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Executive summary

Document

This report sets out the results of a Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA) of existing research on the perceptions of the UK public concerning the impact of counter-terrorism (CT) legislation implemented since 2000. It was conducted by the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl) for the Office of Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT). Dstl is an agency of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and exists to supply impartial, scientific and technical research and advice to the MoD and Other Government Departments (OGDs).

Background

Since 2000, five major pieces of terrorism legislation have been introduced in the UK: The Terrorism Act 2000, The Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, The Terrorism Act 2006 and The Counter-Terrorism Act 2008. This legislation has attracted significant interest and debate from many sectors of the UK, including parliamentary members, the media, human rights organisations and community voices, regarding its effects on UK communities. Debate tends to centre on the key issues of national security, proportionality of the legislation and the perceived erosion of human rights.

Those who support the legislation argue that it is justified due to the increased level of threat to the UK from terrorism and to give up a modest amount of freedom is an acceptable sacrifice to achieving greater security. Those who oppose the legislation argue that although the Government has a duty to protect public safety, this should not be at the expense of fundamental human rights. Campaigning organisations argue that the legislation will inevitably lead to a further alienation of certain sectors of the UK population and runs the risk of creating a climate of fear and suspicion.

Aim

The aim of this REA was to establish and analyse evidence from the existing research base to reveal insights into the perceptions that the UK public have of the impact of CT legislation. For the purposes of this REA, ‘evidence’ refers to data, either quantitative or qualitative in nature, which can be considered in determining whether to accept or reject a position. The main REA question was:

Main question:
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?
A number of sub-questions were also of interest:

1) What specific themes are present?

2) Is there variation in reported impacts across different sub-sets of UK communities?

3) What are the sources of the UK public’s perceptions of the impact of counter-terrorism legislation?

4) Does the evidence support a distinction between the existence of counter-terrorism legislation itself, versus the implementation of the legislation?

**Methodology**

The research was undertaken over a ten-week period, commencing in September 2009 and completing in November 2009. The search processes, analysis, synthesis and presentation of findings followed the basic principles of an REA.

**Key findings**

Although the REA did identify some high quality research, these studies were not specifically designed to answer this REA question. Other studies were assessed to have high relevance to the REA question; however, these were of lower quality. This has led to there being insufficient evidence on specific aspects of the legislation to draw conclusions that could lead to actionable outcomes for policy-makers. In addition, the evidence base was heavily focused on either Muslim communities,\(^1\) or the general UK population. There was very little research covering other specific UK communities.

Three inter-related themes of perceptions were found within the limited evidence base.

**Discrimination**

There was both quantitative and qualitative evidence showing that samples of Muslim communities perceive some aspects of CT legislation to be unfair, unjust and discriminatory. The evidence shows that elements of the Muslim communities generally feel they are being ‘treated differently’ since terrorist events such as 9/11 and 7/7. However, it is unlikely that these perceptions have been brought about solely through the introduction of CT legislation.

**Civil liberties/human rights**

Opinion polls and surveys seeking to be representative of the general UK population tend to show majority agreement, or support for, certain CT measures even though

---

\(^1\) Much of this evidence was assessed by the REA to be of weak methodological quality. This limits the degree to which findings can be seen as representative of the views of the wider Muslim population.
they may erode civil liberties. However, the evidence shows there to be less support within samples of UK Muslim populations who have stronger negative perceptions of CT legislation and perceived violations of civil liberties and human rights.

**Confidence in UK authorities**

The evidence base from this REA shows that samples of UK Muslims, when discussing CT legislation, articulate a lack of trust in the police and have less confidence that they will be treated fairly by UK authorities (Government and the judiciary). Low confidence and trust towards UK authorities could have a detrimental effect on the willingness of Muslim communities to accept and support current and future CT legislation. However, these findings do not entirely reflect other rigorous research (outside the scope of this REA) on wider criminological, judicial and civic issues which show relatively good levels of confidence.

A variation in perceptions was apparent throughout the limited evidence base when comparing the perceptions of the Muslim community to the results of general population polls and surveys. There tends to be support and acceptance of CT measures in samples seeking to represent the general population, whereas those sampling Muslim community members tend to be less supportive and have more negative perceptions about its impact.

The sources of people’s perceptions of impact were not systematically reported in all of the research documents. However, from the limited references to sources of perception, it appears that personal experience and ‘word-of-mouth’ opinions influence people’s perceptions, as well as associated media coverage.

The REA found a limited amount of evidence that directly addressed the distinction between perceptions of the legislation itself as opposed to the way it has been implemented. This limited evidence was derived from the Muslim community and was almost exclusively related to negative perceptions of the way in which ‘Stop and Search’ practices have been implemented by the police.

**Identified research gaps**

There were a number of significant research gaps identified in the process of conducting the REA.

- There is a lack of suitably designed research to explore the complex nature of perceptions. Very little existing research has employed the sophisticated methodologies required to investigate perceptions of impact beyond a superficial level.

- There was insufficient coverage of research across all UK communities. The current evidence base is heavily focused on the Muslim sub-set of the UK population. There is a need to capture the perceived impacts of CT legislation across a wider set of communities.
There was a lack of systematic, scientifically robust, studies capturing evidence of the perceived impact of CT legislation. No studies were identified that were both highly relevant and methodologically strong.

The existing evidence base provides some coverage of people’s opinions of CT legislation, their feelings about the impact it has had and, to an even greater degree, their theorised feelings about the impact it might have. However, there appears to be a particular gap in relation to evidence of the actual behavioural impacts of the legislation.

Insufficient demographic information was contained in studies and polls of the general population. In most cases the data could not be broken down in a way that would permit comparisons to be made between sub-populations of interest, such as different ethnic or religious groups.

**Recommendations for further research**

As noted throughout the REA, there are no existing studies of strong methodological quality which are directly relevant to perceptions of impact. This highlights the need for further research to inform policy design and evaluation.

In order to extract evidence that will address the REA question, both qualitative and quantitative follow-on studies are warranted in order to provide the range of evidence required. Specific recommendations are contained in the report to inform future research on the perceptions of UK communities of the impact of CT legislation.

**Conclusions**

Currently, there is insufficient evidence on specific aspects of CT legislation to draw conclusions that could lead to actionable outcomes for policy-makers in this area. The most prominent themes within the evidence base were those of discrimination, civil liberties/human rights and confidence in UK authorities. To provide a robust evidence base to assist policy makers, there is a need to undertake further research, most notably within sub-sets of UK communities, as identified within the research gaps. It is also suggested that further research be conducted within the Muslim community since the evidence of negative perceptions was frequently assessed as weak in this REA.
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**Introduction**

**Document**

This report sets out the results of a Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA) of existing research on the perceptions of the UK public concerning the impact of counter-terrorism (CT) legislation implemented since 2000. It was conducted for the Office of Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT) by the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl).

**Background**

**Counter-terrorism legislation**

Since 2000, five major pieces of terrorism legislation have been introduced in the UK. The reader can obtain detailed descriptions of each piece of legislation from the Home Office website; briefly summaries are provided below:

1) **The Terrorism Act 2000**: This was implemented in response to the changing threat from International terrorism. The Act created new criminal offences of inciting terrorist acts, providing instruction or training in the use of firearms, explosives or chemical, biological or nuclear weapons and seeking or providing training for terrorist purposes at home or overseas. It enhanced police powers to investigate terrorism, including wide stop and search powers, and the power to detain suspects after arrest for seven days without charge.

2) **The Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001**: This was introduced to provide enhanced powers for the police to investigate and prevent terrorist activity and other serious crime. This Act allowed the Home Secretary to detain foreign nationals pending deportation, even if removal was not currently possible, if the Secretary of State reasonably believed that the person’s presence in the UK was a risk to national security and reasonably suspected that the person was involved with international terrorism linked with Al Qaeda. (It should be noted that these powers were repealed and replaced by a system of control orders under the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005.) The Act also implemented a number of other measures including cutting off terrorist funding and ensuring that Government departments and agencies can collect and share information required for countering the terrorist threat.

3) **The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005**: This Act allows the Secretary of State to make a control order against an individual if the Secretary of State has reasonable grounds for suspecting the individual is or has been involved in terrorism-related activity, and the Secretary of State considers it necessary to do so for purposes connected with protecting members of the public from a risk of terrorism. The Act

---

allows for control orders to be made against any suspected terrorist, whether a UK national or a non-UK national and whatever the nature of the terrorist activity. The control order can impose obligations on the individual that are considered necessary for purposes connected with preventing or restricting involvement by that individual in terrorism-related activity.

4) The Terrorism Act 2006: This contains a comprehensive package of measures designed to ensure that the police, intelligence agencies and courts all have the tools they require to tackle terrorism and bring perpetrators to justice. The Act created a number of new criminal offences including acts preparatory to terrorism, encouragement to terrorism, dissemination of terrorist publication and terrorist training offences. The Act also made amendments to existing legislation, including extending police powers to detain suspects after arrest for up to 28 days without charge.

5) The Counter-Terrorism Act 2008: This Act created new powers to gather and share information for counter-terrorism; to make further provision about the detention and questioning of terrorist suspects and the prosecution and punishment of terrorist offences; to impose notification requirements on persons convicted of such offences and to confer further powers to act against terrorist financing.

Debate surrounding the legislation
Since the implementation of the Terrorism Act in 2000, and throughout the implementation of all subsequent Acts, there has been significant interest and debate about the effects of counter-terrorism legislation on UK communities. Interested parties span parliamentary members, the media, human rights organisations and community voices representing the general public. Although specific parts of the legislation have attracted more controversy than others, debate tends to centre on the key issues of national security, the proportionality of the legislation and the perceived erosion of human rights.

Those who support the legislation argue that it is justified due to the increased level of threat to the UK from terrorism and to give up a modest amount of freedom is an acceptable sacrifice to achieving greater security. Those who oppose the legislation argue that although the Government has a duty to protect public safety, this should not be at the disproportionate expense of fundamental human rights. Campaigning organisations argue that the legislation will inevitably lead to a further alienation of certain sectors of the UK population, particularly Muslims, and runs the risk of creating a climate of fear and suspicion.[9]

Contextual Statistics
Statistics on terrorism arrests and outcomes throughout the period of 11 September 2001 to 31 March 2009 have been recorded and presented by the Home Office.[10] The main points from this report are presented below and provide useful contextual information about the rates of terrorism-related arrests and charges.
There were 1,661 terrorism arrests. This excludes 38 arrests made between the introduction of the Terrorism Act 2000 on 19 February 2001 and 11 September 2001 and 119 stops at Scottish ports under Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act 2000.

In 2008/09 there were 190 terrorism arrests compared with an annual average of 222 since 1 April 2002.

Thirty-eight per cent of terrorism arrests (598) resulted in a charge, of which 397 (66%) were considered terrorism related. The proportion of those arrested (38%) who were charged is similar to that for other criminal offences with 29 per cent of those aged 18 and over arrested for indictable offences prosecuted. For a further nine per cent of terrorism arrests some alternative action was taken (e.g. transferred to the immigration authorities).

The main offences for which suspects were charged under terrorism legislation were possession of an article for terrorist purposes, membership of a proscribed organisation, and fundraising, all offences under the Terrorism Act 2000.

The main offences for which suspects were charged under non-terrorist legislation, but considered as terrorism related, were conspiracy to murder and offences under the Explosive Substances Act 1883.

Forty-five per cent of those arrested under S41 of the Terrorism Act 2000 were held in pre-charge detention for under one day and 78 per cent for under seven days, after which they were charged, released or further alternative action was taken. Since the maximum period of pre-charge detention was increased to 28 days with effect from 25 July 2006, six persons have been detained for the full period, of which three were charged and three were released without charge.

At 31 March 2009 121 persons were in prison for terrorist-related offences and 22 persons were classified as domestic extremists/separatists. The majority (62%) of the 121 persons imprisoned were UK nationals.


In addition, statistics from the Home Office on Stop and Search procedures are presented below:
Stop and Searches under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, Firearms Act 1968 and Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, powers for which there must be grounds for suspecting the finding of stolen goods or prohibitive articles:

- During 2007/08, the police stopped and searched 1,035,438 persons and 10,485 vehicles, totalling 1,045,923 stops and searches. This was nine per cent more than the 2006/07 total of 962,897 under section 1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and other legislation.

Section 44 – Stop and Search under the Terrorism Act 2000, powers to prevent acts of terrorism for which no reasonable grounds of suspicion of criminal activity are necessary:

- In 2007/08, 36 of the 43 forces carried out stops and searches to prevent acts of terrorism.

- In Great Britain 0.6 per cent of all S44 stops and searches resulted in arrest, this compares to 11 per cent of stops and searches made under s1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

- In 2008/09, 256,026 stops and searches were made under this power which represents a 36 per cent increase since 2007/08. Provisional data for the first quarter of 2009/10 shows a 37 per cent reduction over the first quarter of 2008/09 and a 42 per cent reduction over the last quarter of 2008/09.


**Requirement**

*The need for a review of ‘impact’*

In 2001, Lord Carlile was appointed the Government’s independent reviewer of CT legislation. This role includes the provision of an annual report on; the operation of the Terrorism Act 2000, Part 1 of the Terrorism Act 2006 and the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (control orders legislation). The Home Secretary is obliged to lay a copy of the independent reviewer’s reports before Parliament.

