

**Collective Influences on the Participation of Immigrants and  
Minorities in American Electoral Politics**

John R. Logan  
Brown University

Jennifer Darrah  
Brown University

Sookhee Oh  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

A previous version of this paper was presented at the 2007 annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society. This research was supported by the Russell Sage Foundation and by the research initiative on Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences at Brown University.

Key words: Political Participation, Race, Registration, Voting, Voter ID, Immigration, Group-Resources

## Abstract

This study uses CPS data from Congressional election years during 1996-2004 to examine racial/ethnic differences in political participation and the role of immigration in shaping those differences. Blacks and whites participate more than Hispanics or Asians, but this disparity is not due to these latter groups' large share of immigrants among eligible voters or to differences in other personal characteristics (such as income, education, and age) that have large effects on participation. This study shows that More attention needs to be given to collective factors, including race and ethnicity, the community context, and electoral policies that promote or obstruct participation. Although voting is a private act by an individual, this individual behavior is strongly influenced by group membership and their social and political environment.

## **Collective Influences on the Participation of Immigrants and Minorities in American Electoral Politics**

Concern about minority groups' access to the ballot box has a long history in the U.S., and the reappearance of large-scale immigration has added new issues of political representation. Immigration has disproportionately increased the number of Hispanics and Asians in the population, and 'immigrant' issues (such as access to public services, border control, and immigrant work opportunities) are now regular features of partisan politics. Because the first and second generation of immigrant Americans have much at stake in these policy questions, it has become more important to understand the role of these newcomers in the electoral process. Immigrants have begun to mobilize and forge political identities, as illustrated by mass demonstrations in the spring of 2006. But there are reasons to expect that they face barriers to full participation due to their race/ethnicity or nativity.

Past studies have emphasized an array of personal background characteristics that influence political participation, such as age, education, and residential stability. These are important in their own right and because they may reinforce or obscure differentials by both race/ethnicity and nativity. On average immigrants are poorer, less educated, younger, and more residentially mobile than persons born in the U.S. If there are group differences in registration and voting, can these be explained by background differences, and are there other conditions – institutional or contextual factors – that enhance or reduce participation? Table 1 provides a starting point for the discussion. These data are taken from a pooled sample of citizens aged 18 and above in the Current Population Survey conducted in the five national election years during 1996-2004 (see details below on the data source and measurement). They show a marked disparity in voting between Hispanics and Asians, on the one hand, and blacks and non-Hispanic whites, on the other, reflecting what some authors call a "turnout gap" (Citrin and Highton 2002). This gap is due mainly to differences in voter registration (10-13 points), with an additional deficit in voting by Hispanic registered voters (5 points less than Asians and 7 points less than blacks and whites). The

influence of nativity in its own right appears to be small except among Asians, for whom immigrants and the second generation children of immigrants are 10-12 points less likely to vote than those in the third and later generations. The opposite effect of nativity is found among Hispanics, with modestly higher voting turnout (due to greater likelihood that registered voters actually vote) among foreign-born citizens than in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3+ generations. What accounts for these patterns?

Table 1 about here

[Table 1. Registration and Voting by Race/Ethnicity and  
Generation in U.S., 1996-2004 (citizens aged 18+)]

### **Theoretical perspectives**

There is a growing body of theory and research on this subject. The predominant view arises from early studies of civic culture that found many indicators of people's resources and connectedness to be strong predictors of voting. These studies found that disparities between racial and ethnic groups are significant even after controlling for such factors, and a more recent literature has identified effects of nativity itself (like those presented above) that do not follow a simple pattern. Our purpose is to bring to bear more recent data on both voter registration and voting and to examine other collective factors that reflect the conditions of immigrant groups' settlement in different parts of the United States. After reviewing the principal individual-level characteristics, we address two types of collective influences, characteristics of the community environment and the institutional context.

### ***Individual Resources and Investments***

The consensus model of electoral participation builds on a theory of utility maximizing behavior. For persons with the resources of time, political experience, information, and knowledge, political participation is rewarding and comes with few costs (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995). There is considerable evidence for this hypothesis from national-level studies based on the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the National Election Study (NES) using indicators such as age, education and income (Verba and Nie 1972; Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Leighley and Nagler 1992). Several studies have found that age (peaking at 70-79) has a strong positive relationship to voter turnout, as people over time

become more attached to parties, candidates and the political process in general (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). Researchers argue that apart from its relationship with income, education imparts useful political or civic skills and a greater likelihood of being politically invested in voting outcomes (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Verba, Schlozman, Brady and Nie 1993).

Involvement in social networks can also stimulate participation by providing access to political information and a sense of collective attachment (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; also Putnam 1995). Marriage, residential stability, having larger family size, and living with children have all been viewed as indicators of social connectedness. Bueker (2006) and Ramakrishnan and Espenshade (2001) show that, among immigrants, being married and living with a spouse are consistently linked with higher voting turnout. People with local roots (homeowners rather than renters, long-time residents rather than newcomers) are more likely to have stable networks of friends and neighbors (Highton 2000; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). Additionally, residential mobility even over a short distance often requires re-registering in the new location (Timpone 1998). Some have argued that women are likely to be more socially connected and hence more politically interested than men (Verba et al 1995). Jones-Correa (2005) posits that immigrant women may be more rooted and involved in U.S. society than immigrant men or even native women (though Bueker 2006 and Lien 1998 cast doubt on this hypothesis).

### ***Immigrant Status***

A component of understanding participation by Asians and Hispanics in particular (because so many are foreign born) is the effect of immigrant status or generation in the U.S. From the perspective of assimilation theory, the most influential general model of immigrant social behavior, individual-level characteristics should be the prime determinants of participation in mainstream society (Alba and Nee 2003). New immigrants can be expected to exhibit low participation due to a combination of low resources and unfamiliarity with their new setting. Cho (1999) goes so far as to posit that all of the observed racial/ethnic differences in voting and registration by racial minorities can be explained by the interaction between English speaking ability and foreign-born status. To the extent that immigrants “assimilate” (economically, culturally, residentially, or linguistically) they should vote at rates no

different from native born Americans with otherwise similar attributes. Hence the key hypothesis is a linear increase in integration and participation from the first to the third generation.

Conforming to this model, Bass and Casper (2001) find that socioeconomic resources, residential stability and duration of U.S. residence jointly explain much of the observed variation in voting and registering. Controlling for background factors like socioeconomic status, some researchers report that foreign-born persons (regardless of time in the U.S.) have persistently lower levels of voting (Cho 1999; DeSipio 1996). But there is also contrary evidence. Lien (2004) concludes that being foreign born does not affect all Asian national origin groups in the same way. Indeed it has been suggested that those who choose to become citizens are an especially motivated, self-selected subset of immigrants who are therefore most likely to participate in the political process (Segal 2002). After controlling for other characteristics, both Barreto et al. (2005) and Pantoja et al. (2001) find that foreign-born, naturalized Latino citizens in California vote *more* than native-born Latinos and others (as in Table 1 above).

Two other studies (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Ramakrishnan 2005) have generalized the finding that generational differences in propensity to vote vary by racial group. Only for Asians is there a linear progression of increasing participation by generation. By contrast, there is a decline by generation among Latinos. And among whites, the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation is more likely to vote than either of the other generations.

### ***Race and Hispanic origin***

There have been many studies comparing white, black, Hispanic and Asian voter participation (Uhlener et al 1989; Leighley 2001; Leighley and Vedlitz 1999; Antunes and Gaitz 1975; Ramakrishnan 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). How do they account for the lower participation by Hispanics and Asians in electoral politics? A first step is to control for compositional differences. For example, Citrin and Highton (2002) find that low state-level Hispanic voting in California can be explained by Hispanics' lower citizenship rate, their relative youth, and their lower socioeconomic status. But studies of Asian electoral participation have been particularly hard-pressed to come up with models that adequately explain why, given their more favorable socioeconomic position and controlling for

citizenship, Asian-Americans still show depressed voting (Uhlener, Cain and Kiewiet 1989; Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995; Citrin and Highton 2002). Uhlener and colleagues speculate that persistently low rates of Asian-American participation could be the result of geographic dispersion within the U.S., cultural factors such as a “community norm to avoid political involvement or the learned attitude that electoral politics are a waste of time,” lack of political leadership, or experience of discrimination in the U.S. (1989, p. 217).

In theory labor unions and civic associations and even political parties could facilitate participation by Hispanic and Asian minorities (Uhlener et al. 1989; Barreto et al. 2005; Wong et al 2005; Leighley and Vedlitz 1999; Pantoja et al. 2001). Cubans provide a classic illustration of the political strength that is believed to flow from well-orchestrated ethnic organizing (Portes and Mozo 1985; Bueker 2005 and 2006). Some authors argue that Spanish-language voting and registration drives motivated immigrant political activity in California in 1996 in response to anti-immigrant or anti-Latino discrimination (Ramakrishnan 2005; Pantoja et al 2001; Barreto et al. 2005; Pantoja and Segura 2003), and this is a hypothesis that we address in this study.

High voting rates among blacks, despite deficits in individual resources, are often attributed to mobilizing institutions and group consciousness (Verba, Nie and Kim 1978; Verba and Nie 1972; Tate 1993; Miller et al 1981; Harris 1994; Uhlener et al 1989; also see Chong and Rogers 2005 for a helpful review of concepts of racial group identification, solidarity and consciousness). These include the black church (Harris 1994), and other mobilizing networks stemming from the civil rights movement. More recently, Bobo and Gilliam (1990) forwarded a hypothesis of “political empowerment,” arguing that voting is encouraged by increased numbers of black elected officials – actors who can promote mobilization, demonstrate its efficacy, and enhance feelings of solidarity and pride.

