ecpr PRESS

why aren't they there?

the political representation of women, ethnic
groups and issue positions in legislatures

Didier Ruedin

ecpr PRESS

| contents

introduction

In the primaries of the 2008 US presidential election, the battle between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton for nomination by the Democratic Party grabbed headlines. Both candidates were different from the stereotypical white men who tend to dominate governments and legislatures across the western world. Voters were not only presented with the possibility of an alternative to the stereotypical white man, but they also had the opportunity or obligation to choose between one of them. In this sense, the 2008 US presidential election highlighted the importance of gender and ethnicity in political representation, and the tensions that may exist at their interface. Indirectly, the voters faced the question of whether a black man or a white woman should lead the country.

Perhaps less visible internationally was the renewed debate on gender quotas in Germany in 2011 and early 2012 – exemplified by the website Pro Quote in support of quotas. In contrast to the 2008 US election, debates on gender quotas address questions of political representation more directly. Although there is an unmistaken claim that there should be more women in legislatures, debates on gender quotas revolve mostly around the means to achieve this aim, not the aim itself. They draw directly on the radical expansion of citizenship in the twentieth century, namely the understanding that all humans are essentially equal. This argument of justice emphasises principles of fairness and mutual respect. In politics, this is well reflected in the mantra of one person, one vote: the principle that the voice of every citizen counts the same. The inclusiveness that underlies citizenship is a fundamental criterion for democracy (Dahl 1985). Debates on gender quotas and the attention both Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama received highlight that despite remarkable advances, ideals of equality are far from realised. In some places, women and ethnic minority groups remain systematically marginalised, and in almost all countries they are significantly under-represented in national legislatures. For example, the average legislature in 2013 comprises just 20 per cent women. Such political under-representation is problematic because the proportion of women and minority groups in national legislatures is indicative of their status in society.

This book seeks to understand why the proportion of women and ethnic minority groups in national legislatures varies across countries, and why legislatures are reflecting the issue positions of citizens to a different degree. There are various reasons to insist on representation in national parliaments and legislatures. For instance, it is often argued that women and ethnic minorities have interests that are distinct from those of the broader population. In order to accommodate these interests, it is vital to include women and minority groups in legislatures. Examples of such distinct interests include birth control for women or issues of land resources that may affect certain ethnic groups. The argument put forward is that certain issues are only representable by those directly affected because it is

impossible to appreciate the importance of such issues without direct experience. The contention that certain interests are unrepresentable is certainly controversial, but representation is thought to ensure that particularised and uncrystallised interests can be defended in the legislature. Such 'descriptive representation' of group members is necessary because sometimes women and ethnic minority groups do not trust men or members of the ethnic majority to represent their substantive interests (Mansbridge 1999). For a fuller understanding of political representation, this book also examines the representation of policy preferences and issue positions separately. These are considerations of what is commonly referred to as 'substantive representation'.

In most cases, the argument for including various groups and views in legislatures is based on concerns about the legitimacy and accountability of representative institutions. Where certain views, ideas or groups are excluded from the processes of decision-making, the political legitimacy of those institutions can be called into question. Accordingly, an institution consisting only of men, or one where only left-wing ideas are present, for instance, is seen as deviating from the ideal of inclusiveness to such an extent that some may question its legitimacy. This view is rooted in the ideals of direct democracy, where representation in the legislature is understood as entrusting someone else with one's right to participate in decision making processes. Where there are no legitimate representatives or some groups are significantly under-represented, social cohesion can be affected negatively.

Both approaches – whether based on legitimacy or the representation of interests – insist that national legislatures should be representative of the population. In this book, the level of political representation is considered high where the legislature resembles the population and low where the legislature differs significantly. Legislative representation is employed as a case of political representation, and consequently the two terms are largely used synonymously. Some studies concerned with policy-making focus on governments rather than legislatures, arguing that in advanced democracies governments are the drivers of public policy. In practice, there is little difference between the two foci (Powell 2000; Furedi 2005), possibly because government formation is intrinsically linked to the composition of the legislature (Gamson 1961; Manin *et al.* 1999; but see O'Brien 2012).

Not all legislatures are representative to the same degree. This book first examines the vastly different levels of representation in national legislatures, the representation of women and ethnic groups, as well as issue positions. As is common in the literature, I refer to the representation of women and ethnic groups as 'descriptive representation' and use the term 'substantive representation' for the representation of policy preferences and issue positions in different domains. I use the terms 'gender representation' and 'ethnic group representation' interchangeably with the representation of women and ethnic groups respectively, and use a group perspective commonly referred to as 'collective representation'. Similarly, I use policy representation as a synonym for the representation of issue positions and policy preferences.

