

UC Berkeley

Working Paper Series

Title

Where Are all the Immigrant Organizations? Reassessing the Scope of Civil Society for Immigrant Communities

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/840950m0>

Authors

Gleeson, Shannon
Bloemraad, Irene

Publication Date

2011-06-19

“Where all the Immigrant Organizations?
Reassessing the Scope of Civil Society for Immigrant Communities”

Shannon Gleeson¹
Latin American and Latino Studies
University of California-Santa Cruz
sgleeson@ucsc.edu

and

Irene Bloemraad
Sociology
University of California-Berkeley
bloemr@berkeley.edu

June 19, 2011

Wordcount:
6,762 (text)
2,276 (endnotes)
1,923 (references)

¹ Please direct correspondence to Shannon Gleeson, (Latin American and Latino Studies, Merrill Faculty Services, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, 95064). A prior version of this paper was presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, Cleveland, Ohio, November 19-21, 2009. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the National Academic Centers Council and the Russell Sage Foundation, as well as the helpful feedback of Els de Graauw, Kevin Rafter, and Karthick Ramakrishnan.

ABSTRACT

We examine the official scope and actual coverage of immigrant civil society in seven California cities using a widely-employed 501(c)3 database. First, to capture demographic underrepresentation, we compare the number of immigrant organizations in official data to population statistics and find substantially fewer immigrant organizations than we would expect. Second, we measure the organizational undercount by calculating the number of publicly present immigrant organizations not captured in official data. We do this for four immigrant-origin communities (Indian, Mexican, Portuguese and Vietnamese) using 160 key informant interviews and extensive examination of directories and media (ethnic and mainstream). We find a notable organizational undercount, which varies by city and immigrant group. Considering both underrepresentation and undercounts, Mexican-origin organizations seem at a particular disadvantage. Our findings have important implications for resource inequalities and advocacy capacity in minority communities, as well as for scholars' ability to accurately document the vitality of immigrant civil society.

TEXT

Introduction

Like the roles they fulfill for native-born citizens, nonprofit organizations offer immigrants important human, social and legal services (Cordero-Guzmán, 2005; LaFrance Associates, 2005; Marwell, 2007; Valenzuela, 2006). They can also serve as advocates to government agencies and wider society, and act as a training ground for civic and political engagement (Bloemraad, 2006; de Graauw, 2008; Gleeson, 2008; Ramakrishnan & Bloemraad, 2008a). These service and advocacy functions take on particular importance as the United States undergoes a new surge in its immigrant population. In 1970, less than five percent of U.S. residents were foreign-born; by 2008, it was one in eight, or 37.7 million people (Migration Policy Institute, 2008; U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). However, immigrants' cultural, religious or language needs are less likely to be met by existing groups, a dynamic aggravated by many immigrants' lack of citizenship or permanent legal status (Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008a).¹ As during the last wave of mass migration from 1880 to 1924, which spurred Hull House and similar civil society groups, contemporary migration flows have led to growth in immigrant-oriented voluntary and nonprofit organizations (Cortés 1998, 1999).

Despite this growth, a small, but mounting body of evidence indicates troubling under-participation in, and underrepresentation of, immigrants in the third sector. Immigrant organizations make up a much smaller proportion of all nonprofit groups in six California communities studied by Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad (2008b) than their presence in the general population would suggest. Across California, Asian Americans and Latinos—the two minority groups with the highest percentage of foreign born, 65 percent and 41 percent, respectively—are significantly underrepresented on the boards or in the top executive positions of nonprofit organizations (De Vita, Roeger, & Niedzwiecki, 2009), a finding repeated in studies of selected cities (Bell, Moyers, & Wolfred, 2006; Hung, 2007) and in a nationally-representative survey of nonprofits (Ostrower, 2007). If mainstream organizations were including immigrants in their membership and services, irrespective of who runs the organization, this

imbalance would be less problematic. However, recent research suggests that many mainstream groups actively or passively keep out immigrants (Aptekar, 2008; Jones-Correa, 2005; Ramakrishan & Bloemraad, 2008a), while survey data on organizational membership indicates that immigrants appear less likely to belong to voluntary associations than US-born citizens (Ramakrishan & Viramontes, 2006; Sundeen, et al. 2009).²

As researchers evaluate why immigrant organizations may be less numerous, or why immigrants' membership may be lower, a key issue is how scholars identify and count immigrant organizations. Are there truly fewer immigrant organizations, or are they undercounted by standard techniques, rendering them invisible to outsiders? For example, conventional data sources often fail to capture certain types of immigrant organizations, especially those involved in transnational activities (Cortés 1998; Ramakrishan & Viramontes, 2006).

More broadly, how should we evaluate organizational inequality in the nonprofit sector? Most studies concerned with the funding, activities and leadership of diverse nonprofit organizations employ standard ethno-racial minority categories, such as African American, Latino and Asian American (Bell, et al., 2006; De Vita, et al., 2009; González-Rivera, Donnell, Briones, & Werblin, 2008; Hung, 2007). Such studies shine a spotlight on inequalities, often by focusing on leadership, but they fail to fully acknowledge that the particular concerns of immigrants—around legal status, linguistic isolation, access to benefits and services, and settlement needs—are often distinct from those of native-born minority groups (Cordero-Guzmán, 2005; de Graauw, 2008; Valenzuela, 2006). This study focuses specifically on immigrant-origin nonprofits, which we define as organizations with a mission or activities that address the aspirations or problems of people with similar immigrant origins.³ We examine both demographic underrepresentation—the number of immigrant organizations relative to the local population—and organizational undercounts within official data to examine inequality in the third sector.

Many nonprofit studies rely on datasets compiled by institutions such as the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) from IRS registration data (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2008). These data provide an important description of the universe of established organizations and facilitate

geographic and temporal comparisons, benefits that we exploit to examine underrepresentation of immigrant organizations among official nonprofits.

However, official sources typically produce an undercount (Grønbjerg, 2002). Small and informal organizations are commonly overlooked (Colwell, 1997; Toepler, 2003). The existing literature has examined variation in nonprofit undercounts across communities (Grønbjerg & Paarlberg, 2001) and by nonprofit activity (Colwell, 1997; Grønbjerg, 1990), but to our knowledge, researchers have not evaluated organizational undercounts by the characteristics of the clients or members of such organizations. We consequently develop a methodology and analysis of undercounts among immigrant organizations in four national-origin communities in Silicon Valley, a region with the highest percentage of foreign-born residents in California and with one of the largest Asian populations in the United States (Castellanos, 2009). We first craft an estimate of these organizations by focusing on formally registered nonprofits. Then, through an analysis of additional databases and directories, coupled with information from in-depth interviews with 113 community leaders and 47 key informants in our target cities, we examine the extent of the organizational undercount for the Indian, Mexican, Portuguese, and Vietnamese immigrant-origin communities. We attempt to assess the complete universe of publicly present nonprofit organizations for our target populations, by which we mean all groups known to local officials, to ethnic or mainstream media, or to key leaders and volunteers working in the nonprofit sector. We consider whether particular immigrant communities are especially prone to being undercounted, and whether undercount patterns vary by city size or organizational type.

In what follows, we first provide a discussion of the literature on measuring and evaluating nonprofit underrepresentation and undercounts. We then present our methodology, underscoring the innovations and limitations of this approach. Three major findings emerge. First, organizational inequality is high among officially registered 501(c)3 nonprofits: a much lower proportion of nonprofits are oriented to immigrant communities than we might expect given immigrants' demographic weight. Second, official data provide an incomplete picture of immigrant-origin nonprofits, missing a half to a third of publicly present immigrant organizations. Finally, we find variation between migrant groups and

across different types of cities and types of organizations. Considering both demographic underrepresentation and organizational undercounts, the Mexican-origin community appears to face particular inequalities within the third sector.

These findings provide important data on the under-studied question of immigrant nonprofit organizing. We consider these empirical findings as an important baseline for future research. More broadly, our findings carry significant implications for research on immigrants' civic incorporation. Under-estimating the vitality of the immigrant nonprofit sector may lead us to misunderstand issues critical to immigrant-origin communities, to misjudge the mobilization potential of immigrant organizations, as occurred most dramatically in the 2006 immigrant rights protests, as well as in Barack Obama's campaign for the Presidency, and to reinforce perceptions of political apathy or silence (Huntington, 2004).⁴ It might also fuel funding inequities in the nonprofit sector, which often privilege official 501(c)3 organizations, and perpetuate the dominance of mainstream organizations in areas ranging from cultural production to advocacy in public policy debates. This is particularly problematic since immigration is reshaping American society, a transformation we would expect to see reshaping the U.S. nonprofit sector as well.

