

Appendix

Methodology and Data Sources

*T*he research on which this book is based used multiple methods, including both quantitative survey data and qualitative in-depth interviews, to examine American civic institutions and their role in mobilizing Latino and Asian American immigrants. I compared those populations—in particular, Chinese and Mexican immigrant subgroups—in two metropolitan areas, New York and Los Angeles.

Statistical analysis of quantitative data allowed for a broad, systematic, individual-level analysis of political attitudes and participation across these groups. A main advantage of survey data is that they permit researchers to isolate the particular effects of a variable on individual attitudes and behavior. In many cases, quantitative data also make it possible to generalize those relationships to the larger population and to make predictions about attitudes and behavior with some degree of accuracy. However, surveys are limited in some important respects. They capture a single moment in time—a snapshot of individual attitudes and behavior—but do not provide a process-oriented view. The predetermined categories for the survey questions allow little room for nuance or explanation in individuals' answers. Most importantly, surveys do not permit researchers to consider in-depth the role of social, geographic, and institutional contexts as influences on attitudes and behavior. In contrast, qualitative methods facilitate investigation of how and why people exhibit the behaviors they do because interactions are less structured and allow for open-ended responses. Using qualitative methods, researchers explicitly take into account the role of social, geographic, and political context. This project built on the strengths of both methods.

Comparing two ethnic groups of different social, historical, and political backgrounds allowed me to explore critical issues suggested by the sur-

vey data: How do previous political involvement and experiences with a particular political regime affect political participation in the United States? What types of challenges to political involvement exist? Do these change over time? And how does being a member of a racial or ethnic minority group affect the way that immigrants feel about becoming involved in the American system? Comparing immigrants in Los Angeles and New York also allowed me to consider geographic context to understand better how locality affects immigrant political involvement (Mahler 1996). Both cities have large Latino and Asian American communities, but the political environment is different with regard to immigration politics, the relationship of each group to other ethnic groups, and immigrant mobilization.

Quantitative Survey Data

The majority of the quantitative data for this study come from the 2000–2001 Pilot National Asian American Survey (PNAAPS), the 1989–1990 Latino National Political Survey (LNPS) (see de la Garza et al. 1992), and the 1999 *Washington Post*/Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation/Harvard University National Survey on Latinos in America (LAT). The PNAAPS included 1,218 adults of Asian American descent (308 Chinese, 168 Korean, 137 Vietnamese, 198 Japanese, 266 Filipino, and 141 South Asian). The major Asian American population centers in the United States—Los Angeles, New York, Honolulu, San Francisco, and Chicago—were included in the survey. The telephone survey took place between November 16, 2000, and January 28, 2001. Respondents were randomly selected using random-digit dialing at targeted Asian zip code densities and listed-surname frames. Selection probability for each ethnic sample was approximate to the size of the 1990 Census figures for the ethnic population in each metropolitan area. When possible, the respondents were interviewed in their preferred language (English, Mandarin Chinese, Cantonese, Korean, or Vietnamese). Respondents of Japanese, Filipino, and South Asian descent were interviewed in English. Pei-te Lien, M. Margaret Conway, and Janelle Wong (2004) provide baseline survey results for each Asian ethnic group included in the study. (For details on the methodology used and the limitations of the survey, see Lien, Conway, and Wong 2004.)

The LAT was conducted by telephone between June 30 and August 30,

1999. The study included a nationally representative, randomly selected sample of 4,614 adults, eighteen years of age and older, including 2,417 Latinos and 2,197 non-Latinos. According to the survey documentation, the margins of sampling error for each group are ± 2 percent for total respondents and ± 2 percent for Latinos. Respondents are coded as Latino if they answered affirmatively to the question, "Are you, yourself, of Hispanic or Latin origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or some other Latin background?" Respondents were interviewed in English or Spanish. Fifty-three percent of the Latino interviews were conducted predominantly in Spanish. The final sample included 818 Mexicans, 318 Puerto Ricans, 312 Cubans, 593 Central or South Americans, and 340 other Latinos.¹

