

Mobilizing Political Engagement and Participation in Diverse Societies:
The Impact of Institutional Arrangements

Susan A. Banducci and Jeffrey A. Karp
University of Exeter
November 2007

Abstract: The process of democratization in an increasing number of diverse societies has focused attention on how best to devise electoral systems (as well as other institutions) in order to manage ethnic conflict. Institutional arrangements that allow for power-sharing between groups or arrangements that encourage political actors to appeal to those outside their groups are thought to increase legitimacy and reduce (or channel) conflict. We investigate which electoral and institutional arrangements influence political support and engagement across 33 ethnically diverse countries. Contrary to what we might expect from consociational accounts, we find that single member plurality electoral systems tend to reduce differences between ethnic minorities and non-minorities in terms of political engagement. When access to political power is limited, there is some evidence that differences are exaggerated while special accommodation tend to increase differences in participation but minimize difference in government support. We discuss these findings in light of other research on institutional arrangements and political engagement of ethnic groups.

Note: Authorship is equal. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, August 31-September 4, 2005.

Introduction

Calls for group or descriptive representation are based on several different arguments. First, under-representation of minority groups may occur from discriminatory practices and enhancing or assuring group representation is one way of overcoming this systematic discrimination. If people belonging to a minority community express preferences as members of that community, electoral arrangements ought not to prevent these interests from being expressed (Kymlicka 1995). Second, representation of minority interests is assumed to influence policy outcomes. While Pitkin (1967) questions the effectiveness of descriptive representation, others such as Mansbridge (1999, 2000) suggest that descriptive representation can serve to facilitate communication between representative and the represented and to “crystallize” unexpressed minority interests that may not be on the political agenda. Third, not only may policy consequences be influenced by descriptive representation but the actual behavior and attitudes of minority populations may be positively influenced by being descriptively represented (see, for example, Bobo and Gilliam 1990).

The question of fair minority group representation in democratic societies has taken on greater importance with the dramatic increase in the number of democracies worldwide. Concerns about democratic stability in diverse societies have led some researchers to focus on how institutions can incorporate minority group voices into the policymaking process. For example, Lijphart (1995) argues that institutions designed to share power (with features such as a federal structure, coalition governments and proportional representation) are better at giving voice to minority groups. Special arrangements may also facilitate group representation in parliament for previously

underrepresented groups (Htun 2004). Research in the United States, for example, has focused on the consequences of electoral arrangements or redistricting on the representation of African-Americans and Latinos at the local level (see Lublin and Segura (this volume); Bowler, Donovan and Brockington 2003; Davidson and Grofman 1994).

Another line of research addresses the question of how representation influences the attitudes and behaviors of citizens belonging to minority groups (Banducci, Donovan and Karp 2004; Bobo and Gilliam 1990; Tate 2001) and political participation of minority groups (Barreto, Segura and Woods 2004; Gay 2001; Tate 1991). Much of the research on these latter questions has tended to focus on the representation of Latinos and African-Americans in the U.S. case, while research on the influence of institutional design on democratic stability has taken a comparative approach.

In this paper we bridge these two main areas of research and examine, from a comparative perspective, how institutional arrangements influence political support and behavior among minority populations.¹

Electoral Systems and Ethnic Minority Representation

The debate over the appropriate institutions necessary to promote ethnic representation has been, in part, driven by the question of how best to promote democratic stability in diverse societies. The two sides of the debate disagree over the role of parties and institutions in mobilizing ethnic identities and cooperation among diverse groups. Lijphart (1986, 1995) advocates proportional representation and institutions that promote power sharing. Horowitz (1985, 1993), on the other hand favors

majoritarian electoral arrangements that demand parties make appeals across ethnic lines in order to have electoral success.

According to Lijphart (1986, 1995), consociational democracies, which are characterized by institutions that demand compromise among political parties, minimize conflict and allow diverse groups to exist within the same state. In particular, proportional electoral systems (PR) foster the representation of smaller parties in parliament which is assumed to lead to the representation of minority interests. In turn, representation of ethnic minorities in parliament increases support for the political system among members of these groups. Put another way, part of the consociational account suggests that descriptive representation is an important way of fostering support for the political system.

An important assumption within Lijphart's account is that PR leads to the representation of minority interests through the representation of members of minority groups in parliament. PR is assumed to increase the representation of ethnic minorities because it accommodates smaller parties. Where ethnic cleavages are politically salient, ethnic parties are more likely to emerge when proportional electoral formulas are used (Ordeshook and Shvetsova 1994) and parties will tend to develop around these cleavages (Shugart 1994). In contrast, when single member districts (SMD) exist as in the United States (i.e. when the district magnitude is one), an ethnic minority group that is not geographically concentrated is better off working with one of the major parties in order to win concession rather than forming its own party (Taagepera 1994). Nevertheless ethnic parties can emerge in countries where minority populations are regionally concentrated and vote in a bloc such as in India and Canada (Rae 1971).

One of the understudied aspects in the accounts of electoral systems is the degree to which proportional electoral systems actually facilitate the election of representatives from minority groups.² There is clear evidence that PR enhances the representation of women in national legislatures and Lijphart (1999), Taagepera (1994) and Shugart (1994) use this evidence to generalize to ethnic minorities. However, it is not at all clear that the same mechanisms that increase the representation of women will also enhance the representation of racial and ethnic minorities.³ Perhaps the strongest empirical evidence for the impact of electoral systems on ethnic minority representation is based on a few cases where there have been changes in electoral rules. In the United States, for example, adoption of multi-member districts and cumulative voting (a “halfway point” between SMD and PR) increased the representation of Latino and African-Americans on town and city councils and school boards that had previously used single member districts and plurality rules (Bowler, Donovan and Brockington 2003).⁴ In New Zealand, the adoption of a Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) electoral system enhanced the representation of Maori in parliament beyond proportionality (Banducci and Karp 1998).

Those that advocate majoritarian electoral systems for managing ethnic conflict suggest that using rules that encourage parties to compete for votes across groups will enhance representation through policy responsiveness (Horowitz 1993, Reilly 2001, 2002).⁵ Rather than encouraging the creation of ethnic parties that reconstruct the divisions within society, majoritarian rules require that parties bargain, pool votes and accommodate policy preferences of other groups in order to appeal to a majority (or a minimum winning coalition) of voters. The focus on bargaining and accommodation by all political parties, rather than on the election of ethnic parties and coalition formation,

forces parties and candidates to broaden their appeals to ethnic groups in order to build winning coalitions. Therefore, according to this account, perceived system legitimacy would result from policy responsiveness to ethnic interests rather than from minorities sharing power as in the consociational account.