Evaluating Underrepresentation and the Undercount: Existing Literature

The building blocks for many quantitative studies of the third sector are data from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).⁵ The benefits of IRS data are well-documented: much of the information on the form is mandatory, and thus more consistent than other sources; the standard format required of all filers changes little from year to year; the Form 990 (which gathers financial data from organizations) encourages more detailed reporting than other forms, such as audit statements; and since the law requires annual filing, longitudinal studies are possible, although data for the early years may be of lesser quality (Froelich, Knoepfle, & Pollak, 2000; Lampkin & Boris, 2002). Since these are data filed with a federal agency, IRS data also provide a way to compare organizations across the United States, which is not possible with data from state agencies that register or incorporate nonprofits. For all of these reasons, official data are a good starting point to evaluate demographic underrepresentation.

Despite these benefits, IRS data also present several drawbacks for compiling an accurate count of third sector vitality. Religious organizations and nonprofits with less than \$25,000 in revenues are not required to file a Form 990 or register.⁶ IRS listings thus typically leave out groups that are too small to qualify for registration, as well as those which do not have the resources to register formally or which are ideologically opposed to bureaucratization (Dale, 1993; Lampkin & Boris, 2002; Smith, 1997b). Limiting civil society research to official 501(c)3 listings carries an important undercount bias (Colwell, 1997; Grønbjerg, 2002).

Efforts aimed at identifying missing groups range from tracking down organizations that have 501(c)3 status but do not appear on official lists for a particular city, to enumerating all grassroots groups, including those that never officially register.⁷ Administrative data sources used to identify missing organizations not listed in IRS data include Secretary of State lists (Grønbjerg & Paarlberg, 2002), the U.S. Census of Service Industries (Grønbjerg, 2002), and city property data (Reiner, 2003). Non-governmental data sources include sector directories (produced, for example, by hospitals, universities, the United Way, or large foundations), phone listings such as the Yellow Pages, or lists of foundation grantees (Toepler, 2003). Others conduct surveys to identify additional groups (Colwell, 1997), or use in-depth interviews and snowball techniques (Grønbjerg, 2002). In the state of Indiana, Grønbjerg and Paarlberg (2002) find that in conjunction with Secretary of State data, the federal IRS listings provide 60 percent coverage of all organizations. Others claim that databases based on IRS data only capture 10 percent of all voluntary associations (Smith, 1997a, 1997b). Despite debate over the precise number, there is consensus that IRS data are not sufficient to enumerate the full universe of civil society (Smith, 1997; Froelich et. al. 2000; Toepler, 2003).

We do not know, however, whether the undercount varies by the characteristics of those served or active in nonprofit groups, an important question because it speaks to concerns about inequality in service, funding and leadership within the third sector. A growing body of work tackles the question of such inequality (Bell, et al., 2006; Cortés, 1998; De Vita, et al., 2009; Hung, 2007; Ostrower, 2007), but most studies rely on NCCS data drawn from formal IRS registrations and Form 990 data, eliding

undercount problems,⁸ and they often compare African American, Hispanic, Asian and non-Hispanic white populations. In doing so, they overlook important national origin dynamics within these broad categories and they conflate long-established US-born minority populations with new immigrant populations that face unique challenges. We consequently assess demographic underrepresentation for *immigrant* organizations, contributing to an emerging research field on immigrant nonprofits (Cordero-Guzmán, 2005; de Graauw, 2008; Ramakrishan & Bloemraad, 2008b). We also add to this body of work, and research on the undercount more generally, by focusing on the discrepancy between using official IRS data to evaluate immigrant organizing and using intensive fieldwork to draw a more complete picture of third sector vitality in immigrant communities. By considering both demographic underrepresentation and organizational undercounts, we gain a fuller picture of third sector inequality.

Research Methods and Case Selection

This article draws on a study of immigrant community organizing among Indian, Mexican, Portuguese, and Vietnamese immigrant-origin communities in Silicon Valley, California. We focus on seven cities, which span two counties: Fremont (in Alameda County), and Cupertino, Milpitas, Mountain View, Santa Clara, San Jose, and Sunnyvale (all in Santa Clara County). We concentrate on this geographic area to focus our analysis, but also to leverage differences in city size and the size of the immigrant communities.

Geographic Focus: Silicon Valley

Like many metropolitan areas, Silicon Valley is characterized by a core city, with several surrounding suburbs and bedroom communities, some of which are home to large, international firms. San Jose is the hub of Silicon Valley, and the county seat, with almost 900,000 residents in 2006. Fremont, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara have populations of 208,000, 136,000, 109,000, respectively, while Mountain View, Milpitas, and Cupertino count 71,000, 65,000, and 57,000 residents, respectively. In all these cities, well over a third of residents were born outside the United States; in Milpitas the proportion surpasses half (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).⁹ By collecting data in multiple cities, we are able to assess a

broad regional area, responding to the call by De Vita and colleagues (2009) for more regional and local studies of diversity in the nonprofit sector.

<Insert Table1: Overview of Silicon Valley Cities and Immigrant-origin Communities>

Our regional focus is also important since existing research has centered almost exclusively on immigrant nonprofits and civil society in New York City (e.g. Cordero-Guzmán, 2005; Marwell, 2007), with some attention to other traditional immigrant destinations such as Boston (Gamm & Putnam, 1999), Chicago (Sanguino, 2008), San Francisco (de Graauw, 2008) and Los Angeles (Rivera-Salgado & Rabadán, 2004; Valenzuela, 2006). Yet today, a majority of immigrants live in suburbs rather than central cities (Singer, 2003). The dispersion of immigrants to new destinations demands scholarship with a broader geographical focus (Singer, Hardwick, & Brettell, 2008)

Demographic Focus: Indian, Mexican, Portuguese and Vietnamese-origin Communities

We focus on four prominent immigrant communities in Silicon Valley with distinct migration histories, different modes of entry into the country and significant variation in their socio-economic profile. These differences mean that each community has a particular set of resources at its disposal for the creation of a “third space.” First, the groups represent a range of immigrant histories. Mexican and, to a lesser extent, Portuguese immigrants have been migrating for over a hundred years to the area.¹⁰ Some Mexican and Portuguese organizations consequently have a long history in Silicon Valley, generating ties with local bureaucratic and political structures. In contrast, Indian and Vietnamese migration only began on a large scale in the 1970s. These migrants had to establish organizations *de nouveau*, rather than build on previous efforts.

These immigrant communities also differ in their modes of entry into the country and their legal status. All four groups have significant proportions of people who arrived legally in the United States via family sponsorship, the primary means by which most immigrants acquire visas to migrate to the United States. In addition, a large number of Vietnamese migrated under refugee or special visas related to U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. Refugee status carries with it more public assistance with settlement than that offered to other migrants, including help setting up mutual assistance organizations, which facilitates

nonprofit organizing (Bloemraad, 2005, 2006; Hein, 1997). In contrast, over half of all Mexican immigrants in the United States are estimated to lack legal residency documents (Passel, 2006); fear of public scrutiny likely presents a significant barrier to civic engagement for this group. In comparison, the Portuguese, an older and more established group, have higher rates of legal permanent status and naturalization (60 percent of Portuguese immigrants are naturalized), while Indians represent the largest number of legal, temporary workers in the United States (Department of Homeland Security, 2007).

These groups also vary in the degree to which their members can mobilize human and financial capital, factors which facilitate civic engagement and voluntarism (Sundeen, et al. 2009; Verba, et al. 1995). Indian migrants have the highest levels of education as many enter with H1-B visas.¹¹ The Vietnamese and Portuguese communities include some highly educated members, but also a substantial number of low wage workers; large numbers of Mexican immigrants have very modest levels of education.¹² Given educational differences, it is not surprising that Indian immigrants enjoy one of the highest median household incomes in Silicon Valley (\$69,076 in 2000), while one-quarter of all Mexican immigrant families live in poverty (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Portuguese and Vietnamese immigrants have comparable median household incomes (\$48,805 and \$45,740 respectively in 2000), although nearly three times as many Vietnamese families live in poverty, compared to Portuguese (14.2 and 5.3 percent, respectively).