The LNPS used a multistage probability sample based on 1980 census data. The survey specifically targeted members of the Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Latino subgroups living in the United States for face-to-face interviews with bilingual interviewers in the language the respondent felt most comfortable using (English or Spanish). Interviews were conducted with people over eighteen years of age. A total of 2,817 interviews with U.S. residents of Latino descent were conducted, 1,546 with persons of Mexican ancestry, 589 with persons of Puerto Rican ancestry, and 682 with persons Cuban ancestry. In addition, 598 interviews with "non-Latinos" were completed. The sample is representative of 91 percent of the Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban populations in the United States. The overall response rate among Latinos was 74 percent. Data collection took place primarily between July 1989 and March 1990. Based on the original screening identification question, respondents were assigned to a national-origin group (Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban origin).² Responses to a question asking for the respondent's country of birth were used to determine immigrant status.³ (Descriptive statistics of the three survey samples are contained in tables A1, A2, and A3.) I conducted a series of multivariate analyses to distinguish between distinct influences on political participation, such as mobilization by a party or community-based organization and socioeconomic status.

Qualitative Data

I did fieldwork in New York and Los Angeles in 1999 and 2000. This fieldwork consisted of participant observation, extensive note taking, gath-

ering materials from community organizations, and interviews with key informants. In both cities, I attended meetings and events hosted by Chinese and Mexican community organizations, and I worked on voter registration drives, helped conduct exit polls in immigrant communities, and attended marches and demonstrations for immigrant rights. I lived in New York from 1997 to 2000 and during that time volunteered regularly with community organizations working with immigrants in the city.

The qualitative component of the study is based in part on that field research and on forty interviews conducted with Mexican and Chinese immigrants in the two cities. These two subgroups were compared along important dimensions, including their relative population size, length of residence, settlement histories, proximity to countries of origin, socioeconomic resources, and electoral representation.

I also conducted interviews with forty individuals affiliated with organizations providing social, legal, political, or issue-oriented services for Chinese or Mexican immigrants in New York or Los Angeles. These included One-Stop Immigration, the Asian Pacific American Labor Association, the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, and the Asian Pacific American Legal Center in Los Angeles, and the Chinese Staff and Workers Association, the Catholic Archdiocese, and the Asociación Tepeyac in New York. I was interested in interviewing organizational activists who work with Mexican and Chinese immigrant communities as well as rank-and-file (nonelite) members of each community. Activists provide a broad overview of community dynamics, organizational setting, institutional context, and participation patterns.⁴ I asked activists about their personal backgrounds, the development and history of their organizations, political participation in their communities, the larger political and institutional context, and coalition building.

Bilingual research assistants helped conduct interviews with nonelite immigrants in New York City and Los Angeles. The research assistants were selected for their skills in conducting interviews and because they had contacts within the local immigrant communities. Two research assistants, one who had grown up in a Chinese immigrant community and one who was raised in a Mexican community in New York City, conducted the interviews with non-English-speaking immigrants in New York. Similarly, two research assistants, one from a Mexican community and the other from a Chinese community in Los Angeles, conducted the interviews with non-English-speakers in that city. When possible, I accompanied the

research assistants during the interviews. Having grown up in immigrant communities themselves, all four of these research assistants were insiders, familiar with the communities in which they were working and sharing a similar ethnic, language, and immigrant background with those being interviewed (Fahim 1977; Aguilar 1981; Bennoune 1985; Kanuha 2000).

The sample of nonelite immigrants was generated through recruitment by the research assistants and through my social and academic network.⁵ A similar technique has been used by past researchers who have targeted immigrant-dominant communities (Espiritu 2001). One reason I used this sampling method is that my target population sample consists of immigrants. Immigrants, especially those without documents, are a hard-to-reach population. I determined that a targeted sample was the best method to use since I lacked the resources to randomly canvass a large group of immigrants. A targeted sample, recruited by the research assistants and through my existing social and academic network, enabled us to establish trust between the interviewee and the interviewer as well gain access more easily to potential interviewees (Kanuha 2000). The existing relationship between the interviewees and interviewers was critical in terms of getting immigrants to participate in the study.

