





































## Explaining Low Turnout

---

How do we explain lower levels of turnout among Aboriginal communities? Is it the result of a lack of resources among Aboriginal communities, or is there something unique about the experiences of Aboriginal peoples that make them more likely to turn away from federal politics? In this section, we begin by exploring issues of access that are based in standard resource-based voting models. We then turn to alternative (and perhaps complimentary) models that are provided by the Aboriginal politics literature.

Table 3 presents logistic regression models for three sets of respondents: the general population (column 1), a subset of the general population study living on the Prairies (column 2), and the Aboriginal sample (column 3). Each model includes important background variables, including age, urban/rural, gender, and marital status. In addition, three sets of resources are included: socio-economic resources, network resources, and engagement variables. The models are identical with the exception of the inclusion of regional controls in column 1 to control for variation in voting patterns across Canada.

In column 1, the results largely conform to the expectations in the voting behaviour literature. We see a clear curvilinear effect for age, with young people and, to a lesser extent, older Canadians, voting at lower levels than the middle-aged. We find higher voting rates in Quebec and the Maritimes than in Ontario or the West, with the odds of voting in the Prairies compared to Ontario approaching statistical significance at conventional levels. In terms of resources, we find a strong positive effect for post-secondary education and a negative effect for low-income status (defined as an annual personal income below \$20,000). Being involved in political and social organizations also has a positive effect on the odds of voting, as does regular religious attendance. Finally, those who read or watch the news more often and who trust the federal government are more likely to vote. These results are largely replicated in the Prairies only model.

**Table 3: Turnout Based on Standard Predictors**

	General Population <sup>‡</sup>			Prairies Only <sup>‡</sup>			Aboriginal Sample <sup>†</sup>		
	OR	(s.e.)	sign.	OR	(s.e.)	sign.	OR	(s.e.)	sign.
<b>Demographics</b>									
Youth	0.11	(0.02)	***	0.06	(0.02)	***	0.12	(0.04)	***
Senior	0.44	(0.06)	***	0.26	(0.07)	***	0.35	(0.10)	***
Urban	1.05	(0.11)		1.02	(0.23)		0.35	(0.18)	
Female	1.30	(0.14)	**	1.91	(0.44)	**	1.13	(0.24)	
Married or common-law	0.72	(0.08)	***	0.96	(0.21)		0.97	(0.21)	
British Columbia	0.95	(0.15)							
Prairies	1.22	(0.16)	<sup>a</sup>						
Quebec	2.05	(0.30)	***						
East	1.43	(0.24)	**						
<b>Socio-Economic Resources</b>									
Completed Highschool	1.04	(0.16)		1.38	(0.40)		1.28	(0.34)	
Some Post-Secondary	1.46	(0.22)	**	1.71	(0.48)	*	1.74	(0.43)	**
Low Income	0.69	(0.09)	***	0.78	(0.20)		0.73	(0.17)	
Employed	1.09	(0.14)		1.11	(0.26)		1.44	(0.33)	*
<b>Network Resources</b>									
Involved in political org.	1.64	(0.25)	***	1.83	(0.63)	*	1.36	(0.47)	
Involved in charitable org.	1.34	(0.14)	**	1.13	(0.25)		1.42	(0.33)	<sup>a</sup>
Religious Attendance	1.20	(0.06)	***	1.27	(0.13)		0.88	(0.09)	
<b>Engagement in System</b>									
News consumption	1.10	(0.03)	***	1.15	(0.07)	**	1.00	(0.05)	
Trust in federal government	1.46	(0.18)	***	2.10	(0.49)	***	1.60	(0.35)	**
Pseudo R-Squared		0.17			0.25			0.12	
N		4480			1062			467	

\*\*\* p<.01; \*\* p<.0; \* p<.10; <sup>a</sup> p<.15

<sup>‡</sup>Data from the ESC General Sample, 2000 (weighted).

<sup>†</sup>Data from the ESC Aboriginal Subsample, 2004.

The real interest, of course, is in the results of the model in the Aboriginal sample. We have suggested that standard predictors of turnout, which largely revolve around socio-economic, network and psychological resources, may explain in part low turnout among Aboriginals. We find some support for this in Table 3. As expected, young Aboriginals are less likely to vote than those between 30 and 50 years old. Similarly, the odds of older Aboriginals voting are lower than among their middle-aged counterparts. It is also important to note that the effect of living in urban areas, which we discussed in the previous section, largely disappears when other variables are controlled. This suggests that the urban effect noted in Table 2 largely reflects differences in the age and resource composition of Aboriginals living in urban versus rural areas, rather than something distinctive about the urban (or rural) experience as such.

