

Annex to David Sanders, Stephen D. Fisher, Anthony Heath and Maria Sobolewska ‘The Democratic Engagement of Britain’s Ethnic Minorities’. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (2014, forthcoming)

Appendix 1: Definitions of Independent Variables used in Estimating Model [1] Table 6 and Appendix 2

Independent Variable	Range	Explanation
Discrimination – egocentric	0-3	Frequency of experience of discrimination: 0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; no response coded as 0.
Discrimination – sociotropic	1-5 scale	Combination of three discrimination measures: (a) Likert Scale response to statement ‘Non-white people are held back by prejudice’. Recoded so that 1 = very low discrimination; 5 = very high discrimination; no opinion coded as 3. (b) Likert Scale response to statement ‘There is a big gap between what people from my ethnic group expect to get out of life and what they receive’. Recoded so that 1 = very low discrimination; 5 = very high discrimination; no opinion coded as 3. (c) Scale measuring number of specified ethnic groups the respondent believes suffer from discrimination in Britain; scale had range 0-4. Add 1 to convert to 1-5 scale. Sociotropic Discrimination scale constructed as (a) + (b) + (c) divided by 3.
Social Distance	1-5 scale	How far respondent would be ‘bothered’ if a close family member married a white person: 1 = not at all; 2 = not very much; 3 = a little; 4 = rather a lot; 5 = a great deal; no opinion recoded as 3.
Education	0-1	Education: mean zero alpha scaled measure combining qualifications and age left school; recoded so that greater than mean = 1; mean or less = 0
Relative Deprivation	1-5 scale	Likert Scale response to statement ‘There is a big gap between what people like me expect to get out of life and what they receive’. Recoded so that 1 = very low deprivation; 5 = very high deprivation; no opinion coded as 3.
Negative Valence	0-1	Respondent states ‘no party’ is best at handling the most important issue facing the country or that ‘no party’ is best at handling the most important issues facing ‘Black and Asian people’ coded as 1; otherwise = 0.
Minority Embeddedness	0-6 scale	Combination of six measures:

		<p>(a) Respondent feels own ethnic identity more strongly s/he feels British = 1; not = 0</p> <p>(b) Respondent feels a fair amount or a great deal in common either with fellow ethnic minority members or with co-religionists = 1; not = 0</p> <p>(c) Respondent believes back and Asian people should keep their own values = 1; not = 0</p> <p>(d) Respondent takes part in ethnic cultural organization(s) = 1; not = 0</p> <p>(e) Respondent reads a newspaper focused on ethnic minority issues = 1; not = 0</p> <p>(f) Respondent is fairly or very interested in the politics of 'home' country = 1; not = 0</p> <p>Minority Embeddedness scale constructed as (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) + (f)</p>
Majority Embeddedness	-6.9 to +5.3 scale	<p>Combination of two measures:</p> <p>(a) Self-rated command of English language on 1-5 scale</p> <p>(b) British Cultural Practices: alpha mean zero scale combining responses to respondent's use of Christmas cards, Valentine Cards, Mother and Father's Day cards, Christmas trees, Wearing poppies, giving Christmas presents</p> <p>Majority Embeddedness scale constructed as (a)*(b)</p>

Appendix 2: Summary of findings of Democratic Engagement Index ‘Component Models’

	<i>Voting</i>	<i>Party ID</i>	<i>Civic Duty</i>	<i>Conventional Participation</i>	<i>Institutional Trust</i>	<i>Democracy Satisfaction</i>	<i>Reject Violent Protest</i>	<i>Interest in Politics</i>	<i>Political Knowledge</i>	<i>Political Integration Index</i>
Discrimination-egocentric				+	-	-		+		
Discrimination-sociotropic			-		-	-			+	-
Social Distance		+	+	-				-		
Minority Embeddedness		+	+	+			-	+		+
Majority Acculturation	+	+						+	+	+
Relative Deprivation					-	-				
Negative Valence	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-
Education		-	+	+				+		+
Efficacy	*	+	+	+		+	-	+		+
Male									+	
Manual				-					-	-
Young (under 37)	-	-	-				-		-	-
Generation 2 or 3		-		-	-	-	-			-
Young* Generation 2 or 3					-	-				
Ethnic Density of area	+	+	+							+

*Voting model also includes terms for Discounted Benefits, Civic Duty and Party Contact (all positive and significant) and Costs (negative and significant). Voting model excludes Efficacy because Efficacy is included in the construction of the Discounted Benefits term. Political Integration Index combines all nine individual components.

The results reported show the consequences of estimating a reduced form version on equation [1], dropping the age/generation/ethnicity dummies and interaction terms described in b_{16} - b_{23} and estimating only b_1 - b_{15} . The symbol + denotes a significant positive effect; - a significant negative effect; empty cells denote non-significant effects. Estimation for Voting was by clustered binary logit. Estimation for Party ID, Civic Duty, Conventional Participation, Democracy Satisfaction, Political Knowledge and Rejection of Violent Protest was by clustered ordered logit. Estimation for Institutional Trust, Interest in Politics and Political Integration was by clustered OLS.

The results show a variegated but broadly consistent pattern across the component indicators of democratic engagement. We note the following.

1. Where there are mixed positive and negative effects in the component dimensions (as with Discrimination-egocentric), the overall effect on the Democratic Engagement index is null.
2. Where the predominant effect of an independent variable is positive (as with Minority Embeddedness and Efficacy) the overall effect on the Democratic Engagement index is positive.
3. Where the predominant effect of an independent variable is negative (as with Negative Valence and second/third generation) the overall effect on the Democratic Engagement index is negative.
4. Not all effects are conducive to a positive interpretation of the consequences of multiculturalism. Whilst Minority Embeddedness increases engagement in general, it is also associated with greater tolerance of Violent Protest.
5. The terms for Younger and Second/Third Generation consistently have negative effects across a broad range of the component dimensions of democratic engagement. The fact that the Democratic Engagement index is affected negatively by these terms is not driven by a small number of strong effects on particular components.
6. There is an interesting combination of effects relating to the Second/Third Generation term. The factors that increase Conventional Participation (such as Efficacy and Minority Embeddedness) also increase support for Violent Protest. The Second/Third Generation is both less willing to participate in Conventional (Non-Electoral) activity and more prepared to support the use of violence. Indeed, the Second/Third Generation term is the only one that has a negative effect on both conventional participation and the rejection of violence.

We conclude that, although the specific effects of our independent variable set in [1] vary across components in a variegated way, the Democratic Engagement index model, since it combines aspects of all the different dimensions of engagement, provides a good summary expression of the complex forces that drive democratic engagement in contemporary Britain.

Full details of the estimates obtained in all models are available from the authors on request.