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1. Introduction

In 2015, Germany accepted over one million refugees to a country in which 13% of its eighty million people were already foreign-born (Chambers 2015; OECD 2015: 312). German Chancellor Angela Merkel has been lauded for her response to the migrant crisis, winning TIME Magazine’s Person of the Year in 2015. But one group’s voice has been notably absent from the conversation: immigrants. Fewer than three percent of Members of Parliament (MPs) in the current Bundestag were born outside of Germany and the debate over the refugee crisis focuses on Germany’s moral and political obligations and not on the desires of migrant communities. As immigration and immigrants become prominent political topics across the developed world, it is increasingly important to understand how political institutions shape the presence of immigrant voices in the polity. This thesis examines how a particularly powerful type of institution—electoral systems—affects immigrant representation.

Electoral systems control who wins political office. Most often, this question of who is thought of in terms of parties. But electoral systems also change this who more literally, in terms of both demography and ideas. An extensive literature, discussed in Chapter 2, finds that proportional rules can help women and racial or ethnic minorities win office and have their voices heard. In Hanna Pitkin’s (1967) terminology, proportional rules help disadvantaged groups achieve descriptive and substantive representation.
Although women and ethnic minorities are well studied, few scholars tackle how electoral systems affect immigrants. Immigrants often face unique political challenges, making the importance of separate research crucial. Immigrants may not speak the majority language, may lack the same legal status as domestic minorities, and often face blatant xenophobia. Thus, it is by no means obvious that electoral systems should affect immigrants in the same ways that they affect other minorities. This thesis seeks to determine whether immigrants, like other disadvantaged groups, benefit from proportional arrangements or whether their relationship with electoral systems is somehow different.

In a world of many political institutions, why study electoral systems in particular? In the words of Italian political scientist Giovanni Sartori (1968: 273), electoral systems are the “most specific manipulative instrument of politics.” Electoral systems, unlike party systems or constitutional principles, can be changed by voters and politicians and have a significant effect on voting behavior. Thus, determining the impact of electoral systems on major constituencies like immigrants is crucial.

Because electoral reform occurs infrequently, it is particularly important for electoral engineers to fully understand the impact of the rules they are choosing and make well-informed decisions. However, the rarity of reform does not mean it is impossible or even improbable. Recent electoral reform in well-established

---

1 I consider a number of different markers of immigration background in my study, including birthplace and ethnic background. In general though, I use the term immigrants to refer to those born outside of the country, in keeping with the OECD’s (2015) practice. See Chapter 2 for more details on definitional considerations.
democracies from Italy to Israel and New Zealand to Japan proves that change is possible. An understanding of the full consequences of electoral systems is crucial for politicians both in established democracies considering institutional change and in new democracies picking institutions for the first time.

Representation fostered through electoral reform can also be a crucial tool for bringing immigrant voices into the political arena. Political incorporation includes the capacity for “sustained claims making” (Hochschild et al. 2013: 16). By picking electoral rules that help enhance the political representation of immigrants, electoral engineers can help immigrants integrate into the political community and impact political issues that affect their lives. Thus, electoral systems are a crucial tool for understanding immigrant representation at a time when immigrants and immigration are hot button issues.

The world’s two most common electoral systems are first-past-the-post (FPTP) and list proportional representation (PR) (Reynolds, Reilly, and Ellis 2005: 30). In FPTP, individual candidates compete in single-member districts (SMDs) and the one receiving the most votes in each district wins. List PR involves a series of multi-member districts (MMDs) in which voters select their preferred party. Seats in each district are then allocated to the parties proportional to their vote share. In the closed-list version of PR considered in this study, these seats are then filled by each party’s pre-ranked list of candidates.

These two systems can have profoundly different effects. Maurice Duverger (1954, as formalized by Cox 1997) theorizes their best known difference: FPTP tends to lead to two-party competition on the district level while PR tends to lead
to many parties. As discussed in Chapter 2, a great deal of scholarship also considers how these two systems affect the election and representation of women and minorities. However, one of the largest challenges these studies run into is the risk of endogeneity. Countries that are more open to the voices of women and minorities might tend towards certain institutional choices. Specifically, countries that value minority voices might also select proportional representation, which electoral systems experts consider more inclusive (Reynolds, Reilly, and Ellis 2005: 57). Thus, countries that use PR might exhibit enhanced representation of women and minorities not because PR led to more inclusion, but because the countries’ inclusive attitudes led them to select PR in the first place.

In extending electoral systems literature to immigrants, this study seeks to avoid the challenge of endogeneity by employing the mixed-member comparison method pioneered by Robert Moser and his co-authors (1997; 2001; 2004; 2008; 2012). Some countries elect their legislatures via a mix of FPTP and PR. Moser and his colleagues argue that this allows for a controlled comparison of how different rules function in the same country at the same time. My study uses this method to compare the representation of immigrants within New Zealand and Germany under both sets of rules. New Zealand and Germany are the only two established democracies that use this system and have sufficient foreign-born MPs in their legislatures to permit a study. The New Zealand and German populations are also 28 and 13% foreign-born respectively (OECD 2015: 312), making immigrants a sizable constituency in both countries. New Zealand’s immigrant population is on the rise, increasing from 19 to 28% of the total population between 2003 and 2013.
while the German immigrant population has been steady at 13% during this same period (OECD 2015: 312). These cases therefore also represent immigrant representation in a country where the immigrant population is growing and one where it is stagnant.

This study considers two main types of representation: descriptive and substantive (as defined by Pitkin 1967). Descriptive representation involves the election of representatives that share a demographic trait with certain constituents. Female MPs descriptively represent women, black MPs descriptively represent black constituents, and so on. For my purposes, descriptive representation means the election of greater shares of immigrants to the German Bundestag and New Zealand House of Representatives, the main legislative bodies in both countries. Substantive representation involves advocacy by legislators for a particular group, regardless of their personal demographic traits. A white legislator supporting issues favored by his minority constituents substantively represents the minority’s interests, even if he cannot descriptively represent them. I consider substantive representation in the form of parliamentary questions for oral answer asked in the New Zealand Parliament. I focus solely on New Zealand for substantive representation due to a lack of German language skills and to limit the scope of my study.

The Argument

Ultimately, this thesis seeks to determine which set of electoral rules, FPTP or closed-list PR, leads to better descriptive and substantive representation of
immigrants. For descriptive representation, the results are clear: PR offers a substantial advantage in terms of the election of immigrants across both countries by every measure of immigrant status that I use.

While the focus of my study is on if electoral systems have an effect, I also begin an examination of why such an effect occurs by considering the effect of political parties on immigrant descriptive representation. Although collinearity issues prevent me from separating the effects of party and electoral system, I find that at least in part, the benefit of PR for immigrant representation can be attributed to the success of smaller, left-wing parties in the PR tier. Thus, the proliferation of parties under PR may play an important role in helping immigrants win elected office.

My results on substantive representation are more mixed. I find that while immigrant MPs pay more attention to immigrant-relevant issues and are more likely to be elected in the PR tier, list MPs do not pay significantly more attention to immigrant-relevant issues. I find that political parties (beyond the anti-immigration New Zealand First party opposing immigration) also do not play a major role in shaping how much attention their MPs pay to immigrant concerns. I consider a number of possible explanations that might warrant future research to explain this surprising result, including district demographics and New Zealand’s committee system. Ultimately though, I suggest that electoral systems may simply not be an effective tool for improving the substantive representation of immigrants.

The remainder of this chapter outlines the organization of this thesis.
Outline of the Thesis

Chapter 2 reviews existing literature on the effect of electoral systems on the representation of minorities and women. I also consider literature on some possible unique barriers facing immigrants. While I hypothesize that the effect of electoral systems on immigrants will be similar to the effect on disadvantaged groups more generally, I note reasons why this may not be the case.

Chapter 3 offers more detail on the mixed-member research design I employ in my study. I evaluate the debate between proponents and critics who note the risk of “contamination” between the two tiers in mixed-member systems. Critics argue that voters and parties modify their behavior in each tier to account for the presence of the other, limiting the value of mixed-member systems as controlled comparisons. After evaluating both arguments, I side largely with the proponents and argue that this research design is an appropriate methodology for my study. Chapter 3 also provides more details on the mechanics of the New Zealand and German electoral systems.

Chapter 4 analyzes the relationship between electoral systems and descriptive representation in Germany and New Zealand. I find that significantly more immigrants are elected in the PR tier in both countries. My evidence suggests that this may be caused in part by the success of egalitarian left-wing parties in the list tier, since these parties tend to send a greater share of immigrants to parliament.

Chapter 5 analyzes the relationship between electoral systems and substantive representation in New Zealand using the questions for oral answer asked by members of parliament (MPs). While I find evidence that immigrant MPs
pay more attention to immigrant affairs, that result does not hold for the list tier in general. I also observe that beyond the populist anti-immigration New Zealand First party paying more negative attention to immigrants, party appears to have little effect on immigrant substantive representation, which is low across the board in New Zealand.

Chapter 6 contains a qualitative study of the passage of New Zealand’s Citizenship Amendment Act 2005 in the hope of offering possible avenues for future research to explain my results in Chapter 5. I note that efforts by MPs from immigrant-dense SMDs to substantively represent their immigrant constituents might diminish the difference between the list and FPTP tier. I also consider the potential effects of New Zealand’s committee system. Finally, this chapter offers qualitative evidence in support of my findings in Chapter 5 that immigrant MPs pay more attention to immigrant-relevant issues.

Chapter 7 concludes with final thoughts and avenues for future research.
2. Representation, Incorporation, and Electoral Systems

Representation stands at the heart of republican government. In his “Thoughts on Government,” John Adams (1776/2000) argued that the first key task facing any republic is the selection of a “Representative Assembly.” In this name, Adams implies that a central task of a legislature is “representing” the people. But what do we mean by representation? Why should we care about representation? And how do electoral rules shape who gets represented and who does not? Below I trace the literature on representation with an emphasis on how disadvantaged groups gain representation and the impact electoral systems have.

In this chapter, I define key types of representation and trace their relationship before offering a brief overview of political incorporation to highlight why immigrant representation warrants study. I then turn to existing literature on the impact of electoral systems on the descriptive and substantive representation of disadvantaged groups. This exercise illustrates that while a sizeable literature exists about minorities, few scholars have extended these theories to immigrants as I seek to do. I conclude with a brief summary of scholarship about immigrants and why they warrant separate treatment in the literature on representation. The work considered in this chapter offers a theoretical foundation for my hypotheses about immigrant representation in Chapters 4 and 5.
In her seminal work, *The Concept of Representation*, Hanna Pitkin (1967: 8) defines representation quite literally as “making present again.” From this broad statement, she distinguishes several specific types of representation. Her distinction between descriptive representation, “standing for” a group, and substantive representation, “acting for” a group, has become central to the study of representation. In descriptive representation, groups are literally “made present.” Women are descriptively represented by women in the legislature, immigrants by other immigrants, white men by white men, and so on. While Pitkin’s original definition allows for the legislature to either be a demographic mirror or a mirror of public opinion, today the term descriptive representation is commonly used to refer solely to demographic representation. I use that narrower definition as well. In contrast, substantive representation occurs when a group’s interests are advanced in the legislature and can be accomplished by any legislator seeking to act on their behalf. For example, a wealthy senator like Ted Kennedy might substantively represent the poor by advocating for an expanded social safety net even though he himself would never require means-tested welfare.

Many studies have found that increasing descriptive representation can enhance substantive representation. Legislators who belong to a given demographic group tend to be better advocates of that group’s interests in terms of bill sponsorship (Bratton 2006), legislative oversight (Minta 2009), parliamentary speeches and questions (Bird 2011; Saalfeld 2011; Saalfeld and Bischof 2013; Wüst 2011; Wüst and Schmitz 2010), and roll call votes (Casellas and Leal 2013;
Grose 2005; Santos 2001; Santos and Huerta 2001; Welch and Hibbing 1984) (see also Gest and Wong 2016). Furthermore, increasing a group’s demographic share of the legislature can lead to improved outcomes for that group in terms of spending (Owens 2005) and bill passage (Preuhs 2005).

Most studies focus on a single country, often the United States, where scholars find a correlation between legislators’ minority statuses and their support for “minority issues,” however the authors define the term. Given America’s unusual racial history as one of the only modern democracies with a history of large-scale agricultural slavery, it is unclear if the American experience with minority representation is generalizable. Benjamin Knoll (2009) and Rodney Hero and Caroline Tolbert (1995) disagree with the conclusion that descriptive representation furthers substantive representation and instead argue that other factors like the legislator’s party are far more important, but they are a distinct minority in the literature. Most scholars agree that descriptive representation furthers substantive representation, although the comparative work in this field is limited.

Descriptive representation, however, is not required for substantive representation. Myer Siemiatycki (2008; 2011) demonstrates that white politicians have successfully advocated on behalf of minorities in Toronto. Many studies have found that legislators with a high proportion of minority constituents are more likely to substantively represent minorities, regardless of their personal identities (Biles and Tolley 2008; Bird 2011; Bloemraad 2013; Boushey and Luedtke 2011; Casellas and Leal 2013; Celis and Erzeel 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009; Gest and
Likewise, a number of scholars have found party affiliation to be a significant predictor of substantive representation (Bird 2011; Bloemraad 2008; Casellas and Leal 2013; Gest and Wong 2016; Grose 2005; Hero and Tolbert 1995; Knoll 2009; Preuhs 2005; Santos 2001; Schönwälder 2013). Thus, if our aim is to obtain substantive representation for a disadvantaged group, descriptive representation is an important step, but not the only route.

Descriptive representation offers important benefits besides facilitating substantive representation. As Jane Mansbridge (1999: 628) notes, descriptive representation can help disadvantaged groups prove that they have the “ability to rule” and legitimize the regime in the eyes of that group. Descriptive representation also increases political incorporation by showing disadvantaged groups that they can win office (Menifeld 2001a). More generally, descriptive representation can increase trust of government, senses of efficacy, and political participation (Banducci, Donovan, and Karp 2004). These independent benefits mean that even if evidence demonstrates that descriptive representation has failed to advance substantive representation, increased descriptive representation is still a worthwhile objective.

**Political Incorporation**

But why should we care about representation and immigrant representation in particular? One answer lies with political incorporation. Jennifer Hochschild and
her colleagues (2013: 16) define political incorporation as “having the capacity for sustained claims making about the allocation of symbolic or material goods.” Xavier Briggs (2013: 323) highlights that Hochschild et al.’s book demonstrates two dimensions of political incorporation: membership and capacity for influence. The latter is most relevant to studies of electoral representation. In order to fully join the political community of their new home, immigrants need to be able to effectively make claims of their government.

Hochschild et al.’s definition is concerned primarily with substantive representation, but presupposes that immigrants are making demands that policymakers can act on. Both descriptive and substantive representation can contribute to immigrant political participation, which enhances their ability to make claims of the state. Although Hoi Ok Jeong (2013) finds that descriptive representation does not necessarily increase voting rates among American Latinos, Mansbridge (1999: 628) notes how descriptive representation can facilitate communication between group members and legislators, allowing groups to make political demands more easily.

Furthermore, electoral success is the “gold standard” for measuring success in political participation, yet immigrants have received “little attention in the literature on cross-national comparisons” (Alba and Foner 2009: 282, 278). With respect to substantive representation, Jannelle Wong (2013) notes that political incorporation fundamentally requires electoral representation. In addition, substantive representation can benefit political participation by creating a positive feedback loop where policies that benefit a group encourage their future
participation (Jeong 2013: 1254). On the whole, both types of representation can enhance political participation, which in turn advances political incorporation.

**The Effect of Electoral Systems on Descriptive Representation**

While a variety of factors influence descriptive representation, the electoral system is one of the most malleable (Sartori 1968). In general, a consensus exists that proportional representation (PR), particularly with high district magnitude (i.e. many legislators elected in each district), will facilitate the representation of disadvantaged groups (Reynolds, Reilly, and Ellis 2005). Agreement on the positive effect of PR on female representation is fairly universal (Hoecker 1994; Matland 1993; Norris 1985; 2004; Reynolds 1999; Rosen 2013; Salmond 2006; Schönwälder 2012; and many others). Studies of minority representation are less clear since while the multi-member districts of PR may allow more groups to win seats, geographically concentrated minorities might do better under first-past-the-post (FPTP) where they can actually constitute a plurality in certain districts. Despite this possibility, most scholars agree that PR will facilitate minority representation (Bowler, Donovan, and Brockington 2003; Bird 2008; Lakeman 1994; Protysk and Sachariew 2013; Schönwälder 2012). In one of the only existing studies on immigrant legislators, Wüst and Schmitz (2010) find that more migrant-background MPs are elected in the PR tier of the German Bundestag than in single-member districts, although they fail to test whether the difference is statistically significant.
The Benefits of PR for Disadvantaged Groups

Proportional representation promotes the representation of disadvantaged groups for several reasons, most of which relate to higher district magnitude. First, the larger slate of candidates provides more opportunities for parties to nominate women and minorities in winnable positions. Single-member districts encourage parties to nominate “lowest-common-denominator candidates,” which tend to be majority males (Reynolds 1999). This harms the representation of any group that “deviates from the stereotype of a representative” (Taagepera 1994: 238). Since parties are self-interested vote-maximizing actors (Schattschneider 1942), when they only have one nomination to give out, they will rationally choose the candidate most likely to win the election, favoring majority group members (except women) (Zimmerman 1994: 6). Even if minorities are not less likely to win elections, a fear of anti-minority voting behavior can still discourage party leaders from nominating minorities (Sobolewska 2013: 622).

In contrast, the vote-maximizing incentive can encourage more diverse nominations in PR. As district magnitude increases, the exclusion of women from party lists becomes increasingly obvious (Matland 1993: 738) and parties face an incentive to nominate a slate that “looks like the voters” (Bird 2003: 13). Furthermore, multi-member districts allow parties to cater to multiple interests in nominations, making ticket balancing easier (Matland 1993: 738). In general, parties will only nominate minority, female, or immigrant candidates if they think it will help them win more seats (Claro da Fonseca 2011: 110, 122; Soininen 2011: 161; Black 2008: 239).
Second, the winner-take-all nature of FPTP often excludes geographically disperse minorities. Arend Lijphart (1975; 1977) argues that proportionality is an important tool to reduce divisiveness and increase minority representation (1977: 3). Other scholars agree that PR is preferable to FPTP for geographically disperse minorities. In Bulgaria, the Roma had far greater success under PR than FPTP in the one election using mixed rules (Protsyk and Sachariew 2013: 319). While their dispersion makes it hard to organize and coordinate action, even under PR, the Roma at least have a chance to win some seats by working with the major parties under these less adversarial rules (Protsyk and Sachariew 2013: 325).

