DESCRIPTION OF MODEL COVARIATES (ONLINE APPENDIX)

The first set of variables that are included in all of the models are socio-demographic controls. Dummy variables were created for each of the five ethnic groups (reference category= Black African) as well as sex (female=1, μ = 0.52), generational status (second gen=1, μ = 0.35), and income (reference category=low income). Age ranges from 18 to 97 (μ = 39.0, SD = 14.9). Education is an ordinal variable that ranges from 0 to 5, with value 5 indicating post-graduate degree obtained in either the UK or abroad, and 0 signifying no British or overseas qualifications (μ = 2.39, SD = 1.63). Identity ranges from 0 to 2, with 0 indicating moderate to strong Black or Asian identification and 2 representing moderate to strong British identification (μ = 0.84, SD = 0.69). The middle category represents individuals who identify equally as British and Asian/Black. Lack of fluency in English can pose considerable barriers to registration and turnout, especially among the most recent arrivals from Africa. As such, English fluency is also considered, and this variable is operationalized by asking respondents whether English is the main language spoken at home (μ = 0.65, SD = 0.48).

In additional to standard demographic controls, theoretically important predictors of ethnic minority democratic engagement, as suggested by Heath et al. (2013) and Sanders et al. (2014), were also incorporated. Party identification is a dummy variable, where 0 stands for no party identification, and 1 signifies identifying with one of the parties in the UK, such as the Labour party (μ = 0.80, SD = 0.40). Political interest is a four-category measure of interest in British politics. The lowest response option means no interest at all, and the highest value stands for a great deal of interest (μ = 2.2, SD = 1.1). Political knowledge (0-5) is composed of the number of correct items reported from a five-item political quiz (μ = 3.1, SD = 1.2). Political efficacy (μ = 2.6, SD = 2.9) is operationalized using the following question: "On a scale from 0 to 10 where 10 means a great deal of influence and 0 means no influence, how much influence do you have on politics and public affairs?" Institutional trust is measured similarly to political efficacy, but this time respondents were asked how much they trust (0-10; 10=high trust) the Parliament at Westminster (μ = 5.1, SD = 2.7). Satisfaction with democracy is a categorical variable where 0 represents very dissatisfied with democracy in Britain, 1 stands for a little dissatisfied, and values 2 and 3 denote fairly or very satisfied, respectively (μ = 1.7, SD = 0.82). The last three variables are particularly important to account for because political efficacy, institutional trust, and satisfaction with British democracy correlate both with discrimination and turnout. Alternatively, these three variables were excluded from the voting models (see Model 4 reported in Tables 1 and

2).

The final covariates are worship attendance and a sense of civic duty. Worship attendance is an important catalyst to political participation because religious institutions play a significant role in developing civic skills and providing a common meeting place for individuals to interact and discuss salient issues (Verba et al. 2995). The ethical norm that citizens have a duty to vote is also considered an equally consequential and powerful predictor of voting behavior that is widely endorsed and adopted in North America and Europe (Blais and Galais 2016; Galais and Blais 2014, 2016). The higher an individual’s sense of duty, the higher the propensity that he/she will care a great deal about the outcome of the election and hence, to participate in politics. This certainly holds true among ethnic minorities in Britain (Heath et al. 2013). As such, civic duty is a key variable that is included in the local and general election models. To gauge a sense of civic duty, individuals were asked to report how strongly they agree or disagree with the following statement: "It is every citizen’s duty to vote in an election." About 85% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they have a duty to vote in elections. While questions such as these are susceptible to social desirability effects, the high sense of duty is, nevertheless, noteworthy and consistent with previous research that identifies this variable as a widely endorsed ethical norm (Blais and Galais 2016). The exclusion of this variable from the analysis does also not impact the overall findings. Additional descriptive statistics are provided in Table 7.

