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Introduction

The Bureau of the Census has predicted that Latinos will become the largest minority group in the United States shortly after the next millennium. Yet, a close examination of the political orientations, activities, sense of community, and identity of this population is relatively absent from social science investigation. The Latino National Political Survey (LNPS), a national probability household survey, serves to address this deficiency, providing a unique and comprehensive data resource on the largest Latino subgroups in the nation.

General areas of inquiry in the LNPS include:

- Support for core American values
- Attitudes toward other groups in America
- Political attitudes toward social issues and policy
- Partisanship and electoral activities
- Political and organizational behaviors such as organizational involvement, problem-solving strategies, involvement with schools, etc.
- Social networks and group identity

The specific Latino subgroups surveyed were adults (18 years and older) who were of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban origin, or had one parent or two grandparents of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban ancestry. A total of 1,546 Mexicans, 589 Puerto Ricans, and 682 Cubans were interviewed. In addition, 499 non-Latinos, defined as being not of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban origin, were interviewed.

Fieldwork for the survey began in August 1989, and interviewing was completed in April 1990. The face-to-face interviews took approximately 70 minutes with bilingual/bicultural interviewers.

The co-principal investigators for the LNPS, which is distributed by ICPSR as Latino National Political Survey, 1989–1990 (ICPSR 6841), were: Rodolfo de la Garza (University of Texas); Angelo Falcon (Institute for Puerto Rican Policy); F. Chris Garcia (University of New Mexico); and John A. Garcia (University of Arizona). Funding for the survey came from the Ford, Rockefeller, Tinker, and Spencer Foundations.

Methodological Issues

Defining Latinos. A primary concern in conducting a national probability survey of Latinos is the comprehensiveness of coverage. National origin is a major determining factor, and there are potentially 21 Spanish origin countries. The investigators understood the significance of national origin status in terms of community, orientations, experiences, and identity. Although Latinos are grouped together in public discourse and assumed to be connected, the LNPS was to be the vehicle to test empirically the reality of a pan-ethnic community. A guiding principle was the integrity of national origin as a basis for selection and comparison. At the same time, cost, feasibility, and efficiency made it almost impossible to construct national origin samples for all of the Latino subgroups. As a result, a decision was made to limit the LNPS to Mexican-origin persons, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans. These three groups represent approximately 80 percent of the total Latino population in the United States.

Language and Culture. In the examination of Latino populations, matters of culture and language are integral di-
Minority Research Data CD-ROM

The Latino National Political Survey is one of twenty data collections constituting a new CD-ROM available from ICPSR entitled Minority Research Data (ICPSR 6941, CD0016). This CD-ROM was sponsored by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

All data files are provided as text files (ASCII format), and some are provided in portable SPSS format as well. All data files are accompanied by SAS or SPSS data definition statements. Technical documentation is provided in Portable Document Format (PDF), and Adobe Acrobat Reader software is included on the CD-ROM.

One copy of the CD-ROM was sent to ICPSR member institutions. Any interested user may purchase the CD-ROM directly from ICPSR for $30 for individuals at member institutions and $60 for individuals at nonmember institutions. Faculty members at accredited HBCU institutions may purchase the CD-ROM at member rates.

Studies on the CD-ROM include:

- Arce, Carlos H. Mexican Origin People in the United States: The 1979 Chicano Survey (ICPSR 8436)
- Campbell, Angus, and Howard Schuman. Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities, 1968 (ICPSR 3500)
- Davis, Karen. of the Commonwealth Fund Commission on Elderly People Living Alone. National Survey of Hispanic Elderly People, 1980 (ICPSR 9289)
- Duncan, Otis D., and Howard Schuman. Detroit Area Study, 1971: Social Problems and Social Change in Detroit (ICPSR 7325)
- Farley, Reynolds, and Howard Schuman. Detroit Area Study, 1976: A Study of Metropolitan and Neighborhood Problems (ICPSR 7906)
- Jackson, James S. National Black Election Panel Study, 1984 and 1988 (ICPSR 9954)
- Portes, Alejandro. Adaptation Process of Cuban (Mariel) and Haitian Refugees in South Florida, 1983–1987 (ICPSR 9750)
- Roserstone, Steven I. Detroit Area Study, 1989: Political Participation in the Detroit Area (ICPSR 6410)
- Schuman, Howard. Detroit Area Study, 1968: Black Attitudes in Detroit (ICPSR 7324)

dimensions. These dimensions were reflected in the LNPS’s instrument development, pre-test stage, interviewing methods, interviewer selection, and bilingual administration.