Outside of the debate over proportional and majoritarian systems, minority representation can also be enhanced by special accommodations. Lijphart (1986) outlines four methods of special ethnic representation: rigid non-geographic ethnic districts, optional ethnic districts, predetermined ethnically mixed slates and special exemptions for ethnic minorities. In a comprehensive review of special accommodations used for ethnic minorities, Htun (2004) outlines statutory policies and political arrangements used to guarantee group representation. Examples of statutory policies include Venezuela and Colombia which each have reserved seats for indigenes and Lebanon which reserves seats for religious minorities. Some countries that use PR have lower thresholds for ethnic minority parties, such as Germany, Poland and Romania (Htun 2004). However in Germany's case, the lower threshold has not lead to greater minority representation at the federal level as the minority parties are not sufficiently viable.⁶ Examples of political arrangements that guarantee representation include Germany, Poland and Romania, which use PR but have lower thresholds for ethnic minority parties Kymlicka (1995, 133-134) has argued that even in Anglo societies where there is a strong tradition of individual rights in representative government (accompanied by the use of single member districts) there are traditions of group representation such as the development of majority-minority districts in the U.S. and self-government for territories such as Puerto Rico.

Some countries, where ethnic cleavages are salient, have adopted special accommodations to assure representation of minority interests in parliament.

However, while guaranteed representation provides for a proportion of seats in the legislative body to be held by members of a minority group, some suggest that it does not necessarily guarantee that minority representatives are accountable to the minority group. Kymlicka (149) suggests that while under-representation may result from discriminatory practices “it does not follow that reversing this exclusion through guaranteed seats ensures that the group’s interests or perspectives are then ‘represented’ (149). It has also been suggested that these special accommodations, rather than enhancing engagement and support, may actually serve to create resentment among the non-minority population and also lead to resentment among the various ethnic groups (Reynolds and Reilly 2002). Those reserved seats may only serve to further marginalize the ethnic minority groups (Htun 2003). For example, in the US, special accommodations can lead to a lack of policy responsiveness; the median voter in the legislature may move away from minority interests when minority interests are concentrated into a few districts (see Lublin and Segura in this volume).

Minority Representation and Political Support

Underlying the arguments about the effects of institutional arrangements on representation is the link between exclusion from the political process and the attitudes and behaviors of ethnic minority groups. It has long been suggested that citizen attitudes about the political system can be linked to either a democracy characterized by stability or by protest, riots and terrorism. One potential cause of instability of democratic political

systems is when citizens feel disconnected or alienated from the political process (Citrin et al. 1975). In some instances, the disconnection from politics may result in citizens opting out of the political process but in other instances it may lead to rebellious behavior (Muller, Jukam and Seligson 1982). In the literature on ethnic diversity and rebellion, claims have been made that more ethnically diverse societies are more likely to suffer from civil war (Smith 1986, Huntington 1996, for contrary evidence see Laitin and Fearon 2003). Anderson and Paskeviciute (2006) find that there are lower levels of interpersonal trust in ethnically diverse societies in established democracies. This result taken with Laitin and Fearon's (2003) conclusion that greater degrees of ethnic and religious diversity in societies are not necessarily prone to conflict suggests that, at least in some diverse societies, features such as institutional arrangements may serve to promote greater stability.

Institutional arrangements and, in particular, electoral systems can alter the levels of political support. Furthermore, arrangements that tend to facilitate the incorporation of minority group interests through representation or power sharing tend to increase support among those groups that benefit from the institutional arrangements. Anderson and Guillory (1997) show that those who tend to be on the losing side of electoral contests are more satisfied under consensual systems rather than majoritarian systems. Banducci, Donovan and Karp (1999) find that the level of political efficacy for minor party supporters in New Zealand increased following a transition from a plurality system to proportional representation.

Further evidence shows that outside of electoral arrangements, descriptive representation enhances political attitudes and can even influence political participation.

While most of the research in this area is based largely on evidence from the U.S. it shows that having a representative of “one’s own” can, reduce alienation (Pantoja and Segura 2003), increase political efficacy (Banducci, Donovan and Karp 2005; Banducci, Donovan and Karp 2004) and trust in government (Howell and Fagan 1988) and increase participation (Barreto, Segura and Woods 2004; Gay 2001).⁷ This line of research has relied on the political “empowerment model” (Bobo and Gilliam 1990). The argument behind this “empowerment model” is that those minority groups that are excluded from positions of political power are aware that they are politically disadvantaged (one of the most visible signs being the lack of elected representatives from the group).

Awareness of being politically disadvantaged may lead to distrust and disengagement in the political process. This distrust as suggested above, can also lead to rebellious behavior and instability. In a cross national analysis, Alonso and Ruiz-Rufino (2007) find that protest by ethnic minorities is likely to be moderated when minorities achieve greater representation, particularly in parliamentary systems. While much of our preceding discussion of the literature assumes that electoral systems are fixed, we do take note that these institutions are *embedded* in the wider cultural and social context (see Grofman et al. 1999). Ethnic and social cleavages shape party systems (Lipset and Rokkan 1967) which condition the influence of electoral systems; therefore, the structure of the electoral system can be endogenous particularly in newly developed democracies.

Expectations

So far we have outlined the links between electoral systems, descriptive representation, ethnic minorities and citizen’s political support and engagement. From

this outline, we can then build several expectations about how representation will influence the attitudes and behavior of ethnic minorities. Based on Lijphart's theory of consociational democracy and subsequent research on the effects of electoral systems, one would expect that the differences in political support between majority and minority populations will be smallest in proportional systems. A contrary view suggests that majoritarian systems will enhance engagement of minority groups because they encourage parties to mobilize support across different ethnic groups. Whether ethnic groups are proportionally represented may be important but having a representative of "one's own" such as in a single member district system may also be desirable. Thus, the expectations for majoritarian systems are mixed; some theories lead one to expect ethnic group differences to be minimized under majoritarian systems while other theories predict the differences to be minimized under proportional systems.

Aside from the electoral system, special accommodations for ethnic minorities in the national parliament may be another mechanism by that reduces the differences between minorities and non-minorities in political support and engagement. Because group representation is guaranteed regardless of the level of group participation, we may expect that these special arrangements reduce participation but not attitudes. On the other hand, rules that restrict minority access and influence should be expected to increase the gap in political support and engagement.

Data and Methods

Our analysis is based on data from the World Values Survey [WVS] (1998-2002). We use these data because, to our knowledge, it represents the cross-national dataset with

the largest number of countries with wide variation in institutional arrangements, where ethnic minority status can be identified and measures of political activity and attitudes are available.⁸

Any analysis of minority group attitudes or behavior suffers from the same problem. By definition, minority groups make up a smaller proportion of the population. Using survey data based on national probability samples presents researchers with the problem of having a very small number of minorities in the sample (if any). Furthermore, many of these minority populations may be underrepresented in the sample of survey respondents because they are more likely to have the characteristics of non-responders, e.g. socially and economically disadvantaged, living in a difficult to reach location and may be less interested in the subject of the survey (see Goyder 1987). One solution to these problems is to either limit the survey population to minorities or to over-sample the minority population. Another approach, which we use in this paper, is to increase the number of minorities in the sample by pooling across a large number of countries. Admittedly, this approach addresses the first concern but not the second.

