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Motivation, Research Question and Relevance

Motivation and Research Question

Racial intolerance as a challenge for democracies, but little knowledge about its consequences (e.g., in the political arena).

Research Question

Does racial intolerance lead to more non-violent protest behavior?

Relevance

Tolerance and protest as fundamental democratic principles.

Empirical analysis of the political consequences of racial intolerance.

Contribution to the debate on the effects of attitudes and the attitudinal climate on non-violent protest behavior.
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Definition of Concepts

Non-Violent Protest
- public expression of dissent by individuals or groups in order to influence a political decision or process, which they perceive as having negative consequences for themselves, another group or society as a whole (Rucht, 2009, 708)
- extra-representational, either voice- or exit-based (Teorell et al. 2007)
- neither people nor property is harmed (Norris 2002)

Racial Intolerance
- objection of groups outside one's own ethnicity, religion, or culture (cf. Dunn et al., 2009; Kirchner et al., 2011)
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Racial Intolerance and Non-Violent Protest - Argument on the Individual Level

Intolerant attitudes have high internal consistency → stronger basis for political behavior (Gibson, 2006)

Relative Deprivation Theory: racially intolerant people feel deprived and threatened by equality of rights → deprivation fosters frustration and leads to protest (Gurr, 1970)

Hypothesis 1
Racially intolerant individuals will be more likely to actively engage in non-violent protest behavior.
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Racial Intolerance and Non-Violent Protest - Argument on the Aggregate Level (I)

Contexts (e.g. institutions, attitudinal climate) affect individual’s political behavior
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Contexts (e.g. institutions, attitudinal climate) affect individual’s political behavior

Necessary Assumptions regarding Contextual Effects:

1. Value orientations and attitudes differ between countries (cf. Schwartz, 2006) → culture of values and attitudes

2. Culture of values and attitudes is perceived by individuals and influences their behavior (cf. Books and Prysby, 1988) → contextual effects
People react on the perceived culture of values and attitudes in a country → values and attitudes should have an „ecological effect“ on individual level behavior (Welzel and Deutsch 2012, 467)

„Social contagion“ is supposed to cause an „elevator effect“ (Welzel and Deutsch, 2012, 467)
People react on the perceived culture of values and attitudes in a country → values and attitudes should have an „ecological effect“ on individual level behavior (Welzel and Deutsch 2012, 467)

„Social contagion“ is supposed to cause an „elevator effect“ (Welzel and Deutsch, 2012, 467)

Hypothesis 2

A climate of racial intolerance within a country will lead to more active individual engagement in non-violent protest.
Racial Intolerance and Non-Violent Protest - Interaction between Aggregate and Individual Level (I)

Reinforcement of Individual Level Effect:

- „Amplifier effect“ because of social confirmation (Welzel and Deutsch, 2012)
- *Spiral of Silence*: minority refrains itself from expressing its opinion (Noelle-Neumann, 1974)
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Reinforcement of Individual Level Effect:

- „Amplifier effect“ because of social confirmation (Welzel and Deutsch, 2012)
- *Spiral of Silence*: minority refrains itself from expressing its opinion (Noelle-Neumann, 1974)

Hypothesis 3a

A climate of racial intolerance within a country will amplify the positive relation between (individual) racial intolerance and active engagement in non-violent protest.
Reduction of Individual Level Effect:

- *Rational Choice*: political participation is only rational if the benefits of one’s own action are higher than the costs (Blais, 2000; Downs, 1957; Olson, 1965)

- Culture of conformity on attitudes makes action unnecessary
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Reduction of Individual Level Effect:

- *Rational Choice:* political participation is only rational if the benefits of one’s own action are higher than the costs (Blais, 2000; Downs, 1957; Olson, 1965)

- Culture of conformity on attitudes makes action unnecessary

Hypothesis 3b

A climate of racial intolerance within a country will decrease the positive relation between (individual) racial intolerance and active engagement in non-violent protest.
Model, Data and Operationalization

Statistical Modelling and Data

- Linear hierarchical models with random intercepts and random slopes

Data
- WVS 2005 (32 countries with Freedom House Index ≤ 3)

Operationalization
- **Dependent Variable:** factor scores for non-violent protest (items included: signing a petition, joining boycotts, lawful demonstrations)
- **Independent Variable:** factor scores for racial intolerance (would not like to have as neighbors: people of a different race, immigrants/foreign workers, people of a different religion, people who speak a different language)
- **Contextual Variable:** aggregated scores of racial intolerance
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### Table 2: Racial intolerance and non-violent protest – Regression results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender [1=female]</td>
<td>-0.016***</td>
<td>-0.016***</td>
<td>-0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.000*</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-materialism</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-0.008***</td>
<td>-0.008***</td>
<td>-0.008***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active associational engagement</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with life</td>
<td>-0.004***</td>
<td>-0.004***</td>
<td>-0.004***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial intolerance</strong></td>
<td>0.017**</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
<td>-0.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial intolerance climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.521*</td>
<td>-0.561*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human development index</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effect: racial intol.* racial intolerance climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.231**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.128***</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<0.1; **<0.05; ***<0.01
Results (II)

Figure 1: Marginal effect of individual level racial intolerance on non-violent protest participation by contextual racial intolerance climate
Conclusion

Racial intolerance is linked to non-violent protest (individual level: positive link; aggregate level: negative link). The positive effect of racial intolerance is reinforced by intolerant climate ("amplifier effect", Spiral of Silence).