Third, FPTP can reinforce incumbency, which offers a “powerful advantage” and tends to reinforce the status quo (Biles and Tolley 2008: 127). If many minorities are in office it will help keep them there, but if majority men hold power, as is usually the case, incumbency will work against minorities. FPTP appears to offer a greater incumbency advantage than PR. Pippa Norris (2004: 189) finds that 66% of incumbents worldwide are returned under PR while 70% are returned under majoritarian rules. Although this difference appears small, she argues that PR could still help challengers like up-and-coming women. The single-member districts used in FPTP reinforce incumbency by reducing the number of spots for parties to nominate political newcomers (Bird 2008: 151).

Fourth, albeit less relevant for immigrant representation, PR facilitates the implementation of nomination quotas where parties set aside a certain share of seats for women or minorities either voluntarily or due to a legal requirement. Multi-member districts in PR make it easier to mandate that a certain share of nominations
in each district go to women or minorities instead of forcing some districts to pass over majority male candidates (Norris 2004: 190). While the British Labour party successfully implemented gender quotas in 1993 by mandating female candidates in half of seats with no Labour incumbent (Norris 2004: 202), this strategy would be much more difficult to implement with immigrants whose concentration will vary across districts. Quotas are one of the most controversial ways to enhance minority representation (Hampshire 2012: 39) and seem unlikely to be widely adopted for immigrants anytime soon.

Even critics of PR do not contest its correlation with the election of minorities and women. Shaun Bowler, Todd Donovan, and David Brockington (2003: 7) argue that cultural differences may explain the correlation, but they do not dispute the empirical finding. Mark Rush (2001: 79), who encourages his readers to consider the broader, unintended consequences of PR, acknowledges that it does lead to far greater representation for women. Yael and Ayraham Brichta (1994: 115-116) note that Israel, with its 120-seat national district and PR with an extremely low electoral threshold, should be institutionally ideal for women, yet its legislature was never more than 10% female between Israel’s founding in 1949 and the conclusion of their study in 1992. However, Brichta and Brichta ultimately blame other factors like party selection mechanisms and primary turnout and argue that any reforms to raise electoral thresholds or reduce the district magnitude, taking Israel away from archetypal PR, would actually hurt women (119, 124). Similarly, N. Guillermo Molinelli (1994: 199) offers Argentina as a potential case of women doing better under FPTP. However, he concludes that the success of Argentine
women in FPTP was largely due to the overwhelming strength of Peronism, and Eva Perón’s strong advocacy and recruitment of Peronist women. In theory at least, there is broad consensus that PR benefits the descriptive representation of underrepresented groups.

*Party Effects*

Parties offer another reason why immigrants might do better under PR. A number of previous studies have shown that parties of the left tend to be more open to disadvantaged groups, including immigrants. If left-wing parties are more successful under PR, this could in turn lead to more descriptive representation of immigrants.

The success of left-wing parties can enhance the descriptive representation of disadvantaged groups. Miki Caul (1999) finds in a cross-national study that left-wing parties tend to have more women in legislatures, and Anthony Messina (2007: 215) finds that the “vast majority” of ethnic minority politicians in Western Europe come from left-wing parties. Similarly, Karen Celis, Floor Eelbode, and Braum Wauters (2013) observe that social democratic and green parties elect many more ethnic minorities onto local councils in Antwerp and Ghent, and Maria Sobolewska (2013) notes that the UK Labour Party had a virtual monopoly on ethnic minority MPs before the 2010 election. Likewise, Nazem Tahvilzadeh (in Bird, Saalfeld, and Wüst 2011: 84) finds that red-green parties had more migrant candidates elected to parliament in Sweden.
Beyond just descriptive representation, parties of the left have a deeper history of reaching out to minority and immigrant voters that could facilitate descriptive representation today. In the Netherlands, Colin Brown (2015: 47) notes that many early migrants were guest workers and entered the political process through labor unions and in turn supported the Dutch Labor Party. Similarly, some working-class French parties have presented themselves as advocates for minorities through a class framework since French minorities are more likely to be working class (Tiberj and Michon 2013). In the UK, Sobolewska (2013) notes that Labour won 60-80% of minority voters in all post-war elections before 2005. Dancygier and Saunders (2006: 966) attribute Labour’s success to its “minority-friendly” image and its advocacy for legislation criminalizing racial discrimination, a point with which Messina (2007: 207-208) agrees. Most relevant to my study, in Germany, Schönwälder (2013) observes that the Christian democratic parties under Chancellor Kohl had a history of promoting a German national identity and opposing immigration while their social democratic opponents build support among immigrants. Among the smaller parties, the left-wing Greens and Die Linke have both encouraged immigrant representation in regional parliaments since their founding while the pro-business FDP has been irrelevant for immigrant representation.

However, it is also possible that right-wing parties may be nominating and electing more immigrant and ethnic minority legislators to try to counter their negative images among these communities. Karen Bird (in Bird, Saalfeld, and Wüst 2011: 68) documents how the Conservative Party of Canada has actively nominated
more visible minorities than other parties in an effort to court minority voters, which traditionally favor the centrist Liberal Party by a wide margin.

On the whole though, these single country studies present a picture of minorities and immigrants benefiting from the electoral success of the left. While there is no a priori reason to believe that left-wing parties will do better under a certain set of electoral rules, both of my case studies have shown a greater proliferation of smaller pro-immigrant parties in the list tier. If this success comes at the success of labor parties, this trend might be net neutral or harmful to immigrant descriptive representation. Nevertheless, if a country’s party system shows more fragmentation on the left than on the right, as appears to be the case in New Zealand and Germany, then PR could help the left win more seats and benefit immigration representation. Moreover, if there is indeed a correlation between immigrant representation and ideology, we should suspect that far-left parties, which are more likely to succeed under PR than FPTP, should be even better for immigrants than their center-left colleagues. Indeed, Salmond (2006) notes that in the context of gender, small left-wing parties tend to be more egalitarian. By spreading the distribution of parties, PR could help far-left, especially egalitarian parties win seats and promote immigrant representation.

The Effects of Geographic Concentration

In some circumstances though, FPTP may actually be preferable for minorities. Minorities are often geographically concentrated, which can facilitate representation under FPTP. In the 2001 Montréal municipal elections, for example,
minorities only won in ridings where they constituted over 20% of the population (Simard 2008: 84). Likewise, in Russia, Robert Moser (2008) finds that more ethnic minorities have been elected in the FPTP tier than the PR tier in every election he studies. Geographically concentrated minorities can constitute a plurality in SMDs even if they do not have enough national support to clear the 5% national threshold to win seats under PR. In a more established democracy, Rafaela Dancygier (2014) finds that multi-member districts do not lead to different rates of Muslim descriptive representation in UK local elections, although she considers at-large plurality multi-member districts and not PR. In the UK and Australia, Joshua Zingher and Benjamin Farrer (2014) find that center-left parties can obtain a 10% boost in single-member districts from ethnic minority voters by nominating minority candidates; in districts with large shares of minority voters this bonus could encourage parties to nominate more minority candidates and increase minority representation. From a cross-national perspective, Pippa Norris (2004: 226) highlights the importance of geographic concentration under FPTP.

On the whole then, FPTP can actually be preferable for concentrated minorities. In a nation with 100 equal-sized electoral districts, for example, a group constituting 4% of the total population and voting strictly on group membership would win no seats in a PR system with a 5% electoral threshold, but could win up to eight seats under SMD rules if it made up 50% of the population in eight different districts.

This bears out in practice, particularly in North America. In Florida, districts with large numbers of black votes have led to the election of black legislators
(Zimmerman 1994: 107). Similarly, racially concentrated districts, often intentionally gerrymandered, have helped minorities win elsewhere in the US and Canada (Schain 2012: 136; Murray 2008: 190-92). However, “color-coding” seats in districts with minority majorities can actually limit the number of seats that minority candidates can competitively run in (Hampshire 2012: 39). Karen Schönwälder (2012: 70) agrees that American and British minorities struggle to gain seats outside of heavily minority districts. Overall, concentration and district size do matter for the effect of electoral rules on minorities.

For immigrants, however, low geographic concentration might make representation even more difficult. Indeed, Schönwälder (2012) finds that Germany’s low residential concentration of immigrants means that they are generally only nominated on party lists in PR and not in single-member constituencies. Since immigrant minorities are a subset of minorities as a whole, it will be even harder for them to achieve a critical mass needed to win a seat, meaning that FPTP could be even worse for immigrants.

Because immigrants may have different (and lower) concentrations than ethnic minorities, further research on institutional effects is necessary. German and New Zealand immigrants tend to be concentrated in urban areas, but even then do not concentrate a majority in any New Zealand electorate (New Zealand Statistics 2015) or more than 15% of any German land (Destatis 2014).² It is unclear whether this concentration is sufficient to win under SMD since there is no simple

² Germany does not release immigration statistics at the land level, so this figure technically refers to the foreign citizen population, not the foreign-born population, as I define immigrants elsewhere.
relationship between group size and representation (Bloemraad 2008: 61-62). Hopefully, more research will shed light on this phenomenon; however, preliminary evidence suggests that geographic concentration should not offer immigrants a substantial benefit under FPTP.

**The Effect of Electoral Systems on Substantive Representation**

Literature on the effect of electoral systems on substantive representation is less well developed. Most studies focus on women and find that proportional representation does improve substantive representation, but that the effect is not huge. Manon Tremblay (2003) interviews female parliamentarians in Canada and Australia and finds that PR encourages them to see themselves as advocates for women, although other factors play a larger part. However, in a similar 2007 study also including New Zealand, Tremblay concludes that electoral systems do not play a significant role. Taking a different angle, Jennifer Clark and Veronica Caro (2013) argue that multi-member districts allow multiple female MPs to collaborate on women’s issues and encourage female MPs to distinguish themselves by focusing on women’s issues. Both of these potential mechanisms may apply to immigrants.

PR might encourage immigrant MPs to view themselves as specifically representing immigrants and encourage them to differentiate themselves by focusing on this constituency, enhancing substantive representation. Even non-immigrant MPs might choose to focus on immigrant interests to try to win this niche vote in a PR system. While this effect might be more likely under open-list PR due
to the increased incentive to cultivate a personal vote (Carey and Shugart 1995), a party under closed-list PR might still try to substantively represent immigrants in hopes of winning their support, even if immigrants do not constitute a majority of the electorate.

The party effect discussed above may also play a role in substantive representation. As Messina (2007: 209) notes, “parties of the left…are more disposed than parties of the right to advance the collective political interests of immigrant voters.” If PR helps the left win more seats or helps farther left parties enter parliament, then this effect could enhance immigrant substantive representation.

**Turning to Immigrants**

Scholarship on immigrant representation is much less developed than work on women and minorities. However, it is well established that institutions are key to shaping immigrant politics (Garbaye 2005: 211). Existing literature offers a number of possible barriers to immigrant success in achieving representation, only some of which align with barriers for minorities. Because different factors affect electoral outcomes for immigrants, electoral rules may affect them differently. Hence, comparative scholarship on institutions is necessary to lay the groundwork for future research on the sources of national variation in pure systems.

---

3 One forthcoming project by Manlio Cinalli, Laura Morales, Thomas Saalfeld, and Jean Tillie aims to examine the descriptive and substantive representation of immigrants; however, it appears that it will not directly focus on electoral system effects. Their work appears to be in the preliminary stages and has produced no published articles or working papers as of writing. See www.pathways.eu.
Definitional Considerations

Before we turn to factors affecting immigrant representation, it is important to note the challenges that arise in defining immigrants. Jannelle Wong (2013: 97) notes that even within immigrants of the same race, large differences can occur due to national origin, length of residency, religion, and other factors. Most existing studies treat all foreign-born representatives as immigrants as I do.

This definition admittedly ignores the different barriers that face each immigrant group and the fact that citizens can be born abroad to expatriate parents. Joseph Garcea (2008: 164-165), for example, finds that in Regina, Canada, immigrants are descriptively overrepresented by 63%. None of Regina’s foreign-born representatives, however, were born outside of the US and Western Europe. While these elected officials may be foreign born, they likely face few of the hurdles that visible minority immigrants do. Similarly, Jerome Black (2008: 235) notes that foreign birth is an imperfect proxy for minority status in the Canadian parliament, since eight MPs were born in Britain or the United States. Wüst and Schmitz (2010: 132) and Wüst (2011: 253) improve upon birth-based definitions by requiring foreign birth and naturalization after birth, thus excluding foreign-born representatives whose parents were citizens. However, while legislator birthplace is often easy to determine, finding definitive data on naturalizations is not. I therefore stick with legislator birthplace in order to obtain the broadest possible dataset.

For my study of descriptive representation, I will examine electoral system effects on immigrants as a whole and on more visible immigrant groups, namely
non-ethnic Germans and Turks in Germany and East and South Asians in New Zealand. While immigrants are a highly heterogeneous group, they do share some common interests, particularly with respect to citizenship and naturalization policy, making it worthwhile to study immigrants as a whole as well as visible immigrant groups. This analysis is complicated by the German practice of granting near-automatic citizenship to ethnic Germans born outside of Germany while not granting citizenship to the children of non-Germans born in Germany. For this reason, it is especially important to consider visible groups with an immigration background separately as I do with persons of Turkish ancestry in the German Bundestag.

Networks

Lack of networks is the first unique barrier to immigrant representation. Garcea (2008: 175) argues that social capital is “very important” to the election of immigrants. John Biles and Erin Tolley (2008: 124) build on this by specifically emphasizing the importance of bridging social capital, i.e. networks between immigrants and non-immigrants. Networks within the community can also facilitate mobilization and voter turnout as seen in the success of Italians in Hamilton, Ontario (Bird 2008: 150). Bonding social capital, between community members, reinforces the “strong sense of collective identity” that has helped Italians

---

4 Garcea uses Robert Putnam’s traditional definition of social capital: “the degree to which they [candidates] are connected to various social, economic, and political networks within their respective communities” (Garcea 2008: 175, paraphrasing Putnam 1995).
and Jews in Toronto and the civic-oriented culture that has helped Filipinos succeed in Winnipeg (O’Neill and Wesley 2008: 220). Because electoral rules impact how groups mobilize their networks, institutions may have disparate effects on immigrant representation.

Lack of networks may also complicate immigrant substantive representation. Connections between constituents and legislators facilitates substantive representation (Matland 1999) and networks have helped women achieve substantive representation (Clark and Caro 2013). Given the crucial role of networks and interest groups in law making in many countries (Chalmers, Martin, and Piester 1997; Wahlke et al. 1960), a lack of social capital among recent immigrants may impede their political claims making.

**Residency**

Another relevant factor for descriptive representation is the community’s length of residency. Biles and Tolley (2008: 126) highlight how more established communities experience greater electoral success. Likewise, Brenda O’Neill and Jared Wesley (2008: 220) argue that “local roots” help candidates succeed. If voters favor “local” candidates, then SMD arrangements like FPTP will likely hurt immigrants, especially more recent ones. Under list systems, immigrants could be elected as part of a “local” slate even if they would have a harder time winning on their own. Thus, PR might have an even greater impact on new immigrant groups than other minorities.
Anti-Immigrant Attitudes

Finally, many of the arguments in favor of PR for women (and minorities) do not necessarily apply to immigrants due to anti-immigrant attitudes. While excluding women from party lists in multi-member districts is glaringly obvious, leaving immigrants off might be less noticeable. Furthermore, while few voters are unabashedly sexist enough to oppose a party list because it contains a woman, the greater openness of xenophobia means that many voters may very well oppose lists containing immigrants. As Jens Hainmueller and Dominik Hangartner (2013) observe in Switzerland, voters may discriminate against specific immigrant groups. Some Swiss municipalities approve naturalization applications by referenda and country of origin is the single greatest predictor of naturalization success—immigrants from Yugoslavia and Turkey receive substantially more “no” votes (160). Along the same lines, Dancygier (2013) finds that left parties in the UK are less likely to nominate Muslim candidates in areas with poor economic conditions since these conditions might breed resentment of Muslims by working class left voters. Thus, while parties should rationally nominate at least some women in high magnitude districts, it may be rational to intentionally exclude immigrants.

Conclusion

Extensive scholarship exists on the effects of electoral systems on the descriptive representation of women and minorities. In general, scholars agree that proportional representation tends to enhance the representation of these groups. However, it is still unclear whether this effect will apply to immigrants. Immigrant
representation is an “unexplored” field (Claro da Fonseca 2011: 118), and as Schönwälder (2012: 71) notes, no existing research studies how PR affects immigrant candidates. While immigrants are a historically disadvantaged group that likely has much in common with ethnic minorities with respect to representation, the parallels are not perfect, so it is important to study them independently.

Explicitly racist parties are marginalized in liberal democracies, but anti-immigrant parties like the French National Front have had stunning electoral success. As Bonnie Meguid (2008: 148, 143) highlights in the French context, adopting positions that are not only anti-immigration, but anti-immigrant has proven to be an enormously successful electoral strategy for the National Front. Vitriol against immigrants is still acceptable, even in established democracies, making the situation of immigrants possibly differentiable.

While literature on descriptive representation is well developed, it still remains to be seen how electoral systems affect substantive representation. Existing theory suggests that proportional rules should benefit disadvantaged groups, just as they do for descriptive representation, but no existing studies empirically assess the impact of electoral rules on substantive representation. Research does demonstrate that PR improves descriptive representation and that descriptive representation enhances substantive representation. My study will allow us to decouple these effects and determine whether electoral systems have an independent effect on substantive representation.
Despite the extent of the existing literature on the effects of electoral systems on representation, important questions remain about whether these same effects apply to immigrants. It also remains to be seen how electoral systems impact substantive representation independently of their effects on descriptive representation. While theory suggests that PR should encourage legislators to appeal to niche groups like immigrants in order to win a share of the vote even if they do not constitute a majority, my study will help determine whether this is actually the case. In the next chapter, I turn to the methodology I will use to help answer these questions.
3. Mixed-Member Electoral Systems as a Quasi-Experiment

As seen in Chapter 2, proportional electoral systems correlate with increased representation for minorities and women. However, as some critics note, this association may be due to cultural influences on electoral system choice (Bowler, Donovan, and Brockington 2003: 7). Countries more inclined to elect large numbers of women and minorities to legislatures might also prefer more proportional electoral systems. This chapter evaluates whether the mixed-member electoral system controlled comparison method is an appropriate avenue to untangle these effects as they apply to immigrants. Since mixed systems involve the election of MPs in single-member districts (SMDs) and proportional representation (PR) lists, they offer a quasi-experiment of the relative effects of these sets of rules, including their impact on immigrant representation. I conclude that mixed-member systems are a useful tool for studying immigrant representation and utilize this methodology in Chapters 4 and 5.

