

American University of Central Asia
Sociology Department

**Reasons and Types of Participation of Ethnic Korean in Political Activities
in Kyrgyzstan**

By Won Bin Cho

Thesis Supervisor: Aida Bekturova

American University of Central Asia

Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

April 2013

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Significance of the research.....	5
Literature review.....	7
Theoretical framework.....	18
Conceptualization.....	26
Methodology.....	28
Ethical issues and Limitation of the research.....	32
Research finding and Analysis.....	34
Conclusion.....	56
Reference list.....	58
Appendix I (Semi-structure questions)	63

Acknowledgement

Special thanks to my family who were all the time supporting me.

I would like to express great gratitude to my supervisor Aida Bekturova for helping me with thesis.

I also thank our other professors from Sociology department Galina Gorborkova, Gulnara Ibraeva, and Mehriqul Ablezova for sociological knowledge for 4 years.

Abstract

This research analyzes participation of ethnic Koreans in political activities, what kinds of political activities are practiced and not practiced by ethnic Korean by assuming that there are specific types and reasons by implying rational choice theory.

This research employed rational choice theory to analyze with concept of mechanism of reward and punishment for political behaviors of ethnic Korean either on individual level and collective level pre-assuming that ethnic Koreans in Kyrgyzstan are more likely to be encouraged in some particular political activities and while in some political activities are less likely encouraged by implying rational choice theory based on mechanism of benefits or punishments. And the author by pre-assuming that there is difference in political participation rates in different political activities of ethnic Koreans, specifically focuses on what political activities ethnic Koreans are tend to take and what political activities not by relating all ideas to rational choice theory's main concept mechanism of rewards and punishments.

For the data collection, in-depth interview was used for detail understanding of types and reasons of participation of ethnic Korean in political activities and it was analyzed within theoretical framework of rational choice theory.

Introduction

Political participation of ethnic minority has been issued in many countries and its importance is very remarkable. (Add: Importance of ethnic minorities' political participation and its benefits for the country) And, worldwide many multi-ethnic countries are still struggling with ethnic conflicts and problems. Kyrgyz also is not an exception from ethnic problems. Briefly pointing out ethnic conflicts occurred in Kyrgyzstan, since its independence in 1991, two major ethnic tragedies happened in the territory of Osh in 1991 and 2010.

Its initial concern of the research started with personal questions if seats in the parliament are mostly occupied by Kyrgyz people even though if we see the statistics (Chotaeva, 2004), the whole population of Kyrgyzstan is about 4.8 million and among 4.8 million people, 64.9% are indicated as Kyrgyz ethnicity, 13.8% are Uzbek ethnicity, 12.5% are Russian ethnicity and rest are minor ethnicities who are Dungan, Korean, Uighur, and Ukraine (Chotaeva, 2004). Even though the part that minor ethnicities take is not small from whole population, which is 35.1% of whole population, deputies in a parliament are mostly occupied with major ethnic group. Of course we can never say that there is a political discrimination toward ethnic minority and we also cannot make a conclusion that ethnic minorities are simply less likely to be interested in politics and less likely to be advanced in taking political activities. For this reason, this research basically concentrates to get the understanding what types of political activities usually do ethnic Koreans take, and what are the reasons for their taking of certain political activities if political activities are practiced.

If there is high or low political participation rate among ethnic minority, in this research, I am supposed to see why in particular political activities they are passive while in particular activities they are active. So, as a case study of ethnic Korean, with deep interview method, I will investigate to understand all about political participation of ethnic Koreans

including if there was any political participation derived from group behavior or not, what kinds of political activities they usually are involved, was there any politically derived conflicts with other ethnic group, what kind of political activities do ethnic Korean take as an individual and all of concerns relevant to political participations of ethnic Korean. Rational choice theory that I applied for this research, gives us clear approaches how the mechanism of getting rewards and punishment stimulates one's behaviors. Based on this theory, the political behavior of ethnic Korean will be analyzed either in individual level or collective level. And also before focusing on only rational choice theory, others' theories also will be briefly reviewed in the part of literature review how other scholars used different theories to understand political behaviors of particular groups.

Significance of the research-

Since Kyrgyzstan is one of multi-ethnic countries in CIS, which struggled twice with ethnic conflicts in 1991 and 2010, the political participation of ethnic minorities issues very rapidly after 2010. According to the former statistics, its population of ethnic minority is composed more than 35% of whole population of the country which plays a big role of the country. But still many efforts were performed to resolving ethnic conflicts, two tragic death happened 1990 in Osh province and 2010 in Osh province.

For instance according to research of (Fumagalli, 2007), Uzbek organizations were prohibited to play or employ any political characteristics since 1991, a ethnic conflict happened in the territory of city Osh in Kyrgyzstan. Instead of organization that employs political characteristics, all the organizations existed, the name of organization were changed with additional letter that indicates 'Cultural'. After ethnic conflict happened, the name of organization changed into Uzbek cultural organization. Regarding of this, it seems like ethnic minorities do not have any political powers comparing with ethnic majorities. It only seems.

Regardless of previous issues related political empowerment of ethnic minorities, there are other issues related to human civil rights. One of many fundamental human right is right to participate in politics, especially participating in decision making process which is also one of important characteristics of democracy. But interesting point here we need to focus on is that some groups of people actively participate in politics while some groups of people do not actively participate in politics even though they possess their fundamental right. Of course there are many theories how we can explain active political participation and passive political participation of certain groups. For instance, people who possess higher education and social status, they tend to participate in politics more actively then people who have lower education and lower social status according to socioeconomic status model (Verba & Nie, 1972). What things could be problematic is that different political participation

rates of different groups if the preferences or interests of certain groups are major or is reflected to policy making of the government not reflecting other groups' interests and preferences according to Kleppner (1982).

As we know, the centrality of political participation is an important point in most theories about democracy. In this regard, the equality of each individual should be underlined by assuming that all people who are citizens of particular country should take part of participation because each individual political participation makes democracy works. Only by taking political activities, certain groups can get political influence and power.

So, here I understand the political participation as an empowerment. So, in democratic societies, however there is no perfect democracy we call, still individuals should take control of their own lives and holding government to account with equal opportunities. Moreover Kleppner (1982) and other scholars have been arguing that political participation encourages citizens to demonstrate a certain degree of allegiance to the democracy system, which means by taking political activities individuals show their preferences and interests, so this active political participation helps in maintaining the society to be more united. And the loyalty earned toward the government's democratic system could play also important role in uniting different groups of people as Kleppner (1982) explains.

By followings reasons, the political participation of ethnic Koreans are important to be studied to understand whether ethnic Koreans who are considered to be one of ethnic minor groups are encouraged to take political activities or not, if yes or no, what kind of reasons make them to behave in a certain way, either for the development of democratic political system of Kyrgyzstan and for the development of ethnic Korean's participation in political activities.

Literature review

Cultural background of ethnic Korean in Central Asia

Who are called as 'Ethnic Korean', the immigrants in Central Asia are initially sent from regions of Northern Korea and Province Siberia. Some of them are escaped to the Central Asia and Russia because of poor harvest. And majority of ethnic Koreans were forced to immigrate to central Asia in Stalin regime. These ethnic Koreans, basically have experience of discrimination of local societies, and negative group migration experiences. (Jun & Yim, 2007). Most ethnic Koreans who were forced to immigrate, they haven't only experienced hard time, but also had many difficulties to adopted to the society. And many of them lost ethnic identity and cultural livelihood. However they are ethnic Korean, their native language is Russian, and they call Soviet as their country and they call themselves as 'Kyoryo Saram' which means Korean man. Because the connection between ethnic Korean sent to Central Asia and their motherland Korea was lost, they were put to the situation that they need to be adopted to Soviet culturally and linguistically. According the many researches, 'Kyoro Saram' is considered to be one most well adopted ethnic Korean to local society (Jun & Yim, 2007).

And after the collapse of Soviet Union, scholars evaluated that ethnic minorities' legal right recovered, but by collapse of Soviet Union, many ethnic Koreans were scattered to many different post-soviet countries such as Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. And the potential problem might be for ethnic Koreans is that these most post-Soviet countries by applying a ethnocentric policy, these local dominant ethnic majorities' nationalism should be paid an attention. However, most participants of interview, they described Kyrgyz people, as kind nationality who adopted strangers to their land. The significance of the research started with concern of political participation of ethnic minorities initially. However, ethnic Korean, who is considered to be migrants to Kyrgyzstan,

Multiethnic cultures engagement policy

In accordance with laws in most Central Asian countries, governments do not use any discriminative policy toward ethnic minorities. Concerning Kyrgyz government's policy toward ethnic minority, there is an assurance on rights in political activities, economic activities and cultural activities (Jun & Yim, 2007). So, Kyrgyz government, by applying opened policy toward ethnic minority, legally ensures rights to any ethnic group and right to participate in any civil field in any social life. And it also respects ethnic groups' traditions, languages and cultures, and it ensures necessary condition for the development of ethnic minorities' traditions and cultures.

Even though the Kyrgyz legislation ensures rights of ethnic minority, many scholars found out that still ethnic Korean face with the problem of its state language. Even though the official language of Kyrgyzstan is Russian language, and it is illegal to fire someone because one doesn't speak Kyrgyz. In terms of politics, the knowledge of Kyrgyz language is considered to be very required. Therefore many participants faced with difficulties in participating in politics not speaking Kyrgyz language.

I revised few theories applied by other researches which will be helpful for explanation of political participation and political behaviors of ethnic minorities. There are four theories will be discussed which are slightly differentiated from its approaches and its results of researches. Some of these theories are proper for constructing this research's theoretical framework while some of them do not seem proper. However all of these four theories should be partially reviewed and carefully analyzed whether these different theories could be used together or not, for explanation of ethnic Korean's participation in political activities. Basically the theories that I reviewed are 'Group consciousness theory', 'Psychological resource model' and 'Social connectedness theory' and 'Rational choice theory' which I found mostly discussed and applied for studies of social sciences and political

sciences. For this research, two main theories together will be the bases of theoretical framework which are 'Rational choice theory' and 'Social connectedness theory'.

