

CEP Discussion Paper No 790

April 2007

**Culture Clash or Culture Club?
The Identity and Attitudes of Immigrants in Britain**

Alan Manning and Sanchari Roy

Abstract

There is economic evidence that diversity has consequences for economic performance (see Alesina and La Ferrara, 2005). This might have consequences for immigration policy – how many immigrants to allow into a country and from what cultural background. But, central to such a discussion is the pace of cultural assimilation among immigrants – this under-researched topic is the focus of this paper. It investigates the extent and determinants of British identity among those living in Britain and the views on rights and responsibilities in societies. We find no evidence for a culture clash in general, and one connected with Muslims in particular. The vast majority of those born in Britain, of whatever ethnicity or religion, think of themselves as British and we find evidence that third-generation immigrants are more likely to think of themselves as British than second generation. Newly arrived immigrants almost never think of themselves as British but the longer they remain in the UK, the more likely it is that they do. This process of assimilation is faster for those from poorer and less democratic countries, even though immigrants from these countries are often regarded as a particular cause for concern. Our analysis of rights and responsibilities finds much smaller differences in views between the UK-born and immigrants than within the UK-born population.

Keywords: Immigration, Identity, Assimilation
JEL Classification: J61

This paper was produced as part of the Centre's Labour Markets Programme. The Centre for Economic Performance is financed by the Economic and Social Research Council.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Laura Berger-Thomson for her research assistance on this project, Marco Manacorda for helpful discussions and seminar participants at the Centre for Economic Performance and Warwick.

Alan Manning is Director of the Labour Markets Programme at the Centre for Economic Performance and Professor of Economics at the LSE. Sanchari Roy is a Research Assistant in The Suntory and Toyota International Centre for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) and Research Student in the Department of Economics, London School of Economics.

Published by
Centre for Economic Performance
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Working Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

© A. Manning and S. Roy, submitted 2006

ISBN 978 0 85328 166 5

Introduction

Economists have had a lot to say about the economic effects of immigration (see Card, 1990, 1991, 2005, Borjas et al, 1996, Borjas, 2003, Ottaviano and Peri, 2005 for varying US estimates and Fabbri et al, 2005; Manacorda et al, 2006 for UK estimates) but empirical estimates tend to suggest that the economic impact of immigration is not really large enough to be capable of explaining the strength of feeling many people have about immigration. A plausible explanation for this is that popular concerns surrounding immigration are as much about the social and cultural impact of immigration as the economic impact – for example, Dustmann and Preston (2004) find that opposition to immigration is more closely related to racial intolerance than to fears about economic effects (also see Card, Dustmann and Preston, 2005, for an analysis of European attitudes to immigration). If this is the case, it may be that economists' analysis of immigration are missing the most important issues. For example, conventional economic theory (see Borjas, 1999, for a survey) predicts that the net gains from immigration are largest when the immigrants are most different from the natives but this is when the dangers (perceived or real) of 'culture clash' may tend to be highest.

There is a literature in economics on the costs and benefits of ethnic diversity (that might be thought to be related to cultural diversity) that is usefully surveyed by Alesina and La Ferrara (2005). They review evidence like that presented by Easterly and Levine (1997) that ethnic fragmentation leads to lower growth in Africa and Alesina, Baqir and Easterly (1999) that public good provision is lower in US cities with higher levels of ethnic diversity. Alesina and La Ferrara (2005, p794) conclude that there is "overwhelming evidence" that public good provision is lower in fragmented societies" but also concede that there might be productivity benefits from diversity - see Ottaviano and Peri (2004) for one paper arguing there is evidence for this. These findings might be taken as support for popular views that cultural diversity has costs - for example, Huntington (2004) expresses the fear that large-scale Mexican immigration jeopardizes the traditions and values (that he thinks are Protestant and English) that have made the United States the most powerful country in the world today.

If cultural diversity has costs and benefits then public policy needs to take account of them. This policy might be immigration policy (how many immigrants from what countries to allow in) or policy on the assimilation of immigrants once they are in the country e.g. forcing them to learn the

language (see Lazear, 1999) or taking exams in citizenship. Such policies to increase cultural assimilation might be thought of as turning up the heat on the ‘melting pot’. We already see evidence that governments are moving in this direction and against the policy of ‘multiculturalism’ that, according to some of its critics, has actively discouraged assimilation by excessive celebration of diversity¹. For example, the UK government introduced classes in citizenship into the national curriculum for schools in 2002 and since 2005 most immigrants acquiring British citizenship are required to pass a test of knowledge about British history and institutions (that many of the native-born might struggle to pass) and to attend a citizenship ceremony intended to imbue them with a sense of pride in being British.

But, whether such policies are necessary depends crucially on the rate of cultural assimilation, the process by which the views and identities of individuals in a country change over time, and this is a question on which we have very little evidence. We do have studies of the rate of economic assimilation of immigrants (see Chiswick, 1978; Borjas, 1999) but not many studies of the rate of cultural assimilation. Perhaps the most relevant studies are those by Bisin and Verdier (2000), Bisin, Topa and Verdier (2004) who point out that small religious minorities in the US (specifically, Jews) have proved remarkably resilient in preserving their numbers and suggest this is because minority parents increase their investments in maintaining the distinct religious identity of their children. But this failure of the ‘melting pot’ is not generally regarded as a cause for concern because religion is now regarded as a private matter in which differences in tastes can be readily accommodated within society without serious cost. This paper primarily considers another aspect of identity – national identity and, in particular, the extent to which those living in Britain think of themselves as British.

One might legitimately wonder why this matters for the functioning of British society. There are two answers. First, this is perceived as very important by many people (see, for example, CRE, 2005b) and, as such, becomes of political importance. In the UK context the most celebrated example is the ‘Tebbit’ test – the then Cabinet Minister told the LA Times that "A large proportion of Britain's Asian population fail to pass the cricket test. Which side do they cheer for? It's an

¹ For example, Trevor Phillips the chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality in the UK argued in a TV interview that multiculturalism was leading to segregation, saying that “too many public authorities particularly [are] taking diversity to a point where they [are] saying, 'actually we're going to reward you for being different, we're going to give you a community centre only if you are Pakistani or African Caribbean and so on, but we're not going to encourage you to be part of the community of our town'”. Some intellectual heavyweights have weighed in with their criticisms of multiculturalism – see Barry (2000), Parekh (2000) and Sen (2006).

interesting test. Are you still harking back to where you came from or where you are?"^{2,3}. At the heart of current debates about culture clash in the UK is the concern that among some groups, a growing fraction of those who live (and were perhaps born) in Britain do not think of themselves as British, have no aspiration to do so and do not want their children to either, subscribing instead to some other identity and creating little enclaves that resemble, as far as is possible, the countries from which they came or a model of the good society very different from what is generally thought of as 'British'.

A second reason why the study of national identity may be important is that it is easy to find examples where clashes in national identity are symptoms of wider culture clashes. We will give two examples from the UK. As this paper shows, Catholics from Northern Ireland rarely think of themselves as British while Protestants do and this clash in national identities mirrors the wider culture clash within Northern Ireland. Secondly, the statements of some British Muslims (the focus of most contemporary concern) appear to explicitly reject a British identity and affirm another one. One of the July 7 London bombers (British-born but whose parents were from Pakistan) appeared in a video and said "your democratically elected governments continuously perpetuate atrocities against my people and your support of them makes you directly responsible, just as I am directly responsible for protecting and avenging my Muslim brothers and sisters", with the use of the words 'your' and 'my' clearly expressing the people with whom he identified⁴.

The first part of this paper uses data on national identity from the UK Labour Force Survey to investigate the determinants of national identity in the UK. The evidence here is firmly in favour of the culture club rather than culture clash view. New immigrants rarely think of themselves as British but the longer they remain in the UK the more likely they are to do so. Second generation immigrants are only slightly less likely to think of themselves as British than the white UK-born population and it seems that the gap narrows further with each generation. This process of assimilation is faster for some immigrant groups than others but not in the way which might be expected. For example immigrants from Pakistan and Bangladesh (the largest Muslim groups in the UK) are not less likely to feel British than those from other backgrounds and assimilate into a

² He followed this up with the following comment after the London bombings of July 7 2005 "if you have two cultures, you two societies living in the same territory and if you look around the world, you see that is a recipe for trouble."

³ A similar example is given by Huntington (2005, p14) who castigates Mexican-Americans for booing the US soccer team when playing against Mexico in LA in 1998.

⁴ Though the way in which he chose to pursue his objectives was rather odd with almost 10% of those murdered being Muslim compared to under 3% in the total UK population.

British identity faster than the average while those from Western Europe and the United States do so more slowly with Italians standing out as the group which assimilates least. We report evidence that immigrants from poorer and less democratic countries assimilate faster into a British identity and propose a simple model to explain this fact.

The finding that immigrants from other rich democracies do not generally come to think of themselves as British might lead one to argue that national identity is unimportant. There is little concern about the fact that Italians rarely seem to come to think of themselves as British because it is felt that Italians have similar views on the way in which society should be run. And it is the values that possibly lie behind British identity that must be more important to the functioning of society than any name that people use to identify themselves.

For this reason we turn to a analysis of the determinants of views on rights and responsibilities. But, our findings here are very similar – the views of immigrants in general and immigrants from different countries in particular are generally insignificant and smaller than the differences among the UK-born population with different levels of education and of different ages. It is also true that the immigrant groups with different values are not the ones which are the focus of public concern e.g. Muslims do not emerge as having values very different from the UK-born white population. We suggest that this is because the views on desirable rights and responsibilities vary much less among people across the world than is commonly believed.

These findings strongly suggest that the ‘culture club’ rather than ‘culture clash’ view is the correct one about the attitudes of immigrants into the UK. This is not to deny the existence of some people who do not share these views and may be prepared to use violence to oppose them but the evidence suggests that these are such a minority as not to be detectable with the data sets used here.

1. Who Thinks of Themselves as British?

There is a small amount of existing evidence on the national identity of immigrants. We have some ethnographic and focus groups studies (e.g. see the study by Lewis (1994) of Pakistanis in Bradford, and CRE (2005a,b) which was based on focus groups containing 96 people). The largest quantitative study is Modood et al (1997, ppp328-331) which used data from the 1994 National Survey of Ethnic Minorities finding that almost two-thirds of ethnic minorities agreed with the statement “In many ways, I think of myself as British”, with the highest rates among African Asians and the lowest among the Chinese. But, here we use more recent data from a much larger sample.

a. *Trends in British Identity*

The main data set used in this part of the paper is the Labour Force Survey. It started collecting information on national identity in Spring 2001 though not in Northern Ireland. The national identity question follows the questions about country of birth and, for immigrants, the question on when they arrived in the UK. The specific question asked is “What do you consider your national identity to be? Please choose as many or as few as apply”. There are six possible responses: British, English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish and ‘Other’. The order in which these responses are listed depends on the country of residence so English is the first option in England, Scottish in Scotland and Welsh in Wales. For the purposes of this paper we group British, English, Scottish and Welsh into a single ‘British’ category and we will use the term British to refer to any of these answers in what follows⁵. We also combine the Irish into the ‘other’ identity category⁶.

Table 1 gives the cross-tabulation of British and ‘other’ identity using these definitions. Overall 94% report having a British identity and 7% an ‘other’ identity where the sample is restricted to those aged 16-60 inclusive. These add to more than 100% because 1% report a multiple identity. Because of the way the question is structured there are no observations recorded as having no national identity at all – these would be coded as non-responses. But only 0.33% (weighted) do not respond to this question so most respondents are giving at least one answer to this question. There are, of course, questions about what respondents mean when they answer this question – it is quite possible that different respondents mean different things, some referring to their citizenship, others to the values that ‘Britain’ represents to them (see CRE, 2005a, for focus group discussions on what it means to be British). As we are unable to dig into this deeper meaning, one should perhaps think of the enquiry into the determinants of a British identity as been in the spirit of Queen Elizabeth I not seeking to make “windows into men’s souls” when, after a period of vicious religious conflict in the sixteenth century, she sought only outward loyalty and was not too concerned about the specific religious feeling that lay within.