Members of these four immigrant communities are not dispersed equally across the seven cities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Over a quarter of San Jose residents are of Mexican descent, ranging from recently arrived day laborers, service workers and small business-owners to second and third generation Cisco engineers and city officials. Ten percent of San Jose residents are Vietnamese, many of whom resettled as refugees during the 1970s and 1980s, or later via family reunification or special entry provisions in the 1990s. Some Vietnamese own restaurants and other small businesses, while low-wage Vietnamese workers are typically employed in the few remaining electronic assembly plants or in the service industry. The Vietnamese second generation is now graduating from high school and college, and moving into white collar and professional careers. Those of Indian origin are less likely to live in San

Jose, but they make up over 10 percent of the populations of Cupertino, Fremont, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, drawn to the area since the 1960s to attend graduate school, or more recently, to work in the high-tech sector. Although the Portuguese today form less than two percent of the population in the seven Silicon Valley cities in the study, they were amongst the earliest post-World War II immigrants to the area, and are an established and recognized presence in Santa Clara.¹³

Data Strategy: Counting Organizations

The starting point for our data collection was to assemble a database of all formally registered nonprofit organizations in the seven cities of our study. This database, built from NCCS data from the Urban Institute, represents the “official count” of 501(c)3 organizations in the area.¹⁴

The 3,499 organizations in the database were classified as “immigrant-origin” or “non-immigrant” organizations by the authors. Our goal was to identify organizations that, through their activities or mission, serve the needs of immigrants, engage with transnational communities, or preserve the cultural practices of immigrant-origin communities. Similar to Cortés (1998), an organization was considered immigrant-origin if it focused on the problems or aspirations of a group with similar immigrant origins, though members, clients or leaders could be first, second, or third generation. Other studies, such as Hung (2007) and De Vita, Roeger & Niedzwiecki (2009), identify minority and immigrant nonprofits based on the origins of directors and board members, while Cordero-Guzmán (2005)’s study of immigrant social service providers focuses on the origins of clients. To cast as broad a net as possible, we did not limit our categorization by leadership or clientele thresholds, focusing instead on overall mission and activities. Our approach is most consistent with Cortés’ (1998) name-based technique, but we also relied on information from the group’s mission statement, directories, media and in-depth interviews.¹⁵ We then identified, among all immigrant-origin nonprofits, those organizations catering specifically or in large part to people of Mexican, Vietnamese, Indian, or Portuguese origin.

Our next step was to identify community-based organizations *not* included in official data. To find these “non-NCCS” organizations, we followed a method similar to Grønbjerg’s (2002: 1757) “informant/community based approach” and in line with the recommendations by De Vita, Roeger &

Niedzwiecki (2009) for more qualitative research approaches. We relied on references from 160 in-depth interviews with leaders of community groups, public officials, and government staff conducted from August 2005 to December 2006.¹⁶ We also culled through ethnic newspapers and resource directories, and conducted web searches. We included any organization mentioned by local officials, our nonprofit sector informants, or referred to in ethnic or mainstream media. We sought to be as inclusive as possible, though our search probably identified groups that have moved beyond an early stage of development. Since we likely missed embryonic or very informal groups, the undercount we document is, at best, a low estimate of the underrepresentation of immigrant groups in official 501(c)3 data; the actual undercount might well be substantially greater.

We then compared the list of publicly present immigrant organizations we generated through our fieldwork to the database of officially registered 501(c)3 groups; those not in the NCCS database became “non-NCCS” organizations, our tally of the undercount. The resulting list of “non-NCCS” organizations is diverse. It includes groups that organize particular annual events, such as the elaborate annual Diwali festival in Cupertino, and independent subgroups loosely linked to larger organizations, such as a grass-roots Latino immigrant advocacy group that uses space provided by a sympathetic social service agency in San Jose. The list also includes chapters of organizations that may be formally registered outside the seven city area, but are active in Silicon Valley, as is the case for several Portuguese groups formally based in the state’s Central Valley, but with activities and members in Santa Clara. *Not* included in our list are for-profit organizations, such as ethnic TV stations or newspapers, or government sponsored organizations that rely entirely on public employees for staff support, such as the City of San Jose’s Strong Neighborhood Initiative groups.¹⁷

Non-NCCS groups were allocated to a city and an immigrant group to permit comparison with the official NCCS list and census data. We follow the standard strategy of allocating organizations to a geographical area based on the address provided to the IRS for official NCCS organizations. This address is most likely to be where an organization’s financial records are maintained, although it may not be where the organization performs all, or even some, of its activities (Grønbjerg, 2002). For non-NCCS

organizations, we used a set of allocation criteria to best match the organization to its main city of activity.¹⁸ We also allocated groups to a particular national origin, relying on references to national origin in the group title, mission, and/or website. All groups that identified as “Latino” or “Hispanic” were categorized as Mexican. This would be inappropriate in other parts of the United States, but it is a reasonable strategy in Silicon Valley, where 85 percent of all individuals identifying as Hispanic or Latino report Mexican origins.¹⁹ All Hindu, Sikh, and Jain organizations were assigned to the Indian national origin group.²⁰ Pan-ethnic organizations or groups oriented to communities of color were not assigned a particular national origin unless a key informant mentioned the group’s specific relevance to one of the four communities in the study.²¹

Overall, our strategy amounts to a conservative assessment of the civil society undercount in these communities. We do not have an exhaustive list of all the relatively invisible transnational groups, from Mexican hometown associations to Vietnamese anti-Communist political groups, nor of all the informal organizations of concern to some scholars of undercounts (e.g. Colwell, 1997; Smith, 1997b).²² We only included organizations that informants could specifically name. So, when interviewees told us about “that Mexican dance group,” we did not count it unless we could positively identify the group. We nevertheless feel that we generated a comprehensive count of organizations with some public presence and relevance to members of these national-origin communities living in Silicon Valley, a list that is in some cases considerably longer than official NCCS sources.

Organizational Inequality: Official Data and Demographic Underrepresentation

Comparing the proportion of immigrant organizations in official NCCS data (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2005) with American Community Survey demographic data (U.S. Census Bureau 2009) reveals dramatic immigrant underrepresentation in civil society across all cities. The proportion of immigrants in the seven cities we study ranges from 38 percent in Santa Clara to over 51 percent in Milpitas. The relative size of non-White minorities is even larger, ranging from 43 percent in Mountain View to 75 percent in Milpitas, as shown in Table 2.²³ Yet, across the seven cities, the proportion of immigrant NCCS organizations is about half of what we might expect based on population data, 21.6

percent of organizations (755 out of 3499) compared to 40.8 percent of the population (630,187 immigrants out of 1,545,815 residents). Put differently, if immigrants were represented among official NCCS organizations in proportion to their share of the population, we would expect almost double the number of immigrant groups, 1428 organizations.²⁴ To the extent that immigrant organizations articulate or serve needs different from mainstream groups, such dramatic civic inequality raises concerns from social service provision to interest representation.

<Insert Table 2: Official Count of 501(c)3 Organizations in Silicon Valley>

The gap might be less consequential if non-immigrant organizations were including immigrants in their membership, services and activities in proportion to their presence in the local population. However, several recent studies suggest that many organizations actively or passively keep immigrants out in several high immigrant-density communities in California (Ramakrishan & Bloemraad, 2008a, 2008b; Ramakrishnan & Viramontes 2006) and elsewhere in the United States (Aptekar, 2008; Jones-Correa, 2005). In Santa Clara county, a recent survey of nonprofit activity found that immigrants had two to four times the service needs of U.S.-born residents but that immigrants received, on average, half the services that U.S.-born residents receive (LaFrance 2005). This conclusion echoes the more general finding that few mainstream human service nonprofits focus their activities on minority populations and their concerns (Grønbjerg, 1990). In our research, we found that some groups, such as certain Toastmasters chapters or large mainstream social service agencies such as Catholic Charities, did include large numbers of immigrants and people of color. Much more common, however, were cases of passive or active exclusion, such as with a high school PTA in Mountain View that did not want to offer translation during meetings and held meetings when virtual no public transportation was available for low income immigrant parents.