In addition to this, in June 2008 the then Home Secretary made a commitment in the House of Commons to review the impact of CT legislation on UK communities, a commitment that was reiterated by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Security and Counter-terrorism in the House of Lords the following month. To meet this commitment, OSCT commissioned ‘a review of research on the knowledge, views and perceived consequences of CT legislation from the perspective of members of all of the UK’s communities’. Since 2000 a range of research studies have investigated people’s perceptions and experiences of CT legislation,

---

3 As detailed in the Home Office research requirement.
either directly, or as part of a more widely focused study. The approach of this REA was to undertake a detailed review of these aggregated results as opposed to generating new research to elicit perceptions.

The requirement was to establish and analyse the existing research base to reveal insights into the perceptions that the UK public have of the impact of CT legislation. The REA technique\(^4\) was used to filter the vast and complex information base to identify the evidence-based sub-set. For the purposes of this REA, ‘evidence’ refers to data, either quantitative or qualitative in nature, which can be considered in determining whether to accept or reject a position.

**The REA question**

The overarching question was kept deliberately broad by focusing on the UK public to avoid biasing the direction or scope of the REA towards certain sub-sets of the UK population. The main question is presented below:

**Main question:**
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

A number of sub-questions of interest are referred to in the study requirement, but these were not used to drive the direction or scope of the REA. However, this document will assess the extent to which the evidence available answers these sub-questions.

**Sub-questions:**
1) What specific themes are present?

2) Is there variation in reported impacts across different sub-sets of UK communities?

3) What are the sources of the UK public’s perceptions of the impact of counter-terrorism legislation?

4) Does the evidence support a distinction between the existence of counter-terrorism legislation itself, versus the implementation of the legislation?

\(^4\) Further information on the REA approach is included in the Methodology section.
Methodology

The research was undertaken over a ten-week period, commencing in September 2009 and completing in November 2009. The search processes, analysis, synthesis and presentation of findings have followed the basic principles of an REA.

REAs are carried out more quickly than traditional systematic reviews yet still adhere to the same rigorous procedures by:

- setting agreed terms for searching relevant literature;
- setting criteria for including or excluding studies;
- asking detailed questions of each study regarding its methodology and relevance; and
- following a framework for the synthesis stages.

Further information as to how REAs are conducted is available from the Government Social Research (GSR) Unit.5

Figure 1 illustrates the stages followed in this assessment.

### First stage – search process

The search process was carried out by a Dstl Knowledge Agent with experience of the CT domain. Searches were conducted using electronic sources to include published studies and ‘grey’ literature (i.e. unpublished studies or work in progress). By including grey literature in the searches a higher degree of confidence was reached that all relevant sources had been identified.

Search strings were developed by the project team and agreed with the Home Office. The search included terms related to civil liberties/acts, terrorism laws/legislation, community perceptions, public perceptions and society perceptions. A full list of searches and databases searched can be found in Appendix 1.

---

5 http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/professional/gsr/resources/rea-how-to-do-an-rea.aspx
In addition to databases, the World Wide Web was searched primarily using the Google search engine. The search strings used are available in Appendix 1. Due to the large amount of information held on the internet, results were limited to PDF files (to avoid search results related to web blogs, newsgroups, etc.) and results extracted until the Google message of ‘potentially relevant results’ was reached, which indicated the results were less likely to be relevant.

The iterative process adopted during the REA search meant that the project team were able to identify opinion polls as a useful source of quantitative evidence relevant to the topic. Searches of individual company websites were carried out to access potentially relevant polls. A list of the company websites searched can be found in Appendix 1.

The search process resulted in 4,482 potentially relevant results. A further 19 study reports were provided to the project team by the Home Office, making a total of 4,501 articles for Stage 2. In some cases, these reports duplicated articles already identified through the database and World Wide Web searches, and they were removed from the search results. The remaining studies, provided by the Home Office, were generally unpublished and therefore not available in any of the sources searched. Each article in the final set was assigned a unique reference identifier by the project team and was included in subsequent assessment stages. Each article was assessed in the same way throughout the process regardless of its source.

**Second stage – screening of results**

Once potentially relevant articles were obtained from the search process they were screened by the project team against inclusion criteria. Screening of articles against the inclusion criteria was carried out by two members of the study team. Working independently, individual assessments were compared to ensure standardisation in applying the following inclusion criteria to each source document.

- Was the research conducted using UK participants or in a UK setting?
- Was the research conducted between 01/01/2000 and 31/08/2009?
- Did the research gather empirical evidence?
- Is the research relevant to the REA question?

In cases where the abstracts were insufficiently detailed the full text documents were obtained from the British Library.

Fifty articles satisfied all four inclusion criteria and were then assessed in Stage 3 using a Quality Assessment Tool (QAT). Eighteen of the articles were full research studies and 32 were opinion polls or surveys.

---

6 By limiting results to PDF files, it is possible that some studies would not have been captured in the World Wide Web search process.
Third stage – quality assessment

Before documents could be included in the evidence assessment they were evaluated for methodological quality and relevance. This ensured that all research included in the REA was sufficiently rigorous. The method for quality assessment was formalised into a Quality Assessment Tool (QAT) for standardisation purposes.

Design
The study team reviewed available resources for appraising qualitative studies. A framework of ten questions, developed by Glasgow University Critical Appraisal Skills Programme to assess qualitative studies, was subsequently selected to be adapted for use in this REA. Nine of the ten questions from this tool were relevant and therefore included in the QAT, six of which were used to score methodological strength. The four screening questions (from the second stage above) were also added to the QAT in order to maintain clear records for each selected article.

Since ‘relevance’ was missing from the Glasgow University approach, it was deemed necessary to review other complementary frameworks. The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) has created a framework (consisting of 18 questions) for GSR which assesses the credibility, rigour and relevance of qualitative studies. This resource evaluates quality in three dimensions which includes relevance. Thus the EPPI-Centre Weight of Evidence (WoE) questions were also added to the QAT. Therefore, the QAT employed in this REA was designed to incorporate the screening questions from the second stage with nine questions (six scored) from the Glasgow University framework and the four WoE questions from the EPPI-Centre data extraction form.

Assessment
The six scored questions relating to methodological strength within the QAT cover six important aspects of the research, including the appropriateness of the research design, data collection and analysis. These six sections and the sub-questions addressed within them (not formally scored), are shown in the full QAT in Appendix 2.

Each of the 18 research studies was assessed using the full set of six scored QAT questions. A further assessment was then carried out to establish the weight that should be attached to the evidence from each article in the synthesis stage (WoE). Each article was allocated a Low, Medium or High assessment, based on the appropriateness of the research design, the trustworthiness of the findings and the relevance of the study focus. Each study was thus assigned a ‘QAT score’ (for methodological strength), taken from six scored questions and a relevance score, taken from the WoE relevance question. Further details regarding the specific questions asked in order to assess WoE are provided in Appendix 2.

7 Resources are provided in the REA guidance (available on the GSR website).
8 http://www.eppi.ioe.ac.uk
9 The WoE questions are numbered N13-16 in the EPPI-Centre data extraction form.
Judgements on the quality and weight of evidence assigned to each article were carried out independently by three members of the project team and ratified in a study team workshop. Using an iterative process, the analysts’ judgement and allocated ratings were used to define cut-off points for the inclusion of articles in the next stage. In assaying the quality of documents, a matrix system was used (see Appendix 2) to combine the methodology scores with relevance scores. The methodology scores were translated into a three-partition (weak, average, and strong) taxonomy, with ‘strong-quality’ studies scoring between 9 and 11, ‘average-quality’ between 7 and 8, and ‘weak-quality’ at 6. Studies which scored under 6 were assessed as being of insufficient quality to be included in the REA. Of the 18 studies, seven were deemed to be insufficiently rigorous for inclusion. A further three studies were excluded as they were rated as low in relevance and only weak or average in methodological quality. The remaining eight studies were included in the next stage of the REA.

The above approach allows distinction between sources to be made in the synthesis and discussion so that the reader is aware of the relative quality of source data. All studies included in the REA were assessed to be of sufficient quality; however, this varied from strong to more methodologically weak. It should be noted that the terms ‘weak’ (for methodology) and ‘low’ (for relevance) should not necessarily be understood to mean of very little or no value. These terms are used here to refer to a piece of research which contains useful or appropriate evidence for use in the REA. However, evidence assessed to have a weak methodology, or have low relevance, is given less relative weight during the synthesis process and when communicating the findings.

Those studies assessed (using WoE) as having low relevance were included in the REA only where the QAT score for methodology was strong (i.e. 9–11). All studies assessed as being of medium or high relevance were included, provided that these studies also scored above 6 for methodology. Studies which were near the cut-off point were reassessed collectively by the study team to ensure that there was consensus of opinion.

Unlike the primary studies discussed above, the 32 opinion polls and surveys were assessed with slightly different criteria. The QAT methodology questions were applied but only the first four questions were scored due to the presentational nature of the data.

All polling companies targeted in the search strategy were appraised by the study team as providing methodologically suitable results; however, there were some differences in quality in relation to sample size, recruitment strategy and the standard of questions used. It was therefore necessary to use the WoE relevance question as the final inclusion/exclusion criteria. All polls selected for inclusion in the REA were evaluated as either high or medium relevance. Those with low relevance were excluded.

It should be noted that there was increase in CT-relevant polls immediately following the London terrorist attacks in July 07. This may create bias in the results presented and should be considered when reading the findings.

10 Questions 3a, 4a, 5a and 6a in Appendix 2.
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of Counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

Of the 32 opinion polls and surveys, 19 were judged to be of sufficient quality and relevance for inclusion in the next stage of the REA.

Consequently, the findings of this report are based on the 27 sources selected for inclusion in the REA: eight studies and 19 opinion polls and surveys.

Fourth stage – describing studies

An Evidence Extraction Template (EET) was designed and agreed with the Home Office and is presented in Appendix 3. The purpose of the EET was to systematically extract evidence contained in the sources to allow for the Stage 5 synthesis process.

Fifth stage – synthesis of findings

Evidence contained in the completed EETs was extracted and presented visually using visualisation and analysis software. This process allowed the study team to draw the evidence together for the purposes of undertaking an analysis of the clusters and links. The clustering of the evidence permitted the study team to identify and explore emerging patterns and themes in the data. Evidence was coded according to whether it was attributable to individual perceptions; community perceptions; concerns; feelings and behaviours. The data were also coded to indicate the source of evidence, weight of evidence and quality assessment score.

Limitations of the REA

As discussed, this report has followed the principles and guidelines of an REA. Consequently, the following limitations of the report are highlighted.

- Although the search strategy was rigorous, it is unlikely to have captured the complete evidence base. For example, time constraints did not permit iteration of the search strings and the Google search engine does not provide complete coverage of World Wide Web content.

- In order to meet the Home Office’s commitment for delivery in November 2009, this report was conducted over a ten-week period. It was therefore necessary to set a cut-off date for the receipt of the study papers which resulted in seven studies identified in the search process being unavailable to the study team.

- The nature of this REA meant that only primary studies (i.e. those collecting empirical data) were considered. A large amount of anecdotal evidence, media perceptions and other individual sentiments were evident during the initial search process which may be of interest as part of a larger systematic review.

11 i2 Analysts Notebook 8.
Of the studies examined in this REA, none was assessed as being both methodologically strong and highly relevant. Studies that were highly relevant either reported insufficient information on methodology, or had methodological flaws that may have biased the results and were therefore assessed as methodologically average or weak.

The selection of studies to be included in the REA was carried out by a study team and involved a certain degree of subjective interpretation. This was partly mitigated by standardising the criteria used for quality assessment and by ensuring that the final decisions were ratified during study team workshops.

During the initial searches it was evident that some relevant international research had been undertaken that could provide useful comparative information for the UK. However, research that was not conducted in a UK setting, or based on a UK population, was explicitly excluded from this REA.

Non-reporting of methodological detail attracted a lower quality assessment and increased the likelihood that a study would be excluded. The inclusion criteria for the REA were therefore biased towards those studies for which the methodology was reported in detail.

Despite these limitations, this REA currently provides the most comprehensive review of extant evidence of the UK public perceptions towards the impact of CT legislation implemented since 2000. Identification of research gaps and the most suitable ways to fill these gaps is discussed later in the report.
Findings and discussion

Included studies

The REA identified a very limited set of scientifically robust and relevant studies related to people’s perceptions of the impact of CT legislation. No studies were identified that were both methodologically strong and had high relevance to perceptions of impact. The evidence base therefore consisted of studies that had either not systematically collected data in relation to the specific question (i.e. not of high relevance), or had methodological issues that limited the amount of trust that could be placed in the results. Although there is a lack of evidence in relation to the REA question, this does not mean there is a lack of perceived impacts of CT legislation.

Although the search terms used during the REA did not include any words related to ‘Muslims’, the resulting evidence base was heavily focused on this community. Of the eight full research studies included, two used general population samples, three used Muslim only samples, one used a Black and Asian sample and the remaining two used purposive samples that sought to over-represent the Muslim population. There was a significant gap in research coverage of other specific UK communities. Fifteen of the opinion polls were based on samples that aimed to be representative of the general population, although it is unlikely that the sampling strategies used for opinion polls fully achieve this. Three opinion polls used samples of the Muslim population, and only one poll separated its sample into Muslims and non-Muslims.