Defining ethnic groups presents another challenge. As we use the term, ethnic minority groups can refer to social groups that are differentiated by country of origin, skin color, religion, language or caste. In order to identify ethnic minority groups, we rely on the classification of Fearon (2003). We have then classified the ethnic groups based on their status as a non-majority or non-plurality group. While in some states the non-plurality ethnic group may actually hold the power, this is not the case in the countries in our sample. Therefore, we have identified individuals who can be identified as belonging to a non-plurality ethnic group. We have had to restrict our analysis to identifying only

the ethnic groups that are identified in the World Values Survey [WVS]. We have further restricted our analysis to countries that are identified as electoral democracies by Freedom House. Overall, there are 33 electoral democracies where ethnic minority status could be reliably measured in the 1998-2002 wave of the WVS (see Appendix).

The WVS provides several different ways of identifying ethnic minority respondents. When available, we identified ethnic minorities by a question asking respondents which of the following categories (based on race, ethnicity, country of origin, etc) that best described them. Therefore, we rely on a measure of self-identification to determine ethnic identity. However, not all country surveys measured race and ethnicity.⁹ In these cases, we relied on either interviewer coded ethnicity when available, language spoken at home, language of interview, religion or region of interview. Questions used to measure ethnic identity and the identified groups are given in Appendix A.

To measure political involvement, we use two questions: (1) the respondent's level of political interest and (2) whether the respondent feels politics is important. If the respondent indicated that they are somewhat or very interested or that politics is important we have coded the respondent as "1". Otherwise, we give the respondent a score of "0". Political engagement includes a series of questions on conventional and unconventional political acts. Respondents were asked if they had participated in one of the following activities: signing a petition, joining a boycott, attending a lawful demonstration, joining unofficial strikes, occupying buildings or factories. We have given a score of 1 to any respondent who mentioned participating in one of these political actions. Respondents who have not participated in any activities have been given a score

of 0. Questions on participation in the last election are not available in the WVS so we have no measure of voter turnout.

As indicators of political support we rely on confidence in government institutions and satisfaction with national representatives.¹⁰ A scale on confidence in government institutions is created from three questions about confidence in the following institutions: parliament, government and political parties. The items have been rescaled to range from 0 to 1. An alpha test suggests that the composite measure of government confidence is reliable (.82).¹¹ Satisfaction with national representatives also ranges from 0 to 1 and has four categories. Socio-economic characteristics are included as control variables. Question wording for the dependent variables is given in Appendix B.

Aside from ethnic minority status, our main independent variables of interest are institutional rules, specifically the electoral system and the degree to which ethnic minorities are represented in decision making. In terms of the representation of minority groups, district magnitude is viewed by some as the most important feature (Shugart 1994). Therefore, we use a simple dichotomous variable that indicates whether the electoral system for the lower house has single member districts (majoritarian) or multimember districts (proportional).¹² Aside from the electoral system, we identify countries by whether minority groups are in positions of political power. The Minorities at Risk project has coded the degree of differences in political power between majority populations and minorities at risk.¹³ These indicators measure actual political differentials such as differences between majority and minority population in access to civil service and voting rights. One dimension of political differentials is whether there are relative differences in access to power.¹⁴ This dimension is used to measure whether there is

equal access to decision making power. We have created a dichotomous variable where countries exhibiting substantial, major or extreme differential in access to power are coded as “1”. Of the 33 countries in the sample, 16 are considered to have substantial or greater political differences. As discussed above, data on the representation of ethnic minorities in national parliaments are difficult to obtain. Previous studies have used women serving in parliament as a proxy which could be problematic (see also Norris, 204. 212).¹⁵ Although we have reservations about using the proportion of women in the parliament as a proxy for the degree of ethnic minority representation, we include the measure as a test of whether it has the expected effect on our dependent variables of interest. We have also coded countries that have special accommodations for the representation of minority groups in parliament. One country, Colombia, has special provisions for aboriginals but moderately restricts access by blacks to higher office. The coding of the institutional variables discussed above is listed in Table 1 of the Appendix.

Because cross-national variations in political engagement and support are due to factors other than the political representation of minority groups, we control for a number of contextual factors that may influence our main independent variables. We control for the level of economic development and the stage of democratic development.¹⁶ Gross National Income (GNI) per capita is used as an indicator of economic productivity.¹⁷ Our analysis proceeds by first examining bivariate differences in the attitudes and behavior of ethnic minorities and non-minorities across different institutional contexts. We then test for the conditioning effects of these different institutional conflicts on the degree of differentiation between ethnic minorities and non-minorities in multivariate models.

Results

Table 1 shows differences between ethnic minorities and non-minorities on the indicators of political engagement by different institutional contexts.¹⁸ As discussed above, political involvement ranges from 0 to 1 on all indicators where 0 represents the lowest level of political involvement. Negative differences indicate that the ethnic minority groups have lower levels of political involvement. We expect these differences to be minimized under rules that increase representation of ethnic group interests. When averaged across the different contexts, we see that there are significant and substantial differences between minority and non-minority respondents in countries where there is limited access to power for the minority group. When there are no identified barriers to power, ethnic minority groups have higher rates of participation than non-minority groups. As for the electoral system, group differences are greatest on political participation under single member districts and on political involvement under proportional rules. There is no consistent evidence that one type of electoral arrangement is better at minimizing differences in our measures of political engagement. Ethnic minorities are also less involved than non-minorities where there are special arrangements.

The results for political participation are more consistent with expectations. Ethnic minorities are significantly less likely to participate than non-minorities in countries where they have limited access to power and in single member district systems, where the difference is substantial. Specifically, there is a gap between minorities and non-minorities in participation of .10 in systems with single member districts whereas there is virtually no difference in PR based systems. These initial results in Table 1 show

that the context can shape the political engagement of ethnic minorities. In countries where there is a greater probability of power sharing (no limited access to power, special accommodations for representation and PR rules) the differences between ethnic minorities and non-minorities on indicators of political access tend to be minimized or insignificant.

(Table 1 here)

Table 2 shows mean differences in measures of political support among minority and non-minority populations.¹⁹ Of the measures of political support that we use, satisfaction with national representatives may come closest to tapping attitudes that are influenced by the make-up of the parliament. Significant differences on satisfaction with national representatives are evident in some cases though the differences are smaller in most cases than those in Table 1. When there is limited access to power for minorities, minorities are significantly less likely to be satisfied with national representatives. When there is equal access to power, minorities are more satisfied with their representatives than non-minorities. Under proportional rules the difference in satisfaction between ethnic minorities and non-minorities is larger (and significant) than the difference under majoritarian rules. Minorities generally express less confidence in government institutions than non-minorities. The differences are greatest when access to power is limited and where there are no special arrangements. When special arrangements do exist, there are no significant differences in confidence between minorities and non-minorities. We do note that some of the statistically significant differences in both tables are small. However, there are substantial differences on the indicators of political engagement in Table 1.

