Federalism, the geographic location of groups, and conflict

Working Paper**Author(s):**

Christin, Thomas; Hug, Simon

Publication date:

2006

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-a-005389285>

Rights / license:

In Copyright - Non-Commercial Use Permitted

Originally published in:

CIS working paper 23(2006)

Federalism, the geographic location of groups, and conflict

by Thomas Christin and Simon Hug
University of Zurich

Federalism, the geographic location of groups, and conflict*

Thomas Christin[†] and Simon Hug[‡]
CIS, IPZ, Universität Zürich

Paper prepared for presentation at the
Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association
Philadelphia, August 31 - September 3, 2006

August 16, 2006

Abstract

In the literature on civil conflicts federalism is often touted as a useful institution to address regional demands. Diversity in the groups present in a country is associated, however, also with a higher tendency for conflicts. In this paper we examine how the geographic distribution of groups across a country affects the ways in which federalism contributes to conflict resolution. Of tantamount importance in assessing these effects of federalism is whether particular types of distributions of groups across a territory makes the adoption of federal institutions more likely.

* This paper is related to the research project “Democratizing divided societies in bad neighborhoods,” which is financed as part of the National Center for Competence in Research (NCCR) “Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century” by the Swiss National Science Foundation. We thank Sunita Parikh for guiding us to badly needed data on India, and Jenna Bednar for helping us with the classification of federal countries.

[†] Institut für Politikwissenschaft; Universität Zürich; Hirschengraben 56; 8001 Zürich; Switzerland; phone +41 (0)44 634 50 91; fax: +41 (0)44 634 50 98; email: christin@pwi.unizh.ch

[‡] Institut für Politikwissenschaft; Universität Zürich; Hirschengraben 56; 8001 Zürich; Switzerland; phone +41 (0)44 634 50 90/1; fax: +41 (0)44 634 50 98; email: simon.hug@access.unizh.ch

1 Introduction

Federalism and regional autonomy frequently appear among the proposed remedies for societal conflict (e.g., Nordlinger, 1972; Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972; Cohen, 1997; Congleton, 2000; Gurr, 2000; McGarry and OLeary, 2005). Such arrangements would grant disgruntled minorities at the national level autonomy to run their affairs at the regional level. As scholars of federalism have noted for some time, however, such arrangements are quite delicate (Riker, 1964; Lemco, 1991; Watts, 1998; Filippov, Ordeshook and Shvetsova, 2004; Bednar, 2006), and many federal systems have collapsed. Hence, recent research has focused more heavily on the question what types of federal arrangements are more conflict prone and what characteristics may make them more stable (e.g. Bunce, 2003*a*; Hale, 2004; Bakke and Wibbels, 2006; Brancati, 2006 (forthcoming)). At the center of this debate is the question whether ethnofederalism, i.e., a federal system where regional borders follow as closely as possible settlement patterns of minorities, is advisable or not.

Assessing whether particular makeups of federal units lead to more or less conflict is, however, a difficult endeavor. First of all, detailed information on the geographic location of ethnic groups and the composition of federal units is, especially in conflict-prone regions, difficult to come by.¹ Second, the general makeup of the country is likely to influence the presence or absence of federalism and the type of federalism chosen.² In this paper we do our best to address these problems, while assessing how the ethnic makeup of federal units affects the onset of civil wars.

In the next section we briefly review the literature on federalism, especially as it pertains to this institution's potential to mitigate societal conflicts. In section three we discuss and present data on the ethnic makeup of federal countries. Preliminary analyses presented in this section suggest that the ethnic makeup of countries affects the presence and type of federal arrangements. In section four we assess whether particular types of ethnic makeups make conflict onset more

¹We completely eschew in this paper the problem that ethnic groups or any other groups are hardly given, but their definition is often part of ongoing conflict processes (e.g., Breton, 1964; Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972; Fearon and Laitin, 2000*b*).

²A nice little illustration to this effect appears in Glazer (1983), who shows that in the United States after 1789 new states were admitted to the Union only once WASPs formed a clear majority (see also McGarry and OLeary, 2005).

likely in federal countries than in others. Section five concludes and charts future research.

2 The debate on federalism

Whether federalist arrangements or regional autonomy might prove an appropriate institutional means to mitigate societal conflicts is an increasingly hotly debated question.³ Gladly, this literature relies more and more often on the general literature on federal arrangements that highlights the latter’s inherent instability (Riker, 1964; Lemco, 1991; Watts, 1998; Filippov, Ordeshook and Shvetsova, 2004; Bednar, 2006). When seeing the potential benefits of federal arrangements in this larger context, very quickly the question arises under what conditions federal arrangements are adopted.⁴ While there exist many case-based descriptive studies, systematic evidence, especially evidence obtained from theoretically guided research, is rare. Commonly it is assumed that large territories and/or populations or diverse populations make the adoption of a federal system more likely (Panizza, 1999).⁵

The idea that federalism is used to “hold together” diverse populations, or letting them “come together” (Stepan, 1999), is closely related to the notion of ethnofederalism. The debate over whether such federal systems, where federal borders follow closely settlement patterns of minorities, increase societal conflict or help mitigate it is a longstanding one in political science. Lipset (1963, 81) argues against federal units corresponding to the settlement of ethnic groups and is supported in this among others by Nordlinger (1972) (see also McGarry and OLeary, 2005).⁶ More recently Snyder (2000, 199ff) very forcefully argued against ethnofederalism, especially in the light of the experiences after the fall of the iron

³We rely in this section heavily on the excellent reviews of the relevant literature in Sambanis and Milanovic (2004), Lake and Rothchild (2005), Sambanis (2005), and Bakke and Wibbels (2006), as well as several important points raised in McGarry and OLeary (2005). A much more partial review of the literature appears in Schou and Haug (2005).

⁴This problem of endogeneity of federal arrangements, which is already well problematized in Riker’s (1964) incisive work (but since then often forgotten), makes the results discussed in the literature on the effects of federalism (e.g., Cohen, 1997; Saideman, Lanoue, Michael and Stanton, 2002) rather questionable (e.g., Christin and Hug, 2003, 2004, 2006).

⁵Elkins and Sides (2006) find similar results in an auxiliary regression.

⁶Ghai’s (2002) work on autonomy and his case studies (Ghai, 2000) also relate to these arguments.

curtain.⁷ His argument relies on the conception that ethnofederal arrangements were not forced on the communist regimes, but were used for strategic reasons by the communist leadership, and where they were adopted, a breakup was programmed.⁸ Related to this claim is Brancati's (2006 (forthcoming)) argument that regional parties are detrimental to the stability of federal systems. Obviously, ethnofederal systems are likely to create structures fostering the development of regional parties.⁹

More recently scholars have attempted to figure out under what conditions ethnofederal arrangements are more conflict prone. Hale (2004), for instance, suggests that the existence of a core ethnic region may lead to the collapse of states and/or civil war.¹⁰ Bakke and Wibbels (2006) look in their study of federal arrangements at fiscal decentralization, inequality, and the ethnic makeup of federal units and find interesting interaction effects when trying to explain conflicts.¹¹ They find that ethnic heterogeneity when combined with high income inequality leads to more conflict, and that the effect of fiscal decentralization depends on the economic development of the ethnic regions.

While not directly addressing the question of types of federal arrangements, Sambanis and Milanovic's (2004) theory on the demand for sovereignty,¹² and

⁷The experiences of the Soviet Union and the countries in its sphere of influence are discussed by a series of authors (e.g. Roeder, 1991; Cornell, 2002; Bunce, 2003*a*; Bunce, 2003*b*; Hale, 2006).

⁸This rather pessimistic assessment by Snyder (2000) is closely related to the notion that a peacefully functioning democracy requires an open and free "marketplace of ideas" (see also Mansfield and Snyder, 2005). In ethnofederalist countries, the "marketplace of ideas," however, is very likely to be segmented along ethnic lines.

⁹Brancati (2006 (forthcoming)) also suggests ways in which the emergence of regional parties may be hindered (see also Brancati, 2004).

¹⁰This point relates to Toft's (2003) claim that a group's geographic concentration and desire to control territory is closely linked to the outbreak of violence. Interestingly, Saideman, Lanoue, Michael and Stanton (2002) find that group concentration of "minorities at risk" affects positively both protest and rebellion. When separating low from high concentration groups, the authors find that federalism fails to have a statistically significant effect for low concentration groups, but that the negative effect on rebellion is statistically significant for high concentration groups (however this may in part be due to the different sample sizes instead of any substantive differences). Further down the line, Tir (2005) study on the effects of secession highlighting the higher likelihood of continuing violence after secessions that were violent, is instructive.

¹¹Fiscal decentralization obviously relates more generally to the distribution of authority in federal countries, which is addressed in some contributions to Amoretti and Bermeo's (2003) volume.

¹²The reduced form of the theoretical argument is quite debatable, since other theoretical work on decentralization and secession offers much more fine-grained insights (e.g., Bolton and Roland, 1997; Young, 1998; Bordignon and Brusco, 2001; Alesina and Spolaore, 2003; Besley and Coate, 2003).

their proposed empirical investigation suggests also a close relationship between the makeup of subnational units on demands for secession.¹³ Based on her work on the breakup of ethnofederal states in Central and Eastern Europe Bunce (2003*b*) suggests that nationalist mobilization failed to lead to conflict in all cases. Subsequently Bunce (2003*a*) proposes, derived from a comparison of a small number of cases, as explanation the bargaining style in ethnofederal states.

Clearly there are many arguments appearing in the literature whether and in what circumstances ethnofederal arrangements might work.¹⁴ Most obviously the ethnic composition of a country has to be considered, but also the endogenous nature of the federal arrangement. Before attempting to address these problems, we need to know, however, what we consider as federal arrangements.

3 Federalism and the makeup of subunits

When defining countries as federal scholars often refer to Riker's (1964, 11) rightly famous definition suggesting that "[a] constitution is federal if (1) two levels of government rule the same land and people, (2) each level has at least one area of action in which it is autonomous, and (3) there is some guarantee (even though merely a statement in the constitution) of the autonomy of each government in its own sphere." It is clear, however, that this definition is difficult to operationalize and thus it can hardly surprise that scholars often differ in their lists of federal countries.¹⁵ Bednar (2006, 21) convincingly argues that definitions relying both on structural features and "federal practices" are not very useful when attempting to assess the effect of federal arrangements. She pleads for a

¹³This is related to Saideman's (1998) work on secessionism and the study on irredentism by Saideman and Ayres (2000).

¹⁴What is missing, however, are theoretically sound explanations for when federal arrangements and what types of federal arrangements lead to conflict. Myerson (2006) theoretic assessment of federalism and democracy nationalism may offer interesting starting points as might (immodestly) the initial steps proposed in Hug (2005*b*).

¹⁵For our own amusement we depict in the appendix for a set of frequently used federal indicators how they evolve over time for countries considered to be federal at least for a period of time. The chosen indicators are the rather restrictive measure focusing on fiscal federalism provided by Henisz (2002), the typology provided by McGarry (2002), and the POLITY III indicator on centralization (Jagers and Gurr, 1995). In future research we wish to look more closely at the dynamics of the introduction of federal arrangements, an avenue of research that Lake and Rothchild (2005) have started to explore.

strictly structural definition with three necessary components,¹⁶ namely geopolitical division, independence, and direct governance. With the element geopolitical divisions she requires that territorial units are “constitutionally recognized and may not unilaterally abolished” and thus rules out nonterritorial arrangements as those advocated, for instance, by Bauer (1907). With independence it is assured that different levels of governments have “independent bases of authority,” while direct governance assures that “each citizen is [directly] governed by at least two authorities.” This clearcut and crisp definition allows to cut through the maze of different types of federal arrangements and competing lists of federal countries.

Based on these criteria, Bednar (2006, 26) identifies 26 entities having fulfilled all three of them at least for some time between 1990 and 2000 and thus can be classified as federal. The list of countries Bednar (2006) proposes comes very close to the list appearing in McGarry (2002).¹⁷ What McGarry (2002, 2005) provide in addition is a classification of the federal countries as national or multinational federations,¹⁸ as well as starting and end dates of the federal arrangements. We provide in table 1 the list of countries we consider federal.¹⁹

¹⁶We adopt here Goertz’s (2006) advice to clearly determine whether components of a definition are necessary or sufficient elements for a concept.

¹⁷An article with an almost identical title is published (McGarry and OLeary, 2005), it fails to contain, however, the list of federal systems which we employ here.

¹⁸Unfortunately, these notions are nowhere clearly defined, but they come very close to the notion of ethnofederalism. Bunce (2003a), however, refers to Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russia, and Serbia-Montenegro as ethnofederalist states. Of these only the later two are considered by McGarry (2002) as multinational federations. Similarly, the POLITY III indicator (see appendix) classifies both Azerbaijan and Georgia as mixed regime (between unitary and federal), while Henisz (2002) codes this country as not federal. For Georgia Beck, Clarke, Groff, Keefer and Walsh (2001) also suggests that the subnational units fail to have sufficient authority (see appendix).

¹⁹An attractive feature of combining the lists of McGarry and OLeary (2005) and Bednar (2006) is that they both eliminate “quasi-federal” states like Spain, the Ukraine etc..

Table 1: Federal countries

Country	Bednar (2006, 26) ^a	McGarry (2002)
	<i>national federations</i>	
Argentina	-	1853-
Australia	-	1901-
Austria	-	1920-
Brazil	-	1891-
Germany	-	1949-
Mexico	-	1917-
Venezuela	-	1960-
United Arab Emirates	-	1971-
USA	-	1789-
	<i>multinational federations</i>	
Belgium	1994-	1993-
Bosnia	1995-	1995-
Burma		1948-
Cameroon		1961-1972
Canada	-	1867-
Czechoslovakia	1990-1992	1968-1992
Ethiopia	1995-2000	1992-
India	-	1950-
Malaya		1957-1963
Malaysia	-	1963-
Mali		1960
Micronesia	-	
Nigeria	1998-2000	1960-
Pakistan	1990-1999	1947-1971
Russia	1992-2000	1993-
St. Kitts-Nevis		1983-
South Africa	1993-2000	1996-
Soviet Union	1990-1991	1918-1991
Switzerland	-	1848-
West Indies Federation		1958-1962
Yugoslavia (former)	1990-1991	1953-1992
Yugoslavia	1992-2000	1992-

^a- indicates that Bednar (2006, 26) considers the country as federal for the whole period between 1990 and 2000. We omit from her list the European Union, which she codes as federal for 1999-2000.

Table 1 lists these countries and adds two pieces of information. First we provide information on the time period for which Bednar (2006, 26) and McGarry (2002) consider these countries as federal. Second, from McGarry (2002) we also adopt the distinction between national and multinational federations. As table 1 illustrates there are very few contradictions between the two sets of authors. Omitting small differences in timing (e.g., Belgium becoming federal in 1993 or

1994²⁰) the only contradictions concern Burma, St. Kitts-Nevis, and Micronesia. The first two countries are coded by McGarry (2002) as federal but are considered as quasi-federal, respectively unitary by Bednar (2006, 26), while for Micronesia the exact opposite is the case.²¹

The attractiveness of McGarry’s (2002, 2005) distinction between national and multinational federations is that it is obviously closely related to the ethnic makeup of the countries concerned. Related notions are Alemán and Treisman’s (2005) “ethnically mined” federations in which one group is a majority within one of the constituent units and a minority within the federation as a whole.²²

Having at hand a list of federal countries a first question to address is what distinguishes these countries in terms of the overall ethnic makeup from other countries.²³ First, if we just consider the ethnic composition of federal and unitary states we find on the basis of Fearon’s (2002) dataset that the ethnic fractionalization is practically identical in federal and unitary states, namely on average 0.485 compared to 0.476.²⁴ When we distinguish between the two types of federations according to McGarry (2002) we find average ethnic fractionalization indices of 0.381 and 0.601 for the national and multinational federations. Despite the marked difference, and even when compared to the averages for unitary states, we fail to find a statistically significant relationship.

Slightly different is the result if we look at the overall number of groups per country as reported in Fearon’s (2002) dataset. we find on average 5.144

²⁰We also put in this category the rather large differences in timing when it comes to Nigeria and Pakistan. In the later case, Bednar (2006, 26) considers this country as federal between 1990 and 1999, while McGarry (2002) assume that the federal experience was limited to 1947-1971. We follow the latter coding decision, despite the fact that Alemán and Treisman’s (2005) coding suggests that between 1971 and 1990 Pakistan was still federal.

²¹Griffiths and Nerenberg (2005) consider all these cases as federal, with the exception of Burma/Myanmar, while Watts (1996) excludes in addition Micronesia. Given that none of our data on ethnic groups and “minorities at risk” nor the data on conflicts we use have Micronesia and St. Kitts-Nevis as observations, we will no longer consider these cases in the remainder of the paper. For Burma, however, we follow McGarry (2002) and consider it as a multinational federation.

²²These authors consider nine countries to fall in this category, namely Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Soviet Union, Switzerland, Yugoslavia (former).

²³Here, as well as in the subsequent analyses and the tables we present in the appendix we omit Micronesia, St. Kitts-Nevis, and the West Indies Federation. The reason is simply that these three states fail to appear in any of the conflict data we employ and also Fearon’s (2002) data or the “minorities at risk” data (Gurr, 1993).

²⁴With an F-statistic of 0.017 and one degree of freedom this difference is far from reaching statistical significance.

Figure 1: Number of groups in different types of federations

groups in the 160 countries he considers. When distinguishing between federal and non-federal countries we find hardly any differences. In federal states we find on average 5.412 groups, while this number is only slightly lower in unitary states, namely 5.112.²⁵ When we distinguish, however, between the two types of federal systems, namely national and multinational, differences become more marked. In national federations we find 3.556 groups on average, while this number increases to 7.500 in multinational federations.²⁶ These differences mask to some degree the distribution of the number of groups depicted in figure 1. This figure suggests that unitary states have a very wide spectrum of numbers of groups, while national federations are very much concentrated on the left side of the graph, and, not surprisingly, multinational federations more on the right side of the graph. Interesting to note is, however, the pattern that the highest number of groups appear in unitary countries.²⁷

²⁵An F-Test (0.111, one degree of freedom) suggests that we cannot reject the null-hypothesis of equal means.

²⁶This yields an F-statistic of 2.811 and a p-value of 0.063.

²⁷We find almost identical patterns when studying in what countries “minorities at risk” are

Table 2: Group concentration and number of groups in federal countries^a

Country	Groupcon groups spatial distribution ^b				Fearon (2002)	
	0	1	2	3	N	N
<i>national fedederations</i>						
Austria	-	-	-	-	0	4
Australia	1	0	0	0	1	3
Mexico	1	0	2	0	3	4
Venezuela	0	0	1	1	2	4
Brazil	0	0	0	2	2	3
Argentina	0	1	0	1	2	3
Germany	0	1	0	0	1	3
USA	2	0	1	1	4	4
<i>multinational federations</i>						
Belgium	-	-	-	-	0	4
Bosnia	0	1	1	1	3	3
Canada	2	0	0	1	3	6
Czechoslovakia	0	0	0	2	2	4
Ethiopia	0	0	2	5	7	11
India	1	1	3	5	10	12
Malaysia	0	1	1	5	7	9
Mali	1	1	0	2	4	5
Nigeria	0	0	1	4	5	7
Russia	2	2	6	17	27	5
South Africa	2	1	2	3	8	13
Switzerland	1	0	0	1	2	9
Yugoslavia	1	0	4	3	8	7

^aAustria and Belgium have no “minorities at risk.”

^bThe codes correspond to the following labels: 0 Widely dispersed; 1 Primarily urban or minority in one region; 2 Majority in one region, others dispersed; 3 Concentrated in one region.

As noted above, some authors claim that the concentration of groups in particular areas lead to higher probabilities of conflict outbreak in general (e.g., Toft, 2003) and more particularly in ethnofederal countries (Saideman, Lanoue, Michael and Stanton, 2002; Hale, 2004). For this reason we depict in table 2 for each federal country the information on group concentration as collected in the “minorities at risk” project (Gurr, 1993),²⁸ as well as the number of groups

present (Christin and Hug, 2006). In 62.7 % of all unitary countries “minorities at risk” are present, while this percentage increases to 88.9 in federal countries. In national federations the percentage is lower, namely at 77.8, while it is equal to 100.0 in multinational federations. Interestingly enough, already the first difference between unitary and federal countries is statistically significant, as are the latter. Regarding the number of “minorities at risk” in federal countries table 2 shows the results.

²⁸In the country tables we provide in the appendix we also indicate for all minorities at risk in the federal countries considered here their group concentration, as well as information on their relative group size stemming from Fearon (2002) and Elkins and Sides (2006).

according to Fearon (2002).²⁹ What is immediately transparent from this table is that in all multinational federations with “minorities at risk,” some of the latter are concentrated in a region or form a majority in the region (codes 3 respectively 2 in table 2. In national federations, however, having regionally concentrated “minorities at risk” is the exception, with Venezuela and Brazil being the exceptions to the rule. Hence, following Toft’s (2003) argument we would expect multinational federations to be much more conflict-prone.

Taking this cursory evidence as indication that multinational federations (or ethnofederalism) is something to avoid, is, however, a step to far, at least for now. What many defenders of federal arrangements in general and multinational federations in particular argue is that even though multinational federations may lead to conflict or state collapse, the necessary counterfactual would be to look at what would have happened if the country had been federal (e.g., McGarry and OLeary, 2005). This obviously suggests (again) that federal arrangements are chosen in particular situations. Some very initial indications in this direction appear in table 3. Using the set of countries and the number and sizes of groups reported in Fearon (2002) we propose a set of logit and multinomial logits to explain the presence of federal institutions. Given the data depicted in figure 1 and table 2 it fails to surprise that the number of groups cannot explain the presence of federal institutions. However, this same number has a positive effect on the presence of multinational federations and a negative one on national federations. Interestingly enough, the size of the largest group has no statistically significant effect in any of the models presented in table 3.³⁰ Even though these analyses are very rough, they clearly suggest that analyzing the effect of federalism and types of federal arrangements has to proceed carefully.

²⁹Fearon and Laitin (2000*a*) proposes an alternative measure for group concentration, which is used, for instance by Sambanis and Milanovic (2004). Since this data covers only 101 groups so far, we refrain from using it here. Similarly the MAR project proposes a new, more detailed coding of group concentration which we plan on using in future versions of this paper.

³⁰Obviously work on polarization etc. would suggest using other functional forms for the postulated relationship. In the absence of any clear theoretical argument on which the functional form could be derived, we refrain from playing around with different specifications.

Table 3: Explaining federal institutions

	federalism		national federation		multinational federations		nat. fed. /unitary		m. nat. fed. /unitary		nat. fed. /unitary		m. nat. fed. /unitary	
	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)
number of groups size of largest group constant	0.023 (0.070)	0.266 (1.096)	-0.232 (0.165)	1.852 (1.618)	0.141 (0.076)	-1.332 (1.514)	-0.225 (0.166)	0.135 (0.076)			1.787 (1.621)	-1.240 (1.518)		
	-2.252 (0.454)	-2.296 (0.766)	-1.836 (0.689)	-4.093 (1.233)	-3.801 (0.656)	-2.121 (0.949)	-1.820 (0.691)	-3.713 (0.659)			-3.996 (1.235)	-2.120 (0.951)		
-2lik	108.245	108.068	66.549	67.740	60.590	62.647	52.421	113.031						
n	160	160	160	160	160	160	160	160						

4 Geographic location of groups and its effect on conflict

Our hopefully sufficiently careful analysis on the effect of the ethnic makeup of federal countries starts off from Fearon and Laitin's (2003) analysis of the conditions leading to civil war, and we first analyze the effect of federal arrangements.³¹ In table 4 we report simple analyses which first replicate Fearon and Laitin's (2003) analysis on the basis of a logit and a probit model. In model 3 we add as additional indicator a federalism dummy, while in model 4 we make the distinction between national and multinational federalism. While in all cases the estimated coefficients for these additional variables are negative, meaning that in federal countries of whatever type conflict onset is less likely, the associated standard errors are so large that statistical significance is out of reach. Concerning the other estimated coefficients, these hardly change when the new variables are introduced.

