

UC Irvine
CSD Working Papers

Title

The Impact of Perceived Representation on Latino Political Participation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/835859rr>

Author

Uhlener, Carole J

Publication Date

2002-07-01

CSD Center for the Study of Democracy

An Organized Research Unit
University of California, Irvine
www.democ.uci.edu

Political participation provides the means by which members of the mass public can influence the governing choices made by political elites, especially in a democracy. Even when elected officials derive information about the public's preferences by other means, such as opinion polling, their responsiveness ultimately depends upon the prospect of participation. Unhappy constituents may, for example, vote them out of office, or help their opponents campaign, or demonstrate, while happy ones may vote or campaign for them, give money, or come to a rally. Conversely, members of the public expect someone to represent them in the halls of decision-making. Scholars typically treat political representation separately from political participation. However, they both link political elites with mass publics (cf. Uhlaner, 1989). As we shall argue theoretically and demonstrate empirically below, individuals who feel represented are also more politically participatory.

We make the empirical case by examining the political participation of Latinos. Over and above any theoretical concerns, there is good reason to be interested in the political participation of the Latino population in the United States. Latinos are the single largest ethnic "minority" group in the United States as of the 2000 census, and the Latino share of the population is growing. At the same time, Latinos make up a much smaller fraction of political participants than of the population. Partly this reflects the large number of noncitizens and the youthfulness of the population. But other factors might be in play as well. The future of American politics will be shaped in substantial measure by how active a political role Latinos play. Predicting that depends upon understanding which factors shape the current levels of involvement.

While there has been previous research on Latino political participation, summarized below, much remains to be learned. Latinos also provide an especially interesting population for exploring the relationship between representation and participation. The population as a whole has some characteristics of a politically marginalized group. Moreover, while there are some descriptive representatives, the majority of Latinos still have primarily non-Latino elected officials. On the other hand, there have been extensive attempts to organize Latinos along various ethnic and national origin lines. Moreover, a number of public policies in recent years have specific salience for Latinos, leading to high potential for politicization of ethnic or national origin identity.

Participation provides information and pressure from the mass public to the political elite. Representation, especially as defined by Pitkin (1967, pages 221-225; 232-236), is a function

~~Paper prepared for presentation at the 2001 Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 29 to September 2, 2001, San Francisco California.~~ The author would like to acknowledge the support of the UCI Center for the Study of Democracy and the UCI School of Social Sciences Research Fund and the skillful assistance of Steven W. Plette. provided by elites for the mass public. The crucial component of Pitkin's definition is the notion of potentiality. To be well represented, citizens must feel that someone would defend their

interests if they were threatened. “There need not be a constant activity of responding, but there must be a constant condition of responsiveness, of potential readiness to respond.” (Pitkin, 1967, p. 233). Thus measurement of representation rests not upon a simple matching of policy preferences with either elite preferences or outcomes (as representation has, in fact, frequently been operationalized in the literature), but rather more upon the citizen's (reasonable) belief about what would happen if his or her interests were threatened. I argue that if someone does believe that there is a representative in the elite who looks out for his or her interests, then that person is in a linkage relationship, the other element of which is participation. This argument is different from, but related to, the argument that people are more likely to participate, *ceteris parabis*, when elites recruit them (Rosenstone and Hansen¹, 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995, and see Uhlaner 1989). One connection, which we exploit in the data analysis below, is that persons who feel represented by someone are more likely to be in a relationship where that representative recruits them. The sense of representation is likely to serve in part as an indirect measure of recruitment. But not all individuals who feel that someone looks out for their interests will have received a direct message from such a person asking them to participate; that is, they will not all have been recruited. Even those who have not been recruited, however, we hypothesize are more likely to participate than those who do not feel represented. They have a link to the system of political decision-making. The argument made here is supported by Bobo and Gilliam’s finding (1990) that African Americans participate more when they live in cities where blacks are politically empowered (operationalized by whether the city has an African American mayor). Bobo and Gilliam argue that the link is via enhanced trust, efficacy, and interest in politics. We suspect other mechanisms at work as well.

Unfortunately, in the data used here, it is not possible fully to distinguish between persons who feel represented by someone who have been recruited by that representative and those who feel represented but have not been recruited. Our measure will serve double duty. We will, however, be able to separate a feeling of representation from membership in organizations.

The data for this investigation come from the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS). (de la Garza, et. al 1992 provides basic information on this study). The LNPS utilized a national, multi-stage, clustered area probability design to sample three Latino national origin groups – Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans² – as well as the Anglo population. (The Appendix discusses the LNPS methodology and sampling issues in more detail.) The LNPS does contain

¹ Rosenstone and Hansen use the term "mobilization" to refer to essentially the same concept labeled "recruitment" by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady. I prefer to use "recruitment" here because mobilization also has other, less precise, usages in the participation literature. When I do use the term mobilization in this piece, I intend it to be synonymous with recruitment. Wrinkle et al. (1996) operationalize “mobilization” using the LNPS questions on working in a group to solve a local problem, contacting, and discussing problems. While their discussion of the concept is congruent with the discussion here, their actual operationalization taps something different (communal activity and discussion).

²While recognizing that our respondents are residents of the United States and are of Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban origin, for convenience we sometimes refer to these three Latino populations simply as "Mexicans," "Puerto Ricans," and "Cubans." Similarly conveniently, although inaccurately, we use the term "Anglos" to refer to white European-ancestry non-Latinos.

an item (question 61³) that taps representation as conceptualized above. After a battery of questions about organization membership and activities, respondents are asked, "Is there any group or organization that you think looks out for your concerns, even if you are not a member?" We take affirmative answers to this question as indicating that a respondent feels represented. Note that respondents are asked this question even if they belong to no organizations. The question is not ideal. Someone might feel that an individual, such as an elected official, looks out for his or her concerns without believing that any organization does. On the other hand, since the prompt includes "any group or organization" the referent is fairly broad, especially since it explicitly extends beyond groups in which the respondent is a member. This item does tap the respondent's sense of potential defense of their interests, consistent with Pitkin's definition. It moves us away from the need to rely upon matching agenda concerns or policy preferences between elites and mass publics. Another item (question 63) taps into representation more specific to the national origin group. After a follow-up to the first question to elicit the name of the group or organization, respondents were asked, "Thinking about [persons in the respondent's national origin group], even if you are not a member, is there any group or organization that you think looks out for [persons's of your national origin group] concerns?" Arguably, this provides an additional measure of representation, one which is specific to ethnic-national origin. On the other hand, the item asks about concerns of the group, not about those of the respondent. It thus seems both somewhat narrow for the concept we are trying to tap (as respondent's may have concerns that transcend their national origin) and not quite specific enough (as respondents may not share concerns which they identify with their national origin group). Nevertheless, in the "discussion" section below, I do examine this as a measure of representation, especially for participation that has a national-origin group referent. The LNPS data also contain separate items tapping organization membership. The analysis will thus be able to consider explicit membership in addition to subjective sense of being looked out for.

The discussion to this point does not differentiate among "Latinos." However, many analyses of the LNPS have made clear that there are substantial political differences between Latinos of different national origins. The LNPS respondents include representative samples of the three largest groups of Latinos in the United States, collectively making up about eighty percent of the Latino population. In light of the strong results from earlier studies, we will ask what factors lead to greater political participation separately for Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans. We will leave to empirical discovery whether or not there are factors common across these three groups. This approach will make it easier to identify any differences. Ideally, in order to take advantage of the substantial information we already have about participation in the general population, the Anglo respondents should be compared to the Latinos. Unfortunately, however, some of the key variables, notably the belief that someone is looking out for the respondent's concerns (subjective representation), are not available for the Anglo respondents. The analysis that follows is therefore restricted to the Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans in the sample.

³ Since the LNPS is a widely used data set (available through the ICPSR), I use question numbers throughout this paper to refer to items in the survey instrument (English language version) so that the reader may know unambiguously which items were used. The instrument is available from the ICPSR website.

What Is Political Participation? How It Is Operationalized

For purposes of this paper, we include as political participation any voluntary actions undertaken by an individual with the effect or intent of affecting public policies or the persons in a position to make policy decisions. We thus include voting, as well as registering to vote, and activities geared to affect other people's votes – that is, campaign activities. Most of these involve time, such as attending a rally, volunteering for a candidate, or wearing a button. Giving money involves money. But participation also includes activities that have no electoral context. Respondents participate when they work with others to solve a problem affecting their city or neighborhood – this item would fall into the communal mode identified by Verba, Nie, and Kim (1978). Several items address forms of contacting and of protest.

The LNPS data are unusual in including several items assessing a particular form of participation both in a general context and then, in a later question (question 127), in a context specific to the respondent's national origin group. For example, respondents were asked if they had "signed a petition regarding an issue or problem that concerns you?" and later asked if they had "signed a petition in support of [their national origin group's] concerns?" There are similar paired questions for contacting an editor or public official. Although strictly logically anyone who answered the narrow, ethnic-group specific version of the question affirmatively should also answer the general question affirmatively, and anyone who answered the general question negatively should answer the narrow one negatively, in fact people display every combination of answers. Presumably their memories are triggered somewhat differently by the questions. We thus constructed a measure that is "yes" if a person answered yes to either question and "no" if they answered no to both. For several other items – attending a public meeting, working as a volunteer for a candidate, contributing money – the questions are close but not quite the same. For instance, the ethnic-group version of the attending public meeting question also includes attending a demonstration, while the ethnic-group version of contributing money includes not just donations to candidates, parties, "or some other organization supporting a candidate or an issue in an election," but also to national-origin group organizations and "to support other [national origin group] activities." Some forms of participation were asked about only in the ethnic context – respondents were asked if they had "boycotted a company or product in support of [their national origin group's] concerns," but not about other types of boycotting. They were asked about attending a demonstration only in an ethnic context (and as part of the item tapping attending a public meeting) but not in other contexts. Despite the mixed referents in some of these measures and the omission of indicators for some types of activity, on the whole the set of participation measures in these data cover most of the range of political participation.

