**Appendix A: Policies in the Multiculturalism Policy Index**

For each policy in the index countries that have a fully implemented policy indicator get a score of 1 for that policy, countries that have a partially implemented policy score a 0.5, and countries that do not have a policy in place have a score of 0. A country might score 0.5 if it has indicated intent to put a policy in place, but has only implemented certain aspects of it. For example, the Netherlands scores 0.5 for representation of minorities in the media between 1982 and 1994 because the government had reported on the lack of minority representation in the media and developed some efforts to create programs aimed at minorities. The country does not score a 1, however, until 1995 when it allocated set amounts of time to minority programming on its natural broadcaster. A country might also score 0.5 if a policy exists in only some parts of a country. For example, Belgium scores 0.5 on affirmative action between 2002 and 2007 because such a policy was in place in Flanders but not Wallonia. Adding the scores for each policy together creates a total score for the strength of each countries’ multiculturalism policy (Banting et al., 2006, 56-57).

Policies in the Multiculturalism Policy Index

* “The affirmation of a country as multicultural in legislation or in its constitution;
* the inclusion of multicultural or intercultural education in the school curriculum;
* policies requiring sensitivity to, and representation of, ethnic minorities in the media;
* policies providing for exemptions from dress codes for religious or cultural reasons;
* permission for dual citizenship;
* government funding for ethnic minority and multicultural organizations;
* support for mother-tongue education;
* affirmative action policies benefitting ethnic minorities” (Banting et al., 2006, 56-57).

**Appendix B: Measuring Party Support for Multiculturalism**

Consistent with my definition, the Manifesto Project does not use references to the term “multiculturalism” to determine whether statements are supportive or opposed to multiculturalism. Rather, statements are coded as supportive if they include positive references to cultural diversity or suggest that ethnic minorities should preserve their cultural heritage. Statements that refer to the importance of encouraging and enforcing cultural integration are coded as opposed (Volkens et al., 2013b). For example, a 2003 Swiss Social Democratic Party mention of the value of including minorities in the police force is coded as a positive mention of multiculturalism (Volkens et al., 2013a).

 The Manifesto Project conflates multiculturalism with multinationalism. Statements supportive of national minorities do not necessarily reflect a commitment by political parties to support multiculturalism directed at immigrants and ethnic minorities. Indeed, in some cases national minorities see multiculturalism as mutually exclusive with their own goals for recognition. For example, in Canada multiculturalism has seen opposition from some political elites in Quebec. In New Zealand, some Maori elites who are concerned that multiculturalism will replace recognition of their own distinct status[[1]](#footnote-1) (McRoberts, 1997; Spoonley, 2005).

 This conflation of multiculturalism and multinationalism in the data is particularly problematic for regionalist and separatist parties such as the Bloc Quebecois in Canada or the Vlaams Belang in Belgium because it heavily inflates their positive multiculturalism scores. It also exaggerates far-right parties’ support of multiculturalism if far-right parties are strong supporters of federal institutions, as is the case in Belgium and Switzerland. To compensate for this, I exclude regionalist, separatist, and far-right[[2]](#footnote-2) parties in the measures of cross-party support for multiculturalism.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 A trade-off needs to be made between the long time period and number of countries covered in the Manifesto Project and the better coding schemes used in other data such as the Chapel Hill expert survey. The Chapel Hill expert survey includes scores for parties’ multiculturalism positions, but does not extend backwards beyond the year 2000 and misses key countries such as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. As a result, the expert survey misses a key period of policy expansion, the 1980s and three countries in which a great deal of policy adoption took place. Even though there is some noise in the Manifesto Project data, the number of countries and length of time that it covers make it best available data on parties’ positions.

**Appendix C: Absence of Policy Retrenchment**

Figure C1 shows that, with respect to multiculturalism, policy retrenchment is unlikely. The gradual increase in each type of multiculturalism policy in the index shows little evidence of a turn away from multiculturalism. This is also support by table C1, which lists every case of retrenchment in my data. There are 10 total instances of retrenchment, 5 of which occur in the Netherlands. An additional instance of retrenchment occurs in Germany in 1972 for mother tongue education. It is likely that this policy was part of a program to facilitate majority language learning instead of an attempt to adopt a broader set of multiculturalism policies. The remaining instances of retrenchment occur in Austria, Denmark, and Italy in the early 2000s, and in the United States in the mid-1980s. All policies outside of the Netherlands that are retrenched are partial policies. When compared to the over 60 instances of policy adoption, the 10 instances of retrenchment suggest that it is rare that a country removes a multicultural policy once it has adopted one. This justifies the use of a proportional hazard model that looks at the likelihood of a policy being adopted as opposed to an OLS model that treats policy retrenchment as equally as likely as policy adoption.

 It should further be noted that the small number of instances of retrenchment make it impossible to use quantitative analysis to model policy retrenchment. The sample size is simply too small for quantitative analysis to produce meaningful results.

Figure C1: The Development of Multiculturalism Policies Over Time



Average policy adoption reflects the percentage of policies in each category that a country has adopted, with a maximum score of one. For example, a score of 0.5 for participation policies means that a country has adopted 1/2 participation policies. Percentages are used here so that policy categories with different numbers of policies can be compared.

**Table C1: Instances of Policy Retrenchment**

| Country | Year | Policy | Scale of Retrenchment | Policy Re-Adopted? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Austria | 2002 | Recognition in the school curriculum | Partial to no policy | No |
| Denmark | 2002 | Mother-tongue education | Partial to no policy | No |
| Germany | 1972 | Mother-tongue education | Partial to no policy | Partial policy re-adopted in 1983 |
| Italy | 2004 | Recognition in the school curriculum | Partial to no policy | Policy re-adopted in 2006 |
| Netherlands | 2008 | Media sensitivity | Full to partial policy | No |
| Netherlands | 2004 | Affirmative action | Full to no policy | No |
| Netherlands | 1997 | Dual citizenship | Full to partial policy | No |
| Netherlands | 1995 | Recognition in legislation | Full to no policy | No |
| Netherlands | 1994 | Mother-tongue education | Full to no policy | No |
| United States | 1984 | Dress code exemptions | Partial to no policy | No |

**Appendix D: Control Variables and Data Stratification**

The following appendix notes the data sources for control variables and justifies the stratification of data in the hazard models. A far-right party is considered present for an election if it wins either at least 1 seat or 5% of the popular vote. I consider a party to be a far-right party if it is coded as a nationalist party in the Manifesto Project data. I include four additional parties as far-right parties because they are often considered to be strongly anti-immigrant parties. These include the Vlaams Belang (and Vlaams Blok), the Progress Party in Denmark, then Progress Party in Norway, and New Democracy in Sweden. I measure ethnic minority electoral strength by multiplying the size of a country’s foreign-born population by the ease of access to citizenship in a country. The size of the foreign born population is measured using United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs data (United Nations, 2008) and access to citizenship is measured using Janoski’s Barriers to Naturalization Index (Janoski, 2010). By accounting for access to citizenship, the measure not only gets at the size of the foreign-born population in a country but their ability to vote in elections. This measure is correlated with parties’ support for multiculturalism, suggesting that it captures some of ethnic minorities’ political influence (Westlake, 2018).

