Political Behavior, Vol. 16, No. 2, 1994

ETHNICITY AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ASIAN AND MEXICAN AMERICANS*

Pei-te Lien

What is ethnicity and how does it matter for political participation? Previous research has shown that the participatory disparity of Asian Americans, as different from Latinos, cannot be explained with sociodemographic and group consciousness variables. Adopting the view of a growing body of scholars who think ethnicity is an evolving rather than a static phenomenon, this study proposes multidimensional measures of ethnicity for two immigrant groups. Reexamining part of the 1984 data set that contains a unique oversampling of Asian and Mexican Americans in California, it is found that the two groups, despite a huge socioeconomic gap, bear similar ethnicity and participation structures. For both groups, acculturation increases participation; attachment to homeland culture does not necessarily discourage participation; and the role of group consciousness is much more complex than previously conceived.

How does ethnicity influence political participation at the individual level? The prevailing literature stemming from observations of differences among Anglo whites, African Americans, and Latino voting turnout and other electoral or nonelectoral behaviors often emphasizes the defining impact of socioeconomic status (SES), especially education (e.g., Verba and Nie, 1972; Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Nie et al., 1988; Bobo and Gilliam, 1990; Conway, 1991; Verba et al., 1991). Because of a common shortage of these basic resources, nonwhite ethnic Americans are usually found to participate at a lower rate than those of European origin.

The impact of ethnicity as expressed in broad cultural terms such as black or Hispanic generally recedes in its significance or becomes insignifi-

Pei-te Lien, Department of Political Science, University of Florida, 3324 Turlington Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611–2036.

*The author would like to thank M. Margaret Conway, Wayne Francis, Michael Martinez, the anonymous reviewers, and many others for their generous support and thoughtful comments.

0190-9320/94/0600-0237$07.00/0 © 1994 Plenum Publishing Corporation

cant when SES is controlled (e.g., Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Verba et al., 1991; Teixeira, 1992). Recent literature on the political behavior of ethnic groups with a significant number of foreign-borns also stresses the importance of controlling for other immigrant-specific sociodemographic factors such as citizenship status, nativity, English use, age, and length of stay (e.g., de la Garza, 1987; Calvo and Rosenstone, 1989; Uhlaner, Cain, and Kiewiet, 1989; Fuchs, 1990; Hero, 1992).

An expansion of the basic socioeconomic model is the ethnic group consciousness model. Observing that many blacks in 1967 who volunteered race as a social problem participated at a rate higher than those whites of comparable SES, Verba and Nie (1972) proposed with a revised socioeconomic model that ethnic members' awareness of their disadvantaged group status may overcome the negative impact from low SES. The concept that political consciousness derived from group interaction and competition may serve as a mobilizing force through such psychological linkages as political mistrust, internal efficacy, perceived deprivation, and discrimination has won widespread support in the last two decades (Olsen, 1970; Verba and Nie, 1972; Sarna, 1978; Shingles, 1981; Guterbock and London, 1983; Portes, 1984; London and Giles, 1987). However, the empirical affinity between social class and group consciousness among racial/ethnic minorities often makes it difficult to assess the independent impact of ethnicity as separate from its socioeconomic or attitudinal correlates.

Extending the examination of the relationship between group consciousness and political participation to include members of either a subordinate or a dominant social group, Miller, Gurin, Gurin, and Malanchuk (1981) maintained that a perception of self-location within a particular social stratum and the psychological feeling of belonging to that stratum (group identification) alone is not sufficient to mobilize political action. Rather, it takes the combination of feelings of power deprivation (polar power), relative dislike for the outgroup (polar affect), and the belief that inequities in the social system are responsible for a group's disadvantaged status in society (system blame) to transform subjective group identification into participation in electoral and nonelectoral activities.

Uhlaner et al. (1989) applied this refined concept of group consciousness to study the relationship between political participation and membership in social groups objectively defined by common ethnic or national origins. In this seminal study comparing the political behaviors of four racial/ethnic groups in California, differences in sociodemographic background and salience of ethnic and nonethnic group problems are sufficient to explain the disparity in participatory rates between non-Hispanic whites and Latinos but not between Anglo whites and Asian Americans. Uhlaner and associates concluded that ethnicity does matter for political participation and

they suspected that some cultural-related factors may account for the distinctiveness of Asian American sociopolitical participation.

In the subsequent sections, the above research is extended by developing and elaborating upon several dimensions of ethnicity, followed by an empirical investigation utilizing part of the California ethnicity survey collected by Uhlaner and her associates for individuals having origins in Asia or Mexico. The results in part confirm earlier findings about the significant but limited function of ethnic group identification (Uhlaner et al., 1989), but a number of new dimensions are introduced, in particular, those of acculturation, attachment to ethnic culture, senses of alienation, and sense of deprivation.

Asian and Mexican American[1] are among the fastest-growing immigrant groups in the last three decades. They not only experience changing political and social positions in the American system, but also maintain close contacts with ethnic cultures because of the continuing influx of newcomers. As will be seen, the development of a subjective identification with the particular ethnic group may be more problematic for some groups or individuals. Two ethnic groups with dissimilar socioeconomic characteristics, however, do produce similar psychological profiles when ethnicity is viewed as an "emerging" phenomenon formed through a multidimensional process—variously called "ethnicization" (Sarna, 1978), "racialization" (Omi and Winant, 1986), or "ethnic Americanization" (Fuchs, 1990). This perspective on ethnicity may help improve our understanding of the general determinants of political participation.

THE NATURE OF ETHNICITY

What is ethnicity? A basic answer common to many multigroup studies is to define it in terms of an objective sociodemographic background. Although this kind of definition is useful to capture whatever group-related effect is left unexplained by other factors, the reduction of ethnicity or ethnic group identity to cultural or primordial ties denoted by race, language, religion, or national origins has increasingly been criticized in recent years as unable to reflect the "developing" nature of ethnicity. Patterson (1975) comments that the approach is either so descriptive that it loses its impact when other socioeconomic controls are introduced or so inclusive that it becomes analytically useless. For him and many observers on the evolution of immigrant group identity, the nature of ethnicity is multilayered, situational, and volatile.

Expressions of ethnicity always occur against a backdrop of at least two levels of group identification—with own ethnic group and with the dominant group in the host society (Yinger, 1985; Hutnik, 1986). For groups

that are in a process of change, double boundary is maintained from within by the socialization process and from without by the process of intergroup relations (Barth, 1969; Isajiw, 1974). This is a process of building up a sense of national identity with the host country (Garcia, 1987; Finifter and Finifter, 1989) where the extent of identification as being an American is at least as important as being an ethnic minority. Instead of predicting assimilation or the eventual adoption of white American identity *and* the complete detachment from the ethnic culture over time, this multidimensional concept of ethnicity allows one the freedom to maintain ethnic loyalty at one level and to become acculturated to the new identity at another level.

The characterization of immigrants' responses to the host environment as "assimilation" derives mainly from observations of early white Protestant immigrants from Western Europe (Feagin and Feagin, 1993). Because of differences in experiences of discrimination and stereotyping, unique group history, and political/economic structure such as the presence of urban machines, it is inappropriate to transfer the assimilation experience of European immigrants to immigrants from other parts of the world (e.g., Pachon, 1985; Fuchs, 1990; Hero, 1992).