Further descriptions of each of the included studies are provided in Appendix 4.

The findings from the REA are presented below, structured around the main question and the sub-questions.

Research question: What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

The REA identified evidence of opinions, perceptions and concerns held by certain samples of UK communities surrounding CT legislation in Great Britain. Evidence of impacts is presented around the most commented on sections of CT legislation, namely:

- Terrorism Act 2000 – Section 41 – Pre-charge detention;
- Terrorism Act 2000 – Section 44 powers – Stop and search;
- Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 – control orders;
- Counter-Terrorism Act 2008 - Section 22 – Post-charge questioning;¹² and
- other legislative measures

¹² Currently not in force.
Terrorism Act 2000 – Section 41 – Pre-charge detention

Pre-charge detention refers to the amount of time a person, suspected of committing a crime, can be held in custody before being charged with an offence. Pre-charge detention for terrorist suspects was increased from 48 hours to seven days by the Terrorism Act 2000; from seven days to 14 days by the Criminal Justice Act 2003; and from 14 days to the current limit of 28 days in the Terrorism Act 2006.

Very little evidence was found on perceptions about the 28-day limit. Most perceptions were in response to Government proposals to increase the limit further.\(^\text{13}\) For example, a Home Office consultation exercise in July 2007 found more resistance than support for an outright extension to the current 28-day limit.[1] However, opinion polls carried out between August 2005 and August 2006 indicate that an average 70 per cent of respondents from the general population were in favour of extending the detention period to 90 days (Figure 2).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|p{0.8\textwidth}|}
\hline
\textbf{Questions from opinion polls in relation to pre-charge detention} \\
\textbf{Questions from opinion polls carried out between August 2005 and August 2006 (see Figure 2)} \\
\hline
S1 & To what extent do you support or oppose the introduction of each of the following anti-terrorism measures? \\
& \begin{itemize}
\item Allowing the police to hold terror suspects for up to three months without charge, instead of the 14 days they are presently allowed to hold people.
\item Response categories were: strongly support, tend to support, neither support nor oppose, tend to oppose, strongly oppose.
\end{itemize} \\
S2 & Which of these options would you personally support the most? \\
& \begin{itemize}
\item The present 14-day limit for holding a suspected terrorist without charge should be increased to 90 days.
\item The 14-day limit should be increased to 90 days, but only in those cases where the police can persuade a senior judge that the time is needed to gather evidence against the subject(s).
\item The present 14-day limit should be extended but only to 28 days.
\item The present 14-day limit should be kept as it is.
\item The present 14-day limit should be reduced to seven days.
\item Don’t know.
\end{itemize} \\
S3 & Should it be possible to detain terror suspects who have NOT been charged with any offence for up to 90 days? \\
& Response categories were: yes, such detention without charge should be allowed; no, it should not; don’t know. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\(^{13}\) In the aftermath of the 7/7 bombings changes to extend pre-charge detention for terrorist suspects to 90 days were passed in the Terrorism Act 2006. However, after staunch opposition amendments were made allowing 28 days maximum before charge. Since then the UK Government has unsuccessfully attempted to extend this period to 42 and 56 days.
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**Figure 2** Opinion poll results: support and opposition towards allowing the police to hold terror suspects for up to three months (90 days) without charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 (12/08/05)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 (04/11/05)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 (14/08/06)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that these statistics indicate less than one-quarter of samples (individuals) representative of the general population oppose extensions to pre-charge detention, there is a disproportionate amount of qualitative evidence of negative attitudes and perceptions alleging the proposals and legislation to be unfair, unjust and against human rights.[2]

Evidence assessed in this REA has found negative perceptions to be most prevalent in Muslim communities who articulate feelings of being viewed as ‘guilty until proven innocent’ [2] and perceptions that the UK Government aspires to keep people in prison without trials.[3] For instance, in a study examining opinions of Muslim, White UK and other Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, Muslims in particular reported concern that the proposal to increase pre-charge detention periods to 42 days might be used to harass innocent Muslims.[4]

The Muslim Voice UK (MVUK) submission on proposed CT legislation provided the greatest amount of evidence of negative perceptions surrounding increases in pre-charge detention periods.[2] The number of statements sourced from MVUK reflects the volume of direct quotes included in the source report.14 A sample of 184 MVUK members was asked what they thought of the following statement:

“The Government want to extend the 28-days detention limit for holding terrorist suspects without charge and may want to extend this limit to 56 days. What do you think about this proposal?”

MVUK, (p18)

The findings showed that 85 per cent of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this Government proposal, were very critical of the measure, and some wanted to see a decrease in the current detention period of 28 days.[2] These negative perceptions illustrate concerns that there may be human rights compromises if detentions are made without judicial review: [2][2][7]

---

14 This report was assessed as being of weak methodological quality.
“To take 56 days of their liberty without just cause is totally outrageous. This presupposes guilt before trial and already the setting is prejudicial to justice.”

MVUK, (p21)

“This is an erosion of individual civil liberties. You arrest people because you already have evidence to show this person is a criminal or a threat, not arrest people first and gather evidence later. We are moving toward a police state.”

MVUK, (p22)

It should be noted that due to weaknesses in methodology, the evidence from MVUK should not necessarily be regarded as representative of the views of the wider Muslim population. However, a methodologically strong study undertaken in 2005 asked a representative sample of the UK population whether it was acceptable to allow the police to detain people for more than a week or so without charge, if the police suspect them of involvement in terrorism. Seventy-nine per cent of respondents considered the measure to be a ‘price worth paying’ to safeguard national security.[5]

Although the evidence from MVUK cannot be generalised, the qualitative statements do demonstrate some negativity towards how this particular sub-set of the UK Muslim population perceives the impact of increased pre-charge detention. The perceived impacts that are reported are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Perceived impacts of extensions to pre-charge detention periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of impact</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Source and population</th>
<th>Methodological strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Government’s new 42-day detention might be used to harass innocent Muslims</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual &amp; Community</td>
<td>RICU, Muslim and Non-Muslim population, 2009 [4]</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the pre-charge detention period was extended, there is a real risk of innocent people being held on suspicion for as long as 42 days.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>YouGov panel population, YouGov, 2008</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those interned for long periods of time will be stigmatised, impacting on their families; their mental health; their job; and their reputation.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Muslim Population, MVUK [2]</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates friction within the community; and distrust of the Government</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Muslim Population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heighten oppression and feelings of alienation within the Muslim community</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Muslim Population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 See Appendix 4 for discussion of the methodological quality of included studies.
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**Terrorism Act 2000 – Section 44 powers – Stop and search**

Section 44 (S44) of the Terrorism Act 2000 gives the police the power to search vehicles and people for items that could be used to commit a terrorist act. Police can search anybody anywhere under this law and unlike PACE Stop and Search, do not need reasonable suspicion to do so. These powers have been one of the most controversial aspects of CT legislation over the past few years. Although it is acknowledged that such tactics are a necessary procedure to ensure public safety [3] there are perceptions that the process is discriminatory based on stereotypes and racial profiling.[7]

Most objections to S44 stem from acknowledgements of disproportionality in the demographics of those subject to search procedures.[3] However, there is also evidence that shows acceptance of the need for measures to be prioritised towards demographics that are more likely to be involved in terrorism:

“They have to target people that are most likely to be terrorists and that would be Asian people. When I'm going on the train, I want to feel safe, so you have to put up with that.”

(Asian male) CLG, (p64-65)

An opinion poll, carried out by ICM Research for the BBC in April 2004, indicated 69 per cent of the respondents, representative of the UK population, supported police powers to stop and search anyone at anytime. It appears that the contention with S44 is not necessarily linked to the measure itself, but with the way it is implemented.[6] A study into the public’s attitude towards security measures reported that, overall, female respondents were more positive about security measures, including S44.[6] However, official stop and search statistics show females as less likely to be subject to these procedures.[11]

Concerns voiced in the evidence assessed by the REA suggest two key perceptions towards the implementation that are fuelling negative perceptions.

1. Lack of justification by the authorities, or valid logic as to why the procedures are carried out.[6]

2. The manner in which searches are conducted: disrespectful; intimidating; impolite; brusque; and rude. [6]

3. Considering there appears to be a wealth of perceptions surrounding S44 procedures, this is rarely articulated in terms of impact (see Table 3). During the REA process, material describing perceptions of the impact of stop and search, in terms of more general criminal legislation,16 were excluded to focus on the specific CT impacts. Although research included in the REA was specific to S44 it was not always apparent if the distinction between Stop and Search under S44 and Stop and Search under PACE was made clear to respondents in individual studies.17

---

16 Wider impacts are out of the scope of this REA but can be read in the Macpherson report (1999).
17 It is therefore possible that some of the perceptions given by respondents, reported to concern S44, are actually related to wider legislation.
Table 3  Perceived impacts of Section 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of impact</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Source and population</th>
<th>Methodological strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Black and Minority Ethnic males appear to have become so acclimatised to S44, that they almost accept it (i.e. desensitised)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>CML Market Research, BME Males [6]</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 – Control Orders

Control orders are civil orders introduced in the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005. Control orders can impose obligations on an individual that are considered necessary for purposes connected with preventing or restricting involvement by that individual in terrorism-related activity. Specific conditions imposed under a control order are tailored to the individual concerned and must be necessary and proportionate in each case. These obligations are based on a range of options that can be employed to disrupt particular terrorism-related activity on a case-by-case basis. This could for example include measures ranging from a curfew to a ban on the use of communications equipment to a restriction on an individual’s movement.

Although control orders were designed to work within European Convention on Human Rights guidelines, limited evidence from a methodologically weak study suggests a sub-set of the UK Muslim population consider them to be discriminatory and to undermine the presumption of innocence.[2] Of the same sample, 72 per cent of Muslims surveyed by Muslim Voice UK wanted suspects to be put on trial rather than see the control orders made more stringent:

Table 4  MVUK survey results on control orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Individuals on control orders are not put on trial but instead have restrictions imposed on them? Which statement below do you agree with on this issue, if any?” MVUK, (p20)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They must have done something – that is why they are on control orders</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should be put on trial to see whether they are innocent or guilty</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should be released</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control orders should be made even stricter</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control orders should be abolished</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A representative sample of 1,970 UK residents, surveyed by YouGov for the Daily Telegraph in February 2005, indicates that over half of respondents agreed with the principles of control orders, despite the fact that this measure could be applied when there is not enough usable evidence to charge and convict them in a criminal court (see Table 5).
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### Table 5: YouGov Poll Results (Control Orders), February 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As you may know, the Government proposes a new form of punishment, called control orders, for people it considers a threat to national security. This could involve house arrest, curfews, restrictions on the use of telephones and the Internet, and/or tagging, but not imprisonment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is sometimes necessary to restrict the civil liberties of suspected terrorists even though there is not enough usable evidence to charge and convict them.</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody should ever have their civil liberties restricted unless they are charged with a specific offence and taken before the courts.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which of these statements do you most agree with?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposal is wholly wrong. People should have their liberties restricted only if there is enough usable evidence to charge them and bring them to court.</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may be necessary to restrict the liberties of suspected terrorists; but the initial decision to impose a control order should always be taken by a judge, not a Government minister.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposal strikes the right balance, allowing the Home Secretary to act swiftly against suspected terrorists, but requiring a judge to confirm or overturn the control order within seven days.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal does not go far enough. Suspected terrorists should be sent immediately to prison if the intelligence services believe they are a genuine threat, even if there is not enough evidence to charge them.</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no evidence of perceived impacts arising from control orders found during the REA.

**Counter-Terrorism Act 2008 – Section 22 – Post-charge questioning**

In response to widespread resistance for increased pre-charge detention, the Terrorism Act 2008 outlines legislation allowing police to continue to question suspects after they have been charged. This enhances police powers from the restrictions in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE), where a suspect is not allowed to be interviewed after they have been charged.

In general, evidence assessed supported the proposal; a Home Office consultation in 2007 reported support for post-charge questioning and in particular noted that it may lessen the need for lengthy pre-charge detention. [1] This is supported by a YouGov opinion poll in March 2008, where 70 per cent of respondents favoured post-charge questioning, if the police obtain fresh evidence on related offences. Alternatives such as increasing pre-charge detention periods were only preferable to 13 per cent and just seven per cent of respondents favoured no change to existing procedures, i.e. 28-day detention and no post-charge questioning.

Muslim respondents in the MVUK submission had mixed feelings on the acceptability of post-charge questioning. Just under half supported the measure while one-quarter opposed it [2] (see Table 6).
Table 6  MVUK survey results on post-charge questioning

“What do you think of the proposal to question suspects on the same offence after they have been charged providing there are safeguards in place such as legal advice, freedom from oppressive questioning, limits on the length of interviews and number of interviews?”
MVUK, (p18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only evidence of perceived impacts, shown in Table 7, was extracted from a study assessed by this REA as methodologically weak.

