetoric and imagery<sup>60</sup>. For example, there was a continual fixation on the absolute numbers of individuals who could potentially migrate and settle in the UK. One instance of this occurred in the context of the conclusion of the seven year restrictions on Romanian and Bulgarian citizens, where it was stated that 30 million<sup>61</sup> ‘have open access to our country, our welfare system, our jobs market’ (Farage’s 2013 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2013])). Similarly, during the EU election debates Farage (*Clegg V Farage: The LBC Leader’s Debate*, 2014) stated that there is a ‘total open door, unconditionally to 485 million people’, the entire population of the EU. In terms of imagery, aquatic metaphors were commonplace, particularly notions of the ‘wave’ (for example, Farage’s 2014 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b]) – language that has been identified as potent in constructing migration as a threat (see Bleich, 2002). Taking all the features together there is a clear, strong securitizing attempt made on the issue of sovereignty, as migrants are presented as not belonging and threatening.

In terms of the criminal-migrant thesis, this strand was not as prominent, however did appear regularly and was universally framed in a securitizing manner. There was the perhaps expected ‘tough’ rhetoric around deportation and a prevention of exploitation of the system, not too dissimilar to the other three parties, if perhaps slightly more robust. For example, the UKIP manifesto (UKIP, 2010) stated that ‘to avoid disappearances, asylum seekers will be held in secure and humane centres until applications are processed’ while the 2010 and 2015 manifestos both declared an intention to reintroduce the Primary

---

<sup>60</sup> A study from Crines and Heppell (2016) demonstrated that this type of language is ubiquitous in Farage’s rhetoric.

<sup>61</sup> The hyperbolic nature of this statement was underlined in the EU debates where Nick Clegg pointed out that this figure was greater than the total population of those two counties combined (*Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader’s Debate*, 2014; *The European Union: In or Out*, 2014).

Purpose Rule<sup>62</sup> for those seeking to wed. These policy statements portray migrants as prone to deception and therefore a threat to ‘us’. Second, there were more explicit examples of the criminal-migrant thesis being espoused, for instance during the 2013 autumn Conference Farage (liarpoliticians2, 2013) stated that,

There is an even darker side to opening the door [to Romania and Bulgaria] in January. London is already experiencing a Romanian crime wave. There have been an astounding 27,500 arrests in the Metropolitan Police area in the last five years. 92% of ATM crime is committed by Romanians. This gets to the heart of the immigration policy that UKIP wants, we should not welcome foreign gangs and we must deport those that have committed offences.

This is an obvious securitizing move that reinforces the criminal-migrant thesis. Whilst initially referring to Romanians, Farage then uses the more general label of ‘foreign’ for those that could be/are involved in criminal activity. Even though the Romanian label is enough to generate a link between all migrants and crime due to the migrant’s existence inside the Pandorean Box, the broader label of ‘foreign’ makes this link explicit. A final point to stress again is that these securitizing moves were uncontested. There were no attempts to stress that ‘it is a small minority’ or that ‘the majority obey the law’, enhancing the clarity of the securitizing message.

Overall, on the securitarian axis, UKIP’s discourse was consistent in promoting robust securitizing frames – frames which were entirely unchallenged.

## **4.4 Economic Axis**

### **4.4.1 Introduction**

For the economic axis, the referent object is economic security, incorporating both ‘labour’ (wages, employment and the macro-economy) and ‘public services’ (welfare). Analysis of discourses operating on the economic axis concentrates upon whether migration is framed as threatening the economic wellbeing of Britain/British citizens (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

---

<sup>62</sup> The Primary Purpose Rule was a highly controversial piece of legislation that was designed to ensure that marriage itself (as opposed to say, gaining citizenship) was the primary purpose for the marriage. The rule was heavily criticised as arbitrary, intrusive and designed for exclusion (Joppke, 1999). It was scrapped by the New Labour government in 1997.

#### 4.4.2 Conservatives

In terms of the economic axis, the discourse of Conservative leaders is predominantly securitizing in both the labour strand and the public services strand. Starting with the labour strand, prior to 2010 there are several key messages that on the surface appear desecuritizing. There were general sentiments that migration was important to the economic prosperity and dynamism within the UK. For example, in his 2007 Conference speech (Cameron, 2007a) and October 2007 ‘silence breaking’<sup>63</sup> (Kirkup, 2007) speech Cameron (2007b) stresses the macro-economic benefits migration can have, for instance, increasing GDP. Yet, he does point out that macro-economic benefits can mask economic disadvantages for low-paid unskilled workers. This fits Buonfino’s (2004) analysis that different axes are more relevant to the concerns of different audiences. Related to this is Cameron’s framing of labour competition from migrants. Cameron (2007b) claims false ‘the idea that there is a set number of jobs in the economy that can either go to immigrants or locals’ instead arguing that the government ‘should make it a priority to get people off benefits and into work... reduc[ing] the demand for migrant labour.’ Rather than the typical ‘migrants take our jobs’ message, Cameron blames unemployment on the natives and a culture of welfare dependency. Not charging migrants for filling jobs could be interpreted as a desecuritizing message, but this message still operates within a discourse of migration and economic threat. After the 2010 election, Cameron’s securitizing discourse on the labour strand becomes more pronounced. Messages concentrate on the ‘fundamental connection between our welfare and our training policies... and our immigration policy’ (Cameron, 2013a). It is asserted that ‘[i]f we don’t get our people back to work – we shouldn’t be surprised if millions want to come here to work’ (Cameron, 2013b). Although not blaming migrants for ‘taking our jobs’, the us/them dichotomy of competition is made more explicit than previously was the case.

Turning to the public services strand of the economic axis, discourses are consistently securitizing. Predominantly, the messages emphasise the strain migration places upon public services and welfare (i.e. Howard, 2005f; *The First Election Debate*, 2010; *The Sky News Debate*; *The Prime Ministerial Debate*, 2010), however these securitizing frames are not completely unchallenged. For example, Cameron (*The First Election Debate*, 2010) praises the contribution of migrants, stating that

---

<sup>63</sup> A article written by Kirkup (2007) for the *Telegraph* argued that Cameron had deliberately avoided the issue of migration in the immediate months after he assumed the leadership in place of Michael Howard to de-toxify the ‘nasty party’ image the Conservatives were tagged with following their Right-wing election campaign in 2005. The same argument is made by Bale et al. (2011).

...of course we've benefited from immigration for decades in our country. People have come here to work, to make a contribution, to bring their special skills. We see that in our health service and schools all the time.

This message that portrays migrants as a necessary asset that supports social life contrasts notions that migrants put strains on public services which undermine social life. But other messages of this type are not as clear in their framing of migrants as an economic boon. An indicative case is where Cameron (2014b) argues that 'the great majority of those who come here from Europe come to work, work hard and pay their taxes'. On the surface this could be viewed as an objectivist desecuritizing message. But, the fact that only a small minority 'abuse' the system may be incidental, due to the unitary migrant phenomenon and a reinforcement of the general discursive link between migration and economic 'abuse'. Overall, the prevailing frame is that the lack of control over migration is making these benefits redundant.

Promotion of securitizing threat frames on the public services strand is especially prominent from 2010 onwards. A typical example comes from a speech in 2013 where Cameron (2013a) states that,

On benefits: right now the message through the benefit system is all wrong. It says that if you can't find a job or drop out of work early, the British taxpayer owes you a living for as long as you like, no matter how little you have contributed to social security since you arrived...Ending the 'something for nothing' culture is something that needs to apply in the immigration system...

This framing draws a sharp distinction between the upright, rule-abiding 'us' (the 'British taxpayer') and the undeserving exploitative 'them' (migrants) – a clear example of what Huysmans (1995) terms welfare chauvinism. Indeed, Cameron (2014b) notes specifically that 'our generous welfare system...makes the UK a magnetic destination.' Moreover it frames migrants as individuals who look to cheat the system and abscond from fair play. Again, these are archetypal securitizing frames.

In sum, despite the presence of some potentially desecuritizing frames (or at least caveats/partial challenges), the discourse of Conservative leaders in relation to the economic axis is principally securitizing.

#### 4.4.3 Labour

For the Labour leaders, discourse on the economic axis was mixed. Predominantly, messages related to the labour strand were desecuritizing whilst messages in the public services strand were securitizing.

Beginning with the labour strand, Blair and Miliband largely promoted desecuritizing frames, whereas Brown's discourse was far more mixed. First, there are arguments that migrants have made a significant contribution to the economy (i.e. Blair, 2005b; Brown, 2008a). This takes the form of the market-centric argument regarding flexibility of labour, building businesses, contributing to the tax base and supporting vital public services such as the NHS. These are clear objectivist desecuritizing moves. Within Brown's messages however, these desecuritizing frames are somewhat undermined by an emphasis on the benefit of 'skilled' migration (i.e. 2007b, 2008a, 2009). For example, Brown (2008a) states that Labour's policy will be designed so that 'those who have the skills that can help Britain will be welcomed, and those who do not, will be refused.' Drawing this unskilled/skilled distinction indicates that currently many unskilled migrants are entering and therefore not helping Britain. Again, in the context of a unitary migrant, securitizing one type of migrant may in effect assist the securitization of migration as a whole<sup>64</sup>. Moreover, Brown espoused some more explicit securitizing messages, where migrants are framed as taking up employment opportunities in Britain at the expense of native citizens. This was epitomised by Brown's (2007a) call for 'British jobs for British workers' in his 2007 party conference address. It is crucial to point out however, that although this appears to exemplify the us/them dichotomy of threatened and threat, the fact that jobs are going to migrants is framed as being down to the lack of skills in the native labour pool rather than being the fault of migrants per se (echoing Cameron) (i.e. *The First Election Debate*, 2010; *The Sky News Debate*, 2010; *The Prime Ministerial Debate*, 2010). Thus, even though the us/them dichotomy is present and migrants are stated to be occupying 'British jobs', there is an (arguably largely unsuccessful) attempt to frame this in way that avoids securitizing migration.

Miliband's messages deviate from Blair and Brown. Rather than blame migrants for the link between migration and wage deprivation, the 'enemy' or 'Other' on this occasion was British employers who exploit migration through unscrupulous practices, such as exclusive hiring of non-Brits and illegally paying below the minimum wage. As opposed to any of Huysmans' (1995) strategies, this appears to most closely resemble

---

<sup>64</sup> See Mulvey (2010) for deeper analysis of the problematic nature of New Labour's skilled/unskilled binary.

Hansen's (2012) rearticulation strategy of desecuritization. The root of the 'threat', in this case wage deprivation, is shifted onto another source, 'unscrupulous employers'. Within this frame there was the assumption of a class divide in that, in relation to migration, Miliband (2012a) (again mirroring Cameron) argues that 'where the benefits and costs fall is related to economic position'. Whilst a desecuritizing move, it is necessary to note that the us/them dichotomy is present and despite employers being cast as the 'enemy', migration is still framed as part of the problem. Therefore although there are many aspects that can be viewed as desecuritizing, securitizing qualities remain in these frames.

Turning to the public services strand, prior to 2012 there are some messages of welfare chauvinism and benefits exploitation (Blair, 2005b; Brown, 2008a, 2008b) but these are not overly prominent. Through the latter half of Miliband's leadership however, the public services strand increased in salience. Messages centred on benefits and were framed in line with Huysmans' (1995) welfare chauvinism. There was a particular emphasis that 'entitlement to benefits needs to be earned' (Miliband, 2014c) accompanying a pledge that '[i]f I am elected as Prime Minister we'll put in place new rules which say that if you come to this country you won't get benefits for at least two years' (Miliband, 2015; *The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015). Both of these messages frame migrants as undeserving of welfare and burdensome. Equally, this reinforces the notion that benefits act as a magnet for migrants and that there is a deliberate attempt to exploit the citizens of the host state.

Overall, the discourse of Labour Party leaders on the economic axis was inconsistent. On the labour strand, both securitizing and desecuritizing frames were presented. In contrast, on the public services strand, securitizing frames were preeminent.

#### **4.4.4 Liberal Democrats**

The discourse of Liberal Democrat leaders with regards to the economic axis was mixed. On the 'labour' strand, messages were largely desecuritizing. On the public services strand however, messages were inconsistent.

Beginning with the labour strand, two dimensions were addressed. First, in a similar vein to Miliband, there were frequent attacks on unscrupulous employers with skill shortages and a lack of training being framed as responsible for why migrant labour was out-competing members of the host society (2014a; *The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015). Typically these frames mirrored the 2010 manifesto (The Liberal Democrats, 2010) where there was a declared intention to 'crackdown on rogue employers who profit from illegal

labour’ and the ‘need to train up our youngsters meaning they get the jobs they apply for here at home.’ In the first instance, the ‘Other’ or ‘threat’ is not migrants but rather ‘rogue employers’ – another instance where Hansen’s (2012) rearticulation strategy appears. Although a desecuritizing move, parallel to Miliband’s framing, migrants are still heavily linked to the problem of competition and unemployment. The second case regarding jobs is similar in that migrants avoid direct blame but with the us/them divide central and migrants still being part of the problem, the frame takes on a securitizing dimension.

The second aspect of the labour strand related to effects of migration on the broader macro-economy (i.e. Kennedy 2005a; The Liberal Democrats, 2005). These messages were robust in their support for and belief in the economic benefits of migration. Continually, an objectivist desecuritizing strategy was utilised. For example, Clegg (*Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader’s Debate*, 2014) stated that:

But do remember, of all the new jobs created over the last year or two, 9 out of 10 of those jobs have gone to British workers. Let’s remember that people have come to our country, they create wealth, they pay taxes, they help sustain our NHS.

Again however, it is crucial to acknowledge the securitizing potential of utilising the us/them dichotomy to make an objectivist desecuritizing move.

Turning to the public services strand, messages were inconsistent. In line with his other interventions, Kennedy’s discourse aims to desecuritize. An illustrative example is the pledge to ‘end asylum-seekers dependence on benefits, allowing them to work so they can pay their own way and use their skills to benefit everyone’ (The Liberal Democrats, 2005). Although asylum-seekers are said to be dependent on benefits, this message frames this as a flaw in the system that individuals want to overcome, rather than as claimants deliberately ‘scrounging’ off the state. Equally, within Clegg’s discourse there are similar attempts to underline the contribution of migrants to public services (as with the NHS above) and to emphasise that migrants ‘pay much more into our coffers than they take out in benefits.’ Despite these objectivist strategies reinforcing the us/them divide, they are desecuritizing attempts that frame migrants as assets rather than burdens.

Securitizing frames on the public services strand however, were more prolific. Around the 2010 General Election, there was a securitizing frame where migration was said to put pressure on public services, but that this could be overcome by structural reform as opposed an out-right blame on migrants for not being ‘deserving’ of the right to access

services. But from 2013 onwards the dominant frame was more explicitly welfare chauvinistic. Illustrative of these messages are statements such as having changed the benefit rules ‘so people can’t turn up and claim benefits, no questions asked, no strings attached on the first day that they arrive’ (*The European Union: In or Out*, 2014; *Question Time Special*, 2015) and that ‘the freedom to move is [not] the same as the freedom to claim’ (*Question Time Special*, 2015). These messages are securitizing in that they construct migrants as undeserving due to their ‘Otherness’ and prone to exploitative behaviour.

Overall, the messages of Liberal Democrat leaders on the economic axis were varied. Predominantly desecuritizing moves on the labour strand were accompanied by securitizing messages on the public services strand – especially in the latter half of Clegg’s leadership.

#### 4.4.5 UKIP

For the UKIP leaders, the economic axis was exceedingly prominent, with both the ‘labour’ and ‘public services’ strands featuring heavily. Once more, the messages are purely securitizing and do not contain the same caveats or competing desecuritizing messages to soften the security focus that are common amongst the other party leaders.

Interestingly, the labour competition frame was minimal until after the 2010 General Election. During the next five years this frame became far more central. Heavily enmeshed with messages of uncontrollable borders due to EU membership – epitomised by the declaration during the *European Union: In or Out* (2014) debate that 485 million EU citizens had the right to migrate to the UK – Farage (i.e. Farage’s 2011 annual conference address [liarpoliticians, 2011]; Farage’s 2012 annual conference address [voteleavemedia, 2012]) consistently frames migration as a phenomenon that suppresses wages and creates a vast oversupply of labour, generating unemployment. There is no attempt to shift blame onto ‘unscrupulous’ employers (in the manner of Miliband and Clegg) to dampen the threat frame. Rather, the us/them dichotomy is pivotal and at times deliberately invoked. The final segment of this message is the invocation of a class divide. The oversupply of labour is argued to have benefited wealthy individuals who profit from migrants willing to work for low wages whilst damaging the economic security of ‘ordinary folk’ (Farage’s 2014 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b]) or ‘working people’ (*Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader’s Debate*, 2014). An illustrative example comes from the second EU debate where Farage states that



It is bad news for ordinary British workers and families that we have had over the course of the last decade because of an excess in the labour market – not talking about benefits, the labour market – we have had wage compression where wages have gone down 14% in real terms since 2007. We have had a doubling of youth unemployment. It is good for the rich. Because it's cheaper nannies and cheaper chauffeurs and cheaper gardeners but it's bad news for ordinary Britons.

And

we need to find a way to give people at the bottom of our society and to give our young people jobs. And we will not do that with an open door immigration policy to Southern and Eastern Europe. That is about putting British people first.

Here, Farage's exploitation of two friend/enemy binaries (ordinary/rich and British/migrant) is evident. This is again in line with Buonfino's (2004) assertion that the economic axis carries the greatest significance with the working class.

Turning to the public services strand, messages are very much securitizing in nature. In terms of public services, health, housing and schools were prioritised, with welfare focussing on access to benefits. For both public services and the welfare system, there was a consistent message that migration has generated an enormous degree of pressure on their capacity to function adequately. Yet, the argument was not constructed around increasing supply but was instead about reducing demand, where notions of a 'deserving' 'us' and an 'undeserving' 'them' were fundamental. During the *BBC Election Debate* (2015), there are representative examples from all three of the public service areas, with Farage stating on housing that

we've got to build a new house every seven minutes just to cope with current levels of migration. So, a rapidly rising population has put massive, massive pressure on house building in Britain...we should make sure that all new social housing is for UK nationals only.

On schools that,

a massive increase in our population means we've got to find another quarter of a million primary school places by 2020... We are in no position to cope with this massive rise in our population.

And on health that,

If the choice is that we increasingly say to people, particularly older people ‘we cannot treat you for breast cancer, we cannot treat you for prostate cancer, we do not have the money’, whilst at the same time, we allow people to fly into Britain, with no link to this country, and contributed nothing to this system but we are prepared to give them drugs for being HIV positive. You then get yourself to a situation where you ask yourself a sane question: Is the job of the National Health Service to look after people here, or is it to be an international health service?

Similarly, messages revolve around ending ‘welfare tourism’ and that it is unfair for new arrivals to obtain the same access to benefits as UK nationals without contributing into the system for several years (i.e. *Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader’s Debate*, 2014; Farage’s 2007 conference address[Videos from the Underground, 2012]; UKIP Official Channel, 2015). The above statements capture the frequency of hyperbolic language and the explicit invocation of the us/them binary in a welfare chauvinistic sense: where migrants are portrayed as a threat to ‘our’ security which is unacceptable as they are in no way deserving patrons. Again, the lack of alternative desecuritizing messages is important. Indeed, when there was an explicit invitation to present a desecuritizing caveat, Farage (*BBC Election Debate*, 2015) stated that ‘the fact that there are some very good foreign doctors or nurses that work in this country is not the point.’

To summarise, on the economic axis the messages from UKIP are consistent and robust in promoting securitizing threat frames.

## 4.5 Political Axis

### 4.5.1 Introduction

Previously the political axis has been framed as explanatory in that it underpins why the other three axes are used to securitize migration: the political capital to be gained from securitizing frames drives actor’s discourses (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Karyotis, 2007).

Yet, this thesis finds some discourses that are unique to the political axis. These centre on 1) notions of a state’s political culture (democracy) being undermined by migrants who hold undemocratic views and 2) the destabilising effects migration can have by providing a platform for far-Right politics to flourish – this being similar, although not

identical to, van Dijk's (1993) notion of 'vox populi or White racism as threat.' Here, due to the 'real' security threats that migration creates, migration is therefore presented as a threat to political stability as their presence 'understandably' generates fear/xenophobic politics. The second dimension is often linked to the political Catch-22 outlined previously<sup>65</sup>. Desecuritizing discourses can therefore 1) present migration as non-threatening to the state's political culture or 2) stress that xenophobia or public anxiety are not a result of migration being an objective threat to the state's political culture by providing fruitful terrain for the far-Right – rather, blame is placed upon the 'irresponsible' securitizing actors and their claims. Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the political axis concentrates on whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining 'our' political culture/democracy and/or facilitating the popularity of the far-Right (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

#### 4.5.2 Conservatives

Starting with the Conservatives, the general messages are consistent, although there is a tactical distinction between Howard and Cameron. For Howard, there is a call to normalise debate around immigration as an issue. The central message was that to seek a reduction in migrant numbers was 'not racist' (Howard, 2005f, 2005h). Indeed, one of the Conservative Party's main slogans during the 2005 General Election and a full page of their manifesto stated that '[i]t's not racist to impose limits on immigration' (The Conservative Party, 2005) whilst on several occasions Howard (2005j, 2005k) argues that '[i]t's not racist to talk about immigration...It's not racist to want to limit the numbers. It's just plain common sense.' It is argued to not be 'racist' and instead be 'common sense' due to the fact migration poses a real, serious problem. Evidently, this reinforces notions of threat. These messages are linked with the proposition that a failure to deal with the problem will allow the proliferation of destabilising far-Right politics<sup>66</sup>. Thus responsibility for the potential (destabilising) rise of the far-Right (i.e. the threat) is placed at the door of migrants.

---

<sup>65</sup> The Catch-22 being where security discourses are prevalent and public fears are growing, mainstream political parties may attempt to prevent the far-Right from profiting by being 'tough' on the issue. However, engaging in a rhetorical and policy arms race to appear 'tough' effectively, even if unintentionally, supports a far-Right agenda by moving policy to the Right and simultaneously reinforcing the 'realness' of the threat. But failure to appear tough is theorised to leave the far-Right with an open goal. Catch-22.

<sup>66</sup> This message also has implications for the identity axis in that assertions that it is 'not racist' can be viewed as an attempt to promote/protect the British identity of tolerance.

Prior to the 2010 General Election, Cameron's discourse was also concerned with normalising debate but employed less alarmist rhetoric. Cameron's messages revolved around approaching migration 'sensibly' including, for example, a declaration that

I want our party, a modern Conservative Party, to talk about this issue [migration] in a reasonable, humane and sensible way... What I always find with the [Labour] government is that you get the exact opposite<sup>67</sup>. You get a whole lot of language, often quite inflammatory (Cameron, 2007a).

In a similar vein, in each of the three 2010 Prime Ministerial Debates, Cameron argues that he wanted to reduce overall net migration into the UK in order to make sure migration 'is no longer an issue in our politics as it wasn't in the past' (*The ITV Leader's Debate*, 2010). This appears to differ from Howard who did not place any great emphasis on removing migration from the political agenda. Cameron's desire speaks to Hansen's (2012) 'silencing' strategy of desecuritization. However, as Roe (2004) argued, if an issue is currently securitized, ignoring it completely can leave security discourses unchallenged and their hegemony entrenched. After the 2010 election Cameron's call for a 'sensible' debate remains within his broader discourse on migration accompanied by further reiteration of the political capital Right-wing populist/xenophobic parties can make if Centrist parties are not seen to be 'dealing' with the issue (i.e. 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2013a, 2014b)<sup>68</sup>. These messages explicitly outline the political Catch-22 to the audience and again place the responsibility for potential far-Right growth on migrants.

Overall, in terms of the political axis, analysis of the discourse of Conservative leaders demonstrates that despite tactical variation (alarmist vs. non-alarmist rhetoric), securitizing frames presenting migration as fostering threat in the form of causing a proliferation of far-Right extremism were prevalent.

#### 4.5.3 Labour

For Labour, there is a relatively consistent message that is formed of two parts: extremist parties are to be discredited and their politics deemed unethical; and the 'real'

---

<sup>67</sup> Earlier in the speech Cameron attacked Gordon Brown's heavily criticised proclaimed desire for 'British jobs for British workers' for being against EU law.

<sup>68</sup> It is important to note that during this latter period, the emphasis on needing to 'deal' with migration due to the real problems it was causing intensified, bolstering notions of threat.

issues arising from migration mean that concerns have to be dealt with, linked closely to the potential dangers of far-Right politics.

Regarding the discrediting of extremist parties and politics, on several occasions Blair (2005a, 2005b) is explicitly critical of Howard and the Conservative's 'nasty, unprincipled campaign on immigration' in which there was 'an attempt deliberately to exploit people's fears.' Similarly, Miliband (*BBC Election Debate*, 2015) attacked UKIP for reacting to public concerns in an 'exploitative way' by trying to sensationalise the issue to generate fear (for example, references to not wanting 'HIV sufferers attacked on national television' ((Miliband, 2015)) as Nigel Farage did during the *ITV Leader's Debate*, 2015). These attempts to undermine the credibility of both UKIP, the party which most vociferously promotes securitizing discourses, and a Right-wing Conservative election campaign, can be seen as somewhat desecuritizing as securitizing actors/messages are being attacked and discredited – although the threat frames of migration presenting 'real issues' are not challenged directly.

Relating to the 'real concerns' specifically, the arguably desecuritizing moves attacking securitizing actors/parties above are followed by more explicitly securitizing messages that to prevent the issue being used as a 'political weapon' (Blair, 2005b) it is necessary to employ 'strict controls', eradicate 'abuse', and generally 'toughen' up the immigration and asylum system. An illustrative example comes from Blair's (2005a) spring conference speech where he states that '[w]e faced up to the toughening of our asylum and immigration rules because like it or not, decent people, a million miles from the BNP, told us it mattered to them'. More broadly, there is general drive to state that concerns over immigration are 'real' and are not based on 'prejudice.' These messages are significant in two ways. First, echoing Cameron the political Catch-22 is explicitly cited: the need to move political policy to the Right in order to prevent the extreme Right (in this context, the BNP) from gaining influence and electoral support.<sup>69</sup> Second, the rise of the far-Right is again blamed on migrants as those expressing concern are framed as not prejudiced and 'decent' (i.e. they are a 'million miles from the BNP', therefore the British identity of tolerance is intact).

---

<sup>69</sup> Again, the need to placate 'fears' of the migrant Other uncovers friction at the root of the 'tolerant' identity. Earlier notions of a homogenous British identity of tolerance are contradicted, as it is acknowledged the BNP/UKIP do not fit this description. Equally, stressing the 'toughening of our asylum and immigration rules' has securitizing consequences on the securitarian and economic axes as it suggests that previously, the rules were being exploited. Thus frames of migrants as 'law breakers' or 'burdens' are reified.

Overall, despite some potentially desecuritizing moves via the attacking of securitizing actors/messages, Labour's framing was largely securitizing as the cause of the political Catch-22 and threat of a growth of the far-Right are pinned on migration rather than the British public.

#### 4.5.4 Liberal Democrats

For the Liberal Democrats, there is a desecuritizing/securitizing divide between the two central themes (themes that closely mirror those of the Labour Party): criticism of Right-wing politics and parties; and the need to 'restore public confidence' in the immigration system.

In reference to the former, desecuritizing messages are dominant. In the context of Howard's Right-wing General Election campaign, the Liberal Democrat manifesto (The Liberal Democrats, 2005) declares that '[w]e will not pander to fear or prejudice', a line repeated in Kennedy's (2005a) spring conference address. Similarly, Clegg (2014a) vows that the Liberal Democrats will never 'mimic the likes of UKIP and others – [with] the scaremongering, the immigrant-bashing'. The message here is that migration is not a security threat, meaning that even if a portion of the population views it as such, the Liberal Democrats will not treat it as such. By not recognising migration as a security threat and therefore not buying into the logic of the political Catch-22, migrants avoid blame for any growth in intolerance/far-Right politics. In this case the Catch-22 is ameliorated: Orr was just allowed to leave the 256<sup>th</sup> U.S Army Air Force squadron. Relatedly there is, echoing Miliband, an attempt to delegitimise the securitizing messages of Right-wing opponents. For example, there were consistent accusations of 'scaremongering', a significant case being during the *European Union: In or Out* (2014) debate where Clegg repeatedly attacked a UKIP leaflet that stated 29 million Bulgarians and Romanians might come to the UK when the population of the two states combined is less than that number. Once more this strategy can be viewed as desecuritizing through an attack and discrediting of securitizing actors and messages.

Under Clegg's leadership the second theme of having to 'restore public confidence' (*The First Election Debate*, 2010) in the immigration system emerged. For example, Clegg (2014a) states that '[s]uccessful immigration systems have to be managed. People need to see that they are good for society as a whole. Otherwise all you do is create fear and resentment – you give populists an open goal.' These messages are accompanied with declarations of a 'firm but fair' (The Liberal Democrats, 2010) approach to migration

which suppresses abuse of the system. Whilst not ‘hard-line’, Clegg’s toughening of immigration rules fits the Catch-22 of the political axis – that in order to prevent the Right making electoral gain from being able to ‘own the issue’, policies and rhetoric becomes more restrictive/Right-wing. And once again, and in contrast to the messages above, emphasising that fears are ‘real’ apports a substantial percentage of the responsibility for the rise of the far-Right on migrants<sup>70</sup>.

Taken as a whole, Liberal Democrat messages are mixed. In one sense, by emphasising a refusal to accept migration as a threat migrants are not blamed for a growth in far-Right politics. Moreover, attacking/discrediting Right-wing parties can be viewed as a desecuritizing move. In contrast, Clegg’s messages to deal with the ‘real’ problems to restore confidence can be considered to suffer from the Catch-22 and are de facto securitizing as in this instance migrants are framed as responsible for the threat posed by the far-Right.

#### 4.5.5 UKIP

The political axis was generally peripheral in the discourse of UKIP leaders, however when it featured, there was a consistent frame. The frame consisted of two interlinked parts. The first was that the political establishment had shut down debate on immigration and that they deliberately avoided and obfuscated the issue (i.e. Farage’s 2013 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2013]; *BBC Election Debate*, 2015). These messages chime with those proliferated by Howard. The second part related to the essential role UKIP were playing in opening up the debate on immigration. Prior to 2010 when the BNP were making electoral gains and where many people were being tempted by ‘extremes’, the emphasis was on the success of UKIP in discussing immigration in a non-racist way and preventing the BNP from being even stronger (for example, Nigel Farage’s 2009 spring conference address [voteleavemedia 2009a, 2009b] and 2009 annual conference address [voteleavemedia, 2009c, 2009d, 2009e]). The ‘success’ in making it ‘not extremist’ to talk about immigration was reiterated (i.e. Farage’s 2014 annual conference address [liarpoliticians2, 2014a; liarpoliticians2, 2014b]) after the decline of the BNP. These two messages, the irresponsibility of avoiding the issue by the ‘politically correct’ (*BBC Election Debate*, 2015) political class and the rise of ‘extremist’ (Nigel Farage’s 2009 spring conference address [voteleavemedia 2009a, 2009b]) and racist parties create a securitizing frame. In short, a failure to discuss and address the threat from

---

<sup>70</sup> Again these messages are intertwined with the tension over British ‘identity’ with messages that concerns are ‘real’ and are not ‘racist’.

immigration (itself a securitizing message) is framed as dangerous as it causes a proliferation of far-Right politics. Again, migrants (as real threats) are framed as partly responsible for facilitating a destabilising growth of far-Right politics.

Another unique message of the political axis, although rare in UKIP's overall discourse, related to a specific threat that migration was said to pose to Britain's political culture. This 'type' of frame has not been previously acknowledged as a heuristic tool by those who have constructed the four axes model of analysis. The 2010 manifesto states the desire to make it a requirement that migrants sign a 'Declaration of British Citizenship promising to uphold Britain's democratic and tolerant way of life' (UKIP, 2010). This frame presents migrants as at present being different to 'us' and holding different, threatening views related to the 'core of British political culture': democracy and tolerance.

Overall, although the political is a peripheral axis, UKIP discourse is securitizing and includes the use of a frame that has not previously been identified in the four axes model related to the securitization of the host society's political (democratic) culture.

#### **4.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has systematically explored how migration has been framed in the UK during 2005-2015 by political elites from the four largest UK-wide political parties. The findings are summarised in Table 4.1. In short, securitizing threat frames dominated in the messages of political elites. In terms of predominance of securitizing messages, UKIP's messages were the most robust and consistently securitizing, with alternative, desecuritizing frames being absent. The Conservatives followed UKIP who were in turn followed by Labour. The Liberal Democrat messages were the most distinct in that the dominance of securitizing frames was less emphatic. Analysis demonstrated that no axes were consistently marginalised, with the salience of each axis (and even dimensions within each axis) changing over time. Yet, on balance it would be fair to say that the economic and identitarian axes were more central in comparison to the securitarian and political. Beyond the 'big picture' several key findings have emerged.

The first relates to variation. Unsurprisingly, as summarised above, there is variation between parties. A more significant point however, relates to variation within parties. There is variation over time which helps to crystallise the nuances within the evolving party-positioning regarding migration policy and discourse. And perhaps more importantly, there is variation (at the same time) across axes and within different dimensions of axes. For example, there is sharp distinction between the space dedicated to



the securitarian axis between Howard, for whom the securitarian axis was central, and Cameron, where it was peripheral. Or taking Labour's messaging on the economic axis the outcome was mixed, with moves on the 'labour' strand being mostly desecuritizing and securitizing moves dominating on the 'public services' strand. This highlights the complexity of migration discourse and reinforces the argument for the importance of deploying the four axes framework. In short, this framework offers an expedient means of analysing the de/construction of migration as a security threat, by providing a platform to explore all of the major dimensions of migration discourse. However, it is important to clarify that despite the variations in salience of different axes across time, the analysis demonstrated that the general framing from each party (securitizing or desecuritizing) remained relatively stable throughout the analytical period.

Another significant finding relates to the discourses identified on the political axis. Previously, the political axis has been conceived as largely explanatory, in that it underpins why the other three axes are used to securitize migration. It is theorised that there are greater quantities of political capital accrued from securitizing discourses. Moreover, even those who would not gladly use migration in an instrumentalist fashion can fall victim to the political Catch-22. However, this thesis has identified discourses that are unique to the political axis. These centre on notions of 1) a state's political culture (democracy) being undermined by migrants who hold undemocratic views and 2) the destabilising effects migration can have by providing a platform for far-Right politics to flourish. The latter is reminiscent of van Dijk's (1993: 99) notion of 'vox populi or White racism as threat', where the argument runs '[s]top immigration...because otherwise *we* will get even more racist.' But perhaps in the UK context it would be more appropriate to say that the argument is framed as 'stop immigration because otherwise *they* will get even more racist', where the 'they' is some group of British citizens (BNP voters for instance) who are not *really* British as we, the British, are by nature tolerant.

An additional derivation is the apparent confirmation of Huysmans' (1995, 2002) concerns over the challenge of attempting to desecuritize migration, especially when employing objectivist strategies. Consistently, desecuritizing frames were (theoretically, and therefore interpreted in the analysis as being) imbued with securitizing qualities via the reinforcement of the discursive link between migration and threat and a reification of the us/them binary. This finding is perhaps most significant for, although not restricted to, those with a normative agenda who desire to challenge the securitization of migration. How to do so effectively remains unclear.

Table 4.1: Summary of Discourse Analysis of Political Elites

Party	Axis			
	Identitarian	Securitarian	Economic	Political
<b>Tory</b>	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Way of Life: Securitizing Tolerance: Securitizing  Note: Some desecuritizing caveats	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: High to low salience divide between Howard and Cameron	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Labour Strand: Securitizing Public Services Strand: Securitizing  Note: Some desecuritizing caveats	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: Less inflammatory tone from Cameron compared with Howard
<b>Labour</b>	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Way of Life: Mixed Tolerance: Securitizing  Note: Securitizing/desecuritizing divide between Brown and Miliband on 'way of life' theme	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: High to low salience divide between Blair & Brown and Miliband	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Labour Strand: Mixed Public Services Strand: Securitizing  Note: Securitizing/desecuritizing divide between Brown and Blair & Miliband on 'labour' strand	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: Desecuritizing messages present via attacking Right-wing securitizing parties/actors
<b>Lib Dems</b>	<u>Predominant Frame: Desecuritizing</u> Way of Life: Desecuritizing Tolerance: Mixed/Securitizing  Note: Securitizing/desecuritizing divide between Kennedy and Clegg on 'tolerance' theme	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: Absent pre-Clegg; some desecuritizing discourses with securitizing qualities.	<u>Predominant Frame: Mixed</u> Labour Strand: Desecuritizing Public Services Strand: Securitizing  Note: desecuritizing discourses with securitizing qualities; public services more prominent in latter half of Clegg's leadership	<u>Predominant Frame: Mixed/Securitizing</u>   Note: Securitizing messages only during Clegg's leadership; desecuritizing messages present via attacking Right-wing securitizing parties/actors
<b>UKIP</b>	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Way of Life: Securitizing Tolerance: Securitizing  Note: No desecuritizing caveats	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: No desecuritizing caveats	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u> Labour Strand: Securitizing Public Services Strand: Securitizing  Note: No desecuritizing caveats	<u>Predominant Frame: Securitizing</u>   Note: Peripheral in discourse

One possible way forward would be to introduce experimental methods to test the effectiveness of Huysmans' desecuritization strategies and the assumptions upon which they are based. For example, does the link between migration and threat prevent empirically-based 'objective' claims being effective as a desecuritizing tool or not? Are deconstructivist strategies the most effective? Or is a combination of both strategies the most effective or not? Whilst results garnered in experimental settings have their limitations, if designed correctly and the political context of the society accounted for they may provide highly useful ammunition for actors (inside and outside of the academy) to challenge the securitization of migration (see for example, Druckman et al. (2011), Kittel et al. (2012) and Morton and Williams (2010) for a review of the benefits and limitations of experimental research). Beyond those with an agenda to challenge the securitization of migration, the findings derived from such experiments would be highly useful in enabling the acquisition of a more holistic understanding of the security-migration nexus. The potential utilisation of experimental methods will be expanded upon in the concluding chapter.

One further finding relates to the centrality of messages pinned upon the impact migration has on the self-understood identity of Britain as 'tolerant': the 'securitization of British tolerance'. To recap, this is potentially important in several respects. Firstly, it highlights the pivotal role played by the self-understanding of the host society in facilitating the ability of migration to actually 'threaten'. Consequently the battle to define 'us' is deeply significant. The implications of the securitization of British tolerance, however are unclear. This meme may be interpreted as normatively problematic in that 1) migration is framed as threatening 'our' identity 2) it can be used as a device to shield rhetoric or policy from being labelled 'intolerant' and 3) by asserting that Britain is by nature tolerant, this may prevent a reflexive and critical understanding of British migration policy, migration discourse and public attitudes toward migration. Or alternatively, drawing on Katzenstein (1996), this meme may be interpreted as normatively useful in that continual assertions of the audience (British citizens) 'being tolerant' may in fact socialise ('constitute' and 'regulate' to employ Katzenstein's terminology) the audience to hold more tolerant views and indeed make the audience more tolerant. Again, experimental techniques may open up space to further investigate these types of seemingly paradoxical discourse to move beyond theoretical speculation.

