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Abstract
This study makes two original contributions; firstly, it examines the extent to which having a migratory family heritage increases the likelihood that British Members of Parliament (MPs) will submit parliamentary questions pertaining to forms of anti-immigrant prejudice. Other academic research into representation finds a positive association between descriptive and substantive representation immigrant-origin, suggesting that immigrant-origin MPs will substantively represent the interests of minority citizens to a greater extent than MPs who do not have an immigrant family background.

In addition, it examines whether immigrant-origin MPs exhibit signs of an ‘inter-group solidarity’ which renders them more inclined to table questions addressing forms of prejudice that other politically underrepresented groups; chiefly, women, sexual minorities and the disabled, encounter. By doing so, this study investigates two hitherto unexplored areas of research through the use of parliamentary questions for written answer tabled by British MPs over the course of the 2005-10 and 2010-15 Parliaments.
The results from the first line of enquiry indicate that there was, in fact, a negative, albeit statistically insignificant, relationship between immigrant-origin status of MPs and the submission of questions pertaining to prejudice; however, the opposite was the case for ethnic minority MPs, suggesting that feelings of group consciousness is stronger among non-white MPs than it is among white immigrant-origin MPs. Furthermore, this may again indicate that ethnic/racial prejudice is not as salient an issue among these MPs.

Results from the second line of enquiry reveal modest, although statistically insignificant, evidence of group solidarity among immigrant-origin MPs that extends to other groups, although the main determinant for submitting questions of this nature was membership of the parliamentary Labour Party, a finding that is perhaps consistent with the party’s history of highlighting anti-discrimination measures.
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Introduction

Discourse both inside and outside of academia often assumes a positive relationship between descriptive and substantive representation. This is based on the theory that groups which are descriptively under-represented among political office holders are better represented by legislators whom they descriptively resemble, such as race/ethnicity, gender or socioeconomic background because they are more sensitive towards and have a better understanding of issues affecting under-represented groups (Dovi, 2002; Mansbridge, 1999, 2003).

This theory would suggest that immigrant-origin Members of Parliament (MPs) will be expected to be more likely to raise issues relating to forms of racial and religious prejudice than native British parliamentarians.
Research into minority group representation at the national level of British politics has thus far focused on minority issues such as immigration to the UK and matters relating to ethnic, racial and religious diversity (Saalfeld, 2011; Saalfeld & Bischof, 2013; Kolpinskaya, 2016). As a result, less is known about MPs’ responsiveness to specific issues that predominantly or disproportionately affect individuals from an immigrant background. This study seeks to build on this extant research by focusing on MPs’ responsiveness to different kinds of prejudice.

To date, and to the best of my knowledge, research has yet to be conducted into whether immigrant-origin MPs are more likely than native British MPs to raise or draw attention towards the forms of prejudice that predominantly or exclusively affect other groups which have been traditionally descriptively underrepresented in elected office such as women, LGBT individuals and those with mental or physical disabilities. Therefore, this paper seeks to ascertain whether there immigrant-origin MPs exhibit a form of ‘cross-group’ solidarity or consciousness that encompasses these other aforementioned underrepresented groups. This aspect of the paper is loosely based on and inspired by the discussion of surrogate representatives found within Mansbridge (1999, 2003 & 2011). Surrogate representatives are legislators who seek to substantively represent individuals who reside outside of their constituencies, often due to solidarity with citizens with whom they share certain characteristics, such as race, irrespective of where they happen to reside.

At this stage, it is important and useful to clarify and disentangle the terms ‘immigrant-origin’ and ‘ethnic minority’ which appear throughout this paper, especially when previous research into minority representation has typically focused on ethnic minorities and or ‘visible’ minorities. Immigrant-origin is a category that includes UK citizens and residents who are at most generation removed from immigration, (i.e. they are themselves immigrants or who have or had at least one parent who was a foreign national.) This includes those who are of white non-British heritage. Ethnic minority, conversely, refers to individuals with non-European ancestry. As non-European migration into the UK is relatively recent, occurring for the most part from the 1950s and 60s onwards (Heath et al., 2013), many ethnic minority Britons will qualify as immigrant-origin under this definition. A further term, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME), is used interchangeably with ethnic minority throughout the paper.
This study, therefore, makes two contributions. Firstly, it examines whether increasing descriptive representation of immigrant-origin MPs will enhance the substantive representation of immigrant-origin citizens and residents in relation to discrimination and other forms of prejudice in relation to the types of prejudice these groups encounter.

Secondly, it provides an introductory assessment of whether the interests of other minority groups have been substantively represented by immigrant-origin MPs. The rest of this paper is structured as follows. It first continues with a theoretical discussion about representation. This is followed by a section detailing the research design. The latter half of the paper includes the presentation and discussion of the results.

**Theory**

In the United Kingdom, discrimination and other forms of prejudice affect immigrant-origin individuals. Efforts made by legislators to address, combat and raise issues concerning prejudice can be, in this sense, considered to be among the objective interests of immigrant-origin individuals.

It is argued in normative literature on representation that descriptively underrepresented groups will have their interests and concerns best represented and articulated by legislators from similar backgrounds to themselves (see e.g., Mansbridge, 1999, 2003; Dovi, 2002). Increasing the proportion of descriptive representatives elected to a legislature so that it is more evenly representative of wider society is said to increase the likelihood that these interests will be adequately articulated and addressed (Phillips, 1998).