⁵ This approach does ride rough-shod over the sizeable literature that discusses the nuances of separate national identities within the UK – see, for example, Colley (1992) for a historical analysis or McCrone (2002) for a more recent one. We take the approach used here because no-one is at all concerned about the fact that many Scots describe themselves as Scottish and not British, and among those born in Scotland but living in England only 5% describe themselves as English.

⁶ Our main reason for doing this is that most of those reporting an Irish identity were born in the Republic of Ireland which is not part of the UK. The only reason why one might not want to do this is because some of those in Northern Ireland choose to think of themselves as Irish and not British. The classification of the Irish identity only affects the results reported for those from Ireland so is not of great importance for what follows given this fact.

Figure 1 shows the trend in British identity over the sample period. Over the 5-year period there is approximately a 1 percentage point fall in those expressing a British identity. This is a small change but if it were to continue for decades it might cumulate to something important so it is perhaps important to try to understand it. This quantitative evidence also perhaps lines up with the motivation for CRE (2005b) which focused on perceptions that ‘Britishness’ was in decline. The single most important factor in determining whether a respondent thinks of themselves as British is, unsurprisingly, whether they were born in the UK. The time series for the fraction reporting British identity for those born in the UK is shown in Figure 2 and for those born abroad in Figure 3. There is no marked trend in British identity for those born in the UK but a more sizeable fall in British identity among immigrants. The overall series of Figure 1 shows a downward trend both partly because the extent of British identity among immigrants is falling but mostly because the fraction foreign-born is rising over this period. However Figures 2 and 3 make it clear that there are some UK-born individuals who do not think of themselves as British and some immigrants who do think of themselves as British – it is the factors associated with this variation that is the subject of the first part of this paper. Because the levels of British identity are so different we conduct separate analyses for each group.

b. British Identity Among the UK-Born

We first investigate the effect of demographic characteristics on the probability of reporting British identity among the UK-born. It is worth noting that 98.8% of the sample report a British identity so a non-British identity is a rare event. We investigate the impact of a number of factors.

- gender
- age
- education, measured as years left full-time education and a dummy variable for full-time student
- region of residence
- country of birth within the UK (i.e. England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland)
- ethnicity
- religion
- time trend

Descriptive statistics are summarized in Table A1. We estimate a probit model in which the outcome variable is reporting a British identity and all of the regressors are included separately. The results are reported in Table 2 where the marginal effects from a probit regression have been multiplied by 100. If we pool all respondents together we get the results reported in column 1. We will discuss the sets of variables in turn, approximately in order of importance.

The largest marginal effect by a large distance is the effect of being born in Northern Ireland – this reduces the probability of reporting a British identity by 24%. It is almost certain that this is driven primarily by Northern Irish Catholics among whom there remains a strong demand to be part of Ireland and not the UK and who think of themselves as Irish rather than British. Supporting evidence for this view comes from Moxon-Browne (1991) about the reported national identity of those living in Northern Ireland. In 1989 68% of Protestants in Northern Ireland called themselves British, 3% Irish, 10% Ulster and 16% Northern Irish. For Catholics 6% described themselves as British, 60% as Irish, 2% as Ulster and 25% as Northern Irish. This is a perhaps useful benchmark as we know that the identity conflict between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland has been associated with considerable violence mostly in Northern Ireland but also on the mainland with over 3000 deaths since the Troubles began in the 1960s⁷. This culture clash has been associated with significant support among the general population for the use of violence to attain political ends e.g. Hayes and McAllister (2001) show that in 1978 16% of Protestants and 25% of Catholics thought ‘violence is a legitimate way to achieve one’s goals’ while in 1998 31% of Protestants and 21% of Catholics had a little or lots of sympathy with the use of violence.

Now consider the effect of ethnicity on British identity. All non-white ethnic groups have a lower probability of reporting a British identity with marginal effects for all apart from the ‘other’ groups being in 2-5% range though none of these groups have an incidence of non-British identity that is anywhere near the level of those born in Northern Ireland. There is no particular pattern among the different groups e.g. the overwhelmingly Muslim Pakistanis/Bangladeshis do not stand out as having very much lower levels of British identity than other ethnic minority groups. Now consider the effect of religion – even though this might be thought to be many to be extremely important, the estimates suggest otherwise – the effect of religion is small. And among religious groups the pattern is not what might be expected - Muslims do not stand out as having especially

⁷ Though it is also worth noting that the identity conflict remains to the present although the violence in recent years has been very greatly reduced if not quite entirely eliminated.

low levels of British identity – Sikhs are noticeably lower and Hindus slightly lower. It is also interesting to note that Jewish respondents are more likely to report a British identity than the Christian default group even though few Jewish people in the UK could trace their UK roots back more than 4 or 5 generations – this gives an insight into cultural assimilation over a period of a 100 years or more⁸. This all suggests that the vast majority of those born on the British mainland think of themselves as British whatever their ethnicity or religion. Any culture clash in identity is very small compared to that found in Northern Ireland⁹. This does line up with the focus group evidence (CRE, 20005a) where, for example, British-born Muslims saw no difficulty in being both British and Muslim and with opinion poll evidence that under 5% of Muslims in Britain think the July 7 bombings were justified (a much smaller proportion than support violence in Northern Ireland).

The effects of other variables are small – education, gender, age – though often significant as the sample size is so large. Of some interest is the effect over the life-cycle. Because of the large sample size we can include a dummy variable for each age – the predicted probability of reporting a British identity for someone of different ages is shown in Figure 4.

It is also worth noting that the estimate time trend in column 1 of Table 2 is positive suggesting that, among the British-born there is no downward trend in feelings of British identity.

The results so far are an aggregate across all ethnic groups and perhaps the effects of certain variables differ by ethnic group. Columns 2-7 of Table 2 investigate this. The sample sizes for the non-white groups are fairly small so many of the variables are insignificant and many of the variables have similar effects. But, a few findings are worth noting – among the white population the more educated are significantly less likely to think of themselves as British while among Asians the opposite is true. And black women are more likely than black men to think of themselves as British though the effect is not very large. Perhaps most noteworthy is that the trend increases in British identity are largest among the Asian and Black groups with the estimates suggesting a rise in British identity of 19 percentage points for Asians and 10 percentage points for Blacks over a decade. This is not particularly surprising as British identity among the white group could not increase by much more but it is not consistent with the view that any of these groups have a crisis in British identity.

⁸ It is worth noting that Jewish immigration into the UK around 1900 caused widespread fears of ‘culture clash’ and prompted the first legislation designed to limit immigration (see Winder, 2004, for an account of this).

⁹ One should not make light of the size of the conflict in Northern Ireland as, if transplanted to the mainland the same death rate would have seen over 100000 deaths.

The findings so far suggest there is only one group of British-born individuals with a large percentage who do not think of themselves as British – those born in Northern Ireland. Levels of British identity are lower among ethnic minorities but this may be because these are more likely to be second- or third-generation immigrants than whites. This is a plausible explanation for why the time trend among British-born Asians and Black groups is larger than for the white groups – over time, a higher proportion of these are third- rather than second-generation etc. Unfortunately the LFS does not have the information on country of birth of the parents but there are more indirect ways in which we can get evidence for this.

First we include a variable to represent whether the household contains someone who was not born in the UK - this is reported in the final column of Table 2. It has a significantly negative effect on the probability of feeling British and the coefficients on the ethnicity variables are more muted. This is what we would expect if, as seems likely, those who are second-generation immigrants are more likely to be in a household containing an immigrant.

Secondly, if consider young people living at home we can directly identify the country of birth of their parents as the LFS samples all individuals in target households. Taking this approach, Table 3 investigates the determinants of national identity among those aged 16 to 24. The first column estimates the same equation as the first column of Table 2 for everyone in this age group whether they are still living with their parents or not - the pattern of variation in British identity is similar to that found among the entire adult population. Religion is completely insignificant among this group so there is no evidence here of sizeable numbers of Muslim youth who are disaffected with Britain to the extent of not reporting themselves as British. The second column then drops the religion variables completely to increase the sample size to include the period from March 2001 rather than March 2002. The third column then keeps the specification the same but changes the sample to those who ever report in the 5 waves of the LFS that they are a child relative to the household reference person (in which case we can identify the country of birth of their parents). A comparison of columns 2 and 3 gives us some insight into the effect of selecting the sample to be young people who have not yet left home. The only coefficient for which this makes a sizeable difference is the variable for having being born in Northern Ireland which drops from a marginal effect of -28.7 percentage points to -8.6 percentage points¹⁰ – the coefficients on the other ethnicity

¹⁰ The obvious explanation for this is that we are now restricting the sample to those who, although they were born in Northern Ireland, have parents who are resident on the mainland suggesting that they spent a large part of their childhood outside Northern Ireland and hence feel less link to the province and connection with its conflict.

dummies are qualitatively similar. The fourth column then includes a dummy variable for whether the parent is UK born – we find that having a foreign-born parent reduces the probability of reporting a British identity by a significant 1.9 percentage points. Perhaps more importantly it also has the effect of markedly reducing the ethnicity coefficients e.g. reducing the Indian coefficient from -5.6 to -1.3, the Pakistani coefficient from -6.0 to -1.3, the Bangladeshi from -1.9 to -0.1 etc. This is exactly what we would expect if successive generations of immigrants are more likely to feel British and implies that third-generation ethnic minority immigrants are only very slightly likely to feel less British than the white population. We also investigate the existence of a ‘generation gap’ using the fact that sometimes it is the young person themselves who responds and sometimes it is a proxy response (which will most commonly be a parent). In column 5 we find that a proxy response when the household reference person is not UK-born is associated with being significantly less likely to report a British identity though the effect is small. Young second-generation immigrants think of themselves as more British than their parents would like to think.

All of this suggests that there is no problem with British identity among the UK-born. But what about the foreign-born?

c. British Identity Among the Foreign-Born

In studying the extent of British identity among the foreign-born we will use all the variables previously described but there are some additional ones that are of interest – notably the country of birth, the age of arrival into the UK and the time since arrival.

There is a large amount of variation across country of birth in the fraction of immigrants reporting a British identity. For those from Slovakia it is less than 5%, for those from Malta more than 80%. But there is, for the most part a simple explanation for these very large cross-country differences – the average amount of time spent in the UK. Figure 5 plots the fraction reporting a British identity against average number of years in the UK where each observation is a country of birth. The positive relationship is very clear, a first indication that feeling British is something that grows on you. We have also marked on Figure 5 some individual countries, singled out for a variety of reasons. There are two very marked outliers – Ireland and Italy. Ireland might be explained by the fact that there is an explicit ‘Irish’ answer to the question on national identity though is also likely to be partly explained by the long fight for Irish independence, something that lies behind the low level of British identity already noted among Northern Irish Catholics. The low level of British

identity among Italian immigrants has no such obvious explanation – perhaps it is the atrocious food and coffee they can never come to accept.

Other countries are not such marked outliers as these but there are countries that lie above and below the line, suggesting that for a given time in the UK they are more or less likely to report a British identity than the average. But what is striking is that it is not the countries from which immigrants are commonly perceived as a ‘problem’ who are below the line. For example, Pakistanis are, if anything, above the line as are Somalis, a group that is often felt to integrate rather badly and does extremely badly economically. We have also marked other Muslim countries which have large numbers of immigrants in Britain – Bangladesh, Turkey, and Egypt. This is a first indication of results that we will confirm with a more sophisticated result below – there is no evidence in this data for a particular problem with British identity among immigrants from countries very different from the UK. If anything, the countries below the line are countries like the US, Canada and France.

Figure 5 is intriguing but not compelling so we now turn to an analysis of the individual data. We estimate probit models for British identity using the same explanatory variables as for the UK-born but also include as controls, country of birth and age at which they came to the country. These ‘assimilation’ equations have a parallel in the economics literature where the evolution of immigrant’s earnings is investigated (see Chiswick, 1978; Borjas, 1999).

