

DPI 610 Final Project

AAPI Voices on the 2016 Presidential Election: Intersected by Socioeconomic Standing

Angie Shin

May 4, 2021

Introduction

Asian Americans have been the most quickly growing racial demographic in the United States for the past twenty years. The Asian American communities claim an average growth of 600,000 registered voters per presidential election cycle, over 700 AAPI-serving organizations participating in National Voter Registration Day in September 2016, and an increase in Congressional candidates from 10 in 2010 to 30 in 2012 and 40 in 2016. While the Asian American communities face racist stereotypes of passiveness in civic engagement and political infrastructures, AA voices are strongly active in reality.

The National Asian American Survey (NAAS) is a scientific and nonpartisan effort to poll the opinions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Its significance lies in their careful measurement of ethnicities beyond the monolithic “Asian” label that the vast majority of public opinion surveys have normalized, when finding public opinion results at an ethnically granular level can actually reveal important lessons about the AA communities and experiences. This project will concern the 2016 public opinion surveys that the NAAS has organized before and after the 2016 presidential election, to measure AA political opinions intentionally and spotlight them in a deliberately academic manner in order to help close the gap in research and academia on AA experiences. The purpose of this project specifically will involve the socioeconomic standing of survey respondents, to investigate how income level and socioeconomic status affects AA experiences and policy views.

Survey Information and Variables

The 2016 National Asian American Survey is composed of two waves. Individual-level data from the Fall 2016 National Asian American Survey (pre-election) was fielded from August through October 2016. Individual-level data from the NAAS 2016 Post-Election Survey was fielded from November 2016 through February 2017. For both surveys, the NAAS collaborated with Catalist, a for-profit corporation based in Washington, D.C. that operates a voter database and provides data and data-related services to progressive organizations, to utilize registered voter and commercial vendor samples; these were classified according to a variety of ethnicity variables. The 2016 NAAS Pre-Election Survey conducted 2,238 telephone interviews to AAPI adults (respondents were required to be 18 years of age or older to proceed with the survey) between August 10 and September 29, 2016. The 2016 NAAS Post-Election Survey conducted 4,393 telephone interviews to AAPI adults (respondents were required to be 18 years of age or older to proceed with the survey) between November 10, 2016 and March 2, 2017. The variable codebook and survey questionnaire for the Pre-Election survey are available [here](#), and the variable codebook and survey questionnaire for the Post-Election survey are available [here](#). Both datasets are available at the Resource Center for Minority Data, curated by ICPSR.

Demographic Information

For both the Pre-Election and the Post-Election surveys, I measured the following variables:

- “ethnicity”
 - Respondent’s ethnicity
 - * ranging from over 60 options from the AAPI and Latinx communities to specify country-specific heritage
 - * for the purposes of this project, only the AA ethnicities will be utilized that are covered in substantive proportions of the respondent pool from both surveys; this unfortunately excludes the NHPI and some South Asian ethnicities because of inconsistencies in the data measured
- “racegroup”
 - Respondent’s race demographic
 - * inclusive of Asian American (AA), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (NHPI), White, Black, African American, Latinx, Native American, and Multiracial American
- “state”
 - Respondent’s state of residence
- “gender”
 - Respondent’s gender identity
 - * inclusive of male, female, and other
- “education”
 - Respondent’s highest completed level of education
 - * inclusive of no schooling completed, some schooling but no high school degree, high school degree or certificate, college degree or bachelor’s degree, and graduate or professional degree
- “nativity1”
 - Respondent’s country of birth
 - * if respondent reports AA or NHPI
- “nativity2”
 - Respondent’s country of birth
 - * if respondent reports Latinx
- “legality”
 - Respondent’s immigration status
- “income1”
 - Respondent’s annual income
 - * grouped by 10,000 USD
- “income2”
 - Respondent’s annual income
 - * grouped by 50,000 USD
- “age1”
 - Respondent’s age group
 - * based on whether the respondent is of the ages 18-34 or 35 and above

- “age2”
 - Respondent’s age

There were multiple versions of the income and age variables to provide enough levels of ambiguity for respondents such that they would feel comfortable consenting to release such information with the NAAS. For the majority of my analysis, I observed the data intersected by the “ethnicity” and the income variables.