According to this logic, we would, therefore, expect to find that immigrant-origin MPs will be more inclined to raise issues relating to ethnic and racial prejudice and discrimination through various forms of parliamentary activity, such as questions or in speeches. However, this motivation to do so may not be apparent, or as strongly apparent, among white immigrant-origin MPs as racial or ethnic discrimination is not thought to affect whites to nearly the same extent, if at all. As a consequence, MPs
do not consider it an issue that ought to be highlighted and represented. Their decision not to represent this issue may be due to the fact that significant political movements have not mobilised against the settlement of white immigrants and that opposition to white migrants, especially Australians, has been much lower among the general public than non-whites from the Caribbean and the Indian Subcontinent (Ford, Jennings & Somerville, 2015; Ford, 2011). Hence, one could say that there exists a ‘hierarchy’ of migrants that is based on how favourably they are viewed by the host population (see e.g. Pettigrew, 1998). While the experiences of previous (and current) generations of Irish, Jewish, and other Eastern European migrants indicates that ‘whiteness’ does not necessarily shield them from the effects of discrimination (Fox, Morosanu & Szilassy, 2012). Their skin colour, however, could still be a marker of privilege, especially for later generations of European migrants. This is not a luxury that is not afforded to British-born ethnic minorities who remain distinct or ‘foreign’ due to their physical appearance and or name (McDowell, 2009).

In the opinion of Mansbridge (2003), there is a greater probability that descriptive representatives will feel a sense of responsibility to represent the interests of individuals with whom they share certain traits or characteristics, such as gender, race or ethnicity or socio-economic background. This is due, she contends, to the heightened sense of sensitivity that helps them to relate to the experiences of others like them because they have experienced life as a member of a minority group. Legislators from the majority group, in this case, MPs of White British origin, will not have had this experience and so may struggle to relate or understand how various forms of prejudice and discrimination can manifest in different settings.

Empirical research has demonstrated evidence of an association between descriptive and substantive representation. Saalfeld (2011) and Saalfeld & Bischof (2013) found that visible minorities (BAME MPs and MPs and or MPs with a foreign sounding surname) were more likely to table questions addressing topics considered to be ‘minority issues’ such as immigration to the United Kingdom. Further evidence of a positive relationship between descriptive and substantive representation is noted by Kolpinskaya (2016), who demonstrated that Muslim and Jewish MPs were more inclined to submit questions relating to matters that concern Muslims and Jews and their respective faiths.
This paper's initial hypothesis (H1) is, in part, guided by the findings of this existing research.

Research also shows evidence that constituency demography, namely the ethnic diversity of a constituency has some influence on whether or not and the volume of questions MPs representing these constituencies will put to government ministers.

American research has found that Members of the federal House of Representatives will make calculated decisions about how to vote and which issues to promote depending on the ethnic composition of their district (Swain, 1993). For certain legislators, the ability to cultivate and maintain support from different groups within their constituency can mean the difference between re-election and defeat.

MPs may respond to concerns over racism raised by ethnic minority constituents. Members will often use questions to gain information relevant to their constituents (Norton, 1993). As explained later, this article uses constituency demography as an independent variable to assess the significance of local factors in shaping Members’ parliamentary behaviour.

H1: Immigrant-origin MPs tabled a higher number of questions addressing CIO prejudice than native British parliamentarians.

Survey data has discovered that white Britons and ethnic minorities differ considerably in their attitudes in how governments address discrimination and whether or not government should intervene more to improve opportunities to ethnic minorities. An overwhelming majority of white Britons oppose race-based affirmative action or positive discrimination, whereas almost one-third of ethnic minorities believe that race should be taken into account with regards to job opportunities and promotions (Heath et al., 2013).

It has been suggested that this attachment or solidarity felt by minorities to other co-members of their group stems from group consciousness; a concept that broadly refers to a sense of identity, solidarity and attachment that individuals feel to others who share a common culture, history, heritage, skin colour or religious faith to themselves (Chong & Rogers, 2005; Miller et al., 1981). Group consciousness is
based on the notion that relative newcomers in society, namely immigrants and their families, lack knowledge and resources and are motivated by their group identity to participate in political life (Wolfinger, 1965). Group consciousness is linked to another phenomenon known as 'linked fate' in which minorities perceive that their individual interests are intrinsically aligned with other minorities (Dawson, 1994; Tate, 1993). Early studies found that black Americans that indicated racial identity and consciousness were more likely to participate in a variety of political activities than blacks who did not exhibit signs of racial consciousness. ¹

However, much of the earlier research into group consciousness concerns American minorities, specifically African-Americans, although several studies examining group consciousness among Latino and Asians Americans have also been conducted (Chong & Rogers, 2005). Furthermore, it would be difficult and unadvisable to transfer this entirely to the United Kingdom where the experiences of black Britons and British ethnic minorities will differ. Moreover, it is unclear whether or not attachment is stronger to, say, their ethnic or religious group than to ethnic minorities in general. British Asians, for instance, are said to have more multifaceted identities (ethnic, linguistic and religious) and do not subscribe to a 'pan-Asian' identity in the same way that blacks might subscribe to a broad black identity (Statham, 1999). After studying group consciousness among the United States’ pan-ethnic Latino population, Sanchez & Masuoka (2010) conclude that social integration into the US is more salient than having Latin American ancestry. Significantly, these studies have focused on group consciousness among African-American citizens as opposed to legislators. It is more difficult as legislators have an interest in representing multiple and often conflicting interests: their constituents, political party and the country at large (Swain, 1993; Whitby, 1997).