In general we might expect identity to depend on age, age of arrival in the UK, date and year of arrival in the UK. It is impossible to separately identify all of these possible effects because there are identities between them (see Borjas, 1999, for a discussion of these issues in relation to estimating earnings equations for immigrants). After experimentation we settled on modelling British identity as a function of the age of arrival in the UK and the time since arrival. The time since arrival variable will capture any true life-cycle effects but, as these are small for the UK-born (see Figure 4), it is reasonable to assume that most of the effects of time since arrival are assimilation effects. It is also possible that the time since arrival variable captures cohort effects caused by the changing nature of immigrants but we find similar qualitative effects of time since arrival for all immigrant groups so think that the assimilation explanation is the more plausible. Because of the large sample size we include a separate dummy variable for each age of arrival and each year since arrival. We also include 17 dummy variables for broad country or region of birth

Table 4 reports the marginal effects for selected covariates for the estimated model for all immigrants. The largest and most significant effects here are country of birth effects. The excluded category are immigrants from Western Europe. One can see that Irish immigrants are much less likely to think of themselves as British than any other group. Those from the US are less likely to think of themselves as British though the difference is not significantly different from zero. However those from Canada, Australia and New Zealand are significantly more likely to think of themselves as British, probably because many have some British ancestry. But it is when one moves away from the OECD countries that one sees very large positive marginal effects. Immigrants from Eastern Europe are 18.7% more likely to think of themselves as British but for immigrants from most developing countries the marginal effects are around 30%. There is no very marked difference between immigrants from India and those from Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Other variables are much less important than country of birth. Non-white ethnic groups are, for the most part, less likely to think of themselves as British with particularly large effects among those with Black African and Chinese heritages. Interestingly, Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrants are more likely to report a British identity than white immigrants though the effect is not significantly different from zero. Religion has smaller effects and perhaps not in the direction one might think e.g. Muslims are more likely than any other religious group to think of themselves as British.

One explanation for these findings is that immigrants from poorer countries are more likely to find it in their interests to acquire British citizenship and that they then mechanically think of themselves as British. To examine this, the second column of Table 4 uses UK citizenship as the dependent variable – the pattern of coefficients is very similar to that seen in column 1 suggestive of a strong link between British identity and citizenship among immigrants¹¹. But column 3 shows that not all of the results can be explained by the adoption of citizenship as it includes citizenship as an extra regressor in a regression where the dependent variable is British identity. This has a very powerful effect on feeling British – a marginal effect of 57% - but the pattern of differentials by country of birth remains, albeit muted.

¹¹ We do not pretend to be able to disentangle causality here – one might take citizenship because one felt British or feel that as soon as one has citizenship one is British.

Turning to the effect of age at arrival and time since arrival, Figure 6 plots the predicted probability by age at arrival for a new immigrant from Western Europe who is white, Christian, male and left education at 18. The pattern one sees is very sensible. Those who arrived as babies are 15% more likely to think of themselves as British but age of arrival has no effect once one arrives as an adult. Figure 7 investigates the effect of years since arrival which has a more powerful effect. The estimates suggest that no immigrants feel British on arrival into the UK but that, after 40 years, more than half of them do. Figure 7 also shows the pattern of time since arrival effects after controlling for citizenship (i.e. based on the estimates in column 3 of Table 4) – these are more muted as a longer time in the UK produces makes an immigrant more likely to become a citizen. But there remain sizeable assimilation effects.

It is tempting to interpret these assimilation effects as causal but it could be caused by selective attrition. We know that many immigrants return to their countries of origin and if immigrants who feel British are more likely to remain then this would expect that, among the immigrants, who remain the fraction with a British identity rises over time but without any necessary causal effect. In duration models this is the problem of separating true duration dependence from unobserved heterogeneity. But it is not plausible to think that most of the assimilation effects seen in Figure 7 can be explained in this way as to do so would require a rate of return migration far in excess of what is plausible. To give an example suppose that no immigrant ever changes their national identity – some feel British on arrival and some do not. Figure 7 suggests that at most 2% of immigrants are in the first category. For the observed proportion of immigrants feeling British to rise to 50% after 50 years would require 98% of those who do not feel British and 0% of those who do feel British to return home (with an overall return migration rate of 96%). Our best estimates of return migration suggest an overall return migration rate of 50% (Dustmann, 2006) and this is not obviously strongly correlated with feeling British. To investigate this we take immigrants observed in the first wave of the LFS and see whether they are still in the sample at wave 5. If they are not this may be because they have changed address (including leaving the UK) or because of non-response. But, once we control for time since arrival those who do not report a British identity are actually 0.05% more likely to be present in the household in wave 5, though the t-statistic on this is 0.07. The assimilation effects seen in Figure 7 are simply too strong to be primarily explained by unobserved heterogeneity (though part of the profile may be due to this cause) and can only be explained by sizeable assimilation.

The empirical specification used so far has allowed immigrants from different countries to differ in the level of British identity but not in the rate of assimilation. However, there may well also be important differences in the rate of assimilation. To that end, we estimated separate equations for different countries and regions of birth and computed the predicted probability of feeling British by years since arrival. In these equations the sample sizes mean we cannot estimate precisely a dummy variable for each year since arrival so we approximate by a quartic – in the aggregate this works well – see Figure 7. The first set of results are shown in Figure 8 where we show the own rates of assimilation and the aggregate for comparison. It is very noticeable that rates of assimilation are lower for those from richer countries and higher for those from poorer countries. Among the poor countries there is no tendency for those from predominantly Muslim countries to have lower rates of assimilation – if anything, it is the opposite. The second set of estimates summarized in Figure 9 include a control for citizenship. This is important because those from poorer countries are more likely to acquire citizenship. The differences are less marked but qualitatively the same.

These patterns of variation by country/region of birth in the rate of assimilation among immigrants to Britain raise the question of whether there is any systematic pattern to this - are immigrants from certain types of countries more or less likely to feel British? The last part of this section investigates this and we start by speculating on the factors that might be important. First, we have seen that those immigrants who become UK citizens are much more likely to report a British identity and the take-up of citizenship might be influenced by a number of factors. First, there are a number of practical advantages to citizenship – one has the right to work and vote in the UK and one can travel into the country without the need for a visa. To account for these, we include dummy variables for coming from an EU-15 countries and the A-8 countries who have the automatic right to work in the UK, a binary variable ‘Visa’ taking the value 1 if citizens from that country require a visa to enter the UK and a binary variable “Commonwealth” denoting that the immigrant comes from a Commonwealth country who have the right to vote in all UK elections (there may also be closer affinities between these countries and Britain). Apart from the practical advantages, there may be more emotional advantages to adopting a British identity. In particular we hypothesize that immigrants may be more likely to express a British identity if Britain compares favourably with the country from which they came. The dimensions of this comparison might be economic so we include log GDP per capita, or political, so we include the Polity IV measure of

democracy/autocracy¹², or connected with civil liberties (so we include the Freedom House measure of press freedom)¹³.

The fourth column of Table 4 shows what happens when we include these variables instead of the country/region of birth variables. The standard errors are clustered on country and we exclude the Irish because they are such an outlier. When we simply include the levels of these variables we find that immigrants from richer countries are significantly less likely to think of themselves as British, as are those from strong democracies. Those from countries with a free press are more likely to feel British but this is not significant. Being from a Commonwealth country has a powerful positive effect while being from an A8 country has a significant negative effect. This does provide some evidence that immigrants from ‘worse’ countries are more likely to assimilate into Britain. Because this might be correlated with the incentive to acquire citizenship, we include a control for citizenship in the fifth column of Table 4. This does weaken the effect of per capita GDP and the democracy measure but they remain significant. The same is true when, as in the final two columns of Table 4 we estimate separate equations for citizens and non-citizens.

These specifications assume the country variables have a level effect, but they might also affect the rate of assimilation so we then estimate a model in which a quartic in time here is interacted with the country-level variables. There are too many coefficients to report all the results but the terms involving the country-level variables are all jointly significantly different from zero for all variables except the press freedom measure. To summarize results, we plot the predicted assimilation profiles for different types of individuals. Figure 10 does this for democracy/autocracy showing that immigrants from democracies assimilate less quickly. Figure 11 shows the same for GDP per capita with the result that those from richer countries assimilate more slowly. These results hold whether or not one controls for the immigrant being a UK citizen.

d. A Simple Model to Explain Our Findings

The finding that immigrants from countries most dissimilar to the UK are more likely to come to feel British is interesting because it is perhaps unexpected as one suspects that their behaviour remains more distinct. Here we propose a simple ‘identity’ model (along the lines pioneered in economics by Akerlof and Kranton, 2000) to explain which immigrants adopt a British

¹² More details can be found at <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/polity/>.

¹³ More details can be found at <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=1>

identity (see Shayo, 2005, for a model designed to explain the related concept of national pride that could also be used to explain a desire to be on the ‘winning side’ as an explanation for our findings). Assume that immigrants have to choose some behaviour or value, x , and how British they feel, b which we treat as a continuous variable on the unit interval. There are norms of behaviour both in the culture of origin, x_0 , and in Britain, x_b . Immigrants suffer a loss if their behaviour deviates both from the norm of their culture of origin and the norm in Britain so they feel torn between the two cultures – this is a simple way of capturing the cultural tension experienced by many immigrants. By choosing to be British they can increase the weight on the deviation from the British norm and reduce it on the norm of the culture of origin. However there is also a loss from ‘betraying one’s roots’ by being British at all. We represent the loss function for the immigrant as:

$$L(x, b) = (1 - \theta - b)(x - x_0)^2 + (\theta + b)(x - x_b)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha b^2 \quad (1)$$

where θ is the weight on deviations from the norm of origin and α is the cost of betraying one’s roots. Define $\beta = \theta + b$, and consider the optimal behaviour. Minimizing (1) with respect to x , we get that:

$$x^* = \beta x_0 + (1 - \beta)x_b \quad (2)$$

so that optimal behaviour is a weighted average of the cultural norm of origin and the British norm with the weight being influence by how British the person feels. Define $\delta = (x_b - x_0)^2$, a measure of cultural distance between Britain and their country of origin and substituting into (1) we get:

$$L^*(\beta) = \delta\beta(1 - \beta) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\beta - \theta)^2 \quad (3)$$

Minimizing this with respect to β leads to:

$$\beta^* = \frac{\alpha\theta - \delta}{\alpha - 2\delta} \quad (4)$$

which implies that:

$$b^* = \frac{\delta(2\theta - 1)}{\alpha - 2\delta} \quad (5)$$

For the minimization problem to have an interior solution we need to make the assumptions that $\alpha > 2\delta$ and that $2\theta > 1$. With these assumptions we get the result that the optimal level of British identity depends negatively on the cost of ‘betraying one’s roots’, α , and positively on the influence of the British on the loss function, θ . But it also depends positively on δ the difference in norms

between the culture of origin and those of the British. Hence the model predicts that those from cultures that are most dissimilar from Britain are more likely to adopt a British identity as found in the empirical results. The intuition is best understood by thinking of those who come from cultures identical to Britain – these immigrants are under no pressure to change their behaviour so have no incentive to increase the weight on the British component of the loss function and will only suffer a loss by betraying their roots if they become British.

If, as seems plausible, the influence of Britain, θ , rises over time then we can also explain why immigrants come to feel more British over time, and at a faster rate for those from more dissimilar countries.

Note that the model does not predict that immigrants from very different countries come to be as similar in behaviour. Putting (4) into (2) we have that:

$$(x^* - x_b)^2 = \delta(1 - \beta^*)^2 = \delta \frac{(\alpha[1 - \theta] - \delta)^2}{(\alpha - 2\delta)^2} \quad (6)$$

which, in the region of $\delta = 0$ is increasing in δ .

One can also explain why certain groups may seek to segregate themselves which one can interpret as a reduction in θ (see Bisin et al, 2006, for some British evidence on such endogenous segregation). However, the data do not suggest this is the dominant factor in the data and do not have sufficiently disaggregated regional information so we do not explore this further here.

e. *Conclusion on Identity*

The evidence provided on national identity is clear and authoritative. When asked a direct question, most respondents can say whether they are British or not and there are clear patterns of regularities in their responses. Few recently-arrived immigrants think of themselves as British but the fraction who do grows over time. Those who come at an earlier age and from poorer, less democratic countries are more likely to do so. We have suggested that this is because the greater culture clash experienced by these immigrants actually increases their incentives to become British.