Socioeconomic status theory was discussed by many different scholars to explain political behaviors of citizens. This model tries to see people's political behavior in a way that people who have higher socioeconomic resources are more likely to have psychological orientations which make people more stimulated to be participated in politics (Verba & Nie, 1972). According to this model, what these two scholars argue is that individuals' political participation is based on individuals' socioeconomic resources (income and education) and civic orientations (attitudes which individuals hold toward themselves or the political system which predispose them toward political action) and other variables. And as their hypothesis, individuals with high status situated in the higher social environments which stimulate them or indirectly force positive attitudinal and participatory norms, are more likely to participate in politics than individuals who are labeled as low status. This hypothesis is empirically studied in many researches and provided lots of evidences to support this socioeconomic status model. Individuals who have high level of education are more likely to participate in politics than individuals who have low level of education (Verba & Nie, 1972).

Supporting the socioeconomic status model, Rosenstone & Hansen (1993) brought research results which empirically supporting socioeconomic status model. He concluded that the higher education degree people possess, the more they are likely to read a newspapers related to politics than other people who possess lower education degree. He stated that education is significant factor that facilitates people to get basic understanding of political structure, and which provides skills how to participate in politics. As Wolfinger & Rosenstone (1980) also supports, he said "education imparts information about politics and cognate fields and about a variety of skills, some of which facilitate political leaning... Schooling increases one's capacity for understanding and working with complex, abstract and

intangible subjects, that is, subjects like politics" (Who votes? p.18). As Wolfinger & Rosenstone (1980) points out, education plays an important role that stimulates one's political participation. And for people to participate in politics, people need a basic understanding how voting or signing petition process is working. People before going to vote, they should know how to register, where to vote and basic ability to understand issues raised by certain candidates about their main policies, and consideration to vote whom. However there are many critics which stands against socioeconomic status model. There is a challenge that income and education level cannot be the only factors of active political participation. For instance, Brody (1978) challenges this theory by comparing statistics of Americans' income and education degree 1960th and 1980th. Bruce (1978) pointed out that even though level of education and income increased in 1980th, political participation rate declined rapidly in last several decades. And also adding results of the research of Wong (2011), it says that the education is not a major factor decides political participations of one ethnicity. For instance, by pointing out the analysis of each ethnicity of Asian American including Chinese, Indian, Vietnamese, Korean, Filipino, and Japanese American, he concludes socioeconomic advantage may not necessarily play an important role which may actually explain political participation. Bringing with the example of Chinese American, Wong (2011) says, even though Chinese American posses higher educational achievements than Japanese American, Japanese American seems being more active in voting activities than Chinese American, and Vietnamese American who possess lowest level of education and income, they are more likely being active in political activities such as protest more than any other Asian ethnic minorities.

So, in this regard, education degree and economic level seems like, it might be not a proper model for this research, not only because of the limitation of socioeconomic theory itself but also with its methodology and difficulties with the measurement of data and

different characteristics of the research. In contrast to qualitative research methods of socioeconomic status model is mostly developed for quantitative research method approach. In this regard, to generate reliable data and results for socioeconomic theory, it requires bigger sampling than just investigating individuals with qualitative research methods. Moreover, to see the relationship of socioeconomic level and political participation and to measure the level of political participation between ethnic majority and ethnic minority, and at least two different ethnic groups should be compared. Regardless of all, socio-economic model has been challenged in multi-ethnic countries where as USA, from the point of view 'group consciousness theory'. Many researches conducting Blacks' political participation concluded that with the same level of education and income comparing with white Americans, black Americans are more likely to vote (one of activities of political participation) than white American (Teixeira, 1992). In this regard, with its limitation of studying particular ethnic group, instead of socioeconomic model which focuses only individual political behavior, a 'group consciousness theory' which helps to answer questions like 'how group behavior such as political participation is practiced?' would be more proper for this research since it studies ethnic Koreans' political participation rather than an individuals' political behaviors. And Shingles (1981), in his research, claimed that its difference between Black American and white American was related to Black's group consciousness (Shingles, 1981) which will be revised by following.

Group consciousness theory

Group consciousness theory is also an important theory which needs to be discussed briefly. Group consciousness theory was mostly applied to explanation of individuals' group political behaviors (Tate, 1991). Group consciousness model's main concepts that are group consciousness and group solidarity need to be conceptualized. According to Miller (1981), group solidarity is conceptualized how one feels closeness to their own ethnic group and feels

their own group's obligation and collective destiny while group consciousness is considered to be more about one's awareness and actual practices about their ethnic groups' cultural or traditional practices. In the case of USA, in contrast to socioeconomic status model, it says that political participation of black Americans is considered to be more active than political participation of whites. In this regard, socioeconomic status model seems not reliable explaining why black Americans' political participation (voting activity, participating in demonstrations or picketing) is higher than white Americans (Shingles, 1981). So, with the major challenges of socioeconomic status model, group consciousness model sees political participation more in a macro level than socioeconomic status model does. For instance, group consciousness theory focuses on more one's ethnicity's cooperative political behaviors. The way how Verba & Nie (1972) explain is that overrepresentation of black Americans among political activists in terms of black consciousness, their awareness of feeling that they are unequally deprived or oppressed group, stimulates them to participate in politics more actively. Supporting Verba & Nie's (1972) idea, Wong (2011) in his book "Asian American political participation", also points out that factor such as hate crimes or racial victimization stimulate ethnic group to be more politically active than any other factors. Wong (2011), in his work, points out that when ethnic minority are discriminated or threatened from ethnic majority or any other groups, more likely to feel group consciousness and awareness of group collective destiny, so it basically stimulates actors to participate in political activities more actively to protect themselves from the threats might be derived to them. However to check one's level of group consciousness and group solidarity is hard to be measured.

Psychological resource model (political interest and efficacy)

Reviewing other theories which may explain political participation, I figured out psychological resource model is also applied many researches. Psychological resource model is one of the theories that are dominating in the field of political participation. One of

important reasons of reviewing of this model is it is related with the rational choice theory that mostly will be used in this research. It shares many concepts and characteristics of rational choice theory such as political interests, individual rewards, collective rewards, and political efficacy which are also often discussed in rational choice theories.

This model tries to explain how psychological orientations such as political interest, political efficacy, trust in government, and civic duty are related on electoral participation in politics. Especially Rosenstone & Hansen's (1993) work, its aim is mostly concentrated on explaining political behavioral outcomes based on relationship between political interest and political efficacy. The concept "collective rewards" should be very useful for the theoretical frame of this research. He defined the concept "collective reward" as one's taking political activities for collective rewards of particular group.

Psychological resource model's main concepts are mainly two big concepts that are political interest and political efficacy. These two variables are main factors that stimulate one to participate in politics. Political interest refers to one's personal political preference and reward that is driven by their political actions. Reward driven from their political action is divided into two types. One is collective reward which individuals perform political activities for particular one group's benefit. Political efficacy refers to one's personal belief and competence that their political action will affects on outcomes of political issues or decision.

According to Fumagalli (2007) research interview data, ethnic Uzbek people were mostly feared to take any political activities with thoughts that their involvements in Kyrgyz politics might harm their security. For this reason, they were depressed and quite discouraged to take political activities. So, if one believes less one's personal competence and thinks that their efforts to politics would not be reflected to whole consequences of policy makings, and their political participation in voting, petition and campaign is meaningless, and considers it as an waste of time and efforts which is not rational to take (Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993).

Group conflict theory (Should be edited for the implementation)

Group conflict theory is one of the theories concerns ethnic minorities' political behaviors based on power threat model raised by several scholars, but mostly by Blalock (1967). Basically what this theory explains is that how conflicts between two or more groups based on competition for limited resources, in-group identification and out-group hostility reflect in each individual social, political and economic behaviors.

This theory explains dominant group's cooperated political behaviors with the threat increased by minority groups. In Blalock's (1967) researches, they argued that the more the threat from minority group increases, the more individuals who belong to dominant group are likely to participate in voting activity to protect their benefits or interests from other minority groups.

In this regard, this theory seems not useful for explaining ethnic Koreans' political participation, but more about ethnic Kyrgyz political participation.

Social connectedness theory

Social connectedness theory is developed by many sociologists, social psychologists and political scientists to discover whether individual behaviors are related to the connectedness with larger social community or organization where people belong or not.

This theory is important because many scholars (Teixeira, 1992) argued that the decline of political participation is strongly related to its decline of social connectedness between individual citizens and social and political community. Basically they tried to measure a rate of social connectedness with measuring behavioral factors such home ownership, church attendance, marital status and organizational involvement. But there is still a doubt about this measuring scheme. For example, Tate (1991) who basically mostly studied black political participation mentions that home ownership does not really affect on political participation and especially presidential election, but black people who belong to black

organizations or politicized church are more likely to participate in presidential election. Even though social connectedness theory explains one is more likely to take political activities, when individuals are involved in more social networks. In some regards, it might be not fully suitable for this research which is focusing on more one ethnicity's political participation. For example, ethnicity-based institutional resources could be more important factors than just participating in organizations. So, social connectedness theory cannot fully generate deep explanation of political behavior of ethnic minority, if it does not take a consideration of group identity and consciousness of other ethnic minorities in case of Black community in the USA. So, both social connectedness theory and group consciousness theory should be revised together. Concerning two these theories, it is important to study whether ethnic Koreans' collective political behaviors are stimulated by involvement organization or not, and whether these collective political behaviors are derived by ethnic group's needs or not.

Defining the "Social capital", many different scholars have come up with different perspectives and ideas on it. Many different scholars Bourdieu (1983) and Putman (1993) started using this term "Social capital". While Bourdieu defined social capital as

"the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition (Bourdieu, 1983: 249)",

Putman defined social capital as

"features of social organization, such as trust norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (Putnam, 1993: 167).