Turning to the implications for linking elite cues to public attitudes, to repeat it is not possible to try and connect the cues of political elites to public attitudes in the same

respect as it is possible for religious elites. Once more, this is because whilst it is possible to control for party and religious ID (i.e. Conservative, Labour, Anglican, Catholic etc.) there is no variable akin to attendance at religious services for political elites that can account for level of exposure to elite cues. Yet, to reiterate, the CS conceptualise security as a ‘top-down’ elite-driven process. Thus it is tentatively theorised that the direction of causality is from political elite messaging to attitudes of party supporters. At the very least, despite not being to as confidently infer the direction of causality, it is still possible to analyse the extent to which party messaging and the attitudes party supporters align. In short, it will detect any anomalies, for example it would be surprising based on the disparity in migration discourse between UKIP and the Liberal Democrats that those who identify with the latter display the more negative immigration attitudes. Thus in respect of the above analysis the following hypothesis is derived:

*UKIP supporters will have the most negative attitudes, followed by the Conservatives, Labour and then the Liberal Democrats (H1).*

This will be addressed in Chapter 6.

Last, the analysis of political elite discourse has provided critical context for the qualitative and quantitative analysis of religious elite discourse. To reemphasise, political elite actors dominate UK migration discourse (Statham and Geddes, 2006). Crucially then, the extent to which the religious elite discourse differs from the prevailing discourse of the political elites may have consequences for the ease/difficulty that messages from the former can permeate past the latter and influence attitudes. In light of the dominance of security threat frames from political elites, if religious elite discourse attempts to desecuritize, it will likely find it far harder to penetrate and foster more positive immigration attitudes in ‘their flock’ compared to a context in which the prevailing discourse from political elites was more balanced or predominantly desecuritizing. It is to the analysis of religious elite discourse that this thesis now turns.

## **Chapter 5: Love Thy Neighbour? Religious Elite Discourse on Migration**

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Thou Shalt...? Guiding Principles
  - 5.2.1 Guiding Principles: The Catholic Church
  - 5.2.1 Guiding Principles: The Anglican Church
- 5.3 Any Room at the Inn? Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration
  - 5.3.1 Introduction
  - 5.3.2 The Identitarian Axis
  - 5.3.3 The Political Axis
  - 5.3.4 The Economic Axis
  - 5.3.5 The Securitarian Axis
  - 5.3.6 The Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse Summary
- 5.4 Any Room at the Inn? Catholic Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration
  - 5.4.1 Introduction
  - 5.4.2 The Identitarian Axis
  - 5.4.3 The Political Axis
  - 5.4.4 The Economic Axis
  - 5.4.5 The Securitarian Axis
  - 5.4.6 The Catholic Church and Church Elite Discourse Summary
- 5.5 Conclusion

### **5.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to systematically explore how migration has been framed by religious elites from the Anglican Church of England and the Catholic Church in England and Wales. This will provide detailed empirical analysis of exactly how this previously under-explored set of elite actors discusses migration, whilst also illuminating any differences/similarities in relation to the political elite actors. Alongside the empirical findings, the analysis will also enable the formation of a hypothesis regarding the direction of potential attitudinal impact elite cues are having on ‘their’ audiences.

The analytical timeframe mirrors that of the political elite actors. The repository of potential sources included official Church literature that engages with migration, including documents that outline the foundations of what should guide the Church’s response to migration, alongside public interventions into the migration debate from high ranking Church officials (for example, Archbishops, former Archbishops and Senior Bishops). Church publications were analysed to gain a clear insight into the ‘official line’ regarding the Church’s key messages regarding migration – threat or non-threat. The hierarchical nature of the Church informs the assumption that the official Church position would be communicated by the majority of Church actors. To improve confidence in this

assumption, the public interventions of high ranking elites were analysed to provide insight into the extent to which the ‘official line’ was reflected in elite messaging. Whilst it is not possible to be certain, there are good theoretical grounds (hierarchy) to assume that these elite messages will be reflective of the frames that the average church goer will be exposed to.

In brief, desecuritizing non-threat frames are dominant. For the Anglican faith, despite two actors (Michael Nazir-Ali, Bishop of Rochester, and George Carey, former Archbishop of Canterbury – the latter being far more prominent), promoting securitizing threat frames, desecuritizing actors are far more numerous and, crucially, the ‘official’ Church line is explicitly one that attempts to promulgate non-threat-based messages. For the Catholic faith, desecuritizing frames are unequivocal. Next, there is unanimity between the Churches in the extent to which the identitarian axis dominates. The political axis is the next most prominent, however, content was often rooted in identitarian concerns around ‘our’ political culture becoming populated by far-Right anti-immigration parties and rhetoric. Thus there is a clear divergence with political elites in that, whilst the identitarian axis received considerable attention, so did the economic, whilst the securitarian and political were not marginalised to any great extent. This indicates that the religious elites are far more content to operate within discourses surrounding the ‘morality’/identity of migration, paying less attention to the more ‘day-to-day’ discourse of cost/benefit economic and security analysis. This is perhaps to be expected on two accounts. One, the level of capital possessed by religious elite actors is likely to be greater regarding issues of ‘morality’/identity, compared with economics or security. And two, relatedly, ‘morality’, as opposed to economics or security is at the centre of the heuristic devices/myths that are most readily available to religious elites. Finally there is a disparity between the two Churches in the way they view their official role (or ‘mission’) with regards to migration. The approach of the Anglican Church appears to be rooted, at least publicly, solely in the promotion of migrant well-being. Whilst this is central to the Catholic Church position as well, it is stated that this is heavily intertwined with the duty to evangelise, spread the Word and strengthen the Catholic Church. It is suggested that this may open up more space for securitizing actors/discourses to emerge from the Anglican faith.

The chapter proceeds in a number of integrated steps. The first section analyses the ‘guiding principles’ underpinning each Church’s approach to migration as an issue. This provides a useful context for analysing and interpreting the other interventions from the Church and Church elites. The second part concentrates on the discourses of the Anglican

Church and Church elites, using the four axes model as a structural framework to analyse whether migration has been framed as a ‘threat’ (securitizing moves) or non-threat (desecuritizing moves). The third section repeats this process with a focus on the Catholic Church. Last, there will be a brief summary of the empirical findings and the formalisation of hypotheses necessary for the quantitative analyses in the following chapter.

## 5.2 Thou Shalt...? Guiding Principles

Both the Catholic and Anglican Churches in the UK have published documents which set out guiding principles for how the issue of migration should be addressed, rooted in the Church’s teaching/biblical doctrines. An analysis of both documents provides a context that enables a deeper analysis of interventions into the migration debate from each Church and set of elite Church actors.

### 5.2.1 Guiding Principles: The Catholic Church

Starting with the Catholic Church, in 2008 the Office for Migration Policy produced a document entitled the *Mission of the Church to Migrants in England and Wales* authored by the Bishop of Southwark and the Church’s migration spokesperson, Patrick Lynch. It is designed to outline the Catholic Church’s approach and position on the ‘transformation of the social character [via migration] of the dioceses of England and Wales’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008). The main pillars include: the Biblical mandate for welcoming the stranger; practical guidance on integrating migrants into the Church specifically, and civic society generally; and ‘Migration in the Context of the Wider Mission of the Church’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 7). The document remains the only holistic outline given by the Catholic Church in England and Wales underpinning their rationale in approaching migration. Significantly, it draws upon ‘[t]he Church’s main teaching documents on migration’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 6) that have been produced by the Vatican<sup>71</sup>. Overall it is stated that guiding the response to migration should be the ‘mission of the Church’, which is made up of three ‘interdependent elements’: Proclamation of the Word (evangelising); Communion and Holiness of the Church (strengthening the Church); and being at the service of God’s Kingdom (ethical responsibility to reach out to the poor and vulnerable) (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 7).

---

<sup>71</sup> For example, the 1952 Apostolic Constitution, *Exsul Familia* (Thee Émigré Holy Family), ‘considered the Magna Carta of Catholic Teaching on Migrants’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 6) right through to the more recent *Erga migrantes caritas Christi* (Love of Christ Toward Migrants) published in 2004.

Beginning with the first element, it is stated that: ‘migration has always served as a means for transmitting the faith throughout the history of the Church and in the evangelising mission’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 8). This is a clear statement that one of the three founding principles that underpin the Church’s position on migration (including rhetoric, policy and action) is based on the fact that it provides an opportunity to evangelise and proselytise. The second element is similar. It is stated that ‘the ministry of welcome is both an expression of communion and a call to migrants to become full members of the local Church’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 8). Thus the second of the Church’s three founding principles at the bedrock of their approach to migration is based upon the chance and duty to bring migrants into the Church. The third element emphasises that ‘welcoming migrants means much more than saying “hello”, it is about reaching out to build a deeper understanding and bond’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2008: 10). With all elements being ‘interdependent’, this ethical duty to welcome the stranger and improve their wellbeing cannot be viewed in isolation and has to be viewed through the prism of the first two. In short, when considering the Catholic Church’s response to migration it is essential to acknowledge that strengthening the Church is stated as a principle objective. An example illuminating the role ‘mission’ plays in practice comes from a statement made by Bishop Lynch in celebration of the World Day for Migrants and Refugees, entitled *Migration and the New Evangelization*. Bishop Lynch (2012) states that

migration (both internal and external) provides the Church with both a challenge and an opportunity for evangelization... as we celebrate the World Day for Migrants and Refugees... we are conscious that all of us are called to be evangelized and all of us are to be evangelizers. So we pray in thanksgiving for all the migrant communities who down through the years have enriched the Church here in England and Wales by their faith and their faithfulness, by their commitment and their witness and by their devotion and devotions... we pray for the courage to truly become enthusiastic evangelizers and like the shepherds and the Magi be ‘heralds of God’s word and witnesses to the Risen Jesus’ in the world in which we live and work.

Evidently the duty to evangelise in the context of migration is unequivocal. (This duty is a recurrent theme in the sources analysed, alongside the focus upon and specific praise for



migrants who are committed Catholics (for example, Lynch, 2009; Murphy O'Connor, 2006, 2008).

Theoretically then, it would be expected that the Catholic Church would respond positively to migration in that it is more likely to assist in the effort to strengthen the Church. On the other side of the theoretical coin, the Catholic Church may be expected to be less supportive of the immigration of those whom proselytising would be most difficult, namely those committed to another non-Christian faith. However, whilst proselytising and evangelising is 'easier' for those who are nominally Christian/lapsed Catholics as opposed to devout believers in Islam, the duty to try and convert is still mandated (see *Erga migrantes caritas Christi*; Lynch, 2012). Moreover the third element, the ethical duty to care, is not denomination-specific and is mandated on a universal basis. Thus, on the whole, based on the guiding principle it may be expected that the Catholic Church and Church elites will promote desecuritizing messages.

### 5.2.2 Guiding Principles: The Anglican Church

In comparison, the Anglican Church do not, at least publicly, place the same explicit emphasis on how migration relates to the strength of the Church and the spreading of the Anglican faith. The document produced by the Church of England's Liberation and Entrapment Project (2015) entitled *Mission, Migrants and Refugees* is the most comprehensive<sup>72</sup> piece in outlining the Anglican Church's 'official' stance, based on scripture and doctrine, on what guides their response to migration. It is stated that

the missionary purpose of the Church is inextricably linked to the *misseo Dei*, God's purpose for the world. The *misseo Dei* is bound up with the long terms future of human beings, the creation of conditions for human freedom and the flourishing which lead to 'life abundant' (John 10.10) (Liberation and Entrapment Project, 2015: 2).

The Anglican Church's understanding of the 'mission' runs parallel to the third of the 'interdependent elements' outlined by the Catholic Church: being at the service of God's

---

<sup>72</sup> This document was produced in 2015, but was released a few months after the 2015 General Election, after the period of analysis ends. Yet, to allow a fair comparison it has been deemed prudent to include this document as it the only publication akin to that produced by the Catholic Church. Two other documents that are relevant (motions relating to asylum seekers, carried and laid down at the General Synods of 2004 and 2009) are much less detailed. Crucially however, the 2009 motion mirrors the document produced by the Liberation and Entrapment Project regarding the unambiguous stress placed upon about the importance of 'scriptural teaching about care for the vulnerable, welcome for strangers and foreigners and the Church's calling to reach out to the marginalised and persecuted' (The Church of England, 2009), indicating consistency.

Kingdom. Significantly however, the other two elements at the centre of the Catholic mission which stress the importance and duty to use this service to spread the faith and strengthen the Church are absent.

In the context of UK migration, where the vast majority of incomers are non-Anglican and there is the potential for the migration-led spread of Islam to be framed as threatening the preponderance of Anglicanism as the ‘established’ Church, theoretically there is a greater space left for securitizing discourses to emerge. However, with the guiding principles argued to centre on the fulfilment of Scripture, specifically care for the vulnerable and welcoming the stranger, it may be expected that for the Anglican Church and Church elites desecuritizing non-threat frames will dominate.

### **5.3 Any Room at the Inn? Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration**

#### **5.3.1 Introduction**

It is important to note that desecuritizing actors are far more numerous and, critically, the ‘official’ Church line is explicitly one that attempts to promulgate non-threat-based messages (summarised Table 5.1). Beginning with the official Church literature, there are eight key documents that provide insight into the Church’s position on the issue of migration<sup>73</sup>. In addition to the official public documents, 20 public interventions from elite actors were analysed (see Table 3.2).

---

<sup>73</sup> The first five are specifically Church documents, including: the Church’s open letter for the 2015 General Election (GE) (The Church of England, 2015); a ‘guidance note’ on ‘Countering far right political parties, extremist groups and racist politics’ administered following the 2009 EU elections and prior to the 2010 GE (The Church of England, 2010); the Church’s ‘Position Statement’ on refugees (The Church of England, 2014); The Church’s outline of what, drawing on theology, should guide Christian response to migration, in a report entitled *Mission, Migrants and Refugees* (Liberation and Entrapment Project, 2015); and the 2009 General Synod (carried) motion on asylum seekers (The Church of England, 2009). The other three documents are also open letters on election-guidance for: the 2005 GE (Williams, 2005); the 2009 European Elections (Williams and Sentamu, 2009); and the 2010 GE (Williams and Sentamu, 2010). However in these earlier elections, letters were penned by the Archbishop (co-authored with the Bishop of York) on behalf of the Church, rather than the ‘Church’ itself issuing an election letter as in 2015. However, the similarities between the two (pre-election advice) makes it logical to group them alongside official Church documents.

Table 5.1: Four Axes - Hegemonic Frames from the Anglican Church and Church Elites in the UK

<p><b><u>Identitarian</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>	<p><b><u>Securitarian</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>
<p><b><u>Economic</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Mixed/Securitizing Threat</p>	<p><b><u>Political</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>

Two actors, Michael Nazir-Ali, Bishop of Rochester, and George Carey, the former Archbishop of Canterbury, do promote securitizing threat frames. Yet, it is important to note that George Carey held the position of Archbishop from 1991 until 2002, prior to the period of analysis. Whilst as a former Archbishop Carey will wield substantial cultural capital, he no longer possesses the power to speak ‘for the Church’. Moreover, the messages of the two serving Archbishops during the period of analysis, Rowan Williams (2002-2012) and Justin Welby (2012-Present) – alongside the official Church position – are centred on desecuritizing non-threat frames. Further, Nazir-Ali appears to be the only serving Anglican Bishop who has publicly espoused securitizing messages. Thus, the relatively equal space dedicated to both securitizing and desecuritizing frames, whilst necessary to unpack the rhetorical de/construction of migration as a security threat, is not indicative of equal weight.

### 5.3.2 Identitarian Axis

To reiterate, the identitarian axis rests on Wæver’s (1993) concept of societal security, meaning that the referent object is identity. In short, securitizing discourses present migrants as a threat to ‘our way of life’. Thus analysis focused on whether migration is framed as a threat (securitizing frames) to ‘our’ identity as British or otherwise (desecuritizing frames).

Within the discourse of the Anglican Church and elite Church actors on the identitarian axis, there were four key themes which emerged: the impact migration has on the Christian heritage of the UK; the effect migration has on the broader ‘way of life’ in the UK, at times enmeshed with the role of Christianity; an understanding of human beings existing as a common humanity, underpinned by the Biblical idea that humans are ‘all

God's children'; and the impact migration has on the 'tolerant' identity of Britain and the 'moral' Christian identity of Anglicans/Britain based upon 'welcoming the stranger' ('the securitization of Christian traditions').

### ***'Christian Heritage'***

First, the relationship between migration and the Christian heritage of the UK only featured in securitizing discourses (for example, Carey [*Daily Mail*, 2007]; Nazir-Ali, 2008a, 2008b). To give an illustrative example, Carey (2010b) states that migration is undermining Britain's

Christian heritage [and that] to overlook this inheritance of faith will lead to the watering down of the very values of tolerance, openness, inclusion and democracy that we claim are central to what we stand for.

Here there is an essentialist understanding of British culture. Due to this fixed interpretation, British culture and Christian influence due to its perceived pivotal role are the aspects of 'our' identity that are framed as being threatened. This specific concern for Christianity is further reinforced by a more explicit preference for Christian migrants. Nazir-Ali (2008a) states that '[i]f it had not been for the black majority churches and the recent arrival of people from central and Eastern Europe, the Christian cause in many of our cities would have looked a lost one'. Carey (2010a), whilst rejecting that he preferred Christian migrants, sought preference for those who shared 'British values', and stated that whilst this largely meant Christians, this was not the motivating factor. Strategies of the political Right regarding racist discourse outlined by van Dijk (1993), in terms of invoking positive self-representation and negative Other representation, are noticeable here. Being British and Christian is associated with democracy and tolerance whilst being a migrant, especially a non-Christian migrant, is associated with anti-democratic values and intolerance (this overlaps heavily with the political axis and is similar to the frame put forward by UKIP – see section 4.5.5). Even though only non-Christian migrants are explicitly framed as a threat, the unitary migrant phenomenon (Huysmans, 1995) means there is a contribution to the securitization of migration as a whole.

### ***“‘Our”(general) way of life’***

The second theme rests on the impact of migration on the 'way of life' in Britain in general. Again, Carey and Nazir-Ali ensure the presence of securitizing frames, but it is important to note the dominance of the desecuritizing messages. Beginning with the securitizing actors, there are messages about societal change in terms of numbers,

language, and culture with the central frame being that the extent to which change is occurring is generating negative outcomes. It is asserted that further increases in immigration must be prevented in order to ‘retain the essentials of British society’ (Carey, 2008). There is a particular focus on the threat posed by Islamism and Islamic isolationism that is posted to be creating ‘parallel lives’ via the introduction of practices that challenge the British way of life, such as amplified calls to prayer and the practice of sharia law (Nazir-Ali, 2008a). Integration measures designed to counter this disaggregation of society are argued to likely be ineffectual unless Britain ‘recover[s] that vision of its destiny which made it great. That has to do with the Bible’s teachings that we have equal dignity and freedom because we are made in God’s image’ (Nazir-Ali, 2008a). Indeed, Carey states that ‘[t]he sheer number of migrants...threaten the very ethos or DNA of our nation’ (Carey, 2010b), again with a particular emphasis on specific values that are imperilled, especially those of a democratic nature (democracy, free press, free speech etc.). Again, Christianity is framed as being pivotal to these (secular) values, meaning that if migration is undermining Christian influence, it threatens the very fabric of society. As a result, a clear ‘threat’ frame emerges. It also further underlines the central importance the status of the Church and the public influence/role of Christianity is given by the securitizing actors. As suggested in the above section regarding the Anglican Church’s ‘guiding principles’, the lack of obvious instrumental gain for the Anglican faith via migration may have left more space for securitizing actors/discourses to emerge.

Turning to the desecuritizing actors, threat frames that present migrants, and particularly non-Christian/Muslim migrants are challenged by the then Archbishop of Canterbury (2002-2012) Rowan Williams. There was a consistent attempt to stress that ‘British’ culture was not being undermined or threatened by the presence of Muslims and certain aspects of Islamic culture/practice. This was particularly evident in Williams’ discussions around the public presence of Islam, in terms of schools (Rusbridger, 2006) and Sharia law (Williams, 2008). In both instances, the integration of Islamic religion into the public sphere is presented as a path to fairness and inclusivity, with the ‘us’ in this case being constructed in a universal sense<sup>74</sup>. In a more general sense, objective and deconstructive strategies are intertwined with assertions that the Church ‘celebrates the diversity found within its parishes’ (Church of England, 2010) and that ‘[i]mmigration vitally enriches our national life, just as those going out from these islands have often

---

<sup>74</sup> It is important to note that this thesis is not arguing that the integration of Sharia Law or increasing the number of faith schools is desirable. The point is that presenting the existence of Other culture as non-threatening is a textbook desecuritizing move.

contributed to the well-being of countries where they have worked or settled’ (Church of England, 2014). The objective claim that ‘our’ lives are made better is supplemented with an emphasis on the fact that in many cases British people are also migrants, therefore breaking down the notion of the unitary migrant. Recall that this deconstructivist tactic was utilised in the desecuritizing moves of some political elite actors, especially Nick Clegg. Overall, there is a clear contrast between these messages and those of Carey and Nazir-Ali as non-Christian migration is presented as non-threatening and migration in general is argued to be a positive for the Church and society.

### ***‘All God’s Children’***

The third theme centred upon notions of a common humanity, understood as universally encompassing and derived from Biblical teaching (i.e. Williams, 2010). Clear examples come from Justin Welby and the Church’s 2015 election letter. For the former, Welby states that ‘[t]he British are a very mixed bunch, there are few of us who can trace ourselves back to pre-Roman times’ (Bingham, 2015). This is accompanied by his argument that ‘at the heart of Christian teaching about the human being [is the concept that] all human beings are of equal and infinite value’ (Bingham, 2015). The latter reasserts these sentiments vociferously, asking, ‘who counts as “we”?’ (Church of England, 2015: 43), noting that ‘others... [are often] called up as threats to some fictitious us’ (The Church of England, 2015: 33). Evidently, ideas of a homogenous ‘us’ and ‘them’ are challenged therefore undermining the threat frames that are based on the migrant being ‘Other’. Instead, by deconstructing identity down to a foundational humanity, the notion of ‘us’ is no longer exclusive.

### ***‘Welcome the Stranger’: The Securitization of Christian Traditions***

Fourth, how migration impacted upon self-understood identities within the host society was pivotal. Reflecting the discourse of political elites, this arose in the shape of the tension between tolerance and intolerance as what constitutes *the* British identity. Very often integrated into the centre of this divide, however, was the notion of a ‘moral’ identity resting upon the Christian tradition of ‘welcoming the stranger’. When featuring in securitizing discourses there are iterations that ‘British people are not racist’ (Carey, 2008) and, echoing Cameron, that settled immigrant communities are also seeking reductions in current migration – clear attempts to strengthen the ‘tolerant’ identity. However, whereas the political elites stressed that this ‘tolerance’ was a ‘British’ value, Carey intertwines notions of British tolerance with the Christian teaching:

[t]he Church's response to immigration in recent years has drawn heavily upon the call to welcome and treat the stranger as if you have Christ in your midst. This is absolutely right, yet we also have to question whether the unprecedented levels of immigration that we are now seeing can truly contribute to the 'common good' - another theme the churches have emphasised in their teaching on social justice (Carey, 2008).

...the Christian faith emphasises the need to welcome the stranger. Jesus and his family were themselves refugees fleeing to Egypt to escape the wrath of King Herod. The stark fact is that our proud heritage of welcoming strangers is threatened by the breakdown of our border control during the past 15 years (Carey, 2012).

The first extract attempts to portray a lack of welcome to the stranger as being Christian (and therefore just) as this better fosters the Christian notion of the 'common good'. In the second extract the Christian identity of welcoming the stranger is argued to be threatened not due to the British public being intolerant but because the negative effects that stem from the presence of migrants place legitimate strain on these neighbourly qualities – so in effect this is a securitization of Christian traditions ('welcoming the stranger') that acts as a security frame for migration, as migration is framed as threatening the capacity to fulfil this Christian tradition. This mirrors the messages of political elite securitizing actors who framed the promotion of restrictive immigration policy/rhetoric as being the moral/progressive course of action. Here another of the strategies frequented by the political Right outlined by van Dijk (1993) is evident: the tendency to reverse the threat of racism/prejudice where being 'soft' on immigration is presented as leading to ever greater public concern/prejudice. Again, '[t]he argument is: Stop immigration...because otherwise *we* will get even more racist' (van Dijk, 1993: 99) – although to reiterate, in the UK context, replacing 'we' with 'they' (when 'they' constitutes those who support racist parties and are therefore excluded from the British 'us' who are tolerant) is more appropriate. Taken all together, migration is portrayed as a clear threat as the very presence of migrants is framed as undermining the ability of people to uphold a tolerant, welcoming sense of self.

When featuring in desecuritizing discourses, a contrasting picture is presented. Welby (Bingham, 2015) states that there has been

an upsurge in...anti-foreigner, xenophobic...comments being made, things being said, which are for people who come from those backgrounds seriously uncomfortable and really quite frightening... [Britain is] a country that has coped with many waves of immigration and has usually done so with enormous success...And part of the strength and tradition of this country is that we are so good at this and I would hate to see us lose this tradition.

Here, an intolerant identity for the British public is conveyed, however, there is no attempt to blame migrants for making this intolerance rise, as purported by Carey. Rather, migrants are portrayed as victims deserving of sympathy. The second portion emphasises the 'proud history of tolerance' frame that is ubiquitous in the discourses of the political elites. Whilst in securitizing discourses this tolerant identity was framed as being under threat, as similar increases in xenophobia were acknowledged and blamed on migrants, here there is no attempt to remove responsibility from the 'intolerant', ergo again no blame is placed upon migrants. Thus Welby's message takes the form of a desecuritizing rather than securitizing frame.

A Christian specific emphasis is also present in the Church's 2015 election letter. Drawing on the parable of the Good Samaritan, it is stated that:

The politics of migration has, too often, been framed in crude terms of 'us' and 'them' with scant regard for the Christian traditions of neighbourliness and hospitality...Crude stereotyping is incompatible with a Christian understanding of human social relationships (The Church of England, 2015: 44).

Contrary to Carey, the Christian traditions of welcome and hospitality are not said to be under threat due to migration. Rather if these appear to be under threat the blame is placed upon those who push discourses of us and them that underpin securitizations. Going further, Williams (2010) purports how the migrant is necessary to enable the Christian identity of welcoming the stranger to flourish, noting:

[O]ne of the mainsprings of Christian self-understanding in the formative years of the Church's life was the idea that the believer was essentially a 'migrant'... the believer would be involved in discovering what in that society could be endorsed and celebrated and what should be challenged. The Christian, you could say, was present precisely as someone who was



under an obligation to extend or enrich the argument...It does no harm for us to be 'made strange' to ourselves...Arguments are enriched when people join in that don't usually share a group's story but learn the language well enough to bring to it something fresh.

Williams is framing the evolution of society, via the influence of the believer (migrant), as a positive. Initially, *the* identity of the society is portrayed in non-fixed manner, open to and constructed by, change. The believer, due to his/her unfamiliarity and difference, naturally challenges norms or practices. Importantly, this is posited as being necessary for a society to mature, improve and become 'better'. It is not framed as a threat where 'our ways', understood in essentialist terms and as implicitly 'good', are being undermined or contaminated by 'their' less good or 'bad' ways. 'Society' is thus portrayed in an inclusive sense, where the 'us', rather than being in a conflictual relationship with the 'them', takes on a universal form. In sum, the believer, or more precisely the migrant, is presented as a key ingredient to societal health – a clear desecuritizing frame.

To summarise Anglican elite discourses operating on the identitarian axis, the most prominent of all four axes, desecuritizing frames dominated and critically were central within cues outlining the 'official' Church position on migration. An important finding from the analysis of this axis relates to the 'securitization of Christian traditions', centring on 'welcoming the stranger'. Carey presented migration as threatening said traditions (a securitizing frame), whilst several interventions from the Anglican Church and Church elites present migration as a way to fulfil said traditions (a desecuritizing frame). This epitomises why framing matters. The fact that religious morality or traditions can be operationalised for contradictory arguments demonstrates the powerful role of the elite framer – underscoring the value of a detailed discourse analysis – and supports the need to move beyond the 3B's approach that focuses on religion and elements of religiosity in and of themselves without accounting for how they may be being primed.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> This is at the heart of Knoll's (2009) argument highlighted in Chapter 2 and is worth repeating. Knoll argues that to uncover the role of Belief (i.e. that belief in religious doctrines is driving attitudes) would require assumptions to be made about the appropriate political application of the religious doctrine. In short, for the issue of migration, we would need to determine whether 'loving thy neighbour' means backing open borders, a guest-worker program as a path to citizenship, encouraging potential migrants to respect immigration laws and procedures, or encouraging potential migrants to stay and 'improve their current home countries'. With the inevitable disagreement over the 'right' interpretation, it is thus necessary to analyse how certain beliefs are being primed by elites and how they are used in relation to the framing of migration.

### 5.3.3 The Political Axis

As mentioned in the above chapters, previously the political axis has been framed as explanatory in that it underpins why the other three axes are used to securitize migration: the political capital to be gained from securitizing frames drives actor's discourses (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Karyotis, 2007). Yet, this thesis finds some discourses that are unique to the political axis. Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the political axis focuses on whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining 'our' political culture/democracy and/or providing a platform for far-Right politics to flourish (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

On the political axis, the messages of Anglican elites rested upon the climate of the political debate with regards to migration in general and specifically how it corresponds to the fortunes of far-Right politics and political parties. These two strands were highly interconnected and were employed to promote both securitizing and desecuritizing discourses. However it is important to once more reiterate the dominance of the desecuritizing frames and that the promotion of non-threat frames from the official Church documents was universal.

Starting with securitizing discourses, these were underpinned by two messages. The first acted as a prerequisite or introduction to the second point. It centred on the proposition that a rational public debate on migration has been made almost impossible due to accusations of bigotry and racism following those who intervene. Closing down the debate in this manner is said to indicate that politicians are 'out of touch', and that the public have lost 'trust' in the political elite as their 'real fears' are being ignored (i.e. Carey, 2010b, 2012; Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration<sup>76</sup>, 2010).

The idea that 'real fears' are being overlooked is intertwined with the second message: failure to address the issue poses severe risks for societal stability by allowing the far-Right to profit. For example, Carey (2010a) states that 'if we carry on the way that we are, our country is going to be in deep trouble. And this is going to foster social unrest, it's going to play into the hands of the BNP' and that 'if we are to stop the extreme Right, we must respond to real fears over the number and nature of those coming to Britain' (Carey, 2010b). It is said that a 'failure to take action would be seriously damaging to the future

---

<sup>76</sup> Again this document produced by the Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration has been included as Carey is a member of the group, a signatory of the document, and was interviewed by the BBC regarding the reports policy proposals.

harmony of our society’ (Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration, 2010) and that ‘the main political parties must ensure that this becomes an important cross-party concern. Trust in our *entire* political system is at stake’ (emphasis added) (Carey, 2012). These are clear securitizing frames. Migration is framed as inevitably generating a proliferation of far-Right extremism and all of the destabilising effects this type of politics engenders. This is again reminiscent of the strategies employed by the political Right uncovered by van Dijk (1993) – and which were evident in the migration discourse of UKIP outlined in the previous chapter. There is first the reversal of the accusation of racism, where liberal attitudes to migration are argued to be a threat by creating even more racism, and second there is the populist appeal to be speaking on behalf of ‘ordinary people’ or to be representing ‘the man on the street’. These kinds of securitizing moves are exceedingly important as it is they that act as the gate-way for Centrist/Centre-Left parties to become entangled in the Political Catch-22 – which can securitize migration further.

Desecuritizing discourses revolved around a criticism of the political climate within which migration is addressed, shifting the target of criticism<sup>77</sup>. For example there is a rebuke of those who seek to attain votes by trying to ‘frighten voters with the prospect of what “The Others” are going to do’ (Williams, 2005), including immigrants and asylum seekers, and that there are ‘worrying and unfamiliar trends [that] are appearing in our national life. There is a growing appetite to exploit grievances, find scapegoats and create barriers between people and nations’ (Church of England, 2015: 3; a similar political critique is provided by Baines, 2014). A sense of disappointment is conveyed that ‘questions of identity and belonging have no currency except as political bargaining chips’ (Church of England, 2015: 30), whilst Walker (Helm, 2013) notes that ‘[i]t is especially galling in Holy Week, when Christians are remembering how Jesus himself became the scapegoat in political battle, to see politicians vying with each other in just such a process’. In particular, the invocation of ‘Jesus’, a widely recognised cultural symbol or meme for ‘good’ – especially for fellow Christians – as a migrant, is powerful in communicating an essence of non-threat. ‘Scapegoats’, by definition, are not a ‘real’ problem – they are blamed for something unfairly. These criticisms of securitizing actors assist in the discrediting of their messages and can therefore be interpreted as desecuritizing moves.

---

<sup>77</sup> The determination to prevent the growth of far-Right and anti-immigration politics is evident via the Church of England’s (2010) publication of a document entitled ‘Countering far right political parties, extremist groups and racist politics: A guidance note’ – viewed as necessary due to the overtly Christian identity adopted by certain far-Right organisations (i.e. the BNP, the English Defence League) and the deployment of a ‘Clash of Civilisations’ discourse between the ‘Christian West’ and Islam.

Overall, these examples demonstrate the attempts to underline the constructed nature of migration as a threat and in turn weaken securitizing messages that portray migration as an ‘objectively real’ threat.

The impact that these ‘worrying trends’ have on the self-understood identity of Christians is also significant. Williams and Sentamu (2009) note that,

There are those [the BNP are mentioned specifically] who would exploit the present situation to advance views that are the very opposite of the values of justice, compassion and human dignity that are rooted in our Christian heritage.

Thus, it is posited that the rise of far-Right or fascist politics directly challenges ‘our’ identity as ‘moral’ actors derived from Christian heritage. Here, the label of ‘threat’ is given to those who seek to securitize migration, as this facilitates a public discourse that enables the far-Right to prosper. This is in direct contrast to Carey who frames migrants as being ‘responsible’ for the rise in far-Right politics. The above message also contrasts Carey’s comments on the identitarian axis, where the same ‘Christian heritage’ (tolerance, democratic values) was framed as being threatened by migration.

In sum, when the political climate is utilised in security messages, the political correctness and avoidance of the issue are framed as paramount. This avoidance, coupled with the ‘objectively real’ threat posed by migration, is said to cause far-Right political proliferation. On the contrary, desecuritizing discourses focus upon the securitizing actors and their interventions, framing these as irresponsible and often immoral. These discursive strategies have not previously been acknowledged in the four axes paradigm.

#### **5.3.4 The Economic Axis**

For the economic axis the referent object is economic security, incorporating both ‘labour’ (wages, employment and the macro-economy) and ‘public services’ (welfare). Securitizing discourses frame migrants as a threat to these goods whilst desecuritizing discourses make salient the positive/necessary contributions of migrants to the economy and the functioning of public services and/or can deconstruct binary us/them (deserving/undeserving, belonging/not belonging) dichotomies. Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the economic axis concentrates upon whether migration is framed as threatening the economic wellbeing of Britain/British citizens (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

Within the interventions of the Anglican Church and Anglican Elites the economic axis received comparatively little attention in comparison to the political and especially identitarian axes. Indeed it did not feature in any of the interventions consulted for both of the serving Archbishops, Rowan Williams and Justin Welby. It featured most prominently in the messages of Carey, although these also were proportionally far smaller, and arose in interventions from David Walker. This is the only axis where securitizing discourses can therefore be said to have been predominant – however this may not have necessarily undermined the Anglican Church and (majority of) Church elite messaging that is consistently desecuritizing, as will be explored below.

Starting with Carey and the labour strand, there was a sparse portion of desecuritizing caveats, such as a general postulation that immigrants are ‘helping make this country more prosperous’ (Carey, 2010a). Overwhelmingly however, the essence of the issue was rooted in threat. Carey states that vested interests in the form of ‘employers [who] benefit from lower labour costs’ prevent policy to reduce migration. This is another instance where van Dijk’s (1993, 1998) strategies of the political Right can be seen, this time in the shape of a populist claim to support the interests of ordinary people, rather than the ‘vested interests’ of big business. Moreover Carey again used the strategy of representing the view of ‘the man on the street’, stating that, ‘in places like Dagenham and Barking and elsewhere when you’ve got ordinary working class people seeing their jobs taken away from them, which they think is happening’ is generating resentment. On both occasions migration is not directly blamed for generating economic distress (in the form of wage compression or job losses) but there is no attempt to explicitly desecuritize migration and chastise employers (akin to Miliband and Clegg). It is also necessary to note that these messages often merge with those on the political axis (and therefore the identitarian axis). The economic-based messages are used to outline the ‘real fears’ and demonstrate the way in which the ‘man on the street’ is ‘understandably’ tempted by racist/anti-immigration parties (i.e. the BNP in Dagenham and Barking). Thus, parallel to the political axis, the overarching message is that a reduction in numbers is necessary to alleviate a public sense of threat, with the result that migration is framed as ‘problem’.

The public services strand also features. Citing a report from the Economic Affairs Committee it is stated that there is ‘no evidence that net immigration generates significant economic benefits for the existing UK population’ (Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration, 2010) and that reports that do show higher rates of net immigration to have macro-economic benefits fail to account for the ‘wider costs of immigration’. Indeed the

report cites the then Immigration Minister, Damian Green, who stated that ‘uncontrolled migration places unacceptable pressure on the UK’s public services, infrastructure and jobs market.’ This is indicative of a general emphasis on migration putting pressure on ‘public services’ (for example, Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration, 2010; Carey, 2012) and that current trends will put ‘our nation’s resources under considerable strain’ (Carey, 2010b). Carey’s objectivist messages thus portray migrants as both a ‘burden’ on ‘our’ resources and as not being part of ‘us’ therefore not being legitimate users of resources.

Desecuritizing moves were relatively scant, with the desecuritizing actors in the Anglican Church directing the vast majority of their attention to the identitarian and political axis. Where messages on the economic axis did arise they took the form of objectivist moves where migration is presented as having a polarised impact to the one outline by Carey: creating a net benefit for the macro economy; creating economic vibrancy; and providing a net contribution to public services. For example, Walker (2015) notes that

all the evidence is that families who come and make their homes in Britain as asylum seekers and through the free movement of European citizens, add to our wealth, increase job opportunities for all and are not a net drain on housing, healthcare, or other public services.

Similar sentiments are espoused by Walker (Helm, 2013). As always, it is important to note the potential securitizing qualities an objectivist attempt can have, by potentially reinforcing the link between migrants and threats (in this case negative economic effects) and reifying the us/them distinction. However, we can see that deconstructivist facets are often woven into these moves, for instance in the above example, referring to families (which ‘we’ all have), rather than solely migrants or asylum seekers (with which the vast majority of British citizens cannot share in a sense of ‘we-ness’).