This has led some researchers to theorise that they are not just responsible to the residents of their electoral constituencies, but to members of their descriptive groups through the country and therefore seek to represent a national constituency of minority citizens (Fenno, 2003). American studies have documented examples of African-American legislators who have spoken openly about representing a ‘wider’ constituency encompassing all African-Americans nationwide (Broockman, 2013; ¹ For a more detailed discussion of this research see Chong & Rogers, 2005.)
Fenno, 2003). In the UK, empirical evidence has found that some British immigrant-origin MPs do openly express a feeling of responsibility to ‘speak out’ on behalf of citizens and residents from immigrant backgrounds. During a series of interviews with black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) parliamentarians, Nixon (1998) found that some of her interviewees felt a responsibility to others from a minority ethnic background. However, in both the same study Nixon also discovered that other BAME MPs did not reveal a responsibility to these individuals. Similar findings were also observed in more recent studies (Jones et al., 2015; Sobolewska, McKee & Campbell, forthcoming).

Academic interest in group consciousness among immigrant-origin whites has not been as extensive as it has been concluded that ties to the group do not have significant influence on behaviour and attitudes beyond the first generation immigrant whites as they have been absorbed into the host society (Chong & Rogers, 2005).

While certain literature (e.g. Wolfinger, 1965; Hagner & Pierce, 1984) discusses examples of group consciousness among minority white groups, it is easier for these to ‘pass’ into the majority society easier, particularly after one generation, than BAME individuals who will continue to be rendered as physically distinct because of their appearance. As a consequence, the second hypothesis is as follows:

H2: Between 2005-15, ethnic minority Members of Parliament were more likely to have submitted more questions relating to forms of prejudice and discrimination than white MPs.

It has been observed that individuals who subscribe to different political ideologies have differing views when it comes to race and ethnicity which may, in turn, affect whether or not and how likely they are to prioritise issues relating to prejudice. Political conservatives and those on the right of the political spectrum, for instance, have tended to promote a "colour-blind" approach in which someone's race or ethnic origin is less of an issue and the focus is instead placed on individuals and the wider society (Tran, 2016; Kilson, 2014; Ray, 2009). As a result, those on the right are less likely to favour direct action by government to alleviate, eliminate or minimise forms of intolerance. They reject the idea of an ethnic-orientated society and what they
might refer to as "identity politics" and instead favour of individualism and an emphasis on hard work, self-help, individual choice and personal responsibility (Ondaatje, 2011). Political liberals and the centre-left, by contrast, criticise the colour-blind approach, claiming that it ignores, or at least overlooks, undercurrents of racism, discrimination and other disadvantages ethnic and racial minorities might encounter. It is also claimed that this approach does not acknowledge certain privileges which members of a society possess (Tran, 2016; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Wildman, 1996). These contrasting attitudes may exist among Members of the House of Commons.

History has shown that the Labour Party has traditionally been the party that has sought to address ethnic and racial discrimination through government action. Labour governments introduced the Race Relations Acts of 1965, 1968 and 1976, the Equality Act 2010 in addition to other domestic and European Union legislation. The Conservative Party, by contrast, has seldom proposed new anti-discrimination legislation (Wintemute, 2016). Britain’s ethnic minorities have judged Labour to be the party most supportive or their cause(s) (Heath et al., 2013). Furthermore, the Labour parliamentary party has been more ethnically diverse, although the Conservative Party’s efforts under David Cameron’s leadership led to a marked increase in the number of BAME Tory MPs during the 2010 general election (Sobolewska, 2013).

There are other reasons why Labour Party and individual Labour MPs and candidates may look to cultivate and maintain support from British citizens and residents from an immigrant background. Firstly, the immigrant-origin population is more likely to be concentrated in parliamentary constituencies held by Labour MPs. Ethnic minority voters vote, by substantial margins, for Labour and have been a growing section of the electorate (Saggar, 2000; Heath et al., 2013). Due to these factors, Labour Members may look to ‘do more’ to represent this demographic. Conversely, however, it may also mean that Labour politicians may, in fact, take these votes for granted and will neglect or even ignore minority concerns about racism and prejudice.

In addition to the Race Relations Acts that focused on racial discrimination, the party has also been responsible for other legislation that sought to secure greater
protections in the workplace for men and women, such as the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Equal Pay Act 1970 and the Equality Act 2010, the latter which replaced the previous two pieces of legislation. Just as whites and minorities perceive racial prejudice differently, it would also appear that parties have different priorities and views concerning the issue and how best to confront it.

Taking this discussion into account along with Labour’s traditional focus on anti-discrimination in the past, the following hypothesis is formed:

H3: Members of Parliament from the Labour Party were more likely to table questions relating to racial and ethnic prejudice and discrimination in addition to other forms of intolerance directed at women and other minority groups.

Turning to the second objective of this study, research examining whether or not and the extent to which immigrant-origin MPs have addressed prejudice commonly directed at other minority groups has hitherto received minimal attention.

