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This chapter provides recent data on group differences in the political participation of African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans in the United States and discusses advances in our understanding of the processes (e.g., mobilization, legal reforms, experiences of minorities with

the carceral state) and mechanisms (e.g., resources, group consciousness, identity) that account

for such differences. Our review supports the argument that political participation of marginalized groups reflects the costs and benefits imposed by the broader political and historical contexts in addition to the typical individual-level factors considered in standard participation models. Thus, generalizing our understanding of race, ethnicity and participation across different political systems and social contexts requires a nuanced understanding of country-specific histories and efforts to draw broad, systematic comparative conclusions regarding race and ethnicity as determinants of participation can be highly problematic.
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 Studies of race/ethnicity as determinants of participation in the United States over the past several decades have shifted from documenting differences in the levels of participation across racial/ethnic groups to understanding more fully the processes and mechanisms that account for such differences. Traditional participation models have focused on socio-economic status and political mobilization differences to account for aggregate participation variations across groups. More recent studies focus on racial identity as moderating the effects of these factors, and the distinctive importance of non-traditional (non-partisan, non-electoral) institutions in mobilizing - and sometimes, demobilizing - participation. We provide an overview of these developments and our argument below, noting that acquiring valid, systematic data on race/ethnicity and participation across groups is essential to a descriptive understanding of the relevance of race/ethnicity to participation, as well as to rigorously evaluating theories that account for observed differences in participation across racial/ethnic groups. We conclude that recent studies of the processes and mechanisms that account for participatory differences across racial and ethnic groups underscore the participation decisions of minority individuals as uniquely reflecting the costs and benefits imposed by the broader political and historical contexts in addition to the typical individual-level factors considered in standard participation models.

We also conclude that theoretically-motivated research studies developed in the United States to explain variation in ethnic and racial mobilization are rarely generalizable to other countries because they rely on country-specific institutions, histories, cleavages, and policies. For example, theories of racial hierarchy, group consciousness, and party mobilization and integration may not hold absent these contextual factors because ethnic and racial identities are either esoteric or politically irrelevant without a nuanced understanding of country-specific histories and contexts.

We primarily focus on race and ethnicity in the context of American politics for two reasons. First, many theories seeking to understand the role that race and ethnicity play in shaping political participation were pioneered in the context of American politics. Second, our research expertise in, and more comprehensive knowledge of American politics allows us to draw more nuanced arguments regarding the complex relationships of race/ethnicity, social and political context and individual behavior. However, we use a limited comparative framework, with a focus on Western Europe, to highlight our broader argument while keeping crucial factors such as democratic ideals, economic development, and fundamental legal institutions constant. We recognize, of course, that the history of ethnic cleavages, the political power sharing structure, micro-institutions, and racial, immigration, and assimilation policies vary even among countries within Western Europe. Countries across Western Europe grapple with diverse histories of linguistic and regional divisions, patterns of colonization, and cultural norms, among other things, that shape racial and ethnic hierarchies and draw cleavages across distinct identities.

**Race, Ethnicity and Participation: The Empirical Record**

One of the biggest challenges in advancing the study of the political behavior of racial/ethnic minorities in the United States is the limited number of data sets that include a sufficient number of respondents across multiple racial/ethnic groups to allow for appropriate analysis. The Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) provides the longest time series documenting self-reported voting in presidential and midterm elections by race and ethnicity. The CPS conducts a broad sample of households including respondents from dorms, military barracks, and prisons. Figure 1 includes voter turnout rates for non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, Hispanics, and an aggregated category for other racial groups (including Asian Americans and Native Americans) from 1986 to 2018. A clear pattern observed here is the persistent gap in turnout of about 20 percentage points –with White Americans and Black Americans turning out to vote at higher rates, relative to Latinos and those defined as “others” (many of whom are Asian Americans) both in presidential and midterm election years.[[1]](#footnote-1)
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Turning now to participation in non-voting activities, we note that few surveys in the United States provide large enough samples of racial and ethnic minorities to study differences in these participation patterns. Among the few exceptions are the American National Elections Survey (ANES), the Cooperative Congressional Elections Study (CCES), and the Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS). The CMPS offers advantages over the ANES and CCES in that it is specifically designed to include a large and representative sample of both registered (to vote) and non-registered citizens across racial/ethnic origin groups. The 2016 CMPS had more than 10,000 respondents with greater diversity in respondents’ racial/ethnic origins and was conducted in a greater number of languages than the ANES and CCES. For these reasons, we focus on the 2016 CMPS here.