For this research, Putman, one of the scholars who studied how social capital might influence on political participation, is going to be briefly reviewed since his ideas concerning the social capital is relevant to political participation (Putnam, 1995). In his work, he tried to

demonstrate how decline of social capital in America affected on indicators of civic engagement including voting, political participation, newspaper readership, participation in local associations and signing in petition. According to him with decline of social capital in USA, in a last three decades, there was a major shift in political participation of citizens. For instance, in his work, he gave a statistics which claims that American sign petition 30% less and sign consumer boycott 40% less comparing to few decades ago. And also he argued that the decline in non political community life and civic or religious organization influenced on political participation rate.

Concerning Leighley & Vedlitz (1998) research results, supporting Putman's social capital, he tries to come up with more detailed boundary of two types of social capital. For instance, he demonstrated that there are different types of social capital which is politically relevant social capital and which is not politically relevant social capital. Politically relevant social capital stimulates political engagement while not politically relevant social capital does not stimulate political engagement. And social capital is created through the discussion and interaction with other people. If many workers in an office discuss about politics, it increases levels of politically relevant social capital and it eventually engages more people to be participated in politics. When a group of people in their work are talking about movie stars or sports at their lunchtime gathering, it could be defined as social capital but not as politically relevant social capital. At the same time, he states that 'unless these networks of relationships are transformed to accommodate political discussion and communication, they are unlikely to be relevant politically they will produce little in the way of political consequence. So, in this regard, not necessarily all social capital stimulate people to be politically active, but specific politically relevant social capital.

Leighley & Vedlitz (1999) defined politically relevant social capital which facilitates political engagement 'social capital produced as the consequence of political expertise and information that is regularly communicated within an individual's network of social relations.

For instance, in Husckfeldt & Srague (1993) researches, they tried to explain how politically relevant social capital is produced and reproduced based on human capital that one holds. For instance, he stated that 'more highly educated people are more likely to be located socially in ways that maximize their exposure to other people who also have higher levels of education'. And he also raised a statement that human capital which refers to more about one's income, education, and social status might be related with the production of politically relevant social capital. So, social capital is important factor should be studied since consequence of individual relationship between education and participation might not be only effects of human capital, but also social capital which produces politically relevant social capital and stimulate people to be involved in politics.

Supporting former mentioned theories, Wong (2011) in his research, he demonstrates that involvement in non-political activities such as civic or religious organizations stimulate political participation more than any other factors. Bringing the example of Korean American, whose involvement in Christianity is high among Asian Americans, are more likely stimulated to political participation through the religious activities and involvement in religious group (Wong, 2011).

Theoretical frameworks

In few decades, the use of rational choice theory rapidly increased in social sciences and other sciences such as political science, which its discipline is similar to sociology and many works were performed in philosophy and law (Kanazawa & Hechter, 1997). And also rational choice theory has been criticized by many sociologists. However its use of rational choice theory annually increases especially in journal of Rationality and Society and International Sociological Associations meetings (Kanazawa & Hechter, 1997). One of the reasons why it has been criticized is that sociology considers that people behave in a certain way because they could be forced, emotionally stimulated, and also when it is a habit, not necessarily people behave in a certain ways to only maximize their advantages while minimizing the cost. But still this theory covers and may explain many things about political behaviors of individuals and also as a collective political behaviors of certain organization (Kanazawa & Hechter, 1997). However many scholars who basically criticized rational choice theory, they have argued that rational choice theory explains only in individual level and individual behavior in which their behaviors are only stimulated for benefits over the cost. But also against its critics, there are many logical arguments how rational choice theory actually is able to explain collective behaviors of individuals. These will be explained in following paragraphs.

For constructing theoretical framework for this research, I will go through all concepts of rational choice theory that I will use to measure the findings with conceptualized key terms. In this regard, political participation of ethnic Korean will be explained and analyzed based on theoretical framework which will guide and limit boundaries of the research. And also theoretical frameworks' limitation and its solution for further use will be discussed.

There are many concepts were raised by sociologists who mostly applied and supported for rational action theories and many researchers have been enlarging and developing the framework of rational choice theory which its origin started by sociologist George Homans (Kanazawa & Hechter, 1997). Rational choice theory's fundamental idea is that there is belief that all the human behaviors are performed in a rational way to maximize individuals' benefits. This idea gives basic distinction how it differs from other theories' explanation of human behaviors. While some theories explain human behaviors differently from perspectives of Marxist, Functionalism, and Symbolic interactions' point of view. A rational choice theory argues that people are motivated to take particular activities by calculating which action would the most beneficial for them over the costs they need to spend.

And in contrast to most people's misunderstanding of rational choice theory, it doesn't necessarily explain only one individual behavior, but it also may explain social phenomena in terms of the how individuals' collective behaviors led to this social phenomena to occur. So, basically rational choice theory with its basic assumption, also explains social phenomena which is composed by each individual actions (Elster, 1989).

Starting with its concepts that has been used many years, the concepts of rational choice theory will be briefly explained as a theoretical framework of this research. First of all, there is a concept called profitable balance of reward and costs which Homans (1961) implies a conscious social actor engaging calculative strategies to explain that a behaviors of human are made by the benefits or punishments that they may get. In this regard, the potential punishments or rewards could be gained by taking certain activities, people may avoid to do certain activities which may give them punishments and people are stimulated to take certain activities if there are rewards they can gain. So, it is a reinforcement which make people which action to perform which action not to perform. Therefore, the political participation of

ethnic Korean should be understood and explained in this theoretical frame which explains people are motivated to take or not to take certain activities.

In Homans (1961) works, it also explains that rewards are not necessarily only a economic benefits over the costs, but also it could be rewards that recognitions from others, self-satisfactions, emotional satisfaction of performing some activities, love from others, prizes, careers and it could be many of feelings not necessarily material stuffs, punishments, dislikes. However wealth is mostly considered to be most valuable thing since it could be exchanged with many things including market places (Kanazawa & Hechter, 1997). The rewards or punishments the one will get may differ, but its mechanism how it works is basically the same.

However there are some existing paradox of rational choice theory that we need to discuss a bit in details. For instance, Barry (1970) in his research, he states that voting activity doesn't not require big cost and it doesn't also require big benefits as a collective action. What Barry in his research argues is that there is paradox which explains people's voting activities cannot be explained with rational choice theory since the benefits for doing voting and its costs are quite small, so that actors are not really rationally thinking or calculating the benefits and the costs comparison. However, Barry's research also challenges with many difficulties for instance, doing voting and not doing could be also explained from self-satisfaction perspectives for one who is interested in doing these activities and who get satisfactions for these, not necessarily rewards such as wealth but more likely social approval. For instance, going election requires one to take spend time to go to the election which is cost while if one doesn't go he could take a rest home which could be beneficial, and it could be also understood vice versa, if one votes, he gets self-satisfaction which is more important for him just sitting home take a rest. And also 'selective incentives' has been commonly used as

an approach how to solve paradox of rational choice theory in collective behaviors of particular organizations.

The concept 'selective incentives' which was developed by Olson (1965), gives an interesting basic explanation of collective behavior in organization. The basic idea of 'selective incentives' is that rational individuals are motivated to take more active collective activities only with selective incentives which one individual may receive, and these incentives should be selective, so that treatments to active participating individual member could be differed from people who doesn't not actively participate (Olson, 1965).

Rational choice theorists doesn't argue that there is only individual reinforcement, but there is also a mutual reinforcement which is helpful explaining the collective behaviors not only behaviors of individuals, and it can answer question like 'why particular group of people perform certain activities or not' in case of ethnic Korean political participation. What mutual reinforcement means is that every actor's behaviors may positively or negatively influences one's rewards or punishments. And if there are two or more people behave in a certain way, it means there is a interaction of social exchange of benefits or costs, and also individual behavior may influence on other people's behaviors if there are generalized reinforcement which could be considered as social approval. As Homans (1961) explains, social approval is an important reinforcement as much as economic materials such as money, and people could behave in the combination of these two things materials such as money and not materials such as social approval. And for instance, Olson (1965), critically argues that the people are stimulated to take political activities when there are rewards that they can earn such as money, confidence of certain group, and self-satisfaction, or benefits for certain group or punishments they may face with such as threats, discrimination, and policies which may harm certain group of people by actively taking political activities or not taking political activities. So, what his idea is that people rationally think whether taking political activities

are beneficial or not beneficial, and whether it would be harmful or not. This idea quite fits to this research and will be helpful for explaining findings in terms question "why people are taking some particular political activities while not taking other political activities". For instance, people may do participate in political meeting if the benefits they will gained is higher than punishment or costs they may face with by official governors, and people also may take certain political activities which could be beneficial and may not take political activities which may harm them. And while taking particular political activities would be beneficial for them over the costs, other political activities might be not beneficial for them over the costs. So, not only potential rewards stimulate individuals to behave in a certain way, but awareness of potential punishment also stimulate individuals to avoid certain behaviors. And Olson (1965) in his research, he also clearly mentions that when someone's defection of taking political activities will prevent benefits which could be earned, they are more likely to take collective activities against defection. And interesting point what Chong (1991) discusses about is that the benefits of cooperation or defection in collective activities are conditional based different level of political participation. This concerns should be reflected in interviews and analyzing the data.

The another interesting concept of rational choice theory what I will apply here is the interaction of exchange of benefits and costs between people which may explain ethnic minorities group behaviors why most ethnic groups are tended to cooperating in business and supporting financially and morally each other. As previously described about social approval, most rational choice theorists argue that social approval is an important as much as rewards or punishments (Olson, 1965). The reason why concept 'Social approval' is helpful explaining group cooperative behavior is that it says people are more likely to help other people by getting approval from other people and also by expecting people whom they helped, they return the favors back. Interesting what Homans (1961) is arguing there won't be any

interaction of exchange if in a relationship between two or more people, it doesn't make any profit of exchanges in relationship. If one of people doesn't make any profit, he has no reason to stay in interaction with others. This approach actually can explain why some people are initially involved in organization, and later they come out from the organization. People are tend to be involved in organization when they face with certain benefits, and there is no more benefits derived to them, they tend to come out from the organization. So, people's interactions are also dependent on balance of mutual profits that both people make.