Immigrant-origin MPs may seek to substantively represent other underrepresented groups in ways that are similar to the ‘surrogate representatives’ described by Mansbridge. Surrogate representatives, according to Mansbridge, are not necessarily descriptive representatives. Mansbridge cites the example of male legislators acting on behalf of women during congressional deliberations over the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in the 1970s as an example of this happening in practice. These legislators can be relied upon to ‘step in’ and to take on the responsibility of ensuring that certain interests are highlighted and brought to the attention of others in a legislative setting.

Entrusting non-descriptive representatives with the role of defending certain interests is, to some commentators, not considered ideal (Dovi, 2002; Sapiro, 1981). However, in certain cases we may find that some of the strongest advocates of particular causes happen to be non-descriptive representatives. The Representative Audit of Britain Survey of parliamentary candidates contesting the 2015 British general election, for instance, found that BAME candidates were more likely to strongly favour measures designed to improve the descriptive representation, such as minimum number of candidates on shortlists and all minority shortlists, not only
for other BAME MPs, but also other underrepresented groups as well (McKee, 2017). This suggests that BAME MPs are keen to support other minority groups and that by increasing their descriptive representation will lead to more substantive representative outcomes. The fourth and final hypothesis reads:

**H4:** In addition to matters concerning immigrant-origin individuals, MPs from an immigrant-background will have provided substantive representation of discrimination and prejudice aimed at members of other minorities.

### i. Prejudice

Prejudice has featured and continues to feature in the lives of many people in Britain who come from an immigrant background. The 2010 Ethnic Minority British Election Survey (EMBES) discovered that large minorities of BAME respondents report having been a victim of discrimination at some point during their lifetime (Heath et al., 2013). White immigrants from other European countries, specifically former Communist states of Eastern Europe, have been subject to racism, although research into direct discrimination against this demographic remains underdeveloped (Burrell, 2010). Researchers have cited examples of racist incidents and statistics against Eastern Europeans, in particular Poles, suggest that this has been a growing problem over the past decade (Fox, Morosanu & Szilassy, 2015). The framing of Eastern European in often dehumanising terms by the tabloid press and various public figures has helped fuel a climate of opinion that is hostile to Eastern Europeans (Fox, Morosanu & Szilassy, 2015, 2012).

Research has documented examples of discrimination with regards to housing and employment. Immigrants have traditionally found it more difficult to access the labour market, especially during economic downturns. While this has been attributed to a number of factors their having low human capital and the decision to self-exclude themselves from active employment, researchers have also ascribed this gap in employment to racism and discrimination (Khattab & Fox, 2016).
It has been argued that black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) individuals background (BAME) encounter what has been termed an ‘ethnic penalty’ in the job market that persists even after age and experience are taken into account, leading researchers to conclude that these disparities in employment are due, in part, to discrimination by employers (Esmail & Everington, 1993; Heath & Cheung, 2007). White immigrants to the country, it would appear, face similar barriers when attempting to access employment when disparities in employment cannot be attributed to other, aforementioned factors (Currie, 2007).

This study is interested in how MPs have represented issues relating to two broad categories of prejudice. The first is what is referred to in this paper as ‘CIO Prejudice’ whereas the second is titled ‘Other Prejudice’. This rest of this section outlines and clarifies what is meant by both and how they are used in this paper.

CIO Prejudice

The first category of prejudice refers to forms of intolerance that predominantly affect citizens of immigrant-origin (CIOs); those who are either immigrants themselves or who have an immigrant family background. This includes racial and ethnic prejudice in addition to religious intolerance, for example, Islamophobia, as many adherents of minority (i.e. non-Christian) faiths such as Hinduism, Islam, Sikhism and Judaism are from an immigrant background (Heath et al., 2013).

Other Prejudice

The second category concerns a range of other forms of prejudice that is directed at other minority groups such as LGBT and disabled individuals and or groups that are descriptively underrepresented in elected political office, such as women. This enables us to assess the substantive representation of other interests by immigrant-origin parliamentarians.

Further information on MPs’ responsiveness to these forms of prejudice is included below in the Research Design section.
Research Design

i. Parliamentary Questions for Written Answer

To examine the role of non-British family heritage and the raising of issues relating to different types of intolerance, this paper uses parliamentary questions for written answer tabled by MPs over the course of two recent five-year legislative terms: the 2005-10 majority Labour government and the 2010-15 Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition government. In advanced democracies such as the UK, national legislators have the ability to submit oral and written questions to members of the executive (Norton, 1993). In the House of Commons, these are submitted to the relevant Minister or Secretary of State. The government will then publish their responses to each question during the weeks after the question was originally tabled. In many cases, MPs will use questions to extract information from the executive or to highlight issues concerning their constituencies. In addition, MPs use these as a means to communicate to constituents and other members of the public the work that they are carrying out (Franklin & Norton, 1993; Russo & Wiberg, 2010).

In the United States, academics have used roll call votes to gauge responsiveness of American state and federal legislators to matters relating to racial minorities (Swain, 1993). However in legislatures such as the British House of Commons, voting is tightly enforced by parties and although voting against the party has become more common in recent decades (Cowley & Stuart, 2012). Owing to the lower levels of centralised control over parliamentary questions, this device allows researchers to make more accurate assessments and insights into the interests and agendas of MPs (Martin, 2011).