Overall, on the economic axis for the Anglican Church the field is contested, however the securitizing discourses dedicate more space to economic issues. There is a clear linkage between the political (and subsequently identitarian) axis and the economic axis in the securitizing messages – as these are utilised to legitimise other concerns/points, for example facilitation of far-Right politics and that the British are not racist (protecting the tolerant/moral identity). The desecuritizing discourses operate on the objectivist axis and as such incorporate some potentially securitizing qualities – hence it may be a strategic ploy. In short, ignoring economic security arguments, rather than trying to counter them

and risk solidifying them, may be a more effective strategy if the aim is to desecuritize migration – which based on the ‘guiding principles’, official Church literature and interventions from serving Archbishops, appears to be the case. The avoidance of the economic axis (and subsequent focus on issues of identity) may also be somewhat driven by religious elites possessing domain-specific capital. In other words, religious elites may deem themselves more likely to be able to generate framing effects (and have a greater pool of heuristic devices to draw upon) on issues they are deemed an ‘authority’ by their audience (‘morality’ rather than economics). Thus, whilst the economic axis is the only axis in which desecuritizing messages are not the most prominent, this may have actually strengthened the desecuritizing discourses on the identitarian and political axes (or at minimum been necessary for their effective deployment).

### 5.3.5 The Securitarian Axis

For the securitarian axis, the referent objects are the sovereignty of the state and the personal security of individuals or the collective ‘us’. For the former, securitizing discourses are situated around ‘border control’ and their legal and symbolic significance in demarcating who is ‘us’ and who is ‘Other’. The latter is underpinned by the criminal-migrant thesis, which fuses migration and crime (including ‘terror’). Desecuritizing discourses in turn present migrants as ‘belonging’, through deconstruction of essentialist identities, or as ‘law abiding’ and ‘trustworthy’, using objectivist claims. Overall, analysis of discourses operating on the securitarian axis examines whether migration is framed as threatening in terms of undermining UK sovereignty/border control and personal safety from crime (securitizing frames) or not (desecuritizing frames).

The securitarian axis is minimal in the discourses of the Anglican elites. However, both the sovereignty strand centring on borders and the criminal-migrant thesis do feature. Starting with the sovereignty and borders strand, throughout Carey’s interventions there is a focus on the need to prevent the population of Britain exceeding 70m. The main frame is that a ‘breakdown of our border control’ (Carey, 2012) means that there is a need to ‘restore control over our borders... to limit the growth in our population [where a] failure to take action would be seriously damaging to the future harmony of our society’ (Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration, 2010). It is posited then that a failure to ‘restore control over our borders’ (display sovereign powers) will have ‘damaging’ consequences for British society. These messages are underpinned by economic securitizing frames involving public services and identitarian securitizing frames revolving around the watering down of the ‘British’ culture. Although this portrays future migrants as a threat,

due to the unitary migrant phenomenon there is potentially no meaningful distinction between current and future migrants.

Contrary to Carey's securitizing frames, the 'official' line is that the Church 'accepts the need for border control' but believes that it is important to 'not simply reinforce national borders that create damaging boundaries and divisions within national life' (Church of England, 2014). This message has some securitizing qualities in that it draws attention to 'borders' and the challenge migration provides with regard to sovereign control over said borders. However, the crux of the message is that a discourse that places a high degree of emphasis on 'border control' is detrimental to 'social cohesion' and has high 'social costs' (Church of England, 2014). Rather, here it appears that 'immigrant friendly' border policy and discourse, where 'loss of control' is not presented as threatening, is necessary to alleviate threats to social cohesion.

The criminal-migrant thesis arose largely in the sense of rule-breaking and exploiting the system (as opposed to, for example, organised criminality). Interestingly however, this only arose in the discourse of those promoting desecuritizing messages. Walker (2015) states that '[r]efugees do not come to sponge off our benefits system, but because they have been driven from their homes by conflict and persecution', that they are 'pushed, not pulled' to migrate and that '[t]he tone of the current debate suggests that it is better for 10 people with a legitimate reason for coming to this country to be refused entry than for one person to get in who has no good cause' (Helm, 2013). Again the 'vulnerable' identity is ascribed to migrants that are forced to move as opposed to deliberately choosing to move due to devious intentions. This emphasis on compassion is visible on several occasions (for example, Williams, 2005; Williams and Sentamu, 2010). Whilst a clear desecuritizing move it does reinforce the discursive link between migration and Others being undeserving of 'our' welfare and being an economic burden on 'our' people. Securitizing links are noticeable in Walker's stressing that the 'vast majority' have legitimate cause, thus simultaneously drawing attention to the notion that some migrants do 'cheat', meaning *the* identity of the migrant is imbued with cheat/threat. The Church of England (2014) falls into the same trap regarding 'sham marriages'.

Overall, it is important to reiterate that the securitarian axis in general, formed only a minor part of the migration discourse of both the securitizing and desecuritizing Anglican elite actors. Once more securitizing moves come from Carey, the majority of which concentrate on borders. This is countered by desecuritizing actors and supplemented with



further desecuritizing moves regarding the criminal-migrant thesis (in terms of exploiting the system). Notably these messages around exploitation only arose in the discourse of those (religious elites) trying to desecuritize the issue – demonstrating the significance of hegemonic understandings of certain issues as they can act as an entry point for discussion. However, by operating in the same frame of reference, these attempts at desecuritization may reinforce the migrant-crime nexus. This danger of using objectivist strategies (alongside the potential influence of domain-specific capital and/or the heuristic devices most readily available to religious elites), similar to the economic axis, may explain the lack of attention paid to the securitarian axis.

### **5.3.6 Anglican Church and Church Elite Discourse Summary**

To summarise, for the Anglican faith desecuritizing non-threat frames are dominant. Despite two actors (Michael Nazir-Ali and George Carey - the latter being far more prominent), sponsoring securitizing threat frames, desecuritizing messages are predominant. Not only are desecuritizing actors in the clear majority, importantly, the ‘official’ Church line is explicitly one that endeavours to promote non-threat-based messages.

## **5.4 Any Room at the Inn? Catholic Church and Church Elite Discourse on Migration**

### **5.4.1 Introduction**

Table 5.2 provides a concise summary of the discourse analysis of the Catholic Church and elite Church actors. Across all four axes, desecuritizing non-threat frames are dominant. Moreover, the analysis finds that these cues are universal and uncontested. For the official Church literature, there are four documents that provide insight into the Church’s position on the issue of migration. In addition to the official documents 29 public interventions from elite actors were analysed (see Table 3.3).

### **5.4.2 Identitarian Axis**

On the identitarian axis, three main themes emerged that roughly mirrored three of the four to arise from the Anglican elites above: a duty to welcome the stranger (‘the securitization of Christian traditions’); a Biblically inspired universal understanding of humanity; and the general impact of migration on ‘our way of life’.

Table 5.2: Four Axes - Hegemonic Frames from the Catholic Church and Church Elites in the UK

<p><b><u>Identitarian</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>	<p><b><u>Securitarian</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>
<p><b><u>Economic</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>	<p><b><u>Political</u></b></p> <p><b>Official Church Position:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p> <p><b>Predominant Frame from Actors:</b> Desecuritizing Non-Threat</p>

***‘Welcome the Stranger’: The Securitization of Christian Traditions***

First there was the Catholic understanding of duty derived from the Gospel. The crux of the message was that Catholics have a duty to care for the vulnerable and ‘welcome the stranger’, ensuring that migrants are treated with dignity and respect (for example, Lynch, 2009, 2015; O’Donoghue, 2006). In his 2007 Christmas Homily, Archbishop Murphy-O’Connor (2007) asks:

Do we perceive them [migrants] as a threat to our well-being and our way of life, or are we able to welcome people who need that welcome? Is there any room at our inn? Can we offer them tidings of great joy, or do we simply close our doors?

The duty to welcome the stranger is made unequivocally. Presenting migrants as vulnerable beings, such as victims of persecution, violence or economic hardship is largely consistent and is rooted in a paternalistic sense of duty to those ‘whom cannot help themselves’. As such, migrants are not framed as a threatening Other and are instead presented as vulnerable individuals who hold as much worth as the natives, but need the support of the host society. This is also a clear example of how migration can impact upon (parts of the) host societies’ perception of their own identity in a non-threatening, self-assuring way. Rather than the presence of migrants undermining ‘our way of life’, migrants are framed as being necessary to the fulfilment of ‘our’ identity as ‘good Catholics’. This is parallel to the positive framing of the role played by migration in enabling the realisation of Christian traditions espoused by the Anglican Church and elite Anglican actors (and in contrast to Carey) – clear desecuritizing frames.

### **‘All God’s Children’**

The second main theme dovetailed with the first in that it centred on Christian understanding. In this instance, emphasis was on common humanity. This ‘we are all God’s children’ frame arose in two ways. There was a universal form, which reminded the audience that migrants were ‘people’ and ‘share a common humanity and are members of a single human family’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2015) and that ‘[a] human beings worth is defined and determined by their God given dignity not by the papers they do or do not carry’ (Lynch, 2009). These are textbook deconstructivist desecuritizing ploys where us/them dichotomies, essential in demarcating the Other, are framed as being illusory. Messages of this type, however, were also framed in a more exclusive form. For example, Murphy-O’Connor (2006) states that ‘in the Catholic Church no one is stranger...we share a common baptism and a common dignity’. Here the emphasis on a common humanity seems to extend only to Catholics, excluding those of other faiths and of no faith. Perhaps this is evidence of the importance of the evangelical mission in guiding the Catholic Church’s response to migration. Regardless, despite being somewhat exclusionary, the ‘essence’ of the migration frame remains one of non-threat – especially for fellow Catholics who are the audience relevant to the second research question that looks to unpack the effects of Catholic elite cues.

### **“‘Them” Changing “Us””**

Last, in terms of the general impact migration has on British society, messages are unanimously desecuritizing, although again both universal and Catholic-centric sentiments arise. On the universal side, the frame is consistent: the diversity that migration brings is a positive and adds to the wellbeing of society. Often, religious imagery is utilised, with migrants repeatedly being defined as a ‘gift’ or bringing ‘gifts’ (for example, Murphy-O’Connor 2005b; *Telegraph*, 2007; *BBC*, 2008). This demonstrates the capacity for religious elites to draw on powerful heuristic devices that may increase the potential to persuade ‘their’ audience. This is a clear objectivist desecuritizing move where migration is presented as benefitting the host society.

On the Catholic-centric side, the contribution migrants have made to society is consigned to their contribution to the Catholic Church. For example, Lynch (2014b) states that ‘[w]hile immigration does present challenges – both social and cultural – it is important to recognise how we as the Church have been tremendously enriched by the presence and prayer of migrant communities.’ Whilst on the surface a desecuritizing move in that it paints migrants as an asset, the picture is more complicated. Firstly, again

messages of this kind do not extend to non-Catholic migrants and are in that sense exclusory. Secondly, British citizens who belong to other faith groups, or perhaps more likely those of no faith, may view this influx of committed Catholics as a threat to the expansion of secular humanism – a trend being seen in the most recent census in which the number of those who do not believe in any faith is consistently growing (Office for National Statistics, 2012). The point, in short, is that emphasising the role migration is playing in strengthening the Catholic Church is not a universally inclusive message and not necessarily contributing to the desecuritization of migration in general. But again, the audience most relevant in this instance is fellow Catholics, therefore this can still be interpreted, for a Catholic audience, as a desecuritizing frame.

To summarise, the Catholic elite interventions on the identitarian axis are consistent in adopting a desecuritizing approach. With the identitarian axis being the most prominent of all four axes, the unanimity of desecuritizing moves is significant. Although it is necessary to note that some of the messages are potentially framed in a way that may not be fully inclusive, this should not affect the ‘essence’ of the migration issue being one of non-threat for Catholics. The centrality of the evangelising mission in guiding the Catholic Church’s response to migration may underpin this, at times, Catholic-centric approach.

#### **5.4.3 The Political Axis**

On the political axis, the messages of Catholic elites mirrored those of their Anglican counterparts in that they concentrated upon the way in which the migration debate is being conducted in general, and specifically the impact this has on the proliferation of far-Right politics and political parties. The message was consistent: politicians should not exploit societal anxiety around immigration as this will have a deleterious impact on social harmony (for example, Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2005, 2010; Jones, 2014; Lynch, 2009; Nichols, 2013; *The Tablet*, 2005; *The Telegraph*, 2014). Securitizing actors are accused of playing on ‘fears, prejudices and anxieties’ (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2010) and that politicians have a

moral responsibility...to avoid stirring up irrational fears that feed prejudice...The fostering of mistrust and dislike of those who come to this country is the promotion of unjust discrimination, and unworthy of any true political leadership (Nichols, 2013).

The criticism of those employing securitizing moves is holistic: whether due to belief in the severity of problems that are said to arise from immigration; or to obtain political

capital in a strategic (the political Right) or reactionary (Centrist/Centre-Left parties falling into the Political Catch-22) sense. Overall, objective moves such as labelling fears over migration as ‘irrational’ combined with the portrayal of securitizing actors as irresponsible and labelling attempts to construct migration as a threat as a sinister political tool, undermine the credibility of the securitizing moves.

Once again, mirroring the majority desecuritizing messages of the Anglican elites, there is an acknowledgement of how the political climate impacts upon the self-understood identity of ‘the Catholic’. It is asserted that Catholics should not (indeed, must not) support racist parties or politics, which are argued to be incompatible with the Gospel (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2005, 2010; Murphy-O’Connor, 2005a). The emphasis is not placed upon the ‘real’ threat of migration making support for far-Right or restrictionist politics legitimate. Rather, xenophobia or racism is presented as the ‘threat’ to ‘our’ identity as a good Catholic. These sentiments are highly compatible with previous messages relating to the ‘duty to welcome’ and ‘universal humanity’ and are another instance in which ‘securitizing’ an aspect of the host’s identity (i.e. presenting an aspect of identity as being under threat) is framed in a way that is *desecuritizing* for migration.

To sum up, in line with the desecuritizing actors of the Anglican Church, the messages portray the securitizing actors, rather than migrants, as the threat to both political stability and the self-understood identity as being ‘moral’. Again, Christian teaching is framed as pivotal in underpinning these arguments.

#### **5.4.4 The Economic Axis**

In slight contrast to the Anglican elites’ marginalisation of the economic axis, economic frames feature more prominently in the interventions of Catholic elites. Both the labour and public services strand are addressed, with desecuritizing attempts being universal – however some unintentional, and potentially securitizing, qualities can be detected in objectivist moves.

The vast majority of interventions were rooted in the objectivist desecuritizing strategy. The central message was that migration and migrants are an essential ingredient to a successful economy. This takes the form of both general economic prosperity and the fundamental role played by migrant workers in the effective functioning of public services (Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2015; Jones, 2014; Lynch, 2014a, 2014b; Murphy-O’Connor, 2005b, 2006; Nichols, 2013, 2015). However, as is commonplace when the objectivist strategy is used, messages are often framed in the context of highly

potent security messages. For example, phrases such as ‘vast majority’ (Nichols, 2015) when referring to economic contribution can bolster frames of ‘migrants as economic burdens’. Yet, in line with the broader notions of a common humanity and Catholic duty, a purely economic view of migration is not endorsed. For example, Lynch (2009) criticises a cost/benefit approach that is slave to the ‘national interest...leaving very little room for the consideration of other factors’ – where other factors equate to viewing migration through a (Catholic) ‘moral’ prism. Lynch indicates as to what this might look like: public services (healthcare, schooling, housing) are discussed through the lens of ‘basic human rights’. There is a clear attempt to transcend welfare chauvinistic conceptions of belonging/deserving and a non-belonging/undeserving, or in other words, to avoid objectivist pitfalls of reifying securitizing discourses. However, this type of message was rare.

The economic axis is also broached in a similar fashion to Miliband and Clegg where emphasis was placed on the extent to which migrants are also victims of neoliberal economic systems, in which migrants are often consigned to low-paid, unstable employment and are vulnerable to exploitation by criminals operating within the black economy. There is recognition that this exploitation is damaging to the wellbeing of migrants, but also undercuts the wages of other workers (Murphy-O’Connor, 2006). Related to undocumented workers specifically, there is a call – similar to the Liberal Democrat position under Clegg – to legalise their status, enabling Britain to benefit economically (presumably from a higher tax base and a reduction in the negative effects of criminal activity, such as paying below the minimum wage) (*The Telegraph*, 2007). These messages are certainly framed to present migrants as a victim of exploitation and are, in short, a desecuritizing move. However, migrants are still portrayed as part of the problem in terms of undercutting wages (and associated with crime), hence this could potentially reify security threat frames.

Despite these (unintentional) potentially securitizing characteristics in some objectivist moves (although there is also some recognition of the need to take on economic securitizing discourses in non-objectivist terms, for example Lynch above), there is a clear determination to frame migration in desecuritizing non-threat terms. The disparity in attention dedicated to the economic axis between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church may be explained in the number of economic migrants who are Catholic, for example the Eastern European constituency. The Catholic elites are in a sense directing attention to aspects of the debate that will resonate with ‘their’ audience. The

desecuritizing actors of the Anglican Church on the other hand may not have this same incentive.

#### 4.4.5 The Securitarian Axis

In line with their Anglican counterparts, the securitarian axis is also minimal in the interventions of the Catholic Church and elite Church actors. When featuring, however, both the sovereignty strand and criminal-migrant thesis are present.

First, in terms of the sovereignty strand there is a tension at the centre of the position of the Church. There is agreement that states have the right to control their borders and a duty to control immigration and assess its impact, but also that people have the right to migrate (Lynch 2015; Nichols, 2011, 2015). Yet, there is a consistent emphasis placed on the need for the right to migrate to trump state concerns over border control and immigration. This is nested in attempts to challenge perceptions of migrants as a threat by framing migrants through the lenses of ‘victims’, the duty to protect and care for the vulnerable and the general sense that ‘moral’ concerns should override political or economic expediency. Although a desecuritizing attempt, it is again necessary to note that by operating within the discourse of ‘border control’, interventions may unintentionally reify threat frames.

Second, the criminal-migrant thesis features mainly through the issue of asylum and the plight of those who are not asylum seekers or refugees but who still migrate. It is necessary to point out the deliberate attempts to deconstruct the asylum-migration nexus, ensuring the various forms of migration are treated separately (for example, Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2010; Nichols, 2011).<sup>78</sup> The central theme running through these messages is that of the ‘victim’ identity. For example, Lynch (2009) states that ‘[m]igrants are amongst the most vulnerable and exploited people in our world today.’ Similar sentiments are espoused by Murphy-O’Connor, who was active during the height of *Strangers into Citizens* campaign<sup>79</sup> during 2007-8, and Vincent Nichols. Rather than supporting the criminal-migrant thesis, migrants are presented as both

---

<sup>78</sup> It is interesting to note a shift between the 2005 and 2010 General election letters in their treatment of asylum and migration. In the 2005 letter, migrants and refugees are treated as one, with clear distinctions absent. The 2010 letter, however, is explicit in its desire to ‘not reduce immigration simply to a matter of numbers, without distinguishing between its different forms’ (The Bishops Conference of England and Wales, 2010).

<sup>79</sup> *Strangers into Citizens* was a political advocacy campaign running between 2007-2010 that called for a one-off amnesty for irregular migrants to facilitate regularisation, naturalisation and the acquisition of British citizenship.

passive/unthreatening and a victim of crime. Again these messages are interlinked with those of the paternalistic understanding of the Catholic duty to care for the poor, the vulnerable and the stranger.

Last, the ‘exploiting the system’ frame is exceedingly sparse. It does appear, for instance, in an article bemoaning the Government’s immigration policy and its impact of Britons with non-EU spouses that, ‘[t]hose who are determined to cheat should be stopped. Those who offer full cooperation with the system should not be presumed to be cheating’ (Nichols, 2013). Here, despite the overall frame being designed to allay fears that migrants are not a threat, the discourse of migrant as ‘exploiter’ is utilised and potentially strengthened.

Overall, the Catholic elite interventions on the securitarian axis, whilst sparse, are universally designed to desecuritize – despite the effectiveness in some instances being contestable due to the pitfalls of Huysmans’ objectivist strategy. The problematic nature of operating within the securitarian axis, namely the difficulty of avoiding reification of securitizing discourses, may explain the exceedingly limited role assigned to this axis in the overall discourse. Again, the Catholic sense of duty integrated with a portrayal/understanding of migrants as essentially victims needing support, is pivotal.

#### **5.4.6 Catholic Church and Church Elite Summary**

To recap, for the Catholic faith, desecuritizing non-threat frames are hegemonic. In slight contrast to the Anglican Church and Church elites, desecuritizing discourses are uncontested.

### **5.5 Conclusion**

In sum, from the analysis of the discourse of elite actors from the Anglican and Catholic faiths, there are several conclusions which emerge. The most striking is the disparity as a whole between religious and political elite actors. In contrast to their political counterparts, the messages of religious elites are dominated by desecuritizing frames. There is also a divide in the extent to which attention concentrated on the identitarian axis. Whilst this was pivotal in the discourse of political elite actors the other three axes were not marginalised. For the religious elites however, the identitarian axis superseded all of the other three axes in terms of focus and attention. And moreover, when attention was placed upon the second most frequent axis, the political, identity remained at the centre of these frames. These discourses rooted on the political axis, based upon migration threatening ‘our’ political culture - via the introduction of undemocratic values or the



facilitation of a growth in far-Right parties and politics - have not previously been identified in the four axes model and may act as a highly useful heuristic device to aid future analysis of the security-migration nexus.

Thus the religious elite actors were far more content to operate in the realms of identity/‘morality’ with regards to migration, whilst largely absconding from the nitty-gritty of cost-benefit and ‘practical’ political decision-making<sup>80</sup>. It is suggested that this focus on identity may be due to religious elites possessing domain specific capital. Religious elites may deem themselves more likely to be able to generate framing effects (and have a greater pool of heuristic devices to draw upon) on issues they are deemed an ‘authority’ by their audience (‘morality’ rather than security or economics). Moreover, focussing on the identitarian axis may also arise from a concern that attempting to counter securitizing discourses on the economic and securitarian axes, where objectivist strategies seem the natural choice, may in fact reify these discourses. In the same vein, it may be felt that deconstructivist strategies are most effective and useable on the identity axis. Despite the fact that some identity must be allowed (Connelly 1991; Huysmans, 1995), the chosen identity is ‘child of God’. Whilst this is designed to be universal, it may be interpreted as exclusive by non-Christians or secular humanists – however, it may be viewed metaphorically and thus deemed inclusive. But, the important point for this thesis is that framing migrants (and the host society) as ‘children of God’ should be interpreted as a desecuritizing non-threat message by fellow Anglicans/Catholics – the audiences relevant to the second research question designed to unpack the potential impact of elite cues.

Some slight differences between the Churches were also identified. The elite actors of the Catholic Church alongside the ‘official line’ from Church publications are consistent in the promotion of desecuritizing frames. In contrast, the Anglican Church has actors that put forth a securitizing discourse. Again however, it is crucial to underline that desecuritizing actors and messages (including the two serving Archbishops during the period of analysis) are more numerous whilst the ‘official’ Church line is consistent in the attempt to promote non-threat-based messages. It has been suggested, via an analysis of both Church’s ‘guiding principles’ that propel their response to migration, that a preponderance of desecuritizing discourses is what would have been expected. Equally, the disparity in emphasis on an instrumental approach to migration, in terms of viewing it as a

---

<sup>80</sup> The freedom to avoid the ‘politics’ of migration may be rooted in the fact that they do not need to take account of prevailing public attitudes to the same extent as politicians who are seeking to win votes. In short, unlike Centrist/Centre Left parties, they do not have the same forces pulling them into the Political Catch-22 of having to appear ‘tough’ as not to cede ground/votes to the Right.

means to bolster the strength of the Church, may have left more space for desecuritizing discourses to emerge from within the Anglican faith – this is also found.

The other major difference is the disparity in attention given to the economic axis. For the Anglican Church, this axis was infrequently present, and when it was, the securitizing messages from Carey were on balance more robust and numerous. Within the discourses of Catholic elites on the contrary, the economic axis was not marginalised. This may be due to the fact that there are a vastly greater number of economic migrants, particularly from Eastern Europe, who are Catholic, meaning a greater emphasis is afforded to issues that relate to ‘their’ audience.

An additional finding relates to the ‘securitization of Christian traditions’. Carey portrayed migration as threatening said traditions (a securitizing frame for migration) whereas the Anglican Church and other Church elites presented migration as necessary to the fulfilment of said traditions (a desecuritizing frame for migration). These latter frames also featured in the discourse of the Catholic Church and Church elites. In both instances the referent object of ‘Christian traditions’ (an aspect of ‘our’ identity) is framed as being under threat. Yet, as a consequence, migration is both presented in a securitizing and desecuritizing way. The fact that religious morality or traditions can be operationalised for contradictory arguments demonstrates the importance of the role played by the framer. This further bolsters the case for accounting for elite cues to better unpack the effects of religion/religiosity – as the 3B’s approach has to date concentrated overwhelmingly on elements of religiosity without considering how they are cued.

Overall, for both the Anglican and Catholic faiths, desecuritizing non-threat frames were dominant. But this discourse analysis, whilst important in revealing the ways in which religious actors have tried to deconstruct migration as a security issue, is unable to determine whether or not they have been successful in convincing their respective audiences. In securitization parlance, the analysis has so far focussed upon de/securitizing moves and has so far excluded the audience. As such, it is necessary to introduce quantitative analyses in an attempt to discover whether the migration cues from religious elites have ‘cut through’ to impact on the attitudes of their fellow believers. Based on the findings from the religious elite discourse analysis a further two hypotheses have been derived:

*For UK Anglicans, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H2).*

*For UK Catholics, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H3).*

Exploring these hypotheses (in addition to H1 that looks to analyse the relationship between political elite cues and public attitudes) forms the central task of the next chapter.

## Chapter 6: Message Received? Analysis of Public Opinion regarding Immigration

- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Data and Variables
- 6.3 Bringing in the Audience: Political Elites
  - 6.3.1 Introduction
  - 6.3.2 Labour
  - 6.3.3 Liberal Democrats
  - 6.3.4 UKIP
  - 6.3.5 Remaining Parties
  - 6.3.6 Religious Denomination
  - 6.3.7 Other Demographics
  - 6.3.8 Non-Demographics
  - 6.3.9 Political Elite Cues Summary
- 6.4 Bringing in the Audience: Religious Elites
  - 6.4.1 Introduction
  - 6.4.2 Cross National Bivariate Analysis
    - 6.4.2.1 Cross-National Cumulative
    - 6.4.2.2 Cross-National Bivariate Analysis: Split by Survey Round
    - 6.4.2.3 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination
    - 6.4.2.4 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination – Cumulative
    - 6.4.2.5 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination – Round-by-Round
    - 6.4.2.6 Bivariate Analysis Summary
  - 6.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour? Multivariate Analyses - Religious Elite Discourse and the Audience
    - 6.4.3.1 Anglicanism
    - 6.4.3.2 Catholicism
    - 6.4.3.3 Islam
    - 6.4.3.4 'Other' Religion
    - 6.4.3.5 Summary: Connecting Religious Elite Cues and the Audience
- 6.5 Conclusion

### 6.1 Introduction

The previous two chapters have analysed the migration discourse of elite political and religious actors in the UK. To reemphasise, whilst discourse analysis is prescribed by the CS as the 'obvious method' (Buzan et al, 1998: 176) to study security, discourse analysis alone is not always sufficient. The discourse analysis has so far enabled an investigation into the attempts of actors to frame migration in certain lights, in other words, it has traced securitization and desecuritization moves. Yet, discourse analysis cannot reveal whether these de/securitizing attempts have been accepted/rejected by the audience, defined as cutting through to impact upon public attitudes. Thus, in this chapter, the second research question is investigated: Controlling for all other relevant factors, to what extent does the migration messages of political and religious elite actors' impact upon immigration attitudes.

Beginning with the political elites, to reiterate, whilst it is possible to control for party ID, unfortunately there is not a variable available in the ESS data set that can be used to control for the level of exposure to political elite cues (i.e. in the respect that frequency of church attendance is utilised to account for exposure to religious elite cues). As such, analysis of political elite cues and public attitudes of party supporters cannot confidently infer the direction of causality. However, the CS do theorise that the direction of causality is ‘top-down’, as security is conceptualised as an elite-driven process. This theoretical assumption is tentatively integrated into the analysis. Yet, it is important to note that even without any assumption regarding the direction of causality it remains highly useful to analyse whether party messages appear to align with the attitudes of party supporters or not. Failure to identify alignment would raise a plethora of questions as to why there appears to be a fundamental disconnect. Identification of alignment will provide crucial contextual information and allow future research to explore the causal direction in greater depth. To recap, with some variation in consistency and strength between parties, the migration discourse of political elites was characterised by securitizing threat frames. In order of most to least consistently securitizing, UKIP were followed by the Conservatives, then Labour and finally the Liberal Democrats. Thus Hypothesis 1 is as follows:

*Attitudes to immigration will range from least to most positive amongst party supporters in the following order: UKIP, Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat (H1).*

Turning to the religious elites and attempting to account for the effects of elite cues specifically, this makes an explicit contribution to three distinct literatures. First, in combination with the analysis of political elite cues above, a theoretical and methodological contribution is made to securitization theory by introducing quantitative methods to connect de/securitizing attempts and audience acceptance/rejection of said attempts. Second, the broad immigration attitudes literature has previously neglected the impact of elite cues, and in the handful of studies that have accounted for elite cues, analysis has been restricted to political elites and political parties. Third, the literature focused upon the effects of religiosity on attitudes has also previously ignored the effects of elite cues – with the failure to previously consider the effects of elite cues perhaps underpinning the inconsistency of the effects of religiosity on attitudes.

To restate, the religious elite discourse for the Anglican and Catholic denominations was dominated by desecuritizing non-threat messages. It should be noted

that some securitizing messages were espoused by Anglican elites; however the desecuritizing messages dominated, and crucially formed the official position of the Church. Catholic elite discourse was universally based upon desecuritizing non-threat messages. Thus, the following hypotheses have been derived:

*For UK Anglicans, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H2).*

*For UK Catholics, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H3).*

In brief, the chapter finds support for H1: Attitudes to immigration *do* range from least to most positive amongst party supporters of UKIP, the Conservatives, Labour and the Liberal Democrats. Again, the absence of a variable existing in the data set that could account for the level of exposure to political elite cues means that the confidence with which elite influence can be asserted is reduced. Yet, this confirmation of the alignment between party cues and the attitudes of party supporters opens up space to explore this relationship in a more empirical (rather than theoretical) sense and/or detect any future variation. Regarding the analysis of religious elite cues, the chapter finds no support for H3 that elite cues of the Catholic Church and Church elites are having an impact on the attitudes of their audience. However, the opposite is found for the cues of the Anglican Church and Church elites (H2). Even when controlling for all other factors identified in the broad immigration attitudes literature, elite cues appear to be cutting through to their audience: for Anglicans, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) *is* associated with more positive immigration attitudes. In light of the highly securitizing discursive terrain found in the discourse analysis of political elites in Chapter 4, the set of actors who dominate the migration agenda in the UK (Statham and Geddes, 2006), the desecuritizing messages of the Anglican Church and elite Church actors would have been swimming against a powerful tide. The seeming presence of attitudinal effects, accounting for control variables and the general discursive context, demonstrates an apparent considerable capacity from the Anglican Church and Church elites to connect with a committed subset of their audience. As those who identify as Anglicans are found to have less positive attitudes than atheists in general, this indicates that for those attending church frequently and being exposed to the desecuritizing non-threat discourse, messages may be lessening the negative attitudes towards migrants rooted in affiliation with Anglicanism

(i.e. the instrumental, potentially prejudice-inducing Belonging dimension of religiosity). The research design and subsequent empirical findings have critical theoretical and methodological implications. Overall, the findings indicate that elite cues of non-political actors can be highly influential in the de/construction of security in terms of shaping public attitudes and that the adoption of mixed methods can be a fruitful addition to the arsenal of securitization research, the broad study of immigration attitudes and the scientific study of religion.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first briefly outlines the data and variables. The second focuses on relationship between political elite messaging and the attitudes of their supporters. This section also helps to provide key contextual information to facilitate the analysis of religious elite cues, which forms the third section. The third section is further divided into two parts. The first is exploratory, investigating the bivariate correlations between two central variables: immigration attitudes and three measures of religiosity. The second section will introduce multivariate analysis designed to analyse the potential effects of elite cues specifically.

## 6.2 Data and Variables

As outlined in Chapter 3, the data utilised in the thesis are based on the European Social Survey (ESS), Rounds 3-7<sup>81</sup>, conducted between 2006-2014. Following McLaren (2012a) and others, three questions designed to tap into both the economic and cultural facets of immigration, and that appear consistently in each round of the survey, have been combined into a single ‘Immigration Attitudes Index’<sup>82</sup>. The Immigration Attitudes Index is measured on an 11-point scale, where 0 represents the most negative attitude towards immigrants and 10 the most positive. To capture the variable ‘religiosity’, three different measures have been investigated. These relate to frequency of attendance at religious services (Attendance), frequency of prayer outside of religious services (Prayer) and a self-declaration of how religious a person feels that they are (Religious Feeling). Attendance and Prayer are measured on an 8-point scale, where<sup>83</sup>: 1=Never, 2=Less often 3=Only on special holy days, 4=At least once a month, 5=Once a week, 6=More than once a week, 7=Every day. Religious Feeling is measured on an 11-point scale where 0 represents not

---

<sup>81</sup> Round 3, 2006, is not included in any of the analysis that requires the consideration of specific religious denominations as there is no data on religious denominations in the UK during this year of the survey.

<sup>82</sup> All questions used in the bivariate and multivariate analyses are listed in the appendix.

<sup>83</sup> This coding has been reversed from the original format such that higher values represent greater religiosity.

being at all religious and 10 being very religious. Following Knoll (2009) and Karyotis and Patrkiios (2010), Attendance is utilised as a proxy for exposure to elite cues. In line with the broad immigration attitudes literature, the relevant demographic controls are accounted for (see Chapter 3), including: Gender, Age, being Unemployed, Citizenship, and Education level. Further individual-level controls are included to capture: Political Ideology (Left-Right Self-Placement and Party ID); Political Awareness (Political TV Programming Consumption and Interest in Politics); Life Satisfaction; Social Trust; Personal Economic Satisfaction; Country-Level Economic Satisfaction and Intergroup Contact<sup>84</sup>.

## 6.3 Bringing in the Audience: Political Elites

### 6.3.1 Introduction

The following section discusses the multivariate analysis designed to explore the relationship between the migration discourse of political elites and ‘their’ supporters. In light of the discourse analysis, Hypothesis 1 expects that those who feel closest with UKIP should hold the most negative attitudes, followed then by the Conservatives, Labour, and finally the Liberal Democrats.

To explore this question, a linear regression was constructed with three models (see Table 6.9 - a condensed version of this table is shown below<sup>85</sup>). In Model 1 the political parties are entered: Labour, Liberal Democrats and UKIP (alongside the Green party, Plaid Cymru, the Scottish National Party, an amalgamation of ‘Other’ parties and finally not feeling close to any party). The Conservatives are the excluded category and reference point. Model 1 therefore enables a comparison of the attitudes of those who identify with each political party. Model 2 introduces the demographic controls and Model 3 enters the remaining non-demographic variables. Contact is included in a separate regression (also in Table 6.9) to discover whether intergroup contact, available only in Round 7, has a substantial influence on results.

The results for each party are discussed in turn. This is followed by a brief summary of the variables controlling for religious denomination and how this

---

<sup>84</sup> Intergroup Contact was investigated by using a proxy of having ‘None’ ‘A Few’ or ‘Several’ friends from a different race/ethnicity. Unfortunately, the relevant data was only available in Round 7 of the ESS. However, as contact has strong theoretical and empirical support as a powerful predictor of immigration attitudes, it was deemed prudent to include it within the analysis. As such, in all cases, two regressions were carried out, one including and one excluding ‘Contact’ in the Round 7 analysis.

<sup>85</sup> All tables of results are included, in full, in the appendix. Throughout this chapter, a few key tables/condensed versions of tables are included to assist with clarity.



contextualises the analysis of religious elite messaging in the second section. Last, the controls are reviewed.

### **6.3.2 Labour**

To reiterate, the discourse analysis demonstrated that the immigration messages of the Conservative Party were more consistently securitizing and threat-based in comparison with Labour. It is hypothesised that, all things being equal, those who feel closest to the Labour Party will have more positive immigration attitudes than those who align most closely with the Conservatives. With respect to the Labour Party, H1 is consistently supported. In all rounds and all models (with the exception of Model 1 in Round 6, however Models 2 and 3 do reach statistical significance) Labour supporters have more positive immigration attitudes than those who identify with the Conservatives (R4 and 7  $p > .001$ , R5  $p > .01$ , R6  $p > .05$ ). Thus, even when all relevant controls are introduced, identifying with Labour relates to having more positive immigration attitudes, at a statistically significant level. These results demonstrate relative alignment between Labour Party cues and the immigration attitudes of their audience. Whether this indicates that the less heavily securitizing and threat-based messages regarding immigration have been internalised by, and therefore had an effect upon ‘their’ audience – the position with theoretical support from the CS – or whether those who identify with such messages have subsequently identified with the Labour Party, or whether supporters’ attitudes are shaping elite cues, is not fully clear.

### **6.3.3 Liberal Democrats**

The discourse analysis revealed that the least consistently securitizing and threat-based messages regarding immigration were espoused by the Liberal Democrats. Thus, all things being equal, it is anticipated that those who identify most closely with the Liberal Democrats will have more positive immigration attitudes than Conservative supporters and that the effects will be stronger than those who align with Labour (H1). Again, there is consistent support for this hypothesis. First, in all rounds and models, Liberal Democrats have more positive immigration attitudes than Conservatives. Second, statistically significant effects are found for the Liberal Democrats ( $p > .001$ ) in all models and rounds, whereas Labour only achieves this level of effect in Rounds 4 and 7. Equally, the coefficients (b value) for the Liberal Democrats is approximately double that of Labour, again in all rounds and models. The greater distance between the migration discourse of the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives compared to the Labour Party and the

Conservatives again demonstrates alignment between party cues and the attitudes of party supporters – although once more, how this trend is being driven is not fully certain.