Talking about Rational choice theory's other points of view, it faced with many critics as formerly mentioned with question 'how does rational choice theory explain collective behaviors of certain group of people if all human behaviors are dependent on making profits over costs?' and question 'how does rational choice theory explain norms and obligations which might be not rational? As these questions state, many people criticized this theory's limitation that it can explain behavior of actor only in individual level, but nothing with collective level. However, there is justification how rational choice theory explains why people do collective behavior based on their rewards or punishments. How Kanazawa & Hechter (1997) defends rational choice theory from these critics is that he explains if individuals can find any rewards or punishments by being involved in organization or not being involved in organization which demands members to do collective behaviors. In this regard, rational choice theory can also explain collective level of behavior not only individual level of human behaviors. So, the mechanism of explanation of theory is before one decides to join in certain organization, there should be benefits that one may gain being involved in it. And another critics about rational choice theory is that it often considers actors as forward looking maximum results expecting people which is also irrational.

Another concern about rational choice theory is that in contrast to many its critics, rational choice theory may also explain how one's feeling of obligation or responsibilities is

not controversy to its rational theory itself. Rational theory explains the one may feel responsibility or obligation in a way how they are socialized. So, for instance, feeling responsibility to help his/her relatives or family could be understood as rational behavior if one is socialized as helping their family members is commitment which gives self-satisfaction (Ridley, 1996). In this way people's feeling of responsibility and obligations could be explained in way whether ethnic Korean people are involved any organizations or not, and whether there is a feeling of obligation or responsibility to their own group which potentially may influence on political activities or not.

So, explanation of rational choice theory in my theoretical frameworks are

1. Rational choice theory believes all the human behaviors are performed in a rational way to maximize benefits over the costs.
2. Rational choice theory doesn't necessarily explain only one individual behavior or collective behaviors but it also may explain social phenomena in terms of the how individuals' collective behaviors led to this social phenomena to occur. .
3. Rational choice theory explains rewards are not necessarily only a economic benefits over the costs, but also it could be rewards that recognitions from others, self-satisfactions, emotional satisfaction of performing some activities, love from others, prizes, careers and it could be many of feelings not necessarily material stuffs, punishments, dislikes.
4. Mutual reinforcement of rational choice theory gives measure of explanation of collective behaviors not only individual behaviors of actor
5. Rational choice theory explains potential rewards may stimulate people to behave in a certain way, but awareness of potential punishment also may stimulate people to avoid certain behaviors.
6. Rational choice theory explains there won't be any interaction of exchange if in a relationship between two or more people, there won't be any benefits.

7. Rational choice theory explains people are tend to be involved in organization if benefits will be derived by being involved in it.

8. Rational theory explains the one may feel responsibility or obligation in a way how they are socialized.

Conceptualization of term political participation

Before we go into deep discussion, some important key terms should be conceptualized to provide clear understanding of theoretical framework of this research. Basically concepts of 'political participation' should mostly be explained and will be discussed.

Political participation is defined by many different scholars (sociologists, political scientists and socio-psychologists) and all the time it has been differently defined. In Chong & Rogers (2005) research, the political participation basically refers to four separated concepts that are polling activity, campaign activity for candidate, direct action and petitioning. His concept of political participation is well defined and includes many political activities which are proper to my research's basic foundation.

However, Chong & Rogers (2005) the conceptualization of political participation generally includes most types of political activities, it doesn't pay attention on civil activities and involvement in organization. For instance, Putnam (2011) in his work, he defines civil activities as a political activity. And for this research, using Putnam's idea, the conceptualization of this research will also include organization involvement and taking civil activities.

So, I provide more enlarged conceptualization of political participation which totally includes voting activity, supporting for candidates, participating in meeting, participating in picketing or boycott, involvement in any types of organization where people are gathered, and taking civil activities. And there should be two things conceptualized what means to be a direct political activities and what means to be indirect political activities. While direct political activities refers to participating in picketing, boycott, and meeting where as criticizes the government's policy or government itself, and voting activity which could be considered more expressive, indirect political activities refers to calm way of taking political activities

such as supporting for particular candidates, taking civil activities, involvement in organizations.

Describing concepts in more detail for clear conceptualization, voting activity refers to one's voting experience in primary and presidential election. Participating in political meeting includes meetings that are held either legally and illegally. Political meeting also includes demonstration, picketing activity, boycott and any types of meetings motivated with political issues. Supporting for candidates refers to many political activities. Financially helping for particular candidates, helping as volunteer for campaign one candidate does, appeal the people for candidate to win the election, every activities related supporting for particular candidate. Involvement in organization refers to one is involved in organization and either take active activities or take no activities, but who is registered as a member of organization. Organization could be any type where people are gathered for certain purposes. Civil activities refers to any type of activities related to development of society, and it could be public campaigns and charities on certain purposes.

Research questions

By revising other researches which have been conducted before and using rational choice theory by implanting it for this research based on its theoretical frameworks, I figured out two research question, which are

1. What types of political activities are practiced by participants for what reasons?
2. How types of political activities differed dependent on rewards or punishments which will be derived to participants by taking certain activities?

Methodology

Basically, this research fits more to qualitative research which allows the researchers to understand deep ideas of interview participants and their understanding of particular objects who they give meaning for particular behaviors they daily perform. Since the research explores the types and reasons of participation of ethnic Korean in political activities, it is more required to be concentrated on deep explanation rather than surface data which doesn't provide deep understanding of the subject. Principally, the qualitative research method allows researchers to examine "various settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings... how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles, and so forth" (Berg, 2009 p.7). In this regard, for this research, I will use one of the well and broadly used qualitative research method which is in-depth interview. \

Research method

In-depth interview method is one of most representative quantitative research methods, which enables researchers to gather deeper data of one subject than any other methods. Since the subject of the this research can be sensitive and requires deep opinion of the participants, in-depth interview method can be very useful for this kind of research characteristics. It is also one of most appropriate qualitative research method which is discovery-oriented, allows the researcher deeply understand the participant's understanding on a subject and his own perspectives on it. (Boyce, 2006)

Concerning about the analysis method, since it seems more exploratory research design, and there is no previous researches specifically concentrated only on political participation of ethnic Korean in Kyrgyzstan. By following reasons, the data gathered by in-depth interviews, will be critically analyzed base on theoretical framework of rational choice theory which is developed for this research.

Analysis procedure

Concerning the analysis procedure, I divided analyzing stage into four steps. In a first step, three or four transcripts will be initially analyzed and coded to figure out preliminary ideas of interviewees. And these preliminary ideas will be discussed with the advisor of the research for the determination of coding and categorizing standards. In following step, other rests transcripts will be analyzed and coded. In the third step, to make each category more clear and to develop main concepts, repeated components will be eliminated or simplified. In the fourth stage, all coded concepts and categories will be analyzed in framework of rational choice theory. As a last stage, research founding will be discussed with the advisor for making it finalized and it will be presented to the interviewees to check the research results to minimize bias of the researcher and for a reliability of the research. To sum up all these data and concepts developed, all the data and concepts will be classified into its analysis categories that are analyses in two level one as an individual behavior level, another as a collective behavior level.

Sampling and research planning

Concerning the sampling and planning of the research, I decided to choose snowball sampling since sampling population who speaks English was not a lot. Snowball sampling is often used in case hard to track population (Johnston & Sabin, 2010). Initial participant was chosen by recommendation of friend who is working in Korean cultural organization. However, the participants were not taken only from this organizations, most participants were recommended by previous participants purposively who may do favor for doing interviews. The target age of participants were over than 22 years old who basically have basic right to access to political activities such as voting. Interviews were conducted with 10 participants until there is no more new data made, the length of interview time differed from each participant, but mostly one and half hour. However three of the participants were not active

and were not absolutely interested in giving ideas, and were hurrying with interviews. For these reasons, proper data couldn't be collected properly and were not enough to standard of other interviews. With its sensitive topic, they tended not to actively participating to interview.

To make data more variable not being limited only for certain group of Koreans, specialists of participants were differed and I tried to make different characteristics of participants to be involved. However, with the limitation of snowball sampling, the sample of participants was not diverse.

Concerning the selection of participants, I limited the characteristics of participants by following characteristics.

- 1) Participants should be ethnic Korean with Kyrgyz Republic citizenship

- 2) Age of participants should be started from 22 who has right to access to political activities legally

The interviews were taken in a place where the participants considered to be comfortable as it was suggested by Berg (1989). Concerning its procedure of interview, the questions were asked based on the semi-structured questions. According to Berg (1989) there are following advantages of semi-structured questions that are

- 1) Interviewer can answer and also can make clarifications

- 2) It gives systematic and there is specific order

- 3) Even though it is systematic, freedom is allowed to interviewees

- 4) Its flexibility allows to cover additional questions which may concern to research questions

- 5) Initially prepared interview questions allows researchers to keep the consistency with all participants

With following strengths, semi-structured questionnaire is chosen for this research. And in addition, it included questions reflected to the research questions and also some additional questions reflected to theoretical framework to be tested.

Ethical issues and limitation of the research

For this research, my role was to conduct interviews from ethnic Koreans living in Kyrgyzstan about their participation in political activities, what kind of political activities they take, what kind of political activities they do not take based on mechanism of rewards and punishments. Before taking an interview, I ensured participants name will be anonymous and asked for recoding of voices. But four participants felt uncomfortable with taking records, so I had to take a note, and most participants whose voice was recorded, personally asked not to share it publically. And since research itself mainly talks about participation of ethnic Korean in political activities, some participants in the beginning seemed to be very careful with sharing their true thoughts. However, many participant gave their ideas, still they didn't feel absolutely comfortable thinking their ideas may harm Korean population in Kyrgyzstan. And some of the participants requested not to display their speech which could be very politically sensitive. With their requests, their some sentences were not reflected in transcripts. Moreover, before conducting the interview, to all participants anonymity was promised and with requests of participants not to show records files, it won't be available for other researchers, however the transcript files and note will be provided.