 Controls for the institutional barriers that prevent a policy from being adopted come from the Quality of Governance data set (Teorell et al., 2013). The control for federalism comes from the federalism variable while the control for legislative veto points comes from the constraints on governments variable. The GDP control comes from OECD data (OECD, 2013).

 I do not include a control variable for public opinion in my analysis. I expect that when multiculturalism is salient that views on multiculturalism will be reflected through parties’ positions as parties respond to public opinion. When this is the case party positions and public opinion would covary, masking the impact of both on policy adoption. When multiculturalism is not salient, public opinion should affect neither positions nor policy adoption and thus should not need to be controlled for. On a practical level, there is an absence of annualized survey data on multiculturalism that uses similar questions to cover the time period and number of countries in my analysis. This makes the inclusion of a public opinion variable difficult.

 The International Social Survey Program provides point estimates for support for multiculturalism for three years, 1995, 2003, and 2013. Because this data is not annualized and misses policy adoption that occurred prior to 1995 in key countries such as Australia, Canada, and the Netherlands, it cannot be used as a control in the hazard model analysis I conduct throughout the paper. Nonetheless, it does show a disconnect between the public support for multiculturalism and the policies adopted. Figures D1, D2, and D3 show the proportion of respondents who stated that “racial and ethnic groups should maintain their distinct customs and traditions” instead of “adapt[ing] and blend[ing] into society” (ISSP Research Group, 2012) for 1995, 2003, and 2013 respectively. Rarely is there majority support for the idea that racial and ethnic minorities should maintain their own culture. Of the three countries that consistently have high proportions of individuals supporting minorities maintaining their distinct cultural practices, there has been a little change in multiculturalism policy. Germany and Japan both have weak multiculturalism policies that see little change over the 1995 to 2013 period and the United States has a moderate policy that does not change over this period. Meanwhile countries with strong policies such as Australia, Canada, and Sweden see relatively low numbers of respondents saying that racial and ethnic minorities should maintain their own cultural practices. This means one of two things. It could be that public opinion is not closely linked to policy change or that existing cross-national time-series measures of individuals’ attitudes towards diversity are doing a poor job of capturing how those individuals think about distinct policies such as those included in the Banting and Kymlicka index. Both possibilities mean that it is inappropriate to use existing public opinion measures as controls in my analysis.

Figure D1: Proportion of International Social Survey Respondents Saying Racial and Ethnic Minorities Should Maintain Their Culture (1995)



X's show estimates from the ISSP data and lines show the range for a 95% confidence level. Data comes from the ISSP national identity survey conducted in 1995 (ISSP Research Group, 1998).

Figure D2: Proportion of International Social Survey Respondents Saying Racial and Ethnic Minorities Should Maintain Their Culture (2003)



X's show estimates from the ISSP data and lines show the range for a 95% confidence level. Data comes from the ISSP national identity survey conducted in 1995 (ISSP Research Group, 2012).

Figure D3: Proportion of International Social Survey Respondents Saying Racial and Ethnic Minorities Should Maintain Their Culture (2013)



X’s show estimates from the ISSP data and lines show the range for a 95% confidence level. Data comes from the ISSP national identity survey conducted in 1995 (ISSP Research Group, 2015).

Cox proportional hazard models assume that each case in the analysis has the same baseline hazard, in this case, likelihood of policy adoption. The baseline hazard is the estimated likelihood of policy adoption that does not account for the effects of the independent variables. The difference in baseline hazards shown in figure D4 show that this is not the case. Settler countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States) see their baseline hazard peak in 1985 and then decline significantly. Australia and Canada had large immigrant populations by the 1960s and so would have faced significant pressure to adopt policies through the 1970s. This can account for the earlier increase in policy adoption in settler countries compared with non-settler countries. There were fewer policies for settler countries to adopt in the 1990s because Australia and Canada had adopted a large number prior to the 1990s. Stratifying data can help to control for differences in baseline hazards (Therneau and Grambsch, 2000). As such, I stratify data based on whether a country is a settler or non-settler country.

Figure D4: Smoothed Baseline Hazards for Total Policy Adoption in Settler and Non-Settler Countries



Lines show the baseline hazard (likelihood of policy adoption) without taking into account any explanatory variables.