The data on national identity do not support any alarmism about the effects of immigration in general or Muslims in particular on national identity. But, perhaps this misses the point of people's fears surrounding the cultural assimilation of immigrants. There is little concern that the Italian immigrants who never feel British are causing problems but more concern that Pakistani immigrants

(who feel British at about the average rate for immigrants) are doing so. The reason is that it is values that are more important than national identity. – Italians are thought to have values close to our own but there is more uncertainty about the value systems of some other groups of immigrants. There are debates in our intellectual magazines about what it means to be British but we do not know if the respondents to the LFS apply the same criteria – it may be that those born in the UK report they are British simply because of their country of birth and their response says nothing about the values they think important (see CRE, 2005a, for focus group evidence on what being British means to people). The analysis so far has been in the spirit of ‘windows into men’s souls’, asking only if people think of themselves as British and not asking what they mean by that.

2. Values

For an analysis of values we turn to the Home Office Citizenship Surveys (HOCS). This survey has been conducted every two years since 2001 though the questions we use for analysis come from the 2003 and 2005 surveys. In each year the sample consists of a nationally representative ‘core’ sample of slightly under 10000 adults, and a ‘boost’ sample of slightly under 5000 ethnic minority adults designed to ensure there were enough sample members from the main ethnic groups in the UK. More details of the survey and its methodology can be found in Green and Farmer (2004) and Michaelson et al (2006).

HOCS contains information on the usual demographics, country of birth and (in 2005) year of arrival in the UK. We are interested in the answers to the questions on rights and responsibilities. Respondents are asked the following set of questions “Now some questions about the rights of people living in the UK. By rights I mean the things that people are entitled to if they live in this country. First I will ask you about rights that you think you should have and then next the rights that you actually have”, followed by a list of 9 rights. These are listed in Table 5 together with the mean responses. Large majorities are in favour of all of these rights though there is more disagreement about the rights to a job and the welfare state (issues that have been at the heart of political debates in Britain for much of the period since 1945). There is generally a perceived gap between the rights one should have and the rights one actually has. The second part of Table 5 splits the responses into the UK-born and immigrants. Immigrants are, with the exception of a right to a job, less likely than the UK-born to believe in the rights listed though immigrants are often more likely to think they

actually have those rights in Britain. However, it is still the case that over 80% of immigrants believe in each of the rights listed.

The survey then goes on to ask about responsibilities with the question ‘on this card are things which some people feel should be the responsibilities of every person living in the UK. Which, if any, do you feel should be the responsibility of everyone living in the UK?’, followed by the 11 items listed in Table 6 together with the responses. The general pattern is that the vast majority think that all 11 are responsibilities though voting comes out lowest with 80% support. The UK-born do have higher proportions believing in these responsibilities than immigrants but the differences are all small.

Now let us consider the determinants of beliefs in different rights and responsibilities. We only report results using a composite measure of the rights and responsibilities respondents feel they should have that is scaled to be zero if the respondent believes in none of them and 100 if they believe in all of them. This is based on the idea that one thinks of all the rights and responsibilities are ‘good things’ though some may be judged more important than others and all of the measures show a high level of congruence with a Cronbach’s alpha above 0.8¹⁴. Table 7 uses as dependent variable the measure of rights one should have. The first column pools natives and immigrants.

A first point to note is that there are highly significant effects of age and education on belief in rights with the older and more educated believing they should have a greater number of rights. This does tally with popular concerns that young people and less-educated are more inclined to be ‘anti-social’¹⁵. These differences within the UK-born population are much larger and more systematic than any effects we find of other variables and between the UK- and foreign-born. For example, religion is not significant (with the exception of being Jewish) - the effect of being Muslim is not significantly different from zero. The effects of ethnicity are also small. Those with as country of birth outside the OECD (excluding Ireland) are likely to believe in fewer rights but these effects are quite small and generally not significantly different from zero.

The second column of Table 7 then restricts the sample to the UK-born. Education and age remain important and there is a modest negative effect of being Asian or black. Religion is completely unimportant. The third column then restricts the sample to immigrants. The sample size

¹⁴ We did originally report results for each individual question but found no interesting differences when doing this so ended up using a single composite measure.

¹⁵ For example, the word ‘Chav’, named by the Oxford English Dictionary as ‘word of the year’ in 2004, has sprung to prominence in the past few years and has connotations of anti-social behaviour.

is smaller so fewer coefficients are significant but the qualitative pattern is similar. However the age effects are more marked. This could be because they include assimilation effects – however the variable time since arrival is completely insignificant when included in the fourth column (the sample size drops here as this variable is only available for the 2005 survey). The fifth column restricts the sample to immigrants from the OECD and Europe and the sixth column to those from the rest of the world. There do not seem any very marked differences though the age profile for those from the rest of the world is the most marked. The final column replaces the country of birth variables by the country characteristics previously used in the study of national identity. These variables are all insignificant.

We suggest there is a simple explanation for this. The rights and responsibilities considered in this survey are those considered useful for the workings of a liberal democracy but not all countries are liberal democracies. However, data from the World Values Survey suggests near-universal support for an institution like democracy – for example, 87% of Britons think democracy is a fairly or very good political system compared to 98% of Bangladeshis, 82% of Pakistanis, 83% of Poles and 92% of Indians. It is also likely that immigrants into the UK are also selected on belief in those values so that immigrants from these countries are more likely to believe in democracy than the average.

Table 8 does the same exercise as Table 7 but with the dependent variable changed to the measure of the rights actually possessed. The pattern of findings is very similar – there is perhaps a hint that those from poorer countries are more impressed with the rights they have in Britain than the UK-born and those from richer countries. Finally Table 9 changes the dependent variable to responsibilities. The qualitative findings are, again, very similar.

This analysis of views on rights and responsibilities again suggests that the culture club view is more appropriate than the culture clash view. There is certainly no evidence here in support of views like that expressed by Huntington (2005, p188) that “Muslim minorities have proved to be ‘indigestible’ by non-Muslim society”. It is hard to find marked differences in views on rights and responsibilities across different groups and any differences that are found are smaller than exist between young and old, educated and less-educated.

3. Conclusion

For national identity there is clear evidence of cultural assimilation – for values there is not assimilation but there are no very big differences to begin with. This suggests that fears about culture clash in modern Britain are ill-founded. Among the UK-born it is very rare for someone to deny a British identity and the only sizeable group that does so would seem to be Northern Irish Catholics. Those from ethnic minorities are less likely to report a British identity but we presented evidence that this is less true for the third- as compared to second-generation immigrants. Newly-arrived immigrants almost never think of themselves as British but the feeling grows on them, the longer they remain. This assimilation into a British identity is faster for those from poorer, less democratic countries and there is no evidence that there is a problem with the assimilation of Muslims.

The culture club view should not be taken to imply that there are no problems or no potential for conflict. Those with extremist views do exist and have the potential to cause problems disproportionate to their numbers (which are too small to be detectable in the surveys used here). And just because most people in Britain have a shared national identity and shared views on rights and responsibilities does not mean they cannot disagree, or that some of these disagreements may be along cultural or religious lines. For example, though most express a belief in free speech as an abstract concept, most also think there should be some limits (e.g. against slander, against the incitement to racial or religious hatred) but where the lines should be drawn is subject to more debate.

Without taking any particular position on who is right and who is wrong, there are likely to be tensions when the majority view about how everybody should be allowed to live their lives comes into conflict with the minority view. In part such conflicts are influenced by the spheres that are regarded as ‘private’ and ‘public’. Where this line is drawn does vary across time and space e.g. religion used to be a matter of compulsion but is now seen more as a personal choice, Muslim schoolgirls in France are not allowed to wear the hijab but policewomen in London are allowed to do so. But there are some areas where interaction between individuals is inevitable and there is some regulation of what is acceptable e.g. the education of children where the state takes an active role that primarily reflects the views of the majority but may conflict with the desires of some minorities.

There is also one very important question that has not been touched upon in this paper. We have seen that almost all of the UK-born see themselves as British and that most immigrants come to do so as well if they remain in the UK long enough. But, do the white UK-born population think of all of these people of British? We have some evidence perhaps that they do not. For example, the 2003 British Social Attitudes Survey asked the respondents to say whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement “Muslims are more loyal to Muslims than to Britain”. Of the non-Muslim respondents only 9% disagreed with a further 25% neither disagreeing nor disagreeing. But, among the Muslim respondents (who we might expect to be better-informed on the subject) 45% disagreed, a significant difference even though the survey only contained 20 Muslim respondents. And 62% of non-Muslim respondents thought there was a fairly or very serious conflict between Muslims and non-Muslims in Britain, compared to 27% of Muslims¹⁶. A more serious culture clash may be the refusal of the majority population to see minorities as British and it would be useful to think about how people see others as much as how they see themselves (see Glaeser, 2005, for a model along these lines).

¹⁶ Another question about conflicts in the world as a whole between Muslims and non-Muslims had 85% of non-Muslims say they thought there was a fairly or very serious conflict and 67% of Muslims.

Table 1
British and Other Identities

		Other Identity		
		No	Yes	Total
British Identity	No	0.00	6.20	6.20
	Yes	92.88	0.93	93.80
Total		92.88	7.12	100.00

Notes: Statistics derived from LFS March 2001- March 2006 and relates to those aged 16 or over – grossing weights are used. Total sample size is 1970394.

Table 2
British Identity Among the UK-born

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	All	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	Chinese	Other	All
Ethnicity								
Mixed: White/Black	-1.465							-1.433
Caribbean	[0.632]*							[0.624]*
Mixed: White/Black	-3.977		-2.764					-3.705
African	[1.677]*		[2.021]					[1.587]*
Mixed: White/Asian	-3.017		-1.074					-2.741
	[0.950]**		[1.146]					[0.903]**
Mixed: Other	-5.068		-2.999					-4.708
	[1.308]**		[1.496]*					[1.246]**
Indian	-3.271							-2.796
	[0.787]**							[0.705]**
Pakistani	-4.576			-0.151				-3.851
	[1.154]**			[1.334]				[1.024]**
Bangladeshi	-2.467			0.135				-1.99
	[1.120]*			[1.955]				[0.979]*
Other Asian	-5.443			-4.329				-4.708
	[1.452]**			[2.305]				[1.328]**
Black Caribbean	-4.502							-4.272
	[0.558]**							[0.543]**
Black African	-3.252				0.189			-2.743
	[0.861]**				[1.301]			[0.780]**
Other Black	-2.437				2.059			-2.251
	[1.302]				[1.544]			[1.246]
Chinese	-5.122							-4.289
	[1.510]**							[1.348]**
Other	-14.788							-13.809
	[1.884]**							[1.811]**
Religion								
Buddhist	-1.577	-1.247	-17.936	-11.435	-30.806	-4.823	4.722	-1.532
	[0.627]*	[0.624]*	[12.653]	[10.591]	[22.317]	[10.235]	[9.045]	[0.620]*
Hindu	-0.803	-3.056	-51.4	-4.717	-22.463		-4.253	-0.57
	[0.413]	[3.352]	[29.260]	[3.074]	[21.892]		[9.977]	[0.352]
Jewish	0.327	0.353					5.747	0.333
	[0.123]**	[0.107]**					[5.542]	[0.118]**
Muslim	-0.413	-2.622	-3.637	-2.2	2.484		5.47	-0.216
	[0.273]	[1.196]*	[2.909]	[2.349]	[2.341]		[4.650]	[0.225]
Sikh	-1262			-6.165			-8.471	-0.969
	[0.502]*			[3.153]			[12.043]	[0.434]*
any other religion	-1.413	-1.161	-7.195	-14.754	-2.733	-36.524	-6.924	-1.357
	[0.306]**	[0.307]**	[4.620]	[7.626]	[5.392]	[29.051]	[9.768]	[0.300]**
no religion at all	-0.251	-0.225	-1.012	-1.201	-0.176	-6.636	10.885	-0.252
	[0.048]**	[0.045]**	[0.935]	[3.165]	[1.424]	[4.729]	[3.730]**	[0.048]**