Table 1 reports how many respondents in each national origin group take part in various acts of political participation, in percentages. Puerto Ricans are all citizens, whether they were born on the island or in the mainland US. Thus only one figure is given for them. The Mexican American and Cuban American percentages are, however, given first for all respondents in each of these groups and then separately for citizens. Several comments can be made about the data in this table. As found elsewhere, for all citizens, voting and registering to vote are by far the most common acts of political participation. The contact and communal activities and easy campaign activities – display a button, sign or sticker -- come next. Respondents were coded as contacting on an issue if they responded affirmatively either to the general question or to the one placed in the context of national origin group concerns. Similarly, they were coded as signing a petition if

they answered yes either to the general question or to the one posed in terms of national origin group. The “campaign” variable takes on the value one for individuals who do *any* of three activities – display button, sign or sticker; attend rallies or speeches for a candidate; work as a campaign, either generally or for a candidate from their ethnic group. Second, although Cuban Americans are substantially more likely to vote than other Latinos, they are no more likely than Mexican Americans or Puerto Ricans to engage in other forms of participation, and frequently they are less active. Third, citizens are generally more active than noncitizens. The differences are, however, small on the rare activities and, strikingly but reasonably, disappear for particularized contacting. Noncitizens are just as likely as citizens to contact “a government office about a problem or to get help or information.”

Although the political participation of noncitizens is an extremely important topic, in the interests of simplicity we will restrict the rest of this analysis to citizens and return to noncitizens in subsequent research.⁴

TABLE 1: Respondents Participating in Different Activities by National Origin Group

Activity	Mexican Americans		Puerto Ricans	Cuban Americans	
	all	citizens only	all	all	citizens only
vote in 88		51	51		73
ever registered to vote		78	74		86
work on local problem	13	19	15	7	11
contact on an issue	10	14	10	10	14
particularized contact	27	27	25	22	22
sign petition	24	33	23	15	24
boycott (on an ethnic issue)	7	9	2	2	3
attend meeting or demonstration on ethnic issue	7	8	10	6	6
attend public meeting	13	17	14	5	9
give candidate money	5	9	5	4	7
campaign (button, rally, or volunteer)	17	25	18	13	18
display a campaign button, sign or sticker	13	20	14	10	14
attend rally, speech, etc. for candidate	6	10	7	5	7
work as a campaign volunteer	5	7	4	3	4
work as a campaign volunteer for a candidate from the ethnic group	4	6	4	2	3
N	1546	885	589	681	306

⁴ Examining noncitizens introduces several complications, beyond the obvious one that they are not eligible to vote or register nor, technically, to make campaign donations. In addition, the LNPS did not ask them their strength of party attachment. The noncitizens include only Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans, since all of the Puerto Ricans are citizens.

Bivariate Relationships between Participation and Feeling Represented

Are individuals any more likely to act if they feel represented than if they do not? As discussed above, the indicator we use for feeling represented comes from the LNPS item which asks respondents, "Is there any group or organization that you think looks out for your concerns, even if you are not a member?" Affirmative responses are taken as indicating that the respondent does feel represented. As Table 2 shows, the answer is yes, respondents who feel that someone looks out for them are more likely to participate politically, across this whole range of activities.

This table presents the percentage of citizens within each national origin group who take part in each activity, divided by whether they say that there is someone who looks out for them or say instead there is no such group or organization. With only a few exceptions, for each activity, within each national origin group, those who feel represented are substantially more likely to participate than are those who don't. The major exceptions to this statement occur among the Cuban Americans for voting and those activities most closely connected to it. Cuban Americans who feel represented in this way are *less* likely to vote or to register than those who do not feel represented. The differences are not large and either barely or not quite significant, but strikingly in the opposite direction from the behavior of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. Feeling represented also makes no difference in whether or not Cuban Americans work for a candidate endorsed by their national origin group. For the other activities, and for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, however, the subjective sense of identification is associated with higher levels of political participation.

Do Feelings of Representation Really Matter? Or Is It Everything Else?

However, it is not really possible to draw any conclusions from these bivariate tables about the effects upon participation of feeling represented. Quite likely, persons who feel represented share other characteristics, many of which may themselves be associated with participation. Thus the observed relationship might be spurious. In order to assess whether feeling represented has any independent effect upon participation, we need to control for other factors that we know have an impact. Fortunately, much is known about the determinants of participation.

Fairly early on, scholars concluded that persons with more wealth and education and also persons involved in organizations participate more in politics. Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) demonstrated the especially important role of education. Certain other demographic characteristics were consistently found to be associated with higher participation, notably age (with activity lower for young people) and factors related to social integration or stability (homeownership, being married). Certain psychological characteristics were also clearly associated with higher activity, notably interest in politics, efficacy, and partisan identification. (See Conway, 2000, for a summary.)

TABLE 2: Percentage of Respondents Participating in Different Activities by Whether or Not Respondent Identifies a Group or Organization that Looks out for His or Her Concerns, Citizens Only, by National Origin Group

Activity	Mexican Americans		Puerto Ricans		Cuban Americans	
	No One Looks out for R	Someone Looks out for R	No One Looks out for R	Someone Looks out for R	No One Looks out for R	Someone Looks out for R
vote in 1988	47	61	46	63	74	70
ever registered to vote	75	84	71	82	89	84
work on local problem	14	30	11	25	7	20
contact on an issue	11	20	7	19	10	24
particularized contact	24	34	21	36	17	35
sign petition	28	44	18	40	18	41
boycott (on an ethnic issue)	7	15	1	3	2	7
attend meeting or demonstration on ethnic issue	7	11	7	16	5	11
attend public meeting	14	23	11	25	8	12
give candidate money	6	15	3	10	6	8
campaign (button, rally, or volunteer)	21	33	12	34	12	39
display a campaign button, sign, or sticker	18	23	10	28	8	32
attend rally, speech, etc. for candidate	8	15	4	14	6	11
work as a campaign volunteer	6	9	3	8	3	7
work as a campaign volunteer for a candidate from the ethnic group	4	10	2	10	3	3
N	885		589		306	

A major cross-national project in the 1960s, as reported in Verba and Nie (1972) and Verba, Nie, and Kim (1978), as well as other publications from the project, reaffirmed that wealth and education are important predictors of participation – the positive association between them and participation has been dubbed the “socioeconomic baseline model.” This work added to that model the observation that the strength of the relationship between socioeconomic level and participation varies across societies as a function of the strength of other, “group,” resources. Where these are strong, such as in countries with strong political cleavages tied to ascriptive characteristics, or with sociological or occupational segments with strong political leadership, the relationship of socioeconomic status (SES) to participation was relatively weak. The United States portion of this work also established the importance of group consciousness (specifically, in those studies, among African Americans), in increasing participation levels. The group consciousness concept, and its effects, were more fully explored by others (Miller et al., 1981). The next major theoretical development in the study of participation involved incorporation of the recognition that people are more likely to participate when they are asked to do so (i.e. when they

are "recruited" or "mobilized") and, moreover, that mobilization follows systematic patterns (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995).

Arguably, the most complete current statement of the processes leading to participation is the Civic Voluntarism Model (CVM) developed by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995). The three components of the CVM are "resources," "engagement," and "recruitment." Higher levels of any of these factors leads to greater participation -- people participate in politics because they can, because they want to, and because someone asks.

"Resources" are most readily measured by income and education, but these serve as proxies for more fundamental measures. The most interesting components of resources are the "civic skills," operationalized by Verba, Schlozman and Brady as writing a letter, making a speech, and attending or planning a meeting where decisions are made in one or more nonpolitical setting, such as on the job, at church, or in a voluntary association. Civic skills turn out to explain the long-observed association between organization membership and participation.

"Engagement" includes interest, efficacy, political information, and partisan attachment, and also specific issue or ideological concerns. "Recruitment" includes both requests via individual contacts and ones from persons in positions of authority (for example, on the job, at church, or in an organization). This latter route provides one path by which group resources operate to increase participation.

People with greater wealth and education in general have more resources, are more engaged, and are more likely to be recruited, so overall the relationship between socioeconomic status and participation is positive. The CVM model provides a fuller understanding, however, of why the relationship holds.

Previous Research on Latino Political Participation

Although the literature on Latino political participation is more limited than of the general population, we will only touch on it here and not attempt to give a full bibliography. Studies of Latino political participation were hampered by a paucity of data before the last two decades. Not enough Latino respondents are captured in the major national surveys (such as the National Election Studies or the General Social Survey) to permit reliable analysis. The Current Population Survey (CPS) does have such a large sample that Latinos can be isolated, although there are questions about classification and participation information is limited to registration and turnout. Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) and Calvo and Rosenstone (1989) used CPS data to establish that the socioeconomic baseline model held for Latinos, but less strongly than for non-Latinos in the US, and only the income component affected Cuban American turnout. In part, this follows from the fact that Cubans had turnout rates substantially higher than Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. They also emphasized that lower overall turnout rates in the Latino population reflected the large numbers of noncitizens. DeSipio (1996a,b) has underscored that point and added the finding that the newly naturalized participate less than those who were born citizens or who have been citizens longer.

Uhlaner, Cain, and Kiewiet (1989) examined Latino participation compared with that of African-Americans, Asian Americans, and Anglos, all in California. The Latino sample was therefore predominantly Mexican American. Latino participation rates across a variety of activities were somewhat below those of Asian Americans and substantially below the rates for Anglos and African Americans. Citizenship accounted for a substantial part of the disparity, but

the differences also reflected both general variables and some specific to the Latino population. Lower education and income levels among Latinos, and the youthfulness of the population, accounted for much of the remaining difference. Most of the rest reflected language use and limited years of residence in the United States. Both that work and Uhlaner (1991) found that measures of group consciousness (identification of an ethnic-specific problem; experience of discrimination) led to greater participation by Latinos, especially in nonelectoral activities (but not at all for voting and registration). Leighley and Vedlitz (1999) also compared the participation of Anglos, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Mexican Americans, in their case using a statewide survey conducted in Texas in 1993-94. Their findings reinforce the point that general models of participation hold for these groups. People participate more if they have more money and education, more psychological resources (interest and efficacy), and are socially connected. Moreover, once these factors are accounted for, little difference remains among these groups. Leighley and Vedlitz find no effect for group consciousness, but their operationalization of this concept differs enough from others that their negative result can be discounted.

Several analyses of the LNPS investigating the political participation of Latinos were published in a special issue of the *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* (Arvizu and Garcia, 1996; Hero and Campbell, 1996; Wrinkle et al, 1996; Diaz, 1996; DeSipio, 1996b). Most of these find enough differences among the three national origin groups surveyed in the LNPS to argue strongly for analyzing them separately. Overall, the socioeconomic model more or less holds, although more weakly than for Anglos, and younger people tend on the whole to be less active, as in the general population. Although Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans do vote less than Cuban Americans and than Anglos, the disparities diminish substantially for other activities, especially after socioeconomic status is controlled. Moreover, the Cuban Americans may vote more, but they are not necessarily more participatory in other activities (as also shown here in Table 1 above). Members of organizations are more likely to register and to vote than are nonmembers (Diaz, 1996).