Hence these analyses suggest that federal arrangements fail to affect the onset of conflict.³² Given this result we wish to assess whether among federal countries the configuration of the ethnic and political map affect their conflict-proness.³³ To start with we first wish to assess whether limiting ourselves to federal countries affects the general thrust of Fearon and Laitin's (2003) results. The results reported in the first two columns in table 5 suggest that some effects lose their importance or significance or both. Whether the state is noncontiguous (ncontig), whether it exports a significant amount of oil (Oil), whether it is a new state, is

³¹We fully concur with the view articulated in Achen (2005) and Clarke (2005) that this is probably not the best strategy. The alternative, however, would be a fully specified theoretical model on the outbreak of civil wars. Such a model is, however, quite clearly still absent in this literature.

³²We consciously neglect here two possible problems which we have discussed elsewhere. First of all, given that measuring the onset of civil war is error-prone, the dependent variable is very likely to be affected by misclassification. As Christin and Hug (2004) and Hug (2005a) show, however, such misclassifications are likely to lead to biased estimates. Second, federal arrangements are likely to be endogenous in the model we wish to estimate. As we showed in Christin and Hug (2004) Christin and Hug (2006), addressing the problem of endogeneity may lead to substantively different estimated effects, particularly for the effect of political institutions.

³³Hence, we proceed very similarly like Bakke and Wibbels (2006). As a consequence we are open to the same charge as they are, namely that we neglect the endogenous nature of federalism. In a later version we plan to address this shortcoming of our analysis.

instable no longer affects the onset of civil war in a statistically significant way.³⁴ For the other independent variables we find similar significant (or nonsignificant) effects. Interesting to note is especially the suddenly negative effect of religious frationalization, an effect which is positive in the analysis based on the whole set of countries.

Table 4: The effect of federalism on civil war onset

	logit b (s.e.)	probit b (s.e.)	probit b (s.e.)	probit b (s.e.)	probit b (s.e.)	probit b (s.e.)
Prior war	-0.954 (0.314)	-0.391 (0.130)	-0.406 (0.131)	-0.395 (0.130)	-0.402 (0.131)	-0.406 (0.131)
Per capita income _{t-1}	-0.344 (0.072)	-0.135 (0.028)	-0.128 (0.028)	-0.128 (0.029)	-0.135 (0.028)	-0.128 (0.029)
log(population)	0.263 (0.073)	0.108 (0.031)	0.126 (0.033)	0.112 (0.032)	0.120 (0.033)	0.126 (0.033)
log(mountainous terrain)	0.219 (0.085)	0.091 (0.034)	0.092 (0.034)	0.091 (0.034)	0.092 (0.034)	0.092 (0.034)
Noncontiguous state	0.443 (0.274)	0.179 (0.122)	0.191 (0.122)	0.163 (0.123)	0.207 (0.123)	0.190 (0.125)
Oil exporter	0.858 (0.279)	0.352 (0.123)	0.350 (0.124)	0.349 (0.123)	0.353 (0.124)	0.350 (0.124)
New state	1.709 (0.339)	0.757 (0.163)	0.757 (0.164)	0.757 (0.163)	0.757 (0.164)	0.757 (0.164)
Instability	0.618 (0.235)	0.259 (0.101)	0.260 (0.101)	0.261 (0.101)	0.259 (0.101)	0.260 (0.101)
Democracy (Polity)	0.021 (0.017)	0.008 (0.007)	0.009 (0.007)	0.008 (0.007)	0.009 (0.007)	0.009 (0.007)
Ethnic fractionalization	0.166 (0.373)	0.087 (0.157)	0.122 (0.158)	0.077 (0.158)	0.131 (0.160)	0.122 (0.160)
Religious fractionalization	0.285 (0.509)	0.128 (0.209)	0.162 (0.210)	0.123 (0.209)	0.164 (0.210)	0.162 (0.210)
Federalism			-0.223 (0.145)	-0.202 (0.268)	-0.212 (0.165)	
National federation				-0.202 (0.268)		-0.227 (0.268)
Multinational federation					-0.212 (0.165)	-0.222 (0.165)
constant	-6.731 (0.736)	-3.224 (0.303)	-3.412 (0.326)	-3.264 (0.307)	-3.360 (0.321)	-3.412 (0.326)
Log likelihood	-480.402	-481.419	-480.163	-481.111	-480.555	-480.163
N	6327	6327	6327	6327	6327	6327

Thus, we can turn to our main question, namely whether among federal coun-

³⁴In part this is obviously due to the fact that the sample size cut to a sixth of the original size.

tries settlement patterns and borders of the subnational units have an effect conflict onset. A very first and crude analysis relies on the indicator distinguishing between different types of federal systems. Given that we now only consider federal countries we only use the indicator for multinational federations as additional explanatory variable. The results for this model appear in column 3 of table 5 and suggest that multinational federations compared to national federations are more conflict-prone. Since we had noted above that the presence of multinational federations is closely related to the number of groups present in a country, we use both the number of groups reported in Fearon (2002) and the number of “minorities at risk” (Gurr, 1993) as independent variables. In both cases, but especially for the first variable, to find sizeable positive effects. While this already suggests the difficulty to assess the causal effect of particular federal arrangements and the geographic location of groups, we now turn to a more fine-grained analysis.

For these analyses we use a very simple indicator that takes account of the geographic location of groups, combined with the borders of federal units. We count the number of federal subunits in which the national majority group is not in a majority.³⁵ This number of federal subunits inhabited more strongly by another group, we divide by the total number of federal units to obtain as indicator the proportion of such federal subunits.

When we consider the effect of the proportion of federal units dominated by national minorities (column 6 in table 5) we find a negative effect which fails to reach statistical significance. This result, together with the rather strong effects for the number of groups and our discussion of the possible endogeneity of federal institutions should make us suspicious, however. Clearly, whether there is a high proportion of federal units dominated by a national minority is very much a design question and is most likely heavily influenced by the ethnic makeup of the country.

³⁵In both cases we use relative majority (i.e., plurality) as indicator.

Table 5: Explaining civil war onset in federal countries

Table 3. Explaining civil war onset in racial countries												
	b	(s.e.)	b	(s.e.)	b	(s.e.)	b	(s.e.)	b	(s.e.)	b	(s.e.)
Prior war	-0.391 (0.130)	-0.773 (0.467)	-1.266 (0.579)	-1.829 (0.594)	-0.908 (0.462)	-0.830 (0.471)	-0.533 (0.479)	-0.499 (0.485)	-1.144 (0.481)	-0.912 (0.468)		
Per capita income _{t-1}	-0.135 (0.028)	-0.115 (0.073)	-0.057 (0.070)	-0.141 (0.094)	-0.140 (0.085)	-0.124 (0.073)	-0.124 (0.083)	-0.113 (0.084)	-0.159 (0.083)	-0.134 (0.083)		
log(population)	0.108 (0.031)	0.395 (0.201)	0.554 (0.257)	0.176 (0.196)	0.322 (0.215)	0.449 (0.220)	0.324 (0.246)	0.226 (0.230)	0.471 (0.240)	0.339 (0.210)		
log(mountainous terrain)	0.091 (0.034)	0.326 (0.212)	0.250 (0.227)	0.229 (0.222)	0.329 (0.215)	0.267 (0.229)	0.313 (0.237)	0.414 (0.220)	0.169 (0.239)	0.313 (0.214)		
Noncontiguous state	0.179 (0.122)	-0.120 (0.433)	-0.756 (0.637)	0.912 (0.543)	-0.414 (0.491)	-0.087 (0.429)	-0.036 (0.435)	-0.119 (0.448)	-0.336 (0.455)	-0.312 (0.469)		
Oil exporter	0.352 (0.123)	0.336 (0.366)	0.043 (0.392)	0.267 (0.400)	0.180 (0.388)	0.284 (0.381)	-0.012 (0.427)	0.200 (0.385)	0.046 (0.418)	0.243 (0.379)		
New state	0.757 (0.163)	0.960 (0.670)	0.686 (0.760)	1.136 (0.809)	0.880 (0.706)	0.940 (0.673)	0.673 (0.743)	0.775 (0.722)	0.828 (0.726)	0.894 (0.703)		
Instability	0.259 (0.101)	0.239 (0.329)	0.244 (0.340)	0.496 (0.360)	0.351 (0.341)	0.216 (0.331)	0.331 (0.347)	0.351 (0.341)	0.335 (0.346)	0.340 (0.340)		
Democracy (Polity)	0.008 (0.007)	-0.005 (0.021)	0.001 (0.021)	-0.039 (0.027)	0.013 (0.023)	-0.012 (0.024)	0.018 (0.029)	0.026 (0.027)	-0.002 (0.026)	0.010 (0.023)		
Ethnic fractionalization	0.087 (0.157)	0.013 (0.895)	-0.811 (0.969)	-1.442 (1.105)	0.244 (0.919)	0.128 (0.916)	-0.545 (0.995)	-0.565 (0.966)	0.411 (0.937)	0.097 (0.900)		
Religious fractionalization	0.128 (0.209)	-0.108 (1.166)	-2.029 (1.809)	-1.193 (1.278)	-0.723 (1.278)	0.225 (1.258)	-0.418 (1.379)	-1.109 (1.363)	0.139 (1.327)	-0.616 (1.259)		
Multinational federation			1.518 (0.863)									
Number of ethnic groups			0.251 (0.083)									
Number of “minorities at risk”				0.036 (0.022)								
Proportion of minority federal units						-0.508 (0.711)	1.365 (1.148)	0.256 (0.864)				
Proportion of minority federal units (residual)							-2.715 (1.208)	-1.586 (0.796)				
Proportion of minority federal units (pred.)								1.920 (1.134)	1.009 (0.725)			
constant	-3.224 (0.303)	-6.961 (2.534)	-8.148 (3.028)	-4.757 (2.400)	-6.104 (2.663)	-7.343 (2.647)	-6.325 (2.890)	-5.489 (2.720)	-7.396 (2.854)	-6.360 (2.608)		
log-likelihood	-481.419	-55.177	-53.324	-49.584	-53.773	-54.914	-52.322	-53.661		-54.170		
n	6327	959	959	959	959	959	959	959	959	959		

The results reported in table 6 clearly demonstrate this. If we use all the independent variables proposed by Fearon and Laitin (2003)³⁶ together with the number of ethnic groups, the number of “minorities at risk” and the number of federal units to explain the proportion of federal units dominated by a national minority we find an r^2 of 0.6. If we use only the latter variables, we still reach a respectable r^2 of 0.3. Not surprisingly this variable is heavily affected by the ethnic configuration on the ground etc. Hence, the estimated effect for the proportion of federal units dominated by a national minority, as reported in table 5 (column 6) is very likely to be affected by endogeneity bias. A simple test of this consists of using as additional variable in the analysis the residuals from the regressions reported in table 6.³⁷ In both cases (columns 7 and 9 in table 5) the effects are statistically significant. This suggests that the proportion of federal units dominated by a national minority is endogenous. To correct for this we use the predicted values of the regressions reported in table 6 to replace the affected variable. The results reported in columns 8 and 10 of table 5 suggest that when correcting for endogeneity the effect of the proportion of federal units dominated by national minorities increases statistically significantly the onset of civil wars.

³⁶We add these variables to the regression following upon the argument by Acemoglu (2005), that on instrumental variables estimation, all exogenous variables should be included in the first stage regression. Obviously, even more important is to ensure that the instruments are truly exogenous and relate to the endogenous variables. We can show this latter point with the second regression, while the first one remains an argument, as in all instrumental variable estimations.

³⁷This type of test for endogeneity relies on Hausman’s (1978) work in the context of linear models, while Rivers and Vuong (1988) and Bollen, Guilkey and Mroz (1995) provide the derivations for nonlinear models.

Table 6: Explaining the proportion of minority-majority federal units

	b (s.e.)	b (s.e.)
Prior war	-0.251 (0.029)	
Per capita income _{t-1}	-0.014 (0.001)	
log(population)	0.045 (0.008)	
log(mountainous terrain)	-0.055 (0.007)	
Noncontiguous state	-0.096 (0.020)	
Oil exporter	0.008 (0.022)	
New state	0.057 (0.056)	
Instability	0.009 (0.021)	
Democracy (Polity)	-0.008 (0.001)	
Ethnic fractionalization	0.335 (0.036)	
Religious fractionalization	0.177 (0.047)	
Number of federal units	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.001)
Number of ethnic groups	0.010 (0.004)	0.008 (0.003)
Number of “minorities at risk”	0.017 (0.002)	0.028 (0.001)
constant	-0.229 (0.085)	0.148 (0.020)
Root MSE	0.188	0.322
r^2	0.650	0.320
n	959	959

5 Conclusion

If federal arrangements are chosen to allow diverse populations to “come together” or to be “held together,” (Stepan, 1999) two things follow quite directly. First, the stability of federal arrangements and the latter’s conflict-proness is likely to be related to the “ethnic map” of the country. Second, if trying to assess the effect of different federal arrangements like ethnofederalism and the like, we also need to consider what brought about these particular arrangements.

In trying to offer elements pertaining to the first point, we have also tried to address the second point. Using very detailed information on the ethnic make up of federal countries we assessed through a rather crude indicator the effect of different types of ethnic makeups on civil war onset. Once we control for the endogenous nature of federal arrangements we find that larger shares of federal units dominated by a national minority increase the likelihood of civil war onset in federal countries.

This result has to be interpreted with quite some caution, and future research has to demonstrate its robustness. First of all, it would be useful to build into our empirical model more detailed information on the geographic location of groups. Group concentration, ethnic core regions etc. are all notions which we can measure with the data we have assembled and report on in the appendix. A more challenging endeavor would be to have more fine-grained information on the geographic location of groups by using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data gleaned from the Atlas of Soviet geographers (Bruk, 1964) (see Cederman, Roed and Weidmann, 2006). But even with more and better data, the most daunting endeavor still seems to get a theoretical handle on the question why and possibly how and what type of federal arrangements might mitigate societal conflicts.

Appendix

Below we report in detail for each country the type of data we collected to determine the makeup of federal units according to groups. The federal units were determined on the basis of information from the CIA World Factbook (<https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/> (accessed July 21, 2006)) and the Administrative Divisions of Countries ("Statoids") (<http://www.statoids.com/> accessed July 21, 2006)). To identify groups we relied on Fearon (2002) and the "minorities at risk" data (Gurr, 1993) as reported in Elkins and Sides (2006). For the group sizes we relied on data from European Values Study Group and Association (2006) as well as other surveys (as noted in the tables), which we also used to complement the list of groups if appropriate. When possible we use Census data at the level of the federal units. We first present in table ??, however, a summary of the information provided in the tables per country.

Table 7: Federations and Dominant Majorities or Minorities

Federations	N Fed. Units	N Majo / Mino States	Nationwide Dominant Group	Majo. / Mino. Fed unit	Majo. / Mino group
National Federations					
Argentina	24	0	White (85 - 97%)	-	-
Sources: http://www.indec.mecon.gov.ar/ Table: 14.1 Total de hogares y hogares donde al menos una persona se reconoci perteneciente o descendiente de un pueblo indgena. Total del pais segun provincias					
Australia	8	0	Caucasian (84% - 92%)	-	-
Sources: Census 2001: http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/home/Previous%20Censuses:%20Census%20data					
Austria	9	0	Austrians (90 - 93%)	-	-
Sources: Population Estimations 2006: http://www.statistik.at/fachbereich_03/bevoelkerung-tab8.shtml					
Brazil	27	17	White (54 - 55%)	Acre Alagoas Amap Amazonas Bahia Cear Maranhao Mato Grosso Par Paraba Pernambuco Piau Rio Grande do Norte Rondnia Roraima Sergipe Tocantins	Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto Mulatto
Sources: Census 2000: http://www.sidra.ibge.gov.br/ Table 136					
Germany	16	0	Germans (91% - 95%)	-	-
Sources: Estimations 2004 http://www.statistik-portal.de/Statistik-Portal/de-jb01-jahrta2.asp					
Mexico	32	0	Mestizo (60%)	Oaxaca, Chiapas and Yucatan	Strong Indigenous Minorities -
Sources: Census 2000: Instituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e informática; http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/rutinas/ept.asp?t=mlen02&c=3327 ; Library of Congress					
United Arab Emirates	7	0	Ethnic Arabs (87%)	-	-
Sources: Library of Congress: Foreign workers who represent about 70% are not included in the calculation since they are not citizens of UAE.					
United States	51	3	White (67% - 82%)	District of Columbia Hawaii New Mexico	Black Asian Hispanics
Sources: Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau: Annual Estimates of the Population by Race Alone and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States and States: July 1, 2004 (SC-EST2004-04). The Census Bureau provides statistics for non Hispanic or latino origins and Hispanic and latino origins. All "white" hispano have been classified as hispanics. Other groups have been classified according to their group. E.g. Hispanics Asian alone have been classified as Asian.					
Venezuela	25	2	Mestizo (59% - 68%)	Delat Amacuro Monagas	White White
Sources: World Value Survey 2000; http://www.ine.gov.ve/censo/fichascenso/fichacenso.asp					

Multinationals Federations					
Belgium	13	7	Flemming (58%)	Brabant Wallon Brussels Hainaut Liege Luxembourg Namur Wallonia	Wallon (French) Wallon (French) Wallon (French) Wallon (French) Wallon (French) Wallon (French) Wallon (French)
Sources: World Value Survey 1999 and various official internet pages					
Bosnia	3	1	Bosniak (Muslims) (44% - 48%)	Republika Srpska	Serbs
Sources: Estimations because the last census was held in 1991. Brsko District seems to be equally populated by Bosniaks and Serbs (about 40% for each group). http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bosnia_and_Herzegovina					
Burma (Myanmar)	14	7	Burman (68%)	Chin State Kachin State Kayah State Kayin State Mon State Rakhine Shan State	Chin Kachin Kayah Kayin Mon Rakhine Shan
Sources: Reported results based on the last census (1983). All States are dominated by a minority group.					
Cameroon	10	9	Bamilike-Central (21%)	Adamoua Centre East Extreme North North North West South South West	Peulh and Gbaya Beti Meka and Gbaya Mboum, Mafa and Peulh Mboum, Guidar, Fali and Mafa Ring, Ngemba, Wimboum-Yamba and Momo Boulou-Fang Ngoue-Oroko
Sources: DHS Survey 2004; http://www.unesco.org/most/dpzognong.htm and http://www.ethnonet-africa.org/data/camer/genpop.htm					
Canada	13	1	English speaker	Quebec	Quebecois (French)
Sources: Ottawa: Statistics Canada - Language Composition of Canada Cat. No. 97F0007XCB2001001					
Czechoslovakia	2	1	Czech (63%)	Slovak Republic	Slovaks
Sources: (Alemán and Treisman, 2005)					
Ethiopia	11	6	Oromo (35%)	Addis Amhara Affar Somali Tigray Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples States were Oromo is as strong as any other minority: Benishangul-Gumuz Gambela Dire Dawa	Amharra Amharra Affar Somalie Tigray (Tigraway) Guragie, Sidama and many small groups Amharra (28%); Oromo (25%) and Beni-Snagul-Gumuz (?) Amharra (18%), Oromo (10%) and Gambela (?) Oromo (42%); Amharra (39%)
Sources: DHS Survey 2000; http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/ethiopia/et02_04a.pdf ; http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Image:Ethiopia-regions-english.png ; http://www.csa.gov.et/					
India	35	21	Religion: Hindus (81%) Language: Hindi (40%) Hindi (40%)	Jammu and Kashmir Lakshadweep Punjab Meghalaya Mizoram Nagaland Assam Dadra and Nagar Haveli Daman and Diu Goa Gujarat Karnataka Kerala Maharashtra Manipur	Ethnic (language) and Religious majority: Kashmiri and Dogri (in Jammu) / Muslims Malayalam / Muslims Punjabi / Sikhs Khasi / Christian Lushai/Mizo / Christian Ao, Sema and Konyak / Christian Ethnic (language) minority: Assamese Bhili/Nhilodi Gujarati Konkani Gujarati Kannada Malayalam Marathi Manipuri

				Orissa Pondicherry Sikkim Tamil Nadu Tripura West Bengal	Oriya Tamil Nepali Tamil Bengali Bengali
Sources: Census 2001 Religious Data http://www.censusindia.net/religiondata/index.html ; Census 1991 Three Main Languages in every State 1991, Table 26 http://www.censusindia.net/cendat/datatable26.html and http://www.kashmirstudygroup.net/awayforward/mapsexplan/languages.html . The Kashmir, Tamil and Sikh minorities are the most militants, along religious cleavages (Kohli, 2004).					
Malaya (57-63)	11	1	Malay	Penang (Pinang)	Chinese
Malaysia (1963-1965)	14	4	Malay	Penang Sabah Sarawak Singapore	Chinese Kadazan-Dusun Iban Chinese
Note: August 7, 1965: Singapore is expelled from the Malaysian Federation					
Malaysia (1966-)	13	3	Malay	Penang Sabah Sarawak	Chinese Kadazan-Dusun Iban
Sources: http://www.statistics.gov.my/english/frameset_census.php?file=pressdemo ; Wikipedia (See Table for Malaysia for more details). We do not include the 3 Federal Territories of Malaysia; Kuala Lumpur (Capital, 1972), Labuan (Offshore territory, 1984) and Putrajaya (Administrative centre, 1995). All are dominated by Malays and are governed by the Ministry of Federal Territory.					
Mali	8	5	Bambara (34%)	Kayes Mopti Tombouctou Gao Kidal	Sarakole, Soninke, Marka and Malinke Dogon and Peulh Sonrai Sonrai Tamacheck
Sources: DHS Survey 1999 and http://region.segou.net/Donn%E9es%20sur%20le%20Mali.htm					
Nigeria	37	24	Hausa-Fulani (23%)	Kogi Ekiti Kwara Lagos Ogun Ondo Osun Oyo Taraba Plateau Niger Adamawa Bayelsa Delta Abia Anambra Ebonyi Enugu Imo Benue Akwa Ibom Cross River Edo Borno	Yoruba, Igbala and Ibira Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Yoruba Wurkum, Mumuje and many small groups Tera, Hausa, Birom and many small groups Nupe Many groupes (81%) Ijaw Igbo, Urhobo and Ijaw Igbo Igbo Igbo Igbo Idoma and Tiv Ibidio Ekoi and many small groups Edo Bura, Kanuri and many other groups
Sources: DHS Survey 1999					
Pakistan	8	3	Punjabi (44%)	Sindh North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) Baluchistan	Sindhis and Urdu Pakhtuns (Pathan) Brohi, Pakthuns and Baluchi
Sources: (Alemán and Treisman, 2005), World Value Survey 1999 and DHS Survey 1990/1991					
Russia	88	12	Russian (80%)	Chechen Republic Chuvashi Republic Republic of Dagestan Republic of Ingushetia Kabardino-Balkarian Republic Republic of Kalmykia Karachaevo- Chercessian Republic Republic of North Os- setia Alania Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) Republic of Tatarstan Republic of Tuva Aginsky Buryat au- tonomous district	Chechens Chuvash Avars Ingushs Kabardians Kalmyks Karachais Osetians Yakuty Tatars Tuvinians Buriats
Sources: Census 2002; National Composition for regions of the Russian Federation: http://www.perepis2002.ru/ct/doc/English/4-2.xls					

South Africa	9	2	Black African (79%)	Northern Cape Western Cape	Coloured Coloured
Sources: South African Census 2001 by Province and Population group: http://www.statssa.gov.za/extract.htm ; DHS Survey 1998					
Soviet Union	15	14	Russian (51%)	Armenian Republic Azerbaijan Re- public Belorussian Republic Estonian Republic Georgian Republic Kazakh Republic Kirgiz Republic Latvian Republic Lithuanian Republic Moldavian Republic Tadzhik Republic Turkmen Republic Ukrainian Republic Uzbek Republic	Armenians Azeris Belarusians Estonians Georgians Kazakhs Kyrkyz Latvians Lithuanians Moldavians Tajiks Turkmen Ukrainians Uzbeks
Sources: Library of Congress					
Switzerland	26	7	German (62% - 65%)	Fribourg Geneva Jura Neuchatel Tessin Valais Vaud	Romand (French) Romand (French) Romand (French) Romand (French) Ticinese (Italian) Romand (French) Romand (French)
Sources: Census 2000; http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/bevoelkerung/sprachen_religionen/blank/kennzahlen0/sprachen.html					
Former Yugoslavia (1991)	6	5	Serbs (36%, 1991)	Bosnia-Herzegovina Croatia Macedonia Montenegro Slovenia	Muslims (Bosniaks) Croats Macedonians Montenegrins Slovenes
Sources: (Woodward, 1995); Table 2: pp 32-35.					
Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (1992 - 2006)	2	1	Serbs	Montenegro	Montenegrins

Country information

Table 8: Argentina: National federation (1853-
Census 2001^a

Fearon Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b	white 0.85	Mestizo 0.15 indigenous 0.01	Jews 0.01 Jews 1.00 (wvs99: 0.70)
	N total of home	No of home with min. 1 pers. Indigenous	%
Ciudad de Buenos Aires	1'024'540	23'732	2.3
Buenos Aires	3'921'455	98'364	2.5
Catamarca	77'776	1'962	2.5
Chaco	238'182	8'640	3.6
Chubut	114'725	11'112	9.7
Cordoba	877'262	18'380	2.1
Corrientes	225'957	2'243	1.0
Entre Rios	316'715	4'643	1.5
Formosa	114'408	6'123	5.4
Jujuy	141'631	14'935	10.5
La Pampa	91'661	3'444	3.8
La Rioja	68'390	1'429	2.1
Mendoza	410'418	11'725	2.9
Misiones	235'004	3'488	1.5
Neuquen	128'351	11'041	8.6
Rio Negro	154'453	12'164	7.9
Salta	241'407	15'350	6.4
San Juan	148'902	2'198	1.5
San Luis	101'644	2'282	2.2
Santa Cruz	53'834	2'625	4.9
Santa Fe	872'295	16'195	1.9
Santiago del Estero	178'201	2'549	1.4
Tierra del Fuego, Antartida e Islas del Atlantico Sur	27'816	1'096	3.9
Tucuman	310'787	6'239	2.0
Total	10'075'814	281'959	2.8

^aInstituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos de la Republica Argentina; <http://www.indec.mecon.gov.ar/> Table: 14.1; Total of home with at least one Indigenous person

^bWhile there are four WVS carried out in Argentina (1984, 1991, 1995, and 1999), information on ethnic groups was only collected in 1999, and in that survey no information is available on the regions to which individuals belong.