Beginning with Gordon's (1964) notion that the adaptation of non-Anglo Saxon Protestants may take place in a number of stages, many scholars perceive the Americanization of immigrants as an endless and dialectical process of acculturation (Parenti, 1967; Keyes, 1981; Padilla, 1985; Keefe and Padilla, 1987; Kitano and Daniels, 1988; Waters, 1990; Hero, 1992). In this process, immigrants may have adopted certain cultural patterns in public domain but have maintained a distinct subculture in private domain (Keefe and Padilla, 1987; Hutchison, 1988). They may also become culturally but not psychologically or structurally adapted to the new identity (Yinger, 1985). In addition, the process may involve more than individual choice.

In the wake of the civil rights era and after the widening of the immigration door in 1965, the ethnic identity for certain self-conscious and mostly second-generation individuals of Asian or Hispanic origin can be characterized by the rise of pan-ethnicity. This is when previously unrelated and marginalized ethnic groups, thrown together at first by ignorant or insidious pan-ethnic categorization and recently by racial violence, began to confront the meanings of the imposed identity and status (Espiritu, 1992).

In sum, ethnicity is a multidimensional concept. Immigrant group boundaries, rather than static and descriptive, can be flexible and responsive to social conditions and collective needs of group members (Light, 1981). Far beyond shared cultures or social characteristics as a result of birth, migration, or socialization, the formation of ethnic group identity is a consequence of the interaction between subjective identification and objective

conditions. Far from being an essence or something fixed and concrete, ethnic/racial identity is constantly being transformed by political conflicts and social change (Omi and Winant, 1986). Although objective group identity for the "visible" ethnic Americans is most likely a given, the process of acculturation or resocialization into a multiethnic society also offers a latitude for individuals to decide how much to identify themselves in ethnic terms.

DATA

The data on which this study is based are drawn from a 1984 California statewide survey of individuals 18 years of age or older that belong to one of the four ethnic/racial groups: Anglo white, African, Latino, and Asian Americans.[2] Details of sample design can he found in Appendix B of Uhlaner et al. (1989) or, more fully, in the Appendix of Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner (1991). Telephone interviews were completed with 308 Asians and 574 Latinos,[3] with an overall response rate of 44 percent. As indicated by the principal investigators of the project, compared to data from the 1980 Census, Asian males and Latino homeowners are oversampled by respectively 12 percent and 8 percent. Figures for the reported level of having some college education for both groups are also much higher than what should be expected—the difference for Asians is 23 percent and Latinos 14 percent. However, the reported figures for family income and country of birth are consistent with the Census figures. The self-reported rates of voting and registration are also in the same direction as the general findings from studies on Mexican and Asian Americans that they participate much less than non-Hispanic whites (Jackson and Preston, 1991).

A comparison of the frequency distributions in terms of indicators of sociodemography, ethnicity, and political participation between the two immigrant groups can be found in Appendix A. Because of the gap in basic socioeconomic resources between the two subsamples, which are also not evenly represented in terms of numbers and percentages in the pooled sample (there are 105, or 24 percent, more Chicano respondents), the following analyses are presented separately for each ethnic group.

DIMENSIONS OF ETHNICITY

Ethnicity can be defined as a sense of belonging to "an involuntary group of people who share the same culture" or are perceived by others as sharing the same culture (Isajiw, 1974, p. 122). As indicated earlier, a common practice for many cross-group studies is to measure ethnicity with the objective conditions denoted by the diversities of race, religion, language, or

national origin. However, the concept of ethnic identity, particularly for members of ethnic groups that have endured large-scale and continuing influx of newcomers in recent decades, could be considered as always in a state of flux and reflux that may be manifested in a number of dimensions. Although the precise configuration of the process is still under dispute, the few recent studies that empirically examine the concept tend to differentiate among acculturation, ethnic attachment, structural/social assimilation, and receptional assimilation or the levels of perceived prejudice and discrimination (Keefe and Padilla, 1987; Williams and Ortega, 1990). The operationalization of ethnicity for this study is accordingly defined to tackle the existence of these and other distinct dimensions. (Details of question wording and coding schemes appear in Appendix B.)

Acculturation

The extent of cognitive adaptation to the prevailing norms, beliefs, and attitudes of the American political culture can be conceived as indicated by a person's sense of civic duty, level of political information, and attitude toward immigrant issues. These are important indicators of acculturation for they may gauge the extent of a person's *acquisition of a second culture.*[4] In this sense, the process of acculturation, or the entire process of ethnicization, resembles that of adult (re)socialization where political learning is considered to be a lifelong process characterized by both continuity and change and where individuals are both influencing and being influenced by the environment (Sigel, 1988).

An individual is considered to have a high sense of civic duty when giving unconditional support to the question about the importance of voting.[5] An individual's level of information is gauged by the degree of familiarity with the American issues of public affairs as assessed by the interviewer. An individual's attitudes toward two immigrant-relevant policy issues—support sanction of employers for hiring illegal immigrants and against providing for non-English-speaking voters ballots printed in their own language—are considered as indicators of adaptation when they mirror the prevailing non-Hispanic white attitudes toward both issues in the cross-ethnic sample.[6]

Acculturation can be one of the linkages between objective group conditions and political action where resources accumulated by one's ethnic origin, education, income, and occupation are translated into skills and attitudes facilitating involvement in political activities. It is hypothesized that, for both Asian and Mexican Americans, the more one is acculturated, the more one is likely to participate (H1).

Ethnic Ties

The degree of ethnic ties or attachment to home country cultures is measured by one's use of non-English primary language, maintenance of contacts with friends or families back home, and sending money back to the home country. The maintenance of cultural practices may seem to interfere with the process of adaptation to the new environment. However, past studies have shown that the two processes may not be on the same dimension (Keefe and Padilla, 1987; Kitano and Daniels, 1988; Hutchison, 1988). It is therefore hypothesized that keeping contacts with home country culture may not have a negative impact on participation (H2).

Group Consciousness

Defined as the "identification with a group *and* a political awareness or ideology regarding the group's relative position in society along with a commitment to collective action" (Miller et al., 1981, p. 495), the concept of group consciousness may also approximate the extent of structural and social/psychological integration into the American system. As indicated earlier, Miller and his associates' definition of group consciousness distinguishes group identification from sense of system blame and polar power—two components relating to Gordon's (1964) conception of the receptional dimension in the process of becoming an ethnic American. They found that these three conceptual components, when considered as a whole, were particularly useful to explain participation in a number of electoral and nonelectoral activities.

In a previous study using this data set, group consciousness was measured by one's self-identified and politicized memberships with the American ethnic or nonethnic organizations and social groups (Uhlaner et al., 1989). This may be a broader and more politically relevant—and much more concise—measure of the Miller et al. concept of group consciousness than existing NES items (note 14). However, to see if the concept and the impact of the group consciousness variable derived from studying blacks, women, the aged, and the poor can apply to the study of non-African American ethnic minorities, the present analysis adds measures of perceived prejudice, discrimination, and deprivation based on one's ethnic group origin[7] to indicate components of immigrant group consciousness.

In this study, "group identification" is operationalized by one's membership and concern about own ethnic/nationality group and other sociopolitical group problems; "polar power" is measured by the perception of own ethnic group getting fewer opportunities than most Americans; and "system

blame" is measured by the perceived prejudice of most Americans being against own nationality group and by the personal experience of discrimination because of one's nationality group background. Based on theories of group mobilization and rational choice (Uhlaner, 1986, 1989), it is hypothesized that the identification with American social groups and the sense of being racially alienated and systematically deprived will generally mobilize ethnic group members to participate in sociopolitical activities (H3). However, because of the huge discrepancies in socioeconomic resources and the different types of discriminatory experiences[8] between the two groups, it is further hypothesized that there may be some intergroup differences in the shape and impact of group consciousness (H4).