Limits
The micro-macro paradox remains unsolved, and causality remains unclear.

Implications
- New participatory gap
- Study underscores the importance of values and attitudes for political participation.
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### Descriptive Statistics

#### Table 1: Mean of non-violent protest activity and racial intolerance by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>mean of non-violent protest</th>
<th>mean of racial intolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Variables (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization and source</th>
<th>Exp¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Non-violent protest      | Now I'd like you to look at this card. I'm going to read out some forms of political action that people can take, and I'd like you to tell me, for each one, have you or have you not done any of these activities in the last five years? (Read out and code one answer for each action):  
  - Signing a petition [V100]  
  - Joining in Boycotts [V101]  
  - Attending a peaceful demonstration [V102]  
  have done=1, Have not done=0. With the help of ML-factor analysis on the base of a tetrachoric correlation matrix we could identify a single factor for non-violent protest behavior with higher values indicating higher likelihood of participation. |      |
| Racial intolerance       | On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbors?  
  - People of a different race [V35]  
  - Immigrants/Foreign workers [V37]  
  - People of a different religion [V39]  
  - People who speak a different language [V42]  
  not mentioned=0, mentioned=1. With the help of ML-factor analysis on the base of a tetrachoric correlation matrix we could identify a single factor for racial intolerance with higher values indicating higher levels of individual racial intolerance. |      |
| Gender                   | Dummy variable with 0 = male and 1 = female [V235, recoded]. |      |
| Age                      | Can you tell me your year of birth, please? 19__ [V236]. Recoded in years old and centered on the grand mean of the sample. |      |
| Educational level        | Scale from ‘no formal education’ (0) to ‘university-level-education with degree’ (8). [V238, recoded]. |      |
| Active associational engagement | The variable takes the value 1 if the respondent is an active member in at least one of the following kinds of clubs/associations:  
  - Church or religious organization [V24];  
  - Sport or recreational organization [V25];  
  - Art, music or educational organization [V26];  
  - Labor Union [V27];  
  - Political party [V28];  
  - Environmental organization [V29];  
  - Professional association [V30];  
  - Humanitarian or charitable organization [V31];  
  - Consumer organization [V32];  
  Any other (write in):__ [V33].  
  If the respondent is a passive member or not a member at all in any of the above listed associations the variable takes the value 0. |      |
### Variables (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization and source¹</th>
<th>Exp²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-materialism</strong></td>
<td><em>If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? (Code one answer only under “first choice”) [V71], And which would be the next most important? (Code one answer only under “second choice”) [V72].</em>&lt;br&gt;- Maintaining order in the nation&lt;br&gt;- Giving people more say in important government decisions&lt;br&gt;- Fighting rising prices&lt;br&gt;- Protecting freedom of speech&lt;br&gt;Recoded: 0 = materialist (i.e., priority given to order and prices); 1 = priority to materialist and postmaterialist concerns; 2 = postmaterialist (i.e., priority given to government decisions and freedom).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td><em>In political matters, people talk of “the left” and “the right.” How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking? [V114]</em>&lt;br&gt;Scale ranging from 1 = the left to 10 = the right.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with life</strong></td>
<td><em>All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? Using this card on which 1 means you are “completely dissatisfied” and 10 means you are “completely satisfied” where would you put your satisfaction with your life as a whole? [V22]</em>&lt;br&gt;Scale ranging from 1 = completely dissatisfied to 10 = completely satisfied.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contextual-Level Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial intolerance climate</strong></td>
<td>Aggregated values of individual-level variable for each country (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human development index (HDI)</strong></td>
<td>UNDP Human Development Index (HDI); high values indicate high socioeconomic development. Average 2001-2002 [0.02, 0.14]. Source: Norris (2009a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic diversity</strong></td>
<td>Fractionalization index for various ethnic groups in a country. 0 = absolutely homogeneous; 1 = highly fractionalized [0; 0.75]. Source: Norris (2009a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All data on the individual-level come from the World Values Survey 2005-2008 (World Values Survey 2005 Official Data File v20090621a and v20090621b 2009).

² Exp. = theoretically derived expected direction of relationship (+ = positive relationship; − = negative relationship).