A further advantage of parliamentary questions, certainly in the British context, is their brevity. Questions generally address one particular point and are short in length, containing, on average, 300 words, thus making it easier to ascertain the genesis of each question. In this study, I use a large dataset containing all questions
for written answer tabled over the course of two five-year Parliaments. \(N = 466,212\).

Questions that were tabled by MPs during the 2010-15 Parliament were collected by PATHWAYS, a cross-national study of the representation of immigrant-origin inhabitants of eight European democracies. The questions submitted by MPs during the 2005-10 Parliament were gathered independently of this project.

Table 1 presents a set of descriptive statistics concerning the number of questions tabled by MPs that addressing CIO Prejudice and Other Prejudice based on MPs’ immigrant-origin status. It shows that 469 were tabled over the course of the two Parliaments that related, explicitly, to CIO Prejudice. As for Other Prejudice, we observe that a total of 231 questions were tabled that pertained to this second category of prejudice.
Table 1: CIO Prejudice related questions – total number and column percentages & Other Prejudice related questions – total number and column percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant-origin MP</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>412,149</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>412,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.49%</td>
<td>77.49%</td>
<td>88.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53,594</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.51%</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>465,743</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>466,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi² = 1.71 p = 0.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant-origin MP</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>412,376</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>412,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>77.49%</td>
<td>88.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53,605</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>22.51%</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>465,981</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>466,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi² = 27.47 p = 0.000

*Source*: Author's own.
ii. Variables

**Dependent Variables**

Two binary dependent variables are used in this study. The first dependent variable includes questions that concern, in some way, CIO prejudice. Potential questions were first identified using a list of search terms – a collection of words and phrases that relate to prejudice. These terms have been selected so as to encompass the widest possible range of questions which pertain to prejudice. All search terms used in this analysis can be found in the Appendix. Each of these questions was then read in order to ascertain its context and the questions judged to be relevant to CIO prejudice were coded as ‘1’. Given the fact that a number of the chosen search terms can appear in a variety of different contexts, extra caution was taken to ensure that each question identified by using the search terms was coded accordingly.

Each of the questions was selected on the basis that the MP tabling the question was seeking to confront or mitigate the effect of CIO prejudice. Additionally, the question in some way raised awareness about the CIO prejudice. Examples of some the selected questions are as follows:

The second dependent variable tests MPs’ likelihood of highlighting other forms of discrimination in their parliamentary questions. This variable was formed by using the same process as the first, with the difference being in the adoption of different search terms (e.g., ‘sexism’). Questions that explicitly pertained to other forms of prejudice were assigned the value of ‘1’.

**Independent Variables**

The first independent variable is, therefore, dichotomous and separates questions tabled by immigrant-origin MPs from questions tabled by native British MPs.

All parliamentary questions tabled by immigrant-origin MPs have been coded as ‘1’ whereas questions submitted by native British parliamentarians were marked as ‘0.’

The remaining independent variables are also binary and were created by using a similar process. Questions submitted by ethnic minority MPs and questions
submitted by Members of the Labour Party were all assigned values of 1 whereas questions tabled by non-minority (i.e. white), MPs from government parties and non-Labour Members were all coded as zero. The final binary variable used in this analysis separates questions submitted by MPs from the government party or parties and those from MPs from Opposition parties. In both the British House of Commons and in other European legislatures, members of Opposition parties will submit more questions to the executive. Given the monitoring and oversight role that questions fulfil, it is unsurprising that this is the case (Hänni, 2016).

A continuous variable was introduced which seeks to ascertain the extent to which Members are guided by constituency demography to table questions for written answer relating to forms of prejudice typically directed at immigrant-origin individuals.

Using data from the most recent Census conducted in 2011, each question was coded with the percentage of foreign-born residents in the constituency of the MP tabling the question. An additional continuous variable was originally created that coded each question with the percentage of ethnic minority residents in the constituency of the MP tabling the question at the time of the 2011 Census. It was thought to be possible that an MP and their staff may use either or both the foreign-born or the proportion of ethnic minority residents when formulating questions to be submitted to the executive. However, it was not necessary to include this latter variable as the proportion of BAME residents across parliamentary constituencies were found to correlate almost exactly with the proportion of foreign-born residents ($R = .93$).

The latter two continuous independent variables are likewise intended to assess the potential influence that local factors may have on the likelihood that MPs will put forward questions relating to prejudice. This pair of variables are referred to as Anti-Immigrant Party Presence (AIPP) and Marginality. The former was formed by coding each question with the combined vote share for anti-immigrant and or anti-immigration parties in the immediately preceding general election. I expect to find a negative association between Marginality and both dependent variables. MPs defending more marginal parliamentary seats to be more inclined to submit parliamentary questions

---

2 These parties are the British National Party (BNP), UK Independence Party (UKIP) and the National Front (NF).
It has been claimed by anti-racism campaign groups that racist attacks had risen in areas where the British National Party (BNP) has made electoral gains; such as in the aftermath of local election victories in Burnley and in Halifax in the early 2000s (Renton, 2005). Similar claims were made following the party’s successes in the European Parliament elections in 2009 in areas targeted by the party (Independent, 2009).