A Common Structure

The underlying structure of ethnicity is assessed by using a principal components extraction and a varimax rotation. The results for each group are reported in Table 1 and Table 2. These results are inspiring in three respects. First, they confirm the conception that ethnicity is a multidimensional phenomenon. Second, the principal components for each factor generally comply with what should theoretically be expected. Third, despite the huge sociodemographic gap, Asians and Mexicans mostly share a similar ethnicity structure.

For both groups, factors of ethnic ties, acculturation, and group identification are composed of identical items. The main difference between the two groups is in the behavior of the deprivation variable. Whereas it is a distinct factor for Mexicans, Asians' sense of deprivation is comparatively more similar to their sense of alienation, and to a lesser degree, identification with own ethnic group. However, the low factor loading score of Asian deprivation indicates that the alienation factor of Asians, like the Mexicans, mainly consists of perceived prejudice and discrimination.

Since the group consciousness for non-African American immigrants can be more or less broken into alienation, group identification, and deprivation, it seems to confirm Miller and others' hypothesis about the components of group consciousness for American racial/social groups. Yet, the finding that immigrant group consciousness consists of more than one dimension is a situation more complex than has previously been conceived and addressed.[9] To estimate the impacts of the ethnicity structure on political participation, summated indices[10] of acculturation, group identification, alienation, and ethnic attachment are created by adding up highly loaded items for each index and then dividing the summed scores by the number of items in each index.

TABLE 1. Principal Component Analysis of Asian American Ethnicity

Variable	Varimax Rotated Components[1] (N = 308) I	II	III	IV	Communality[2]
Ethnic Ties					
Contact friends/relatives	.904				.820
Non-English home lang.	.792				.634
Send money back	.694				.493
Acculturation					
Importance of voting		.712			.571
Information level		.638		.319	.562
Support employer sanction		.637			.470
Against bilingual ballot		.635			.412
Alienation					
Experience of discrimination			.774		.630
Perception of prejudice			.774		.623
Group Identification					
Nonethnic social group				.858	.753
Own ethnic group			.430	.570	.525
Deprivation					
Own ethnic group has fewer opportunities			.415		.182
Eigenvalue	2.16	1.88	1.52	1.11	
Variance(%)	18.0	15.7	12.6	9.2	

1. Loading scores greater than .30 or smaller than −.30.

2. A communality in factor analysis shows how much variance of an observed variable is accounted for by the common factor. In an orthogonally rotated factor model, it is equivalent to the sum of the squared factor loadings.

Source: 1984 California Ethnicity Survey from the University of California Institute for Social Science Research.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION, PARTISANSHIP, AND OTHER CONTROLS

Political participation is traditionally defined as those actions of private citizens by which they seek to influence the selection and/or the action of government officials (Verba and Nie, 1972). Many studies have found political participation to be multidimensional; it includes a number of electoral and nonelectoral activities (Verba and Nie, 1972; Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Bobo and Gilliam, 1990). Because of the different degrees of demand on information and motivation for each type of activities, those who vote often do not share the same level of involvement as those who join with a group or organization to solve community problems, or work for political campaigns, or contact elected officials.

TABLE 2. Principal Component Analysis of Mexican American Ethnicity Varimax Rotated Components[1] (N = 513)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	Communality[2]
Ethnic Ties						
Contact friends/relatives	.882					.791
Send money back	.846					.753
Non-English home lang.	.658				.344	.601
Acculturation						
Importance of voting		.710				.592
Information level		.557		.460		.601
Against bilingual ballot		.532			−.310	.478
Support employer sanction		.519				.396
Alienation						
Perception of prejudice			.776			.706
Experience of discrimination			.697	.310		.606
Group Identification						
Nonethnic social group				.753		.583
Own ethnic group			.419	.583		.529
Deprivation						
Own ethnic group has fewer opportunities					.790	.659
Eigenvalue	2.22	1.76	1.04	1.26	1.01	
Variance(%)	18.5	14.7	8.7	10.5	8.4	

Note: (see Table 1)

For the majority of Americans, voting requires few resources (registration and information) and is easily practiced (Teixeira, 1992). For individuals with personal or recent family history of immigration, however, there is an additional "cost" to this most common form of participation—the acquisition of citizenship. This is a process most likely influenced by proximity to the mother country, fear of discrimination by officials from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, lack of information and knowledge on the benefits of naturalization, difficulty in meeting language and civics requirements, and a general lack of a sense of political efficacy and trust in political institutions of the mother country where socialization initiated (Fuchs, 1990; Pachon, 1991).

Other barriers that increase the costs of participation include the regionally dispersed and geographically concentrated distribution of the population, the high proportions of the young, foreign-borns, or recent immigrants, and the institutionalized practices of minority vote dilution (Pachon, 1985). To gauge a fuller meaning of ethnic minority political participation for those with or without an American citizenship, the operational definition of participation for this study covers both voting and four other forms

of participation: campaign contribution, contacting officials, contacting media, and noncampaign group-related community work.[11]

A Common Structure

Similar procedures to assess a common ethnicity structure are used to study the principal components of participation for both groups. Quite differently from classic findings, the five more commonly practiced participatory acts all load into one factor and the two immigrant groups virtually share the same underlying structure.[12] Regardless of ethnic origins, those who voted also tended to contribute money, work with groups to solve community problems, and contact officials or media. This finding seems to support the time-series study by Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) that participants tended to overlap in activities that required the same kinds of resources but not to the extent of clustering in identifiable "modes." Again, based on the same principle for constructing the ethnicity indices, a summated index for participation other than voting is created for regression analyses.

Partisanship

The extent of affiliation with dominant political parties in the host nation can be conceived as part of the indicators of structural assimilation or the large-scale entrance into institutions of the host society (Gordon, 1964; Yinger, 1985). It is an important part of the sense of national identity and integration (Garcia, 1987; Finifter and Finifter, 1989). However, strength of partisanship is treated here as a control variable distinct from indicators of ethnicity because the incidence of one's being a strong or weak partisan or political independent[13] may not necessarily correlate with how much one identifies with an ethnic group. In fact, previous studies conducted in California have found that the strength and pattern of Asian American partisan affiliation is highly puzzling and cannot be explained with the same variables that work for Latino immigrants (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner, 1991; Nakanishi, 1991). Besides, political partisanship has consistently been found to be the single most important determinant of participation either with all Americans (Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Conway, 1991; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993) or Latinos (Garcia et al., 1992).

The impact of partisanship varies nevertheless a great deal with different modes of activities. In a previous study using this data set, citizen partisanship has been found to contribute to the explanation of voting, somewhat less to the explanation of contacting officials, but little in the estimation of other nonvoting participation (Uhlaner, 1991). This finding basically resem-

bles those reported in Verba and Nie (1972) and Milbrath and Goel. It is therefore hypothesized that the strength of political partisanship will exert a positive influence on voting turnout but not on other kinds of participation (H5).

Other variables used to control the relationship between ethnicity and participation include education,[14] high income level,[15] prestigious occupation,[16] age,[17] nativity, citizenship status (for nonvoting participation), and national group membership (for Asians). Logistic regression, a statistical method for handling dichotomous dependent variables, is used to analyze voting participation.[18] Multiple regression is used to analyze participation in activities other than voting. All original variables except education, information level, age, and length of stay are recoded into dummies for regression analyses.[19] These recoded variables take on the value of 1 or more to represent positive response to the elicited phenomenon and 0 otherwise.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The logistic regression results for citizens' voting participation are reported in Table 3. For each group, three models are presented to compare the basic effect of socioeconomic status and the additional effects of group identification (or group consciousness in Uhlaner et al.'s study) and other ethnicity indicators. For Asian citizens, having higher education, family income, prestigious head-of-household occupation, or being foreign-born and male do not significantly affect one's likelihood of voting.[20] Group consciousness or ethnic ties do not make much difference either. The only ethnicity dimension that matters is acculturation. Being more informed, having greater sense of civic duty, and sharing the prevailing white attitude on immigration issues significantly increase Asians' likelihood to vote. Like the American voters in general, being older and having stronger partisanship also mobilize voting participation by Asian citizens.