Recruitment to register or vote by a Latino organization was found to be an important predictor of validated voting among Latinos by Shaw, de la Garza, and Lee (2000). They surveyed Latino citizens in California, Florida, and Texas and checked the voting rolls to validate their turnout. In addition to the powerful effect of mobilization, they found that many of the standard determinants of turnout (income, interest, age, strength of partisanship) also were associated with higher rates of voting among Latinos.

As the above summary suggests, in examining the political participation of Latinos, we need to consider some variables that do not necessarily loom important for the general population. Most of these can be placed within the CVM framework although they are not generally used in the model as applied by its originators. First and most obviously, citizenship is a key variable in discussing Latino participation. Noncitizens are legally barred from voting and registering to vote. While noncitizens are allowed to engaged in other activities, and do so (see e.g. Uhlaner, Cain, and Kiewiet, 1989), their levels of participation are generally lower than for citizens. In part this may reflect selection bias; in part it probably relates to informational resources. For purposes of this paper, just to make analysis more manageable, we restrict ourselves to examination of the activity of citizens, leaving the study of noncitizen participation for a later project. Second, even among Latino citizens, many are immigrants. They will not receive as much socialization into US politics as the native born, and the amount of personal experience they have will depend upon how much of their life they have lived in the US. Third, substantial numbers of Latinos are more

comfortable speaking Spanish than English. Although there are many, and increasing, Spanish-language information sources in the US, these persons have at the least different, and possibly narrower, sources of political information than Latinos who speak English (de la Garza and DeSipio, 1992).

Independent Variables Used in this Analysis

In order to investigate the impact of a feeling of representation upon participation, we need to control for other known factors that have an effect. The models which follow tap “resources” by household income (question 182), measured in thousands of dollars, by education, measured in years of schooling, and by civic skills acquired in the context of a job. The LNPS measure of civic skills (question 103) includes writing a letter, taking part in a meeting, and giving a presentation, but does not include planning a meeting where a decision is made. “Engagement” is tapped by a measure of strength of party attachment, ranging from no party identification to strong partisan (questions 92 to 95) and by a measure of interest (question 54, “would you say you follow what’s going on in politics and public affairs . . .”). For the Cuban American respondents, partisan strength is only used for those who identify as Republican. Earlier estimations found that including the Cuban American Democrats led to no effect from partisan attachment, whereas, as will be shown below, when limited to Republicans it has some. A parallel restriction to Democrats for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans had no effect on the results.

“Recruitment” is tapped partially, only in the context of registering to vote, by a question asking whether anyone talked to the respondent about registering during the most recent national election (question 72). As Verba, Scholzman, and Brady note, this type of personal recruiting presents some difficulties as an independent variable, since being asked may primarily indicate that the respondent already independently had the characteristics that would lead them to take the action. We will thus, later, also consider models that exclude this measure. And, as noted, this particular item is restricted to recruitment for registration. Nonetheless, being asked to register may well be correlated with being asked to engage in other activities, especially those connected to the election.

We include six other demographic measures, three commonly used in discussing participation in the general population, and three particularly appropriate in examining Latino participation. Greater age has long been observed to correlate with higher rates of participation, presumably representing both resources in the form of greater experience and engagement in the form of greater information and interest. We thus include the respondents’ age, in years. For the foreign born, however, the impact of age upon US political information and experience depends upon how long they have lived in the United States. We thus also include as an independent variable the proportion of a person’s life that person has lived in the United States. For estimation reasons, this variable is set to “0” for the native born, and ranges from near 0 to near 1 for those born abroad. Partly for that reason, it is always used in conjunction with a dummy variable that takes on the value “1” for those who are born abroad and “0” for those born in the United States. For both of these variables, Puerto Ricans born on the island are treated as “foreign born” and those born on the mainland treated as “native born,” even though this is technically inaccurate. It does, however, allow us to capture the effects of migrating from the island to the mainland. The language the respondent prefers to use is included as another dummy variable, set to “1” for those who are predominantly Spanish-speaking, versus “0” for those who are bilingual or predominantly

English-speaking. Language use affects access to information, and in that way it fits into the resource component of the CVM. Language also serves as an indicator of cultural position and identity and thus can have an impact over and above resources. Earlier work, on the partisanship of Latinos (Uhlener and Garcia, 1998, 2000), found that among Cuban Americans individuals who combined speaking Spanish with professing Catholicism were distinctive. Thus, for Cuban Americans, the actual dummy used is “1” for persons who both speak predominantly Spanish and are Catholic and “0” for everyone else.⁵ Finally, in light of some research showing married people to be more participatory than the unmarried, and in light of an historical pattern of higher participation by men than by women (although this pattern has now been replaced by higher turnout rates among women), we include a dummy variable that takes on the value “1” for the married and another that takes on the value “1” for males.

Finally, and most importantly, we include the variable which taps subjective representation, described above in the discussion around Table 2, and a simple measure of organizational involvement (following question 59, is the respondent a member of any organization). Organization membership has long been identified as a correlate of higher rates of participation, especially when the individual is an active member. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) show that much of this relationship is due to civic skills acquired by organization members. Since we do not have available any measure of civic skills outside the job, including those acquired in organizations, we need to revert to tapping membership. William Diaz (1996) used the LNPS data to examine memberships in more depth – taking account of multiple memberships, of whether the individual donated money, and of whether the individual was an active member – and concluded that memberships did increase voting and registration among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. Here we use a more simplistic measure of organizational activity – just whether the respondent belongs to at least one – but examine a broader range of participation. The measure of subjective representation – whether a respondent identifies a group or organization that defends his or her interests -- interacts with organizational involvement. If we just use the measure of whether or not someone feels that a group or organization looks out for his or her interests, and do not also consider organization membership, we may find a spurious effect that reflects that fact that people who are organization members are more likely to feel that there is someone looking out for them. Among Mexican American organization members, 40 percent feel that someone looks out for them, versus 27 percent among nonmembers. Among Puerto Ricans, 37 percent of members feel represented by someone versus 23 percent among nonmembers. Among Cuban Americans, 37 percent of organization members feel represented versus only 17 percent of nonmembers. Thus we need to consider both membership and subjective representation.

Both membership in organizations and a sense of being represented may also be serving the role in these data of indirectly indicating recruitment. Organization members are open to recruitment in a variety of ways, only one of which (being talked to about registering) is directly tapped in these data. As for the sense of being represented, one of the ways we argue the linkage works to increase participation is precisely by enhancing both the prospects for recruitment and its success.

⁵ The large majority of Spanish-speaking Cuban Americans are Catholics, but not all.

All of these variables were used as independent variables in logit estimations⁶ on the each of the participation activities listed in Tables 1 and 2. Tables 3 through 15 report these results. Each table reports the estimation results for a particular dependent variable. The first column reports the results for all of the Latino respondents together. The next three columns report the results separately for each of the national origin groups. The top, larger, number in each entry is the coefficient on the independent variable. The bottom, small number (in parentheses) is the standard error. Coefficients significant at .10 or better are printed in bold. Those significant at .05 or better are also underlined. These tables report models that included both recruitment to registration and the measure of interest. Others models, the results of which are not reported here, were run excluding these two variables. These results will be referred to as appropriate below.

A very interesting and variegated picture of Latino participation comes out of these estimations. We will go through the detailed story before reaching conclusions about the main variable of interest.

Let us start with turnout in 1988. (See Table 3.) For all three national origin groups, voting is associated with being older, being a strong partisan, and belonging to an organization. For Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans, socioeconomic status also increases voting, as does being native born or having lived longer in the US. Controlling for those, the Spanish-speakers vote more than their bilingual or English-speaking compatriots. For Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans, having been recruited to register increases turnout, as does being interested for Puerto Ricans. Feeling represented does increase turnout among Puerto Ricans. With recruitment excluded from the estimation, it also increases turnout among Mexican Americans, and does so more clearly (significance level .043) among Puerto Ricans. So in the case of voter turnout, the representation variable appears to be partly picking up recruitment effects. Quite to the contrary, those Cuban Americans who feel someone looks out for them are less likely to vote, consistent with the bivariate results. This does not fit the main story; the explanation requires further investigation.

Ever having been registered to vote (Table 4) follows a similar pattern across the demographic variables. Older, educated, strong partisans who have been in the US longer and who have been recruited, if Mexican American or Puerto Rican, are more likely to have at some time registered. Additionally, Puerto Ricans are more likely to have once registered if they are interested in politics or a member of an organization, and Mexican Americans are more likely to have done so if they have acquired civic skills on the job. However, subjective sense of representation seems to have no effect. On the other hand, when recruitment to registration is omitted from the estimation, then Mexican Americans who feel represented are more likely to have once been registered. Again, the effect appears to go via recruitment.

Working with others to solve local problems is quite a different type of activity, since it takes place entirely outside of the electoral context. It is the main component of the mode of participation which Verba, Nie, and Kim (1978) label “communal.”

⁶ The logit estimations were run using the STATA logit command, with “sfwt” as a probability weight for the estimations separated by national origin, and “fwt” was the weight for those run for all Latinos together.