In terms of resources, similar to the general population models, we find a positive and significant effect for obtaining some post-secondary education. We also find a weak but significant effect for employment status, although no comparable effect for income. It is important to note, however, that 46% of the Aboriginal sample falls into the low income category (<\$20,000). Critically, the survey instrument does not distinguish income categories below \$20,000 for some members of the Aboriginal subsample, which compromises our ability to estimate income effects with precision.<sup>30</sup> However, looking just at those respondents for whom fine-grained income reports were ascertained, the pattern is definitely consistent with general population estimates: individuals earning less money are less likely to vote.

In terms of networks and psychological engagement, we find only limited support for the importance of these variables when controlling for socio-economic resources. Involvement in charitable organizations has a positive effect that approaches statistical significance, but neither involvement in a political organization or religious attendance are significant. Similarly, we find no evidence that news consumption increases the odds of voting. On the other hand, Aboriginals who report trusting the “federal government in Ottawa” have higher odds of voting than those who say they never or almost never trust the federal government in Ottawa. This is a notable finding. Indeed, in view of the fact that trust in the federal government may have unique significance for Aboriginal communities, whose treatment by the federal government has historically been oppressive and, in many instances, continues to be contentious, it is striking that trust effects among Aboriginals parallel the positive and significant effect of trust in the general population.

In sum, it appears that resources, especially socio-economic resources, are part of the explanation for low turnout among Aboriginal communities in Canada. This follows the political behaviour interpretation outlined in the introductory section of the paper. It is well known that Canada’s Aboriginal communities are among the most disadvantaged in the country.<sup>31</sup> The results here suggest that their collective disadvantage may translate into lower participation in politics. Yet, it is also important to note that the model performs less well than for the general population: pseudo R-squared is lower and, in general, fewer of the model’s variables are statistically significant. This suggests that, while resources are part of the story, other factors may play an important role in explaining turnout among Aboriginal peoples.

This assessment is confirmed when we pool the Aboriginal sample with the general population sample of the ESC (not shown).<sup>32</sup> Running a simple model containing only a dummy variable for membership in the Aboriginal sample, we find, as expected, a negative and significant effect (odds ratio of 0.345). In other words, without controlling for any other variables, the odds of Aboriginals in our sample voting were about two-thirds less than the odds of non-Aboriginals voting. Adding in the three sets of control variables in Table 3, the dummy variable for Aboriginals remains negative and significant, but the odds of voting for Aboriginals rises to about half the odds of voting for non-Aboriginals. This confirms that our resource model is explaining part – but only part – of the tendency of Aboriginal voters to abstain. There is still a significant difference in the odds of voting between Aboriginals and non-Aboriginals that requires exploration.

As we discussed in a previous section, the Aboriginal politics literature provides a rich and nuanced view of Aboriginal participation in federal politics in Canada. The nationalism and post-nationalism theses, as we have styled them, both suggest that Aboriginal peoples exist in a unique relationship to the Canadian state, one that is more accurately characterized as a nation-to-nation relationship. Both theses also point out that the federal state has traditionally been a source of oppression for these communities, and that alternative venues of participation are often viewed as more legitimate. Drawing on these literatures, we suggest that, on top of differences in important resources, three additional sets of factors might explain low turnout levels among Aboriginals.

First, Aboriginal peoples in Canada have had varied experiences with the Canadian state, and these experiences can in part be captured by examining Aboriginals in different circumstances. We might expect that Aboriginal peoples who are more integrated into the dominant societal framework may be more likely to vote in federal elections. Those living on reserves and who continue to speak their ancestral language in their every day life, in contrast, may be more likely to see their Aboriginal identity as a national or post-colonial one. However, in the previous section, an examination of the relationship between reserve-status and home language provided little evidence in support of this argument: we found little difference in turnout rates between on-reserve and off-reserve Aboriginals. Furthermore, home language had a more nuanced relationship with turnout than expected, with Blackfoot speakers less likely to vote than Cree-speaking Aboriginals, and English-speaking Aboriginals found between these two extremes.