**Appendix E- Regression Models with Varying Numbers of Control Variables**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E1: Left and Right Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only- First Column Table 1)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC Support | 1.067(0.798-1.427) | 1.058(0.858-1.305) | 1.171(0.826-1.660) | 1.132(0.845-1.517) | 1.012(0.807-1.268) |
| Right Party MC Support | 1.079(0.869-1.339) | 1.068(0.886-1.288) | 1.091(0.870-1.367) | 1.096(0.897-1.338) | 1.142\*(0.995-1.311) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.799(0.426-1.500) | 0.698(0.361-1.349) | 0.428\*\*\*(0.230-0.797) | 0.385\*\*(0.163-0.908) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.962(0.893-1.037) | 0.908\*\*(0.828-0.996) | 0.973(0.891-1.062) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.574(0.865-2.866) | 1.405(0.849-2.327) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.802\*(0.974-3.337) | 2.098\*(0.928-4.743) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.397(0.034-4.576) | 5.757(0.145-228.120) |
| Left Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 1.267\*(0.977-1.642) | 1.200(0.931-1.547) |
| Right Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 0.675\*\*\*(0.549-0.830) | 0.654\*\*\*(0.514-0.831) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.994(0.895-1.103) | 1.050(0.959-1.149) |
| MC Policies Already in Place  |  |  |  |  | 0.612\*\*\*(0.462-0.811) |
| Observations  | 959 | 958 | 711 | 611 | 611 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E2: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism- Second Column Table 1)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.935(0.852-1.027) | 0.934(0.852-1.024) | 0.971(0.871-1.084) | 0.953(0.829-1.094) | 0.951(0.822-1.101) |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.235\*\*\*(1.063-1.435) | 1.240\*\*\*(1.065-1.444) | 1.235\*\*\*(1.059-1.440) | 1.197\*\*(1.016-1.409) | 1.244\*\*\*(1.105-1.400) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.719(0.439-1.178) | 0.615\*(0.363-1.042) | 0.508\*\*(0.292-0.883) | 0.437\*(0.187-1.018) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.966(0.909-1.027) | 0.927\*\*(0.872-0.984) | 0.981(0.910-1.058) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.610(0.902-2.873) | 1.451(0.862-2.443) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.736\*\*(1.065-2.831) | 2.036\*(0.932-4.447) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.322(0.056-1.844) | 5.678(0.178-181.598) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.992(0.898-1.096) | 1.050(0.963-1.144) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.608\*\*\*(0.454-0.813) |
| Observations  | 959 | 958 | 711 | 611 | 611 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E3: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Multiculturalism Only- First Column Table 2)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.107(0.917-1.337) | 1.094(0.904-1.325) | 1.108(0.932-1.317) | 1.095(0.884-1.356) | 1.197\*\*(1.044-1.373) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.852(0.408-1.781) | 0.679(0.307-1.501) | 0.432\*\*(0.200-0.933) | 0.371\*\*(0.139-0.991) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.912\*\*(0.850-0.978) | 0.895\*\*\*(0.836-0.959) | 0.947(0.882-1.017) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.997\*\*(1.137-3.508) | 2.288\*(0.937-5.588) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.139(0.007-2.682) | 3.840(0.027-539.227) |
| Right Party Nationalism |  |  |  | 0.705\*\*(0.515-0.966) | 0.665\*\*(0.485-0.911) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.970(0.855-1.100) | 1.029(0.908-1.166) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.602\*\*\*(0.453-0.799) |
| Observations  | 561 | 561 | 412 | 376 | 376 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E4: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism- Second Column Table 2)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.258\*\*\*(1.099-1.439) | 1.263\*\*\*(1.096-1.456) | 1.223\*\*\*(1.086-1.378) | 1.214\*\*\*(1.057-1.394) | 1.298\*\*\*(1.156-1.458) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.762(0.387-1.503) | 0.653(0.344-1.241) | 0.497\*(0.246-1.000) | 0.392\*(0.152-1.009) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.914\*\*(0.853-0.980) | 0.896\*\*\*(0.838-0.957) | 0.948(0.880-1.020) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.050\*\*(1.164-3.611) | 2.278\*(0.917-5.658) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.187(0.010-3.450) | 6.454(0.044-946.918) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.962(0.849-1.091) | 1.024(0.911-1.150) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.599\*\*\*(0.452-0.795) |
| Observations  | 561 | 561 | 412 | 376 | 376 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E5: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only- First Column Table 3)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC Support | 0.902(0.715-1.137) | 0.877(0.693-1.111) | 0.900(0.689-1.176) | 0.878(0.662-1.163) | 0.865(0.719-1.039) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.685(0.365-1.285) | 0.591(0.286-1.221) | 0.464\*\*(0.243-0.887) | 0.395\*\*(0.167-0.939) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.975(0.918-1.034) | 0.940\*\*(0.890-0.993) | 1.008(0.934-1.087) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.695\*(0.927-3.097) | 1.412(0.872-2.288) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.546(0.902-2.650) | 1.691(0.764-3.743) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.056(0.902-2.650) | 17.556\*(0.742-415.197) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.888(0.751-1.050) | 0.750\*\*\*(0.624-0.901) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.946(0.863-1.038) | 1.028(0.950-1.111) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.576\*\*\*(0.419-0.792) |
| Observations  | 904 | 903 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E6: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only- Second Column Table 3)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC Support | 1.933\*\*(1.133-3.298) | 1.882\*\*(1.103-3.213) | 1.921\*\*(1.115-3.311) | 1.714\*\*(1.088-2.701) | 1.525\*\*(1.010-2.303) |
| Government MC Support | 0.547\*\*(0.338-0.885) | 0.551\*\*(0.342-0.888) | 0.559\*\*(0.339-0.922) | 0.584\*\*\*(0.391-0.873) | 0.638\*\*(0.449-0.906) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.810(0.445-1.477) | 0.674(0.336-1.354) | 0.488\*\*(0.256-0.928) | 0.424\*(0.177-1.018) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.967(0.911-1.026) | 0.957\*(0.910-1.006) | 1.011(0.944-1.083) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.999\*\*(1.017-3.929) | 1.521(0.788-2.933) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.487(0.903-2.449) | 1.710(0.761-3.840) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.485(0.099-2.386) | 8.904(0.329-240.795) |
| Cross Party Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.597(0.300-1.189) | 0.752(0.350-1.616) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 1.285(0.760-2.174) | 0.914(0.509-1.640) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.949(0.760-2.174) | 1.031(0.953-1.115) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.593\*\*\*(0.422-0.834) |
| Observations  | 903 | 902 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E7: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism- Third Column Table 3)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 1.025(0.888-1.183) | 1.017(0.884-1.170) | 1.031(0.873-1.217) | 0.991(0.827-1.188) | 1.051(0.908-1.217) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.755(0.427-1.336) | 0.643(0.325-1.271) | 0.462\*\*(0.239-0.892) | 0.359\*\*(0.154-0.886) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.966(0.908-1.028) | 0.937\*\*(0.887-0.989) | 0.994(0.921-1.072) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.670\*(0.940-2.968) | 1.378(0.837-2.270) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.570(0.895-2.753) | 1.729(0.781-3.829) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.334(0.133-13.351) | 23.143\*(0.577-938.246) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.944(0.862-1.035) | 1.019(0.944-1.101) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.603\*\*\*(0.456-0.798) |
| Observations  | 904 | 903 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table E8: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism- Fourth Column Table 3)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC/Nationalism Score | 1.675\*\*\*(1.241-2.261) | 1.704\*\*\*(1.252-2.320) | 1.609\*\*\*(1.168-2.217) | 1.644\*\*\*(1.165-2.320) | 1.386\*(0.957-2.007) |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 0.700\*\*(0.528-0.929) | 0.688\*\*\*(0.519-0.913) | 0.722\*\*(0.529-0.986) | 0.679\*\*(0.505-0.914) | 0.824(0.627-1.083) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.721(0.425-1.223) | 0.637(0.343-1.183) | 0.503\*\*(0.293-0.865) | 0.409\*\*(0.184-0.911) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.985(0.932-1.042) | 0.954\*(0.910-1.001) | 1.001(0.928-1.080) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.948\*\*(1.157-3.282) | 1.526(0.911-2.556) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.517(0.892-2.580) | 1.705(0.784-3.707) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.588(0.094-3.670) | 10.997(0.952-494.393) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.951(0.867-1.044) | 1.024(0.952-1.102) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.622\*\*\*(0.465-0.832) |
| Observations  | 903 | 902 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