Over thirty countries have adopted electoral rules that include a mixture of pluralitarian/majoritarian and proportional elements since 1990 (Golosov 2014: 435). Used in (West) Germany since 1949 and long considered an electoral oddity, these systems have been lauded as “the best of both worlds” by proponents and have become increasingly popular in established and emerging democracies alike (Shugart and Wattenberg 2001). The demographic happiest about this development is undoubtedly political scientists. Scholars, most notably Robert Moser and his co-
authors (1997; 2001; 2004; 2008; 2012), argue that mixed systems create a controlled experiment for testing the effect of proportional versus pluralitarian electoral systems on a variety of dependent variables.

Critics, however, argue that mixed-member systems exhibit “contamination” between their components and are therefore not an appropriate experiment. In this chapter, I detail both sides of this debate before arguing that mixed-member electoral systems are a useful tool for examining the effect of electoral systems on immigrant representation and reviewing a handful of existing studies that use mixed systems to study representation. First though, I explain the mechanics of mixed-member electoral systems, specifically as they operate in Germany and New Zealand.

The Mechanics of Mixed-Member Electoral Systems

Robert Moser and Ethan Scheiner (2012: xvi-xvii) define a mixed-member electoral system as: “an electoral system that provides voters with two ballots, one for a candidate in a single-member district and one for a party in a proportional representation contest.” This definition leaves out so-called one-ballot systems where voters choose a candidate and a party through a single vote, which is then used to elect a candidate in a single-member district and a party list in a multi-member district. While one-ballot systems are mixed in the sense that MPs are chosen through multiple sets of rules, they do not ask voters to make a simultaneous choice under different sets of rules and are therefore less useful as a test of voting behavior.
Two-ballot systems more closely resemble two simultaneous elections under proportional representation (PR) and single-member district (SMD) rules. Voters select an MP for their district, who is chosen via pluralitarian or majoritarian rules (commonly the traditional first-past-the-post (FPTP) plurality rules used in most former British colonies) and also vote for a party in a multi-member district where seats are allocated proportionally to parties and then awarded to candidates, most often via closed party lists. In FPTP, the electorate is divided into various districts, usually geographic, and the candidate in each district that wins the most votes is elected to the legislature. In closed-list PR, voters vote for a party, which presents a pre-ranked list of candidates in a district with multiple seats. If a party wins X seats, then the first X candidates on its list fill those seats. Many candidates on these lists often run in SMDs as well, a practice known as dual listing which most countries permit. The number of candidates elected from each list is proportional to the share of votes that party won, although smaller parties are sometimes excluded if they do not win a certain share of the total vote.

Mixed-member systems are distinguished from one another on the basis of (1) linkage between the two tiers, (2) the ratio of seats in each tier, (3) the rules under which the SMD seats are allocated, and (4) the district magnitude and legal threshold of the PR tier (Moser and Scheiner 2004: 578). The most significant of these differences is the presence of linkage between the two tiers. In mixed-member

---

5 Throughout this thesis, I use the terms “list tier” and “SMD tier,” which are common in the electoral systems literature. New Zealand and Germany both use closed-list PR in the list tier and first-past-the-post in the SMD tier so my results technically only apply to these more specific rules.
majoritarian (MMM) systems (also known as mixed-member parallel or mixed-superposition systems), the SMD and PR tiers operate separately and no attempt is made to attempt to compensate for the disproportionality created by the SMD tier. In mixed-member proportional (MMP) systems, the number of seats allocated to each party is largely determined by the PR tier. The SMD tier only selects which candidates will fill some of those seats. Because of the linkage between the two tiers, MMP systems are less similar to simultaneous SMD and PR elections and are therefore more likely to exhibit contamination between the two tiers as voters and parties might alter their behavior to respond to the connection between the two tiers (Moser 2001: 496).

MMP, however, has been the mixed system of choice in developed democracies including Germany and New Zealand, as well as in Lesotho and parts of Latin America. To date, MMM has been most commonly used in post-communist states with less institutionalized party systems including Armenia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Russia (1993-2003), and the Ukraine (Farrell 2011; Moser and Scheiner 2004). This lack of stability in MMM countries makes them difficult cases to test institutions. While Japan is an established democracy that uses MMM, its homogeneity makes it a poor case study of immigrant representation. I will therefore focus on the details of MMP and its operation in Germany and New Zealand, the two case studies I will turn to in Chapter 4.

Because Moser and Scheiner (2012) find that electoral systems have less of an effect in new democracies, I pick New Zealand and Germany, established,
politically stable countries, as my case studies, acknowledging that my quasi-experiment would have less risk of contamination if they used MMM. Germany and New Zealand’s electoral systems are fairly similar. In Germany, 50% of seats are allocated in the SMD tier; in New Zealand the share was 59% in the most recent election. Both allocate SMD seats under plurality rules. Both determine the number of PR seats each party wins in a single national district and have a 5% legal threshold, which is waived if parties win a certain number of SMDs (three in Germany, one in New Zealand).

After voters cast their ballots for a candidate and a party, the constituency candidate who wins a plurality of votes in each district is elected to Parliament. The party votes from all constituencies are tallied and the total number of seats a party should proportionally receive is calculated. The number of SMD seats each party has won is then subtracted from the total seats it should win based on the PR tier. The remaining list seats are then allocated via the PR lists until each party’s total number of seats is proportional to its share of the PR votes. New Zealand awards

---

6 One wrinkle to New Zealand’s electoral system is that a small number of SMD seats (seven out of seventy-one in 2014) are reserved for the native Māori people. Māori electorates are drawn on top of general electorates and Māori voters have the option to choose which electorate they vote in. Because these districts by definition do not include immigrant voters and are an oddity of the New Zealand electoral system, they are excluded from my study.

7 Germany technically allocates its seats in ten regional districts, but since parties have the option to pool their votes nationally, in practice, total seats are determined in a single national district and awarded to candidates regionally (Moser and Scheiner 2004: 579).

8 In the time periods considered in this study, Germany and New Zealand both used the Sainte-Laguë formula to calculate the number of seats each party should receive. This details of this calculation are beyond the scope of this study. An exceptionally interested reader may consult Reynolds, Reilly, and Ellis (2005) for more details.
list seats at the national level while Germany does this at the *land* (state) level, which makes it more likely that parties will win more constituency seats than their PR vote share entitles them to win. When this occurs, the constituency MPs are still elected, that party receives no list MPs (nationwide for New Zealand, in that *land* for Germany), and the size of Parliament expands to accommodate these extra seats (overhang seats in New Zealand, *überhangsmandate* in Germany). With these details in mind, we can now turn to how mixed-member systems can be a useful tool for studying immigrant representation.

**Mixed-Member Systems as Quasi-Experiments**

Although the two tiers of the New Zealand and German electoral systems are linked in terms of seat allocation, voters still cast two separate votes. In a perfect world, this would provide a natural experiment of what would occur if we conducted the same election twice on the exact same day, in the exact same country, with the exact same voters, under two different sets of electoral rules. In practice though, voters, parties, and candidates are aware of the two tiers and adjust their behavior accordingly. Parties may run SMD candidates in seats they cannot win to boost PR support; voters may strategically support a favored party’s coalition partner in the SMD tier if that could help them pass the threshold for the PR tier; and parties may avoid running SMD candidates in certain districts in an agreement with a coalition partner.

Despite this risk, a number of scholars still argue that mixed-member systems create the opportunity to do a controlled comparison (Benoit 2001; Haspel,
Remington, and Smith 1998; Lancaster and Patterson 1990; Moser 1997; 2001; Moser and Scheiner 2004; 2012; Protsyk and Sachariew 2013; Shugart 2005; Stratmann and Baur 2002). Moser and Scheiner (2012: 46) compare this strategy to Lijphart’s (1994: 79) usage of electoral reforms as an opportunity to find cases where two elections (one pre-reform and one post-reform) can be assumed to “differ only marginally” except for the electoral system. Mixed-member systems should offer even fewer differences here since the two votes happen simultaneously and no intervening political changes can occur.

Mixed-member systems also allow for the inclusion of more elections, increasing my sample size. Electoral reform comparisons require the selection of elections as close as possible to the reform to reduce the risk of domestic political changes. However, electoral system reform often does not lead to equilibrium immediately, forcing scholars to pick elections farther apart to measure the true effect, which can raise the risk of domestic political changes. In contrast, mixed-member comparisons allow us to consider all elections using mixed rules since there is no risk of domestic political changes between the portion of the election conducted under each set of rules as the two tiers are elected simultaneously.

**Problems with Using Mixed-Member Systems**

Critics of this approach, however, note that “contamination” between the two tiers means that mixed systems are not equivalent to simultaneous PR and SMD elections (Clark and Wittrock 2005; Ferrara and Herron 2005; Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa 2005; Herron and Nishikawa 2001). As Federico Ferrara, Erik Herron,
and Misa Nishikawa (2005: 6) note: “under mixed electoral rules, voters, legislators, and parties do not necessarily make strategic decisions for each tier separately, as if the two components were different elections.” Because of this contamination, they argue that Moser and others are wrong to treat the two tiers as independent and that mixed systems are not “social laboratories” (139).

Most studies of contamination focus on the number of parties contesting and receiving votes in the SMD tier. As Steven Reed and Michael Thies (2001: 387) note, mixed systems encourage small parties to run candidates in SMDs where they have no hope of winning in an effort to boost the party’s PR vote through the extra publicity the candidate provides. Cox and Schoppa (2002: 1040), Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa (2005: 34), Gschwend, Johnston, and Pattie (2003), Herron and Nishikawa (2001), and Manow (2015) have all found evidence of this vote bonus.

Scholars offer two complementary explanations for why this bonus occurs. Using survey data from New Zealand, Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa (2005: 78) find that voters do not compartmentalize information between the two tiers, so liking an SMD candidate can make voters more likely to support that party in PR as well. Therefore, parties have an incentive to run SMD candidates with no chance of winning in an effort to boost their PR share.

Taking an elite mobilization perspective, Karen Cox and Leonard Schoppa (2002: 1031) argue that mixed systems cause voters to receive mixed messages about wasted votes. In all countries, some voters will always vote expressively (for the candidate or party they truly prefer), some will always vote strategically (for
their preferred candidate or party out of those with a realistic chance of winning), and some will be on the fence between these two strategies. In mixed systems, small parties are incentivized to remind voters that voting for them in the PR tier will not be a wasted vote so long as they clear the electoral threshold. In the interest of not confusing voters and possibly costing themselves PR votes, small party elites have little incentive to point out to their supporters that it may be rational to strategically abandon them in the SMD tier.

Thus, more parties have an incentive to run candidates in the SMD tier and voters may be more likely to vote expressively for these candidates instead of strategically abandoning them as Duverger’s Law (1954, as formalized by Cox 1997) would predict. For this reason, strategic voting is less common in mixed systems than pure SMD systems (Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa 2005: 82).

Furthermore, mixed systems vary in the degree to which they discourage pre-electoral coordination, further demonstrating that the tiers are not independent. Ferrara and Herron (2005: 18) demonstrate that linkage between the two tiers and the national allocation of PR seats both encourage small parties to “go it alone” in the SMD tier and not join a coalition. Likewise, Cox and Schoppa (2002: 1038) note that the Japanese practice of awarding PR seats to “best losers” in the SMD tier makes coordination more difficult. Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa (2005: 63) argue more generally that the dominance of the PR tier will encourage smaller parties to avoid coalitions while the dominance of majoritarian components will encourage cooperation. The fact that institutional differences in the PR tier of mixed
systems affects how the SMD tier operates provides further evidence of contamination.

Contamination critics also argue that mixed systems impact legislator behavior. Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Bernhard Wessels (2001) note that in Germany, all MPs are assigned to constituency service and many stand for election in both tiers, making it unreasonable to clearly distinguish between the electoral incentives of list MPs and SMD MPs. Similarly, Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa (2005: 118) demonstrate using Italian and Ukrainian data that electoral method has little effect on party loyalty. While we would normally predict list MPs to be more loyal to party leaders since a high ranking on the party list can guarantee reelection, Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa argue that since MPs can run for reelection as list and SMD candidates, their current electoral status has little effect on their loyalty to party leadership.

The Counter-Response

While not contesting the existence of interaction between the two tiers, defenders of using mixed electoral systems as a controlled comparison successfully respond to these attacks. Centrally, Moser and Scheiner (2012: 50) argue that the contamination critique attacks a straw man. At no point do they argue that the two tiers are wholly independent. They instead accept mixed systems as the closest we can get in the real world to testing the simultaneous conduction of an election under two different sets of rules and acknowledge the risk of interaction. In fact, because of contamination, mixed systems often provide a more difficult test of the
difference between SMD and PR. If scholars can identify an effect even under these more difficult conditions, then the difference must be especially significant (Moser and Scheiner 2004: 578). For example, despite the evidence that mixed systems tend to boost the effective number of parties in the SMD tier (Cox and Schoppa 2002; Ferrara and Herron 2005; Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa 2005; Herron and Nishikawa 2001), Moser and Scheiner (2012) still find a lower effective number of parties in the SMD tier in most of their cases as we would expect. Thus, they argue that this provides even more definitive evidence of the effect of electoral system on the effective number of parties.

While the possible effect of contamination on the descriptive and substantive representation of immigrants is not considered directly in the literature, a similar logic appears to hold. With respect to the descriptive representation of women, Golosov (2014) finds that dual candidacies in Russia have boosted the number of female candidates in both tiers. While we typically expect parties to nominate more women under PR to achieve a balanced ticket, finding an entirely new male slate of candidates to run in the SMD tier puts a large burden on the party. Parties may therefore choose to nominate the women they have already nominated for the PR tier for SMD seats as well. Since Golosov finds a strong correlation between female candidacies and female MPs, the difference between female representation in both tiers of the Russian system may be smaller than the difference between pure SMD and PR would be in Russia. A similar effect may well hold for the descriptive representation of immigrants. More immigrants may win seats in
the PR tier, but since not all PR candidates run in and win SMDs, the difference may be smaller than it would be in pure systems.

Likewise, since legislators can run for reelection as SMD and PR candidates, many MPs face incentives both to cater to geographic constituencies as we would expect under pure SMD and to focus on more national issues as we would expect under PR. Thus, for both descriptive and substantive representation, mixed systems present a harder test. If we still find evidence of an effect between the tiers, we should be even more confident that a difference in fact exists.

In addition to criticizing Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa (2005) for attacking a straw man, Moser and Scheiner (2012) argue that Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa use a biased sample by focusing too closely on elections immediately following electoral reform and using too many former Soviet republics with poorly institutionalized parties. As Reed and Thies (2001) note, it may take a few elections to reach equilibrium after electoral reform as voters, parties, and candidates adjust to the new incentives. Moser and Scheiner (2012: 134) note that New Zealand and Japan have both shown declining levels of personal voting. While Germany was the only major case that had substantial experience with mixed systems in the early 2000s when most of the contamination critics were conducting their studies, Moser and Scheiner (2012: 53) argue that Ferrara, Herron, and Nishikawa’s (2005) focus on 1990-2002 is also misleading since German reunification in 1990 led to renewed party fragmentation. Thus, all of their cases were in a state of transition that makes measuring party fragmentation difficult. Using more cases and removing the post-Soviet states, Moser and Scheiner (2012: 57) find that mixed systems, especially
unlinked mixed systems, do not lead to a substantial increase in the effective number of parties.

Jeffrey Karp’s (2009) research reinforces this finding. He notes that while the contamination critics are correct about the positive relationship between SMD candidacy and PR vote share, this may be occurring because parties are most likely to run candidates in the districts where they are most popular to start. While contamination critics attempt to correct for this by including past vote share and incumbency, Jens Hainmueller and Holger Lutz Kern (2008: 215) argue that these controls are insufficient since other confounding variables, like the expectation that a given party will do well in a given district in the current election, are not accounted for.

Using individual level survey data, Karp (2009: 48) finds that the presence of an SMD candidate does not make a voter more likely to vote for that party in the PR tier. Given that personal voting contamination is especially likely in New Zealand due to its small districts and a ballot structure that lines up candidates in the SMD tier with their party in the PR tier, Karp argues that this lack of contamination demonstrates that most of the contamination found by other scholars is due to confounding variables.

Whether or not contamination between the two tiers actually exists, this criticism does not prevent us from used mixed systems as a partially controlled comparison. While the PR and SMD tiers of mixed systems may be less different than pure SMD and pure PR, this only strengthens the comparison by making them
an especially difficult test case. If I find a significant difference between the two tiers despite contamination, then this will only reinforce my findings.

**Preliminary Evidence from Mixed Systems on Representation**

While most studies of mixed systems have used them as a tool to study party systems, a few have looked at their impact on representation. Contrary to conventional wisdom, some scholars of mixed systems observe that PR does not improve the descriptive representation of women and minorities. Moser (2008) finds that ethnic minorities have actually done better under Russia’s SMD tier, which he credits to the geographic concentration of many ethnic minorities. Also in Russia, Golosov (2014) argues that PR ticket balancing has led to increased female nominations in the SMD tier since parties do not want to recruit additional male candidates to run when they already have a gender-balanced slate of candidates to draw upon. However, as Moser and Scheiner (2012) argue, electoral rules have different effects depending on context. The usual impact that we expect on party systems often does not always occur in emerging democracies. Thus, it is possible that established democracies will demonstrate a positive relationship between PR and immigrant representation even if Russia does not. Since PR will only benefit immigrants if parties have an electoral incentive to nominate them, it seems likely that societies with greater acceptance of immigrants to start will show a larger electoral effect.