The research itself, faced with many its limitations. in terms of research design. Initially regarding only rational choice theory, the other theories which could be helpful for this research were not critically reviewed. My opinion is if I concerned about social capital in more details before actually conducting the research, the findings would be more rich and analysis part will be more productive. However, with mostly applying rational choice theory, there are many parts which cannot easily be explained in terms of questions "why some ethnic Koreans are supporting being involved in Korean organization, while other Koreans just go and vote him?" My concern is that such questions could be answered if I initially applied theories related to Social capital. Although for the further research, by implanting this

limitation, I consider that research design should be made more strongly in a way that with bigger sample, it may measure and generate concrete ideas based on this surface analysis and results of this research.

Research findings and Analysis

Conducting in-depth interview based on semi-structured interview questions many unexpected data and concepts were gathered and some of the concepts found were not concerned previously in the theoretical framework. In terms of findings, for its anonymity, participants' name were excluded as it was promised before conducting the interview.

General ideas of the participants are that they were not really interested in taking any political activities. Of course, with limitation of the research, no data and concept cannot be just generalized, but most participants through the interview agreed and mentioned that they were just indifferent in politics and in taking political activities with many reasons they provided. These reasons will be discussed more in detail in followings. The main theory 'rational choice theory' which was mainly applied for this research, could explain the case of ethnic Koreans why they are in certain political activities were discouraged to take political activities and in certain political activities they were encouraged to take political activities, however there is some limitation of theory which couldn't not explain some findings. And since it is a qualitative research, I couldn't analyze big sample of Korean population. But with its advantages of in-depth interview, I could understand deeply the political participation of ethnic Korean in Kyrgyzstan, and the research question itself So, in following paragraphs, I analyzed whether findings could be explained through the theories or not. In following data will be classified into two categories one as boundaries of taking political activities which were analyze based on rational choice theory and another as collective political behavior of ethnic Koreans.

Mechanism of benefits and costs in individual political activities

Through all the interviews, most participants expressed their indifference in politics in Kyrgyzstan. However many findings which were found could be theoretically explained with rational choice theory. Basically in this analysis, individual behaviors will be analyzed

based on mechanism of rational choice theory in terms of getting rewards and punishments. Findings clarify that political behavior level of individuals were discouraged in three different barriers language limitations, no expectation from the government, no trust to government, no belongingness to the country, dangerousness, and awareness that they are ethnic minorities. However these different barriers differed from each participant. These findings didn't not make all participants to be discouraged to take a political activities, instead of that how participants explained, these factors played a role of making ethnic Korean to feel and think in a way that taking political activities is less likely worth it for them to perform. There were many reasons for these, but initially there were several reasons why it was not beneficial for them to take political activities, for instance the potential threat which might be derived by actively participating in some political activities. And also remarkably most interviewees agreed and expressed there is not really benefits might be derived to individuals in terms of wealth, but little about protection of their business or demands and interests to be reflected in policy making in governmental level. So in this regard, in following paragraphs, I will go by each item which discourage ethnic Korean to take political activities by calculating its benefits and costs and how mechanism of rational choice of getting rewards and punishments worked in political participation of ethnic Korean in Kyrgyzstan.

Potential dangers by active political participations

Initially in the progress of developing the theoretical framework, once I developed Group conflict theory and eliminated since I thought this theory is more proper for explaining the political behavior of ethnic majority instead of ethnic minority. However by taking interviews, findings gave quite interesting result. Blalock (1967) explains this theory as when there is competition between two groups for the limited resources, or threat increases from ethnic minority to ethnic majority, he explains that ethnic majority are more likely to take political activities to protect their benefits or interests from ethnic minority. For that reason,

group conflict theory seemed more suitable for explaining the political behavior of ethnic majority rather than ethnic minority. With its limitation of group conflict theory that can explain only majorities' political participation, rational choice theory would be more suitable for explanation of ethnic minorities who are mostly discouraged to take political activities by being aware of potential conflicts may happen to them.

An interesting findings is that most participants were aware of Ethnic conflict happened between Uzbeks and Kyrgyz in 2010 in Osh, and they were remarkably were avoiding to take direct political activities such as participating in political meetings, and writing or publically complaining the governments which are considered to be intense political participation which may give potential threat to ethnic Korean population as participants of interview explained.

"After the event 2010 in Osh, I came back from US, I thought there must be something we should protect of right as an ethnic minority because you know the problems between Kyrgyz and Uzbek, then I thought kind need to be together to protect our right because everything could be happened.. you know.. today Kyrgyz and Uzbek fight each other but tomorrow it could be us or Dungans and other minorities.."

"I am saying all Kyrgyz are not nationalists... but there are some of them.. for those nationalists... we could be seen bad... in active political participation of ethnic Korean"

The reason why participants were avoiding to take direct political activities is that they were aware of potential conflict might happen to Korean with any ethnic group, especially ethnic Kyrgyz. Most participants expressed in a way that they were trying to hide any potential conflicts might happen to them. Interesting thing is that these participants explained that most participants were considered themselves as not proper for politically high occupations with many reasons, but mostly that they are minority and agreeing that political high occupations should be held by Kyrgyz, but not by many Koreans. This is quite interesting findings which should be analyzed from approach of rational choice theory. Ethnic Koreans, most participants, thinking of potential threats may happen to ethnic Korean

population by actively taking direct political activities, they were trying to avoid direct political activities except only voting activity.

"If us will be a lot in ruling position.. it would be seen little not beautiful.. we don't really feel like being a ruling position.. one or two would be perfect.. just as a representatives.. of Korean.. but not more any different reasons.. that would result bad things"

This finding quite matches the idea of how Homans (1961) explains the mechanism of rewards and its costs in humans' behaviors. According to interviews, most participants considered potential threats as bigger costs than benefits they may receive. As one participant said that there are good side and bad sides which could be understood a benefit and costs. With active political involvement, participants may expect benefits such as protection of their business, political empowerment in policy decision making, and other advantages, and bad side which could be understood as punishment that are hate crimes toward Koreans, dislike from ethnic majority groups, bad discourse about Koreans, aggravation of good relationship with Kyrgyz, and so forth.

"Yes, there is good side if there will be more ethnic Koreans, for us it will be much easier to support our people and achieve something but in this case, there is bad side.. we are afraid of and we do not want to affect a lot on mono-political country Kyrgyzstan.. because here there is nationalism, and even who are not nationalists, if ethnic Korean will take big part of political activity, And if ethnic Korean will be actively take political activities, there will be discourse about ethnic Koreans..."

An remarkable point is that most participants considered more about potential threat may happen to them rather than benefits they indirectly may receive, which means for participants, costs (potential threat) was higher than benefits (chances to more advance of business, protection of their business). In this regard, individuals thinking rationally if the costs is higher than its benefits by taking certain activities, actors wouldn't not take certain activities which requires high costs. However participants' case was slightly differentiated, for instance, they didn't demand a lot of political attentions and empowerments, still

participants of interview were aware of need small political empowerment. Most participants agreed that there is a need to have a Korean deputy to represent demands of whole Korean populations.

These awareness of conflict with ethnic majority, most participants were arguing that they need a politician who will be a representative for Korean population for the protection of their business or interests, but not really for material benefits might be given for them. As these explain, there is not really financial support expectation from the government. In case of religion repression, and language fine case, Korean deputy who basically understands their culture and their interests and who actually might protect their interests, was considered to be needed by participants.

"It is good still that there is person in the government who understands our Koreans' difficulties.. our interests.. our cultures.. it is good... at least one representative of all Koreans here should be to understand Korean's difficulties as an ethnic minority... "

However the awareness of potential threat does not limit every political activities, but it does only in political activities that maybe threat them such as occupying many political seats, demanding loud publically to the government, organizing a political meeting, and criticizing the government publically, but not about involvement in organization, supporting for particular candidates, and going to election which is considered to be more calm way of political activities rather than intense and conflicting. Intense political activities such as organizing a meeting, publically complaining the governors and criticizing the governor might be considered as intense were not performed absolutely by none of the Korean participants. Most participants constantly said that intense political activity may generate a problem in their good relationship with Kyrgyz people in Kyrgyzstan.

"Voting is careful way.. how to explain you.. just I don't want to be here too loud arguing... and demanding.."

In addition, as most participants said, they were claiming that no matter what, for Koreans in Kyrgyzstan, who are considered as 'migrants', they considered themselves that they do not deserve many political ruling position in Kyrgyzstan. As these participants say, they were afraid some bad things might happen in their active political interests and participation in political high occupations and intense political activities.

For instance, one participant also considered political activities and political affairs as Kyrgyz people's job which Koreans shouldn't really touch and to be involved in politics because this participant considered Kyrgyz politics as Kyrgyz people's housework. And some of the participants by considering themselves as 'strangers', 'migrants' by noticing Kyrgyzstan is democratic country and knowing that they have right to participate in politics, still they recognized themselves people who do not deserve high political occupation. This is quite interesting factor, however it cannot be generalized for whole Korea population in Kyrgyzstan

And interesting thing found out is most participants took political activities which are less likely visible and calm way such as taking civil activities, involvement in organization, supporting for Korean candidate, and as a direct political activity only voting. Participants considered these political activities as a silent way of taking political activities which may not harm themselves. However, with interviewing them, these political activities that ethnic Korean perform provides certain benefits. These will be discussed later in following paragraphs.

