Indian Americans and Chinese Americans both share similar demographics such as high income and education levels. Yet, in regards to political activity from voting to elected positions, the political participation of Chinese Americans is more extensive than of Indian Americans.

In this study, it was found that the identity of Indian and Chinese Americans influences their political participation. For both groups, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity was positively associated with political participation. For Indian American respondents, the ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ was negatively associated with participation. This study also found that a majority of Indian American respondents identified themselves with a sub-ethnic group, and, in contrast, a majority of Chinese American respondents identified themselves with their ethnic group.

The implications of this study include encouraging Indian Americans to think of themselves as Indians instead of solely identifying with a sub-ethnic group. The process by which identity directly influences participation needs further exploration.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Indian and Chinese Americans both share similar immigration histories to the extent that around 70% of each population is foreign born and immigrated to the United States in the past 35 years. Both populations also share very similar demographics such as high income and education levels.\(^1\) Yet, in regards to political activity from voting to elected or appointed positions, the political participation of Chinese Americans is more extensive than of Indian Americans.\(^2\)

In 1992, the Republican National Committee conducted a survey of 5000 Asian American adults in California, measuring the political activity and attitudes of various Asian ethnic groups. The results for the question regarding contributions for a political candidate showed that of those surveyed, 49.6% of Chinese Americans compared to 32.5% of Indian Americans ever contributed. The reported results for participation in labor unions were that 23.8% of Chinese Americans versus 6.3% of Indian Americans participated.

When asked about campaign rallies and town meetings, 20.5% of Chinese Americans compared to 8.8% of Indian Americans and 17.6% of Chinese Americans compared to 8.8% of Indian Americans, respectively, stated that they participated.\(^3\)

Chinese Americans have also been more successful than Indian Americans in achieving

\(^1\) www.census.gov

\(^2\) The terms ‘Indian American’ and ‘Chinese American’ refer to those individuals of Indian and Chinese ethnicity regardless of citizenship status in the United States.
elected and appointed positions in all levels of government, as will be shown in more
detail below. Overall, Chinese Americans’ political participation, as individuals and in
organized groups, is more widespread and successful than that of Indian Americans.
This situation is puzzling, since both groups enjoy high socio-economic demographics,
which are known to encourage political participation.

The hypothesis tested in this study states that the stronger an individual’s identity
is with their ethnicity (Indian or Chinese) the greater an individual’s political
participation. Because this study compares the influence of multiple ethnic identities on
an individual, I have defined ethnicity in terms of nationality so that a respondent’s
ethnicity is either Chinese or Indian. A respondent’s sub-ethnicity will based primarily
on regional, linguistic, caste, and religious lines, thus, representing the other ethnic
identities an Indian or Chinese individual has in addition to his or her nationality.

The role ethnic and sub-ethnic identity has in individual participation may be
linked to the contexts that support those identities. For example, ethnic and sub-ethnic
organizations may play a role in influencing individuals’ political participation. While
the influence of ethnic and sub-ethnic identity on individual political participation is
tested, the role of ethnic or sub-ethnic organizations in mobilizing individuals is not
tested in this study.

The empirical model of this study compares the political participations of Indian
and Chinese Americans to their level of identity with ethnicity and sub-ethnicity. Data

---

was obtained from a survey of 100 Indian Americans and 100 Chinese Americans regarding their sense of identity and political participation.
CHAPTER 2

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS

Chinese Americans

According to the 1990 US Census, the Chinese population in America was 1,645,472; 69.3% of this population is foreign born and mostly immigrated to the United States in the past 35 years. Over half the population immigrated within the past twenty years. Around forty-percent of this population is employed in a managerial or professional occupation with a per capita income greater than the general population.4 According to the same census, the following statistics were given for the Chinese American population: 41% hold a bachelor’s degree or higher (compared to 20% as the total US population), and earn $14,876 per capita (compared to $14,143 as the national per capita).

The Chinese population in China and in the United States is a very homogenous group with very little room for formal divisions. The diversity in China “is recognized as regional variation of dialect and lifestyle rather than difference in race, ethnicity, or culture.”5 The Chinese population is over 93 percent composed of Han people, and they have two major languages: Mandarin and Cantonese.6 Chinese Americans, do not have a tradition of voting for members of a particular sub-group population of Chinese.

---

4 Bacon, 10.
According to Sheth, “a significant proportion of Chinese Americans in each major Chinese community still live in a Chinatown.”7 Chinese Americans have a high concentration of local ethnic organizations located in these densely populated communities around the nation. The Chinese American organizations advocate political awareness or participate politically either by voter-registration drives, lobbying, or community organizing. Chinese American organizations, also, readily participate and organize with other Asian Americans.

Additionally, Chinese Americans have over a dozen national organizations that work for the interests of all Chinese Americans. The largest and most visible Chinese American lobby and activist group is the Organization of Chinese Americans (OCA), which has been established for 25 years and has 44 chapters around the nation. OCA has championed a number of legislative issues vital to Chinese and other Asian Americans’ civil rights including supporting legal immigration and voter education while opposing all legislation that has anti-immigrant sentiment, defeating state initiatives seeking to eliminate affirmative action, and testifying in hearings on the controversy over the campaign fundraising done by Chinese Americans in the 1996 elections.

Chinese American political organizations successfully continue to advocate voter registration and support their candidates for political positions. Chinese American California voter registration rate in the early 1990s, for instance, exceeded Indian Americans’ 35.5% to 16.7%.8 On the Democratic National Committee’s web page, which discusses the high level administrative and judicial appointments by President Clinton, 14 individuals were Chinese American. Hiram Fong and Daniel K. Akaka are

---

8 Ibid, 16.
Chinese Americans who have been United States Senators. Bill Lann Lee was appointed by President Clinton to be the Justice Department’s key civil rights official. Other well known Chinese Americans have served as a Lieutenant Governor, Vice Chairman of California State Board of Equalization, California Secretary of State, ambassador to Micronesia, ambassador to Nepal, director of the Peace Corps, members of state legislatures, and many have been city mayors.9

Indian Americans

According to the 1990 US Census, the Indian population in America was 815,447; 75.4% of this population is foreign born and mostly immigrated to the United States in the past 35 years. Around forty-eight percent of this population is employed in a managerial or professional occupation with a per capita income significantly greater than the general population. According to the 1990 US Census, the following statistics were given for the Indian American population: 57% hold a bachelor’s degree or higher (compared to 20% as the total US population), and earn $17,777 per capita (compared to $14,143 as the national per capita). Among all ethnic groups in the United States, Indian Americans rank highest in educational achievements and among the top in income.