#### 6.3.4 UKIP

The immigration messages of UKIP were, in comparison to the other three parties, the most consistent and strongest (due to a lack of contestation/inclusion of caveats) in promotion of security and threat frames. Thus, it would be expected that those who identify closest with UKIP will persistently hold more negative immigration attitudes than Conservative supporters. In Round 4, the effects only appear in Model 2 ( $p > .05$ ) and fail to hold in Model 3. However, in the remaining three rounds (including Round 7 with Contact) the effects hold across all models (R5 and 7  $p > .001$ , R6 M1 and 2  $p > .01$ , M3  $p > .05$ ). Thus, once more, alignment between party cues and the attitudes of party supporters is found.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> It was also possible to investigate whether this alignment broke down when the survey population was divided by religious denomination (using the regressions designed to explore the potential impact of religious elite discourse) – although direct comparison (via a dummy variable and omitted category) is not possible. For Anglicans (Table 6.10), in the majority of models and in all rounds political allegiance to the Liberal Democrats is associated with more positive immigration attitudes. For UKIP, in most models in Rounds 5, 6 and 7, the reverse effects arise. The only instance a statistically significant relationship occurs for Labour affiliation is in Model 4 of Round 6 – the relationship being positive but not as strong as that of the Liberal Democrat variable. This is roughly in line with the above findings. For Catholics (Table 6.15 and 6.16), feeling close to Labour is associated with more positive immigration attitudes in all three models, however, the Liberal Democrat variable produces no effect. The more positive effects of Labour affiliation in comparison to Conservative are in line with the discourse analysis. Yet, it would be expected that, compared with Labour, even stronger immigration attitudes would be found for those feeling closest to the Liberal Democrats. Interestingly then, there does not appear to be universal alignment between the elite cues and the immigration attitudes of their supporters when only looking at Catholics. For those identifying with an ‘Other’ minority faith (Table 6.15 and 6.16) results show the Labour and Liberal Democrats variables are linked with more positive attitudes, with the latter being of greater strength, and UKIP being associated with more negative attitudes – in line with the above findings. Therefore, when the population is divided by religious denomination, there is not as neat an alignment as with when the population is analysed as a whole. However, the variation is minimal (for instance, there is no substantial variations such as UKIP support having more positive attitudes than Liberal Democrat affiliation) demonstrating that alignment between political elite cues and the immigration attitudes of those who identify with each party is relatively consistent.

Table 6.9 (Condensed Version): Regression to Explore Political Elite Discourse

Variable	Round 4			Round 5			Round 6			Round 7		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Labour	0.889*** (0.162)	0.79*** (0.155)	0.492*** (0.154)	0.478** (0.151)	0.428** (0.142)	0.416 ** (0.144)	0.329 (0.171)	0.326* (0.162)	0.368* (0.164)	0.54*** (0.167)	0.625*** (0.159)	0.597*** (0.162)
Liberal Democrats	1.193*** (0.226)	1.03*** (0.214)	0.838*** (0.201)	1.034*** (0.214)	0.987*** (0.199)	0.819*** (0.189)	1.196*** (0.285)	0.995*** (0.268)	0.808*** (0.248)	1.515*** (0.311)	1.285*** (0.291)	1.108*** (0.268)
UKIP	-0.599 (0.41)	-0.937* (0.389)	-0.624 (0.357)	-2.02*** (0.455)	-1.923*** (0.423)	-1.277*** (0.395)	-0.983** (0.352)	-0.878** (0.329)	-0.685* (0.301)	-2.127*** (0.222)	-1.872*** (0.209)	-1.448*** (0.194)
Green	1.62*** (0.389)	1.246*** (0.371)	1.178*** (0.345)	1.27** (0.43)	1.037** (0.4)	0.839* (0.377)	1.399** (0.517)	0.77 (0.489)	0.225 (0.45)	1.875*** (0.349)	1.591*** (0.33)	1.436*** (0.304)
SNP	-0.496 (0.511)	-0.626 (0.485)	-0.241 (0.444)	0.391 (0.569)	0.24 (0.531)	0.298 (0.501)	0.655 (0.429)	0.556 (0.404)	0.547 (0.37)	0.868* (0.349)	0.857** (0.33)	0.857** (0.306)
Plaid Cymru	-1.005 (0.796)	-0.959 (0.751)	-0.926 (0.684)	1.099 (0.825)	0.422 (0.772)	-0.073 (0.721)	0.333 (0.574)	0.12 (0.538)	-0.174 (0.492)	1.404 (1.115)	0.617 (1.042)	0.318 (0.949)
Other Party	1.145 (0.444)	0.98* (0.431)	0.625 (0.396)	0.829 (0.485)	0.774 (0.452)	0.422 (0.421)	-0.413 (0.53)	-0.268 (0.499)	-0.541 (0.454)	0.936* (0.417)	0.916* (0.394)	1.051** (0.362)
No Party	0.205 (0.135)	0.093 (0.135)	0.25 (0.132)	-0.159 (0.129)	-0.183 (0.126)	0.107 (0.125)	0.03 (0.15)	-0.101 (0.148)	0.085 (0.142)	-0.093 (0.143)	-0.105 (0.14)	0.19 (0.136)
Adj R2	0.035	0.144	0.293	0.038	0.179	0.292	0.019	0.144	0.303	0.104	0.224	0.366
Constant	4.213*** (0.116)	3.68*** (0.238)	1.3*** (0.385)	4.52*** (0.108)	3.671*** (0.233)	1.41*** (0.38)	4.501*** (0.131)	4.091*** (0.263)	1.933*** (0.404)	4.763*** (0.122)	3.759*** (0.263)	1.368*** (0.403)
N	2065			2028			1870			1906		

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$ 

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

### 6.3.5 Remaining Parties

Turning to the remaining parties for which there are no expectations based upon discourse, those who felt closest to the Green Party had far more positive immigration attitudes in comparison to the Conservatives. This was relatively consistent, holding in all three Models for three rounds and Model 1 in Round 6. This is perhaps not surprising as, despite not conducting a discourse analysis, the Green Party across the UK have continuously advocated a very liberal immigration policy and have broadly espoused a desecuritizing immigration discourse. There were no effects for identifying with the SNP until Round 7, where SNP supporters held more positive immigration attitudes than Conservatives. This may be explained by the shifting political landscape during and after the Scottish Referendum campaign (2012-2014) in which the SNP began to accrue large swathes of Left/Centre-Left, traditionally Labour, support.

### 6.3.6 Religious Denomination

To control for religious denomination, dummy variables for affiliation with Anglicanism, Catholicism, Islam and Other religion (the excluded category was atheists) were introduced. This enabled further contextual understanding to enable a deeper analysis of the potential impact of religious elite cues in the following section. First, those who identify as Anglican hold consistently more negative immigration attitudes than atheists (R4  $p > .001$ , R5 and 7  $p > .001$ ). This may be a reflection of the Belonging aspect of religiosity which tends to be linked with conservative and prejudicial attitudes that can trigger hostility toward out-groups, including migrants (see Ben-Nun Bloom et al., 2015).

Identifying as a Catholic has little effect, however, more positive immigration attitudes arise in Model 2 of Round 7 ( $p > 0.5$ ), yet these effects do not hold in Model 3. Previous research has shown that those identifying with a minority faith tend to have more positive immigration attitudes than those who do not, theorised to result from increased levels of empathy and solidarity with other minority groups (Knoll, 2009). Whilst Catholics do not display more positive immigration attitudes than atheists, unlike Anglicans, their attitudes are not more negative. Therefore, it is feasible that the positive attitude inducing effects of being part of a minority faith are cancelling out the intolerance inducing effects of religion/religiosity (the Belonging dimension, perhaps).

Identifying as a Muslim produces consistently strong effects in all four rounds: Muslims are more positive in their immigration attitudes than atheists. This is in line with the theory that those that belong to a minority faith group are more likely to empathise and

feel solidarity with other minority/out groups. Yet, the explanatory effects of identifying as a Muslim disappear when Contact is introduced – indicating that the link between being a Muslim and positive immigration attitudes is not rooted in the faith, but is being driven by contact.

Finally, identifying with any other religion produces inconsistent effects. In Model 3 of Rounds 4 and 7 (with and without Contact), those who are affiliated with a faith group hold more negative attitudes than atheists. In contrast, in Rounds 5 and 6 the opposite relationship is found. However, these latter effects only appear in Model 2 and do not hold when all variables are introduced in Model 3. Thus, the ‘minority-faith equals migrant empathy’ proposition receives ambiguous support. Moreover, this fits previous scholarship that has shown the effects of religion/religiosity can be mixed, but the predominant relationship is between religion/increased religiosity and greater levels of prejudice towards out-groups.

### **6.3.7 Other Demographics**

Attention will now turn to the remaining demographic controls. First, Non-Citizens have more positive immigration attitudes than citizens. This is in line with expectations as non-citizens are almost by definition likely to be migrants themselves and are likely to be related to migrants. As such, greater empathy and solidarity for fellow migrants who are part of ‘us’ (migrants) is unsurprising. For Gender, there is a consistent link associated with being Female and having more positive immigration attitudes (all rounds and Models with the exception of R5 M3). Increased Age is associated with more negative immigration attitudes. This holds in all rounds and models with the exception of one (R7 M2, both with and without Contact). Education produces strong and uniform effects: as education increases, more positive immigration attitudes are found. All of the demographic results are in line with previous literature and theoretical expectations. Interestingly, Unemployment, a crucial variable in individual ‘realistic-threat’ theories of anti-immigrant sentiment fails to generate any effects.

### **6.3.8 Non-Demographics**

Considering the remaining controls, increased Satisfaction with Household Income is related with more positive immigration attitudes, holding in three out of four rounds. Thus, unlike Unemployment, here there is support for ‘realistic-threat’ theories of immigration attitude drivers. In all rounds, increased levels of Social Trust, Country-Level Economic Satisfaction and holding a more Left-wing Political Ideology are associated with

more positive immigration attitudes. Life Satisfaction is also related to more positive attitudes, although the effects are not as consistent (R5 and R7 with and without Contact). Enhanced Political Awareness, in the form of Interest in Politics (all rounds) and Consumption of Political TV Programming (R6 and R7) is also associated with more positive attitudes, producing statistically significant effects. Intergroup Contact produces mixed results. In comparison to those who have no close friends of a different race/ethnicity, having 'A Few' friends does not generate any effect. However, having 'Several' friends leads to a strong positive relationship and more positive immigration attitudes ( $b=0.753^{***}$ ). This lends support to the notion that the quantity and quality of contact is important in the shaping of attitudes towards various out groups, including migrants.

### 6.3.9 Political Elite Cues Summary

In sum, the key purpose of the above section has been to analyse the relationship between political elite cues and the immigration attitudes of 'their' audiences. Broad support is found for Hypothesis 1: in comparison with those who identify with the Conservatives, UKIP supporters hold more negative immigration attitudes, Labour supporters have more positive immigration attitudes, and those identifying with the Liberal Democrats have more positive immigration attitudes than both the Conservatives and Labour. This is in line with expectations based on the findings from the discourse analysis. Drawing upon the CS's conceptualisation of security as a 'top-down' process, it is theorised that the cues of political elite actors may be influencing the attitudes of their supporters. Yet, the inability to control for level of exposure to elite discourse makes this principally a theoretical claim (with some empirical backing) rather than a solidly empirical claim. In short, it is not possible to be certain the relationship is not being driven by individuals identifying with parties whose messages on a certain issue most closely match their own attitudes or whether supporter's attitudes are shaping elite cues. Theory would predict these two scenarios unlikely, and that the direction of causal influence is in fact elite-led. However this is not fully clear and requires further research.

The statistical analysis has also facilitated the formation of contextual picture of the attitudes of those identifying with specific religious faiths. Whilst there was little distinction between atheists and Catholics, Anglicans on average held more negative attitudes towards immigrants. The higher base-line in immigration attitudes found for Catholics in relation to Anglicans may be rooted in the minority-faith hypothesis.

## 6.4 Bringing in the Audience: Religious Elites

### 6.4.1 Introduction

This third section of this chapter is designed to explore the potential impact of cues from the Anglican and Catholic Churches/Church elites on the immigration attitudes of their respective ‘flocks’. Prior to the multivariate analysis, bivariate correlations were investigated to test the relationship between the dependent variable, immigration attitudes, and the independent variable, religiosity (with one dimension of religiosity, church attendance, representing exposure to elite cues in analyses focussing on UK Anglicans and Catholics). The bivariate analysis is subdivided into two parts. The first is a cross-national analysis whilst the second concentrates on the specific religious denominations in the UK that are relevant to this thesis. Based on the potentially powerful influence citizenship/non-citizenship may have on results, all bivariate models were repeated and split by citizenship status. Citizenship status had little impact on results and therefore these models are excluded from the main analysis and are summarised in a footnote at the end of section 6.4.

### 6.4.2 Cross National Bivariate Analysis

To contextualise the relationship between religiosity and immigration attitudes in the UK, it is instructive to provide some cross-national comparison. The cross-national analysis investigates the bivariate relationships for 31 European countries on a cumulative (Table 6.1, Rounds 3-7) and round-by-round basis (Table 6.2).

#### 6.4.2.1 Cross-National Cumulative

Starting with the results from the cumulative data, two key points emerge. First, there are only two countries where the correlation is above 0.1 across all three measures of religiosity (Greece and Israel, although Cyprus is extremely close to meeting this criterion). Including Cyprus, in all of these countries there is a strong negative relationship between religiosity and immigration attitudes. In short, higher levels of religiosity correlate with more negative attitudes towards immigrants. Second, where there is a statistically significant relationship ( $p > 0.05$  or  $p > 0.01$ ) across all three measures of religiosity, eight are negative (Cyprus, Spain, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Poland and Portugal) whilst only four are positive (Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia and the UK)<sup>87</sup>. Out of the latter group, the UK demonstrates the strongest correlations (.144\*\* .060\*\* and .085\*\* for Attendance, Prayer and Religious Feeling, respectively). Comparing the two groups on the whole, the negative relationships are stronger – higher levels of religiosity tends to be

---

<sup>87</sup> Interestingly, Hungary is anomalous in that it has statistically significant relationships that are positive (Attendance and Religious Feeling) and negative (Prayer).

associated with more negative attitudes towards immigrants. Notably, the UK does not fit this majority description. This gives a preliminary indication that religiosity in the UK may be serving to desecuritize the issue of immigration, and this is in stark contrast to many other European countries, where religion or religiosity may, in fact, be contributing to the securitization of immigration and immigrants.

The previous paragraph has outlined the general results for countries in which all three measures of religiosity had an effect. However, there are some patterns of variation between each measure of religiosity.

Beginning with Attendance, 21 countries produced statistically significant relationships. However, only six countries generate a correlation above 0.1 (Cyprus, the UK, Greece, Israel, Italy and Slovenia). Of these six, the UK is alone in producing a positive relationship where increased Attendance correlates with more positive immigration attitudes. From the other fifteen countries where the relationship is statistically significant but below a correlation of 0.1, nine are positive (Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Russia, Sweden and Ukraine) and six negative (Switzerland, Spain, Ireland, Poland, Portugal, and Slovakia). Overall, the eleven negative correlations tend to be of greater strength than the positive correlations – with the UK's strong positive correlation being an exception. It is interesting to note that, for most countries, Attendance tends to have the weakest effects compared to the other two measures of religiosity. However, Attendance produces the most powerful effects in four countries, of which the UK is included. For the UK, the preponderance of the Attendance measure of religiosity, compared to Prayer and Religious Feeling, is pronounced (.144\*\*, .060\*\* and .085\*\*, respectively) – suggesting a particularly powerful role for Attendance in the UK.

Turning to the frequency of prayer measure of religiosity, there is a similar pattern. Of the four countries that produced a statistically significant positive relationship (Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia and the UK), none reached a correlation above 0.1, however the UK was the strongest with .060\*\*. Eleven countries generated a statistically significant negative relationship (Switzerland, Spain, Croatia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia and Turkey, with Cyprus, Greece, Israel and Poland being the four countries where there were correlations above 0.1). Alongside the numerical dominance of negative relationships, the strength of the relationships are again on average far more powerful than their positive counterparts.



For the last measure of religiosity, Religious Feeling, in eleven countries there was a statistically significant positive relationship between religiosity and immigration attitudes (Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Russia, Sweden, Ukraine and the UK). None of the correlations were above 0.1. In ten countries the relationship was negative (Spain, Ireland, Iceland, Poland, Portugal and Turkey, with the correlations of Cyprus, Greece, Israel and Italy all above 0.1). Parallel with the other two measures of religiosity, again the negative relationships tend to be stronger on the whole.

Overall, the cumulative cross-national analysis demonstrates several key trends. In short, the picture is relatively mixed, however for the countries analysed, high religiosity is chiefly associated with negative immigration attitudes – with the negative relationships tending to be of greater strength. Second, the UK does not fit this majority description and is the only country that produces a statistically significant positive relationship across all measures of religiosity. Third, the UK is relatively unique in terms of 1) how strong a positive correlation Attendance generates, and 2) that Attendance produces the strongest effects out of all three measures of religiosity. For most countries, stronger effects are found for Prayer and Religious Feeling. In sum, the highly inconsistent results from the bivariate analysis has demonstrated that religion/religiosity offer little explanation for immigration attitudes on their own, bolstering the case to account for the potential effects of elite cues.

#### **6.4.2.2 Cross-National Bivariate Analysis: Split by Survey Round**

In an attempt to unpack the bivariate relationships further, the cross-national data was split by ESS round (Table 6.2). It is evident that in every country there is a degree of change across rounds and between different measures of religiosity. Indeed the change is so varied that no general trends emerge between countries. This indicates that the domestic context is likely to be paramount.

For the UK specifically, first, in all rounds Attendance produces the strongest correlations, followed by Religious Feeling and lastly Prayer. All of the frequency of attendance correlations are statistically significant and are above 0.1. The correlations for Religious Feeling are all statistically significant, but are only above 0.1 in two of the five rounds. Only three rounds produce statistically significant correlations for Prayer, none of which are above 0.1. Overall, the round-by-round analysis supports the cumulative analysis

above showing that the attendance measure of religiosity has by far the strongest relationship with immigration attitudes in the UK.

#### **6.4.2.3 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination**

This section explores the relationship between religiosity and attitudes to immigration in the UK, however this time separates the findings into the two relevant religious denominations (Anglicanism and Catholicism – Islam is also included for context). Again a cumulative analysis is followed with a round-by-round exploration.

#### **6.4.2.4 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination - Cumulative**

Table 6.3 displays the results of the cumulative bivariate analysis. The first thing to note is that all of the statistically significant relationships are positive: higher religiosity relates to more positive attitudes towards immigration. Taking each measure of religiosity individually, for Attendance, Anglicanism (.239\*\*) delivers the strongest statistically significant correlation, Catholicism (.110\*\*) the second strongest, whilst Islam does not produce a statistically significant relationship. For Anglicans, Attendance yields by far the strongest relationship, in comparison to the other two measures of religiosity. Second, for Prayer, only Anglicanism (.098\*\*) has a statistically significant effect. Third, Religious Feeling is the only measure in which the relationships are statistically significant across all three denominations. The effects for Islam (.200\*\*) are the strongest, followed by Anglicanism (.150\*\*) and then Catholicism (.117\*\*). For Catholics, compared to the other two measures of religiosity, Religious Feeling has the strongest effects; however this is very marginal and closely followed by Attendance (.117\*\* and .110\*\*, respectively).

Table 6.3: UK Bivariate Correlations, Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Denomination: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

Denomination	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		How religious	
	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
Roman Catholic	.110**	868	0.006	867	.117**	863
CoE/Anglican	.239**	2067	.098**	2054	.150**	2062
Islam /Muslim	0.115	227	0.13	228	.200**	228
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)						

#### **6.4.2.5 UK Bivariate Analysis: Split by Denomination - Round-by-Round**

Next the data were split by denomination and survey round (Table 6.4). Beginning with Attendance, results show Anglicanism to generate a statistically significant relationship for each round ( $p > .01$ ). Statistically significant relationships are found for

Catholicism in Rounds 4 and 7 ( $p > .05$ ). Moving to Prayer, only two statistically significant relationships arose across all three denominations – Anglicanism in Rounds 4 and 7. Last, for Religious Feeling, statistically significant relationships are found in all rounds for Anglicanism, although this fails to rise above a correlation of 0.1 in Rounds 5 and 6. Rounds 4 and 7 and Rounds 4 and 6 result in statistically significant relationships for Catholicism and Islam respectively. Religious Feeling is the only measure in which any effects are found for Islam. Overall, for Anglicanism and Catholicism, it is evident that Attendance generates the most powerful correlations followed by Religious Feeling and then finally Prayer.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> It may be expected that non-citizens (i.e. immigrants) are likely to hold different views from the majority that are citizens. To explore whether being a citizen or not has impacted upon or may have distorted the results, further bivariate correlations were investigated that split the respondents by citizenship status (Table 6.5). Starting with the cumulative data, comparing this with the UK's results in Table 6.1, where this distinction is not made, although the 'citizens' relationship's across all three measures of religiosity each decline marginally, they still remain positive and statistically significant. This would indicate that the effect of citizenship on the results is minimal. Interestingly, for the non-citizens, for frequency of attendance, a statistically significant relationship remains, but this time it is negative: higher Attendance equates to more negative attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 6.6 shows the bivariate correlations split by survey round and by citizen. Comparing this to the UK's results in Table 6.2 where this distinction is lacking, again there are some very minimal variations, however these do not alter the significance of the relationships (with the exception of frequency of prayer in Round 5 where the cumulative data produces a relationship significant to the 0.01 level, but the 'citizens' only generate a relationship significant at the 0.05 level). Again, for the non-citizens, Attendance results in a negative correlation. Yet, overall, the round-by-round analysis indicates citizenship has limited impact.

Next the UK cumulative data was split by denomination and citizenship, displayed in Table 6.7. Comparing Table 6.7 with Table 6.3, where citizenship is not distinguished, there are very slight changes between 'citizens' and the non-split group, however the levels of significance remain constant. The only exception here is Islam on the Attendance measure of religiosity, with the non-split data showing no statistically significant relationship whereas there is one for the 'citizens' – meaning that non-citizen Muslims may be more negative in their attitudes towards immigrants than their Muslim counterparts who do have citizenship. Overall, however, the effects of citizenship are minimal.

Finally, Table 6.8 shows the UK data split by round, denomination and citizenship. Comparing these results with those in table 6.4, in relation to the Anglican denomination, there are some minute variations between the non-split data and the 'citizens' but the levels of significance and direction of the correlations all remain constant across all three measures of religiosity. For the Catholic denomination, the non-split data and the 'citizens' display some very slight variations, with the one change being where Religious Feeling moves from statistically significant to insignificant in Round 4. Interestingly, for Religious Feeling in Round 7 there is a positive correlation for both the non-split group and the citizens. Yet, there is a negative relationship for non-citizens, meaning that non-citizens who feel more religious have more negative immigration attitudes than citizens. Last, the sample sizes for the Islamic faith when split by round and citizenship are very small, making any findings weak. Again, there are some very slight variations between the citizens and the non-split cohort.

In sum, the overall effects of citizenship are minimal. However, the slight variations make controlling for citizenship in the multivariate analysis essential to ensure robust results.

#### **6.4.2.6 Bivariate Analysis Summary**

To summarise, the bivariate analysis has illuminated several crucial points. On a cross-national basis on a cumulative level, on average, high religiosity is more consistently associated with more negative immigration attitudes and these tend to be of greater strength than those that are positive. The UK does not fit this trend and is the only country that produces statistically significant positive relationships across all measures of religiosity – producing the highest positive correlation for Attendance. Splitting the data by ESS round revealed exceedingly diverse variations in the cross-national data, bolstering the case that one, domestic context is paramount and two, that religion/religiosity do not appear to hold much explanatory power as a driver of immigration attitudes in and of themselves, meaning there is a need to try and account for the potential effects of religious elite cues.

For the UK specifically, Attendance produced the strongest relationship with immigration attitudes, compared with the other two measures of religiosity. When the data were split by denomination, these UK-wide patterns of the strength of Attendance were closely reflected by the Anglican and Catholic denominations. Overall, the positive relationships between Attendance and more positive immigration attitudes for both UK Anglicans and Catholics provides initial support for H2 and H3 that predict that greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes.

#### **6.4.3 Love Thy Neighbour? Multivariate Analyses - Religious Elite Discourse and the Audience**

Yet, the bivariate correlations do not reveal whether this preliminary support for H2 and H3 will hold once other potentially powerful explanatory variables are considered. Equally, they are limited in enabling an exploration of what may be underpinning the effects of religiosity, and Attendance in particular (i.e. exposure to elite cues) – highlighted as a necessary step due to the contrasting picture that emerges when just religion/religiosity is considered. As such, multivariate analyses were investigated using linear regression.

The central question that this section aims to unpack is whether, after controlling for all other potentially relevant factors, religious elite discourse appears to have an effect on the immigration attitudes of ‘their’ audience. Based upon the discourse analysis of elite religious actors, H2 (Anglicans) and H3 (Catholics) expect that greater levels of Attendance and exposure to elite cues will increase positive immigration attitudes. The

lack of data (discourse) collected from the Muslim faith make it impossible to make predictions on the subsequent impact of discourse on the attitudes of adherents to Islam. However, to investigate whether, rather than specific elite cues, Attendance in and of itself, or indeed any other measure of religiosity was in some way driving immigration attitudes, Islam has been included in the analysis as a form of control. All other minority faiths in the UK have been combined into the category of ‘Other Religion’ for the same purpose<sup>89</sup>.

To explore this primary question, a separate, but identical, linear regression was carried out for each faith group. The regressions were split by ESS round (Rounds 4, 5 6 and 7) to detect any surprising variations over time and divided into four models. Model 1 contains the three measures of religiosity: Attendance; Prayer; and Religious Feeling. Again, Attendance is acting as a proxy for exposure to elite religious cues, whilst the other two measures are included as controls to determine whether, rather than exposure to elite cues, it is in fact religiosity in general that is having an effect on immigration attitudes. Model 2 introduces party identification<sup>90</sup>. Model 3 brings in demographic controls and Model 4 the remaining controls (including Contact in Round 7). Additionally, exploratory analysis revealed that, compared to the Anglican denomination, overall there are far fewer statistically significant relationships in general for the other three faith groups. One potential explanation for this is the low N, due to Roman Catholicism, Islam and ‘Other Religions’ all being minority faiths in the UK. As such a further regression was carried out for all denominations which merged all four rounds survey together, providing an approximate fourfold boost in N. Results of this cumulative regression will be explored in tandem with the round-by-round results. Each religious denomination will be investigated in turn.

#### **6.4.3.1 Anglicanism**

Table 6.15 and 6.16 show the multivariate results in the cumulative analysis for the Anglican denomination (a condensed version of the key variables is shown below). Beginning with Model 1, there is a statistically significant positive relationship between

---

<sup>89</sup> These include: Church of Ireland; Baptist; Methodist; Presbyterian/Church of Scotland; United Reformed Church/Congregational; Free Presbyterian; Brethren; Other Protestant; Greek or Russian Orthodox; Other Eastern Orthodox; Other Christian; Hindu; Sikh; Buddhist; Other Eastern Religions; Jewish; and Other non-Christian.

<sup>90</sup> This enabled a further degree of insight into the alignment of political elite messaging and the immigration attitudes of their supporters as to whether this varies across religious denomination/levels of religiosity, outlined above in section 6.3.

Attendance and immigration attitudes ( $p > .001$ ). Attendance maintains the same level of significance in Model 2 when party identification is included, in Model 3 when the demographic controls are introduced, and in Model 4, when all variables have been entered<sup>91</sup>. These results buttress those from the bivariate analysis, providing further support for H2: that exposure to desecuritizing non-threat cues from Anglican elites, measured via church attendance, is having an effect on the immigration attitudes of Anglicans<sup>92</sup>.

Table 6.15 (Condensed Version): Regression to Explore Anglican Elite Discourse

Variable	Anglican			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.337*** (0.04)	0.305*** (0.039)	0.198*** (0.039)	0.186*** (0.037)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.036 (0.026)	-0.034 (0.025)	-0.001 (0.025)	0.028 (0.024)
Religious Feeling	0.048 (0.028)	0.048 (0.027)	0.078** (0.027)	0.029 (0.025)
Adj R2	0.054	0.094	0.157	0.255
Constant	3.35*** (0.13)	3.481*** (0.15)	3.303*** (0.273)	1.396*** (0.412)
N	1857			

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Importantly, despite all three measures of religiosity having positive bivariate correlations, in the multivariate analysis Attendance is the only measure to be consistently associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Prayer did not garner any statistically significant relationships, whilst effects were only found for Religious Feeling in Model 3, before disappearing in Model 4. This indicates that it is not religion or religiosity in and of itself that is having an effect on attitudes, or it would be expected that each measure of religiosity would produce similar effects. To reiterate, the contrasting correlations between religiosity and immigration attitudes found in the cross-national bivariate analysis, from exceedingly negative to highly positive, gives religiosity limited explanatory power. Thus whilst imbued with limitations, the elite cues argument (i.e. the important element lies beyond ‘religiosity’, potentially in the cuing certain Beliefs/attitudes) can be viewed as

<sup>91</sup> The size of the effect was calculated using the standard deviations (SD) of Attendance (SD = 1.44) and the Immigration Attitudes Index (SD = 2.15) and multiplying the latter by the standardised coefficient (Beta) for Attendance in Model 4 (0.186\*\*\*). The sum is as follows:  $0.186 \times 2.15 = 0.4$ . Thus, holding everything else constant, and once all controls have been entered, for every 1.44 increase in Attendance, immigration attitudes increase by 0.4.

<sup>92</sup> In the regression split by ESS round (Table 6.10) there is almost no variation in which variables are statistically significant. Attendance is statistically significant in all 4 Models in 3/4 rounds (R5, R6 and R7). There are no effects found for Prayer and just two effects for Religious Feeling (Model 3 of Round 4 and 7). These round-by-round findings further support H2.

more powerful if policy positions of religious elites/organisations are clear – which they are for the Anglican Church/Church elites in the UK (see Knoll, 2009). As such, it is suggested that it is not religiosity that may be serving to desecuritize the issue of immigration in the UK, as indicated by the bivariate results. Rather, those of high religiosity (in terms of Attendance) are being exposed more consistently to desecuritizing elite messaging. This appears a particularly impressive effect in light of the findings from the political elite discourse. Securitizing messages dominated the discourse of political elites, who as a set of actors have been found to monopolise UK migration discourse (Statham and Geddes, 2006). Thus, the fact that religious elite cues have managed to cut through to their audience in this highly securitized discursive context displays a powerful capacity to connect with sections of ‘their’ audience. Therefore, for Anglicans attending church frequently, this discourse may be acting as a partial shield against the hegemonic security threat-based frames that have characterised political elite discourse in the UK.

A final point relates to the above finding (section 6.3.6) that in comparison to atheists, those who identity as Anglicans are associated with more negative immigration attitudes. This appears to provide further support for the argument that Anglican elite discourse is having an effect of the attitudes of ‘their’ audience by providing support for the assumption that the direction of the causal effect is top-down. In other words, that it is elites that are influencing the attitudes of their audience rather than the attitudes of audiences influencing the shape of elite messaging on migration. If the reverse were true it would follow that Anglican elite discourse and the ‘official’ Church position would be securitizing and threat-centred in order to reflect the views of their audience (those identifying as Anglican). The opposite is found in the discourse analysis. Thus, even though Anglicans hold more negative attitudes than atheists, greater levels of Attendance relate to an increase in positive immigration attitudes. Therefore the desecuritizing, non-threat elite messaging on the issue of immigration may be dampening the generally negative attitudes resulting from Anglican affiliation. Once more, the support for the effect of elite cues, as opposed to those ‘living their religion’ and scoring higher on the Behavioural or Belief elements of religion (aspects that can be associated with greater tolerance) is rooted in the lack of effects from Prayer and Religious Feeling.

To briefly address the controls, older individuals (Age) are consistently more negative in their attitudes. In contrast, increased levels of Education are related with more positive attitudes. Whilst not occurring as frequently, Non-citizens and Females (Gender) are more positive in their attitudes. All of these findings are in line with expectations based

on the literature. The only effects for Unemployment are found in Round 7. Interestingly, those who are unemployed appear to have more positive immigration attitudes, contradicting self-interest centred immigration attitudes theories. However, these effects disappear once Contact is introduced. For the Model 4 variables there is a universal positive relationship between high levels of Social Trust and Country-Level Economic Satisfaction and more positive attitudes. Greater Political Awareness, measured via Political TV Programming Consumption and Interest in Politics is also associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Last, there is a solitary instance in Model 4 of Round 5 where increased Life Satisfaction is related with positive attitudes. Again, these findings are congruent with previous research.

#### **6.4.3.2 Catholicism**

Table 6.11 shows the results of the Catholic denomination split by survey round. The first thing to note is that overall there are far fewer statistically significant relationships in general when compared with the Anglican denomination. To reiterate, one likely explanation for this is the low N due to Roman Catholicism being a minority faith in the UK, hence the need for the cumulative regression.

For the cumulative results for the Catholic denomination (Table 6.15 and 6.16 with Contact – condensed version shown below) when all rounds are integrated, Attendance has no effect. Across all four models, Prayer is associated with more negative immigration attitudes, whilst, in contrast, Religious Feeling relates to more positive immigration attitudes. These results fail to provide any support for Hypothesis 3 that, for Catholics, the desecuritizing non-threat migration messages of Catholic elites and exposure to such cues via Attendance would have the effect of garnering more positive immigration attitudes<sup>93</sup>. It is not clear why the apparent effects of Anglican elite messages are not matched by their Catholic counterparts. The complexity of the European picture outlined in the bivariate analysis would indicate that the explanation is rooted in UK context, rather than simply being caused by the religious denomination or specific religious doctrines. Further exploration is required.

---

<sup>93</sup> The round-by-round results (Table 6.11 and 6.14 with Contact) show that church attendance has no effect in any model of any round. Religious Feeling is related with more positive immigration attitudes in Models 2 and 3 of Round 7 only ( $p > .05$ ), whilst Prayer is associated with more negative immigration attitudes (R5 M3; R6 [the relationship is positive in Model 1 ( $b = 0.044^*$ ) but then becomes negative in Model 2 ( $b = 0.208^*$ )] M2; R7 M2, M4).



Table 6.15 (Condensed Version): Regression to Explore Catholic Elite Discourse

Variable	Catholic			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.118 (0.064)	0.108 (0.064)	0.039 (0.06)	0.008 (0.057)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.149** (0.047)	-0.161*** (0.047)	-0.106* (0.045)	-0.096* (0.043)
Religious Feeling	0.129** (0.049)	0.14** (0.049)	0.153*** (0.045)	0.124** (0.043)
Adj R2	0.017	0.045	0.17	0.265
Constant	4.409*** (0.239)	3.971*** (0.324)	3.21*** (0.444)	1.051 (0.662)
N	776			

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$ 

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

With respect to the demographic control variables introduced in Model 3 and 4, Table 6.11 shows older individuals tend to hold negative immigration attitudes (R4 M4; R6 M4). In contrast, being a Non-Citizen and having higher levels of Education are associated with more positive immigration attitudes in all models in Rounds 5, 6 and 7. All three findings are in line with theoretical expectations. Gender, Unemployment and Satisfaction with Household Income have no effect. For the non-demographic variables introduced in Model 4, there is a link between more positive immigration attitudes and higher levels of Social Trust (R6), Life Satisfaction (R5), Country-Level Economic Satisfaction (R4, 5 and 6), holding a more Left-wing Political Ideology, and being more Interested in Politics (Political Awareness; R5, R6). In the cumulative regression, all of the above variables retain their statistically significant relationships, with the exception of Life Satisfaction which generates no effect. Lastly, Contact in the form of having ‘A Few’ friends of a different race/ethnicity produces no effect, however, having ‘Several’ friends is associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Again, this points to the importance of both quality and quantity of intergroup contact being important to ameliorate/weaken prejudice and intolerance towards migrants and other out-groups.

#### 6.4.3.3 Islam

To reiterate, no predictions have been made regarding the potential impact of Muslim ‘elite’ discourse due to the aforementioned limitations. The purpose of this analysis is to explore the effects of religiosity in and of itself in order to see if this illuminates the findings from the Anglican and Catholic denominations in any way. The main point of note is the lack of statistically significant relationships – particularly in the regression split by survey round (Table 6.12). Only Religious Feeling is associated with more positive attitudes toward immigration across all four Models in Round 4, however effects are not found in any other rounds. Once again, the lack of statistically significant relationships may be a result of the small N available for the Islamic faith.

Turning to the cumulative results displayed in Table 6.15 and 6.16 with Contact (N 196), Attendance and Prayer do not result in any statistically significant effects, whilst Religious Feeling reaches significance in all four models. Why Religious Feeling appears to relate to more positive immigration attitudes whereas the other measures of religiosity do not is unclear. Overall, the relationship between the Islamic faith/religiosity amongst Muslims and immigration attitudes requires further research. The lack of consistency in terms of effects of religiosity, however, bolsters the case for taking a context dependent approach to each faith and each country and highlights the lack of explanatory power that is garnered by a sole focus on religiosity – as opposed to also accounting for the effects of elite cues.

#### **6.4.3.4 ‘Other’ Religion**

Again, the thesis has not analysed the discourse of all religious denominations, meaning predictions about the impact of elite discourse is not possible. The purpose of the ‘Other’ religion category mirrors that of the Islamic faith: to determine whether there appears to be any special influence played by religion or religiosity in general.

The religiosity variables have a limited impact in the regression split by survey round (Table 6.13), with Attendance and Religious Feeling only having a positive impact on immigration attitudes in Rounds 4 and 5 respectively. For the cumulative results (Table 6.15 and 6.16) Attendance is the only religiosity variable that has any effect – with greater Attendance being associated with more positive immigration attitudes. However, this does not hold in Model 4, when all controls have been entered.

#### **6.4.3.5 Summary: Connecting Religious Elite Cues and the Audience**

To summarise, the central question that this section has attempted to explore is whether exposure to religious elite cues is likely to impact upon the immigration attitudes. For the Anglican elites, there is support for this hypothesis (H2). Increased levels of church attendance and the anticipated exposure to desecuritizing non-threat immigration messages is consistently associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Moreover, the other two measures of religiosity (Prayer and Religious Feeling) fail to generate any effects indicating that it is not religion or religiosity itself which is driving immigration attitudes. In contrast, the Catholic denomination provides no support for the hypothesis (H3), with Attendance producing no statistically significant effects. Interestingly, the other two measures of religiosity, Prayer (negative) and Religious Feeling (positive) are associated with polarised effects. Why cues from the Catholic Church and Church elites in the UK do

not seem to have the same degree of impact on ‘their’ audience in comparison to their Anglican counterparts is unclear and requires further research. Yet, the two contradictory findings for the other two measures of ‘religiosity’ for Catholics does support the need to move beyond the 3B’s approach and to incorporate other potentially powerful influences, including elite discourse. No predictions were made regarding the potential impact of elite discourse for the Islamic faith and Other religions. For these two groups, the effects of religiosity were again inconsistent, further supporting the argument that religion/religiosity independently provide limited explanatory power. Rather, aspects of religiosity can be triggered – one such trigger being elite discourse.

## 6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the second research question. The first part analysed the relationship between political elite cues and the immigration attitudes of those who identify with each party. The second part concentrated on the immigration messages of religious elites and the immigration attitudes of those who identify with the corresponding faith.

Beginning with the political elites, the discourse analysis generated one central hypothesis (H1): UKIP supporters will hold the most negative immigration attitudes, followed by the Conservatives, then Labour, whilst the Liberal Democrats will have the most positive attitudes. This hypothesis is supported by results. In spite of data limitations, drawing upon the CS’s theoretical understanding of security as a ‘top-down’ process, it is suggested that the elite cues are likely having some influence on the attitudes of their audiences. In any case, confirmation of the alignment between party cues and the attitudes of party supporters opens up space to further explore this relationship on an empirical basis (i.e. test the theoretical assumption) and/or detect any future variation.