**TABLE 3: Logistic Regression of Vote in 1988, Citizens only
(from Questions 75 and 78)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	<u>0.013</u> (0.005)	<u>0.016</u> (0.007)	0.007 (0.012)	0.009 (0.011)
Education	<u>0.123</u> (0.028)	<u>0.147</u> (0.038)	0.063 (0.047)	<u>0.105</u> (0.053)
Age (in years)	<u>0.041</u> (0.007)	<u>0.044</u> (0.010)	<u>0.030</u> (0.012)	<u>0.089</u> (0.018)
Foreign Born	<u>-0.934</u> (0.443)	<u>-2.575</u> (1.146)	-0.351 (0.677)	<u>-1.946</u> (1.022)
% life in US	<u>1.211</u> (0.612)	<u>2.857</u> (1.651)	0.836 (0.777)	<u>2.145</u> (1.195)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	<u>0.697</u> (0.262)	<u>1.071</u> (0.395)	0.080 (0.380)	<u>0.983</u> (0.429)
Married	0.159 (0.175)	0.236 (0.222)	0.214 (0.300)	-0.063 (0.396)
Male	-0.174 (0.172)	-0.121 (0.215)	-0.263 (0.287)	0.096 (0.377)
Civic Skills-job	0.057 (0.095)	0.051 (0.119)	0.058 (0.170)	0.214 (0.210)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	<u>0.609</u> (0.092)	<u>0.561</u> (0.125)	<u>0.941</u> (0.155)	<u>0.957</u> (0.440)
Recruited to Register to vote	<u>0.619</u> (0.172)	<u>0.655</u> (0.211)	<u>0.865</u> (0.294)	0.261 (0.453)
Interest	<u>0.219</u> (0.081)	0.139 (0.109)	<u>0.450</u> (0.123)	0.170 (0.157)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.777</u> (0.184)	<u>0.600</u> (0.227)	<u>1.472</u> (0.322)	<u>1.023</u> (0.388)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.217 (0.175)	0.226 (0.220)	<u>0.480</u> (0.285)	<u>-1.085</u> (0.430)
constant	<u>-5.899</u> (0.576)	<u>-5.991</u> (0.764)	<u>-6.552</u> (0.934)	<u>-5.962</u> (1.256)
N of cases	1603	802	514	287
LL at 0	-1109.533	-555.514	-356.213	-180.171
LL at conv.	-863.815	-431.220	-255.001	-135.725
Chi2 (df)	178.47 (14)	118.87 (14)	105.36 (14)	39.74 (14)
pseudo R2	0.2215	0.2237	0.2841	0.2467

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

As shown in Table 5, Cuban Americans are more likely to participate in this way if they are married, Spanish-speaking Catholics who are well-educated with civic skills from their job. Puerto Ricans participate communally if they are well-educated organization members who feel someone represents them. Mexican Americans participate communally if they are older, bilingual or English-speaking organization members who have civic skills from their job, are interested in politics, were recruited to register, and who feel represented. Contacting officials about some issue is also a nonelectoral activity; when the issue is of general concern, as the questions here may elicit, it is considered part of communal activity.

**TABLE 4: Logistic Regression of Ever Registered to Vote, Citizens only
(from Question 74)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	-0.001 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.008)	0.015 (0.014)	0.006 (0.015)
Education	<u>0.147</u> (0.035)	<u>0.175</u> (0.048)	<u>0.093</u> (0.053)	<u>0.241</u> (0.081)
Age (in years)	<u>0.060</u> (0.009)	<u>0.068</u> (0.013)	<u>0.037</u> (0.013)	<u>0.087</u> (0.027)
Foreign Born	<u>-1.935</u> (0.518)	<u>-4.172</u> (1.420)	-0.942 (0.653)	-0.159 (1.151)
% life in US	<u>1.921</u> (0.700)	<u>4.388</u> (1.953)	<u>1.670</u> (0.836)	1.304 (1.510)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	<u>0.642</u> (0.367)	0.841 (0.582)	0.508 (0.402)	0.856 (0.633)
Married	0.106 (0.202)	0.181 (0.261)	-0.038 (0.336)	<u>-0.939</u> (0.566)
Male	-0.263 (0.206)	-0.242 (0.259)	-0.129 (0.312)	-0.233 (0.434)
Civic Skills-job	<u>0.343</u> (0.122)	<u>0.419</u> (0.172)	0.276 (0.241)	0.132 (0.272)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	<u>0.498</u> (0.097)	<u>0.389</u> (0.129)	<u>0.927</u> (0.151)	-0.138 (0.527)
Recruited to Register to vote Interest	<u>0.620</u> (0.214)	<u>0.548</u> (0.268)	<u>1.289</u> (0.330)	-0.150 (0.521)
	<u>0.165</u> (0.091)	0.108 (0.123)	<u>0.283</u> (0.122)	0.081 (0.224)
Member of an Organization	0.287 (0.225)	0.103 (0.281)	<u>0.934</u> (0.396)	0.530 (0.472)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.338 (0.223)	0.390 (0.282)	0.501 (0.352)	-0.766 (0.525)
constant	<u>-4.303</u> (0.625)	<u>-4.382</u> (0.865)	<u>-5.210</u> (0.971)	<u>-5.046</u> (1.672)
N of cases	1607	803	517	287
LL at 0	-860.612	-421.701	-297.982	-135.351
LL at conv.	-677.079	-325.835	-213.867	-98.492
Chi2 (df)	155.55 (14)	98.42 (14)	94.74 (14)	33.41 (14)
pseudo R2	0.2133	0.2273	0.2823	0.2723

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

**TABLE 5: Logistic Regression of Work with Others to Solve Local Problem, citizens only
 (“communal” activity; from question 119)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	0.003 (0.007)	0.007 (0.009)	-0.011 (0.012)	0.007 (0.015)
Education	0.055 (0.045)	0.041 (0.057)	0.110 (0.057)	0.406 (0.129)
Age (in years)	0.015 (0.008)	0.023 (0.010)	0.000 (0.013)	-0.022 (0.024)
Foreign Born	0.243 (0.615)	1.413 (1.471)	-0.192 (0.717)	-1.433 (1.394)
% life in US	0.126 (0.784)	-0.875 (1.802)	0.193 (0.895)	0.284 (1.917)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.655 (0.371)	-1.364 (0.732)	-0.205 (0.509)	1.619 (0.650)
Married	0.142 (0.195)	0.091 (0.255)	0.249 (0.397)	1.737 (0.611)
Male	-0.292 (0.195)	-0.354 (0.248)	-0.030 (0.355)	-0.714 (0.666)
Civic Skills-job	0.355 (0.090)	0.431 (0.110)	0.177 (0.171)	0.722 (0.305)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	-0.037 (0.109)	-0.033 (0.139)	-0.081 (0.191)	-0.299 (0.568)
Recruited to Register to vote Interest	0.679 (0.194)	0.928 (0.244)	-0.027 (0.355)	-0.039 (0.689)
	0.215 (0.112)	0.253 (0.153)	0.164 (0.158)	-0.090 (0.320)
Member of an Organization	0.641 (0.208)	0.642 (0.265)	0.577 (0.325)	0.280 (0.577)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.905 (0.196)	0.913 (0.243)	1.049 (0.335)	0.700 (0.534)
constant	-4.793 (0.573)	-5.417 (0.786)	-3.728 (0.882)	-8.330 (2.432)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-762.400	-391.392	-234.175	-106.907
LL at conv.	-639.243	-314.972	-205.629	-68.417
Chi2 (df)	136.74 (14)	104.27 (14)	32.00 (14)	48.18 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1615	0.1953	0.1219	0.3600

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

**TABLE 6: Logistic Regression of Contact (write, phone, etc.) on Issue, Citizens only
(From Questions 124b, 127g)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	0.008 (0.007)	0.008 (0.009)	0.024 (0.013)	-0.018 (0.012)
Education	0.062 (0.058)	0.040 (0.078)	0.105 (0.067)	0.132 (0.073)
Age (in years)	0.022 (0.007)	0.022 (0.010)	0.024 (0.012)	0.004 (0.015)
Foreign Born	-0.182 (0.653)	0.431 (1.830)	-1.021 (0.884)	0.460 (1.077)
% life in US	0.164 (0.881)	-0.571 (2.464)	0.937 (0.993)	0.455 (1.247)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.188 (0.471)	-0.860 (0.880)	0.505 (0.677)	-0.299 (0.537)
Married	-0.125 (0.223)	-0.026 (0.278)	-0.330 (0.462)	-0.169 (0.444)
Male	-0.386 (0.225)	-0.332 (0.279)	-0.515 (0.475)	0.090 (0.446)
Civic Skills-job	0.409 (0.122)	0.484 (0.140)	0.113 (0.214)	0.369 (0.237)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	-0.055 (0.131)	-0.110 (0.170)	0.142 (0.263)	-0.793 (0.432)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.272 (0.218)	0.366 (0.273)	0.091 (0.406)	0.002 (0.608)
Interest	0.458 (0.128)	0.524 (0.165)	0.330 (0.248)	0.467 (0.231)
Member of an Organization	0.410 (0.220)	0.314 (0.273)	0.568 (0.360)	1.125 (0.570)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.417 (0.219)	0.232 (0.274)	1.158 (0.338)	-0.212 (0.504)
constant	-5.933 (0.768)	-5.951 (0.981)	-6.547 (1.516)	-5.782 (1.623)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-630.278	-321.771	-183.580	-124.004
LL at conv.	-534.703	-274.857	-151.464	-101.764
Chi2 (df)	83.11 (14)	60.83 (14)	44.55 (14)	31.37 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1374	0.1458	0.1749	0.1739

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

**TABLE 7: Logistic Regression of Contact for Help, Info, or Problem, citizens only
 (“particularized contacting,” from question 65)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.010 (0.007)	0.012 (0.011)	0.004 (0.011)
Education	0.058 (0.031)	0.075 (0.046)	0.047 (0.051)	0.034 (0.054)
Age (in years)	0.008 (0.006)	0.008 (0.009)	0.019 (0.010)	0.002 (0.014)
Foreign Born	-0.326 (0.449)	-0.073 (1.169)	-0.969 (0.660)	-0.454 (0.822)
% life in US	0.265 (0.606)	0.464 (1.508)	0.211 (0.830)	0.454 (1.099)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	0.581 (0.275)	0.427 (0.456)	1.059 (0.422)	-0.296 (0.398)
Married	-0.404 (0.171)	-0.444 (0.219)	-0.433 (0.335)	0.187 (0.409)
Male	0.107 (0.172)	0.080 (0.221)	0.298 (0.312)	-0.271 (0.387)
Civic Skills-job	0.235 (0.090)	0.291 (0.113)	-0.079 (0.184)	0.229 (0.187)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	-0.003 (0.093)	-0.002 (0.125)	0.053 (0.150)	-0.028 (0.372)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.311 (0.165)	0.236 (0.212)	0.485 (0.280)	0.136 (0.458)
Interest	0.239 (0.085)	0.280 (0.113)	0.139 (0.137)	0.187 (0.163)
Member of an Organization	0.162 (0.180)	0.237 (0.229)	-0.258 (0.298)	0.723 (0.397)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.643 (0.169)	0.670 (0.216)	0.727 (0.277)	0.325 (0.416)
constant	-3.269 (0.523)	-3.519 (0.727)	-3.293 (1.082)	-2.913 (1.118)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-920.889	-462.509	-290.460	-167.599
LL at conv.	-860.174	-423.868	-266.730	-149.702
Chi2 (df)	65.96 (14)	52.90 (14)	22.72 (14)	23.39 (14)
pseudo R2	0.0659	0.0835	0.0817	0.1068

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

As Table 6 indicates, Mexican Americans are more likely to contact on issues if they are older, interested in politics, and have civic skills from the job. Puerto Ricans are more likely to contact if they are, also, older, wealthier, and feel represented. Cuban Americans are more likely to contact if they are better educated, in some organization, interested in politics, and either a weak Republican or a Democrat or Independent. When recruitment to registration and interest are omitted from the estimation, education becomes significant for Puerto Ricans as well, and civic skills becomes significant for Cuban Americans. Individuals might also contact about some particularized individual concern. The way the question is posed in these data, the contact might include requests for information, such as about a driver’s license, which arguably falls outside of

political participation. Nonetheless, these are contacts with some official about an individual concern.