Table 9: Australia National federation (1901-) Census 2001^a

	Caucasian 0.92	Asian 0.07	Aborigines 0.01	Others	Total
Fearon (2002)					
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b			1.4 (wvs95: 0.4)		
Group concentration	%	%	%	%	%
Units	n	n	n	n	n
1991					
Australian Capital Territory	91	3	1	5	100
New South Wales	254'071	9'101	1592	14'559	279'323
Northern Territory	87	5	1	7	100
Queensland	4'991'977	263'216	69999	406'840	5'732'032
South Australia	67	3	23	8	100
Tasmania	116'976	5'208	39893	13'811	175'888
Victoria	91	2	2	5	100
Western Australia	2'722'374	48'597	70102	136'737	2'977'810
Total	93	2	1	4	100
	1'308'401	26'623	16223	49'375	1'400'622
	95	1	2	3	100
	428'738	2'812	8882	12'405	452'837
	90	4	0	5	100
	3'834'717	160'288	16729	232'487	4'244'221
	90	3	3	4	100
	1'430'961	45'404	41769	68'691	1'586'825
Total	90	3	2	6	100
	15'088'792	561'252	265371	934'919	16'850'334
2001					
Australian Capital Territory	87	4	1	7	100
New South Wales	271'667	13'321	3576	23'383	311'947
Northern Territory	80	7	2	11	100
Queensland	5'114'075	448'751	119865	689'054	6'371'745
South Australia	60	2	24	13	100
Tasmania	126'756	5'256	50785	27'867	210'664
Victoria	87	3	3	8	100
Western Australia	3'169'141	91'812	112772	281'414	3'655'139
Total	90	2	2	6	100
	1'324'428	36'619	23425	82'789	1'467'261
	91	1	3	5	100
	413'587	2'881	15773	24'411	456'652
	85	6	1	8	100
	3'964'870	261'247	25078	393'755	4'644'950
	86	3	3	8	100
	1'587'044	62'964	58496	142'748	1'851'252
Total	84	5	2	9	100
	15'972'610	923'491	410003	1'666'246	18'972'350

^aAustralian Bureau of Statistics; <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/home/Previous%20Censuses:%20Census%20data>

^bThe WVS survey of 1995 also allows determining the ethnic makeup of the federal units and yields the same results for our measures.

Table 10: Austria: National federation (1920-) Statistics 2005 ^a

	Austrians	Former Yugoslavs	Turks	Croatians	
Fearon (2002) ^b	0.93	0.04	0.02	0.01	
	Austrians	Eu-14	EU-10	Not EU	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
	n	n	n	n	n
Burgenland	95.5	0.8	1.0	2.7	3.4
	265'693	2'159	2'886	7'477	278'215
Kaernten (Carinthia)	93.9	1.6	0.4	4.1	6.8
	525'543	9'224	2'286	22'838	559'891
Niederoesterreich	93.7	0.9	0.8	4.6	19.1
	1'470'451	14'514	12'936	71'695	1'569'596
Oberoesterreich	92.6	1.1	0.4	5.9	17.0
	1'293'405	15'387	5'748	81'688	1'396'228
Salzburg	87.7	2.9	0.5	8.9	6.4
	461'177	15'337	2'577	46'926	526'017
Steiermark (Styria)	94.5	1.0	0.5	0.4	14.6
	1'131'766	11'628	6'013	4'812	1'197'527
Tirol	90.0	0.4	0.4	6.0	8.4
	622'473	2'482	2'974	41'516	691'783
Vorarlberg	87.1	2.9	0.4	9.6	4.4
	314'323	10'416	1'522	34'566	360'827
Wien (Vienna)	82.0	2.1	0.2	14.0	19.8
	1'333'084	34'178	3'211	227'068	1'626'440
Total	90.4	1.7	0.8	7.1	100.0
	7'417'915	137'663	69'052	581'894	8'206'524

^aStatistik Austria: http://www.statistik.at/fachbereich_03/bevoelkerung_tab8.shtml

^bWhile there are two WVS carried out in Austria (1990 and 1997), no information on ethnic origins or language is available for the respondents. Similarly, there are no “minorities at risk.”

Table 11: Belgium: Multinational Federation (1993 -) (WVS 1999)

	Flemming	Walloon	Italians	Moroccans	Total
Fearon (2002) ^a	0.6	0.31	0.0	0.01	
	%	%	%	%	%
Units	n	n	n	n	n
Antwerpen	100	0			100
	242	0			242
Brabant Wallon	0	100			100
	0	46			46
Brussels* (Bruxelles)	2.4	97.6			100
	12	485			497
Flanders* ^b	>50%				
Hainaut	—	>50%			
Liege	0	100			100
	0	177			177
Limburg	100	0			100
	102	0			102
Luxembourg	0	100			100
	0	44			44
Namur	0	100			100
	0	61			61
Oost-Vlaanderen	100	0			100
	209	0			209
Vlaams-Brabant	100	0			100
	104	0			104
Wallonia*		>50%			
West-Vlaanderen	100	0			100
	164	0			164
Total	43.6	56.4			100
	833	1079			1912

^aThere are no “minorities at risk” in Belgium.

^bReported results for Flanders, Hainant and Wallonia are basic estimations of the dominant group.

Table 12: Brazil: National federation (1891 -) Census 2000 ³⁸

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) ³⁹ Group concentration	White			Mullato			Black			Afro-Brazilians 39.9 (wvs97: 19.8)			Asian			Indigenes			No Declaration			Total
	0.55			0.38			0.06			3			3			3			3			
	%	n	%	%	n	%	%	n	%	%	n	%	%	n	%	%	n	%	%	n		
Units																						
Acre		30.2	168'549	62.2	346'909	28'083	5.0	0.3	1'394	8'009	4'939	0.9	1.4	0.3	557'883	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
Alagoas		34.1	964'919	59.5	1'681'391	142'747	5.1	0.1	2'950	9'074	26'775	1.0	0.3	0.1	2'827'836	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	
Amapa		26.6	126'850	65.7	313'519	25'543	5.4	0.2	795	4'972	5'354	1.1	1.0	0.2	477'033	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
Amazonas		24.2	681'717	66.9	1'884'507	87'471	3.1	0.3	9'343	113'391	40'822	1.5	4.0	0.3	2'817'251	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	
Bahia		25.2	3'297'989	60.1	7'869'770	1'704'248	13.0	0.2	23'796	64'240	125'726	1.0	0.5	0.2	13'085'769	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	
Ceara		37.3	2'770'560	57.5	4'274'359	305'279	4.1	0.1	10'373	12'198	58'828	0.8	0.2	0.1	7'431'597	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	
Distrito Federal		49.2	1'008'199	44.8	918'305	98'462	4.8	0.4	7'996	7'154	11'029	0.5	0.4	0.4	2'051'145	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	
Espirito Santo		48.8	1'512'200	43.7	1'354'142	200'192	6.5	0.1	3'056	12'746	15'161	0.5	0.4	0.5	3'097'497	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	
Goiás		50.7	2'538'412	43.5	2'176'260	226'963	4.5	0.2	12'052	14'110	36'399	0.7	0.3	0.7	5'004'196	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	
Maranhao		26.7	1'512'324	62.3	3'523'999	542'834	9.6	0.1	7'565	27'571	43'260	0.8	0.5	0.8	5'657'553	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	
Mato Grosso		44.1	1'104'962	47.9	1'200'602	141'305	5.6	0.4	9'984	29'196	19'196	0.8	1.2	0.8	2'505'245	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	
Mato Grosso do Sul		54.7	1'135'811	38.0	788'797	71'139	3.4	0.3	16'263	53'900	12'162	0.6	2.6	0.6	2'078'072	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	
Minas Gerais		53.6	9'594'370	37.6	6'737'420	1'397'199	7.8	0.2	28'563	48'720	98'862	0.6	0.3	0.6	17'905'134	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	
Para		26.1	1'617'015	66.4	4'115'414	340'901	5.5	0.2	11'574	37'681	73'380	1.2	0.6	1.2	6'195'965	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Paraiba		42.6	1'467'260	52.3	1'801'161	136'577	4.0	0.1	2'439	10'088	27'269	0.8	0.3	0.8	3'444'794	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
Parana		77.2	7'387'842	18.3	1'745'610	271'871	2.8	0.9	88'452	31'488	39'380	0.4	0.3	0.4	9'564'643	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	
Pernambuco		40.8	3'238'329	52.9	4'194'790	391'160	4.9	0.1	9'562	34'669	60'644	0.8	0.4	0.8	7'929'154	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	
Piaui		26.5	752'760	64.6	1'836'589	220'371	7.8	0.2	5'272	2'664	25'771	0.9	0.1	0.9	2'843'427	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	
Rio de Janeiro		54.7	7'871'002	33.5	4'819'488	1'528'262	10.6	0.2	26'524	35'934	110'896	0.8	0.3	0.8	14'392'106	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	
Rio Grande do Norte		42.2	1'171'699	52.4	1'454'665	126'441	4.6	0.1	2'374	3'168	19'161	0.7	0.1	0.7	2'777'508	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	
Rio Grande do Sul		86.6	8'817'727	7.5	762'365	527'144	5.2	0.1	9'656	38'718	32'232	0.3	0.4	0.3	10'187'842	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	
Rondonia		42.6	588'568	42.6	698'309	63'452	4.6	0.2	3'094	10'683	16'846	1.2	0.8	1.2	1'380'952	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	
Roraima		24.8	80'387	61.6	199'661	13'725	4.2	0.1	455	28'128	2'041	0.6	8.7	0.6	324'397	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Santa Catarina		89.3	4'786'293	7.0	376'766	142'207	2.7	0.1	6'130	14'542	31'925	0.6	0.3	0.6	5'357'863	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	
Sao Paulo		70.7	26'185'687	22.8	8'456'718	1'627'267	4.4	1.2	456'420	63'789	245'576	0.7	0.2	0.7	37'035'457	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	
Sergipe		31.5	562'858	60.8	1'085'409	111'461	6.2	0.2	2'909	6'717	15'475	0.9	0.4	0.9	1'784'829	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	
Tocantins		30.6	353'754	60.6	701'167	82'032	7.1	0.2	2'592	10'581	7'564	0.7	0.9	0.7	1'157'690	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	
hline Total		53.7	91'298'042	38.5	65'318'092	10'554'336	6.2	0.5	761'583	734'127	1'206'675	0.7	0.4	0.7	169'872'855	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 13: Bosnia: Multinational Federations(1995 -) ^a

	Muslims	Bosniaks (SERBS)	Croats	other	Total	
Fearon (2002)	0.44	0.31	0.17			
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b	38.0 (wvs01:40.4)	40.0 (wvs01: 43.7)	22.0 (wvs01: 15.5)			
Group concentration	1	2	3			
Units	%	%	%	%	%	n
Brcko district (Brcko Distrikt)*	40	40	20		2	87000
Federacija Bosna i Hercegovina	80	14	4		63	2'500'000
Republika Srpska	10	88	1		35	1'411'000
Total	48	37	14		100	4'000'000

^aEstimations found on CIA Factbook and Wikipedia

^bBoth the WVS of 1995 and of 2001 also allow for estimating the ethnic make-up of the federal units and yield similar results.

Table 14: Burma: Multinational Federations(1948 -) Last census in 1983 ^a

Fearon (2002) Group concentration	Burman 0.68	Shan 0.09 3	Karens 0.07 3	Arakanese 0.04 2	Chinese 0.03	Zomis (chins) 0.02 3	Indian 0.02	Mons 0.02 3	Kachins 0.01 3	Hill Tribals 1
divisions: Ayeyarwady	>50			small minority						
Bago	present	present		present				present		
Magway	>95	present	present	present		present		present		
Mandalay	>50	present		present		present				
Sagaing	>50	present						present		
Tanintharyi	present	present	present	present		present				
Yangon	>50	present			present		present			
states: Chin State									>50	
Kachin State	18	17						>50		
Kayah State			>50							>50
Kayin State										
Mon State	present					>50				
Rakhine				>50						
Shan State	present	>50						present		

^aResults of Census reported on various web pages

Table 15: Canada: Multinational Federations (1867 -) ^a

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b Group concentration	English 0.59		French 0.23 q:19.7 (wvs00: 22.0) F:3.8 (wvs00: 2.3) 3 / 0		Rom. lang.		Chinese 0.03		South Asian 0.02		Slavic		Germanic		Indigenous 0.03 2.9 (wvs00: 1.1)		Other lang.		Multiple lang.		Black 0.02		Total
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n			
Alberta	80.9	2'379'515	2.0	1.5	2.7	78'470	1.7	50'645	2.7	78'580	3.6	106'815	0.8	23'525	3.0	88'390	1.1	33'770	1.1	33'770	1.1	33'770	2'941'150
British Columbia	73.0	2'825'780	1.4	2.0	8.0	308'635	4.7	182'565	1.9	75'210	3.3	128'445	0.3	10'455	4.1	158'755	1.3	48'750	1.3	48'750	1.3	48'750	3'868'865
Manitoba	74.6	823'910	4.0	1.6	4.0	9'235	0.8	9'210	3.9	43'555	6.5	71'610	3.0	33'415	3.1	34'385	1.5	16'290	1.5	16'290	1.5	16'290	1'103'700
New Brunswick	64.6	32.9	32.9	0.2	0.2	1'210	0.2	780	0.1	660	0.4	2'795	0.4	3'010	0.3	2'230	0.3	5'940	0.3	5'940	0.3	5'940	2.4
Newfoundland and Labrador	98.4	499'750	0.4	0.1	0.1	520	0.1	595	0.1	440	0.1	645	0.4	2'065	0.2	945	0.1	650	0.1	650	0.1	650	719'700
Northwest Territories	77.2	28'645	2.6	0.4	0.4	77.2	0.4	90	0.2	245	0.9	335	14.4	5'345	2.0	730	1.2	440	1.2	440	1.2	440	508'080
Nova Scotia	92.8	832'660	3.8	0.2	0.2	2'125	0.2	1'660	0.3	2'355	0.6	5'640	0.5	4'045	1.0	8'670	0.5	4'375	0.5	4'375	0.5	4'375	37'085
Nunavut	26.0	6'940	1.5	0.2	0.1	20	0.1	15	0.1	35	0.2	45	69.8	18'620	0.4	95	1.7	460	1.7	460	1.7	460	897'570
Ontario	70.6	7'965'225	4.3	5.3	3.6	406'015	3.8	428'130	3.5	389'820	2.2	251'015	0.2	20'185	5.2	582'125	1.4	162'610	1.4	162'610	1.4	162'610	26'665
Prince Edward Island	93.8	125'125	4.2	0.1	0.1	140	0.1	80	0.1	200	0.6	775	0.2	225	0.4	495	0.4	535	0.4	535	0.4	535	11'285'560
Quebec	7.8	557'040	80.9	3.4	0.6	43'885	0.6	55'910	0.7	49'650	0.5	32'550	0.5	35'560	3.5	250'815	1.4	97'345	1.4	97'345	1.4	97'345	133'380
Saskatchewan	84.9	817'955	1.8	0.4	0.6	6'070	0.3	2'570	2.7	26'185	3.9	37'305	3.2	30'465	1.2	11'115	1.0	9'650	1.0	9'650	1.0	9'650	7'125'590
Yukon Territory	86.2	24'590	3.1	0.4	0.6	175	0.6	155	0.5	175	3.1	885	2.7	760	1.5	425	1.2	335	1.2	335	1.2	335	963'150
Total	58.5	17'352'305	22.6	3.3	2.9	856'660	2.5	732'405	2.3	667'110	2.2	638'860	0.6	187'675	3.8	1'139'175	1.3	381'150	1.3	381'150	1.3	381'150	28'515
						6'703'320		980'335		732'405		667'110		187'675		1'139'175		381'150		381'150		381'150	29'639'010

^aOttawa: Statistics Canada - Language Composition of Canada Cat. No. 97F0007XCB2001001

^bThe WVS survey of 2000 also allows to determine the ethnic composition of the Canadian provinces and yields similar results.

Table 16: Cameroon: Multinational Federation (1961 - 1972) DHS Survey 2004 ^a

	Bamilike-Central 0.13	Beti 0.18	Mboum	Peulh	Bassa-Bakoko 0.08	Mafa	Bamoun 0.02	Boulou-Fang	Ring	Ngemba	Ngoe-Oroko	Momo	Meka
Fearon (2002) Group concentration ^b Units n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
Adamaoua	5.2	2.8	9.0	33.2	0.9	0.2	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.7
	22	12	38	140	4	1	1	5	0	1	0	0	7
Centre + Yaounde	18.2	41.7	1.2	1.7	9.7	0.7	1.9	4.4	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.3	1.3
	351	805	23	32	187	13	36	85	25	24	20	6	25
Littoral + Douala	51.7	3.8	1.0	1.0	16.7	0.1	2.2	1.0	0.5	2.4	3.6	0.3	0.7
	865	64	16	16	279	2	37	16	9	40	60	5	12
Est	8.3	6.9	1.0	5.1	1.0	0.4	0.2	1.6	0.0	0.2	1.2	0.2	24.9
	42	35	5	26	5	2	1	8	0	1	6	1	126
Extreme Nord	0.4	0.0	22.9	15.0	0.3	17.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.1
	7	0	394	257	5	297	0	3	0	2	0	5	2
Nord	1.0	0.0	22.1	10.1	0.1	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
	10	0	214	98	1	102	0	0	1	0	0	8	0
Nord Ouest	4.2	0.1	0.0	2.0	0.3	0.1	3.8	0.0	22.8	17.8	0.8	10.4	0.0
	46	1	0	22	3	1	41	0	249	194	9	114	0
Ouest	67.3	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.0	23.6	0.3	1.7	1.0	0.4	0.1	0.1
	766	11	2	2	7	0	268	3	19	11	5	1	1
Sud	6.6	15.2	0.2	0.7	3.6	0.2	1.4	58.5	0.5	1.8	0.0	0.2	3.6
	29	67	1	3	16	1	6	258	2	8	0	1	16
Sud Ouest	13.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.1	7.0	6.2	29.7	9.1	0.0
	99	5	0	0	7	0	5	1	53	47	225	69	0
Total	21.0	9.4	6.5	5.6	4.8	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.1	2.0	1.8
	2237	1000	693	596	514	419	395	379	358	328	325	210	189

^aOnly groups that represent at least 1% nationwide and 10% in at least one unit are represented.^bMAR cites in addition Westerners with group concentration 3.

Table 17: Cameroon *Continued*

Feaon (2002) Group concentration	Gbaya	Wimbum-Yamba	Guidar	Fali	Other	Kirdi	Northwest	Fulani	Southwest	Eastern Nigritic	Total	pop.
Units ^a	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	0.15 3	0.12	0.09	0.08		n %	
Adamaoua	21.3 90	2.4 10	0.5 2	0.2 1	20.9 88						100.0 422	495'185
Centre + Yaounde	0.1 1	0.3 5	0.0 0	0.0 0	15.1 291						100.0 1929	1'651'600
Littoral + Douala	0.1 2	0.5 8	0.0 0	0.0 0	14.4 241						100.0 1672	1'352'833
Est.	15.4 78	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	33.7 171						100.0 507	517'198
Extreme Nord	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.3 5	1.0 17	42.1 723						100.0 1717	1'855'695
Nord	0.1 1	0.0 0	14.0 136	10.9 106	30.2 293						100.0 970	832'165
Nord Ouest	0.0 0	11.7 128	0.0 0	0.0 0	25.9 283						100.0 1091	1'237'348
Ouest	0.0 0	0.4 4	0.0 0	0.0 0	3.3 38						100.0 1138	1'339'791
Sud	0.7 3	0.7 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	6.1 27						100.0 441	373'798
Sud Ouest	0.0 0	1.2 9	0.0 0	0.0 0	31.4 238						100.0 758	838'042
Total	1.6 175	1.6 167	1.3 143	1.2 124	22.5 2393						100.0 10645	10'493'655

^aThe information for the federal units as well as the population sizes (1987) comes from <http://www.statoids.com/ucm.html>.

Table 18: Czechoslovakia: Multinational Federation (1968 - 1992)

	Czech		Slovak		Hungarians		Roma	
Fearon (2002)	0.63		0.31		0.04		0.03	
Group concentration ^a			3		0			
Units ^b	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Czech Republic	Majority							
Slovak Republic			Majority					

^aThese group concentration indices come from the Czech Republic (Slovaks, Roma) and Slovakia (Hungarians, Roma).