The research assistants received several hours of training before conducting the interviews. Interviews with immigrants were done mostly in person, with a few conducted over the phone. Interviews occurred primarily in Cantonese or Spanish, although some of the respondents opted to be interviewed in English.⁶ Interview guides were used that included questions about each interviewee's immigration and settlement history, transnational activities, political participation in their countries of origin and in the United States, contact with other minorities, racial identity, and experiences with racial discrimination. The data from interviews and fieldwork are used primarily to gather information on institutional and community context, to provide descriptive information about immigrants' political involvement, and to illustrate trends found in the quantitative data.

Because of the small sample sizes and sampling methods, the qualitative data are not representative of the general population. Conversely, qualitative interviews provide a more personal, descriptive, and process-oriented view of the ways that Chinese and Mexican immigrants and community leaders come to understand politics in their everyday lives and communities.

TABLE A1. Descriptive Statistics of the Pilot National Asian American Political Survey Sample

	Total (N = 1,218)	Chinese (N = 308)	Korean (N = 168)	Vietnamese (N = 137)	Japanese (N = 198)	Filipino (N = 266)	South Asian (N = 141)
Foreign born	75%	91%	94%	99%	21%	68%	86%
Citizens (among foreign born)	59%	60%	53%	67%	37%	73%	43%
Planning to become citizen (among noncitizens)	70%	63%	77%	91%	27%	81%	63%
Median education	College	College	College	High school	Some college	Some college	College
Mean age in years	44 (17.4)	47 (17.8)	47 (17.4)	44 (14.1)	49 (19.7)	40 (16.6)	36 (13.4)
Mean years in U.S. among immigrants	13.1 (9.1)	12.07 (8.7)	14.8 (8.6)	12.3 (7.0)	16.6 (14.8)	14.7 (9.6)	10.7 (8.8)
Median family or household income	\$30–39K	\$30–39K	\$30–39K	\$30–39K	\$30–39K	\$40–59K	\$40–59K

Source: 2000–2001 PNAAPS.

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses.

TABLE A2. Descriptive Statistics of the National Survey on Latinos in America Sample

	Total (<i>N</i> = 2,412)	Puerto Rican (<i>N</i> = 318)	Mexican (<i>N</i> = 818)	Cuban (<i>N</i> = 312)	Central and S. American (<i>N</i> = 593)	Other Latino (<i>N</i> = 340)
Foreign born	61%	43%	56%	78%	85%	40%
Citizens (among foreign born)	44%	NA	28%	63%	32%	51%
Planning to become citizen (among noncitizens)	84%	NA	80%	91%	87%	84%
Median education	High school	High school	High school	Business, tech./ vocational beyond high school	High school	Some college
Mean age in years	39 (15.6)	39 (15.6)	35 (13.3)	46 (18.5)	37 (14.9)	38 (15.6)
Mean years in U.S. among immigrants	17 (11.9)	25 (14.7)	14 (10.1)	23 (13.3)	14 (9.4)	17 (12.3)
Median family or household income	\$20– 29,999K	\$20– 29,999K	Less than \$20K	\$20– 29,999K	\$20– 29,999K	\$25– 35,000K

Source: 1999 LAT.

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses.

TABLE A3. Descriptive Statistics of the Latino National Political Survey Sample

	Total sample (<i>N</i> = 3,412)	Mexican (<i>N</i> = 1,545)	Puerto Rican (<i>N</i> = 589)	Cuban (<i>N</i> = 680)
Immigrants	55%	50%	73%	90%
Citizens (among foreign born)	28%	14%	NA	38%
Applying for/planning to apply for citizenship (among noncitizens)	75%	77%	NA	74%
Median education (years in school)	11	10	10	11
Mean age in years	42 (17.1)	37.7 (13.9)	39.9 (15.8)	50.6 (17.8)
Mean years in U.S. among immigrants	19.5 (12.8)	16.7 (13.5)	24.2 (13.3)	19.7 (10.1)
Median family or household income	\$17–19,999K	\$17–19,999K	\$11–12,999K	\$17–19,999K

Source: 1989–90 LNPS.

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses.

