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Table 1A: Service Terms and Sub-Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education/Youth/Recreation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Security/Justice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amusement</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement park</td>
<td>immunization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>Mobile clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childcare</td>
<td>rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinics</td>
<td>soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>Soup kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fotball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>futball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soccer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health/Emergency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambulance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antibiotic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blanket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crescent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs/Welfare/Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fertilizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harambee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyr’s fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Disaster</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earthquake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsunami</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodbank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garbage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
orphanage
park
political
Political wing
postal
Postal service
Public goods
Public safety
Public works
radio
rebuild
reconstruction
Reconstruction subsidy
removal
representation
rubbish
Rubbish collection
sanitation
Sanitation protection
septic
service
services
sewage
Sewage removal
shadow
Social mission
Social service
Social services
street
Street light
taxi
Taxi service
trash
visa
waste
Waste removal
Water
Water access
Water sanitation

Religious
christian
church

cleric
hadith
Islamic
Islamic institutions
mosque
religious
Religious institution
seminaries
madrassa
madrassas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Variable (ranked)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Services</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Youth, Recreation</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Emergency</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Justice</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial, Jobs, Welfare, Subsidies</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disaster</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2A: Descriptive statistics for ranked service indicators*

**Cross-Validation**

MAROB is related to the Minorities at Risk (MAR) data and covers 118 ethnopolitical organizations (representing MAR groups) from 26 countries in the Middle East and North Africa. Our major independent variable, social services, comes directly from MAROB (“ORGST3” in MAROB). It can take on three values: 0 indicating that the group does not use participation in electoral politics as a strategy, 1 if the group uses electoral politics infrequently, and 2 if the group uses electoral politics frequently (see the MAROB codebook for more details).

Our dependent variable, negotiations, also from MAROB, indicates whether the group and the state have engaged in negotiations. It is a binary variable created from “ORGSUCCESS”. It takes on the value of 1 when the state makes any concessions or negotiates with the group (ORGSUCCESS>0) and 0 otherwise. Though imprecise, this measure is most analogous to Cronin’s measure of negotiation occurrence. To the best of our knowledge, there is no synonymous indicator for stable negotiations.
To replicate our controls, we used data on organizational type (religious organizations), group age, participation in electoral politics (“ORGST12”), and organizational popularity (“ORGPOP”) directly from MAROB. We also included a variable indicating whether the organization was militant (“ORGMILITANT”). Unlike our data, only some MAR groups use violence. We included controls for polity scores, log of population, and log of CINC scores. Using logit models, we also include time and country dummy variables in all models. Additionally, we cluster on organizational ID for each regression. Table 4A below shows our results.

Consistent with our findings, the results indicate a strong positive relationship between organizations’ provision of social services and negotiations. Providing services is, in fact, the most significant and strongest predictor of negotiations across all our models. Interestingly, for this population the controls included do very little to predict negotiations. Political participation is a negative predictor for negotiations, unlike in our previous analysis. This may be an artifact of the population from which these groups are drawn (MENA countries, ethnopolitical groups). Interestingly, violence, the only new variable here, does nothing to predict negotiations. Also interesting is the fact that the variables we suspect would proxy for organizational capacity, group age and organizational popularity, are statistically unimportant. This suggests, as in our models above, that service provision has an independent and unique effect on negotiation status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model A1</th>
<th>Model A2</th>
<th>Model A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Provision</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td>1.30***</td>
<td>1.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Group</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-2.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>-0.82***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Popularity</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militant Organization</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Population</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log CINC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Org. Clusters</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>-2.93</td>
<td>-30.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(2.26)</td>
<td>(32.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-pseudolikelihood</td>
<td>-330.63</td>
<td>-314.79</td>
<td>-200.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo X²</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3A: Using MAROB data, testing Negotiation Occurrence using logit models. Standard errors in parentheses. ***significant at 0.01, **significant at 0.05, *significant at 0.10
Further validation of the measure

To address the question of endogeneity between service provision and organization capacity, we have evidence that provision of services is a choice made by groups. We acknowledge that we are unable to unambiguously isolate this first part of the causal chain at present. We are currently working on disaggregating the service data by group-year, which will allow for us to more closely trace the causal relationship. In the interim, we control for group lifetime. The most obvious explanation for what generates organizational capacity is survival.