In order to establish which factors are associated with higher levels of representation, it is first necessary to outline different conceptions of representation. This brief discussion clarifies the existence of different understandings of political representation and helps to approach the representation in national legislatures in a systematic manner. Based on a clear understanding of what political representation means, it is possible to establish the levels of representation in different countries. The first research question of this book is: How can we explain differences in the levels of political representation? In other words, applied to the specific forms of representation examined in this book: What factors are associated with levels of gender representation, ethnic group representation and policy representation in different domains?

In order to address this question, this book uses a cross-national comparison to tease out significant patterns. Throughout the book, institutional, cultural, and other factors are considered as variables that are associated with the different levels of representation observed. Very broadly, institutional factors refer to aspects of the electoral system and cultural variables capture the prevalent attitudes towards women and ethnic minority groups in different societies. The systematic inclusion of institutional and cultural factors in the empirical chapters (see Chapters Two – Five) leads to a better understanding of how these variables influence levels of representation. Existing studies on the representation of women may be most complete in this regard, but cultural variables are often an afterthought, despite the recognition that attitudes of the population and the elite may be substantial in shaping levels of representation.

Regarding the representation of women, almost all studies find a strong association between the presence of proportional electoral systems and higher levels of representation. In a similar vein, the presence of gender quotas is generally found to be associated with higher levels of representation. Party ideology is often highlighted, but it no longer appears that stronger left-wing parties result in higher levels of representation. More consistent are findings based on the supply of qualified women, although it is not entirely clear how the stipulated variables affect levels of representation. The variables might capture how established a democracy is or acknowledge economic modernisation; both aspects are thought to affect the prevalent attitudes in society. Studies that include cultural variables consistently find very strong associations with the representation of women. In the empirical chapter (see Chapter Two), both institutional and cultural variables are included in a systematic manner, leading to a better understanding of how these variables work when considered simultaneously.

As far as the representation of ethnic groups is concerned, lack of data prevented the multivariate comparative studies common for the representation of women. Instead, it is often assumed that findings from the representation of women apply equally to the representation of different kinds of ethnic groups, including immigrants in Western societies. This assumption seems to be supported by single-country studies. In particular, the role of proportional electoral systems is highlighted. Supply factors are sometimes discussed, but interlocking statuses make it more difficult to examine their influence than is the case for women. Cultural

chapter one | political representation: a framework

The concept of political representation is often used in the literature, but its exact meaning is rarely examined in detail (Birch 1971; Eulau and Wahlke 1978; Blondel *et al.* 1997; Brennan and Hamlin 1999; Miller *et al.* 1999).[1] When looking at the concept in detail, it becomes clear that there is no single understanding (Pitkin 1967; Brennan and Hamlin 1999). It is therefore helpful to reflect on the different notions of representation. It is the central concept of this book and this chapter unpacks its complexity, bringing together the varied approaches into a comprehensive understanding of political representation.

The chapter begins by looking at the different components of the concept of representation, which helps to define the scope of this book. The role of representatives is investigated, as well as which characteristics should be represented. This discussion builds towards the theoretical framework by selecting the forms of representation most relevant to the empirical analysis. The framework itself is a new synthesis of previous contributions and forms the basis for the chapters that follow. Whilst the framework integrates different facets of representation, it does not attempt to provide a comprehensive theory. It is a tool to inform the hypotheses presented at the end of the chapter.

What is representation?

Whilst political representation is frequently studied, surprisingly few contributions work towards a better understanding of its meaning. In this book, representation in legislatures refers to a case of political representation. At its most general, representation is defined as '[being] present on behalf of someone else who is absent' (*Britannica* 2006a). In the context of politics, this describes 'the idea that people, while not in person present at the seat of government are to be considered present by proxy' (Ford 1925: 3). In order for representation to take place, two conditions are required: a person or group of persons that should be present, and a person or group of persons to take their place instead. This process implies a specific purpose that representation serves (Fairlie 1940a, 1940b). For political representation, this specific purpose is involvement in decision-making, and it requires a specific means of selecting representatives.