The Indian population in India and in the United States is a very heterogeneous group leaving much room for formal divisions. Members of the Indian population can have various identities that separate them from other Indians. They can and do gather in terms of region, language, religion, caste, and class differences.10

9 The Asian American Almanac, 58.
10 Bacon, 27.
In India, Hinduism, Islam, Sikhism, and Jainism are important religions that regulate many aspects of family and social life and affect Indian culture as a whole. The fact that Indians believe in various religions and various sects of various religions creates another barrier to ethnic solidarity. Most Indians “identify with their province first and nation second.” During local and state elections in India, Indians vote along lines of caste, religion, language, and region; also, there is a degree of political mistrust among members of various groups. This significant cultural fact reveals that the organizations that have formed in the U.S. based along these lines were inevitable. The sub-group diversity characterizing Indian immigrants “is a disadvantage for establishing a territorial community” as exists in the many Chinatowns established on the West and East coasts of the United States.

There are a great number of organizations of the Indian American community that are focused on a particular region, language, religion, caste, or class. For example, between July 1990 and December 1991, “at least 107 Indian [sub-ethnic] organizations were active in the Chicago area.” Another estimate says there are at least several hundred such organizations in the United States and nearly fifty in the New York City area alone.

There are three national “pan-India organizations” that are active and well known and two that contribute to political activity and awareness. The earliest group, the Association of Asian Indians in America was founded in 1967 and the latest and most

---

13 Bacon, 23.
prominent, the India Abroad Center for Political Awareness, was formed in 1993. The India Abroad Center for Political Awareness (IACPA) is one of the few politically active pan-Indian organizations. IACPA established a full-time office in Washington, DC in 1996 that monitors legislation and communicates concerns to federal officials. The center also runs various opportunities, such as summer internships in the US Congress, for Indian American college students.

Dalip Singh Saund is the only Indian American who has served in the U.S. Congress. Dr. Arati Prabhakar served as research director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce under President Clinton. Three Indian Americans have served as mayors and one has served on a state legislature.\textsuperscript{15}

Though a few political achievements have been made, Indian Americans are among the most invisible of all ethnic minorities. According to one study, “other Asian American groups, including those which are much smaller in number, are more visible socially, politically and geographically [than Indians].”\textsuperscript{16} A study by Nakanishi and colleagues indicated that Indian Americans are the least likely group to register to vote.\textsuperscript{17} The “extreme diversity” among Indian Americans “makes it difficult, if not impossible, for [them] to organize around common issues.”\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} The Asian American Almanac, 17.
\textsuperscript{16} Kar, Campbell, Jimenez, and Gupta, 28.
\textsuperscript{17} Kar, Campbell, Jimenez, and Gupta, 43.
\textsuperscript{18} Kar, Campbell, Jimenez, and Gupta, 43.
CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ethnicity

An ethnic group consists of individuals who consider themselves similar by virtue of their common ancestry. Members of an ethnic group share category patterns of values, social customs, language, and norms for social interaction. These common patterns color the perceptions, feelings, thoughts, and actions of ethnic members, distinguishing them from other ethnicities. An individual’s family plays one of the most important roles in developing the ethnic identity for the individual. In addition to the family, ethnic peers also facilitate ethnic identity. Ethnic organizations can reinforce and add to a person’s ethnic identity. Membership in ethnic or sub-ethnic organizations is used as part of the operationalization of an individual’s level of identity with ethnicity and sub-ethnicity.

Ethnicity can coincide with nationality, such as in the Italian or Northern Irish communities or the Chinese and Indian communities in this study. Ethnicity can also exist beyond national affiliations such as with the Hispanic community. Finally, ethnicity can exist separately within a national identity such as with regionally based ethnicities in India.

The term ‘ethnic group’ is used to describe a group of Indian and Chinese Americans in this study. For the purposes of distinction in this study, any identity that is

---

regional, religious, linguistic, or with caste within a nationality will be labeled a sub-ethnic identity. However, it is to be noted that the identity with either ethnicity or sub-ethnicity is formed in similar ways, ie. through family, peer groups, social networks, and organizations. The literature reviewed does not distinguish between ethnicity and sub-ethnicity; however, this distinction is important to explore in comparing two populations in this study.

What is the group?

The process of group organization is distinct from the process of individual identity development, yet these factors are both connected in terms of political participation. The group is “no more than a set of individuals who are its members”. Groups may become reference points for the formation of members’ attitudes and group standards can influence members’ behaviors. The formal group boundaries of certain groups are quite clear if membership is a factual matter (i.e. registered with the organization), yet all nominal members can vary in “degree of membership, in a psychological sense.” The concept of “group identification and psychological membership” is fundamental for a more “general model of group influence in politics.”

The theory of group identification is important to understand the influence an ethnic or sub-ethnic group has on its individual members. If a group, as stated above, can influence members’ attitudes and behaviors depending on the level of identification with the group, then the political behavior (or lack there of) of a group has influence on the

---

5 Sarafica, 161.
22 Campbell et. al, 297.
23 Campbell et. al, 297.
political behavior of a member in that group. Moreover, the more an individual identifies with a group, the more influence the group will have on that individual’s attitudes and actions.

**Identity and Political Participation**

The nature of the group has an effect on political participation, thus membership in a group in and of itself does not necessitate political participation. Groups are known to vary with the amount of intentional or unintentional mobilization for political participation.\(^{24}\) Depending on the type of group an individual joins, there are varying effects on their political participation.\(^{25}\)

The units of analysis for identity, ethnic or sub-ethnic, are important in evaluating the effect of individuals’ identities on their choices for joining and participating with groups in political activity. There is some evidence revealing the impact of so-called identity groups, which “center around collective identities that are not originally ideological or economic, but which have to do with ethnicity, race, religion, gender, sexual preference, etc.”\(^{26}\) These identifications are “proving to be effective in mobilizing individuals politically” and are “better able to secure strong affective ties among their members.”