While UKIP has been categorised differently to the BNP; this is due to the fact the party does not exhibit all three core features owing to the fact that, unlike the BNP, nativism is not a core feature the party’s ideology (Mudde, 2017) the party has, nonetheless, adopted a populist programme and themes similar to those used by the BNP (Copsey et al., 2013; Cutts, Ford & Goodwin, 2011) and has drawn its support from the same pool as the BNP (Cospey et al., 2013).

The rise of these groups may also additionally affect other minority groups. Cutts, Ford and Goodwin (2011) observe that the BNP have ‘mobilised hostility towards out-groups defined by their sexuality.’ MPs, noting the rise in nationalism and intolerance towards out-groups in their constituencies and possibly elsewhere in the country may, therefore, be prompted to draw attention to this issue through parliamentary questions.

The final independent variable assigns to each parliamentary question the majority (as a percentage) gained by the winning candidate in the prior general election. Electorally vulnerable MPs may be more likely to submit questions in general as they

In contrast, an MP who has been elected to represent a safe parliament seat where the risk of defeat in a forthcoming election is minimal may, on the other hand, be less active when it comes to tabling parliamentary questions.

**Results**
The first regression table (Table 2) presents the logistic regression results for MPs will submit a parliamentary question for written answer relating to CIO Prejudice.

The results listed diagonally on the left-hand side of the table show each variable when it had been regressed individually. We observe a slight, yet statistically insignificant, positive association between being immigrant-origin and tabling questions of this nature. The odds that Members from a minority ethnic background would table a question of this variety were 2.5 times greater than a white MP. Both of these results suggest support for the initial two hypotheses outlined above. A negative link between membership of the parliamentary Labour Party and the tabling of CIO prejudice questions can also be observed, in a manner similar to that which was outlined in the third hypothesis.

When all of our independent variables (immigrant-origin, Labour, BAME, proportion of constituents born abroad, the share of the vote secured by anti-immigrant parties during the most recent election, the majority secured my winning candidate in previous election as a percentage) are entered into the regression, this picture alters somewhat. Contrary to the earlier prediction, the results demonstrate that there was no relationship between having an immigrant background and the submission of parliamentary questions addressing CIO prejudice, although this particular result was not found to be statistically significant. Ethnicity, however, was a key determinant that a British parliamentarian would table a question concerning CIO prejudice. Overall, MPs from a minority ethnic background were found to be the most likely to table a question. This result is statistically significant at the five percent level, thus validating the earlier hypothesis (H2).

It is also revealed in Table 2 that Labour party membership had a marginal negative effect on the submission of parliamentary questions that related to immigrant-origin prejudice, although this particular result did not meet the significance threshold of five percent. Consequently, the third hypothesis, which predicted that Labour MPs would submit more questions pertaining to CIO prejudice, is therefore invalidated. Interestingly, constituency demography had only a neutral effect on the dependent variable. One may expect to find that the more diverse a constituency, the greater the odds that MPs representing those constituencies will submit questions
addressing CIO prejudice. The final two independent variables, *Anti-Immigrant Party Presence* and *Marginality*, exhibited similarly neutral effects.

To expand on this analysis, several interactions were introduced. The first interaction gives the odds ratio for ethnic minority Labour MPs thus enables us to examine the influence of ethnicity and partisanship may have on the submission of CIO prejudice questions. On a practical level, this interaction was introduced as there were twice as many BAME Labour MPs as there were BAME Conservative MPs serving during the 2005-10 and 2010-15 Parliaments. The results indicate firm support for this hypothesis as Labour MPs from an ethnic minority background were found to be, overall, significantly the most likely to table questions pertaining to CIO prejudice (OR = 5.13 \( p=<0.01 \)).

The second interaction presents the results for Labour Party membership and parliamentary term. This is to ascertain the odds for Labour when in Opposition between 2010-15. We find that there was a very marginal negative relationship between this interaction and the dependent variable Labour MPs, showing that there was virtually no relationship between Labour MPs in Opposition and the tabling of questions that related to CIO Prejudice.
Table 2: Odds Ratio of submitting a parliamentary question relating to *CIO Prejudice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I.O. MP</th>
<th>BAME MP</th>
<th>Labour MP</th>
<th>% Constituents Foreign Born</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Party Presence</th>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>All Variables</th>
<th>All variables with interaction</th>
<th>All variables with interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.O. MP</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92***</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour MP</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Constituents Foreign Born</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Immigrant Party Presence</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1***</td>
<td>1.1***</td>
<td>1.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME*Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab*Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 469*

*p<0.5  **p<0.01  ***p<0.001*
The second regression table (Table 3) contains the logistic regression results for different MPs tabling parliamentary questions that addressing Other Prejudice.

When the odds for each variable have been calculated separately, as shown in the left-hand side of Table 3, we find that immigrant-origin MPs were over twice as likely to table questions concerning other types of prejudice than native British MPs, a finding that lends support to the fourth hypothesis. Additionally, these results demonstrate that Labour Party MPs and MPs from a minority ethnic background were more likely to have submitted questions addressing other types of prejudice than MPs from different parties and White MPs, respectively, suggesting that Labour MPs have taken a greater interest in tackling various forms of prejudice and intolerance affecting different groups, as shown in the party’s history of introducing and championing anti-discrimination legislation.