The instrument development stage consisted of an extensive bibliographic search on political attitudes, behaviors, and values in general, as well as research on Latino and other minority populations. In addition, the investigators shared working instruments with the Verba, Schlozman, Brady, and Nie study on political participation (see American Citizen Participation Study, 1990 [ICPSR 6635]). Finally, the LNPS study had an advisory committee of scholars to provide input and evaluation of the instrument. The instrument for the non-Latino sample was a subset of the Latino instrument, as many of the items were specific to Latino subgroup attitudes and activities. Ultimately, the final selection of the items used in the instrument was the decision of the investigators.

The question of language of the instrument and Spanish-language variations were major concerns. Clearly, the necessity for a Spanish version was affirmed, as 60 percent of the respondents were interviewed in Spanish. Research literature suggests that some Spanish-language variations (i.e., colloquialisms, vocabulary, etc.) exist among the Latino subgroups. Rather than use several versions of the Spanish language instrument, the investigators decided to employ the “back and forth” translation technique. That is, once the English version was complete, three Spanish translators (trained professionals with national origin from each of the three groups) translated the instrument into Spanish. Once translated, the current Spanish version was retranslated back into English. This back and forth process con-
continued until the two versions were mirror images of each other. In cases of differences regarding Spanish words or phrases, the translators met to resolve any differences. As a result, a common Spanish language version was used for the LNPS.

The Institute for Social Research at Temple University was the contractor for the fieldwork, sampling, and interviewer selection and training. As limited survey experience had been accumulated with the Latino populations under study, it was decided that conducting face-to-face interviews was essential. Personal interviews also served to enhance response rates, clarity of survey contents, interviewee rapport, and completeness of survey foci.

About 150 interviewers were used in the data collection. Extensive screening and testing was conducted to ensure good English and Spanish language skills, as well as good interpersonal skills. Each interviewer, many of whom had previous experience with fieldwork in Latino communities, completed a rigorous three-day training program. The LNPS interviewers conducted interviews with both Latinos and non-Latinos.

Sampling Design and Issues

The sample design was a multistage area probability sample using the 1990 Census. Sampling areas or Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) were selected at the first stage. PSUs consisted of groups of contiguous metropolitan counties, called Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs), and groups of rural counties. Forty PSUs were used in the survey, of which 28 were self-representing (i.e., areas containing so many Latinos that they would fall, with virtual certainty, into every sample that employed a design using selection probabilities proportional to the Latino population counts). The remaining 12 non-self-representing areas were selected with probabilities proportional to the Latino population counts (pps). Selection probabilities were based on weighted measures of size reflecting the oversampling of Cubans and Puerto Ricans relative to the Mexican-origin population. Stratification factors included metropolitan status, geography (state/region), and concentration of the Latino population.

At the second stage of selection (SSU), a total of 550 listing areas were sampled with “pps” from the PSUs. Stratification for the SSU design included density of the Latino population and geography. Higher density Latino neighborhoods were oversampled by a factor of 3 to 1 relative to the lowest density neighborhoods. In addition, the SSU design also featured a sampling stratum to detect the birth and expansion of Latino neighborhoods since 1980. Within each SSU, a smaller tertiary unit — listing area (LA) — was selected with “pps”. Then enumerators were sent to list the addresses in the sample and to obtain a household listing of the residents, their ages, and their ethnicity.

The LNPS sampling design also employed a two-phase sample design feature. This was necessary as the survey experienced a higher than expected Latino eligibility rate, especially for Mexicans. In October 1989, after two-thirds of the final interviews had been completed, it was determined that the overall sampling rate should be adjusted downward to minimize the possibility of cost overruns and yet ensure that the Latino interview targets were attained or achieved. The second phase of the sample, therefore, consisted of the stratified random subsampling of half of the SSUs. A random half-sample was retained in the study, and all of its sample addresses were brought to a final disposition. Fieldwork ceased on the non-final addresses in the other half of the sample. The two-phase design feature retained the integrity of the sample design by preserving the probability structure of the design. Even though some statistical inefficiency resulted from the introduction of a twofold oversampling factor, the strategy proved successful.