TABLE A4. Voting Participation among Eligible Latino Immigrants

Independent variables	Logistic analysis of vote turnout in 1988 (N = 528)	
	B	Std. Err.
Socioeconomic status		
Age	2.24***	0.67
Female	0.25	0.24
Education	0.81	0.62
Family income	0.25	0.48
Political engagement		
Follow politics	1.42***	0.42
Strong partisan	0.73***	0.24
Strong ideology	0.08	0.42
Organizational affiliation and mobilization		
Member of Hispanic organization	0.63	0.59
Mobilized by party	-0.14	0.54
Mobilized by individual	0.74***	0.30
Religious attendance	1.37***	0.35
Minority group status and language		
English language use	0.11	0.45
Personal discrimination	0.51*	0.28
Ethnic group (comparison group is Cuban)		
Mexican origin	-0.62	0.40
Puerto Rican origin	-0.55	0.31
Constant	-2.70***	0.77
-2 (LL ³) Initial = 577.94		
-2 (LL) Converge = 496.25		
Chi-Square 81.70 (df 15)		
<i>p</i> < .00		

Source: LNPS.

Logistic analysis of voter turnout in 1988: 1 = Voted in 1988, 0 = Registered but did not vote in 1988.

Note: Including controls for length of residence or political participation in homeland politics does not change the results.

³LL = Log-Likelihood.

p* ≤ .10 *p* ≤ .05 ****p* ≤ .01

TABLE A5. Participation in Activities Other than Voting among Latino Immigrants

Variable	Participation in activities other than voting (N = 1,394)	
	B	Std. Error
Socioeconomic status		
Age	0.00	0.00
Female	0.03	0.06
Education	0.04***	0.01
Family income	0.03***	0.01
Political engagement		
Citizenship status	0.06*	0.04
Follow politics	0.08***	0.02
Strong partisan	-0.08	0.08
Ideology	0.01	0.02
Organizational affiliation and mobilization		
Member of Hispanic organization	0.66***	0.13
Mobilized by a party	-0.12	0.21
Mobilized by individual	0.30***	0.10
Religious attendance	0.05**	0.02
Minority group status and language		
English language use	0.08***	0.03
Personal discrimination	0.18***	0.07
Ethnic group (comparison group is Cuban)		
Mexican origin	0.10	0.08
Puerto Rican origin	0.09	0.09
Migration-related variables		
Years in the United States	0.01***	0.00
Active in homeland politics	0.03	0.08
Constant	-1.21	0.22
Adjusted R-Square = .15		

Source: LNPS.

Note: OLS Regression, Dependent Variable = Index of Participation beyond Voting; "We would like to find out about some of the things people in the U.S. do to make their views known. Which of the activities listed on this card, if any, have you done in the past twelve months? (1) Signed a petition regarding an issue or problem that concerns you? (2) Written a letter, telephoned or sent a telegram to an editor or public official regarding issues that concern you? (3) Attend a public meeting? (4) Worn a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on your car, or placed a sign in your window or in front of your house? (5) Gone to any political meetings, rallies, speeches, or dinner in support of a particular candidate? (6) Worked either for pay or on a volunteer basis for a party or a candidate running for office? (7) Contributed money to an individual candidate, a political party, or some other political organization supporting a candidate or an issue in an election?"

* $p \leq .10$ ** $p \leq .05$ *** $p \leq .01$

TABLE A6. Voting Participation among Eligible Asian American Immigrants

Independent variables	Logistic analysis of voter turnout in 2000 (<i>N</i> = 336)		Logistic analysis of consistent vote turnout (1998 and 2000) (<i>N</i> = 336)	
	B	Std. Err.	B	Std. Err.
Socioeconomic status				
Education	2.43**	0.78	1.25**	0.55
Family income	-0.43	0.76	-1.40***	0.56
Age	2.55**	1.13	2.71***	0.87
Female	0.12	0.36	-0.12	0.27
Political engagement				
Political interest	0.45	0.53	0.32	0.41
Strong partisanship	0.95**	0.48	0.46	0.35
Ideology (Conservative)	1.49**	0.72	-0.50	0.53
Organizational affiliation and mobilization				
Member of Asian American organization	0.75	0.58	-0.12	0.36
Mobilized by political party	0.75**	0.36	0.87***	0.30
Mobilized by individual	-0.21	0.44	0.07	0.33
Religious attendance	1.32**	0.55	1.03***	0.39
Minority group status and language				
English language use	-0.23	0.97	-1.18	0.78
Experience with discrimination	0.03	0.52	0.21	0.39
Migration-related variables				
Percentage of life in United States	-2.54***	1.02	0.88	0.85
Educated outside of the United States	-0.14	0.44	-0.48	0.34
Active in homeland politics	-0.65	0.85	0.43	0.59
National origin group (comparison category is Japanese)				
Chinese	-0.14	1.10	-1.76*	0.95
Korean	-2.56**	1.11	-2.50***	0.96
Vietnamese	0.64	1.15	-1.16	0.94
Filipino	-1.46	1.02	-1.43	0.89
Indian	-0.87	1.15	-1.90**	0.95
Constant	-0.51	1.47	-0.68	1.21
	-2 (LL) ^a Initial = 318.35		-2 (LL) Initial = 424.91	
	-2 (LL) Convergence = 244.24		-2 (LL) Convergence = 365.32	
	Chi-Square 74.11 (df 21)		Chi-Square 59.59 (df 21)	
	<i>p</i> < .00		<i>p</i> < .00	