^bWhile there were separate WVS carried out in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, none contained information on the language. However, it would be possible to get information on the proportion of Gypsies.

Table 19: Ethiopia: Multinational Federation (1992 -)

Fearon (2002) Group concentration ^a	Oromo		Amhara		Tigray		Guragie		Sidama		Welatta, (Sado)		Somalie		Affar		Gambela		Beni-Shangul-Gumuz		Other groups		Total		pop.
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Units																									
Tigray	0.1		1.3		97.8		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.1		0.1		0.03		0.6		100		3'593'000
Afar	1		13		947		0		0		0		0		1		6				6		968		1'188'000
	7.9		24.9		0.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		62.7		4.0				4.0		100		
Amhara	14		44		1		0		0		0		0		111		7				7		177		
	3.7		90.2		0.3		0.1		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.1		5.6				5.6		100		15'850'000
	142		3'444		12		2		0		0		0		5		213				213		3'818		
Oromia	81.2		13.2		0.3		1.8		0.6		0.5		0.6		0.0		1.8				1.8		100		21'694'000
	4'821		781		15		109		36		31		36		0		106				106		5'935		
Somali	13.3		5.8		0.0		0.6		0.0		0.0		79.8		0.0		0.6				0.6		100		3'602'000
	23		10		0		1		0		0		138		0		1				1		173		
Benshangul-Gumuz	25.8		28.3		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		45.9				45.9		100		523'000
	41		45		0		0		0		0		0		0		73				73		159		
South. Nations, Nat and Peoples (SNNP)	1.7		4.7		0.1		18.4		16.9		9.3		0.0		0.0		48.8				48.8		100		12'132'000
	55		154		4		605		556		307		0		0		1'603				1'603		3'284		
Gambela people	10.3		17.9		2.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		69.2				69.2		100		206'000
	4		7		1		0		0		0		0		0		39				39		100		
Harari people	60.0		30.0		0.0		2.5		0.0		0.0		2.5		0.0		5.0				5.0		100		154'000
	24		12		0		1		0		0		1		0		2				2		40		
Addis Ababa	23.0		50.4		7.2		16.1		0.0		0.1		0.0		0.0		3.2				3.2		100		2'424'000
	157		344		49		110		0		1		0		0		683				683		100		
Dire Dawa	41.8		39.2		1.3		7.6		0.0		0.0		7.6		0.0		2.5				2.5		100		306'000
	33		31		1		6		0		0		6		0		2				2		79		
Total	34.6		31.8		6.7		5.4		3.9		2.2		1.2		0.8		13.4				13.4		100		61'672'000
	5'315		4'885		1'030		834		592		339		181		117		2'062				2'062		15'355		

^aMAR adds in addition Eritreans (3), Nilo-Saharan (3) and Somals (3).

Table 20: Germany: National federation (1949 -) Statistics 2004 ^a

	German 1.0	Foreigners	Turks 0.02 2.4 (wvs99: 2.1)	Yugoslavs	European - South 0.01	Other	Total
Units	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Baden-Wuerttemberg	88.0	12.0					13.0
Bayern	9'435'702	1'281'717					10'717'419
Berlin	90.6	9.4					15.1
Brandenburg	11'268'695	1'175'198					12'443'893
Bremen	86.6	13.4					4.1
Hamburg	2'933'283	454'545					3'387'828
Hessen	97.4	2.6					3.1
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	2'500'482	67'222					2'567'704
Niedersachsen	87.2	12.8					0.8
Nordrhein-Westfalen	654'752	8'461					663'213
Rheinland-Pfalz	85.9	14.1					2.1
Saarland	1'490'429	244'401					1'734'830
Sachsen	88.6	11.4					7.4
Sachsen-Anhalt	5'403'072	694'693					6'097'765
Schleswig-Holstein	97.7	2.3					2.1
Thuringen	1'680'236	39'417					1'719'653
Total	93.3	6.7					9.7
	7'464'516	536'393					8'000'909
	89.2	10.8					21.9
	16'130'796	1'944'556					18'075'352
	92.3	7.7					4.9
	3'749'549	311'556					4'061'105
	91.6	8.4					1.3
	967'492	88'925					1'056'417
	97.2	2.8					5.2
	4'284'436	11'848					4'296'284
	98.1	1.9					3.0
	2'447'314	47'123					2'494'437
	94.7	5.3					3.4
	2'677'474	151'286					2'828'760
	98.0	2.0					2.9
	2'307'463	47'817					2'355'280
	91.2	8.8					100
	75'212'910	7'287'939					82'500'849

^aEstimations 2004 http://www.statistik-portal.de/Statistik-Portal/de_jb01_jahrtab2.asp

Table 21: India: Multinational Federation (1950 -) Census 1991 and 2001 ^a

Units	Hindi	Bengali	Telugu	Marathi	Tamil	Gujarati	Kannada	Malayalam	Oriya
0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Group concentration ^b	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	17.6 49'469	23.1 64'706			19.1 53'536				
Andhra Pradesh	2.8 1'841'290		84.8 56'375'755						
Arunachal Pradesh		8.2 70'771							
Assam		11.3 2'523'040							
Bihar	80.9 69'845'979								
Chandigarh	61.1 392'054				0.8 5'318				
Chhattisgarh									
Dadra and Nagar Haveli						21.9 30'346			
Daman and Diu	3.6 3'645			1.2 1'256		91.1 92'579			
Delhi	81.6 7'690'631								
Goa				33.4 390'270			4.6 54'323		
Gujarat	2.9 1'215'825					91.5 37'792'933			
Haryana	91 14'982'409								
Himachal Pradesh	88.9 4'595'615								
Jammu and Kashmir									
Jharkhand									
Karnataka			7.4 3'325'062				66.2 29'785'004		
Kerala					2.1 616'010		0.3 75'571	96.6 28'096'376	
Lakshadweep	0.4 217				0.5 282			84.5 43'678	
Madhya Pradesh	85.6 56'619'090								
Maharashtra	7.8 6'168'941			73.3 57'894'839					
Manipur									
Meghalaya		8.1 144'261							
Mizoram		8.6 59'092							
Nagaland									
Orissa	2.4 759'016		1.6 502'102						82.8 26'199'346
Pondicherry			4.3 34'799		89.2 720'473			4.8 38'392	
Punjab	7.3 1'478'993								
Rajasthan	89.6 39'410'968								
Sikkim									
Tamil Nadu			7.1 3'975'561		86.7 48'434'744		2.2 1'208'296		
Tripura	1.7 45'803	68.9 1'899'162							
Uttar Pradesh	90.1 125'348'492								
Uttaranchal									
West Bengal	6.6 4'479'170	86 58'541'519							
Total	40 337'272'114	8 69'595'738	7.9 66'017'615						

^aMain languages 1991 or religion 2001 in each State;
<http://www.censusindia.net/cendat/datatable26.html>; http://www.censusindia.net/religiondata/Religiondata_2001.x
The religion data have been used for the Sikhs, Muslims and Christians. The groups are not exclusive.

^bMAR adds Nagas 0.3 (3), Santals 0.7 (1), Scheduled Tribes 7.5 (wvs01:5.0) (2)

Table 22: India: Multinational Federation (1950 -) *Continued*

	Punjabi	Sikhs	Assamese	Urdu	Nepali	Kashmiri	Muslims	E N
Fearon (2002)	0.0	0.0	0.02					
Elkins and Sides (2006)		2.0 (wvs01:1.4)	1.5 (wvs01:0.5)		11.4 (wvs01:12.4)	0.6 (wvs01:0.2)	11.4 (wvs01:12.4)	
Group concentration	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n		0 n %	
Andaman and Nicobar Islands		0.4 1'587					8.2 29'265	
Andhra Pradesh		0.0 30'998		8.4 5'560'154			9.2 6'986'856	
Arunachal Pradesh		0.2 1'865			9.4 81'176		1.9 20'675	
Assam		0.1 22'519	57.8 12'958'088				30.9 8'240'611	
Bihar		0.0 20'780		9.9 8'542'563			16.5 13'722'048	
Chandigarh	34.7 222'890	16.1 145'175					3.9 35'548	
Chhattisgarh		0.3 69'621					2.0 409'615	
Dadra and Nagar Haveli		0.1 123					3.0 6'524	7
Daman and Diu		0.1 145					7.8 12'281	
Delhi	7.9 748'145	4.0 555'602		5.4 512'990			11.7 1'623'520	
Goa		0.1 970					6.8 92'210	
Gujarat		0.1 45'587					9.1 4'592'854	
Haryana	7.1 1'170'225	5.5 1'170'662		1.6 261'820			5.8 1'222'916	
Himachal Pradesh	6.3 324'479	1.2 72'355					2.0 119'512	
Jammu and Kashmir		2.0 207'154					67.0 6'793'240	
Jharkhand		0.3 83'358					13.8 3'731'308	
Karnataka		0.0 15'326		10 4'480'038			12.2 6'463'127	
Kerala		0.0 2'762					24.7 7'863'842	
Lakshadweep		0.0 6					95.5 57'903	
Madhya Pradesh		0.2 150'772					6.4 3'841'449	2'
Maharashtra		0.2 215'337		7.3 5'734'468			10.6 10'270'485	
Manipur		0.1 1'653					8.8 190'939	
Meghalaya		0.1 3'110					4.3 99'169	
Mizoram		0.0 326					1.1 10'099	
Nagaland		0.1 1'152					1.8 35'005	
Orissa		0.0 17'492					2.1 761'985	
Pondicherry		0.0 108					6.1 59'358	
Punjab	92.2 18'704'461	59.9 14'592'387		0.1 13'416			1.6 382'045	
Rajasthan		1.4 818'420		2.2 953'497			8.5 4'788'227	2'
Sikkim		0.2 1'176			63.1 256'418		1.4 7'693	
Tamil Nadu		0.0 9'545					5.6 3'470'647	
Tripura	0.5 661'215	0.0 1'182					8.0 254'442	
Uttar Pradesh		2.5 212'025		9 12'492'927			11.9 1'012'141	
Uttaranchal		0.4 678'059					18.5 30'740'158	
West Bengal		0.1 66'391		2.1 1'455'649			25.2 20'240'543	
Total		1.9 19'215'730					13.4 138'188'240	

Table 23: India: Multinational Federation (1950 -) *Continued*

	Bodo/ Boro 0.5	Khasi	Konkani	Lushai/ Mizo 0.1	Manipuri	Nissi/ Daffla	Punjabi	Tripuri 0.1	Christians	Total
Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration	2 %	%	%	3 %	%	%	%	3 %	n %	%
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Andaman and Nicobar Islands									21.7	0.0
Andhra Pradesh									77'178	280'661
Arunachal Pradesh						19.9			1.6	7.9
Assam	5.3					172'149			1'181'917	66'508'008
Bihar	1'184'569								18.7	0.1
Chandigarh							34.7		205'548	864'558
Chhattisgarh							222'890		3.7	2.6
Dadra and Nagar Haveli			12.3						986'589	22'414'322
Daman and Diu			17'062						0.1	10.2
Delhi									53'137	86'374'465
Goa			51.5						0.8	0.1
Gujarat			602'626						7'627	642'015
Haryana							7.9		1.9	
Himachal Pradesh							748'145		401'035	
Jammu and Kashmir									2.7	0.0
Jharkhand									6'058	138'477
Karnataka									2.1	0.0
Kerala									3'362	101'586
Lakshadweep									0.9	1.1
Madhya Pradesh									130'319	9'420'644
Maharashtra									26.7	0.1
Manipur					60.4				359'568	1'169'793
Meghalaya		49.5							0.6	4.9
Mizoram		879'192		75.1					284'092	41'309'582
Nagaland				518'099					0.1	1.9
Orissa									27'185	16'463'648
Pondicherry									6.3	0.6
Punjab									7'687	5'170'877
Rajasthan									0.2	0.9
Sikkim									20'299	7'718'700
Tamil Nadu									4.1	
Tripura									1'093'382	5.3
Uttar Pradesh									1.9	44'977'201
Uttaranchal									19.0	3.4
West Bengal									6'057'427	29098518
Total									0.8	0.0
									509	51'707
									0.3	7.8
									170'381	66'181'170
									1.1	9.3
									1'058'313	78'937'187
									34.0	0.2
									737'578	1'837'149
									70.3	0.2
									1'628'986	1'774'778
									87.0	0.1
									772'809	689'756
									90.0	0.1
									1'790'349	1'209'546
									2.4	3.7
									897'861	31'659'736
									6.9	0.1
									67'688	807'785
							92.2		1.2	2.4
							18'704'461		292'800	20'281'969
									0.1	5.2
									72'660	44'005'990
									6.7	0.0
									36'115	406'457
									6.1	6.6
									3'785'060	55'858'946
							0.5	23.5	3.2	0.3
							661'215	647'847	102'489	2'757'205
									0.3	16.4
									27'116	139'112'287
									0.1	
									212'578	
									0.6	8.0
									515'150	68'077'965
									2.3	100
									24'080'016	846'302'688

Table 24: Malaya: Multinational Federation (1957 - 1963) ^a

Units	Malay % (n)	Chinese % (n)	Indians % (n)
Federated Malay States:			
Perak			
Selangor			
Pahang			
Negeri Sembilan			
Unfederated Malay States:			
Perlis			
Kedah			
Kelantan			
Terengganu			
Johore			
British Settlements:			
Penang			
Malacca			

^aIn 1963 Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak became member of the new Federation of Malaysia. Singapore is expelled in 1965.

Table 25: Malaysia: Multinational Federations (1963 -) Census 2000 ^a

Fearon	Malays	Chinese	(east) indians	Ibans	Kadazan-Dusun	Bajau	Murut	dayaks
Fearon (2002)	0.58	0.25	0.07		0.03			0.03
University of Tokyo Institute of Oriental Culture (2003)	0.58	0.25	0.07		0.03			0.03
Group concentration	735	47	12					6
Units ^b	0	0	1		3			3
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	n
Johor ^c	55	36	7					2'565'70
Kedah ^d	85	16	8					1'572'10
Kelantan ^e	95							1'289'19
Kuala Lumpur ^{*f}								1'297'52
Labuan ^{*g}	>50	present	present					70'517
Melaka ^h	50	40						602'867
Negeri Sembilan ⁱ	46	36	15					830'080
Pahang ^j	75	19	6					1'231'17
Perak ^k	45	41	14					2'030'38
Perlis ^l	78	17	2					198'335
Pulau Pinang ^m	41	43	10					1'225'50
Putrajaya ^{*n}								
Sabah ^o	15	20			25	17	3	2'449'38
Sarawak ^p	23	27		30				2'012'61
Selangor ^q	44	35	18					3'947'52
Terengganu ^s	94	5	1					879'691
Singapore ^t		77						
Total ^u	65	26	8					22'202'6

^ahttp://www.statistics.gov.my/english/frameset_census.php?file=pressdemo and Wikipedia

^bThe information for the federal units as well as the population sizes (2000) comes from <http://www.statoids.com/umy.html>.

^c<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Johore>

^d<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kedah>

^e<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kelantan>

^fIn 1 February 1972 Kuala Lumpur seceded from Selangor and the city became a Federal Territory (Wilayah Persekutuan).

^gin 1984, Labuan was transferred from Sabah to the central government and made a Federal Territory. In 1990, it was declared an International Offshore Financial Centre and Free Trade Zone.

^h<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Melaka>

ⁱhttp://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negeri_Sembilan

^j<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pahang>

^k<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perak>

^l<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perlis>

^m<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Penang>

ⁿPutrajaya was founded on October 19, 1995. It is the new administrative centre of Malaysia

^o<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sabah>

^p<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sarawak>

^q<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Selangor>

^rn include Putrajaya

^s<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terengganu>

^tSingapore was member of the Federation of Malaysia only 2 years (1963 - 1965)

^uWithout Singapore. http://www.statistics.gov.my/english/frameset_census.php?file=pressdemo

Table 26: Mali: Multinational Federation (1960 - 1960) DHS Survey 1999

Fearon (2002) Group concentration DHS Groups Units ^a	Mande 0.43 3		Peul Fulani 0.15	Senufo 0.15	Sarakole-Soninke 0.08	Songhai 0.06	Tuareg 0.06 3
	Bambara	Malinke	Peulh	Senoufo /	Sarakole / Soninke /	Sonrai	Tamacheck
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Bamako	33.7 685	13.2 268	15.8 322	7 142	13 265	5.3 107	1.3 26
Gao	1.3 3	0 0	3.5 8	0 0	0.9 2	84.7 194	6.1 14
Kayes	11.2 190	29 492	20.4 347	0.3 5	35.7 606	0.2 3	2.4 40
Kidal	5 1	0 0	5 1	0 0	0 0	10 2	80 16
Koulikoro	59.4 1213	12.2 249	7.4 152	1 21	13.5 276	1.1 22	2.8 57
Mopti	8.9 157	2.7 48	24.6 432	0.3 5	7.2 126	6.6 116	1.2 21
Segou	47.2 968	2.3 47	9.8 201	11.3 232	10.8 221	2.3 48	1.6 33
Sikasso	40.7 969	2.9 68	11.7 279	27.6 657	3.5 83	1.1 27	0.3 6
Tombouctou	13.9 58	0.7 3	12.9 54	0.2 1	1 4	58.5 244	10.3 43
Total	33.6 4'244	9.3 1'175	14.2 1'796	8.4 1'063	12.5 1'583	6 763	2 256

^aInformation on units and population sizes come from <http://www.statoids.com/uml.html>

Table 27: Mali: Multinational Federation (1960 - 1960) *Continued*

Fearon (2002) Group concentration DHS Groups Units	Dogon 0.04	Bozo 0.01	Moor 0.01	Xaasongaxango 0.01	Other	Total	pop.
	Dogon	Bobo					
	% n	% n			% n	% n	
Bamako	5.7 115	2.3 46			2.8 57	100 2'033	646'153
Gao	1.3 3	0.4 1			1.7 4	100 229	383'734
Kayes	0.1 2	0.1 1			0.6 11	100 1'697	1'058'575
Kidal	0 0	0 0			0 0	100 20	
Koulikoro	0.9 18	1.2 25			0.5 10	100 2'043	1'180'260
Mopti	40.1 705	0.6 11			7.8 137	100 1'758	1'261'383
Sikasso	1 25	9.9 237			1.3 31	100 2'382	1'308'828
Segou	3.4 70	8.1 166			3.2 65	100 2'051	1'328'250
Tombouctou	0 0	0 0			2.4 10	100 417	453'032
Total	7.4 938	3.9 487			2.6 325	100 12'630	7'620'215

Table 28: Mexico: National federation (1917 -) Census 2000^a

	Amerindian	Mayans
	Indigenous	Indigenous
Fearon (2002)	.30	.01
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b	indigenous 10.8 (wvs00: 1.9) (Basanez, Lawson, Camp, Cornelius, Dominguez, Estevez, Klesner, Magaloni, McCann, Moreno, P)	0
Group concentration	%	%
Units	n	n
Aguascalientes		0.1
Baja California		1'244
Baja California Sur		1.5
Campeche		37'685
Coahuila de Zaragoza		1.3
Colima		5'353
Chiapas		13.6
Chihuahua		93'765
Distrito Federal		0.1
Durango		3'032
Guanajuato		0.5
Guerrero		2'932
Hidalgo		20.6
Jalisco		809'592
Mxico		2.8
Michoacan de Ocampo		84'086
Morelos		1.6
Nayarit		141'710
Nuevo Leon		1.7
Oaxaca		24'934
Puebla		0.2
Queretaro Arteaga		10'689
Quintana Roo		11.9
San Luis Potos		367'110
Sinaloa		15.2
Sonora		339'866
Tabasco		0.6
Tamaulipas		39'259
Tlaxcala		2.8
Veracruz-Llave		361'972
Yucatan		3.1
Zacatecas		121'849
Total	6.2	2.0
	6'044'547	30'896
		4.0
		37'206
		0.4
		15'446
		32.6
		1'120'312
		11.1
		565'509
		1.8
		25'269
		19.8
		173'592
		10.2
		235'253
		2.0
		49'744
		2.5
		55'694
		3.3
		62'027
		0.6
		17'118
		2.8
		26'662
		9.2
		633'372
		33.1
		549'532
		0.1
		1'837

^aInstituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e informática. Percentage of the population speaking an indigenous language; <http://www.inegi.gob.mx/est/contenidos/espanol/rutinas/ept.asp?t=mlen02&c=3327>

^bWhile there are three WVS carried out in Mexico (1990, 1996, and 2000), the information on residency only covered 4 regions, which fail to correspond to any of the 31 + 1 federal units.

^cThis survey has blanco (16.3) moreno claro (45.5) moreno oscuro (38.3). (variable d3, x3 is estados).

Table 29: Nigeria: Multinational Federation (1960 -) DHS Survey 1999

	Hausa-Fulani	Yoruba	Ibo	Ibibio - Efik - Ijaw	Kanuri	
Fearon (2002)	0.29	0.2	0.17	0.08	0.05	
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^a	29.0	20.0 (wvs00:25.5)	17.0 (wvs00:21.0)	3.6		
Group concentration		3	2	3		
	Hausa and Fulani	Yoruba	Igbo	Ibibio	Ijaw	Kanuri
Units	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Akwa Ibom	0.0 0	0.1 1	1.8 13	61.2 438	0.0 0	0.0 0
Anambra	1.0 3	0.0 0	98.7 309	0.3 1	0.0 0	0.0 0
Bauchi	46.9 128	1.1 3	1.8 5	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Edo	0.0 0	2.1 7	3.1 10	0.0 0	1.5 5	0.0 0
Benue	0.5 2	0.5 2	9.3 34	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Borno	11.8 21	0.0 0	0.6 1	0.0 0	0.0 0	15.7 28
Cross River	0.0 0	0.0 0	2.4 3	8.7 11	0.0 0	0.0 0
Adamawa	17.9 36	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Imo	0.0 0	0.5 1	99.1 216	0.5 1	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kaduna	50.9 144	2.5 7	4.2 12	0.7 2	0.0 0	1.1 3
Kano	92.2 506	1.3 7	0.5 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.4 2
Katsina	97.3 354	0.8 3	0.5 2	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.3 1
Kwara	0.0 0	86.0 208	0.4 1	0.4 1	0.0 0	0.0 0
Lagos	2.0 10	66.4 336	19.0 96	0.4 2	0.0 0	0.0 0
Niger	9.6 28	7.8 23	7.8 23	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Ogun	0.3 1	79.3 249	3.8 12	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Ondo	0.0 0	89.6 163	4.9 9	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Oyo	0.7 3	94.7 410	0.7 3	0.5 2	0.0 0	0.0 0
Plateau	13.4 32	2.1 5	2.9 7	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Rivers	0.0 0	0.9 2	34.0 72	2.4 5	15.6 33	0.0 0
Sokoto	100.0 175	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Abia	0.0 0	0.0 0	99.2 237	0.0 0	0.4 1	0.0 0
Delta	0.0 0	2.0 6	36.9 113	1.6 5	15.4 47	0.0 0
Enugu	0.0 0	0.0 0	99.4 164	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Jigawa	88.7 180	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	4.4 9
Kebbi	77.7 157	1.5 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kogi	0.2 1	32.9 156	2.1 10	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Osun	0.4 1	97.3 249	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Taraba	12.4 24	1.5 3	9.3 18	0.0 0	0.0 0	3.6 7
Yobe	29.8 75	0.4 1	1.2 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	5.2 13
Bayelsa	0.0 0	0.0 0	4.8 3	0.0 0	88.7 55	0.0 0
Ebonyi	0.0 0	0.0 0	100.0 171	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Ekiti	0.0 0	79.1 87	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Gombe	43.4 49	0.0 0	2.7 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Nassarawa	29.1 30	0.0 0	3.9 4	0.0 0	0.0 0	2.9 3
Zamfara	100.0 240	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
F.C.T. (Abuja)	29.2 19	6.2 4	6.2 4	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Total	23.0 2'219	20.0 1'936	16.2 1'561	4.8 468	1.5 141	0.7 66

^aWhile there are three WVS (1990, 1995, and 2000) none contains simultaneously information on language and regions.