**Appendix F- Models Excluding Switzerland and the United States**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F1: Left and Right Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC Support | 1.101(0.808-1.501) | 1.091(0.878-1.355) | 1.164(0.843-1.607) | 1.137(0.860-1.505) | 1.017(0.821-1.261) |
| Right Party MC Support | 1.041(0.836-1.297) | 1.024(0.842-1.246) | 1.041(0.849-1.276) | 1.056(0.875-1.275) | 1.109(0.975-1.261) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.742(0.379-1.453) | 0.628(0.295-1.330) | 0.385\*\*\*(0.198-0.748) | 0.364\*\*(0.147-0.900) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.958(0.891-1.030) | 0.912\*\*(0.834-0.998) | 0.974(0.892-1.062) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.556(0.837-2.8940 | 1.379(0.817-2.328) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.736\*(0.928-3.245) | 2.050\*(0.894-4.701) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.434(0.0.035-5.328) | 5.884(0.145-238.909) |
| Left Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 1.285\*(0.991-1.665) | 1.222(0.949-1.574) |
| Right Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 0.656\*\*\*(0.533-0.807) | 0.641\*\*\*(0.501-0.819) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.998(0.893-1.116) | 1.051(0.955-1.156) |
| MC Policies Already in Place  |  |  |  |  | 0.619\*\*\*(0.468-0.818) |
| Observations  | 864 | 863 | 636 | 578 | 578 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F2: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.945(0.857-1.043) | 0.943(0.856-1.038) | 0.960(0.862-1.069) | 0.953(0.831-1.092) | 0.953(0.826-1.0990 |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.227\*\*(1.049-1.435) | 1.233\*\*(1.051-1.447) | 1.212\*\*(1.040-1.412) | 1.184\*\*(1.007-1.393) | 1.229\*\*\*(1.094-1.381) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.676(0.397-1.150) | 0.567\*(0.311-1.034) | 0.492\*\*(0.272-0.892) | 0.439\*(0.181-1.065) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.960(0.905-1.018) | 0.930\*\*(0.876-0.987) | 0.982(0.0912-1.057) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.570(0.874-2.819) | 1.427(0.847-2.405) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.709\*\*(1.054-2.772) | 2.015(0.917-4.429) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.340(0.061-1.909) | 5.723(0.190-172.539) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.996(0.899-1.105) | 1.051(0.962-1.47) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.613\*\*\*(0.458-0.818) |
| Observations  | 864 | 863 | 636 | 578 | 578 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F3: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.077(0.896-1.295) | 1.050(0.868-1.270) | 1.068(0.895-1.273) | 1.084(0.901-1.304) | 1.155\*\*(1.005-1.328) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.735(0.314-1.720) | 0.599(0.237-1.517) | 0.427\*(0.164-1.109) | 0.332\*\*(0.110-0.999) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.916\*\*(0.855-0.981) | 0.898\*\*\*(0.836-0.965) | 0.954(0.887-1.027) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.924\*\*(1.054-3.512) | 1.982(0.806-4.870) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.651(0.023-18.553) | 25.557(0.114-5728.178) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.949(0.824-1.079) | 1.004(0.904-1.114) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.629\*\*\*(0.488-0.810) |
| Observations  | 537 | 537 | 390 | 355 | 355 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F4: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.245\*\*\*(1.089-1.423) | 1.250\*\*\*(1.086-1.440) | 1.210\*\*\*(1.076-1.360) | 1.200\*\*\*(1.050-1.372) | 1.279\*\*\*(1.148-1.425) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.687(0.336-1.406) | 0.599(0.300-1.195) | 0.468\*\*(0.221-0.990) | 0.384\*(0.141-1.045) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.919(0.858-0.983) | 0.900\*\*\*(0.844-0.959) | 0.949(0.883-1.020) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.007\*\*(0.1.155-3.487) | 2.216\*(0.902-5.444) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.218(0.0.012-3.969) | 6.887(0.053-898.389) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.965(0.846-1.102) | 1.022(0.906-1.153) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.607\*\*\*(0.462-0.799) |
| Observations  | 537 | 537 | 390 | 355 | 355 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F5: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC Support | 0.879(0.709-1.089) | 0.848(0.684-1.052) | 0.867(0.681-1.104) | 0.850(0.655-1.104) | 0.841\*\*(0.710-0.996) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.622(0.303-1.278) | 0.533(0.228-1.244) | 0.438\*\*(0.219-0.873) | 0.381\*\*(0.150-0.965) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.978(0.923-1.037) | 0.945\*\*(0.895-0.997) | 1.010(0.937-1.089) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.634(0.889-3.005) | 1.380(0.850-2.240) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.512(0.877-2.606) | 1.655(0.735-3.727) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.064(0.121-9.384) | 16.971\*(0.716-402.254) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.886(0.747-1.051) | 0.750\*\*\*(0.625-0.899) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.951(0.860-1.052) | 1.030(0.950-1.116) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.580\*\*\*(0.421-0.798) |
| Observations  | 860 | 859 | 634 | 577 | 577 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F6: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC Support | 1.875\*\*(1.109-3.171) | 1.800\*\*(1.061-3.053) | 1.826\*\*(1.072-3.111) | 1.634\*\*(1.030-2.591) | 1.465\*(0.965-2.222) |
| Government MC Support | 0.549\*\*(0.343-0.878) | 0.556\*\*(0.349-0.886) | 0.564(0.347-0.918) | 0.591\*\*(0.396-0.882) | 0.642\*\*(0.451-0.914) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.755(0.380-1.501) | 0.627(0.279-1.409) | 0.453\*\*(0.217-0.945) | 0.406\*(0.151-1.095) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.970(0.915-1.029) | 0.962(0.913-1.014) | 1.014(0.947-1.085) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.971(0.969-1.014) | 1.500(0.749-3.005) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.443(0.863-2.411) | 1.671(0.713-3.913) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.493(0.098-2.482) | 8.885(0.315-250.848) |
| Cross Party Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.587(0.286-1.208) | 0.751(0.334-1.690) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 1.297(0.755-2.229) | 0.917(0.499-1.685) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.954(0.860-1.057) | 1.032(0.953-1.119) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.596\*\*\*(0.423-0.841) |
| Observations  | 859 | 858 | 634 | 577 | 577 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F7: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 1.013(0.882-1.164) | 1.003(0.876-1.149) | 1.014(0.864-1.189) | 0.978(0.822-1.164) | 1.038(0.903-1.194) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.703(0.365-1.357) | 0.592(0.266-1.317) | 0.446\*\*(0.222-0.896) | 0.367\*\*(0.144-0.937) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.969(0.912-1.029) | 0.940\*\*(0.890-0.993) | 0.995(0.923-1.073) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.618(0.905-2.892) | 1.350(0.820-2.223) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.551(0.875-2.749) | 1.710(0.760-3.849) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.344(0.134-13.443) | 21.885\*(0.576-831.594) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.948(0.859-1.046) | 1.020(0.944-1.103) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.609\*\*\*(0.461-0.805) |
| Observations  | 860 | 859 | 634 | 577 | 577 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table F8: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC/Nationalism Score | 1.650\*\*\*(1.221-2.229) | 1.677\*\*\*(1.231-2.284) | 1.585\*\*\*(1.149-2.186) | 1.617\*\*\*(1.145-2.285) | 1.366\*(0.945-1.974) |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 0.701\*\*(0.530-0.927) | 0.689\*\*\*(0.521-0.911) | 0.720\*\*(0.529-0.980) | 0.680\*\*(0.506-0.915) | 0.823(0.628-1.080) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.682(0.374-1.244) | 0.594(0.289-1.219) | 0.488\*\*(0.274-0.869) | 0.408\*\*(0.173-0.961) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.988(0.935-1.043) | 0.956\*(0.912-1.003) | 1.002(0.929-1.080) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.895\*(1.112-3.231) | 1.495(0.890-2.514) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.505(0.877-2.582) | 1.695(0.766-3.750) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.607(0.097-3.795) | 10.840(0.258-454.634) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.955(0.865-1.055) | 1.025(0.951-1.105) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.627\*\*\*(0.469-0.838) |
| Observations  | 859 | 858 | 634 | 577 | 577 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