Table 2 (continued)

	All	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	Chinese	Other	All
Country of Birth								
Wales	0.402 [0.069]**	0.382 [0.061]**	-2.043 [2.884]	-0.42 [4.121]			4.756 [11.721]	0.399 [0.068]**
Scotland	0.532 [0.052]**	0.477 [0.047]**		-0.126 [4.677]	-6.817 [10.902]		10.936 [7.437]	0.529 [0.051]**
Northern Ireland	-24.305 [1.269]**	-23.131 [1.247]**	-13.545 [16.048]	-13.615 [17.365]			-44.93 [20.541]*	-24.083 [1.261]**
Country not stated	-5.934 [1.970]**	-7.18 [2.189]**	-41.25 [25.400]					-6.004 [1.969]**
Other Variables								
Month	0.554 [0.125]**	0.319 [0.121]**	3.195 [3.261]	19.739 [3.220]**	10.229 [3.576]**	-24.002 [19.874]	-3.428 [15.193]	0.552 [0.123]**
Sex	-0.059 [0.031]	-0.086 [0.030]**	0.571 [0.735]	0.285 [0.760]	2.094 [0.931]*	0.029 [4.619]	9.326 [3.655]*	-0.052 [0.031]
age completed ft education	-0.064 [0.006]**	-0.062 [0.005]**	-0.225 [0.125]	0.313 [0.146]*	-0.175 [0.166]	1.003 [0.964]	-0.331 [0.596]	-0.061 [0.006]**
Student	-0.037 [0.082]	-0.169 [0.103]	-3.004 [2.079]	0.926 [1.094]	0.46 [1.696]	6.471 [3.687]	-0.034 [7231]	-0.008 [0.079]
Household contains foreign –born individuals								0.51 [0.088]**
Observations	880459	852497	4405	12932	7468	411	1518	880459
Fraction Reporting British Identity	0.988	0.990	0.953	0.924	0.937	0.914	0.791	0.988

Notes.

1. Sample is from LFS March 2002-March 2006 inclusive.
2. Reported coefficients are marginal effects from probit model multiplied by 100.
3. Robust standard errors, clustered on the individual are in parentheses. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table 3

British Identity Among the Young UK-born

	1	2	3	4	5
Ethnicity					
Mixed: White/Black Caribbean	-0.5 [0.5]	-1.4 [0.7]*	-1.9 [0.8]*	-1.4 [0.7]*	-1.4 [0.7]*
Mixed: White/Black African	-3.8 [2.2]	-5.7 [2.6]*	-3.6 [2.5]	-1.8 [1.5]	-1.8 [1.5]
Mixed: White/Asian	-1.2 [0.9]	-1.2 [0.7]	-1.2 [0.8]	-0.1 [0.4]	-0.1 [0.3]
Mixed: Other	-1.7 [1.2]	-2.9 [1.1]*	-2 [1.2]	-1 [0.9]	-1 [0.9]
Indian	-2.9 [1.1]**	-6.3 [0.7]**	-5.6 [0.8]**	-1.3 [0.4]**	-1.3 [0.4]**
Pakistani	-4.6 [1.8]**	-6.8 [0.8]**	-6 [0.9]**	-1.3 [0.4]**	-1.3 [0.4]**
Bangladeshi	-1.5 [1.1]	-2.2 [0.8]**	-1.9 [0.8]*	-0.1 [0.3]	-0.1 [0.3]
Other Asian	-5.4 [2.1]*	-6.3 [1.7]**	-5.1 [1.8]**	-1.2 [0.7]	-1.2 [0.7]
Black Caribbean	-3.9 [1.0]**	-4 [0.8]**	-3.6 [0.9]**	-1.5 [0.6]**	-1.5 [0.6]**
Black African	-3.1 [1.3]*	-3.2 [1.0]**	-2.6 [1.1]*	-0.2 [0.4]	-0.2 [0.4]
Other Black	-0.6 [1.0]	-2.1 [1.4]	-1.2 [1.2]	-0.2 [0.5]	-0.3 [0.6]
Chinese	-3.8 [1.8]*	-5 [1.6]**	-2.8 [1.2]*	-0.3 [0.4]	-0.3 [0.4]
Other	-10.2 [2.8]**	-11.3 [2.1]**	-10 [2.3]**	-3.7 [1.4]**	-3.7 [1.3]**
Religion					
Buddhist	-0.5 [0.8]				
Hindu	-0.9 [0.6]				
Jewish	-0.2 [0.4]				
Muslim	-0.3 [0.4]				
Sikh	-1.1 [0.7]				
any other religion	1.3 [0.6]*				
no religion at all	-0.1 [0.1]				

Table 3 (continued)

	1	2	3	4	5
Country of Birth					
Wales	0.4 [0.1]**	0.4 [0.1]**	0.4 [0.1]**	0.4 [0.1]**	0.4 [0.1]**
Scotland	0.6 [0.1]**	0.4 [0.1]**	0.3 [0.1]	0.1 [0.1]	0.1 [0.1]
Northern Ireland	-27.7 [3.6]**	-28.7 [3.1]**	-8.6 [3.6]*	-8.6 [3.5]*	-8.6 [3.5]*
Country not stated	-6.8 [4.7]	-1.2 [0.6]*	-0.6 [0.6]	-0.6 [0.5]	-0.6 [0.5]
Other Variables					
Sex	-0.1 [0.1]	0 [0.0]	0.1 [0.1]	0.1 [0.1]	0.1 [0.1]
age completed ft education	-0.1 [0.0]**	-0.1 [0.0]**	0 [0.0]	0 [0.0]	0 [0.0]
Student	0 [0.1]	0 [0.1]	0 [0.1]	0 [0.1]	0 [0.1]
Parent is Foreign- Born				-1.9 [0.3]**	-1.7 [0.3]**
Proxy response					0 [0.1]
Proxy response*Parent Foreign Born					-0.3 [0.1]*
Observations	160288	247626	171192	169741	169737
Fraction Reporting British Identity	0.987	0.988	0.989	0.989	0.989

Notes.

1. Sample is from LFS March 2002-March 2006 inclusive for column 1 and March 2001-March 2006 inclusive for the other columns.
2. Reported coefficients are marginal effects from probit model multiplied by 100.
3. Robust standard errors, clustered on the individual are in parentheses. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table 4

British Identity Among Immigrants

Dependent Variable	1 Identity All	2 citizenship All	3 Identity All	4 Identity All	5 identity All	6 Identity Non- Citizens	7 identity Citizens
Ethnicity							
Mixed: White/Black Caribbean	0.086 [0.103]	0.085 [0.117]	0.083 [0.120]	0.245 [0.102]*	0.235 [0.115]*	0.24 [0.178]	0.023 [0.073]
Mixed: White/Black African	-0.251 [0.044]**	-0.088 [0.068]	-0.252 [0.047]**	-0.118 [0.079]	-0.143 [0.051]**	-0.057 [0.014]**	-0.09 [0.069]
Mixed: White/Asian	-0.075 [0.056]	0.068 [0.069]	-0.135 [0.057]*	-0.078 [0.062]	-0.148 [0.056]**	-0.06 [0.012]**	-0.062 [0.060]
Mixed: Other	-0.117 [0.042]**	-0.159 [0.039]**	-0.058 [0.050]	-0.102 [0.042]*	-0.032 [0.054]	0.028 [0.029]	-0.135 [0.054]*
Indian	-0.051 [0.023]*	0.028 [0.026]	-0.082 [0.026]**	-0.082 [0.038]*	-0.045 [0.025]	-0.001 [0.013]	-0.032 [0.023]
Pakistani	0.064 [0.052]	0.045 [0.054]	0.017 [0.060]	-0.117 [0.060]	-0.093 [0.041]*	-0.015 [0.014]	-0.079 [0.040]*
Bangladeshi	0.036 [0.063]	0.01 [0.070]	0.018 [0.071]	-0.059 [0.047]	-0.023 [0.031]	0.005 [0.015]	-0.033 [0.031]
Other Asian	-0.127 [0.020]**	-0.118 [0.022]**	-0.095 [0.025]**	-0.08 [0.032]*	-0.061 [0.025]*	-0.018 [0.011]	-0.042 [0.029]
Black Caribbean	-0.02 [0.041]	-0.064 [0.041]	0.009 [0.049]	-0.078 [0.040]	-0.013 [0.025]	0.004 [0.016]	-0.023 [0.021]
Black African	-0.169 [0.016]**	-0.204 [0.015]**	-0.086 [0.020]**	-0.178 [0.051]**	-0.07 [0.038]	-0.027 [0.012]*	-0.042 [0.040]
Other Black	-0.094 [0.057]	-0.219 [0.045]**	0.051 [0.073]	-0.105 [0.067]	0.044 [0.075]	0.016 [0.035]	0.03 [0.055]
Chinese	-0.275 [0.024]**	-0.248 [0.027]**	-0.218 [0.034]**	-0.24 [0.031]**	-0.196 [0.032]**	-0.05 [0.010]**	-0.191 [0.043]**
Other	-0.226 [0.014]**	-0.204 [0.014]**	-0.17 [0.017]**	-0.197 [0.037]**	-0.141 [0.030]**	-0.036 [0.009]**	-0.13 [0.041]**
Religion							
Buddhist	-0.067 [0.030]*	-0.055 [0.033]	-0.038 [0.035]	-0.045 [0.051]	-0.013 [0.042]	-0.006 [0.019]	-0.011 [0.026]
Hindu	-0.001 [0.021]	0.016 [0.023]	-0.004 [0.025]	-0.031 [0.020]	-0.046 [0.017]**	-0.006 [0.010]	-0.046 [0.017]**
Jewish	-0.047 [0.048]	0.071 [0.054]	-0.105 [0.053]*	0.087 [0.044]*	0.015 [0.046]	0.05 [0.031]	-0.036 [0.045]
Muslim	0.047 [0.017]**	0.053 [0.018]**	0.026 [0.020]	0.045 [0.029]	0.015 [0.025]	0.009 [0.009]	0 [0.019]
Sikh	-0.063 [0.027]*	-0.095 [0.028]**	-0.027 [0.033]	-0.08 [0.019]**	-0.058 [0.015]**	-0.033 [0.006]**	-0.022 [0.018]
any other religion	-0.066 [0.028]*	-0.022 [0.030]	-0.055 [0.031]	-0.081 [0.029]**	-0.077 [0.032]*	-0.021 [0.012]	-0.072 [0.029]*
no religion at all	0.026 [0.013]*	0.052 [0.014]**	0.002 [0.014]	0.026 [0.019]	0 [0.018]	0.002 [0.008]	-0.007 [0.017]

Table 4 (continued)

Dependent Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Country/Region of Birth	Identity	citizenship	identity	Identity	identity	Identity	identity
Ireland	-0.332 [0.010]**	-0.341 [0.010]**	-0.205 [0.017]**				
Eastern Europe	0.112 [0.020]**	0.168 [0.022]**	0.036 [0.023]				
United States	-0.041 [0.025]	-0.118 [0.027]**	0 [0.026]				
Canada/Australia/NZ	0.083 [0.020]**	0.074 [0.023]**	0.066 [0.021]**				
Turkey	0.187 [0.034]**	0.252 [0.036]**	0.077 [0.039]				
Middle East/North Africa	0.353 [0.019]**	0.417 [0.019]**	0.191 [0.026]**				
India/Sri Lanka	0.292 [0.020]**	0.34 [0.021]**	0.148 [0.025]**				
Pakistan	0.284 [0.046]**	0.403 [0.041]**	0.129 [0.059]*				
Bangladesh	0.315 [0.050]**	0.424 [0.048]**	0.158 [0.065]*				
China/HK/Taiwan	0.452 [0.023]**	0.512 [0.023]**	0.284 [0.040]**				
Japan	0.158 [0.055]**	0.065 [0.058]	0.122 [0.063]				
Other Asia	0.298 [0.021]**	0.339 [0.023]**	0.171 [0.026]**				
Caribbean	0.24 [0.036]**	0.332 [0.035]**	0.086 [0.045]				
Central/South America	0.134 [0.030]**	0.215 [0.032]**	0.045 [0.034]				
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.395 [0.014]**	0.458 [0.015]**	0.227 [0.018]**				
Somalia	0.35 [0.030]**	0.399 [0.031]**	0.197 [0.043]**				