Table 30: Nigeria: Multinational Federation (1960 -) *Continued*

Units	Edo	Ogoni				
	0.03	0.5				
	Edo % n	Ogoni % n	Igbala % n	Ibira % n	Idoma % n	Annang % n
Akwa Ibom	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	17.5 125
Anambra	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Bauchi	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.7 2	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Edo	60.1 196	0.0 0	9.8 32	18.7 61	0.0 0	0.0 0
Benue	0.0 0	0.0 0	4.6 17	0.0 0	40.7 149	0.0 0
Borno	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	1.7 3	2.2 4	0.0 0
Cross River	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	5.6 7
Adamawa	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Imo	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kaduna	0.4 1	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.7 2	0.0 0
Kano	0.2 1	0.0 0	0.9 5	0.0 0	0.9 5	0.0 0
Katsina	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kwara	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.8 2	0.0 0	0.0 0
Lagos	1.2 6	0.0 0	0.8 4	1.2 6	0.2 1	0.0 0
Niger	0.3 1	0.0 0	0.3 1	0.7 2	0.7 2	0.0 0
Ogun	3.2 10	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.3 1	0.6 2	0.0 0
Ondo	0.0 0	0.0 0	1.6 3	0.0 0	2.2 4	0.0 0
Oyo	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.2 1	0.0 0	0.0 0
Plateau	0.4 1	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Rivers	0.5 1	17.9 38	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.5 1	0.0 0
Sokoto	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Abia	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Delta	7.2 22	0.7 2	1.0 3	0.3 1	0.0 0	0.0 0
Enugu	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Jigawa	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kebbi	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Kogi	0.0 0	12.9 61	31.6 150	19.6 93	0.2 1	0.0 0
Osun	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.4 1	0.0 0
Taraba	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.5 1	0.0 0	1.0 2	0.0 0
Yobe	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Bayelsa	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Ebonyi	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Ekiti	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.9 1	16.4 18	0.0 0	0.0 0
Gombe	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Nassarawa	0.0 0	0.0 0	1.0 1	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
Zamfara	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0	0.0 0
F.C.T. (Abuja)	0.0 0	0.0 0	13.8 9	3.1 2	1.5 1	0.0 0
Total	2.5 239	1.0 101	2.4 229	2.0 190	1.8 175	1.4 132

Table 31: Nigeria: Multinational Federation (1960 -) *Continued*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration	Middle Belt 0.18					Total % n
	Tiv % n	Nupe % n	Urhobo % n	Others % n	% n	
Units						
Akwa Ibom	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.4		100
	0	0	0	139		716
Anambra	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100
	0	0	0	0		313
Bauchi	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.5		100
	0	0	0	135		273
Edo	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.1		100
	0	0	8	7		326
Benue	33.6	0.0	0.0	10.7		100
	123	0	0	39		366
Borno	0.0	0.0	1.1	66.9		100
	0	0	2	119		178
Cross River	4.0	0.0	0.0	79.4		100
	5	0	0	100		126
Adamawa	0.0	0.0	1.0	81.1		100
	0	0	2	163		201
Imo	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100
	0	0	0	0		218
Kaduna	0.0	0.0	0.7	38.9		100
	0	0	2	110		283
Kano	0.0	0.7	0.0	2.9		100
	0	4	0	16		549
Katsina	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1		100
	0	0	0	4		364
Kwara	0.0	3.7	0.0	8.7		100
	0	9	0	21		242
Lagos	0.0	0.0	2.4	6.5		100
	0	0	12	33		506
Niger	0.0	35.8	0.0	36.9		100
	0	105	0	108		293
Ogun	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.4		100
	0	0	0	39		314
Ondo	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6		100
	0	0	0	3		182
Oyo	0.0	0.0	0.2	3.0		100
	0	0	1	13		433
Plateau	0.0	0.0	1.3	79.9		100
	0	0	3	191		239
Rivers	0.0	0.9	0.5	26.9		100
	0	2	1	57		212
Sokoto	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100
	0	0	0	0		175
Abia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4		100
	0	0	0	1		239
Delta	0.0	0.7	19.0	15.4		100
	0	2	58	47		306
Enugu	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6		100
	0	0	0	1		165
Jigawa	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9		100
	0	0	0	14		203
Kebbi	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8		100
	0	0	0	42		202
Kogi	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2		100
	0	1	0	1		474
Osun	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.6		100
	1	0	0	4		256
Taraba	0.0	0.0	0.5	71.1		100
	0	0	1	138		194
Yobe	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.5		100
	0	0	0	160		252
Bayelsa	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5		100
	0	0	0	4		62
Ebonyi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100
	0	0	0	0		171
Ekiti	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0		100
	0	0	4	0		110
Gombe	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.0		100
	0	0	0	61		113
Nassarawa	2.9	0.0	0.0	60.2		100
	3	0	0	62		103
Zamfara	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100
	0	0	0	0		240
F.C.T. (Abuja)	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0		100
	0	0	0	26		65
Total	1.4	1.3	1.0	19.2		100
	132	123	94	1'858		9'664

Table 32: Pakistan: Multinational Federation (1947 - 1971)

Fearon	Punjabi		Sindhi		Pashtuns (Pushtuns)		Mohajirs		Baluchis		Urdu		pop
Group concentration ^a	0.66		0.13		0.09		0.08		0.03				
Fearon (2002)	0.7		0		0.1		0.08		0.03				
Units ^b	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	(n)
Azad Kashmir													2,800,000
Balochistan	7.9	8	4.0	4	51.5	0			36.6	37			6,565,885
Federally Administered Tribal Areas						0							3,176,331
Islamabad	0.0	0	0.0	0	90.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	805,235
Northern Areas						0							910,000
North-West Frontier	9.7	27	0.0	0	87.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	2.5	7	17,743,645
Punjab	95.3	1105	0.3	4	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.6	8	0.0	0	73,621,290
Sindh	36.0	162	40.2	181	3.6	0	0.0	0.0	1.1	5	19.1	86	30,439,893
Total	65.6	1311	9.5	189	17.9	357	0.0	0.0	2.5	50	4.7	93	30,439,893

^aMAR cites in addition Ahmadis (0), Hindus (3)

^bFederal units and population size (1998 census) from www.statoids.com.

Table 33: Pakistan: Multinational Federations (1947 - 1971) WVS 1999

Fearon	PUNJABI		SINDHI		pashtuns (pushtuns)		mohajirs		baluchis					
Units	0.66	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.03									
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
	Punjabi		Sindhi		Sindhi		Urdu		Urdu		Pathan (Pashtuns)			
Total	66	1311			9.5	189	4.7	93	17.9	357				
Islamabad	9	90			0	0	0	0	1	10				
Urban Punjab	544	94			3	0.5	0	0	30	5.2				
Rural Punjab	561	97			1	0.2	0	0	13	2.2				
Urban Sindh	112	49			12	5.2	86	38	14	6.1				
Rural Sindh	50	23			169	76.5	0	0	2	0.9				
Urban North-West Frontier Province (NWFP)	27	17			0	0	7	4	127	78.9				
Rural North-West Frontier Province (NWFP)	0	0			0	0	0	0	118	100				
Urban Baluchistan	8	16			4	8	0	0	23	46				
Rural Baluchistan	0	0			0	0	0	0	29	57				
Federally Administrated Tribal Areas (F.A.T.A)														
Azad Kashmir														
Northern Areas														

Table 34: Pakistan: Multinational Federations (1947 - 1971) DHS Survey 1990/1991

Fearon	PUNJABI	SINDHI	pashtuns (pushtuns)		mohajirs		baluchis			
Units	Punjabi	Sindhi	Pushto	Urdu	Siraiki	Hindko	Brohi	Baluchi	Other	Total
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Punjab	2848	32	86	300	616	2	19	2	44	3949
	72.1	0.8	2.2	7.6	15.6	0.1	0.5	0.1	1.1	100
Sindh	51	915	22	454	10	5	3	17	51	1528
	3.3	59.9	1.4	29.7	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.1	3.3	100
NW Frontier	6	0	652	20	58	143	0	0	0	879
	0.7	0.0	74.2	2.3	6.6	16.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Balochistan	2	30	58	13	3	0	84	56	2	248
	0.8	12.1	23.4	5.2	1.2	0.0	33.9	22.6	0.8	100
Total	2907	977	818	787	687	150	106	75	97	6604
	44.0	14.8	12.4	11.9	10.4	2.3	1.6	1.1	1.5	100

Table 35: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Ia*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) ^a Group concentration ^b Unit	Russians 0.81	Tatars 0.04 3.8 (wvs: 4.7)	Ukrainians 0.03	Bashkirs	Chuvash 0.01	Chechens	Mordivians	Avars	Kazakhs
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	0.6 (3) % n	% n	0.4 (2) % n	% n
Amur region	92.0	0.5	3.5	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	0	0.1
	831'004	4'889	31'475	1'183	1'206	196	1'258	371	481
Arkhangelsk region	94.2	0.2	2.1	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0
	1'258'938	3'283	27'841	474	1'874	354	944	187	275
Astrakhan region	69.7	7	1.3	0.1	0.1	1	0.1	0.4	14.2
	700'561	70'590	12'605	614	1'171	10'019	924	4'217	142'633
Belgorod region	92.9	0.2	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'403'977	3'391	57'846	314	718	261	583	350	302
Bryansk region	96.3	0.1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'328'448	1'173	20'214	151	355	273	217	122	190
Chelyabinsk region	82.3	5.7	2.1	4.6	0.3	0	0.5	0	1
	2'965'885	205'087	76'994	166'372	9'483	1'249	18'138	578	36'219
Chita region	89.8	0.7	1	0.1	0.1	0	0.1	0	0
	1'037'502	8'159	11'843	1'228	1'271	226	749	249	535
Irkutsk region	89.9	1.2	2.1	0.1	0.3	0	0.2	0	0
	2'320'493	31'068	53'631	2'451	7'295	712	3'879	254	1'138
Ivanovo region	93.7	0.7	0.9	0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0
	1'075'815	8'205	10'629	490	1'648	633	1'948	491	324
Kaliningrad region	82.4	0.5	4.9	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0	0.1
	786'885	4'729	47'229	562	2'027	738	2'320	162	631
Kaluga region	93.5	0.4	2.2	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0
	973'589	4'299	23'162	451	1'108	466	1'413	244	378
Kamchatka region	80.9	1	5.8	0.2	0.4	0	0.3	0	0.1
	290'108	3'617	20'870	575	1'292	147	1'170	131	343
Kemerovo region	91.9	1.8	1.3	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.2	0	0.1
	2'664'816	51'030	37'622	3'161	15'480	1'480	7'221	316	1'919
Kirov region	90.8	2.9	0.8	0	0.1	0	0	0	0
	1'365'438	43'415	11'399	510	1'856	350	604	211	269
Kostroma region	95.6	0.4	1.1	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0
	704'049	2'731	8'011	203	943	467	358	243	174
Kurgan region	91.5	2	1.1	1.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	0	1.5
	932'613	20'899	11'243	15'343	1'912	1'041	1'089	76	14'804
Kursk region	95.9	0.1	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'184'049	1'576	20'920	177	368	360	313	211	155
Leningrad region	89.6	0.6	2.5	0.1	0.2	0	0.1	0	0
	1'495'295	9'432	41'842	1'102	2'817	542	2'139	567	779
Lipetsk region	95.8	0.1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'162'878	1'751	13'350	214	400	468	382	312	246
Magadan region	80.2	1.1	9.9	0.2	0.2	0	0.2	0	0.1
	146'511	2'006	18'068	344	357	52	287	13	175
Moscow region	91	0.8	2.2	0.1	0.2	0	0.3	0	0
	6'022'763	52'851	147'808	3'565	12'530	1'941	21'856	1'242	2'493
Murmansk region	85.2	0.9	6.4	0.1	0.3	0	0.3	0	0.1
	760'862	7'944	56'845	1'162	2'759	210	2'479	402	541
Nizhnij Novgorod region	95	1.4	0.7	0	0.3	0	0.7	0	0
	3'346'398	50'609	24'241	900	11'364	329	25'022	459	501
Novgorod region	93.9	0.3	1.5	0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0	0
	652'165	2'080	10'449	253	728	1'074	538	176	192
Novosibirsk region	93	1	1.3	0	0.2	0	0.1	0	0.4
	2'504'147	27'874	33'793	1'104	4'147	459	2'608	317	11'691
Omsk region	83.5	2.3	3.7	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0	3.9
	1'735'512	47'796	77'884	1'101	4'191	1'091	1'966	247	81'618
Orenburg region	73.9	7.6	3.5	2.4	0.8	0.1	2.4	0	5.8
	1'611'509	165'967	76'921	52'685	17'211	1'996	52'458	461	125'568
Oryol region	95.3	0.2	1.3	0	0	0.2	0	0	0
	820'024	1'417	11'212	149	406	1'630	272	373	176
Penza region	86.4	6	0.9	0	0.5	0	4.9	0	0
	1'254'680	86'805	12'421	368	6'738	455	70'739	131	274
Pskov region	94.3	0.2	1.6	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0
	717'101	1'499	12'471	256	658	557	317	137	190
Rostov region	89.3	0.4	2.7	0	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1
	3'934'835	17'866	118'486	1'142	3'017	15'469	3'447	4'038	3'021
Ryazan region	94.6	0.5	1	0	0.1	0	0.6	0	0
	1'161'447	5'569	12'671	386	1'284	504	7'252	465	294
Sakhalin region	84.3	1.2	4	0.1	0.2	0	0.5	0	0.1
	460'778	6'830	21'831	586	1'300	185	2'943	149	554
Samara region	83.6	3.9	1.9	0.2	3.1	0	2.7	0	0.5
	2'708'549	127'931	60'727	7'885	101'358	1'193	86'000	563	14'918
Saratov region	85.9	2.2	2.5	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.1	2.9
	2'293'129	57'577	67'257	3'988	15'956	8'515	16'523	1'445	78'320
Smolensk region	93.4	0.2	1.7	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0
	980'073	2'424	17'362	303	735	405	627	235	320
Sverdlovsk region	89.2	3.7	1.2	0.8	0.3	0	0.2	0	0.1
	4'002'974	168'143	55'478	37'296	11'510	920	9'702	680	4'403
Tambov region	96.5	0.2	0.9	0	0	0.1	0	0	0
	1'136'864	2'730	10'809	177	423	637	478	241	272
Tomsk region	90.8	1.9	1.6	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.2	0	0.1
	950'222	20'145	16'726	1'953	5'881	711	1'808	330	1'215
Tula region	95.2	0.5	1.3	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0
	1'595'564	8'968	22'260	409	1'085	469	1'217	488	332
Tver region	92.5	0.5	1.5	0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0	0
	1'361'006	6'717	23'563	499	3'057	2'724	1'694	486	438
Tyumen region	71.6	7.4	48.5	1.4	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.6
	2'336'520	242'325	211'372	46'575	30'205	10'623	9'683	2'766	18'639
Ulyanovsk region	72.6	12.2	1.1	0.1	8	0	3.6	0	0
	1'004'588	168'766	15'588	1'217	111'316	542	50'229	248	571
Vladimir region	94.7	0.6	1.1	0	0.2	0	0.2	0	0
	1'443'857	8'670	16'755	724	2'334	354	3'570	333	388

^aWhile three WVS have been carried out in Russia (1990, 1995, and 1999), none gives detailed information on the ethnic groups.

^bMAR lists in addition Roma 0.2 (0)

Table 36: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Continued Ib*

-2 Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	Udmurts	Marijs	Kabardians	Osetians	Dargins	Buriats	Yakuty	Kumyks	Ingushs
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	0.3 (2) %	0.3 (3) %	0.2 (3) %	1.7 (3) %
Amur region	0.1 486	0.1 542	0 34	0 214	0 159	0.1 474	0 314	0 140	0 109
Arkhangelsk region	0.1 807	0 644	0 72	0 181	0 144	0 30	0 12	0 83	0 121
Astrakhan region	0 216	0 484	0 153	0 498	0.4 3'550	0 30	0 10	0.1 1'356	0 394
Belgorod region	0 328	0 208	0 27	0 385	0 244	0 21	0 39	0 78	0 113
Bryansk region	0 126	0 118	0 36	0 147	0 133	0 18	0 20	0 105	0 114
Chelyabinsk region	0.1 3'344	0.1 3'695	0 153	0 383	0 372	0 81	0 56	0 155	0 350
Chita region	0 498	0 496	0 69	0 196	0.1 589	6.1 70'457	0 206	0 127	0 131
Irkutsk region	0.1 1'895	0.1 1'439	0 100	0 610	0 176	3.1 80'565	0 922	0 91	0 332
Ivanovo region	0 495	0.1 830	0 79	0 210	0 201	0 36	0 20	0 117	0 203
Kaliningrad region	0 382	0 448	0 142	0 433	0 127	0 67	0 23	0 107	0 213
Kaluga region	0 304	0 241	0 84	0 420	0 456	0 35	0 12	0 172	0 234
Kamchatka region	0.1 503	0.1 307	0 48	0.1 286	0 80	0.1 223	0 92	0 34	0 53
Kemerovo region	0.1 2'665	0.1 1'548	0 60	0 320	0 67	0 223	0 86	0 54	0 867
Kirov region	1.2 17'952	2.6 38'930	0 35	0 180	0 144	0 40	0 20	0 83	0 182
Kostroma region	0 222	0 221	0 39	0 115	0 274	0 25	0 10	0 78	0 345
Kurgan region	0.2 2'291	0 411	0 16	0 136	0 38	0 9	0 17	0 26	0 300
Kursk region	0 137	0 105	0 67	0 368	0 119	0 25	0 10	0 188	0 308
Leningrad region	0.1 959	0.1 981	0 187	0 466	0 432	0 124	0 68	0 188	0 192
Lipetsk region	0 155	0 148	0 31	0 286	0 172	0 15	0 19	0 119	0 259
Magadan region	0.1 136	0.1 155	0 15	0.2 378	0 14	0.3 466	0.3 469	0 29	0.4 808
Moscow region	0 1'847	0 2'554	0 570	0 2'389	0 953	0 482	0 242	0 818	0 572
Murmansk region	0.1 933	0.1 1'037	0 259	0.1 541	0 327	0 44	0 21	0 179	0 105
Nizhnij Novgorod region	0 828	0.2 7'757	0 184	0 323	0 516	0 59	0 72	0 164	0 253
Novgorod region	0 253	0 150	0 35	0 132	0 193	0 21	0 30	0 84	0 80
Novosibirsk region	0 964	0.1 1'661	0 106	0 408	0 115	0 940	0 473	0 102	0 774
Omsk region	0 1'004	0 729	0 76	0 365	0 78	0 139	0 78	0 72	0 187
Orenburg region	0.1 1'416	0.1 1'372	0 145	0 342	0 682	0 67	0 29	0 217	0 137
Oryol region	0 146	0 128	0 22	0 160	0 358	0 34	0 20	0 82	0 221
Penza region	0 207	0 224	0 16	0 159	0 117	0 28	0 9	0 57	0 41
Pskov region	0 167	0 160	0 55	0 163	0 105	0 18	0 20	0 82	0 79
Rostov region	0.1 3'630	0.1 2'752	0 591	0.1 2'687	0.2 6'735	0 88	0 92	0 1'341	0 1'134
Ryazan region	0 311	0 286	0 68	0 159	0 200	0 38	0 16	0 254	0 134
Sakhalin region	0 273	0.1 316	0 53	0.1 312	0 101	0 239	0 120	0 82	0 51
Samara region	0 1'608	0.1 3'889	0 184	0 891	0 281	0 44	0 38	0 182	0 168
Saratov region	0.1 1'800	0.1 3'983	0 198	0 673	0 813	0 40	0 29	0 694	0 451
Smolensk region	0 297	0 225	0 35	0 181	0 174	0 35	0 32	0 96	0 52
Sverdlovsk region	0.4 17'903	0.6 27'863	0 284	0 710	0 263	0 241	0 277	0 287	0 358
Tambov region	0 142	0 112	0 28	0 251	0 183	0 20	0 12	0 91	0 96
Tomsk region	0.1 1'485	0.1 829	0 35	0 173	0 82	0.1 603	0 128	0 53	0 298
Tula region	0 263	0 217	0 40	0 409	0 275	0 27	0 17	0 177	0 126
Tver region	0 411	0 545	0 60	0 332	0 480	0 56	0 48	0 184	0 304
Tyumen region	0.2 6'310	0.3 11'023	0 349	0.1 1'829	0.1 2'663	0 399	0 70	0.4 12'343	0.1 2'391
Ulyanovsk region	0 499	0.1 821	0 49	0 337	0 106	0 33	0 17	0 61	0 147
Vladimir region	0.1 959	0.1 1'010	0 61	0 256	0 234	0 62	0 21	0 115	0 97

Table 37: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Continued 1c*

	Lezgins 0.02	Komi	Tuvinians	Karachais	Kalmyks	Adygejs	Balkars	Khakassians	Altays
Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	3 % n	% n	0.1 (3) % n	0.1 (2) % n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Amur region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkhangelsk region	393	47	148	28	26	29	9	56	31
Astrakhan region	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgorod region	364	5'745	18	35	28	19	19	9	13
Bryansk region	0.4	0	0	0	0.7	0	0	0	0
Chelyabinsk region	3'646	157	6	96	7'162	49	34	19	8
Chita region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irkutsk region	440	148	3	33	20	17	8	14	3
Ivanovo region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kaliningrad region	173	85	1	15	18	15	10	5	0
Kaluga region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kamchatka region	551	267	59	73	70	37	33	35	16
Kemerovo region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kirov region	296	40	274	22	46	8	8	92	129
Kostroma region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kurgan region	630	231	513	96	66	39	19	397	127
Kursk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leningrad region	307	191	15	26	22	14	30	12	0
Lipetsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Magadan region	359	137	20	54	44	26	18	12	10
Moscow region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murmansk region	644	114	12	29	13	18	11	10	9
Nizhnij Novgorod region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Novgorod region	160	69	21	38	21	26	4	47	28
Novosibirsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Omsk region	379	232	261	75	75	26	13	503	528
Orenburg region	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oryol region	188	1'054	6	21	8	4	4	5	13
Penza region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pskov region	282	168	17	17	8	10	2	3	4
Rostov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ryazan region	218	67	6	6	6	2	4	14	4
Sakhalin region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Samara region	345	80	5	56	12	17	11	9	8
Saratov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smolensk region	737	669	24	67	84	45	25	38	11
Sverdlovsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tambov region	454	63	1	22	21	3	7	21	6
Tula region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tver region	131	22	2	11	8	22	9	46	17
Tyumen region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ulyanovsk region	2'130	708	90	428	395	228	98	94	40
Vladimir region	0.1	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vologda region	840	2'177	165	73	91	44	21	14	21
Voronezh region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	687	532	8	61	60	40	23	10	16
Yaroslavl region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yuzhnyy Kamchatka region	299	150	42	22	11	8	12	3	2
Zakumskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zemlevaly region	453	206	526	67	225	24	28	279	434
Zhigulskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	324	708	105	30	148	11	21	82	49
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	717	151	44	64	30	33	24	31	16
Zhukovskiy region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	456	62	14	37	8	13	8	9	5
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	270	56	22	19	10	10	14	19	3
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	151	161	23	19	10	16	4	5	2
Zhukovskiy region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	3'659	386	141	516	936	388	89	53	41
Zhukovskiy region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	738	131	5	46	45	21	21	19	5
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	195	46	55	15	37	8	8	70	44
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	1'126	291	45	32	159	57	27	32	19
Zhukovskiy region	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	5'308	170	29	223	234	48	44	21	16
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	307	120	5	43	14	7	10	12	3
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	1'246	629	145	78	95	45	32	92	43
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	307	61	1	28	24	4	10	9	1
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	363	142	197	19	92	21	22	402	160
Zhukovskiy region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	874	155	3	45	27	19	25	6	4
Zhukovskiy region	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	989	199	18	92	46	27	27	11	7
Zhukovskiy region	0.3	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	10'631	10'555	13	210	513	270	74	256	81
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	422	139	9	22	41	12	10	12	4
Zhukovskiy region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zhukovskiy region	440	248	27	24	27	22	18	19	8