Pre-Election Survey

From the Pre-Election survey, I examined the following additional variables:

- “reg”
 - Respondent’s state of voter registration
- “votepred”
 - Respondent’s intended candidate of choice for the 2016 Presidential Election
- “votelead”
 - Respondent’s lean towards a candidate of choice for the 2016 Presidential Election
- “party”
 - Respondent’s political party affiliation
- “partycloser1”
 - Respondent’s closeness with the Republican or the Democratic party
- “partycloser2”
 - Respondent’s closeness with the Republican or the Democratic party based on party standing with political issues
- “favorbo”
 - Respondent’s stance of favor with Barack Obama
- “favordt”
 - Respondent’s stance of favor with Donald Trump
- “favorhc”
 - Respondent’s stance of favor with Hillary Clinton
- “p1”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “the health care law passed by Barack Obama and Congress in 2010.”
- “p2”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “major new spending by the federal government that would help undergraduates pay tuition at public colleges without needing loans.”
- “p3”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “accepting Syrian refugees into the United States.”
- “p4”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “legalizing the possession of small amounts of marijuana for personal use.”

- “p5”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “banning people who are Muslim from entering the United States.”
- “p6”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “setting stricter emission limits on power plants in order to address climate change.”
- “p7”
 - Respondent’s policy view on “the government doing more to give blacks equal rights with whites.”
- “media1”
 - Respondent’s method of getting information about politics
 - * if respondent reports AA
- “media2”
 - Respondent’s method of getting information about politics
 - * if respondent reports NHPI
- “soc1”
 - Respondent’s view on “the most important problem facing the United States today”
- “soc2”
 - Respondent’s view on “the issue [that] is the most important to you personally”

Post-Election Survey

- “reg”
 - Respondent’s state of voter registration
- “vote”
 - Respondent’s state of voting
- “voter”
 - Respondent’s voted candidate of choice for the 2016 Presidential Election
- “party”
 - Respondent’s political party affiliation
- “partycloser1”
 - Respondent’s closeness with the Republican or the Democratic party
- “partycloser2”
 - Respondent’s closeness with the Republican or the Democratic party based on party standing with political issues
- “favorbo”
 - Respondent’s stance of favor with Barack Obama
- “favordt”
 - Respondent’s stance of favor with Donald Trump
- “favorhc”

- Respondent’s stance of favor with Hillary Clinton
- “contact1”
 - Respondent’s status of receiving contact from campaign organizations about the election
- “contact2”
 - Respondent’s status of receiving contact from nonpartisan organizations about the election
- “e1”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should do more to reduce income differences between the richest and poorest households.”
- “e2”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should do more to regulate banks.”
- “e3”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should raise the minimum wage to allow every working American a decent standard of living.”
- “e4”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should increase income taxes on people making over a million dollars a year.”
- “e5”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should do more to discourage big American companies from hiring foreign workers to replace workers in the U.S.”
- “e6”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “The federal government should enact major new spending that would help undergraduates pay tuition at public colleges without needing loans.”
- “i1”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “Undocumented or illegal immigrants should be allowed to have an opportunity to eventually become U.S. citizens.”
- “i2”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “Congress needs to increase the number of work visas it issues every year.”
- “i3”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “Congress needs to increase the number of family visas it issues every year.”
- “i4”
 - Respondent’s policy view of the following: “States should provide driver’s licenses to all residents, regardless of their immigration status.”
- “mi1”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people.”
- “mi2”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores.”