The stark underrepresentation of immigrant organizations varies somewhat across cities. The data hint at some correlation between the size of underrepresentation and the size of the city. Focusing on the gap between the proportion of foreign-born residents in a city's population and the proportion of immigrant NCCS organizations among all officially registered nonprofits, the smallest gap, 18.3

percentage points, is found in the largest city, San Jose. The largest gaps are found among the two smallest cities, Cupertino and Milpitas, at 23.6 and 26.1 percentage points, respectively.²⁵ These results lend support to the argument put forward by Ramakrishnan and Lewis (2005) that bigger cities are better placed to facilitate immigrant organizing due to their larger and more professional bureaucratic structure, which facilitates the development of formal policies and informal practices to engage and assist immigrant communities. It might also speak to possible “free-riding” dynamics where officials and residents of smaller suburban communities rely on the services and activities of immigrant organizations established in large central cities within a region (de Graauw, Gleeson & Bloemraad 2011). If confirmed in other settings, the relationship between larger cities and more immigrant organizing would suggest that research demonstrating a link between smaller city size and a denser mainstream nonprofit sector (Grønbjerg & Paarlberg, 2001) might not hold for immigrants, implying the need to modify third sector models when considering particular sub-populations.

What is Missing? Organizational Undercounts

The official data can be read as a measure of civic inequality, which is our interpretation, but they can also be viewed as an objective measure of weak civic values or a lack of voluntary ethos on the part of newcomer populations, as was the controversial position of Huntington (2004). Such an interpretation rests, however, on the assumption that official data sources, such the IRS 501(c)3 registration system, accurately and adequately capture voluntary organizing and organizational vitality in immigrant communities.

Our search for organizations absent from the NCCS dataset reveals a broader picture of immigrant organizing. For each national origin group across the seven cities, Table 3 displays three columns of data: the number of 501(c)3 organizations in the NCCS database, the number of all other non-NCCS organizations identified during fieldwork, and the resulting “undercount” of immigrant-organizations if we were to rely solely on NCCS data.²⁶ The number of Indian, Mexican, Portuguese and Vietnamese organizations increases substantially when we include the non-NCCS groups, from 282 in

the official data to 457 with both NCCS and non-NCCS organizations. This means that NCCS data provide coverage of about 62 percent of all publicly present immigrant organizations in our seven cities of interest, a figure similar to the coverage rate found by Grønbjerg and Paarlberg (2002) in their analysis of nonprofit undercounts in Indiana.

The undercount differs, however, by city and national origin group. Across cities, as seen in Table 3, there is some hint that immigrant organizations in big cities are more likely to be in official datasets. In both of the two largest cities in our study, San Jose and Fremont, two thirds of publicly present organizations appeared in the official NCCS data. In contrast, the other cities, all with populations under 200,000, had undercounts of roughly 50%, although as the denominators for these calculations decrease, small changes in the number of undercounted organizations have larger effects on proportions. Nevertheless, the fact that the undercount differs across cities—all municipalities in the same region—should give pause to researchers who want to use NCCS data to compare the vitality of immigrant organizing across U.S. localities. This variation requires further study.

<Insert Table 3: Organizational Undercount, by City and Immigrant-origin Group >

The undercount also differs between national origin groups. NCCS data included only 48 percent of Portuguese and 57 percent of Mexican community organizations in the seven cities, compared to 63 percent of Vietnamese organizations and 66 percent of Indian organizations. Variation in the undercount becomes even more acute when we consider particular immigrant-origin groups in individual cities, rather than across our seven cities, and when we examine specific types of organizations. According to official NCCS data, Mexican organizations are only present in significant numbers in San Jose, despite the fact that those of Mexican origin make up 12 to 18 percent of the population in five of the other cities. About a third of official NCCS organizations within the Mexican-origin community are churches—many evangelical Protestant—a higher percentage of officially registered religious organizations than across any of the other immigrant-origin groups. So, for example, in Milpitas, where 15 percent of the city's population reports Mexican origin, we found only two officially registered NCCS organizations, both religious groups: Ministerio Pentecostal Melquisedec, and Iglesia Emmanuel, Inc. However, our field

research revealed another six non-NCCS organizations, including three religious groups, one cultural organization (Ballet Folklorico Milpitas) and two educational groups (Latino Parent Potluck Club and the Milpitas Parents Pre-School, which is largely Latino).

Considering the type of activities undertaken by the non-NCCS organizations, we find that cultural, civic, business/professional, religious and educational organizations were likely to be undercounted in all four immigrant-origin communities.²⁷ We also found some variation in undercount, by type, between the Mexican and Portuguese nonprofit sector, on the one hand, and the Vietnamese and Indian sector, on the other. As with Mexican organizations, most registered Portuguese groups are religious or cultural groups, in addition to one large social service organization in San Jose, Portuguese Social Services and Opportunities. Of the non-NCCS Portuguese groups, most had Catholic and/or cultural missions.

This pattern differs for the Asian-origin communities, likely due to differences in their relative resources and migration histories. Many Vietnamese groups, almost two-thirds, are registered 501(c)3s. This is probably due, in part, to the legacy of financial and technical assistance from the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and the support of local officials who distribute ORR funds.²⁸ For example, many Vietnamese social service organizations, such as the Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation, began by offering refugee settlement services and today provides ESL classes, citizenship services, and employment assistance. Other registered organizations include cultural groups, language schools, the Santa Clara County Vietnamese Parent Teacher Association, and several Catholic churches and Buddhist temples that cater to Vietnamese speakers. An emerging professional class of 1.5 generation Vietnamese has also registered various transnational aid groups. Among the groups not present in the NCCS database are several student groups at local high schools and colleges, smaller veteran and transnational groups, and a few cultural and service-provision organizations. Twenty of these non-registered Vietnamese organizations engaged primarily in civic activities.

The immigrant community with the highest degree of formalized organizing, and the one best represented in official data sources, is also the most recently arrived, a surprising finding for those who

hypothesize that immigrants need time to understand U.S. incorporation and tax regulations, as well as to absorb the American tradition of voluntary organizing. Yet the Indian community—the most affluent group, as well as the one with widespread English ability and very high levels of education—exhibits the smallest undercount of their associational activities. Like the Vietnamese, professional Indians have established many transnational aid organizations, such as Adhishree, which supports abused or neglected children and poor seniors in India. Several prominent cultural and social service organizations are registered, including the India Community Center and the Lasya Dance company. There are also several Hindu and Sikh temples, as well as professional and alumni groups, such as a chapter of the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay graduates' organization. All of these groups are formally registered.

Most non-NCCS Indian groups are cultural and transnational organizations, but they also include the Northern California Cricket Association (as well as the breakaway Bay Area Cricket Association). Our interviews suggest that those active in non-NCCS Indian organizations perceive few economic incentives in formal registration; they can garner donations from community members and businesses despite the absence of tax benefits, and without relying on government or foundation support that often requires registration. This dynamic is very different for Mexican organizations that fail to register, often due to economic or linguistic barriers.²⁹

The substantial, and unequal, organizational undercount across national-origin communities supports existing cautions about using official data of registered nonprofits to understand the scope of civil society. Our results also hint that the level of underrepresentation is more severe in communities with fewer internal resources or less external public support for establishing nonprofit organizations. This suggests that resource inequalities between groups become replicated and reinforced in civil society.

Conclusion: Lessons Learned

The primary goal of this paper was to assess the scope of immigrant civil society using the tools commonly employed by nonprofit scholars. This assessment was conducted in two parts. First, using official IRS data on all formally registered 501(c)3 organizations in seven Silicon Valley cities, we found

a much lower proportion of organizations oriented to immigrant communities than we might expect given the demographic profile of the region, only half as much as population data would suggest. The level of underrepresentation appears greater in smaller cities than larger ones, and it varies across immigrant-origin groups. Underrepresentation is especially severe for the Mexican-origin community: while 21 percent of the population in this region is Mexican origin, organizations with a mission or activities primarily dedicated to the Mexican-origin community only accounted for 71 of 3499 officially registered 501(c)3 organizations, or two percent of the total. There is a growing literature on diversity—and its absence—in the leadership of nonprofit organizations (Bell, et al., 2006; De Vita, et al., 2009), but very few studies have examined civic diversity by looking at the mission and activities of voluntary organizations. We see our research as a first step to obtaining baseline information that should be replicated in other cities and with other migrant groups.