For citizens of Mexican origin, in direct contrast to Asians, more education and better occupation significantly increase the likelihood of voting—but occupation becomes insignificant when ethnicity indicators other than group identification are included. Similar to Asians, age, partisanship, and acculturation have a positive effect on voting; family income, gender, nativity, group identification, deprivation, and ethnic ties do not. Although sense of alienation has an insignificant effect for Asians, the sense of being discriminated and prejudiced against because of one's Mexican origin significantly increases the chance of Mexican American voting participation.

These differences in the determinants of voting participation between citizens of Asian and Mexican origin basically explain the difficulty for Uhlaner and her associates (1989) to account for the participatory discrep-

TABLE 3. Logistic Regression Models of Voting Participation

Variable	Asian Americans (N = 194) (1)	(2)	(3)	Mexican Americans (N = 355) (1)	(2)	(3)
Socioeconomic Status						
Education	−.09	−.09	−.13	.89**	.87**	.69**
	(.25)	(.25)	(.25)	(.18)	(.18)	(.20)
High income	.32	.32	.11	.57	.62	.52
($30,000+)	(.40)	(.41)	(.45)	(.35)	(.36)	(.38)
Hi-occupation	.22	.22	.21	.86*	.76*	.49
	(.40)	(.40)	(.41)	(.36)	(.36)	(.40)
Ethnic Identity						
Group Id		.02	−.22		.64	.57
		(.62)	(.65)		(.41)	(.46)
Alienation			.23			.75*
			(.47)			(.34)
Deprivation			−.10			−.17
			(.24)			(.10)
Acculturation			1.27*			2.35**
			(.53)			(.43)
Ethnic ties			−.34			.24
			(.78)			(.73)
Partisanship/Demographic Controls						
Partisanship	.74**	.74**	.65**	.53**	.52**	.47**
	(.18)	(.18)	(.19)	(.13)	(.13)	(.14)
Foreign-born	−.79	−.79	−.37	−.14	−.15	−.19
	(.47)	(.48)	(.63)	(.41)	(.41)	(.53)
Gender	−.01	−.01	−.06	.25	.28	.28
	(.37)	(.37)	(.38)	(.28)	(.28)	(.30)
Age	.59**	.59**	.65**	.74**	.74**	.80**
	(.16)	(.16)	(.17)	(.12)	(.12)	(.13)
Korean	−.51	−.51	−.51			
	(.78)	(.78)	(.82)			
Japanese	−.75	−.75	−.90			
	(.77)	(.77)	(.81)			
Chinese	.16	.16	.19			
	(.76)	(.77)	(.79)			
Filipino	−.49	−.49	−.49			
	(.77)	(.77)	(.79)			
(Constant)	−.86	−.86	−2.58*	−4.44**	−4.57**	−7.85**
	(1.05)	(1.05)	(1.30)	(.60)	(.62)	(.99)
% correct	77.84	77.84	81.96	77.49	78.06	81.77
log-likeli.	194.73	194.73	188.00	347.12	344.60	302.35

Note: Numerical entries are logistic coefficients except where noted. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .005$

ancies of citizens with different ethnic origins via socioeconomic and group consciousness variables. With the inclusion of measures more sensitive to the formation of ethnicity, this study finds that the common ground of voting participation for Asians and Mexicans is in the extent of acculturation, partisanship, and political experience gained from aging.

The multiple regression analyses of other forms of participatory activities in which both citizens and noncitizens are eligible to participate are reported in Table 4. Similar to the analyses for logistic regression, three models are computed for each ethnic group. For Asian American citizens as well as potential citizens, when only sociodemographic variables are considered, having higher family income and citizenship status can significantly increase the rate of participation in campaign contributions, contacting officials and media, and working with groups to solve community problems. The influence of income and citizenship erode, however, with the entrance of various ethnicity variables. In contrast to the models of Asian voting, age and partisanship do not have any significant impact, whereas membership and concern over group problems do. As in voting models, acculturation can significantly increase the participation in the more commonly practiced forms of nonvoting activities; education, income, occupation, nativity, gender, alienation, and ethnic ties do not have any impact. Moreover, as in voting by citizens, when partisanship, sociodemographic, and ethnicity factors are controlled, one's membership in any of the four major Asian national groups has no impact on the likelihood of participation in other types of activities. This finding supports the basic premise adopted by this study that ethnic group membership based on objective conditions does not have much meaning in itself.

For Mexican American citizens and noncitizens, better education, occupation, and stronger partisanship are important predictors of campaign contribution, particularized contacting, and noncampaign group-related community work. The effect of partisanship recedes, nevertheless, when a full array of ethnicity indicators is introduced. As in previous models, income level, nativity, gender, and sense of deprivation are unimportant predictors. But age and citizenship become insignificant, too. Yet, two indicators of ethnicity—group identification and sense of alienation—join rank with acculturation to increase the rate of nonvoting types of participation. A fourth indicator of ethnicity—attachment to ethnic culture—significantly discourages Mexican Americans' participation in more "costly" activities. This finding regarding the negative impact of ethnic ties is in sharp contrast to the observed insignificance of the variable on Mexican voting or on Asian voting and participation other than voting. However, two ethnicity indicators—group identification and acculturation—emerge as common bases for both Asian and Mexican participation in activities other than voting.

TABLE 4. Multiple Regression Models of Participation Other Than Voting

Variable	Asian Americans (N = 278) (1)	(2)	(3)	Mexican Americans (N = 488) (1)	(2)	(3)
Socioeconomic Status						
Education	.02	.01	.01	.08**	.07**	.05**
	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
High income	.07	.05	.03	.04	.04	.03
($30,000+)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Hi-occupation	.03	.02	.02	.09**	.08*	.06*
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)
Ethnic Identity						
Group Id		.19**	.17**		.14**	.13**
		(.05)	(.05)		(.03)	(.03)
Alienation			.05			.05*
			(.04)			(.02)
Deprivation			.01			.00
			(.02)			(.01)
Acculturation			.12**			.09**
			(.04)			(.03)
Ethnic ties			−.09			−.11*
			(.07)			(.05)
Partisanship/Demographic Controls						
Partisanship	.02	.02	.00	.02*	.02*	.01
	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Foreign-born	−.04	−.02	.03	.02	.02	.06
	(.04)	(.04)	(.05)	(.03)	(.03)	(.04)
Gender	.04	.05	.05	.00	.01	.00
	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)
Age	.02	.02	.02	.01	.01	.01
	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Citizenship	.09*	.11**	.06	.03	.04	−.00
	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)	(.04)
Korean	−.02	−.03	−.05			
	(.06)	(.06)	(.06)			
Japanese	−.01	.01	−.04			
	(.06)	(.06)	(.06)			
Chinese	−.05	−.05	−.09			
	(.06)	(.06)	(.06)			
Filipino	.01	.01	−.01			
	(.06)	(.06)	(.06)			
(Constant)	.02	−.01	−.13	−.09	−.12*	−.16**
	(.09)	(.09)	(.10)	(.05)	(.05)	(.06)
Adj-R^2	.07	.11	.13	.16	.19	.22
F	2.82**	3.73**	3.54**	12.62**	13.76**	11.73**

Note: Numerical entries are regression coefficients except where noted. Standard errors are in parentheses.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .005$

The implication of these findings on supporting the study's hypotheses is generally positive. I have hypothesized that the more one is acculturated, the more one is likely to participate (H1). This is clearly borne out across types of participation and ethnic groups. For both Asian and Mexican Americans, those who are more informed, have a higher sense of civic duty, and share with non-Hispanic whites their prevailing attitudes toward immigrant-related issues tend to participate more. As expected, maintaining contacts with home country culture does not have a negative impact on participation (H2). In three out of four cases, using non-English language at home, maintaining social contacts with friends or relatives, or sending money back to the home country does not have negative impact. Only for Mexicans does attachment to ethnic culture discourage participation in activities other than voting.