As a substitute for systematic information on organizational activity, one approach has been to study how attitudes related to group consciousness (Uhlener, Cain and Kiewiet 1989; Lien 1994) or measures of organizational membership (Wong, Lien and Conway 2005) affect political participation –

with mixed results. Another approach, which we follow here, is to introduce measures of the residential and political environment.

### ***Residential and political environment***

We treat two sorts of contextual characteristics: the community environment and local political institutions that may impact participation. Both are aspects of the “context of reception” (Portes and Rumbaut 1990) that different immigrant groups find in the U.S. and that they largely share with U.S. born persons of the same racial/ethnic background.

#### *1. Residential Context*

Several scholars have argued that participation will be greater in communities where minority or immigrant group members are a larger share of the population. This hypothesis is based on the possibility that the community context itself can channel group-relevant information, shape political consciousness, encourage the formation of racial or ethnic group identity, and invite mobilization by outside political actors or elites (Timpone 1998; Cho 1999; Jones-Correa 2001b and 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Bueker 2005; Leighley 2001; Gay 2001). The growing literature on the political implications of majority-minority electoral districts show some evidence that such districts enhance minority turnout – at least in the case of African Americans (Gay 2001; see also Brace et al 1995). Immigrants may face special challenges establishing social networks that promote electoral involvement. Still, they may find themselves more readily welcomed in ethnic or immigrant communities and thus benefit from the ‘ethnic social capital’ inhering in such places. There is weak support for this expectation. Bueker (1995) found that the overall percentage of foreign-born (regardless of ethnicity) population at the MSA level had a small but significant positive relationship to voting. Ramakrishnan and Espenshade (2001) found that ethnic concentration, measured by the state-level ethnic proportion of group members, had a significant positive effect on voting participation only for 3+generation Asian-Americans.

There are also reasons to believe that majority-minority communities tend to isolate residents from the social mainstream and sideline them from the political process. Research on Latino participation (DeSipio 1996; de la Garza 2004) has shown that areas of high Latino ethnic concentration often have

low political mobilization and participation. This may be due to the effect of other features of these communities such as concentrated poverty, high proportions of non-citizens and peers with low English proficiency (Cho 1999; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Bueker 2005). Another recent study, using data from official registration lists in cities with large proportions of four major Asian groups (Asian Indian, Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans), examined the effects on voting of the proportion of each Asian group in the local population at the Census tract level (Cho et al. 2006). Effects varied across groups but were mostly negative.

Cohen and Dawson (1993) tested whether concentrated poverty and social isolation together limit political participation. They found such contextual effects only among African-Americans in extremely high poverty neighborhoods (e.g., over 21% poor).

## *2. Political Context*

The political context may also influence individuals' behavior, facilitating or obstructing participation. The "motor-voter" bill in 1993 created national standards for voter registration. Additionally, beginning in the 1990s, new citizens were offered the opportunity upon naturalization to register to vote (Bass and Casper 2001). Several scholars have examined ways that remaining variations in voting and registration rules could promote or impede voting (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Jones-Correa 2001b; 2005; Timpone 1998; Leighly and Nagler 1992). Jones-Correa (2001) found no significant relationship between voting turnout and the length of the period before an election in which people may register. However, states that more frequently cancel or purge lists of registered voters had lower rates of voting. Using a different data set (the National Election Survey from the 1980s, Timpone (1998) showed that individuals in states with earlier closing dates for registration and in states that purge registration lists more frequently were slightly less likely to be registered. This finding was confirmed with earlier data from the NES (Leighly and Nagler 1992).

Another dimension of political context is provision for absentee voting. Ramakrishnan and Espenshade (2001) and Jones-Correa (2001b) both found that higher restrictions on absentee voting

decrease the probability of voting by registered voters. In places where more people are allowed to mail in ballots, there is increased voter turnout.

Voting rights legislation has been designed to mitigate or remove obstacles to voting by linguistic minorities, but analyses of these provisions have yielded mixed results. Jones-Correa (2005) reported from his analysis of the Current Population Survey (CPS) from 1996 and 2000 that Asians and Hispanics were more likely to vote in states that offer voting and registration materials in the respondents' native languages, and that this was especially true for Hispanics (both immigrants and native-born) while the effect varied among Asian groups. By contrast, Ramaskrishnan and Espenshade (2001), in their analysis of CPS data from 1994, 1996, and 1998, found that minority rights provisions did not significantly impact voting among first generation Latinos.

An additional feature of the political context has become prominent in policy debates: the requirements for voters to show identification prior to voting. Provisions for photo identification are now widely discussed, and came under review by the U.S. Supreme Court during its 2007-2008 session. A recent report by researchers at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, and the Moritz College of Law, Ohio State University (2006) argued that strict voter identification requirements depressed voting turnout in 2004, and that this effect was especially pronounced for minority voters (Eagleton Institute 2006). However another recent study (also using 2004 CPS data) suggested that effects are mixed and small (Muhlhausen and Sikich 2007).

## **Research Design**

This study is based on the Current Population Survey in the years 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004. In these years the November survey included a voting and registration supplement. Its key advantage is that it is nationally representative, in contrast to sources such as the Post/Kaiser/Harvard 1999 Latino Survey, the Thomas Rivera Policy Institute Data, or the PNAAPS that collect data only from selected states. Since the CPS also contains questions that allow identification of the nativity and citizenship status of respondents, it is well-suited for analyses of the registration and voting of immigrants, members of the "second generation," and U.S.-born persons of native parents. When data from all of

these years are pooled together the CPS includes adequate samples of naturalized immigrants for each of four major racial/ethnic categories. Other common sources of political participation data, such as the National Election Survey (NES), contain much smaller samples of foreign-born members of non-white racial groups.

The CPS also includes questions about the residential location of households, which allows examination of contextual effects. The state of residence is provided for all cases. The smallest identifiable geographical unit of residence is the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA/PMSA). For this study, contextual variables constructed from the Census 2000 summary tape files and other sources were merged with CPS data based on state or MSA/PMSA of residence.

Recent changes in the CPS and Census definition of metropolitan boundaries create challenges for consistent construction of metropolitan variables over time. MSAs were redefined by the Office of Management and Budget in 2003, and as a result the definitions used in the 2004 CPS data differ from those used in prior years. To deal with this change, the 2004 MSA definitions have been recoded here in a way that would correspond as closely as possible to the MSA definitions from earlier CPS years, as well as to definitions used in the Census 2000 summary files.

### ***CPS variable definition***

Table 2 provides a summary of variable definitions from all data sources. The key outcome variables are from the CPS and are self reports of voting or being registered for the November election of the year of data collection. The specific question about voting is: “In any election some people are not able to vote because they are sick or busy or have some other reason, and others do not want to vote. Did (you/name) vote in the election held on Tuesday, November \_?” This question is only asked about citizens aged 18 and above. A follow-up question is asked of those who were eligible to vote, but did not report having voted: “(Were you/Was ‘name’) registered to vote in the November \_\_ election?”

Table 2 about here

[Table 2. List of variables included in the analysis]

The wording of these questions is designed to diminish stigma associated with non-voting or non-registration (Bueker 2006, p. 21). Presser, Traugott and Traugott (1990) have shown that the CPS contains less misreporting than other surveys such as the NES. Ramakrishnan (2005, p. 22) validated data for white immigrants in the CPS with comparable data collected from the National Election Survey (NES), and showed that 2<sup>nd</sup> generation whites under-reported their voting in the CPS compared to other generations. Accordingly the effects we find for whites, if anything, *underestimate* the differences between first and second generation whites. Other studies of voting behavior data employing validated data, such as the three-state study conducted by the Thomas Rivera Policy Institute in 1996 (cited by Ramakrishnan 2005), found no significant differences by nativity or generation status in the reliability of self-reported voting.

### ***Independent variables from the CPS***

Race and ethnicity are represented by four broad categories constructed from two different questions posed in the CPS basic survey, the race question and the Hispanic origin question. The race question in the basic CPS allows respondents to select one of five racial categories, with the option to chose 'other' or 'something else'. Specifically, respondents are asked to answer the question "What is your race? Are you White, Black, American Indian, Aleut or Eskimo, Asian or Pacific Islander or something else?" Unlike the 2000 decennial census, respondents were *not* given the option to select multiple race categories except in the 2004 CPS. A separate CPS question about Hispanic origin or descent allows individuals to identify as: Mexican American; Chicano; Mexican; Puerto Rican; Cuban; Central Or South American; other Spanish; All Other; or Don't Know.

We combined data from these two questions to construct four broad race/ethnic categories that structure much of our analysis: non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Asian/Pacific Islander and Hispanic (because of their small number "other" race respondents have been excluded from the sample). If a respondent indicated any category of Hispanic origin they are treated as "Hispanic" regardless of race. Non-Hispanics are categorized as white, black, or Asian/Pacific Islander based on the race question.

Information from the 2004 CPS was recoded to match these categories as closely as possible, in the same way as the 2000 census data (described below).

In these analyses race/ethnicity is treated in conjunction with generation in the U.S. based on information contained in the Basic CPS about birthplace and parental birthplace. Those born outside of the U.S. are considered 1<sup>st</sup> generation. Those born in the U.S. with at least one parent born outside of the U.S. (in a non-U.S. territory) are classified as members of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation. The remaining 3<sup>+</sup> generation cases are individuals born in the U.S. whose parents were also born in the U.S. (or in U.S. territories).