A few other studies have used mixed-member electoral systems to study descriptive representation and found a more notable difference. A 1993 poll found
that a majority of New Zealanders believed that electoral reform would improve minority representation (Jackson and McRobie 1998) and indeed in the first election under MMP in 1996, significantly more minorities entered Parliament in the PR tier as expected (Barker et al. 2001: 397). Beate Hoecker (1994: 71) finds that in the 1972 election to the German Bundestag, six times as many women were elected in the list tier as the SMD tier. Considering minority representation in the 1990 Bulgarian election under mixed rules, Olem Protsyk and Konstantin Sachariew (2013: 319) find that the Roma did three times better in the PR tier. Thus, although evidence on minority representation in mixed systems is itself mixed, there is reason to be optimistic that we will observe an effect, especially in the more established democracies in my study.

Despite the contamination created by dual candidacies, initial evidence suggests an effect on substantive representation as well. A handful of studies demonstrate that SMD MPs view their role more as servicing their geographical constituency while PR MPs focus on more national issues like immigration and integration policy. In Venezuela, Michael Kulisheck and Brian Crisp (2001) find that list MPs are more attentive to party interests while SMD MPs are more active in constituency service and view their role more as being attentive to local concerns. In a more extreme case, René Mayorga (2001) finds that Bolivian SMD MPs campaign exclusively on municipal politics and ignore national concerns.

These trends also hold in more established democracies. In Germany, even though parties do not see a significant difference between the two types of MPs, survey data suggests that MPs view their role differently (Farrell 2011: 106).
Indeed, SMD MPs took constituency service seriously from the start of MMP (Bawn 1993: 979), are more likely to view pork-barrel projects as constituency service (Lancaster and Patterson 1990), and are more likely to join committees that allow them to service geographic constituencies (Stratmann and Baur 2002). While I could locate no studies of mixed systems to date that look at their effect on the substantive representation of groups, the focus of list MPs on national concerns lends credence to the hypothesis that list MPs will be more attentive to immigration and integration issues.

Conclusion

In Chapter 2, I highlighted the need for further study of electoral system effects on immigrant representation. Since immigrant dynamics generally vary between countries, cross-national studies may fail to isolate the effect of electoral systems (Matland 1993). The mixed-member research design discussed in this chapter offers a solution to this challenge. By comparing the attributes of MPs elected under different rules within the same country, this approach allows for a partially controlled comparison of electoral rules.

In addition to furthering our understanding of immigrant representation, this approach can enhance our understanding of the representation of disadvantaged groups more generally. While the literature on the descriptive representation of women and minorities is well developed, few studies are able to overcome the possible confounding effects of inter-country differences. The mixed approach employed in this study can help further our understanding of representation more
generally by controlling for endogenous effects. In Chapter 4, I apply the approach outlined above to descriptive representation in New Zealand and Germany.
4. The Effect of Electoral Systems on Descriptive Representation

In the previous chapter, I highlighted the value of mixed-member controlled comparisons to study the effect of electoral systems on political phenomena. In this chapter, I apply that method to immigrant descriptive representation using New Zealand and Germany as case studies. In line with existing literature on the descriptive representation of women and minorities, I find that proportional representation (PR) makes immigrant representation more likely than under single-member district (SMD) plurality rules. I also find that this effect is related to the increased presence of smaller left-wing parties in the PR tier, but I cannot directly test the relationship between parties and electoral systems due to collinearity.

Even if the change in party composition is the only reason that PR benefits immigrants, PR still enhances descriptive representation by reducing the effective threshold needed for smaller parties to gain seats. Thus, the results in this chapter provide strong evidence that proportional representation is more effective than SMD at promoting immigrant descriptive representation. In both countries I conduct my analysis on immigrants as a whole and then single out more visible immigrant groups to account for the different conditions facing immigrants from different countries.

---

9 SMD plurality is equivalent to the first-past-the-post (FPTP) system discussed earlier in this thesis. The change in terminology here reflects the more common usage of the term “SMD tier” in electoral systems scholarship while the representation literature discussed in Chapter 2 tends to refer to FPTP.
This chapter begins by outlining the hypotheses to be tested, referencing the literature examined in Chapter 2. Second, I discuss my data sources and coding for both countries, including a brief outline of their party systems. Third, I offer summary statistics and make general observations on my data. Fourth, I present the methodology for my statistical analysis, and finally, I present my results.

Hypotheses

In Chapter 2, I discussed the extensive existing literature on the value of proportional representation for disadvantaged groups. Three of the principal reasons for this general effect are potentially relevant to immigrants: (1) PR requires parties to nominate larger slates of candidates, which encourages more diverse nominations, and nomination is a necessary step for electoral success; (2) PR makes it easier for groups that do not constitute a majority (including small egalitarian parties) to win seats; and (3) PR has a weaker incumbency advantage, which helps political outsiders break in. Because of these factors, I predict:

\[ H_1: \text{MPs elected in the PR tier will be more likely to be immigrants than MPs elected in the SMD tier.} \]

While evidence for this hypothesis will demonstrate that PR enhances immigrant descriptive representation, it will not explain why this is the case. Notably, different types of parties, which may vary in their level of immigrant inclusion, tend to experience different levels of success in the two tiers. Large parties, with the electoral support to constitute a plurality in many districts, tend to do well in the SMD tier while small parties tend to get the majority of their seats in
the PR tier. As discussed in Chapter 2, parties of the left may promote immigrant
descriptive representation and the smaller left-wing parties that tend to be most
successful in the list tier may be especially supportive of immigrant representation.
Because of this, I predict:

\[ H_2: \text{MPs from small left-wing parties will be more likely to be immigrants than MPs from the largest party in each country.} \]

If both of these hypotheses hold, it will be difficult to determine whether
electoral system benefits are due exclusively to parties. Because of the high
correlation between list election and membership in a smaller party, I cannot control
for party effects in my electoral systems model. While candidate-level data might help remedy this problem by allowing me to analyze the lists offered by each party,
reliable birthplace data on candidates not elected to parliament proved difficult to collect.

I can, however, control for electoral system in part by considering list MPs separately. Because I suspect that small left-wing parties will be more likely to promote the election of immigrant MPs, even after controlling for electoral system, I predict:

\[ H_3: \text{List MPs from small left-wing parties will be more likely to be immigrants than list MPs from the largest party in each country.} \]

This hypothesis differs from Hypothesis 2 in that it isolates the effect of party from electoral system. It is possible that PR encourages all parties to nominate diverse list slates and that smaller party MPs happen to be more likely to be immigrants because they are also more likely to be list MPs. By only considering
list MPs, I can isolate party effects from electoral system effects. While party
effects will certainly depend on the party composition of each country, if small left-
wing parties have a larger effect on immigrant representation than large center-left
parties, this can still demonstrate the power of electoral systems to help more
ideologically diverse parties win office.

Hypothesis 3 investigates whether parties have an effect beyond electoral
system. However, it is also possible that electoral systems have an effect beyond
parties since PR encourages all parties to nominate a more diverse slate. Only the
largest two parties in each country elect a sizeable number of MPs in both tiers. By
comparing the share of immigrants elected within each tier for these larger parties,
I can test whether they behave differently in the two tiers. Because all parties should
face incentives to nominate lowest common denominator candidates in the SMD
tier and a more diverse slate in the PR tier, and nominations translate into seats, I
predict that:

\[ H_4: \text{Within large parties, MPs elected in the PR tier will be more likely to be immigrants than MPs elected in the SMD tier.} \]

Overall, I expect to find evidence that (1) PR enhances immigrant
descriptive representation over SMDs, (2) small left-wing parties enhance
immigrant descriptive representation over large center-right parties, (3) parties have
an effect independent of electoral system, and (4) electoral systems have an effect
independent of party composition.
Data

*New Zealand*

My New Zealand dataset contains 757 MP-legislature pairs including all parliaments from the first MMP election in 1996 to the most recent one in 2014. Although there may have been some instability in the first elections after the adoption of MMP, I include all cases to maximize my sample size. Given that my sample includes six elections, this initial instability should not have a major effect on my data. I use the MP-legislature pair as my unit of analysis (i.e. each MP serving in each legislature is its own observation) instead of just MPs on the theory that one immigrant serving in five legislatures has the same descriptive effect (if not a greater one) as five different immigrants serving in one parliament each. Treating each MP as a single observation, regardless of the number of terms they serve, would ignore the added representation that comes from each additional term.

My dataset excludes MPs elected in New Zealand’s Māori electorates. These districts by definition exclude immigrants since only Māori voters are allowed to participate. Therefore, parties competing in these seats should have little incentive to appeal to immigrant voters. In practice, of the forty-seven Māori electorate-legislature pairs for which I had data that I could have included in this study, zero elected an immigrant MP.

---

10 The basis of my dataset was generously provided to me by Professor Daniel M. Smith, which I supplemented with additional MP birthplaces, drawing on information provided by the Parliamentary Information Service, MP and party personal webpages, and Wikipedia, which I corroborated with official sources whenever possible. All data besides birthplace, including party affiliation, come from the Parliamentary Information Service.
After excluding the Māori seats, I was able to determine country of birth for 715 MP-legislature pairs. My remaining 42 observations come from cases where a specific fact in the MP’s biography like descent from early New Zealand settlers, Māori tribal membership, or a parent in the New Zealand Parliament, led me to deduce that the MP in question was most likely born in New Zealand. I reran my analysis excluding these 42 observations and got functionally equivalent results. I have included these observations in the results below.

As dependent variables of interest, I use both birth abroad and birth in East or South Asia. I separate Asian immigrants out because they are the most visible immigrant group in New Zealand and likely face unique integration challenges that migrants from Australia, for example, would not face. In fact, outside of Asia, every immigrant save one who has served in the New Zealand Parliament since 1995 was born in the United States, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, or a Pacific island nation. The lone exception is a white South African. While Pacific island nations are not majority white like the other common source countries, the strong Māori presence in New Zealand and the relationship between the Māori and other indigenous Pacific Islanders means that Pacific Islanders are not political outsiders in New Zealand in the same way as Asians. The British government formally recognized the rights of indigenous and white New Zealanders alike in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi. While the relationship between white and Pacific Islander New Zealanders has been tumultuous, it is also deeply rooted. In contrast, Asian immigration expanded dramatically in the 1990s, and Asians only became the largest immigrant group in 2006 (Economist 2014).
Of course, birth abroad is an imperfect proxy for immigration status. New Zealand practiced both *jus soli* (citizenship by birth in New Zealand) and *jus sanguinis* (citizenship by birth to New Zealander parents) until 2005 (New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs 2015; New Zealand Legislation 2010). Thus, while birth in New Zealand is generally a good indicator that an MP is not an immigrant, persons born abroad to New Zealand citizens are automatically citizens themselves and cannot immigrate. Likewise, MPs born in Asia could be New Zealand citizens by blood or citizens of other non-Asian countries. Despite this, other studies of immigrant representation use birthplace as a proxy as I do (e.g. Garcea 2008). Although not ideal, birthplace data are far more readily available than immigration and citizenship status data and allow me to use a substantially larger sample.

My data also include each MP’s political party. For MPs that switch party midterm, I use their party at the time of election, since I am interested in the role of parties in helping immigrants get elected. Since the 1996 electoral reform, New Zealand has experienced a great deal of party fragmentation. Nevertheless, National and Labour, the two largest parties before reform, still dominate New Zealand politics. They have now been joined by two smaller parties, New Zealand First and the Greens, which have won over 5% of support in almost all post-reform elections. These parties as well as two other smaller parties that have experienced some success, ACT and Alliance, are introduced below.

**National** — the largest party in my study, National was in power during the electoral reform and formed a coalition government with New Zealand First from 1996 to 1999. It then left power for nine years, returning in 2008 under the
leadership of John Key who remains Prime Minister as of writing. National is New Zealand’s main center-right party. Despite this, National embraces fairly liberal positions on immigrant issues. Its online platform describes the value of diversity to New Zealand society and encourages skilled immigration (National 2014).

**Labour**—along with National, Labour is one of New Zealand’s two principal parties. A social democratic party, it governed New Zealand from 1999 to 2008 under the leadership of Prime Minister Helen Clark. Labour’s online policy positions on immigration take a similar tone to National’s, although they perhaps offer more specificity (Labour 2013).

**Green**—a classic environmental party, the New Zealand Greens left the Alliance in 1997 and have won seats in every subsequent election, almost exclusively in the list tier. The Greens take the most liberal positions on immigration of any New Zealand party in Parliament, calling for an increase in humanitarian, family, and skilled migration (Green 2015).

**New Zealand First**—founded by former Labour MP Winston Peters in 1993, New Zealand First surged into government after electoral reform in 1996 on a populist anti-immigration platform, with Peters becoming Deputy Prime Minister. After leaving government mid-term, the party’s popularity fell and by 2008 it failed to clear the 5% threshold and won no seats. In 2011 and 2014, however, the party rebounded and reentered Parliament. New Zealand First takes the most stridently anti-immigration position of any New Zealand party calling for a “rigorous and strictly applied immigration policy” (New Zealand First 2014).
**ACT**—a free market political party, ACT New Zealand was founded out of the Association of Consumers and Taxpayers. It has won seats in every parliament since the electoral reform, despite having failed to clear the 5% threshold since the 2002 election. It owes its continued representation to its repeated victories in the Epsom electorate (recall that New Zealand allows parties to win list seats if they win 5% of the national party vote or one SMD). In 2011 and 2014, ACT won only the Epsom seat. Despite being economically conservative, ACT defines itself as “pro-immigration” (ACT 2014).

**Alliance**—the New Zealand Alliance is a democratic socialist party formed out of four left-wing parties. While initially very successful under the mixed member system, coming in fourth and third in the 1996 and 1999 elections, the party fragmented and failed to win any subsequent seats. It continues to advocate a relatively liberal immigration policy (Alliance n.d.).

**Other**—New Zealand’s practice of awarding electoral representation to any party that wins a single constituency, even if it fails to clear the 5% threshold, has perpetuated the existence of a number of smaller parties. United Future New Zealand, for example, has not won more than a single seat in parliament since 2005, but continues in office thanks to the repeated reelection of its leader, Peter Dunne. The Māori Party has also continued to receive seats via its success in New Zealand’s Māori electorates. Because these smaller parties depend on SMD seats for their representation, they often have a greater share of their MPs in the SMD tier than their mid-sized counterparts like New Zealand First and the Greens who can enter Parliament by clearing the 5% threshold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>757</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1. Observations for each New Zealand party in my dataset by tier.*

**Germany**

My German dataset contains 4,656 observations from 1990 to 2015.\(^{11}\) I choose 1990 as my starting point since this was the first Bundestag election in a reunified Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall, marking a new era in German politics. Again, some instability may exist in the initial elections after this change, but my sample contains seven elections which should mute any variance in the early post-unification elections.

My three dependent variables of interest are birth abroad, non-German ancestry, and Turkish ancestry. Like New Zealand, I use birth abroad as an

---

\(^{11}\) My German data are also drawn from a dataset provided to me by Professor Daniel M. Smith, which I supplemented with biographies on the German Bundestag website (2002-2015) and in the *Biographisches Handbuch de Mitglieder des Deutschen Bundestages: 1949-2002* for earlier years. For MPs who sat in the 18th Bundestag, I also used Andreas Wüst’s research (2013: 7) to help identify non-ethnic Germans and immigrants.
imperfect proxy for immigration status. I count those born in the Weimar Republic (1919-1933), the German Reich (1933-1945), Allied Occupied Germany (1945-1949), the German Democratic Republic (1949-1990), and the Federal Republic of Germany (1949-present) as born in “Germany.” Since Germany does not practice *jus soli*, using birthplace as a proxy for immigration status is more problematic than in New Zealand. Persons born in Germany to non-citizen parents are not entitled to citizenship and therefore persons coded as non-immigrants may in fact face the same integration and naturalization challenges as persons born abroad. Further complicating the matter, ethnic Germans born outside of Germany (even to parents who are not German citizens) face a streamlined naturalization process that allows almost automatic citizenship upon obtaining residency in Germany (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees 2011).

Because of these challenges, I seek out other dependent variables in Germany. First, I utilize non-German ancestry. I code this variable on the basis of MP biographies. If an MP’s last name suggested that he or she might not be ethnically German, I searched his or her biography for evidence that this was the case. If I found a definitive statement of non-German ancestry, I coded the MP as non-German. Although this methodology will likely exclude many MPs who are not ethnically German but have German surnames, under-inclusion is acceptable because it makes it more difficult to achieve significance. Therefore, if I am able to identify an observable effect despite my under-inclusive sample of this dependent variable, we can be even more confident that my results are significant. There is no reason to believe that list MPs will be more or less likely to reveal their non-German
ancestry in their official biographies so this under-inclusion should not affect my results.

Similarly, I examine the effect of electoral system on Turkish representation. Turks are the most visible immigrant minority in Germany, similar to Asians in New Zealand, and face unique integration challenges. Since Germany does not grant citizenship to the children of non-citizens, I identified MPs with Turkish heritage on the basis of last names and official biographies instead of birthplace as I did with Asians in New Zealand. A child born to Turkish parents in Germany would face many of the same challenges as a child born in Turkey that immigrated at a young age. In contrast, an Asian child born in New Zealand (before 2005) would be accorded full New Zealand citizenship, while that same child born abroad and immigrating at a young age would not. Because of the complicated nature of German citizenship policy, examining MPs that are not ethnically German and MPs that have Turkish heritage will allow me to focus on the effect of electoral systems on visible immigrant minorities.

My German dataset also contains party information. In broad strokes, Germany’s party system resembles New Zealand’s. Germany has two major parties, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) on the right and the Social Democratic Party (SPD) on the left. It also has three smaller parties that win seats primarily in the list tier.

**CDU/CSU**—the Christian Democratic Union combines with the Christian Social Union (CSU), its Bavarian sister party, to form one block in the Bundestag. The CSU only runs candidates in the state of Bavaria while the CDU only runs
candidates outside of Bavaria. While the CSU is generally viewed as more socially conservative than the CDU, for the purposes of immigrant-relevant policy at the federal level, we can treat the CDU and CSU as one unit. The CDU led Germany in 1990 during reunification under Chancellor Helmut Kohl and held power until 1998, regaining it again in 2005 under Chancellor Angela Merkel. The CDU belongs to the family of Christian democratic parties common in Europe. Despite the CDU’s history of opposing immigration and promoting German national identity (Schönwälder 2013), Chancellor Merkel’s CDU has become well known for its embrace of refugees following the crisis in Syria.

