**Appendix**

**Further Details of Research Design**

Focus Groups

Qualitative interviews are of two basic types: in-depth with individuals and focus groups. In-depth interviews are optimal for research designs in which the researcher is interested in individual attitudes and experiences of a topic, while focus groups, which generally consist of 6 to 8 participants, are a superior approach if the researcher’s interest is in shared (and unshared) understandings of a topic, in how people react and interact, and “help the processes by which meaning is socially constructed through everyday talk (Lunt and Livingstone 1996, 85). Because we were interested in how individuals arrived at threat perceptions through deliberation, we adopted a hybrid approach, of group interviews of three people, providing us with elements of individual depth and group deliberation. A smaller group size also tends to lead to a greater generation of ideas.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The moderator’s guide, moderator, and respondents were supplied by TNS-BRMB, a social research agency located in the UK, in consultation with the authors. The moderator was from TNS-BMRB, rather than one of the authors, in order to mitigate potential bias in questioning.

Focus Group Profiles

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender**  | **Religion** | **Age and life stage** | **Region (group)** |
| Female |  | Young parents  | North (16) |
| Female  |  | Retired  | North (18) |
| Female  | Hindu / Sikh | Younger | Midlands (4) |
| Female  |  | 18-25  | Midlands (5) |
| Female | Muslim | Younger (26-40) | South (7) |
| Female  |  | 18-25 | South (8) |
| Female  | Muslim  | Older (40+) | London (19) |
| Female  |  | Older parents  | London (2) |
| Male | Muslim  | Younger (26-40) | North (15) |
| Male  |  | Older parents  | North (17) |
| Male  | Muslim  | Older (40+) | Midlands (3) |
| Male |  | Young parents  | South (9) |
| Male  |  | Retired  | South (10) |
| Male  | Hindu / Sikh | Older  | London (20) |
| Male  |  | 18-25 | London (1) |
| Mixed |  | Older  | Scotland (11) |
| Mixed |  | Younger | Scotland (12) |
| Mixed |  | Older  | Wales (13) |
| Mixed  |  | Younger  | Wales (14) |
| Mixed |  | Retired  | Midlands (6) |
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Survey

We conducted a 25-minute internet survey of 2,004 respondents in Britain from 6–15 June 2012, drawn from ICM’s panel. It included a booster sample of 251 Muslims. Survey respondents were representative of the British population on dimensions of sex, age, region and the party for which they voted in the 2010 general election (see Table A1 below).

**Table A1: Survey Sample Profile**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Population (%)** | **Survey (%)****n=2004** |
| Sex |  |  |
| Male | 49 | 48 |
| Female | 51 | 52 |
|  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |
| 18-24 | 12 | 13 |
| 25-34 | 16 | 18 |
| 35-44 | 19 | 17 |
| 45-54 | 17 | 16 |
| 55-64 | 15 | 16 |
| 65+ | 21 | 20 |
|  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 90 | 82 |
| Asian | 4 | 11 |
| Other | 6 | 7 |
|  |  |  |
| Region |  |  |
| London | 13 | 16 |
| South and East (outside London) | 31 | 29 |
| Midlands | 17 | 17 |
| North | 25 | 26 |
| Scotland | 9 | 8 |
| Wales | 5 | 4 |
|  |  |  |

Notes: Figures for the population are from the National Readership Survey <http://www.nrs.co.uk/interview.html> with the exception of vote in the 2010 election. The figures in this category for the survey exclude refusals and don’t knows for this question (3% of the sample).