We include several indicators of socioeconomic standing and demographic characteristics (operationalized as a set of dummy variables) deemed important by both the assimilation literature and standard voting behavior literature. Educational attainment, family income, and home ownership are the socioeconomic status indicators. Demographic variables include age, marital status, gender, and residential mobility (years at the current address). (Note that, because education is reported only for persons aged 25 and above, the age categories of 5-15 and 16-24 must be interpreted both as categories of age and as persons without a reported education.) Another variable was constructed from information on household members: the number of children under age 18 living in the household.

The only language measure available in the November CPS is a variable indicating whether a person lives in a household where only Spanish is spoken). We used this household variable as a rough indicator of the English ability of Hispanics.

One potentially relevant variable not used in the analysis is length of residency in the U.S. This variable would only be defined for 1<sup>st</sup> generation persons, and it is logically linked to the residential mobility indicator. Including years in the U.S. would require the inclusion of a combined variable for years, generation, and residential stability; our focus instead will be on the effects of immigrant generation within categories of race and ethnicity.

### *Contextual variables*

We turn to data sources apart from the CPS to investigate the importance of residential context and the political or institutional context. A weakness of the CPS questionnaire is lack of explicit measures of group consciousness or other racial/ethnic or political attitudes. We use contextual variables as indirect measures of other influences on people's choices.

We drew primarily from the Census 2000 data (Summary Files 1 and 3) to capture key information about social context (at the level of the metropolitan region). Racial isolation indices were calculated from tract level summary data from SF1. The Isolation Index measures the racial/ethnic composition of the census tract in which the average group member lives, and specifically the proportion of same-group members in the tract. It is equal to the mean proportion of group members in tracts within an MSA, where each value is weighted by the number of group members in the tract. Race/ethnicity was defined in Census 2000 to allow respondents to choose more than one race category. For our purposes, the categories are defined as: 1) non-Hispanic white (non-Hispanic individuals who only selected "white" alone, and no other racial category); 2) non-Hispanic black (non-Hispanic individuals who selected "black" alone or in combination with any other racial categories; 3) Asian (individuals who selected "Asian" or "Pacific Islander" alone or in combination with any other racial category except for black; 4) Hispanic (individuals who identified as having any Hispanic origin regardless of other racial identification).

A second metropolitan variable is the ratio of the median household income of each racial group in the MSA to the median household income of non-Hispanic whites. These data are derived from Summary File 3, where the household is categorized by the race/ethnicity of the household head. Data for non-Hispanic whites, blacks, and Asian/Pacific Islanders refer to households headed by a person who listed only that race. This is a measure of relative affluence or poverty.

Indicators of the political context are measured at the level of states. Rules about voting and registration can be proxies for the overall openness and accessibility of political institutions in a given

state, and they may play an important role in their own right in shaping political participation (Jones-Correa 2001b; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001).

A key variable of this type is voter identification policy. The question is whether or not a respondent lives in a state requiring prospective voters to show some form of personal identification before casting a ballot. Forms of identification required or requested may include photo or non-photo ID. There also may be variation in policies that govern what a poll worker should do in case a prospective voter does not have an ID. States that do not require or request any form of ID have varying requirements and procedures for verifying the identity of potential voters, including having them state their name, sign their name, or matching a signature with a signature on record with election officials. We draw here mainly on the classification of policies by state from reports published by the Election Reform Information Project conducted in conjunction with Electionline.org and The Constitution Project (2002 and 2006) and the Eagleton Institute and Moritz College of Law (2006), with corrections from a report of the Heritage Center for Data Analysis (Muhlhausen and Sikich 2007). We use information about state level policies in 2000 as indicators of state level policies in 1998 and 1996, since significant legislative and political activity to shift voter ID policies took place only after 2000 (Election Reform Information Project 2006).

The Election Reform Information Project and the Eagleton Institute both utilized five original categories of voter ID policy (though the reports used slightly different classification systems). We collapsed these into a simple dichotomy based only on the maximum requirement: does the state request documentary evidence at the polls of the prospective voter's identification? These categories do not take into account other procedures (sometimes called "minimum requirements") to be employed when voters do not meet "maximum" identification requirements, nor do they account for rules specific to absentee voters, election-day registrants (where allowed), first time voters or those who have registered by mail (see Eagleton and Moritz 2006 for discussion of minimum vs. maximum requirements). They also do not reflect variation in voter identification policies that may exist at local (sub-state) jurisdictions.

Two additional political indicators are drawn from Hansen and the Task Force on the Federal Election System (Hansen 2001): the availability of early voting and the flexibility of absentee voting policies. Tucker and Espino (2006) also provide information about the number of counties within each state that are covered by bilingual voting ballot provisions, as mandated by the Federal Voting Rights Act. We used these data at the state level to construct three categories reflecting the amount of “coverage” by these provisions: 1) no coverage (meaning no counties are required to comply with the bilingual ballot provisions; 2) some coverage (meaning that some counties offer bilingual ballots by law); and 2) full coverage (meaning that all counties offer bilingual ballots by law). One qualification of this variable is that our source does not identify which specific language groups were covered by the requirement. The ballot variable indicates the significant presence of non-English speaking populations and a political-institutional climate formally designed to promote linguistic minority participation.

We also included dummy variables indicating the year of the election to account for the historical particularities of each electoral contest. Presidential election years (1996, 2000 and 2004) are expected to have higher turnout. One additional measure of the impact of group-specific mobilization, or group specific reaction to racial discrimination, is a dummy variable identifying 1996 cases in which the respondent lived in California. California’s Proposition 187 was enacted in 1994 to deny undocumented immigrants’ access to social services, health care, and public education. It has been speculated that anti-immigration legislation would have a mobilizing effect on naturalized citizens in the subsequent 1996 election (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). Hence we include a dummy variable for California 1996..

### ***Analytical Procedures***

We estimated multivariate probit models of voting and registration (with and without selection bias) as well as logit models without correction for selection bias. Each is appropriate for dichotomous outcome variables. Here we report only the logit results. Timpone (1998) has argued that selection is an important consideration because voting is contingent on registration, and he recommends correction for selection bias using a probit model discussed by Dubin and Rivers (1989, available in STATA as Heckprob). In such a model, the selection equation (registration) should contain at least one variable that

is not in the outcome equation (voter turnout). To implement this procedure for the registration model, we included an indicator that is likely only to affect registration (how close in time to an election a person is allowed to register). For the voter turnout model, we added the voting policy variables that indicate states' early voting and liberalized absentee voting policy. (All the personal characteristics shown to be strong predictors of registration are also expected to influence voting, so these were included in both models.)

The estimated correlations (*rho*) between the errors in the registration and voting equations for the Hispanic, Asian, non-Hispanic black, and non-Hispanic white sub-samples are negative. They are also statistically significant, except in the Hispanic model. These correlations imply the counter-intuitive results that, after controlling for measured characteristics, those who *did not* register would have been more likely to vote (had they registered) than those who *did* register. This counter-intuitive result reduces our confidence in the selection model. We then compared the magnitudes and signs of the estimated coefficients in the logit voting turnout equation (estimated only for registered voters) with coefficients in probit models with and without correction for selection bias. We found no significant differences. Therefore we conclude that the logit approach, which has the advantage of easier interpretability of model coefficients, provides a sound basis for analysis in this case.

The analysis is conducted with pooled data from all five years (1996, 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004). Dummy variables indicate the year in which the respondent was interviewed. We select only potential voters: citizens (including both U.S. born and naturalized foreign born) aged 18 and above in the year of the survey. In order to correct for autocorrelation between household members, we then randomly select one person per household (for the group-specific models this is done after selecting by race/ethnicity).

We first present results for a model that combines persons from all racial/ethnic groups (non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Asian and Hispanic). We then present separate models for each race/ethnicity. In all analyses, cases are weighted by the CPS "second stage/final step" weight (PWSSWGT) and then divided by 1,000. This procedure results in weighting cases properly in relation to one another without artificially inflating the overall sample size.

## Results

The overall levels of registration and voting by race/ethnicity and generation were presented in Table 1. We turn now to multivariate analysis to discover 1) whether differences by race/ethnicity persist after introduction of controls, 2) whether there are more consistent effects of generation than shown before, and 3) what other personal and contextual factors affect these outcomes.

Table 3 presents models for registration and for voting (among registered voters only) in which persons of all racial/ethnic categories are pooled together. The model does not include variables that are defined only for specific groups, such as the Spanish language variable or Isolation measures. In the first set of variables, labeled “Group Membership,” non-Hispanic whites in the 3+ generation are taken as the reference category. Separate dummy variables identify 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation whites, as well as blacks, Latinos, and Asians of each generation. Table 4 reorganizes the coefficients to facilitate comparisons of the coefficients by race/ethnicity and generation.

Tables 3-4 about here

[Table 3. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: All Races, 1996-2004]

[Table 4. Model coefficients for group and generation (from Table 3)]

### ***Race/ethnicity and generation***

Net of other factors, are there racial and ethnic differences, and is there a significant difference in political participation across generations? Let us first compare these groups in the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation. With the white 3<sup>rd</sup> generation as the reference category, 3+ generation blacks are substantially and significantly more likely to register and to vote. The coefficients are large, representing odds of both registering and voting that are more than 50% higher than those of whites. 3+ generation Hispanics are moderately but significantly less likely to register and vote than whites. Asians in this generation are much less likely to register (with odds only two thirds as high as whites), although once registered they are equally likely to vote.