A second, related explanation that is implied by the Aboriginal politics literature is that disengagement in Canadian elections does not reflect apathy from politics, but rather reflects the fact that Aboriginals see community-specific Aboriginal organizations as the appropriate sites for political mobilization. In the nationalism literature, such organizations include band governments, whereas the post-colonialist literature points to alternative venues, e.g. social movements and direct action. While we are not able to break down the type of organizational involvement of the respondents in our sample, both the nationalist and post-colonial theses suggest that one might expect Aboriginal peoples to participate in Aboriginal organizations as an alternative to federal politics.

Finally, a third explanation for low turnout focuses on attitudinal disengagement from Canadian politics. If Aboriginals do not identify with the Canadian state, we might expect them to be less inclined to participate in its electoral processes. Similarly, negative views of the Canadian state's relationship with Aboriginal communities may have an impact, as one's willingness to be part of a process (federal elections) may be less when one's relationship with the broader institution of which that process is a part (the federal government) has been contentious. Such attitudinal disengagement may take the form of replacing a Canadian national identity with an Aboriginal one, as suggested by the nationalism thesis. Or it may be reflected in disengagement from both Canadian and Aboriginal governance structures, in favor of a more direct form of participation (as proposed by the post-colonial thesis). In any case, it is clear that a more detailed examination of Aboriginals' views of the Canadian state and its relationship with Aboriginal communities is necessary to understand Aboriginal electoral participation.

We are able to test each of these sets of hypotheses with the ESC Aboriginal sample, and the results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. In column 1, we present the differentiated experience hypothesis to examine if reserve status and language community assist in distinguishing voters from non-voters. In order to distinguish these effects from the provincial differences noted earlier, we have also included provincial control variables in the model for Alberta and Manitoba, leaving Saskatchewan as the reference category.

**Table 4: Three Hypotheses for Explaining Aboriginal Turnout**

	Differentiated Experience			Alternative Venue			Attitude toward State		
	OR	(s.e.)	sign.	OR	(s.e.)	sign.	OR	(s.e.)	sign.
<b>Demographics</b>									
Youth	0.10	(0.04)	***	0.11	(0.04)	***	0.08	(0.03)	***
Senior	0.31	(0.10)	***	0.29	(0.09)	***	0.22	(0.08)	***
Urban	0.72	(0.26)		0.65	(0.23)		0.64	(0.25)	
Female	1.18	(0.27)		1.21	(0.28)		1.08	(0.27)	
Married or common-law	0.96	(0.22)		0.98	(0.23)		0.95	(0.24)	
Alberta	0.84	(0.28)		1.27	(0.35)		0.81	(0.30)	
Manitoba	1.38	(0.38)		2.15	(0.58)		1.53	(0.47)	
<b>Socio-Economic Resources</b>									
Completed Highschool	1.35	(0.37)		0.66	(0.16)		1.52	(0.45)	
Some Post-Secondary	2.27	(0.60)	***	1.22	(0.30)	***	2.29	(0.69)	***
Low Income	0.71	(0.17)	<sup>a</sup>	1.12	(0.41)	*	0.60	(0.16)	**
Employed	1.35	(0.32)		1.22	(0.31)		1.27	(0.33)	
<b>Network Resources</b>									
Involved in political org.	1.06	(0.38)		0.85	(0.10)		1.22	(0.50)	
Involved in charitable org.	1.45	(0.35)	<sup>a</sup>	1.05	(0.06)		0.94	(0.26)	
Religious Attendance	0.89	(0.10)		1.63	(0.38)		0.93	(0.12)	
<b>Engagement in System</b>									
News consumption	1.07	(0.06)		0.83	(0.28)		1.03	(0.07)	
Trust in federal government	1.56	(0.36)	**	1.39	(0.39)	**	1.40	(0.37)	
<b>Aboriginal Hypotheses</b>									
On Reserve	0.87	(0.26)		0.79	(0.25)		0.80	(0.26)	
Home lang. – Blackfoot	0.44	(0.21)	*	0.40	(0.20)	*	0.36	(0.20)	*
Home lang. – Cree	2.82	(0.87)	***	3.08	(0.96)	***	2.98	(1.02)	***
Participate in Aboriginal Org.				1.71	(0.43)	**	1.83	(0.49)	**
Aboriginal Identity over Canadian							0.99	(0.25)	
Dissatisfaction Scale							0.95	(0.08)	
Pseudo R-Squared		0.167			0.173			0.193	
N		464			453			410	

\*\*\* p<.01; \*\* p<.0; \* p<.10; <sup>a</sup> p<.15  
 Source: ESC Aboriginal Sample, 2004.