Such baseline data are important because the consequences of organizational inequality could be substantial. Official 501(c)3 status is necessary for certain kinds of funding (Bell, et al., 2006), so areas with fewer officially registered nonprofit organizations will generate insufficient financial support for immigrant-centered services (LaFrance 2006). In addition to service provision, nonprofit organizations are also important because they can engage in lawful advocacy and serve as intermediaries between immigrant communities and municipal officials (de Graauw 2008), and they frequently become the public face of a community, to which the media turn for a perspective on local events (Jenkins, 2006). Without a robust 501(c)3 sector, policy-makers and media are likely to get a distorted perspective of the needs and issues facing immigrant residents, creating broader civic and political inequalities for immigrant communities (Ramakrishan & Bloemraad, 2008b). While the generalizability of our findings is limited to Silicon Valley, one of the most immigrant-dense and progressive places in the United States, the underrepresentation of immigrant nonprofits is likely more dramatic in places new to large-scale immigration and those where local officials and residents are less accommodating of immigrants. Thus, outside Silicon Valley, it is very possible that immigrant underrepresentation might be even more acute, underscoring the need for further research on civic stratification in other regions.

Second, our research also shows that official data provide an incomplete picture of voluntary organizing in immigrant communities. Nonprofit scholars have long known that statistical datasets, such as those compiled from IRS filings, carry an undercount bias. Based on our field research across seven cities and four immigrant-origin groups, we find that only 62 percent of publicly present immigrant organization are found in official databases, a proportion similar to some other studies of the undercount. In addition, however, we demonstrate that the undercount varies across cities and across four immigrant-origin communities with very different migration histories, socio-economic profiles and relations to government. It seems that in cities and in groups with more resources, a greater proportion of voluntary and nonprofit organizations are formally registered third sector organizations. These findings carry implications not only for how we measure and understand civic organizing, particularly for immigrants, but they also raise questions about the causes and consequences of civic stratification among different communities in the United States.

Our focus on immigrant organizations also raises questions about how policy-makers, funders, and non-profit scholars should study diversity in the third sector. Traditionally, the issue of ethnic diversity in the United States has been viewed from a racial minority perspective (Jones-Correa, 2007). There are some similarities in the challenges faced by certain immigrant and native-born minority communities, such as limited financial resources that community members can invest in third sector activities. However, the particularities of the immigrant experience—from individuals' legal status to their ability to speak English—raise unique questions largely absent from the literature on nonprofit organizing. To give one example, studying immigrant organizing requires an expanded geographical understanding of what constitutes “civic engagement.” Transnational groups are a well established phenomenon in the immigration literature (e.g. Bada, Fox, & Selee, 2006; Fox, 2005; Guarnizo, Portes, & Haller, 2003), but such groups were likely to be missing from the NCCS dataset we used, the same dataset on which nonprofit scholars regularly rely. Although ostensibly oriented to the homeland, transnational groups can involve their members in domestic politics and local community events and are consequently part of American civil society (Bloemraad, 2006; Smith, 2007).

Immigrants' movement to suburbs and new rural destinations will also require policymakers and funders to re-think iconic images of central city immigrant settlement associations like Chicago's Hull House. Although sizeable Mexican and Vietnamese populations were present in many of the cities we studied, nonprofit organizations were often located in San Jose, a fact that public officials across the region mentioned during interviews. For smaller cities, in particular, we see a potentially negative, self-fulfilling prophecy: political leaders in small municipalities might assume that the needs of their immigrant residents are being addressed by nonprofits in central cities like San Jose, and they may be less likely to reach out to these residents to assist them in becoming integrated into the civic, cultural and political life of where they live. This would be a loss for immigrants, and for American communities that could harness the energies of our newest residents to strengthen U.S. civil society into the 21st century.

Finally, our measurement of the undercount provides a corrective to those who might read the low numbers of official Latino nonprofits as an objective indicator of limited community organizing or ingrained cultural distrust of civic engagement (Huntington 2004). In the cities we studied, engagement takes place, but these activities are not always formalized under 501(c)3 status for those of Mexican-origin; it is more likely for those with origins in India. To the extent that 501(c)3 status carries material and political benefits, research on undercounts helps us understand variation in the long-term viability of immigrant organizations and the civic and political influence of different communities. Our findings, combined with other recent work showing that Latinos are especially likely to be absent from leadership positions in the nonprofit sector (Bell, et al., 2006; Hung, 2007), shines a spotlight on the need for more research into such inequalities. The undercount of immigrant-origin organizations is consequential as it exacerbates an erroneous perception of immigrant civil society as anemic and resistant to being engaged. Thus, we need not only to reconsider the organizational forms we consider valid components of civil society, but also the data collection methods we rely on to assess patterns of civic incorporation.

NOTES:

¹ In this article, we refer interchangeably to “organizations” and “groups”.

² Both Ramakrishan & Viramontes (2006) and Sundeen, et al. (2009) draw on data from the Current Population Survey Volunteer Supplement, which asks respondents about their organizational memberships, but these data do not distinguish between volunteering for formal 501(c)3 organizations and more informal groups.

³ Legally, an immigrant is someone who is a foreign-born non-citizen. Academics usually refer to immigrants as the foreign-born, regardless of legal status. In this paper, we use the term "immigrant organization" to refer to those organizations that primarily serve, are run by or focus on immigrant concerns: members, clients or leaders of these organizations can be first, second, or even third generation, but the organizations' primary mission and activities are influenced by the group's immigrant origins. For example, a Vietnamese language school, set up by immigrant parents, but teaching Vietnamese to mostly US-born children, would be, for our purposes, an immigrant organization. The same is true for an organization focused on furthering the culture of the homeland, providing services in non-English languages or addressing issues related to immigrants' legal status in the United States. We consequently use the terms “immigrant” and “immigrant-origin” interchangeably.

⁴ For a broader discussion of immigrant civic engagement during the 2006 immigrant rights marches, see Voss & Bloemraad (2011), Wang & Winn (2006) and the December 2008 issue of the *American Behavioral Scientist*.

⁵ These data are compiled by the National Center for Charitable Statistics (which mainly serves academic researchers) and Guidestar (which mainly serves practitioners and companies). NCCS data are regularly used by authors in this journal such as Froelich et. al. (2000), Toepler (2003), and Hung (2007).

⁶ All private foundations must file a Form 990-PF annually regardless of size.

⁷ For example, in our research, we found that an organization might be officially registered in a central city but not in an adjacent suburb or another city in the region, despite having an active membership in those other locations. When it comes to groups that do not register, our interviews with organization leaders revealed that some affluent groups relied on personal resources and/or corporate donations to fund activities without needing the tax benefit of 501(c)3 status. Conversely, groups with limited resources did not register due to language barriers, lack of technical expertise in navigating the registration bureaucracy, or undocumented residents' apprehension of government entities.

⁸ They either use the data directly, or use the data as a sampling frame to survey organizations. The Greenlining Institute uses a slightly different methodology, examining the list of organizations receiving grants from major U.S. foundations. But since many foundations require grantees to have 501(c)3 status, their findings do not help gain leverage on organizational undercounts.

⁹ Fieldwork took place in 2005 and 2006, thus we provide demographic data from the 2005-2007 American Community Survey (three year average). ACS data come from U.S. Census samples. Estimates are subject to random sampling error and likely undercount immigrants, so the precise figures must be treated with caution. For our analysis, an undercount of immigrant residents will *understate* organizational inequality. On ACS sampling, see: <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/AdvMeth/CollProc/CollProc1.htm>

¹⁰ Mexican populations have a history in California which can be traced back to when the region was part of Mexico prior to the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

¹¹ H1-B visas are temporary residency permits available to highly-skilled workers in specialty occupations. Many immigrant software engineers in Silicon Valley arrive as H1-B visa holders (Saxenian, 2007).