Table 3 also provides a direct test of the significance of generational differences among whites. These show a curvilinear relationship: immigrant whites are substantially less likely to register (odds

more than 40% below those of the 3+ generation) or to vote (odds one-sixth lower), while the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation is more likely to register and vote.

Because there is only one reference category for this set of 11 dummy variables, the table does not offer significance tests of other differences between groups, but the direction of differences can be read easily from Table 4. The table reveals a varying hierarchy in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation. For registration in the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation, the highest (or least negative) coefficient is for whites, followed by blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. For registration in the 1<sup>st</sup> generation, blacks and Hispanics have similar coefficients, followed by whites, then Asians. Turning to voting, the ranking is black, white, Hispanic, Asian in the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation, and black, Hispanic, white, Asian in the 1<sup>st</sup> generation.

Table 4 also can be read in terms of generational effects within race/ethnic groups, and the significance of differences is tested in Tables 5-8. Table 5 confirms that the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation is most likely to register and vote among whites, while the 1<sup>st</sup> generation is least likely. Table 6 shows that among blacks the 3+ generation is most likely to register, while the 1<sup>st</sup> generation is least likely. But generational differences in black voting are smaller, and there is no significant difference between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation. Among Asians, too, there is a 3+ generation advantage in registration, and this advantage extends also to voting. Hence while we see an apparent “second generation surge” in participation by whites, the black and Asian pattern is more consistent with the assimilation hypothesis of higher participation in the more established generation. Among Hispanics, there is a similar “assimilation” effect for registration, but evidence of exactly the opposite effect for voting. In contrast to all other groups, it is the 1<sup>st</sup> generation of Hispanics who stand out as most likely to vote.

Tables 5-8 about here

[Table 5. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: non-Hispanic White, 1996-2004

Table 6. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: non-Hispanic Black, 1996-2004

Table 7. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: Asian, 1996-2004

Table 8. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: Hispanic, 1996-2004]

These findings show interaction effects between race/ethnicity and generation that support no simple theoretical model. In most comparisons, apparently whites' overall parity with blacks (seen in Table 1) is due to their advantages in other background characteristics that have been controlled in the multivariate models. All else equal, blacks participate more in terms of both registration and voting than do whites. Asians' higher overall participation than Hispanics is due to the same compositional differences. All else equal, Asians in every generation are less likely to register than Hispanics. If registered, they are less likely to vote except in the 3+ generation. Looked at in another way, no conclusions about generation differences apply to all groups.

### ***Individual-level Resources***

Aside from generation and race/ethnicity, Table 3 shows significant and theoretically important effects of people's resources. Because there are small variations across race/ethnicity, we focus here on the group-specific models in Tables 5-8, but we emphasize that these effects are nearly uniform. As found in previous research, having more resources and indicators of stronger connections to the local community increases the propensity of registering and voting for all groups. There is a uniform relationship between socioeconomic status and registration/voting for all groups. The higher a person's education or income level, the more likely the person is to register and vote. Compared to renters, homeowners are also more likely to register and vote in almost every model (the exception is the model for Asian voting where the coefficient is insignificant).

Older people register and vote at higher rates, as do those who have lived longer in their current place of residence. For the most part, women are more likely to register and vote than men, with some variation (among whites men are more likely to vote and there is no significant difference between Asian men and women in voting). Marriage generally enhances registration and voting (the exception is voting among blacks). However, for all groups (except for Asians in the voting model), having more children in the household depresses registration and voting.

The language variable is only available in the Hispanic model. As expected we find that those who live in Spanish-speaking households are less likely to register; but they are substantially more likely

to vote. Linguistic isolation does not have the depressing effect on voting that is assumed in assimilation theory.

### ***Residential Context***

Because the sample includes people in non-metropolitan areas and we wish to estimate the effects of some metropolitan area characteristics, it is necessary to include a dummy variable for metropolitan status. This variable may also tap overall differences between rural and urban environments. There are some significant differences. Whites and blacks in non-metropolitan areas are more likely to register, and whites in non-metropolitan areas are also more likely to vote. In contrast non-metropolitan Hispanics are less likely to register.

One measure of metropolitan residential context is segregation, indicated by the Isolation Index. Ethnic isolation (living in an area with a higher probability that the respondent has many coethnic neighbors at the census tract level and less exposure to other groups) increases propensity to register for whites, blacks, and Hispanics. For whites and blacks, but not for Hispanics, voter participation also increases in metropolitan regions where they are highly isolated – or in other words, where they are a larger fraction of the population in the tracts where they live. This could be interpreted as a mobilization effect in areas where the group has greater potential political impact. The tables show smaller effects for Asians, slightly negative for registration and slightly positive for voting. In additional analyses, however, we found that even these small effects depend on the outlier of Honolulu. The Asian isolation index for Honolulu is 75.3 (the largest value in the nation, due to the high share of Asians in the population), compared to the mean Asian isolation index value of 19.4 for all other MSAs. After introduction of a control for residence in Hawaii, the isolation index no longer has a significant impact on voting or registering for Asians.

The other measure of residential context is the group's average income in comparison to that of U.S. born non-Hispanic whites in the metropolis. This variable is only included in the black, Hispanic, and Asian models. Controlling for individuals' own socioeconomic status, we expected voting to be depressed in areas where the group's income (as a ratio to whites) is low. This is not the result. Where

Hispanics and blacks are relatively poor, they are both more likely to register, and blacks are more likely to vote. The results we report for Asians also show an effect on registration but this result disappears with the Hawaii control. These results suggest that lower income for the group as a whole can sometimes be a stimulus for minority participation.

### ***Political Context***

Finally we review state-level measures of the political context. These institutional variables have some significant effects on registration and voting, as follows.

Voter ID requirements reduce voter turnout in the pooled model in Table 3, but are positively related to voter registration. A slightly modified pattern is found in group-specific models. For whites the effect of voter ID requirements is positive on registration (increasing odds of registration by about 15%), but negative on voting (reducing odds of voting by about 10%). For blacks and Hispanics, there is no significant impact on registration but again a negative effect on voting (reducing the odds by about 14% and 20%, respectively). For Asians, there is a negative effect on registration (an effect that disappears after controlling for Hawaii), but no effect on voting. For three of the four groups, therefore, voter ID substantially reduces electoral participation.

The availability of bilingual ballots is intended to encourage electoral participation by linguistic minorities, principally Hispanics and Asians. In the pooled sample the effect is positive and significant for registration (for states with partial coverage) but negative for voting (for states fully covered by the provisions). But results again vary by group. For whites the requirement of bilingual ballots in parts of the state or in the entire state increases registration, but slightly depresses voting for states with partial coverage (the effect of statewide ballots is not significant). For blacks all effects are positive and significant. For Hispanics, there is a positive effect of bilingual ballot coverage (full or partial coverage) on registration but a surprising negative impact on voting turnout for states fully covered by the provision. For Asians, the effects (significant only for states with a partial requirement) are negative for voting (and not significant for registration).

Absentee voting policies increase the propensity of both registration and voting in the pooled sample and for most individual groups (with the exception of registration for Hispanics on which it has a negative impact; the significance level of the effect on Asian registration is only .06 and about .08 for voting). Some of these coefficients suggest very large impacts, and strikingly so for Hispanic voting: a 27% boost in odds of voting in the pooled sample, 28% for whites, 11% for blacks, 36% for Hispanics, and 16% for Asians, compounded by increased likelihood of registering. The provision for early voting, however, depresses registration and voting in the pooled sample, as well as for whites and Hispanics. Early voting policies do not depress voting for blacks, and there is no effect for Asians.

The last measure of political context included in the analysis is the dummy variable for 1996 cases in California. This is a special case often cited in the research literature as an instance when the threat of anti-immigrant legislation was likely to mobilize participation by Hispanics and perhaps by Asians. Controlling for all other predictors, the odds of registration are 19% higher in California 1996 for the pooled sample, 26% higher for whites and 23% higher for Hispanics, though not significant for Blacks and Asians. By this indicator, both Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites were highly mobilized by this election. Interestingly, the Hispanic mobilization shows up only for registration and not for turnout; Hispanics showed significantly lower turnouts in this election year (by nearly 25%). For voting there is no effect overall and for whites. By contrast California in 96 saw a substantially increased turnout for blacks and an almost significant increase of the same magnitude for Asians. And apparently the charged atmosphere on immigration policy did elicit interest by other groups. Unlike most other studies of voter behavior that do not separately examine registration and voting, we are able to more clearly pinpoint the group-level responses to this charged political climate.

### **Discussion and conclusion**

This study has examined a very wide range of factors that contribute to variations in political participation. The results confirm that an individual-level resource based model goes a long way toward explaining registration and voting. The news is the importance of collective effects – the interaction of race/ethnicity and generation and the residential and political context where people live. Although

electoral participation is ultimately something that people do in isolation in a voting booth, we have emphasized that it is also a collective act in which these individual behaviors are influenced by the things they have in common.

We organized the analysis in a way that highlights net differences across racial/ethnic groups and also probes for differences across groups in the effects of other predictors. Group differences in participation are important in themselves, and we have shown that all else equal, blacks register and vote at higher rates than whites. Among the largely immigrant groups with lower levels of participation, Hispanics register and vote at higher rates than Asians.