Table 7  Perceived impacts of post-charge questioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of impact</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Source and population</th>
<th>Methodological strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The measure would open the doors for the case against the accused to continue to be built on after he or she had been charged</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>35 organisations and 36 individual responses, Home Office, 2007. [1]</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to silence would be undermined 18</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>35 organisations and 36 individual responses, Home Office, 2007</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measure would be useful for the defendant as it would give them the opportunity to put their case forward</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>35 organisations and 36 individual responses, Home Office, 2007</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 The right to remain silent under police questioning and the privilege against self-incrimination are generally recognised international standards which lie at the heart of the notion of a fair procedure under Article 6 of the Equality and Human Rights Commission.
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Other legislative measures

The evidence assessed by the REA indicated opinion and perceptions of impact on other aspects of CT legislation not covered in the sections above. However, these are relatively small sections and are presented here as other legislative measures to include:

- retention and use of DNA samples; and
- powers at ports.

Retention and use of DNA samples

Powers in the Counter-Terrorism Act 2008 allow police to take routinely and use fingerprints and non-intimate samples from those subject to a control order. It puts the retention and use of covertly acquired DNA or fingerprints on a statutory footing; ensuring that DNA/fingerprints taken under PACE and retained on the national DNA or fingerprint databases can be cross referenced for the purposes of national security. Civil liberty concerns over the retention and treatment of biometric data relate to general legislation and are not exclusive to CT legislation. This REA highlighted the following concerns specific to CT legislation; however, they were both sourced from methodologically weak consultations:

- The Home Office consultation in 2007 received feedback from respondents as to why biometric information should continue to be stored if individuals were subsequently found to be innocent.[1]

- The Muslim Voice UK submission asked a number of questions surrounding the collection and retention of biometric data (see Table 8). MVUK interpreted the results to be that ‘most Muslims’ either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the storage of such information on both the National database (84%) and the stand alone CT database (85%).[2] The results are shown in Table 8 and reveal that this is a simplified conclusion to draw. It appears that responses varied greatly according to whether DNA information was proposed to be retained only for those convicted or charged of terrorist offences, as opposed to those detained under the Terrorism Act 2000:
Table 8  MVUK survey results on DNA questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MVUK questions on DNA retention</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The Government is proposing to store DNA and fingerprints on the national DNA and fingerprint databases from anyone detained under the Terrorism Act 2000, even if they are not charged. What do you think about storage of DNA and fingerprints of those who have never been charged with any crime?</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 What do you think about putting the DNA and fingerprints on the national databases of those who have been convicted of terrorism or terror-related offences?</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The police have begun to set up a standalone counter-terrorism DNA database. This database contains DNA obtained through searches, crime scenes and arrests and will include DNA of people even if they have not been charged. What do you think about the storage of DNA of people who have never been charged with any crime on this database?</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 What do you think about the storage of DNA on the counter-terrorism DNA database provided it only contained information on those convicted of terrorism or terror-related offences?</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 What do you think about DNA data and fingerprints of those who have never been charged with any crime being shared internationally after they have been placed on the national or counter-terrorism databases?</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no evidence of perceived impacts surrounding the retention and use of biometric data found during the REA.

**Powers at ports**

The Terrorism Act 2006 provided increased search powers at ports. There were few sources of evidence in the REA which explicitly related to this measure.
The Home Office consultation exercise in 2007 states:

“The proposals did not generate many responses. Some respondents were concerned about how they would work in practice. Most respondents welcomed the measures considering them to be proportionate and necessary to the current threat, provided that all legal and constitutional issues were addressed before.”

HOC, (p21)

A similarly weak study quoted an individual opinion on the seizure of travel documents at ports:

“As long as there is sufficient grounds for suspicion and a reasonable time limit is imposed by which documents etc. have to be returned if nothing is found.”

MVUK, (p30)

Conversely, the same MVUK report suggested that 87 per cent of respondents were against giving the police these powers and the author makes the tenuous link with a single respondent’s statement [2] that this is because ‘they were concerned that such powers would be abused and targeted towards Muslims as the stop and search powers have been.’[2] However, the statistical conclusions drawn were from the following data, which appear to be derived from a question that could be described as ‘leading’ and so cannot be construed as objective:

**Table 9 MVUK survey results on powers at ports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact statements below were articulated by the author of the MVUK report and are presented in Table 10, although the preceding comments on methodological strength should be noted.
Table 10  Perceived impacts of increased powers at ports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of impact</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Source and population</th>
<th>Methodological strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causes resentment within the Muslim community and increases already present feelings of resentment.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Muslim population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to wrongful arrests</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Muslim population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opens the door of institutional racism and bullying</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Individual &amp; Community</td>
<td>Muslim population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May restrict police effectiveness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Muslim population, MVUK</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-question1: What specific themes are present?

During the fifth stage (synthesis of findings) of the REA, evidence was extracted from source reports (see Appendix 3) and presented visually using analysis software.\(^1\)\(^9\) This process allowed the study team to draw the evidence together for the purposes of undertaking cluster and link analysis. Evidence was coded according to whether it was attributable to individual perceptions; community perceptions; concerns; feelings and behaviours. The data were also coded to indicate the source of evidence, weight of evidence and quality assessment score.

This process resulted in the creation of an REA Map (visual map of the evidence) which allowed the study team to identify three distinct, although inter-related, themes of perceptions:

- discrimination;
- civil liberties/human rights; and
- confidence in UK authorities.

**Discrimination**

Discrimination is defined here as treatment taken toward, or against, a person of a certain group based on class or category. This is a prominent theme identified during the synthesis stage of the REA. Weak, average and strong evidence assessed all contain references to the differing degrees of perceptions among Muslim respondents that they are disproportionately affected and potentially criminalised by some aspects of CT legislation.

\(^{19}\) i2 Analysts Notebook 8.
Ultimately, these perceptions give rise to the belief, within samples of Muslim populations, that the legislation is unfair, unjust and discriminatory.

- A Populus poll carried out in June 2006 using a sample of 1,131 Muslims found that 47 per cent felt that anti-terror laws were being applied unfairly to the Muslim community – as opposed to 34 per cent who agreed that anti-terror laws are applied fairly to the Muslim community.

- A GfK NOP poll carried out on behalf of Channel 4 News in April 2007, sought Muslim opinions on the 7/7 bombings, concluding that only 39 per cent of respondents were confident they would be treated fairly, as a Muslim, if they were arrested in Britain (54% were not confident they would be treated fairly). It also found that 45 per cent of respondents agreed that the tactics used by police when arresting Muslim terror suspects were racist (33% disagreed).

- A Muslim Voice UK survey of its own members suggests that there is a perception amongst the Muslim community that security is ‘faith led’, rather than ‘intelligence led’.

- A Synovate study, assessed as methodologically strong, reported ‘several’ perceptions that the UK Government was victimising all Muslims for the acts of a very small minority of Muslims.

- A CLG study, assessed as methodologically strong, reported that ‘many’ Muslims commented on how the “community” was beginning to think that the courts discriminated against Muslims.

There were very few examples of non-discriminatory perceptions.

- A GfK NOP poll carried out on behalf of Channel 4 News in April 2007 found that 56 per cent of respondents agreed that the police tactics used when arresting Muslim suspects under the Terrorism Act can be justified (28% disagreed).

In terms of explanation of the observed theme, the most controversial aspect of the legislation appears to be S44. Evidence from strong methodological studies indicates that negative perceptions appear to be derived from the way in which the legislation is implemented. This evidence suggests that Muslims in particular feel that they are unfairly targeted by the police and that they are being disproportionately stopped and searched. In addition, weaker evidence voices concerns that the police are employing ‘racial profiling’ and specifically targeting people who appear to be Muslim.

In terms of impact, evidence from a weak methodological source suggests that if Muslims continue to perceive legislation as discriminatory, it could potentially undermine the readiness for community collaboration with the authorities to root out and expose terrorism. The same source states that it may also fuel problems of victimisation and suspicion among youth, which could potentially cause increased feelings of persecution and discrimination.

---

20 It is not always evident from the evidence if perceptions of Stop and Search result from implementation under the Terrorism Act 2000 or wider legislation, i.e. PACE 1984.
A study, assessed as methodologically average, explored perceptions using focus groups that consisted of samples representing different faiths and ethnicities in the UK population. The study found that ‘feeling different’ and being ‘treated differently’ was evident among many Muslims and other Minority Ethnic participants’ [4] especially for those born and educated overseas and for whom English was not their first language. It was also reported that more observant Muslims felt that practising their faith and maintaining their cultural heritage set them apart from the White UK populations. [4]

Other evidence indicates that these feelings of being treated differently by others/the authorities have increased following recent terrorist attacks. Many Muslims, especially more observant Muslims who wore traditional dress, reported being acutely aware that society peers viewed them with suspicion. Many had direct experiences of being treated differently as a result of such suspicions. Many Asians (from all ethnic and faith backgrounds) felt there was a growing anti-Muslim sentiment in British society in general and expected that this would lead them to experience discrimination in public services. [3]

“People are scared of you that you’re going to explode, or every Muslim person is a terrorist. That gives a whole different phase for what Islam’s meant to be. So it’s getting worse actually. Although I didn’t feel anything change, you can see people are looking at you, people are noticing you and if they see a group of Muslim women, or a group of Muslim men walking together people will notice what’s going on, so those kinds of things”

UPBT (p58)

Despite there being some opinion that Britain is a tolerant and ethnically diverse society, several sources of evidence from strong methodological sources reported perceptions of direct and institutional racism and Islamophobia. Although not unique to the implementation of CT legislation, some elements of Muslim communities hold perceptions that ‘the UK Government is anti-Islam and pursues hostile policies towards Muslims at home and overseas’. In addition, several UK Muslims thought ‘the Government used the threat of terrorism to encourage people to distrust Muslims and justify what they perceive as anti-Islamic policies’. [4]

**Civil liberties/human rights**

A significant theme identified from the literature included in the REA surrounds concerns over the erosion of civil liberties and loss of human rights. A number of statements to this effect were sourced from the submission from MVUK on the proposed anti-terror laws which was assessed to be methodologically weak and therefore may not be representative of the views of the wider Muslim population. The author reported emotive responses of perceptions that terrorism legislation violates human rights and fundamental freedoms, specifically for Muslims in the UK:

21 A Populus poll of 1,131 Muslims in June 2006 found that 76 per cent of respondents agreed or somewhat agreed that they had experienced more hostility since the July 7 bombings.

22 It is not clear if feelings of rising prejudice/discrimination are directly linked to CT legislation. Examination of this is beyond the scope of the REA.
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“Our civil liberties are being taken away, piecemeal, by the new Labour Government in the name of security and public safety.” MVUK, (p37)

Feelings of vulnerability and potential behaviours arising from these perceptions were also found in the MVUK report:

“I feel vulnerable and abandoned by the powers that be who seem willing to sacrifice our individual rights so easily.”

MVUK, (p33)

“The powers are at present being totally abused. If human rights are to be abused we may as well live in a country where human rights are not recognised.”

MVUK, (p21)

The issue of CT legislation versus civil liberties is a relatively balanced debate with proportionate amounts of anecdotal and empirical evidence on either side.

One of the largest, and most robust, pieces of research into public attitudes towards CT legislation and civil liberties was conducted in the 2006/2007 annual British Social Attitudes (BSA) Survey. The findings provide in-depth multivariate analysis over time, of opinions designed to be representative of the population, towards specific measures. A full account of this analysis is constrained by the nature of an REA and therefore a summary of the most relevant findings are presented in Table 11.

The BSA survey concludes that only two of the eight measures have 'clear majorities' who think they are unacceptable: torture and the banning of peaceful protests and demonstrations. However, the authors note that interpretation should consider that these two measures may be rejected by respondents as 1) torture is perceived as the ultimate infringement on a person's freedom and 2) protests may be rather tenuously linked to CT.

The BSA concludes that societal commitments to civil liberties have decreased over the past 25 years. However, the events of 9/11 and 7/7 have influenced current attitudes towards civil liberties; the mention of something being a counter-terrorist measure makes people more willing to contemplate giving up some of their freedoms.

“Of those people who thought that it was important for democracy that every adult had the right to a fair trial by jury, 44 per cent thought denying it to terror suspects was a price worth paying.”

BSA, (p60)

This conclusion is largely supported by opinion polls.