**Appendix G- Analyses Excluding Dual Citizenship**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G1: Left and Right Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC Support | 1.061(0.808-1.394) | 1.050(0.795-1.387) | 1.153(0.826-1.609) | 1.110(0.829-1.470) | 1.004(0.796-1.266) |
| Right Party MC Support | 1.079(0.916-1.271) | 1.060(0.895-1.256) | 1.085(0.913-1.290) | 1.079(0.904-1.289) | 1.144\*\*(1.017-1.287) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.702(0.299-1.651) | 0.664(0.268-1.644) | 0.413\*\*\*(0.221-0.773) | 0.349\*\*(0.146-0.834) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.972(0.903-1.046) | 0.918\*(0.842-1.001) | 0.965(0.879-1.058) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.847\*(0.946-3.608) | 1.632\*(0.922-2.888) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.855\*(0.957-3.593) | 2.170\*(0.961-4.899) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.373(0.021-6.569) | 3.842(0.055-268.644) |
| Left Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 1.245(0.941-1.647) | 1.200(0.913-1.577) |
| Right Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 0.671\*\*\*(0.564-0.800) | 0.653\*\*\*(0.516-0.826) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.972(0.893-1.058) | 1.046(0.969-1.129) |
| MC Policies Already in Place  |  |  |  |  | 0.631\*\*\*(0.502-0.794) |
| Observations  | 951 | 950 | 704 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G2: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.932(0.845-1.029) | 0.931(0.846-1.024) | 0.970(0.873-1.078) | 0.955(0.816-1.119) | 0.947(0.802-1.118) |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.246\*\*\*(1.103-1.407) | 1.245\*\*\*(1.102-1.407) | 1.233\*\*\*(1.097-1.386) | 1.190\*\*(1.041-1.361) | 1.241\*\*\*(1.125-1.368) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.669(0.315-1.423) | 0.619(0.285-1.346) | 0.501\*\*(0.267-0.939) | 0.401\*\*(0.163-0.985) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.975(0.917-1.038) | 0.935\*\*(0.879-0.993) | 0.973(0.900-1.052) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.928\*(0.944-3.936) | 1.722\*(0.903-3.284) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.724\*(0.988-3.010) | 2.044\*(0.936-4.463) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.307(0.032-2.974) | 3.919(0.065-237-236) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.963(0.887-1.046) | 1.043(0.967-1.125) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.625\*\*\*(0.490-0.797) |
| Observations  | 951 | 950 | 704 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G3: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.064(0.877-1.292) | 1.051(0.853-1.295) | 1.071(0.875-1.311) | 1.097(0.890-1.352) | 1.162\*(0.998-1.353) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.866(0.333-2.252) | 0.703(0.248-1.992) | 0.517(0.211-1.265) | 0.371\*(0.130-1.060) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.932\*\*\*(0.885-0.981) | 0.916\*\*\*(0.872-0.961) | 0.960(0.893-1.033) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.068\*\*(1.055-4.056) | 2.200\*(0.873-5.545) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.455(0.011-18.265) | 12.432(0.027-5827.457) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.907(0.831-0.990) | 0.995(0.908-1.089) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.629\*\*\*(0.499-0.792) |
| Observations  | 555 | 555 | 407 | 371 | 371 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G4: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.261\*\*\*(1.106-1.438) | 1.260\*\*\*(1.104-1.438) | 1.221\*\*\*(1.092-1.366) | 1.222\*\*\*(1.073-1.392) | 1.310\*\*\*(1.175-1.461) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.874(0.387-1.972) | 0.752(0.334-1.695) | 0.575(0.285-1.158) | 0.445\*(0.173-1.142) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.935\*\*(0.883-0.990) | 0.919\*\*\*(0.877-0.964) | 0.955(0.887-1.028) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.224\*\*(1.185-4.174) | 2.563\*(0.999-6.577) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.153(0.008-3.050) | 2.830(0.016-511.463) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.913\*\*(0.846-0.985) | 1.008(0.915-1.111) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.605\*\*\*(0.470-0.778) |
| Observations  | 555 | 555 | 407 | 371 | 371 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G5: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC Support | 0.898(0.711-1.133) | 0.859(0.676-1.090) | 0.881(0.676-1.149) | 0.856(0.655-1.118) | 0.836\*(0.698-1.002) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.542(0.245-1.200) | 0.492(0.207-1.167) | 0.406\*\*\*(0.208-0.794) | 0.338\*\*(0.137-0.836) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.981(0.930-1.035) | 0.945\*\*(0.899-0.993) | 1.002(0.930-1.080) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 2.030\*(0.947-4.349) | 1.661(0.898-3.072) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.506(0.845-2.685) | 1.661(0.752-3.668) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.529(0.067-4.209) | 10.921(0.319-373.436) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.879(0.753-1.027) | 0.767\*\*\*(0.640-0.919) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.947(0.857-1.045) | 1.028(0.950-1.111) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.586\*\*\*(0.444-0.772) |
| Observations  | 897 | 896 | 662 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G6: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC Support | 2.133\*\*(1.120-4.063) | 2.014\*\*(1.053-3.852) | 2.060\*\*(1.063-3.995) | 1.834\*\*\*(1.219-2.761) | 1.644\*\*(1.099-2.461) |
| Government MC Support | 0.506\*\*(0.280-0.914) | 0.515\*\*(0.287-0.926) | 0.523\*\*(0.283-0.967) | 0.544\*\*\*(0.356-0.833) | 0.588\*\*\*(0.411-0.841) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.651(0.304-1.393) | 0.586(0.255-1.348) | 0.433\*\*(0.215-0.876) | 0.373\*\*(0.148-0.938) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.971(0.916-1.029) | 0.955(0.902-1.012) | 1.002(0.931-1.079) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 2.355\*\*(1.091-5.084) | 1.749(0.856-3.576) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.496(0.838-2.673) | 1.703(0.758-3.829) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.285(0.041-1.997) | 5.871(0.124-277.148) |
| Cross Party Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.636(0.316-1.278) | 0.796(0.377-1.680) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 1.237(0.730-2.096) | 0.899(0.508-1.589) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.951(0.857-1.054) | 1.032(0.954-1.116) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.602\*\*\*(0.447-0.811) |
| Observations  | 896 | 895 | 662 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G7: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 1.040(0.894-1.209) | 1.027(0.883-1.195) | 1.025(0.868-1.212) | 0.982(0.818-1.179) | 1.026(0.880-1.196) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.613(0.298-1.262) | 0.542(0.240-1.221) | 0.407\*\*(0.201-0.823) | 0.322\*\*(0.129-0.804) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.973(0.921-1.028) | 0.940\*\*(0.892-0.990) | 0.989(0.915-1.068) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.973\*(0.966-4.030) | 1.608(0.887-2.918) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.542(0.846-2.811) | 1.709(0.771-3.788) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.717(0.057-8.973) | 14.368(0.197-1049.280) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.946(0.858-1.042) | 1.021(0.946-1.102) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.612\*\*\*(0.483-0.776) |
| Observations  | 897 | 896 | 662 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table G8: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC/Nationalism Score | 1.617\*\*\*(1.133-2.306) | 1.646\*\*\*(1.150-2.355) | 1.575\*\*(1.090-2.273) | 1.673\*\*(1.718-2.388) | 1.424\*(0.946-2.142) |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 0.716\*(0.502-1.022) | 0.701\*\*(0.491-0.999) | 0.725\*(0.496-1.060) | 0.658\*\*(0.462-0.937) | 0.786(0.562-1.098) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.588(0.294-1.176) | 0.552(0.260-1.174) | 0.442\*\*(0.236-0.828) | 0.361\*\*(0.154-0.849) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.990(0.937-1.045) | 0.956\*(0.907-1.008) | 0.997(0.922-1.078) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 2.366\*\*(1.182-4.736) | 1.823\*(0.964-3.447) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.505(0.831-2.727) | 1.680(0.765-3.690) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.343(0.035-3.384) | 6.524(0.083-515.678) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.953(0.035-3.384) | 1.026(0.955-1.103) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.633\*\*\*(0.495-0.809) |
| Observations  | 896 | 895 | 662 | 604 | 604 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