When all variables are included in our model, the results suggest only a modest positive association between immigrant background and the dependent variable, a result that is statistically insignificant.

Party membership is also a determining factor; the odds that a Labour MP will put forward a question of this nature are higher than the other variables included in the model (OR = 2.30 p= <0.001). This indicates that Members belonging to the Labour Party have shown a greater interest in highlighting other types of prejudice in the parliamentary arena.

These findings demonstrate that BAME MPs have substantively represented the other forms of prejudice to a greater extent than white MPs, although this result does not meet the minimum level of statistical significance. Returning to Mansbridge’s surrogate representatives; the results from Table 3 show that ethnic minority MPs cannot necessarily be counted upon to raise issues relating to other types of intolerance and prejudice such as homophobia and disability hate crime through their parliamentary questions, findings which support the final hypothesis (H4).

The proportion of foreign-born residents in a constituency and the electoral presence of anti-immigrant parties were both found to have had non-existent effects on the dependent variable.
Likewise, the odds for *Marginality* suggest that MPs are not driven by electoral incentives; alternatively, MPs do not regard this issue as a vote winner to table more questions that fall under the category of Other Prejudice.

Once again, an interaction between Labour Party membership and Parliamentary Term was introduced to examine whether there is a meaningful effect of Labour MPs when in Opposition, as opposed to when the party was in government. Table 3 registers a slight positive association that is statistically insignificant, suggesting that whether Labour MPs in Opposition or government made minimal difference to whether or not they submitted questions that dealt with this category of prejudice.
Table 3: Odds Ratio of submitting a parliamentary question relating to Other Prejudice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I.O. MP</th>
<th>BAME MP</th>
<th>Labour MP</th>
<th>% Constituents Foreign Born</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Party Presence</th>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>All Variables</th>
<th>All variables with interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.O. MP</td>
<td>2.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3***</td>
<td>2.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Immigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Presence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab*Parl_Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 231

*p<0.5  **p<0.01  ***p<0.001
Discussion

The results demonstrate evidence that ethnic minority legislators, in particular those belonging to the Labour Party, exhibit the greatest interest in CIO prejudice in their parliamentary question for written answer.

A popular theme found within normative literature on minority representation is the theory that minority groups will have their interests best represented by descriptive representatives; in other words, by elected officials with whom they share traits or characteristics such as race/ethnicity. The findings presented in this paper offer weight to this theory, although it is most apparent among a subsection of immigrant-origin MPs; specifically, BAME Labour MPs.

The fact that White immigrant-origin MPs exhibited similar behaviour to that of native parliamentarians suggests that group consciousness among white immigrant-origin MPs dissipates after the first generation, as has been theorised in previous research (Chong & Rogers, 2005). Alternatively, a sense of a group or collective consciousness may never have been present in the first place among these legislators. Ethnic minorities, by contrast, remain physically distinct beyond the first generation which may engender a continued sense of group consciousness. There is evidence that translates to MPs as well. The Representative Audit of Britain Survey found that BAME candidates believed that an ethnic minority background confers on BAME MPs a responsibility to represent other ethnic minorities (Sobolewska, McKee & Campbell, forthcoming).

There is further evidence that whites and ethnic minorities in Britain can have often markedly different views on race and racial prejudice. For instance, the EMBES found that one-third of minorities have a preference for race being taken into account during the hiring and promotion of staff. While not a substantial percentage, the figure is still significantly higher than among whites, who, conversely, registered negligible support for race-based preferences in the labour market (Heath et al, 2013). This advocacy for government to play a more active role in assisting ethnic minorities to prosper and to offset potential discrimination in the workplace as well as in other areas of life. Examples of these differences with regards to racial
discrimination have been noted in electoral politics. The Representative Audit of Britain Survey observes that BAME party candidates, irrespective of partisanship, were more likely to believe that non-whites are hindered by prejudice and discrimination and therefore do not enjoy the same opportunities as whites than candidates who did not come from a minority ethnic background (Sobolewska, McKee & Campbell, forthcoming). If white MPs do not personally regard discrimination as an issue to the same extent as their ethnic minority colleagues, then it stands to reason that they will be less likely to highlight it through opportunities such as parliamentary questions. This may be due to the notion that whites in western societies are less likely to ‘see’ racism. Members of a majority demographic may struggle to understand or recognise certain privileges that this bestows (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Wildman, 1996). Central to this is the ‘transparency phenomenon’ which allows whites to not view themselves in racial terms (Flagg, 1993).

Turning to other findings, the odds ratio for Labour MPs indicates a moderate positive relationship between membership of this party and the tabling of CIO prejudice-related questions. Previously Labour’s support for anti-discrimination legislation, their political ideology and greater willingness to offer ethnic minorities greater opportunities to organise within the party structure have been cited as a reason that Labour MPs would be more likely to submit parliamentary questions addressing types of prejudice affecting the immigrant-origin population (Saalfeld & Bischof, 2013). Given these trends, it is understandable that BAME Labour parliamentarians are the MPs most likely in our model to table parliamentary questions that concern CIO prejudice as they are influenced by their status as an ethnic minority in addition to their own political leanings and beliefs.