¹² Census Bureau data indicate that less than seven percent of Indian-origin residents of Santa Clara county had not completed a high school diploma, compared to 21 percent of Portuguese, 25 percent of Vietnamese and 41 percent of Mexican-origin residents. Fully 82 percent of Indian-origin residents had a

four-year college degree or higher level of education, compared to 28 percent of Vietnamese, 21 percent of Portuguese and 10 percent of Mexican-origin residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).

¹³ For more on the changing demography of this region, see Pitti (2002), Matthews (2003), Pellow and Park (2003), and Zolniski (2006).

¹⁴ We examine c(3) filers because scholarly research on IRS data overwhelmingly focuses on these organizations to define the scope of civil society. We excluded private foundations, as these organizations fall outside our interest in publicly present organizations within civil society, and they are often treated as distinct financial entities in other analyses. (See, for example: Skelly (1994), Desai and Yetman (2005), Boris and Steuerle (2006).)

¹⁵ Our classification process involved multiple steps. First, like Cortés (1998), the authors went through all 3,499 organizations to identify immigrant-origin organizations based on group name. Organizations were coded as possibly immigrant-origin if they included the use of a non-English language in the name (e.g., Centro de Servicios Legales del Pueblo Santa Clara, Co So Thi Van Coi Nguon), made specific mention of a foreign place or ethnic origin (e.g. Afghan Center; Friends of South Asia) or specifically mentioned “immigrant,” “refugee” or some variation of these words in the name (e.g., African Refugee Community Services). We then investigated each of these possible immigrant-origin groups using the internet, directories, media and informant interviews to confirm the categorization. We also used these additional resources to add overlooked groups without clearly ethnic or immigrant names to our “immigrant-origin” category (e.g., Hands Across the Water). “Non-immigrant” organizations are consequently those whose mission is not directed at any given immigrant-origin group (e.g., an Elks Lodge, a mainstream Parent-Teacher Association), while an “immigrant-origin” organization largely serves a particular immigrant-origin community (such as the Santa Clara County Vietnamese PTA).

¹⁶ The breadth of our research focus—four immigrant groups across seven cities—required a large sample of key informants and knowledgeable insiders. Interviews followed a semi-structured format, and varied slightly between city officials and representatives from community-based organizations. We asked both

sets of respondents to list all the organizations they knew in their city that are active within a specific domain, such as in the arts, healthcare or business development. We did not prime for immigrant or ethnic organizations. We did, among the domains we covered, ask about immigrant or refugee issues and ethnic and cultural groups as specific issue areas. From the list of *all* organizations generated by our respondents, regardless of activity, we identified all immigrant-origin organizations using methods similar to our NCCS categorization. If we could not find these immigrant-origin organizations in the official NCCS database, the group became a “non-NCCS organization.” A copy of the interview schedule is available from the authors upon request.

¹⁷ The list of organizations we collected during fieldwork in 2005-06 was compared to the most recent NCCS Business Master File available (1/2006). Non-NCCS organizations fell into three main categories: (1) groups not formally registered as 501(c)3 organizations; (2) groups with headquarters outside Silicon Valley (which may or may not be formally registered) but with a significant membership and activities within one of our seven cities; or (3) registered groups that were not in the database or that were registered as another 501(c) category. For example, among the non-NCCS groups, 13 are non-registered chapters (or branches) of other organizations and 10 are sub-groups of a host organization with a distinct membership and volunteer base. The non-NCCS list also includes “ethnic” chambers of commerce, such as the Vietnamese or Hispanic Chambers of Commerce in San Jose, since informants identified them as publicly present organizations. However, because such groups are registered as 501(c)6 organizations and therefore could not appear in our official 501(c)3 database, we do not include ethnic Chambers of Commerce in the calculation of the 501(c)3 undercount.

¹⁸ The allocation criteria involved the following steps: (1) If a group’s city location could be identified through web searches, and that city was one of the seven cities in our study, the group was allocated to that city; (2) if an organization demonstrated activity in one of our 7 study cities, but the official group location was outside the seven cities (yet within Santa Clara or Alameda County), it was allocated to the city within our study where it was active; (3) if the city location was outside the seven cities, and outside

of the South Bay, they were allocated to the city of the organization that the interviewee source represents, or if multiple interviewees mentioned this non-registered nonprofit organization, the group was listed once for each city mentioned; (4) any government sponsored community organization that relied partly on government-funded staff (such as a city commission, city-sponsored neighborhood association, or school-sponsored group) was allocated to the city of support; and (5) if no city location could be explicitly identified, and the interviewee source represented an entity outside the seven cities (e.g. a consular office), or the group was identified from a directory or web search, that group was allocated to San Jose.

¹⁹ This decision was made based on the overwhelming homogeneity of the Latino population in Silicon Valley. We do not mean to conflate the Mexican-origin population with other Latino groups. Any group explicitly identified as Latino, but which had a predominant focus on a country other than Mexico, would have been excluded, but we did not encounter any such group. Groups with an explicit mention of a non-Mexican affiliation, such as the “Western Region Puerto Rican Council, Inc,” were *not* included in the Mexican-origin count.

²⁰ Two Muslim organizations with a significant Indian membership were also included.

²¹ Non-registered pan-ethnic organizations are enumerated in our data only if they are described as directly serving or representing one of our four immigrant-origin communities. We do this due to the heterogeneity of the “Asian-American” population in Silicon Valley, including the significant linguistic, socio-economic, and legal differences between the Indian and Vietnamese populations, and between these two groups and other Asian-origin communities (such as Chinese and Filipinos).

²² Our undercount list includes numerous transnational or informal groups identified through interviews or other sources, but we doubt that we have an exhaustive list of all such organizations or of all religious groups. Unions, which are active in the Mexican community in particular, were not included, nor were social service agencies that are not ethnic-specific in mission.

²³ The immigrant population is not a simple subset of the racial minority population, hence the need for immigrant-focused research studies. A focus on racial minority communities will exclude immigrant groups such as the Portuguese, and can exclude Hispanics who identify as white in census tallies and surveys. Conversely, the African American community in Northern California is overwhelmingly non-immigrant. To the extent that immigrant populations are undercounted by the Census Bureau, due to linguistic barriers or concerns about legal status, the underrepresentation of immigrant organizations will be even more acute than what we report.

²⁴ In comparison, a recent study of non-profit leadership found that whereas people of color made up 54 percent of Bay Area residents (including San Francisco, San Jose and East Bay cities such as Oakland), only 24.5 percent of area non-profits were run by a person of color and only 30 percent of board members were people of color (De Vita, et al., 2009).

²⁵ Due to the small number of cities in our study, any statistical analysis is tenuous, at best. Based on suggestions by reviewers and the editor of this journal, we can report a negative correlation between the size of the seven cities (measured as total population) and the percentage point disparity between the proportion of foreign-born residents in the total population and the proportion of immigrant nonprofits among official registered 501(c)3 organizations. The Pearson's correlation coefficient is -0.46 ($p=0.30$) and the Spearman's rho value is -0.857 ($p=0.014$). Alternatively, we calculated the number of immigrant-origin organizations per 10,000 foreign-born residents in each city. We find that all the larger cities, with a population over 100,000, count 11 to 12 immigrant organizations per 10,000 immigrants. Among the smaller cities, the number varies from a high of 17 immigrant organizations per 10,000 immigrants in Cupertino to a low of 9.6 in Milpitas. If we calculate a similar ratio of non-immigrant NCCS organizations per 10,000 *native-born* residents, we find that Cupertino, the smallest city in our study, has the densest non-immigrant civil society, at a level far above that for immigrants: 49 nonprofit organizations per 10,000 U.S.-born residents. Mountain View is second highest with 41 nonprofits per 10,000 US-born residents. All other cities have an organizational density between 27 (Fremont) and 33

(Santa Clara) per 10,000 U.S.-born residents. This alternate measure further underscores the immense gap between the density of civil society for immigrant and non-immigrant residents.

²⁶ The ethnic Chambers of Commerce hold 501(c)6 status, and could not be expected to be in the official NCCS 501(c)3 data we use to measure civil society. Ethnic Chambers of Commerce are consequently not included in the table or in calculations of the undercount.