**Appendix H- Analyses Excluding Affirmative Action**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H1: Left and Right Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC Support | 1.065(0.804-1.411) | 1.054(0.792-1.404) | 1.160(0.848-1.587) | 1.136(0.881-1.464) | 1.037(0.849-1.267) |
| Right Party MC Support | 1.080(0.871-1.339) | 1.069(0.863-1.324) | 1.094(0.883-1.357) | 1.101(0.887-1.368) | 1.157\*(0.986-1.358) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.773(0.440-1.357) | 0.651(0.338-1.252) | 0.422\*\*(0.223-0.799) | 0.375\*\*(0.162-0.871) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.955(0.890-1.024 | 0.904(0.833-0.981) | 0.960(0.892-1.034) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.797\*(0.914-3.532) | 1.536(0.880-2.680) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.629\*(0.930-2.855) | 1.849(0.858-3.986) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.315(0.028-3.578) | 3.973(0.109-144.688) |
| Left Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 1.204(0.931-1.557) | 1.169(0.912-1.498) |
| Right Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 0.648\*\*\*(0.510-0.824) | 0.624\*\*\*(0.484-0.805) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.996(0.905-1.096) | 1.050(0.956-1.153) |
| MC Policies Already in Place  |  |  |  |  | 0.634\*\*\*(0.482-0.835) |
| Observations  | 959 | 958 | 711 | 611 | 611 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H2: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.952(0.882-1.028) | 0.951(0.883-1.025) | 0.986(0.910-1.068) | 0.982(0.889-1.084) | 0.979(0.880-1.090) |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.260\*\*\*(1.079-1.470) | 1.266\*\*\*(1.084-1.479) | 1.254\*\*\*(1.077-1.461) | 1.218\*\*(1.035-1.435) | 1.271\*\*\*(1.126-1.434) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.695(0.424-1.141) | 0.580\*\*(0.340-0.989) | 0.506\*\*(0.286-0.898) | 0.427\*\*(0.189-0.964) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.957(0.903-1.014) | 0.920(0.869-0.973) | 0.967(0.910-1.029) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.775\*(0.993-3.172) | 1.555\*(0.963-2.511) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.634\*\*(1.020-2.618) | 1.821(0.870-3.813) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.271(0.044-1.671) | 3.852(0.133-111.725) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.996(0.907-1.094) | 1.048(0.958-146) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.631\*\*\*(0.478-0.832) |
| Observations  | 959 | 958 | 711 | 611 | 611 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H3: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.083(0.892-1.315) | 1.068(0.877-1.301) | 1.092(0.909-1.313) | 1.107(0.910-1.348) | 1.174\*(0.996-1.385) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.811(0.387-1.698) | 0.645(0.296-1.406) | 0.447\*(0.187-1.071) | 0.338\*\*(0.123-0.933) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.920\*\*(0.853-0.991) | 0.903\*\*\*(0.841-0.970) | 0.955(0.884-1.031) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.057\*\*(1.084-3.904) | 1.964(0.811-4.757) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.528(0.016-17.884) | 17.518(0.070-4384.155) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.965(0.856-1.088) | 1.022(0.911-1.123) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.634\*\*\*(0.494-0.814) |
| Observations  | 561 | 561 | 412 | 376 | 376 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H4: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.250\*\*\*(1.088-1.436) | 1.257\*\*\*(1.086-1.455) | 1.219\*\*\*(1.076-1.380) | 1.218\*\*\*(1.057-1.403) | 1.286\*\*\*(1.133-1.459) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.739(0.374-1.462) | 0.628(0.331-1.191) | 0.489\*\*(0.257-0.968) | 0.389\*\*(0.152-0.998) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.922\*\*(0.859-0.990) | 0.904\*\*\*(0.847-0.964) | 0.948(0.880-1.022) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.173\*\*(1.180-4.001) | 2.189\*(0.905-5.298) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.157(0.007-3.323) | 4.431(0.028-701.563) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.984(0.873-1.110) | 1.030(0.917-1.157) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.618\*\*\*(0.474-0.806) |
| Observations  | 561 | 561 | 412 | 376 | 376 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H5: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC Support | 0.882(0.700-1.112) | 0.859(0.681-1.084) | 0.887(0.676-1.645) | 0.855(0.651-1.123) | 0.858(0.708-1.041) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.672(0.352-1.283) | 0.557(0.265-1.169) | 0.490\*\*(0.253-0.950) | 0.395\*\*(0.169-0.924) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.966(0.911-1.025) | 0.934\*\*(0.886-0.985) | 0.990(0.936-1.047) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.752\*(0.978-3.138) | 1.460(0.896-2.381) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.377(0.829-2.286) | 1.459(0.698-3.049) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.185(0.120-11.730) | 14.887\*(0.641-345.549) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.796\*\*(0.656-0.965) | 0.695\*\*\*(0.566-0.853) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.944(0.865-1.029) | 1.022(0.942-1.108) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.608\*\*\*(0.455-0.813) |
| Observations  | 904 | 903 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H6: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC Support | 1.944\*\*(1.072-3.525) | 1.882\*\*(1.032-3.435) | 1.940\*\*(1.067-3.527) | 1.687\*(0.964-2.952) | 1.509(0.901-2.527) |
| Government MC Support | 0.536\*\*(0.326-0.880) | 0.543\*\*(0.332-0.888) | 0.550\*\*(0.330-0.918) | 0.592\*\*(0.383-0.916) | 0.645\*\*(0.440-0.946) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.800(0.435-1.470) | 0.641(0.317-1.294) | 0.501\*\*(0.258-0.973) | 0.417\*(0.174-1.001) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.959(0.904-1.017) | 0.954\*(0.905-1.006) | 0.997(0.939-1.059 |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 2.195\*\*(1.008-4.779) | 1.653(0.834-3.274) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 0.443(0.084-2.344) | 1.470(0.701-3.085) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.443(0.084-2.163) | 6.407(0.284-144.766) |
| Cross Party Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.559(0.247-1.266) | 0.684(0.301-1.551) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 1.228(0.659-2.290) | 0.915(0.492-1.701) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.951(0.872-1.037) | 1.026(0.947-1.112) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.625\*\*\*(0.463-0.844) |
| Observations  | 903 | 902 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H7: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 1.045(0.892-1.226) | 1.037(0.887-1.213) | 1.065(0.879-1.292) | 1.026(0.848-1.240) | 1.083(0.936-1.253) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.751(0.421-1.340) | 0.618(0.309-1.236) | 0.470\*\*(0.238-0.928) | 0.359\*\*(0.152-0.851) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.952(0.896-1.012) | 0.931\*\*\*(0.883-0.981) | 0.979(0.920-1.042) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.739\*(0.974-3.107) | 1.424(0.869-2.333) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.459(0.838-2.540) | 1.533(0.723-3.250) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.456(0.130-16.246) | 19.199(0.482-765.508) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.945(0.868-1.029) | 1.013(0.936-1.096) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.627\*\*\*(0.484-0.813) |
| Observations  | 904 | 903 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table H8: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC/Nationalism Score | 1.723\*\*\*(1.220-2.431) | 1.763\*\*\*(1.230-2.526) | 1.637\*\*(1.118-2.399) | 1.723\*\*\*(1.157-2.566) | 1.475\*(0.984-2.211) |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 0.704\*\*(0.509-974) | 0.689\*\*(0.496-0.956) | 0.738(0.507-1.073) | 0.682\*\*(0.483-0.963) | 0.813(0.592-1.117) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.703(0.412-1.201) | 0.611(0.327-1.143) | 0.510\*\*(0.289-0.900) | 0.401\*\*(0.183-0.878) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.976(0.925-1.030) | 0.951\*\*(0.911-0.992) | 0.989(0.927-1.054) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 2.104\*\*\*(1.218-3.634) | 1.622\*(0.996-2.642) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.458(0.873-2.437) | 1.527(0.739-3.153) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 0.518(0.077-3.487) | 7.947(0.192-328.533) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.960(0.883-1.043) | 1.022(0.947-1.103) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.647\*\*\*(0.496-0.845) |
| Observations  | 903 | 902 | 668 | 610 | 610 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