As reported in Table 7, Mexican Americans are more likely to make these contacts if they are unmarried organization members who have civic skills from the job, are interested in politics, and feel represented by someone. Puerto Ricans are more likely to make these contacts if they are older Spanish speakers who were recruited by someone to register to vote and who feel represented. Cuban Americans are more likely to make these contacts if they belong to at least one organization, and nothing else matters significantly.

TABLE 8: Logistic Regression of Sign a Petition on Issue, Problem, or Ethnic Group Concerns, Citizens only (from questions 124a, 127c)

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	<u>0.013</u> (0.005)	<u>0.016</u> (0.006)	0.013 (0.011)	<u>0.020</u> (0.009)
Education	<u>0.125</u> (0.030)	<u>0.112</u> (0.039)	<u>0.215</u> (0.060)	0.089 (0.073)
Age (in years)	0.005 (0.006)	0.001 (0.008)	<u>0.030</u> (0.012)	0.001 (0.013)
Foreign Born	-0.427 (0.458)	-0.251 (1.190)	-0.870 (0.696)	-0.349 (0.899)
% life in US	0.132 (0.590)	-0.185 (1.536)	0.718 (0.812)	-0.026 (1.188)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.417 (0.268)	-0.642 (0.471)	-0.281 (0.422)	-0.173 (0.430)
Married	-0.053 (0.176)	0.050 (0.214)	-0.455 (0.321)	0.325 (0.402)
Male	<u>-0.325</u> (0.172)	-0.316 (0.210)	-0.403 (0.328)	-0.271 (0.387)
Civic Skills-job	<u>0.252</u> (0.089)	<u>0.332</u> (0.110)	-0.048 (0.176)	0.133 (0.194)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.024 (0.093)	0.036 (0.116)	0.121 (0.173)	-0.604 (0.412)
Recruited to Register to vote	<u>0.491</u> (0.170)	<u>0.407</u> (0.206)	<u>1.037</u> (0.298)	0.003 (0.479)
Interest	<u>0.281</u> (0.085)	<u>0.226</u> (0.107)	<u>0.498</u> (0.149)	<u>0.462</u> (0.196)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.438</u> (0.175)	0.276 (0.216)	<u>1.039</u> (0.303)	<u>1.001</u> (0.425)
Identify org. that defends interests	<u>0.511</u> (0.175)	<u>0.388</u> (0.215)	<u>0.993</u> (0.311)	0.240 (0.407)
constant	<u>-4.230</u> (0.516)	<u>-3.755</u> (0.658)	<u>-7.347</u> (0.977)	<u>-4.847</u> (1.413)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-1017.849	-521.022	-299.851	-172.467
LL at conv.	-847.476	-442.047	-217.284	-134.204
Chi2 (df)	160.31 (14)	85.25 (14)	116.73 (14)	42.78 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1674	0.1516	0.2754	0.2219

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

Several of the items here address activities that are generally thought of as protest. Respondents were asked whether or not they had signed a petition about a matter of concern to them, either in general or specific to their national origin group. They were coded one on the dependent variable if they had answered yes to either. The profiles of participants in Table 8 suggest that this activity is more conventional than protest. Mexican Americans were more likely to sign a petition if they were wealthier, better educated individuals with civic skills who were interested in politics, had been recruited to register, and felt represented. When interest and recruitment to register are excluded from the estimation, then being in an organization predicts signing a petition. Puerto Ricans were more likely to sign petitions if they were older, also better educated, also recruited, interested, and feel represented, and belonged to an organization. Cuban Americans were more likely to sign a petition if they were wealthier organization members who were interested in politics.

Taking part in a boycott—asked here only in the context of national origin group concerns – similarly is thought of as protest, but from the profiles of the participants in Table 9 appears to be so for the Cuban Americans but not for Puerto Ricans or Mexican Americans. Cuban Americans are more likely to have taken part in a boycott if they have less education, were foreign born, and among the foreign born lived less in the United States. On the other hand, controlling for that, they are more likely to boycott if they have civic skills from a job and were recruited to register. Puerto Ricans, in contrast, are more likely to boycott if they are older, better educated, organization members who are weaker partisans – suggesting that boycotting substitutes for partisan activities. Mexican Americans, in contrast to both other groups, are more likely to boycott if they are wealthier, better educated strong partisans who are interested in politics and feel represented.

The third dependent variable that partly overlaps protest combines two activities – respondents were asked whether they had attended any meetings or demonstrations about issues of concern to their national origin group. As shown in Table 10, Mexican Americans were more likely to say yes if they belonged to at least one organization and were either bilingual or an English-speaker. Puerto Ricans were also more likely to attend these meetings or demonstrate if they were an organization member and if they were well-educated individuals who had been recruited to register and were interested in politics. For Cuban Americans, only civic skills from the job predict a greater propensity to attend these meetings or demonstrations.

**TABLE 9: Logistic Regression of Boycott in Support of Ethnic Group Concerns,
Citizens only (from Question 127d)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	<u>0.019</u> (0.007)	<u>0.023</u> (0.009)	0.013 (0.018)	-0.013 (0.026)
Education	<u>0.151</u> (0.057)	<u>0.178</u> (0.069)	<u>0.226</u> (0.131)	<u>-0.168</u> (0.081)
Age (in years)	0.014 (0.010)	0.006 (0.011)	<u>0.084</u> (0.029)	-0.042 (0.031)
Foreign Born	-0.920 (0.860)	0.346 (1.650)	-0.776 (1.542)	<u>2.514</u> (1.262)
% life in US	0.560 (1.219)	-0.489 (2.167)	1.095 (1.798)	<u>-2.680</u> (1.551)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.284 (0.539)	-0.265 (0.756)	0.660 (1.315)	0.887 (1.031)
Married	0.013 (0.309)	-0.071 (0.334)	-0.961 (0.936)	0.534 (0.911)
Male	0.094 (0.281)	0.155 (0.310)	-0.803 (0.821)	-0.024 (0.786)
Civic Skills-job	-0.037 (0.143)	-0.033 (0.156)	0.219 (0.402)	<u>0.838</u> (0.414)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.201 (0.181)	<u>0.387</u> (0.218)	<u>-1.036</u> (0.401)	0.668 (0.854)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.476 (0.296)	0.381 (0.324)	0.966 (0.647)	<u>1.861</u> (0.993)
Interest	<u>0.392</u> (0.170)	<u>0.502</u> (0.197)	0.001 (0.214)	1.254 (0.884)
Member of an Organization	0.024 (0.305)	-0.165 (0.330)	<u>3.000</u> (1.377)	0.433 (1.215)
Identify org. that defends interests	<u>0.873</u> (0.273)	<u>0.829</u> (0.296)	-0.238 (0.811)	0.646 (1.132)
constant	<u>-7.749</u> (0.977)	<u>-8.432</u> (1.263)	<u>-9.697</u> (2.636)	<u>-9.038</u> (2.722)
N of cases	1606	803	516	287
LL at 0	-484.468	-285.330	-62.996	-37.095
LL at conv.	-405.492	-234.685	-44.797	-28.509
Chi2 (df)	62.90 (14)	52.73 (14)	25.80 (14)	50.61 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1630	0.1775	0.2889	0.2315

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

**TABLE 10: Logistic Regression of Attend Meeting or Demonstration on Ethnic Issue, Citizens only
(from Question 127e)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	-0.003 (0.010)	0.005 (0.012)	-0.019 (0.014)	-0.018 (0.015)
Education	0.056 (0.035)	0.041 (0.048)	0.118 (0.065)	-0.060 (0.137)
Age (in years)	0.004 (0.009)	0.004 (0.012)	0.015 (0.017)	-0.029 (0.020)
Foreign Born	0.555 (0.607)	2.606 (1.986)	0.052 (0.807)	-0.614 (1.036)
% life in US	-0.546 (0.743)	-3.813 (2.515)	0.362 (0.874)	1.827 (1.570)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.423 (0.402)	<u>-3.078</u> (1.228)	-0.037 (0.549)	0.435 (0.700)
Married	-0.433 (0.281)	-0.335 (0.362)	-0.423 (0.508)	-0.436 (0.581)
Male	-0.189 (0.266)	-0.185 (0.344)	-0.102 (0.396)	0.297 (0.639)
Civic Skills-job	0.100 (0.132)	0.149 (0.165)	-0.219 (0.207)	0.481 (0.278)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.047 (0.157)	0.035 (0.202)	0.256 (0.210)	-0.042 (0.649)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.205 (0.259)	0.051 (0.325)	<u>0.831</u> (0.399)	-0.079 (0.929)
Interest	0.225 (0.148)	0.208 (0.205)	0.300 (0.189)	-0.353 (0.287)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.864</u> (0.262)	<u>0.710</u> (0.341)	<u>1.369</u> (0.370)	1.144 (0.816)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.233 (0.260)	0.121 (0.335)	0.361 (0.455)	0.380 (0.780)
constant	<u>-4.396</u> (0.693)	<u>-4.205</u> (0.883)	<u>-6.302</u> (1.310)	-3.082 (2.414)
N of cases	1607	804	516	287
LL at 0	-482.424	-233.425	-172.589	-79.241
LL at conv.	-451.484	-216.896	-147.631	-67.996
Chi2 (df)	44.95 (14)	30.68 (14)	40.45 (14)	33.47 (14)
pseudo R2	0.0641	0.0708	0.1446	0.1419

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

Respondents were also asked whether they had attended public meetings, without any reference given to their national origin group. The predictors for this more general measure, which omits the protest component (the demonstrations), differ, as reported in Table 11. Mexican Americans have a higher propensity to attend these meetings if they are older women who have civic skills from a job, were recruited to register to vote, and are interested in politics. With recruitment and interest omitted from the estimation, organization membership and feeling represented come close to significance. Puerto Ricans are more likely to attend these public meetings if they are an English-speaking or bilingual organization member who feels represented. Cuban Americans are more likely to attend such meetings if they are wealthier, older, Spanish-

speaking Catholics, born in the United States or spent more of their life here with civic skills from a job and belong to at least one organization.