Though there has been speculation that the high share of immigrants in the voting-eligible Hispanic and Asian populations could help to explain their lower political participation, the impact of nativity is not uniform across groups and does not account for the differences between groups in participation. For whites it is the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation that is more involved in electoral politics, for Asians it is the 3+ generation, but in terms of voting it is the immigrant generation that stands out. In this respect the assimilation model, which has proved useful in studying other aspects of social and economic life and which posits a general direction of incorporation across generations, is insufficient. Even language, which is a strong predictor of such outcomes as occupational achievement among immigrants, has mixed effects on Hispanics in this study – living in a Spanish-speaking household reduces the likelihood of registering but increases voting.

The metropolitan setting where people live also affects their political behavior. It would be preferable to have direct measures of organized efforts to mobilize voter turnout, such as voter registration drives or campaigns on specific issues that could stimulate greater participation. We introduced the “California 1996” variable in hopes of tapping such activity, especially among Hispanics. Our results confirm that Hispanic participation was boosted, but only for registration and surprisingly not for voting. More effort is needed to bring measures of organizational activity into analysis of individual political behavior. Still, we found that measures of metropolitan social composition and statewide institutional policies do have significant effects.

Ethnic isolation appears to be mobilizing for whites, blacks, and Hispanics (for registration). For Hispanics and blacks, but not for Asians, participation is enhanced in metropolitan areas where group members are poorer relative to whites. In both of these examples, the pattern contradicts the assimilation perspective (that voting should be seen as an aspect of becoming closer to mainstream society). Rather, it is the strength of group boundaries that appears to promote participation. Again there are exceptions, in this case the lack of an effect for Asians.

State voting rules have independent effects on turnout, an important finding because these are amenable to change. Voter ID is associated with lower voting turnout by blacks and Hispanics (the negative effect for whites is counterbalanced by increase in registration). The requirement of bilingual ballots in some states, or parts of states, turns out to have only a negative effect for Hispanics and Asians, though it enhances black political participation. Provisions for early voting unexpectedly depress registration and voting (except for Asians). Liberal absentee voting policies, however, stimulate higher registration and voting for all groups. From a current policy perspective the finding regarding voter ID is the most salient, because some states have recently introduced new identification requirements and others are considering it. The evidence here suggests that this policy will depress black and Hispanic participation in electoral politics.

Besides emphasizing collective factors, this study has revealed differences across groups in how these factors operate. The prime example is the case of Asians, for whom several factors that affect other groups are not significant or have significant effects in the opposite direction. It is natural to find variations in coefficient estimates when many predictors are introduced in models for four different groups. We suspect, however, that there are real differences here that remain to be explained. The challenge for researchers (from this study as well as many prior studies that allow group differences to be revealed) is not to find the theoretical model that applies to all situations but to understand the specific circumstances of each group's arrival and incorporation into American society.

## References

- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Antunes, George, and Charles M. Gaitz. 1975. "Ethnicity and Participation: A Study of Mexican-Americans, Blacks, and Whites." *The American Journal of Sociology* 80(5):1192.
- Barreto, M. A., R. Ramirez, and N. D. Woods. 2005. "Are naturalized voters driving the California Latino electorate? Measuring the effect of IRCA citizens on Latino voting." *Social Science Quarterly* 86(4):792-811.
- Bass, L. E., and L. M. Casper. 2001a. "Differences in registering and voting between native-born and naturalized Americans." *Population Research and Policy Review* 20(6):483-511.
- . 2001b. "Impacting the political landscape: Who registers and votes among naturalized Americans?" *Political Behavior* 23(2):103-130.
- Bobo, L., and F. D. Gilliam. 1990. "Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84(2):377-393.
- Brace, K., L. Handley, R. G. Niemi, and H. W. Stanley. 1995. "Minority Turnout and the Creation of Majority-Minority Districts." *American Politics Quarterly* 23(2):190-203.
- Bueker, C. S. 2005. "Political incorporation among immigrants from ten areas of origin: The persistence of source country effects." *International Migration Review* 39(1):103-140.
- Bueker, Catherine Simpson. 2003. "The Personal is Political: The Relationship Between Marital Status and Immigrant Political Incorporation " in *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association*.
- . 2006. *From Immigrant to Naturalized Citizen*. LFB Scholarly Pub. LLC.
- Cho, W. K. T. 1999. "Naturalization, socialization, participation: Immigrants and (non-) voting." *Journal Of Politics* 61(4):1140-1155.
- Cho, W. K. T., J. G. Gimpel, and J. J. Dyck. 2006. "Residential concentration, political socialization, and voter turnout." *Journal of Politics* 68(1):156-167.

- Chong, D., and R. Rogers. 2005. "Racial solidarity and political participation." *Political Behavior* 27(4):347-374.
- Citrin, Jack, and Benjamin Highton. 2002. "How Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration Shape the California Electorate." edited by Public Policy Institute of California. Public Policy Institute of California.
- de la Garza, R. O. 2004. "Latino politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7:91-123.
- de la Garza, R. O., and J. Cortina. 2007. "Are Latinos Republicans but just don't know it? The Latino vote in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections." *American Politics Research* 35(2):202-223.
- DeSipio, L. 1996. "Making citizens or good citizens? Naturalization as a predictor of organizational and electoral behavior among Latino immigrants." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(2):194-213.
- Dubin, J. A., and D. Rivers. 1989. "SELECTION BIAS IN LINEAR-REGRESSION, LOGIT AND PROBIT MODELS." *Sociological Methods & Research* 18(2-3):360-390.
- The Eagleton Institute of Politics and Moritz College of Law. 2006. "Report to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission on Best Practices to Improve Voter Identification Requirements Pursuant to the Help America Vote Act of 2002 Public Law 107-252." The State University of New Jersey and The Ohio State University. Accessed March 2007.
- The Election Reform Information Project and The Constitution Project ("Electionline.org"). 2002. "Election Reform Briefing: Voter Identification." Washington DC.  
<http://www.electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/Voter%20Identification.pdf>. Accessed April 2007.
- The Election Reform Information Project ("Electionline.org"). 2006. "Election Reform: What's Changed, What Hasn't and Why, 2000-2006." Washington DC.  
<http://www.electionline.org/Portals/1/Publications/2006.annual.report.Final.pdf>. Accessed October 2007.
- Freedom House. 2005. "Freedom House Index (Table of Independent Countries)."  
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=25&year=2005>. Accessed September 2006.

- Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Minority Districts and Minority Representation on Political Participation in California." edited by Public Policy Institute of California. Public Policy Institute of California.
- Geys, B. 2006. "Explaining voter turnout: A review of aggregate-level research." *Electoral Studies* 25(4):637-663.
- Gimpel, J. G., J. J. Dyck, and D. R. Shaw. 2004. "Registrants, voters, and turnout variability across neighborhoods." *Political Behavior* 26(4):343-375.
- Hansen, J.M. 2001. "Early Voting, Unrestricted Absentee Voting, and Voting by Mail" Task Force on the Federal Election System.
- Harris, F. C. 1994. "Something within - religion as a mobilizer of African-American political activism." *Journal of Politics* 56(1):42-68.
- Harris, F. C., V. Sinclair-Chapman, and B. D. McKenzie. 2005. "Macrodynamics of black political participation in the post-civil rights era." *Journal of Politics* 67(4):1143-1163.
- Highton, B. 2000. "Residential mobility, community mobility, and electoral participation." *Political Behavior* 22(2):109-120.
- Hutchings, V. L., and N. A. Valentino. 2004. "The centrality of race in American politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7:383-408.
- Jones-Correa, M. 1998. "Different paths: Gender, immigration and political participation." *International Migration Review* 32(2):326-349.
- . 2001a. "Under two flags: Dual nationality in Latin America and its consequences for naturalization in the United States." *International Migration Review* 35(4):997-1029.
- . 2005. "Language provisions under the Voting Rights Act: How effective are they?" *Social Science Quarterly* 86(3):549-564.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 2001b. "Institutional and Contextual Factors in Immigrant Naturalization and Voting." *Citizenship Studies* 5(1):41-56.