Table 4 (continued)

Dependent Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Identity	citizenship	identity	Identity	identity	Identity	identity
Country-Level Variables							
Visa Required				-0.004 [0.054]	-0.022 [0.036]	-0.003 [0.019]	-0.026 [0.016]
Commonwealth				0.08 [0.030]**	0.038 [0.021]	0.009 [0.010]	0.031 [0.018]
EU-15				-0.088 [0.075]	-0.065 [0.047]	-0.048 [0.010]**	0.06 [0.023]**
EU A8				-0.13 [0.046]**	-0.131 [0.036]**	-0.034 [0.013]*	-0.114 [0.037]**
Log Per capita GDP				-0.063 [0.022]**	-0.031 [0.013]*	-0.013 [0.007]	-0.016 [0.005]**
Democracy/Autocracy				-0.011 [0.003]**	-0.008 [0.002]**	-0.003 [0.001]*	-0.005 [0.001]**
Press Freedom				-0.002 [0.001]	-0.001 [0.001]	0 [0.000]	0 [0.000]
Other Variables							
Month	0.013 [0.030]	0.01 [0.035]	-0.004 [0.037]	-0.003 [0.039]	-0.031 [0.048]	-0.01 [0.024]	-0.021 [0.030]
Female	0.007 [0.008]	-0.013 [0.008]	0.016 [0.009]	0.013 [0.007]	0.018 [0.007]**	-0.001 [0.004]	0.022 [0.006]**
age when compltd ft education	-0.004 [0.001]**	0.002 [0.001]	-0.006 [0.001]**	-0.005 [0.002]*	-0.004 [0.002]*	-0.001 [0.001]	-0.001 [0.001]
Student	0.005 [0.016]	0.023 [0.018]	-0.022 [0.018]	0.013 [0.025]	-0.016 [0.026]	-0.011 [0.010]	0.001 [0.017]
UK Citizen			0.571 [0.007]**		0.572 [0.017]**		
Observations	98371	89321	89240	26693	24230	13985	10204

Notes.

1. Sample is from LFS March 2002-March 2006
2. Reported coefficients are marginal effects from probit model
3. Robust standard errors, clustered on the individual are in parentheses. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.
4. Data on Democracy/Autocracy come from Polity IV database, on press freedom from xxx

Table 5**Descriptive Statistics on Rights of those living in the UK**

	Total		UK-Born		Foreign-Born	
	Should have	Actually have	Should have	Actually have	Should have	Actually have
freedom of speech	92.4	79.5	92.7	79.2	89.8	81.6
freedom of thought, conscience, religion	88.1	82.0	88.1	81.8	87.9	84.2
free elections	85.2	83.9	85.6	84.6	82.3	77.8
Treated fairly and equally	94.1	74.3	94.3	74.3	91.8	75.1
Free education for children	90.5	86.4	90.8	87.0	87.4	80.7
be looked after by state if cannot look after yourself	84.8	65.4	85.3	65.7	80.5	62.7
protected from crime	94.1	71.6	94.4	71.4	91.6	73.0
free health care if you need it	91.2	82.4	91.8	82.4	86.1	82.0
have a job	72.8	59.7	72.4	59.1	76.3	65.1

Notes: pooled 2003 and 2005 survey, weighted responses. Sample sizes are approximately 16500 for the UK-born and 6800 for the Foreign-Born though vary slightly from question to question.

Table 6**Descriptive Statistics on Responsibilities of those living in the UK**

	Total	UK-Born	Foreign-Born
To help and protect your family	94.9	95.1	93.2
To raise children properly	96.8	97.1	94.5
To work to provide for yourself	90.7	90.8	90.5
To behave morally and ethically	93.0	93.2	90.9
To behave responsibly	95.7	95.9	93.1
To help others	89.1	89.3	88.1
To treat others with fairness and respect	96.1	96.4	93.8
To treat all races equally	93.1	93.0	93.9
To obey and respect law	96.4	96.4	96.4
To vote	80.4	80.5	80.1
To respect and preserve the environment	93.9	94.1	91.9

Notes: pooled 2003 and 2005 survey, weighted responses. Sample sizes are approximately 16500 for the UK-born and 6800 for the Foreign-Born though vary slightly from question to question.

Table 7

Rights Should Have

Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Demographics							
Constant	88.406 [0.502]**	88.731 [0.526]**	88.214 [2.829]**	92.121 [3.444]**	92.121 [3.444]**	88.599 [3.615]**	85.329 [2.410]**
Male	0.304 [0.271]	0.239 [0.281]	0.651 [0.997]	0.548 [1.147]	2.789 [1.388]*	-0.473 [1.386]	1.341 [1.066]
Degree or equivalent higher education below degree level	1.783 [0.391]**	1.751 [0.402]**	2.549 [1.700]	1.729 [2.202]	0.397 [2.627]	3.014 [2.227]	3.506 [1.856]
a level or equivalent	1.587 [0.566]**	1.567 [0.579]**	1.718 [2.402]	1.034 [2.580]	-1.31 [3.591]	2.658 [3.179]	2.045 [2.563]
gcse grades d-e or equivalent	1.206 [0.424]**	1.13 [0.432]**	2.616 [1.937]	1.234 [2.515]	-2.962 [2.928]	6.041 [2.580]*	2.564 [2.113]
foreign and other qualifications	-3.093 [0.595]**	-2.845 [0.602]**	-6.676 [2.890]*	1.363 [3.749]	-17.27 [4.373]**	-0.82 [3.811]	-6.942 [3.066]*
No qualifications	-1.558 [0.998]	-2.76 [1.303]*	0.738 [2.158]	-1.072 [2.740]	2.945 [3.162]	-1.508 [2.903]	1.397 [2.321]
Age ((years-40)/10)	-4.039 [0.437]**	-4.092 [0.445]**	-3.141 [1.943]	-3.586 [2.282]	-5.5 [2.952]	-2.114 [2.587]	-2.276 [2.098]
Age squared	0.883 [0.104]**	0.8 [0.108]**	1.764 [0.408]**	1.794 [0.647]**	0.251 [0.588]	2.874 [0.557]**	1.726 [0.430]**
Religion							
Buddhist	1.053 [2.883]	2.588 [5.118]	0.138 [4.055]	3.098 [4.491]	0.837 [11.016]	-1.535 [4.650]	-2.826 [4.250]
Hindu	-2.902 [1.843]	2.463 [3.611]	-5.477 [2.542]*	-2.779 [2.935]	46.205 [38.231]	-6.562 [2.899]*	-5.204 [2.617]*
Jewish	-5.39 [1.874]**	-5.176 [2.010]*	-6.538 [5.377]	-1.23 [6.300]	-13.19 [5.715]*	8.802 [10.100]	-6.587 [5.381]
Muslim	-1.068 [1.391]	1.458 [2.890]	-0.878 [1.929]	1.845 [2.227]	-3.473 [3.478]	-1.258 [2.436]	-0.94 [2.071]
Sikh	0.133 [2.219]	2.529 [3.594]	0.059 [3.547]	2.509 [3.956]	0 [0.000]	-1.505 [3.940]	0.535 [3.651]
Any other religion	-0.32 [1.146]	0.666 [1.237]	-4.498 [3.188]	-1.886 [3.214]	-0.548 [3.644]	-10.543 [5.267]*	-3.628 [3.294]
no religion at all	-0.411 [0.346]	-0.408 [0.351]	-1.601 [1.628]	-2.967 [2.018]	1.55 [1.878]	-8.092 [2.765]**	-1.77 [1.716]

Table 7 (continued)

Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Country/Region of Birth							
Ireland	-2.723 [1.429]		-3.315 [2.715]	-5.873 [3.137]	-1.181 [2.615]		
Eastern Europe	0.774 [1.757]						
OECD	0.068 [0.860]		-1.075 [2.283]	0.814 [2.532]	-0.802 [2.217]		
Middle East/North Africa	-5.624 [2.186]*		-7.76 [3.273]*	-0.442 [3.796]		0.698 [5.373]	
South Asia	-0.639 [1.301]		-4.697 [2.995]	-4.367 [3.505]		3.789 [5.066]	
China/HK/Taiwan	-5.026 [2.965]		-5.941 [4.221]	-4.011 [5.079]		7.258 [6.006]	
Other Asia	-7.064 [2.104]**		-9.912 [3.391]**	-5.313 [3.967]		-0.393 [5.196]	
Caribbean	0.144 [2.123]		-1.54 [3.575]	-4.523 [4.217]		6.605 [5.392]	
Central/South America	-5.856 [3.621]		-8.714 [4.735]	-14.177 [5.366]**		0 [0.000]	
Sub-Saharan Africa	-2.079 [1.048]*		-3.951 [2.551]	-3.864 [2.857]		4.611 [4.779]	[0.373]
Ethnicity							
Asian	-1.875 [1.494]	-6.403 [2.799]*	2.418 [2.521]	1.94 [3.083]	-35.57 [17.498]*	2.367 [2.866]	-1.54 [2.363]
Black	-2.803 [1.190]*	-3.372 [1.588]*	-1.087 [2.163]	2.516 [2.577]	7.286 [12.093]	-1.596 [2.411]	-2.966 [2.274]
Mixed	-1.065 [1.776]	1.569 [2.178]	-3.883 [3.522]	-1.484 [3.997]	-14.799 [7.505]*	-2.476 [4.155]	-7.887 [3.815]*
chinese or other'	-1.798 [1.742]	-0.66 [3.145]	-0.294 [2.527]	0.429 [3.092]	6.363 [5.742]	-0.245 [2.978]	-4.91 [2.476]*
Assimilation/Country Vars							
Decades since Arrival				0.795 [0.566]			
Visa Required							2.832 [2.439]
Commonwealth							-0.144 [1.294]
Log Per Capita GDP							0.058 [0.690]
Democracy/Autocracy							0.078 [0.127]
Observations	20859	18702	2157	1243	872	1285	1921
R-squared	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.1	0.06	0.05

Notes. Dependent variable is out of 100. Regressions are weighted. Standard errors in parentheses. Other variables included whose coefficients are not reported are region and year dummies. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table 8