**TABLE 11: Logistic Regression of Attend Public Meeting, Citizens only
(from Question 124c)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	0.004 (0.007)	0.006 (0.009)	0.002 (0.012)	0.026 (0.015)
Education	0.042 (0.044)	0.059 (0.060)	0.045 (0.071)	-0.010 (0.099)
Age (in years)	0.016 (0.007)	0.024 (0.009)	-0.003 (0.014)	0.034 (0.020)
Foreign Born	0.437 (0.660)	2.104 (1.549)	0.624 (0.751)	-3.936 (1.205)
% life in US	-0.280 (0.865)	-2.383 (2.157)	-0.169 (0.857)	4.687 (1.621)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.859 (0.410)	-0.951 (0.699)	-1.228 (0.567)	1.442 (0.668)
Married	0.098 (0.192)	0.177 (0.242)	-0.111 (0.365)	-0.087 (0.596)
Male	-0.327 (0.192)	-0.564 (0.243)	0.418 (0.351)	0.196 (0.583)
Civic Skills-job	0.374 (0.100)	0.450 (0.121)	0.116 (0.203)	0.419 (0.252)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.042 (0.118)	0.049 (0.153)	0.110 (0.193)	0.596 (0.557)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.349 (0.198)	0.511 (0.245)	0.040 (0.349)	-0.467 (0.893)
Interest	0.270 (0.107)	0.318 (0.142)	0.106 (0.176)	-0.182 (0.252)
Member of an Organization	0.566 (0.209)	0.295 (0.260)	1.201 (0.333)	2.014 (0.857)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.333 (0.202)	0.285 (0.247)	0.653 (0.355)	-0.138 (0.817)
constant	-4.646 (0.640)	-5.363 (0.851)	-3.737 (1.117)	-5.492 (2.014)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-744.616	-381.377	-230.288	-105.833
LL at conv.	-654.049	-328.543	-190.689	-78.527
Chi2 (df)	101.58 (14)	67.02 (14)	45.35 (14)	35.90 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1216	0.1385	0.1720	0.2580

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

A final set of activities relate to election campaigns. Respondents were asked if they had contributed money to a party or candidate. As Table 12 reports, Mexican Americans were more likely to have done so if they were wealthier, better educated married individuals, who were strong partisans who had been recruited to register, and who felt represented. Puerto Ricans were more likely to contribute if they were strong partisans who felt represented and belonged to at least one organization. Cuban Americans were more likely to have contributed if they were well educated, born in the US or lived here longer, interested in politics and had civic skills from the job.

**TABLE 12: Logistic Regression of Give Candidate Money, Citizens only
(from Question 124g)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	<u>0.019</u> (0.007)	<u>0.023</u> (0.009)	0.012 (0.014)	0.000 (0.017)
Education	<u>0.157</u> (0.048)	<u>0.181</u> (0.064)	0.119 (0.095)	<u>0.367</u> (0.140)
Age (in years)	0.010 (0.010)	0.013 (0.014)	0.002 (0.017)	0.034 (0.024)
Foreign Born	-0.169 (0.811)	-0.628 (1.415)	1.192 (1.132)	<u>-5.454</u> (2.448)
% life in US	0.273 (1.038)	1.005 (1.794)	-1.781 (1.332)	<u>5.946</u> (2.802)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	-0.048 (0.495)	0.708 (0.665)	-0.645 (0.834)	0.584 (0.830)
Married	<u>1.073</u> (0.305)	<u>1.289</u> (0.406)	0.483 (0.508)	1.197 (0.812)
Male	0.260 (0.259)	0.294 (0.308)	0.237 (0.581)	0.161 (0.612)
Civic Skills-job	-0.022 (0.138)	-0.053 (0.172)	-0.064 (0.295)	<u>0.601</u> (0.298)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	<u>0.410</u> (0.160)	<u>0.365</u> (0.196)	<u>0.981</u> (0.287)	-0.209 (0.698)
Recruited to Register to vote	<u>0.592</u> (0.276)	<u>0.657</u> (0.331)	0.465 (0.515)	0.526 (0.969)
Interest	<u>0.274</u> (0.161)	0.266 (0.193)	0.482 (0.383)	<u>0.746</u> (0.447)
Member of an Organization	0.102 (0.278)	-0.128 (0.325)	0.841 (0.519)	-0.700 (0.774)
Identify org. that defends interests	<u>0.620</u> (0.268)	<u>0.585</u> (0.323)	<u>1.075</u> (0.587)	-0.440 (0.926)
constant	<u>-8.553</u> (0.956)	<u>-9.047</u> (1.238)	<u>-9.924</u> (1.961)	<u>-12.741</u> (2.175)
N of cases	1607	803	517	287
LL at 0	-480.358	-255.914	-124.460	-74.441
LL at conv.	-387.464	-203.699	-92.876	-50.514
Chi2 (df)	82.53 (14)	63.03 (14)	42.67 (14)	34.93 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1934	0.2040	0.2538	0.3214

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

Table 13 presents results for a combined campaign variable, which is set to one if an individual did any one or more of four different activities: displaying a button, sticker, or sign; attending rallies, speeches, dinners, and so forth to support a candidate; and volunteering to work for a candidate, asked both in general and in terms of national origin group-endorsed candidacies. Among Mexican Americans, the campaigners are well-educated, married women who have civic skills from a job, are strongly partisan, are interested in politics, and were recruited to register. With interest and recruitment omitted from the estimation, identifying an organization that defends the respondent's interest also significantly predicts campaigning. Among Puerto Ricans, the campaigners are persons who were born in the US or who lived here longer who are

organization members who feel represented and who were recruited to register. Among Cuban Americans, the campaigners are women organization members who feel represented.

TABLE 13: Logistic Regression of Campaign (button, rally, or volunteer) Citizens only
(“One” if yes to any of Questions 124d, e, f, or 127a)

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.007)	0.015 (0.012)	-0.009 (0.013)
Education	<u>0.075</u> (0.031)	0.078 (0.042)	0.090 (0.061)	-0.030 (0.070)
Age (in years)	0.009 (0.006)	0.008 (0.008)	0.012 (0.012)	-0.010 (0.015)
Foreign Born	<u>-1.524</u> (0.608)	-2.761 (1.833)	-1.277 (0.721)	-1.181 (1.021)
% life in US	<u>2.080</u> (0.787)	3.613 (2.279)	1.726 (0.890)	1.910 (1.307)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	0.111 (0.307)	-0.096 (0.532)	0.223 (0.498)	0.153 (0.480)
Married	0.266 (0.180)	0.394 (0.223)	-0.083 (0.367)	0.158 (0.417)
Male	-0.321 (0.175)	<u>-0.436</u> (0.216)	0.213 (0.349)	-0.889 (0.484)
Civic Skills-job	<u>0.278</u> (0.090)	<u>0.391</u> (0.114)	-0.179 (0.166)	0.292 (0.238)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.154 (0.104)	0.233 (0.135)	0.013 (0.176)	-0.061 (0.436)
Recruited to Register to vote	<u>0.434</u> (0.173)	0.398 (0.214)	<u>0.644</u> (0.326)	0.301 (0.524)
Interest	<u>0.267</u> (0.092)	<u>0.305</u> (0.120)	0.198 (0.157)	0.087 (0.188)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.407</u> (0.178)	0.210 (0.219)	<u>0.788</u> (0.334)	<u>1.183</u> (0.478)
Identify org. that defends interests	<u>0.521</u> (0.177)	0.303 (0.222)	<u>1.133</u> (0.308)	<u>1.365</u> (0.461)
constant	<u>-4.318</u> (0.544)	<u>-4.570</u> (0.735)	<u>-4.578</u> (0.916)	-1.623 (1.245)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-883.856	-447.140	-275.826	-151.255
LL at conv.	-783.023	-390.950	-230.344	-124.159
Chi2 (df)	94.39 (14)	63.35 (14)	50.70 (14)	47.33 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1141	0.1257	0.1649	0.1791

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

The last two tables show the estimations for two of the components of this combined campaign variable. Table 14 indicates the results for the estimations with displaying buttons, stickers, and signs as the dependent variable. The results for Mexican Americans are virtually identical to those for the combined dependent variable (except that interest is only significant at .103). For Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans, the profile is identical to that for the combined variable. Table 15 indicates the results when the dependent variable is attending rallies and speeches. Mexican Americans are more likely to engage in these activities if they are well-

educated older individuals who have civic skills from the job and were recruited to register to vote. When recruitment to register is omitted, then Mexican Americans are more likely to attend rallies and speeches if they feel someone represents them, and being a member of an organization comes close to significance. Puerto Ricans are more likely to attend these events when they are members of an organization and either born on the mainland or have spent more of their life here. Cuban Americans are more likely to attend these events when they have been born in the US or spent more of their life here.

We report the results without including the tables for the campaign volunteers since so few people engage in these activities and they are subsumed in the combined “campaign” variable. The first campaign volunteer item asks whether the respondent worked either for pay or on a volunteer basis for a party or a candidate running for office. The second asks if the respondent worked as a volunteer or for pay for a candidate endorsed by [national origin group] groups or leaders. The volunteers for general campaigns were found among Mexican Americans who were older organization members, born in the US or here longer, with civic skills from the job. Among Puerto Ricans, they are unmarried strong partisans. Among Cuban Americans, they are more educated organization members. The volunteers for national origin group-endorsed campaigns were found among older Mexican Americans with job-related civic skills who were interested in politics and among better-educated Puerto Ricans who belong to an organization and who feel represented. None of these factors were significant predictors of this form of participation for Cuban Americans (except education when recruitment and interest are excluded from the estimation).