As shown in Figure 2, participation in signing petitions and discussing politics on social media is relatively high compared to other types of participation in 2016. Whites and Black Americans report signing petitions at significantly higher rates than do Latinos and Asian Americans. A gap between Asian Americans and Whites in discussing politics on social media is evident, while Whites are significantly more likely to contact officials and contribute money than are Latinos, Black Americans and Asian Americans.
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The activity where individuals participate least, regardless of their race/ethnicity, is volunteering or working for a presidential campaign. Only 2.4% of Whites, 2.9% of Latinos and 4.8% of Black Americans report engaging in this type of activity. The largest gap in participation levels is observed for leaving political comments on a message board or internet site, which about 11% of White Americans report doing, compared to slightly just under half the percentage of Latinos (6.1%) Latinos and Black Americans (6.9%) who report doing so.

These self-reported turnout and participation patterns are similar when using other data sources such as the ANES or CCES, and together confirm the general claim that participation levels in the US are marked by important differences across racial/ethnic groups. Most indicators suggest that Whites generally vote, contact elected officials, donate money and engage online at higher rates than other racial and ethnic groups, though turnout differences between Black Americans and Whites are sometimes quite small. Black participation rates are typically higher than those for Latino and Asian Americans. Yet it is still the case that White Americans participate at the highest rates. (One notable exception to this pattern is that data from the 2012 CMPS and 2012 ANES which suggest that in 2012, Black Americans voted, volunteered or worked for presidential campaigns, and donated to presidential candidates, at higher rates than whites.) Furthermore, Black Americans and Latinos attend protests, rallies, and marches at higher rates than Whites and Asian Americans. Finally, data from most surveys suggest that Asian Americans generally participate at lower rates than other groups.

The general conclusion that racial/ethnic minorities participate less than Whites is but one of many challenges to democratic politics in the United States today. Importantly, a comparative perspective suggests that racial and ethnic minority status is not “inherently” associated with lower levels of political participation; our empirical findings based on the US cannot be automatically generalized elsewhere. If we look across the Atlantic, there does not appear to be a consistent role that ethnicity and race play in shaping political participation in Western Europe. While some scholars contend that ethnicity plays a central role in shaping variation in political participation across Western Europe (Simonsen 2020), the role of ethnicity as a determinant of political participation in the region remains an open question. Sandovici and Listhaug (2010) use the European Social Survey to study participation gaps in 21 countries across eight varied activities including voting, contacting a politician, boycotting a product, and participating in illegal protests. They find that there are only participation gaps between minority ethnic groups and the majoritarian ethnic group in terms of voting. They do not find participation gaps in the seven other political activities they examine. Gallego (2007), also using the European Social Survey, comes to a similar conclusion: ethnic-minority status is not clearly associated with lower levels of political participation when controlling for other covariates in Western Europe. Taken altogether, these studies suggest that few consistent patterns exist acrosscountries in the region. Therefore, it stands to reason that country-specific factors are critical in shaping differential patterns in political participation among racial and ethnic minorities.

These findings highlight a crucial argument made in this review: differential patterns in political participation among minority racial and ethnic groups are a result of complex historical, institutional, and contextual factors, and therefore vary across time and place. We argue that both the differences in participation patterns across groups, as well as the variations we observe from year to year, reflect that participation of racial and ethnic groups is socially and politically mobilized differently across elections and over time. We review below the development of theories and evidence analyzing these differences to substantiate this claim.