- “mi3”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “People act as if you don’t speak English.”
- “mi4”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “People act as if they are afraid of you.”
- “mi5”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “People act as if they’re better than you are.”
- “mi6”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “You are called names or insulted.”
- “mi7”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “You are threatened or harassed.”
- “mi8”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “People mispronounce your name.”
- “mi9”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following microaggression: “People assume you are good at math and science.”
- “ma1”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion?”
- “ma2”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Have you ever been unfairly fired from a job?”
- “ma3”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “For unfair reasons, do you think you have ever not been hired for a job?”
- “ma4”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Have you ever been unfairly stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened or abused by the police?”
- “ma5”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Do you think you have ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood?”
- “ma6”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Have you ever moved into a neighborhood where neighbors made life difficult for you or your family?”
- “ma7”
 - Respondent’s experience of the following macroaggression: “Have you ever been denied entry into a religious institution?”
- “identity”
 - Respondent’s self-reflection as a member of the AAPI community

Data

The 2016 Election

First, we will look at party affiliation. In the Pre-Election survey, the percentage of Democrats increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Korean, or Indian ethnicities; the percentage of Democrats increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Japanese ethnicities; the percentage of Democrats was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Democrats was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino or Hmong ethnicities. In the Post-Election survey, the percentage of Democrats increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Korean ethnicities; the percentage of Democrats increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of Democrats was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, or Japanese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Democrats was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities.

Next, we will look at candidate favorability—starting with the 2016 Democratic Nominee, Hillary Clinton. In the Pre-Election survey, the percentage of Clinton favorers increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Korean, Filipino, or Hmong ethnicities; the percentage of Clinton favorers increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of Clinton favorers was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Clinton favorers was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese or Indian ethnicities. In the Post-Election survey, the percentage of Clinton favorers increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Korean or Indian ethnicities; the percentage of Clinton favorers increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; the percentage of Clinton favorers was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese, Vietnamese, or Hmong ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Clinton favorers was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese or Filipino ethnicities.

Now, we will look at candidate favorability with the 2016 Republican Nominee, Donald Trump. In the Pre-Election survey, the percentage of Trump unfavorers increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Korean, Japanese, or Hmong ethnicities; the percentage of Trump unfavorers was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Trump unfavorers was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino or Indian ethnicities. In the Post-Election survey, the percentage of Trump unfavorers increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian, Filipino, Korean, Indian, or Vietnamese ethnicities, while the percentage of Trump unfavorers was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese, Chinese, or Hmong ethnicities.

To continue with candidate views, we'll observe how vote predictions led to vote results, specifically concerning Hillary Clinton. In the Pre-Election survey, the percentage of Clinton voters increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese ethnicities, while the percentage of Clinton voters was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Indian, Japanese, or Korean ethnicities. In the Post-Election survey, the percentage of Clinton voters increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong or Chinese ethnicities; the percentage of Clinton voters was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Clinton voters was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Filipino, Korean, or Indian ethnicities.

Next, we'll observe how vote predictions led to vote results, specifically concerning Donald Trump. In the Pre-Election survey, the percentage of Trump voters increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese, while the percentage of Trump voters was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Indian, Japanese, or

Korean ethnicities. In the Post-Election survey, the percentage of Trump voters increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese or Hmong ethnicities; the percentage of Trump voters was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Indian, or Korean ethnicities; finally, the percentage of Trump voters was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese or Vietnamese ethnicities.

Finally, we'll look at whether or not respondents have received contact from campaigns or nonpartisan voter organizations about the election. For campaigns, the percentage of voter contact increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting any ethnicity except for Japanese, for which the percentage of voter contact was the highest in the middle annual income bracket. For nonpartisan voter organizations, the percentage of voter contact increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong or Indian ethnicities; the percentage of voter contact increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of voter contact was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Japanese, or Korean ethnicities; finally, the percentage of voter contact was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino ethnicities.

Policy Views

Pre-Election Survey

For the Affordable Care Act, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Japanese, or Korean ethnicities.

For federal public college tuition aid, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino, Indian, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities, while the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Chinese, Japanese, and Hmong ethnicities.

For accepting Syrian refugees, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese or Korean ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong, Indian or Japanese ethnicities.

For legalizing recreational marijuana, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Filipino, or Japanese ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities.