**Appendix I- Analyses Excluding Mother Tongue Education**

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I1: Left and Right Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC Support | 1.074(0.742-1.555) | 1.064(0.734-1.543) | 1.210(0.776-1.886) | 1.176(0.876-1.578) | 1.025(0.810-1.296) |
| Right Party MC Support | 1.066(0.813-1.397) | 1.045(0.803-1.360) | 1.047(0.801-1.370) | 1.056(0.845-1.320) | 1.132(0.959-1.337) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.694(0.356-1.356) | 0.585(0.268-1.275) | 0.319\*\*(0.134-0.759) | 0.292\*\*(0.108-0.786) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.968(0.903-1.039) | 0.931\*(0.866-1.001) | 0.986(0.928-1.047) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 0.983(0.526-1.838) | 0.928(0.572-1.507) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.692\*\*(1.030-2.779) | 1.967\*(0.990-3.906) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.946(0.112-33.701) | 19.199(0.386-955.899) |
| Left Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 1.206(0.937-1.552) | 1.225(0.925-1.621) |
| Right Party Nationalism Support |  |  |  | 0.723\*\*\*(0.606-0.862) | 0.680\*\*\*(0.541-0.854) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.955(0.840-1.085) | 1.013(0.914-1.124) |
| MC Policies Already in Place  |  |  |  |  | 0.667\*\*\*(0.518-0.858) |
| Observations  | 933 | 932 | 685 | 585 | 585 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I2: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.971(0.824-1.143) | 0.971(0.824-1.144) | 1.032(0.854-1.249) | 0.987(0.828-1.177) | 0.940(0.789-1.120) |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.188\*(0.982-1.438) | 1.192\*(0.985-1.444) | 1.180(0.965-1.443) | 1.152(0.936-1.418) | 1.228\*\*(1.051-1.434) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.643(0.353-1.172) | 0.542\*(0.280-1.049) | 0.381\*\*(0.172-0.847) | 0.338\*\*(0.128-0.894) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.978(0.919-1.040) | 0.949\*\*(0.903-0.998) | 0.995(0.942-1.052) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.022(0.584-1.789) | 0.998(0.624-1.594) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.636\*\*(1.078-2.483) | 1.912\*(0.993-3.683) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.477(0.163-13.345) | 17.465(0.454-671.482) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.958(0.847-1.084) | 1.017(0.922-1.123) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.660\*\*\*(0.508-0.859) |
| Observations  | 933 | 932 | 685 | 585 | 585 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I3: Right Influence when the Left is in Power (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Right MC/Nationalism  | 1.091(0.884-1.348) | 1.063(0.866-1.305) | 1.080(0.895-1.304) | 1.068(0.870-1.312) | 1.166\*(0.979-1.388) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.721(0.302-1.720) | 0.599(0.226-1.588) | 0.301\*\*(0.116-0.780) | 0.225\*\*\*(0.080-0.628) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.927\*\*(0.860-0.998) | 0.909\*\*\*(0.852-0.970) | 0.966(0.892-1.045) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 2.128\*\*(1.184-3.825) | 2.292\*(0.867-6.060) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 2.790(0.087-89.517) | 174.718\*(0.879-34738.49) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.919(0.781-1.081) | 0.976(0.858-1.110) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.628\*\*\*(0.465-0.847) |
| Observations  | 551 | 551 | 402 | 366 | 366 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I4: Left and Right Party Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Left Party MC/Nationalism | 0.971(0.824-1.143) | 0.971(0.824-1.144) | 1.032(0.854-1.249) | 0.987(0.828-1.177) | 0.940(0.789-1.120) |
| Right MC/Nationalism | 1.188\*(0.982-1.438) | 1.192\*(0.985-1.444) | 1.180(0.965-1.443) | 1.152(0.936-1.418) | 1.228\*\*(1.051-1.434) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.643(0.353-1.172) | 0.542\*(0.280-1.049) | 0.381\*\*(0.172-0.847) | 0.338\*\*(0.128-0.894) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.978(0.919-1.040) | 0.949\*\*(0.903-0.998) | 0.995(0.942-1.052) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.022(0.584-1.789) | 0.998(0.624-1.594) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.636\*\*(1.078-2.483) | 1.912\*(0.993-3.683) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 1.477(0.163-13.345) | 17.465(0.454-671.482) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.958(0.847-1.084) | 1.017(0.922-1.123) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.660\*\*\*(0.508-0.859) |
| Observations  | 933 | 932 | 685 | 585 | 585 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I5: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC Support | 0.854(0.688-1.059) | 0.816\*(0.661-1.007) | 0.825\*(0.656-1.036) | 0.798(0.607-1.049) | 0.810\*\*(0.685-0.958) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.551(0.248-1.223) | 0.462\*(0.185-1.156) | 0.315\*\*(0.123-0.807) | 0.287\*\*(0.101-0.818) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.987(0.935-1.041) | 0.963(0.920-1.009) | 1.019(0.975-1.065) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 0.973(0.586-1.615) | 0.909(0.600-1.375) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.471(0.888-2.437) | 1.506(0.742-3.058) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 4.309(0.318-58.352) | 42.176\*\*(1.344-1323.424) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.801\*\*(0.670-0.959) | 0.721\*\*\*(0.590-0.882) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.899\*(0.804-1.004) | 0.985(0.908-1.068) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.645\*\*\*(0.493-0.843) |