---

23 Consideration of anecdotal evidence is outside the scope of this REA.
24 For a fuller account please refer to British Social Attitudes, Perspectives on a changing society. National Centre for Social Research.
25 Civil libertarian views were compared from 1985 to 2005.
### Table 11  Percentage viewing anti-terrorist measures as unacceptable or a price worth paying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt from British Social Attitudes 2006/2007 edition. Table 7.13 (pg.159). Percentage viewing anti-terrorist measures as unacceptable or a price worth paying (Base: 1058)</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Price worth paying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torturing people held in British jails who are suspected of involvement in terrorism to get information from them, if this is the only way this information can be obtained.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banning certain peaceful protests and demonstrations.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denying the right to trial by jury to people charged with a terrorist-related crime.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banning certain people from saying whatever they want in public.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having compulsory identity cards for all adults.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing the police to detain people for more than a week or so without charge if the police suspect them of involvement in terrorism.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting people suspected of involvement with terrorism under special rules, which would mean they could be electronically tagged, prevented from going to certain places, or prevented from leaving their homes at certain times.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following people suspected of involvement with terrorism, tapping their phones and opening mail.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12  Questions asked in UK opinion polls related to civil liberties and terrorism, July 2002–July 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions from opinion polls carried out between July 2002 and July 2007 (see Figure 3)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 Giving up some privacy rights is necessary to fight terrorism and crime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 National security and the prevention of terrorism means more than civil liberties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Sometimes necessary to restrict civil liberties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Do you think it is right or wrong to lose some civil liberties to improve our security against terrorist attacks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 If necessary, it is worth curbing some of our civil liberties in order to fight effectively against terrorism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Government should put combating terrorism ahead of concerns for civil liberties and give police whatever powers they need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 Government should put combating terrorism ahead of concerns for civil liberties and give police whatever powers they need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in most cases the question posed in polls and surveys is undefined and describes ‘some’ civil liberties and these observed responses may well change if people are asked about specific measures.
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of Counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

Figure 3  Opinion poll results showing support on questions related to civil liberties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance Survey</td>
<td>July 02</td>
<td>(n=1,002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouGov/Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>Feb 02</td>
<td>(n=1,970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouGov/Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>July 05</td>
<td>(n=1,854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM/Guardian</td>
<td>Aug 05</td>
<td>(n=1,006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouGov/Sun</td>
<td>July 06</td>
<td>(n=1,942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus/BBC</td>
<td>June 07</td>
<td>(n=1,002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus/BBC</td>
<td>July 07</td>
<td>(n=1,007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidence in UK authorities

The third significant theme identified from the REA is that of confidence and trust in UK authorities. The police, judiciary and central Government are all commented on specifically. Evidence on this theme can be found in a number of primary studies as well as polls and surveys. Racism, Islamophobia and the role of the media were also prominent aspects within the evidence base; these topics are discussed at greater length elsewhere in the report.

With regard to the police, the author of the MVUK 2007 submission repeatedly refers to a lack of trust, making inferences on the basis of a limited number of quotes from respondents such as:

“The Anti-Terror Laws are already being abused and misused by the police.”

MVUK, (p22)

“Allowing the police to have more powers amounts to a total trust in them, which I do not believe they merit.”

MVUK, (p28)

Despite the weakness of the MVUK assertions, in principle, the findings are supported by a study with a stronger methodological design,[3] which also documents a lack of trust in the police, particularly among Black males, although these findings are often in reference to wider criminal legislation (i.e. not CT specific).
In terms of impact, this can lead to a lack of confidence towards the police to treat British Muslims fairly.[7] MVUK note that negative perceptions arising from the implementation of CT legislation can result in reluctance for Muslims to accept CT proposals despite them appearing reasonable.[2] If this can be substantiated, it could mean that a negative perception of the police, at implementation level, has significant potential to impact on the success and efforts of UK Government proposals.

Quotes were also provided to demonstrate feelings towards Government, such as fear and isolation, in the MVUK submission:

“As a Muslim who has never committed any sort of crime in her life, let alone terrorism related, I actually feel victimised, isolated and scared of a Government which is meant to not only represent me but also protect me.”
MVUK, (p33)

“I think the policies of this Government are to attack Islam as their new enemy.”
MVUK, (p21)

Some strong evidence suggested Muslim and other Minority Ethnic participants thought the Government was doing little to tackle Islamophobia and far-right parties like the British National Party which resulted in Muslim communities feeling isolated and vulnerable.[4]

In terms of impact, these perceptions can create scepticism amongst UK communities.

“The estimates of the security services were rarely seen as credible, and people mentioned the failure to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq as evidence of poor quality intelligence.”
CTMT, (p44)

Qualitative research and opinion polls have demonstrated perceptions that the Government had exaggerated the threats of terrorism26 in order to justify hostile domestic policies towards Muslims.[4] This means that significant pockets of the population distrust the messages that the Government are presenting. For instance, many UK Muslims said they distrusted the UK media; especially the press coverage as they felt the UK media presents the Government’s view.[4] Further evidence of distrust in Government was reported in relation to official statistics of terrorist convictions and confessions. The publication of such statistics appears not to have had a positive impact on perceptions. Instead, views can become even more negative with certain respondents suggesting that, ‘those convicted might have been pressurised to confess, or even tortured.’[8]

26 YouGov poll for the Spectator, using demographic sample designed to be representative of the UK community, August 2006.
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In a number of opinion polls\(^2\) there is suggestion that the UK population would be more willing to accept CT proposals if the implementation is overseen by a judicial authority. This implies greater confidence in courts and the judicial system than in central Government. For example, a small sample of British Arab Muslims reported a lack of confidence towards the police to treat British Muslims fairly and slightly more confidence in the judicial system to do so.[7] However, the same study, assessed as having a methodologically weak recruitment strategy and small sample size, concluded that CT policies and Government positions are beginning to undermine some British Arab Muslims’ trust in Government and ‘sense of equal protection under law’.[7]

This is supported by evidence with a stronger methodology [3] which found that CT legislation has given rise to perceptions that courts discriminate against Muslims.

> “With all the new powers, the new anti-terror laws, Asians are getting really discriminated against. They’ve had the IRA for years and never measures like now. Suddenly, they’re keeping people in prison without trials. The system is breaking up: there’s one law for everybody and there’s another for this lot!”

CLG, (p90)

> “I have heard stories about the courts from people in the community and also read about it in the papers. Asian people don’t get justice.”

CLG, (p90)

> “The law is harsher on us. It’s all changed after 9/11.”

CLG, (p92)

It should be noted that the evidence presented on the identified theme of confidence in UK authorities is specific to CT legislation. This evidence should be considered in the context of other rigorous research such as the British Crime Survey[12] and the Citizenship Survey[13] Since these reports were concerned with broader legislative, judicial and civic issues and were not specific to CT, they were not included in the REA. However, the findings from these studies do not entirely reflect what has been found in the REA evidence and show that Muslims had relatively high levels of confidence in wider criminological, judicial and civic issues.[12][13] In addition, the Crime in England and Wales 2008/09 Home Office Statistical Bulletin,[11] reported slightly improved confidence, amongst a representative sample of UK population, in overall policing and the Criminal Justice System (CJS).

Sub-question 2: Is there variation in reported impacts across different subsets of UK communities?

Evidence already discussed in this REA supports a distinction in perceptions and attitudes towards the impact of CT legislation between samples representative of the general population and those representative of Muslim communities. In summary, there tends to be support and acceptance of CT measures in samples representative of the general population, whereas those representative of Muslim communities tend to be less supportive and have more negative perceptions about its impact.

Studies that offer the most reliable means to compare the views of general population samples and Muslim samples are those that employ sampling approaches to explicitly capture both populations within the same methodological framework. Few of these types of studies were found for inclusion in the REA: two qualitative studies[4][6] and one opinion poll. The remaining studies and opinion polls used samples that were representative of either the UK general population or the Muslim sub-population. Whilst the results of these studies can be compared superficially, a detailed comparison is not possible as bias may have been introduced into the respective studies (for example, due to question phraseology, interviewer bias or priming).

The REA evidence base provides some possible explanations for the observed differences in perceptions and attitudes of CT legislation between the general population and Muslim populations:

- In some studies, marked differences were observed across samples in terms of actual experience of certain security measures, particularly S44. Male BME groups report having more direct experience of this particular element of the legislation. These experiences appear to be a significant factor in forming negative perceptions.[6][4]

- One study found that ‘White UK respondents and other Minority Ethnic participants were less aware of and engaged with Government anti-terrorism policies’. [4]

- One study suggests that the reason people seem to be willing to accept an impact on civil liberties for counter-terrorism measures, ‘may be because those surveyed thought suspect terrorists were always going to be ‘other people’ so it wouldn’t be their freedom being sacrificed’. [5]

**Sub-question 3: What are the sources of the UK public’s perceptions of the impact of counter-terrorism legislation?**

The sources of people’s perceptions of impact were not systematically reported in all of the research documents. However, the Communities and Local Government report [3] specifically focuses on the drivers of perceptions of racial discrimination by public services. The findings of this comprehensive assessment are useful when considering sources of perception and an excerpt is provided.

---

28 YouGov Sun Survey Results, 4-6th July 2006.
Perceptions of racial discrimination were found to be an outcome of the interaction between “psychosocial” factors, on the one hand, and service-specific factors, on the other.

**Psychosocial drivers of perceptions**
The psychosocial factors which were found to impact on perceptions of discrimination or fairness were the respondents’:

- self-concept;
- view of the world;
- understanding of racial discrimination;
- sensitivity to racial discrimination; and
- sources and types of knowledge.

Respondents who perceived and expected racial discrimination in many public services tended to:

- have a self-concept based on a politicised (racial or religious) social identity;
- assume that the world is not “just” and have a sceptical attitude towards public services;
- have a complex understanding of racial discrimination which combines personal and structural components;
- be sensitive to racial discrimination across various contexts; and
- draw on personal and vicarious experiences, informal and formal knowledge, and the media to elaborate their perceptions.

Respondents who perceived and expected racial discrimination in few or no public services tended to:

- have a self-concept based on a personal identity or a non-politicised social identity;
- assume that the world is “just” and have a trusting attitude towards public services;
- have a limited understanding of racial discrimination focused predominantly on attitudes and behaviours displayed in personal interactions;
- be insensitive to racial discrimination across various contexts; and
- draw mainly on personal and vicarious experiences to elaborate their perceptions.

These psychosocial drivers of perceptions impacted on perceptions of racial discrimination in British society as a whole, in the labour market and in public services.

Excerpt from ‘The drivers of Black and Asian people’s perceptions of racial discrimination by public services: A qualitative study.’ (p7)

More specific references to CT legislation were found. For example, the ‘Understanding perceptions of the terms “Britishness” and Terrorism’ report [4] identifies personal and vicarious experience of CT measures as influential in resulting perceptions.

“Many Muslim participants said they had personal experience of being treated differently by the UK authorities, especially at airports.”

UPBT, (p66)
“Several knew people who had been stopped and searched by the police for apparently no reason.”

UPBT, (p66)

This is echoed in the Communities and Local Government report where perceptions of S44 were based on formal and informal knowledge gleaned from their community and from the media.[3]

In contrast the “Britishness” and Terrorism study reported few Muslims making any reference to their Mosque or prayer circle as influencing their views on terrorism. However, it was assumed that these sources did have some impact on perceptions.[4]

The mention of the media as a source of perceptions was highlighted in a few of the source documents. For example, a few responses highlight where knowledge has been gained from the media which has then affected perception.[2][3][4] There were also comments from the Counter-Terror Message Testing report where some Muslim participants reported greater trust in Islamic media than the British media and that because of this they used Islamic websites and online forums to gather knowledge.[8]

In conclusion, from the limited amount of reference to sources of perception, it appears that personal experience and ‘word-of-mouth’ opinions influence people’s perceptions, as well as associated media coverage.

**Sub-question 4: Does the evidence support a distinction between the existence of counter-terrorism legislation itself, versus the implementation of the legislation?**

This question addresses any emerging distinctions between perceptions directed at the existence of CT legislation (i.e. perception of S44 legislative powers) and the implementation of CT legislation (i.e. perceptions arising from personal or vicarious experience of S44 implementation or how people perceive it is, or could be, implemented).

Research and opinion polls assessed in this REA do contain some evidence which distinguishes between perceptions of impact related to the implementation of CT legislation and the legislation itself. However, this evidence is limited and pertains to just two areas of legislation; S44 and powers at ports. It should be noted that there is a lack of systematic nationwide research on this question and where evidence was found among the included studies in this REA it was not routinely recorded or reported in order to answer this sub-question.

Evidence of perceptions related to the implementation of CT legislation is primarily found in relation to S44. This may be due to the wider reach of this legislation in terms of the number of people who have personal experience of it compared, for example, to control orders which are very limited in number.
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There is evidence\(^{29}\) from the CML research, Public Appetite for Security Measures [6] that the way in which the police conduct the stop and search is a concern. This study finds that ‘the way S44 is conducted is often found contentious’ due to:

- ‘non-random experience’ which is found unfair/unethical;
- lack of understanding/logic as to why being done; and
- manner of personnel found disrespectful and/or intimidating. CML, (slide 105)

Other evidence, assessed as methodologically strong, also reports perceptions of disproportionate use of stop and search. This research found that a number of respondents interpreted this as ‘a symptom of racial stereotyping and of personal and/or institutional discrimination’.\[^3\] However, it should be noted that these comments were in relation to community policing and are not CT (S44) specific.

Perceptions related to implementation rather than the legislation itself were reported in relation to CT powers at ports. A further source of evidence states that, ‘many [Muslims] thought they had been singled out by the police, airport security staff, and said that customs staff treat them like suspected terrorists’[4]

Weaker evidence has also reported ‘resentment amongst Muslims towards the police and Government due to the way existing counter-terrorism legislation has been applied’. This research also notes that ‘there is already much resentment within the Muslim community as many Muslims are already being stopped at ports and questioned for hours because they visibly appear Muslim’.\[^2\]

\(^{29}\) Assessed as having an average methodological strength.
Identified research gaps

There were a number of research gaps identified in the process of conducting the REA. These include:

- **Lack of systematic, scientifically robust, studies capturing evidence of the perceived impacts of CT legislation.** No studies were identified that were both highly relevant and methodologically strong. The evidence base therefore consisted of studies that had either not systematically collected data in relation to the specific question (i.e. not of high relevance), or had methodological issues that limited the amount of trust that could be placed in the results.