**Race/Ethnicity and Models of Participation**

The consideration of demographics as determinants of political behavior has been a dominant approach in the social sciences for nearly a century. Ray Wolfinger and Steven Rosenstone’s study of turnout in the 1972 presidential campaign, updated and expanded by Leighley and Nagler (2014) is an early exemplar of the field’s focus on demographics and voter turnout. Leighley and Nagler highlight the important distinction between bivariate differences in White/Black and Hispanic/non-Hispanic turnout differences[[2]](#footnote-2) and race/ethnic differences *controlling for other demographic characteristics*. The latter approach reflects the greater theoretical development and analytical emphasis on education and income as predictors of turnout and participation. Controlling for education and income, Leighley and Nagler find that Black Americans are more likely to vote than Whites, but that Hispanics are less likely to vote than Whites.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Leighley and Nagler’s findings underscore the limitations of the “socio-economic status” model, in that they raise the continued question of what accounts for the differences between black and white turnout, or between Hispanic and non-Hispanic turnout after controlling for socio-economic status? Similarly, studies of Asian American turnout and participation often report the inconsistent pattern that “even though” Asian Americans (as a group) report higher levels of education and income, they report participating less than other racial/ethnic groups (Wong et al 2011). These inconsistencies--observed over many data sets and years--have led scholars of racial/ethnic politics to develop alternative models of turnout and participation many of which focus on the distinct their experiences as a marginalized and stigmatized group (Garcia Bedolla and Michelson 2012; Wong et al 2011). Both of these works confirm the importance of education and income in understanding who votes, but also affirm that understanding variations in turnout across race/ethnicity requires attention to alternative factors that influence turnout—else why do we observe different levels of turnout for Black Americans and Latinos controlling for education and income?

Verba, Schlozman and Brady’s “Civic Voluntarism” model posits that participating in political acts beyond voting reflects individuals’ resources, (psychological) engagement and recruitment (through both political and non-political networks). They find that time, money and skills are necessary for political engagement, while psychological engagement such as political interest *alone* is inadequate. They also report that once resources, engagement and recruitment are controlled for, Black-Americans and Latinos participate in non-voting participation at the same level as Whites (p. 523). This is early, important evidence that differences in participation levels across racial/ethnic groups reflects variations in the economic, social and psychological resources that typically vary across these groups, with variations elaborated on distinctly in subsequent group-specific studies.

For example, studies of Latino and Asian American political participation also consider factors associated with immigrant generation, country of origin differences and family/social networks as either direct or indirect influences on participation levels. [For Latinos, see Abrajano and Alvarez 2012; Barreto 2005; Barreto and Nuno 2011; Bueker 2013; Carlson et al 2020; DeFrancesco and Merolla 2006; Leal 2002; 2000; Leighley and Nagler 2016; Levin 2013; Michelson 2000; Pantoja, Ramirez and Segura 2001; White 2016; For Asian Americans, see Chan 2020; Cho 1999; Jang 2009; Lien 2017, 2010; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; Ramakrishnan and Shah 2016; Wong, Lien and Conway 2008; Wong et al. 2011a, 2011b ].

Studies of Black American non-voting participation tend to reflect general arguments regarding socioeconomic status, discussing in greater deal the distinctive consequences of poverty for political engagement, and examine engagement in protest behavior, often drawing on the historical context of the civil rights movement (Cohen and Dawson 1993; Gillion 2020; Grumbach and Sahn 2019, Harris, Sinclair-Chapman and McKenzie 2005; McKee, Hood and Hill 2012; Tate 1991.)

Despite Verba, Schlozman and Brady’s conclusion that group consciousness is not associated with participation, Dawson (1994) argued that “linked fate” (similar to social psychology’s “common fate”) is what leads (increasingly class-diverse Black Americans) to the maintenance of ideological and partisan homogeneity. In response to Dawson’s work, research on minority political participation shifted from a focus on demographics to a variety of attitudinal factors unique to, or reflecting the distinctive experiences of, racial/ethnic minorities in US society (see, for example, Bonilla and Tillery 2020; Jang 2009; Masuoka 2008; Valdez 2011). More recently, studies of Black-American participation recognize the importance of consciousness, or group identity, but also consider emotions as a stimulus of political engagement (see, for example, Banks, White and McKenzie 2019; White and Laird 2020). Group consciousness, particularly as tool of political mobilization, appears to only be present in groups that share a common history of disenfranchisement and marginalization. For example, studies suggest that group consciousness may mobilize Latinos and Asian Americans but does so less strongly compared to Black Americans, likely because these pan-ethnic identities do not capture shared experiences with discrimination as strongly as Black identification does (Stokes 2003; Wong, Lien, Conway 2005)