In Table 5A below, we show variation in service provision by negotiation status that lend support to our argument that service provision is not only a function of organizational capacity. While certain types of services are more correlated with negotiations, that pattern is not universal. We also considered the possibility that state spending on services could be driving negotiations. To assess that possibility, we compared Taydas and Peksen (2012) data on public spending to negotiations and found that states that have different levels of public spending enter negotiations at statistically similar rates.
| Variable Name                  | Mean (no negotiation) | Mean (negotiation) | Difference of Means | T-test p-value Ha(T<\(t\)) | T-test p-value Ha(\(|T|<\mid t\mid\)) | T-test p-value Ha(T>\(t\)) |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Total Services Count          | 2430.9               | 4747.2            | 2316.3              | 0.0000                      | 0.0001                          | 1.0000                       |
| Education Count               | 188.7                | 650.6             | 461.9               | 0.0001                      | 0.0003                          | 0.9999                       |
| Health Count                  | 155.7                | 152.3             | 3.4                 | 0.5450                      | 0.9100                          | 0.4550                       |
| Security Count                | 251.2                | 309.8             | 58.6                | 0.1536                      | 0.3073                          | 0.8464                       |
| Financial Count               | 220.7                | 313.8             | 93.1                | 0.0301                      | 0.0603                          | 0.9699                       |
| Disaster Count                | 88.3                 | 409.9             | 321.6               | 0.0006                      | 0.0012                          | 0.9994                       |
| Public Services Count         | 929.3                | 1758              | 828.7               | 0.0001                      | 0.0002                          | 0.9999                       |
| Religious Count               | 154.5                | 238.4             | 83.9                | 0.0248                      | 0.0497                          | 0.9752                       |
| Total Public Spending (Taydas and Peksen (2012)) | 15.1                 | 14.6              | .45                 | 0.6690                      | 0.6620                          | 0.3310                       |

*Table 4A: Difference in means of States Entering Negotiations*
Service Categories

In Tables 5a and 6a below, we report the models summarized in Table 5 of the article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 17 (Educate)</th>
<th>Model 18 (Health)</th>
<th>Model 19 (Security)</th>
<th>Model 20 (Finance)</th>
<th>Model 21 (Disaster)</th>
<th>Model 22 (Pub Serv)</th>
<th>Model 23 (Religion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Service Provision</td>
<td>2.69** (0.94)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.80)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.81)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.49*** (0.89)</td>
<td>1.73** (0.87)</td>
<td>0.73 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Controls Included?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-25.50 (1.88)</td>
<td>-24.81 (2.72)</td>
<td>-24.87 (1.74)</td>
<td>-24.80 (1.75)</td>
<td>-24.87 (3.01)</td>
<td>-25.12 (1.89)</td>
<td>-24.76 (1.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>-82.06</td>
<td>-86.49</td>
<td>-86.17</td>
<td>-86.30</td>
<td>-82.35</td>
<td>-84.43</td>
<td>-86.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo X²</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5a: Testing Negotiation Occurrence (“talks”) using logit models. ***significant at 0.01, **significant at 0.05, *significant at 0.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 24 (Educate)</th>
<th>Model 25 (Health)</th>
<th>Model 26 (Security)</th>
<th>Model 27 (Finance)</th>
<th>Model 28 (Disaster)</th>
<th>Model 29 (Pub Serv)</th>
<th>Model 30 (Religion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Service Provision</td>
<td>2.04** (1.19)</td>
<td>0.31 (1.13)</td>
<td>1.15 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.46 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.15* (1.15)</td>
<td>2.06* (1.12)</td>
<td>0.84 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Controls Included?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country FE?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-22.37 (2.29)</td>
<td>-21.55 (1.74)</td>
<td>-21.81 (1.69)</td>
<td>-21.61 (2.20)</td>
<td>-22.18 (1.76)</td>
<td>-22.40 (1.77)</td>
<td>-21.62 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>-54.00</td>
<td>-55.51</td>
<td>-54.97</td>
<td>-55.47</td>
<td>-53.70</td>
<td>-53.77</td>
<td>-55.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo X²</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6a: Testing Negotiation Stability (“talksstable”) using logit models. ***significant at 0.01, **significant at 0.05, *significant at 0.10

---

i See [http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.asp#marob](http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/data.asp#marob) (accessed various times 2012-13) for more information