Implicit in this classic view of representation is the contention that the citizens deserve a voice: they are sovereign citizens. The fundamental moral principle is

---

[1]. This has changed recently with new theoretical developments that examine the concept of representation in detail. See, for example, Rehfeld 2006, 2009, 2011; Mansbridge 2003, 2008, 2011; Saward 2006, 2010; and Severs 2010.

that the preferences of the citizens should prevail. For practical or other reasons, the sovereign citizens cannot be present at a place, and they elect representatives to look out for their substantive interests. The basis of the notion of sovereign citizens is the concept of equality. If the citizens are of equal worth, this means that all citizens should be eligible to vote, as well as to stand for election (Rehfeld 2006). Whilst most classical contributions emphasise the representation of policy preferences, the general argument equally applies to the representation of women and ethnic groups.

There are two sets of principles of social justice that can be applied to political representation. First, there are principles of distributive justice, as championed by Dahl (1985) or Rawls (1999). Secondly, there is Young (1990) arguing for a justice of difference. Rawls' approach regards justice as fairness, and it is based on a thought experiment involving rational actors behind the veil of ignorance. For Rawls, justice means that people are not discriminated against because of criteria such as skin colour or age. The principle of equality is based on individual rights. Young's argument contradicts both the logic and consequences of Rawls' approach. Young focuses on domination and oppression as the basis of injustice. Groups are regarded as oppressed if they are marginalised and powerless, amongst others, because they cannot take part in decision making. Justice can only be achieved where all voices can be heard, no matter how dominant one group may be. Her argument is based on the rights of groups. Whereas Rawls pays attention to the outcome of policy making, Young's approach includes an unmistakable claim that all minority groups should be present in the legislature to defend their interests.

Almost all accounts of political representation agree that the representatives should *act for* the citizens. The interests of individuals, however, can rarely be said to be singular. Together with different social roles and group membership – reflected in different and multiple identities – come different needs and interests (Squires 1996; Walby 2009; Smooth 2011). For example, a person's interests as a car driver may differ from those of the same person as an employee or as a parent. As a car driver, I might be interested in quick roads for short journey times. As a parent, I might be concerned with my children's safety when walking to school along busy roads. For all different roles, there are separate political interests that may not agree. When faced with the task of choosing a representative, these differing interests may complicate matters, since voters are normally only allowed a single vote. Most contributions to political representation ignore such cross-pressures or assume the primacy of certain political domains, such as concerns for the economy. The approach in this book allows for such influences and is open about which issue domain matters most to citizens.

Saward (2006, 2010) takes quite a different approach to the active aspects of political representation. Rather than simply insisting that representatives should act for citizens, he presents political representation as a question of claims-making, thus an active and creative process. Modern democracies are regarded as representative because they claim to be. Whilst this perspective expands the scope to non-electoral representative relationships, it can distract from the special role of electoral representation. Elections provide a systematic claim to

legitimacy that is widely accepted – other representative claims may speak to a more limited audience. Because of its institutional nature, electoral representation may also increase the chances that uncrystallised interests will be represented should the need arise. The claims-making perspective regards such interests as not represented until someone claims to do so. Moreover, because it is possible to remove representatives, elections can ensure formal accountability.

Questions of accountability are made more difficult because different forms of representation can be differentiated (Mansbridge 2003, 2011; Rehfeld 2011). For example, the relationship between citizens and representatives can be shaped in terms of electoral promises made during campaigns, but it is also possible that representatives focus on the interests of citizens outside their constituency. Seen this way, issues of responsiveness – acting for citizens – appear in a new light. Despite highlighting various possible relationships, recent theoretical developments contribute a clear insistence on the relational nature of political representation. While the comparative approach of this book is unable to capture all the different relationships possible, the theoretical framework used in the empirical chapters agrees with these theoretical developments and regards representation as a relationship between citizens and representatives. By looking at the representation of women, ethnic groups and different policy preferences, this book works towards a wider understanding of political representation, particularly in terms of representative outcomes. The exact relationship these entail will remain unexplored. The focus on electoral representation limits the scope of this book to forms where accountability and legitimacy are clearer than in many other representative relationships that can and do exist.

Linked with accountability is, to a certain extent, the question of whether citizens are the best judges of their own interests. On the one hand, citizens are regarded as independent and able individuals, capable of judging their own needs and desires better than anyone else can (Williams 1995; Thompson 2001). In this case, the possibility to remove unwanted representatives is an important part of political representation. On the other hand, the view that citizens are not very capable of knowing or expressing their priorities is also common (Ross 1943; Schumpeter 1996/1976; Eichenberg 2007). In this context, the concept of guardianship is often cited, emphasising the common good thought to be beyond the grasp of the ordinary person. Whilst there might be a case for disregarding some declared wishes, the concept of guardianship is in danger of legitimising undemocratic governments that no longer act for its citizens.