Rights Actually Have

Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Demographics							
Constant	83.012 [0.633]**	83.787 [0.677]**	84.102 [3.043]**	82.694 [4.599]**	90.576 [4.290]**	88.793 [5.196]**	83.565 [2.585]**
Male	-0.935 [0.343]**	-1.105 [0.361]**	0.549 [1.073]	-0.181 [1.531]	-0.65 [1.656]	1.284 [1.424]	0.02 [1.148]
Degree or equivalent higher education below degree level	0.692 [0.493]	1.084 [0.517]*	-3.06 [1.827]	-0.469 [2.946]	-5.78 [3.114]	-2.139 [2.288]	-1.815 [1.995]
a level or equivalent	2.165 [0.715]**	2.294 [0.746]**	-0.765 [2.587]	2.035 [3.450]	-3.753 [4.273]	0.954 [3.268]	0.407 [2.761]
gcse grades d-e or equivalent	1.001 [0.535]	0.893 [0.556]	1.456 [2.083]	5.287 [3.362]	-1.203 [3.474]	2.61 [2.651]	2.807 [2.273]
foreign and other qualifications	-2.382 [0.752]**	-2.155 [0.775]**	-7.471 [3.111]*	0.577 [5.004]	-7.803 [5.205]	-7.084 [3.917]	-6.84 [3.303]*
No qualifications	-3.799 [1.258]**	-1.273 [1.673]	-8.852 [2.323]**	-8.718 [3.665]*	-11.78 [3.760]**	-7.331 [2.984]*	-7.74 [2.500]**
Age ((years-40)/10)	-2.749 [0.551]**	-2.564 [0.574]**	-5.592 [2.091]**	-3.812 [3.053]	-11.993 [3.512]**	-2.521 [2.654]	-4.69 [2.259]*
Age squared	1.539 [0.132]**	1.285 [0.139]**	3.862 [0.440]**	4.066 [0.866]**	2.948 [0.704]**	4.637 [0.572]**	4.202 [0.464]**
Religion							
Buddhist	-0.493 [0.085]**	-0.454 [0.089]**	-0.86 [0.291]**	-0.934 [0.414]*	-0.568 [0.463]	-0.982 [0.379]**	-1.1 [0.310]**
Hindu	-2.547 [3.646]	-0.117 [6.592]	-3.161 [4.379]	-7.993 [5.991]	-36.707 [13.138]**	-0.434 [4.792]	-4.354 [4.595]
Jewish	-1.664 [2.327]	2.25 [4.651]	-3.911 [2.738]	-5.354 [3.918]	16.777 [45.916]	-3.401 [2.980]	-4.578 [2.822]
Muslim	-2.518 [2.365]	-1.7 [2.588]	-6.362 [5.790]	-5.399 [8.402]	-9.223 [6.816]	-0.521 [10.377]	-6.128 [5.800]
Sikh	-1.805 [1.756]	-2.77 [3.721]	-0.486 [2.079]	-0.765 [2.975]	-9.035 [4.147]*	0.732 [2.504]	-2.107 [2.233]
Any other religion	-0.352 [2.801]	-4.129 [4.629]	3.329 [3.820]	2.541 [5.281]	0 [0.000]	3.134 [4.049]	2.454 [3.936]
no religion at all	-0.562 [1.443]	0.595 [1.590]	-5.742 [3.424]	-5.134 [4.291]	-4.328 [4.348]	-7.082 [5.374]	-4.778 [3.541]
	-1.281 [0.436]**	-1.588 [0.452]**	0.059 [1.752]	-2.077 [2.694]	2.866 [2.239]	-6.946 [2.839]*	-0.546 [1.849]

Table 8 (continued)

Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Country/Region of Birth							
Ireland	2.345 [1.809]		-0.289 [2.928]	-7.81 [4.196]	-1.155 [3.127]		
Eastern Europe	0.416 [2.217]						
OECD	1.85 [1.085]		0.384 [2.458]	-1.929 [3.379]	-1.911 [2.646]		
Middle East/North Africa	1.013 [2.763]		-1.367 [3.527]	-5.356 [5.068]		-6.891 [4.819]	
South Asia	-0.041 [1.642]		-4.463 [3.226]	-4.539 [4.676]		-10.398 [4.589]*	
China/HK/Taiwan	2.386 [3.726]		0.939 [4.532]	-1.37 [6.778]		0 [0.000]	
Other Asia	-1.69 [2.657]		-4.672 [3.653]	-7.607 [5.295]		-9.047 [4.458]*	
Caribbean	2.367 [2.679]		-2.563 [3.850]	-6.083 [5.625]		-8.249 [5.111]	
Central/South America	6.605 [4.570]		4.754 [5.100]	1.955 [7.157]		-1.417 [6.160]	
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.681 [1.323]		-1.061 [2.748]	-2.792 [3.810]		-6.461 [4.377]	
Ethnicity							
Asian	0.583 [1.886]	-0.828 [3.604]	3.622 [2.717]	3.622 [4.116]	-17.229 [21.555]	2.082 [2.946]	1.451 [2.549]
Black	-3.76 [1.503]*	-5.306 [2.047]**	-0.959 [2.329]	-1.456 [3.437]	-4.766 [14.422]	-1.688 [2.477]	-1.132 [2.451]
Mixed	-1.965 [2.241]	0.465 [2.803]	-3.688 [3.799]	-6.875 [5.332]	-2.654 [8.951]	-4.796 [4.277]	-5.677 [4.121]
chinese or other'	-6.187 [2.200]**	-3.947 [4.055]	-4.513 [2.723]	-0.327 [4.130]	4.874 [6.848]	-6.133 [3.062]*	-5.765 [2.666]*
Assimilation/Country Vars							
Decades since Arrival				-0.161 [0.757]			
Visa Required							-4.306 [2.629]
Commonwealth							-0.09 [1.395]
Log Per Capita GDP							-1.02 [0.745]
Democracy/Autocracy							-0.053 [0.137]
Observations	20852	18695	2156	1240	872	1284	1920
R-squared	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.11	0.09	0.08

Notes. Dependent variable is out of 100. Regressions are weighted. Standard errors in parentheses. Other variables included whose coefficients are not reported are region and year dummies. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table 9

Views on Responsibilities

Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Demographics							
Constant	95.03 [0.350]**	95.408 [0.364]**	91.274 [2.052]**	92.728 [2.784]**	93.548 [2.882]**	91.409 [3.742]**	90.01 [1.762]**
Male	1.021 [0.189]**	0.882 [0.194]**	2.099 [0.725]**	2.822 [0.931]**	2.973 [1.116]**	1.756 [0.977]	2.557 [0.782]**
Degree or equivalent higher education below degree level	-0.969 [0.273]**	-1.104 [0.279]**	0.694 [1.235]	0.591 [1.786]	-1.245 [2.088]	1.659 [1.574]	1.653 [1.360]
a level or equivalent	0.768 [0.395]	0.588 [0.401]	3.011 [1.748]	3.635 [2.093]	3.719 [2.871]	2.101 [2.244]	4.199 [1.882]**
gcse grades d-e or equivalent	0.599 [0.296]*	0.548 [0.299]	1.849 [1.408]	3.844 [2.041]	-0.486 [2.333]	3.073 [1.822]	2.693 [1.550]
foreign and other qualifications	-3.231 [0.416]**	-3.123 [0.417]**	-4.673 [2.103]*	-1.21 [3.042]	-6.692 [3.503]	-3.612 [2.690]	-3.978 [2.252]
No qualifications	-1.706 [0.695]*	-1.992 [0.901]*	-0.233 [1.568]	-0.328 [2.222]	-2.416 [2.526]	0.761 [2.046]	0.604 [1.701]
Age ((years-40)/10)	-3.999 [0.305]**	-3.968 [0.309]**	-3.64 [1.412]*	-4.2 [1.852]*	-5.117 [2.359]*	-2.713 [1.823]	-2.727 [1.539]
Age squared	1.252 [0.073]**	1.169 [0.075]**	2.133 [0.297]**	1.931 [0.526]**	2.105 [0.474]**	2.174 [0.393]**	2.413 [0.316]**
Religion							
Buddhist	-2.229 [2.009]	-4.738 [3.548]	-1.15 [2.946]	-1.264 [3.634]	-2.222 [8.854]	-1.51 [3.274]	-2.324 [3.124]
Hindu	-0.838 [1.286]	3.048 [2.504]	-2.215 [1.850]	0.519 [2.382]	34.561 [30.727]	-3.039 [2.045]	-1.791 [1.924]
Jewish	0.262 [1.300]	0.555 [1.393]	-0.809 [3.782]	-4.535 [4.816]	-0.412 [4.371]	-0.528 [7.127]	-0.292 [3.824]
Muslim	-1.964 [0.970]*	0.336 [2.003]	-1.918 [1.403]	0.4 [1.805]	-0.382 [2.791]	-2.736 [1.717]	-1.717 [1.521]
Sikh	1.326 [1.548]	4.055 [2.492]	0.313 [2.578]	3.236 [3.203]	0 [0.000]	-0.649 [2.776]	0.386 [2.679]
Any other religion	-2.08 [0.798]**	-1.938 [0.856]*	-2.329 [2.311]	-1.345 [2.608]	-0.51 [2.929]	-4.419 [3.678]	-1.354 [2.411]
no religion at all	-1.193 [0.241]**	-1.231 [0.243]**	-1.75 [1.184]	-2.805 [1.638]	-0.842 [1.509]	-2.912 [1.948]	-2.25 [1.261]

Table 9 (continued)


Sample	1 All	2 UK Born	3 Foreign -Born	4 Foreign -Born	5 Foreign -Born OECD +Europe	6 Foreign -Born RoW	7 Foreign -Born
Country/Region of Birth							
Ireland	2.095 [1.000]*		3.301 [1.975]	0.351 [2.545]	3.512 [2.101]		
Eastern Europe	-2.082 [1.220]						
OECD	-1.248 [0.599]*		0.097 [1.654]	2.075 [2.041]	-0.033 [1.773]		
Middle East/North Africa	-0.187 [1.525]		1.037 [2.376]	1.523 [3.072]		0.217 [3.792]	
South Asia	-0.332 [0.908]		0.261 [2.176]	-1.118 [2.840]		-0.874 [3.576]	
China/HK/Taiwan	-3.918 [2.058]		-2.249 [3.058]	-3.151 [4.112]		-2.597 [4.228]	
Other Asia	-1.75 [1.468]		-1.047 [2.464]	-0.849 [3.214]		-2.043 [3.667]	
Caribbean	1.825 [1.481]		1.726 [2.598]	2.235 [3.416]		0.869 [3.805]	
Central/South America	1.032 [2.528]		1.308 [3.446]	0.861 [4.350]		0 [0.000]	
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.776 [0.731]		1.529 [1.852]	1.248 [2.311]		0.578 [3.373]	
Ethnicity							
Asian	-0.68 [1.042]	-3.694 [1.940]	1.123 [1.835]	1.932 [2.502]	-22.977 [14.063]	1.509 [2.022]	-1.126 [1.735]
Black	-1.25 [0.830]	-2.045 [1.101]	0.609 [1.573]	1.579 [2.090]	5.558 [9.719]	0.284 [1.699]	-0.072 [1.668]
Mixed	-2.49 [1.239]*	-3.175 [1.509]*	-0.183 [2.565]	-0.65 [3.244]	1.481 [6.032]	-0.707 [2.932]	-1.334 [2.804]
chinese or other'	-1.231 [1.215]	0.469 [2.180]	-0.816 [1.839]	-0.258 [2.509]	1.558 [4.615]	-0.994 [2.101]	-1.322 [1.816]
Assimilation/Country Vars							
Decades since Arrival				-0.063 [0.460]			
Visa Required							-0.596 [1.790]
Commonwealth							1.822 [0.951]
Log Per Capita GDP							-0.487 [0.508]
Democracy/Autocracy							-0.021 [0.093]
Observations	20870	18708	2161	1244	874	1287	1925
R-squared	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.07

Notes. Dependent variable is out of 100. Regressions are weighted. Standard errors in parentheses. Other variables included whose coefficients are not reported are region and year dummies. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics


Variable	UK-Born		Foreign-Born	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
British Identity	0.988	0.108	0.459	0.498
Age	38.371	12.421	37.643	11.122
Female	0.482	0.500	0.459	0.498
Age Completed FT education	1.468	2.480	2.987	3.636
Student	0.069	0.253	0.067	0.251
Religion				
Buddhist	0.002	0.041	0.018	0.133
Hindu	0.003	0.054	0.075	0.263
Jewish	0.003	0.058	0.007	0.081
Muslim	0.009	0.095	0.198	0.398
Sikh	0.003	0.057	0.029	0.169
Other Religion	0.007	0.085	0.018	0.133
No Religion	0.178	0.383	0.125	0.331
Ethnicity				
Mixed: White/Black Caribbean	0.002	0.047	0.001	0.034
Mixed: White/Black African	0.001	0.024	0.004	0.060
Mixed: White/Asian	0.001	0.038	0.004	0.061
Mixed: Other	0.001	0.034	0.009	0.092
Indian	0.008	0.088	0.117	0.322
Pakistani	0.006	0.074	0.073	0.260
Bangladeshi	0.001	0.034	0.033	0.180
Other Asian	0.001	0.031	0.053	0.223
Black Caribbean	0.007	0.081	0.030	0.172
Black African	0.002	0.041	0.077	0.267
Other Black	0.001	0.025	0.003	0.057
Chinese	0.001	0.031	0.033	0.179
Other	0.002	0.042	0.095	0.293
Country/Region of Birth				
Wales	0.051	0.219		
Scotland	0.105	0.306		
Northern Ireland	0.005	0.073		
UK- Country not stated	0.000	0.018		
Ireland			0.060	0.237
Eastern Europe			0.058	0.234
United States			0.029	0.167
Canada/Australia/NZ			0.050	0.218
Turkey			0.014	0.116
Middle East/North Africa			0.053	0.223
India/Sri Lanka			0.107	0.309
Pakistan			0.064	0.244
Bangladesh			0.043	0.202
China/HK/Taiwan			0.032	0.176
Japan			0.007	0.082
Other Asia			0.057	0.231
Caribbean			0.040	0.195
Central/South America			0.020	0.140
Sub-Saharan Africa			0.187	0.390
Somalia			0.012	0.109
Age At Arrival			11.6349	20.3655
Years Since Arrival			14.6060	17.7041
UK Citizen	0.9761	0.1529	0.4977	0.4519

Figure 1
Trends in British Identity, 2001-2006




Source: Labour Force Survey

Figure 2 :Trends in British Identity Among the UK-Born




Source: Labour Force Survey

Figure 3 : Trends in British Identity Among the Foreign-Born




Source: Labour Force Survey

Figure 4
The Life-Cycle Profile in British Identity Among the UK-Born




Notes: These are the coefficients on the individual dummy variables for each age in the results reported in Table 2, column 1.

