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Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate how annually household income affects ethnic minorities' relationship with political parties in the UK. Understanding the elements that influence political party affiliation is essential to understanding the political environment and the actions of various social groupings. Utilizing data from a poll performed in 2010 after the general election, this study focuses especially on five ethnic minority groups: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, and Black African.

Methodology

Survey Description

The study's data originates from a special survey that was carried out in 2010 with a focus on ethnic minorities in the UK. 2,787 individuals from Wales, Scotland, and England who were at least 18 years old participated in the study. The participants were questioned in-person using computer-assisted personal interviews and mail-back paper questionnaires. They were selected from backgrounds including Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, and Black African. The poll looked into a number of facets of political identification, such as party affiliation, sentiments toward political personalities, personal financial situation, and media sources for election-related news.

Research Question

The primary research question guiding this study is: "Does Annual Household Income Play a Role in Minority’s Political Party Identification?"

Analytical Approach

To address this research question, a multi-step analytical approach was employed:

1. Descriptive Analysis: To summarize the distribution of annual household income and political party identification within the sample.

2. Bivariate Analysis: Using chi-square tests to explore the relationship between annual household income and political party identification.

Key variables:

● Dependent Variable: Political party identification(nominal).

● Independent Variable: Annual household income(ordinal).

● Control Variables: Ethnic background(nominal).

For Annual household Income, the transformation was done as there were many income groups with less than 5% of the sample distribution so to have a better distribution we use Label Encoding, Before Using Label Encoding the, the group goes as follows

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Value | Labels |
|  |  |
| -2 | Refused |
| -1 | Don't know |
| 0 | Not Stated |
| 1 | 0-5000 |
| 2 | 5001-10000 |
| 3 | 10001-15000 |
| 4 | 15000-20000 |
| 5 | 20001-25000 |
| 6 | 25001-30000 |
| 7 | 30001-35000 |
| 8 | 35001-40000 |
| 9 | 41000-45000 |
| 10 | 45001-50000 |
| 11 | 50001-60000 |
| 12 | 60001-70000 |
| 13 | 70001-80000 |
| 14 | 80001ormore |

After Encoding the group goes as follows

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chi-Square Tests** | | | |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 71.760a | 36 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 74.897 | 36 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 3.886 | 1 | .049 |
| N of Valid Cases | 2787 |  |  |
| a. 27 cells (51.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08. | | | |

Party Identification vs Annual Income

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chi-Square Tests** | | | |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 156.468a | 48 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 148.143 | 48 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 20.531 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 2787 |  |  |
| a. 44 cells (67.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .00. | | | |

Party Identification vs Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chi-Square Tests** | | | |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 35.488a | 12 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 35.854 | 12 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 8.416 | 1 | .004 |
| N of Valid Cases | 2787 |  |  |
| a. 8 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08. | | | |

Party Identification vs Ethnicity

Hypotheses

For Bivariate Analysis (Chi-square Test):

● Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no association between annual household income and political party identification among ethnic minorities.

● Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is an association between annual household income and political party identification among ethnic minorities.

Conclusion

After conducting non-parametric tests and correlation analysis, we have determined that annual household income plays a significant role in minority political party identification. This is particularly evident in the context of Labour Party support. Our analysis reveals that nearly 60% of minorities vote for the Labour Party, with even higher percentages observed among certain ethnic groups within specific income ranges.

Key Points:

Labour Party Support: Approximately 60% of the minority population supports the Labour Party.

Ethnic Variations: Support for the Labour Party is especially high among individuals of Asian-Mixed and Black-Mixed ethnicities.

Income Range Impact: The strongest Labour Party support within these ethnic groups is observed in the annual income range of £0-£25,000.

Statistical Evidence: Non-parametric tests and correlation analysis confirm the significant relationship between lower annual household income and Labour Party identification among these minority groups. These findings highlight the critical intersection of income and ethnicity in shaping political preferences within minority communities, particularly for those in lower income brackets.

So, H1 is accepted rejecting the H0:

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant relationship between annual household income and political party identification among minorities.

The results indicating a significant relationship between annual household income and political party identification among minorities have several implications within the context of the data

**Understanding Political Behavior**: The findings provide valuable insights into how socioeconomic factors shape political preferences within minority communities.

**Targeted Policy Development**: Policymakers can use these findings to develop targeted policies aimed at addressing the needs and concerns of minority communities, particularly those in lower income brackets.

**Community Empowerment**: For minority communities, the results highlight the importance of economic representation and advocacy. Overall, the impact of the results within the context of the data is significant, as they provide valuable insights into the relationship between socioeconomic factors and political behavior