Support for the hypothesis that the consciousness of being an American ethnic minority and the sense of being racially alienated and systematically deprived will mobilize ethnic group members to participate in sociopolitical activities (H3) is mixed. The crux of the matter is that there is more than one dimension of ethnic group-based consciousness. In terms of subjective membership and concern for ethnic group problems, the support is found in nonvoting types of participation but not in voting. Regardless of one's ethnic origin, group identification significantly mobilizes participation in campaign contributions, contacting media and elected officials, and working with groups to solve community problems.

In terms of alienation, regardless of the type of participation, Asians are not significantly affected but Mexicans are positively affected. The sense of relative deprivation, on the other hand, adds little to the impact of ethnicity across groups or types of participation. These findings lend support to the proposition of intergroup differences in the shape and impact of group consciousness (H4).

Lastly, the hypothesis that the strength of political partisanship will increase voting but not nonvoting participation (H5) is largely supported. For both groups, with sociodemographic background and the extent of ethnic identity controlled, stronger partisanship increases the likelihood of voting; it insignificantly increases the rate of participation in other activities.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

What has emerged is a rather complicated picture of the relationship between ethnicity and political participation. Despite the huge discrepancy in socioeconomic resources, both Asian and Mexican Americans are found to bear similar underlying structures of ethnicity and participation. Yet, there are enough evidences of intergroup differences to support the state-

ment that ethnicity matters. In a sense, this conclusion is no different from what has been uncovered by Uhlaner and her associates (1989). However, this study strives to answer why and how it matters.[21]

To answer the "why" question, this study reviews the literature on ethnicity that refuses to treat it as a static phenomenon denoted by objective background. Rather, ethnicity is viewed as an emerging phenomenon resulting from the continuous interactions between internal resources and outside forces. To answer the "how" question, this study advances five dimensions of ethnicity, the structure of which is then basically confirmed by a principal component analysis and a varimax rotation for each immigrant group. Summated indices created from combining highly loaded items are then entered as indicators of ethnicity along with partisanship and sociodemographic variables to test their independent impact on participation.

For groups undergoing significant changes in sociopolitical outlooks while maintaining close contacts with ethnic cultures because of the continuing influx of newcomers, this study finds that the measures of ethnicity basically cluster around five dimensions: acculturation, ethnic ties, group identification, alienation, and deprivation. For both Asian and Mexican Americans, being more informed, having a higher sense of civic duty, and sharing with the non-Hispanic white attitude toward immigrant-related issues (acculturated) significantly increase the likelihood of voting or the rate of participation in campaign contributions, contacting media and elected officials, and working with groups to solve community problems. For members of both groups, having subjective membership and concern for ethnic or nonethnic group problems (group identification) significantly mobilize participation in activities other than voting.

Maintaining contacts with home country culture (ethnic ties) does not significantly discourage participation except in the participation of the aforementioned types of activities by Mexicans. Perceiving one's own ethnic group as being discriminated and prejudiced against by other Americans (alienation) significantly mobilizes both voting and other participatory activities for Mexicans but not for Asians. The perception of one's own ethnic group having fewer opportunities (deprivation) does not mobilize in any significant way the participation of Asian or Mexican Americans.

Apparently, the effects of ethnicity on political participation are much more complex than one's ethnic origin would imply. And interpretations based on cultural differences simply overlook the issue of "ethnic Americanization" in the process of becoming an American ethnic minority. Although limited by the cross-sectional nature of the available data set, this study attempts to address the issue by adopting a set of multidimensional indicators of ethnicity. After the addition of these ethnicity indicators into basic socioeconomic models, without exception, variables concerning a per-

son's demographic background such as foreign-born, gender, citizenship status (for participation in activities other than voting), and national origins (for Asians) become statistically meaningless predictors of participation.

Previous studies of the relationship between political participation and ethnicity have mainly focused their attention on groups that are politically as well as economically disadvantaged. This empirical affinity between class and denominational ethnicity has prompted some scholars to search for a conceptual distinction between the roles of the two concepts for political participation (e.g., Nelson, 1979; Miller et al., 1981). With the unique oversampling of two socioeconomically distinct immigrant groups in this California data set, this study is able to shed some light on this issue.

Although Asian and Mexican groups are both overrepresented by the young and equally represented in terms of the percentage of citizens, they differ much in every other aspect of sociodemography. This huge gap in group resources, however, does not seem to translate into differences in the structures of ethnic group identity or political participation. And the role of basic resources is far from consistent. For participation in voting and other types of activities, education is comparatively much more important for the disadvantaged Mexicans than for the significantly advantaged Asians. Otherwise, only prestigious occupation seems to encourage the participation of Mexicans in activities other than voting. This lack of deterministic impact from socioeconomic class is consistent with other studies of Asian or Hispanic participation (e.g., Welch, Comer, and Steinman, 1972; Nakanishi, 1985–1986; Calvo and Rosenstone, 1989).

Yet, the effects of ethnicity on participation are not fully clarified. Despite evidence of mobilization by subjective membership and group concerns in the more demanding types of participation, the same cannot be said of participation in the "easier" type of activity such as voting. Sense of alienation mobilizes participation for Mexicans, not Asians; perception of deprived group interests adds little impact; and ethnic attachment decreases participation in "harder" activities for Mexicans. Acculturation, nevertheless, consistently increases participation across ethnic groups and activities. Thus, even though this study is not able to support uniformly the observation that the relatively low participation of ethnic minority groups stems from the lack of basic resources and that ethnic group consciousness mediates the disadvantage in basic resources (e.g., Verba and Nie, 1972; Milbrath and Goel, 1977), acculturation is surely a positive force in immigrant participation. As explained, acculturation can be indexed in part by "sense of civic duty" and "level of information"—two variables commonly associated with greater political participation. The result reported above highlights the usefulness of the variables for individuals with non-European cultural background.

Lastly, although the incidence of participation is often interpreted as a self-motivated effort, some scholars contend that studies focusing on individual motivation only tell half of the story. Defining participation as "the product of strategic interaction of citizens and leaders" (p. 228), Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argued that the strategic mobilization by political parties, interest groups, and government elites constitutes the other half. In terms of ethnic minority group participation, to some extent low turnout can be attributed to the presence of a substantial number of illegal aliens, the continued disinclination to become naturalized, and the large proportion of young voters (Calvo and Rosenstone, 1989). Other barriers may include the restrictive naturalization policy and registration law in the American legal-political structure, the failure of political institutions to resocialize new members both of native and foreign-born status, and the prior socialization in certain Asian nation-states (Nakanishi, 1991; Schmidt, 1992). The impacts of these factors on participation need to be considered in future studies.