Studies examining the link between group consciousness or linked fate and political participation in Western Europe highlight the significance of shared experiences with state disenfranchisement in the formation of politicized group consciousness. Laniyonu (2018) finds that Blacks in Great Britain demonstrate racial group consciousness but generally have lower levels of linked fate than Black Americans in the United States. Also, greater levels of racial group identity are linked with lower voter turnout in both countries while perceptions of marginalization are linked to greater voter participation rates in the United States but not in Britain (Laniyonu 2019; but see Giugni and Grasso 2019b). Again, these studies suggest that theories, even those based off of general psychological and rational principles, do not easily translate across borders and identity cleavages.

**Recruitment and Mobilization**

The third factor identified by Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995) as a determinant of political participation is also affirmed in more recent studies of recruitment and mobilization efforts targeting racial/ethnic minorities. Importantly, their research reveals that Black Americans are more likely than Latinos and Whites to be recruited via their engagement in church communities, and that these recruitment efforts are effective in equalizing participation across racial/ethnic groups. Historically Latinos have not had the same level of established, politicized recruitment networks as experienced by Black Americans, perhaps a reflection of the national origin, immigrant experiences and citizenship diversity of the community, or their unique social or political experiences. However, the increasing salience and political conflicts associated with immigration and other issues experienced by the Latino community has made more evident the potential of formal and informal mobilization efforts targeting Latinos as being successful in increasing Latino turnout and participation (Barreto and Nuno 2011; Levin 2013; Martinez 2010; Oberholzer-Gee and Waldfogel 2009; Pantoja, Ramirez and Segura 2001; Parkin and Zlotnick 2011; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; White 2016; on non-partisan recruitment, see Ramirez 2007).

 Because of the increased significance of immigration in the ethnic diversification of Western Europe, several studies on ethnic political participation have focused on the role of voluntary ethnic associations in mobilizing ethnic minorities. Studies in the United States often find that membership in voluntary associations is linked with increased political participation, particularly for ethnic and racial minorities (Leighley 1995; Verba and Nie 1972; Verba, Scholzman, and Brady 1995). In some instances, these theories developed in the United States appear to generalize across borders (See, for example, Eggert and Giugni 2010; Giugni and Grasso 2019b; Yurdakul 2006; 2009). Yet in France, where immigration policies are dominated by principles of assimilation and an opposition to cultural diversity, ethnically based voluntary associations were illegal until the 1980s. Because of assimilation-oriented policies and cultures, North African organizations in France appear to largely avoid directly engaging in political issues (Hamidi 2003).

Party mobilization appears to be important as parties systematically reach out to racial/ethnic minorities at lower rates than to whites. This pattern reflects, in part, political parties targeting individuals who voted previously (high propensity voters) in Get-Out-The-Vote (GOTV) campaigns (see Enos, Fowler and Vavreck 2013). This creates a self-reinforcing dynamic for racial/ethnic groups such as Latinos and Asian Americans who tend to vote less or less consistently, and thus have larger proportions of low-propensity voters and are less likely to be targeted by partisan organizations (Abrajano et al 2020; Abrajano and Panagopoulos 2011; García Bedolla and Michelson 2012). Garcia Bedolla and Michelson (2012) contend that the key to mobilizing low-propensity voters of color is a psychological shift in how they see their place and position in the polity; instead of thinking of themselves as politically marginalized members, they need to view themselves as central to the polity. They argue that only in-person, interactive contact exerts enough power to cause the internal cognitive shifts necessary to change a low-propensity voter’s behavior on Election Day. Other studies of GOTV effort have shifted to studying the specific features of mobilization efforts unique to Latinos (e.g., language, co-ethnic contact, non-partisan groups) that might make recruitment efforts more effective (Abrajano and Panagopoulos 2011; Barreto and Nuno 2011; Matland and Murray 2012; Michelson 2003; Ramirez 2007; see also Nickerson 2015).