- Leighley, J. E., and J. Nagler. 1992. Individual and systemic influences on turnout - Who votes 1984." *Journal of Politics* 54(3):718-740.
- Leighley, J. E., and A. Vedlitz. 1999. "Race, ethnicity and political participation: Competing models and contrasting explanations." *Journal of Politics* 61(4):1092-1114.
- Leighley, Jan. 2001. *Strength in Numbers*. Princeton University Press.
- Lien, P. 1994. "Ethnicity and Political Participation: A Comparison between Asian and Mexican Americans" *Political Behavior* 16(2):237-264.
- . 2004. "Asian Americans and voting participation: Comparing racial and ethnic differences in recent US elections." *International Migration Review* 38(2):493-517.
- Lien, P. T. 1998. "Does the gender gap in political attitudes and behavior vary across racial groups?" *Political Research Quarterly* 51(4):869-894.
- Muhlhausen, David B. and Keri Weber Sikich. 2007. "New Analysis Shows Voter Identification Laws Do Not Reduce Turnout." *A Report of the Heritage Center for Data Analysis*.  
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/LegalIssues/cda07-04.cfm>. Accessed October 2007.
- Pantoja, A. D., R. Ramirez, and G. M. Segura. 2001. "Citizens by choice, voters by necessity: Patterns in political mobilization by naturalized Latinos." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(4):729-750.
- Pantoja, A. D., and G. M. Segura. 2003a. "Does ethnicity matter? Descriptive representation in legislatures and political alienation among Latinos." *Social Science Quarterly* 84(2):441-460.
- . 2003b. "Fear and loathing in California: Contextual threat and political sophistication among Latino voters." *Political Behavior* 25(3):265-286.
- Portes, A., and R. Mozo. 1985. "The political adaptation process of Cubans and other ethnic-minorities in the United States: a preliminary analysis." *International Migration Review* 19(1):35-63.
- Portes, A. and R.G. Rumbaut. 1990 *Immigrant America : A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Presser, Stanley, Michael W. Traugott, and Santa Traugott. 1990. "Vote 'Over' Reporting in Surveys: The Records or the Respondents." *Technical Report No. 39*, National Election Study.  
[www.umich.edu/~nes](http://www.umich.edu/~nes).
- Putnam, Robert D. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *PS* 28: 664-83.
- Ramakrishnan, S. K., and T. J. Espenshade. 2001. "Immigrant incorporation and political participation in the United States." *International Migration Review* 35(3):870-909.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick. 2005. *Democracy in immigrant America :changing demographics and political participation*. Stanford University Press.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993 *Mobilization, participation, and democracy in America* Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Segal, Adam. 2002. "Records Broken: Spanish-language Television Advertising in the 2002 Election. ." in *Hispanic Voter Project*. John Hopkins University.
- Segura, G. M., and H. A. Rodrigues. 2006. "Comparative ethnic politics in the United States: Beyond black and white." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9:375-395.
- Stokes-Brown, A. K. 2006. "Racial identity and Latino vote choice." *American Politics Research* 34(5):627-652.
- Timpone, R. J. 1998. "Structure, behavior, and voter turnout in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 92(1):145-158.
- Uhlener, Carole J. , Bruce E. Cain, and D. Roderick Kiewiet. 1989. "Political participation of ethnic minorities in the 1980s." *Political Behavior* 11(3):195-231.
- Verba, S., K. L. Schlozman, H. Brady, and N. H. Nie. 1993. "Race, Ethnicity and Political Resources - Participation in The United-States." *British Journal Of Political Science* 23:453-497.
- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: political democracy and social equality*. Harper & Row.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.

Wattenberg, Martin P. 2002. *Where have all the voters gone?* Harvard University Press.

Wolfinger, Raymond, and Steven J. Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?* Yale University Press.

Wong, J. S., P. T. Lien, and M. M. Conway. 2005. "Group-based resources and political participation among Asian Americans." *American Politics Research* 33(4):545-576.

**Table 1. Registration and Voting by Race/Ethnicity and Generation in U.S., 1996-2004 (citizens aged 18+)**

	<b>% Registered</b>	<b>% of registered who voted</b>	<b>Net % who voted</b>	<b>Weighted N</b>
<b>Hispanic</b>				
All	66	71	47	34,781
Foreign Born	65	78	51	7,745
2nd generation	66	71	47	8,765
3+ generation	66	68	45	18,271
<b>Asian</b>				
All	66	76	50	12,534
Foreign Born	62	76	47	6,745
2nd generation	67	73	49	2,713
3+ generation	72	82	59	3,077
<b>Non-Hispanic Black</b>				
All	76	78	59	57,897
Foreign Born	71	80	57	1,815
2nd generation	69	77	53	1,226
3+ generation	77	77	59	54,858
<b>Non-Hispanic White</b>				
All	79	78	62	369,383
Foreign Born	75	80	60	8,726
2nd generation	84	83	70	31,654
3+ generation	78	78	61	329,002

Source: Current Population Survey 1996-2004

(N) reported here is total count of those who responded to voting turnout question.

**Table 2. List of variables included in the analysis**

Variable	Variable Values	Data Source
Voting	1=vote 0=did not vote	CPS voting and registration supplement
Registration	1=registered 0=not-registered	CPS voting and registration supplement
Generation status/years in U.S.	<i>Categorical</i> ref=1st generation 2nd generation (one or both parents are foreign born) 3+ generation (native born of native parents)	CPS Basic
Age	ref=age 55+ age 18-24 age 25-40 age 41-55	CPS Basic
Educational Attainment (only for those over 25 years of age)	Ref=more than Bachelor's (i.e. graduate or professional degree)—dummy variable left out of equation	CPS Basic
<i>Less than High School</i>	1=Less than H.S. over 25yrs 0=all else	CPS Basic
<i>High School or equivalent graduate</i>	1=High school 0=all else	
<i>Some college (or Associate Degree)</i>	1=Some college 0=all else	
<i>Bachelor's Degree</i>	1=Bachelor's degree 0=all else	
Total Family Income	ref=less than \$14,999 \$15,000-39,999 \$40,000-74,999 \$75,000 + don't know income	CPS Basic
Home Ownership	1=homeowner 0=tenant/renter	CPS Basic
Spanish Only Household**	1=all HH members speak only Spanish 0=not all members of household only speak Spanish	CPS Basic
Gender	1=male 0=female	CPS Basic
Marital Status	1=married (spouse present or absent—includes married but separated) 0=not married (including never married, divorced, widowed)	CPS Basic

Residential mobility	ref=less than 1 yr at address 1-2 yrs at address 3-4 yrs at address 5+yrs at address don't know yrs at address	CPS voting and registration supplement
Number of Children in Household		CPS Basic
Isolation index of racial group in MSA*	total children<=18 in HH <i>Continuous</i> Isolation index* (0-100) “The average member of racial group lives in a tract that is <i>i</i> % of the same racial group”	Census 2000 Summary File 1
Ratio median income of racial group in MSA relative to all whites *	<i>Continuous</i> ratio of group’s median HH income to whites*	Census 2000 Summary File 3
Metropolitan/non-Metropolitan	1=not metro or not identified 0=metro	CPS Basic
Voter Identification	1=voter id policy required 0=no voter id policy required	The Election Reform Information Project, Electionline.org, and The Constitution Project (2002); Eagleton Institute and Moritz College of Law (2006)
Bilingual Ballot Provisions in state of residence	ref=bilingual ballot—no state coverage bilingual ballot—partial state coverage bilingual ballot—statewide coverage	Hansen/Task force on Federal Election System
Absentee voting policy in state of residence	1=absentee policies 0=no absentee voting policy	Hansen/Task force on Federal Election System
Registration policy in state of residence	1=early vote policies 0=no early voting policy	Hansen/Task force on Federal Election System

\*These variables are race-specific.  
\*\*Only included in analysis of Hispanics.

**Table 3. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: All Races, 1996-2004**

		Registration				Voting			
		B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)
<b>Group Membership: Race and Immigration</b>									
Generation and Race	3+ generation White (ref)								
	1st generation White	-0.578	***	0.027	0.561	-0.180	***	0.035	0.835
	2nd generation White	0.141	***	0.017	1.152	0.136	***	0.019	1.146
	1st generation Black	-0.355	***	0.057	0.701	0.308	***	0.078	1.361
	2nd generation Black	-0.066		0.067	0.936	0.436	***	0.091	1.547
	3rd generation Black	0.445	***	0.012	1.560	0.418	***	0.015	1.518
	1st generation Asian	-1.173	***	0.029	0.309	-0.498	***	0.040	0.608
	2nd generation Asian	-0.592	***	0.046	0.553	-0.350	***	0.059	0.705
	3rd generation Asian	-0.421	***	0.044	0.656	-0.045		0.061	0.956
	1st generation Hispanic	-0.374	***	0.027	0.688	0.271	***	0.039	1.311
	2nd generation Hispanic	-0.208	***	0.026	0.812	-0.133	***	0.033	0.875
	3rd generation Hispanic	-0.106	***	0.018	0.900	-0.118	***	0.023	0.889
<b>Individual-level Resources</b>									
Sex	Male	-0.201	***	0.008	0.818	-0.014		0.009	0.986
Marital Status	Married	0.261	***	0.009	1.298	0.218	***	0.010	1.244
Age	Age 55+ (ref)		***				***		
	Age 18-24	-2.448	***	0.025	0.086	-1.941	***	0.026	0.144
	Age 25-40	-0.858	***	0.012	0.424	-0.954	***	0.014	0.385
	Age 41-55	-0.617	***	0.012	0.539	-0.540	***	0.013	0.583
Education	More than BA (ref)								
	Less than high school and age 25 over	-2.156	***	0.023	0.116	-1.599	***	0.023	0.202
	High school	-1.542	***	0.022	0.214	-1.038	***	0.020	0.354
	Some college	-0.885	***	0.022	0.413	-0.617	***	0.021	0.540
	BA	-0.344	***	0.023	0.709	-0.244	***	0.022	0.784
Family Income	Less than \$14,999 (ref)		***				***		
	\$15,000-39,999	0.139	***	0.011	1.149	0.220	***	0.014	1.246
	\$40,000-74,999	0.319	***	0.013	1.376	0.361	***	0.016	1.434
	\$75,000 +	0.522	***	0.016	1.686	0.461	***	0.019	1.586
	Don't know income	0.145	***	0.014	1.156	0.279	***	0.017	1.322
Homeowner	Owner	0.276	***	0.009	1.318	0.204	***	0.012	1.227
Residential Mobility	Less than 1 yr at address (ref)		***				***		
	1-2 years at address	0.202	***	0.012	1.224	0.297	***	0.015	1.346
	3-4 years at address	0.448	***	0.013	1.565	0.444	***	0.016	1.558
	5+ years at address	0.778	***	0.011	2.178	0.587	***	0.014	1.798
	Don't know years at address	0.393	***	0.039	1.481	0.394	***	0.050	1.483
Number of Children	Total children<=age 18	-0.044	***	0.004	0.957	-0.040	***	0.005	0.961
<b>Policy Context</b>									
Bilingual Ballot	In state with no bilingual ballot (ref)		***				***		
	In state with partial bilingual ballot coverage	0.063	***	0.009	1.066	-0.016		0.011	0.984
	In state with full bilingual ballot coverage	0.018		0.012	1.018	-0.079	***	0.015	0.924
Absentee policy		0.041	***	0.009	1.042	0.239	***	0.010	1.270
Early vote policy		-0.063	***	0.009	0.939	-0.054	***	0.011	0.948
Voter ID policy		0.103	***	0.009	1.108	-0.123	***	0.010	0.884
Election year	2000 (ref)						***		