**Table A2: Perceptions of the Number of Threats among Women and Men**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Average number of threats identified* |  |
| *Level* | *Women* | *Men* | *Difference (p-value)* |
| Global | 6.92 | 6.16 | .00 |
| National | 4.11 | 3.91 | .19 |
| Community | 2.17 | 2.16 | .92 |
| Personal | 2.09 | 2.01 | .44 |

**Table A3: Issues Perceived as Security Threats by Women and Men (numbers are %)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Women more threatened than men | No difference | Women less threatened than men |
| *Global level*  |
| Online fraud/identity theft (37-23), knife crime (34-21), racial or religious hate crime (47-35), crimes against women (23-11), burglary (21-13), terrorism (72-65). religious extremism (59-52), nuclear accident (30-23), economy (48-43), environmental issues (32-27) | Health pandemic (24-20), immigration (27-24), international military crisis between states (30-28), increasing power of Russia and China (18-17), nuclear weapons (48-48), disruption of critical infrastructure (27-27), cybercrime (23-23), Islamophobia (18-18), resource scarcity (31-32), weak border control (27-28), UK foreign policy (9-10), the Far Right (14-16) |  |
| *National level* |
| Knife crime (29-18), online fraud/identity theft (23-13), racial or religious hate crime (31-22), crimes against women (10-4), burglary (11-8) | Economy (47-43), immigration (33-32), environmental issues (13-12), increasing power of Russia and China (5-4), health pandemic (9-9), nuclear accident (6-6), nuclear weapons (11-12), cybercrime (11-12), the Far Right (11-12), international military crisis between states (6-7), terrorism (47-49), UK foreign policy (11-13), Islamophobia (10-12), weak border control (27-30), resource scarcity (14-17), disruption of critical infrastructure (13-16) | Religious extremism (32-39) |
| *Community level* |
| Burglary (31-26), online fraud/identity theft (18-13), crimes against women (11-7) | Economy (37-34), knife crime (25-22), racial or religious hate crime (16-13), health pandemic (7-6), environmental issues (7-6), the Far Right (5-4), disruption of critical infrastructure (7-7), cybercrime (5-5), UK foreign policy (2-2), nuclear accident (2-2), increasing power of Russia and China (1-1), Islamophobia (4-5), international military crisis between states (1-2), immigration (15-18) | Nuclear weapons (1-3), terrorism (6-9), resource scarcity (5-9), weak border control (4-8), religious extremism (7-13) |
| *Personal level* |
| Online fraud/identity theft (24-19), crimes against women (9-4), health pandemic (10-7) | Economy (39-36), burglary (26-24), knife crime (16-15), racial or religious hate crime (9-8), cybercrime (7-6), the Far Right (4-3), terrorism (10-10), UK foreign policy (3-3), international military crisis between states (2-2), nuclear accident (2-2), increasing power of Russia and China (1-1), disruption of critical infrastructure (7-8), environmental issues (6-7), Islamophobia (3-4), nuclear weapons (2-3), resource scarcity (8-10) | Immigration (9-12), weak border control (3-6), religious extremism (6-10) |

Source: ICM Survey, *Security in an Age of Austerity*, June 6-15 2012.

Notes: % are for women first, men second, e.g., (24-19) means 24% of women and 19% of men. *Issues for which women or men are described as “more threatened” are based on chi-squared tests at p.05. “No difference” implies statistical insignificance.*

**Table A4: Summary Statistics for Control Variables**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Variable* | *Women* | *Men* |
|  |  |  |
| Authoritarianism | .59 | .58 |
|  |  |  |
| Internal efficacy\* | .50 | .61 |
| External efficacy\* | .36 | .38 |
| Approval\* | .31 | .34 |
|  |  |  |
| Age\* | .37 | .43 |
|  |  |  |
| Conservative identifier\* | .22 | .26 |
| Labour identifier | .33 | .33 |
| No party identification\* | .16 | .11 |

*All variables are on 0-1 scales. \* indicates a statistically significant difference at p<.05*

*Correlations*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Woman | Authoritarianism | Internal efficacy | External efficacy | Approval | Age | Conservative | Labour | No party |
| Woman | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Authoritarianism | -.01 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internal efficacy | -.24 | -.07 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External efficacy | -.05 | -.16 | .12 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approval | -.05 | .01 | -.01 | .19 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Age | -.09 | -.03 | .07 | .04 | -.03 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Conservative | -.03 | .03 | .04 | .13 | .46 | .24 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Labour | .01 | .03 | .08 | -.04 | -.28 | -.12 | -.42 | 1.0 |  |
| No party | .07 | .01 | -.17 | -.08 | -.09 | -.13 | -.22 | -.27 | 1.0 |