**SPD**—the Social Democratic Party (SPD) is the CDU’s chief rival in German politics. Historically, it has run second to the CDU and since 1990 it has only governed from 1998 to 2005 under Chancellor Gerhard Schröder. Despite some surprising criticism from the left of Chancellor Merkel’s refugee policy, the SPD generally maintains an open position on immigration (SPD n.d.).

**FDP**—the Free Democratic Party (FDP) is a classical liberal party that has traditionally held the balance of power in the Bundestag between the CDU and the SPD. In 2013 though, the FDP failed to clear the 5% threshold and is currently unrepresented in the Bundestag for the first time since the body’s creation in 1949. The FDP advocates skilled immigration and integration (FDP n.d.).

**Green**—Bündnis 90/Die Grünen is an environmental party merging the former green parties of East and West Germany. In 1990, when the 5% threshold applied separately in the former East and West Germany, only the East German Greens won seats in the Bundestag. Since then though, the combined party has won
well over 5% of the vote in every national election and served in government with the SPD from 1998 to 2005. Like their New Zealand counterparts, the German Greens are unabashedly welcoming when it comes to immigration and diversity (Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen 2015).

**Die Linke/PDS**—the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS) was the successor to the communist party that ruled East Germany as a one-party state until 1990. In 2007, the PDS merged with another left wing party to form Die Linke (the Left). Before the merger, the PDS sometimes entered Parliament only by winning SMD seats in the former East Germany, surpassing the three-seat threshold needed for list representation without 5% of the national vote. In 2002 though, PDS won only two SMDs and was therefore ineligible for additional representation. Since the foundation of Die Linke however, the party has experienced much more success, winning over 11% of the national vote in 2009 and 2013. Die Linke’s policy positions include a stand against racism and increased support for refugees (Die Linke n.d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDU/CSU</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Linke/PDS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>4,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.2. Observations for each German party in my dataset by tier.*
Preliminary Analysis

Electoral System

Before turning to my formal methodology and analysis, I present summary data on the relationship between immigrant status and tier of election and party in both countries. As shown in tables 4.3 and 4.4, electoral systems appear to make a sizable difference. A greater share of list MPs are immigrants by all five measures of immigrant status across the two countries in my study. Some of the differences are especially stark. Only twenty-four seats in the New Zealand Parliament have ever been captured by Asian-born MPs. Of these, only one was an SMD seat. Pansy Wong, a four-term National list MP, captured the newly created, heavily Chinese seat in Botany in 2008. We will encounter Ms. Wong again in Chapter 6 as one of the most vocal advocates for New Zealand’s Chinese immigrant community. However, only eleven different individuals born in Asia have served in the New Zealand Parliament since 1996, suggesting that even with electoral reform, Asians have been unable to secure substantial descriptive representation.

Using the more general definition of birth outside New Zealand, the difference between the two tiers is also pronounced. A full 22.8% of New Zealand’s list MPs were born outside the country, compared to 8.5% of SMD MPs. Considering that 28% of New Zealand’s population was born outside of the country (OECD 2015: 312), this wide difference suggests that PR may be a powerful tool for immigrants to achieve descriptive representation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
<th>Foreign-born Observations</th>
<th>Asian-born Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>36 (8.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>76 (22.8%)</td>
<td>23 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>112 (14.8%)</td>
<td>24 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Summary statistics by tier for New Zealand MPs born abroad and in Asia.

Results for Germany suggest more caution. While immigrants constitute a greater share of the list tier across all three definitions, their absolute numbers remain miniscule. In fact, even though I have over 4,600 German observations and only 753 New Zealand observations, my study contains more New Zealand MPs born abroad than German MPs born abroad despite the fact that 13% of the German population was born outside of Germany (OECD 2015). Nevertheless, a clear difference in immigrant representation exists between the two tiers.

Together, the German and New Zealand results suggest that electoral systems make a difference when it comes to the descriptive representation of immigrants, but that national factors not examined in this study may be playing an even larger role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
<th>Foreign-born Observations</th>
<th>Not Ethnically German Observations</th>
<th>Turkish Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>36 (1.7%)</td>
<td>16 (0.7%)</td>
<td>5 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>64 (2.6%)</td>
<td>51 (2.1%)</td>
<td>20 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>100 (2.1%)</td>
<td>67 (1.4%)</td>
<td>25 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Summary statistics by tier for German MPs born abroad, not of ethnic German ancestry, and of Turkish ancestry.
A cursory analysis of the party data suggests that parties may have an effect as well. As seen in Table 4.5, the New Zealand parties with the greatest shares of foreign-born MPs are all left-wing list-based parties. Surprisingly, the center-right National Party claims the greatest number of Asian-born MPs, although as shown below, these results turn out to be insignificant due to the small overall number of Asian-born MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
<th>Foreign-born Observations</th>
<th>Asian-born Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>34 (10.2%)</td>
<td>14 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>38 (14.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7 (25.9%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 (35.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 (18.9%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>753</strong></td>
<td><strong>112 (14.9%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24 (3.2%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Summary statistics by party for New Zealand MPs born abroad and in Asia.

In Germany (see Table 4.6), preliminary results are also in line with expectations. By all metrics, the greatest share of immigrants come from the small left-wing parties. Overall though, most immigrant MPs are still elected through the mainstream parties in both New Zealand and Germany due to their size and dominance of both countries’ politics. Nevertheless, the small parties sometimes
come close. For example, despite having had over five times as many MPs elected overall, the center-left SPD has only two more ethnically non-German MPs than Die Linke. In fact, the CDU/CSU has eight fewer ethnically non-German MPs than Die Linke and only has one Turkish MP compared to the Greens’ nine. Thus, the initial data suggest that parties may be playing an important role in the descriptive representation of immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
<th>Foreign-born Observations</th>
<th>Not Ethnically German Observations</th>
<th>Turkish Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDU/CSU</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>31 (1.6%)</td>
<td>10 (0.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>40 (2.5%)</td>
<td>20 (1.2%)</td>
<td>8 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>8 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>14 (4.0%)</td>
<td>17 (4.9%)</td>
<td>9 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Linke/PDS</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>7 (2.5%)</td>
<td>18 (6.4%)</td>
<td>6 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 (2.1%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>67 (1.4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 (0.5%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Summary statistics by party for German MPs born abroad, not of ethnic German ancestry, and of Turkish ancestry.

**Methodology**

I now turn to my more formal statistical tests. To examine the relationship between electoral system and descriptive representation, I perform Pearson’s chi-squared tests using several different markers of immigrant status: birth abroad and birth in Asia for New Zealand and birth abroad, ethnically non-German ancestry, and ethnically Turkish ancestry for Germany. I begin by only using method of
election as my independent variable since even if party plays a role, electoral systems still impact the types of parties that win seats.

In order to test Hypothesis 2 regarding the effect of parties, I use regression to account for the potentially different effects of each party. I perform ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to obtain a linear probability model (LPM), which I check with logistic regression. I use party membership as my independent variable, coding it as a dummy variable for each party in both countries and performing multivariate regression. I treat National and CDU/CSU as my reference parties (or omitted categories) in New Zealand and Germany respectively. I use these parties as my reference cases since they are the largest parties in each country (holding 44% and 42% of observations in each sample respectively). Both are center-right and currently in government, making them a logical point of comparison.

I reran my regression models using the center-left Labour Party and SPD as my omitted categories to test the significance of the difference between the center-left and the smaller left-wing parties. However, given the similarity of these results to the results using National and CDU/CSU as my omitted variables, I do not reproduce these models below.

My OLS models here takes the following form:

\[ y = \alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_n x_n + e \]

Where \( y \) represents the probability an MP has the dependent variable trait; \( \alpha \) is the intercept, which represents the probability that an MP has the dependent variable trait given than he or she belongs to the National Party for New Zealand or the CDU/CSU for Germany; \( \beta_i \) is the added probability from being a member of party
$i$ for $i = \{1, \ldots, n\}$; $x_i$ is a dummy variable that equals 1 if the MP belongs to party $i$ and 0 otherwise; and $e$ is the error term. Thus, the probability an MP is an immigrant if he or she belongs to National or CDU/CSU is $\alpha$ and the probability if he or she belongs to party $i$ is $\alpha + \beta_i$. Note that only one of the $x_i$ can be equal to 1 for each observation.

Ideally, I would perform multivariate regression including electoral system and party in order to compare the significance of these two effects. Unfortunately, this is precluded by the high degree of collinearity between these variables (see Table 4.7 below). Because list election is so strongly correlated with party, it is impossible to disentangle the effect of the electoral method and the effect of party membership in my regression model. Larger parties are much more likely to win seats in the SMD tier while smaller parties are more likely to win most of their seats in the PR tier.

I attempt to consider how parties might play a role independent of electoral system, by rerunning my regression analysis for party after excluding SMD MPs. I choose to only look at list MPs because more parties are able to gain seats in the PR tier. While the two largest parties make up over 79% of my SMD observations in New Zealand and 98% in Germany, they account for only 60% of list MPs in both countries. Therefore, looking at list MPs gives us an opportunity to analyze the effect of party while holding electoral system constant. I only consider Germany in this analysis because excluding SMD MPs leaves me with insufficient observations in New Zealand to draw significant conclusions.
I also examine the effects of electoral system independent of party, by examining the share of immigrants elected in each tier within the largest two parties in each country using Pearson’s chi-squared tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient with List (Probability of independence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>–0.1883 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>–0.1627 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.3099 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>0.2238 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.1458 (0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>0.1356 (0.0002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>–0.0377 (0.3012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU/CSU</td>
<td>–0.3323 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>–0.0625 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>0.2840 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.2651 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Linke/PDS</td>
<td>0.1817 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Pearson Correlation Coefficients between party indicator variables and list election (excluding Māori electorates).

Results

Electoral System

I now turn to the results of these analyses. Principally, list MPs appear much more likely to be immigrants than their SMD counterparts. I begin by testing for the effect of electoral system on my five dependent variables. As Figure 4.1 demonstrates, all of my Chi-squared tests are significant at the 0.05 level and all except foreign-born MPs in Germany are significant at the 0.01 level. Thus, list
election has a significant, positive effect on all five dependent variables, providing evidence to support Hypothesis 1, in line with my preliminary results.

These findings agree with Wüst and Schmitz’ (2010: 135) observation that more German immigrants are elected in the list tier than the SMD tier. Thus, while other intervening factors may be causing this effect, it appears that electoral systems are an important influence on immigrant representation in line with my expectations. However, as Figure 4.1 suggests, immigrant representation remains low across the board, especially in Germany.
Figure 4.1. Descriptive representation of immigrants in New Zealand and Germany by tier with chi-squared tests.
Party

Although small sample sizes complicate my study of party effects, I find significant evidence suggesting that small left-wing party MPs are more likely to be immigrants than their major party colleagues. This finding, which is explored in more detail in following sections, suggests that the party fragmentation that occurs in the PR may be an important mechanism for increasing immigrant representation.

In New Zealand, Green and Alliance MPs are significantly more likely to be foreign-born than National MPs in both models. ACT MPs are more likely to be foreign-born and this result comes close to significance. Labour and New Zealand First MPs are also more likely to be immigrants in both models, although these results are not significant. This evidence supports Hypothesis 2, as both Green and Alliance are list-based parties on the left. ACT New Zealand is a Liberal party more commonly identified with the political center, although it identifies as “pro-immigration” (ACT 2014). Thus, these data suggest that small left-wing party MPs are indeed more likely to be immigrants. It is worth noting that members of the major party of the left (Labour) are not significantly more likely to be immigrants than National MPs. Given that Labour wins two-thirds of its non-Māori seats in the SMD tier, this could be a potential sign of the impact of electoral systems beyond the party effect or evidence of a split in levels of immigrant representation between center-left and left parties.

Most New Zealand parties are not a statistically significant predictor of birth in Asia, however. This is likely due to my small sample size. As noted above, I have only twenty-four Asian MP-legislature observations in my sample and all but
five of them come from National and Labour. I was able to obtain significant results in my electoral system model for birth in Asia because there was such a dramatic difference between the tiers—only one MP born in Asia has ever won an SMD seat. In the party model, however, the small sample size and greater variance means that my results are insignificant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Birth Abroad</th>
<th>Birth in Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPM</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>LPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.027)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.183***</td>
<td>0.213***</td>
<td>-0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.063)</td>
<td>(.074)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.064)</td>
<td>(.079)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.157*</td>
<td>0.189*</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.086)</td>
<td>(.101)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>0.251**</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
<td>-0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.118)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.099)</td>
<td>(.122)</td>
<td>(.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.102***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.017)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.4949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob LR &gt; $\chi^2$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses for LPM, regular standard errors for logit marginal effects (ME). Green and Alliance are dropped from the logistic birth in Asia model since there are no MPs born in Asia for these parties and thus no variance exists in predicting probabilities for logit. These variables were also dropped in order to conduct the F-test for my LPM.

Table 4.8. Results of OLS and logistic regression on specified dependent variables and New Zealand party membership, presented as a linear probability model (LPM) for OLS and marginal effects (ME) for logit.
Results in Germany are largely similar. Both of my overall models for birth abroad are not statistically significant, although Green party membership has a significant effect. As discussed above, Germany’s *jus sanguinis* naturalization policy limits the value of birth abroad as a proxy for immigration status and it is perhaps unsurprising that I was unable to obtain significant results for this variable. Membership in the Green Party or Die Linke/PDS, however, makes an MP significantly more likely to be ethnically non-German (under both models) or Turkish (under the LPM) than a CDU/CSU MP. The Greens and Die Linke are the two left-wing, list-based parties in Germany, providing support for Hypothesis 2. The fact that the other list-based party, the centrist FDP, did not have a significant effect on ethnic non-German or Turkish representation suggests that party ideology plays a role and that electoral system alone does not determine immigrant representation.

Furthermore, the center-left SPD, which elects a majority of its MPs in the SMD tier like the CDU, had a significant effect on the representation of ethnic non-Germans in both models and a significant effect on the representation of Turkish ancestry Germans in my LPM. This reinforces the other evidence that party does have an effect beyond just electoral system and that the results we see below are not solely indicative of the tier in which a party wins most of its seats. This evidence aligns with Wüst’s (2013: 2) finding that the Greens, Die Linke, and SPD nominated significantly more immigrant-origin candidates in the 2013 election than the CDU and the FDP. These results also demonstrate that Schönwälder’s (2013) account of the role of the SPD, Greens, and Die Linke in promoting immigrant
representation at the regional level applies to the federal parliament as well. Thus, parties do appear to influence the election of immigrant MPs although some evidence (namely the limited benefit of Labour party membership in New Zealand for immigrants) suggests that electoral systems play a role beyond parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Birth Abroad</th>
<th>Not Ethnically German</th>
<th>Turkish Ancestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPM</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>LPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>0.008* (.005)</td>
<td>0.009* (.006)</td>
<td>0.007** (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>0.004 (.008)</td>
<td>0.006 (.010)</td>
<td>0.000 (.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.023** (.111)</td>
<td>0.028** (.14)</td>
<td>0.042*** (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Linke/PDS</td>
<td>0.008 (.009)</td>
<td>0.010 (.12)</td>
<td>0.057*** (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.016*** (.028)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.005*** (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.1363</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob LR &gt; $\chi^2$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses for LPM, regular standard errors for logit marginal effects (ME).

**Table 4.9.** Results of OLS and logistic regression on specified dependent variables and German party membership, presented as a linear probability model (LPM) for OLS and marginal effects (ME) for logit.

Of course, these party results are specific to Germany and New Zealand. However, the enhanced success of immigrants within small left-wing parties may
be generally applicable. If the success of these parties comes at the expense of mainstream center-left parties, the increased success of small left-wing parties under PR might not actually be a net benefit for immigrants. Looking at these results though, it seems that small left-wing parties enhance immigrant representation more so than larger center-left parties. I reran my regressions using Labour and SDP as my baselines and found that while the results were generally not significant, the smaller list-based left-wing parties tend to have a greater share of immigrants than the larger center-left parties. This finding suggests that the greater diffusion of parties that occurs under PR will benefit immigrant descriptive representation. Even in countries with a different party structure, PR can help small parties like the Greens enter parliament and increase immigrant descriptive representation.

Analyzing List MPs

In order to further isolate the role of parties, I examine list MPs separately in Germany and find that small left-wing party MPs are more likely to be immigrants. While my model for birth abroad is again insignificant, Green and Die Linke list MPs have a four to ten percentage point higher probability of being ethnically non-German than CDU list MPs. My LPM results for Turkish ancestry are similar although not quite as dramatic. Thus, even after controlling for electoral system, membership in a small, left-wing party does make an MP more likely to be non-German or Turkish, providing support for Hypothesis 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birth Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPM ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>0.013* (.008) 0.016 (.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP</td>
<td>0.004 (.009) 0.005 (.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.023** (.011) 0.029* (.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Linke/PDS</td>
<td>0.011 (.011) 0.015 (.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.017*** (.005) ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.2342 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob LR &gt; χ²</td>
<td>--- 0.2254 ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses for LPM, regular standard errors for logit marginal effects (ME).

Table 4.10. Results of OLS and logistic regression on specified dependent variables and German party membership for MPs elected in the list tier, presented as a linear probability model (LPM) for OLS and marginal effects (ME) for logit.

**Analyzing Major Parties**

As shown above, party membership appears to have an effect on immigrant descriptive representation beyond just electoral systems. Results on whether electoral systems play a role beyond party membership are more mixed. While small sample sizes prevent me from testing electoral system effects in all cases, I find that for the New Zealand National party, list MPs are significantly more likely to be foreign-born or Asian-born. For foreign-born MPs in the New Zealand Labour
Party, German CDU/CSU, and German SPD as well as ethnically non-German MPs in the German SPD, however, I find no significant difference between the two tiers.

These results suggest that electoral systems affect parties differently. The New Zealand National Party appears to respond strongly to electoral incentives to help immigrants win more seats in the list tier while other parties appear less responsive. This could perhaps be the result of the party making a more conscious effort to nominate immigrants in the tier where it can do so most easily. Although scholarship on New Zealand is limited, Maria Sobolewska (2013) highlights the concerted effort made by the British Conservative Party, the closest analog of National in the British party system, to overhaul its image and appear more welcoming by nominating more minorities. Future research should explore why the New Zealand National appears to respond differently to electoral incentives.