Several other features of the political system or context are also identified as important to understanding participation of racial/ethnic groups. For example, Bobo and Gilliam (1990)’s analysis of turnout in mayoral elections showed that Black Americans were more likely to vote in cities where Black Americans held elected positions. Subsequent studies elaborated on the particular mechanisms (e.g., higher levels of efficacy or greater GOTV efforts targeting Black Americans) accounting for this increased turnout and sought to examine the argument at different election levels (i.e., local or state; see Gay 2001, Keele, Shah, White and Kay 2017). Studies of Latino and Black American turnout have also examined the extent to which party contacting efforts, the existence of Latino candidates and residing in majority/minority districts might increase turnout levels (Barreto, Seguro and Woods 2004; Barreto 2007; Barreto, Merolla and Defrancesco Soto 2011; DeFrancesco Soto and Merolla 2006; Stevens and Bishin 2011; on Asian Americans, see Sadwani 2020). This evidence suggests that these aspects of the electoral system can either increase or reduce group-specific differences in voting.

More recently, the impact of state election laws on minority turnout has been highlighted in studies of photo identification requirements for voting. Findings on the direct effects of photo identification requirements on Black Americans, Latinos and other minorities are somewhat mixed (see Burden 2018; Gimmer et al. 2018; Hajnal, Lajevardi, & Nielson 2017; Hajnal, Kuk, and Lajerardi 2018; Rocha and Matsubayashi 2014). While methodological choices and data inaccuracies have partially led to divergent results, these mixed findings also reflect that the adoption and politicization of these laws often triggers a counter-mobilization effort which is likely to minimize the actual negative effects of the laws (Valentino and Neuner 2017). Incorporating these features of the political environment as explanations of differences across racial/ethnic groups underscores the extent to which thinking about race/ethnicity as leading to lower or greater turnout is seriously limited, as the relevance of race/ethnicity in the political system is a reflection of the political system within which any individual “chooses” to vote/participate (or not). We expand on this observation below.

**Race/Ethnicity and Politics--or Politics and Race/Ethnicity?**

 The accumulated research discussed above demonstrates the critical recognition that the participatory differences observed across racial/ethnic groups reflects not just resource differences across groups, but also systemic differences in elite recruitment, mobilization and features of the electoral system. Here we argue that the distinctive political experiences of racial/ethnic minorities within the political system leads to important attitudinal differences in minorities’ identification with democracy, citizenship and inclusion. These experiences and attitudes also contribute to explaining participatory differences across racial/ethnic groups over time and elections. Accordingly, we suggest that race/ethnicity is not “just” a self-reported demographic characteristic, but also an identity that is determined in part by our politics. We elaborate on these ideas discussing relevant research below.

 Scholars have typically viewed disparities in political participation as a *cause of*, not a *consequence of*, discriminatory government policies and practices. Yet recent research suggests that everyday interactions with street-level bureaucrats teach lessons that reinforce the racial hierarchy and shape the political identities of historically disenfranchised racial and ethnic groups (for examples, *see* Bruch and Soss 2018; Lerman and Weaver 2014; Soss 1999; Weaver and Lerman 2010). For instance, Soss (1999)) finds that recipients of Aid for Family and Dependent Children (AFDC) are less likely to vote than non-welfare recipients even when controlling for socio-economic status and that recipients view government as a whole as an extension of the welfare office (also see Michener’s 2018 study of Medicaid participants). Similarly, disparities in K-12 education practices and policies exacerbate racial gaps in political participation because Black and Latino students are more likely to have negative experiences with authority figures in government sponsored roles (Bruch and Soss 2018: 37).