Turning to the religious elites, two hypotheses were derived from the discourse analysis: for both Anglicans (H2) and Catholics (H3), greater exposure to elite cues, using church attendance as a proxy, will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Starting with the Anglican elites, there is support for this hypothesis. Greater levels of Attendance and anticipated exposure to desecuritizing non-threat immigration messages consistently relate to more positive immigration attitudes. Furthermore, the two other measures of religiosity, Prayer and Religious Feeling, fail to generate any effects. This reinforces the case for impact residing in elite messaging – there does not appear to be anything magical about religion or religiosity itself which is driving immigration attitudes. It is crucial to emphasise that the effects of Anglican elite cues held despite the inclusion of

all control variables identified as important in the broad immigration attitudes literature, including some of the most powerful such as education, party ID and intergroup contact. Moreover, the highly securitizing discursive terrain identified in the discourse analysis of political elites in Chapter 4 (the set of actors who dominate the migration agenda in the UK, see Statham and Geddes, 2006) demonstrated that the desecuritizing messages from the Anglican Church and Church elites would be at a competitive disadvantage. Taking the above factors into consideration, the perceived effects of Anglican Church/Church elite cues indicates a relatively strong capacity to connect with certain portions of their audience.

The analysis of political elite discourse also enabled a further exploration of the impact of religious elite discourse by controlling for religious denomination. Compared to atheists, Anglicans were shown to hold more negative immigration attitudes. This may be explained by the potentially prejudicial influences ‘Belonging’ can induce as an aspect of religiosity. It is therefore suggested that the desecuritizing non-threat messages of Anglican elites may be dampening the negative attitudes held towards migrants of those who are affiliated with Anglicanism. This is argued to further bolster the case that it is Anglican elite discourse that is having an effect on the attitudes of ‘their’ audience by providing support for the assumption that the direction of the causal effect is top-down. More simply, that it is elites that are influencing the attitudes of their audience rather than the attitudes of audiences influencing elite migration messaging. If the opposite were true it would be expected that Anglican elite discourse and the ‘official’ Church position would be securitizing and threat-centred in order to reflect the majority view of their audience (those identifying as Anglican) - the opposite is found in the discourse analysis.

Contrary to the Anglican results, the Catholic denomination does not provide support for the hypothesis (H3). Attendance, and exposure to elite cues, fails to generate statistically significant effects. In contrast, the other two measures of religiosity, Prayer (negative) and Religious Feeling (positive) do have an effect, yet they contradict one another. To reiterate, why the impact of elite messaging of Catholic and Anglican appears to produce mixed results is unclear and requires further research. However, the two contradictory findings for religiosity in the Catholic denomination – in addition to the inconsistency of the religiosity variables for Islam and the combination of the ‘Other’ faiths – does reinforce the limitations of the 3B’s approach in trying to understand the formation of immigration attitudes by looking at religiosity in and of itself. Once more this

subsequently buttresses the case for focussing on other potentially powerful influences, including elite discourse.

To conclude, some broader implications that arise from the research design and consequent empirical findings will be discussed. First, unlike the limited amount of previous research that has focused upon the effects of cues from political elites and political parties, these findings demonstrate that, for specific societal constituencies, non-political elite actors can play a pivotal role in shaping immigration attitudes. For issues such as migration, this presents both an opportunity and a potential cause for concern for those with a normative agenda (this point will be expanded upon in the concluding chapter). For scholars attempting to grapple with migration politics – particularly in light of the sharp rise in anti-immigration rhetoric, policy and attitudes following the so-called ‘migration crisis’ in Europe – the role being played by religious elites and institutions may be in need of greater attention. How these actors are framing the issue of migration (securitizing threat or desecuritizing non-threat) may be vitally important – especially as it has been demonstrated that religious heuristic devices, myths and memes can be used to portray polarised frames. This is perhaps most true in states where religious and national identities are deeply entwined – as in the case of Eastern and Southern Europe which has been most exposed to the ‘migration crisis’.

Second, the findings also have consequences for the scientific study of religion and immigration attitudes literatures. Regarding the former, the findings substantiate Djupe and Calfano’s (2012) call to account for elite discourse to untangle the contradictory findings arising from previous research. The previous neglect of elite cues may underpin a considerable degree of the inconsistency in the effects that religiosity has been found to have on attitudes. For the latter, depending on the question being asked, finding a way to incorporate elite discourse in statistical models may be essential to gain a more holistic understanding of what is driving immigration attitudes – a practice which to date has been severely neglected.

Third, for securitization theory, alongside highlighting the value in expanding the analytical net beyond traditional security actors, the thesis has highlighted the effectiveness of disaggregating the audience and engaging with context to identify which audience(s) actors are primarily trying to engage and are most likely to reach. This opens up the possibility that other factors that are integral to identity (like religion), that have an institutional framework, and that have capital-endowed elite actors, may also have the

potential to influence attitudes. With followers in the millions and a ‘religious’ commitment to ‘their’ team, highly influential football clubs seem like prime candidates. Last, a central argument this thesis makes is that synthesising quantitative methods with discourse analysis can be a valuable addition to securitization research as a means of identifying whether or not the de/securitizing messages of elites have been accepted/rejected. Employing a mixed-methods research design can therefore assist in deepening the analysis beyond de/securitizing moves to develop a more intricate understanding of the full process of securitization.

## Chapter 7: Conclusion

### 7.1 Introduction

### 7.2 Summary of Main findings

#### 7.2.1 Rhetorically De/Securitizing Migration in the UK (and Beyond?): The Discourse Analysis

#### 7.2.2 From De/Securitizing Moves to De/Securitizations? The Statistical Analyses

### 7.3 Implications

### 7.4 As One Door Closes... Limitations and Avenues for Further Research

## 7.1 Introduction

The last decade of UK migration politics has been a turbulent one. With the increasing politicisation of the issue following the 2005 General Election, the intense prioritisation of the issue by the general public, the unprecedented levels of net migration, the electoral success of Right-wing anti-immigration parties, the hardening of migration discourse, and finally the vote to leave the EU, developing a deeper understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK, particularly regarding the construction of immigration attitudes, is arguably more pressing than ever. Hence, the aim of this thesis was to contribute to the understanding of the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond), and in particular, to unpack the discursive de/construction of migration as a threat (de/securitizing moves) in the UK and to ‘bring the audience back in’ to securitization research via an analysis of the relationship between elite discourse and the construction of immigration attitudes.

Whilst being one of the most innovative reconceptualisations of ‘security’ and a highly useful theoretical lens, securitization theory is imbued with several limitations, two of which have been addressed in this thesis to facilitate an effective exploration of the security-migration nexus. The first is rooted in the theoretical and empirical overemphasis placed upon political elite actors to the neglect of other potentially influential actors in the security process. As the set of actors who lead UK migration politics (Statham and Geddes, 2006), a focus on political elites is necessary to contextualise the interventions of any other actors. Moreover, to date, a thorough analysis of the discursive construction of migration by political elites across the major thematic battlegrounds using a securitization lens – although not limited to securitization research – is missing, meaning this analysis is itself intrinsically valuable. To expand the analytical net, the thesis focussed upon religious elites as a previously neglected – and potentially highly influential – set of elite actors. Indeed, from 2005 (although even the research prior to this was limited), the role of religious elite actors in UK migration politics has been ignored. The second limitation of securitization

theory addressed in this thesis centres on the previous disconnect between elite discourse and public opinion. Or, in other words, the overemphasis on securitizing moves and a neglect of the relationship between said moves and the audience. However, this failure to sufficiently link elite cues to public attitudes is not unique to securitization research and is also prominent in the broad immigration attitudes literature and the scientific study of religion. Addressing both of these limitations and the various empirical gaps that have emerged as a consequence has acted as the fundamental rationale of this thesis.

The purpose of this final chapter is three-fold. The first is to provide a summary of the central findings. The second is to emphasise the key contributions made by this research and explore the subsequent implications. The third focuses on the limitations of the thesis and teases out avenues for future research.

## **7.2 Summary of Main Findings**

To summarise the central findings it is fruitful to separate those derived from the discourse analysis and those related to the analysis of the relationship between such discourse and public attitudes. Each set of findings is addressed in turn.

### **7.2.1 Rhetorically De/Securitizing Migration in the UK (And Beyond?): The Discourse Analysis**

The purpose of the discourse analysis was twofold: to fill an empirical gap through the generation of a nuanced analysis of how political and religious elites framed migration across the various dimensions on which migration is discursively de/securitized; and to gain a broad understanding of the migration discourses of both sets of actors in order to derive hypotheses regarding the potential impact of said discourse. This section explores the findings related to the former.

Beginning with the discourse analysis of political elites, namely the four largest UK-wide parties, several key findings emerge. The first set of findings relate to the broad picture. In short, unsurprisingly, securitizing threat frames dominated. Regarding the preponderance of securitizing messages, in line with expectations, UKIP's messages were the most robust and consistently securitizing with alternative desecuritizing frames being absent. The messages of the Conservative Party ranked second and Labour third. Finally, the Liberal Democrat discourse was less one-sided in terms of the balance between securitizing and desecuritizing frames, although the former were still more prominent. The analysis found that no axes were consistently marginalised, with the salience of each axis (and even dimensions within each axis) varying over time. Yet, on the whole, the



economic and identitarian axes were more prominent in comparison to the securitarian and political.

The second set of findings build upon the first. Alongside the natural broad variation between parties, variation is found within parties. This variation is detected over time, underlining and highlighting intricacies of the constantly evolving party-positioning on the issue of migration. However, there is variation identified (at the same time) across axes and within different dimensions of axes. This demonstrates the complexity of migration discourse and is at the root of the approach taken to the analysis of political elite discourse in this thesis. To date, a detailed analysis of the migration discourse of political elites in the UK across the various dimensions on which migration can be de/securitized is lacking – argued in this thesis to have been potentially masking crucial nuance. The detection of such nuance bolsters the case for utilising the four axes framework to offer an effective means of analysing migration discourse and further unpack the security-migration nexus by ensuring all major dimensions of migration discourse are accounted for. Yet, despite this intricate variation, taking all axes into account the *general* framing of migration (de/securitizing) over the period of analysis for each party remained largely consistent. These findings therefore led to the hypothesis that UKIP supporters would have the most negative attitudes, followed by the Conservatives, Labour and then the Liberal Democrats (H1).

Turning to the analysis of the religious elite discourse, a number of key findings emerge. First, there are striking differences between the two sets of actors as a whole. Polarised to the predominant security threat-centred messages of the political elites, desecuritizing frames dominated in the discourse of the Church and Church elites of both faiths. There is also a divide regarding the degree of focus placed upon the identitarian axis. For the political elite actors, broadly speaking, the economic and identitarian axes were the most pronounced yet the securitarian and political axes were not marginalised to any great extent. For the religious elites however, the identitarian axis received unparalleled attention - even when attention was placed upon the second most frequent axis, the political, identity remained at the bedrock of these messages. This indicates that religious elite actors feel more comfortable discussing migration as an issue rooted in identity/‘morality’ as opposed to one centred upon economics or security. This focus on issues of identity may be underpinned by the cultural capital available to religious elites. Religious elites may (perhaps correctly) view their capital as domain specific and therefore deem themselves more likely to be able to generate framing effects, as well as having a

greater pool of relevant heuristic devices to draw upon, on issues they are deemed an 'authority' by their audience ('morality' rather than security or economics).

Secondly, the discourse analysis of religious elites revealed some slight differences between elite discourses emerging from the Anglican and Catholic faiths. For the Catholic faith, both the 'official line' from Church publications as well as messages from elite Church actors consistently centres on desecuritizing frames. However, the Anglican Church, in the shape of Michael Nazir-Ali and George Carey in particular, had actors that promoted securitizing messages – although it is again necessary to stress that the desecuritizing actors (including the two serving Archbishops during the period of analysis) are more numerous and, most significantly, the 'official' line from Church publications continually promoted desecuritizing non-threat-based messages. Analysis of documents explicitly outlining each Church's 'guiding principles' that drive their response to migration led to the expectation that desecuritizing discourses would be preponderant. More tentatively it was suggested that the disparity in emphasis on an instrumental approach to migration outlined as underpinning each Church's response to the issue (i.e. viewing migration as a means to strengthen the Church) may have left more space for desecuritizing discourses to emerge from within the Anglican faith. The universality of desecuritizing actors/messages from the Catholic Church and Church elites and the small minority of securitizing actors/messages from the Anglican faith bear this out.

A second difference between the two faiths relates to the unequal attention given to the economic axis. For the Anglican faith, this axis was minimal and the securitizing messages from Carey were on balance more robust and numerous than the desecuritizing challenges by other Anglican actors. In contrast, in the messages of the Catholic elites, the economic axis was not marginalised to the same extent. This may further support the notion that elite actors themselves account for domain specific capital. In short, the fact that there are a vastly greater number of economic migrants, particularly from Eastern Europe who are Catholic, means a greater emphasis is afforded to issues that relate to 'their' audience.

There are also several key findings that span the analysis of both sets of elite actors. The first relates to the political axis. Previously, the political axis has been conceived as largely explanatory in that it underpins why the other three axes are utilised to securitize migration. It is theorised that political pressures, namely that there are greater quantities of political capital to gain, foster securitizing discourses. This potential to accrue political

capital may tempt (or even trap) Centrist/Centre-Left parties who would perhaps not enthusiastically use migration in an instrumentalist fashion. The dragging of Centrist/Centre-Left parties' politics and discourse to the Right is labelled in this thesis as the political Catch-22. However, the discourse analysis has uncovered two discourses that are unique to the political axis. These centre on notions of 1) a state's political culture (democracy) being undermined by migrants who hold undemocratic views and 2) the destabilising effects migration can have by providing a platform for far-Right politics to flourish. This finding epitomises the contribution made through a nuanced and holistic analysis of migration discourse. These discursive 'templates'/heuristic devices can be added to the four axes framework to support future research that seeks to unpack the security-migration nexus.

The second key finding relates to the apparent confirmation of Huysmans' (1995, 2002) concerns over the difficulty of trying to desecuritize migration, particularly when utilising objectivist strategies. Desecuritizing frames were consistently saddled with securitizing baggage via both the reinforcement of the discursive link between migration and threat and a reification of the us/them binary that underpins 'successful' securitizing frames. Indeed, it is suggested in this thesis that the problematic nature of desecuritization discourses related to migration may explain the bias shown by religious elites towards the identitarian axis. In short, an overwhelming focus on identity avoids having to counter securitizing discourses on the economic and securitarian axes where objectivist strategies seem the natural choice – strategies which may unintentionally reify these discourses. And equally, the identitarian axis may offer the best platform to use deconstructivist strategies that do not (theoretically) suffer from the same securitizing baggage. This finding, that a plethora of elite actors continue to struggle with the difficulty of desecuritizing migration, is important for those who seek to unpack the security-migration nexus, especially as desecuritization remains under-researched. Yet this finding is perhaps most significant for those with normative agenda who desire to challenge the securitization of migration. It is suggested that experimental methods may offer one avenue to empirically explore the theoretical effects of the securitizing 'baggage' – a notion that will be expanded upon below.

A third key finding relates to the significance placed upon the self-understood identity of the host society. In the discourse of the political elites this centred on the identity of Britain as 'tolerant' – labelled in this thesis as the 'securitization of British tolerance'. In the discourse of the religious elites this centred on the identity of what it

meant to be a ‘good member of the faith’ – dubbed the ‘securitization of Christian traditions’. This finding is important in two respects. First it underlines the necessity for which, for migration to threaten ‘our way of life’, this fundamentally relies upon a self-understanding of what ‘we’ are (Campbell, 1998; Connelly, 1991) – meaning that the battle to define ‘us’ is pivotal. Starting with the securitization of Christian traditions, Carey portrayed migration as threatening said traditions (a securitizing frame) whereas the other Anglican elites, the Anglican Church, the Catholic Church and Catholic Church elites presented migration as necessary to the fulfilment of said traditions (a desecuritizing frame). The fact that one dimension of identity, in this case religious morality or traditions, can be operationalised to support polarised arguments demonstrates the importance of the role played by the framer. Indeed, of direct consequence for the scientific study of religion literature, this forcefully underlines the argument that to understand the effect of religion/religiosity on attitudes it is necessary to move beyond the 3B’s approach that focuses on religion and elements of religiosity in and of themselves, and try and account for the role played by elite cues.

Turning to the securitization of British tolerance, the device is almost universally used in a (theoretically) securitizing sense, where migration is presented as threatening Britain’s tolerant identity by inducing intolerance. The desecuritizing alternative, where British tolerance is framed in a way to challenge securitizing discourses as un-British is almost non-existent. Yet the implications of the securitization of British tolerance are not clear cut. In one respect, constant assertions that Britain is tolerant may be normatively problematic for several reasons. Firstly, migration can be framed as threatening a part of ‘our’ identity. Secondly, it can be used as a protective shield, or even an obfuscating veil, to prevent policy/discourse from being labelled ‘intolerant’. And thirdly, by asserting that Britain is *by nature* tolerant, this may block a reflexive and critical understanding of British migration policy, migration discourse and public attitudes toward migration. However, in another respect the securitization of British tolerance may be normatively useful. Drawing on Katzenstein (1996), consistent claims that the audience (British citizens) are ‘tolerant’ may in fact *constitute* greater levels of tolerant attitudes through socialisation or at least *regulate* attitudes/behaviour by raising the minimal level of tolerance that is deemed socially acceptable. It has again been suggested that this conundrum, and others of its kind, may also be best approached through experimental framing techniques (an idea that will be expanded upon below).

### 7.2.2. From De/Securitizing Moves to De/Securitizations? The Statistical Analyses

A primary argument made in this thesis is that discourse analysis (proscribed by the CS as the ‘obvious method’) alone is not overly well equipped to explore the securitization process in full. The discourse analysis enabled an intricate exploration of central migration frames (securitization and desecuritization moves). However, discourse analysis could not reveal whether these de/securitizing attempts were accepted/rejected by the audience, defined in this thesis as cutting through to impact upon public attitudes. This inability for discourse analysis to connect elite cues to public attitudes underpins the introduction of quantitative statistical techniques. Thus, the thesis sought to analyse the relationship between the migration messages of political and religious elite actors and those who identify with the relevant party/faith (the second research question).

The first part of this analysis examined the relationship between political elite cues and the immigration attitudes of party supporters. Based on the broad findings from Chapter 4, H1 stated that ‘*Attitudes to immigration will range from least to most positive amongst party supporters in the following order: UKIP, Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat.*’ The statistical analyses broadly support the hypothesis: attitudes to immigration *do* range from least to most positive amongst party supporters of UKIP, Conservative, Labour, and Liberal Democrat. The inability to control for the level of exposure to political elite cues (due to limitations in the ESS data set) means that it is difficult to infer the direction of any causal link. In other words, whether elite cues are shaping the attitudes of their audience, whether this relationship is reversed, or whether individuals seek out parties whose cues match their own attitudes is uncertain. Yet, with securitization theory being defined as a top-down elite-driven process, it is theorised that elite cues may be influencing the attitudes of party supporters. Even in absence of this theoretical assumption, the confirmation of the alignment between party cues and the attitudes of supporters is useful in that it confirms that there is nothing strange or unusual going on (such as those with the most positive immigration attitudes supporting the party that is most negative about immigration) – with a failure to detect alignment raising a plethora of questions – and opens up space to explore the direction of this relationship in far greater depth on an empirical basis.

The second part of the quantitative analysis attempted to account for the effects of elite cues more specifically. Having identified the prominence of desecuritizing non-threat messages in the discourse analysis of religious elites in Chapter 5, two further hypotheses were investigated.

*For UK Anglicans, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H2).*

*For UK Catholics, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) will be associated with more positive immigration attitudes (H3).*

Firstly, no support was found for H3. A greater level of church attendance, and subsequent exposure to elite discourse, does not have any statistically significant effects on the attitudes of Catholics in the UK. However, there is consistent support for H2: for Anglicans, greater exposure to elite cues (via church attendance) *is* associated with more positive immigration attitudes. Crucially, these effects hold even after all of the controls identified in the broad immigration attitudes literature have been entered into the model. Equally as important, the two other measures designed to control for any potential effects being rooted in religiosity, Prayer and Religious Feeling, fail to generate any effects. This supports the argument that the attitudinal effects for ‘Attendance’ are rooted in elite cues – there does not appear to be anything extraordinary about religion or religiosity itself which is driving immigration attitudes. The inconsistency of effects for the ‘control faiths’ (Islam and Other) further bolster this argument. Moreover, the discourse analysis of political elites in Chapter 4 portrayed the discursive terrain in the UK as saturated by securitizing discourses. With political elite actors dominating UK migration politics, the desecuritizing messages of the Anglican Church and elite Church actors would have been at a substantial competitive disadvantage. The apparent presence of attitudinal effects from elite cues, accounting for all control variables and the general discursive context, appears to show the Anglican Church and Church elites have a powerful capacity to connect with parts of their flock.

The analysis also demonstrated that, in comparison to atheists, the immigration attitudes of Anglicans were on average more negative. It is suggested this finding may be underpinned by the potentially prejudicial influences that the ‘Belonging’ (instrumental or ‘groupish’) element of religiosity can induce. Subsequently it is conceivable that the desecuritizing non-threat cues from the Anglican Church and Church elites are dampening the negative immigration attitudes fostered through religious affiliation. The above finding also provides further support for the argument that the direction of the causal effect is top-down, in other words, that it is the discourse of the Anglican Church and Church elites that is having an effect on the attitudes of ‘their’ audience, rather than the attitudes of the

audience influencing the Anglican elite cues. If the opposite were true and the Anglican Church and Church elites were tailoring their migration discourse to ‘their’ audience, it would be expected that discourses would be securitizing and threat-centred. However, the reverse is found in the discourse analysis.

To summarise, for both political and religious elites, at a discursive level, the analysis has unearthed a deeper understanding of the rhetorical de/construction of migration as a security threat. In addition, the marriage of discourse analytical and statistical methods to explore the potential *effects* of this discourse has provided a nuanced understanding of the relationship between the cues of key political parties and religious faiths and their respective audiences. Overall, the empirical findings have contributed to a more intricate understanding of the construction of immigration attitudes and the security-migration nexus in the UK (and beyond).

### 7.3 Implications

Attention will now turn to some broader implications that arise from the research design and consequent empirical findings. First, in contrast to previous research that has focused upon the effects of cues from political elites and political parties, the findings in this thesis show that, for specific societal groups, other sets of elite actors can play an important role in shaping immigration attitudes and subsequently the de/construction of security issues. For the broad immigration attitudes literature it has demonstrated the importance of accounting for elite cues in models designed to explore drivers of immigration attitudes. In short, finding a way to incorporate elite discourse in statistical models may be essential to gain a more complete understanding of what is driving immigration attitudes.

The second general implication relates to the consequences the findings have for the scientific study of religion literature. The findings of the thesis (both in terms of the discourse analysis, namely the ‘securitization of Christian traditions’ to try and sway attitudes in alternative directions, and the statistical analyses) support Djupe and Calfano’s (2012) call to account for elite discourse to dissect the confusing and inconsistent findings that have been generated by research that has explored the effects of religiosity on attitudes towards various out-groups, including migrants. The findings broadly support the argument that the previous neglect of elite cues may underpin a considerable degree of the inconsistency in the literature.

The third general implication relates to the contribution made by this thesis to securitization theory. This contribution is threefold. First, the findings from both the discourse analysis and statistical analysis underline the value in widening the analytical net beyond traditional security actors. To build on the point made above, for those with a normative agenda who seek to challenge the securitization of migration, the capacity for non-traditional actors to influence public attitudes and therefore the de/construction of security issues, presents a cause for optimism and caution. Whilst in this instance the discourse of non-traditional actors can be viewed to assist attempts at desecuritization, this is not inevitable. Actors who seek to entrench the securitization of migration further also have the opportunity to have a greater impact on public attitudes. Regarding the findings of this thesis in particular, scholars attempting to understand migration politics – a task of vital importance in light of the substantial rise in anti-immigration rhetoric, policy and attitudes blossoming from the so-called ‘migration crisis’ in Europe – may have to direct significantly more attention to the actions of religious elites and religious institutions. The way in which these actors choose to frame the issue of migration (securitizing threat or desecuritizing non-threat) may be crucial – especially as this thesis has underlined the Janus-face of religious heuristic devices, myths and memes. Once more this seems particularly pressing in states where religious and national identities are tightly intertwined – as in the case in much of Eastern and Southern Europe which has been on the front line of the ‘migration crisis.’

Second, the results garnered from the statistical analyses have demonstrated the effectiveness of disaggregating the audience and engaging with context to identify which audience(s) the actor is primarily trying to engage and is most likely to reach (this also has direct consequences for the broad immigration attitudes literature if elite cues are to be understood). Failure to disaggregate the audience may therefore risk masking the important impact that certain societal actors are having on sub-sets of the population and therefore contribute to the generation of an incomplete understanding of the de/securitization process (and/or the construction of immigration attitudes).

Lastly, a key argument made in this thesis is that combining quantitative methods with discourse analysis can be a valuable addition to securitization research as a way of identifying whether or not the de/securitizing messages of elites have been accepted/rejected. The findings of this thesis have demonstrated the fruitful nature of adopting such a mixed methods approach, enabling future studies to move beyond an



analysis of de/securitizing attempts (discursive interventions) and develop a more comprehensive understanding of the securitization process in its entirety.

#### **7.4 As One Door Closes... Limitations and Avenues for Further Research**

There are five potential limitations that are identified in this thesis. These centre on: the use of church attendance as a proxy for exposure to religious elite cues; the selection of political and religious elites; broader limitations to quantitative research; the incapacity to fully analyse the effects of political elite cues; and last, the challenge of interpreting the effects of certain discourses, most pertinent being objectivist desecuritizing moves. Yet, the identification of such limitations opens up several avenues for future research. Each will be addressed in turn.

The first potential limitation of the thesis relates to the fact that, in light of the constraints of the ESS data set, church attendance was utilised to account for exposure to religious elite cues. The decision to utilise church attendance as a proxy drew from a handful of studies that had previously attempted to analyse the effects of religious elite discourses (see Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010; Knoll, 2009). To better ensure church attendance was capturing elite cues, an attempt was made to control for the effects of religion/religiosity in and of itself, by including two other measures of religiosity (Prayer and Religious Feeling) in the model. This provided a solid basis to assume that church attendance is in fact capturing exposure to the cues of elite religious actors – whilst previous research has demonstrated this to be the case (Wald et al., 1988). Yet, it is not possible to be certain. Future research may try and overcome this challenge by designing a survey that contains questions explicitly related to whether religious services address migration and whether messages are generally positive/negative. Equally, further qualitative analysis, most likely in the form of elite interviews with bishops and ministers or observations of strategically selected churches may provide a deeper insight into the content of church attendance-based cues.

The first limitation is linked to the second: whilst a thorough review of online archives and media outlets was conducted in order to obtain as full a range of migration discourse from both faiths analysed in the thesis, inevitably the range of sources and actors analysed is not exhaustive. The same is true for the analysis of political elite discourse. In trying to explore the central migration messages of the four-largest UK wide parties and several religious faiths, this breadth naturally hindered depth. Whilst it is argued that the depth was sufficient for the purpose of the thesis – in particular to establish prevailing

frames (securitizing or desecuritizing) in order to explore the relationship and effects of elite discourse on public attitudes – a deeper analysis including more actors would have enabled more nuance to be extracted from migration discourse. For the religious elites, expanding the analysis to include more faiths (for example, the Church of Scotland) and/or more junior bishops/church figures may be rewarding. For the political elite discourse, including more parties (for example the SNP, the Greens) and/or to relevant ministers, the wider Cabinet or powerful backbenchers may also be instructive. Both avenues offer a plethora of further opportunities to tease out the intricacies of the attempts to de/construct migration as a threat in the UK and subsequently gain a more holistic understanding of the security-migration nexus.

A third potential limitation is also related to constraints within the data set – and speaks to more general issues in quantitative research. All of the relevant controls identified in the broad immigration attitudes literature were introduced to try to isolate church attendance and subsequently the effects of elite cues. However, it is possible that some factors which the model was unable to account for – psychological dispositions, mood when answering the survey and so on – were having an effect on results. However, whilst this kind of factor is impossible to control for, the substantial sample size should offer relatively robust protection against such spurious influences.

A fourth limitation relates to the inability of this thesis to control for exposure to political elite cues. As such, the thesis was forced to rely upon the CS's theoretical assumption of the direction of causal influence being top-down. Whilst this theoretical premise has a plethora of previous support, exploring this on an empirical basis with regards to the UK case is a necessary next step. Limitations in the data may therefore create a need to introduce questions that are tailored to explicitly tap into exposure to political elite cues across various platforms, spanning both old and new media. The alignment found in this thesis at minimal indicates that the relationship between party cues and party supporters is roughly as expected. Yet, future research that sought to better understand the causal direction of the relationship would be highly valuable in further dissecting drivers of public opinion and the security-migration nexus.

A fifth limitation relates to the difficulty of interpreting the likely effects of certain discourses, especially those designed to desecuritize migration using the objectivist strategy. Discourses attempting to emphasise the falsity of certain claims (typical examples being 'migrants contribute more in taxes than they take out in benefits' or 'migrants are no

more likely to commit a non-migration related crime than those of the host population') are theorised to carry securitizing 'baggage' through reinforcing the discursive link between migration and 'threat' and operating with divisive rhetoric based upon a conflictual notion of us and them. Thus whilst this thesis has followed convention and interpreted objectivist desecuritizing attempts as somewhat problematic, this is largely a theoretical rather than empirical claim. It has been suggested that experimental methods may provide a route to empirically explore the theoretical effects of the securitizing 'baggage'. Three questions naturally present themselves:

- 1) Are the theorised securitizing discursive links between migration and threat as problematic as Huysmans fears? (In short, does the link between migration and threat prevent empirically-based 'objective' claims being effective as a desecuritizing tool or not?)
- 2) Are deconstructivist strategies as effective as theoretically anticipated? (In other words, is the best strategy to desecuritize migration rooted in identity deconstruction as Huysmans suggests?)
- 3) Is a combination of both strategies the most effective or not? (More simply, does combining strategies make for a powerful rhetorical device or does the inclusion of objectivist claims, with their links between migration and threat, undermine the desecuritizing potential of identity deconstruction?)

Experimental methods have their limitations and results can be criticised for their generalisability and 'realism'. Yet, if designed diligently and the political context of the society accounted for (for example, acknowledging that certain types of actors/cultural capital may be more or less likely to generate framing effects across place and time; deconstructivist strategies may be more or less effective across place and time; the audience must be disaggregated to account for elite impact on 'their' audience etc.), experimental techniques could be a valuable analytical tool (see Druckman et al., 2011; Kittel et al. 2012; Morton and Williams, 2010). For those with a normative agenda that seek to challenge the securitization of migration, the findings from experimental research may provide highly useful ammunition for actors inside and outside of the academy. However, the value of experimental techniques goes beyond those with a normative agenda. Results may buttress or challenge theoretical assumptions about the likely de/securitizing effects of certain discursive approaches to migration. Thus, to simply gain a

more comprehensive and precise understanding of the security-migration nexus, experimental techniques may be necessary to provide key insights.

A final point is not centred on a limitation but relates solely to an opportunity. The focus on a non-traditional set of societal (security) actors, and the apparent demonstration that they are able to play an important role in the shaping of public attitudes and therefore in the de/construction of security issues, creates ample opportunities for further research. Elite actors who represent organisations with strong institutional frameworks which are integral to identity (like religion) may also have the potential to influence the attitudes of ‘their’ followers. Highly influential football clubs who enjoy the ‘religious’ support of tens of thousands or even millions seem like prime candidates that have to this point been ignored. (Football clubs might be a particularly fruitful case for further exploration as ‘attendance’ may also offer a useful proxy for exposure to elite cues.)

Regarding the issue of migration, certain football clubs (or at least supporters groups integral to football clubs) have embraced certain initiatives such as ‘Refugees Welcome’, whilst on the other side clubs through the culture of their ‘ultras’ have been associated with racist, xenophobic and fascist politics<sup>94</sup>. Are these discourses constituting or regulating the attitudes of those who are committed to these clubs? It is arguably highly plausible. Of course this influence is not restricted to the issue of migration and may be exerted over a range of political and security issues. To give just one non-migration related example, the deep entanglement between certain football clubs and regional, national or ethnic identities, provides a solid platform for clubs to impact upon attitudes regarding critical constitutional questions – Glasgow Rangers Football Club and their historically pro-British stance and the Scottish referendum campaign or F.C Barcelona and their symbolic stance as the Catalan ‘national’ football team and the question of Catalanian independence are two pertinent examples. Have the messages from these clubs/elites from said clubs on these issues been affecting the attitudes of their supporters? Again, it is a very feasible proposition.

---

<sup>94</sup> For example, in 2015 there was a coordinated campaign in the German Bundesliga where several supporters groups within a series of top clubs displayed ‘Refugees Welcome’ banners at games. Borussia Dortmund even invited 220 recently arrived refugees to watch their Europa League fixture against the Norwegian side Odds Balkclubb. A banner bearing the same message has appeared in stadiums across the UK as well as by supporters of the Scottish national football team prior to their fixture with Germany in September of 2015. In contrast, during the same period supporters of Lyon and Maccabi Tel Aviv have displayed ‘Refugees not Welcome’ banners.

Overall, the crux of the message is that in certain contexts and for certain issues, the analytical net may have to be widened and the concept of ‘public opinion’ disaggregated somewhat to account for the effects of elite cues – and indeed this is the central argument made in this thesis. Failure to do so, it is argued, may inhibit the capacity to develop a full understanding of what is shaping immigration attitudes and therefore the de/construction of the security-migration nexus – although this is true across the spectrum of political and security issues – both inside and outside of the academy. With migration poised to remain one of the most pressing issues in politics and international relations, failure on this front may have severe consequences.

## Appendix

### Survey Data: Questions and Scales

All questions are taken from the European Social Survey (ESS) and are listed in order of appearance.

**Immigration Attitudes Index:** An index was created from the following three questions. ‘Would you say it is generally bad or good for [country]’s economy that people come to live here from other countries?’ (0 = bad for the economy; 10 = good for the economy) [Rounds 3-5 B38; Rounds 6-7 B32]. ‘Would you say that [country]’s cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?’ (0 = cultural life undermined; 10 = cultural life enriched) [Rounds 3-5 B39; Rounds 6-7 B33]. ‘Is [country] made a worse or a better place to live by people coming to live here from other countries?’ (0 = worse place to live; 10 = better place to live) [Rounds 3-5 B408; Rounds 6-7 B33].

**Frequency of Church Attendance:** ‘Apart from special occasions such as weddings and funerals, about how often do you attend religious services nowadays?’ [Original coding reversed] (1 = never; 2 = less often; 3 = once a week; 4 = only on special holy days; 5 = at least once a month; 6 = more than once a week; 7 = every day) [Rounds 3-5 C22; Rounds 6-7 C14].

**Frequency of Prayer:** ‘Apart from when you are at religious services, how often, if at all, do you pray?’ [Original coding reversed] (1 = never; 2 = less Often; 3 = once a week; 4 = only on special holy days; 5 = at least once a month; 6 = more than once a week; 7 = every day) [Rounds 3-5 C23; Rounds 6-7 C15].

**Religious Feeling:** ‘Regardless of whether you belong to a particular religion, how religious would you say you are?’ (0 = not at all religious; 10 = very religious) [Rounds 3-5 C21; Rounds 6-7 C13].

**Party ID:** Two variables were merged due to different coding in survey rounds. ‘Which one [party feeling closest to]?’ [Rounds 4-5 B20bGB; Rounds 6-7 B18bGB].

**Gender:** Coded by interviewer [F21].

**Age:** ‘In what year were you born?’ [F31a].

**Unemployment:** The variable was constructed by merging the two questions related to unemployment. ‘Using this card, which of these descriptions applies to what you have been doing for the last 7 days?’ Unemployed and actively looking for a job (0 = not marked; 1 = marked) ‘Using this card, which of these descriptions applies to what you have been doing for the last 7 days?’ Unemployed, wanting a job but not actively looking for a job (0 = not marked; 1 = marked) [Round 4 F8a, Rounds 5-7 F17a].

**Citizenship:** ‘Are you a citizen of [country]?’ [Rounds 4-5 C26; Rounds 6-7 C18].

**Education:** ‘What is the highest level of education you have achieved?’ (0 = not possible to harmonise into 5-level ISCED; 1 = less than lower secondary education (ISCED 0-1); 2 = lower secondary education completed (ISCED 2); 3 = upper secondary education completed (ISCED 3); 4 = post-secondary non-tertiary education completed (ISCED 4); 5 = tertiary education completed (ISCED 5-6). [Round 4 F6; Rounds 5-7 F15].

**Social Trust:** An index was created from the following three questions. ‘Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?’ (0 you can’t be too careful; 10 = most people can be trusted) [Rounds 4-5 A8; Rounds 6-7 A3]. ‘Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?’ (0 = most people try to take advantage of me; 10 = most people try to be fair) [Rounds 4-5 A9; Rounds 6-7 A4]. ‘Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?’ (0 = people mostly look out for themselves; 10 = people mostly try to be helpful) [Rounds 4-5 A10; Rounds 6-7 A5].

**Life Satisfaction:** ‘All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays?’ (0 = extremely dissatisfied; 10 = extremely satisfied) [Rounds 4-5 B24; Rounds 6-7 B20].

**Country-Level Economic Satisfaction:** ‘On the whole how satisfied are you with the present state of the economy in [country]?’ (0 = extremely dissatisfied; 10 = extremely satisfied) [Rounds 4-5 B25; Rounds 6-7 B21].

**Feeling about Household Income:** ‘Which of the descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel about your household’s income nowadays?’ (1 = living comfortably on present income; 2 = coping on present income; 3 = difficult on present income; 4 = very difficult on present income) [Round 4 F33; Rounds 5-7 F42].

**Political Ideology:** ‘In politics people sometimes talk of “left” and “right”. Using this card, where would you place yourself on this scale?’ (0 = Left; 10 = Right) [Rounds 4-5 B23, 6-7 B19].

**Political Awareness:** Two questions were used. ‘On an average weekday, how much of your time watching television is spent watching news or programmes about politics and current affairs?’ (0 = no time at all; 1 = less than 0,5 hour; 2 = 0,5 hour to 1 hour; 3 = more than 1 hour, up to 1,5 hours; 4 = more than 1,5 hours, up to 2 hours; 5 = more than 2 hours, up to 2,5 hours; 6 = more than 2,5 hours, up to 3 hours; 7 = more than 3 hours) [A2]. ‘How interested would you say you are in politics?’ [Original coding reversed] (1 = not at all interested; 2 = hardly interested; 3 = quite interested; 4 = very interested) [B1].

**Contact:** ‘Do you have any close friends who are of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people?’ IF YES, is that several or a few? (Yes, several = 1; Yes, a few = 2; No, none at all = 3) [D19].