Consistent with our previous discussion, we find no evidence of differences in the turnout rates of Aboriginals on-reserve compared to those living off-reserve. Interestingly, however, we do continue to find significant differences between language communities. Contrary to the expectation that English-speakers would be more integrated into the Canadian political system, we continue to find significant differences between Blackfoot, English, and Cree-speaking Aboriginals. Blackfoot speakers are significantly *less* likely to vote than those speaking English at home, and Cree speakers are significantly *more* likely to vote than English-speakers. This finding holds despite the inclusion of controls for province of residence (with Blackfoot being concentrated in Alberta in our sample), and it also holds despite controls for demographic and socio-economic differences that may exist between these groups.

Why might this be? We imagine that these differences reflect experiences various groups have had with the federal government, but clearly, more in-depth work into the situation and circumstances of these three groups is necessary. However, the presence of these differences and their resilience to the inclusion of a rigorous set of control variables suggests that these differences are real. Policy-makers interested in promoting turnout among Aboriginal communities may well be advised to target efforts at individual communities and examine how their specific circumstances and histories may impact their involvement in federal politics.<sup>33</sup>

However, low turnout would not be as disconcerting if there were evidence that Aboriginal voices were being heard in alternative venues, which translate Aboriginal concerns to federal politicians at the elite level (nationalism thesis) or on the streets (post-colonial thesis). In the second model in Table 4, we test the hypothesis that Aboriginal peoples are turning away from federal politics and participating in organizations associated with their Aboriginal identity. This expectation, it should be noted, is in direct contrast to the expectation that would emerge in classic voting behaviour studies, which view involvement as begetting more involvement.

In Table 4, we find no evidence that involvement in Aboriginal organizations reflects a turning away from federal politics in Canada. In fact, consistent with a resource model of political participation, we find that those who report involvement in an organization connected with their Aboriginal identity have 1.7 times the odds of voting than those who are not involved in such organizations. In other words, we find no evidence that involvement in Aboriginal-based organizations competes with traditional forms of political participation. On the contrary, such organizational involvement seems to foster engagement in federal elections. This is a particularly important finding because in the ESC Aboriginal sample about 35 percent of respondents reported being involved in an Aboriginal organization. Despite fears among some scholars that such venues compete with federal representative institutions, this suggests that Aboriginal organizations are an important source of mobilization among First Nations communities in federal elections.

Future research should try to tease out more directly the nature of Aboriginal involvement in such organizations. Are these “mainstream” organizations that largely parallel the typical non-Aboriginal organization, or do they reflect more “radical” politics, and so might be expected to promote disengagement from all forms of traditional political participation? It is our view that to more fully test the post-colonial thesis, it would be important to isolate participants in more radical organizations, which we are not able to do with our data. The post-colonial thesis aside, it is important to note that the finding that Aboriginal organizational involvement in general promotes voting does directly challenge the nationalism thesis.

In the final model, we add in an additional set of Aboriginal-specific variables to address the attitudinal hypothesis. Two variables are included. Respondents were asked the following question: “Some Aboriginal people say they are an Aboriginal person first and a Canadian second, while others say they are a Canadian first and an Aboriginal person second. How would you describe yourself?” We have included a dummy variable for those who said they considered themselves an Aboriginal person first. The second variable is an additive scale of responses to two questions that ask about the level of satisfaction (on a 4-point scale) with the federal government’s efforts to resolve longstanding 1) Aboriginal attempts to negotiate self government

and 2) Aboriginal land claims. Higher scores on the additive scale indicate more dissatisfaction. Together, these two variables are an empirical test of claims in both the nationalism and post-colonial literature that suggest that Aboriginals see themselves as separate nations with a contentious relationship with the federal government. Those who identify more strongly with their Aboriginal identity and who are dissatisfied with the federal government's efforts to address Aboriginal claims may be particularly likely to turn away from federal politics.