For now, this research suggests that electoral systems may have an effect independent of parties by incentivizing some parties to support the election of more immigrants under PR. However, given that none of my results are significant for Germany, it may be the case that parties have an effect beyond electoral system as demonstrated above, but electoral systems do not have an effect beyond parties in all countries.
Foreign-born MPs in the New Zealand National Party

- Foreign-born MPs
- New Zealand-born

χ² = 27.3626
p = 0.000

Asian-born MPs in the New Zealand National Party

- Asian-born MPs
- Non-Asian born

χ² = 23.1908
p = 0.000

Foreign-born MPs in the New Zealand Labour Party

- Foreign-born MPs
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p = 0.887
Figure 4.2. Descriptive representation of immigrants within major German and New Zealand parties by tier with chi-squared tests. Asian-born MPs for the New Zealand parties are not shown here.
Zealand Labour Party, ethnically non-German MPs in the German CDU/CSU, and Turkish ancestry MPs in both major German parties are excluded due to insufficient observations.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The results in this chapter offer strong evidence that proportional representation enhances the descriptive representation of immigrants and this effect occurs at least in part due to the increased presence of small left-wing parties in the PR tier. My results on electoral system are most significant. I find that for all potential markers of immigrant status that I use (birth abroad and birth in Asia for New Zealand; birth abroad, ethnically non-German ancestry, and Turkish ancestry for Germany), list MPs are significantly more likely to be immigrants than SMD MPs. This finding matches with existing theory on the descriptive representation of women and minorities. In Chapter 2, I highlighted how xenophobia and the less visible nature of immigrants may mean that the reasons PR benefits women and minorities do not apply to immigrants. The evidence presented in this chapter, however, should refute that hypothesis. Immigrant candidates benefit from PR and benefit substantially.

Because certain parties tend to win almost all of their seats in the list tier while others tend to dominate in the SMD tier, I am unable to include party membership and electoral system in the same model to test their relationship. However, constructing a separate model of party effects, I find that membership in a small, left-wing party does make an MP more likely to be an immigrant for most of my dependent variables and that small left-wing parties have a larger effect than mainstream center-left parties. Since membership in small parties correlates
strongly with list election, it appears likely that one of the reason PR benefits immigrants so much is that PR helps egalitarian parties that are more likely to elect immigrants win seats.

Looking at just the list tier, I find that membership in a small left-wing party still makes an MP more likely to be an immigrant, suggesting that parties do have an impact independent of electoral systems. While these results are not significantly different from the results I obtained considering all MPs, it is still possible that some of the other reasons that PR is hypothesized to benefit disadvantaged groups—like encouraging parties to nominate diverse slates—may apply to immigrants as well and help them even within parties. Looking at results for the largest two parties in both countries, I find that more immigrants are elected from the list tier for the New Zealand National Party, but that no significant effect occurs in the other three parties, suggesting that party differences may be the primary cause of the electoral system effect I observed in this chapter. Whatever the mechanism, PR appears to be a powerful tool to advance immigrant descriptive representation. In Chapter 5, I consider whether this translates into a benefit for substantive representation as well.
5. The Effect of Electoral Systems on Substantive Representation

As Hanna Pitkin (1967: 209) emphasizes, the heart of political representation is substantive representation, or the presence of a group’s viewpoints in the legislature. This chapter pivots from the results for descriptive representation presented in Chapter 4 to consider the impact of electoral systems on substantive representation.

As noted in Chapter 2, literature on the effect of electoral system on substantive representation is fairly sparse, but those studies that do exist tend to predict that disadvantaged groups will receive more attention under proportional representation (PR). It remains to be seen, however, whether these results extend to immigrants. Immigrant MPs, who are more likely to be elected in the list tier, might choose to ignore immigrant concerns to avoid being dismissed as an “ethnic” politician and list MPs generally might avoid immigrant issues to avoid costing their party votes nationwide, even if engaging with these issues would likely help them win immigrant votes.

In this chapter, I test the impact of an MP’s birthplace, electoral method, and party on the share of oral parliamentary questions he or she asks that relate to immigrants and immigration. I also make an effort to include the effects of the share of immigrants in an MP’s single-member district (SMD), but the severely limited

---

12 In this chapter, immigrant MP refers solely to foreign-born MPs. I have insufficient observations here to also use birth in Asia as a marker of immigration background as I do for New Zealand MPs in Chapter 4.
availability of data makes those results more exploratory than concrete. I exclude Germany from the analysis in this chapter due to a lack of requisite language skills and to limit the scope of my analysis. This novel dataset of parliamentary questions provides a direct measure of how much attention MPs give to immigrant-relevant topics in one form of parliamentary debate. Although parliamentary questions are only one aspect of substantive representation, these data allow us to take a first step in examining whether scholarship on the substantive representation of women and minorities extends to immigrants.

This chapter presents the counterintuitive result that while immigrant MPs themselves pay more attention to immigrant issues, list MPs in general are not more interested in immigrant concerns and parties have a minimal effect (except for New Zealand’s anti-immigration party, which pays a great deal of attention to immigration, but almost exclusively in a negative light). While it would be easy to attribute this lack of evidence to the methodological challenges of using a mixed-member study—after all, New Zealand’s linkage between the two tiers makes it a harder test of electoral system effects—the low degree of attention paid to immigrant concerns by all MPs, regardless of electoral method, suggests that electoral system effects are minimal. Proportional rules may help immigrant MPs get elected, but they do not appear to encourage MPs to pay substantial attention to immigrant-relevant topics. PR also allowed the anti-immigration New Zealand First party to gain a sizable foothold in the legislature. On the whole, it appears that electoral systems may be a wash when it comes to the substantive representation of
immigrants, although I consider the effect of district demographics in this chapter and other explanations in Chapter 6.

**Hypotheses**

Extensive research exists on whether descriptive representation translates into substantive representation for minorities. As Chapter 2 discusses, the vast majority of these scholars find that minority MPs are better substantive representatives of their groups. When it comes to immigrants however, the scholarship is much more limited. In a German-language study, Wüst and Schmitz (2010) find a relationship in Germany between immigrant background and parliamentary questions relevant to immigrants. However, xenophobia could cause immigrants to downplay their identity, leaving immigrant concerns to native politicians that can express interest in immigration without being labeled as ignoring native New Zealanders. Despite this possibility, the relative consensus in the literature on minority representation coupled with Wüst and Schmitz’ research leads me to suspect:

\[ H_1: \text{Immigrant MPs will ask greater shares of (a) immigrant-relevant questions and (b) pro-immigrant questions relative to New Zealand-born MPs.} \]

As we saw in Chapter 4, immigrants are more likely to be elected in the list tier. Combining this with Hypothesis 1, I predict that:

\[ H_2: \text{List MPs will ask greater shares of (a) immigrant-relevant questions and (b) pro-immigrant questions relative to SMD MPs.} \]
List MPs in general have an incentive to focus on national issues like immigration. Several scholars have found that SMD MPs are more likely to focus on servicing geographic interests (Bawn 1993: 989), supporting pork-barrel spending (Lancaster and Patterson 1990), and attempting to join committees that allow them to bring localized money to their districts (Stratmann and Baur 2002). This focus on local issues inherently leaves national concerns to list MPs. Since MPs in a national closed-list PR system like New Zealand’s have little incentive to cultivate a personal vote (Carey and Shugart 1995), their best strategy for electoral success is to try to maximize their party’s support nationwide. This incentivizes list MPs to tackle national issues, like immigration, that can help them win votes for their party across districts instead of local issues, like a new highway, that might win support in a concentrated area at the expense of votes elsewhere.

Ideally, I would rerun my analysis with list status and immigrant origin in the same model, to see which has a larger effect on substantive representation. However, like in Chapter 4, collinearity prevents me from including these variables in the same model. In Chapter 4, I reran my analysis on just the list tier in an attempt to separate out my other effects. As discussed below, however, the electoral system effect in this chapter is insignificant, meaning that there is no need to try to isolate which part of the electoral system bonus is caused by the increased number of immigrants since there is no bonus in the first place.

This chapter also presents an opportunity to test the effect of parties on substantive representation of immigrants. While the role of New Zealand’s parties will not directly apply to other countries, this research can serve as a starting point
for examining the role of parties cross-nationally given that New Zealand’s party system is not particularly unusual. (See Chapter 4 for a summary of the New Zealand party system.) I use the large center-right National Party as my baseline in all of my tests, as I did in Chapter 4.

I expect small party MPs to focus more on immigration, not only because of their increased likelihood to be elected in the PR tier, but also because they have to rely on niche issues to win seats nationally. Since none of these parties will ever win a parliamentary majority, they cannot hope to determine economic policy. Instead, their appeal relies on winning over voters that care strongly about an issue and want to push a coalition more in that direction. The Green Party’s focus on environmental issues is a good example of this strategy. Given that these MPs have little incentive to focus on bread-and-butter issues like the economy (since they will likely have little impact on these policies while in office), I expect that they will have more question time available to focus on immigration issues. I therefore hypothesize:

\[ H_3: \text{Small party MPs (New Zealand First, Green, and ACT) will ask greater shares of immigrant-relevant questions.}^{13} \]

This hypothesis hinges in part on specifics of New Zealand’s party system. As discussed in Chapter 4, New Zealand First has staked a clear position in New Zealand’s party system as the anti-immigration party. While it is not as far right on other issues as many of its European counterparts, its hardline approach to

---

\[ ^{13} \text{Alliance MPs did not serve in the four parliaments considered in this chapter and are therefore excluded even though I counted the Alliance as a small party in Chapter 4.} \]
immigration resembles that of the British National Party, the French National Front, and Greece’s Golden Dawn. In the American context, New Zealand First voters might find a kinship with 2016 Republican Presidential contender Donald J. Trump. Given New Zealand First’s clear opposition to increased immigration, it appears highly probable that its MPs will frequently ask anti-immigrant questions. Thus:

\[ H_4: \text{New Zealand First MPs will ask greater shares of anti-immigrant questions.} \]

The parties on the left have not focused as much attention on immigration as New Zealand First, but based on their ideology I expect that they will be more likely to pay attention to these issues and do so in a positive fashion than their National colleagues. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, these parties are more likely to further the election of immigrant MPs and as discussed in Chapter 2, left-wing parties have deeper ties to immigrant communities cross-nationally. It therefore seems likely that they will also articulate pro-immigrant policy positions:

\[ H_5: \text{Small left-wing party MPs (Green and ACT\textsuperscript{14}) will each ask greater shares of pro-immigrant questions.} \]

While these hypotheses are influenced by the nature of New Zealand’s party system and each party’s platform (as outlined in Chapter 4), they also reflect broader trends of how populist parties and left-wing parties affect the substantive representation of immigration.

\textsuperscript{14} ACT is a traditional Liberal party and is normally classified as centrist, but embraces immigration in its platform (see Chapter 4).
As noted in Chapter 2, a number of scholars find that legislators with a high share of ethnic minority constituents are better substantive representatives for these communities regardless of their individual characteristics (Biles and Tolley 2008; Bird 2011; Bloemraad 2013; Boushey and Luedtke 2011; Casellas and Leal 2013; Celis and Erzeel 2013; Chavez and Provine 2009; Gest and Wong 2016; Griffin 2014; Griffin and Newman 2007; Grose 2005; Juenke and Preuhs 2012; McLendon, Mokher, and Flores 2011; Saalfeld 2011; Saalfeld and Bischof 2013). The geographic concentration of New Zealand immigrants in cities—the Auckland Central district was 46% foreign-born in the 2013 census while the rural Invercargill district was only 9% foreign-born (New Zealand Statistics 2015)—might give MPs from these immigrant-dense SMDs a strong incentive to substantively represent immigrants, washing out any difference between them and list MPs. I therefore hypothesize that:

\[ H_6: \text{MPs with a greater share of immigrant constituents will ask a greater share of (a) immigrant-relevant questions and (b) pro-immigrant questions.}\]

For the purposes of this hypothesis, I will test both exclusively SMD MPs and all MPs counting a list MP’s share of immigrant constituents as the national average.

In one of the few studies looking specifically at immigrants, Justin Gest and Tom Wong (2016) find in the United States and Canada that district-level demographics play a sizable role in the immigration voting behavior of legislators. Representatives from heavily immigrant districts are more likely to support permissive immigration policies regardless of their own immigration backgrounds.
Therefore, it is possible that list MPs are not better substantive representatives of immigrants than SMD MPs and that Hypothesis 6 could help explain the non-results I ultimately find for electoral systems in Hypothesis 2. In a country with as many immigrants as New Zealand, a large number of SMD MPs have a strong electoral incentive to substantively represent immigrants which may reduce the difference between the tiers. However, as discussed in more detail below, district-level demographic data is extremely limited for New Zealand and these results are primarily exploratory.

Unfortunately, the small sample size of MPs who ask any questions about immigrants makes it impossible to separate out the effects of immigrants, parties, electoral rules, and district demographics. While that in itself should say something about the potentially limited impact of electoral rules on the substantive representation of immigrants, the results in this chapter provide a first step towards understanding the understudied effects of electoral rules and other factors on immigrant substantive representation.

**Data**

*Parliamentary Questions*

I follow the lead of Saalfeld (2011), Saalfeld and Bischof (2013), Wüst (2011), and Wüst and Schmitz (2010) in using parliamentary questions as a proxy for substantive representation. While scholars of American politics often prefer to focus on roll call votes as a measure of substantive representation (e.g. Casellas and Leal 2013; Grose 2005; Martin 2009; Santos 2001; Santos and Huerta 2001; Welch.
and Hibbing 1984), the high degree of party unity in voting in Westminster systems like New Zealand makes voting a poor gauge of an MP’s advocacy.

Questions for oral answer, however, allow MPs to highlight issues that they care about and are working on. Since only twelve questions are typically allowed per day (New Zealand Parliament 2013), MPs are incentivized to only ask about issues that are especially important for them. While senior opposition MPs sometimes get to ask over 100 questions per term (government ministers rarely if ever ask questions since they are answering them), 25% of the MPs in my sample that asked at least one question asked fewer than ten. Thus, MPs have to choose their questions carefully, focusing on issues they care strongly about (and want to show constituents they care strongly about). Question time is allocated proportionally to parties (New Zealand Parliament 2010) and party leaders tend to take a disproportionate number of questions for themselves, leaving little time for backbenchers.

While parliamentary questions might be dismissed as a form of political posturing with no practical effect, they are in many ways a quintessential form of representation. Pitkin (1967: 8) defines representation as “making present again,” and parliamentary questions make issues and the viewpoints of groups present in parliamentary debate. The fact that a democracy as old as New Zealand’s still begins each day’s meeting with questions for its ministers suggests that this is more than a meaningless exercise. The empty desks in the US Congress that often appear on C-SPAN would be a foreign sight to many New Zealanders, as their parliamentary sessions feature a full House and often rancorous debate. Question
time can also have a significant effect on a party’s popularity in the “bear pit” that is the New Zealand Parliament (Salmond 2004). Therefore, questions for oral answer are a form of substantive representation useful for analysis. Other scholars agree, noting the value of parliamentary questions for determining the policy interests of a legislator (Martin 2011).

**Dependent Variables**

Building off my dataset from Chapter 4, I use the New Zealand Parliament’s online database of questions for oral answer to measure the share of immigrant-relevant questions MPs asked between 2002 and 2014 (the 47th through 50th Parliaments), which are the only complete parliamentary terms for which searchable online data are available. As in Chapter 4, the MP-legislature pair serves as my unit of analysis. In all, I have 372 observations of MPs that asked at least one question (ministers tend not to ask questions, which is why this number is smaller than the 483 observations for these four Parliaments in Chapter 4). In 71 of these observations, the MP asked at least one question relevant to immigrants. In order to test the effect of immigration history, I need observations where I also know the MP’s place of birth. I have 333 such observations of which 63 contain an immigrant-relevant question.

I define “immigrant-relevant” broadly, including questions related to immigration policy and topics especially salient to immigrants like bilingual education, minority economic outcomes, and multiculturalism programs. I am not as expansive as authors like Welch and Hibbing (1984) who treat liberal outcomes
in general as evidence of substantive representation, noting that minorities tend to be more liberal. I also excluded questions that addressed only a possible scandal in the immigration ministry without expressing a view on policy. Members of the opposition sometimes asked questions accusing senior officials of committing fraud in an apparent attempt to score general political points, but without mentioning policy or immigrants. After classifying questions as “immigrant relevant,” I rate them as generally pro-immigrant, anti-immigrant, or neutral. Questions that expressed support for policies that helped immigrants or increased immigration were classified as pro-immigrant, those that expressed opposition to these policies or expressed a negative view of immigrants were classified as anti-immigrant, and ambiguous questions were coded as neutral. While this determination was subjective, most questions expressed a reasonably clear perspective. Those that were unclear or ambiguous were coded as neutral to avoiding skewing my results in either direction.  

Of course, immigrants do not necessarily support increased immigration themselves. Immigrants might adopt a “close-the-door-behind-us” view, supporting their own immigration, but opposing anyone else’s (Gest 2013). Unfortunately, I could not locate any poll data from New Zealand assessing whether immigrants support expansive immigration policies. However, data from the

---

15 Neutral questions are often a request for factual information. Examples include: “For what categories of immigrants, if any, is evidence of age required when applying for a visa or permit?”; “What does [the Minister of Immigration] consider to be the three most important developments he has progressed as Minister of Immigration?”; and “What progress has been made on the Government’s immigration reform programme?”
United States suggest that Hispanics, who are more likely to be immigrants themselves, are more likely to support increased immigration. A 2015 Gallup poll found that while more Americans as a whole favor decreasing immigration to increasing it, a plurality of Hispanics prefer increasing immigration and 81% of Hispanics say that immigration is a good thing compared to 72% of non-Hispanic whites (Dugan 2015).

Using data from eighteen European democracies, Aida Just and Christopher Anderson (2015) similarly conclude that immigrants support immigration more than natives although this effect diminishes once immigrants naturalize. While the results are by no means overwhelming, they add credence to the theory that immigrants are more likely to favor increased immigration and at very least, probably oppose the negative characterizations of immigrants expressed by some New Zealand MPs.