## Tables from Chapter 6: Bivariate and Multivariate Analyses

Table 6.1: Cross-National Bivariate Correlations, Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7): Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

Country	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
	Pearson Correlations	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
Austria	0.016	3793	-0.002	3677	0.028	3787
Belgium	.061**	8736	-0.002	8721	.035**	8734
Bulgaria	0.018	5921	0.012	5821	.050**	5907
Switzerland	-.054**	7762	-.069**	7701	-0.009	7732
Cyprus	-.110**	4215	-.140**	4106	-.099**	4195
Czech Republic	.056**	7503	.028*	7512	.071**	7421
Germany	.063**	13931	.051**	13813	.091**	13922
Denmark	0.014	7472	0.016	7438	-0.008	7463
Estonia	.028*	8394	.031**	8349	.095**	8361
Spain	-.060**	9285	-.071**	9248	-.082**	9281
Finland	.041**	10013	0.015	9981	.052**	10003
France	-0.006	9451	-0.004	9431	-0.017	9447
United Kingdom	.144**	11168	.060**	11128	.085**	11128
Greece	-.149**	4637	-.192**	4604	-.182**	4628
Croatia	-0.014	2707	-.061**	2643	-0.018	2689
Hungary	.025*	6940	-.029*	6850	.027*	6933
Ireland	-.064**	10608	-.094**	10575	-.024*	10598
Israel	-.116**	2193	-.149**	2199	-.162**	2184
Iceland	-0.07	684	-0.062	682	-.077*	684
Italy	-.112**	907	-.086**	901	-.150**	905
Lithuania	-0.017	4817	-.054**	4690	0.004	4792
Netherlands	0.018	8838	-0.013	8823	0.019	8820
Norway	0.013	7745	-0.011	7706	0.013	7735
Poland	-.090**	7290	-.105**	7080	-.077**	7284
Portugal	-.068**	8520	-.070**	8298	-.045**	8556
Russia	.044**	8077	0	7798	.082**	8220
Sweden	.038**	8395	0.017	8383	.062**	8377
Slovenia	-.118**	6009	-.063**	5950	-0.017	5878
Slovakia	-.042**	6270	-.046**	6254	-0.002	6242
Turkey	-0.031	2057	-.050*	2057	-.094**	2061
Ukraine	.041**	5779	0.019	5536	.053**	5816
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)						
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)						

Table 6.2: Cross-National Bivariate Correlations, Split by Survey Round: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

Country	ESS Round	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
		Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
Austria	3	-0.035	2130	-0.037	2053	-0.005	2128
	7	.085**	1663	0.045	1624	.082**	1659
Belgium	3	0.019	1750	-0.044	1747	-0.031	1749
	4	0.004	1716	-0.029	1711	-0.035	1716
	5	.087**	1680	0.003	1680	.063**	1679
	6	.116**	1845	0.021	1842	.100**	1845
	7	.071**	1745	0.026	1741	.057*	1745
	3	0.032	897	0.01	871	0.023	892
	4	0.025	1566	0.022	1537	0.037	1566
	5	-0.009	1799	0.016	1772	.063**	1792
	6	0.047	1659	0.016	1641	.080**	1657
	3	-.102**	1726	-.106**	1709	-0.014	1716
	4	-0.037	1696	-.076**	1684	-0.041	1688
	5	-0.05	1447	-.075**	1439	-0.028	1447
	6	-0.022	1417	-0.05	1407	0.011	1408
	7	-0.046	1476	-0.021	1462	0.04	1473
Cyprus	3	-.131**	947	-.163**	913	-.116**	952
	4	-.071*	1172	-.085**	1158	-.072*	1173
	5	-.162**	1016	-.068*	972	-0.053	993
	6	-.105**	1080	-.178**	1063	-.096**	1077
Czech Republic	4	.066**	1791	0.017	1785	.084**	1742
	5	.088**	2136	.054*	2124	.061**	2116
	6	0.028	1656	0.018	1683	.105**	1667
	7	.046*	1920	0.029	1920	0.036	1896
Germany	3	.046*	2685	0.031	2660	.070**	2677
	4	.087**	2605	.066**	2574	.112**	2606
	5	.071**	2819	.048*	2796	.092**	2818
	6	.063**	2861	.048*	2842	.076**	2860
	7	.060**	2961	.046*	2941	.091**	2961
Denmark	3	0.005	1399	-0.011	1389	-0.022	1398
	4	0	1539	-0.014	1531	-.058*	1537
	5	0.019	1507	0.039	1501	-0.007	1505
	6	.054*	1575	0.042	1573	0.04	1572
	7	-0.004	1452	0.024	1444	-0.011	1451
Estonia	3	0.018	1267	0.005	1257	.097**	1259
	4	0.005	1487	0.022	1478	.107**	1478
	5	.080**	1612	.073**	1612	.130**	1608
	6	0	2130	0.029	2118	.084**	2123
	7	0.036	1898	0.003	1884	.073**	1893
	3	-.071**	1696	-.100**	1688	-.097**	1700



	4	-.050*	2309	0	2294	-0.032	2309
	5	-.055*	1778	-.097**	1774	-.110**	1774
	6	-.059*	1793	-.078**	1792	-.083**	1790
	7	-.071**	1709	-.103**	1700	-.111**	1708
Finland	3	0.039	1848	-0.005	1841	.060*	1843
	4	0.028	2155	0.031	2149	.069**	2153
	5	.053*	1832	0.043	1827	.072**	1833
	6	0.034	2151	0.002	2144	0.028	2148
	7	.056*	2027	0.005	0.005	0.037	2026
France	3	0.004	1949	0.024	1947	-0.017	1950
	4	-0.013	2006	-0.029	1998	-.049*	2003
	5	-0.001	1699	-0.005	1696	-0.017	1696
	6	-0.009	1931	-0.016	1926	-0.021	1933
	7	-0.01	1866	0.002	0.002	0.008	1865
United Kingdom	3	.114**	2296	0.037	2285	.069**	2292
	4	.191**	2262	.094**	2255	.110**	2256
	5	.143**	2281	.065**	2271	.109**	2272
	6	.113**	2156	0.031	2148	.063**	2137
	7	.154**	2173	.076**	2169	.079**	2171
Greece	4	-.077**	2015	-.151**	1987	-.148**	2014
	5	-.197**	2622	-.216**	2617	-.215**	2614
Croatia	4	-.065*	1282	-.088**	1242	-.058*	1268
	5	0.031	1425	-0.036	1401	0.02	1421
Hungary	3	-0.023	1236	-.091**	1228	-.075**	1225
	4	0.01	1270	-0.002	1250	-0.002	1269
	5	.060*	1322	0	1311	0.053	1319
	6	.057*	1683	-0.032	1658	.074**	1695
	7	0.042	1429	0.011	1403	.079**	1425
Ireland	3	-.075**	1673	-.081**	1661	-0.012	1666
	4	-.064**	1732	-.147**	1732	-.091**	1728
	5	-.081**	2453	-.107**	2450	0.001	2452
	6	-.071**	2524	-.097**	2517	-.052**	2521
	7	-.070**	2226	-.090**	2215	-0.028	2231
Israel	7	-.116**	2193	-.149**	2199	-.162**	2184
Iceland	6	-0.07	684	-0.062	682	-.077*	684
Italy	6	-.112**	907	-.086**	901	-.150**	905
Lithuania	5	-0.029	1300	-0.051	1292	0.027	1294
	6	-0.04	1719	-.062*	1660	-0.007	1710
	7	0.011	1798	-0.04	1738	0.002	1788
Netherlands	3	-0.007	1800	-0.004	1796	0.039	1795
	4	0.026	1708	-0.016	1703	-0.017	1703
	5	0.004	1742	-0.023	1741	0.002	1739
	6	0.009	1761	-0.032	1759	0.028	1759
	7	.054*	1827	0.006	1824	0.031	1824
Norway	3	0.026	1711	-0.033	1701	-0.006	1707

	4	-0.005	1522	-0.006	1515	-0.002	1523
	5	0.02	1516	-0.032	1508	0.01	1512
	6	0.014	1591	0.048	1585	.051*	1591
	7	0.006	1405	-0.025	1397	0.013	1402
Poland	3	-.067**	1515	-.081**	1474	-.073**	1515
	4	-.113**	1383	-.099**	1341	-.080**	1383
	5	-.088**	1469	-.147**	1421	-.090**	1471
	6	-.113**	1589	-.121**	1551	-.084**	1586
	7	-.069*	1334	-.095**	1293	-.059*	1329
Portugal	3	-.083**	1727	-.063*	1660	-.063**	1709
	4	-.142**	1898	-.116**	1873	-.079**	1922
	5	1	1847	-.085**	1774	-.107**	1867
	6	-0.021	1881	-0.019	1831	0.025	1890
	7	-0.056	1167	-.130**	1160	-.072*	1168
Russia	3	.053*	1881	0.003	1823	.070**	1907
	4	0.02	1976	-0.038	1911	0.041	2043
	5	0.032	2138	0.019	2056	.119**	2172
	6	.056*	2082	0.003	2008	.081**	2098
Sweden	3	0.045	1777	0.034	1774	.074**	1771
	4	0.022	1726	0.012	1725	.067**	1722
	5	0.028	1412	0	1411	0.027	1411
	6	.083**	1763	.048*	1762	.093**	1759
	7	0.01	1717	-0.007	1711	.052*	1714
Slovenia	3	-.128**	1323	-.087**	1312	0	1310
	4	-.149**	1156	-.059*	1139	-0.038	1145
	5	-0.048	1293	-0.025	1276	0.008	1198
	6	-.116**	1148	-0.057	1142	-0.02	1142
	7	-.143**	1089	-.078*	1081	-0.034	1083
Slovakia	3	-0.022	1520	-0.031	1517	0.015	1519
	4	-.062*	1529	-0.047	1524	-0.04	1526
	5	-0.04	1564	-.075**	1563	0.012	1548
	6	-0.031	1657	-0.02	1650	0.016	1649
Turkey	4	-0.031	2057	-.050*	2057	-.094**	2061
Ukraine	3	0.002	1476	0.012	1436	-0.004	1495
	4	0.049	1312	.075**	1238	.077**	1321
	5	0.051	1411	-0.015	1364	.057*	1414
	6	.059*	1580	0.019	1498	.092**	1586

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 6.3: UK Bivariate Correlations, Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Denomination: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

Denomination	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
Roman Catholic	.110**	868	0.006	867	.117**	863
Church of England / Anglican	.239**	2067	.098**	2054	.150**	2062
Islam / Muslim	0.115	227	0.13	228	.200**	228
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)						

Table 4: UK Bivariate Correlations, Split by Round, Split by Denomination: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

ESS Round	Denomination	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
		Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
4	Roman Catholic	.163*	215	0.092	215	.139*	215
	Church of England / Anglican	.288**	545	.172**	543	.212**	543
	Islam / Muslim	0.225	57	0.127	57	.415**	57
5	Roman Catholic	0.107	194	-0.016	194	0.136	191
	Church of England / Anglican	.181**	489	0.064	485	.092*	488
	Islam / Muslim	0.182	53	0.132	54	0.043	54
6	Roman Catholic	0.036	232	-0.068	231	0.078	231
	Church of England / Anglican	.196**	507	0.031	503	.091*	504
	Islam / Muslim	-0.035	51	0.193	51	.316*	51
7	Roman Catholic	.133*	227	0.017	227	.136*	226
	Church of England / Anglican	.277**	526	.110*	523	.189**	527
	Islam / Muslim	0.069	66	0.087	66	0.039	66
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)							
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)							

Table 6.5: UK Bivariate Correlations, Cumulative (ESS Rounds 3-7), Split by Citizenship: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

Citizen of country	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
Yes	.141**	10690	.048**	10652	.080**	10653
No	-.148**	476	-0.055	-0.055	-0.062	473
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)						



Table 6.8: UK Bivariate Correlations, Split by Survey Round, Split by Citizenship, Split by Denomination: Immigration Attitudes Index and Religiosity.

ESS Round	Citizen of country	Denomination	Frequency of Attendance		Frequency of Prayer		Religious Feeling	
			Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N	Pearson Correlation	N
4	Yes	Roman Catholic	.165*	188	0.097	188	0.138	188
		Church of England / Anglican	.289**	538	.157**	536	.212**	536
		Islam / Muslim	.284*	51	0.159	51	.452**	51
	No	Roman Catholic	-0.045	27	-0.091	27	0.071	27
		Church of England / Anglican	-0.142	7	0.725	7	1	7
		Islam / Muslim	-0.33	6	0.044	6	0.503	6
5	Yes	Roman Catholic	0.109	166	-0.034	166	0.146	164
		Church of England / Anglican	.180**	483	0.062	479	.099*	482
		Islam / Muslim	0.129	44	-0.009	45	-0.032	45
	No	Roman Catholic	0.071	28	-0.011	28	0.018	27
		Church of England / Anglican	-0.457	6	-0.131	6	-0.783	6
		Islam / Muslim	0.448	9	.729*	9	0.467	9
6	Yes	Roman Catholic	0.05	212	-0.048	211	0.075	211
		Church of England / Anglican	.193**	499	0.018	495	1	0.088
		Islam / Muslim	0.072	44	0.201	44	.323*	44
	No	Roman Catholic	0.018	20	0.099	20	0.187	20
		Church of England / Anglican	-0.38	7	-0.106	7	0.371	7
		Islam / Muslim	-.907**	7	-0.259	7	0.031	7
7	Yes	Roman Catholic	.148*	197	0.032	197	.174*	196
		Church of England / Anglican	.270**	518	.101*	515	.190**	519
		Islam / Muslim	0.185	56	0.1	56	0.028	56
	No	Roman Catholic	-0.24	30	-0.283	30	-.413*	30
		Church of England / Anglican	-0.042	8	0.372	8	-0.033	8
		Islam / Muslim	-.748*	10	-0.013	10	0.098	10
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)								
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)								

Table 6.9: Regression to Explore Political Elite Discourse (Round 7 without Contact)

Variable	Round 4			Round 5			Round 6			Round 7		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Labour</b>	0.889*** (-0.162)	0.79*** (-0.155)	0.492*** (-0.154)	0.478** (-0.151)	0.428** (-0.142)	0.416 ** (-0.144)	0.329 (-0.171)	0.326* (-0.162)	0.368* (-0.164)	0.54*** (-0.167)	0.625*** (-0.159)	0.597*** (-0.162)
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	1.193*** (-0.226)	1.03*** (-0.214)	0.838*** (-0.201)	1.034*** (-0.214)	0.987*** (-0.199)	0.819*** (-0.189)	1.196*** (-0.285)	0.995*** (-0.268)	0.808*** (-0.248)	1.515*** (-0.311)	1.285*** (-0.291)	1.108*** (-0.268)
<b>UKIP</b>	-0.599 (-0.41)	-0.937* (-0.389)	-0.624 (-0.357)	-2.02*** (-0.455)	-1.923*** (-0.423)	-1.277*** (-0.395)	-0.983** (-0.352)	-0.878** (-0.329)	-0.685* (-0.301)	-2.127*** (-0.222)	-1.872*** (-0.209)	-1.448*** (-0.194)
<b>Green</b>	1.62*** (-0.389)	1.246*** (-0.371)	1.178*** (-0.345)	1.27** (-0.43)	1.037** (-0.4)	0.839* (-0.377)	1.399** (-0.517)	0.77 (-0.489)	0.225 (-0.45)	1.875*** (-0.349)	1.591*** (-0.33)	1.436*** (-0.304)
<b>SNP</b>	-0.496 (-0.511)	-0.626 (-0.485)	-0.241 (-0.444)	0.391 (-0.569)	0.24 (-0.531)	0.298 (-0.501)	0.655 (-0.429)	0.556 (-0.404)	0.547 (-0.37)	0.868* (-0.349)	0.857** (-0.33)	0.857** (-0.306)
<b>Plaid Cymru</b>	-1.005 (-0.796)	-0.959 (-0.751)	-0.926 (-0.684)	1.099 (-0.825)	0.422 (-0.772)	-0.073 (-0.721)	0.333 (-0.574)	0.12 (-0.538)	-0.174 (-0.492)	1.404 (-1.115)	0.617 (-1.042)	0.318 (-0.949)
<b>Other Party</b>	1.145 (-0.444)	0.98* (-0.431)	0.625 (-0.396)	0.829 (-0.485)	0.774 (-0.452)	0.422 (-0.421)	-0.413 (-0.53)	-0.268 (-0.499)	-0.541 (-0.454)	0.936* (-0.417)	0.916* (-0.394)	1.051** (-0.362)
<b>No Party</b>	0.205 (-0.135)	0.093 (-0.135)	0.25 (-0.132)	-0.159 (-0.129)	-0.183 (-0.126)	0.107 (-0.125)	0.03 (-0.15)	-0.101 (-0.148)	0.085 (-0.142)	-0.093 (-0.143)	-0.105 (-0.14)	0.19 (-0.136)
<b>Gender</b>		-0.334*** (-0.095)	-0.245** (-0.088)		-0.212* (90.091)	-0.14 (-0.086)		-0.225* (-0.099)	-0.188* (-0.092)		-0.463*** (-0.096)	-0.412*** (-0.09)
<b>Unemployed</b>		-0.039 (-0.224)	0.235 (-0.206)		-0.346 (-0.196)	0.087 (-0.188)		0.04 (-0.205)	0.319 (-0.19)		0.067 (-0.232)	0.249 (-0.212)
<b>Age</b>		-0.006* (-0.003)	-0.014*** (-0.003)		-0.007* (-0.003)	-0.011*** (-0.003)		-0.014*** (-0.003)	-0.024*** (-0.003)		-0.003 (-0.003)	-0.009** (-0.003)
<b>Non-Citizen</b>		1.115*** (-0.249)	0.731*** (-0.228)		1.381*** (-0.237)	1.125*** (-0.222)		1.079*** (-0.274)	0.734** (-0.25)		1.353*** (-0.228)	0.946*** (-0.209)
<b>Education</b>		0.316*** (-0.028)	0.196*** (-0.028)		0.408*** (-0.03)	0.288*** (-0.03)		0.379*** (-0.033)	0.229*** (-0.032)		0.425*** (-0.034)	0.26*** (-0.033)
<b>Anglican</b>		-0.176 (-0.121)	-0.383** (-0.122)		-0.193 (-0.119)	-0.408*** (-0.125)		0.17 (-0.128)	-0.087 (-0.129)		-0.175 (-0.124)	-0.52*** (-0.128)
<b>Roman Catholic</b>		0.237 (-0.17)	-0.101 (-0.175)		0.136 (-0.166)	-0.045 (-0.173)		-0.044 (-0.165)	-0.328 (-0.171)		0.406* (-0.161)	-0.06 (-0.169)
<b>Islam/Muslim</b>		2.277*** (-0.3)	1.43*** (-0.295)		1.32*** (-0.297)	0.955*** (-0.299)		1.278*** (-0.341)	0.762* (-0.333)		0.888** (-0.288)	0.656* (-0.286)
<b>Other Religion</b>		0.22 (-0.161)	-0.367* (-0.168)		0.479*** (-0.145)	0.208 (-0.156)		0.65*** (-0.157)	0.174 (-0.168)		0.058 (-0.17)	-0.444* (-0.176)

<b>Social Trust</b>			0.252*** (-0.027)			0.218*** (-0.028)			0.341*** (-0.031)			0.265*** (-0.027)
<b>Life Satisfaction</b>			0.041 (-0.022)			0.07** (-0.023)			0.022 (-0.025)			0.059* (-0.023)
<b>Country Eco Satisfaction</b>			0.219*** (-0.022)			0.159*** (-0.023)			0.21*** (-0.024)			0.178*** (-0.023)
<b>HH Income Satisfaction</b>			-0.129* (-0.059)			-0.144* (-0.058)			-0.206*** (-0.061)			-0.068 (-0.061)
<b>Left-Right Ideology</b>			-0.074** (-0.026)			-0.092*** (-0.027)			-0.108*** (-0.028)			-0.166*** (-0.026)
<b>Political TV Consumption</b>			0.053 (-0.03)			0.026 (-0.032)			0.094** (-0.034)			-0.078* (-0.031)
<b>Interest in Politics</b>			0.379*** (-0.054)			0.409*** (-0.052)			0.31*** (-0.055)			0.44*** (-0.053)
<b>Church Attendance</b>			0.144*** (-0.038)			0.052 (-0.041)			0.108* (-0.043)			0.141*** (-0.041)
<b>Frequency of Prayer</b>			0.024 (-0.026)			-0.017 (-0.026)			0.014 (-0.028)			-0.019 (-0.027)
<b>Religious Feeling</b>			0.017 (-0.022)			0.033 (-0.022)			0.006 (-0.023)			0.039 (-0.022)
<b>Adj R2</b>	0.035	0.144	0.293	0.038	0.179	0.292	0.019	0.144	0.303	0.104	0.224	0.366
<b>Constant</b>	4.213*** (-0.116)	3.68*** (-0.238)	1.3*** (-0.385)	4.52*** (-0.108)	3.671*** (-0.233)	1.41*** (-0.38)	4.501*** (-0.131)	4.091*** (-0.263)	1.933*** (-0.404)	4.763*** (-0.122)	3.759*** (-0.263)	1.368*** (-0.403)
<b>N</b>	2065			2028			1870			1906		

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male; Religious Denomination: Atheist; Contact = No friends of different race/ethnicity

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.9 Continued: (Contact included in Round 7)

Variable	Round 7 (with contact)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b>Labour</b>	0.54*** (-0.167)	0.625*** (-0.159)	0.636*** -0.16
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	1.515*** (-0.311)	1.285*** (-0.291)	1.17*** -0.266
<b>UKIP</b>	-2.127*** (-0.222)	-1.872*** (-0.209)	-1.371*** -0.192
<b>Green</b>	1.875*** (-0.349)	1.591*** (-0.33)	1.403*** -0.301
<b>SNP</b>	0.868* (-0.349)	0.857** (-0.33)	0.98*** -0.304
<b>Plaid Cymru</b>	1.404 (-1.115)	0.617 (-1.042)	0.409 -0.94
<b>Other Party</b>	0.936* (-0.417)	0.916* (-0.394)	1.203*** -0.359
<b>No Party</b>	-0.093 (-0.143)	-0.105 (-0.14)	0.252 -0.135
<b>Gender</b>		-0.463*** (-0.096)	-0.381*** -0.089
<b>Unemployed</b>		0.067 (-0.232)	0.233 -0.21
<b>Age</b>		-0.003 (-0.003)	-0.007* -0.003
<b>Non-Citizen</b>		1.353*** (-0.228)	0.892*** -0.208
<b>Education</b>		0.425*** (-0.034)	0.227*** -0.033
<b>Anglican</b>		-0.175 (-0.124)	-0.482*** -0.127
<b>Roman Catholic</b>		0.406* (-0.161)	-0.049 -0.167
<b>Islam/Muslim</b>		0.888** (-0.288)	0.543 -0.284
<b>Other Religion</b>		0.058 (-0.17)	-0.439* (-0.175)
<b>Social Trust</b>			0.272*** (-0.027)
<b>Life Satisfaction</b>			0.057* (-0.023)
<b>Country Eco Satisfaction</b>			0.181*** (-0.023)
<b>HH Income Satisfaction</b>			-0.089 (-0.061)
<b>Left-Right Ideology</b>			-0.15*** (-0.026)
<b>Political TV Consumption</b>			-0.082** (-0.031)
<b>Interest in Politics</b>			0.424*** (-0.052)
<b>Church Attendance</b>			0.133*** (-0.041)
<b>Frequency of Prayer</b>			-0.03 (-0.027)
<b>Religious Feeling</b>			0.034 (-0.022)
<b>Contact: A Few</b>			0.177 (-0.1)
<b>Contact: Several</b>			0.753*** (-0.121)
<b>Adj R2</b>	0.104	0.224	0.379
<b>Constant</b>	4.763*** (-0.122)	3.759*** (-0.263)	1.14** (-0.405)
<b>N</b>	1906		



Table 6.10 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Anglican

Variable	Round 4				Round 5				Round 6				Round 7			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.355*** (0.071)	0.333*** (0.072)	0.209** (0.074)	0.208 ** (0.069)	0.264** (0.083)	0.23** (0.082)	0.125 0.081	0.133 0.078	0.33*** (0.085)	0.309*** (0.085)	0.167* (0.083)	0.22** 0.08	0.393*** (0.082)	0.342*** (0.08)	0.275*** (0.08)	0.231** (0.076)
Frequency of Prayer	0.017 (0.046)	0.012 (0.046)	0.045 (0.047)	0.092 (0.043)	-0.047 (0.055)	-0.047 (0.054)	-0.008 (0.054)	0.007 (0.052)	-0.053 (0.054)	-0.041 (0.053)	0.004 (0.052)	0.015 (0.05)	-0.066 (0.052)	-0.048 (0.05)	-0.024 (0.049)	-0.013 (0.048)
Religious Feeling	0.072 (0.051)	0.068 0.051	0.099* (0.051)	0.04 (0.047)	0.011 (0.062)	0 (0.061)	0.006 (0.059)	-0.042 (0.057)	0.013 (0.056)	0.026 (0.056)	0.066 (0.054)	0.019 (0.051)	0.081 (0.056)	0.077 (0.054)	0.116* (0.053)	0.08 (0.051)
Labour		0.334 (0.262)	0.4 (0.258)	0.36 (0.268)		-0.2 (0.284)	-0.065 (0.277)	0.049 (0.292)		0.179 (0.274)	0.277 (0.264)	0.674* (0.292)		0.094 (0.294)	0.11 (0.289)	0.284 (0.314)
Liberal Democrats		0.688 (0.354)	0.88* (0.347)	1.003** (0.335)		0.901* (0.371)	0.882* (0.359)	0.688* (0.349)		0.906 (0.467)	1.062* (0.443)	1.314** (0.433)		1.347** (0.495)	1.184* (0.485)	1.304** (0.47)
UKIP		-0.822 0.782	-1.197 (0.768)	-1.257 (0.711)		-3.34*** (0.947)	-3.285*** (0.919)	-2.086* (0.9)		-2.135*** (0.571)	-2.085*** (0.543)	-1.653** (0.52)		-1.88*** (0.366)	-1.865*** (0.356)	-1.395*** (0.349)
Green		-0.326 (0.918)	-0.136 (0.896)	0.311 (0.851)		-2.16 (1.481)	-2.174 (1.434)	-2.195 (1.378)		1.865 (1.458)	1.817 (1.384)	1.837 (1.319)		1.296 (0.942)	1.093 (0.92)	0.734 (0.874)
SNP										-3.255 (2.04)	-2.665 (1.935)	-3.401 (1.891)				
Plaid Cymru		-0.162 (2.033)	0.101 (1.987)	-0.817 (1.837)		0.689 (2.093)	1.463 (2.025)	0.822 (1.938)		-0.483 (1.034)	-0.571 (0.982)	-0.676 (0.951)				
Other Party						1.271 (1.483)	0.891 (1.437)	0.947 (1.372)		0.174 (0.851)	0.532 (0.817)	0.597 (0.776)		-0.874* (1.476)	-0.779 (1.439)	-0.231 (1.365)
No Party		-0.134 (0.216)	-0.12 (0.22)	0.137 (0.222)		-0.476* (0.242)	-0.335 (0.237)	-0.046 (0.245)		-0.058 (0.236)	-0.123 (0.229)	0.223 (0.235)		-0.118* (0.233)	-0.209 (0.232)	0.065 (0.235)
Gender			-0.363 (0.192)	-0.227 (0.18)			-0.382 (0.209)	-0.403* (0.201)			-0.342 (0.195)	-0.351 (0.185)			-0.333 (0.197)	-0.181 (0.191)
Age			-0.001 (0.006)	-0.012* (0.006)			-0.006 (0.006)	-0.011 (0.006)			-0.012* (0.006)	-0.018** (0.006)			-0.015* (0.006)	-0.02** (0.006)
Unemployed			0.627 (0.642)	1.177 (0.607)			-0.556 (0.562)	-0.316 (0.549)			-0.214 (0.577)	-0.323 (0.55)			1.081* (0.539)	1.15* (0.512)
Non-Citizen			1.434 (0.817)	1.47 (0.755)			1.102 (0.916)	1.417 (0.88)			1.516* (0.752)	1.392 (0.716)			1.895* (0.778)	1.749* (0.737)
Education			0.247*** (0.056)	0.177*** (0.054)			0.285*** (0.067)	0.176** (0.067)			0.33*** (0.064)	0.259*** (0.064)			0.154* (0.07)	0.078 (0.069)
Social Trust				0.166** (0.053)				0.19** (0.07)				0.316*** (0.061)				0.147** (0.057)
Life				0.045				0.165**				-0.078				0.041

Satisfaction				(0.045)				(0.055)				(0.051)				(0.048)
Country Eco Satisfaction				0.246*** (0.047)				0.139* (0.055)				0.164 *** (0.047)				0.246*** (0.048)
HH Income Satisfaction				-0.228 (0.129)				-0.121 (0.142)				0.036 (0.129)				-0.177 (0.131)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.044 (0.052)				-0.07 (0.06)				0.083 (0.057)				-0.071 (0.058)
Political TV Consumption				0.116 (0.061)				0.135 (0.074)				0.14* (0.07)				0.019 (0.063)
Interest in Politics				0.424*** (0.113)				0.314* (0.128)				0.038 (0.109)				0.12 (0.109)
Adj R2	0.086	0.091	0.138	0.267	0.021	0.069	0.132	0.216	0.032	0.067	0.165	0.261	0.73	0.143	0.198	0.288
Constant	2.886*** (0.237)	2.924*** (0.279)	2.408*** (0.499)	0.475 (0.798)	3.75*** (0.288)	4.057*** (0.324)	3.806*** (0.571)	1.164 (0.902)	3.755*** (0.266)	3.697*** (0.311)	3.624*** (0.549)	1.198 (0.822)	3.148*** (0.255)	3.363*** (0.297)	3.889*** (0.604)	2.336** (0.856)
N	503	503	503	503	434	434	434	434	449	449	449	449	471	471	471	471

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.11 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Catholic

Variable	Round 4				Round 5				Round 6				Round 7			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.11 (0.117)	0.03 (0.12)	-0.028 (0.12)	-0.052 (0.118)	0.051 (0.144)	0.082 (0.145)	0.104 (0.136)	0.07 (0.133)	0.044 (0.131)	0.047 (0.134)	0.046 (0.127)	0.048 (0.113)	0.228 (0.125)	0.195 (0.12)	0.056 (0.109)	0.026 (0.107)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.063 (0.1)	-0.039 (0.098)	-0.013 (0.098)	-0.041 (0.097)	-0.15 (0.094)	-0.159 (0.095)	-0.184* (0.091)	-0.152 (0.089)	0.044* (0.089)	-0.208* (0.091)	-0.124 (0.092)	-0.078 (0.082)	-0.167 (0.093)	-0.257** (0.09)	-0.155 (0.083)	0.163* (0.082)
Religious Feeling	0.099 (0.095)	0.149 (0.097)	0.185 (0.096)	0.159 (0.095)	0.174 (0.174)	0.142 (0.108)	0.15 (0.101)	0.071 (0.102)	0.15 (0.095)	0.16 (0.098)	0.137 (0.092)	0.101 (0.082)	0.126 (0.095)	0.2* (0.093)	0.19* (0.082)	-0.14 (0.082)
Labour		1.303 (0.688)	1.434* (0.686)	1.21 (0.729)		0.917 (0.485)	1.049* (0.456)	1.081* (0.513)		-0.211 (0.522)	-0.062 (0.497)	-0.172 (0.477)		1.904*** (0.524)	2.154*** (0.468)	1.848*** (0.515)
Liberal Democrats		1.446 (0.942)	1.537 (0.931)	1.579 (0.928)		0.003 (1.057)	0.258 (0.991)	0.443 (0.991)		-0.233 (1.031)	-0.554 (0.979)	-1.474 (0.871)		3.077* (1.297)	2.393* (1.154)	2.601* (1.121)
UKIP		-1.169 (1.665)	-0.96 (1.645)	-0.234 (1.617)						-0.679 (0.962)	-0.897 (0.912)	-0.506 (0.826)		-1.564* (0.773)	-0.607 (0.698)	-0.586 (0.683)
Green		1.199 (2.278)	0.813 (2.245)	1.513 (2.32)		3.644 (2.237)	3.766 (2.11)	3.971 (2.103)		-0.661 (2.337)	-1.26 (2.216)	-1.075 (1.951)		-0.255 (2.183)	0.682 (1.942)	0.776 (1.864)
SNP		-2.076 (1.232)	-1.835 (1.22)	-1.329 (1.253)						0.578 (1.106)	-0.647 (1.042)	-0.8 (0.919)		2.242* (0.912)	1.749* (0.828)	1.528 (0.835)
Plaid Cymru																
Other Party		2.133* (0.855)	2.257** (0.857)	2.137* (0.865)		0.819 (2.225)	1.399 (2.098)	1.987 (2.06)		-0.96 (1.106)	0.082 (1.35)	-1.139 (1.246)		1.645* (0.756)	2.157** (0.676)	2.081** (0.683)
No Party		0.606 (0.625)	0.71 (0.63)	0.806 (0.648)		0.437 (0.459)	0.494 (0.448)	0.552 (0.481)		-0.056 (0.472)	-0.47 (0.462)	-0.4 (0.434)		0.943* (0.453)	1* (0.411)	1.043* (0.44)
Gender			-0.181 (0.324)	0.163 (0.343)			-0.382 (0.329)	-0.327 (0.328)			0.168 (0.342)	0.286 (0.305)			-0.398 (0.276)	-0.208 (0.271)
Age			-0.015 (0.01)	-0.02* (0.01)			0.004 (0.01)	0.008 (0.01)			-0.017 (0.01)	-0.029** (0.01)			0.001 (0.009)	-0.005 (0.009)
Unemployed			-0.872 (0.785)	-0.616 (0.774)			0.318 (0.714)	1.017 (0.735)			-0.464 (0.67)	0.22 (0.605)			0.383 (0.631)	0.24 (0.632)
Non-Citizen			0.371 (0.506)	0.382 (0.504)			1.344** (0.454)	1.335** (0.456)			1.67** (0.602)	1.396* (0.536)			0.987* (0.437)	0.949* (0.443)
Education			0.186 (0.101)	0.086 (0.109)			0.409*** (0.098)	0.32** (0.102)			0.332** (0.109)	0.237* (0.105)			0.623*** (0.093)	0.483*** (0.096)
Social Trust				0.131 (0.1)				-0.065 (0.096)				0.298** (0.095)				0.283*** (0.085)
Life Satisfaction				0.057 (0.083)				0.18* (0.085)				0.085 (0.078)				0.104 (0.081)
Country Eco Satisfaction				0.208* (0.083)				0.206** (0.076)				0.019*** (0.072)				0.072 (0.077)
HH Income				-0.069				-0.014				0.019				0.079

Satisfaction				(0.214)				(0.232)				(0.2)				(0.199)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.016 (0.101)				0.014 (0.101)				-0.235* (0.093)				-0.141 (0.084)
Political TV Consumption				0.14 (0.107)				-0.154 (0.11)				0.194 (0.123)				0.033 (0.089)
Interest in Politics				0.26 (0.213)				0.447* (0.181)				0.379* (0.171)				0.304 (0.173)
Adj R2	-0.001	0.058	0.092	0.148	0.007	0.013	0.144	0.207	0.014	-0.016	0.102	0.313	0.024	0.148	0.333	0.39
Constant	4.236*** (0.488)	3.289*** (0.791)	3.257** (1.037)	1.475 (1.51)	4.355*** (0.505)	3.972*** (0.63)	2.444* (0.946)	0.317 (1.564)	4.289*** (0.468)	4.394*** (0.626)	4.083*** (0.885)	1.145 (1.302)	4.595*** (0.452)	3.713*** (0.609)	1.739*** (0.806)	-0.228 (1.221)
N	191	191	191	191	178	178	178	178	203	203	203	203	204	204	204	204

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.12 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Islam

Variable	Round 4				Round 5				Round 6				Round 7			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.108 (0.139)	0.198 (0.134)	0.243 (0.17)	0.308 (0.185)	0.15 (0.153)	0.107 (0.166)	0.074 (0.168)	-0.026 (0.161)	0.032 (0.225)	-0.041 (0.24)	-0.155 (0.313)	-0.288 (0.31)	0.055 (0.18)	0.056 (0.197)	0.009 (0.238)	-0.083 (0.22)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.243 (0.168)	-0.261 (0.164)	-0.182 (0.183)	-0.387 (0.224)	0.037 (0.141)	0.016 (0.148)	-0.03 (0.129)	0.134 (0.137)	-0.04 (0.251)	-0.076 (0.255)	0.024 (0.28)	0.033 (0.251)	0.056 (0.173)	0.023 (0.188)	0.058 (0.195)	-0.018 (0.181)
Religious Feeling	0.405** (0.136)	0.394** (0.147)	0.429** (0.156)	0.439* (0.17)	-0.069 (0.153)	-0.045 (0.165)	0.032 (0.148)	-0.113 (0.145)	0.396 (0.216)	0.458 (0.236)	0.396 (0.258)	0.343 (0.247)	-0.017 (0.153)	-0.013 (0.163)	-0.121 (0.202)	-0.064 (0.188)
Labour		0.967 (1.342)	1.617 (1.493)	0.034 (1.843)		-0.19 (1.239)	-1.428 (1.097)	-0.944 (1.161)		0.344 (0.908)	0.223 (0.975)	0.25 (0.874)		0.588 (1.317)	0.84 (1.409)	0.395 (1.285)
Liberal Democrats		1.992 (1.407)	2.247 (1.511)	0.692 (1.847)		1.641 (1.946)	-0.734 (1.743)	-0.986 (1.759)		4.326 (2.241)	4.851 (2.537)	6.75* (2.856)				
UKIP		-3.411 (2.116)	-3.199 (2.267)	-5.465 (2.728)												
Green														0.119 (1.905)	0.686 (2.031)	1.871 (1.859)
SNP						-0.179 (1.643)	-2.702 (1.549)	-0.962 (1.752)		1.244 (2.194)	1.315 (2.463)	-1.084 (2.533)		1.491 (2.422)	1.309 (2.938)	2.147 (2.813)
Plaid Cymru																
Other Party														1.295 (1.917)	1.735 (2.006)	1.008 (2.121)
No Party		0.399 (1.257)	0.735 (1.314)	-0.68 (1.586)		-0.381 (1.216)	-1.605 (1.079)	-0.837 (1.207)						0.845 (1.275)	0.995 (1.386)	1.138 (1.258)
Gender			-0.443 (0.615)	0.067 (0.71)			-0.164 (0.488)	-0.017 (0.483)			-0.709 (0.943)	-1.059 (0.955)			-0.877 (0.668)	-0.179 (0.657)
Age			-0.006 (0.019)	0.012 (0.022)			0.001 (0.017)	-0.007 (0.019)			-0.025 (0.029)	-0.024 (0.025)			-0.01 (0.024)	0.002 (0.023)
Unemployed			-1.578 (0.946)	-0.635 (1.122)			0.955 (1.02)	0.763 (1.028)			0.261 (0.94)	0.563 (0.897)			-1.06 (1.472)	-1.587 (1.327)
Non-Citizen			1.437 (0.865)	2.257* (1.031)			0.078 (0.582)	-0.194 (0.584)			-0.638 (1.499)	-1.239 (1.41)			0.929 (1.283)	-0.086 (1.256)
Education			0.016 (0.16)	-0.014 (0.173)			0.629 (0.137)	0.43** (0.145)			0.058 (0.273)	0.07 (0.262)			-0.011 (0.199)	-0.176 (0.196)
Social Trust				0.032 (0.159)				0.342 (0.175)				0.89 (0.313)				0.196 (0.173)
Life Satisfaction				-0.203 (0.177)				0.135 (0.137)				0.129 (0.235)				0.367* (0.148)
Country Eco Satisfaction				-0.019 (0.149)				-0.007 (0.11)				0.031 (0.246)				0.126 (0.169)
HH Income				-0.379				-0.349				-0.423				0.337