Discussion

Respondents who feel that some group or organization looks out for their concerns are more participatory than those who do not share that feeling across a number of activities, although the pattern varies by national origin group. For a few of the activities, Mexican Americans who feel represented appeared significantly more likely to participate than those who do not only when the estimation excluded the “recruitment” variable.

If we omit the recruitment variable, those who feel represented are more likely to participate in the following ways among the respective groups. They are more likely to vote, among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans; to at some time have been registered to vote, among Mexican Americans; to work with others to solve local problems, among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans; to contact officials about some issue, if they are Puerto Rican; to contact about a personal matter, among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans; to sign a petition, among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans; to take part in a boycott, if they are Mexican American; to attend a public meeting on any subject, among Puerto Ricans; to give money to a candidate, among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans; to engage in a campaign activity, among all three groups, and specifically to display a button, sign or sticker, among all three groups. Mexican Americans are also more likely to attend rallies and the like if they feel represented. Puerto Ricans are more likely to volunteer for a candidate endorsed by Puerto Rican groups if they feel well-represented. When we do take explicit account of recruitment, the effects of feeling represented become insignificant, among Mexican Americans only, for voting in 1988, ever registered, and to engage in a campaign activity, specifically to display a button, sign or sticker.

**TABLE 14: Logistic Regression of Display a Campaign Button, Sign, or Sticker,
Citizens only (from Question 124d)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	-0.005 (0.006)	-0.007 (0.008)	0.014 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.014)
Education	<u>0.076</u> (0.033)	<u>0.084</u> (0.046)	0.084 (0.069)	-0.114 (0.076)
Age (in years)	0.001 (0.007)	-0.001 (0.009)	0.010 (0.013)	-0.024 (0.017)
Foreign Born	<u>-1.382</u> (0.682)	-2.256 (2.104)	<u>-1.434</u> (0.818)	-1.204 (1.267)
% life in US	<u>1.997</u> (0.888)	2.912 (2.643)	<u>2.047</u> (1.004)	2.044 (1.602)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	0.065 (0.347)	-0.364 (0.684)	0.281 (0.551)	-0.034 (0.572)
Married	<u>0.386</u> (0.196)	<u>0.564</u> (0.245)	0.041 (0.393)	-0.143 (0.475)
Male	<u>-0.397</u> (0.188)	<u>-0.408</u> (0.228)	-0.174 (0.381)	<u>-1.617</u> (0.547)
Civic Skills-job	<u>0.211</u> (0.095)	<u>0.288</u> (0.121)	-0.145 (0.176)	0.310 (0.253)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.177 (0.114)	<u>0.241</u> (0.146)	0.074 (0.192)	-0.213 (0.491)
Recruited to Register to vote	<u>0.480</u> (0.187)	<u>0.454</u> (0.235)	<u>0.750</u> (0.350)	-0.179 (0.548)
Interest	<u>0.167</u> (0.097)	0.210 (0.129)	0.109 (0.166)	0.000 (0.215)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.408</u> (0.196)	0.196 (0.240)	<u>0.795</u> (0.367)	<u>1.420</u> (0.524)
Identify org. that defends interests	<u>0.422</u> (0.192)	0.152 (0.242)	<u>1.016</u> (0.332)	<u>1.832</u> (0.485)
constant	<u>-3.945</u> (0.570)	<u>-4.201</u> (0.764)	<u>-4.415</u> (1.009)	0.284 (1.286)
N of cases	1608	804	517	287
LL at 0	-778.865	-390.634	-248.948	-136.616
LL at conv.	-705.362	-351.379	-211.069	-104.980
Chi2 (df)	76.39 (14)	56.25 (14)	41.20 (14)	45.77 (14)
pseudo R2	0.0944	0.1005	0.1522	0.2316

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

**TABLE 15: Logistic Regression of Attend Rally, Speech, etc. for Candidate, Citizens only
(from Question 124e)**

	All Latinos	Mexicans	Puerto Ricans	Cubans
Income	0.012 (0.007)	0.014 (0.009)	0.021 (0.014)	0.004 (0.018)
Education	<u>0.104</u> (0.047)	<u>0.130</u> (0.062)	0.030 (0.070)	-0.029 (0.136)
Age (in years)	0.017 (0.009)	0.022 (0.012)	0.017 (0.015)	0.009 (0.021)
Foreign Born	-1.866 (0.987)	-2.082 (3.949)	<u>-2.053</u> (1.004)	<u>-3.062</u> (1.077)
% life in US	<u>2.535</u> (1.199)	3.046 (4.573)	<u>2.191</u> (1.081)	<u>4.477</u> (1.556)
Spanish Speaker (Cubans: Cath. only)	0.292 (0.549)	-0.881 (1.522)	0.679 (0.781)	0.739 (0.599)
Married	0.033 (0.248)	0.136 (0.313)	-0.260 (0.516)	-0.110 (0.633)
Male	-0.364 (0.242)	-0.338 (0.296)	-0.724 (0.528)	-0.069 (0.648)
Civic Skills-job	<u>0.352</u> (0.118)	<u>0.449</u> (0.148)	0.136 (0.211)	0.393 (0.256)
PartyID strength (Cubans: Rep. only)	0.315 (0.183)	0.362 (0.244)	0.244 (0.295)	0.513 (0.592)
Recruited to Register to vote	0.419 (0.241)	<u>0.757</u> (0.295)	-0.779 (0.498)	-0.024 (0.841)
Interest	0.063 (0.118)	0.052 (0.152)	0.028 (0.225)	0.187 (0.306)
Member of an Organization	<u>0.658</u> (0.248)	0.339 (0.295)	<u>1.570</u> (0.500)	1.245 (0.860)
Identify org. that defends interests	0.431 (0.241)	0.339 (0.299)	0.351 (0.433)	0.458 (0.782)
constant	<u>-6.294</u> (0.864)	<u>-7.065</u> (1.146)	<u>-4.675</u> (1.143)	<u>-4.990</u> (2.441)
N of cases	1607	804	516	287
LL at 0	-492.007	-254.762	-141.408	-84.255
LL at conv.	-414.823	-205.050	-118.477	-69.694
Chi2 (df)	73.09 (14)	61.69 (14)	28.91 (14)	30.19 (14)
pseudo R2	0.1569	0.1951	0.1622	0.1728

Logit coefficients (s.e.) **Bold underlined** significant at .05 or better. **Bold** significant at .10 or better.

Feeling represented does not lead to higher participation within any national origin group for two of the activities examined here: attending a public meeting or demonstration about issues affecting the national origin group and volunteering for a party or candidate with no ethnic context.

Thus the belief that there is some group or organization which looks out for the respondent's concerns increases the political participation of Mexican Americans across almost all of these forms of participation and of Puerto Ricans across most of them. The fact that including the recruitment to register variable wipes out the impact of this belief for Mexican Americans for

voting, registering, and displaying campaign paraphernalia strongly suggests that, for these activities, feeling linked is strongly associated with availability for and susceptibility to recruitment.

Cuban Americans stand out for the almost complete lack of any impact upon their participation from feeling represented. In fact, those who identify a group or organization who looks out for their concerns are significantly *less* likely to vote than are those who do feel represented (and also *less* likely to have at some time been registered, with a p-value of .145 – near significance although not quite there). The only activity the Cuban Americans are more likely to engage in if they feel represented is displaying campaign buttons, signs, and stickers (and the composite campaign variable which includes this).

As discussed much earlier, there some connection between belonging to an organization and feeling represented by a group. Actual membership may lead to the acquisition of civic skills and to availability for recruitment. Group members are also more likely to feel that some group or organization looks out for their concerns. In terms of the estimations, each of these variables may be picking up some effects appropriately attributable to the other. Consistent with much of the literature, we find that organization members are more likely to participate, even with the use in these estimations of the very simple dichotomous measure that distinguishes between those who belong to no organizations and those who belong (whether active or inactive) to at least one. The only form of participation which is unrelated to organization membership across all three groups is contributing money to a party or candidate. Organization membership is associated with higher participation in virtually all of the other activities for Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans. Organization membership is thus more potent than subjective sense of representation in accounting for Cuban American participation. Both explain much about Puerto Rican participation. For Mexican Americans, in contrast, organization membership is associated only with voting, working on a local problem, working as a campaign volunteer, and attending a meeting or demonstration on a Mexican American issue. The subjective sense of representation is not related to these last two activities, but otherwise explains Mexican American participation more broadly than does organization membership.

Representation Specific to National Origin Group

Cuban Americans differ from Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in a number of ways. Perhaps most relevant for the current analysis is their geographic concentration, which may produce a different mentality with regard to representation. Ninety percent of the Cuban American respondents in the LNPS lived in Florida. Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans were much less concentrated; for example, only sixty percent of the Puerto Rican respondents lived in the northeastern states. It may thus be that representation in terms of national origin group is more salient for Cuban American participation.

Shortly after the question about feeling represented, the LNPS instrument asks respondents the following question (63), rendered here as it was stated to Cuban American respondents. “Thinking about Cuban Americans, even if you are not a member, is there any group or organization that you think looks out for Cuban American concerns?” We will call this ethnic group representation. With this included in the estimation, Cuban Americans who do feel this ethnic group representation are more likely to sign a petition, are more likely to give a candidate

money, and are more likely to attend a campaign rally or speech. Because this representation is national-origin group specific, we also looked at the impact upon some additional group-specific activities, in particular adding responses to the item which asked if the respondent had “contributed money to a [national origin group] candidate, to a [national origin group] organization or to support other [national origin group] activities.” This was previously excluded because it goes beyond political participation. We also looked separately at the national-origin group specific components of contacting on an issue, signing a petition, and working as a campaign volunteer. Cuban Americans who feel ethnic representation are more likely to give money to a Cuban American cause. They are more likely to sign petitions related to a Cuban American concern. And they are more likely than those who do not feel ethnically represented to contact on an issue that concerns Cuban Americans. Thus, the ethnic specific sense of representation does predict to more forms of participation for Cuban Americans than does the overall sense of representation. Both senses of representation are significantly related to campaign activity, but the general sense is associated with displaying buttons, signs, and stickers, while the ethnically specific sense is associated with attending rallies and speeches. The ethnically-specific sense of representation is associated both with contributions to candidates in general and with giving money to Cuban American causes and contacting on Cuban American concerns.