For banning Muslim immigrants, the percentage of opposition increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Japanese ethnicities; the percentage of opposition increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino, Hmong, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of opposition was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Chinese, or Indian ethnicities.

For limiting power plants, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Japanese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese, Korean, or Filipino ethnicities; finally,

the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Hmong, or Vietnamese ethnicities.

For black civil rights, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Japanese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese, Hmong, or Indian ethnicities.

Post-Election Survey

Economic Policy For federally closing the income gap, the percentage of agreement increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Indian, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese ethnicities.

For federal bank regulation, the percentage of agreement increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Indian, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian or Filipino ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese ethnicities.

For raised minimum wage, the percentage of agreement increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Indian, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Chinese ethnicities.

For wealth income tax increases, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Filipino or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong, Indian or Japanese ethnicities.

For discouraging hiring foreign workers, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong or Cambodian ethnicities.

For federal public college tuition aid, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Japanese, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Filipino ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Korean or Chinese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities.

Immigration Policy For undocumented naturalization, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian, Japanese, or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong, Filipino, Korean, or Chinese ethnicities.

For increased work visas, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Japanese, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Filipino ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Korean or Chinese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities.

For increased family visas, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Hmong, Japanese, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Filipino ethnicities; the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Korean or Chinese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Indian ethnicities.

For documentation-optional driver's licenses, the percentage of support increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino or Indian ethnicities; the percentage of support increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Cambodian or Vietnamese ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Hmong, Japanese, Korean, or Chinese ethnicities.

Society and Racism

To wrap up the data results, we'll lastly look at assorted questions about AA access, welfare, and racial aggressions. To start, the percentage of consumers of Asian/ethnic TV, radio, and newspapers increased with decreasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Filipino, Hmong, Indian, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese ethnicities, while the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian or Chinese ethnicities.

For important issues of national and personal concerns, distinct variations differentiate the ethnicity lines. Cambodian respondents largely reported the economy as a national concern, and education as a heightened personal concern. Chinese respondents largely reported the economy as a national concern, and health care as a heightened personal concern. Filipino respondents largely reported the economy and terrorism as national concerns, and racism and health care as heightened personal concerns. Hmong respondents largely reported the economy and terrorism as national concerns, and health care and education as heightened personal concerns. Indian respondents largely reported the economy as national concerns, and terrorism and racism as heightened personal concerns. Japanese respondents largely reported the economy and terrorism as national concerns, and health care as heightened personal concerns. Korean respondents largely reported the economy as a national concern, and health care as heightened personal concerns. Vietnamese respondents largely reported the economy and terrorism as national concerns, and health care as heightened personal concerns.

Last, but not least, we have variables measuring various situations of racism. For one variable that notes mispronunciations of a name, the percentage of people who have experienced these increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting any ethnicity except for Indian, for which (in addition to having higher numbers across all three socioeconomic subgroups than any other ethnicity depicted) the lowest percentage is in the middle annual income bracket. For another variable measures general threats or cases of harassment, the percentage of people who have experienced these increased with increasing annual income brackets for respondents reporting Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, or Vietnamese ethnicities; the percentage of the experienced was the highest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Cambodian, Indian, or Korean ethnicities; finally, the percentage of support was the lowest in the middle annual income bracket for respondents reporting Japanese ethnicities.

Significant Results and Concluding Thoughts

To conclude, this project revealed that several political experiences were intersected by socioeconomic standing. I will quickly digress into some ethnicity-specific summations here.

For the Cambodian demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to support legalizing recreational marijuana, accepting Syrian refugees, and the ACA; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to identify as a Democrat, receive contact from a campaign, and support black civil rights, a raised minimum wage, closing the income gap, undocumented naturalization, documentation-optional driver's licenses, and more work and family visas.

For the Chinese demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to vote for Clinton and support legalizing recreational marijuana, accepting Syrian refugees, federally discouraging foreign workers, and increasing income taxes on the wealthy; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign and/or a nonpartisan voter organization.