	1996		-0.012		0.012	0.988	-0.217	***	0.016	0.805
	1998		-0.255	***	0.012	0.775	-1.147	***	0.014	0.318
	2002		-0.239	***	0.012	0.787	-1.116	***	0.014	0.328
	2004		0.187	***	0.012	1.206	0.246	***	0.016	1.279
	California in 1996		0.174	***	0.030	1.190	-0.026		0.039	0.975
<b>Residential Context</b>										
Metropolitan Status	Metropolitan (ref)									
	Non MSA or not identified		0.036	***	0.009	1.036	-0.083	***	0.011	0.921
	No match MSA		-0.041		0.038	0.960	-0.103	*	0.049	0.903
Constant	Constant		2.153	***	0.028	8.610	2.221	***	0.030	9.221
N (weighted)										
Model Statistics	Model Chi-Square		66973.4	***			45170.2	***		
	Goodness of fit		684.6	***			34.0	***		

Notes: a. (ref) means a reference category.

b. Education variables apply only to those who are age 25 and over.

Source: Current Population Survey (1996-2004)

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

**Table 4. Model coefficients for group and generation (from Table 3)**

	1 <sup>st</sup> generation	2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	3+ generation
Registration			
White	-0.578***	0.141***	a
Black	-0.355***	-0.066	0.445***
Hispanic	-0.374***	-0.208***	-0.106**
Asian	-1.173***	-0.592***	-0.421***
Voting			
White	-0.180***	0.136***	a
Black	0.308***	0.436***	0.418***
Hispanic	0.271***	-0.133**	-0.118***
Asian	-0.498***	-0.350**	-0.045

<sup>a</sup> Reference category

**Table 5. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: non-Hispanic White, 1996-2004**

		Registration			Voting				
		B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)
<b>Group Membership: Race and Immigration</b>									
Generation	3+ generation (ref)								
	1st generation	-0.556	***	0.028	0.574	-0.160	***	0.035	0.852
	2nd generation	0.153	***	0.017	1.166	0.153	***	0.019	1.166
<b>Individual-level Resources</b>									
Sex	Male	-0.159	***	0.009	0.853	0.025	*	0.010	1.025
Marital Status	Married	0.318	***	0.010	1.374	0.267	***	0.012	1.306
Age	Age 55+ (ref)		***				***		
	Age 18-24	-2.468	***	0.028	0.085	-1.984	***	0.029	0.138
	Age 25-40	-0.929	***	0.014	0.395	-1.029	***	0.016	0.358
	Age 41-55	-0.668	***	0.014	0.513	-0.589	***	0.015	0.555
Education	More than BA (ref)		***						
	Less than high school and age 25 over	-2.337	***	0.027	0.097	-1.739	***	0.026	0.176
	High school	-1.614	***	0.025	0.199	-1.093	***	0.022	0.335
	Some college	-0.929	***	0.025	0.395	-0.646	***	0.023	0.524
	BA	-0.349	***	0.027	0.705	-0.257	***	0.024	0.773
Family Income	Less than \$14,999 (ref)		***				***		
	\$15,000-39,999	0.161	***	0.013	1.174	0.227	***	0.016	1.254
	\$40,000-74,999	0.357	***	0.015	1.429	0.369	***	0.019	1.446
	\$75,000 +	0.547	***	0.019	1.728	0.450	***	0.021	1.568
	Don't know income	0.203	***	0.017	1.225	0.280	***	0.020	1.323
Homeowner	Owner	0.294	***	0.011	1.342	0.190	***	0.013	1.210
Residential Mobility	Less than 1 yr at address (ref)		***				***		
	1-2 years at address	0.211	***	0.014	1.235	0.330	***	0.018	1.391
	3-4 years at address	0.445	***	0.016	1.560	0.436	***	0.019	1.546
	5+ years at address	0.805	***	0.013	2.236	0.588	***	0.017	1.800
	Don't know years at address	0.374	***	0.047	1.453	0.285	***	0.059	1.330
Number of Children	Total children<=age 18	-0.054	***	0.005	0.947	-0.031	***	0.006	0.969
<b>Policy Context</b>									
Bilingual Ballot	In state with no bilingual ballot (ref)		***				*		
	In state with partial bilingual ballot coverage	0.043	***	0.010	1.044	-0.033	**	0.012	0.968
	In state with full bilingual ballot coverage	0.039	*	0.018	1.039	-0.023		0.020	0.977
Absentee policy		0.078	***	0.010	1.081	0.249	***	0.011	1.283
Early vote policy		-0.059	***	0.011	0.942	-0.041	***	0.012	0.959
Voter ID policy		0.138	***	0.010	1.148	-0.108	***	0.012	0.898
Election year	2000 (ref)								
	1996	0.000		0.014	1.000	-0.217	***	0.018	0.805
	1998	-0.242	***	0.014	0.785	-1.177	***	0.016	0.308
	2002	-0.228	***	0.014	0.796	-1.130	***	0.016	0.323
	2004	0.186	***	0.015	1.204	0.261	***	0.019	1.298
	California in 1996	0.233	***	0.039	1.263	-0.003		0.048	0.997
<b>Residential Context</b>									
Isolation Index		0.004	***	0.001	1.004	0.003	***	0.001	1.003
Metropolitan Status	Metropolitan (ref)								
	Non MSA or not identified	0.414	***	0.053	1.513	0.178	**	0.060	1.195

	No match MSA	0.281	***	0.067	1.324	0.026		0.080	1.027
Constant		1.779	***	0.061	5.925	2.024	***	0.068	7.568
N (weighted)									
Model Statistics	Model Chi-Square	52075.4	***			35944.5	***		
	Goodness of fit	451.9	***			42.7	***		

Notes: a. (ref) means a reference category.

b. Education variables apply only to those who are age 25 and over.

Source: Current Population Survey (1996-2004)

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

**Table 6. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: non-Hispanic Black, 1996-2004**

		Registration			Voting				
		B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)
<b>Group Membership: Race and Immigration</b>									
Generation	3+ generation (ref)								
	1st generation	-0.754	***	0.059	0.471	-0.157	*	0.080	0.855
	2nd generation	-0.408	***	0.069	0.665	0.022		0.094	1.023
<b>Individual-level Resources</b>									
Sex	Male	-0.420	***	0.022	0.657	-0.204	***	0.027	0.815
Marital Status	Married	0.080	**	0.025	1.083	0.016		0.029	1.016
Age	Age 55+ (ref)		***				***		
	Age 18-24	-2.459	***	0.096	0.086	-1.665	***	0.092	0.189
	Age 25-40	-0.630	***	0.037	0.533	-0.630	***	0.042	0.533
	Age 41-55	-0.460	***	0.035	0.631	-0.302	***	0.040	0.740
Education	More than BA (ref)								
	Less than high school and age 25 over	-1.795	***	0.091	0.166	-1.266	***	0.085	0.282
	High school	-1.433	***	0.089	0.239	-0.816	***	0.081	0.442
	Some college	-0.833	***	0.090	0.435	-0.454	***	0.081	0.635
	BA	-0.264	**	0.097	0.768	0.018		0.089	1.018
Family Income	Less than \$14,999 (ref)		***				***		
	\$15,000-39,999	0.161	***	0.027	1.175	0.290	***	0.033	1.337
	\$40,000-74,999	0.248	***	0.037	1.282	0.391	***	0.044	1.479
	\$75,000 +	0.562	***	0.062	1.753	0.752	***	0.071	2.121
	Don't know income	0.057		0.035	1.059	0.275	***	0.043	1.316
Homeowner	Owner	0.284	***	0.026	1.329	0.329	***	0.030	1.390
Residential Mobility	Less than 1 yr at address (ref)		***				***		
	1-2 years at address	0.230	***	0.030	1.258	0.214	***	0.038	1.238
	3-4 years at address	0.501	***	0.035	1.650	0.471	***	0.043	1.601
	5+ years at address	0.695	***	0.031	2.005	0.590	***	0.038	1.803
	Don't know years at address	0.368	***	0.093	1.445	0.688	***	0.123	1.990
Number of Children	Total children<=age 18	-0.040	***	0.009	0.961	-0.054	***	0.011	0.948
<b>Policy Context</b>									
Bilingual Ballot	In state with no bilingual ballot (ref)		***				***		
	In state with partial bilingual ballot coverage	0.192	***	0.025	1.212	0.160	***	0.030	1.173
	In state with full bilingual ballot coverage	0.399	***	0.039	1.491	0.180	***	0.046	1.197
Absentee policy		0.061	*	0.029	1.063	0.104	**	0.035	1.110
Early vote policy		-0.092	***	0.027	0.912	-0.047		0.033	0.954
Voter ID policy		0.038		0.025	1.039	-0.137	***	0.029	0.872
Election year	2000 (ref)						***		
	1996	-0.108	**	0.034	0.898	-0.286	***	0.043	0.751
	1998	-0.363	***	0.033	0.696	-1.045	***	0.040	0.352
	2002	-0.292	***	0.033	0.747	-1.026	***	0.040	0.358
	2004	0.239	***	0.035	1.270	0.286	***	0.045	1.332
	California in 1996	0.017		0.101	1.018	0.271	*	0.137	1.311
<b>Residential Context</b>									
Isolation Index		0.015	***	0.001	1.015	0.012	***	0.001	1.012
Income ratio		-0.754	***	0.166	0.471	-0.471	*	0.207	0.624
Metropolitan Status	Metropolitan (ref)								

	Non MSA or not identified	0.264	*	0.134	1.302	0.091		0.166	1.095
	No match MSA	0.532	**	0.187	1.702	0.593	*	0.235	1.810
Constant		2.178	***	0.166	8.828	1.842	***	0.192	6.310
N (weighted)									
Model Statistics	Model Chi-Square	7314.1	***			5541.0	***		
	Goodness of fit	37.4	***			32.6	***		

Notes: a. (ref) means a reference category.

b. Education variables apply only to those who are age 25 and over.