The claim that representatives should mirror the population may appeal even to those insisting on guardianship, provided it does not contradict the selection of individuals qualified for work as representatives (Dunn 1999; Mansbridge 2005). Most of the literature is silent on how the legislature should mirror the population, although the next section will explore different possibilities.

In order to ensure a legitimate and responsive government, this book insists on democracy, as do most accounts of political representation. Representative democracy is by far the most common means for selecting representatives, although other approaches are possible, such as direct appointment (Pennock 1968; Rehfeld

of representation is not concerned with proportions. Groups can be defined by demographic features or certain policy preferences. In multiparty elections, it can be assumed that legislatures represents all major issue positions, considering one domain at a time, and this relationship does not merit further investigation. The case is different for women and ethnic minority groups that may be absent from the legislature. Insisting on having at least one group member in the legislature reflects Young's (1990) conception of group justice to a certain extent: all voices should be heard and included in legislative discussions; here, diversity is positively valued (Walby 2009). However, it is frequently argued that a certain threshold needs to be reached before numerical presence translates into changes in legislatures. This argument usually draws on a case study by Kanter (1977), who demonstrated that the composition of groups affects the behaviour of group members. Whilst the presence of a single woman technically fulfils the requirement of women's voices being present, Kanter's study demonstrated that in groups dominated by one kind, the minority group often simply adopts the views and values of the dominant group. In rare cases, the visible prominence of minorities leads to over-achievers. Differences are likely to be emphasised and stereotyped. With a more balanced group composition, Kanter observed different kinds of behaviour. However, it is unclear to what extent these findings can be applied to national legislatures (Mackay 2004; Childs 2006; Childs and Krook 2006, 2008).

This book implicitly supports the idea that collective representation means that membership of the legislature should reflect the different groups and issue positions in society. Based on the view that all citizens are equal and should have their views represented in the legislature, the book goes further: higher levels of descriptive representation can be regarded as an indication of the status of the respective groups in society. The key argument is that the number of women in legislatures, for example, is a reflection of women's real position in the public sphere (Thomas 1994; Kimmel 2004). Indeed, in countries where the number of female representatives is high, the number of women in public positions of responsibility also tends to be high (Vallance 1979; Ruedin 2009). In this sense, it can be argued that high levels of descriptive representation are indicative of a society with harmonious gender and race relations. Identifying the factors shaping levels of representation may also help understanding and ultimately improve the status of women and minority groups.

A framework of political representation

So far, this chapter has focused on disentangling the different aspects of legislative representation. This has helped to delimit the research focus to a collective relationship between citizens and their representatives in national legislatures. This relationship covers both group membership – descriptive representation – and issue positions and policy preferences – substantive representation. In both cases, there is a normative assumption that legislatures should reflect the groups and preferences of the population. However, examining the nature of representation in isolation does not help to

chapter three | the representation of ethnic groups

In Trinidad and Tobago, about 38 per cent of the population are African and they are present in the House of Representatives in more or less this proportion. At the same time, individuals of mixed descent are numerically under-represented. Indeed, in many countries, ethnic minority groups are under-represented or even absent, such as in Chile. In this chapter, I examine ethnic group representation to examine why in many places ethnic minority groups are marginalised and under-represented in national legislatures. Although theories of justice emphasise both the under-representation of ethnic minorities and the under-representation of women, the political representation of ethnic groups is studied far less frequently. Studying ethnic groups is no less important than studying women, since ethnicity is the source of much segregation and discrimination. I define ethnic groups as groups of people who are related through kinship and have an awareness of a shared culture and ancestry. This means that ethnicity refers to self-declared group membership (Jenkins 1997). Despite some elements of choice, since ethnicity is what one identifies with, ethnic identities are rather stable (Green 2005; Hoddie 2006). For this reason, a systematic analysis of ethnic groups is possible. I examine the covariates of high levels of ethnic group representation, complementing the previous chapter with a different dimension of descriptive representation.