---

\(^{24}\) In her study, Jan Leighley defines intentional mobilization as the “average frequency with which the group asked its members to engage in each type of participation on behalf of the group”. Unintentional mobilization, according to Leighley, is “an interaction term consisted of the extent to which the group engages in practices associated with participatory democracy (high levels of interaction or policy debate) multiplied by the individual’s level of activity within the group.” Leighley, Jan. “Group Membership and the Mobilization of Political Participation.” *The Journal of Politics*. 58 (20) 1996:447-463, 452.


members in many cases than are traditional ideological groups.”27 Essentially, identity
groups give individuals a connection to political activity based on their “most basic
conceptions of themselves, thereby giving membership in these groups deeper roots than
membership in traditional political interest groups.”28

However, the ability of a group to mobilize its members or to simply provide a
network for communication may be the actual cause for individuals becoming politically
active, rather than incentives for identifying with the group, There is some evidence that
regardless of social incentives to join a group, unintentional mobilization is associated
with greater participation.29 Intentional mobilization, however, is most often only found
in political groups, and thus, is more effective in mobilizing political groups.30

Similarly, Robert Putnam’s theory of social capital states that networks of civic
engagement, such as neighborhood associations, sports clubs, cultural organizations, and
other cooperatives, facilitate communication and collaboration, which help resolve the
dilemmas of collective action. These, in turn, foster institutional success in the broader
community and are associated with good government.

Hoover states that identity is a positive influence on political participation of an
individual, and Putnam states that all networks of civic engagement are beneficial to
collective action; I argue that the degree of these positive influences are somehow
mediated by the type of identity a person maintains – ethnic versus sub-ethnic. This
reasoning is similar to and combined with the argument that the role an organizational
membership has in increasing an individual’s political participation depends on the type

27 Hoover, 400.
28 Hoover, 401.
29 Leighley, 456.
of organization. Thus, not all civic associations lead to collective action for developing institutional success or good government. If certain organizations are insular and focused on the cultural unity of their members, they may not influence the wider community as much as another civic organization.

Paradox of participation and rational ignorance

Networks of civic engagement, as Putnam states, overcome the dilemmas of collective action. What are these dilemmas? How exactly do such networks or civic organizations overcome them? If this process is elaborated, then it may become clearer why certain civic or social organizations are more or less successful in mobilizing their group for collective action.

According to Rosenstone and Hansen, there are two paradoxes of political activity. A certain paradox holds that if people are rational, and if they only receive collective benefits, then they will not vote since the result of the election will not change whether or not they vote.31 The same paradox exists for all other types of political activity, since any one person’s act most likely will not determine a specific political outcome. Because people receive collective benefits from political outcomes, it objectively follows that political action directed toward collective outcomes, is irrational.

A second paradox is of rational ignorance: if political action is irrational, then for the same reason, political learning is irrational. If the voters had information, it still is irrational for them to act; therefore, there is not much incentive to become informed about political issues or events. Government affairs are complicated, national

---

30 Leighley, 454.
government is distant from most Americans, and government records are dense, which all act as barriers to becoming informed.

Why do individuals, then, participate? Due to these and other barriers, such as necessary financial and human resources to begin political action, certain forces must be in place to counteract the barriers and provide incentives for individuals to become politically active. There are some factors that cause groups of individuals to organize politically, including socio-economic status and social networks. Other factors exist that cause individuals not to participate even though they may be organized in a civic association and identify with it. Sidney Verba discusses how individuals’ different organizational affiliations may have different influences on political behavior. These reasons, elaborated below, describe why certain groups are more successful at overcoming the paradoxes of participation.

**Socio-Economic Status**

Evidence supports the idea that “citizens of higher social and economic status participate more in electoral politics.” Formal education fosters “organizational and communication skills that are germane to political activity” and helps create a sense of civic duty or political efficacy, which is associated with political involvement. A higher level of income allows an individual to release a significant percentage of time and money ordinarily spent on day to day living, and pay that attention to political issues and activities.

---

34 Verba et.al, 457.
35 Bacon, 6.
High socioeconomic status and education, as mentioned above, provide material and psychological resources that aid individuals in understanding the political system and in organizing for issues about which they are concerned. Political activity also requires overhead costs of organizing and publicizing for which capital is required.\textsuperscript{36} Citizens with economic influence are more able to contribute to campaigns or to organizations that may lobby for certain issues. The strength of political contributions is positively related to the attention received to issues favored by the donor groups.

In this study, both Indian and Chinese Americans share high socio-economic status; however, Indian Americans’ political participation is not as widespread as that of Chinese Americans. Differences between these groups, such as how they organize or identify themselves, must be explored in order to this apparent deficiency for Indian Americans.

\textit{Social Networks}

Social networks play a key role in overcoming the paradoxes of participation and rational ignorance. Social networks address rational ignorance by providing information through the communication between participants in a family, workplace, or group of friends, which also reduces the cost of collecting information for each member. This type of exchange is rewarded, since social networks favor those who contribute knowledge to the “collegium”\textsuperscript{37}.

Social networks also address the paradox of participation, since people “take part in family, work, and friendship groups on a regular basis” and can further categorize

\begin{footnotes}
\item Lien, 50.
\item Rosenstone and Hansen, 24.
\end{footnotes}
those members who do or do not comply with certain social/political expectations.38

Because members of social networks can label who is or is not politically active, they can also reward and sanction behavior selectively based on a social expectation to participate. Social networks, therefore, make coordinated, effective political action possible.

Both Indian and Chinese Americans have many social networks that provide for the opportunity to encourage individuals to participate politically and reduce the cost of information for individuals. It is unclear, once again, why Indian Americans with a high socio-economic status and many social networks, remain politically invisible.

Community Organizing and Mobilization

The probability of whether or not members of the social network ultimately participate depends on whether or not they will become mobilized. Voluntary associations have been known to influence people to participate in politics. “Political analysts have long known that people who belong to clubs, organizations, and interest group are more likely to participate in politics than people who do not.”39 Organizing as a community also creates a large base of influence that can effectively be used in politics and social change. The social phenomenon of community can be geographically, ideologically, or ethnically defined. Therefore, organizing as an ethnic community can create change in institutions that would otherwise affect the ethnicity adversely.40

Certain organizational affiliations can expose members to political stimuli. A member of an organization can either be exposed to political discussions or to politically

---

38 Ibid, 24.
39 Rosenstone and Hanson, 83.
relevant organizational activities. Also, political representatives frequently seek out
organizations to solicit votes, support, or to gain ideas about a community’s needs.

Sidney Verba and Norman Nie examined the influence of various nonpolitical
organizations on an individual’s participation and found that “affiliation with manifestly
nonpolitical organizations does increase an individual’s participation rate but only if there
is some political exposure within the organization…and in order to benefit from that
exposure the individual must be active in the organization.” If an individual’s
participation is encouraged by the organization primarily when there is some political
exposure within the organization, then this is a factor that would be important to further
explore for Indian and Chinese American organizations.