²⁷ Other researchers have relied on the “IRS service category” (NCCS code “activ1/2/3”) when assessing the activity focus of non-profit organizations. However, as Cortés (1998) points out, these codes are not always reliable. We created an alternative schema that builds on these categories, as well as the NTEE (National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities) codes, but with more room to accommodate the breadth of immigrant-origin nonprofit activities (e.g. transnational activities). Further details on this categorization are available from the authors upon request. As discussed above, the absence of some of the business and religious groups can be explained by the fact they file as another type of nonprofit organization, or because they do not need to register with the IRS.

²⁸ A similar conclusion was reached by Hein (1997) and Bloemraad (2005) in their work on Vietnamese organizing.

²⁹ Space constraints prevent a thorough discussion of variation between immigrant communities. Important factors include immigrants’ human and financial capital, legal status, language ability and differences in government treatment across migrant groups (Gleeson et. al 2006, 2007)

REFERENCES

- Aleinikoff, T. A., Martin, D. A., & Motomura, H. (2008). *Immigration and Citizenship Process and Policy*. Eagan, MN: Thomson West.
- Aptekar, S. (2008). Highly Skilled but Unwelcome in Politics: Asian Indians and Chinese in a New Jersey Suburb. In S. K. Ramakrishnan & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement* (pp. 222-243). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Bada, X., Fox, J., & Selee, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Invisible No More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Mexico Institute and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Bell, J., Moyers, R., & Wolfred, T. (2006). *Daring to Lead 2006: A National Study of Nonprofit Leadership*. Compass Point Nonprofit Services.
- Bloemraad, I. (2005). The Limits of de Tocqueville: How Government Facilitates Organizational Capacity in Newcomer Communities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(5), 865-887.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boris, Elizabeth T., and C. Eugene Steurele. 2006. "Scope and Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector." in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by W. W. Powell and R. Steinberg. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brettell, C. B. (2008). Immigrants as Netizens: Political Mobilization in Cyberspace. In D. Reed-Danahay & C. Brettell, B. (Eds.), *Citizenship, Political Engagement, and Belonging: Immigrants in Europe and the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Castellanos, T. (2009). Santa Clara County Model of Immigrant Integration: Overview of SCC County Programs *Latino Immigrant Civic Engagement Trends Conference*. Washington, D.C.: Mexico Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Collet, C. (2007). The Significance of Madison Nguyen and the Rise of Vietnamese American Politics in San José, California: Analysis and Commentary. *Doshisha American Studies*, 43, 131-150.
- Colwell, M. A. C. (1997). The Potential for Bias When Research on Voluntary Associations is Limited to 501(c)3 Organizations. *Nonprofit Sector Research Fund Working Paper Series*. Washington, D.C. The Aspen Institute.
- Corbin, J. J. (1999). A Study of Factors Influencing the Growth of Nonprofits in Social Services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28, 296-314.
- Cordero-Guzmán, H. (2005). Community-Based Organisations and Migration in New York City. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(5), 889-909.
- Cortés, M. (1998). Counting Latino Nonprofits: A New Strategy for Finding Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(4), 437-458.
- Cortés, M., Díaz, W. A., & Ramos, H. A. J. (1999). A Statistical Profile of Latino Nonprofit Organizations in the United States. In D. Campoamor (Ed.), *Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy* (pp. 17-54). Houston: Arte Público Press.
- Dale, H. P. (1993). On Estimating the Size of the Non-profit Sector in the US Economy. *Voluntas*, 4(2), 183-189.
- de Graauw, E. (2008). Nonprofit Organizations: Agents of Immigrant Political Incorporation in Urban America. In S. K. Ramakrishnan and I. Bloemraad (Ed.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Community Organizations and Political Engagement among Immigrants in the United States and Abroad* (pp. 323-350). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Desai, Mihir A., and Robert J. Yetman. 2005. "Constraining Managers without Owners: Governance of the Not-for-Profit Enterprise." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series* No. 11140. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w11140.pdf>.

- De Vita, C. J., Roeger, K. L., & Niedzwiecki, M. (2009). Measuring Racial-Ethnic Diversity in California's Nonprofit Sector. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2007). 2007 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2007/ois_2007_yearbook.pdf.
- Fox, J. (2005). Unpacking 'Transnational Citizenship'. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 171-201.
- Froelich, K. A., Knoepfle, T. W., & Pollak, T. H. (2000). Financial Measures in Nonprofit Organization Research: Comparing IRS 990 Return and Audited Financial Statement Data. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(2), 232-254.
- Gamm, G., & Putnam, R. D. (1999). The Growth of Voluntary Associations in America, 1840-1940. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29(4), 511-557.
- Gleeson, S., Bloemraad, I., & Ramakrishnan, K. (2006). Latino Civic Organizing in Comparative Perspective: How Individual, Community, and Contextual Determinants Shape Civic and Political Participation, *American Sociological Association Annual Meeting*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- Gleeson, S., Bloemraad, I., & Ramakrishnan, K. (2007). Civic Inequality: Civic and Political Presence among Immigrants in the Silicon Valley, *American Political Science Association Annual Meeting*. Chicago, IL.
- Gleeson, S. (2008). Organizing for Latino Immigrant Labor Rights in Two U.S. Cities: The Case of San Jose and Houston. In S. K. Ramakrishnan & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement* (pp. 107-133). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- González-Rivera, C., Donnell, C., Briones, A., & Werblin, S. (2008). Funding the New Majority: Philanthropic Investment in Minority-Led Nonprofits. Berkeley, CA: The Greenlining Institute.
- Grønbjerg, K. A. (1990). Poverty and Nonprofit Organizational Behavior, Contingencies, and Linkages. *Social Service Review*, 64(208-243).
- Grønbjerg, K. A. (2002). Evaluating Nonprofit Databases. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(11), 1741-1777.
- Grønbjerg, K. A., & Paarlberg, L. (2001). Community Variations in the Size and Scope of the Nonprofit Sector: Theory and Preliminary Findings. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(4), 684-706.
- Grønbjerg, K. A., & Paarlberg, L. (2002). Extent and Nature of Overlap Between Listings of IRS Tax-Exempt Registration and Nonprofit Incorporation - The Case of Indiana. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31, 565-594.
- Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A., & Haller, W. (2003). Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), 1211-1148.
- Hein, J. (1997). Ethnic Organizations and the Welfare State: The Impact of Social Welfare Programs on the Formation of Indochinese Refugee Associations. *Sociological Forum*, 12(2), 279-295.
- Hung, C.-K. R. (2007). Immigrant Nonprofit Organizations in US Metropolitan Areas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(4), 707.
- Huntington, S. (2004). *Who Are We : The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jenkins, J. C. (2006). Nonprofit Organizations and Political Advocacy. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (pp. 307-332). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jiménez, F., García, A. M., & Garcia, R. A. (2007). *Ethnic Community Builders: Mexican Americans in Search of Justice and Power, The Struggle for Citizenship Rights in San José, California*. Plymouth: Alta Mira Press.
- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Jones-Correa, M. (2005). Bringing Outsiders In: Questions of Immigrant Incorporation. In C. Wolbrecht & R. Hero (Eds.), *The Politics of Democratic Inclusion* (pp. 75-101). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Jones-Correa, M. (2007). Fuzzy Distinctions and Blurred Boundaries: Transnational, Immigrant and Ethnic Politics. In R. Espino, D. Leal & K. Meier (Eds.), *Latino Politics: Identity, Mobilization and Representation* (pp. 44-60). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- LaFrance Associates. (2005). *The 2005 Santa Clara County Nonprofit Benchmark Study*. Santa Clara, CA: Community Foundation Silicon Valley and CompassPoint Nonprofit Services.
- Lampkin, L. M., & Boris, E. T. (2002). Nonprofit Organization Data: What We Have and What We Need. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(11), 1675-1715.
- Marwell, N. P. (2007). *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Matthews, Glenna. 2003. *Silicon Valley, Women, and the California Dream: Gender, Class, and Opportunity in the Twentieth Century*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Migration Policy Institute. (2008). Foreign-Born Population and Foreign-Born as a Percentage of the Total Population for the United States: 1850 to 2006 *US Historical Trends*. Washington, D.C.
- National Center for Charitable Statistics. (2008). Nonprofit Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute. <http://nccs.urban.org>
- Ostrower, F. (2007). Nonprofit Governance in the United States: Findings on Performance and Accountability from the First National Representative Study. Washington, D.C. : Urban Institute.
- Park, E. J. W., & Li, W. (2006). Asian Americans in Silicon Valley: High Technology Industrial Development and Community Transformation. In W. Li (Ed.), *The New Asian Immigrant Community: From Urban Enclave to Ethnic Suburb* (pp. 119-133). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Passel, J. S. (2006). Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized Migrant Population in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Pellow, D. N., and L. S. H. Park. 2003. *The Silicon Valley of Dreams: Environmental Injustice, Immigrant Workers, and the High-Tech Global Economy*. New York: NYU Press.
- Pitti, Stephen J. 2002. *The Devil in Silicon Valley: Northern California, Race, and Mexican Americans*: Princeton University Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. K., & Bloemraad, I. (2008a). Introduction: Civic and Political Inequalities. In S. K. Ramakrishnan & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement* (pp. 1-44). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. K., & Bloemraad, I. (2008b). Making Organizations Count: Immigrant Civic Engagement in California Cities. In S. K. Ramakrishnan & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement* (pp. 45-76). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. K., & Viramontes, C. (2006). Civic Inequalities: Immigrant Volunteerism and Community Organizations in California. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Ramakrishnan, S. K., & Lewis, P. G. (2005). *Immigrants and Local Governance: The View From City Hall*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Regional Oral History Office. (2010). *Portuguese in California*. Berkeley: Bancroft Library, University of California-Berkeley. <http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/projects/portuguese/>
- Reiner, T. A. (2003). Tally of Nonprofits. *Administration and Society*, 35(5), 629-637.
- Rivera-Salgado, G., & Rabadán, L. E. (2004). Collective Identity and Organizational Strategies of Indigenous and Mestizo Mexican Migrants. In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.), *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States* (pp. 145-178). San Diego: Center for Us-Mexican Studies.
- Sanguino, L. (2008). Selective Service: Indians, Poles, and Mexicans in Chicago. In S. K. Ramakrishnan & I. Bloemraad (Eds.), *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community*