(Table 2 here)

We next turn to a multivariate analysis where we examine how institutional features and levels of minority representation influence the differences between minority and non-minority populations. Because we are interested in whether the institutional differences minimize the differences between ethnic minority groups and non-minorities, we include interaction terms between minority status and the institutional features considered above. We also control for individual level socio-economic characteristics that may influence levels of political engagement and support. In order to simplify the presentation and because our interest is in how the institutional variables influence attitudes and behavior, we have not included the estimated coefficients for the individual level variables (except for ethnic minority status in the full model). In our analysis, we weight the data to equal sample sizes in each country.

Table 3 shows the estimates for the model predicting levels of political engagement. When looking at the main effects for ethnic minority group status, we see that ethnic minorities are significantly less likely to express an interest in the political process and/or feel that it is important even when controlling for socio-demographics. Nevertheless they are just as likely as non-minorities to engage in political activities. When we turn to the interaction effects, in general, we find support for the idea that institutional arrangements can alter differences in political engagement between minorities and non-minorities.

Due to the inclusion of the interaction term, the main effects for the institutional variables represent the effect of these arrangements for non-minority populations. Turning first to the model predicting political involvement, while non-minorities appear

to be more involved in the political process in systems where access to power is limited, the sign on the interaction term indicates that ethnic minorities in countries are less likely to be involved where power is limited. Therefore, where access to power is limited non-minorities are significantly more likely to be interested in politics than ethnic minorities. However minorities are no different from non-minorities in terms of their political activity when power is limited. Where special accommodations are in place, ethnic minorities are significantly less likely to participate. Specifically, minorities in countries that have adopted special accommodations to assure minority group representation are 5% less likely to engage in a political activity than non-minorities. Consistent with the results in Table 1 and contrary to expectations based on a consociational model, we also see that ethnic minorities under majoritarian rules are more politically interested suggesting that electoral systems can have an influence in marginalizing minorities.

(Table 3 here)

Table 4 shows the results for the indicators of political support: satisfaction with national representatives and confidence in government institutions. Citizens express greater satisfaction and more confidence in established democracies. Furthermore, citizens in majoritarian systems appear to be more satisfied and more confident. When countries have special accommodations, ethnic minorities have more confidence in government institutions. Minorities are also more likely to be satisfied with their representatives under majoritarian rules. Again, these results support our expectations that institutional arrangements not only serve to reduce differences in political engagement but can also reduce differences in political support between minorities and non-minorities.

We should note that not all interactions between minority status and institutional arrangements are significant across all dependent variables. For example, the interaction between the electoral system and minority status is only significant in the involvement and satisfaction with representatives model. The significant interaction indicates that minorities are more likely than non-minorities to be supportive of representatives and involved in politics. We also note that the effect for special accommodations differs between the indicators of political engagement and political support. Special accommodations appear to reduce the probability of minorities participating in politics. While special accommodations may signal to ethnic groups that the government is responsive, the reservation of seats guarantees representation which means there is no need to mobilize voters to support candidates for these seats. Therefore, guaranteed seats may have the unintended consequence of reducing participation. On the other hand, because our measure of participation is not refined, the lower rates of participation among non-majority ethnic groups may have prompted the implementation of these special accommodations.

We also tested interactions (not reported in the tables) between ethnic minority status and the proportion of women represented as women's representation has been used as a proxy for ethnic representation. However, none of these interactions were significant in the expected direction cautioning against assuming ethnic representation and women's representation have similar causes and consequences. We do see that women's representation is related to both higher levels of political engagement and political support across both ethnic minorities and non-minorities suggesting that visible diversity in national parliaments can enhance overall engagement and political support which is

consistent with recent research on the impact of women's representation on mobilization (Karp and Banducci, nd).

Discussion and Conclusions

In this paper we have attempted to bridge the cross-national literature that focuses on the relationship between institutional arrangements and democratic stability with the "political empowerment" literature which suggests that choosing a representative of one's own can alter attitudes and behavior.

Generally our results support expectations that differences in political engagement and political support between ethnic minorities and those in the majority can be minimized under certain institutional arrangements. These institutional arrangements are either directly or indirectly related to the representation of ethnic minorities in national parliaments. Particularly important in reducing differences is an indicator of access to power. Our initial bivariate analysis presented in Tables 1 and 2 show that differences between ethnic minorities and non-minorities are significant and the magnitude of the difference greater in countries where there is limited access to political power. These results have some support in the multivariate analysis: significant differences are evident on the indicator of political involvement. Also important are special allowances for ethnic minority representation. Differences on the indicator of political support are minimized when there are special allowances; however, differences are exaggerated on political participation when special accommodations are in place. These different effects suggest the possibility that ethnic minority groups respond positively to the symbolism of setting aside seats to assure representation. However, the guaranteed representation does not

create incentives for political parties or civil society groups to mobilize voting or other forms of participation.

The findings on the role of the electoral systems indicate that differences in both psychological engagement and satisfaction with national representatives are more likely to be minimized under majoritarian systems rather than under PR. These results undermine the consociational model which assumes that the representation of minority interests will lead to greater mobilization. These findings are similar to Norris (2004) who found no clear evidence that PR reduced differences in political support between minority and non-minority populations. Based on a country by country analysis, Norris concludes that ethnic differences were smallest in majoritarian systems. There are two possible conclusions to draw regarding the apparent advantage of majoritarian systems. First, this finding suggests that mobilization of ethnic minorities is more likely to occur under systems that encourage catch-all parties to mobilize across the citizenry. Second, because the majoritarian systems are also candidate based systems there may be an appeal to having a representative who is directly selected by and accountable to a district. When an ethnic group is regionally concentrated, the representative is more likely to be a member of an ethnic group.

Special arrangements are not designed only for ethnic representation. Many countries now guarantee women's representation by reserving seats or setting quotas for party candidate nominations (Krook 2006; Norris 2004). If descriptive representation has the potential to improve the perceived legitimacy among ethnic minorities, women's representation could similarly affect the view of government among women. The historical under representation of women in national parliaments may dampen women's

trust in government. As noted earlier, institutional arrangements such as proportional representation tend to enhance women's representation and some states and parties have instituted quotas or reserved seats for women. Like ethnic minority representation, increased women's representation may signal to women that elected officials are taking their concerns seriously, issues of importance to them are being considered and decisions will reflect the input of women. Women may also respond to the symbolic importance of descriptive representation. Therefore, we may expect that, similar to ethnic minorities, under certain institutional arrangements women's trust in government will be higher.