Table 38: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Continued Id*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	Cherkes	Nenets	Evenks	Chukchis	Koriaks	Dolgans	Others	Total
% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Amur region	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	2.9	100
	9	4	1'501	12	4	2	26'010	902'844
Arkhangelsk region	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	1.9	100
	14	8'326	15	2	3	2	25'663	1'336'539
Astrakhan region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.4	100
	45	1	4	1	1	8	44'014	1'005'276
Belgorod region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	100
	3	2	6	3	5	1	41'729	1'511'620
Bryansk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.9	100
	6	6	1	1	2	0	26'643	1'378'941
Chelyabinsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	100
	32	22	8	14	5	0	113'523	3'603'339
Chita region	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	1.6	100
	17	2	1'492	3	2	3	18'381	1'155'346
Irkutsk region	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	2.8	100
	39	30	1'431	12	10	1	71'013	2'581'705
Ivanovo region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.9	100
	17	4	8	2	0	0	45'307	1'148'329
Kaliningrad region	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.2	100
	18	6	5	1	4	2	107'340	955'281
Kaluga region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	100
	12	3	3	2	1	0	33'692	1'041'641
Kamchatka region	0	0	0	0.4	2	0	8.3	100
	33	3	15	1'487	7'328	0	29'642	358'801
Kemerovo region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.7	100
	28	6	22	13	4	2	108'040	2'899'142
Kirov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	100
	15	37	8	3	4	0	20'541	1'503'529
Kostroma region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.4	100
	4	4	3	0	0	1	17'610	736'641
Kurgan region	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	100
	0	41	6	2	3	1	16'888	1'019'532
Kursk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
	14	4	5	5	3	0	25'061	1'235'091
Leningrad region	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5	100
	34	26	21	9	14	2	109'287	1'669'205
Lipetsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.6	100
	4	4	1	1	0	0	31'686	1'213'499
Magadan region	0	0	0	0.1	0.5	0	6	100
	8	5	25	248	888	0	11'001	182'726
Moscow region	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.1	100
	142	32	18	19	17	1	336'622	6'618'538
Murmansk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.8	100
	56	163	13	4	2	0	52'200	892'534
Nizhnij Novgorod region	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	100
	27	8	4	7	3	3	52'560	3'524'028
Novgorod region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.6	100
	10	8	3	1	0	1	25'150	694'355
Novosibirsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.6	100
	24	6	22	11	7	7	98'249	2'692'251
Omsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.9	100
	29	25	12	48	9	6	123'479	2'079'220
Orenburg region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	100
	26	5	2	0	7	1	69'217	2'179'551
Oryol region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.7	100
	3	4	3	0	0	2	22'808	860'262
Penza region	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	100
	4	4	0	4	0	1	19'036	1'452'941
Pskov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.5	100
	5	3	3	5	1	2	26'365	760'810
Rostov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.3	100
	163	17	15	13	10	1	277'214	4'404'013
Ryazan region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.9	100
	19	7	6	3	0	0	35'506	1'227'910
Sakhalin region	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100
	27	1	243	11	4	1	49'227	546'695
Samara region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.7	100
	33	13	9	10	2	1	121'472	3'239'737
Saratov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.2	100
	62	3	10	5	1	5	110'740	2'668'310
Smolensk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.3	100
	4	5	2	1	2	1	45'427	1'049'574
Sverdlovsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	100
	30	63	16	12	15	3	144'378	4'486'214
Tambov region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.1	100
	6	4	4	2	2	0	24'414	1'178'443
Tomsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
	18	5	103	6	5	3	41'804	1'046'039
Tula region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	100
	7	6	2	0	1	1	42'240	1'675'758
Tver region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.6	100
	9	15	10	6	3	4	68'392	1'471'459
Tyumen region	0	0.9	0	0	0	0	8.2	100
	562	27'965	109	5	9	5	267'498	3'264'841
Ulyanovsk region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
	3	2	6	2	2	2	26'988	1'382'811
Vladimir region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	100
	5	5	7	7	4	2	43'327	1'523'990

Table 39: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Second part of Russian Units IIa*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	Russians 0.81	Tatars 0.04 3.8 (wvvs: 4.7)	Ukrainians 0.03	Bashkirs	Chuvash 0.01	Chechens 0.6 (3)	Mordivians	Avars 0.4 (2)	Kazakhs
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Volgograd region	88.9 2'399'300	1.1 28'641	2.1 56'281	0 1'129	0.3 8'439	0.5 12'256	0.1 3'601	0.1 2'118	1.7 45'301
Vologda region	96.6 1'225'957	0.1 1'857	1 12'297	0 232	0.1 911	0 320	0 432	0 158	0 177
Voronezh region	94.1 2'239'524	0.1 3'486	3.1 73'716	0 400	0.1 1'705	0.1 1'815	0.1 1'217	0 481	0 378
Yaroslavl region	95.2 1'301'130	0.5 6'175	1 13'155	0 397	0.1 991	0.1 989	0.1 713	0 181	0 285
Republic of Adygeya	64.5 288'280	0.6 2'904	2 9'091	0 214	0.1 349	0.3 1'122	0.1 378	0 133	0 94
Republic of Altai	57.4 116'510	0.2 460	0.7 1'437	0 62	0.1 103	0 34	0 81	0 45	6 12'108
Republic of Bashkortostan	36.3 1'490'715	24.1 990'702	1.3 55'249	29.8 1'221'302	2.9 117'317	0 1'195	0.6 26'020	0 239	0.1 4'092
Republic of Buryatia	67.8 665'512	0.8 8'189	1 9'585	0.1 539	0.1 864	0 145	0.1 685	0 118	0.1 711
Chechen Republic	3.7 40'645	0.2 2'134	0.1 829	0.1 594	0 372	93.5 1'031'647	0 157	0.4 4'133	0 470
Chuvashi Republic	26.5 348'515	2.8 36'379	0.5 6'422	0 318	67.7 889'268	0 105	1.2 15'993	0 73	0 240
Republic of Dagestan	4.7 120'875	0.2 4'659	0.1 2'869	0 383	0 294	3.4 87'867	0 148	29.4 758'438	0 619
Republic Ingushetia	1.2 5'559	0 151	0 189	0 51	0 38	20.4 95'403	0 23	0 102	0 38
Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	25.1 226'620	0.3 2'851	0.8 7'592	0 192	0 197	0.5 4'241	0.1 490	0 386	0 285
Republic of Kalmykia	33.6 98'115	0.4 1'076	0.9 2'505	0 100	0.1 164	2 5'979	0 110	0.8 2'305	1.7 5'011
Karachaevo-Chercessian Republic	33.6 147'878	0.5 2'021	0.8 3'331	0 134	0 81	0.4 1'757	0 102	0 207	0 248
Republic of Karelia	76.6 548'941	0.4 2'628	2.7 19'248	0 312	0.2 1'298	0.1 393	0.1 808	0 91	0 205
Republic of Khakassia	80.3 438'395	0.7 4'001	1.5 8'360	0.1 336	0.5 2'530	0 125	0.3 1'853	0 133	0.1 424
Republic of Komi	59.6 607'021	1.5 15'680	6.1 62'115	0.3 3'149	0.7 7'529	0 410	0.2 2'390	0 374	0.1 553
Republic of Marij El	47.5 345'513	6 43'377	0.7 5'097	0 317	1 7'418	0 281	0.2 1'255	0 163	0 168
Republic of Mordovia	60.8 540'717	5.2 46'261	0.5 4'801	0 172	0.1 1'097	0 116	31.9 283'861	0 53	0 122
Republic of North Ossetia Alania	23.2 164'734	0.3 2'108	0.7 5'198	0 315	0 330	0.5 3'383	0 207	0.1 610	0 265
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	41.2 390'671	1.1 10'768	3.6 34'633	0.2 2'335	0.2 1'700	0.1 520	0.2 2'092	0 305	0.2 1'525
Republic of Tatarstan	39.5 1'492'602	52.9 2'000'116	0.6 24'016	0.4 14'911	3.3 126'532	0 706	0.6 23'702	0 251	0 1'832
Republic of Tuva	20.1 61'442	0.2 584	0.3 832	0 101	0.1 195	0 11	0 106	0 27	0 117
Udmurtian Republic	60.1 944'108	7 109'218	0.7 11'527	0.3 4'320	0.2 2'764	0 478	0.1 1'157	0 137	0 339
Aginsky Buryat aut. dist.	35.1 25'366	0.5 390	0.3 190	0.2 126	0.1 63	0 2	0 31	0 7	0 32
Chukotka aut. dist	51.9 27'918	1 534	9.2 4'960	0.2 116	0.3 162	0 9	0.1 77	0 5	0.1 48
Evenk aut. dist	61.9 10'958	0.9 162	3.1 550	0.3 48	0.5 85	0 6	0.1 24	0 6	0.2 35
Khanty-Mansijsk aut. dist. Yugra	66.1 946'590	7.5 107'637	8.6 123'238	2.5 35'807	1.1 15'261	0.5 6'943	0.4 6'386	0.1 1'910	0.3 4'258
Koryak aut. dist	50.6 12'719	0.9 216	4.1 1'029	0.2 45	0.2 48	0 11	0.2 56	0 3	0.1 20
Nenets aut. dist	62.4 25'942	0.5 211	3.2 1'312	0.1 33	0.2 88	0 3	0.1 30	0 8	0 12
Taimyr (Dolgano-Nenets) aut. dist.	58.6 23'318	1.1 425	6.1 2'423	0.3 104	0.3 131	0.1 20	0.2 87	0 12	0.1 57
Ust'-Ordyn Buryat aut. dist.	54.4 73'646	3 4'102	1 1'300	0.1 73	0.2 211	0 22	0 67	0 1	0 49
Yamalo-Nenets aut. dist.	58.8 298'359	5.5 27'734	13 66'080	1.6 7'932	0.7 3'730	0.4 2'222	0.3 1'650	0.1 584	0.3 1'404
Altai territory	92 2'398'117	0.3 8'899	2 52'700	0 728	0.1 3'385	0 839	0.2 4'769	0 338	0.4 9'825
Khabarovsk territory	89.8 1'290'264	0.8 10'972	3.4 48'622	0.1 1'458	0.2 2'225	0 278	0.2 3'399	0 457	0.1 841
Krasnodar territory	86.6 4'436'272	0.5 25'589	2.6 131'774	0 2'061	0.1 4'141	0.1 2'864	0.1 4'861	0 1'460	0 1'331
Krasnoyarsk territory	88.9 2'638'281	1.5 44'382	2.3 68'662	0.1 3'874	0.6 16'859	0 999	0.3 7'526	0 636	0.1 2'613
Perm region	85.2 2'401'659	4.8 136'597	0.9 25'948	1.4 40'740	0.2 7'033	0 899	0.1 2'363	0 301	0 802
Primorie territory	89.9 1'861'808	0.7 14'549	4.5 94'058	0.1 2'101	0.2 3'287	0 649	0 4'307	0 579	0.1 1'296
Stavropol territory	81.6 2'231'759	0.5 12'988	1.7 45'892	0 812	0.1 1'404	0.5 13'208	0.1 1'946	0.3 7'167	0.1 1'779
the City of Moscow	84.8 8'808'009	1.6 166'083	2.4 253'644	0.1 5'941	0.2 16'011	0.1 14'465	0.2 23'387	0 4'950	0.1 7'997
the City of Saint-Petersburg	84.7 3'949'623	0.8 35'553	1.9 87'119	0.1 2'453	0 6'007	0.1 1'685	0.1 3'369	0 1'516	0.1 2'830
Yevrey Jewish aut. region (Birobidzhan)	89.9 171'697	0.6 1'196	4.4 8'483	0.1 188	0.2 320	0 33	0.2 401	0 86	0 94
Total	79.8 115'889'107	3.8 5'554'601	2 2'942'961	1.2 1'673'389	1.1 1'637'094	0.9 1'360'253	0.6 843'350	0.6 814'473	0.5 653'962

Table 40: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Second part of Russian Units Continued IIb*

	Udmurts	Marijs	Kabardians	Osetians	Dargins	Buriats	Yakuty	Kumyks	Ingushs
Fearon (2002)									
Elkins and Sides (2006)									
Group concentration						0.3 (2)	0.3 (3)	0.2 (3)	1.7 (3)
Unit	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Volgograd region	0.1 3'073	0.2 6'028	0 307	0 1'025	0.1 2'604	0 114	0 38	0 895	0 387
Vologda region	0 288	0 268	0 62	0 252	0 362	0 21	0 11	0 58	0 78
Voronezh region	0 313	0 336	0 83	0 789	0 526	0 50	0 36	0 207	0 218
Yaroslavl region	0 310	0 302	0 51	0 237	0 306	0 36	0 22	0 90	0 511
Republic of Adygeya	0.1 311	0 184	0.1 309	0.1 413	0 108	0 8	0 8	0 103	0 151
Republic of Altai	0 60	0 54	0 5	0 13	0 10	0 43	0 27	0 13	0 48
Republic of Bashkortostan	0.6 22'625	2.6 105'829	0 56	0 262	0 258	0 54	0 34	0 136	0 183
Republic of Buryatia	0 339	0 390	0 43	0 136	0 65	27.8 272'910	0 283	0 77	0 42
Chechen Republic	0 157	0 171	0 133	0 230	0.1 696	0 105	0 83	0.8 8'883	0.3 2'914
Chuvashi Republic	0 453	0.3 3'542	0 18	0 65	0 30	0 13	0 22	0 23	0 42
Republic of Dagestan	0 123	0 88	0 233	0 897	16.5 425'526	0 57	0 6	14.2 365'804	0 272
Republic Ingushetia	0 6	0 4	0 35	0 106	0 35	0 3	0 30	0 136	77.3 361'057
Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	0 87	0 81	55.3 498'702	1.1 9'845	0.1 504	0 27	0 3	0.1 713	0.1 1'236
Republic of Kalmykia	0 115	0 121	0 110	0.1 209	2.5 7'295	0 108	0 13	0.2 621	0 136
Karachaevo-Chercessian Republic	0 67	0 62	0.2 915	0.8 3'333	0.1 290	0 3	0 4	0.1 244	0 173
Republic of Karelia	0 290	0.1 362	0 50	0 142	0 175	0 20	0 14	0 38	0 96
Republic of Khakassia	0.1 331	0.1 729	0 55	0 76	0 58	0 188	0 52	0 28	0 52
Republic of Komi	0.2 2'336	0.3 3'202	0 191	0 418	0 268	0 34	0 25	0 198	0 156
Republic of Marij El	0.3 2'166	42.9 312'178	0 17	0 83	0 43	0 10	0 21	0 28	0 26
Republic of Mordovia	0 147	0 227	0 18	0 110	0 35	0 14	0 4	0 29	0 43
Republic of North Ossetia Alania	0 155	0 168	0.4 2'902	62.7 445'310	0.1 401	0 28	0 10	1.8 12'659	3 21'442
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	0 459	0.1 634	0 81	0.1 733	0 63	0.8 7'266	45.5 432'290	0 199	0.1 1'000
Republic of Tatarstan	0.6 24'207	0.5 18'787	0 57	0 364	0 232	0 43	0 43	0 147	0 139
Republic of Tuva	0 89	0 66	0 5	0 40	0.1 207	0.1 436	0 45	0 126	0 7
Udmurtian Republic	29.3 460'584	0.6 8'985	0 31	0 115	0 202	0 46	0 23	0 33	0 118
Aginsky Buryat aut. dist.	0 23	0.1 43	0 0	0 4	0 1	62.5 45'149	0 10	0 1	0 0
Chukotka aut. dist	0 25	0.1 74	0 8	0.2 92	0 15	0.2 119	0.1 73	0 5	0.1 28
Evenk aut. dist	0.1 13	0.2 36	0 0	0 1	0 0	0.1 13	5.6 991	0 4	0.1 10
Khanty-Mansijsk aut. dist. Yugra	0.3 3'670	0.5 7'309	0 197	0.1 886	0.1 1'956	0 181	0 35	0.7 9'554	0.1 770
Koryak aut. dist	0.1 18	0.1 28	0 2	0.1 31	0 3	0.1 22	0.1 17	0 0	0 0
Nenets aut. dist	0.2 95	0.1 33	0 0	0 3	0 6	0 6	0 3	0 4	0 5
Taimyr (Dolgano-Nenets) aut. dist.	0.1 22	0.1 54	0 4	0.1 30	0 15	0.1 50	0.1 45	0 15	0 18
Ust'-Ordyn Buryat aut. dist.	0 38	0 24	0 2	0 65	0 4	39.6 53'649	0 52	0 8	0 1
Yamalo-Nenets aut. dist.	0.2 809	0.4 1'815	0 89	0.1 535	0.1 496	0 138	0 14	0.5 2'613	0.1 326
Altai territory	0 920	0 715	0 103	0 455	0 149	0 166	0 145	0 84	0 181
Khabarovsk territory	0.1 759	0 604	0 95	0 426	0 365	0.1 793	0.1 1'454	0 199	0 283
Krasnodar territory	0.1 3'425	0.1 2'733	0 727	0.1 4'133	0 860	0 119	0 114	0 586	0 723
Krasnoyarsk territory	0.1 3'250	0.2 5'104	0 268	0.1 1'754	0 367	0 1'051	0 1'368	0 567	0 496
Perm region	0.9 26'272	0.2 5'395	0 152	0 431	0 270	0 109	0 40	0 113	0 230
Primorie territory	0.1 1'130	0.1 1'151	0 237	0 742	0 420	0 880	0 703	0 338	0 177
Stavropol territory	0 1'141	0 760	0.2 6'619	0.3 7'772	1.5 40'218	0 74	0 82	0.2 5'744	0.1 1'751
the City of Moscow	0 1'983	0 1'979	0 1'801	0.1 10'561	0 2'898	0 2'304	0 1'448	0 1'615	0 4'050
the City of Saint-Petersburg	0 1'265	0 1'288	0 507	0.1 2'836	0 729	0 1'152	0 847	0 499	0 670
Yevrey Jewish aut. region (Birobidzhan)	0 88	0.1 103	0 22	0 76	0 41	0 50	0 95	0 24	0 16
Total	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3

Table 41: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Second part of Russian Units Continued IIc*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	Lezgins 0.02	Komi	Tuvinians	Karachais	Kalmyks	Adygejs	Balkars	Khakassians	Altays
	3 %	%	0.1 (3) %	0.1 (2) %	%	%	%	%	%
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Volgograd region	0.1	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0
Vologda region	2'046	223	41	226	1'617	126	46	24	7
Voronezh region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yaroslavl region	350	367	5	36	14	8	7	11	7
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	546	141	7	103	38	24	21	12	7
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	477	343	21	26	18	15	13	12	3
Republic of Adygeya	0.1	0	0	0	0	24.2	0	0	0
Republic of Altai	300	70	1	64	22	108'115	18	4	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.6
	17	23	22	4	8	3	1	39	62'192
Republic of Bashkortostan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	313	167	9	81	70	18	16	30	5
Republic of Buryatia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	206	42	405	35	71	4	7	121	64
Chechen Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chuvashi Republic	196	23	267	15	148	17	72	46	65
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	66	103	1	13	10	5	5	5	7
Republic of Dagestan	13.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	336'698	19	30	65	105	68	32	6	17
Republic Ingushetia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	40	21	41	9	98	20	9	4	20
Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	0.1	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	11.6	0	0
Republic of Kalmykia	867	35	22	1'273	40	584	104'951	2	14
	0.2	0	0	0	53.3	0	0	0	0
	493	20	14	138	155'938	15	8	17	6
Karachaevo-Chercessian Republic	0.1	0	0	38.5	0	0.1	0.1	0	0
Republic of Karelia	444	24	2	169'198	23	309	476	12	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	172	282	7	28	20	12	15	7	3
Republic of Khakassia	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	12	0
	124	170	494	28	127	12	23	65'421	77
Republic of Komi	0.1	25.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'198	256'464	7	84	49	64	33	37	7
Republic of Marij El	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	113	78	4	9	8	14	0	7	0
Republic of Mordovia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	65	45	2	27	15	5	5	10	2
Republic of North Ossetia Alania	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	848	25	35	58	88	81	117	6	2
Republic of Tatarstan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	369	71	136	66	114	52	15	186	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	819	163	10	62	167	19	15	29	10
Republic of Tuva	0	0.5	77	0	0	0	0	0.4	0
	25	1'404	235'313	13	44	1	1	1'219	55
Udmurtian Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	209	242	6	34	20	2	4	5	3
Aginsky Buryat aut. dist.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chukotka aut. dist	0	1	29	0	22	0	1	4	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	20	10	4	6	6	4	1	13	2
Evenk aut. dist	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	0
	6	10	7	0	3	0	0	152	1
Khanty-Mansijsk aut. dist. Yugra	0.6	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Koryak aut. dist	8'580	3'081	6	69	263	176	42	125	48
	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	15	1	1	2	0	1	0	4	2
Nenets aut. dist	0.1	10.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	48	4'510	3	2	8	1	0	2	1
Taimyr (Dolgano-Nenets) aut. dist.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0
	14	10	16	1	4	4	0	121	0
Ust'-Ordyn Buryat aut. dist.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	18	7	33	4	5	0	0	9	8
Yamalo-Nenets aut. dist.	0.2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'260	6'177	1	97	134	79	13	82	21
Altai territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
	271	167	327	79	80	14	16	86	1'880
Khabarovsk territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	546	122	334	37	49	34	11	107	84
Krasnodar territory	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0
	3'752	684	37	784	294	15'821	142	46	43
Krasnoyarsk territory	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0.2	0
	2'199	353	1'492	123	322	99	65	4'489	215
Perm region	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	369	1'181	49	75	50	26	23	42	28
Primorie territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	822	137	375	50	103	56	41	152	126
Stavropol territory	0.2	0	0.54	0.6	0	0	0	0	0
	6'558	216	27	15'146	584	208	783	42	20
the City of Moscow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4'475	734	415	823	2'047	648	354	330	85
the City of Saint-Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1'805	1'455	272	323	551	221	128	128	100
Yevrey Jewish aut. region (Birobidzhan)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	88	13	64	8	2	2	4	8	6
Total	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0
	411'535	293'406	243'442	192'182	173'996	128'528	108'426	75'622	67'239

Table 42: Russia: Multinational Federation (1993 -) Census 2002 *Second part of Russian Units Continued IIc*