  The available evidence indicated that Muslims perceive CT legislation to be unfair, unjust and discriminatory. In addition, some evidence indicates that Muslims think CT legislation could have an impact on willingness to cooperate with the police or wider Government initiatives. However, it was beyond the scope of this REA to examine whether in practice, CT legislation has any such effect or produces behavioural impacts.

- **Insufficient demographic information contained in studies, polls and surveys of the general population.** Many of the included studies, polls and surveys of the general population provided broad statistics relating to opinions and some indications of perceptions and attitudes. However, in most cases the data could not be broken down in a way that would permit comparisons to be made between sub-populations of interest, such as different ethnic or religious groups.

- **Insufficient coverage of research across all UK communities.** The current evidence base is heavily focused on the Muslim sub-set of the UK population. There is a need to capture the perceived impacts of CT legislation across a wider set of communities, in terms of both religious or ethnic groupings and community function (for example, business, finance, tourism and charity communities.) This would provide the means to compare perceptions across different communities and could provide greater insight into the range of possible impacts the legislation has had.

- **Lack of suitably designed research to explore the complex nature of perceptions.** This REA has indicated the presence of a number of inter-related factors and influences on people’s opinions and feelings towards CT legislation and their perceptions of the impacts it has, or could, cause. There is a lack of high-quality research that employs the sophisticated methodologies required to investigate this area beyond a superficial level. For example, if data collection methods were appropriately designed, data analysis could move beyond simple descriptive statistics to inferential statistics that support a more detailed examination of cause and effect.
Summary and conclusions

Research question: What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

Although the REA did identify some high-quality research, these studies were not specifically designed to answer this REA question. Other studies were assessed to have high relevance to the REA question; however, these were of lower quality. This has led to there being insufficient evidence on specific aspects of the legislation to draw conclusions that could lead to actionable outcomes for policy-makers. In addition, the evidence base was heavily focused on either Muslim communities,30 or the general UK population. There was very little research covering other specific UK communities.

Three inter-related themes of perceptions were found within the limited evidence base which are discussed below.

Sub-question 1: What specific themes are present?

Discrimination

- Within the limited evidence base, there was both quantitative and qualitative evidence showing that samples of the Muslim community perceive some aspects of the CT legislation to be unfair, unjust and discriminatory. Negative perceptions were particularly evident regarding the way in which S44 powers have been implemented.

- The evidence shows that elements of the Muslim community generally feel they are being ‘treated differently’ since terrorist events such as 9/11 and 7/7. It is likely that this has not been brought about solely through the introduction of CT legislation.

Civil liberties/human rights

- Opinion polls and surveys seeking to be representative of the UK general population tend to show majority agreement, or support for, certain CT measures even though they may erode civil liberties. However, the evidence shows there to be less support within samples of UK Muslim populations who have stronger negative perceptions of CT legislation and perceived violations of civil liberties and human rights.

30 Much of this evidence was assessed by the REA to be of weak methodological quality. This limits the degree to which findings can be seen as representative of the views of the wider Muslim population.
Confidence in UK authorities

- The evidence base shows that samples of UK Muslims, when discussing CT legislation, articulate a lack of trust in the police and have less confidence that they will be treated fairly; a finding not mirrored in research on wider criminological, judicial and social issues.

- Low confidence and trust towards UK authorities (police, Government and the judiciary), identified in this REA, could have a detrimental effect on the willingness of Muslim communities to accept and support current and future CT legislation.

Sub-question 2: Is there variation in reported impacts across different sub-sets of UK communities?

The evidence base was heavily focused on the Muslim community31 and as reported previously, there was a significant gap in the research coverage of other UK communities. It was therefore difficult to compare this particular community to any other UK community due to lack of research. However, when the perceptions of the Muslim community are compared to the results of general population polls and surveys, a variation is apparent. In summary, there tends to be support and acceptance of CT measures in samples seeking to be representative of the general population, whereas, those seeking to be representative of Muslim communities tend to be less supportive and have more negative perceptions about its impact.

Sub-question 3: What are the sources of the UK public’s perceptions of the impact of counter-terrorism legislation?

The sources of people’s perceptions of impact were not systematically reported in all of the source documents. However, from the limited amount of reference to sources of perception, it appears that personal experience and ‘word-of-mouth’ opinions influence people’s perceptions, as well as associated media coverage.

Sub-question 4: Does the evidence support a distinction between the existence of counter-terrorism legislation itself, versus the implementation of the legislation?

The REA found a limited amount of evidence that directly addressed this question, all of which was derived from the Muslim community. The evidence was almost exclusively related to negative perceptions of the way in which S44 has been implemented by the police. This may be due to the wider reach of this legislation in terms of the number of people who have personal experience of it compared, for example, to control orders which are very limited in number. Evidence related to perceptions of S44 was also found in research related to general crime. This more general literature may provide useful insights that are applicable to the CT application of S44.

31 It should be noted that the search terms used in this REA did not include any words related to ‘Muslims’. See also Appendix 1.
Recommendations

This REA has been carried out to determine the amount and quality of extant empirical research into the UK population’s perceptions of CT legislation as it is acknowledged that the success of legislation is determined, in part, by the perceptions it creates. As noted throughout the REA, there are no existing studies of strong methodological quality which are directly relevant to perceptions of impact. This highlights the need for further research to inform policy design.

In order to elicit evidence that will address the REA question, there is scope for a variety of both qualitative and quantitative follow-on studies, as it is unlikely that one single study will provide the range of evidence required. It is also unlikely that all of the studies would need to be established as newly commissioned research. For example, some of the existing surveys and data collection efforts could be extended in order to capture the data required to inform the REA question. The following recommendations are made in relation to the formation of any programme of work that seeks to elicit evidence on the perceptions of UK communities of the impact of CT legislation.

Scope the question

The REA question (and set of sub-questions) is very broad and has multiple dimensions. The existing evidence base has provided only limited insights and consequently, there is a need to scope the question further prior to further research being undertaken. For example, the set of communities of interest needs to be established, since the nature of the community to be studied may drive the choice of methodology. It is recommended that the perceptions of the Muslim community are studied in further detail in order to establish what factors are driving some members to hold negative perceptions of the impact of CT legislation. Additionally, the definition of ‘impact’ requires refinement, as different methodologies are employed when studying feelings as opposed to behaviours. Behaviours can, to a certain extent, be measured objectively and it is recommended that any programme of research in this area includes a component that seeks to capture ‘behaviour’-based impacts.

Focus the research

There is a need for research that directly addresses the REA question, as opposed to capturing information of relevant perceptions on an opportunistic basis. For this topic area which has attracted public, political and media interest and elicited some emotive responses in certain communities, appropriate methodological approaches need to be employed to reduce potential bias and risk of confusion.
Employ sophisticated designs

Sophisticated methodologies that support the level of data collection required to apply ‘inferential’ statistics are required. The outcome of the scoping phase should inform the design and data collection phases, and should therefore permit variables of interest to be analysed beyond a superficial level.

Sampling and demographics

Assessments of the existing evidence base have identified a number of methodological concerns related to the sampling and recruitment strategies employed by some studies. In order to avoid introducing potential bias into future studies, it is recommended that stratified and/or random sampling methods are adopted.

It is recommended that existing surveys that capture data relevant to the REA question are revised to ensure they capture increased demographic detail related to the respondents. This will permit perceptions to be compared between communities of interest.

Ensure analysis is transparent

Regardless of the study design adopted, it is important that all decisions in design and analysis be documented and a clear audit trail available in order to ensure transparency of the analytical process and conclusions drawn.
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**Acronyms**

ASSIA: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts
BBC: British Broadcasting Corporation
BCS: British Crime Survey
BME: Black Minority Ethnic
BNP: British National Party
BSA: British Social Attitudes
CJS: Criminal Justice System
CLG: Communities and Local Government
CML: Carne Martin Litchfield (CML Market Research)
CSA: Cambridge Scientific Abstracts
CT: Counter Terrorism
CTMT: Counter-Terror Message Testing
DSTL: Defence Science Technology Laboratory
EconLit: Economic Literature
EHRC: Equality and Human Rights Commission
EET: Evidence Extraction Table
EPPI-Centre: The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre
GSR: Government Social Research
HOC: Home Office Consultation
IBSS: International Bibliography of the Social Sciences
ISI: Institute for Scientific Information
MVUK: Muslim Voice UK
NCJRS: National Crime Justice Reference Service
OGD: Other Government Department
OSCT: Office of Security and Counter Terrorism
PACE: Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984
QAT: Quality Assessment Tool
REA: Rapid Evidence Assessment
RICU: Research, Information and Communications Unit
S44: Section 44
UK: United Kingdom
UPBT: Understanding Perceptions of the terms ‘Britishness’ and ‘Terrorism’
WoE: Weight of evidence
WoK: Web of Knowledge
Glossary

Communities
A group of people who live in the same area, or the area in which they live, or a group of people with a common background or with shared interests within society.

Counter-terrorism legislation
Law or laws passed by the UK Parliament to address counter-terrorist threats. For this REA the legislation of interest is the Terrorism Act 2000, the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, the Terrorism Act 2006 and the Counter-Terrorism Bill 2008.

Grey literature
Unpublished studies or work in progress.

Inclusion criteria
Study specific criteria which research included in the study must meet.

Perceptions
An attitude or understanding based on what is observed or thought.

Primary study
A piece of research that produces original data in order to answer a specific question.

Quality Assessment Tool (QAT)
An assessment framework to ensure methodological quality specific to the REA question, developed from Home Office guidance.

Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA)
A review of evidence that follows principles of a systematic review with concessions made in order to complete reviews in shorter timescales.

Systematic review
Reviewers systematically identify all relevant primary studies which are then systematically appraised and summarised according to an explicit and reproducible methodology.

UK
The United Kingdom, formed by the union of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
Appendix 1: Search strategy

Literature searches were carried out by a DSTL Knowledge Agent on the Web of Knowledge (WoK), Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (CSA) and International Bibliography of Social Sciences (IBSS) databases using the criteria below.

Web of Knowledge

WoK was searched for results published between 01/01/2000 and 31/08/2009; patent records were removed.

Databases included:

- Web of Science (with Conference Proceedings)
- Current Contents Connect
- Derwent Innovations Index
- BIOSIS Previews
- CABI: CAB Abstracts
- Inspec
- MEDLINE
- Journal Citation reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search string</th>
<th>Date searched</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 (act OR acts) AND (civil liberty OR civil liberties)</td>
<td>07/09/2009</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 AND (S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6)</td>
<td>07/09/2009</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>07/09/2009</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S3. (“alienate” OR “alienating” OR “alienation” OR “attitude of the public” OR “attitudes of the public” OR “british community” OR “british communities” OR “british society” OR “british societies” OR “welsh community” OR “welsh communities” OR “welsh society” OR “welsh societies” OR “scottish community” OR “scottish communities” OR “scottish society” OR “scottish societies” OR “northern irish community” OR “northern irish communities” OR “northern irish society” OR “northern irish societies” OR “communities perspective” OR “communities perspectives” OR “community impact” OR “community impacts” OR “community perspective” OR “community perspectives” OR “community view” OR “community views” OR “community voice” OR “community’s perspective” OR “community’s perspectives” OR “estranged” OR “estrangement” OR “expectation of society” OR “expectation of the community” OR “expectation of the public” OR “expectation of the societies” OR “expectation of the society” OR “expectations of societies” OR “expectations of the community” OR “expectations of the public”)

S4. (“expectations of the societies” OR “expectations of the society” OR “impact on communities” OR “impact on community” OR “impact on public” OR “impact on society” OR “impact on the community” OR “impact on the public” OR “impacts on society” OR “people’s expectation” OR “people’s expectations” OR “people’s opinion” OR “people’s opinions” OR “people’s perception” OR “people’s perceptions” OR “people’s views” OR “people’s views” OR “peoples expectation” OR “peoples expectations” OR “peoples opinion” OR “peoples opinions” OR “peoples perception” OR “peoples perceptions” OR “peoples view” OR “peoples views” OR “perceived by the public” OR “perceptions of the public” OR “public attitude” OR “public attitudes” OR “public impact” OR “public impacts” OR “public opinion” OR “public opinions” OR “public perception” OR “public perceptions” OR “public perspective” OR “public perspectives”)

S5. (“public view” OR “public views” OR “public’s opinion” OR “public’s opinions” OR “public’s perception” OR “public’s perceptions” OR “public’s perspectives” OR “public’s view” OR “public’s views” OR “societies perspective” OR “societies perspectives” OR “societies view” OR “societies views” OR “society perspective” OR “society perspectives” OR “society view” OR “society views” OR “society’s perspective” OR “society’s perspectives” OR “society’s view” OR “society’s views” OR “voice of the community”)

S6. Britain OR British OR UK OR “United Kingdom” OR Britishness OR welsh OR wales OR Scotland OR Scottish OR scot OR scots OR English OR England OR “Northern Ireland” OR ((Ireland OR irish) NOT (southern OR republic))

S7. Terrorism AND Communit*

Cambridge Scientific Abstracts

CSA was searched for results published between 01/01/2000 and 31/08/2009.
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Databases included:

- ASSIA
- Criminal Justice Abstracts
- EconLit
- ERIC
- National Criminal Justice Reference Service Abstracts
- PAIS International
- PsycINFO
- Social Services Abstracts
- Sociological Abstracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search string</th>
<th>Date searched</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>14/09/2009</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>14/09/2009</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>14/09/2009</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,866</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S1. (act OR acts) AND ("civil liberty" OR "civil liberties")