Source: PNAPPS.

Logistic analysis of voter turnout in 2000: 1 = Voted in 2000, 0 = Registered but did not vote in 2000. Logistic analysis of voter turnout in 1998 and 2000: 1 = Voted in 1998 and 2000, 0 = Registered but did not vote in 1998 and 2000.

^aLL = Log-Likelihood.

p* ≤ .10 *p* ≤ .05 ****p* ≤ .01

TABLE A7. Participation in Activities Other than Voting among Asian American Immigrants

Variable	Immigrant sample (<i>N</i> = 727)	
	B	Std. Error
Socioeconomic status		
Education	.04	.03
Family income	.08***	.02
Age	.00	.00
Female	-.12*	.08
Political engagement		
Political interest	.21***	.04
Strong partisanship	.04*	.02
Ideology (Conservative)	.01	.03
Citizen	.03	.09
Organizational affiliation and mobilization		
Member of Asian American organization	.44***	.11
Mobilized by political party	.08	.09
Mobilized by individual	.57***	.11
Religious attendance	.03	.03
Minority group status and language		
English language use	-.01	.07
Experience with discrimination	.21*	.11
Migration-related variables		
Percentage of life in United States	.13	.24
Educated outside of the United States	-.23**	.10
Active in homeland politics	1.27***	.16
National origin group (comparison category is Japanese)		
Chinese	.39*	.21
Korean	.31	.21
Vietnamese	.59***	.21
Filipino	.44**	.20
Indian	.68***	.21
Constant	-1.17***	.30
Adjusted R-Square = .31		

Source: PNAAPS.

Note: OLS Regression, Dependent Variable is Index of Participation beyond Voting; "During the past four years, have you participated in any of the following types of political activity in your community? (ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS)" 1 = written or phoned a government official, 2 = contacted an editor of a newspaper, magazine, or TV station, 3 = donated money to a political campaign, 4 = attended a public meeting, political rally, or fund-raiser, 5 = worked with others in your community to solve a problem, 6 = signed a petition for a political cause, 7 = taken part in a protest or demonstration (7-point index). Control variables included in model but not shown in table are age, female, and length of time at current residence. The coefficient for age is positive and statistically significant only for the foreign-born, and that for length of residence at current address is positive and significant only for the full sample.

* $p \leq .10$ ** $p \leq .05$ *** $p \leq .01$

TABLE A8. Logistic Regression of Education on Political Activity among pre-1965 European Immigrant Sample ($N = 401$)

Independent variables	B	Standard error
Age	.143*	.071
Age-squared	-.001*	.001
Education (0 = < H.S, 1 = H.S. +)	.549*	.200
Grew up outside of U.S.	.084	.241
Constant	-5.330	2.100

Initial -2 Log-Likelihood = 445.874
-2 Log-Likelihood at Convergence = 439.263

Source: NES Cumulative File for 1952-65.

Dependent Variable: Participation in a Political Activity (talking to someone to influence their vote, attending a political meeting or rally, working for a party or candidate, wearing a button, giving money to a campaign, or writing to a public official); 0 = participated in at least one activity; 1 = did not participate in a political activity.

* $p \leq .10$