The listing phase of the fieldwork served to identify eligible respondents (i.e., Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban origin). When more than one adult Latino resided in the household, one was randomly selected to be the survey respondent.

In all, a total of approximately 15,200 addresses were used in the survey. The screening response attained in this study was 90 percent. The Latino interview response reached 82 percent, while the non-Latino interview response rate was 62 percent. Latinos achieved an overall response rate of 74 percent, whereas the overall response rate for non-Latinos was 56 percent. (The overall response rate combines the screening and interview response by taking their product. The overall response rate estimates the percentage of the survey population that participated in the survey.)

To analyze the survey data, weights that reflect differential selection probabilities were generated. These weights incorporate adjustments for nonresponse and post-stratification. Weights appear on the dataset for Latino subgroup specific analysis (i.e., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban), and for analyzing the combined Latino population.
Using the 1980 Census counts of households by Latino type, the overall sampling fraction was set for Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. The sampling rate assumed 90 percent population coverage and an overall 70 percent response rate. Thus the number for Mexican households to be sampled was $800 / (1.9) \times (0.7) = 1270$. Using the same assumptions for Cuban and Puerto Rican households, sample sizes were 952 for each group. Taking the ratio of desired to total households yielded the following overall sampling rates by Latino type: Mexican — 1 in 1,800; Puerto Rican — 1 in 630; and Cuban — 1 in 300. Cubans were oversampled relative to Mexican origin by a factor of 6, and were oversampled relative to Puerto Ricans by a factor of 2.1. Similarly, Puerto Ricans on the average were oversampled by a factor of 2.9 relative to Mexicans. The investigators felt that national origin status was critical to the analysis, and attaining sufficient numbers of Puerto Rican and Cuban respondents required their oversampling.

**Survey Content**

As suggested earlier, the primary substantive focus of the LNPS was to explore extensively the political values, attitudes, and behaviors of Latinos. National discourse on Latinos has presumed the existence of interactive and communicative Latino subcommunities. One of the areas of inquiry was an exploration of the existence of communities (both within and between the Latino subgroups). Questions regarding ethnic identity in national origin terms, as well as pan-ethnic labels, were asked. The availability of multiple responses would enable researchers to examine multiplicity of identities and some sense of preference. In addition, items that reflected community included questions that probed for a sense of a pan-ethnic community based on common cultural and/or policy-political interests. In addition, a number of items elicited the extent of contact and voluntary interactions within and between each of the Latino subgroups. Finally, community-related items also explored sense of group collectivity, affinity, and circumstances.

The political behavior component of the LNPS covered both electoral and non-electoral activities. Within the electoral arena, voting patterns over the past three elections, vote choice, and electoral involvement beyond voting were recorded. For the Spanish-speaking citizens, a short battery of items covered the provisions of the Voting Rights Act. The non-electoral section of LNPS placed much emphasis on organizational involvement, assessment, and awareness. Organizational membership was operationalized into types of organizations (i.e., work-related, social issues, Latino, etc.) as well as whether one was a member, was active, or had given money or goods to the organization. In addition, respondents indicated the ethnic composition of the organizations they belonged to, as well as identifying Latino advocacy groups.

Another feature of the LNPS was a battery of items that explored the perspective of political involvement as a problem-solving process. Respondents were asked to identify national or local problems and to specify whose responsibility it was to resolve them (i.e., government or individuals/groups), whom the respondent talked to about the problem, any efforts (individual and/or collective) to solve the problem, and, if involved, the outcome of the problem-solving.

Other political behavior items dealt with campaign activities, contacting public officials, and protest/demonstrations. Information was also elicited on respondents’ involvement in a broad range of general political activities, as well as in specific Latino-based political activities, and on their contact and involvement in the educational system. Conventional items were included regarding partisanship, political ideology, political tolerance, and political interest and knowledge. Finally, recent developments in the study of political participation have examined the acquisition of organizational skills as a precursor to political involvement; the LNPS includes items that incorporate these skills.