Socio-economic status is the most consistent predictor of political mobilization,
but political institutions and institutional affiliation as predictors of mobilization varies
across groups. For example, Anglo Americans are more likely to be mobilized if they
ideologically identify with a political party. However, this pattern is only significant for
African American democrats but not other African Americans or Latinos. Minority
empowerment (defined as having an elected official of particular ethnic minority
background) increases the probability that African Americans are mobilized, but this has
no effect on Latino mobilization.

In terms of group size affecting mobilization, Leighley finds that there is little
support “for the notion that group size structures patterns of political mobilization or

42 Verba and Nie, 194.
44 Ibid, 169.
participation.\textsuperscript{45} Some studies suggest that larger groups would be more active.\textsuperscript{46} Due to the contextual characteristics of African Americans and Latino populations, Leighley states that there is an opposite effect of group size on mobilization. Other factors such as empowerment and citizenship of individuals in a large versus small group context are better predictors of mobilization than the size of the group itself.\textsuperscript{47}

\textit{Gap In The Literature}

Most work relating to Indian and Chinese American groups has focused on how the American political institutions have excluded and discriminated against Asian Americans. Until recently, less academic attention has been given to show how Asian American groups responded to such treatment and more generally, “how they engaged in a variety of political activities.”\textsuperscript{48} While there is some evidence that Asian American candidates raise funds best in Asian American communities than in other communities and are able to register a large number of Asian American voters, there is limited data on their voting patterns and turnout rates.\textsuperscript{49}

The study of identity as a precursor to collective action has not been fully studied, and especially not with respect to ethnic versus sub-ethnic identity. A recent study stated that Chinese and Chinese Americans were found to score higher than Euro-Americans on various measures of collectivism possibly because group solidarity tends to remain

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 46.
\textsuperscript{49} The Asian American Almanac, 346.
strongest among first and second-generation immigrants. Yet, the study did not discuss this in terms of political participation or group divisions.

CHAPTER 4

HYPOTHESIS AND METHODOLOGY

This research design seeks to clarify why the established pattern between education/income and political participation does not explain Indian American’s lack of political participation, and will compare this group with Chinese Americans whose political activity meets the established pattern. The Indian American community has developed many civic and social organizations; yet, there seems to be some other factor hindering these organizations from encouraging political participation.

Since Putnam, and others have stated that organizations and networks encourage collective action and civic engagement in politics, factors such as individual identity and the ability for certain groups to mobilize, must be explored to explain this puzzle for Indian Americans. While identity and mobilization are linked, because individuals join, participate, and mobilize with groups with which they identify, this research was conducted to test the influence of individuals’ identity on their participation.

I hypothesize that increased identity of an individual with his/her ethnic group population causes an increase in her/his political participation.
CHAPTER 5

DATA COLLECTION

With the assistance of the staff of the University of Georgia Survey Research Center, 102 Indian American and 104 Chinese American respondents completed the questionnaire. A sample of 1,000 phone numbers was ordered from Survey Sampling, Inc., a company that specializes in providing samples for marketing and research firms. The company used a list-assisted race targeted sample drawn using surnames from published sources (e.g. white page telephone directories, driver's license and voter registration information, and other secondary sources. The sample included only those with Chinese and Indian surnames—excluding Park and Lee—randomly selected throughout the United States.

The survey included 19 questions requested information associated with the respondents’ cultural identity and political participation, and it solicited demographic information (see appendix 1). The survey was conducted at the Survey Research Center on several evenings and weekends through the month of June 2000. The response rate was approximately 20%.

In order to operationalize the concept of identity, the survey requested information about the type and number of organizations or groups in which the respondent participated and number of hours spent with these groups. The respondents were also directly asked whether they would be more likely to interact with an ethnic or

---

51 I wish to thank the Survey Research Center for subsidizing the costs of this research and allowing me to use their facilities to conduct the survey.
sub-ethnic group and whether they identify more with the characteristics of the ethnicity or a sub-ethnicity. This is a valid operationalization, since ethnic communities and their churches, clubs and organizations “clearly provide a sense of pride in belonging to that particular group.”

Political participation was operationalized using a broad construction of the word, including direct and indirect forms of political participation. In their study of the political resources of various races and ethnicities, Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry Brady, and Norman H. Nie define political participation similarly. They not only include voting and “other electoral activity such as working in campaigns and making financial contributions, but also contacting public officials, attending protests, joining or otherwise supporting organizations that take stands in politics and getting involved either formally or informally on local issues. The conception used in this survey included discussion of issues with others as well as individually following events or thinking about issues related to the respondents’ ethnicity.

Values for the independent variables, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’, were gathered by adding the responses from the questions requesting identity information. ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ was the sum of the responses from questions such as:

‘Are you more likely to interact with a broader group of Indian/Chinese Americans or with a more specific group?’;
‘Do you identify more with the characteristics of a certain specific group of Indian/Chinese American than with a broader group of Indian/Chinese American?’;

Barrett, Susan E. “Contextual identity: A model for therapy and social change.” Women & Therapy
‘Could you approximate the number of hours per month that you spend with each type of organization?’.

Values for the dependent variable, Political Participation, were gathered by adding the responses about political activity, which included answers from questions such as:

‘Do you follow political events?’;
‘How many hours per month do you spend in some activity you believe constitutes political participation?’;
‘Do you vote regularly in any elections?’;
‘Do you donate money to any campaigns or organizations that promote your opinion of political issues?’.

After considering what other variables may affect the relationship between the ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and political participation of Indian Americans and Chinese Americans, particular control variables were included in the questionnaire.

*Control Variables:*

1. Status of Citizenship: U.S. citizens could have greater ease and more incentive to participate in politics than visa holders and other non-citizens.

2. Generation of Immigrant: Second generation and higher immigrants would be more assimilated than first generation immigrants. The former may have more motivation to be politically active than the latter. The higher an individual’s generation, the more an individual could identify with the ethnic group than with a sub-ethnic group.

3. Income: Number of dollars of income per year as measured in tens-of-thousands of dollars. It is generally expected that the higher the respondent’s income, the more the individual will participate in politics. Income is not expected to influence identity.

4. Education Level: Level of education completed by the respondent. It is generally expected that the higher the respondent’s education, the more the individual will participate in politics. Education is not expected to influence identity.

5. Gender: Males could have an advantage in participating, particularly in more traditional Indian American and Chinese American homes.
CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

The Difference In Cultural Identities:

The ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ scores were given to each respondent based on her/his answers to the questions about identity. The average ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ score for Chinese Americans is 6.44 and the average ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ score for Indian Americans is 1.47. The average ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ score for Chinese Americans is 1.30 and the average ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ score for Indian Americans is 6.38. The values clearly show that Chinese Americans scored higher for ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and Indian Americans scored higher for ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’.