However, there are differences that may lead to different effects. Importantly, women tend to crosscut the socio-economic cleavages that structure party systems while ethnic minority groups tend to align with a particular party (see Htun 2004, 443-446). For example, while there tends to be a left-leaning gender gap in the United States with a higher proportion of women than men identifying as Democratic, African Americans overwhelmingly identify with the Democratic party. While gender is rarely a mobilizing identity, ethnicity can be the main cleavage in some societies. Other characteristics, such as a lack of geographic concentration also differentiate ethnicity from gender identity. These differences tend to influence the institutional arrangements that are adopted to increase representation and may then alter the influence on perceived legitimacy if an inappropriate remedy to under representation is adopted. The types of accommodations given to women and ethnic minority groups tend to vary: states tend to grant candidate quotas for women and reserved seats for ethnic minorities (Htun 2004). If the incorrect remedy is applied this may lessen the positive impact of increased representation.

An understanding of the consequences of different arrangements to enhance gender and ethnic representation is crucial for scholars and policymakers designing institutions. Demands for representation based on gender or ethnicity can stem from a desire to be integrated in the political process or from a desire for access to political power in their own right (Htun 2004). Different institutional arrangements, whether majoritarian or proportional electoral rules are adopted or whether special arrangements are made, have consequences for how parties systems and, consequently, representatives and governments can respond to groups demands.

There is a fundamental disagreement among some scholars over whether individual rights of political equality allow for group representation or whether community rights can be balanced against individual rights. However, even in countries such as the United States where there is a strong tradition of individual rights in representative government there are traditions of group representation such as the development of majority-minority districts. Furthermore, districts have also been drawn to facilitate the representation of other interests such as agriculture or region. For example, the U.S. and Australian senate are examples of cases where over-representation of regional interests is allowed because representation is based not on population but on state interest.

If we accept that even the most liberal countries allow for representation based on membership in a group, the question then becomes what is the substance of that representation for under-represented groups? In the chapter in this volume by Lublin and Segura, the authors note the trade-offs between the increase in minority representation in the U.S. that result from the use of majority-minority districts and policy responsiveness.

The use of redistricting to assure that a concentration of minority voters can elect one of their own has also served to reduce the number of representatives with similar policy views (but who may be non-minorities). Our analysis in this chapter has taken a comparative approach to the question of group representation. While some have questioned the effectiveness of descriptive representation in reproducing policy preferences, we find that accommodations that guarantee representation (including majority-minority districts in the U.S.) are effective in enhancing both perceived responsiveness and political involvement.

References

- Alonso, Sonia and Rubén Ruiz-Rufino. 2007. "Political Representation and Ethnic Conflict in New Democracies" *European Journal of Political Research*. 46: 237-267.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Christine A. Guillory. 1997. 'Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy.' *American Political Science Review* 91(1): 66-81.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Aida Paskeviciute. 2006. "How Ethnic and Linguistic Heterogeneity Influence the Prospects for Civil Society: A Comparative Study of Citizenship Behavior" *Journal of Politics* 68(4):783-802.
- Banducci, Susan and Jeffrey Karp. 1998. "Representation Under a Proportional System in Voters' Victory? New Zealand's First Election Under Proportional Representation." Auckland University Press. 135-152.
- Banducci, Susan A., Todd Donovan and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2004. "Minority Representation, Empowerment, and Participation" *Journal of Politics*. 66: 534-556.
- Banducci, Susan A., Todd Donovan, and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2005. "Effects of Minority Representation on Political Attitudes and Participation" in *Diversity in Democracy: Minority Representation in the United States*. Gary M. Segura and Shaun Bowler, eds. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Barreto, Matt A., Gary M. Segura, and Nathan D. Woods. 2004. "The Mobilizing Effect of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout." *American Political Science Review* 98:65-75.
- Bird, Karen. 2005. "The Political Representation of Visible Minorities in Electoral Democracies: A Comparison of France, Denmark, and Canada" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*. 11(4):425-465.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Franklin D. Gilliam. 1990. "Race, Sociopolitical Participation and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84:377-93.
- Bowler, Shaun, Todd Donovan, and David Brockington. 2003. *Electoral Reform and Minority Representation: Local Experiments with Alternative Elections*. Ohio State University Press.
- Cameron, Charles, David Epstein, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American Political Science Review* 90(4): 794-812.

- Citrin, Jack, H. McClosky, J.M. Shanks, and P. Sniderman. 1975. "Personal and Political Sources of Alienation." *British Journal of Political Science* 5:1-31.
- Caul, Miki. 2001. "Political Parties and the Adoption of Candidate Gender Quotas: A Cross-National Analysis," *The Journal of Politics* 63 (4): 1214-1229.
- Chinn, Jeff, and Steven D. Roper. 1995. "Ethnic Mobilisation and Reactive Nationalism: The Case of Moldova". *Nationalities Papers* 23 (2): 291-325.
- Cohen, Frank S. 1997. "Proportional Versus Majoritarian Ethnic Conflict Management in Democracies". *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (5): 607-630.
- Davidson, Chandler and Bernard Grofman, eds. 1994. *Quiet Revolution in the South: The Impact of the Voting Rights Act 1965-1990*. Princeton University Press.
- Fearon, James. 2003. "Ethnic and Cultural Diversity by Country" *Journal of Economic Growth* 8(2) 195-222.
- Goyder, John. 1987. *The Silent Minority: Nonrespondents on Sample Surveys*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- James Fearon and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War" *American Political Science Review* 97(1) 75-90.
- Fennema, Meindert, and Jean Tillie. 1999. "Political Participation and Political Trust in Amsterdam: Civic Communities and Ethnic Networks," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 25(4): 703-726.
- Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*. 95:589-602.
- Grofman, Bernard et al. eds. 1999. *Elections in Japan, Korea and Taiwan Under the Single Non-Transferable Vote: The Comparative Study of an Embedded Institution*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1993. "Democracy in Divided Societies". *Journal of Democracy* 4 (4): 18-38.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 2003. Electoral Systems: A Primer for Decision Makers - *Journal of Democracy* 14:4 *Journal of Democracy* 14 (4) 115-127