For the Filipino demographic, the following behaviors were noted: the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to support black civil rights, legalizing recreational marijuana, federal college affordability, and documentation-optional driver's licenses; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign, oppose banning Muslims from the U.S., and support federally discouraging foreign workers and more work and family visas.

For the Hmong demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to vote for Clinton, receive contact from a nonpartisan voter organization, and support a raised minimum wage, closing the income gap, and more work and family visas; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign, oppose banning Muslims from the U.S.

For the Indian demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a nonpartisan voter organization and support limiting power plants in light of climate change, federal college affordability, raised minimum wage, closing the income gap, and undocumented naturalization; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign.

For the Japanese demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to oppose banning Muslims from the U.S., support legalizing recreational marijuana, federally discouraging foreign workers, a raised minimum wage, and more work and family visas; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to support black civil rights, limiting power plants in light of climate change, and undocumented naturalization.

For the Korean demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent was, the more often they tended to identify as a Democrat, favor Clinton, and unfavor Trump, as well as support federal college affordability, federally discouraging foreign workers, increased income taxes on the wealthy, and a raised minimum wage; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign, oppose banning Muslims from the U.S., and support accepting Syrian refugees.

For the Vietnamese demographic, the following behaviors were noted: (1) the poorer the respondent is, the more often they tended to support black civil rights, college affordability, the ACA, increased income taxes on the wealthy, a raised minimum wage, and more work and family visas; (2) the richer the respondent was, the more often they tended to receive contact from a campaign and/or a nonpartisan voter organization, oppose banning Muslims from the U.S., and support undocumented naturalization and documentation-optional driver's licenses.

Some larger takeaways from this dataset are also in order. For instance, compared to the national average, Asian American registered voters hold more favorable views of Obama and Clinton, and much more unfavorable views of Trump. However, despite generally affiliating with progressive leadership and parties, AA voices are left largely unsolicited. Every subgroup of socioeconomic standing across every ethnicity

has reported at least a 50% nay vote, showing how Asian Americans were less likely to be contacted by political parties and other partisan and nonpartisan voter organizations. In addition, Asian Americans hold progressive views on many policy issues, including health care, education spending, racial justice, and bans on Muslim immigrants. However, they are split on Syrian refugees and are conservative on marijuana legalization. Moreover, ethnic media is an important source of information for Asian groups—several of the AAPI respondents participated in the 2016 NAAS surveys by speaking in a language other than English. Language barriers are capable of limiting AAPI exposure to current events, news and politics with the lack of accessibility in American news outlets. The most serious problems facing Asian Americans include education, health care, and terrorism. It is crucial that different avenues of literacy and access to the news, current events, and political moments in non-English formats are considered when designing infrastructure to civically engage with the AA communities.

As depicted by the several survey questions on microaggressions and other discriminatory treatment in the data, racism has acute variations across AA-specific ethnicities that as a whole have alarming levels of intensity even at the aggregated level—this is represented all too tragically in the rise in press coverage of Asian American hate crimes in 2021. Beyond the political stirrups of the COVID-19 years, Asian American hate crimes have been occurring for many, many years, and work like the NAAS is worth studying to validate the struggles of Asian Americans and the racism terraced with socioeconomic constraints in achieving social mobility in the United States. For the AA communities across the country, the political path is not uniform, but, rather, depends more strongly on socioeconomic standing, heritage, and age. Perhaps even more importantly, they are much less likely to be mobilized to participate in politics than most Americans. The AA communities have always been aggregately portrayed as a passive demographic group, but the 2016 NAAS data displays them in a more accurate light of strong, political voices and increasingly vital bodies to American politics today.

References

Ramakrishnan, Karthick, Jennifer Lee, Taeku Lee, and Janelle Wong. “National Asian American Survey (NAAS) 2016 Pre-Election Survey.” Riverside, CA: National Asian American Survey. 2017-12-05. Ramakrishnan, Karthick, Jennifer Lee, Taeku Lee, and Janelle Wong. “National Asian American Survey (NAAS) 2016 Post-Election Survey.” Riverside, CA: National Asian American Survey. 2018-03-03.