Difference In Political Participation

A participation score was given to each respondent based on her/his answers to the questions about their general political participation. Using descriptive statistics, the mean participation score for Chinese American respondents is 5.86, with a range of 53, and the mean participation score for Indian American respondents is 2.29, with a range of 17.

Link Between Identity And Participation

The results of the overall model of participation of all respondents on gender, citizenship, generation, education, income, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity,’ ‘Level of
Identity with Sub-ethnicity’, and ethnicity is significant and 90% explained (please see Table 1). The results of the overall models of participation of Indian Americans and Chinese Americans on gender, citizenship, generation, education, income, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity,’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ are significant and 76% and 90% respectfully explained (please see Table 2).

The variable ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ for all respondents, and Indian Americans and Chinese Americans separately, has a large positive standardized beta-weight and is significant in the model with the dependent variable participation. These values support the idea that as respondents’ level of identity with ethnicity increases, their participation increases. The variable ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ has a slightly negative standardized beta-weight of -.094 for all respondents and -.036 for Chinese Americans but neither is significant. However, the same variable has a large negative standardized beta-weight of -.471 for Indian Americans, which supports the idea that as these respondents’ level of identity with sub-ethnicity increases, their participation decreases.

Also revealing is the difference in variables’ values besides ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity,’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’. Looking at the direction of the beta-weights for Indian Americans and Chinese Americans, the two groups differ on most control variables. For Indian Americans, generation was somewhat influential, and ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-Ethnicity are opposite yet equally influential and significant in explaining participation. With Chinese Americans, only the ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ variable was significant. According to the beta-weights for Indian
Americans, gender, citizenship, generation, education and income status are positive in relation to the dependent variable participation. For Chinese Americans, the beta-weights for gender, citizenship, generation, and education status are negative and income is positive in relation to the dependent variable.

These differences suggest that the control variables may have different affects on Indian and Chinese American respondents, though it is important to note that of these, only the variable of generation for Indian Americans was significant. The ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ was used again in models with participation to find the separate correlations with citizenship, generation, gender, lower and higher levels of income.

The mean participation of Indian Americans without citizenship was 1.50 and with citizenship was 1.59. The mean participation of Chinese Americans without citizenship was 5.39 and with citizenship was 7.05. These variables indicate that there is some difference in participation between those respondents, Indian and Chinese Americans, who have citizenship and those who did not. The variable ‘generation’ was divided and controlled for as first, second, and third generations. First generation Indian Americans had r-squared of .742 and first generation Chinese had .813. Second generation Indian Americans had .965 and second generation Chinese Americans had .732. Finally, third generation Chinese Americans had r-squared of .659. The mean participation and ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ for second generation Chinese and Indian Americans and third generation Chinese Americans is greater than the mean participation and ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ of first generation Chinese and Indian Americans.
Table 1 – Regression Model of Participation on Gender, Citizenship, Generation, Education, Income, Level of Identity with Ethnicity, Level of Identity with Sub-Ethnicity, and Ethnicity for All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Respondents – Both Ethnicities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Beta-weights (Significance levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Female 0 = Male</td>
<td>-.079 (.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No Visa; 1 = Visa; 2 = Citizen</td>
<td>-.011 (.821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = 1st; 2 = 2nd; 3 = 3rd</td>
<td>-.018 (.702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education*</td>
<td>.017 (.745)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income*</td>
<td>.045 (.388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identity with Ethnicity*</td>
<td>.877 (.000)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identity with Sub-Ethnicity*</td>
<td>-.098 (.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = Indian; 0 = Chinese)</td>
<td>-.020 (.704)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases: N = 115

R-square: .899

* = Please see appendix for coding

** = significant values
Table 2 – Regression Model of Participation on Gender, Citizenship, Generation, Education, Income, Level of Identity with Ethnicity, and Level of Identity with Sub-Ethnicity for Indian Americans and Chinese Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indian Americans Std. Beta-weights (Significance levels)</th>
<th>Chinese Americans Std. Beta-weights (Significance levels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.080 (.446)</td>
<td>-.086 (.227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Female 0 = Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Status</td>
<td>.016 (.876)</td>
<td>-.023 (.779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = No Visa; 1 = Visa; 2 = Citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>.225 (.041)</td>
<td>-.053 (.448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = 1st, 2 = 2nd, 3 = 3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education*</td>
<td>.222 (.077)</td>
<td>-.016 (.840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income*</td>
<td>.166 (.173)</td>
<td>.028 (.727)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identity with Ethnicity*</td>
<td>.450 (.000)**</td>
<td>.887 (.000)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identity with Sub-Ethnicity*</td>
<td>-.471 (.000)**</td>
<td>-.036 (.580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
<td>N = 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Please see appendix for coding

** = significant values
Therefore, participation generally seems to increase with subsequent generations of Indian and Chinese Americans, however, the relationship between ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and participation may be less explained by generation alone for subsequent generations of Chinese Americans.

The r-square correlation and mean participation scores taken from regression models of ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ on participation while controlling separately for income, education, and gender are shown in Table 3. Females of both ethnicities generally participate less than their male counterparts. The correlation of ‘level of participation with ethnicity’ and participation is stronger in wealthier Chinese Americans, and the wealthy in both ethnicities combined, expectedly, participate more than the less wealthy. The relationship of ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and participation is not significant for Indian Americans with less than an undergraduate degree, but this is partially due to their low participation in general. The more educated of both ethnicities participate more in politics.