- Howell, Susan and Deborah Fagan. 1988. "Race and Trust in Government." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52:343-50.
- Htun, Mala. 2003. "Why Identity Groups Get Represented in Politics." Working Paper. New York University.
- Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identify Groups." *Perspectives on Politics* 2(3): 439-458.
- Huntington, Samuel 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* New York Simon and Shuster.
- Ishiyama, John. 2000. "Institutions and Ethnopolitical Conflict in Post-Communist Politics." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 6(3): 51-67.
- Johnson, Ollie. 1998. "Racial Representation and Brazilian Politics: Black Members of the National Congress, 1983-1999." *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs* 40(4): 97-118.
- Karp, Jeffrey A. and Susan A. Banducci. 1999. "The Impact of Proportional Representation on Turnout: Evidence from New Zealand" *Australian Journal of Political Science*, Volume 34: 363-377.
- Karp, Jeffrey A., Susan A. Banducci and Shaun Bowler. 2008. "Getting Out the Vote: Party Mobilization in a Comparative Perspective." *British Journal of Political Science*. forthcoming.
- Karp, Jeffrey A. and Susan A. Banducci. Nd. " " *Electoral Studies*, forthcoming.
- Krook, Mona Lena. 2006. "Reforming Representation: The Diffusion of Candidate Gender Quotas Worldwide." *Politics & Gender*. 2(3): 303-327.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1984. *Democracies. Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-one Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1991. "Constitutional Choices for New Democracies". *Journal of Democracy* 2 (1): 72-84.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1994. *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies, 1945-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lijphart, Arend. 1995. "Self-Determination versus Pre-Determination of Ethnic Minorities in Power-Sharing Systems," in Will Kymlicka, ed. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 275-87.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1986. "Proportionality by Non-PR Methods: Ethnic Representation in Belgium, Cyprus, Lebanon, New Zealand, West Germany, and Zimbabwe." In Bernard Grofman and Arend Lijphart, eds. *Electoral Laws and their Political Consequences*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments." In *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*, ed. Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan. New York: Free Press, 1-64.
- Lustick, Ian. 1979. "Stability in Deeply Divided Societies: Consociationalism versus Control." *World Politics* 31(3): 325-44.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes'," *Journal of Politics*. 61: 628-57.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2000. "What does a Representative Do? Descriptive Representation in Communicative Settings of Distrust, Uncrystallized Interests, and Historically Denigrated Status." In Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman, *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1861 [1958]. *Considerations on Representative Government*. New York: Liberal Arts Press.
- Minorities at Risk Project. 2005. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management. Retrieved from <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar/> on: [June 3, 2005]
- Muller, Edward N., Thomas O. Jukam and Mitchell Seligson. 1982. "Diffuse Support and Antisystem Political Behavior: A Comparative Analysis" *American Journal of Political Science* 26:240-64.
- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering: Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 1985. 'Women in European Legislative Elites.' *West European Politics* 8(4): 90-101.
- Ordeshook, Peter C. and Olga V. Shvetsova. 1994. "Ethnic Heterogeneity, District Magnitude and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 38(1):100-23.

- Pitkin, Hannah. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rae, Douglas. 1971. *The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Reilly, Benjamin. 2001. *Democracy in Divided Societies. Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Reilly, Benjamin 2002. 'Electoral Systems for Divided Societies', *Journal of Democracy* 13(2):156-170
- Rabushka, Alvin and Kenneth A. Shepsle. 1972. *Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Reynolds, Andrew and Benjamin Reilly. 2002. *Electoral System Design*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Rule, Wilma. 1994. 'Women's Underrepresentation and Electoral Systems.' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 4:689-692.
- Saideman, Stephen M. & Ayres, R. William (2000) Determining the Causes of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities at Risk Data from the 1980s and 1990s. *The Journal of Politics* 62 (4): 1126-1144.
- Saideman, Stephen M., David J. Lanoue, Michael Campenni, and Samuel Stanton. 2002. "Democratization, Political Institutions, and Ethnic Conflict. A Pooled Time-Series Analysis, 1985-1998". *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (1): 103-129.
- Smith, Anthony. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shugart, Matthew. 1994. 'Women and Minorities.' In Wilma Rule and Joseph Zimmerman. Eds. *Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Taagepera, Rein. 1994. 'Beating the Law of Minority Attrition.' In Wilma Rule and Joseph Zimmerman. Eds. *Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Taagepera, Rein. 1998. "How Electoral Systems Matter for Democratization" *Democratization*.5(3): 68-91.
- Tsebelis, George. 1990. "Elite Interaction and Constitution Building in Consociational Democracies." *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 2: 5-29.
- Tate, Katherine. 2001. "The Political Representation of Blacks in Congress: Does Race Matter?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26:623-38

Tate, Katherine. 1991. "Black Political Participation in the 1984 and 1988 Presidential Elections." *American Political Science Review* 85(4): 1159–76.

Welch, Susan. 1990. "The Impact of At-Large Elections on the Representation of Blacks and Hispanics" *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 52, No. 4. (Nov., 1990), pp. 1050-1076.

Appendix A: Ethnic Minority Status

World Values Survey Questions:

1. Identity: Which of the following best describes you? Except where noted, ethnic status was measured using this question.
2. Ethnic Group (coded by interviewer observation)
3. Language: What language do you normally speak at home?
5. Religion: Do you belong to a religious denomination? Which one?
6. Region of Interview
7. Language of interview.

Countries and Ethnic Groups Identified:

Albania: Greek; Roma
Australia: Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander [based on interviewer observation]
Bangladesh: Asian, Hindu
Belgium: Wallonian [identified by language of interview]
Brazil: Black; Indigenous
Canada: French Canadians; Native/Indigenous
Chile: Indigenous
Taiwan: Hakka; Aboriginal [identified by language at home]
Colombia: Black; Indigenous
Dominican Republic: Black
Estonia: Russian [language of interview]
Georgia: Russian; Ossetian, Adzhars; Abkhazian [identified by language at home]
India: Scheduled Tribes; Sikhs; Muslims
Indonesia: Javanese; Sudanese; Sumatranese
Israel: Arab
Latvia: Russians [language of interview]
Mexico: Black; Indigenous
Moldova: Slavs; Gagaus
New Zealand: Maori, Pacific Islanders
Nigeria: Hausa; Yoruba; Edo [identification based on language]
Peru: Black; Other (indigenous)
Philippines: Igorots and Moros MAR database; identified by Muslim religion
South Africa: Coloured; Indian
Spain: regional identity
Switzerland: Italian, French, Romansch
Uruguay: Mestizo, indigenous
United States: Black; Latino; Native American
Venezuela: Black; Indigenous
Northern Ireland : Catholic [identified by religious denomination]
Serbia: Albanian, Croat, Roma
Montenegro: Serb, Albanian, Croat, Roma

Appendix B: Question Wording

For each item, coding using in analysis is given in parentheses.

Political Support

A. Confidence in Government

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in then: Is it a great deal of confidence (1), quite a lot of confidence (.66), not very much confidence (.33) or none at all (0)?

- a. The government in YOUR CAPITAL
- b. Political Parties
- c. Parliament

B. Satisfaction with National Representatives

How satisfied are you with the way the people now in national office are handling the country's affairs? Would you say you are very satisfied (1), fairly satisfied (.66), fairly dissatisfied (.33) or very dissatisfied (0)?

Political Engagement

A. Political Interest:

How interested would you say you are in politics? Very interested(1); Somewhat interested (.66); Not very interested (.33); Not at all interested (0).

B. Political Activities

Now I'd like you to look at this card. I'm going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I'd like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things (1), whether you might do it (0) or would never, under any circumstances, do it (0).

- a. Signing a petition
- b. Joining in boycotts
- c. Attending lawful demonstrations
- d. Joining unofficial strikes
- e. Occupying buildings or factories.

Endnotes

¹ In this paper we use the terms “ethnic” and “ethnic minority” to refer to groups that are differentiated along racial, ethnic, religious, language, country of origin and status as “original peoples.” Our use of the term “ethnic” and “ethnic minority” to indicate these groups is a more inclusive use of the term “ethnic” than is usually used. However, ethnic identities can largely be seen as social constructs based on the divisions listed above and the more inclusive use of the term is increasing (see Htun 2003).