Source: Current Population Survey (1996-2004)

\* p< .05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

**Table 7. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: Asian, 1996-2004**

		Registration			Voting				
		B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)
<b>Group Membership: Race and Immigration</b>									
Generation	3+ generation (ref)								
	1st generation	-0.633	***	0.056	0.531	-0.315	***	0.079	0.730
	2nd generation	-0.179	**	0.064	0.836	-0.206	*	0.088	0.814
<b>Individual-level Resources</b>									
Sex	Male	-0.135	***	0.041	0.874	-0.045		0.058	0.956
Marital Status	Married	0.211	***	0.048	1.235	0.152	*	0.071	1.164
Age	Age 55+ (ref)		***				***		
	Age 18-24	-1.804	***	0.104	0.165	-1.388	***	0.145	0.250
	Age 25-40	-0.619	***	0.067	0.538	-0.871	***	0.098	0.418
	Age 41-55	-0.471	***	0.064	0.625	-0.497	***	0.094	0.608
Education	More than BA (ref)						***		
	Less than high school and age 25 over	-1.817	***	0.097	0.163	-0.540	***	0.149	0.583
	High school	-1.222	***	0.081	0.295	-0.578	***	0.108	0.561
	Some college	-0.768	***	0.081	0.464	-0.247	*	0.104	0.781
	BA	-0.427	***	0.077	0.653	-0.257	**	0.093	0.773
Family Income	Less than \$14,999 (ref)		***				***		
	\$15,000-39,999	-0.016		0.071	0.984	-0.143		0.110	0.867
	\$40,000-74,999	0.114		0.076	1.121	-0.009		0.116	0.991
	\$75,000 +	0.372	***	0.083	1.450	0.351	**	0.126	1.420
	Don't know income	-0.222	**	0.085	0.801	0.050		0.136	1.051
Homeowner	Owner	0.147	**	0.051	1.158	0.022		0.075	1.023
Residential Mobility	Less than 1 yr at address (ref)		***				***		
	1-2 years at address	-0.015		0.066	0.985	0.236	*	0.093	1.266
	3-4 years at address	0.269	***	0.072	1.308	0.571	***	0.102	1.770
	5+ years at address	0.442	***	0.063	1.556	0.615	***	0.088	1.850
	Don't know years at address	0.654	***	0.177	1.923	1.063	***	0.286	2.896
Number of Children	Total children<=age 18	-0.048	*	0.020	0.954	0.027		0.030	1.027
<b>Policy Context</b>									
Bilingual Ballot	In state with no bilingual ballot (ref)						**		
	In state with partial bilingual ballot coverage	-0.047		0.071	0.954	-0.295	**	0.099	0.745
	In state with full bilingual ballot coverage	-0.059		0.070	0.943	-0.151		0.099	0.860
Absentee policy		0.060		0.057	1.062	0.149		0.080	1.161
Early vote policy		0.058		0.055	1.060	0.108		0.078	1.113
Voter ID policy		-0.146	*	0.064	0.865	0.009		0.089	1.009
Election year	2000 (ref)								
	1996	-0.049		0.084	0.952	-0.149		0.121	0.861
	1998	-0.379	***	0.069	0.685	-0.998	***	0.099	0.369
	2002	-0.304	***	0.067	0.738	-1.148	***	0.095	0.317
	2004	0.111		0.063	1.117	0.276	**	0.095	1.318
	California in 1996	0.119		0.104	1.126	0.192		0.157	1.212
<b>Residential Context</b>									
Isolation Index		-0.004	**	0.001	0.996	0.004	*	0.002	1.004
Income ratio		-0.355	*	0.170	0.701	0.231		0.235	1.260
Metropolitan Status	Metropolitan (ref)								

	Non MSA or not identified	-0.356		0.188	0.701	0.118		0.259	1.125
	No match MSA	-0.385		0.235	0.680	0.371		0.349	1.449
Constant		2.377	***	0.224	10.777	1.824	***	0.311	6.194
N (weighted)									
Model Statistics	Model Chi-Square	1471.9	***			911.9	***		
	Goodness of fit	25.5	**			41.1	***		

Notes: a. (ref) means a reference category.

b. Education variables apply only to those who are age 25 and over.

Source: Current Population Survey (1996-2004)

\* p< .05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

**Table 8. Logistic Regression Model for Registration and Voting: Hispanic, 1996-2004**

		Registration			Voting				
		B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	S.E.	Exp(B)
<b>Group Membership: Race and Immigration</b>									
Generation									
	3+ generation (ref)								
	1st generation	-0.276	***	0.033	0.759	0.255	***	0.047	1.290
	2nd generation	-0.069	*	0.031	0.934	-0.012		0.040	0.988
<b>Individual-level Resources</b>									
Sex	Male	-0.205	***	0.025	0.815	-0.080	*	0.033	0.923
Marital Status	Married	0.120	***	0.027	1.128	0.095	**	0.037	1.100
Age	Age 55+ (ref)		***				***		
	Age 18-24	-2.282	***	0.097	0.102	-1.951	***	0.114	0.142
	Age 25-40	-0.768	***	0.043	0.464	-0.809	***	0.057	0.445
	Age 41-55	-0.530	***	0.042	0.588	-0.486	***	0.055	0.615
Education	More than BA (ref)								
	Less than high school and age 25 over	-1.626	***	0.089	0.197	-1.276	***	0.102	0.279
	High school	-1.214	***	0.088	0.297	-0.956	***	0.098	0.385
	Some college	-0.582	***	0.089	0.559	-0.679	***	0.098	0.507
	BA	-0.227	*	0.096	0.797	-0.358	**	0.105	0.699
Family Income	Less than \$14,999 (ref)		***				***		
	\$15,000-39,999	0.117	***	0.034	1.125	0.120	*	0.047	1.128
	\$40,000-74,999	0.255	***	0.042	1.290	0.296	***	0.056	1.345
	\$75,000 +	0.462	***	0.055	1.587	0.396	***	0.070	1.486
	Don't know income	-0.003		0.048	0.997	0.328	***	0.068	1.388
Homeowner	Owner	0.238	***	0.029	1.268	0.253	***	0.040	1.287
Residential Mobility	Less than 1 yr at address (ref)		***				***		
	1-2 years at address	0.146	***	0.038	1.157	0.181	**	0.054	1.199
	3-4 years at address	0.405	***	0.040	1.500	0.406	***	0.056	1.500
	5+ years at address	0.729	***	0.036	2.072	0.563	***	0.050	1.756
	Don't know years at address	0.304	*	0.128	1.356	0.356	*	0.178	1.427
Number of Children	Total children<=age 18	-0.038	***	0.010	0.963	-0.110	***	0.014	0.896
Spanish language used in HH		-0.257	***	0.046	0.773	0.517	***	0.075	1.678
<b>Policy Context</b>									
Bilingual Ballot	In state with no bilingual ballot (ref)		**				*		
	In state with partial bilingual ballot coverage	0.172	***	0.052	1.188	-0.125		0.074	0.883
	In state with full bilingual ballot coverage	0.180	**	0.058	1.197	-0.207	*	0.081	0.813
Absentee policy		-0.126	***	0.036	0.882	0.310	***	0.050	1.363
Early vote policy		-0.090	**	0.032	0.914	-0.186	***	0.044	0.830
Voter ID policy		0.026		0.036	1.027	-0.203	***	0.049	0.816
Election year	2000 (ref)								
	1996	0.008		0.044	1.008	-0.053		0.060	0.948
	1998	-0.179	***	0.039	0.836	-1.062	***	0.053	0.346
	2002	-0.244	***	0.038	0.783	-1.133	***	0.051	0.322
	2004	0.163	***	0.039	1.177	0.114	*	0.054	1.121
	California in 1996	0.204	**	0.070	1.226	-0.262	**	0.096	0.770
<b>Residential Context</b>									
Isolation Index		0.003	**	0.001	1.003	-0.001		0.001	0.999

Income ratio		-0.713	***	0.166	0.490	-0.030		0.225	0.970
Metropolitan Status	Metropolitan (ref)								
	Non MSA or not identified	-0.364	**	0.139	0.695	-0.207		0.188	0.813
	No match MSA	-0.350	*	0.173	0.705	0.204		0.251	1.227
Constant		2.178	***	0.167	8.829	2.411	***	0.217	11.149
N (weighted)									
Model Statistics	Model Chi-Square	4675.1	***			3357.3	***		
	Goodness of fit	38.4	***			23.6	**		

Notes: a. (ref) means a reference category.

b. Education variables apply only to those who are age 25 and over.

Source: Current Population Survey (1996-2004)

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\* p<.001 (two-tailed tests)