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration Unit	Cherkes	Nenets	Evenks	Chukchis	Koriaks	Dolgans	Others	Total
% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Volgograd region	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.6	100
	79	9	8	6	0	0	123'228	2'699'223
Vologda region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
	6	15	11	4	3	0	24'983	1'269'568
Voronezh region	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.2	100
	36	6	5	12	6	1	52'558	2'378'803
Yaroslavl region	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
	14	10	7	5	0	0	40'553	1'367'398
Republic of Adygeya	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	7.5	100
	642	1	3	2	1	0	33'704	447'109
Republic of Altai	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.7	100
	1	0	0	0	0	0	9'524	202'947
Republic of Bashkortostan	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	100
	22	4	7	11	4	1	67'310	4'104'336
Republic of Buryatia	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	1.8	100
	3	5	2'334	7	0	8	17'293	981'238
Chechen Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	100
	13	3	5	0	0	0	8'463	1'103'686
Chuvashi Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	100
	6	2	2	12	0	0	11'996	1'313'754
Republic of Dagestan	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.3	100
	47	2	1	0	0	0	470'283	2'576'531
Republic Ingushetia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	100
	26	0	1	0	0	0	4'039	467'294
Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	4.3	100
	725	0	0	0	1	0	38'928	901'494
Republic of Kalmykia	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
	56	22	6	4	0	1	11'579	292'410
Karachaevo-Cherchessian Republic	11.3	0	0	0	0	0	13.3	100
	49'591	4	1	0	0	0	58'536	439'470
Republic of Karelia	0	0	0	0	0	0	19.6	100
	13	6	1	3	1	0	140'600	716'281
Republic of Khakassia	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
	15	0	21	2	3	7	21'822	546'072
Republic of Komi	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	5.3	100
	29	708	6	10	1	2	53'926	1'018'674
Republic of Marij El	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	100
	7	6	3	0	1	0	9'568	727'979
Republic of Mordovia	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	100
	3	0	2	1	0	0	10'757	888'766
Republic of North Ossetia Alania	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.9	100
	83	6	1	1	0	3	48'696	710'275
Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	0	0	1.9	0.1	0	0.1	4.3	100
	64	27	18'232	602	10	1'272	40'704	949'280
Republic of Tatarstan	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	100
	14	3	10	7	4	2	49'244	3'779'265
Republic of Tuva	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
	29	0	7	0	0	0	2'963	305'510
Udmurtian Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	100
	7	4	3	3	0	1	25'588	1'570'316
Aginsky Buryat aut. dist.	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.8	100
	1	0	164	0	0	0	551	72'213
Chukotka aut. dist	0	0	0.1	23.5	0.1	0	12.6	100
	1	19	37	12'622	55	1	6'755	53'824
Evenk aut. dist	0	0.1	21.5	0	0	0.2	4.1	100
	1	12	3'802	0	0	30	731	17'697
Khanty-Mansijsk aut. dist. Yugra	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	10.2	100
	368	1'290	43	1	6	1	146'130	1'432'817
Koryak aut. dist	0	0	0	5.6	26.7	0	10.8	100
	5	1	7	1'412	6'710	0	2'728	25'157
Nenets aut. dist	0	18.7	0	0	0	0	3.4	100
	2	7'754	13	0	0	1	1'407	41'546
Taimyr (Dolgano-Nenets) aut. dist.	0	7.7	0.8	0	0	13.9	9.8	100
	6	3'054	305	1	0	5'517	3'903	39'786
Ust'-Ordyn Buryat aut. dist.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	100
	7	3	64	2	0	0	1'853	135'327
Yamalo-Nenets aut. dist.	0	5.2	0	0	0	0	11	100
	162	26'435	57	3	1	4	55'950	507'006
Altai territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.7	100
	26	4	13	9	1	1	121'934	2'607'426
Khabarovsk territory	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	4.7	100
	26	12	4'533	85	49	10	67'037	1'436'570
Krasnodar territory	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	9.3	100
	4'446	23	26	30	8	10	475'302	5'125'221
Krasnoyarsk territory	0	0.1	0.2	0	0	0.2	4.9	100
	67	3'188	4'632	8	13	5'805	144'915	2'966'042
Perm region	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	100
	26	20	9	3	4	1	168'161	2'819'421
Primorie territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.9	100
	26	12	103	54	20	4	80'717	2'071'210
Stavropol territory	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	12	100
	2'097	14	9	5	7	1	328'306	2'735'139
the City of Moscow	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	100
	520	66	74	138	88	14	1'042'817	10'382'754
the City of Saint-Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.9	100
	115	192	140	102	68	38	555'633	4'661'219
Yevrey Jewish aut. region (Birobidzhan)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
	10	4	72	16	8	0	7'597	190'915
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.1	100
	60'517	41'302	35'527	15'767	8'743	7'261	7'423'403	145'166'731

Table 43: South Africa: Multinational Federation (1996 -) (WVS 2001)

	Zulu	Xhosa	North Sotho	Tswana	Coloured	Afrikaner	South Sotho	English Speaking	Tsonga	Swazi	Asian	Venda	Ndebele
Fearon (2002)	0.22	0.18	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.0
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^a	15.9 (wvs01: 22.0)	17.0 (wvs01:10.9)			8.7 (wvs01:10.7)			13.2 (wvs01:14.2)		2.6 (wvs01:3.6)			
Group concentration ^b	2	2	%	%	3	%	%	%	%	%	1	%	%
Units ^c	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Eastern Cape	0	54.3				24.6		20.8			0		
	0	170				77		65			0		
Free State	0.7	1.5				36.5		2.9			0		
	1	2				50		4			0		
Gauteng	16.9	3.6				29.2		23			5.7		
	158	34				273		215			53		
KwaZulu-Natal	31.8	8.1				6.3		52.6			39.4		
	197	50				39		326			244		
Limpopo (Northern Prov.)	0.8	0			0.8	12.8		1.6			1.6		
	1	0			1	16		2			2		
Mpumalanga	36.1	2.8				28.7		5.6			0		
	39	3				31		6			0		
North-West	3.1	3.9				22.8		3.1			0		
	4	5				29		4			0		
Northern Cape	0	1.2				62.7		13.3			0		
	0	1				52		11			0		
Western Cape	0	9.6				55		34.8			0		
	0	53				303		192			0		
Total	13.3	10.6			16.6	29		27.5			10		
	400	318			499	870		825			299		

^aI coded Europeans as english speaking.

^bMAR cites in addition Black Africans (0), European (0)

^cUnits and population sizes come from <http://www.statoids.com/uza.html>

Table 44: South Africa: Multinational Federations (1996 -) Census 2001 on population groups ^b

Units	Black African % n	Coloured % n	Indian/Asian % n	White % n	Total n
Eastern Cape	87.5 5'635'080	7.4 478'805	0.3 18'372	4.7 304'504	14.4 6'436'761
Free State	88 2'381'072	3.1 83'192	0.1 3'721	8.8 238'791	6 2'706'776
Gauteng	73.8 6'522'789	3.8 337'974	2.5 218'013	19.9 1'758'396	19.7 8'837'172
KwaZulu-Natal	84.9 8'002'409	1.5 141'888	8.5 798'274	5.1 483'448	21 9'426'019
Limpopo	97.3 5'128'614	0.2 10'162	0.2 8'585	2.4 126'276	11.8 5'273'637
Mpumalanga	92.4 2'886'345	0.7 22'161	0.4 11'243	6.5 203'245	7 3'122'994
Northern Cape	35.7 293'976	51.6 424'389	0.3 2'321	12.4 102'040	1.8 822'726
North West	91.5 3'358'450	1.6 56'960	0.3 9'904	6.7 244'036	8.2 3'669'350
Western Cape	26.7 1'207'429	53.9 2'438'976	1 45'028	18.4 832'902	10.1 4'524'335
Total	79 35'416'164	8.9 3'994'507	2.5 1'115'461	9.6 4'293'638	100 44'819'770

^aCensus 2001 by Province and Population group: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/extract.htm>

^bCensus 2001 by Province and Population group: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/extract.htm>

Table 45: Soviet Union: Multinational Federation (1918 - 1991)

Fearon (2002) Group concentration ^a Units	Russian 0.51	Ukrainian 0.15	uzbeks 0.06	Byelorussian 0.04	kazakhs 0.03	tatars 0.02	azerbaijanis 0.02	armenians 0.02	tadzhiks 0.02	georgians 0.01	moldavians 0.01	lithuanians 0.01	0.01
Dominant group													
Russian Republic	Russians												
Armenian Republic	Armenians												
Azerbaijadian Republic	Azeris												
Belorussian Republic	Belarusans												
Estonian Republic	Estonians												
Georgian Republic	Georgians												
Kazakh Republic	Kazakhs												
Kirgiz Republic	Kyrgyz												
Latvian Republic	Latvians												
Lithuanian Republic	Lithuanians												
Moldavian Republic	Moldavians												
Tadjik Republic	Tajiks												
Turkmen Republic	Turkmen												
Ukrainian Republic	Ukrainians												
Uzbek Republic	Uzbeks												

^aNo information in MAR.

Table 46: Switzerland: Multinational Federations (1848 -) Census 2000 ^a

Fearon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b Group concentration	German 0.62	French 0.16	Italians 0.08	Romansch 0.05	Yugoslavs 0.01	Spanish 0.03	Portuguese 0.02	Turks 0.01	Asians 0.01	
n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
	German	French	Italians	Romansch	Ex-Yugoslavs	Spanish	Portuguese	Albanese	Turks	Other
Aargau	477'093 87.1	4'151 0.8	17'847 3.3	618 0.1	11'586 2.1	3'287 0.6	3'615 0.7	9'823 1.8	5'709 1.0	13'764 2.5
Appenzell A-Rhoden	48'810 91.2	187 0.3	905 1.7	75 0.1	1'266 2.4	396 0.7	272 0.5	401 0.7	299 0.6	893 1.7
Appenzell I-Rhoden	13'586 92.9	31 0.2	134 0.9	11 0.1	376 2.6	84 0.6	44 0.3	153 1.0	56 0.4	143 1.0
Basel-Landschaft	226'275 87.2	3'822 1.5	8'979 3.5	214 0.1	2'998 1.2	2'047 0.8	1'052 0.4	2'562 1.0	2'931 1.1	8'494 3.3
Basel-Stadt	149'192 79.3	4'658 2.5	9'409 5.0	231 0.1	3'854 2.0	3'881 2.1	1'502 0.8	2'443 1.3	4'086 2.2	8'823 4.7
Bern	804'190 84.0	72'646 7.6	18'908 2.0	688 0.1	8'539 0.9	8'220 0.9	6'052 0.6	9'092 0.9	3'344 0.3	25'518 2.7
Fribourg	70'611 29.2	152'766 63.2	3'100 1.3	131 0.1	1'252 0.5	1'731 0.7	4'320 1.8	2'442 1.0	768 0.3	4'585 1.9
Geneva	16'259 3.9	313'485 75.8	15'191 3.9	229 0.1	2'095 0.5	13'631 3.3	14'365 3.5	2'809 0.7	1'000 0.2	34'609 8.4
Glarus	32'765 85.8	123 0.3	1'689 4.4	55 0.1	803 2.1	333 0.9	304 0.8	940 2.5	534 1.4	637 1.7
Graubunden	127'755 68.3	961 0.5	19'106 10.2	27'038 14.5	3'152 1.7	852 0.5	3'099 1.7	1'277 0.7	370 0.2	3'448 1.8
Jura	3'001 4.4	61'376 90.0	1'210 1.8	27 0.0	277 0.4	786 1.2	475 0.7	401 0.6	98 0.1	573 0.8
Luzern	311'543 88.9	2'053 0.6	6'801 1.9	388 0.1	7'829 2.2	2'491 0.7	3'126 0.9	6'768 1.9	955 0.3	8'550 2.4
Neuchatel	6'849 4.1	143'191 85.3	5'407 3.2	95 0.1	956 0.6	1'860 1.1	4'230 2.5	723 0.4	546 0.3	4'092 2.4
Nidwald	34'458 92.5	229 0.6	533 1.4	48 0.1	487 1.3	145 0.4	272 0.7	361 1.0	16 0.0	686 1.8
Obwald	29'920 92.3	144 0.4	329 1.0	32 0.1	456 1.4	95 0.3	370 1.1	452 1.4	95 0.3	534 1.6
Sankt Gallen	398'666 88.0	1'813 0.4	10'640 2.3	845 0.2	12'120 2.7	2'910 0.6	2'524 0.6	10'388 2.3	3'251 0.7	9'680 2.1
Schaffhausen	64'323 87.6	370 0.5	1'897 2.6	80 0.1	2'008 2.7	524 0.7	335 0.5	1'374 1.9	686 0.9	1'795 2.4
Schwyz	115'688 89.9	502 0.4	2'447 1.9	234 0.2	2'864 2.2	424 0.3	642 0.5	2'477 1.9	533 0.4	2'893 2.2
Solothurn	215'784 88.3	2'323 1.0	7'678 3.1	190 0.1	3'845 1.6	1'154 0.5	879 0.4	3'795 1.6	3'140 1.3	5'553 2.3
Thurgau	202'521 88.5	948 0.4	6'317 2.8	287 0.1	3'588 1.6	1'387 0.6	2'480 1.1	5'136 2.2	2'036 0.9	4'175 1.8
Ticino	25'579 8.3	5'024 1.6	254'997 83.1	384 0.1	5'879 1.9	3'099 1.0	3'474 1.1	1'703 0.6	875 0.3	5'832 1.9
Uri	32'518 93.5	67 0.2	462 1.3	51 0.1	681 2.0	66 0.2	144 0.4	224 0.6	229 0.7	335 1.0
Valais	77'255 28.4	171'129 62.8	5'987 2.2	114 0.0	2'800 1.0	1'464 0.5	6'233 2.3	2'513 0.9	309 0.1	4'595 1.7
Vaud	30'408 4.7	524'234 81.8	18'713 2.9	268 0.0	6'070 0.9	10'312 1.6	15'494 2.4	5'551 0.9	1'596 0.2	28'011 4.4
Zug	85'142 85.1	1'138 1.1	2'525 2.5	156 0.2	2'891 2.9	689 0.7	968 1.0	1'146 1.1	871 0.9	4'526 4.5
Zurich	1'040'168 83.4	17'685 1.4	49'750 4.0	2'606 0.2	22'694 1.8	15'638 1.3	13'256 1.1	19'983 1.6	10'190 0.8	55'936 4.5
Total	4'640'359 63.7	1'485'056 20.4	470'961 6.5	35'095 0.5	111'366 1.5	77'506 1.1	89'527 1.2	94'937 1.3	44'523 0.6	238'680 3.3

^aBundesamt fuer Statistik; <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/bevoelkerung/sprachen...religion>
The WVS of 1996 also allow for estimating the ethnic make-up of the federal units and yield similar results.

^bMAR cites Jurassians 2.2 (3) and foreign workers 18.4 (wvs96: 5.0) (0).

Table 47: United States: National federation (1789 -) Estimates 2004 ^a

	White	Hispanics	Black	Asians	Am. Indians and Alaska	Nat. Hawaiian or Pacific Isl.	Two or more races	To
Fearon (2002)	0.69	0.13	0.12	0.04				
Elkins and Sides (2006) ^b		9.7 (wvs99: 8.5)	(12.4 wvs99: 16.0)					
Group concentration	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Units	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	
Alabama	69.5 3'147'620	1.9 87'142	26.4 1'194'396	0.8 36'798	0.5 23'095	0.0 1'712	0.9 39'419	
Alaska	66.9 438'177	3.9 25'439	3.6 23'842	4.5 29'783	15.8 103'617	0.6 3'768	4.7 30'809	
Arizona	61.1 3'509'599	26.5 1'523'102	3.5 203'233	2.1 122'933	5.0 288'918	0.2 10'384	1.5 85'665	
Arkansas	77.2 2'126'382	4.1 112'108	15.8 434'395	0.9 25'907	0.7 19'555	0.1 2'285	1.2 31'997	
California	44.5 15'982'109	32.7 11'728'118	6.8 2'436'678	12.1 4'326'126	1.2 416'646	0.4 149'134	2.4 854'988	
Colorado	72.5 3'334'447	17.8 820'017	4.1 189'159	2.5 116'483	1.1 52'334	0.1 6'485	1.8 82'478	
Connecticut	75.9 2'657'671	9.3 325'388	10.1 352'272	3.1 107'762	0.3 11'812	0.1 2'648	0.1 46'051	
Delaware	70.2 583'119	5.1 41'998	20.4 169'251	2.6 21'466	0.4 3'263	0.1 453	1.3 10'814	
District of Columbia	30.3 167'563	7.2 39'683	57.7 319'196	3.0 16'784	0.3 1'873	0.1 374	1.5 8'050	
Florida	62.8 10'919'745	17.8 3'102'702	15.7 2'726'160	2.0 351'975	0.4 73'606	0.1 13'945	1.2 209'028	
Georgia	60.2 5'318'847	6.2 544'131	29.6 2'612'936	2.6 229'741	0.3 27'457	0.1 6'768	1.0 89'503	
Hawaii	23.3 294'558	3.2 40'194	2.2 28'105	41.8 527'546	0.3 4'299	0.1 114'346	20.1 253'792	
Idaho	87.2 1'214'571	8.4 116'486	0.6 7'863	1.0 14'166	1.4 19'891	0.1 1'640	1.3 18'645	
Illinois	66.2 8'414'026	13.3 1'687'137	15.1 1'926'010	4.0 504'618	0.3 38'997	0.1 8'062	1.1 134'784	
Indiana	84.6 5'279'777	4.0 249'930	8.8 548'269	1.2 73'013	0.3 17'532	0.0 2'833	1.1 66'215	
Iowa	91.7 2'709'712	3.3 96'921	2.3 67'596	1.4 42'378	0.3 10'338	0.0 1'275	0.9 26'231	
Kansas	81.9 2'239'170	7.5 205'645	5.9 161'305	2.1 56'859	1.0 26'193	0.1 1'870	1.6 44'460	
Kentucky	88.7 3'677'961	1.7 68'960	7.5 310'996	0.9 36'986	0.2 9'220	0.0 1'927	1.0 39'872	
Louisiana	61.8 2'788'717	2.4 107'379	33.0 1'492'298	1.4 61'803	0.6 27'331	0.0 1'576	0.8 36'666	
Maine	96.1 1'266'068	0.8 10'958	0.7 9'560	0.8 10'854	0.6 7'454	0.0 459	0.9 11'900	
Maryland	59.8 3'324'989	4.6 258'221	29.1 1'615'036	4.6 257'876	0.3 17'860	0.1 3'319	1.5 80'757	
Massachusetts	80.8 5'181'427	6.2 399'626	6.8 434'545	4.6 294'701	0.3 18'404	0.1 5'223	1.3 82'579	
Michigan	78.1 7'895'516	3.3 336'622	14.3 1'450'583	2.2 220'019	0.6 60'462	0.0 3'770	1.4 145'648	
Minnesota	86.7 4'420'829	3.2 162'589	4.1 211'628	3.4 172'312	1.2 59'411	0.1 2'669	1.4 71'520	
Mississippi	59.9 1'739'026	1.4 41'287	36.8 1'068'990	0.7 21'409	0.5 13'448	0.0 844	0.6 17'962	
Missouri	83.1 4'781'115	2.3 134'581	11.5 661'233	1.3 74'585	0.5 26'493	0.1 3'811	1.3 72'800	
Montana	89.1 825'827	2.0 18'634	0.4 3'471	0.5 5'044	6.4 59'514	0.1 511	1.5 13'864	
Nebraska	85.7 1'496'640	6.4 112'416	4.3 74'815	1.5 26'746	0.9 16'562	0.1 1'176	1.1 18'859	
Nevada	61.2 1'429'272	21.3 497'814	7.5 176'167	5.5 128'470	1.4 33'045	0.5 12'033	2.5 57'970	
New Hampshire	94.3 1'225'145	1.9 24'434	0.9 12'263	1.7 21'824	0.2 3'214	0.0 520	0.9 12'100	
New Jersey	63.8 5'549'273	13.1 1'141'017	14.5 1'259'839	7.0 607'108	0.3 26'625	0.1 6'734	1.2 108'283	
New Mexico	43.5 827'230	41.3 785'113	2.4 44'749	1.3 24'025	10.1 192'135	0.1 2'421	1.5 27'616	
New York	61.1 11'745'589	12.9 2'470'692	17.5 3'361'053	6.5 1'249'166	0.5 103'443	0.1 17'876	1.5 279'269	
North Carolina	68.6 5'860'777	5.5 471'260	21.8 1'861'416	1.7 148'299	1.3 110'198	0.1 5'784	1.0 83'487	
North Dakota	91.1 577'639	1.4 8'697	0.7 4'583	0.7 4'150	5.2 33'032	0.0 245	0.9 6'020	

^aPopulation Division, U.S. Census Bureau; Table 4: Annual Estimates of the Population by Race Alone and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States and States (SC-EST2004-04)

^bWhile there are four WVS carried out in the United States (1982, 1990, 1995, and 1999), the information on residency only covered 9 regions and 1 state, instead of the 50 states.

Table 48: United States *Continued*

	White	Hispanics	Black	Asians	Am. Indians and Alaska	Nat. Hawaiian or Pacific Isl.	Two or more races	
Fearon (2002)	0.69	0.13	0.12	0.04				
Elkins and Sides (2006)		9.7 (wvs99: 8.5)	(12.4 wvs99: 16.0)					
Group concentration	%	2 %	0 %	%	%	%	%	
Units	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	
Ohio	83.3 9'547'385	1.9 220'858	11.9 1'362'446	1.4 159'094	0.2 26'025	0.0 3'556	1.2 139'647	11'451
Oklahoma	72.9 2'569'827	5.7 200'472	7.7 272'224	1.5 53'846	8.1 283'844	0.1 2'934	4.0 140'406	3'521
Oregon	82.0 2'948'024	8.9 318'572	1.8 64'117	3.4 121'880	1.4 49'138	0.3 9'630	2.3 83'225	3'591
Pennsylvania	82.9 10'288'227	3.3 405'086	10.5 1'304'439	2.2 266'757	0.2 21'900	0.0 5'203	0.9 114'680	12'401
Rhode Island	80.5 870'209	8.5 92'228	6.1 65'958	2.7 28'763	0.6 6'366	0.1 1'275	1.5 15'833	1'081
South Carolina	65.6 2'753'295	2.7 114'799	29.4 1'232'732	1.1 44'385	0.4 15'677	0.1 2'283	0.8 34'897	4'191
South Dakota	87.1 671'072	1.6 12'696	0.8 6'006	0.7 5'208	8.6 66'535	0.0 280	1.2 9'086	771
Tennessee	78.1 4'610'827	2.6 151'962	16.8 991'435	1.2 71'115	0.3 17'005	0.0 2'929	0.9 55'689	5'901
Texas	49.8 11'190'222	33.5 7'535'337	11.7 2'633'219	3.2 717'986	0.7 153'353	0.1 24'494	1.0 235'411	22'491
Utah	83.8 2'002'538	10.0 238'534	0.9 22'534	1.9 44'608	1.3 32'191	0.7 17'368	1.3 31'266	2'381
Vermont	96.0 596'514	0.9 5'797	0.6 3'704	1.0 6'311	0.4 2'326	0.0 166	1.1 6'576	621
Virginia	68.7 5'121'944	5.1 380'387	19.9 1'482'963	4.4 329'529	0.3 24'314	0.1 5'476	1.5 115'214	7'451
Washington	77.5 4'808'520	7.8 481'498	3.5 216'484	6.3 387'757	1.6 101'384	0.5 28'189	2.9 179'956	6'201
West Virginia	94.4 1'714'473	0.7 13'320	3.2 58'094	0.6 10'238	0.2 3'729	0.0 425	0.8 15'075	1'811
Wisconsin	86.2 4'748'917	3.9 217'583	5.9 327'626	1.9 105'769	0.9 51'463	0.0 2'156	1.0 55'512	5'501
Wyoming	88.6 448'694	6.2 31'370	0.9 4'448	0.6 3'255	2.4 12'224	0.1 358	1.2 6'180	501
Total	67.4 197'840'821	13.0 38'216'940	12.8 37'502'320	4.2 12'326'216	1.0 2'824'751	0.2 505'602	1.5 4'438'754	293'651

Table 49: Venezuela: National federation (1960 -) (WVS 2000)^a

Featureon (2002) Elkins and Sides (2006) Group concentration	Mestizo 0.68	White 0.21	Blacks 0.10 10.0 (wvs00: 4.3)	Indigenous 0.01 1.4 (wvs00: 0.5)	Other	Indigenous ^b
Units	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Amazonas	70	10	0	20	0	22
	7	1	0	2	0	70'464
Anzoategui	63	32.5	1.9	0	0	0.5
	34	19	1	0	0	1'222'225
Apure	100	0	0	0	0	0.4
	9	0	0	0	0	377'756
Aragua	67.3	29	3.7	0	0	0.2
	72	31	4	0	0	1'449'616
Barinas	86.3	13.6	0	0	0	0.3
	19	3	0	0	0	624'508
Bolivar	68.4	25	6.6	0	0	0.8
	52	19	5	0	0	1'214'846
Carabobo	48.3	49	2.7	0	0	0.2
	71	72	4	0	0	1'932'168
Cojedes	44.4	55.6	0	0	0	0.2
	4	5	0	0	0	253'105
Delta Amacuro	30	60	0	1	0	4.9
	3	6	0	10	0	97'987
Dependencias Federales**					0	0.3
						1'651
Distrito Federal*	54.2	40.1	5.1	0.6	0	0.2
	96	71	9	1	0	1'836'286
Falcon	79.4	20.6	0	0	0	0.3
	27	7	0	0	0	763'188
Guarico	88.9	0	11.1	0	0	0.3
	8	0	1	0	0	627'086
Lara	76.7	23.4	0	0	0	0.1
	59	18	0	0	0	1'556'415
Merida	47.4	52.6	0	0	0	0.3
	9	10	0	0	0	715'268
Miranda	50.5	39.2	7.2	1	2.1	0.3
	49	38	7	1	2	2'330'872
Monagas	37.9	55.2	3.4	3.4	0	0.8
	11	16	1	1	0	712'626
Nueva Esparta	63.2	31.6	5.3	0	0	1
	12	6	1	0	0	373'851
Portuguesa	52.1	8.7	39.1	0	0	0.2
	12	2	9	0	0	725'740
Sucre	57.2	32.1	10.7	0	0	1
	16	9	3	0	0	786'483
Tachira	52.7	44.4	2.8	0	0	0.2
	19	16	1	0	0	992'669
Trujillo	88.9	11.1	0	0	0	0.2
	8	1	0	0	0	608'563
Vargas	81.8	13.6	4.5	0	0	0.2
	18	3	1	0	0	298'109
Yaracuy	51.8	48.4	0	0	0	0.2
	14	13	0	0	0	499'049
Zulia	54.7	42.7	2.7	0	0	8.9
	82	64	4	0	0	2'983'679
Total	59.3	35.8	4.3	0.5	0.2	1.5
	711	430	51	6	2	23'054'210

^aWe also report the data from the census 2001 which provides statistics on Indigenous people in each unit.