Language limitation

In most interviews with participants, fundamental barriers to take political activities were found out. Since it is concerned with its theoretical framework in terms mechanism of rational choice theory, regardless of previous theories which explains political participation, I

suppose this should be also analyzed. In findings, most participants said that not speaking Kyrgyz language is a biggest barrier which discourages to take political activities.

By taking interviews from participants, I realized that none of them was actually speaking Kyrgyz language. Most participants in their interviews were saying that to take any political activities for instance participating in meeting, it is required to know Kyrgyz language since most meetings are held by Kyrgyz and in Kyrgyz language. This is an interesting finding\ why most participants explained why they do not take any political activities that are related to meeting, picketing, and boycott. And most participants agreed that to be politically involved, or at least if someone who is not Kyrgyz wants to be a politician, speaking Kyrgyz language is required as a basic requirements. However knowing Kyrgyz language may be not required to be politician in Kyrgyzstan, most participants of interview considered knowing Kyrgyz language as a basic element one should know before to be involved in political meetings or taking political occupation. However knowing Kyrgyz language is only limited for certain political activities that are participating in political meetings and to become a politician in a parliament. Rest political activities that are involvement in organization, supporting for candidates, and going voting didn't really required knowing Kyrgyz language.

One participant who is from Osh, even faced with discrimination in education system learning Kyrgyz language. As he argues, many participants were remarkably saying similar position that there is need to use Kyrgyz language, but before officially applying Kyrgyz language, specific education or benefits should be made as a case of Kazakhstan or other countries.

And also most participants, distinguished that not speaking Kyrgyz language would be problematic if someone Korean is interested in politics or taking political activities since most political things are held in Kyrgyz or mostly by Kyrgyz people. So, most participants

considered themselves as proper at taking political activities such as participating in political meetings and occupying high political position since they do not speak Kyrgyz language. Implying rational choice theory's mechanism, a benefits and costs, most participants considered to participate in political meetings, one should know Kyrgyz language. And to all participants, question was asked whether they are learning Kyrgyz language or not. And most participants said they actually do not speak Kyrgyz language, and they were not learning it.

So, by interview data, it made clear that all participants considered to know Kyrgyz language as one of most important matters that one should have for participating in meeting activities or to occupy politically high position such as deputies, however interesting finding is that most participants were not willing to learn Kyrgyz language saying that this is not beneficial for them to learn at least for participating in politics. For instance, Many participants say that it would be more beneficial for them to learn other languages than Kyrgyz language.

"I don't know... I didn't really study Kyrgyz language.. and it is not really beneficial to study it.. for me at least.. as you know many city Kyrgyz, they also speak bad Kyrgyz.. Russian is more formal and useful.. So, I am not really planning but still for someone who wants be working in a parliament, one should speak Kyrgyz well.."

"For instance... most people in Kazakhstan they learn Kazakh language because they know it would be beneficial for them and also there is a good program..."

Participant also specifically mentions why Russians in Kazakhstan learn Kazak languages while Russians are not learning Kyrgyz language in Kyrgyzstan, pointing out that learning Kazak language would be beneficial for Kazak people while learning Kyrgyz language is not beneficial for one who wants to be working in politics and just for participation in political meetings. Here comes Homans (1961) idea mechanism of benefits and costs. For him, if someone is interested working in politics or participating in political meetings, one is required to know Kyrgyz language, however to learn the Kyrgyz language,

there is specific costs for this that are times spent for learning language, money signed for a good language school. As most participants explained, for ethnic Koreans, it was not beneficial to learn Kyrgyz language which is considered to be basic requirements for political participation such as occupying politically high position and participating in political meetings. So, in this case, participants' tendency not learning Kyrgyz language is could be explained with mechanism of benefits and its costs. While its benefits might be only in terms of to take active political participation and working in politics, as its costs, it requires for them to spend its costs.

No trust to government, No expectation from the government

Another finding is that most participants were not expecting some financial supports or public supports from the government, and most participants expressed that they simply do not trust the government's political activities. No trust and no expectation from the government once again it cannot discourage ethnic Koreans to take political activities but this is could be a factor which make individuals to think no benefits might be derived by taking active political activities at least for the participants of interviews. So, which means no expectation from the government and no trust to the government makes neither satisfaction of ethic issues which individual may get by taking political activities, not be financial rewards might be derived to participants as a group and as an individuals.

And usually taking political activities are considered to be costs which one should spend its costs for taking political activities. For instance, one should spend time, efforts going to election, supporting for the candidates, and spend money when someone is helping specific candidates with money. As participants explain, no trust to the government and no expectation from the government made them to think their political activities will not be influential anyway. For instance, all participants said that these factors played a role of discouraging them to take active political activities.

"I think that more likely discourages me.. cause.. you know... I know that it won't be anyway influential.. maybe that's why.. I think this way.."

So, individuals think and do certain actions by calculating the benefits of actions and costs of actions (Olson, 1965). In this case, no trust and no expectation from the government playing a role which individuals to feel their political activities are not influential and not beneficial. As Homans (1961) explains, there is not only benefits of wealth, but also self-satisfaction which individual might receive by performing certain activities. In this case, with no expectations and no trust to government, the process of getting satisfaction by taking political activities were excluded. So, self-satisfaction which could be earned by taking political activities, absolutely were not derived to participants. This absence of self-satisfaction affected on participants to be politically discouraged, since their is no benefits and instead of benefits there are costs that they need to spend. However factors no expectation and no trust to government are limited in only some political activities such as going to election, participating in political meetings. No trust and no expectation from the government are not related with involvement in organization, taking civil activities and supporting for particular candidates.

Awareness of minority and Kyrgyz priority

According to the interview data, one of the most important factors which discouraged participants to take political activities were awareness of ethnic minorities and Kyrgyz priority in Kyrgyzstan. Interview data show quite interesting findings that most participants shared a sense of being migrants who were basically accepted by kind Kyrgyz people in Kyrgyz land.

The idea that they are minorities in Kyrgyzstan made them more being far away from political activities with ideas of not proper of ethnic Korean in politically high position as a original citizen of Kyrgyzstan. And with many barriers for them to access to political stuffs,

they tended to be far away from politically high occupations and intense political activities such as organizing or participating in meetings or petitioning. And instead of being politically positioned, they more likely proffered to do private businesses to be economically high situated instead of being politically highly situated.

"Um.. we as ethnic Koreans.. we don't try we don't want to be in the government.. we.. are preferred to occupy private sectors.. entrepreneurship and businesses... um.. okay. The idea we know that it could be not appropriate for Koreans to be in the government with higher positions..."

Another finding concerning the priority to ethnic majority is that most participants were aware of political advances of ethnic Kyrgyz and they were not against of it. Most of participants knew that Kyrgyz were over-manipulating politics in Kyrgyzstan, and they considered this thing as acceptable things how it should be. Most participants agreed that since Kyrgyzstan is land of Kyrgyz, Kyrgyz people should be in ruling positions than any other ethnicities. And moreover, some participants considered politics in Kyrgyzstan as house works of Kyrgyz people which ethnic Koreans shouldn't really be involved in it.

"How to explain you.. just I don't want to be here too loud arguing... and demanding.. my needs you know.. since we are here like strangers... better not to be much involved in family's discussion and conflict stuffs.. you understand me?"

By following reasons, participants were not really interested in politics, instead of that they were more advancing economic status of ethnic Korean by expanding their businesses in Kyrgyzstan rather than political stuffs and social stuffs or works in governments. Many of them considered business as their way how they can survive in Kyrgyzstan in being wealthy and not touching emotionally ethnic majorities or other ethnicities. Moreover some participants considered doing business as calm way how they may avoid problems with ethnic majorities and other ethnic groups. So, the awareness participants that ethnic Koreans are minority and with agreement of rational Kyrgyz priority, participants tended to be more discouraged to take political activities since there is no

benefits will be derived neither to individuals nor to as an whole population of ethnic Koreans. These factors indirectly make ethnic Koreans considered themselves less political powerful, and this ideas eventually lead them to think rationally taking political activities is not worth it. However, this awareness that they are minorities, seemed playing an important role to unite participants to be united through the organization Korean oriented and eventually make them to be participated to this organization either directly by taking activities or indirectly by being registered. So, the feeling of participants that they are ethnic minorities, led them to think in a way that occupying high political position is less likely available for ethnic minorities and there are not really benefits or chances to compete, in the same time this awareness that participants are being a minority led them to take more political activities such as involvement in Korean organization or supporting for particular candidates for other benefits might be derived to them by being involved in this organization. For instance, most participants shared a group identity, and group obligation that they need to help each other since they are 'strangers' and 'ethnic minority' in Kyrgyzstan. The concerns about organization involvement will be discussed later in following paragraphs.

"Um I don't know.. for me.. first of all, it is not interested in politics at all, and it is absolutely no benefits I could gather by taking any political activities for me... because even though I do, it is like my political activities won't really be affective and influential here.."

Overall review

So, revising these factors that are language limitation, no trust to governments and no expectation from government, Awareness of ethnic minority and Kyrgyz priority and Potential dangers by active political participations played a role of discouraging ethnic Koreans to take certain political activities and also it encourages to take certain political activities. These factors affects on decision making of ethnic Koreans whether it is more rational for them to take political activities or not based on calculation of benefits and its

costs. For some activities, it was beneficial for participants to take, and for some political activities, it was harmful for them to take political activities. In following paragraphs, findings will be measured in a collective behavior level. One thing should be remembered is that this research does not generalize whole population of ethnic Korean, but selected ethnic Korean population in Kyrgyzstan by snowball sampling. So, here in this research, we cannot directly say it could be applied for whole Korean population, however it focuses on more deep understanding what kind interests relationship is existing in participation of ethnic Korean in taking political activities. And with rational choice theory, it explores and analyzes political activities derived with its mechanism of benefits and costs, how participants perform political activities dependent on what benefits can be gained and how much its cost is in case of performing certain behaviors.