A consistent element in the content of the LNPS was the inclusion of items that allowed for comparative analysis with other major social surveys, as well as items pertinent to Latinos that have been ignored or under-researched. A balance between some replication and comparison of Latinos with other groups and exploring new concepts and measures was a central dimension of this project.

Background information gathered on LNPS respondents was extensive. In addition to including socioeconomic status variables, the survey also facilitated detailed immigration profiles. Each respondent not only accounted for his or her own birthplace, but also for that of his or her parents and grandparents; thus, it becomes possible to create a generational distance measure. (This is more applicable to the Mexican-origin respondents, as there is less of a “native-born” segment among the Puerto Rican and Cuban respondents.)

The extensive foreign-born segment of the LNPS is an important unit of analysis in terms of attitudes, involvement, and incorporation/integration. Other
salient background information concerned both religious affiliation and religiosity among Latinos. In the language area, a paper and pencil section of the instrument provided a language “proficiency” test in the language the respondent did not use in the interview. Finally, the Latino respondents were asked to rate (on a 100-point thermometer scale) their affinity to a number of countries, including the United States. Social distance thermometers were included for each of the Latino subgroups (encompassing Mexican immigrants and native-born Mexican-origin people, and Puerto Ricans born on the island and the mainland U.S.) and other minority groups.

Nevertheless, these groups exhibit some commonalities regarding positions on a number of social/domestic policy issues. Latinos favor increased governmental spending on health, crime and drug control, education, the environment, child services, and bilingual education. Support for bilingual education continues to be an important policy issue, especially among Puerto Ricans and Mexican-origin people. They also look to government to solve problems that most concern them. In comparison to the non-Latinos in the LNPS, the Latinos are more liberal on a domestic agenda.

Latino partisanship is characterized as more diverse than popular perceptions would indicate. Although many Mexicans and Puerto Ricans are Democrats, and more Cubans are Republicans, their respective levels of affiliation are less one-sided. That is, although a majority of Cubans are Republicans, many Cubans are either Democrats or leaning in that direction; and fewer strongly identify as Republicans than might be expected. Mexicans and Puerto Ricans report a lower level of Democratic partisanship, while a substantial number of Mexican Republicans are former Democrats. Each group identifies itself as moderate to conservative on a political ideology scale. At the same time, each group, in varying degrees, perceives a significant degree of discrimination encountered by each of the Latino subgroups. The Cuban respondents perceive lower levels than the other two groups.

Behaviorally, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans report different levels of political involvement in electoral and non-electoral activities. Mexicans and Puerto Ricans report lower interest in current events and vote at lower levels than Cubans and non-Latinos. Cubans almost take the character of voting specialists while being much less active in non-voting activities. The Latinos report higher degrees of involvement in school-related activities than non-Latinos. None of the Latino subgroups reports high rates of participation in activities related to their specific groups. They do not exhibit much knowledge about Latino leaders and organizations, but they do express ethnic group solidarity and support for their fellow co-ethics. There is evidence that Latinos are quite willing to vote for a fellow co-ethnic if they have the opportunity to do so. Somewhat surprisingly, less than one-third of the Latinos have had that opportunity.

At the time of the LNPS, its results suggest that these groups (at the mass level) do not constitute an interactive political community. There is some agreement on some policy areas but divergence on others. There is a strong, positive (for the most part) identification with the U.S., while maintaining cultural and social ties with their countries of origin. To a large extent, the results of the LNPS suggest that Latinos are within the mainstream of the nation’s politics. At the same time, the areas of commonality and the efforts by Latino leaders to mobilize their constituencies will rest upon increasing gains in socioeconomic status and greater political interest and knowledge.

Research areas such as coalitional conditions across the Latino community, determinants of political mobilization, individual resources and political participation modes, and identifying possible Latino policy agendas remain to be explored further. The LNPS provides both a benchmark for the understanding of Latino politics and a vehicle to develop newer models for empirical research.
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National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey, 1993 — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 6915)


National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 1982 — National Institute on Drug Abuse (ICPSR 6845)

National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 1985 — National Institute on Drug Abuse (ICPSR 6844)


National Survey of College Graduates, 1993 — National Science Foundation (ICPSR 6880)


National Survey of Jails: Jurisdiction-Level Data, 1995 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 6784)