Figure 5
The Relationship Between British Identity and Country of Birth




Notes: Pooled LFS – only countries with more than 100 observations reported.

Figure 6
British Identity for the Foreign-Born by Age of Arrival




Notes: The 'DV' estimates are the coefficients on each dummy variable for age of arrival in the first and third columns of Table 4. The quartic estimates are the marginal effects predicted when replacing these dummy variables by a quartic.

Figure 7
British Identity for the Foreign-Born by Years Since Arrival




Notes: The 'DV' estimates are the coefficients on each dummy variable for age of arrival in the first and third columns of Table 4. The quartic estimates are the marginal effects predicted when replacing these dummy variables by a quartic.

Figure 8
Rates of Assimilation by Country/Region of Birth (No Controls for Citizenship)




These estimates come from separate estimation of a probit model for British identity for immigrants from different countries where the assimilation is modelled as a quartic.

Figure 9
Rates of Assimilation by Country/Region of Birth (controlling for citizenship)




These estimates come from separate estimation of a probit model for British identity for immigrants from different countries where the assimilation is modelled as a quartic and a control for citizenship is included.

Figure 10
Rates of Assimilation for Democracies/Autocracies



Notes: these estimates come from estimation of a probit model for British identity for immigrants from different countries where there are controls for the characteristics of countries, assimilation is modelled as a quartic, and this quartic is interacted with country characteristics.

Figure 11
Rates of Assimilation by Per Capita GDP



Notes: as for Figure 10.

References

- Akerlof, George and Rachel Kranton (2000) "Economics and Identity", Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115, 715-753.
- Alesina, Alberto, Reza Baqir and William Easterly (1999) "Public Goods and Ethnic Divisions", Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114, 1243-1284.
- Alesina, Alberto and Eliana La Ferrara (2005) "Ethnic Diversity and Economic Performance", Journal of Economic Literature, 43, 762-800.
- Barry, Brian (2000) Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism, London: Polity Press.
- Bisin, Alberto, Eleonora Patacchini, Thierry Verdier and Yves Zenou (2006) "'Bend It Like Beckham': Identity, Socialization and Assimilation", CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5662..
- Bisin, Alberto and Thierry Verdier (2000) "Beyond the Melting Pot: Cultural transmission, Marriage and the Evolution of Ethnic and Religious Traits", Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115, 955-988.
- Bisin, Alberto, Giorgio Topa and Thierry Verdier (2004) "Religious Intermarriage and Socialization in the United States", Journal of Political Economy, 112, 615-664.
- Borjas, George J. (1999) "The Economic Analysis of Immigration", in O.Ashenfelter and D.Card (eds) Handbook of Labor economics, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Borjas, G., (2003), "The Labour Demand Curve is Downward sloping: Re-examining the Impact of Immigration on the Labour market" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 118, pp. 1335-1374.
- Borjas G, R.Freeman and L.Katz (1996), "[Searching for the Effect of Immigration on the Labour Market](#)", *American Economic Review*, May 1996, pp. 246-251.
- Card, D. (1990), "The Impact of the Mariel Boatlift on the Miami Labour Market", *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, Vol. 43, pp. 245-257.
- Card, D. (2001), "Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and the Local Labour Market Impacts of Higher Immigration", *Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 19(1), pp.22-63.
- Card, D. (2005), "Is the New Immigration Really So Bad?" *Economic Journal*, Vol. 115, pp F00-F323, November.
- Card, D. C. Dustmann and I. Preston (2005) "Understanding attitudes to immigration: the migration and minority module of the first European social survey", CREAM Discussion Paper, UCL.
- Chiswick, Barry R. (1978) "The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men", Journal of Political Economy, 86, 897-921.
- Colley, Linda (1992) Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837, London: Yale University Press.

Commission for Racial Equality (2005a) Citizenship and Belonging: What is Britishness?, London: CRE. www.cre.gov.uk/downloads/what_is_britishness.pdf

Commission for Racial Equality (2005b) The Decline of Britishness: A Research Study, London: CRE. www.cre.gov.uk/downloads/decline_of_britishness.pdf

Dustmann, Christian (2006) "Return Migration", unpublished UCL.

Dustmann, C. Fabbri, F. and Preston, I., (2005), "The Impact of Immigration on the UK Labour Market", *Economic Journal*, Vol. 115, pp F324-F341.

Dustmann, Christian and Ian Preston (2004) "Racial and Economic Factors in Attitudes towards Migration", UCL CReAM Discussion Paper No.01/04
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~uctpb21/Cpapers/CDP_01_04.pdf

Easterly, William and Ross Levine (1997) "Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 1203-1250.

Glaeser, Edward L. (2005) "The Political Economy of Hatred", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120, 45-86.

Green, Hazel and Christine Farmer (2004) 2003 Home Office Citizenship Survey: Technical Report, London: Office for National Statistics.

Hayes, Bernadette C. and Ian McAllister (2001) "Sowing Dragon's teeth: Public Support for Political Violence and Paramilitarism in Northern Ireland", *Political Studies*, 49, 90-922.

Huntington, Samuel (2002) The Clash of Civilizations: And the Remaking of World Order, New York: Free Press.

Huntington, Samuel (2004) Who Are We? America's Great Debate, New York: Free Press.

Lazear, Edward P. (1999) "Culture and Language", *Journal of Political Economy*, 107, S95-S125.

Lewis, P (1994) Islamic Britain: London: IB Tauris.

Manacorda, Marco, Alan Manning and Jonathan Wadsworth (2006) "The Impact of Immigration on the Structure of Male Wages: Theory and Evidence from Britain", CEP Discussion Paper No. 754.

McCrone, David (2002) "Who do you say you are? Making Sense of national identities in modern Britain", *Ethnicities*, 2, 301-320.

Michaelson, Juliet, Kevin Pickering, Natasha Wood and Shaun Scholes (2006) 2005 Home Office Citizenship Survey: Technical Report, London: Office for National Statistics.

Modood, Tariq, et al (1997) Ethnic Minorities in Britain: Diversity and Disadvantage, London: Policy Studies Institute.

Moxon-Browne, Edward. (1991), "National Identity in Northern Ireland", in Social Attitudes in Northern Ireland, the First Report: Belfast: Blackstaff.

Ottaviano, G. and Peri, G. (2004), "The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities.", NBER Working Paper No. 10904.

Ottaviano, G. and Peri, G. (2005), "Rethinking the Gains From Immigration: Theory and Evidence from The U.S.", NBER Working Paper No. 11672.

Parekh, Bhikhu (2000) The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, London: Runnymede Trust.

Sen, Amartya (2006) Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny, London: Allen Lane.

Shayo, Moses (2005) "Nation, Class and Redistribution: Applying Social Identity Research to Political Economy", unpublished, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Winder, Robert (2004) Bloody Foreigners: The Story of Immigration to Britain, London: Abacus.

CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE
Recent Discussion Papers

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 789 | Giorgio Gobbi
Roberta Zizza | Does the Underground Economy Hold Back Financial Deepening? Evidence from the Italian Credit Market |
| 788 | Nick Bloom
Raffaella Sadun
John Van Reenen | Americans do I.T. better: US Multinationals and the Productivity Miracle |
| 787 | Elizabeth O. Ananat
Guy Michaels | The Effect of Marital Breakup on the Income Distribution of Women with Children |
| 786 | Willem H. Buiter | Seigniorage |
| 785 | Gustavo Crespi
Chiara Criscuolo
Jonathan E. Haskel
Matthew Slaughter | Productivity Growth, Knowledge Flows and Spillovers |
| 784 | Richard Layard
Guy Mayraz
Stephen Nickell | The Marginal Utility of Income |
| 783 | Gustavo Crespi
Chiara Criscuolo
Jonathan E. Haskel | Information Technology, Organisational Change and Productivity Growth: Evidence from UK Firms |
| 782 | Paul Castillo
Carlos Montoro
Vicente Tuesta | Inflation Premium and Oil Price Volatility |
| 781 | David Metcalf | Why Has the British National Minimum Wage Had Little or No Impact on Employment? |
| 780 | Carlos Montoro | Monetary Policy Committees and Interest Rate Smoothing |
| 779 | Sharon Belenzon
Mark Schankerman | Harnessing Success: Determinants of University Technology Licensing Performance |
| 778 | Henry G. Overman
Diego Puga
Matthew A. Turner | Decomposing the Growth in Residential Land in the United States |
| 777 | Florence Kondylis | Conflict-Induced Displacement and Labour Market Outcomes: Evidence from Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| 776 | Willem H. Buiter | Is Numéraireology the Future of Monetary Economics? <i>Unbundling numéraire and medium of exchange through a virtual currency and a shadow exchange rate</i> |
| 775 | Francesco Caselli
Nicola Gennaioli | Economics and Politics of Alternative Institutional Reforms |

- 774 Paul Willman
Alex Bryson Union Organization in Great Britain
Prepared for symposium for the Journal of Labor Research on “The State of Unions: A Global Perspective”
- 773 Alan Manning The Plant Size-Effect: Agglomeration and Monopsony in Labour Markets
- 772 Guy Michaels The Effect of Trade on the Demand for Skill – Evidence from the Interstate Highway System
- 771 Gianluca Benigno
Christoph Thoenissen Consumption and Real Exchange Rates with Incomplete Markets and Non-Traded Goods
- 770 Michael Smart
Daniel M. Sturm Term Limits and Electoral Accountability
- 769 Andrew B. Bernard
Stephen J. Redding
Peter K. Schott Multi-Product Firms and Trade Liberalization
- 768 Paul Willman
Alex Bryson Accounting for Collective Action: Resource Acquisition and Mobilization in British Unions
- 767 Anthony J. Venables Shifts in Economic Geography and their Causes
- 766 Guy Michaels The Long-Term Consequences of Regional Specialization
- 765 Fabrice Murtin American Economic Development Since the Civil War or the Virtue of Education
- 764 Carlo Rosa
Giovanni Verga The Impact of Central Bank Announcements on Asset Prices in Real Time: Testing the Efficiency of the Euribor Futures Market
- 763 Benjamin Aleman-Castilla The Effect of Trade Liberalization on Informality and Wages: Evidence from Mexico
- 762 L. Rachel Ngai
Roberto M. Samaniego An R&D-Based Model of Multi-Sector Growth
- 761 Mariano Bosch Job Creation and Job Destruction in the Presence of Informal Labour Markets

The Centre for Economic Performance Publications Unit
 Tel 020 7955 7673 Fax 020 7955 7595 Email info@cep.lse.ac.uk
 Web site <http://cep.lse.ac.uk>