One might reasonably ask whether ethnic representation impacts Mexican American and Puerto Rican participation as much, more, or less than does general representation, and how persons in these groups compare with Cuban Americans. In brief, the sense of national-origin group representation has much less impact for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans than it does for Cuban Americans and also less impact than does the general sense of representation. For Puerto Ricans, the sense of ethnic representation has a significantly positive impact only upon the propensity to contact for a particular personal reason and upon the probability of working as a campaign volunteer for a candidate endorsed by Puerto Rican groups. In both cases, this supplements the significant positive impact of the general sense of representation. Thus, the belief that someone is looking out for Puerto Rican concerns does not have nearly the impact upon Puerto Rican’s participation as does the more general belief that a group or organization is looking out for the individual’s concerns.

The sense of ethnic group representation has more impact for Mexican Americans, who in that sense resemble the Cuban Americans. On the other hand, they resemble Puerto Ricans in the breadth of activities associated with a general sense of representation. Among Mexican Americans, the ethnic-specific sense of representation is related to three activities which are unrelated to a general sense of representation: attending a meeting or demonstration on a Mexican American issue, signing a petition on a Mexican American issue, and working as a campaign volunteer (for any party or candidate). Both general and ethnic-specific representation are simultaneously significantly related to working on a local problem (communal activity) and to donating money to Mexican American concerns. Both forms of representation, taken one at a time, are significantly related to displaying campaign buttons, signs, or stickers and to attending speeches and rallies (and therefore also to the overall campaign measure), but when both are entered simultaneously, it is the sense that Mexican Americans are represented that appears more significant than the general sense for explaining these activities.

Conclusion

Overall, the factors that account for higher rates of political participation in the general population also account for greater activity among Latino citizens. Longer residence in the United States also tends to be associated with higher rates of participation, especially for activities connected to elections. On the other hand, it is associated with lower propensity to boycott, among Cuban Americans. Language use has only a scattered impact upon participation once other factors are controlled, and, contrary to some expectations, in many of the cases where it matters Spanish-speakers are more active than persons who are bilingual or who prefer to speak English.

These analyses support the claim that persons who have a subjective sense of representation are more likely to participate than are those who do not. The bivariate relationship is clear. However, bivariate relationships hide other factors. Even allowing for a reasonable set of other variables that influence level of participation, those individuals who believe that some group or organization looks out for their concerns are more active than those who do not.

Consistent with other studies using the LNPS data, these analyses show that Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans differ substantially from each other in the factors that are associated with higher rates of political activity. Most notably, the participation rates of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans are related to the general sense of representation across a much broader set of activities than is the case for Cuban Americans. On the other hand, a sense of representation tied to national-origin group concerns does more to predict Cuban American participation than that of Mexican Americans and much more than that of Puerto Ricans.

The sense of representation appears in part to incorporate effects from recruitment and from organization membership, but it also appears to have components that go beyond these. We began this paper by noting the interest of many people in increasing the political participation rates of Latinos. Demographic changes clearly matter, but political activity also responds to more directly political forces. Elites competing for power put some of these in motion. In an article discussing low turnout rates even among Latino citizens, one politician is quoted making the inverse point of this paper. "'They don't vote because they don't see politics offering any hope for the future,' said Union City [New Jersey] Commissioner Rafael Fraguera, a Democrat. 'We have to spend more time in the community explaining the opportunity this country has to offer.'" (Pace, 2001) Those who feel someone looks out for them are those who do see some point and hope in politics. Other researchers have also argued for the important roles of mobilization and organizational involvement in increasing the participation of Latinos. This research adds to that mix the importance of fostering a linkage with political elites in the specific form of a sense of representation.

APPENDIX

The data presented here are from the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS) (de la Garza, et. al 1992 provides basic information on this study). Based on the 1980 census of the US mainland, the LNPS utilized a national, multi-stage, clustered area probability design to sample three Latino national origin groups—Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans—as well as an Anglo population. The “Anglos” are white, European origin, non-Latinos who reside in areas from which the Latino sample was drawn. The Anglo sample (N=456) was not drawn to be representative of the national Anglo population, which could be a disadvantage. They do not represent Anglos residing in states or areas with a combined Latino population of less than 5 percent (or in some cases 3 percent). However, the LNPS Anglo population's characteristics do closely match those calculated from the 1987-88 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), a national probability sample of 9,417 self-identified Anglos who represent the non-institutionalized United States white population age 19 and older. The balancing advantage is that it is representative of those Anglos who live in the same areas as the sampled Latinos and, as indicated by the threshold, these areas include many with small Latino populations.

The sampling strategy recognizes the distinctiveness of the many Latino national origin populations (Bean and Tienda 1987: 2) and does not accept an *a priori* aggregation of these groups under a single label such as "Hispanic" or "Latino" that assumes cultural homogeneity or political unity. LNPS generated 1,546 Mexican, 589 Puerto Rican and 682 Cuban origin respondents. Each of these samples represent 91%, 90.2%, and 91.5%, respectively, of each of these populations in this nation. For purposes of this study, a respondent is a member of one of these populations if he/she has at least one parent or two grandparents who were solely of Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban ancestry. The sample was limited to these particular Latino groups for three reasons. First, they are the largest and politically most significant Latino populations in the nation. Together, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans represent approximately 85% of the "Spanish origin" population of the United States. Second, because each of the other national origin groups is also distinct, we rejected combining them into a residual "other Hispanic" category. Third, the costs of drawing representative national samples of any of the other considerably smaller Latino national origin groups were prohibitive.

A total of 40 primary sampling units (PSUs) were designated for the sample. These include the 28 metropolitan areas having at least a ten percent Latino population. The other 12 were randomly selected from all other PSUs across the nation based on geography and concentration of Latinos. A total of 12,187 households were screened, and 4,390 persons were eligible for the survey. After households were randomly selected, in-home, face-to-face interviews were conducted with eligible persons 18 years of age and older.

The sample was specifically designed to include Latinos from across the social spectrum. Thus, one-fourth of these Latino respondents came from low density areas (areas in which Latino households of all national origins comprise between 5% and 20% of the population), one-fourth from areas with 20% to 49% Latino household density; and half reside in majority Latino population areas. The non-represented populations include those residing in states (including Washington, DC) with combined Latino populations of less than a combined total of 5% of the three groups, and those within states who reside in areas with less than a combined minimum percentage (usually 3% but sometimes 5%) of these groups.

Over 97% of all LNPS interviews were completed between August 1989 and February 1990. These Latino respondents had the choice of being interviewed in English or Spanish, and 60% chose Spanish. The English language interviews averaged 83 minutes, while those in Spanish ran 91 minutes. Anglo interviews used a shortened interview schedule and averaged 59 minutes. The overall response rate was 74% for Latinos and 56% for Anglos.

References

- Arvizu, John R. and Garcia, F. Chris. 1996. "Latino Voting Participation: Explaining and Differentiating Latino Voting Turnout." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May 1996):104-128.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Gilliam, Frank D. Jr. 1990. "Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84 (June 1990):377-393.
- Bean, Frank and Martha Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic Population of the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Calvo, Maria Antonia and Rosenstone, Steven J. 1989. "Hispanic Political Participation (Latino Electorates Series)," San Antonio: Southwest Voter Research Institute.
- Conway, M. Margaret. 2000. *Political Participation in the United States*, 3rd ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press
- de la Garza, Rodolfo O., Louis DeSipio, F. Chris Garcia, John A. Garcia, and Angelo Falcon. 1992. *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- de la Garza, Rodolfo O. and DeSipio, Louis. From Rhetoric to Reality: Latinos and the 1988 Election. Boulder: Westview Press.
- DeSipio, Louis. 1996a. *Counting on the Latino Vote: Latinos as a New Electorate*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- DeSipio, Louis. 1996b. "Making Citizens or Good Citizens? Naturalization as a Predictor of Organizational and Electoral Behavior Among Latino Immigrants." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May 1996):194-213.
- Diaz, William A. 1996. "Latino Participation in America: Associational and Political Roles." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May 1996):154-174.
- Hero, Rodney E. and Campbell, Anne G. 1996. "Understanding Latino Political Participation: Exploring the Evidence From the Latino National Political Survey." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May 1996):129-141.
- Leighley, Jan E. and Vedlitz, Arnold. 1999. "Race, Ethnicity, and Political Participation: Competing Models and Contrasting Explanations." *Journal of Politics* 61 (November 1999):1092-1114.
- Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk. 1981. "Group Consciousness and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science* 25 (August):494-511.
- Pace, David, Associated Press. 2001. "Analysis finds U.S. Latinos slow to vote." Modbee.com. *The Modesto Bee*. Published August 25, 2001. Accessed August 27, 2001 at <<http://24hour.modbee.com/24hour/politics/story/702483p-763572c.html>>.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., Hansen, John M. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Shaw, Daron; de la Garza, Rodolfo O., and Lee, Jongho. 2000. "Examining Latino Turnout in 1996: A Three-State, Validated Survey Approach." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (April 2000):332-340.
- Uhlener, Carole Jean. 1989. "'Relational Goods' and Participation: Incorporating Sociability into a Theory of Rational Action." *Public Choice* 62:253-285.

- Uhlener, Carole Jean. 1991. "Political Participation and Discrimination: A Comparative Analysis of Asians, Blacks, and Latinos." In *Political Participation and American Democracy*, ed. William Crotty, pp. 139-170. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Uhlener, Carole Jean; Cain, Bruce E.; and Kiewiet, D. Roderick. 1989. "Political Participation of Ethnic Minorities in the 1980s." *Political Behavior* 11 (3):195-231.
- Uhlener, Carole Jean and Garcia, F. Chris. 1998. "Foundations of Latino Party Identification: Ethnicity and Other Demographic Foundations Among Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and Anglos in the United States," paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association.
- Uhlener, Carole Jean, Mark M. Gray and F. Chris Garcia. 2000. "Ideology, Issues, and Partisanship Among Latinos," paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association.
- Verba, Sidney; Nie, Norman H. 1972. *Participation in America*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Verba, Sidney; Nie, N. H., Kim, J-O. 1978. *Participation and Political Equality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Verba, Sidney; Schlozman, Kay Lehman; Brady, Henry E. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Wolfinger, Raymond and Rosenstone, Steven J. 1980. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wrinkle, Robert D.; Stewart, Joseph Jr., Polinard, J. L.; Meier, Kenneth J.; and Arvizu, John R. 1996. "Ethnicity and Nonelectoral Political Participation." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May 1996):142-153.