Mutual reinforcement and selective incentives in collective political behavior

In this part, collective political behaviors of ethnic Koreans will be discussed mainly. The interesting outcomes of interview data is that the participants were rarely were taking individual political activities except voting activities, but most participants were more likely were taking collective political activities which are derived by being involvement in organization. I cannot so far conclude that being involved in organization stimulates ethnic Koreans to take political activities, however Putnam (2011) in his famous work concerning about social capital, he often demonstrated decline of people involvement in organization reduced social capital which affected negatively people's civil participation rate. and also supporting his idea, Wong (2011), in his research, demonstrated that involvement in organizations more likely stimulate its members to take political activities. Maybe in this regard, we could explain ethnic Koreans' collective behaviors.

Another interesting findings are all the participants distinguished specific political activities they wouldn't not prefer to take while some political activities were considered to

be okay to take. Interesting factors found out through in-depth interview data, most participants who were actively involved in Korean organization, were taking mostly indirect political activities except voting activity such as supporting for candidate, involvement in organization, and civil activities, not nothing with intense political activities as participants explained such as participating in political meetings, picketing, and criticizing government publically which factors which participants considered it may harm ethnic Korean population negatively. For instance, the activities such as participating or organizing a political meeting and criticizing the governors were not completely practiced by no one participant. Instead of taking intense political activities, the participants preferred to take political activities such as charities, going for election, supporting for particular candidates, participating in civic campaigns, helping people, gatherings of youth, teaching Korean cultures and making newspapers which how they consider as 'smooth political activities' and indirect political activities only exception of voting activity.

"This is mostly charity and cultural organization.. I can say this is charity fund.... - Korean charity fund for supporting old men and our old men who serviced and children who do not have home.... - who needed to take an operation, heart operation, and we made a concert and we gather 150.000som for him about 3000\$ for one concert and in this concert participated ethnic Korean deputy, and business men and people who are working in organizations ..."

And basically, there were three different collective political behaviors were performed by ethnic Koreans in Kyrgyzstan. Two different collective political activities are 'Involvement in organization' and 'Supporting for particular candidate'. However, for taking these political activities, according to my findings and analysis, there was existing the concept of 'exchange of benefits and costs', 'selective incentives' which made members to be involved in organization and social capital which connected people to this organization. So,

by following, each collective political behavior will be explained and analyzed in more details.

Involvement in organization

As I initially conceptualized, the involvement in organization is considered to be a political activity since any organization may play a role of political actor. Concerning the ethnic Korean's involvement in organization, brought me many interesting findings why most participants were either directly involved as active participants or involved indirectly in Korean organization. For instance, some participants rarely attended, but still they were registered or their family members or friends were attending to this ethnic based organization. And while some participants were actively participating, some participants were not taking active participation in this organization. But all participants were aware of Korean organization and most participants were aware of what this organization does for particularly ethnic Koreans, and on what purpose this organization is existing.

"Um.. not really.. I do not really attend there... I know about these organizations.. there are Korean youth movement... Kyoryoin associations... yes.. I know some people.. who is working there... teaching Korean... Korean culture.. and newspaper 'Ilchi' .. and charity stuffs.."

Involvement in organization as one of political activities, in this chapter, it should be studied why participants were involved in this organization based on explanation of rational choice theory. The first question 'why participants are involved either indirectly and directly in this organization?' To answer this question, I looked interview data carefully. During the interview, questions were asked why participants were involved in organization for what benefits. And most participants gave interesting findings.

Before going into deep discussion of analysis, one thing should be made sure that the collective political activities such as supporting for candidates and taking civil activities could be dependent results of political activity, an involvement in organization, which means

involvement in organization comes first and then involvement in organization, and then 'supporting for particular candidate' and 'taking civil activities' these collective political behaviors occurs as a result of being involved in organization. The reason why I consider it this way is the involvement in organization played a role of stimulating these two collective political activities, but it might not necessarily come after involvement in organization. And in the same time 'supporting for particular candidate' and 'taking civil activities' these two collective political behaviors could be also the reasons or benefits why participants are involved in this organization.

Even we consider the 'supporting for particular candidate' and 'taking civil activities' as reasons or benefits why ethnic Koreans are stimulated to be involved in Korean organization, it seems it doesn't fully explain ethnic Koreans are involved in Korean organization only to perform and support for Korean candidates to be deputies for their future uses which may not give them either material benefits and social security or to get self-satisfaction and approvals. And most participants expressed need of Korean deputy in Kyrgyzstan, but still it does not mean that they are necessarily should be involved in Korean organization to go to vote for Korean candidate. They still can go to election to vote and support for Korean candidates without being involved in Korean organization. And also benefits of taking civil activities doesn't seem it clearly explains only for self-satisfaction or reputation of ethnic group, individuals are involved in Korean organization, which will bring them no materials benefits and little of self-satisfaction, approval and reputation of ethnic Korean group.

Regardless of these two collective political behaviors, by assuming that there should be other reasons or benefits why ethnic Koreans are involved in Korean organization, I reviewed findings and concepts of rational choice theory which are 'mutual reinforcement' and 'selective incentives'.

An interesting finding that was found in interview is that participants were aware of actual benefits which they could get selectively.

"Um.. I can't say for 100% sure, but I think they didn't consider only my economic situation and grades... but more I think they value more that I actively participate in this organization.. maybe that is why?" A

"Um by actively participating we get relationships.. I mean relationship with new people, with people who does different businesses... like casino, even it is not working nowadays.. for instance, when I got hired to work, the director of Korean organization introduced the manager of the Casino... so I could work there... however it is closed... no casinos anymore in Bishkek.." B

Although it shouldn't be generalized, for whole ethnic Koreans and all participants of interview, these two participants who were actively participating in Korean organizations, one received scholarship, another as advantages at job mobilization with their active participation in organization. For instance Participant A, she was organizing many charity activities as an project manager in this organization. And another participant B, was very actively participating especially in ethnic Korean's charity concert and he also had an experience at supporting for Korean candidate. These two participants who were mostly actively participating in Koran organization, and they got something like selective incentives such as scholarship and easy job mobilization, with their active collective behaviors.

The concept 'selective incentives' which was developed by Olson (1965), gives an interesting basic explanation of collective behavior in organization. The basic idea of 'selective incentives' is that rational individuals are motivated to take more active collective activities only with selective incentives which one individual may receive, and these incentives should be selective, so that treatments to active participating individual member could be differed from people who doesn't not actively participate (Olson, 1965). In this sense, it seems individuals in organizations, by expecting selective incentives are more likely to be stimulated to take active participation. However even its concept explains that members who get selective incentives are stimulated more to take collective activities, for my research,

it is difficult to measure and conclude with its limitation of research structure. Still we may carefully predict that participants were aware of selective incentives which may be derived to them such as scholarship and job mobilization among communities with their active participation.

Regardless of selective incentives, there were other minor benefits could be earned by participating in organization. Being involved in Korean organization, there were some benefits derived to members of it as participants explained.

"All the time get informed with new information... news... related to South Korea... some events held by Koreans in KG... some interesting stuffs... invitation to Korean holiday event... business information and business that are held by ethnic Koreans.."

Most participants explained that there are benefits being involved in Korean organization in terms of getting information about ethnic Koreans' business cooperation through the newspapers, and useful information such as announcement Korean language and musical instruments classes, announcement of visa, and Korean scholarship and etc.

Some of the members of participants were getting information about potential jobs being involved in this organization which may give rational reasons why he is involved in organizations. Instead of job mobilization, most participants considered Korean organization as means of Insurance, where provides protections and helps and cooperates ethnic Koreans in Kyrgyzstan. So, many participants considered Korean organization as means of protection of ethnic Koreans where they share their sense of obligation of helping, responsibility and ethnic minorities who need help themselves.

Supporting for candidates

Regardless of taking civil activities related to political activities, participants who were actively involved or who is actively involving currently, they were more likely to be stimulated to take collective political activities in terms of supporting for a Korean candidate,

as a actual case of Korean deputy 'Shin Roman'. And interesting finding is when Roman Shin, a Korean deputy was involved in party and were fighting for a seat in the parliament, many Koreans, who were actively taking activities in Koreans organization used be more supporting than Koreans who were not taking active participation in Korean organization. Participants of interview who were taking active participation in organization, they were remarkably supporting him in different dimensions. One participant said that there was an non-official support for his party from Korean organization to make a Korean candidate as a deputy in the parliament. As he stated, people who are supporting for him, took different activities starting from Public relations and giving a nice discourse about this party and about Roman Shin.

"We had to vote, it was not necessary, but we wanted.. we wanted this person, who was checked, we were sure he could do something, and.. what kinds of supports were there, we didn't only vote for him, but we gathered voices.. each person somehow supported candidates... it was not forced, but by own.. someone wrote in internet about that person's good side, and you feel supporting him, and.. we gathered people and met with Korean assembly, and we asked what kinds supports are needed.."

And interesting finding is that in this case, participants who were involved actively in Korean organization were used be more supporting for Korean candidate in a more structured and systematic way than Koreans who were not taking active participation in organization.

Indeed, they had a sense of responsibility and obligation to their own ethnic group. They were supporting for Korean candidate as a volunteer. Miller (1981), in accordance with his group consciousness theory, argues that the more one feels group solidarity and group obligation, the more they are likely to take political activities for the benefits of their ethnic group or when they feel their ethnic group is not equally treated. In this regard, most participants felt a sense of responsibility when their ethnic group gets into the trouble, they were ready to help for them who are in danger or in a financially bad condition. And as well

as most participants, Koreans, were aware that they are ethnic minority and migrants who basically need to help themselves.

"We help each other.. of course... because.. we are here minority.. you know... if we will not help each other... there won't be really people who is going to help us... - we are small minority... and you know... we have our own.. superannuation insurance.. and also education scholarship funds.. basically supports the population of Koreans living in KG.. "

"There was a boy Kim, who needed to take an operation, heart operation, and we made a concert and we gather 150.000som for him about 3000\$ for one concert and in this concert participated ethnic Korean deputy, and business men and people who are working in organizations.."