^bCensus 2001; <http://www.ine.gov.ve/censo/fichascenso/fichacenso.asp>

Table 50: Yugoslavia: Multinational Federation (1992 - 1996)

	Serbs	Albanian	Montenegrin	Roma	Hungarians	Muslims	Croats
Fearon (2002)	0.63	0.17	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.01
Elkins and Sides (2006)		12.7 (wvs01: 1.1)	3.5 (wvs01: 1.3)	4.8 (wvs01: 4.0)	4.8 (wvs01: 4.0)	1.8 (wvs01: 4.0)	1.3 (wvs01: 1.3)
Group concentration ^a	2	2		0	3	3	2
Units	(n)	(n)					
Serbia							
Montenegro							
?							

^aMAR also cites Slovenes (3)

Table 51: Yugoslavia (former): Multinational Federations (1953 - 1992)^a

Fearon (2002)	Serbs 0.36	Croats 0.20	Muslims 0.10	Albanians 0.09	Slovenes 0.08	Macedonians 0.06	Hungarian 0.03	Montenegrim 0.02	Yugoslavs	Others	Total
1981	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Bosnia-Herzegovina	32.2 1'328'010	18.4 758'863	39.5 1'629'081	0.1 4'124	0.1 4'124	0 0	—	0.3 12'373	7.9 325'816	1.5 61'864	4'124'256 4'601'469
Croatia	11.6 533'770	75.1 3'455'703	0.5 23'007	0.1 4'601	0.5 23'007	0.1 4'601	—	0.2 9'203	8.2 377'320	3.7 170'254	4'601'469 1'909'136
Macedonia	2.4 45'819	0.2 3'818	2.1 40'092	19.7 376'100	0.1 1'909	67 1'279'121	—	0.2 3'818	0.8 15'273	7.5 143'185	8.5 1'909'136
Montenegro	3.3 19'282	1.2 7'012	13.4 78'298	6.5 37'980	0.2 1'169	0.2 1'169	—	68.5 400'252	5.4 31'553	1.3 7'596	2.6 584'310
Serbia	66.4 6'184'281	1.6 149'019	2.3 214'215	14 1'303'915	0.1 9'314	0.5 46'568	—	1.6 149'019	4.8 447'056	8.7 810'290	41.5 9'313'676
Slovenia	2.2 41'621	3 56'756	0.7 13'243	0.1 1'892	90.5 1'712'137	0.2 3'784	—	0.2 3'784	1.5 28'378	1.6 30'270	8.4 1'891'864
Total	36.3 8'141'213	19.8 4'440'662	8.9 1'996'055	7.7 1'726'924	7.8 1'749'352	6 1'345'655	—	2.6 583'117	5.4 1'211'090	5.5 1'233'517	100.0 22'427'585
1991	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
Bosnia-Herzegovina	31.4 1'370'811	17.3 755'256	43.7 1'907'784	0 0	0 0	0 0	—	0 0	5.5 240'110	2.1 91'678	18.6 4'365'639
Croatia	12.2 583'680	78.1 3'736'511	0.9 43'058	0.3 14'353	0.5 23'921	0.1 4'784	—	0.2 9'569	0.5 23'921	5.5 263'135	20.3 4'784'265
Macedonia	2.2 44'855	0 0	0 0	21 428'158	0 0	64.6 1'317'095	—	0 0	12.2 248'739	8.7 2'038'847	8.7 2'038'847
Montenegro	9.3 57'318	0 0	14.6 89'984	6.6 40'678	0 0	4 0	—	61.8 380'890	0 24'653	3.7 22'804	2.6 616'327
Serbia	65.8 6'396'534	1.1 106'933	2.4 233'308	17.2 1'672'042	0.1 9'721	0.4 38'885	—	1.4 136'096	3.2 311'078	8.4 816'579	41.3 9'721'177
Slovenia	2.4 47'396	2.7 53'321	1.4 27'648	0.2 3'950	87.6 1'729'959	0.2 3'950	—	0.2 3'950	0.6 11'849	4.7 92'817	8.4 1'974'839
Total	36.2 8'517'219	19.7 4'635'061	10 2'352'823	9.3 2'188'125	7.5 1'764'617	5.8 1'364'637	—	2.3 541'149	3 705'847	6.2 1'458'750	100.0 23'528'230

^aSource: (Woodward, 1995, Table 2.2); N population total: <http://www.statoids.com/ucs.html>

Duration of federalism

In the figures that follow (2-5) we depict how according to three measures federalism has changed over time for all countries that appear as having some decentralization according to at least one of the indicators. First, we use the Polity III indicator of “centralization of state authority: geographic concentration of decision making authority” with the following three values: 1 = unitary, 2 = intermediate category, 3 = federal. Second, we depict McGarry’s (2002) classification with 0 indicating non-federal states, 1 national federations, and 2 multinational federations. Finally, we also report whether Henisz (2002) classifies a particular state in a particular year as federal, despite the fact that he focuses on fiscal federalism.

Beck, Clarke, Groff, Keefer and Walsh (2001) provide the following information on federalism:

Federalism

AUTON Are there contiguous autonomous regions?

Autonomous regions are not the same as states, provinces, etc. An autonomous region is recorded if a source explicitly mentions a region, area, or district that is autonomous or self-governing. We required that autonomous regions be contiguous with the country to which they belonged, on the presumption that such regions would be more likely to impose a check on central government decision making than would non-contiguous regions. Hence, the Basque region in Spain and Montenegro in Yugoslavia are counted as autonomous regions, but Northern Ireland, Hong Kong, Puerto Rico are not. Furthermore, they must be constitutionally designated as “autonomous” or “independent” or “special”. Federal Districts or Capital Districts do not count as autonomous regions. Disputed autonomy is not recorded. Indian reservations are not counted as autonomous. Deviating from convention, no information recorded as 0.

MUNI Are municipal governments locally elected?

0 if neither local executive nor local legislature are locally elected. 1 if the executive is appointed, but the legislature elected. 2 if they are both locally elected. No information, or no evidence of municipal governments, is recorded as blank. If one source has information on a specific period, and the other has no information on a different period, we do not extrapolate from one source to another - no information is always recorded as blank. If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, we consider the lowest level as the “municipal” level. For this variable, there was less information than usual, and as a result only 42

STATE Are there state/province governments locally elected?

Recorded in the same manner as MUNI. If there are multiple levels of sub-national government, we consider the highest level as the "state/province" level. Indirectly elected state/province governments, where directly elected municipal bodies elect the state/province level, are not considered locally elected. Indirectly elected state/province governments elected by directly elected state/province bodies are considered locally elected. For this variable, there was less information than usual, and as a result only 66 are non-blank.

AUTHOR Do the state/provinces have authority over taxing, spending, or legislating?

If 1 for any of these, category gets a 1. Authority over "cultural affairs", or "planning" in Communist systems, does not qualify. For this variable, there was less information than usual, and as a result only 38

STCONST Are the constituencies of the senators the states/provinces?

No information recorded as blank. If no senate or no states/provinces, NA. If the senate is only partially elected through the constituencies, we score according to how the majority is elected. If the senate is appointed or elected on a national basis, this gets a 0.

¿From this data source we used the authority indicator, with 1 meaning that there is some authority devolved to subnational units, while 0 indicating the absence of such arrangements

Figure 2: Duration of federalism

Figure 3: Duration of federalism

Figure 4: Duration of federalism

Figure 5: Duration of federalism

References

- Acemoglu, Daron. 2005. "Constitutions, Politics and Economics: A Review Essay on Persson and Tabellini's "The Economic Effect of Constitutions"." *Journal of Economic Literature* 43(4):1025–1048.
- Achen, Christopher. 2005. "Let's Put Garbage-Can Regressions and Garbage-Can Probits Where They Belong." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(4):327–339.
- Alemán, Eduardo and Daniel Treisman. 2005. Fiscal Politics in "ethnically Mined," Developing, Federal States: Central Strategies and Secessionist Violence. In *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy After Civil Wars*, ed. Philip G. Roeder and Donald Rothchild. Ithaca: Cornell University Press pp. 173–216.
- Alemika, Etannibi, Michael Bratton and Peter Lewis. 2001. "AFROBAROMETER: ROUND 1.5 SURVEY OF NIGERIA, 2001 [Computer File]. ICPSR04235-V1." Lagos, Nigeria: Research and Marketing Services (RMS) [producer], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2005-11-22.
- Alesina, Alberto and Enrico Spolaore. 2003. *The Size of Nations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Amoretti, Ugo M. and Nancy Bermeo, eds. 2003. *Federalism and Territorial Cleavages*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bakke, Kristin M. and Erik Wibbels. 2006. "'Peace-Preserving' Federalism?" Paper prepared for the 2006 Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA.
- Basanez, Miguel, Chappell Lawson, Roderic Camp, Wayne A. Cornelius, Jorge Dominguez, Frederico Estevez, Joseph Klesner, Beatriz Magaloni, James McCann, Alejandro Moreno, Pablo Paras and Alejandro Poiré. 2004. "MEXICAN ELECTION PANEL STUDY, 2000 [Computer File]. ICPSR03380-V1." Mexico City, Mexico: Reforma/Mexico City, Mexico: MORI [producers], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.
- Bauer, Otto. 1907. *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie*. Wien: Verlag Ignaz Brand.
- Beck, Thorsten, George Clarke, Alberto Groff, Philip Keefer and Patrick Walsh. 2001. "New Tools in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions." *World Bank Economic Review* 15(1):165–176.
- Bednar, Jenna. 2006. "The Robust Federation." University of Michigan, Department of political science, book manuscript.
- Besley, Timothy and Stephen Coate. 2003. "Centralized versus Decentralized Provision of Local Public Goods: A Political Economy Analysis." *Journal of Public Economics* 87(12):2611–2637.

- Bollen, Kenneth A., D.K. Guilkey and T.A. Mroz. 1995. "Binary Outcomes and Endogenous Explanatory Variables: Tests and Solutions with an Application to the Demand for Contraceptive Use in Tunisia." *Demography* 32.
- Bolton, Patrick and Gérard Roland. 1997. "The Breakup of Nations: A Political Economy Analysis." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(4):1057–1090.
- Bordignon, Massimo and Sandro Brusco. 2001. "Optimal Secession Rules." *European Economic Review* 45:1811–1834.
- Brancati, Dawn. 2004. "Can Federalism Stabilize Iraq?" *The Washington Quarterly* 27(2):7–21.
- Brancati, Dawn. 2006 (forthcoming). "Decentralization: Fueling the Fire or Dampening the Flames of Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism." *International Organization*.
- Bratton, Michael, Massa Coulibaly and Fabiana Machado. 2003. "AFRO-BAROMETER: ROUND I SURVEY OF MALI, JANUARY 2000 [Computer File]. ICPSR03935-V1." Mali: African Workers Participation Development Program (PADEP) [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.
- Breton, Albert. 1964. "The Economics of Nationalism." *Journal of Political Economy* 72(4):376–386.
- Bruk, Salomon I. 1964. *Atlas Narodov Mira*. Moscow: Academy of Science USSR.
- Bunce, Valerie. 2003a. "Cooperation, Compromise, or Conflict: Three Models of Center-Regional Bargaining in Ethnofederal States." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association Philadelphia Marriott Hotel, Philadelphia, PA, 2003-08-27 2003-09-05.
- Bunce, Valerie. 2003b. "Rethinking Recent Democratization: Lessons from the Postcommunist Experience." *World Politics* 55(2):167–192.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Jan Ketil Roed and Nils Weidmann. 2006. "Georeferencing of Ethnic Groups. Creating a New Dataset." PRIO GROWnet Workshop, Oslo.
- Christin, Thomas and Simon Hug. 2003. "Federalism and Conflict Resolution: Considering Selection Biases." Paper prepared for presentation at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, April 3-6 Chicago.
- Christin, Thomas and Simon Hug. 2004. "Methodological Issues in Studies of Conflict Processes." Prepared for delivery at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 2 - September 5, 2004.
- Christin, Thomas and Simon Hug. 2006. "Political Institutions and Ethnic Conflict Resolution: Dealing with the Endogenous Nature of Institutions." Paper prepared for the 2006 Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA.

- Clarke, Kevin. 2005. "The Phantom Menace: Omitted Variable Bias in Econometric Research." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(4):341–352.
- Cohen, Frank S. 1997. "Proportional Versus Majoritarian Ethnic Conflict Management in Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 30(5):607–630.
- Congleton, Roger D. 2000. A Political Efficiency Case for Federalism in Multinational States: Controlling Ethnic Rent-Seeking. In *Competition and Structure: The Political Economy of Collective Decisions: Essays in Honor of Albert Breton*, ed. G. Galeotti, P. Slamon and R. Wintrobe. New York: Cambridge University Press pp. 365–397.
- Cornell, Svante E. 2002. "Autonomy as a Source of Conflict Caucasian Conflicts in Theoretical Perspective." *World Politics* 54(2):245–276.
- Elkins, Zachary and John Sides. 2006. "The Problem of Stateness." Paper prepared for the 2006 Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA.
- European Values Study Group and World Values Survey Association. 2006. "EUROPEAN AND WORLD VALUES SURVEYS FOUR-WAVE INTEGRATED DATA FILE, 1981-2004, V.20060423, 2006. Aggregate File." Producers: Análisis Sociológicos Económicos y Políticos (ASEP) and JD Systems (JDS), Madrid, Spain/Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands. Data Files Suppliers: Analisis Sociologicos Economicos y Politicos (ASEP) and JD Systems (JDS), Madrid, Spain/Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands/ Zentralarchiv fur Empirische Sozialforschung (ZA), Cologne, Germany:) Aggregate File Distributors: Análisis Sociológicos Económicos y Políticos (ASEP) and JD Systems (JDS), Madrid, Spain/Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands/Zentralarchiv fur Empirische Sozialforschung (ZA) Cologne, Germany.
- Fearon, James D. 2002. *Ethnic Structure and Cultural Diversity around the World: A Cross-National Data Set on Ethnic Groups*. Boston: Paper prepared for delivery at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, August 29-September 1, 2002.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2000a. "Development of Group Concentration Values for the MAR Data Set." Prepared for presentation at the second semi-annual LiCEP meeting, to be held at the University of Pennsylvania, October 20-22, 2000.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2000b. "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity." *International Organization* 54(4 Autumn):845–877.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97(1):1–17.
- Filippov, Mikhail, Peter Ordeshook and Olga Shvetsova. 2004. *Designing Federalism: A Theory of Self-Sustainable Federal Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ghai, Yash. 2002. Constitutional Asymmetries: Communal Representation, Federalism, and Cultural Autonomy. In *The Architecture of Democracy: Institutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy in the Late Twentieth Century*, ed. Andrew Reynolds. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp. 141–170.
- Ghai, Yash P., ed. 2000. *Autonomy and Ethnicity : Negotiating Competing Claims in Multi-Ethnic States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Glazer, Nathan. 1983. Federalism and Ethnicity: The American Solution. In *Ethnic Dilemmas 1964-82*, ed. Nathan Glazer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press pp. 274–292.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Griffiths, Ann L. and Karl Nerenberg, eds. 2005. *Handbook of Federal Countries*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1993. *Minorities at Risk. A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflict*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 2000. "Ethnic Warfare on the Wane." *Foreign Affairs* 79(3):52–65.
- Hale, Henry E. 2004. "Divided We Stand: Institutional Sources of Ethnofederal State Survival and Collapse." *World Politics* 56(1):165–193.
- Hale, Henry E. 2006. "Designing Ethnofederalism for Divided Societies: Developments in the USSR and Russia." *Perspectives on Politics* .
- Hausman, Jerry. 1978. "Specification Tests in Econometrics." *Econometrica* 46(6):1251–1271.
- Henisz, Witold J. 2002. "The Institutional Environment for Infrastructure Investment." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 11(2).
- Hug, Simon. 2005a. "The Effect of Misclassifications in Probit Models. Monte Carlo Simulations and Applications." Zürich: unpublished paper, IPZ, Universität Zürich.
- Hug, Simon. 2005b. "Federal Stability in Unequal Societies." *Constitutional Political Economy* 16(2):149–160.
- Jagers, Keith and Ted Robert Gurr. 1995. "Tracking Democracy's Third Wave with Polity III Data." *Journal of Peace Research* 32(4):469–482.
- Kohli, Atul. 2004. India: Federalism and the Accommodation of Ethnic Nationalism. In *Federalism and Territorial Cleavages*, ed. Ugo M. Amoretti and Nancy Bermeo. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press chapter 10, pp. 281–300.

- Lake, David A. and Donald Rothchild. 2005. Territorial Decentralization and Civil War Settlements. In *Sustainable Peace : Power and Democracy After Civil Wars*, ed. Philip G. Roeder and Donald Rothchild. Ithaca: Cornell University Press pp. 109–132.
- Lemco, Jonathan. 1991. *Political Stability in Federal Governments*. New York: Praeger.
- Lipset, Seymour M. 1963. *Political Man*. Garden City: Anchor Books.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder. 2005. *Electing to Fight. Why Emerging Democracies Go to War*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- McGarry, John. 2002. “Federalism (Federation) as a Method of Ethnic Conflict Regulation.” Working paper to be presented at the Conference on From Power-sharing to Democracy: Post- Conflict Institutions in Ethnically Divided Societies, London, Ontario, November 9-10 2002.
- McGarry, John and Brendan OLeary. 2005. Federation as a Method of Ethnic Conflict Regulation. In *From Power Sharing to Democracy*, ed. Sid Noel. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Myerson, Roger B. 2006. “Federalism and Incentives for Success of Democracy.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1:3–23.
- Nordlinger, Eric A. 1972. *Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies*. Cambridge: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
- Panizza, Ugo. 1999. “On the Determinants of Fiscal Centralization: Theory and Evidence.” *Journal of Public Economics* 74(1):97–139.
- Rabushka, Alvin and Kenneth A. Shepsle. 1972. *Politics in Plural Societies: A Theory of Democratic Instability*. Columbus: C.E. Merrill.
- Riker, William H. 1964. *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Rivers, Douglas and Quang H. Vuong. 1988. “Limited Information Estimators and Exogeneity Tests for Simultaneous Probit Models.” *Journal of Econometrics* 39(3 NOV):347–366.
- Roeder, Philip G. 1991. “Soviet Federalism and Ethnic Mobilization.” *World Politics* 43(2):196–232.
- Saideman, Stephen M. 1998. Is Pandora’s Box Half Empty or Half Full? The Limited Virulence of Secessionism and the Domestic Sources of Disintegration. In *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict. Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation*, ed. David A. Lake and Donald S. Rothchild. Princeton: Princeton University Press pp. 127–150.
- Saideman, Stephen M., David J. Lanoue, Campenni Michael and Samuel Stanton. 2002. “Democratization, Political Institutions, and Ethnic Conflict: A Pooled Time-Series Analysis, 1985-1998.” *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1, February):103–129.

- Saideman, Stephen M. and R. William Ayres. 2000. "Determining the Causes of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities at Risk Data from the 1980s and 1990s." *Journal of Politics* 62(4 (Nov)):1126–1145.
- Sambanis, Nicholas. 2005. "Globalization, Decentralization, and Secession: A Review of the Literature and Some Conjectures." New Haven: Yale University, Departement of Political Science.
- Sambanis, Nicholas and Branko Milanovic. 2004. "Explaining the Demand for Sovereignty." New Haven: Yale University, Departement of Political Science.
- Schou, Arild and Marit Haug. 2005. "Decentralisation in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations." NIBR Working Paper: 2005:139.
- Snyder, Jack. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: Norton.
- Stepan, Alfred. 1999. "Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model." *Journal of Democracy* 10(4):19–34.
- Tir, Jaroslav. 2005. "Keeping the Peace After Secession: Territorial Conflicts Between Rump and Secessionist States." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(5):713–741.
- Toft, Monica Duffy. 2003. *The Geography of Ethnic Violence: Identity, Interests, and the Indivisibility of Territory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- University of Tokyo Institute of Oriental Culture. 2003. "ASIABAROMETER, 2003 [Computer File]. ICPSR04300-V1." Tokyo: University of Tokyo, Institute of Oriental Culture [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2005-11-04.
- Watts, Richard J. 1996. Schweizerische Identität und der Schweizerische Beitrag an Europa: Aus der Sicht Eines Ausländers. In *Schweizer Eigenart - eigenartige Schweiz*, ed. Wolf Linder, Prisca Lanfranchini and Ewald R. Weibel. Bern: Haupt pp. 129–142.
- Watts, Ronald L. 1998. "Federalism, Federal Political Systems, and Federations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1:117–137.
- Woodward, Susan L. 1995. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Young, Robert. 1998. Games of Secession. In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics and the Law*, ed. Peter Newman. London: Macmillan Reference pp. 183–188.