² Based on case studies of France, Denmark and Canada, Bird (2005) identifies other factors in addition to the electoral system that influence the representation of ethnic minorities. These other factors include the size and spatial concentration of the ethnic group, openness of citizenship rules, degree of cultural assimilation, party competition and legislative turnover.

³ For example, in the United States, at large elections increase the proportion of women elected in municipalities while ward elections are better at electing African-Americans (Darcy, Welch and Clark 1994). In these cases, the effectiveness of different electoral systems at increasing minority representation is dependent on the geographic distribution of the minority population. From a global perspective, Htun (2003) suggests that ethnic groups are more likely to be aligned with political communities which is not the case with women: political parties in democracies are more likely to respond to demands for women’s representation with the use of party quotas but states are more likely to use reserved seats for ethnic minorities. Mechanisms such as party quotas are have shown to be more influential at increasing women’s representation than proportional representation (Caul 2001) and there are not noted cases of party quotas for ethnic minorities (Htun

2003). Furthermore, the representation of women is more dependent on the responsiveness of parties to pressure to nominate women (both to appeal to voters and satisfy intra-party demands) while the representation of ethnic minorities depends on the formation of ethnic parties (see Taagepera 1994).

⁴ In the US, at-large districts tend to underrepresent black candidates though the evidence is less clear for Latino candidates (see Welch 1990). While some municipal governments have moved to cumulative voting or preference voting to increase minority representation, a countervailing trend has been to move from at-large elections to ward or district elections. Especially where minority populations tend to be geographically concentrated, district elections can serve to enhance representation as well.

⁵ Reilly proposes a system of preferential voting – either STV or AV. Therefore, he is not strictly advocating a majoritarian system though preference voting systems such as the AV are majoritarian.

⁶ The South Schleswig Voters League, representing the small Danish-speaking minority, took advantage of this exemption and won one seat in the 1949 Bundestag election (Lijphart 1986, 121).

⁷ In one exception to the U.S. focus, Fennema and Tillie (1999) find that increased representation of ethnic minorities on municipal councils and voter turnout are linked. However, they also find that ethnic minorities (with the exception of Turks) have lower rates of participation and trust than the majority population.

⁸ The European Social Survey (ESS) represents another possible source of data. One advantage of the ESS is that it includes an item that asks respondents whether they belong to an ethnic minority group. Unfortunately those describing themselves as an

ethnic minority are small; only 5 of the 22 countries in the sample, have proportions of self described ethnic minorities over 5 percent. In addition, because the sample includes only European countries and proportional electoral systems are common, there is very little variation in institutional arrangements across the countries in the sample.

Furthermore, data on measures of empowerment are only available for a small number of the countries in the sample. The proportion of identified ethnic minorities and the number of countries available for analysis are larger in the WVS which is why we rely on it for our analysis.

⁹ Self-identified ethnicity was not available in most Western European countries. It is not clear whether questions measuring ethnic background were not included in the survey instrument or whether they were excluded from the archived data set.

¹⁰ Satisfaction with democracy was not asked in every country so it was not included in the analysis.

¹¹ The three item index was also considerably more reliable than any index combined from just two indicators of confidence.

¹² When we substituted district magnitude for our dichotomous measure we found no substantive changes in the results indicating that the difference between single member and multi-member districts is the most important distinction in our analysis. In Northern Ireland, STV is used for elections to the Assembly but First-Past-the-Post is used for elections to the House of Commons. Therefore Northern Ireland is coded as having a district magnitude of one.

¹³ The MAR database does not include information on all ethnic groups. The criteria for inclusion in the MAR database is whether or not the group “collectively suffers, or

benefits from, systematic discriminatory treatment” (MAR Codebook, 5). If the country or group was not included in MAR, we assume that there is no difference in access to power and have therefore coded the power differential as “0”.

¹⁴ According to the MAR documentation, indicators are based on the coding of expert judgements regarding the status of minority groups relative to the dominant group(s). Political differentials are “objective differences between groups, as best as we can judge them” (MAR 2005, 27). They are not necessarily the result of deliberate discrimination. The political differentials has been used in prior publications (see Saideman and Ayres 2000, for example).

¹⁵ We obtained data on ethnic minority representation in 19 national parliaments. The correlation between minority and women’s representation is .30 which suggests a fairly weak relationship.

¹⁶ The sample of established democracies include Australia, Canada, India, Israel, New Zealand, Spain, and the United States.

¹⁷ GNI measures the total output of goods and services for final use produced by residents and non-residents, regardless of allocation to domestic and foreign claims, in relation to the size of the population. It differs from gross domestic product (GDP) by further adjusting for income received from abroad for labour and capital by residents, for similar payments to non-residents, and by incorporating various technical adjustments including those related to exchange rate changes over time (World Bank).

¹⁸ These differences by country, where significant, are reported in Table 2 in the Appendix.

¹⁹ The survey in Israel did not report values for these questions on political support.

Table 1: Mean Differences in Political Engagement by Minority Status and Institutional Rules

	Political Involvement				Political Participation			
	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference		Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference	
No limited access to power	.54	.53	-.02		.43	.49	.06	**
Limited access to power	.62	.53	-.10	**	.38	.30	-.08	**
No special arrangements	.56	.53	-.04	**	.39	.37	-.02	
Special arrangements	.62	.53	-.09	**	.43	.40	-.04	**
Proportional rules	.58	.51	-.07	**	.35	.35	.01	
Single Member Districts	.61	.58	-.03	**	.57	.47	-.10	**
N	50,458	12,453			51,776	13,153		

**p<.01

Table 2: Mean Differences in Attitudes about Government by Minority Status and Institutional Rules

	Satisfaction with Reps				Confidence in Government			
	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference		Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference	
No limited access to power	.45	.48	.03	**	.42	.40	-.02	**
Limited access to power	.42	.38	-.04	**	.40	.36	-.04	**
No special arrangements	.44	.43	-.01		.43	.38	-.05	**
Special arrangements	.43	.42	-.02	**	.38	.39	.01	
Proportional rules	.40	.38	-.03	**	.39	.35	-.03	**
Single Member Districts	.53	.55	.02		.48	.45	-.03	**
N	41,277	9,928			38,645	8,393		

**p<.01

Table 3: Political Engagement: Logit Coefficients

	Political Involvement			Political Participation		
	Coef.	St. Error	Min-Max	Coef.	St. Error	Min-Max
GNI per capita	-.10 ***	(0.02)	-.11	-.11 ***	(0.03)	-.10
Women's representation	.00	(0.00)	-.02	.02 ***	(0.00)	.11
Established democracy	.19 ***	(0.06)	.05	1.96 ***	(0.06)	.46
Special accomodation	-.06 *	(0.03)	-.01	.10 ***	(0.04)	.02
Limited access to power	.18 ***	(0.03)	.04	-.32 ***	(0.03)	-.08
Single Member District	.18 ***	(0.03)	.05	.22 ***	(0.04)	.05
Ethnic Minority	-.10 *	(0.06)	-.02	-.04	(0.06)	-.01
Minority*Special accomodation	-.03	(0.07)	-.01	-.24 ***	(0.07)	-.05
Minority*Limited power	-.18 ***	(0.07)	-.05	.06	(0.07)	.01
Minority*Single Member District	.20 ***	(0.08)	.05	.01	(0.08)	.00
Pseudo R^2 (Cragg & Uhler's)	.05			0.25		
n (weighted)	27,265			29,084		

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .10

Note: Estimates for socio-economic controls (female, age, education, employment status and income) not shown.