As a comparative analysis, this chapter breaks with the established literature where single-country studies are the norm (Messina 1989; Anwar 1994; Geisser 1997; Ramet 1997; Geddes 1998; Saggar 2000; Delemotte 2001; Pantoja and Segura 2003; Togeby 2008). Bird (2005) compares three developed countries, but stays clear of a numerical assessment; Banducci *et al.* (2004) compare the situation in the United States and New Zealand. Reynolds (2006) only addresses individual groups, focusing entirely on the role of the electoral system, whilst Bird (2003) examines the situation of individual visible minorities in fourteen countries, but avoids multivariate comparisons. Despite covering multiple countries, Bird *et al.* (2010) do not include comparative statistical analyses. Norris (2004) approaches the representation of ethnic groups with a survey question on whether members of different groups feel represented. Whilst her approach allows a numerical comparison, Norris cannot say anything about actual levels of representation. The systematic comparative consideration of ethnic group representation in this chapter leads to a better understanding of why levels of representation vary across countries.

Initially, I assess previous research, followed by a brief discussion of methodological aspects specific to this chapter. I then present the levels of ethnic group representation in free and partly-free countries: the extent to which different ethnic groups are present in national legislatures. The level of representation of some individual ethnic groups is discussed to highlight the diversity across ethnic groups

and countries. The main part of the chapter is dedicated to examining the contrib-
uting factors that shape the differences between countries in a multivariate cross-
national manner.

Research on ethnic group representation is notably sparser than research on
gender representation. Most of the literature concerned with ethnic group repre-
sentation regards representation at the local level and does not cover representation
in national legislatures (Engstrom and McDonald 1982; Welch 1990; Saggar and
Geddes 2000; Garbaye 2000; Bousetta 2001; van Heelsum 2002; Togeby 2005,
2008). In single-country studies, the focus is often on a specific minority group,
ethnic minorities as opposed to the majority population, or in Western Europe
immigrant groups. It is also often argued that ethnic minorities are traditionally
under-represented (Rothman 2004; Bird 2005).

When it comes to the different levels of ethnic group representation, party
political explanations are probably most common. Sometimes candidates do not
come forward for election in sufficient numbers, although this factor is difficult to
capture. No systematic data exist to deal with 'candidate effects' in an adequate
manner in this chapter. Where collected, such data – measuring participation in
education or the labour force – tend to use nationality rather than ethnicity as
the basis (OECD 2006; ILO 2007). The resulting indicators allow no reasonable
conclusions about the supply of candidates. Following the theoretical framework
in Chapter One, however, it is likely that models that account for differences in
cultural attitudes to some extent cover issues of supply. Nonetheless, the absence
of data should not be interpreted as a lack of association. Institutional factors are
also mentioned in some studies, especially the presence of proportional electoral
systems. Proportional systems are thought to benefit all kinds of minorities and
their political representation. Discrimination on behalf of the party elite or voters
is also mentioned, but this tends to be argumentative rather than based on clear
evidence. It seems that many members of ethnic minorities think that their inter-
ests can only be appropriately represented by another group member (Ross 1943;
Schwartz 1988; Phillips 1993; Williams 1995). In other words, they demand de-
scriptive representation to achieve substantive representation.

There are also utilitarian arguments for increased levels of ethnic group rep-
resentation, since levels of representation are associated with better integration:
where levels of representation are higher, fewer members of ethnic minorities feel
alienated by the political system (Pantoja and Segura 2003; Norris 2004; Banducci
et al. 2004). Saggar (2000) is more cautious, suggesting that in Britain higher
levels of representation at the local level did not lead to reduced alienation from
the system overall. Reynolds (2006) follows a similar line of thought, arguing that
only where minority communities are properly included can ethnic conflict be
avoided. Minorities in many places are systematically excluded from significant
decisions, such as electoral reform, government, or the drafting of a new constitu-
tion. It is argued that where certain ethnic groups are excluded, such as the Roma
in many European countries, there is potential for future conflict (Ramet 1997;
Rothman 2004; Cederman *et al.* 2010; Wucherpfennig *et al.* 2012).

What unites almost all studies on ethnic group representation is that they find a significant under-representation of ethnic minorities in positions of power. The popular view that ethnic minorities are completely excluded from positions of power, however, is often an exaggeration (Alba and Moore 1982; Geddes 1998). Geisser (1997) highlights that, despite much talk of what he calls an ethnification of the world, the integration of ethnic minority groups is incomplete. In France, this is reflected in the low level of Algerians and Muslims in local councils. Saggar (2000) equally focuses on representation at the local level, and argues that local representation stands for a certain degree of local autonomy, assuming a geographical concentration of ethnic groups.