| Observations  | 877 | 876 | 641 | 583 | 583 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I6: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Multiculturalism Only)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC Support | 1.899\*\*(1.116-3.231) | 1.799\*\*(1.064-3.042) | 1.774\*\*\*(1.040-3.027) | 1.722\*\*(1.087-2.727) | 1.624\*\*(1.063-2.480) |
| Government MC Support | 0.530\*\*\*(0.332-0.846) | 0.538\*\*\*(0.339-0.852) | 0.552\*\*(0.344-0.886) | 0.544\*\*\*(0.370-0.799) | 0.578\*\*\*(0.405-0.824) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.665(0.315-1.404) | 0.538(0.225-1.285) | 0.344\*\*(0.137-0.863) | 0.319\*\*(0.115-0.886) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.979(0.928-1.034) | 0.975(0.928-1.024) | 1.015(0.963-1.069) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.062(0.594-1.896) | 0.904(0.526-1.553) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.491\*(0.983-2.262) | 1.585(0.808-3.110) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 2.376(0.237-23.791) | 27.499\*(0.662-1142.686) |
| Cross Party Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.726(0.316-1.667) | 0.935(0.378-2.313) |
| Government Nationalism  |  |  |  | 0.997(0.549-1.813) | 0.740(0.385-1.423) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.904\*(0.807-1.014) | 0.990(0.910-1.007) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.652\*\*\*(0.487-0.874) |
| Observations  | 876 | 875 | 641 | 583 |  |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I7: Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 1.011(0.890-1.148) | 1.000(0.884-1.130) | 1.016(0.873-1.182) | 0.986(0.814-1.194) | 1.037(0.887-1.212) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.639(0.309-1.322) | 0.529(0.223-1.254) | 0.338\*\*(0.141-0.811) | 0.282\*\*(0.100-0.794) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.973(0.919-1.029) | 0.958\*\*(0.919-0.999) | 1.005(0.954-1.059) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.036(0.576-1.864) | 0.950(0.590-1.529) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.516(0.886-2.494) | 01.587(0.782-3.224) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 6.622(0.566-77.504) | 77.200\*\*(1.854-3214.625) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.903\*\*(0.820-0.995) | 0.981(0.912-1.056) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.666\*\*\*(0.522-0.850) |
| Observations  | 877 | 876 | 641 | 583 | 583 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table I8: Cross Party and Government Effects on Policy Adoption (Combined Multiculturalism and Nationalism)** |
| **Variable** | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** | **Model 5** |
| Cross Party MC/Nationalism Score | 1.613\*\*(1.091-2.387) | 1.643\*\*(1.098-2.458) | 1.562\*\*(1.047-2.362) | 1.487\*(0.981-2.252) | 1.287(0.818-2.024) |
| Government MC/Nationalism Score | 0.714\*\*(0.517-0.986) | 0.700\*\*(0.506-0.968) | 0.726\*(0.511-1.032) | 0.734(0.500-1.075) | 0.861(0.594-1.247) |
| Far-Right Party Presence  |  | 0.625(0.323-1.210) | 0.538(0.253-1.146) | 0.377\*\*\*(0.187-0.763) | 0.314\*\*(0.124-0.796) |
| Ethnic Minority Electoral Strength |  |  | 0.998(0.949-1.049) | 0.976(0.944-1.010) | 1.014(0.961-1.071) |
| Left Party in Government |  |  |  | 1.156(0.666-2.005) | 1.019(0.633-1.642) |
| Federal System |  |  |  | 1.494\*(0.928-2.404) | 1.569(0.792-3.105) |
| Constraints on Government |  |  |  | 3.239(0.358-29.288) | 42.714(0.846-2157.715) |
| GDP Growth |  |  |  | 0.914\*(0.829-1.008) | 0.986(0.917-1.060) |
| MC Policies Already in Place |  |  |  |  | 0.680\*\*\*(0.528-0.877) |
| Observations  | 876 | 875 | 641 | 583 | 583 |
| \*\*\* P>0.01, \*\* P>0.05, \*\* P>0.10Coefficients are hazard ratios for cox proportional hazard models. A coefficient greater than 1 indicates a positive effect, a coefficient less than 1 indicates a negative effect.Range of effects for a 95% confidence level are shown in brackets. |

1. This is not to say that all or even most national minority groups oppose multiculturalism. Rather it is to suggest that there is a tension between the recognition of ethnic minorities and the recognition of national minorities. This makes the conflation of the two in the coding of party manifestos problematic. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. These parties are coded as nationalist in the Manifesto Project's coding scheme. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Unfortunately, without access to the manifestos for all countries in the analysis (the number of actual manifestos is limited), there is no way to recode that manifestos to compensate for issues with the way the Manifesto Project codes parties’ position on multiculturalism. Some noise in the scores is unavoidable for a data set that covers the range of time and countries that the Manifesto Project and Multiculturalism Policy index covers. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)