Source: World Values Surveys

Table 4: Political Attitudes: Ordered Logit Coefficients

	Satisfaction with Reps			Confidence in Government		
	Coef.	St. Error	Min-Max	Coef.	St. Error	Min-Max
GNI per capita	.43 ***	(0.02)	.24	.19 ***	(0.02)	.08
Women's representation	.01 ***	(0.00)	.06	.00	(0.00)	.01
Established democracy	-1.12 ***	(0.06)	-.21	-1.10 ***	(0.06)	-.10
Special accomodation	.21 ***	(0.03)	.04	-.09 ***	(0.03)	-.01
Limited access to power	.09 ***	(0.03)	.05	.19 ***	(0.03)	.02
Single Member District	1.00 ***	(0.03)	.18	1.02 ***	(0.04)	.10
Ethnic Minority	-.24 ***	(0.06)	-.05	-.45 ***	(0.05)	-.04
Minority*Special accomodation	.04	(0.07)	.01	.40 ***	(0.07)	.04
Minority*Limited power	-.07	(0.07)	-.01	-.01	(0.07)	.00
Minority*Single Member District	.24 ***	(0.08)	.05	-.05	(0.08)	-.01
Pseudo R^2 (Cragg & Uhler's)	.04			.03		
n (weighted)	22,791			22,072		

***p < .01; **p < .05; *p < .10

Note: Estimates for socio-economic controls (female, age, education, employment status and income) not shown.

Min-max represents the average change in probability of being in the modal category(above the mid-point) across each category of the dependent variable.

Data from Israel are missing.

Source: World Values Surveys

Appendix Table 1: Institutional Factors Associated with Minority Representation

Country	Limited Power*	Special Accommodations†	Single Member District
Albania			
Australia	x		x
Bangladesh			x
Belgium		x	
Brazil			
Canada			x
Chile	x		
Colombia	x	x	
Dominican Republic	x		
Estonia			
Georgia			
India	x	x	x
Indonesia	x		
Israel	x		
Latvia	x		
Mexico	x		
Moldova			
New Zealand	x	x	
Nigeria			x
Peru			
Philippines	x		
South Africa	x		
Spain			
Switzerland		x	
Republic of Macedonia			
Great Britain			x
Taiwan	x	x	
Uruguay			
United States		x	x
Venezuela		x	
Northern Ireland	x		x
Serbia	x	x	
Montenegro	x	x	

*Minorities at Risk (MAR); †Htun (2003)

Appendix Table 2: Mean Differences by Minority Status and Country

	Political Involvement			Participation			Satisfaction with Reps			Confidence in Government					
	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference	Non-Minority	Ethnic Minority	Difference			
Albania	.47	.33	-.14	.27	.33	.06	.26	.11	-.15	+	.44	.28	-.17		
Australia	.64	.69	.05	.81	.47	-.34	*	.43	.56	.13		.36	.46	.10	
Bangladesh	.61	.92	.31	.15	.15	.01		.62	.59	-.03		.74	.69	-.05	
Belgium	.43	.48	.04	.80	.66	-.14	*								
Brazil	.59	.47	-.12	*	.56	.47	-.09	*	.51	.45	-.05	*	.35	.32	-.03
Canada	.60	.48	-.12	*	.76	.71	-.05	*	.54	.51	-.03	*	.42	.40	-.01
Chile	.41	.38	-.03		.27	.27	.00		.56	.48	-.09	*	.41	.41	-.01
Taiwan	.57	.59	.02		.11	.16	.05		.44	.44	.00		.50	.51	.01
Colombia	.76	.57	-.18	*	.26	.23	-.03	*	.31	.32	.01		.34	.32	-.02
Dominican Republica	.59	.56	-.03		.33	.32	-.01		.16	.18	.02		.27	.24	-.03
Estonia					.27	.21	-.05	*							
Georgia	.61	.55	-.06	+	.27	.22	-.05	+	.30	.28	-.02		.40	.44	.04
India	.61	.51	-.10	*	.35	.24	-.10	*	.51	.54	.03		.49	.45	-.04
Indonesia	.57	.53	-.04		.15	.24	.09		.36	.52	.16		.47	.39	-.09
Israel	.70	.66	-.04		.49	.21	-.28	*							
Latvia					.33	.35	.02								
Mexico	.56	.61	.04		.17	.16	-.01		.45	.42	-.03	+	.32	.34	.02
Republic of Moldova	.56	.47	-.09	*	.30	.09	-.21	*	.31	.31	.00		.37	.37	.01
New Zealand	.66	.73	.07		.90	.73	-.17	*	.31	.29	-.03		.28	.30	.02
Nigeria	.67	.65	-.02		.28	.28	-.01		.60	.58	-.03	*	.47	.49	.01
Peru	.65	.57	-.08	*	.33	.30	-.04		.45	.48	.03		.31	.29	-.01
Philippines	.70	.70	.01		.13	.15	.02		.49	.50	.01		.51	.53	.01
South Africa	.69	.42	-.28	*	.38	.35	-.03		.54	.35	-.18	*	.60	.34	-.27
Spain	.36	.36	.00		.36	.28	-.08	*	.47	.41	-.06	*	.44	.42	-.02
Switzerland	.56	.41	-.16	*	.60	.78	.18		.54	.52	-.02		.43	.42	-.01
Republic of Macedonia	.59	.53	-.06	+	.33	.33	.00		.28	.19	-.09	*	.20	.16	-.04
Great Britain	.46	.44	-.02		.79	.81	.03								
United States	.72	.79	.07		.87	.70	-.17	*	.54	.58	.04		.40	.44	.03
Uruguay	.49	.50	.01		.36	.48	.12		.36	.31	-.06	*	.41	.36	-.06
Venezuala	.43	.37	-.06		.21	.24	.04		.54	.52	-.01		.37	.39	.02
Northern Ireland	.44	.54	.10		.59	.63	.04								
Serbia	.46	.36	-.10	*	.38	.28	-.09	*	.40	.41	.01		.31	.37	.05
Montenegro	.53	.46	-.07	*	.32	.25	-.07	*	.34	.34	.00		.37	.32	-.05

*p<.05; +p<.10