It is sometimes argued that both women and ethnic groups are under-represented in positions of power for similar reasons. Consequently – as reflected in the theoretical framework – the same hypotheses can be applied to gender representation and ethnic group representation (Taagepera 1994; Lijphart 1999; Heath *et al.* 2005; but see Walby 2009). In broad terms, this means that both the electoral system and cultural aspects can be expected to contribute to levels of ethnic group representation. More specifically, the presence of PR systems and liberal cultural attitudes is thought to be conducive to higher levels of ethnic group representation. Where there are quotas for specific ethnic groups, the expectation would be that levels of representation are higher. Similarly, more developed political rights and more established systems are thought to be associated with higher levels of representation. These general expectations reflect the findings of single-country studies (Welch 1990; Geisser 1997; Saggar 2000; Saggar and Geddes 2000; Spirova 2004; Moser 2004; Bochsler 2006).

Newly collected data and those based on established reference works are used to examine the representation of ethnic groups (see the Appendix). The representation scores compare the proportion of ethnic minority groups in the population and the legislature. Formally, ethnic representation scores Q_E are calculated as the difference between the proportion of each ethnic group in the population ($\Pi_{Z,i}$), and the equivalent in the representatives ($\Pi_{R,i}$). The measure used is a generalised form of the one used for gender representation: $Q_E = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\Pi_{Z,i} - \Pi_{R,i}\right|$. It is suited for all countries, regardless of the size of the minority groups in the population. This measure corresponds to the *Rose Index* (Mackie and Rose 1991), and representation scores theoretically range from 0 to 1. A representation score of 1 is achieved in a country where the proportions of the different ethnic groups are perfectly reflected in the legislature. For example, in 2006, the proportion of whites in the population in the UK was 93 per cent, whilst the proportion of whites in parliament was 98 per cent. The difference between the two values is 0.05. At the same time, the proportion of ethnic minorities in the population was 7 per cent, with 2 per cent in parliament. The difference between values in this case is 0.05. The values are added up, divided by two, and then subtracted from 1 to give a representation score $Q_{E,UK}$=0.95.

Rather than focusing on a single ethnic minority group, the measure Q_E allows an assessment of how well the legislature reflects all the ethnic groups found in the

population. In this sense, the measure is concerned with the normative claim that legislatures should mirror the population overall. Rather than imposing external categories, the measure used caters for the most salient ethnic differences in each country. There is more than one estimate for many countries, although the different sources tend to agree on which ethnic divisions are salient in a country and how many citizens and representatives fall into each group. The approach used in this chapter means that, in a few countries immigrant groups are considered as relevant ethnic groups, whereas in other countries different divisions are salient.

A measure of relative representation can be calculated by dividing the proportion of ethnic minorities in the legislature ($II_{R,m}$) by the proportion in the population ($II_{Z,m}$): $R_E = II_{R,m}/II_{Z,m}$. The variable m in this case denotes all ethnic minority groups combined. Such R-scores are simply a statement of what proportion of the minority population is included in the legislature, irrespective of its size. The values range from zero, where ethnic minorities are absent in the legislature, to values greater than one, where they are numerically over-represented. The latter happens for some individual ethnic groups. While they are sensitive to measurement error and outliers, relative representation scores (R-scores) are insensitive to the heterogeneity of society overall, and are therefore useful in assessing the influence of heterogeneity on levels of representation measured by Q-scores.

Findings

Using the data available, levels of ethnic group representation can be calculated for 101 countries; for 115 countries, there is information on whether or not ethnic minorities are present in the legislature. Figure 3.1 reproduces the distribution of representation scores in graphical form; the representation scores for all countries are included in the Appendix. The levels of ethnic group representation are generally considerably higher than the levels for women. However, in contrast with gender, there are many countries where the population is ethnically relatively homogeneous. Sensitivity analysis suggests that the skew visible in Figure 3.6 is not problematic: The more homogeneous countries do not drive the results reported in this chapter. The distribution for countries that are more heterogeneous than average is somewhat similar to the overall distribution: values are concentrated towards the upper end of the scale, but the distribution is flatter. As discussed below, the representation scores will invariably be comparatively high in relatively homogeneous societies, but a control for heterogeneity will be used to cater for this characteristic of the measurement. The nature of the measurement means that a direct comparison of representation scores is of limited value.

In 77 per cent of the national legislatures covered in this chapter, there is at least one member of an ethnic minority group present. In the countries that are more heterogeneous than average, this value is 94.7 per cent. This indicates that in most countries, members from ethnic minority groups are in one way or another present in the legislature, particularly in countries where they form a more substantial part of the population. In some of the more homogeneous countries, ethnic