APPENDIX A. Percentage Distribution of Sociodemography, Ethnicity, and Participation Among Asian and Mexican Americans

Sociodemography	Asian (N = 308)	Mexican (N = 513)
Education		
High school or less	22	66
College degree or more	39	9
Family income*		
Below $15,000	16	33
Over $30,000	33	17
Prestigious occupation*	42	19
Citizenship (among non-U.S. born*)	65 (53)	69 (28)
Foreign-born*	57	37
Male*	60	49
Age		
Under 30	41	48
Over 60	10	9
National groups		
Korean	29	
Chinese	22	
Japanese	23	
Filipino	16	
Vietnamese	4**	
Ethnicity		
Importance of voting	68	72
Against bilingual ballot*	45	29

APPENDIX A. (*Continued*)

Ethnicity	Asian (N = 308)	Mexican (N = 513)
Support employer sanction*	46	38
Information		
Very or fairly high	47	42
Average	36	38
Contacted friend/relative* (non-U.S.-born)	44 (75)	30 (76)
Sent money back (non-U.S.-born)	20 (35)	16 (43)
Use non-English language at home	47	54
Intent to return to homeland**	7	4
Perception of prejudice	50	60
Experience of discrimination*	42	35
Group ID		
Nonethnic	11	13
Own ethnic*	37	46
Fewer opportunity for own group*	14	24
Participation		
Voted in 1984 (among citizens*)	48% (69%)	45% (60%)
Contributed money*	18	12
Contacted officials	26	26
Contacted media*	25	19
Worked with group to solve community problem	24	20
Displayed poster/sticker**	6	11
Attended political rally**	8	10
Worked on campaigns**	3	3
Partisanship		
Strong	23	28
Weak or leaning	50	47
Independent or no	27	25

*Differences between the two ethnic groups significant at Pearson chi-square $p < .05$ or Kendall's tau-b and tau-c t-values greater than 2.00 or smaller than -2.00.

**Item dropped from analysis because of the difficulty to derive meaningful statistical interpretation out of the small percentage of members or participants.

Source: 1984 California Ethnicity Survey from the University of California Institute for Social Science Research.

APPENDIX B. Question Wording and Selected Coding Schemes* of Participation and Ethnicity Variables

PARTICIPATION

(1) *Voting*—"In talking to people about elections, we often find that many people are not able to vote because they were ill, they weren't registered, or they just didn't have time. How about you—did you vote in the election this November?"; (2) *Campaign contribution*—"During the past year did you contribute money to a party, candidate, or some other political organization?"; (3) *Contacting officials*—"Many people often contact their congressman or other elected officials—either by letter or phone or in person—to register complaints or express their opinions. How about you? Would you say that contacting an elected official is something that you frequently do, seldom do, or never do?"; (4) *Contacting media*—"How about writing letters to the editor of a newspaper or magazine? Is this something you do frequently, or seldom, or never?"; (5) *Working with group*—"Have you ever joined or worked in an organization to do something about a problem in your community, or a state or national-level problem?"; (6) *Campaign display*—"During the past year did you put a political bumper sticker on your car or a campaign sign on your lawn?"; (7) *Campaign rally*—"During the past year did you attend a political rally for a party or candidate or a meeting or fund-raiser?"; (8) *Campaign work*—"During the past year did you do any work either for pay or on a volunteer basis for a party or candidate's campaign office?"

ETHNICITY

ETHNIC TIES: (1) *Social contact* (asked of foreign-born only)—"Do you still keep in touch with friends or relatives back in the country you were from?"; (2) *Monetary contact* (asked of foreign-born only)—"Do you every send money back to friends or relatives in the country you were born in?"; (3) *Lingual link*—"Is your primary speaking language a language other than English?"; (4) *Intent to return* (asked of foreign-born only)—"Have you ever considered going back to the country you were from to live, or are you pretty sure you will always live in the United States?"

ACCULTURATION: (1) *Importance of voting*—"I'm going to read you three statements about voting in elections. Please tell me which of the three comes closest to your opinion. 1. So many people vote, it's not very important for me to vote in elections. 2. It's only important for me to vote in those elections where the interests of people like me are affected. 3. Whether or not the interests of people like me are affected, it's important for me to vote in elections." (2 = important whatsoever, 1 = important only if affected, 0 = not important); (2) *Information level*—Interviewer assessment of respondent's general level of information about politics and public affairs (5 = very high, 4 = fairly high, 3 = average, 2 = fairly low, 1 = very low). *Issue attitudes*—"Suppose that on election day you could have voted on the following propositions. Please tell me in each case whether you would have favored the proposition or opposed it;" (3) *Employer sanction*—"A law making it illegal for an employer to hire immigrants who have come to the U.S. without papers—favor, oppose, or no opinion?" (1 = yes); (4) *Bilingual ballot*— "Providing non-English-speaking voters in an election with ballots printed in their own language—favor, oppose, or no opinion?" (1 = no).

*Coding schemes are not provided for questions coded with "yes = 1, otherwise = 0."

GROUP CONSCIOUSNESS
GROUP IDENTIFICATION: (1) *Ethnic group*—"Do you think there are problems today of special concern to people of your racial or national background?"; (2) *Non-ethnic group*—"In addition to a racial or nationality group, is there any other kind of group—people in a particular occupation or religion, for example—that you feel part of, and that makes you more concerned about certain problems?"
ALIENATION: (1) *Discrimination* (asked of all respondents except West European whites)—"Have you, yourself, personally experienced discrimination because you are (respondent's nationality)?"; (2) *Prejudice* (except West European whites)—"Do you think that most Americans are prejudiced against (respondent's nationality), only some Americans are prejudiced, or that most Americans are not prejudiced?" (2 = most are, 1 = some are).
DEPRIVATION: "Do you think there are any groups of people in the United States today who get fewer opportunities than they deserve?" If yes or maybe, the interviewer asked, "What group is that?" and probed for up to four responses (4 = own ethnic group—i.e., Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, or Hispanics—mentioned upon first query, 3 = own ethnic group mentioned upon second query, and so forth**).

NOTES

1. The terms Asian Americans and Mexican Americans are used in this article to refer to persons of Asian or Mexican descent who may be either citizens or noncitizens of the United States.
2. These data were originally collected by Carole J. Uhlaner, Bruce E. Cain, and D. Roderick Kiewiet and made available to the author through the University of California Institute for Social Science Research. Neither the original investigators nor the institute bear responsibility for these analyses and interpretations.
3. Eighty-nine percent of the Latino subsample are of Mexican origin. The Pearson chi-square test of difference among participation, ethnicity, and sociodemographic variables indicates a general comparability between Hispanic respondents of Mexican and non-Mexican origin. Although non-Mexicans were more educated and had a lower percentage of citizens, the inclusion of them produced virtually the same final results as when only Mexicans were examined. However, due to an original programmatic error in excluding non-Mexican Latinos from a few central attitudinal questions (Uhlaner, 1991, p. 168n), only persons of Mexican origin are included in this study. This decision, although it produces a slightly smaller N for analysis, has the benefit of not confounding the Chicano experience with the Latino experience—which is emphasized by a recent national study of Latinos (de la Garza et al., 1992).
4. The difference between acculturation and assimilation is that the latter emphasizes the *unconditional acceptance* of the *dominant* culture *and* the *replacement* of an *ethnic* cul-

**The idea of treating responses to the deprivation question as a five-point scale is to tap the perceptual strength (or the ease of access to the deprivation schemata, if framed in cognitive psychology language) one may demonstrate in his/her reaction toward consecutive queries of the same concept. It can be argued that the order of response here does not make enough difference to warrant a scale. An alternative approach used by a previous study (Uhlaner, 1991) is to make it a dummy for those who do mention their own group versus those who do not. Results using the latter approach indicate little change in the ethnicity structure for Asians and a slightly different structure for Mexicans.

ture. As indicated earlier, the assimilation perspective is not appropriate to describe the experiences of many non-Anglo Saxon Protestant whites. Therefore, although the indicators of acculturation in this study may seem to gauge conformity to the American mainstream, they only measure part of the complex process of forming an ethnic identity in America.