For each MP-legislature observation, I calculated a “share” (the number of immigrant-relevant questions divided by the total number of questions asked by the MP), a “pro-share” (the number of pro-immigrant questions divided by the total number of questions asked by the MP), and an “anti-share” (the number of anti-immigrant questions divided by the total number of questions asked by the MP). Note that for pro-share and anti-share I use the total number of questions that the MP asked instead of the number of immigrant-relevant questions as my denominator so that ambiguities in classifying the slant of question do not result in as large of fluctuations in share for MPs who only asked a few immigrant-relevant questions. Thus, these are measures of the amount of positive or negative attention
an MP gives to immigrant concerns overall, not the share of immigrant-relevant questions that are positive or negative.

I use share of immigrant-relevant questions instead of the raw number of immigrant-relevant questions as my variable of interest because there is a great deal of variance in the number of questions each New Zealand MP gets to ask. Question time is allocated by party, roughly proportional to total representation in the House (New Zealand Parliament 2010). Thus, for the Leader of the Opposition to ask two immigrant relevant questions out of the two hundred he might get to ask in one Parliament seems less significant than a backbench MP from a minor party who might only get to ask three questions in three years asking the same two questions.

**Electorate Demographics**

This chapter also includes a preliminary test of the effect of district-level demographics on substantive representation. Unfortunately, New Zealand only has publicly available electorate-level immigrant demographic data for the 2013 census (Statistics New Zealand, pers. comm.). This census was used for redistricting for the 51st Parliament, which lasts until 2017, and is excluded from my substantive representation analysis since the data have yet to be completed. However, New Zealand has not undergone dramatic redistricting since 2002.16 While there certainly have been changes in lines and demographics themselves change over time, urban districts that display large immigrant populations now were urban

---

16 More substantial redistricting has occurred since 1996, which is why I do not attempt to use these data as a control in Chapter 4 where the timespan analyzed is longer.
districts likely with large immigrant populations in 2002. Therefore, I use the 2013 percentage of foreign-born persons in an electorate as a crude measure of its relative demographics in the 2002-2014 Parliaments (for those electorates that exist in the 2013 census data) and test for a relationship between district demographics and substantive representation.

I end up with demographic data for 165 MP-legislature observations in single-member general electorates. And of these 165 MPs, only 28 ask an immigrant-relevant question and only 21 ask a pro-immigrant question. I conduct my analysis using these 165 observations, and then rerun my regression including list MPs with the percentage of foreign-born constituents for their “district” set at the national average. This test allows me to add 195 observations for a total of 360 where 68 ask an immigrant-relevant question and 45 ask a pro-immigrant question. While these data are far from perfect, they offer an approximation of demographic effects.

**Preliminary Analysis**

Before turning to my regression model, I present summary statistics on my three main independent variables in this chapter: (1) birth abroad, (2) electoral system, and (3) party.

*Birth Abroad*

As Figure 5.1 demonstrates, immigrants appear to pay substantially more attention to immigrant affairs than non-immigrants. On average, 9.5% of the
questions asked by immigrant MPs relate to immigrant affairs. In contrast, only 1.3% of questions asked by New Zealand-born MPs do so. A similar difference exists for pro-immigrant questions. Interestingly, immigrants also seem to ask more anti-immigrant questions than their New Zealand-born colleagues. Looking at the raw data, this finding may be attributable to a handful of New Zealand First MPs born in the British Commonwealth that asked an extremely high share of anti-immigrant questions. Excluding New Zealand First MPs, there does not appear to be a sizable difference between foreign-born and New Zealand-born MPs when it comes to anti-immigrant questions.

Figure 5.1. The mean share, pro-share, anti-share, and anti-share excluding New Zealand First MPs for foreign-born and New Zealand-born MPs in the New Zealand Parliament.

Electoral System

Electoral systems appear to have a more muted effect on the substantive representation of immigrants. However, list MPs do appear to ask more immigrant-relevant and more pro-immigrant questions. Again, we see list MPs asking more
anti-immigrant questions contrary to expectations, but this also appears to be due to the presence of New Zealand First MPs in the immigrant MPs. Excluding New Zealand First, the difference between list and SMD MPs is again negligible.

**Figure 5.2.** The mean share, pro-share, anti-share, and anti-share excluding New Zealand First MPs for list and SMD MPs in the New Zealand Parliament.

**Party**

Parties appear to have a mixed effect on substantive representation. The three largest parties (National, Labour, and Green) ask roughly similar levels of immigrant-relevant questions. All pay relatively little attention to immigrants with Labour having the highest overall share of the three at 2.0%. In contrast, New Zealand First stands out with the average MP asking 8.9% immigrant-relevant questions and 8.2% anti-immigrant questions and almost no pro-immigrant questions. ACT and other MPs also appear to ask an elevated share of immigrant-relevant and pro-immigrant questions. With these preliminary results in mind, I turn to my formal methodology.
Figure 5.3. The mean share, pro-share, and anti-share by party in the New Zealand Parliament.

Methodology

Using OLS regression, I examine the relationship between electoral method, immigration status, party, and electorate demographics with my three dependent variables discussed above (share, pro-share, and anti-share). My independent variables will be the same party dummy variables (with National serving as the baseline) and list variable from Chapter 4 as well as my birth abroad dependent variable from Chapter 4, which now functions as an independent variable. I exclude birth in Asia due to the smaller sample size here. The OLS models used in this chapter take the same general form as my OLS models in Chapter 4.

The high degree of collinearity between electoral method, immigration status, and party variables makes it difficult to separate out the effects. This would have proved challenging had all of my tests presented significant results; however, because only immigrant status and New Zealand First membership proved
significant (excluding electorate demographics), there was little need to separate these effects. Since immigrant status increased the share of pro-immigrant questions while New Zealand First membership increased the share of anti-immigrant questions, there does not appear to be an issue of indirect causation here.

Results

Immigrants

As expected, immigrant descriptive representation enhances immigrant substantive representation. Depending on the model, the proportion of immigrant-relevant questions asked by immigrants is 8.2 percentage points higher than the 1.3% asked by non-immigrants and the proportion of pro-immigrant questions asked by immigrants is 6.6 percentage points higher than the 0.6% asked by non-immigrants. Both of these results are highly statistically significant, providing evidence to support both prongs of Hypothesis 1. So far, literature on minorities appears to apply well to immigrants despite many of the unique challenges they face (see Chapter 2).

As noted above, New Zealand First MPs born in other British Commonwealth countries may be skewing my results for anti-share. While this emphasizes the fact that birthplace may be an imperfect proxy for immigration status, this result did not come close to approaching significance. I reran my test for anti-immigrant share excluding New Zealand First MPs and found effectively no relationship between birth abroad and anti-immigrant share. Nevertheless, the results below provide evidence that immigrants are more likely to pay attention to
immigrant-relevant concerns and do so with a favorable view towards immigrants and immigration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Pro-Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Share (excluding NZ First)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth Abroad</td>
<td>0.082***</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.025)</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>(.012)</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.013***</td>
<td>0.006***</td>
<td>0.006***</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.5441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5.1. Results of OLS regression on specified dependent variables and birth abroad.

Electoral System

Surprisingly, list election appears to not make MPs more likely to ask immigrant-relevant questions. This result is especially unexpected given that immigrants do appear more likely to ask immigrant-relevant and pro-immigrant questions and there is a moderate, positive correlation between immigrant status and list election (the Pearson’s correlation coefficient equals 0.2144 for my sample in this chapter). Nevertheless, list MPs are not significantly more likely to ask immigrant-relevant or pro-immigrant questions and I do not find evidence supporting Hypothesis 2.
List MPs have an increased likelihood of asking anti-immigrant questions, although this again appears to be driven entirely by the success of the anti-immigration New Zealand First party in the list tier. I reran my results for this variable excluding New Zealand First and list election once again had a negligible impact. As I discuss below, the lack of significant results here may be due to the small sample size of MPs asking immigrant-relevant questions, but this itself might be a sign of the limited impact of electoral system on immigrant substantive representation.

**Party**

While members of New Zealand First are significantly more likely to ask immigrant-relevant and anti-immigrant questions than National MPs, party appears to have little other effect on immigrant-relevant questions. Thus, I find evidence to support Hypothesis 4, but not Hypotheses 3 and 5. Perhaps surprisingly, Green MPs appear less likely to ask immigrant-relevant questions than National MPs,
although all the questions they do ask are positive. The unexpected direction of the relationship here may come from the fact that while they are more likely to select immigrants for favorable positions on their party list, the Greens really are a one-issue party, and therefore most of their limited question time is consumed with environmental concerns. On the whole though, with the exception of New Zealand First, whose MPs ask 8 percentage points more anti-immigrant questions, party appears to not significantly influence immigrant substantive representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Pro-Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>0.008 (.007)</td>
<td>0.008 (.007)</td>
<td>0.000 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.001 (.111)</td>
<td>0.004 (.101)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>0.077*** (.026)</td>
<td>-0.005 (.004)</td>
<td>0.080*** (.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.050 (.37)</td>
<td>0.042 (.37)</td>
<td>0.009 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.021 (.26)</td>
<td>0.024 (.26)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.012*** (.004)</td>
<td>0.009*** (.003)</td>
<td>0.002 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>0.2813</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Alliance is excluded since no Alliance MP asked an immigrant-relevant question during the timeframe considered in this study. Green and Other were dropped in order to calculate the F-test for my anti-immigrant share model since these MPs asked no anti-immigrant questions in my sample.

Table 5.3. Results of OLS regression on specified dependent variables and New Zealand party membership.
Electorate Demographics

District demographics may be a partial explanation of why I do not find an electoral systems effect above. SMD MPs from immigrant-dense districts may substantively represent immigrants, muting any difference between the two tiers. The limited availability of demographic data and the relatively few MPs who ask questions relevant to immigrants makes this analysis fairly inconclusive. Nevertheless, my models for immigrant share and pro-immigrant share near significance in the direction suggested by Hypothesis 6. Furthermore, anti-immigrant share is also decreased, as we might expect. Overall, though, the imprecision of these data makes these results unable to account for the lack of substantive representation of immigrants by list MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Pro-Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District % Born Abroad</td>
<td>0.083*</td>
<td>0.091*</td>
<td>−0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.048)</td>
<td>(.046)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>−0.011</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.0861</td>
<td>0.0503</td>
<td>0.4252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5.4. Results of OLS regression on specified dependent variables and percentage of district born abroad for selected New Zealand SMD MPs.

In order to account for list MPs, I reran my regression setting the district immigrant share for list MPs to the national average and garnered similar results. Here, however, I obtained a significant effect for pro-immigrant share, implying
that each additional percentage point of immigrants in an MP’s district leads to an additional .09% of pro-immigrant questions asked out of their total questions. Electorate demographics may be a promising avenue for further research as MPs with a greater share of immigrant constituents do appear to be more supportive of immigrants, in line with Gest and Wong’s (2016) findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Pro-Immigrant Share</th>
<th>Anti-Immigrant Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District % Born Abroad</td>
<td>0.084*</td>
<td>0.092**</td>
<td>–0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.048)</td>
<td>(.046)</td>
<td>(.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>–0.003</td>
<td>–0.007</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>0.0819</td>
<td>0.0458</td>
<td>0.4882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.1; **=p<.05; ***=p<.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5.5. Results of OLS regression on specified dependent variables and percentage of district born abroad for selected New Zealand MPs. List MPs are included with the national average for general electorates in the 2013 census, which was 23.6%, as their district’s percentage born abroad.

Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter presents surprising results about the impact of immigrant origin, electoral method, and party on immigrant substantive representation. While immigrants are more likely to ask immigrant-relevant and pro-immigrant questions as expected, electoral system does not appear to have a significant effect, even though immigrants themselves are more likely to be elected in the list tier. Note

---

17 Statistics New Zealand uses a different methodology than the OECD to calculate foreign-born percentage, accounting for the difference between this value and the 28% figure for New Zealand’s foreign-born population cited elsewhere.
that these data do not demonstrate the role of electoral method on an MP’s issue focus in a legislature generally—only for immigration.

It might be tempting to attribute the insignificance of these results to a relatively small sample size (N = 372, but only 71 observations where an MP asked an immigrant-relevant question). Looking more carefully at the numbers, however, this is not a case of a strong effect getting buried by a wide margin of error; my results come nowhere near significance. For pro-immigrant questions in particular, list election provides only 0.8 percentage point increase. This suggests that my results are not simply clouded by noise, but representative of the insignificant impact of electoral system on substantive representation.

Furthermore, the relatively small sample size itself might be taken as evidence of the insignificance of electoral system. Of the over 11,000 questions asked during the four Parliaments in my study, only 304 were relevant to immigrants. If we exclude New Zealand First, this falls to 151 out of 10,482. Thus, even with an electoral system that in part is theorized to enhance substantive representation, immigrants appear to be receiving relatively little attention in a country where they make up 28% of the total population (OECD 2015: 312).

PR electoral systems appear to help immigrants win elected office, but they do not address the core issue of raising the profile of immigrant issues in the legislature. This may be a matter of time. Scholars of female substantive representation argue that a ‘critical mass’ of women, often placed between 10 and 35% of a legislature, is needed before major changes occur (Studlar and McAllister 2002). Immigrants make up only 14% of my total observations, and possibly a
smaller share overall, since the MPs for which I could not determine birthplace may be native New Zealanders for whom birthplace was not a salient characteristic to mention in their biography. Thus, it is possible that electoral systems may have a long-term effect on substantive representation, and New Zealand’s PR tier is simply too new to demonstrate an effect. Nevertheless, in the data at hand, immigrant MPs provide a boost to substantive representation, but electoral system effects are negligible. I also consider the role of district demographics in encouraging urban SMD MPs to advocate for immigrant issues and find that demographics may provide a partial explanation. In the following chapter, I undertake a case study of the New Zealand Citizenship Amendment Act 2005 and offer other explanations for the results in this chapter.
6. In Search of Other Explanations: A Case Study of New Zealand’s Citizenship Amendment Act 2005

Taken together, the previous two chapters present evidence for the counterintuitive result that while immigrant MPs are more likely to substantively represent immigrants and list MPs are more likely to be immigrants, list MPs as a whole are not more likely to substantively represent immigrants. This chapter proposes hypotheses for future research that may explain why I find that proportional representation (PR) does not appear to benefit immigrant substantive representation, even though such an effect is typically expected for other groups.

In order to develop these hypotheses, I examine the parliamentary debates surrounding the New Zealand Citizenship Amendment Act 2005. As John Gerring (2004: 349) highlights, “Case studies enjoy a natural advantage in research of an exploratory nature.” While looking at one bill will not provide sufficient data to prove why I find no relationship between list election and attention to immigrants, this methodology allows me to overcome the inherent bluntness of quantitative analysis and search for an underlying mechanism. My goal therefore, is not to lay out a comprehensive theory of immigrant substantive representation, but to offer possible explanations that warrant future research.

This chapter offers two main hypotheses and qualitative evidence on a third point. First, as discussed in Chapter 5, it is possible that single-member-district

---

(SMD) MPs representing districts with a large number of immigrants may face an electoral incentive to substantively represent immigrants that equals or exceeds the incentives faced by list MPs. A number of scholars have found similar results for other minorities (see Chapter 2). If this is the case, then any difference between the tiers could be obscured by the enhanced substantive representation of immigrants by SMD MPs with large immigrant constituencies.

Second, I consider the role of New Zealand’s committee system, which lumps immigrant-relevant topics with other issues that may be of more interest to SMD MPs, on the substantive representation of immigrants.

In addition, my case study uncovers further evidence that an MP’s personal immigration background does appear to shape their approach to immigrant affairs, providing anecdotal support for my findings in Chapter 5. However, I note that this does not always cause foreign-born MPs to view current immigrants favorably. While I am unable to draw definitive conclusions on any of these points, this chapter offers a starting point for future research on the subject. After providing background on the Citizenship Amendment Act 2005, I consider all three of these points in turn.

**Background**

On April 12, 2005, the New Zealand Parliament passed the Citizenship Amendment Act 2005, which made two dramatic reforms to New Zealand citizenship. First, it ended the practice of granting automatic (*jus soli*) citizenship to children born in New Zealand whose parents are not citizens or permanent
residents. Second, it lengthened the residency requirement to obtain citizenship from three to five years.

I focus my analysis on a citizenship bill instead of an immigration bill because current immigrants that have yet to naturalize should support an easier path to citizenship for themselves and their families, even if they might oppose increased immigration. As discussed in Chapter 5, cross-national research suggests that current immigrants do in fact support more liberal immigration policies (Just and Anderson 2015). However, it seems likely that current immigrants will support liberal naturalization policy even more than they support liberal immigration policy. Bearing this out, Asian immigrants made thousands of submissions in opposition to this bill and successfully lobbied for it to not be applied retrospectively (Gregory 2004).

The Citizenship Amendment Bill was initially introduced along with a reform to passport legislation as the Identity (Citizenship and Travel Documents) Bill and first read\(^\text{19}\) on the House floor on June 29, 2004 on the motion of Minister of Internal Affairs George Hawkins (Labour – Manurewa). It was then referred to the Government Administration Committee. After being reported from committee, the bill was read for a second time on April 12, 2005 and then debated in the Committee of the whole House, at which point the Identity Bill was split into the Citizenship Amendment Bill (containing the relevant citizenship provisions) and

\(^{19}\) New Zealand, like many other British-influenced legislatures, requires multiple “readings” of a bill. Bills are not actually read aloud. Instead, readings are an opportunity for the entire House to debate a bill and for members to give speeches expressing their view on the proposed legislation.
the Passports Amendment Bill (changing requirements for New Zealand Passports). The Citizenship Amendment Bill then passed its third and final reading that same day and received the royal assent to become law on April 20, 2005, following the standard legislative process for bills in New Zealand. After the bills split, I focus solely on the Citizenship Amendment Bill.

Minister Hawkins, a native-born New Zealander from a single-member district, took responsibility for this bill as the minister whose department oversees citizenship grants. At all three readings of the bill, the first member to speak after Minister Hawkins was Pansy Wong (National), a Chinese-born list MP. While Ms. Wong and the center-right National Party supported the bill when it was combined with the passport provision, Ms. Wong sharply criticized the lengthening of the residency requirement for citizenship and the National Party ultimately voted against final passage of the bill. Ms. Wong also made frequent claims to substantively represent immigrants, highlighting during the second reading that the “largely passive Asian migrant community” was “very angry.”