The results presented in Table 3 provide evidence that immigrant-origin British parliamentarians, namely MPs from a BAME background, were more likely to submit parliamentary questions that are concerned with forms of prejudice directed at other underrepresented groups. This indicates, as predicted in H4, that ethnic minority legislators possess a weak ‘cross-minority’ group consciousness which not only encompasses immigrant-origin individuals, but other groups such as sexual minorities, those with disabilities and those with different gender identities, although this result was in excess of the five percent threshold of significance. This hypothesis
was based on the assumption that the experience of having lived life as a member of a minority group would give these legislators sensitivity to the prejudices that others may face, fostering both a sense of solidarity and an impetus to confront these while serving in elected office.

Table 3 also demonstrates a positive association between Labour party membership and an interest in other prejudice in parliamentary questions. This may also be because of the Labour Party’s commitment, as outlined earlier, to tackling various forms of intolerance, as evidenced by the passage of significant pieces of legislation under Labour governments that sought to redress racial discrimination and to try and ensure workplace protections for both sexes.

To conclude this section, it is worth discussing possible limitations with this research design. Firstly, parliamentary questions for written answer are but one outlet or device MPs can use to represent constituents and other members of society. Hence, the work in other areas is less apparent.

Moreover, the search terms used to identify parliamentary questions refer more directly to prejudice. This may exclude questions from the analysis which may address discrimination in a more ‘subtle’ manner, such as when the context or the motivation behind the question is less apparent. An example of which could be if an MP appeals to the government to provide statistics of staff by ethnicity in a particular department, agency or public service as the MP is seeking to highlight possible discrimination in the recruitment of staff.

Finally, determining whether or not the question is sufficiently relevant is, in some cases, subjective and at the discretion of the individual(s) conducting the research. However, it provides an introductory investigation into this phenomenon which would merit further research.

**Conclusion**

This paper has had two main objectives. Firstly, it has sought to determine whether immigrant-origin British Members of Parliament, over the course of two recent five-
year Parliaments, were more likely to table parliamentary questions for written answer that addressed types of prejudice affecting immigrant-origin citizens.

Its second objective was to provide an early investigation into whether immigrant-origin MPs have substantively represented the interests of other minority groups in relation to prejudice. This was an enquiry which was loosely based and inspired by Mansbridge’s conception of surrogate representatives and sought to examine the existence of a possible ‘cross-minority’ solidarity or consciousness among immigrant-origin MPs, which encourages them to take a greater interest in addressing forms of prejudice directed at other groups.

In the literature, minority group consciousness is a predominantly American focus, although this has come to feature more prominently in studies of British politics. Similarly, the notion of a cross-minority consciousness is unexamined in academic literature and further research would improve our understanding of minority representation.

Normative literature suggests that by increasing the proportion of descriptive representatives in elected office will ensure that minority group interests will receive a more prominent voice in the House of Commons. Findings presented in this paper have indicate that by increasing the number of BAME Labour MPs will lead to matters concerning CIO prejudice being prioritised to a larger extent in parliamentary questions. Earlier studies have demonstrated evidence of a positive link between descriptive and substantive representation in the British House of Commons with regards to minority issues such as immigration to the UK and ethnic/racial diversity. Similarly, this paper finds some evidence of a positive association between descriptive and substantive representation with regards to CIO prejudice. However, its main finding is that BAME Members of Parliament, specifically those from the Labour Party, are the parliamentarians who have been instrumental in sustaining this interest through their parliamentary questions. The intersectionality of partisanship (and ideology) along with non-white ethnicity appear to be the primary motivators in explaining the submission of questions pertaining to CIO prejudice during two recent British parliaments.

To summarise, substantive representation of immigrant-origin individuals' interests, with regards to prejudice, is not equally offered by immigrant-origin MPs; rather, it
comes disproportionately from BAME Labour MPs. The second enquiry uncovered different results. While there was a marginal positive association between immigrant heritage and tableing of questions concerning Other Prejudice, the main determinant was membership of the parliamentary Labour Party.

This paper has shown that the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation is not as clear as one may initially presume. Increasing the number of immigrant-origin representatives may further the representation of issues relating to CIO Prejudice; however, this would be best achieved through more BAME Members from the political left, as evidenced by the results presented in this paper. Regarding Other Prejudice, these matters are more likely to be represented by Labour MPs. Evidence of cross group consciousness is, however, relatively weak.
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Appendix

Table A1: Search terms used to identify prejudice-related questions

Prejudice aimed at immigrant-origin individuals

race hate, hate crime(s), race/racial discrimination, Islamophob*, racist, race/racial prejudice, caste discrimination, religious discrimination, grounds of race/ethnicity, racial intolerance, anti-immigrant, anti-migrant, racial bigotry, racism, hatred, far-right, extremism, immigrant, harassment, racial harassment, xenophob*, anti-Muslim, racial harassment, racially motivated, British National Party, BNP, English Defence League, Nazi, fascis*, anti-semit* (with/without hyphen), Jew

Prejudice aimed at other minority groups

homophob*, transphob*, LGBT/lgbt, gay, lesbian, bisexual, sexism, hate crime(s), intolerance, prejudice, sectarianism, transgender, transsexual, sexist, pay discrimination, anti-discrimination

3 Words marked with an asterisk have been truncated so as to capture words or terms. For instance, a search for ‘xenophob’ returns results for both xenophobic and xenophobia within the body of parliamentary questions.