The variable, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’, was again used in regression models (please see Table 4) with participation with the respondents’ answers to question 19: “Do you vote regularly? Include any election”; question 18: “Do you donate money to any campaigns or organizations that promote your opinion of political issues?”; and questions 10, 11, and 17. The r-squared values from these regressions were then compared to see which part of the participation factor was most explained by ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and how the mean participation would be effected by each answer.
Table 3 – Comparing the R-square of Models With ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ on Participation While Controlling for Income, Education, and Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt;$55,000</th>
<th>&lt;= $55,000</th>
<th>Less than Undergraduate degree</th>
<th>Greater or equal to Undergraduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r²</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>r²</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Americans</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Americans</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r²</td>
<td>r²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td>mean participation</td>
<td>mean participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Americans</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Americans</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in table 4 are compared to the r-squared of all Chinese American respondents – .791 – and all Indian American respondents – .761 – and to the mean participation of Chinese Americans – 6.61 – and of Indian Americans – 1.56. Voting, actively participating, following and being concerned with political issues and events raises the participation values of both ethnicities. The greatest increases come from the number of hours-reported in question 17 for participating actively. Questions 18 and 10 most help explain the relationship of ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and participation of Chinese Americans, and questions 10 and 11 most help explain the relationship of ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and participation of Indian Americans.
Table 4 – Comparing the R-square of Models with ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ on Participation with the Respondents’ Answers to Questions 10, 11, 17, 18, and 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q10 Following political events</th>
<th>Q11 Concerned with political issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = yes 0 = no</td>
<td>1 = yes 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r^2 ) mean participation</td>
<td>( r^2 ) mean participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese American</td>
<td>.779 8.30</td>
<td>.740 9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Americans</td>
<td>.765 2.85</td>
<td>.771 3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q19 Voting</th>
<th>Q17 = 0 Not actively participating</th>
<th>Q 17 &gt; 0 Actively Participating</th>
<th>Q18 Donating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = yes 0 = no</td>
<td>( r^2 ) mean participation</td>
<td>( r^2 ) mean participation</td>
<td>( r^2 ) mean participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Americans</td>
<td>.747 9.97</td>
<td>.538 3.38</td>
<td>.733 11.97</td>
<td>.823 11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Americans</td>
<td>.737 3.83</td>
<td>.194 .72</td>
<td>.621 7.27</td>
<td>.707 6.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

The identity scores of Indian Americans predict that those who identify with the ethnicity will participate more in political activity than those who identify with the sub-ethnicity. The identity scores for Chinese Americans predict that those who identify with the ethnicity will be likely to also participate in political activity. Descriptive statistics from this study showed that the majority of Indian American respondents identify themselves with a sub-ethnic group, while the tendency of Chinese Americans was to identify with their ethnic group. Using the ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ scores, findings show that 81.4% of Indian Americans versus 9.7% of Chinese Americans have a score of 2 or greater. For the ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ scores, 18.6% of Indian Americans compared to 80.7% of Chinese Americans have a score of 2 or greater.

Since Indian Americans organize, notably with sub-ethnic groups, there must be some mediating influence of the sub-ethnic group on Indian Americans’ political participation or mobilization. The sub-ethnic identity of Indian Americans and the ethnic identity of Chinese Americans lead each group to organize differently. Chinese Americans’ overall political participation benefits from having cultural centers and political organizations that are inclusive of all Chinese Americans. Indian Americans’ overall political participation seems to be negatively affected by predominately having organizations that are exclusive of all but a single sub-group of Indian Americans.
The diversity in sub-ethnic identity of Indian Americans is a major factor in contributing to the lack of ethnic cohesiveness, and political and social influence. Studies indicate that the intra-Indian divisions affect “Indian immigrants’ adjustment to a new society, facilitating sub-ethnic identity, but also hindering a Pan-Indian unity.” 48

The sub-ethnic identity of many Indian or Chinese Americans increases the likelihood that they will associate with members of this sub-ethnicity. Repeated interaction with members of this group leads to a greater probability of organizing with the sub-ethnic group. This sub-ethnicity will become their social network. In the case of Indian Americans, the sub-ethnic social network, identity, and organization may not overcome certain barriers to participation, because of a lack of political exposure and smaller membership, and thus puts the individual at a disadvantage for political participation.

For example, an Indian sub-ethnic organization, such as the Jain religious community, is not representative of the Indian ethnicity as a whole. Political representatives would thus be less willing to solicit a sub-ethnic organization in order to understand the needs of the ethnic community as a whole. Additionally, Indian American sub-ethnic organizations are often more oriented towards cultural and social activities than towards discussing political change and participation. Such organizations do not have much exposure to political information, are not solicited by political representatives, and may discourage political participation overall. Sub-ethnic groups, because of their relatively smaller size, are understandably less willing to risk their resources for advocating their interests if they do not perceive some likelihood of success.

Unity with other sub-ethnic groups increases the number of individuals and resources devoted to promoting common interests. Political organizations in particular “have rightly noted that their requests are more readily heeded when one voice represents the whole community.”\textsuperscript{49} If society will only allow one voice representing an ethnic group then the separate voices of the sub-groups of an ethnic group would not be as politically influential.

Ethnicity, however, is known to be an “important predictor of political behavior in American society.”\textsuperscript{50} The power of ethnic coalitions in political campaigns and coalition building is further emphasized by the priority that most politicians give in their campaigns to winning the “ethnic vote.”\textsuperscript{51}

A higher level of identity with an ethnicity encourages an Indian or Chinese American individual to associate and organize more with all Indian or Chinese Americans rather than with a sub-ethnic population. Organizing as an ethnic group allows individuals to be more exposed to community-wide issues, as opposed to more narrow, or focused sub-ethnic interests. The ethnic organization in turn may allow exposure to political activity and information, and thus increase this individual’s inclination for political participation. Organizing with an ethnic group would also increase the chances that political forces will take notice of the organization and visit with its members. Indian or Chinese Americans, when organized with an ethnic group, may be more able to participate successfully in US politics with their sub-ethnic group


\textsuperscript{50} Greeley, Andrew M. “Political Participation among Ethnic Groups on the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance,” American Journal of Sociology 80 (July 1974), 173.

populations, so an individual who identifies with the ethnic group would be more able and/or more motivated to participate successfully.

It seems that being a member of an ethnic group positively influences an individual’s political participation. Moreover, these advantages are lacking when an individual is joined with a sub-ethnic group. An individual participating with a large organization with broad community goals will be a part of a social network that reduces costs and barriers to an individual’s political involvement. While a sub-ethnic group may create social network, the size and goals of this group may not increased individuals’ understanding of the political process nor create avenues to have their voices heard in local, state, or national government.

If Indian Americans are to organize and mobilize for a common goal of the Indian ethnic community, then they must at least see themselves as a part of this larger, inclusive community. This formation of identity is a significant precursor to any choice for working collectively to advance the interests of the community as a whole.

Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes developed a model that can help explain the variation of ‘in-group’ political strength. They describe a triangle of elements: “(1) the individual, (2) the group, and (3) the world of political objects” suggesting the interaction of “(a) the relationship of the individual to the group, (b) the relationship of the group to the political world, and (c) the relationship of the individual to the political world.”

Since the relationship of the group to the political world affects the relationship of the individual to the political world through this triangle of elements, Indian Americans

52 Campbell et. al, 299.
as an ethnic group, following this theory, would have less ‘in-group’ political strength than Chinese Americans. I will show that this is due to the fact that Indian Americans tend to have stronger sub-ethnic identities than an ethnic identity.