Despite the prominence of this explanation, we find no evidence that either of these variables impacts turnout among Aboriginals on the Prairies.<sup>34</sup> It should also be noted that the inclusion of these variables also weakens the effect of trust in the federal government, which loses statistical significance in this model. This is largely driven by the correlation (.39) between trust in the federal government and the dissatisfaction scale. This is consistent with our suggestion that while trust in government impacts both the propensity to vote of the general population and of Aboriginal peoples, trust in the federal government among the latter may well be tied to the colonial relationship in which treaty and land claims play an important role.

All this is not to say that attitudes toward the federal government play no role in involvement in federal elections. Our measures may simply lack the validity to capture the relationship. In addition, the adoption of certain attitudinal dispositions may also be correlated with the demographic and resource variables in the model.

It may also be the case, following the post-colonial thesis, that we should expect to see attitudes toward federal institutions playing a greater role among certain groups of Aboriginals – particularly the younger generation (see discussion above). Alfred and colleagues, for instance, have argued that the trend toward Aboriginal youth disengagement reflects a shift to alternative forms of political participation that reflect more direct action.<sup>35</sup> Such involvement rests on a critique of both the Canadian state and mainstream Aboriginal organizations that is highly critical of traditional politics in both venues. As such, we might expect that Aboriginal identity and dissatisfaction may play a more important role for youth who have grown up surrounded by post-colonial discourses.

We find that attitudes toward the state are important among young people, but not in the manner the post-colonial thesis would suggest. In Table 5, we present the full model estimates only for Aboriginal persons 30 years and younger. (We have also excluded the community variables due to small sample sizes.) Strikingly, we find evidence that dissatisfaction with the federal government's attempts to resolve longstanding land claims and treaties actually *mobilizes* the youth vote ( $p < 0.10$ ). Those who express more dissatisfaction are more likely to report voting in the last federal election. In addition, trust in the federal government in Ottawa is also significant and would seem to have a particularly large effect among young people: the odds of voting among Aboriginal youth who reported some trust in the federal government to “do what is right” are over 3.5 times greater than the odds of voting among Aboriginal youth who reported almost never or never trusting the federal government.

<b>Table 5: Youth Only Model of Turnout</b>			
	OR	(s.e.)	sign.
<b>Demographics</b>			
Urban	1.09	(0.72)	
Female	0.94	(0.52)	
Married or common-law	0.19	(0.12)	**
Alberta	0.21	(0.16)	**
Manitoba	0.37	(0.24)	<sup>a</sup>
<b>Socio-Economic Resources</b>			
Completed Highschool	5.09	(3.29)	**
Some Post-Secondary	13.02	(9.94)	**
Low Income	0.50	(0.28)	
Employed	1.97	(1.13)	
<b>Network Resources</b>			
Involved in political org.	3.53	(2.83)	<sup>a</sup>
Involved in charitable org.	2.29	(1.51)	
Religious Attendance	0.82	(0.23)	
<b>Engagement in System</b>			
News consumption	0.91	(0.14)	
Trust in federal government	3.61	(2.33)	**
<b>Aboriginal Hypotheses</b>			
Participate in Aboriginal Org.	0.46	(0.28)	
Aboriginal Identity over Canadian	2.20	(1.30)	
Dissatisfaction Scale	1.39	(0.27)	*
Pseudo R-Squared		0.277	
N		123	
*** p<.01; ** p<.05; * p<.10; <sup>a</sup> p<.15			
Source: ESC Aboriginal Sample, 2004. Model limited to those who reported being 30 years old or younger.			

These findings suggest that among young Aboriginals, both dissatisfaction with negotiations and trust in the federal government promote involvement in the electoral process. This finding has implications for the post-colonial thesis, which seems to imply that distrust of the federal government and dissatisfaction with its negotiations with First Nations communities should lead people to alternative forms of participation. We find, on the contrary, that such attitudes actually mobilize participation in the very traditional form of voting in federal elections.



## Discussion and Conclusions

---

We set out in this paper to examine the extent to which traditional resource models of turnout explain low levels of electoral participation among First Nations communities in Canada. Along with important age dynamics, we found evidence that resources – especially socio-economic resources like education – play an important role in explaining who votes and who does not among Aboriginal Canadians.

In addition to the importance of resources, the research presented in this paper also points to the importance of Aboriginal-specific variables. A strict application of a resource model to Aboriginal communities ignores the situation of Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Their unique relationships with the state and the history of oppression that colours these relationships cannot be overlooked. Our research suggests that there are important differences across Aboriginal communities in their willingness to vote. We find little evidence of differences between on-reserve and off-reserve Aboriginals, but significant differences across bands and language groups. Furthermore, we find evidence that involvement in Aboriginal organizations was positively associated with turnout. Finally, among young Aboriginals, we also find that attitudes toward the federal government and its negotiations with First Nations communities can motivate them to express their voice in the ballot box.