5. This is different from the NES four-item measurement of an individual's belief in civic duty. However, since civic attitude has been found to be highly correlated with the level of political participation (Sigelman et al., 1985), I chose to include this single indicator of civic orientation that is present in the data set. It may be argued that a sense of civic duty, or for that matter, information, does not necessarily indicate acculturation. Nevertheless, for individuals with personal or recent family history of environmental change due to international migration, it is highly likely that their learning of a basic orientation toward democratic participation results from acculturation, which may in turn facilitate more learning. Whereas the issue of causality is difficult to resolve, the presence of a sense of civic duty should be a reasonable way to index acculturation. By the same token, the acquisition of information about issues in democratic politics suggests another indicator of acculturation.
6. Two other immigrant-relevant issues—amnesty for illegal aliens and bilingual education—could not be used because of the ambiguity in the direction of non-Hispanic white attitudes.
7. The study's use of the term *ethnic group* refers to both the pan-ethnic and the respective nationality groups. Although it may be imperative for scholars on an internally diverse ethnic group such as Asian Americans to distinguish the two concepts, this is not possible here because of the inconsistent usage of the two concepts in measuring ethnic group consciousness in the data set. Specific references to the ethnic group concept(s) used in each operationalization can be found in the following paragraph and in Appendix B.
8. Previous studies of the data set have found that there are differences in the nature of personal experiences of discrimination for the two groups. For Asians, these mostly occurred in social situations; for Mexicans, economic situations (Cain et al., 1991; Uhlaner, 1991).
9. This finding that, for recent immigrant groups, indicators of subjective identification, polar power, and system blame may not share principal components with each other mainly explains the rejection in this study to use interactive terms as suggested by Miller et al. (1981). In fact, when three-way interactive terms were used in place of individual factors, the explanatory powers of the current models decreased. The erosion was more substantial for Mexicans than for Asians.
10. The reason for using a simple summated factor-based index is that it allows factors to be correlated with each other; whereas the creation of an index based on orthogonal rotation and factor loadings may exaggerate differences among factors. The summated index thus provides a conservative test of the multidimensionality of participation (Williams and Ortega, 1990). A more common approach to deal with possible intercorrelation of variables in factor analysis is to use oblique rotation. However, the latter approach, although it produced the same factor structure for the Asian Americans, failed to converge and produce an interpretable structure under the assumption of interdependence for Mexican Americans.
11. As indicated in Appendix A, three forms of participation—public display, rally, and campaign work—have been dropped from the analysis due to statistical concerns. A similar decision of exclusion is reported in Uhlaner (1991). Registration to vote, a form of participation considered in previous analyses (Uhlaner et al., 1989; Uhlaner, 1991), is omitted from the present study so as to allow a comparison between results reported here and

those reported in other studies of participation that also seek to discover "modes" of behavior.

12. The respective factor score for each act is as follows; Among Asian Americans (N = 308), contact official = .710, work with group = .668, contribute money = .595, contact media = .556, vote = .542, eigenvalue = 1.91, explained variance = 38.1 percent. Among Mexican Americans (N = 513), contact official = .683, contact media = .603, contribute money = .598, work with group = .590, vote = .566, eigenvalue = 1.86, explained variance = 37.1 percent. The same underlying structure was observed when oblique rotation rather than varimax rotation was used.
13. The procedure assumes that the measure of party identification is unidimensional, that weak identifiers are stronger partisans than leaners. Dennis (1988a, 1988b) discussed some of the problems with these assumptions.
14. 1 = 0–8 years or some high school, 2 = high school diploma, 3 = some college or training/trade school, 4 = completed college or graduate work.
15. The criterion for assigning respondents into the high-income group is the income category into which the top one-third of non-Hispanic whites in the same survey fall. For this data set, this approximates a family income of $30,000 or more. Raw measure of family income cannot be used because of a substantial number of missing cases (22 percent Asians, 15 percent Mexicans). Readers should be cautioned that this may produce some biases in results and may account for the insignificance of income in the estimation for Asian Americans.
16. Head of household who holds a professional/technical or managerial occupation.
17. To distinguish the impact of the increment in age, five age groups (18–27 = 1, 28–37 = 2, 38–47 = 3, 48–59 = 4, 60+ = 5) are created. This procedure slightly reduces the explanatory power of the models where raw age is a significant variable, but it does not change the outputs in terms of the significance of variables. An alternative measure of the impact of time is length of stay. Converse (1969) noted that for foreign-born immigrants their length of stay rather than age may be a better indicator of exposure. However, when length of stay (i.e., age for native-borns) or percentage of lifetime spent in the U.S. (i.e., length/age) is used along with nativity in the regression analyses, they are generally less useful than age to predict participation. This is consistent with findings in the two previous studies using both age and the percentage-of-life measure to estimate citizen participation (Uhlaner et al., 1989; Uhlaner, 1991). The two studies differ nevertheless in their findings of the percentage measure. Whereas the 1989 study found it useful to predict citizen participation in group-related community work, the 1991 study reported an overall insignificance of the measure when salience of ethnic problem and perception of discrimination are both included in the models. Because of the high intercorrelation among age, length, and percentage of life, only age is used to estimate the impact of time.
18. Probit analysis was used in the Uhlaner et al. (1989) study to deal with the problem of having dichotomous dependent variables (registration, voting, contribution of money, working in groups, contacting media, and contacting officials). Although both logistic regression and probit approaches are likely to produce identical results, probit is more difficult to understand because the prediction derived from the independent variables is not the dependent variable itself but the distance from 0 in a standard normal distribution (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977). Logistic regression, on the other hand, is easier to interpret. Ordinary least-square-based analysis such as multiple regression, which requires the least number of assumptions and the result is the easiest to interpret, was not considered in the Uhlaner et al. (1989) analysis perhaps because of the lack of interest in detecting the "modes" of participation.
19. This is the same procedure used by Uhlaner et al. (1989) and Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner (1991) to deal with the problem of a significant loss of cases in a number of variables.

20. This finding of the lack of significant impact from one's socioeconomic background needs to be interpreted more carefully. Because of possible problems dealing with multicollinearity (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977), although together the three SES indicators may not have any impact, it does not necessarily mean that each cannot significantly influence participation. However, when only the three SES indicators are entered into the models for Asians, the log likelihood model for voting participation is not statistically significant and the total explanatory power for "nonvoting" participation is only 4 percent, with income standing out as the single predictor of participation in activities such as campaign contribution and particularized contacting.
21. This is by no means a claim that the current study has "better" measures or that it can explain "more" about ethnic participation than what was used in the previous endeavor. In fact, the improvements in explanatory power between the second and third model in Table 3 and Table 4 are little. What seems to be more interesting here is the consistency in the levels of improvement across types of participation and between the two socioeconomically distinct groups. For voting participation, between the basic socioeconomic models and the full ethnicity models, the percentages of cases predicted correctly improves from 77.84 percent to 81.96 percent for Asians and from 77.49 percent to 81.77 percent for Mexicans. For participation other than voting, the adjusted R-square increases from 7 percent to 13 percent for Asians and from 16 percent to 22 percent for Mexicans. This may be another indication of the "commonness" between the two groups.