The carceral state – the set of confinement and criminal justice institutions including prisons, jails, police departments, judges, parole officers, etc. – is another institution that shapes racial and ethnic political participation (Burch 2013; Kang and Dawes 2017; Soss and Weaver 2017; Walker 2014; Walker 2020). Felon disenfranchisement laws are the most direct barrier to democratic participation (Uggen and Manza 2002; Haselswerdt 2009). Weaver and Lerman (2010) and Lerman and Weaver (2014) find that all levels of police contact, ranging from police stops to prison convictions, are demobilizing. They argue that negative experiences with law enforcement teach political lessons that are antagonistic to democratic participation, with more serious or prolonged contact correlated with more intense democratic alienation. Moreover, perceptions of unjust criminal justice practice can mobilize people of color beyond the voting booth as well (Williamson, Trump, and Einstein (2018) and Walker (2020). Such was the case in the United States, where thousands of protests emerged in the throughout the country in the summer of 2020 in response to the racial violence and killing of unarmed Black men at the hands of law enforcement.

Research on the effects of carceral state and policing practices on political participation conducted in the United States appear to partially generalize to the United Kingdom because the United Kingdom adopted and borrowed a broad set of policies from the United States (Newburn 2002). For example, Laniyonu (2018), using panel data from three metropolitan areas in the United Kingdom, finds that communities that experienced greater levels of quality-of-life policing had lower levels of voter turnout when controlling for other covariates. Importantly, these effects appear to be moderated by the percentage of Asians, Blacks, and Muslims in the community. More aggressive policing practices were associated with lower voter turnout primarily in neighborhoods with larger ethnic minority populations. However, these findings may not generalize in other places because they do not share similar ethnic cleavages, policing practices, and political contexts. For example, various recent studies in Spain have aimed to understand the relationship between policing, political participation, and ethnic conflict but through drastically different frames because historical linguistic and regional divisions have largely defined ethnic conflict in Spain – not racial hierarchies – and ethnically based social movements have often pursued a separatist agenda (Medrano 1994; for example, *see* Rodon and Guinjoan 2020). Thus, it is important to note that the inherent differences in the histories, contexts, policies, social movements, and ethnic/racial cleavages between the United States and Spain provide limited common ground for the findings to speak to each other.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, we first provided an overview of the racial dynamics of political participation in the United States by examining data on voter turnout and political participation. We provide evidence that racial and ethnic minorities participate in politics at lower rates than Whites, although there are numerous exceptions to this general observation. We argued that lower levels of participation by racial/ethnic minorities reflects variations in resources and experiences with the political system. These latter findings suggest that addressing these systemic differences might allow for the possibility of fewer participatory differences across groups in the coming years.

Our emphasis on the systemic factors that often lead to lower levels of participation of racial/ethnic minorities emphasizes the importance of understanding that one cannot think of participation differences across racial/ethnic groups without explicitly recognizing the particular ways that the political system--its institutions, agencies and policies--have an influence on those participation levels. In this respect, participation differences across racial/ethnic groups are endogenous to the political system under study.

New data sources and empirical techniques have allowed research to better understand the causes of racial/ethnic disparities in political participation rates. Recent efforts to conduct large-scale surveys on specific racial/minority groups, or oversample racial and ethnic minorities in general population surveys allow for better powered statistical tests that are required to tease out illusive but important factors shaping racial/ethnic minority participation. For example, the CMPS has allowed researchers to better understand the role of linked fate in shaping racial/ethnic participation (see Berry, Ebner and Cornelius 2019; Marsh and Ramirez 2019). Use of voter registration files and predictive algorithms have allowed us to advance our understanding of topics where causal inference was once difficult (see Imai and Khanna 2015).

We emphasize again that scholars interested in studying race/ethnicity in cross-national settings must keep in mind that race is a social construction (Omi and Winant 1994). That is, how societies conceive of racial categories and structures is a function of their unique socio-political histories and processes. In societies where the dominant cleavage centers on class or religion, for instance, the role that race plays in the political arena is likely distinctive from the role of race/ethnicity in societies where the dominant cleavage centers on race/ethnicity. Thus, the relationships between race, ethnicity and participation in these two different contexts must be carefully assessed. Our discussion of studies on race conducted in Western European countries provide an important reminder of the dangers in over-generalizing what we know about race across geographical boundaries. The history of slavery, legal segregation and discrimination in the United States means that race has always been and continues to be a key cleavage that structures and dominates the social, economic and political realms of our society. This particular context is important to consider when generalizing conclusions based on studies conducted in the United States to other settings.
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