The policy implications of this research are three fold. First and foremost, the disadvantaged position of Aboriginal communities in terms of socio-economic resources is an important source of low turnout among Aboriginal peoples. If Aboriginal voices are valued in the electoral process, then ensuring that these communities have adequate resources to participate in the process is essential. The disproportionate levels of poverty and low education among these communities compared to the general population almost ensure their underrepresentation at the ballot box.

Second, our research also points to the importance of promoting participation in Aboriginal organizations. Such organizations should not be viewed as “rival systems of representation” that reduce incentives to participate in Canadian federal institutions.<sup>36</sup> Rather, a healthy and vibrant Aboriginal civil society facilitates voice both within these communities as well as in federal elections.

Finally, our findings among young Aboriginals imply that young people are willing to participate in the process to address their concerns about Aboriginal issues, but that this involvement is fostered by a trust in the federal government. If participation in federal institutions is desired, then it is important that negotiations with First Nations communities to resolve longstanding disputes proceed in good faith. Young Aboriginals who do not trust the federal government to do what is right are much more likely to tune out of federal politics.



## References

---

- Alfred, Taiaiake. *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Alfred, Taiaiake, and Lana Lowe. *Warrior Societies in Contemporary Indigenous Communities*. Toronto: Ipperwash Inquiry, 2005.
- Alfred, Taiaiake, Brock Pitawanakwat, and Jackie Price. *The Meaning of Political Participation for Indigenous Youth* [electronic resource]. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 2007.
- Bedford, David. "Aboriginal Voter Participation in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick." *Electoral Insight* 5, no. 3 (November 2003): 16–20.
- Bedford, David, and Sidney Pobihushchy. "On-Reserve Status Indian Voter Participation in the Maritimes." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 15, no. 2 (1995): 255–78.
- Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Blais, Andre, Elisabeth Gidengil, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau. "Where Does Turnout Decline Come From?" *European Journal of Political Research* 43 (2004): 221–36.
- Cairns, Alan C. "Aboriginal People's Electoral Participation in the Canadian Community." *Electoral Insight* 5, no. 3 (November 2003): 2–9.
- Cairns, Alan C. *First Nations and the Canadian State: In Search of Coexistence*. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 2005.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960.
- Coleman, James. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1988): 95–120.
- Dahl, Robert. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Delli Carpini, Michael, and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Guérin, Daniel. "Aboriginal Participation in Canadian Federal Elections: Trends and Implications." *Electoral Insight* 5, no. 3 (November 2003): 10–15.
- Howe, Paul. "Non-Political Sources of Political Disengagement Among the Young." In *Canadian Democracy: Bringing Youth Back into the Political Process.*, 12–15. Montreal: Centre for Research and Information on Canada, 2004.
- Johnston, Richard, Scott J. Matthews, and Amanda Bittner. "Turnout and the Party System in Canada, 1998–2004." *Electoral Studies* 26 no. 4, (December 2007): 735–745.
- Ladner, Keira L. "The Alienation of Nation: Understanding Aboriginal Electoral Participation, 1988–2004." *Electoral Insight* 5, no. 3 (November 2003): 21–26.

- Ladner, Keira L., and Michael McCrossan. "The Electoral Participation of Aboriginal People." In *Working Paper Series on Electoral Participation and Outreach Practices*. Ottawa: Elections Canada, 2007.
- Pendakur, Krishna, and Ravi Pendakur. "Aboriginal Income Disparity in Canada." In *Metropolis British Columbia Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Diversity Working Paper Series*, No. 08–15. Vancouver: Metropolis British Columbia, 2008.
- Peters, Evelyn. "Geographies of Aboriginal People in Canada." *Canadian Geographer* 45, no. 1 (2001): 138–44.
- Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Schouls, Tim. "Aboriginal Peoples and Electoral Reform in Canada: Differentiated Representation Versus Voter Equality." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 29, no. 4 (1996): 729–49.
- Silver, Jim, Cyril Keeper, and Michael MacKenzie. "A Very Hostile System in Which to Live: Aboriginal Electoral Participation." In *In Their Own Voices: Building Urban Aboriginal Communities*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006.
- Turpel, Mary Ellen. "Indigenous Peoples' Rights of Political Participation and Self-Determination: Recent International Legal Developments and the Continuing Struggle for Recognition." *Cornell International Law Journal* 25 no. 3 (1992): 579–602.
- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Wolfinger, Raymond, E. and Steven J. Rosenstone. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

## End Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Dahl (1989).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Blais et al. (2004); Howe (2004).