S2. ("terrorism act" OR "terrorism bill" OR "terrorism bills" OR "counter terrorism act" OR "counter terrorism bill" OR "counterterrorism act" OR "counterterrorism bill" OR "terrorism law" OR "terrorism laws" OR "counterterrorism law" OR "counterterrorism laws" OR "counter terrorism law" OR "counter terrorism laws" OR "anti-terror law" OR "anti-terror laws" OR "antiterror law" OR "antiterror laws" OR "antiterror legislation" OR "anti-terror bill" OR "anti-terror act" OR "anti-terrorism legislation" OR "anti terror law" OR "anti-terror legislation" OR "anti terror laws" OR "anti terror bill" OR "anti terror act" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "terrorism legislation" OR "CT legislation" OR "counterterrorism legislation" OR "counter terrorism legislation" OR "stop and search" OR "section 44" OR "S44")

S2A. This search string was used in addition to S2. (TI=("terrorism act" OR "terrorism bill" OR "terrorism bills" OR "counter terrorism act" OR "counter terrorism bill" OR "counterterrorism act" OR "counterterrorism bill" OR "terrorism law" OR "terrorism laws" OR "counterterrorism law" OR "counterterrorism laws" OR "counter terrorism law" OR "counter terrorism laws" OR "anti-terror law" OR "anti-terror laws" OR "antiterror law" OR "antiterror laws" OR "antiterror legislation" OR "anti-terror bill" OR "anti-terror act" OR "anti-terrorism legislation" OR "anti terror law" OR "anti-terror legislation" OR "anti terror laws" OR "anti terror bill" OR "anti terror act" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "terrorism legislation" OR "CT legislation" OR "counterterrorism legislation" OR "counter terrorism legislation" OR "stop and search" OR "section 44" OR "S44")) or (AB=("terrorism act" OR "terrorism bill" OR "terrorism bills" OR "counter terrorism act" OR "counter terrorism bill" OR "counterterrorism act" OR "counterterrorism bill" OR "terrorism law" OR "terrorism laws" OR "counterterrorism law" OR "counterterrorism laws" OR "counter terrorism law" OR "counter terrorism laws" OR "anti-terror law" OR "anti-terror laws" OR "antiterror law" OR "antiterror laws" OR "antiterror legislation" OR "anti-terror bill" OR "anti-terror act" OR "anti-terrorism legislation" OR "anti terror law" OR "anti-terror legislation" OR "anti terror laws" OR "anti terror bill" OR "anti terror act" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "anti terrorism legislation" OR "terrorism legislation" OR "CT legislation" OR "counterterrorism legislation" OR "counter terrorism legislation" OR "stop and search" OR "section 44" OR "S44"))
law” OR “counterterrorism laws” OR “counter terrorism law” OR “counter terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror law” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “antiterror law” OR “antiterror laws” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror laws” OR “anti terror bill” OR “anti terror act” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “terrorism legislation” OR “CT legislation” OR “counterterrorism legislation” OR “counter terrorism legislation” OR “stop and search” OR “section 44” OR “S44”)) or (KW=(“terrorism act” OR “terrorism bill” OR “terrorism bills” OR “counter terrorism act” OR “counter terrorism bill” OR “counterterrorism act” OR “counterterrorism bill” OR “terrorism law” OR “terrorism laws” OR “counterterrorism law” OR “counterterrorism laws” OR “counter terrorism law” OR “counter terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror law” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “antiterror law” OR “antiterror laws” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti terror bills” OR “anti terror act” OR “anti terrorism law” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “anti terror act” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terrorism laws” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “terrorism legislation” OR “CT legislation” OR “counterterrorism legislation” OR “counter terrorism legislation” OR “stop and search” OR “section 44” OR “S44”)) or (DE=(“terrorism act” OR “terrorism bill” OR “terrorism bills” OR “counter terrorism act” OR “counter terrorism bill” OR “counterterrorism act” OR “counterterrorism bill” OR “terrorism law” OR “terrorism laws” OR “counterterrorism law” OR “counterterrorism laws” OR “counter terrorism law” OR “counter terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror law” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “antiterror law” OR “antiterror laws” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “terrorism legislation” OR “CT legislation” OR “counterterrorism legislation” OR “counter terrorism legislation” OR “stop and search” OR “section 44” OR “S44”))

S3. Terrorism AND Communit*

### International Bibliography of Social Sciences

All text fields (TX) of IBSS were searched for reports published between 01/01/2000 and 31/08/2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search string</th>
<th>Date searched</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4</td>
<td>04/09/2009</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S1. (act OR acts) AND (“civil liberty” OR “civil liberties”)

S2. (“terrorism act” OR “terrorism bill” OR “terrorism bills” OR “counter terrorism act” OR “counter terrorism bill” OR “counterterrorism act” OR “counterterrorism bill” OR “terrorism law” OR “terrorism laws” OR “counterterrorism law” OR “counterterrorism laws” OR “counter terrorism law” OR “counter terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror law” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “antiterror law” OR “antiterror laws” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror laws” OR “anti terror bill” OR “anti terror act” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “terrorism legislation” OR “CT legislation” OR “counterterrorism legislation” OR “counter terrorism legislation” OR “stop and search” OR “section 44” OR “S44”))
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of Counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

laws” OR “counter terrorism law” OR “counter terrorism laws” OR “anti-terror law” OR “anti-terror laws” OR “antiterror law” OR “antiterror laws” OR “antiterror legislation” OR “anti-terror bill” OR “anti-terror act” OR “anti-terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror law” OR “anti-terror legislation” OR “anti terror laws” OR “anti terror bill” OR “anti terror act” OR “anti terrorism legislation” OR “anti terror legislation” OR “terrorism legislation” OR “CT legislation” OR “counterterrorism legislation” OR “counter terrorism legislation” OR “stop and search” OR “section 44” OR S44)

S3. Terrorism AND Communit*

S4. (counterterror* OR antiterror* OR “anti terror” OR “anti-terror”) AND (policy OR policies OR agenda OR governance*)

World Wide Web

Searches were made of the World Wide Web using Google Search engine with dates restricted to 01/01/2000 to 31/08/2009 with results in English using the following search string:

allintext: Terror perception | opinion | attitude | impact survey | poll | research UK | Britain | British | legislation OR act OR power OR powers OR Bill “united kingdom” filetype:pdf

762 results were returned until the Google message: In order to show you the most relevant results, we have omitted some entries very similar to the 762 already displayed.

Opinion polls

Quantitative opinion polls were sourced from the following companies:

GfK NOP http://www.gfknop.com/customresearch-uk
GfK NOP Social Research carries out opinion polling on topics including general election polling, by-elections, exit polls and surveys measuring public opinion on issues of the day.

ICM http://www.icmresearch.co.uk
ICM Polling carries out focus groups and polls using its omnibus service and its multinational polls, to explore what voters really think about the issues of the day.

Ipsos MORI http://www.ipsos-mori.com
Ipsos MORI carries out qualitative and participative research on public-sector issues to help policy and decision makers understand what works.
ComRes  
http://www.comres.co.uk  
ComRes are a polling and research consultancy and carry out social research for the public sector.

Populus  
http://www.populuslimited.com  
Populus carries out opinion polling using a variety of techniques in order to provide its clients with usable knowledge and informed insight on social research topics.

YouGov  
http://www.yougov.co.uk  
YouGov carries out opinion polling on behalf of a wide range of clients from media, to academics, to companies, to not-for-profit organisations. It aims to provide accurate and high-quality research and provides YouGov panel members the chance to voice their opinions on a wide range of topics.

The following potentially relevant results were found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICM</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULUS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouGov</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsos MORI</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GfKNOP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComRes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Appendix 2: Quality Assessment Tool (QAT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REA Ref No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Screening questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it in a UK setting/UK population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted between 01/01/2000 and 31/08/2009?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it a primary study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it relevant to the REA question?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Filtering questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research? Is it related to the REA topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? Does the research set out to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detailed questions (Scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the reasons for the particular elements of the design been discussed and justified? Especially choice of data collection methods (interviews, focus groups, diaries, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the researcher explained how the participants were selected and recruited?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the researchers explained why the participants included were the most appropriate to provide information sought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were there any issues with recruitment? – e.g. response rate/ineligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 Only the rows 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7a and 8a (coloured blue) were scored. The sub-questions (coloured grey) were used by the study team as prompts in order to inform the score given to each main question.
### Detailed questions (Scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a Data collection</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the setting for the data collection justified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the form of data clearly specified? (tape, notes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a description of the method of data collection (e.g. in interviews, was topic guide used etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have they justified methods chosen? (for example why audio taping, why notes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is saturation of data discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If methods were modified during the study, has it been explained how and why? (if methods were not modified score 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a Reflexivity (research partnership relations/recognition of researcher bias)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the researcher critically examined their role, potential bias and influence during: – formulation of research questions – data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a Data analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a reasonably full description of analysis process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If thematic analysis used, is it clear how themes were developed from the data? (score 2 if thematic analysis not used)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it clear how the data presented were selected from the sample? (e.g. selection of quotes used)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is sufficient data presented to support the findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What extent is contradictory data taken into account/discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the researcher examine own role, potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Detailed questions (Scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed questions (Scored)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Detailed questions (Not Scored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed questions (Not Scored)</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a Ethical issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weight of Evidence questions (WoE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight of Evidence questions (WoE)</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.13 Weight of Evidence A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High/Medium/Low trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.14 Weight of Evidence B:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High/Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.15 Weight of Evidence C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High/Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.16 Weight of Evidence D:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High/Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distribution of Quality Assessment and relevance ratings for the research studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WoE-C (relevance)</th>
<th>QAT Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-MED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- x Included in the final REA selection.
- x Excluded from the REA at QAT stage (after reassessment due to borderline rating).
- x Excluded from the REA at QAT stage.

### No. studies included in the final REA selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High relevance/strong QAT</td>
<td>Medium to high relevance/average to strong QAT</td>
<td>Low relevance/strong QAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excluded from the REA at QAT stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low to high relevance/weak to average QAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Data extraction table for included studies – Evidence Extraction Table (EET)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REA Ref</th>
<th>Internal Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Name of assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the study</td>
<td>What key questions were addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study methodology</td>
<td>Qualitative/Quantitative, specific method used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Number of participants who took part?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling strategy – payment? How recruited etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographics? Consider age, sex, ethnicity, religious belief, geographical location/spread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect of CT legislation addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it focus on the legislation itself, or implementation of the legislation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE - what impacts are reported, and at what levels?</td>
<td>Individuals – identity, feelings of safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community – cohesion, trust, alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other – family, small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the evidence based on affect, beliefs, behaviours, other?</td>
<td>Affect 1) Affective: what a person feels about the attitude object; how favourably or unfavourably it is evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition 2) Cognitive: what a person believes the attitude object is like, objectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour 3) Behavioural: how a person actually responds, or intends to respond, to the attitude object based on 1) and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the sources of the participants’ knowledge/attitudes?</td>
<td>E.g. media, direct experiences, community-based knowledge, formal knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Conclusion/Discussion</td>
<td>Personal view of what this means for the REA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAT score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoE relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoE overall grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Included studies

Methodologically Strong Studies

| Title: British Social Attitudes Survey 2007. Civil liberties and the challenge of terrorism |
| Authors: Mark Johnson and Conor Gearty |
| Date: Fieldwork: June to September 2005 |
| Publication: The results are reported in the British Social Attitudes Survey 2007 |
| Aim: Analysis focuses on three main areas: 1) changes in general attitudes to civil liberties that have occurred over the past 20 years; 2) how those views are affected by the specific mention of the threat of terrorism, and to what extent the public are willing to ‘trade-off’ various civil liberties to tackle that threat; 3) attitudes to human rights and international law, examining whether fear of terrorism influences attitudes to these inherently progressive ideas. |
| Approach: Self-report questionnaires (with trained interviewer assistance). The entire survey used a stratified/random sample of 860 or 1,058 depending on the question, representative of the UK population. Some results are split by age, party identification, and newspaper readership. |
| Main findings: Key findings included: There has been a marked decline in societal commitment to civil liberties over the last 20–25 years, and this cannot be fully explained away by age, party affiliation or education. The extent to which this decline has been influenced by a growing fear of terrorist attack is difficult to gauge accurately in the absence of figures from earlier surveys. The general public is generally less convinced about civil liberties than they were 20–25 years ago. This trend long pre-dates September 11th and 7/7. However, these events play a role in current attitudes: even where civil liberties ideals persist, the very mention of something being a counter-terrorism measure makes people more willing to contemplate giving up their freedoms. |
| Relevance: Medium |

| Title: Understanding perceptions of the terms ‘Britishness’ and ‘Terrorism’ (Audience insight associative networks) |
| Authors: Synovate and Aevolve (RICU) |
| Date: Fieldwork: October to November 2008 |
| Pending publication |
| Aim: The aim was to obtain audience-led insights into the views of the British population including specific Muslim audiences, the White UK population, and other Minority Ethnic communities on the topics of Britishness and terrorism. |
| Approach: A qualitative approach was adopted consisting of 45 group discussions with citizens and in-depth interviews with 16 community leaders. A purposive recruitment strategy was employed to ensure the correct sample structure was achieved. Sampling controlled for sex, age, faith and ethnicity, socio-economic group, citizenship and level of observance. This detailed sample segmentation |
allowed exploration of differences in responses. The associative networks technique was used to explore participants’ perspectives on two themes of interest: Britishness and terrorism. The technique aimed to elicit participants’ spontaneous associations with the term ‘Britishness’ and identify the relative strength of each association with the term.