Paths of Generation: Longitudinal Comparative Study of Secondary School Graduates in Different Regions of the Former Soviet Union — Stage 1, 1983 — Maja Ashmane, Esther Katz, and Mikk Titma (ICPSR 6312)

Politbarometer West (Germany), Partial Accumulation, 1977–1993 — Forschungsgruppe Wahlen (Mannheim) (ICPSR 6913)

Political Support in Canada, 1993 — Harold D. Clarke and Allan Kornberg (ICPSR 6891)


Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data (United States): County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, 1995 — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 6850)


Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities, 1984 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 8444)


Myth and Reality of Aging, 1974 — National Council on Aging (ICPSR 7657)


Revisions/Updates


National Jail Census, 1988 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 9256)


National Survey of Jails: Jurisdiction-Level and Jail-Level Data, 1986 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 8871)

National Survey of Jails: Jurisdiction-Level Data, 1990 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 9569)


Roster of United States Congressional Officeholders and Biographical Characteristics of Members of the United States Congress, 1789–1996: Merged Data — Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research and Carroll McKibbin (ICPSR 7803)


Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: [United States] — United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation (ICPSR 9028)


Publication Archive Additions

Coercion and Protest: An Empirical Test in Two Democratic States — Ronald A. Francisco (ICPSR 1131)
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Biennial Meeting to Be Held in October

Please join us for the Biennial Meeting of ICPSR Official Representatives (ORs), which will take place October 23–26, 1997, on the University of Michigan campus in Ann Arbor.

This is an excellent opportunity for ORs to interact and to share their experiences with other members of the social science research community. ORs can register electronically on the ICPSR Website at:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/Membership/OR97/reg.html

Survey of ORs Being Conducted

ICPSR is conducting a survey of ORs and DRs to gauge levels of satisfaction with ICPSR services and products. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey, which is available at:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/orsubop.html

Or contact us (313-764-2570) for a paper copy of the survey.

SAMHDA Archive Established

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive (SAMHDA) is a new addition to ICPSR’s “topical” archives. SAMHDA provides data and documentation that are freely available, and upcoming features will include an online data analysis system. The Office of Applied Studies (OAS) at the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) provides funding for the archive. The goal of the archive is to provide ready access to substance abuse and mental health research data and to promote the sharing of these data among researchers, academicians, policymakers, service providers, and others, thereby increasing the use of the data in understanding and assessing substance abuse and mental health problems and the impact of related treatment systems.

Some of the data to be acquired and archived under SAMHDA have never before been publicly distributed. These data include public use files of Treatment Episode Data and the Drug Abuse Warning Network. Current holdings include the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (1979–1995) and Monitoring the Future, 12th grade surveys (1977–1995). Other datasets for archiving include the Washington, DC, Metropolitan Area Drug Study, the Treatment Outcomes Prospective Study, the National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study, and Monitoring the Future, 8th and 10th grade surveys, among others.

Information on Documentation Now on the Website

Users can now find current documentation information for all released data collections in the ICPSR holdings on the ICPSR Website. A list, modeled after the Study Number-Documentation Index previously found in the Guide to Resources and Services, can now be accessed at the following URL:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/codes.html

Note that the Guide is no longer being published in printed form.

Notes and Errata

In July 1997 ICPSR received an errata notice from the Roper Center about several discrepancies between the SPSS data definition statements and the printed codebook for the General Social Surveys, 1972–1996: [Cumulative File] (ICPSR 6870). Below are the corrections communicated in the notice:

Q569—OTHERESP:
SPSS labels should be changed to:
10 = completely responsible

Q570—SELFRESP:
SPSS labels should be changed to:
10 = completely responsible

Q599A-Q599F—FIXERA, FIXERB, FIXERC, FIXERD, FIXERE, FIXERF:
SPSS labels should be changed to:
1 = yes
2 = no

Q654—KNWMHOSP:
Codebook labels should be:
1 = yes

2 = no
8 = not sure
9 = no answer
bk = not applicable

Q637D and Q779C—STRESSES,
STRESS:

In the VARIABLE LABELS section of the SPSS data definition file, the variables STRESSES and STRESS are switched. This situation occurs in the VAR LABEL section only.

STRESSES refers to “caused by stressful circumstances” and STRESS refers to a job.
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