ONLINE APPENDIX TABLES

**Table 5.** Street and government discrimination models

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Local election | General election |
| Street Disc (Societal) | −0.154\*\* | −0.180\*\* |
|  | (0.076) | (0.076) |
| Government Disc (Political) | 0.163\*\* | 0.131\* |
|  | (0.079) | (0.078) |
| Worship Attendance | 0.092\*\*\* | 0.105\*\*\* |
|  | (0.033) | (0.034) |
| Political Interest | 0.258\*\*\* | 0.306\*\*\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.058) |
| Political Knowledge | 0.190\*\*\* | 0.218\*\*\* |
|  | (0.048) | (0.049) |
| Party ID (Yes = 1) | 0.889\*\*\* | 0.928\*\*\* |
|  | (0.141) | (0.139) |
| Identity (Brit = 2) | 0.053 | 0.089 |
|  | (0.084) | (0.086) |
| English (Main Lang) | 0.225\* | 0.255\* |
|  | (0.135) | (0.138) |
| Native Born | 0.377\*\*\* | 0.382\*\*\* |
|  | (0.140) | (0.146) |
| Female | 0.196\* | 0.360\*\*\* |
|  | (0.109) | (0.112) |
| Age | 0.040\*\*\* | 0.037\*\*\* |
|  | (0.005) | (0.005) |
| Education | −0.015 | −0.035 |
|  | (0.037) | (0.038) |
| High Income | 0.136 | 0.307 |
|  | (0.210) | (0.223) |
| Med Income | 0.127 | 0.311\* |
|  | (0.161) | (0.168) |
| Missing Income | 0.068 | 0.185 |
|  | (0.125) | (0.126) |
| Black Caribbean | 0.031 | 0.050 |
|  | (0.182) | (0.186) |
| Indian | 0.306\* | 0.599\*\*\* |
|  | (0.172) | (0.178) |
| Pakistani | 0.814\*\*\* | 0.703\*\*\* |
|  | (0.172) | (0.172) |
| Bangladeshi | 1.228\*\*\* | 1.337\*\*\* |
|  | (0.228) | (0.236) |
| Vote Duty | 0.496\*\*\* | 0.527\*\*\* |
|  | (0.068) | (0.066) |
| Political Efficacy | 0.034\* | 0.035\* |
|  | (0.020) | (0.020) |
| Democratic Satisfaction | 0.054 | 0.050 |
|  | (0.077) | (0.078) |
| Trust Parliament | 0.045\* | 0.020 |
|  | (0.024) | (0.025) |
| Constant | −6.320\*\*\* | −6.361\*\*\* |
|  | (0.465) | (0.468) |
| N | 1,979 | 2,102 |
| Log Likelihood | −1,060.935 | −1,032.876 |
| AIC | 2,169.870 | 2,113.753 |

*Note*:logistic regression (two-tailed test); standard errors in parentheses. \*p < 0.l; \*\*p < 0.05; \*\*\*p < 0.01

**Table 6.** The impact of street and government discrimination on ethnic engagement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Ethnic-based participation |
| Street Disc (Societal) | 0.180\*\*\* |
|  | (0.066) |
| Government Disc (Political) | 0.131\*\* |
|  | (0.065) |
| Worship Attendance | 0.231\*\*\* |
|  | (0.032) |
| Political Interest | 0.139\*\*\* |
|  | (0.051) |
| Political Knowledge | 0.184\*\*\* |
|  | (0.046) |
| Party ID (Yes = 1) | 0.434\*\*\* |
|  | (0.147) |
| Identity (Brit = 2) | −0.175\*\* |
|  | (0.076) |
| English (Main Lang) | −0.192 |
|  | (0.124) |
| Native Born | 0.383\*\*\* |
|  | (0.131) |
| Female | 0.040 |
|  | (0.101) |
| Age | 0.005 |
|  | (0.004) |
| Education | 0.069\*\* |
|  | (0.035) |
| High Income | 0.145 |
|  | (0.186) |
| Med Income | −0.001 |
|  | (0.145) |
| Missing Income | −0.125 |
|  | (0.117) |
| Black Caribbean | −0.024 |
|  | (0.170) |
| Indian | 0.537\*\*\* |
|  | (0.157) |
| Pakistani | −0.389\*\* |
|  | (0.162) |
| Bangladeshi | 0.053 |
|  | (0.203) |
| Political Efficacy | 0.081\*\*\* |
|  | (0.017) |
| Democratic Satisfaction | −0.061 |
|  | (0.070) |
| Trust Parliament | −0.030 |
|  | (0.022) |
| Constant | −3.042\*\*\* |
|  | (0.356) |
| N | 2,133 |
| Log Likelihood | −1,229.014 |
| AIC | 2,504.029 |

*Note*:logistic regression (two-tailed test); standard errors in parentheses. \*p < 0.l; \*\*p < 0.05; \*\*\*p < 0.01

**Table 7.** Summary Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Mean | Std. dev. | Min | Max |
| Local Election | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| General Election | 0.69 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| British Identity | 0.84 | 0.69 | 0 | 2 |
| Ethnic Engagement | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Broad Disc I | 0.30 | 0.46 | 0 | 1 |
| Broad Disc II | 0.57 | 0.93 | 0 | 3 |
| Societal Disc | 0.55 | 1.37 | 0 | 9 |
| Political Disc | 0.55 | 1.41 | 0 | 12 |
| Street Disc | 0.30 | 0.75 | 0 | 3 |
| Gov/Police Disc | 0.19 | 0.74 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Vote Duty | 4.21 | 0.88 | 1 | 5 |
| Worship Attendance | 2.66 | 1.79 | 0 | 5 |
| Political Interest | 2.18 | 1.12 | 0 | 4 |
| Political Knowledge | 3.13 | 1.24 | 0 | 5 |
| Political Efficacy | 2.64 | 2.86 | 0 | 10 |
| Democratic Satisfaction | 1.73 | 0.82 | 0 | 3 |
| Trust Parliament | 5.08 | 2.73 | 0 | 10 |
| Party ID (yes = 1) | 0.80 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| English Main Language | 0.65 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Native Born | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Female | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0 | 1 |
| Age | 39.01 | 14.89 | 18 | 97 |
| Education | 2.39 | 1.63 | 0 | 5 |
| High Income | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0 | 1 |
| Middle Income | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0 | 1 |
| Low Income | 0.39 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
| Missing Income | 0.38 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Black-Caribbean | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 |
| Black-African | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| Indian | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| Pakistani | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0 | 1 |
| Bangladeshi | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0 | 1 |

*\**Summary statistics without survey weights.