Main findings: The findings with relevance to this REA came predominantly from the associative network analysis on terrorism. This highlighted some specific discussion related to the 42-day detention proposal and also stop and search policies. The report identified some of the key differences when comparing the views of Muslim communities and other sectors of the UK population, concluding that faith and ethnicity had the biggest impact on views and experience.

Relevance: Medium

Title: The Drivers of Black and Asian people’s perceptions of racial discrimination by public services. A qualitative study

Author: Communities and Local Government
Date: Fieldwork: April to June 2006
Publication: January 2008

Aim: To identify what perceptions were, and how improvements can be made, to reduce perception of racial discrimination towards public services. Of particular interest to this REA were discussions of terrorism and what the ‘community’ thinks.

Approach: A qualitative study, using individual in-depth interviews incorporating the use of vignettes of ambiguous scenarios. Each interviewee was presented with three scenarios in which a Black or Asian person is in contact with public services. The scenarios were designed specifically to be ambiguous with respect to racial discrimination, so that respondents’ reactions could be taken as a measure of their understanding of and sensitivity to racial discrimination. Interviewees were then asked to discuss in detail their expectations of fairness or racial discrimination in public services, in the labour market and in wider society. One-hundred-and-twenty participants took part. Respondents were selected from a database of Black and Asian people who had taken part in the 2005 Citizenship Survey and had agreed to be re-contacted for research purposes. Respondents were selected to ensure that there was a spread of people in the following categories: Black and Asian ethnic groups, aged under 35, both sexes, higher and lower socio-economic group, different regional groupings, including a group living in areas of low Minority Ethnic population.

Main findings: The paper includes some sections which provide people’s perspectives of wider legislation with findings such as the rising anti-Muslim sentiments, disproportionality of stop and search procedures and worries about ethnic profiling amongst police. Relevant to this REA the report states that one issue, the anti-terrorism legislation, conveyed to some Muslim respondents the sense that the courts were structurally discriminating against them. There are quotes which evidence perceived injustice and make parallels between Islamic extremism and the IRA. The conclusion presented is that anti-terror legislation brought in to combat terrorism is perceived to be discriminatory against Muslims.

Relevance: Medium
Title: Counter-Terror Message Testing
Author: Turnstone Research and Consultancy (RICU)
Date: Fieldwork: February 2007
Aim: The research was conducted to explore reactions to counter-terror messages developed by the Research, Information and Communications Unit (RICU).
Approach: A qualitative approach was adopted, utilising 11 focus groups and ten in-depth interviews among British Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Somali people. The sample was controlled for age, sex, social background, geographic location, level of interest in news and current affairs and attitude towards Government.
Main findings: The research elicited some comments in relation to stop and search and pre-charge detention. Overall, the findings suggest that compared to previous research, there was a feeling that the manner in which terrorism and extremism were being dealt with in the media, and spoken about by the Government, had “calmed down”. Some had noticed a change in the tone of Government communications, in that terrorism was less often specifically linked with Islam, and that terms such as “fanatics” or “Muslim terrorists” were less commonly used.

Relevance: Medium

Methodologically Average Studies

Title: Public Appetite for Security Measures Strategic Research (PowerPoint Briefing)
Author: CML Market Research
Date: Fieldwork: November 2008
Aim: The main aim of the research was to understand public attitudes towards security measures, both generally, and with particular reference to the 2012 Olympics.
Approach: The study was conducted in three phases: 1) Twelve two-hour focus groups with the general public 2) Twenty 15-minute ‘street-grabs’ with foreign tourists to London 3) Two two-hour interactive workshops with the general public. In addition, 20 five-minute vox pops were conducted with the general public outside football matches and museums (and outside a tube station). The focus group samples were controlled to a certain extent for ethnic background (there were general public samples and BME samples). Samples were also split by age, life stage, socio-economic status and geographical region.
Main findings: The study found that overall, there is broad acceptance of security measures within the public domain, with most believing that generally, the benefit of feeling protected outweighs any inconvenience that may be caused. However, the security measures employed should match the level of risk implied by the

33 Not commissioned by Home Office Research Development and Statistics.
situation and overall, if measures are to be supported. Of particular relevance to this REA was discussion surrounding views and experiences of stop and search procedures. This was found to be particularly controversial among male BME audiences. Their main contention was not necessarily with the measure itself, but with the way it is implemented.

**Relevance:** High

### Methodologically Weak Studies

**Title:** Summary of Responses to the Counter-Terrorism Bill Consultation  
**Author:** Home Office  
**Date:** Fieldwork: Unknown  
**Publication:** December 2007

**Aim:** This document summarises the responses to the consultation papers ‘Possible Measures for Inclusion in a Future Counter-Terrorism Bill’ and ‘Options for Pre-Charge Detention in Terrorist Cases’, which were published on 25 July 2007.

**Approach:** Researchers wrote to over 100 organisations asking for comments on the proposals. In addition they held five regional seminars across the country which were attended by a number of organisations including community groups, civil liberty groups, law organisations and the police. The total number of responses to the consultation was 71. Of these, 35 were from organisations and 36 were written responses from individuals.

**Main findings:** The main conclusions of the consultation were that pre-charge detention is a controversial issue and the majority of the responses which were received did not support an outright extension to the current 28-day limit.

**Relevance:** High

**Title:** Submission on the proposed anti-terror laws  
**Author:** Muslim Voice UK (MVUK)  
**Date:** Fieldwork: September to October 2007  
**Publication:** October 2007

**Aim:** To provide a response to the counter-terrorism proposals (October 2007) by MVUK. The main focus of MVUK’s submission is on the pre-charge detention time, retention of DNA profiles and seizure of travel documents at ports. However, the submission does include a response on some of the other anti-terror law proposals. Other specific questions covered the following areas of legislation: Post-Charge Sentencing, Enhanced Prison Sentences, Notification Requirements for Convicted Terrorists, Control Orders, Seizure of Terrorist Assets.

**Approach:** A qualitative method using quantitative descriptors was adopted, consisting of interviews with 184 members of MVUK. MVUK only surveys its own members (who have registered to participate). Participants were chosen from diverse ethnic backgrounds and ages. Information about the age, sex, ethnicity, geographic area and social class of the participants is provided.
Main findings: This submission captures some very specific perceptions and attitudes towards proposed and existing counter-terrorism legislation. The author accepts that some measures need to be taken to curb terrorist activity; she concludes that the measures proposed are not proportionate and will be counterproductive. She states that the extent of mistrust is reflected in the reluctance of some Muslims to accept those counter-terrorism proposals that appear reasonable such as post-charge questioning, retention of DNA of convicted terrorists, a register of a convicted terrorists and extended prison sentences for non-terrorist crime linked to terrorism. It is noted that there is also a perception that ‘human rights and civil liberties of Muslims are unimportant to the Government.’ Should these proposals become law, it is argued that that effect will be to further damage the already fragile relationship with the Muslim community.

Relevance: High

Title: British Arab Muslims and the War on Terror: Perceptions of Citizenship, Identity and Human Rights

Author: Layla El-Wafi
Date: Fieldwork: 2006
Publication: Unknown

Aim: The aim of the research was to focus on British Arab Muslims (as the author believes they are an under-researched sub-set). It gauges their perceptions on citizenship, ‘Britishness’ and confidence in the legal justice system towards them in the context of the ‘war on terror’. The Government’s three approaches to the ‘war on terror’ are addressed: Foreign policy decisions (notably the war on Afghanistan and Iraq), domestic anti-terrorism legislation and policing practices and finally social policies and initiatives aimed primarily at integrating Muslims to combat extremism.

Approach: The research used semi-structured face-to-face interviews, although some responses were gathered via email communication. Any email replies were followed up with telephone or personal contact to clarify or develop responses. The sample size was small at only 18, consisting of British Arab Muslims living in London. Participants were recruited through the author’s network and from further contacts within that group of people.

Main findings: The overall conclusion was that participants have received the Government’s three-pronged approach to the ‘war on terror’ with anger, scepticism and anxiety. The author goes on to discuss the knock-on impact that this has had on participants, such as an undermining of trust in the Government and sense of equal protection under law. Some participants felt that Muslims were being targeted, and that sensationalist media reporting potentially stirs up public hysteria and Islamophobia.

Relevance: Medium
What perceptions do the UK public have concerning the impact of Counter-terrorism legislation implemented since 2000?

**Opinion Polls**

Opinion polls and surveys were assessed with slightly different criteria to studies. The QAT methodology questions were applied but were only scored against the first four questions due to the presentational nature of the data.

The study team appraised all polling companies as providing methodologically suitable results; however, there were some differences in quality in relation to sample size, recruitment strategy and the quality of questions used. It was therefore necessary to use the WoE relevance question as the final inclusion/exclusion criteria. All polls selected for inclusion in the REA were evaluated as either High or Medium relevance. Those with low relevance were excluded.

It should be noted that there was an increase in CT relevant polls immediately following the London terrorist attacks in July 07. This may create bias in the results presented and should be considered when reading the findings.

**High Relevance Polls**

**Poll Title:** Channel 4 News Survey on Muslim opinions of 7/7 bombings  
**Company:** GfK NOP  
**Date:** 2–19 April 2007  
**Topic:** Muslim opinion of London terrorist attacks, CT proposals, life in Britain and opinions towards authorities.  
**Sample:** 500 participants. No detailed demographics presented.

**Poll Title:** Tony Blair Survey  
**Company:** ICM  
**Date:** 10 November 2005  
**Topic:** Public opinion on current politics and Government proposals.  
**Sample:** 511 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.

**Poll Title:** Attitudes of British Muslims  
**Company:** Ipsos MORI  
**Date:** 2 –22 July 2005  
**Topic:** Muslim attitudes towards being British and reactions to the London terrorist attacks.  
**Sample:** 282 interviews carried out on the street across ten local authority areas in the UK.

**Poll Title:** Muslim Poll  
**Company:** POPULUS  
**Date:** 1–13 June 2006  
**Topic:** Muslim experiences and opinions towards living in the UK.  
**Sample:** 1131 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age and region.

34 Questions 3a, 4a, 5a and 6a in Appendix 2.
Poll Title: BBC Daily Politics Show Poll  
Company: POPULUS  
Date: 25–26 July 2007  
Topic: Public attitudes and opinions on a range of political activities and Government proposals.  
Sample: 1,007 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class and region.

Poll Title: Daily Telegraph Survey Results (control orders)  
Company: YouGov  
Date: 24–25 February 2005  
Topic: Public opinion on control orders.  
Sample: 1,970 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.

Poll Title: Liberty Survey Results  
Company: YouGov  
Date: 25–27 March 2008  
Topic: CT legislation including specific mentions of pre-charge detention.  
Sample: 1,926 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.

Medium Relevance Polls

Poll Title: Daily Telegraph Survey Results  
Company: YouGov  
Date: 8 July 2005  
Topic: Questions concentrate on the Government’s response to the 7/7 terrorist attacks and potential CT responses.  
Sample: 1,854 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.

Poll Title: Guardian Opinion Poll  
Company: ICM  
Date: 12–14 August 2005  
Topic: Public opinion on proposed CT legislation and opinions towards current practices.  
Sample: 1,006 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class, voting intention and region.

Poll Title: BBC Daily Politics Show Poll  
Company: POPULUS  
Date: 6–7 June 2007  
Topic: Public opinion on proposed CT legislation and opinions towards current practices.  
Sample: 1,002 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Surveillance Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>ICM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12–14 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Public attitudes and opinions towards potential surveillance measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>1,002 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class and region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Sun Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>YouGov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>4–6 July 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Feelings and opinions on the threat of terrorism and CT interventions one year after the London terrorist attacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>310 Muslims and 1,632 non-Muslims resident in the UK.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Sky News</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>YouGov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>4–5 November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Threats of terrorism and potential proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>2,014 participants. No demographic data presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Mirror and GMTV Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>YouGov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>22 and 24 July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Survey of opinions following London terrorist attacks and proposed methods for protecting the UK against terrorism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>1,671 participants. No demographic data presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Times Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>POPULUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>6–8 June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Public opinion on Government proposals, with particular mention of 42-day detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>753 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class, voting intention and region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>State of the Nation Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>ICM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>26 May–4 June 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Public opinion on democracy in Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Title:</th>
<th>Terrorist Bombings and The Olympics Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
<td>POPULUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>8–10 July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Public opinion and responses to the London terrorist attacks and potential CT measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>1,005 participants weighted to be representative of the UK population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Spectator Survey

**Company:** YouGov  
**Date:** 14–15 August 2006  
**Topic:** Public opinion on terrorism, safety and security.  
**Sample:** 1,696 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class and region.

### BBC Terrorism Survey

**Company:** ICM  
**Date:** 23 –25 April 2004  
**Topic:** Public opinion on CT measures.  
**Sample:** 510 participants. Demographics are split by sex, age, social class and region.