REFERENCES

Barth, Fredrick (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little Brown.

Black, Jerome H. (1987). The practice of politics in two settings: Political transferability among recent immigrants to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 20: 731–753.

Bobo, Lawrence, and Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr. (1990). Race, sociopolitical participation, and black empowerment. *American Political Science Review* 84: 377–393.

Cain, Bruce E., D. Roderick Kiewiet, and Carole J. Uhlaner (1991). The acquisition of partisanship by Latinos and Asian Americans. *American Journal of Political Science* 35: 390–422.

Calvo, Maria A., and Steven J. Rosenstone (1989). *Hispanic Political Participation*. San Antonio: Southwest Voter Research Institute.

Conway, M. Margaret (1991). *Political Participation in the United States*, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Converse, Philip E. (1969). Of time and partisan stability. *Comparative Political Studies* 2: 139–177.

de la Garza, Rodolfo O. (1987). *Ignored Voices: Public Opinion Polls and the Latino Community*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

de la Garza, Rodolfo O., Louis DeSipio, F. Chris Garcia, John Garcia, and Angelo Falcon (1992). *Latino Voices*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Dennis, Jack (1988a). Political independence in America, Part I. *British Journal of Political Science* 18: 77–109.

Dennis, Jack (1988b). Political independence in America, Part II. *British Journal of Political Science* 18: 191–219.

Espiritu, Yen L. (1992). *Asian American Pan-ethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Feagin, Joe R., and Clairece B. Feagin (1993). *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Finifter, Ada W., and Bernard M. Finifter (1989). Party identification and political adaptation of American migrants in Australia. *Journal of Politics* 51: 599–630.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. (1990). *The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity, and the Civic Culture*. Hanover, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Garcia, F. Chris, John Garcia, Rodolfo de la Garza, and Angelo Falcon (1992). The effects of ethnic partisanship on electoral behavior. Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

Garcia, John A. (1987). The political integration of Mexican immigrants: Examining some political orientations. *International Migration Review* 21: 372–389.

Gordon, Milton M. (1964). *Assimilation in America Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Guterbock, Thomas M., and Bruce London (1983). Race, political orientation, and participation: An empirical test of four competing theories. *American Sociological Review* 48: 439–453.

Hanushek, Eric, and John Jackson (1977). *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hero, Rodney E. (1992). *Latinos and the U.S. Political System*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hutchison, Ray (1988). The Hispanic community in Chicago: A study of population growth and acculturation. In Cora Marrett and Cheryl Leggon (eds.), *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*, pp. 193–229. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hutnik, Nimmi (1986). Patterns of ethnic minority identification and modes of social adaptation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 9: 150–167.

Isajiw, Wsevolod W. (1974). Definitions of ethnicity. *Ethnicity* 1: 111–124.

Jackson, Byran O., and Michael B. Preston (eds.) (1991). *Racial and Ethnic Politics in California*. Berkeley, CA: IGS Press.

Keefe, Susan E., and Amado M. Padilla (1987). *Chicano Ethnicity*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Keyes, Charles F. (1981). *Ethnic Change*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kitano, Harry L., and Roger Daniels (1988). *Asian-Americans: Emerging Minorities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Light, Ivan (1981). Ethnic succession. In Charles Keys (ed.), *Ethnic Change*, pp. 54–86. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

London, Bruce, and Michael W. Giles (1987). Black participation: Compensation or ethnic identification. *Journal of Black Studies* 18: 20–44.

Milbrath, Lester W., and Madan L. Goel (1977). *Political Participation*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk (1981). Group consciousness and political participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 494–511.

Nakanishi, Don T. (1985–86). Asian American politics: An agenda for research. *Amerasia Journal* 12(2): 1–27.

Nakanishi, Don T. (1991). The next swing vote? Asian Pacific Americans and California politics. In Byran O. Jackson and Michael B. Preston (eds.), *Racial and Ethnic Politics in California*, pp. 25–54. Berkeley: IGS Press.

Nelson, Dale C. (1979). Ethnicity and socioeconomic status as sources of participation. *American Political Science Review* 73: 1024–1038.

Nie, Norman, Sidney Verba, Henry Brady, Kay Schlozman, and Jane Junn (1988). Participation in America: Continuity and change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Olsen, Marvin E. (1970). Social and political participation of blacks. *American Sociological Review* 35: 682–297.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant (1986). *Racial Formation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.

Pachon, Harry (1985). Political mobilization in the Mexican-American community. In Walker Connor (ed.), *Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective*, pp. 245–256. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Pachon, Harry (1991). U.S. citizenship and Latino participation in California politics. In Bryan O. Jackson and Michael B. Preston (eds.), *Racial and Ethnic Politics in California*, pp. 71–88. Berkeley: IGS Press.

Padilla, Felix M. (1985). On the nature of Latino ethnicity. In Rodolfo de la Garza et al. (eds.), *The Mexican-American Experience*, pp. 332–345. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Parenti, Michael (1967). Ethnic politics and the persistence of ethnic identification. *American Political Science Review* 61: 717–726.

Patterson, Orlando (1975). Context and choice in ethnic allegiance: A theoretical framework and Caribbean case study. In Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (eds.), *Ethnicity*, pp. 305–349. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Portes, Alejandro (1984). The rise of ethnicity: Determinants of ethnic perceptions among Cuban exiles in Miami. *American Sociological Review* 49: 383–397.

Rosenstone, Steven J., and John M. Hansen (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Sarna, Jonathan D. (1978). From immigrants to ethnics: Toward a new theory of "ethnicization." *Ethnicity* 5: 370–378.

Schmidt, Ronald J. (1992). The political incorporation of immigrants in California: An institutional assessment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

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

Sigel, Roberta S. (ed.) (1988). *Political Learning in Adulthood*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sigelman, Lee, Philip W. Roeder, Malcolm Jewell, and Michael A. Baer (1985). Voting and nonvoting: A multi-election perspective. *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 749–765.

Teixeira, Ruy A. (1992). *The Disappearing American Voter*. Washington, DC: Brookings.

Uhlaner, Carole J. (1986). Political participation, rational actors, and rationality: A new approach. *Political Psychology* 7: 551–573.

Uhlaner, Carole J. (1989). Rational turnout: The neglected role of groups. *American Journal of Political Science* 33: 390–422.

Uhlaner, Carole J. (1991). Political participation and discrimination: A comparative analysis of Asians, blacks, and Latinos. In William Crotty (ed.), *Political Participation and American Democracy*, pp. 139–170. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Uhlaner, Carole J., Bruce E. Cain, and D. Roderick Kiewiet (1989). Political participation of ethnic minorities in the 1980s. *Political Behavior* 11: 195–232.

Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie (1972). *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Schlozman, Henry Brady, and Norman Nie (1991). Resources and political participation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Welch, Susan, John Comer, and Michael Steinman (1972). Political participation among Mexican Americans: An exploratory examination. *Social Science Quarterly* 53: 799–813.

Williams, J. Allen, Jr., and Suzanne Ortega (1990). Dimensions of ethnic assimilation: An empirical appraisal of Gordon's typology. *Social Science Quarterly* 71: 697–710.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., and Steven J. Rosenstone (1980). *Who Votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Yinger, J. Milton. (1985). Assimilation in the United States: The Mexican-Americans. In Walker Connor (ed.), *Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective*, pp. 29–55. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.