Indian Americans have not realized the power that ethnic political cohesion can bring, whereas Chinese Americans already use their unified base of encouraging their candidates and issues. The high socio-economic status of Indian Americans may not encourage Indian Americans to become involved in politics if they do not know the potential of their status. Individuals may perceive great risk to their status in organizing or advocating for their special interests if successful group organizing seems unlikely. If these individuals regularly organize with a sub-ethnic group and identify with this sub-ethnic group, then they would be less likely to identify or organize with the group as a whole. If they also see other Indian American individuals organizing on a sub-ethnic level, they may assume that it is unlikely that Indian Americans can successfully identify or organize as a group. In order to build a pan-ethnic identity, Indian Americans must develop organizations that bridge their sub-ethnic groups.

Alternatives And Rebuttals

There are some alternative hypotheses to consider for explaining the puzzle for the difference in political participation of Indian Americans and Chinese Americans. Citizenship is a factor in the level of political participation a group will achieve. Having United States citizenship allows an individual to vote and possibly to feel as if he or she has more reason to participate in politics. Having a foreign citizenship may mean that an individual is more interested in the politics of their home country than of the United
States. This individual, however, can participate in United States politics for the interests of their home country such as influencing bilateral relations between the United States and that country. Additionally, when controlling for citizenship, the results of the survey, still show a significant correlation between participation and ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’. The r-square value of the relationship between ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and participation without controlling for citizenship was .856 for Indian Americans and .821 for Chinese Americans and the values became .737 and .741, respectively, when removing respondents with United States citizenship.

The generation of the respondent can be a factor in political participation. The majority of both Chinese and Indian Americans have immigrated to the United States over the past 40 years. Describing the Chinese Americans, in this study, 67.3% are first generation, 26% are second generation, and 6.7% are third generation. This is compared the Indian Americans in this study of whom, 90.2% are first generation and 9.8% are second generation. The significance values for generation in the models do not give telling evidence that generation influences the dependent variable, possibly due to the low numbers of individuals of second and third generations of both ethnicities. Descriptive statistics, however, for both Indian and Chinese Americans show a step-wise increase in participation score with the later generations. While the mean for participation of first generation Indians was 2.12, the mean for second generation Indians was 3.90. Similarly, the mean participation for first generation Chinese was 5.29 and rose to 5.89 and 11.57 for second and third generations respectfully.

It is important to note the influence of earlier immigrants on the social context of these groups. A fourth of the current United
States Chinese population immigrated prior to 1960 compared to a few thousand Indian Americans. These earlier immigrants would be more established and could be a factor in the political participation of later Chinese immigrants. Chinatowns were formed in the late 19th century, but the primary reason for Chinese immigrants to segregate themselves in Chinatowns as for protection from the discrimination and racism of the greater society and not for political mobility. But Chinatowns, as discussed earlier, are now territorial communities that inevitably provide social and political support for Chinese Americans.

Among the earlier Indian American immigrants, a man named Dalip Singh Saund, became the first Asian American Congressman. The Gadar Movement during the early 1900’s consisted of Indian Americans who organized in the United States for India’s freedom from Britain. But these Indian Americans were a small community, and the majority of Indians immigrated to the United States after 1965. There are Indian communities in a few large U.S. metropolitan cities, such as New York City, NY; Edison, NJ; Chicago, IL; and San Francisco, CA that resemble Chinatowns.

The main issue for generation being a factor is whether the earlier immigrants passed on any political support to later immigrants – whether they created a ‘pipe line’ of political knowledge, contacts, and other resources. If the earlier Chinese Americans seem to have created a more effective pipeline, it is likely due to the same pan-ethnic identity that unites Chinese Americans today.

The most critical alternative hypothesis is whether Chinese Americans are as heterogeneous a population as Indian Americans. After studying the composition of both groups, it is obvious that there is a significant difference in how the groups are internally structured. The Chinese American
population does not seem to have but one or two possible ways of dividing their racial identity within the population while the Indian Americans seem to have multiple opportunities for a division of racial identity within the population. For example, an individual of the Chinese American population could choose to associate with either Mandarin or Cantonese speaking Chinese Americans, with Chinese Americans who are Han Chinese or who are not Han Chinese. A Chinese American individual mainly would choose among Christianity, Buddhism, or Confucianism. An Indian American individual on the other hand could choose among 26 different major languages, thousands of dialects, hundreds of sects within several religions, many regions, or thousands of castes. Chinese Americans have established more pan-Chinese (ethnic) organizations and have participated to a greater degree in government than Indian Americans who have established more intra-Indian (sub-ethnic) organizations. Thus, Chinese Americans are able to interact more readily and to organize as a community as a whole while Indian Americans lack this interaction due to the great degree of interaction on a sub-group (sub-ethnic) level. Assuming this is true, it would follow that Indian Americans’ lack of interaction as a community as a whole hinders the general political participation of Indian American individuals.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

While the socio-economic status of these populations are similar, aggregate data and the participation scores from this study show that Chinese Americans more extensively participate in politics than Indian Americans. From the quantitative and qualitative analysis above, it is clear that the identity of Indian Americans and Chinese Americans influences their political participation. High participation scores were shown in several Indian American respondents; these respondents, however, were those Indian Americans who also had a high level of identity with the Indian ethnicity. This study found that a majority of Indian American respondents identified themselves with a sub-ethnic group, and, in contrast, a majority of Chinese American respondents identified themselves with their ethnic group.

The implications of this study might include encouraging Indian Americans to think of themselves as Indians instead of solely identifying with a sub-ethnic group. The process by which identity directly influences participation needs further exploration. Identity leads an individual to organize and participate with certain groups as opposed to others. While much of the literature discussing the influence of civic organizations and networks on an individual’s participation state that most organizations can encourage collective action and political participation, there might be some impediments to mobilizing certain insular, or sub-ethnic groups. The role of these sub-ethnic
organizations in encouraging or discouraging political participation must be further explored.
SURVEY

Introduction:
Hello, my name is ______________ and I am a student at the University of Georgia. I am working on my Master’s Thesis in Political Science and I am conducting a survey of Indian and Chinese Americans. I can tell you more about it in a minute, but first, could you spare a few minutes now to answer just a few questions over the phone?

1. Yes
0. No – then, may I call back at a better time?

If yes, then are you of the age of 18 or above?
1. Yes
0. No – then, interview cancelled.