<sup>3</sup> Ladner and McCrossan (2007).

<sup>4</sup> Verba et al. (1995) See also Verba and Nie (1972).

<sup>5</sup> Berelson et al. (1954); Verba and Nie (1972); Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980); Verba et al. (1995).

<sup>6</sup> Putnam (2000); Coleman (1988).

<sup>7</sup> Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996); See also Campbell et al. (1960).

<sup>8</sup> Johnston et al. (2007).

<sup>9</sup> Silver et al. (2006) at pp. 109–111.

<sup>10</sup> For a discussion about location see Ladner and McCrossan (2007) p. 21. For a discussion about age and mobility see Silver et al. (2006) at pp. 109–111.

<sup>11</sup> Silver et al. (2006) at pp.111–112. Also see Ladner (2003).

<sup>12</sup> Bedford and Pobihushchy (1995).

<sup>13</sup> Guérin (2003).

<sup>14</sup> Silver et al. (2006) at p. 23.

<sup>15</sup> Schouls (1996) at p. 744. Here Schouls advances that a “significant obstacle to Aboriginal participation within Parliament is the proclivity of many Aboriginal peoples to identify their citizenship exclusively with their Aboriginal nation of origin. The position of Aboriginal peoples so inclined is to view the institutions of Canada’s Parliament as ideologically incommensurable with the norms and practices that guide their own political institutions.”

<sup>16</sup> Cairns (2005) at pp. 23–26.

<sup>17</sup> Cairns (2003) at p. 6.

<sup>18</sup> Turpel (1992) at p. 580.

<sup>19</sup> Alfred (1995) at p. 7.

<sup>20</sup> Band level governments are included here because segments of the Aboriginal population that adhere to the postcolonial thesis (for example, certain parts of the Warrior and Aboriginal youth movements) advance that these governments are also instruments of colonization and need to be resisted. See Alfred and Lowe (2005).

<sup>21</sup> Alfred et al. (2007) at p. 15.

<sup>22</sup> Alfred et al. (2007).

<sup>23</sup> Data for the Equality, Security and Community survey were collected by the Institute for Social Research, York University. The ESC project was funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, grant number 412-97-0003. The survey was carried out under the direction of Dr. Richard Johnston, UBC.

<sup>24</sup> The various components of the ESC survey were collected by the Institute for Social Research (<http://www.isr.yorku.ca/>).

<sup>25</sup> Current estimates actually place the Aboriginal population living off reserves at approximately 50%. See Guérin (2003).

<sup>26</sup> Guérin (2003).

---

<sup>27</sup> Bedford (2003) Note that this is counter to work on turnout among Status Indians for federal elections though, that suggest Manitoban Aboriginals are among the least likely to vote in Canada. See Guérin (2003).

<sup>28</sup> Peters (2001).

<sup>29</sup> See Guérin (2003) He notes that the salience of Aboriginal issues can help explain higher levels of turnout in some areas.

<sup>30</sup> Income was calculated based on two questions. Those who did not report their exact income were asked to report the range of their personal annual income in a second question. For these respondents, the lowest range was \$0–\$20,000.

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, Pendakur and Pendakur (2008).

<sup>32</sup> Because the aboriginal sample is not representative, pooling the data means we are not able to use population weights. As such, these models should not be used for population estimates. However, they do allow us to assess the relationship between being aboriginal and voting.

<sup>33</sup> See for example Kiera Ladner and Michael McCrossan's recommendations for increasing Aboriginal participation in elections. Ladner and McCrossan (2007) at pp. 38–41. For a critique of these recommendations see Alfred et al. (2007) at pp. 14–15.

<sup>34</sup> It should be noted that alternative variables were examined, including pride in being Canadian and rating scales of the federal government. None of these alternative measures provided significant findings (results not shown).

<sup>35</sup> Alfred et al. (2007).

<sup>36</sup> Cairns (2003).