**Table A5: Summary Statistics for Comparison of Government’s Current Handling versus its Future Handling of Threat**

**(positive scores = more optimistic, 0 = same, negative scores = more pessimistic)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Threat* | *Mean Score* | *Standard Deviation* |
| Financial crisis | 0.60 | 1.06 |
| Crime | 0.32 | 0.95 |
| Cybercrime | 0.26 | 0.90 |
| Identity theft | 0.31 | 0.91 |
| Terrorism | 0.01 | 0.83 |
| Religious extremism | 0.33 | 1.01 |
| Immigration | 0.59 | 1.14 |
| Islamophobia | 0.22 | 0.97 |
| Far right | 0.21 | 0.88 |
| Climate change | 0.23 | 0.91 |
| Global warming | 0.26 | 0.94 |

**Table A6: Confidence in Self and Confidence in Government to Know How to Handle a Terrorist Attack**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women | Men |
| Confidence in self | .86 | 1.25 |
| Confidence in government | 1.52 | 1.60 |

Notes: Figures are mean scores on a 4-point scale, where 0 = not at all confident and 3 = very confident).

Differences in mean scores between women and men are statistically significant at p<.05 for confidence in self and government.

Differences in mean scores for confidence in self and confidence in government are statistically significant at p<.05 for women and men.

**Coding of Variables from Survey**

*Global, National, Community, Personal/ Family Threats*

Questions: Which, if any, of the following issues do you personally consider to be serious threats to the security of the world/ UK/ community in which you live/ you and your family at the moment? RANDOM ORDER.

Terrorism; Knife crime; Burglary; Crimes against women; Racial or religious hate crime; Weak border control; Nuclear weapons programmes in Iran, North Korea, and other hostile states; A health pandemic (e.g. Avian flu); Environmental issues, e.g., global warming or the greenhouse effect, pollution; Online fraud or identity theft; UK foreign policy; Religious extremism; Immigration; Resource scarcity (e.g. dependence on oil, water shortages); Economic depression/financial crisis/unemployment; Increasing power of Russia and China;

Attacks on cyber-space and cyber crime; An international military crisis between states; Severe disruption of critical infrastructure (e.g., information, energy resources such as oil or gas, food); The far right (e.g. English Defence League); A nuclear accident like Fukushima;

Islamophobia; Other (specify)

Coding: Number of global, national, community, and personal/family threats

*Woman*

Coding: 1 = woman, 0 = man

*Authoritarianism*

Questions: Although there are a number of qualities that people feel that children should have, every person thinks that some are more important than others. We are going to show you pairs of desirable qualities. Please tell us which one you think is more important for a child to have: Independence/Respect for elders; Obedience/Self Reliance; Curiosity/Good manners; Considerate/Well behaved

Coding: Preferences for Respect for elders, Obedience, Good manners, Well behaved added and divided by four, giving a zero to one range.

*Efficacy*

Questions: For each of the following statements, please tell me whether you ... strongly agree, tend to agree, neither agree nor disagree, tend to disagree, strongly disagree (or don’t know). (1) Public officials don't care much what people like me think; (2) I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country; (3) Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on; (4) I consider myself to be well qualified to participate in politics; (5) I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people; (6) People like me don't have any say about what the government does; (7) I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people.

Coding: Internal efficacy: answers to statements 2, 4, 5 and 7 added and divided by four, giving a zero to one range. External efficacy: answers to statements 1 (reversed), 3 (reversed) and 6 (reversed) added and divided by three.

*Approval of current government*

Question: Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the Government is running the country?

Coding: Very satisfied = 1, fairly satisfied = .66, not very satisfied = .33, not at all satisfied = 0

*Age*

Coding: in years

*Party identification*

Question: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as Labour, Conservative, Liberal Democrat or something else?

Coding: Conservative id: 1 = Conservative, 0 = not Conservative, Labour id: 1 = Labour, 0 = not Labour, No party id: 1 = no party, 0 = not no party.

1. Fern (1982) finds that two groups of 4 people each generate more ideas than a single focus group of 8 (see also Merton 1987). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)