And I also have found is that in contrast to Black Americans case (Verba & Nie, 1972) a group conciseness theory, ethnic Korean case was slightly differentiated. While Black Americans' feeling that they are oppressed or not equally deprived, stimulated Black Americans to take more cooperative political activities, most participants in Kyrgyzstan, they answered that they haven't really experienced direct discriminations and hate crimes toward them except one participant. In addition, most participants have told that they do not really have a big problems or difficulties because of discrimination or hate crimes since they rarely experience discriminative behaviors on them.

However instead of violent discriminations or hate crimes, most Korean participants were aware of problems with policies which could be discriminative for ethnic minority. There were several discriminative policies or nationalistic attitudes toward ethnic minorities that participants stated in the in-depth interviews. And most participants were having problems with discriminative language policy proposals.

"I watched news and there were some people who argued we should put fine on people who don't speak Kyrgyz language, so if you don't speak Kyrgyz they put fine on you.. it is pretty much socking and this thing absolutely doesn't concern of ethnic minorities and Russian speaking group of people who do not speak Kyrgyz..."

The participant was absolutely aware of discriminative language proposals raised by people which was announced through the news. At this point, the participant was really expressing their emotions if this policy will be adopted through the government, it could be a big problem for Russian speaking groups which will bring maybe not a violent discrimination, but a discrimination which may generate many social, economic, and political barriers for Russian speaking groups. And the participant was aware of this discriminative discourses concerning the Kyrgyz language policy among people, and he was aware of how to deal with this discriminative language policy. He said,

"In case of putting fine on those people who do not speak Kyrgyz... for instance Russian deputy who is also ethnic minority and who was against of this policy too.. so this thing could be beneficial for us and actually representing minorities' demands.. and maybe for this case, maybe we need to participate in politics to make a representatives of ethnic Koreans too.. "

With Russian deputy's reaction against discriminative language policy, the participant was aware that it is quite beneficial for participants to have deputies from ethnic minorities' groups. And the participant mentioned that for making representative of ethnic Korean, they answered that they need to support for a Korean candidate. In this regard, having not violent discrimination or direct hate crime on them, but awareness of potential indirect discrimination, gave them stimulations that they need a representative of ethnic Korean in the parliament in terms of protection of Korean population's disadvantages. To stand against discriminative policies is also considered as one of reasons why ethnic Koreans demanded Korean deputy. So basically, a existence of Korean deputy is considered to be a benefit. However, it is still hard to say all ethnic Koreans who supported for Korean deputy, they may not receive any direct benefits. However, participants of interview who were involved organization, and tried to help themselves, they seemed to get social approval from other members of organization, and self-satisfactions by helping Koreans. And with sharing

particular sense of obligation that Koreans should help each other being ethnic minorities in Kyrgyzstan, by helping Koreans and cooperating with Koreans, participants had a sense when they supports Koreans, the supports will be paid back when they will face with any troubles.

Conclusion

This research, based on Rational Choice Theory analyzed the types and reasons of participation of ethnic Korean in political activities in Kyrgyzstan. To understand deeply ethnic Koreans' basic ideas of participation in political activities, I applied in-depth interview, with Local Koreans with snowball sampling strategy. There were many concepts we discussed previously such as 'exchange of benefits and costs' and 'selective incentives' and all the explanation of participation of participants of interview in political activities and their collective political behaviors were understood in a way how rational choice theory sees the problem. However, there were many limitations of the research were found out such as relatively weak research design, theoretical framework not considering social capital, things which were regard at research design stage.

Overall, most participants shared an idea that they need a Korean deputy, as a means of way how they could avoid discriminative policies which may be accepted regardless of their demands or interests and to represent their demands of ethnic Korean population in policy making and in governmental levels. For these, they seemed like they are more likely to be aware that they need to take political activities in terms of supporting for candidate. So, these discriminative policies which could be understood as indirect discrimination, are considered as factors which stimulate ethnic Korean to take collective political activity.

According to the interview findings, most participants shared the idea of importance of Korean deputy in Kyrgyz parliament as a representative of whole population of ethnic Korean to demand their interests and needs as a protection against not to be discriminated. And also most participants shared the idea that there shouldn't too many ethnic Korean deputies in the same time, but one or two for function of being representatives but rarely just being a ruling position. And when the election was, there was collective political behaviors of ethnic Koreans who were active members and not active members in this organization, they

tend to be supporting for the party with different methods where Roman Shin was. Why did ethnic Koreans support for Roman Shin's party should be analyzed since it was collective behaviors and what kinds of benefits the participants were expecting for this activities.

Unfortunately with its limitation of methodological structures, no data can be analyzed with quantities and numbers. However with its advantage of qualitative research methods, I try to see deeper understanding of certain behaviors and why people behaved in a way by calculating what kind of benefits and costs based on rational choice theory. As most participants explain, their collective behavior to support to make Korean candidates could be understood as a means of protection of ethnic Korean population and to represent their needs and interests which is not direct beneficial for each person who takes political activities, but could be considered beneficial for maintenance of ethnic Korean population as one unity. For instance, most participants shared strong obligation and responsibility to their ethnic Koreans while they were interviewed. And also most participants were aware of ethnic conflict might happen to ethnic Korean anytime so that they had a idea that they should be cooperated together and help each other. And probably these factors such as feeling of obligation to own ethnic group and shared idea that ethnic Koreans should be cooperated in case any threat may happen to them, is stimulating more ethnic Koreans to be united and perform certain types of collective behaviors together. Although for the further research, by implanting this limitation, I consider that research design should be made more strongly in a way that with bigger sample, it may measure and generate concrete ideas based on this surface analysis and results of this research.

Reference List

Barry, B. (1970). *Sociologists, economists and democracy*. London: Collier Macmillan.

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social science* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boyce, C. (2006, May). *Conducting in-depth interview: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input*. Pathfinder international.

Blalock, H.M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bourdieu, P. (1983). *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Brody, R.A. (1978). *The puzzle of political participation in America*. In *The new American political system*, ed, Anthony King. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Brustein, W. (1996). *The logic of evil: The social origins of the Nazi party, 1925 to 1933*. New Haven: Yale university press.

Chong, D. (1991). *Collective action and the civil rights movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Chong, D., & Rogers, R. (2005, December). Political behavior: Racial solidarity and political participation, 27 (4), 347-374.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

Elster, J. (1989). *The cement of society: A study of social order*. New York: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Friedman, D., & Diem, C. (1990). Comments on England and Kilbourne. *Rationality and society*, 2 (4), 517--521.

Fumagalli, M. (2007, June). Farming ethnic minority mobilization in Central Asia: The case of Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, 59 (4), 567-590.

Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Huckfeldt, R., & Sprague, J. (1993). *Citizens, contexts, and social communications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, L.G. & Sabin, K. (2010). Sampling hard to reach populations with respondent driven sampling. *Methodological innovation online*, 5 (2), 38-48.

Jun, H.G. & Yim, Y. (2007). Ethnic identity of Koreans in Uzbekistan and identity of Diaspora. Jeonnam: Central Asian Korean Association.

Kanazawa, S., & Hechter, M. (1997). Annual review of sociology: Sociological rational choice theory, 23, 191-214.

Kleppner, P. (1982). Who voted?: The dynamics of electoral turnout. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Miller. A.H., Gurin. P., Gurin. G., & Malanchuk. O. (1981). Group consciousness and political participation. American Journal of Political science, 25 (3), 494-511.

Olson, M (1965). The logic of collective action. Cambridge Mass: Harvard university press.

Parsons, T. (1937). The structure of social action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making democracy work. Civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putman, R. D. (1995). Turning in, turning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. Political science, 28, 664-683.

Putnam, R. D., (2011). Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ridley, M. (1996). *The origin of virtue: Human Instincts and the Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Penguin Group Penguin Books USA Inc.

Riker, W.H. (1995, March). Political psychology: The political psychology of rational choice theory, 16 (1), 23-44.

Riker, W.H., & Ordeshook, P. (1973). *An introduction to positive political theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Rosenstone, S.J., & Hansen, J.M. (1993). *Mobilization, participation, and democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Shingles, R.D. (1981). Black consciousness and political participation: The missing link. *American Political Science Review*, 75 (1), 76-91.

Tate, K. (1991). Black political participation in the 1984 and 1988 presidential election. *American Political Science Review*, 85 (4), 1159-1176.

Teixeira, R.A. (1992). *The disappearing American voter*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Verba, S., & Nie, N. (1972). *Participation in America*. New York: Harper.

Whiteley, P.F. (1995, March). Political research quarterly: Rational choice and political participation. *Evaluating the debate*, 48 (1), 211-233.

Leighley, J.E., Vedlitz, A., & Dyer, J.A. (1998). Party identification and public opinion in Texas, 1984-94: Establishing a competitive two-party system. New York: Norton

Wong, J., Ramakrishnan, S.K., Lee, T., & Junn, J. (2011). Asian American political participation: Emerging Constituents and their political identity. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wolfinger, R.E., & Rosenstone, S. (1980). Who votes? New Haven: Yale University Press.

Appendix I (Semi-structured questions)

- What is your opinion toward participating in politics?
- Does talking about politics give interests to you be you more participated in politics?
- Could you tell me your experiences of political participation?
- Have you ever experienced hate crime or discrimination on your ethnic group?
- In what kind of political activities you were mostly participated?
- Have you ever been stimulated to participate in politics by other people whom you are working with?
- Do you think if you participate in politics, do you believe that your political activities will actually affect on decision making in politics?
- How often do you talk in any organization or work place about politics? (Frequency)
- Do you attend ethnic based organization?
- Do you feel any obligation or group destiny to your own ethnic group?
- Does this feeling of obligation stimulate you to be politically participated to protect certain benefits or defeats might be made from other ethnic group?
- So, with this thought, were you actively participating in political activities such as supporting ethnic Korean candidate?