- Organizations, and Political Engagement* (pp. 244-270). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Saxenian, A. (2007). *The New Argonauts: Regional Advantage in a Global Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Singer, A. (2003). The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways *Immigration, Demographics, Ethnicity, Race*. Washington, D.C.: Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, the Brookings Institution.
- Singer, A., Hardwick, S. W., & Brettell, C. (2008). *Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Skelly, D. F. 1994. "Tax-based Research and Data on Non-profit Organisations." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 4(4):555-568.
- Smith, D. H. (1997a). Grassroots Associations are Important: Some Theory and a Review of the Impact Literature (Vol. 26, pp. 269): ARNOVA.
- Smith, D. H. (1997b). The Rest of the Nonprofit Sector: Grassroots Associations as the Dark Matter Ignored in Prevailing "Flat Earth" Maps of the Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26(2), 114.
- Smith, M.P.. 2007. "The Two Faces of Transnational Citizenship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6):1096-1116.
- Sundeen, R. A., Garcia, C., & Raskoff, S. A. (2009). Ethnicity, Acculturation, and Volunteering to Organizations: A Comparison of African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and Whites. . *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 929-955.
- Toepler, S. (2003). Grassroots Associations Versus Larger Nonprofits: New Evidence from a Community Case Study in Arts and Culture. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(2), 236.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008). Foreign-Born Profiles (STP-159). Washington, D.C.: Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates, Custom Table. *American Factfinder* Retrieved January 21, 2010, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- Valenzuela Jr., A. (2006). *Identifying and Assessing Immigrant-Serving Organizations: Los Angeles and Orange County*. Report prepared for the Rockefeller Foundation.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. (1995). Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89, 271-294.
- Voss, K., & Bloemraad, I. (Eds.). (2011). *Rallying for Immigrant Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wang, T., & Winn, R. C. (2006). Groundswell Meets Groundwork: Recommendations for Building on Immigrant Mobilizations (Special Report): Four Freedoms Fund and Grantmakers Concerned With Immigrants and Refugees.
- Zolniski, Christian. 2006. *Janitors, Street Vendors, and Activists: the Lives of Mexican Immigrants in Silicon Valley*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

TABLES & FIGURES

Table 1: Overview of Silicon Valley Cities and Immigrant-origin Communities

	San Jose	Fremont	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	Mountain View	Milpitas	Cupertino	Total
Total Pop.	898,901	208,455	136,162	109,363	71,153	65,215	56,592	1,545,815
Mexican	246,410	25,265	17,063	15,969	12,532	9,766	1,290	328,295
<i>% of Pop</i>	<i>27.4%</i>	<i>12.1%</i>	<i>12.5%</i>	<i>14.6%</i>	<i>17.6%</i>	<i>15.0%</i>	<i>2.3%</i>	<i>21.2%</i>
Vietnamese	89,371	5,596	4,198	5,249	767	7,562	892	113,635
<i>% of Pop</i>	<i>9.9%</i>	<i>2.7%</i>	<i>3.1%</i>	<i>4.8%</i>	<i>1.1%</i>	<i>11.6%</i>	<i>1.6%</i>	<i>7.4%</i>
Indian	32,709	33,072	16,780	13,046	4,226	7,168	9,903	116,904
<i>% of Pop</i>	<i>3.6%</i>	<i>15.9%</i>	<i>12.3%</i>	<i>11.9%</i>	<i>5.9%</i>	<i>11.0%</i>	<i>17.5%</i>	<i>7.6%</i>
Portuguese	14,977	5,353	1,098	4,115	728	655	568	27,494
<i>% of Pop</i>	<i>1.7%</i>	<i>2.6%</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<i>3.8%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>1.8%</i>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census, 2005-2007 three year average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009)

Note: Figures for each ethnic group are taken from subcategories of the Census tallies for "Hispanic or Latino" (for Mexican), "Race" (for Vietnamese and Indian), and "Ancestry" (for Portuguese).

Table 2: Demographic Underrepresentation:
Official Count of 501(c)3 Organizations in Silicon Valley

	Total Population	Total NCCS Organizations	Immigrant NCCS Organizations	Percent Immigrant Orgs (of total)	Percent Foreign Born in population	Percentage point difference, population and organizations	Percent Non-White in population*
San Jose	898,901	1987	412	20.7%	39.0	18.3	50.7
Fremont	208,455	416	102	24.5%	43.4	18.9	62.3
Sunnyvale	136,162	280	65	23.2%	43.0	19.8	53.3
Santa Clara	109,363	277	52	18.8%	37.9	19.1	53.4
Milpitas	65,215	127	32	25.2%	51.3	26.1	75.1
Mtn. View	71,153	222	46	20.7%	40.0	19.3	42.5
Cupertino	56,592	190	46	24.2%	47.8	23.6	62.6
Total	1,545,841	3499	755	21.6%	40.8	19.2	53.8

Source: National Center for Charitable Statistics (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2008); American Community Survey, U.S. Census, 2005-07 three year average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

* This percentage includes all individuals who do not identify solely as White.

Table 3: Organizational Undercount, by City and Immigrant-origin Group

	Indian			Mexican			Portuguese			Vietnamese			TOTAL		
	NCCS	non-NCCS	% <i>cov- erage</i>	NCCS	non-NCCS	% <i>cov- erage</i>	NCCS	non-NCCS	% <i>cov- erage</i>	NCCS	non-NCCS	% <i>cov- erage</i>	NCCS	non-NCCS	% <i>cov- erage</i>
San Jose	37	16	70%	60	27	69%	8	5	62%	68	39	64%	173	87	67%
Fremont	37	16	70%	3	1	75%	1	3	25%	2	1	67%	43	21	67%
Sunnyvale	11	7	61%	2	5	29%	0	0	-	3	1	75%	16	13	55%
Santa Clara	5	6	45%	2	1	67%	2	6	25%	2	1	67%	11	14	44%
Milpitas	10	5	67%	2	6	25%	0	0	-	2	3	40%	14	14	50%
Mtn. View	6	0	100%	2	13	13%	2	0	100%	1	0	100%	11	13	46%
Cupertino	13	10	57%	0	1	0%	0	0	-	1	2	33%	14	13	52%
Total	119	60	66%	71	54	57%	13	14	48%	79	47	63%	282	175	62%

Source: National Center for Charitable Statistics (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2008); authors' compilation.