Data

Jae Yeon Kim (UC Berkeley)

1 Asian American and Latino Advocacy and Community Service Organizations

There exists no comprehensive ready-made dataset on Asian American and Latino advocacy organizations and community service organizations (CSOs). Existing Asian American or Latino organizational directories solely cover organizations in particular regions or national organizations. Therefore, between May 2017 and August 2017, I collected data from scratch on Asian American and Latino advocacy organizations and CSOs. I created my initial dataset drawing on four directories: the Encyclopedia of Associations (EA) – National Organizations of the US, the Encyclopedia of Associations – Regional, State, and Local Organizations of the US, the National Directory of Nonprofit Organizations, and the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCSS). Collecting data from multiple sources is useful to reduce sampling bias. The total number of Asian American organizations in the dataset is 299, and there are 519 Latino organizations.

To begin with, I used the following search strategy to find the organizations of interest in the data sources. For the Asian American side, I used the following search queries: "Asian," "Asian American," and "Asian Pacific American." For the Latino side, I used "Hispanic," "Latino," "Latina," and "Spanish." The databases find organizations that match these search queries either by their titles or descriptions. 86% of Asian American organizations and 85% of Latino organizations in the dataset were found through this initial search.

To avoid missing ethnic organizations that had become panethnic organizations (or served panethnic constituencies but did not use panethnic markers in their titles), I also searched "Chinese," "Chinatown," "Japanese," and "Filipino" on the Asian American side and "Mexican," "Chicano," "Chicana," "Puerto Rican," "Cuban," "la Raza,"[1] and "centro" on the Latino side. In the 1960s and 1970s, it was not clear whether organizing Asian Americans or Latinos would be successful. In addition, if an organization was deeply rooted in a particular ethnic community, transitioning from an ethnic to panethnic organization was not easy because the organization needed to maintain its base while appealing to new constituents. For instance, the NCLR started as a regional organization focused on Mexican Americans in 1968 in Phoenix, Arizona. It began to officially focus on non-Mexican issues only in the mid-1970s. Its transition was intentionally gradual because the organization needed to negotiate simultaneously with its old supporters and new partners (Mora 2014, 57). For this historical reason, the proportion of such gradually evolved panethnic organizations is greater among those founded earlier than the others in the dataset. Overall, this type of organization consists of only 7% of the Asian American organizations and 12% of the Latino ones in the dataset. Conversely, the proportion of those organizations founded in the 1960s and 1970s goes up to 22% on the Asian American and 32% on the Latino side. Including these organizations in the dataset is crucial to avoid undermining the extent of Asian American and Latino community organizing during these early decades. Ideally, I would like to have information on when exactly these organizations

1. Although la Raza literally means "the race" and refers to the Hispanophone population, this term was particularly favored by the Chicano/Chicana activists in the Mexican American community (Alaniz and Cornish 2008).

turned into panethnic ones. Unfortunately, archival resources on these organizations are scarce and non-systematic. As a result, I use their founding years as a proxy variable.

Finally, I use primary and secondary sources to note Asian American and Latino advocacy and community service organizations that did not use panethnic or ethnic markers in their titles. For instance, the ASPIRA Association, a Latino CSO focusing on educational access is not searchable by either ethnic or panethnic markers. The number of these uniquely named organizations is far smaller than that of the other two types of organizations (only 7% of the Asian American and 3% of the Latino organizations in the dataset).

To verify whether these are indeed panethnic organizations in their names as well as their programs and activities, I visited their websites.[2] I checked whether the organizations claimed to be panethnic in their mission statements or served broader ethnic groups than one national origin group in their project descriptions. When an organization did not have a website, I searched news sites for more information. I used the same validation method in terms of classifying whether an organization is an advocacy, community service, or hybrid organization to determine the year in which each organization was founded, rather than the year of their incorporation according to Internal Revenue Service (IRS) records. I was able to locate about 77% of the Asian and 71% of the Latino organizations' founding years in this way. If these data were not available, I then emailed the staff at these organizations.

To increase reliability, I exclude organizations for which I could not find any information online beside IRS records as of August 2017. I also omit foundations, chambers of commerce, mutual aid organizations, labor unions, and religious organizations because they have different primary revenue sources such as membership dues and donations.

2 Funding information

I provide information on the funding source of organizations in my dataset drawing on Foundation Directory Online data[3], which has compiled information from all 140,000 U.S. foundations (2003-2017) and federal agencies (2014-2017).

2. Except for a handful of well-known organizations (e.g., the NCLR), most of these organizations' internal materials are not publicly available. Using their websites is limited but is one of the feasible ways to collect information of interest.

3. For more information, see https://fconline.foundationcenter.org/