Ethnicity of the Individual:
1. Indian American 9. Refused/Don’t Know/NA
0. Chinese American

Question 1
What is the gender of the respondent?
1. Female 9. Refused/Don’t Know/NA
0. Male

Question 7x1A
Do you spend time with an informal or formal group of Indian/Chinese Americans during any given month?
1. Yes 9. Refused/Don’t Know/NA
0. No

Question 7x1B
Does this group include any type of Indian or Chinese American? For example, does it cross language or religious differences? Or is this group more specific?

b. More specific

c. Any that address political issues?
99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 7x1C
If you are involved in more than one group, then please characterize the few primary ones.

a. More specific groups?
b. Broader, more inclusive groups?
c. Any that address political issues?
99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 7x1Ca
a. More specific groups, how many?
Question 7x1Cb
b. Broader, more inclusive groups, how many?
99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 7x1Cc
c. Any that address political issues, how many?
99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 7x2a,b,c
Could you approximate the number of hours per month that you spend with each type of organization?

a. More narrow groups, number of hours ___ 99. Ref/DK/NA
b. More broad groups, number of hours ____ 99. Ref/DK/NA
c. Any that address political issues, number of hours ____ 99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 8
Are you more likely to interact with a broader group of Indian/Chinese Americans or with a more specific group?

a. More specific group
b. More inclusive group
c. Either
d. Cannot say/Neither

Question 9
Do you identify more with the characteristics of a certain specific group of Indian/Chinese Americans than with a broader group of Indian/Chinese Americans?

1. Yes 9. Ref/DK/NA
0. No

Question 10
Do you follow political events? (For example, through the newspaper or television?)

1. Yes 9. Ref/DK/NA
0. No

Question 11
Are there any political issues recently that you are concerned with?

1. Yes 9. Ref/DK/NA
0. No

Question 12
Do you discuss political events with any of the following?

a. Your family members?
b. Your friends of neighbors?
c. Members of the Indian/Chinese community?
d. Exit
Question 13
Are there any political issues that you know of that all Indian/Chinese Americans should think about?
   1. Yes
     9. Ref/DK/NA
   0. No

Question 14
Do you think all Indian/Chinese Americans could work together to influence these issues through the America political system?
   1. Yes
     9. Ref/DK/NA
   0. No

Question 15
Do you think Indian/Chinese Americans participate enough in the American political process to address issues of their concern?
   1. Yes
     9. Ref/DK/NA
   0. No

Question 16
What is the major reason why Indian/Chinese Americans do not participate enough to have their views heard?
   1. The community is apathetic/or does not have time
   2. The community cannot organize well together
   3. They do not have enough resources
   4. They do not understand the system
   5. Exit

Question 17
How many hours per month do you spend in some activity you believe constitutes political participation?   ________   99. Ref/DK/NA

Question 17b
What type of activity is it? Examples include writing/calling officials, discussion issues within an organization, campaigning, other?

Question 17c
Will you participate in the future or have you in the past?
   1. Yes
     9. Ref/DK/NA
   0. No

Question 18
Do you donate money to any campaigns or organizations that promote your opinion of political issues?
   1. Yes
     9. Ref/DK/NA
   0. No
Question 19
Do you regularly vote (in any elections)?
   1. Yes
   0. No
   9. Ref/DK/NA

CONTROL VARIABLE QUESTIONS

Question 2
What is the status of your citizenship?
   0. Non-Citizen
   1. Visa (Student, Visitor, H-1, etc)
   2. Citizen
   3. No Answer

Question 3
What is your immigrant generation?
   1. 1st generation = born abroad
   2. 2nd generation = child of immigrant, born in America
   3. 3rd generation = grandchild of immigrant
   4. 4th generation, etc
   9. Ref/DK/NA

Question 4
What is your occupation?

Question 5
What is the highest education level you have achieved?
   1. < High School
   2. High School Diploma
   3. Associates Degree
   4. Technical Institute
   5. Undergraduate Degree
   6. Professional Degree
   7. Graduate Degree
   8. MD, JD, PhD
   9. Ref/DK/NA
Question 6
What is your average household income level?

1. < 15,000
2. 15-25,000
3. 25-35,000
4. 35-45,000
5. 45-55,000
6. 55-65,000
7. 65-75,000
8. 75-100,000
9. 100-150,000
10. 150,000 >
11. Ref/DK/NA
VARIABLES:

Variables were coded as follows –

Values for the independent variables, ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ and ‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’, were gathered by adding the responses from the questions requesting identity information.

The score for the variable of ‘Level of Identity with Ethnicity’ was the sum of the answers from questions 7x1B_1, 7x1C_2, 7x1Cb, 7x2b, 8_2, and 9b. These questions requested the number of inclusive, ethnic organizations, informal or formal, the respondent associated with and the number of hours per month spent with them. Additionally, the respondent was asked whether or they would be more likely to interact with such groups and whether he or she identified more with the characteristics of the overall ethnicity.

‘Level of Identity with Sub-ethnicity’ included answers from questions 7x1B_2, 7x1C_1, 7x1Ca, 7x2a, 8_1, 9a. These questions requested the number of exclusive, sub-ethnic organizations, informal or formal, the respondent associated with and the number of hours per month spent with them. Additionally, the respondent was asked whether or they would be more likely to interact with such groups and whether he or she identified more with the characteristics of that specific sub-group.

Values for the dependent variable, Political Participation, were gathered by adding the responses about political activity which
included answers from questions 10, 11, 12_1, 12_2, 12_3, 17, 18, 19. These questions requested the number of groups, informal or formal, the respondent associated that addressed political issues and the number of hours per month spent with them. The respondent was asked if they followed political events, whether or not they were concerned with political issues, discussed political information with family, friends, and others of the ethnicity, and if they thought there were issues that concerned the ethnicity as a whole. Finally, the respondent was asked how many hours per month they participated politically in some way, if they donated money to further their political views, and if they voted.

Control Variables:

6. Status or Level of Citizenship: 0 = No Visa or Non-Citizen; 1 = Visa (Student, Visitor H-1, etc); 2 = Citizen

7. Generation of Immigrant: 1st Generation = Born in a country other than the United States; 2nd Generation = Born in the United States and with parents who were born abroad; 3rd Generation = Born in the United States and with parents who were born in the United States but grandparents who were born abroad.

3. Education:
   < High School
   High School Diploma
   Associates Degree
   Technical Institute
   Undergraduate Degree
   Professional Degree
   Graduate Degree
   MD, JD, PhD
   Ref/DK/NA
4. Income
   < 15,000
   15-25,000
   25-35,000
   35-45,000
   45-55,000
   55-65,000
   65-75,000
   75-100,000
   100-150,000
   150,000 >
   Ref/DK/NA

5. Gender: 0 = Males, 1 = Females
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