Satisfaction				(0.374)				(0.222)				(0.398)				(0.378)
Left-Right Ideology				0.02 (0.232)				-0.026 (0.134)				-0.271 (0.3)				-0.056 (0.154)
Political TV Consumption				-0.196 (0.197)				-0.047 (0.165)				0.122 (0.263)				-0.132 (0.152)
Interest in Politics				0.889* (0.416)				0.238 (0.243)				-0.343 (0.431)				0.381 (0.352)
Adj R2	0.131	0.237	0.25	0.242	-0.036	0.34	0.225	-0.095	0.04	0.28	-0.04	0.066	-0.049	-0.14	-0.181	0.076
Constant	5.093*** (0.807)	4.243** (1.469)	3.343* (1.57)	4.793 (2.393)	5.915*** (0.841)	6.292*** (1.407)	5.413** (1.604)	3.877 (2.174)	3.425* (1.471)	3.288 (1.735)	4.705 (3.046)	2.955 (3.276)	5.729*** (0.941)	5.161*** (1.528)	6.53** (2.212)	1.638 (2.825)
N	52	52	52	52	49	49	49	49	40	40	40	40	55	55	55	55

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.13 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: 'Other' Denominations Combined

Variable	Round 4				Round 5				Round 6				Round 7			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.231* (0.102)	0.246* (0.1)	0.208* (0.095)	0.157 (0.094)	0.059 (0.103)	0.069 (0.104)	0.009 (0.099)	0.05 (0.098)	0.128 (0.113)	0.129 (0.117)	0.092 (0.114)	0.06 (0.105)	0.168 (0.113)	0.177 (0.113)	0.122 (0.11)	0.128 (0.111)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.042 (0.076)	-0.055 (0.074)	-0.05 (0.071)	-0.029 (0.07)	0.038 (0.068)	0.037 (0.069)	0.06 (0.066)	0.032 (0.066)	-0.113 (0.083)	-0.117 (0.085)	-0.074 (0.083)	0.009 (0.077)	0.071 (0.08)	0.079 (0.08)	0.07 (0.078)	0.05 (0.078)
Religious Feeling	-0.022 (0.08)	-0.016 (0.079)	0.006 (0.076)	-0.029 (0.076)	0.14* (0.067)	0.132 (0.068)	0.164* (0.066)	0.139* (0.066)	0.052 (0.085)	0.053 (0.086)	0.075 (0.084)	-0.008 (0.079)	-0.065 (0.072)	-0.06 (0.072)	-0.03 (0.071)	-0.015 (0.069)
Labour		1.14* (0.477)	1.399** (0.458)	1.082* (0.502)		0.378 (0.429)	0.139 (0.414)	0.22 (0.444)		0.331 (0.479)	0.091 (0.468)	0.094 (0.482)		0.397 (0.469)	0.657 (0.467)	0.921 (0.515)
Liberal Democrats		2.016*** (0.579)	1.956*** (0.549)	1.724** (0.591)		0.528 (0.683)	0.348 (0.653)	0.322 (0.65)		1.59* (0.774)	0.891 (0.763)	0.348 (0.728)		-0.183 (1.063)	0.309 (1.042)	0.343 (1.027)
UKIP		-1.427 (2.212)	-1.919 (2.103)	-2.024 (2.078)						-0.262 (0.933)	-0.355 (0.908)	-0.71 (0.836)		-1.418* (0.676)	-1.333* (0.666)	-1.095 (0.661)
Green		3.012** (1.152)	2.477* (1.103)	2.435* (1.128)		-1.962 (1.474)	-1.857 (1.411)	-2.023 (1.387)		0.315 (1.654)	-0.131 (1.61)	0.115 (1.473)		1.202 (2.043)	2.045 (1.987)	1.866 (1.949)
SNP		-0.038 (0.96)	0.021 (0.912)	-0.125 (0.916)		0.059 (0.897)	0.251 (0.858)	0.133 (0.853)		-0.606 (0.993)	-0.413 (0.96)	-0.425 (0.908)		0.446 (0.706)	0.936 (0.715)	1.259 (0.736)
Plaid Cymru						0.769 (0.901)	0.021 (0.876)	-0.488 (0.873)		0.087 (1.083)	-0.01 (1.049)	-0.299 (0.989)		4.105* (2.051)	3.1 (2.071)	3.191 (2.112)
Other Party		0.462 (0.75)	0.927 (0.717)	0.618 (0.742)		-0.382 (0.73)	-0.34 (0.7)	-0.483 (0.68)		-0.698 (0.885)	-0.539 (0.862)	-1.016 (0.789)		-0.952 (0.772)	-0.215 (0.771)	-0.021 (0.756)
No Party		1.023* (0.427)	0.821* (0.413)	0.76 (0.459)		-0.106 (0.39)	-0.357 (0.383)	-0.106 (0.397)		0.379 (0.448)	0.132 (0.441)	0.217 (0.441)		-0.361 (0.423)	-0.089 (0.422)	0.426 (0.449)
Gender			-0.094 (0.291)	0.135 (0.292)			-0.208 (0.256)	-0.164 (0.259)			-0.345 (0.295)	-0.299 (0.271)			-0.283 (0.308)	-0.222 (0.318)
Age			-0.01 (0.009)	-0.013 (0.009)			-0.023** (0.007)	-0.029*** (0.008)			-0.018* (0.009)	-0.025** (0.008)			-0.012 (0.01)	-0.018 (0.01)
Unemployed			1.411 (0.776)	1.294 (0.787)			-0.41 (0.702)	-0.155 (0.686)			0.006 (0.753)	0.638 (0.705)			-0.147 (0.8)	-0.049 (0.779)
Non-Citizen			1.032 (0.608)	0.912 (0.609)			0.548 (0.62)	0.686 (0.61)			-0.231 (0.639)	-0.528 (0.59)			0.603 (0.604)	0.267 (0.602)
Education			0.301*** (0.088)	0.3*** (0.092)			0.224** (0.01)	0.131 (0.087)			0.322*** (0.095)	0.19* (0.091)			0.278* (0.114)	0.25* (0.119)
Social Trust				0.056 (0.088)				0.27*** (0.08)				0.31** (0.099)				0.2* (0.096)
Life Satisfaction				0.169* (0.074)				-0.09 (0.072)				-0.082 (0.079)				-0.096 (0.092)
Country Eco Satisfaction				0.163* (0.074)				0.056 (0.061)				0.366*** (0.073)				0.224** (0.084)
HH Income				0.271				-0.171				-0.181				-0.169

Satisfaction				(0.206)				(0.172)				(0.183)				(0.216)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.036 (0.089)				-0.103 (0.085)				-0.134 (0.085)				-0.015 (0.101)
Political TV Consumption				0.008 (0.097)				-0.074 (0.096)				0.036 (0.101)				0.042 (0.101)
Interest in Politics				0.169 (0.184)				0.286 (0.161)				0.414* (0.167)				0.13 (0.186)
Adj R2	0.013	0.067	0.165	0.201	0.045	0.041	0.14	0.197	-0.002	-0.004	0.07	0.252	0.013	0.056	0.12	0.182
Constant	4.353*** (0.45)	3.374*** (0.568)	2.956*** (0.894)	0.524 (1.457)	3.853*** (0.351)	3.818*** (0.482)	4.531*** (0.741)	4.332*** (1.234)	4.976*** (0.469)	4.705*** (0.596)	4.81*** (0.884)	3.018* (1.367)	4.455*** (0.436)	4.486*** (0.533)	4.214*** (0.938)	2.57 (1.462)
N	222	222	222	222	250	250	250	250	238	238	238	238	183	183	183	183

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.



Table 6.14 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Round 7 with Contact for each Denomination

Variable	Anglican				Catholic				Islam				Other			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.393*** (0.082)	0.342*** (0.08)	0.275*** (0.08)	0.234** (0.076)	0.228 (0.125)	0.195 (0.12)	0.056 (0.109)	0.042 (0.108)	0.055 (0.18)	0.056 (0.197)	0.009 (0.238)	-0.222 (0.207)	0.168 (0.113)	0.177 (0.113)	0.122 (0.11)	0.097 (0.109)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.066 (0.052)	-0.048 (0.05)	-0.024 (0.049)	-0.019 (0.048)	-0.167 (0.093)	-0.257** (0.09)	-0.155 (0.083)	-0.164* (0.082)	0.056 (0.173)	0.023 (0.188)	0.058 (0.195)	0.022 (0.176)	0.071 (0.08)	0.079 (0.08)	0.07 (0.078)	-0.005 (0.076)
Religious Feeling	0.081 (0.056)	0.077 (0.054)	0.116* (0.053)	0.073 (0.051)	0.126 (0.095)	0.2* (0.093)	0.19* (0.082)	0.117 (0.084)	-0.017 (0.153)	-0.013 (0.163)	-0.121 (0.202)	0.11 (0.182)	-0.065 (0.072)	-0.06 (0.072)	-0.03 (0.071)	-0.035 (0.067)
Labour		0.094 (0.294)	0.11 (0.289)	0.329 (0.314)		1.904*** (0.524)	2.154*** (0.468)	1.763*** (0.519)		0.588 (1.317)	0.84 (1.409)	0.845 (1.191)		0.397 (0.469)	0.657 (0.467)	1.048* (0.494)
Liberal Democrats		1.347** (0.495)	1.184* (0.485)	1.388** (0.472)		3.077* (1.297)	2.393* (1.154)	2.571* (1.119)						-0.183 (1.063)	0.309 (1.042)	0.508 (0.983)
UKIP		-1.88*** (0.366)	-1.865*** (0.356)	-1.305*** (0.352)		-1.564* (0.773)	-0.607 (0.698)	-0.661 (0.685)						-1.418* (0.676)	-1.333* (0.666)	-0.689 (0.646)
Green		1.296 (0.942)	1.093 (0.92)	0.793 (0.878)		-0.255 (2.183)	0.682 (1.942)	0.815 (1.869)		0.119 (1.905)	0.686 (2.031)	1.591 (1.709)		1.202 (2.043)	2.045 (1.987)	2.829 (1.879)
SNP						2.242* (0.912)	1.749* (0.828)	1.535 (0.835)		1.491 (2.422)	1.309 (2.938)	3.069 (2.593)		0.446 (0.706)	0.936 (0.715)	1.346 (0.704)
Plaid Cymru														4.105* (2.051)	3.1 (2.071)	2.842 (2.052)
Other Party		-0.874* (1.476)	-0.779 (1.439)	0.107 (0.236)		1.645* (0.756)	2.157** (0.676)	2.108** (0.683)		1.295 (1.917)	1.735 (2.006)	0.188 (1.961)		-0.952 (0.772)	-0.215 (0.771)	0.794 (0.749)
No Party		-0.118* (0.233)	-0.209 (0.232)	-0.17 (1.365)		0.943* (0.453)	1* (0.411)	1.034* (0.441)		0.845 (1.275)	0.995 (1.386)	1.76 (1.17)		-0.361 (0.423)	-0.089 (0.422)	0.519 (0.43)
Gender			-0.333 (0.197)	-0.144 (0.192)			-0.398 (0.276)	-0.203 (0.271)			-0.877 (0.668)	-0.303 (0.61)			-0.283 (0.308)	-0.167 (0.304)
Age			-0.015* (0.006)	-0.018** (0.007)			0.001 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.009)			-0.01 (0.024)	0.011 (0.021)			-0.012 (0.01)	-0.006 (0.01)
Unemployed			1.081* (0.539)	1.249* (0.515)			0.383 (0.631)	0.093 (0.639)			-1.06 (1.472)	-0.46 (1.28)			-0.147 (0.8)	0.308 (0.753)
Non-Citizen			1.895* (0.778)	1.8* (0.739)			0.987* (0.437)	0.877* (0.445)			0.929 (1.283)	-0.761 (1.172)			0.603 (0.604)	-0.056 (0.587)
Education			0.154* (0.07)	0.055 (0.071)			0.623*** (0.093)	0.444*** (0.099)			-0.011 (0.199)	-0.246 (0.182)			0.278* (0.114)	0.201 (0.115)
Social Trust				0.155** (0.057)				0.289*** (0.085)				0.206 (0.159)				0.206* (0.092)
Life Satisfaction				0.043 (0.048)				0.121 (0.082)				0.214 (0.145)				-0.102 (0.089)
Country Eco Satisfaction				0.249*** (0.048)				0.064 (0.077)				0.189 (0.161)				0.206* (0.081)
HH Income				-0.191				0.071				0.14				-0.316

Satisfaction				0.131				(0.2)				(0.356)				(0.21)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.054 0.059				-0.144 (0.084)				-0.141 (0.144)				-0.004 (0.098)
Political TV Consumption				0.017 0.063				0.026 (0.089)				-0.177 (0.142)				0.039 (0.097)
Interest in Politics				0.095 0.11				0.294 (0.173)				0.597 (0.331)				0.116 (0.178)
Contact: A Few				0.141 0.207				0.074 (0.313)				0.626 (0.786)				1.074** (0.387)
Contact: Several				0.478 0.273				0.519 (0.348)				2.03* (0.798)				1.535*** (0.384)
Adj R2	0.73	0.143	0.198	0.290	0.024	0.148	0.333	0.392	-0.049	-0.14	-0.181	0.226	0.013	0.056	0.12	0.252
Constant	3.148*** (0.255)	3.363*** (0.297)	3.889*** (0.604)	2.1* (0.87)	4.595*** (0.452)	3.713*** (0.609)	1.739* (0.806)	-0.21 (1.227)	5.729*** (0.941)	5.161*** (1.528)	6.53** (2.212)	0.156 (2.667)	4.455*** (0.436)	4.486*** (0.533)	4.214*** (0.938)	2.058 (1.404)
N	471	471	471	471	204	204	204		55	55	55	55	183	183	183	183

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male; Contact = No friends of different race/ethnicity

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.15 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Cumulative

Variable	Anglican				Catholic				Islam				Other			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.337*** (0.04)	0.305*** (0.039)	0.198*** (0.039)	0.186*** (0.037)	0.118 (0.064)	0.108 (0.064)	0.039 (0.06)	0.008 (0.057)	0.055 (0.084)	0.063 (0.084)	0.017 (0.096)	-0.032 (0.091)	0.165** (0.053)	0.165** (0.053)	0.114* (0.05)	0.091 (0.048)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.036 (0.026)	-0.034 (0.025)	-0.001 (0.025)	0.028 (0.024)	-0.149** (0.047)	-0.161*** (0.047)	-0.106* (0.045)	-0.096* (0.043)	-0.037 (0.089)	-0.049 (0.089)	-0.032 (0.091)	0.004 (0.088)	-0.023 (0.038)	-0.02 (0.038)	3.74E-05 (0.036)	0.018 (0.035)
Religious Feeling	0.048 (0.028)	0.048 (0.027)	0.078** (0.027)	0.029 (0.025)	0.129** (0.049)	0.14** (0.049)	0.153*** (0.045)	0.124** (0.043)	0.177* (0.079)	0.188* (0.079)	0.212** (0.08)	0.176* (0.079)	0.029 (0.038)	0.032 (0.038)	0.057 (0.036)	0.033 (0.035)
Labour		0.119 (0.138)	0.2 (0.135)	0.371** (0.143)		0.835** (0.27)	0.963*** (0.253)	0.905*** (0.262)		0.432 (0.751)	0.465 (0.76)	0.488 (0.727)		0.599** (0.231)	0.582** (0.221)	0.563* (0.23)
Liberal Democrats		0.892*** (0.203)	0.923*** (0.196)	1*** (0.19)		0.778 (0.513)	0.657 (0.48)	0.634 (0.458)		2.343* (0.963)	2.352* (0.971)	1.799 (0.939)		1.158*** (0.349)	1.028** (0.332)	0.83* (0.326)
UKIP		-1.897*** (0.263)	-1.871*** (0.254)	-1.568*** (0.241)		-1.331* (0.544)	-0.991 (0.51)	-0.771 (0.486)		-2.387 (2.008)	-2.256 (2.047)	-3.021 (2.008)		-0.869 (0.507)	-1.012* (0.483)	-1.067* (0.462)
Green		0.308 (0.554)	0.345 (0.535)	0.462 (0.507)		1.033 (1.135)	0.82 (1.059)	0.936 (1.006)		-0.369 (1.495)	-0.368 (1.52)	0.37 (1.463)		0.888 (0.729)	0.694 (0.695)	0.587 (0.669)
SNP		-3.222 (2.05)	-2.684 (1.98)	-2.378 (1.876)		0.235 (0.598)	0.114 (0.56)	0.144 (0.54)		0.438 (1.173)	0.029 (1.233)	0.342 (1.203)		0.132 (0.433)	0.333 (0.414)	0.307 (0.403)
Plaid Cymru		-0.242 (0.841)	-0.123 (0.812)	-0.464 (0.768)										1.018 (0.639)	0.639 (0.609)	0.323 (0.592)
Other Party		0.225 (0.654)	0.352 (0.633)	0.542 (0.597)		1.434** (0.469)	1.596*** (0.442)	1.561*** (0.428)		0.387 (1.51)	0.322 (1.518)	0.047 (1.525)		-0.396 (0.39)	-0.051 (0.374)	-0.157 (0.357)
No Party		-0.189 (0.115)	-0.196 (0.114)	0.088 (0.116)		0.403 (0.244)	0.31 (0.234)	0.5* (0.235)		0.387 (1.51)	0.223 (0.735)	0.451 (0.709)		0.269 (0.209)	0.158 (0.203)	0.366 (0.208)
Gender			-0.323*** (0.098)	-0.271*** (0.093)			-0.264 (0.157)	-0.073 (0.151)			-0.459 (0.305)	-0.228 (0.303)			-0.206 (0.139)	-0.101 (0.136)
Age			-0.008* (0.003)	-0.015*** (0.003)			-0.01* (0.005)	-0.015** (0.005)			0.001 (0.01)	0.004 (0.01)			-0.017*** (0.004)	-0.021*** (0.004)
Unemploy- ed			0.255 (0.286)	0.357 (0.272)			-0.268 (0.348)	-0.02 (0.335)			-0.032 (0.445)	0.148 (0.426)			0.118 (0.369)	0.258 (0.355)
Non- Citizen			1.61*** (0.404)	1.587*** (0.38)			1.092*** (0.244)	0.967*** (0.235)			0.305 (0.425)	0.038 (0.415)			0.548 (0.301)	0.377 (0.29)
Education			0.255*** (0.031)	0.171*** (0.031)			0.391*** (0.049)	0.296*** (0.05)			0.109 (0.086)	0.001 (0.087)			0.283*** (0.045)	0.219*** (0.046)
Social Trust				0.222*** (0.029)				0.174*** (0.046)				0.231** (0.086)				0.201*** (0.043)
Life Satisfaction				0.04 (0.024)				0.075 (0.039)				0.207** (0.076)				-0.006 (0.038)
Country Eco-Sat				0.177*** (0.022)				0.209*** (0.036)				-0.044 (0.069)				0.183*** (0.032)
HH Income				-0.146*				0.007				-0.05				-0.039

Satisfaction				(0.065)				(0.101)				(0.156)				(0.092)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.026 (0.028)				-0.119** (0.046)				-0.058 (0.083)				-0.089 (0.042)
Political TV				0.09** (0.033)				0.072 (0.051)				-0.022 (0.087)				-0.01 (0.047)
Interest in Politics				0.211*** (0.056)				0.339*** (0.088)				0.23 (0.147)				0.292*** (0.083)
Adj R2	0.054	0.094	0.157	0.255	0.017	0.045	0.17	0.265	0.027	0.055	0.052	0.153	0.016	0.037	0.133	0.214
Constant	3.35*** (0.13)	3.481*** (0.15)	3.303*** (0.273)	1.396*** (0.412)	4.409*** (0.239)	3.971*** (0.324)	3.21*** (0.444)	1.051 (0.662)	5.12*** (0.485)	4.739*** (0.841)	4.462*** (0.981)	2.171 (1.248)	4.389*** (0.21)	4.044*** (0.269)	4.108*** (0.413)	2.47*** (0.648)
N	1857				776				196				893			

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

Table 6.16 - Regression to Explore Religious Elite Discourse: Cumulative, with Contact

Variable	Anglican				Catholic				Islam				Other			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Church Attendance	0.337*** (0.04)	0.305*** (0.039)	0.198*** (0.039)	0.186*** (0.037)	0.118 (0.064)	0.108 (0.064)	0.039 (0.06)	0.013 (0.057)	0.055 (0.084)	0.063 (0.084)	0.017 (0.096)	-0.037 (0.09)	0.165** (0.053)	0.165** (0.053)	0.114* (0.05)	0.086 (0.049)
Frequency of Prayer	-0.036 (0.026)	-0.034 (0.025)	-0.001 (0.025)	0.028 (0.024)	-0.149** (0.047)	-0.161*** (0.047)	-0.106* (0.045)	-0.097* (0.043)	-0.037 (0.089)	-0.049 (0.089)	-0.032 (0.091)	0.004 (0.088)	-0.023 (0.038)	-0.02 (0.038)	3.74E-05 (0.036)	0.015 (0.035)
Religious Feeling	0.048 (0.028)	0.048 (0.027)	0.078** (0.027)	0.028 (0.025)	0.129** (0.049)	0.14** (0.049)	0.153* (0.045)	0.12** (0.043)	0.177* (0.079)	0.188* (0.079)	0.212** (0.08)	0.193* (0.078)	0.029 (0.038)	0.032 (0.038)	0.057 (0.036)	0.036 (0.035)
Labour		0.119 (0.138)	0.2 (0.135)	0.373** (0.143)		0.835** (0.27)	0.963*** (0.253)	0.913*** (0.262)		0.432 (0.751)	0.465 (0.76)	0.525 (0.721)		0.599* (0.231)	0.582** (0.221)	0.575* (0.231)
Liberal Democrats		0.892*** (0.203)	0.923*** (0.196)	1.005*** (0.19)		0.778 (0.513)	0.657 (0.48)	0.663 (0.457)		2.343* (0.963)	2.352* (0.971)	1.945* (0.935)		1.158*** (0.349)	1.028** (0.332)	0.861** (0.327)
UKIP		-1.897*** (0.263)	-1.871*** (0.254)	-1.553*** (0.242)		-1.331* (0.544)	-0.991 (0.51)	-0.824 (0.486)		-2.387 (2.008)	-2.256 (2.047)	-3.014 (1.984)		-0.869 (0.507)	-1.012* (0.483)	-0.998* (0.466)
Green		0.308 (0.554)	0.345 (0.535)	0.495 (0.509)		1.033 (1.135)	0.82 (1.059)	0.989 (1.006)		-0.369 (1.495)	-0.368 (1.52)	0.187 (1.458)		0.888 (0.729)	0.694 (0.695)	0.616 (0.67)
SNP		-3.222 (2.05)	-2.684 (1.98)	-2.376 (1.877)		0.235 (0.598)	0.114 (0.56)	0.126 (0.54)		0.438 (1.173)	0.029 (1.233)	0.254 (1.192)		0.132 (0.433)	0.333 (0.414)	0.306 (0.403)
Plaid Cymru		-0.242 (0.841)	-0.123 (0.812)	-0.465 (0.769)										1.018 (0.639)	0.639 (0.609)	0.317 (0.593)
Other Party		0.225 (0.654)	0.352 (0.633)	0.554 (0.597)		(1.434)** 0.469	1.596*** (0.442)	1.577*** (0.428)		0.387 (1.51)	0.322 (1.518)	-0.789 (1.549)		-0.396 (0.39)	-0.051 (0.374)	-0.117 (0.359)
No Party		-0.189 (0.115)	-0.196 (0.114)	0.092 (0.116)		0.403 (0.244)	0.31 (0.234)	0.509* (0.235)		0.209 (0.726)	0.223 (0.735)	0.517 (0.704)		0.269 (0.209)	0.158 (0.203)	0.383 (0.209)
Gender			-0.323*** (0.098)	-0.267** (0.093)			-0.264 (0.157)	-0.068 (0.151)			-0.459 (0.305)	-0.207 (0.3)			-0.206 (0.139)	-0.095 (0.136)
Age			-0.008* (0.003)	-0.015*** (0.003)			-0.01* (0.005)	-0.014** (0.005)			0.001 (0.01)	0.004 (0.01)			-0.017*** (0.004)	-0.02*** (0.004)
Unemploy- ed			0.255 (0.286)	0.372 (0.273)			-0.268 (0.348)	-0.066 (0.335)			-0.032 (0.445)	0.238 (0.423)			0.118 (0.369)	0.264 (0.355)
Non- Citizen			1.61*** (0.404)	1.579*** (0.381)			1.092*** (0.244)	0.951*** (0.235)			0.305 (0.425)	0.076 (0.411)			0.548 (0.301)	0.378 (0.29)
Education			0.255*** (0.031)	0.171*** (0.031)			0.391*** (0.049)	0.288*** (0.05)			0.109 (0.086)	-0.017 (0.087)			0.283*** (0.045)	0.216*** (0.046)
Social Trust				0.223*** (0.029)				0.174*** (0.045)				0.238** (0.085)				0.202*** (0.043)
Life Satisfaction				0.039 (0.024)				0.078* (0.039)				0.187* (0.076)				-0.001 (0.038)
Country Eco-Sat				0.179*** (0.023)				0.194*** (0.037)				-0.048 (0.071)				0.175*** (0.033)
HH Income				-0.149*				0.003				-0.066				-0.046

Satisfaction				(0.065)				(0.101)				(0.154)				(0.092)
Left-Right Ideology				-0.025 (0.028)				-0.112* (0.046)				-0.079 (0.083)				-0.089* (0.042)
Political TV				0.09** (0.033)				0.07 (0.051)				-0.026 (0.087)				-0.01 (0.047)
Interest in Politics				0.211*** (0.056)				0.327*** (0.088)				0.266 (0.146)				0.291*** (0.083)
Contact: A Few				-0.115 (0.161)				0.092 (0.255)				-0.388 (0.46)				-0.081 (0.304)
Contact: Several				0.122 (0.221)				0.624* (0.288)				0.866* (0.406)				0.442 (0.287)
Adj R2	0.054	0.094	0.157	0.254	0.017	0.045	0.17	0.267	0.027	0.055	0.052	0.173	0.016	0.037	0.133	0.215
Constant	3.35*** (0.13)	3.481*** (0.15)	3.303*** (0.273)	1.396*** (0.413)	4.409*** (0.239)	3.971*** (0.324)	3.21*** (0.444)	1.069 (0.661)	5.12*** (0.485)	4.739*** (0.841)	4.462*** (0.981)	2.177 (1.236)	4.389*** (0.21)	4.044*** (0.269)	4.108*** (0.413)	2.444*** (0.65)
N	1857				776				196				893			

Significance Levels: \* $\leq 0.05$  \*\* $\leq 0.01$  \*\*\* $\leq 0.001$

Excluded Dummies: Party ID = Conservative; Citizenship = Citizen; Gender = Male; Contact = No friends of different race/ethnicity

For each variable and the constant, numbers represent the Standardized Coefficients (Beta) and the numbers in parenthesis represent the Standard Error.

## References

- Adorno, T. W. Frenkel-Brunswick, E. Levinson, D. J. and Sanford, N. R. (1950) *The Authoritarian Personality*, (New York: Harper and Row).
- Allport, G. W. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley).
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London: Verso).
- Anderson, M. (1996) *Frontiers, Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*, (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Appleby, R. S. (1999) *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion Violence and Reconciliation*, (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publications Inc.).
- Aradau, C. (2004) "Security and the democratic scene", *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7, 4, pp. 388-413.
- "Ask Nigel Farage", *BBC News*, 30.04.15.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do Things with Words*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Baines, N. (2014) "Dear Prime minister: what is the UK government's strategy in Iraq and Syria", *The Guardian*, 16.08.14.
- Baker, P. Gabrielatos, C. Krzyżanowski, T. M. and Wodak, R. (2008) "A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourse of refugee and asylum seekers in the UK press", *Discourse and Society*, 19, 3, pp. 273-306.
- Baldwin, D. (1997) "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies*, 23, 1, pp. 5-26.
- Bale, T. Green-Pederson, C. Krouwel, A. Luther, K. R. Sitter, N. (2010) "If You Can't Beat Them? Explaining Social Democrat Responses to the Challenge from Populist Radical Right in Western Europe", *Political Studies*, 58, 3, pp. 410-426
- Bale, T. Hampshire, J. and Partos, R. (2011) "Having One's Cake and Eating It Too: Cameron's Conservatives and Immigration", *The Political Quarterly*, 82, 3, pp. 389-406.
- Balzacq, T. (2005) "Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience, and Context", *European Journal of International Relations*, 11, 2, pp. 171-201.
- Balzacq, T. (2011) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge).
- Balzacq, T. Léonard, S. and Ruzicka, J. (2016) "'Securitization' revisited: Theory and cases", *International Relations*, 30, 4, pp. 494-531.
- Barkin, J. S. and Sjöberg, L. (2015) "Calculating Critique: Thinking Outside the Methods Matching Game", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 43, 3, pp. 852-871.
- Basaran, T. (2008) "Security, Law, Borders: Spaces of Exclusion", *International Political Sociology*, 2, pp. 339-54.
- Batson, C. D. Schoenrade, P. and Ventis, W. L. (1993) *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*, (New York: Oxford University Press).
- BBC (2008) "Make immigrants legal – Cardinal", *BBC News*, 23.11.08 [online] Available: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7744556.stm> [24.06.2014].
- BBC (2009) "Elections 2009". *BBC News*, [online] Available: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/elections/euro/09/html/ukregion\\_999999.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/elections/euro/09/html/ukregion_999999.stm)
- BBC (2010) "Election 2010". *BBC News*, [online] Available: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/election2010/results/#> [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- BBC (2014a) "UK European election results", *BBC News*, 26.05.14. [online] Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/events/vote2014/eu-uk-results> [Accessed: 01.08.14].
- BBC (2014b) "Nigel Farage: '2010 UKIP Manifesto was 'drivel'", *BBC News*, 24.01.14. [online] Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-25879302> [Accessed: 20.07.17].

- BBC (2015) "Results" *BBC News*, [online] Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election/2015/results> [20.07.16].
- "BBC Election Debate 2015", *BBC News*, 16.04.15.
- Ben-Nun Bloom, P. Arikan, G. (2012a) "Priming Religious Belief and Religious Social Behaviour Affects Support for Democracy", *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 25, 3, pp. 368-82.
- Ben-Nun Bloom, P. Arikan, G. (2012b) "Religion and Support for Democracy: A Cross-National Test of the Mediating Mechanisms", *British Journal of Political Studies*, 43, pp. 375-97.
- Ben-Nun Bloom, P. Arikan, G. and Courtemanche, M. (2015) "Religious Social Identity, Religious Belief, and Anti-Immigration Sentiment", *American Political Science Review*, 109, 2, pp. 203-21.
- Bigo, D. (2002) "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", *Alternatives*, 27, 63-92.
- Bigo, D. (2006a) "Internal and External Aspects of Security", *European Security*, 15, 4, pp. 385-404.
- Bigo, D. (2006b) "Liberty, Whose Liberty? The Hague Programme and the Conception of Freedom" in T. Balzacq and S. Carrera (eds.) *Security versus Freedom? A Challenge for Europe's Future*, (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 35-45.
- Bigo, D. and Tsoukala, A. (2008) *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of the Liberal Regimes After 9/11*, (Oxon: Routledge).
- Bingham, J. (2015) "Welby: We must take in Mediterranean migrants" *Telegraph*, 20.04.15
- Bishops Conference of England and Wales (2005) "*The General Election 2005: A Letter to Catholics in England and Wales from their Bishops*", Catholic Communications Network, [online] Available: <http://archive.cliftondiocese.com/assets/files/pdf/2005/march/letter.pdf> [Accessed 27.07.17].
- Bishops Conference of England and Wales (2008) "*Mission of the Church to Migrants in England and Wales*", [online] 10.03.08, Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Catholic-News-Media-Library/Archive-Media-Assets/Files/CBCEW-Publications/Mission-of-the-Church-to-migrants-in-England-and-Wales-word> [Accessed 27.07.17].
- Bishops Conference of England and Wales (2010) "*Choosing the Common Good*", Stoke-on Trent: Alive Publishing.
- Bishops Conference of England and Wales (2015) "*The General Election 2015: A Letter to Catholics in England and Wales from their Bishops*", [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/Featured/Features-2015/General-Election-2015/Election-Letter> [Accessed 27.07.17].
- Blair, T. (2005a) "*Spring Conference Speech*", 13.02.05, Gateshead.
- Blair, T. (2005b) "*Speech on asylum and immigration*", 22.04.05.
- Blair, T. (2005c) "Third term speech", 06.05.05, London.
- Blair, T. (2005d) "*Conference: Leader's Speech*", 27.09.05, Brighton.
- Blair, T. (2006a) "*Conference: Leader's Speech*", 26.09.06, Manchester.
- Blair, T. (2006b) "*The Duty to Integrate: Shared British Values*", 08.12.06, London.
- Bleich, E. (2002) "Integrating Ideas into Policy-making analysis; Frames from Race Policies in Britain and France", *Comparative Political Studies*, 35, 9, pp. 1054-1076.
- Bobo, L. (1983) "Whites' Opposition to Busing: Symbolic Racism or Realistic Group Conflict?", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 6, pp. 1196-1210.
- Boomgaarden, H. G. and Freire, A. (2009) "Religion and Euroscepticism: Direct, Indirect or No Effects", *West European Politics*, 32, 6, pp. 1240-1265.
- Booth, K. (2005) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, (London: Lynne Rienner).
- Booth, L. (2007) *Theory of World Security*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Borah, P. (2011) "Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature", *Journal of Communication*, 61, 2, pp. 246-263.



- Borjas, G. J. (1995) "The Economic Benefits from Immigration", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9, 2, pp. 3-22.
- Borjas, G. J. (1999) "The Economic Analysis of Immigration", in O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labour Economics*, Vol. 3A, Amsterdam, North-Holland, pp. 1697-1760.
- Boswell, C. (2007) "Migration Control in Europe After 9/11: Explaining the Absence of Securitization", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45, 3, pp. 589-610.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992) *The Logic of Practice*, (Oxford: Polity Press).
- Brown, G. (2007a) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 02.10.07, Bournemouth.
- Brown, G. (2007b) "Managed Migration and Earned Citizenship", 2.02.08. London.
- Brown, G. (2008a) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 23.09.08, Manchester.
- Brown, G. (2009b) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 29.09.09, Brighton.
- Brewer, J. Tenney, F. and Higgins, G. (2010) "Religion and Peacemaking: A Conceptualization", *Sociology*, 44, 6, pp. 1009-1017.
- British Religion in Numbers (2017) "Church attendance in Britain, 1980-2015" *British Religion in Numbers*, [online] Available: <http://www.brin.ac.uk/figures/church-attendance-in-britain-1980-2015/> [26.05.17].
- Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Buonfino, A. (2004) "Between unity and plurality: the politicization and securitization of the discourse of immigration in Europe", *New Political Science*, 26, 1, pp. 23-49.
- Burns, P. and Gimpel, J. G. (2000) "Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public Opinion on Immigration Policy", *Political Science Quarterly*, 115, 2, pp. 210-225.
- Buzan, B. (1983) *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Buzan, B. (2007) "Will the 'global war on terrorism' be the new cold war?", *International Affairs*, 82, 6, pp. 1101-18.
- Buzan, B. and Wæver, O. (2009) "Macrosecuritisation and security constellations: reconsidering scale in securitisation theory", *Review of International Studies*, 35, 2, pp. 253-276.
- Buzan, B. Wæver, O. and de Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishing Inc.).
- Cameron, D. (2006) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 04.10.06, Bournemouth.
- Cameron, D. (2007a) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 03.10.07, Blackpool.
- Cameron, D. (2007b) "The challenges of a growing population", 29.10.07.
- Cameron, D. (2011a) "Speech on immigration", 14.04.11. Hampshire.
- Cameron, D. (2011b) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 05.10.11, Manchester.
- Cameron, D. (2011c) "Speech on immigration", 10.10.11, London.
- Cameron, D. (2013a) "Speech on immigration and welfare reform", 25.03.13. London.
- Cameron, D. (2013b) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 02.10.13, Manchester.
- Cameron, D. (2014a) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 01.10.14, Birmingham.
- Cameron, D. (2014b) "Speech on the EU", 28.11.14, Staffordshire.
- Capdevila, R. and Callaghan, J. E. M. (2008) "'It's not Racist. It's Common Sense'. A Critical Analysis of Political Discourse Around Asyoun and Immigration in the UK", *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 18, pp. 1-16.
- Carey, G. (2008) "It isn't racist to want a cap on immigration", *The Times*, 10.09.2008.
- Carey, G. (2010a) "Interview on BBC Radio 5", Interviewed by Nicky Campbell. [radio] BBC Radio 5, 6.01.2010. Available: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk\\_politics/8443338.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/8443338.stm) [Accessed 21.06.16]
- Carey, G. (2010b) "Migration threatens the DNA of our nation", *The Times*, 7.01.2010.

Carey, G. (2012) "When will our politicians realise that it's not racist to actually DO something about immigration?", *Daily Mail*, 06.10.2012.

Carey, (2014) "Why I, as a Christian, believe we must banish evil British jihadis from these shores, says the former Archbishop of Canterbury Lord Carey", *Mail on Sunday*, 24.08.2014.

Case Collective (2006) "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto", *Security Dialogue*, 37, pp. 443-487.

"Census religion question questioned" *National Secular Society*, 25.01.12  
<http://www.secularism.org.uk/news/2012/01/census-question-questioned>

Ceyhan, A. and Tsoukala, A. (2002) 'The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies: Ambivalent Discourse and Policies', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27, 3, pp. 91-126.

Chandler, R. C. and Tsai, Y. (2001) "Social factors influencing immigration attitudes: an analysis of data from the General Social Survey", *The Social Science Journal*, 38, pp. 177-188.

Chong, D. and Druckman, J. N. (2007a) "Framing Theory", *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 1, pp. 103-126.

Chong, D. and Druckman, J. N. (2007b) "A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments", *Journal of Communication*, 57, 1, pp. 99-118

Clegg, N. (2013) "*Speech on immigration*", 22.03.13. London.

Clegg, N. (2014a) "*Speech on immigration*", 05.08.14. London.

Clegg, N. (2014b) "*Conference: Leader's Speech*", 08.10.14. Glasgow.

*Clegg v Farage: The LBC Leader's Debate*. (2014) LBC. 26.03.14

Connolly, W. E. (1991) *Identity/Difference*, (London: Cornell University Press).

Crepaz, M. M. L. and Damron, R. (2008) "Constructing Tolerance: How the Welfare State Shapes Attitudes About Immigrants", *Comparative Political Studies*, 42, pp. 437-463.

Crisp, R. J. Husnu, S. Meleady, R. Stathi, S. and Turner, R. N. (2011) "From Imagery to intention: A dual route model of imagine contact effects", In W. Stroebe and M. Hewstone (eds.), *European review of social psychology*, 21, (Hove, UK: Psychology Press), pp. 188-236.