In addition to Mr. Hawkins and Ms. Wong, a number of other MPs played an active role in the debates. These MPs are listed in Table 6.1. This table presents a number of interesting trends, some of which will be discussed in more detail below. First, immigrant MPs do appear to be playing an outsized role in this debate, particularly among those who speak the most. As discussed below, many of these MPs reference their own migration background in speeches, providing strong evidence of substantive representation by descriptive representatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Readings Spoken At</th>
<th>Words Spoken</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Robson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Locke*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansy Wong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Brown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Alexander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>United Future</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hawkins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Franks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,555</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig McNair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>NZ First</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Yates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Hamilton East</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Tisch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Piako</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Roy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Ardern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Taranaki-King Country</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taito Phillip Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Mangere</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On the first reading of the Identity (Citizenship and Travel Documents) Bill, Green MP Sue Kedgley gave a speech on behalf of Mr. Locke. I count this as participation by Mr. Locke.

**Table 6.1.** MPs who gave speeches during the three reading debates on the Identity (Citizenship and Travel Documents) Bill 2005 or the Citizenship Amendment Bill 2005.
Second, there appears to be a disproportionate number of speeches by list MPs. However, upon closer examination, all but one of these list MPs represents a minor party. This may not provide evidence of list MPs taking a greater interest in immigration issues. The New Zealand House affords every party the opportunity to participate in each debate whenever possible (New Zealand Parliament 2010). In short debates where each party has only time for one or two speakers, this rule gives small parties a disproportionate number of speakers. Thus, many small party list MPs might speak in these debates in order to represent their party, not because they have a special interest in immigrant issues.

Third, among SMD MPs that speak multiple times there appears to be a slight bias towards urban districts, which may have a disproportionate number of immigrants. As discussed in Chapter 5, electorate demographics might influence the behavior of SMD MPs and mute any difference between the two tiers. I use this case study to examine whether this plays out in practice.

**Electorate Demographics**

The debates surrounding the Citizenship Amendment Act 2005 offer ambiguous evidence on the role of electorate demographics. SMD MPs from urban districts do appear to be overrepresented among the most frequent speakers. While publicly available electorate-level demographics data does not exist for the 2002 election during which these MPs were elected, George Hawkins (Manurewa), Diane Yates (Hamilton East), and Taito Phillip Field (Mangere) all represent major population centers. Shane Ardern (Taranaki-King Country) and Lindsay Tisch
Piako) come from more rural districts, but these MPs both only spoke once. SMD MPs with a large number of immigrant constituents may substantively represent immigrants in the debates, reducing the magnitude of any difference between MPs elected in the SMD tier as a whole and those in the PR tier. Without complete electorate data for 2002 though, it is impossible to fully evaluate whether the number of speeches given by SMD MPs from immigrant-dense districts in this debate exceeds their share of Parliament.

Even if immigrant-dense districts encouraged the MPs in this debate to engage with these issues, the impact appears implicit at best. During all the speeches made on this bill, only Pansy Wong (National – List) and Taito Phillip Field (Labour – Mangere) referenced specific immigrant communities. Both of these MPs, however, referred to the immigrant group to which they belonged. As discussed below, this reinforces my finding that foreign-born MPs may be better substantive representatives of immigrants. Although Mr. Field’s reference to the Samoan community could be a reflection of his district’s demographics, the fact that he as a Samoan-New Zealander specifically singled out the Samoan-New Zealander community suggests that electorate demographics may not be his central motivation.

Besides Mr. Field, no SMD MP explicitly referred to his or her immigrant constituents. Thus, even if electorate demographics are shaping who speaks, they do not appear to have a major impact on MP rhetoric. Nevertheless, my tentative findings in Chapter 5 combined with the elevated number of speeches by urban
MPs in this debate suggests that future research on the impact of electorate demographics on immigrant substantive representation may be fruitful.

Committee Stage

After its first reading, the Identity Bill was referred to the Select Committee on Government Administration. While government administration might seem unrelated to citizenship policy, this committee has jurisdiction over the Department of Internal Affairs, which oversees grants of citizenships in New Zealand. As outlined below, New Zealand’s committee structure may discourage the substantive representation of immigrants by list MPs.

Immigrant-relevant bills in New Zealand are funneled to committees that may have a propensity to be populated by SMD MPs. Since MPs face incentives to focus on issues related to the committees on which they serve, list MPs who are not on committees with jurisdiction over immigrant-relevant topics may be discouraged from focusing on immigrant concerns. As disproportionately few list MPs end up on committees with jurisdiction over immigrant-relevant issues in New Zealand, fewer list MPs have an incentive to substantively represent immigrants, which may result in less of a difference between list and SMD MPs in the substantive representation of immigrants.

Legislators elected in large multi-member districts (like New Zealand’s PR list tier) have an incentive to focus on “targeted policy areas” since they do not need a majority of votes to be reelected (Fujimura 2015: 219). By becoming an expert on one issue they can win a niche voter that cares passionately about an issue.
without needing to win over a majority of constituents like SMD MPs. List MPs may therefore choose to ask questions relevant to their committee membership to demonstrate their specialization in a particular area and try to appeal to voters that care about that issue. A list MP on the Justice and Electoral committee, for example, which has responsibility for human rights, might choose to ask parliamentary questions about human rights to show voters passionate about human rights that she and her party care about that issue. Even if this same MP also cared about immigrants’ rights, she might choose to narrow her focus to make a stronger appeal to a smaller group of voters. Thus, list MPs may have an incentive to specialize in policy areas related to their committee assignments instead of immigrant issues.

Furthermore, committee assignments tend not to be randomly distributed between list and SMD MPs. Thomas Stratmann and Martin Baur (2002) find that in Germany, SMD MPs are more likely to serve on committees like transportation and agriculture, which allow them to provide pork-barrel services for their constituents. Combining Stratmann and Baur’s (2002) theory of committee membership in mixed-member systems with Naofumi Fujimura’s (2015) hypothesis about the desire of MPs in systems with high district magnitude to focus on concentrated policy areas, might help explain why New Zealand’s list MPs do not pay more attention to immigrants.

New Zealand’s relatively small Parliament only has thirteen select committees with responsibility for legislation, so issues are often lumped together, forcing MPs to choose their interests carefully. Notably, immigration is covered by
the Select Committee on Transport and Industrial Relations, which also covers a degree of localized interests, which might attract SMD MPs to that committee, while citizenship falls in with civil defence, sport and leisure, Pacific Island affairs, and a host of other issues that may or may not appeal to list MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Select Committee</th>
<th>Share of list MPs</th>
<th>Deviation from House average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Justice and Electoral</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>+28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maori Affairs</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>+21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education and Science</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>+13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Government and Environment</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>+13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transport and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>−5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>−8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Law and Order</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>−8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Trade</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>−11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Finance and Expenditure</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>−14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>−19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Primary Production</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>−19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.2.** The share of list MPs on each of New Zealand’s thirteen select committees as of 15 October 2015. In the House as a whole, 41.3% of MPs were elected in the list tier.
New Zealand’s committees are appointed after each Parliament. Parties are broadly represented in proportion to their overall membership in the House, but no stipulation is made as to how the list and SMD MPs from the parties large enough to have sizeable amounts of both will be allocated between committees (New Zealand Parliament 2014). Table 6.2 presents the share of each committee that was elected in the list tier as of 9 October 2015. These results provide further anecdotal evidence for Stratmann and Baur’s (2002) findings. While there are some aberrations, the committees with the greatest share of list MPs tend to focus on nation-wide policy issues while those with the smallest share are those that allow MPs to focus on geographic interests and allocate pork (the Select Committee on Primary Production, for example, has responsibility for agriculture, one of Stratmann and Baur’s classic geographic interest areas).

What is interesting from the perspective of immigrants in these data is that the committees with responsibility for immigration (Transport and Industrial Relations) and citizenship (Government Administration), both have a below average share of list MPs. Given that both of these committees cover a diverse area of topics, it is possible that MPs interested in immigrant issues have a decreased incentive to join either of these committees.

Once list MPs are on a committee that does not have jurisdiction over immigrant-relevant topics, they may choose to specialize in another area and pay less attention to immigrants in their parliamentary questions. While New Zealand has not used a mixed-member electoral system for long enough to gather sufficient data about the relationship between committee membership and parliamentary
questions (some committees may have had as few as forty-two members since the implementation of MMP, and only twenty-four in complete terms for which online data are available), committee structure may be playing a role in my non-result and warrants further research.

**MP Migration Background**

Although not a direct explanation of my results in Chapter 5, a number of ministers mentioned their personal migration backgrounds throughout the debate, reinforcing my finding in Chapter 5 that immigrant MPs substantively represent immigrants. As discussed in the background section above, National MP and Chinese immigrant Pansy Wong references her efforts to engage with the New Zealand Asian community on this citizenship bill. More explicitly though, Matt Robson, a Progressive MP who broke with the Labour-Progressive government to oppose this bill, notes that he was born in Australia and was in fact elected to Parliament four years before obtaining New Zealand citizenship. He notes that at the time he thought “what a great country New Zealand was, for being so broad-minded and for being so good.” Here, he uses his perspective as an immigrant to suggest that New Zealand should continue this tradition of offering extensive rights to immigrants.

Other MPs are less explicit about their own migration history, but still express common cause with immigrants. Taito Phillip Field, a Samoan-born Labour MP and government minister, for example notes that he is “pleased to reassure the Samoan community” that the Citizenship (Western Samoa) Act is not affected by
this bill. He also hints in the first reading debate that he believes that lengthening the residency requirement to apply for citizenship will “attract a lot of submissions and perhaps some concerns amongst the people in the community.” As a government minister, Mr. Field might not be politically able to criticize aspects of the bill publicly, however, his statements signal a potential disagreement with a provision that National MP Pansy Wong notes is highly unpopular with immigrants. He also directly addresses Samoan-New Zealanders, working to substantively represent the immigrant group to which he personally belongs.

Non-immigrants may also reference their own migration background to demonstrate solidarity with immigrants. Lindsay Tisch (National – Piako) mentions his family’s immigration from Germany in 1851 to demonstrate his empathy with immigrant concerns during the first reading debate, even though he himself was born in New Zealand.

However, MPs with migration history are not always empathetic to the concerns of new immigrants. During the third reading debate, Marc Alexander from the centrist United Future party states:

I was born in Japan, in Kobe, and lived there for a long period of time. I was not entitled to a Japanese passport, and why should I have been? I do not look Japanese, I do not act Japanese, and I have nothing to do with Japanese culture, despite the fact that I was born in Japan and lived there for 9 years before I left. I do not understand why any foreigners can come to New Zealand and arrogantly assume that just because they drop a child in our country, that child automatically has certain rights and entitlements born totally and utterly out of the historicity of what New Zealand is all about.

Here, Mr. Alexander’s experience immigrating from a country that does not offer *jus soli* citizenship actually causes him to oppose liberal citizenship policy. While
his experience being born in a country where he himself did not receive citizenship is unusual, it demonstrates that immigration history can cut both ways when it comes to substantive representation of immigrants.

Peter Brown, an English-born MP from the anti-immigration New Zealand First party, also fails to empathize with current immigrants, noting during the first reading debate that he immigrated to New Zealand and “fell in love with the place” but that “nowadays things have changed…[and] we have to be very careful who we let in, when we let them in, and for how long we let them.” Even while acknowledging his immigration history, Mr. Brown’s comments about “who we let in” perpetuate the anti-Asian undertones that are common in New Zealand First’s rhetoric on immigration. Thus, personal immigration history does not guarantee that an MP will be a good representative of immigrants, especially when the MP in question belongs to the dominant ethnic group. Nevertheless, Mr. Robson’s, Mr. Field’s, and Ms. Wong’s comments, coupled with my quantitative finding in Chapter 5, suggest that immigrant MPs are themselves more likely to voice support for immigrant-relevant issues.

Conclusion

In Chapter 5, I found that electoral systems do not have a significant direct impact on the substantive representation of immigrants in New Zealand. This result is unexpected given my findings in Chapter 4 and 5 that more immigrant MPs are elected in the list tier and that immigrant MPs pay significantly more attention to immigrant-relevant issues. In this chapter, I undertake a case study of the
Citizenship Amendment Act 2005 in hopes of offering some further explanations that may provide fruitful avenues for future research on the relationship between electoral systems and immigrant substantive representation more generally.

First, I note that SMD MPs may actually face strong incentives to substantively represent immigrants if their districts contain a large share of immigrants. While scholars have found similar effects for other minority groups, further research should follow the lead of Gest and Wong (2016) and examine the relationship between the geographic concentration of immigrants and their substantive representation.

Second, the lumping of immigrant-relevant topics with other issues on committees may discourage list MPs interested in immigrant affairs from joining these committees and instead encouraging them to focus their question time on other issues more relevant to their committee assignments. Future research should examine whether this relationship between committee membership and the issues an MP highlights in parliamentary debates is statistically robust and consider how that impacts immigrant representation.

Finally, this chapter also presents evidence on the role of MPs’ personal migration backgrounds on their statements. In line with my findings in Chapter 5, immigrant MPs do appear to pay more attention to immigration although this attention can sometimes be negative.

Despite the observations presented in this chapter, it may also be the case that electoral systems do not have a sizeable impact on immigrant substantive representation. New Zealand has now had twenty years of experience with a mixed-
member system that includes proportional elements. Despite this, in a country where 28% of the population was born abroad, less than 3% of the questions asked in Parliament relate to immigrants. While my study focuses on the impact of electoral systems, other factors may be muting the representation of immigrants in New Zealand, warranting further research as well.
7. Conclusion

Immigration and immigrants are increasingly high-profile political issues, from the Syrian refugee crisis in Europe to Donald J. Trump’s politics of exclusion in the United States. Meanwhile, immigrants are a growing constituency in developed democracies, making it increasingly important to understand how institutions shape their political representation. This thesis contributes to this understanding by examining how electoral systems affect the descriptive and substantive representation of immigrants. I conclude that closed-list proportional representation (PR) can help increase the number of immigrants in the legislature (relative to first-past-the-post (FPTP) rules). PR’s effect on the share of attention legislators pay to immigrants appears weaker or non-existent.

My study utilizes the mixed-member controlled comparison method to test these effects. In Germany and New Zealand, some MPs are elected under closed-list PR and some are elected under FPTP. Because these MPs are elected concurrently in the same country, they offer a test of what would happen if two elections were conducted at the same time in the same circumstances using different rules. While contamination between the tiers may mute this effect, mixed-member systems still provide a unique opportunity to test the impact of electoral systems. To this end, I compare the immigration backgrounds of MPs elected in each tier within Germany and New Zealand to test electoral system effects on descriptive representation. In order to test the effect of electoral systems on substantive representation, I examine the parliamentary questions for oral answer asked by New Zealand MPs.
In my examination of descriptive representation, I find strong evidence in both countries that proportional representation leads to enhanced representation for immigrants. In New Zealand, 22.8% of list MPs were born abroad compared to 8.5% of SMD MPs. In Germany, the difference is 2.6% to 1.7%, but this result is also statistically significant. I use a few other measures of immigrant status dependent on local circumstances and find a statistically significant positive effect of PR on immigrant descriptive representation in all cases. This difference appears to be partially attributable to the success in the list tier of small left-wing parties that are more likely to elect immigrants. Even if party differences explain the entire bonus for immigrant representation, PR can still indirectly benefit immigrant representation by helping these left-wing parties win more seats.

My results on substantive representation are less straightforward. I find that immigrant MPs pay more attention to immigrant-relevant issues and do so in a positive light. However, list MPs as a whole do not pay significantly more attention to immigrants and party appears to have a minimal effect (besides New Zealand’s anti-immigration party staking out frequently anti-immigrant positions). It is possible that my methodology diminishes the observable effect. However, the utter lack of evidence for any effect of PR election on pro-immigrant parliamentary questions hints that New Zealand’s relatively proportional electoral system has not led to sizable substantive representation for New Zealand’s large immigrant community.

I also undertake a case study of New Zealand’s Citizenship Amendment Act 2005 in search of other explanations for my null result in Chapter 5. I examine two
hypotheses. First, the large share of immigrants in many New Zealand districts may incentivize many SMD MPs to substantively represent immigrants and diminish any difference between the two tiers. Second, I suggest that New Zealand’s committee system may encourage list MPs that would have otherwise shown interest in immigrant affairs to focus on other issues. My case study also provides qualitative evidence in support of my earlier quantitative finding that immigrant MPs pay more attention to immigrant-relevant issues.

Beyond the case study in Chapter 6, this thesis should prompt further inquiry in a number of areas. First, it highlights the need for a developing body of research on the effects of electoral systems on immigrant representation. A rich literature already examines how electoral systems impact the representation of women and racial minorities. Given the growing number of immigrants in many democracies, this literature should be expanded to immigrants. The Pathways project by Manlio Cinalli and his co-authors appears to be a promising step here. Their research, when released, will hopefully take the field of immigrant representation beyond its current nascent stage.\(^\text{20}\)

Second, this thesis only considers the relative impact of FPTP and closed-list PR. Future research should consider the impact of open-list PR, majoritarian rules, and other electoral systems on the representation of immigrants. While FPTP and closed-list PR are two of the most popular types of electoral system worldwide, immigrants may live under a host of electoral rules, and a better understanding of

\(^{20}\) See note 3 in Chapter 2 for more information.
how all these rules affect immigrants is necessary for electoral engineers to make appropriate choices.

Third, further research should be undertaken on how to better represent immigrants within current electoral systems. While electoral systems can have dramatic effects on representation, electoral system reform is not an everyday occurrence. I do not expect my thesis to lead the United States to adopt closed-list PR for congressional elections anytime soon (although this would likely help more immigrants win election to the US Congress). A clear understanding of electoral system effects is crucial for those rare occasions when electoral systems do change, but most countries will likely stick with their current system for the foreseeable future. Finding ways to integrate immigrants into the political process within existing structures is a growing challenge for political scholars and practitioners.

Overall, this thesis seeks to offer a preliminary understanding of how the world’s two most popular electoral systems impact immigrant representation. Initial evidence suggests that proportional representation is preferable, at least in terms of descriptive representation and countries seriously committed to immigrant representation should consider adopting more proportional rules. However, this research should be only the beginning of a growing and continuing conversation about how we can integrate and represent immigrants in liberal democracies.
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