Croft, S. (2012) "Constructing Ontological Insecurity: The Insecuritization of Britain's Muslims", *Contemporary Security Policy*, 33, 2, pp. 219-235.

Cross Party Group on Balanced Migration (2010) "*A Declaration on Population: 70 Million is Too Many*", 6<sup>th</sup> Jan, [online] Available: <http://www.balancedmigration.com/briefing/declaration-on-population/>

Daily Mail (2007) "It is not extremist, or fascist, or illiberal to demand stringent immigration controls", *Daily Mail*, [online] 25.06.07, Available: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/columnists/article-464355/It-extremist-fascist-illiberal-demand-stringent-immigration-controls.html> [Accessed: 26.06.17].

Dannreuther, R. (2011) "China and global oil: vulnerability and opportunity", *International Affairs*, 87, 6, pp. 1345-1364.

Dannreuther, R. (2012) "Russia and the Middle East: A Cold War Paradigm?", *Europe-Asia Studies*, 64, 3, pp. 543-560.

Dannreuther, R. (2012) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Dannreuther, R. (2017) *Energy Security*, (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Day, C. L. (1989) "US Hispanics and immigration reform", *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association* (Chicago, IL, April 13-15).

Day, C. L. (1990) "Ethnocentrism, economic competition, and attitudes toward US immigration policy", *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association* (Chicago, IL, April 5-7).

Desrosiers, M. (2015) "Tackling Puzzles of Identity-Based Conflict: The Promise of Framing Theory", *Civil wars*, 12, 2, pp. 120-140.

Djupe, P. A. and Calfano, B. R. (2012) "Religious Value Priming, Threat, and Political Tolerance", *Political Research Quarterly*, 66, 4, pp. 768-780.

- Doty, R. L. (2007) "States of Exception on the Mexico-US Border: Security, 'Decisions,' and Civilian Border Controls", *International Political Sociology*, 1, 1, pp. 113-137.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001) "On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame?", *The Journal of Politics*, 63, pp. 1041-1066.
- Druckman, J. N. Green, D. P. Kuklinski, J. H. and Lupia, A. (2011) *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*, (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press).
- Druckman, J. N. and Nelson, K. R. (2003) "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence", *American Journal of Political Science*, 47, pp. 729-745.
- Eisinga, R. Felling, A. and Peters, J. (1990) "Religious Belief, Church Involvement, and Ethnocentrism in the Netherlands", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 1, pp. 54-75.
- Entman, R. M. (1993) "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm", *Journal of Communication*, 43, 4, pp. 51-58.
- Espenshade, T. J. and Calhoun, C. A. (1993) "An Analysis of Public Opinion toward Undocumented Immigration", *Population Research and Policy Review*, 12, 3, pp. 189-224.
- Espenshad, T. J. and Hempstead, K. (1996) "Contemporary American Attitudes Toward U.S Immigration", *International Migration Review*, 30, 2, pp. 535-70.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, (London: Longman).
- Faist, T. (2002) "'Extension du domaine de la lutte': International Migration and Security before and after September 11, 2001", *International Migration Review*, 36, 1, pp. 7-14.
- Floyd, R. (2007) "Towards a Consequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing Together the Copenhagen and Welsh Schools of Security Studies", *Review of International Studies*, 33, 2, pp. 327-350.
- Floyd, R. (2016) "Extraordinary or ordinary emergency measures: what, and who, defines the 'success' of securitization", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 29, 2, pp. 677-694.
- Ford, R. (2011) "Acceptable and Unacceptable Immigrants: How Opposition to Immigration in Britain is Affected by Migrants' Region of Origin", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37, 7, pp. 1017-1037.
- Fox, J. and Sandler, S. (2004) *Bringing Religion into International Relations*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan).
- Franco, F. M. and Maass, A. (1999) "Intentional control over prejudice: when the choice of the measure matters", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, pp. 469-477.
- Freeman, G. P. (1979) *Immigrant Labor and Racial Conflict in Industrial Societies*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Freeman, G. P. (1995) "Modes of Immigration Politics in Liberal Democratic States", *International Migration Review*, 29, 4, pp. 881-902.
- Gabel, M. (1998) "Public support for European integration: an empirical test of five theories", *Journal of Politics*, 60, pp. 333-54.
- Gamson, W. A. and Modigliani, A. (1987) 'The Changing Culture of Affirmative Action', *Research in Political Sociology*, 3, pp. 137-177.
- Gamson, W. A. and Modigliani, A. (1989) "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach", *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1, pp. 1-37.
- Geddes, A. and Scholten, P. (2016) *The Politics of Immigration in Europe*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (London: Sage).
- Gillham, B. (2000) *Case Study Research Methods*, (London: Continuum).
- Gorodzeisky, A. and Semyonov, M. (2016) "Not only Competitive Threat but also Racial Prejudice: Sources of Anti-Immigration Attitudes in European Societies", *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28, 3, pp. 331-354.
- Grayson, K. (2003) "Securitization and the Boomerang Debate: A Rejoinder to Liotta and Smith Windsor", *Security Dialogue*, 34, 3, pp.337-343.
- Hampshire, J. (2005) *Citizenship and Belonging: Immigration and the Politics of Demographic Governance in Postwar Britain*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Hampshire, J. and Bale, T. (2015) "New administration, New Immigration Regime: Do Parties Matter After All? A UK Case Study", *West European Politics*, 38, 1, pp. 145-166.

Hainmuller, J. and Hiscox, M. J. (2010) "Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-Skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment", *The American Political Science Review*, 104, 1, pp. 61-84.

Hansen, L. (2000) "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School", *Millennium*, 29, 2, pp. 285-306.

Hansen, L. (2011) "The politics of securitization and the Muhammad cartoon crisis: A post-structuralist perspective", *Security Dialogue*, 42, 4-5, pp. 357-369.

Hansen, L. (2012) "Reconstructing securitisation: the normative-political in the Copenhagen School and directions for how to apply it", *Review of International Studies*, 38, 3: 525-546.

Hansen, R. (2000) *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Hartman, T. K. and Weber, C. R. (2009) "Who Said What? The Effects of Source Cues in Issue Frames", *Political Behaviour*, 31, 4, pp. 537-558.

Haynes, J. (2007) *An Introduction to International Relations and Religion*, (Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.).

Hellwig, T. and Kweon, Y. (2016) "Taking Cues on Multidimensional Issues: The Case of Attitudes toward Immigration", *West European Politics*, 39, 4, pp. 710-730.

Helm, T. (2013) "Immigration fears are being stoked by politicians, says bishop", *The Guardian*, 23.03.13.

Herreroros, F. and Criado, H (2009) "Social Trust, Social Capital and Perceptions of Immigration", *Political Studies*, 57, 2, pp. 337-555.

Hertog, J. K. and McLeod, D. M. (2001) "A Multiperspective Approach to Framing Analysis: A Field Guide", in S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy Jr. and A. E. Grant (eds.) *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*, (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), 141-162.

Hewstone, M. and Swart, H. (2011) "Fifty-odd years of inter-group contact: From hypothesis to integrated theory", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, pp. 374-386.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2005) "Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration", *European Union Politics*, 6, 4, pp. 419-443.

Howard, M. (2005a) "*Howard: Time to act for the forgotten majority*", 04.01.05, Wellingborough.

Howard, M. (2005b) "*Howard: Firm but fair immigration controls*", 24.01.05, Conservative Campaign Headquarters.

Howard, M. (2005c) "*Howard: the cost of Tony Blair's chaotic asylum system*", 28.01.05, Kent.

Howard, M. (2005d) "*Michael Howard Speech to the CBI*", 01.03.05, London.

Howard, M. (2005e) "*Howard: Defeating the terrorism threat*", 11.03.05, Conservative Campaign Headquarters.

Howard, M. (2005f) "*Howard: It's time for change, it's time for action*", 12.03.05, Conservative Party Spring Conference.

Howard, M. (2005g) "*Howard: We can control our borders*", 29.03.05, Conservative Campaign Headquarters.

Howard, M. (2005h) "*Howard: It's time to set an annual limit to immigration*", 10.04.05, Telford.

Howard, M. (2005i) "*Howard: It's time to take a stand*", 23.04.05, Hastings.

Howard, M. (2005j) "*Howard: Our Hope is for a better Britain*", 02.05.05, London.

Howard, M. (2005k) "*Howard: It's not about talking and promising. It's about doing and delivering*", 03.05.05, Loughborough.

Hunsberger, B. and Jackson, L. M. (2005) "Religion, Meaning and Prejudice", *Journal of Social Issues*, 61, 4, pp. 807-826.

- Huysmans, J. (1995) "Migrants as a security problem: dangers of 'securitizing' societal issues", in R. Miles and D. Thranhardt (eds.) *Migration and European Integration: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion*, (London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.), 53-72.
- Huysmans, J. (2000) "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38, 5, pp. 751-777.
- Huysmans, J. (2001) "European identity and migration policies", in L. E. Cederman (ed.) *Constructing Europe's Identity: The External Dimension*, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner), pp. 189-211.
- Huysmans, J. (2002) "Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security", *Alternatives, Special Issue*, pp. 41-62.
- Huysmans, J. (2006) *The Politics of Insecurity*, (London: Routledge).
- Huysmans, J. and Buonfino (2008) "Politics of the Exception and Unease: Immigration, Asylum and Terrorism in Parliamentary Debates in the UK", *Political Studies*, 56, 4, pp. 766-788
- Ibrahim, M. (2005) "The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse", *International Migration*, 43, 5, pp. 163-187.
- Inglehart, R. and Klingeman, H. (1976) "Party Identification, Ideological Preference and the Left-Right Dimension among Western Mass Public", in Budge, I. Crewe, I. and Farlie, D. (eds.) *Party Identification and Beyond: Representations of Voting and Party Competition*, (London: John Wiley and Sons).
- "Interview: Rowan Williams", (2006) Interviewed by Alan Rusbridger. *The Guardian*, 21.03.06.
- Ipsos Mori (2017) Issues Index: "Most important issue facing Britain today", *Ipsos Mori*, [online] Available: <https://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/2905/Issues-Index-2012-onwards.aspx?view=wide> [Accessed: 26.07.17].
- Iyengar, S. (1991) *Is Anyone Responsible?*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Jackman, M. R. (1978) "General and Applied Tolerance: Does Education Increase Commitment to Racial Integration?", *American Journal of Political Science*, 22, 2, pp. 302-324.
- Janssen, J. H. (1991) "Postmaterialism, cognitive mobilization and public support for European integration", *British Journal of Political Science*, 21, pp. 443-468.
- Jones, B. and Martin, D. J. (2017) "Path-to-Citizenship or Deportation? How Elite Cues Shaped Opinion on Immigration in the 2010 U.S House Election", *Political Behaviour*, 39, pp. 177-204.
- Jones, S. "Vincent Nichols: enigmatic archbishop stepping into pope's inner circle", *The Guardian*, 18.02.14.
- Joppke, C. (1999) *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Jorgenson, M. and Phillips, L. J. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, (London: Sage).
- Joslyn, M. R. and Haider-Markel, D. P. (2006) "Should we Really 'Kill' the Messenger? Framing Physician-Assisted Suicide and the Role of Messengers", *Political Communication*, 23, 1, pp. 85-103.
- Karyotis, G. (2007) "European Migration Policy in the aftermath of September 11: The Security-Migration Nexus", *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 1, pp. 1-17.
- Karyotis, G. (2012) "Securitization of Migration in Greece: Process, Motives and Implications", *International Political Sociology*, 6, 4, pp. 390-408.
- Karyotis, G. and Patrikios, S. (2010) "Religion, Securitization and Anti-Immigration Attitudes: The Case of Greece", *Journal of Peace Research*, 47, 1, pp. 43-57.
- Katzenstein, J. (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Kennedy, C. (2005a) "Spring Conference: Leader's Speech", 05.03.05.
- Kennedy, C. (2005b) "Conference: Leader's Speech", 22.09.05, Blackpool.
- Kinder, D. R. and Sanders, L. M. (1990) "Mimicking political debate with survey questions: the case of white opinion on affirmative action for blacks", *Social Cognition*, 8, pp. 73-103.

- Kirkup, J. (2007) "David Cameron: 'UK needs immigration cut'", *Telegraph*, 29.10.07 [online] Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/conservative/1567722/David-Cameron-UK-needs-immigration-cut.html> [Accessed: 13.04.16].
- Kittel, B. Luhan, W. J. & Morton, R.B. (2012) *Experimental Political Science: Principles and Practices*, (London: Palgrave-Macmillan).
- Klüfers, P. (2014) "Security repertoires: towards a sociopragmatist framing of securitization processes", *Critical Studies on Security*, 2, 3, pp. 278-292.
- Knoll, B. R. (2009) "'And Who Is My Neighbour?' Religion and Immigration Policy Attitudes", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48, 2, pp. 313-331.
- Krosnick, J. A. and Brannon, L. A. (1993) "The Impact of the Gulf War on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations", *American Political Science Review*, 87, 4, pp. 963-975.
- Kunovich, R. M. (2004) "Social structural position and prejudice: an exploration of cross-national differences in regression slopes", *Social Science Research*, 33, pp. 20-44.
- Laclau, E. (2001) "Democracy and the Question of Power", *Constellations*, 8, 1, pp. 3-14.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, (London: Verso).
- Lausten, C. B. and Wæver, O. (2000) "In Defense of Religion: Sacred Referent Objects for Securitization", *Journal of International Studies*, 29, pp. 705-739.
- Layton-Henry, Z. (1992) *The Politics of Immigration: Immigration, 'Race' and 'Race' Relations in Post-war Britain*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).
- Léonard, S. and Kaunert, C. (2011) "Reconceptualizing the audience in securitization theory", in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve* (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 31-76.
- Lewin, K. (1951) *Field theory in social science—selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin*. Edited by D. Cartright (NY: Harper & Row).
- liarpoliticians (2011) "UKIP's Nigel Farage 2011 Conference Speech, part 1/2", [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8wOThpFw0lg> [30.04.16].
- liarpoliticians2 (2013) "2013 UKIP Party Conference: Nigel Farage keynote speech", [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v6GanjuNTMQ> [30.04.16].
- liarpoliticians2 (2014a) "Nigel Farage keynote speech, UKIP 2014 Spring Conference", [online]. Available: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A6JgyJp\\_QJw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A6JgyJp_QJw) [30.04.16].
- liarpoliticians2 (2014b) "2014 UKIP Conference: Nigel Farage keynote speech", [online]. Available: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cJ5aEIS\\_0MM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cJ5aEIS_0MM) [30.04.16].
- Liberation and Entrapment Project (2015) "Mission, Migrants and Refugees", *The Church of England*, [online] Available: <https://www.churchofengland.org/our-faith/mission/mission-theology.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- Little, D. (ed.) (2007) *Peacemakers In Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*, (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Lohrmann, R. (2000) "Migrants, Refugees and Insecurity: Current Threats to Peace", *International Migration*, 38, 4, pp. 3-22.
- Lubbers, M. Coenders, M. and Scheepers, P. (2006) "Objections to Asylum Seeker Centres: Individual and Contextual Determinants of Resistance to Small and Large Centres in the Netherlands", *European Sociological Review*, 22, 3, pp. 243-257.
- Lynch, P. (2009) "Our mission to, with and for migrants today: the context, the principles and the pastoral strategy", 31<sup>st</sup> Annual National Justice and Peace Conference, Hayes Conference Centre, Swanwick.
- Lynch, P. (2011) "Migration Bishop on the 2011 World Day of Migrants and Refugees", 13.01.11. [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/News/2011/Migration-Bishop-on-the-2011-World-Day-of-Migrants-and-Refugees> [Accessed: 20.06.16].
- Lynch, P. (2012) "Migration and the New Evangelization" 12.01.2012, Southwark. [online] Available at: <http://www.indcatholicnews.com/news.php?viewStory=19615> [Accessed: 20.06.16].

- Lynch, P. (2013a) "Bishop for Migration responds to Home Office 'Go Home or face arrest' mobile billboard campaign", *The Catholic Church of England and Wales*, 26.07.13. [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/News/2013/July-Sept/Go-home-or-face-arrest> [Accessed: 20.06.16].
- Lynch, P. (2013b) "Bishop's message for the World Day of Migrants and Refugees", 10.01.2013. [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/News/2013/January-March/Migrants-and-Refugees-Day> [Accessed: 20.06.16].
- Lynch, P. (2014a) "World Day for Migrants and Refugees: Bishop Patrick Lynch's Homily", 19.01.14, St George's Cathedra, Southwark. [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/News/2013/January-March/Migrants-and-Refugees-Day> [Accessed: 20.06.16].
- Lynch, P. (2014b) "Migrants Mass 2014, Homily: Bishop Patrick Lynch", 05.05.14, Westminster Cathedral, London,
- Lynch, P. (2015) "Right to asylum must never be denied when people's lives are truly threatened", *Huffington Post*, 29.03.15.
- Mavelli, L. (2013) "Between Normalisation and the Exception: The Securitisation of Islam and the Construction of the Secular Subject", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 41, 2, pp. 159-181.
- McDaniel, E. L. Nooruddin, I. and Shortle, A. F. (2011) "Divine Boundaries: How Religion Shapes Citizens' Attitudes toward Immigrants", *American Politics Research*, 39, 1, pp. 205-233.
- McDonald, M. (2008) "Securitization and the Construction of Security", *European Journal of International Relations*, 14, 4, pp. 563-587.
- McDonald, M. (2008) "Discourses of climate security", *Political Geography*, 33, 1, pp. 42-51.
- McLaren, L. M. (2001) "Immigration and the new politics of inclusion and exclusion in the European Union: The effect of elites and the EU on individual-level opinions regarding European and non-European immigrants", *European Journal of Political Research*, 39, pp. 81-108.
- McLaren, L. M. (2003) "Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat, Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants", *Social Forces*, 3, pp. 909-936.
- McLaren, L. M. (2012a) "The cultural divide in Europe: migration, multiculturalism, and political trust", *World Politics*, 64, 2, pp. 199-241.
- McLaren, L. M. (2012b) "Immigration and Trust in Politics in Britain", *British Journal of Political Science*, 42, 1, pp. 163-185.
- McLaren, L. M. and Johnson, M. (2007) "Resources, Group Conflict, and Symbols: Explaining Anti-Immigration Hostility in Britain", *Political Studies*, 55, 4, pp. 709-732.
- McSweeney, B. (1996) "Review: Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School", *Review of International Studies*, 22, 1, pp. 81-93.
- McSweeney, B. (1999) *Security, Identity and Interests*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Miliband, E. (2012a) "Speech to Institute for Public Policy Research", 22.06.12. London.
- Miliband, E. (2012b) "Speech on Immigration", 14.12.12, London.
- Miliband, E. (2014a) "Speech to London Business School on Europe", 12.03.14, London.
- Miliband, E. (2014b) "Britain needs real change, not false promises", 27.05.14, Thurrock.
- Miliband, E. (2014d) "Election Pledge on Immigration", 15.12.14. Great Yarmouth.
- Miliband, D. (2015) "Speech on immigration", 18.04.15.
- Möller, F. (2007) "Photographic Interventions in Post-9/11 Security Policy", *Security Dialogue*, 38, pp. 179-196.
- Morton, R. B. and Williams, K. (2010) *Experimental Political Science and the Study of Causality. From Nature to the Lab*, (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press).
- Mulvey, G. (2010) "When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematicizing of Immigration and the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK", *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23, 4, pp. 437-462.
- Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2005a) "Cardinal Spells out his Position", 15.03.05. [press release] Catholic Communications Service.

Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2005b) "Address by the Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor at the interfaith gathering, Lyon", 12.09.05, Lyon. [online] Available: [http://www.rcdow.org.uk/cardinal/default.asp?library\\_ref=1&content\\_ref=498](http://www.rcdow.org.uk/cardinal/default.asp?library_ref=1&content_ref=498) [Accessed: 30.06.15].

Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2006) "Homily by Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor for Migrants", 02.05.06. [online] Available: <http://www.catholicnews.org.uk/Home/News/2006/Homily-by-Cardinal-Cormac-Murphy-O'Connor-May-Day-for-Migrants>. [Accessed: 30.06.15].

Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2007) "Christmas Homily 2007", [online] Available: [http://www.rcdow.org.uk/cardinal/default.asp?library\\_ref=1&content\\_ref=1715](http://www.rcdow.org.uk/cardinal/default.asp?library_ref=1&content_ref=1715) [Accessed: 24.06.2014].

Murphy-O'Connor, C. (2008) "Cardinal Cormac welcomes Polish migrants", 17.01.08. [online] Available: [http://www.cardinalrating.com/cardinal\\_65\\_\\_article\\_6546.htm](http://www.cardinalrating.com/cardinal_65__article_6546.htm). [Accessed: 30.06.15].

NatCen (2011) "Religion: Losing Faith?" in *British Social Attitudes* 28, pp. 173-184. [online] Available: <http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-28/key-findings/summary.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].

NatCen (2016) "Understanding the Leave Vote", *Natcen*, [online] Available: <http://natcen.ac.uk/our-research/research/understanding-the-leave-vote/?gclid=CLKivoXQstMCFQML0wodlwUOKQ> [Accessed: 27.07.17].

Nazir-Ali, M. (2008a) "Extremism flourished as UK lost Christianity", *Telegraph*, 06.01.2008.

Nazir-Ali, M. (2008b) "Breaking Faith with Britain", *Standpoint*, June 2008.

Neal, A. W. (2009) "Securitization and the Risk at the EU Border: The Origins of FRONTEX", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47, 2, pp. 333-356.

Nelson, T. E. Clawson, R. A. and Oxley, Z. M. (1997) "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance", *The American Political Science Review*, 91, 3, pp. 567-583.

Migration Watch (2017) "Net Migration Figures", *Migration Watch*, [online] Available: <https://www.migrationwatchuk.org/statistics-net-migration-statistics>

Nichols, V. (2011) "Interview on Sky News", Interviewed by Dermot Murnaghan. [Television] *Sky News*, 17.04.11.

Nichols, V. (2013) "UK immigration policy is punishing Britons with non-EU spouses", *The Guardian*, 15.12.13.

Nichols, V. (2014) 'Cardinal Vincent Nichols warns against "alarmist" language on immigration', *The Telegraph*, 21 April, [online], Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/10773522/Cardinal-Vincent-Nichols-warns-against-alarmist-language-on-immigration.html> [24.06.2014].

Nichols, V. (2015) "Interview: Cardinal Vincent Nichols Archbishop of Westminster", Interviewed by Sophie Raworth, [television], *The Andrew Marr Show, BBC One*, 01.03.15.

O'Donoghue, P. (2006) "Message for World Migration Day", 14.11.06. [online] Available: <http://archive.cliftondiocese.com/message-for-world-migration-day-2006> [Accessed: 03.04.17].

Office for National Statistics (2012) "Religion in England and Wales", *ONS*, [online] Available: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/religion/articles/religioninenglandandwales2011/2012-12-11>. [Accessed: 03.04.17].

Page-Gould, E. Mendoza-Denton, R. and Tropp, L. R. (2008) "With a Little Help From My Cross-Group Friend: Reducing Anxiety in Intergroup Contexts Through Cross-Group Friendship", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 5, pp. 1080-94.

Paris, R. (2001) "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air", *International Security*, 26, 2, pp. 87-102.

Paul, K. (1997) *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era*, (New York: Cornell University Press).

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997) "Generalized Intergroup Contact Effects on Prejudice", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 2, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2006) "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 5, pp. 751-783.



- Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2008) "How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, pp. 922-934.
- Philpott, D. (2007) "Explaining the Political Ambivalence of Religion", *American Political Science Review*, 101, 3, pp. 505-525.
- Question Time Special*. (2015) BBC. 30.04.15
- Quillian, L. (1995) "Prejudice as a Response to Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-Immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe", *American Sociological Review*, 60, 4, pp. 586-611.
- Roe, P. (2004) "Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization", *Security Dialogue*, 35, 3, pp. 279-294.
- Roe, P. (2008) "Actor, Audience(s) and emergency measures: Securitization and the UK's decision to invade Iraq", *Security Dialogue*, 39, 6, pp. 615-635.
- Salter, M. B. (2008) "Securitization and desecuritization: a dramaturgical analysis of the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority", *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 11, pp. 321-349.
- Salter, M. (2011) "When securitization fails: the hard case of counter-terrorism programs", in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 116-131.
- Saroglou, V. Delpierre, V. and Dernelle, R. (2004) "Values and religiosity: a meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's model", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, pp. 721-734.
- Schain, M. A. (2008) *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain and the United States: A Comparative Study*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Scheepers, P. Gijsberts, M. and Hello, E. (2002) "Religiosity and Prejudice against Ethnic Minorities in Europe: Cross-National Tests on a Controversial Relationship", *Review of Religious Research*, 43, 3, pp. 242-265.
- Scheufele, D. A. and Tewksbury, D. (2007) "Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Model", *Journal of Communication*, 57, 1, pp. 9-20.
- Scheve, K. F. and Slaughter, M. J. (2001) "Labour Market Competition and Individual Preferences Over Immigration Policy", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83, 1, pp. 133-145.
- Schmitt, C. (1985 [1922]) *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, translated by G. Schwab, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Schneider, S. L. (2008) "Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: Outgroup Size and Perceived Ethnic Threat", *European Sociological Review*, 24, 1, pp. 53-67.
- Schuck, A. R. T. and de Vreese, C. H. (2006) "Between risk and opportunity: News framing and its effects on public support for EU enlargement", *European Journal of Communication*, 21, 1, pp. 5-32.
- Schwartz, S. H. and Huismans, P. (1995) "Value Priorities and Religiosity in Four Western Religions", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 2, pp. 88-107.
- Semyonov, M. Raijman, R. and Gorodzeisky, A. (2006) "The Rise of Ant-Foreigner Sentiment in European Societies, 1988-2000", *American Sociological Review*, 71, 3, pp. 426-499.
- Semyonov, M. Raijman, R. and Gorodzeisky, A. (2008) "Foreigners' impact on European societies: Public views and perceptions in a cross-national comparative perspective", *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49, 1, pp. 5-29.
- Shen, F. and Edwards, H. H. (2005) "Economic individualism, humanitarianism, and welfare reform: A value-based account of framing effects", *Journal of Communication*, 55, pp. 759-809.
- Sides, J. and Citrin, J. (2007) "European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information", *British Journal of Political Science*, 37, 3, pp. 477-504.
- Sjoberg, L. and Peet, J. (2010) "Targeting Civilians in War: Feminist Approaches", in J. A. Ticker and L. Sjoberg (eds.) *Feminism in International Relations: Conversations about the Past, Present, and Future*, (New York, Routledge), 169-87.
- Sjöstedt, R. (2011) "Health issues and securitization: the construction of HIV/AIDS as a US national security threat", in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 170-185.

- Slothuus, R. (2010) "When Can Political Parties Lead Public Opinion? Evidence from a Natural Experiment", *Political Communication*, 27, 2, pp. 158-177.
- Slothuus, R. and de Vreese, C. H. (2010) "Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue Framing Effects", *The Journal of Politics*, 72, 3, pp. 630-645.
- Smidt, C. E. Kellstedt, L. A. and Guth, J. L. (2009) "The role of Religion in American Politics: Explanatory Theories and Associated Analytical and Measurement Issues" in C. E. Smidt, L. A. Kellstedt and J. L. Guth (eds.) *Oxford Handbook on Religion and American Politics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 3-42.
- Smith, J. (2008) "Towards Consensus? Centre-right parties and immigration policy in the UK and Ireland", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15, 3, pp. 415-431.
- Sniderman, P. M. Hagendoorn, L. and Prior, M. (2004) "Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities", *American Political Science Review*, 98, 1, pp. 35-49.
- Sniderman, P. M. and Theriault, S. M. (2004) "The structure of political argument and the logic of issue framing", in W. E. Saris and P. M. Sniderman (eds.) *Studies in Public Opinion*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), pp. 133-165.
- Spencer, I. R. G. (1997) *British Immigration Policy Since 1939: The Making of Multi-Racial Britain*, (London: Routledge).
- Stake, R. C. (2005) "Qualitative Case Studies", in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (London: Sage), pp. 443-466.
- Starr, P. D. and Roberts, A. E. (1982) "Attitudes towards new Americans: Perceptions of Indo-Chinese in nine cities", *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*, 3, pp. 165-186.
- Statham, P. (2003) "Understanding the Anti-Asylum Rhetoric: Restrictive Politics or Racist Publics?", *Political Quarterly*, 74, 1, pp. 163-177.
- Statham, P. and Geddes, A. (2006) "Elites and the 'organised public': Who drives British immigration politics and in which direction?", *West European Politics*, 29, 2, pp. 248-269.
- Steenbergen, M. R. Edwards, E. E. and de Vries, C. E. (2007) "Who's Cueing Whom?: Mass Elite Linkages and the Future of European Integration", *European Union Politics*, 8, 1, pp. 13-35.
- Stritzel, H. (2007) "Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond", *European Journal of International Relations*, 13, 3, pp. 357-383.
- Stritzel, H. (2012) "Securitization, power, intertextuality: Discourse theory and the translations of organized crime", *Security Dialogue*, 43, 6, pp. 549-567.
- Sullivan, J. L. Pierson, J. And Marcus, G. E. (1982) *Political tolerance and American democracy*, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Tajfel, H. (1970) "Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination", *Scientific American*, 232, pp. 96-102.
- Telegraph (2005) "Amnesty demanded for 500,000 immigrants", *Telegraph*, 08.05.07.
- Tesfahuney, M (1998) "Mobility, racism and geopolitics", *Political Geography*, 17, 5, pp. 499-515.
- The Church of England (2009) "General Synod 2009 motion on asylum seekers" February 2009, [online] Available: <https://www.churchofengland.org/our-views/home-and-community-affairs/asylum-and-immigration/asylum-and-immigration-synod/asylum-seekers-general-synod-february-2009.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- The Church of England (2010) "Countering far right political parties, extremist groups and racist politics: A guidance note", Mission and Public Affairs Division: London. 20.01.10.
- The Church of England (2014) "Position statement passed unanimously at the Churches' Refugee Network conference, meeting at Sheffield on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2014", 05.04.14. [online] Available: [http://www.cte.org.uk/Articles/399109/Home/News/Latest\\_news\\_articles/Churches\\_Refugee\\_Network.aspx](http://www.cte.org.uk/Articles/399109/Home/News/Latest_news_articles/Churches_Refugee_Network.aspx) [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- The Church of England (2015) "Who is my neighbour? A Letter from the House of Bishops to the People and Parishes of the Church of England for the General Election 2015", 17.02.15. [online] Available: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2015/02/house-of-bishops'-pastoral-letter-on-the-2015-general-election.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].

The Church of England (2016) "2015 Attendance Figures Published", 26.10.16. [online] Available: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2016/10/2015-attendance-statistics-published.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].

The Conservative Party (2005) *The Conservative Election Manifesto*.

The Conservative Party (2010) *The Conservative Election Manifesto*.

The Conservative Party (2015) *The Conservative Election Manifesto*.

*The European Union: In or Out*. (2014) BBC. 02.04.14

*The First Election Debate*. (2010) ITV. 15.04.10

*The ITV Leader's Debate*. (2015) ITV. 02.04.15

The Labour Party (2005) *The Labour Election Manifesto*.

The Labour Party (2010) *The Labour Election Manifesto*.

The Labour Party (2015) *The Labour Election Manifesto*.

The Liberal Democrats (2005) *The Liberal Democrats Election Manifesto*.

The Liberal Democrats (2010) *The Liberal Democrats Election Manifesto*.

The Liberal Democrats (2015) *The Liberal Democrats Election Manifesto*.

The Migration Observatory (2014) "Migration to the UK: Asylum" (2014) *The Migration Observatory*, [online] Available: <http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/briefings/migration-uk-asylum> [Accessed: 07.07.16].

*The Prime Ministerial Debate*. (2010) BBC. 29.04.10

*The Sky News Debate*. (2010) Sky News. 22.04.10

The Tablet (2005) "Howard's immigration policies 'immoral'" *The Tablet*, [online] 29.01.05, Available: <http://archive.thetablet.co.uk/article/29th-january-2005/35/howards-immigration-policies-immoral> [Accessed: 12.04.16].

Tolsma, J. Lubbers, M. and Coenders, M. (2008) "Ethnic Competition and Opposition to Ethnic Intermarriage in the Netherlands: A Multi-Level Approach", *European Sociological Review*, 24, 2, pp. 215-30.

Trombetta, M. J. (2011) "Rethinking the securitization of the environment: old beliefs, new insights", in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 235-149.

Tsoukala, A. (2005) "Looking at Migrants as Enemies", in D. Bigo and E. Guild, *Controlling Frontiers*, (Aldershot: Ashgate), 161-192.

Turner, R. N. and Crisp, R. J. (2010) "Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, pp. 129-42.

UKIP (2005) *The UKIP Election Manifesto*.

UKIP (2010) *The UKIP Election Manifesto*.

UKIP (2015) *The UKIP Election Manifesto*.

UKIP Official Channel (2013) "Nigel Farage addresses the UKIP 2013 Spring Conference in Exeter", [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAR0bOdY1mU> [Accessed: 30.04.16].

United Nations. (2000) *Replacement Migration: Is It a Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?*, (New York, United Nations, Population Division, Economic and Social Affairs).

Van Dalen, H. P. and Henkens, K. (2005) "The Rationality Behind Immigration Policy Preferences", *De Economist*, 153, 1, pp. 67-83.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993) *Elite Discourse and Racism*, (Sage: California).

Videos From The Underground (2012) *UKIP 2007 Annual Conference 2/7* [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J1tKU8m0X-0> [Accessed: 30.04.16]

voteleavemedia (2009a) *UKIP Nigel Farage MEP Speech – Spring Conference 2009 Part 1* [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z7xj-jtipJg> [Accessed: 30.04.16].

- voteleavemedia (2009b) *UKIP Nigel Farage MEP Speech – Spring Conference 2009 Part 2* [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qzksm8hPvpg> [Accessed: 30.04.16].
- voteleavemedia (2009c) *UKIP Conference Speech 2009 – Nigel Farage Part 1 of 3* [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tJv8Q5XAe-4> [Accessed: 30.04.16].
- voteleavemedia (2009d) *UKIP Conference Speech 2009 – Nigel Farage Part 2 of 3* [online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H26C4DCoUw4> [Accessed: 30.04.16].
- voteleavemedia (2009e) *UKIP Conference Speech 2009 – Nigel Farage Part 3 of 3* [online]. Available: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bl\\_HhlyL8EY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bl_HhlyL8EY) [Accessed: 30.04.16].
- voteleavemedia (2012) *UKIP Conference 2012 – Nigel Farage leader Full Conference Speech* [online]. Available: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOONG\\_9mUoE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOONG_9mUoE) [Accessed: 30.04.16].
- Vossing, K. (2015) “Transforming public opinion about European integration: Elite influence and its limits”, *European Union Politics*, 16, 2, pp. 157-175.
- Vuori, J. A. (2008) “Illocutionary Logic and the Strands of Securitization: Applying the Theory of Securitization to the Study of Non-Democratic Political Orders”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 14, 1, pp. 65-99.
- Vuori, J. A. (2011) “Religion bites: Fulungong, securitization/desecuritization in the People’s Republic of China”, in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 186-211.
- Wæver, O. (1993) “Societal security: the concept” in O. Wæver, B. Buzan and M. Kelstrup (eds.) *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*, (New York: St. Martin’s Press Inc.), pp. 17-40.
- Wæver, O. (1995) “Securitization and Desecuritization” in R. D. Lipshutz (ed.) *On Security*, (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 46-86.
- Wæver, O. (1998) “Insecurity, security and asecuritization in the West European non-war community”, in E. Adler and M. Barnett (eds.) *Security Communities*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 69-118.
- Wæver, O. (2003) *Securitisation: taking stock of a research programme in security studies*, (unpublished manuscript).
- Wald, K. D. Owen, D. E. and Hill, S. S. (1988) “Churches as Political Communities”, *The American Political Science Review*, 82, 2, pp. 531-548.
- Wald, K. D. and Smidt, C. E. (1993) “Measurement Strategies in the Study of Religion and Politics”, in D. C. Leege and L. A. Kellstedt (eds.) *Rediscovering the Religious Factor in American Politics*, (New York: M. E. Sharpe), pp. 26-49.
- Walker, D. (2015) “Bishop of Manchester: I want leaders who look on migrants with compassion”, *The Guardian*, 25.04.15.
- Walker, P. M. Silvert, L. Hewstone, M. and Nobre, A. C. (2008) “Social contact and other-race face processing in the human brain”, *Social, Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 3, 1 pp. 16-25.
- Walt, S. M. (1991) “The Renaissance of Security Studies”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 35, 2, pp. 211-239.
- Waltz, K. (1959) *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Weiner, M. (1992) “Security, Stability and International Migration”. *International Security*, 17, 3, pp. 91-126.
- Weldon, S. (2006) “The Institutional Context of Tolerance for Ethnic Minorities: A Comparative, Multilevel Analysis of Western Europe”, *American Journal of Political Science* 50, 2, pp. 331-349.
- West, K. Holmes, E. and Hewstone, M. (2011) “Enhancing imagined contact to reduce prejudice against people with schizophrenia”, *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 3, pp. 407-428.
- Wellman, J. K. and Kyoko, T. (2004) “Is Religious Violence Inevitable”, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 43, 3, pp. 291-296.
- Wilkinson, C. (2011) “The limits of spoken words: from meta-narratives to experiences of security”, in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 94-115.

- Williams, M. C. (1998) "Modernity, Identity and Security: A Comment on the 'Copenhagen Controversy'", *Review of International Studies*, 24, 3, pp. 435-439.
- Williams, M. C. (2003) "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics", *International Studies Quarterly*, 47, 4, pp. 511-531.
- Williams, M. C. (2011) "The continuing evolution of securitization theory", in T. Balzacq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*, (Oxon: Routledge), pp. 212-222.
- Williams, R. (2005) "An open letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, to the leaders of political parties: General Election 2005", 31.03.05. [online] Available: <http://rowanwilliams.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/1178/archbishop-issues-letter-to-party-leaders> [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- Williams, R. (2008) "Civil and Religious Law in England: a religious perspective", 07.02.08, London.
- Williams, R. (2010) "Enriching the arguments: the refugee contribution to British life" 12.05.10, London.
- Williams, R. and Sentamu, J. (2009) "Joint Statement on the European Parliamentary and local elections", 24.05.09. [online] Available: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2009/05/prabcaby.aspx> [Accessed: 27.07.17].
- Williams, R. and Sentamu, J. (2010) "Archbishops article on the General Election", *Church Times*, 29.04.2010.
- Wright, S. C. Aron, A. McLaughlin-Volpe, T. and Ropp, S. A. (1997) "The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, pp. 73-90.
- Wuthnow, R. J. (2011) "Taking Talk Seriously: Religious Discourse as Social Practice", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, 1, pp. 1-21.
- Wyn Jones, R. (1999) *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner).
- Yin, R. K. (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods 4<sup>th</sup> ed.*, (London: SAGE).
- Zaller, J. (1992) *The nature and origins of mass opinion*, (New York: Cambridge University Press).