DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

THE RESURGENCE OF NATIVISM IN CALIFORNIA? THE CASE OF PROPOSITION 187 AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

R. Michael Alvarez

Tara L. Butterfield

SOCIAL SCIENCE WORKING PAPER 1020

October 1997

The Resurgence of Nativism in California? The Case of Proposition 187 and Illegal Immigration

R. Michael Alvarez Tara L. Butterfield

Abstract

Theory: We argue that support among California voters for Proposition 187 in 1994 was an example of cyclical nativism. This nativism was provoked primarily by California's economic downturn during the early 1990s.

Hypotheses: We develop four specific hypotheses to explain how poor economic conditions in California and the consequent nativistic sentiments would result in support for Proposition 187:

1. voters who believe that California's economic condition is poor will be more likely to support Proposition 187;
2. voters who perceive themselves as being economically threatened by illegal immigrants will be more likely to support Proposition 187;
3. voters with lower levels of education are more economically vulnerable and will be more likely to support Proposition 187;
4. voters in Southern California feel more directly affected by illegal immigration and will be more likely to support Proposition 187.

Methods: To test these hypotheses, we analyze voter exit poll data from the 1994 California election. We utilize a two-stage probit model to allow for the endogeneity which results from the politicization of illegal immigration during this election.

Results: We find support for our hypotheses in the data. These findings cause us to conclude that nativism, fueled by economic conditions, was a salient factor leading many Californians to support Proposition 187.

The Resurgence of Nativism in California? The Case of Proposition 187 and Illegal Immigration*

R. Michael Alvarez Tara L. Butterfield

1 Introduction

Recent years have witnessed a resurgence of nativism, the practice or policy of favoring native-born citizens over immigrants, across the United States. This nativist sentiment is expressed as a growing distrust of the immigrants already in the country and a strong desire to tighten laws that would keep others out. When surveyed on the topic of immigration, U.S. citizens often voice their belief that the presence of illegal immigrant workers depresses wages and displaces native workers (Muller et al., 1985; Cornelius, 1982; *Los Angeles Times*, 1988).[1] Media throughout the country have questioned whether or not the United States is still capable of controlling its own borders (*El Paso Times*, 1994; *San Francisco Examiner*, 1989; *U.S. News & World Report*, 1985).

Nowhere has this sentiment been more evident than in California. During the early 1990s, the Golden State suffered numerous economic setbacks associated with military base closures and defense industry cutbacks. Nearly one million jobs were lost, state tax revenues diminished, and the state experienced repeated budget deficits. By 1994, California was in the midst of that state's worst recession since the Great Depression. In that year, California legislators introduced 30 bills concerning legal and illegal immigration, and the state's residents produced two related ballot initiatives. One of these initiatives was Proposition 187. Called by its supporters the Save Our State initiative, this controversial proposition was approved by 59 percent of California voters in November 1994. The proposition's popularity with voters coupled with California's dreary economy gives rise to the question: were the state's economic condition and the strong appeal of Proposition 187 to voters related?

Ostensibly, the purpose of Proposition 187 was to deny certain publicly funded social and health care services to illegal aliens and to prevent their enrollment in tax-supported

*We thank Garrett Glasgow, Carol Pierannanzi, and Fang Wang for their helpful discussions and Gail Nash for her assistance. The John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation provided support for this research through a Faculty Fellowship to Alvarez. An earlier version of this work was presented at the Southern Political Science Association Annual Meetings, November 1996. The authors can be reached at rma@crunch.caltech.edu and tarab@hss.caltech.edu, respectively.

educational institutions.[2] Proponents of this initiative argued that California had become a welfare magnet for illegal aliens, who used counterfeit documents to access the U.S. job market and social service agencies at an estimated cost to California taxpayers of more than $5 billion a year. According to their argument, stemming the tide of illegal immigration was needed to halt the spread of disease, eliminate overcrowding in schools, and prevent wage rates from dropping still further as unemployed illegals competed for scarce jobs in a shrinking economy. In essence, the authors of Proposition 187 sought to end illegal immigration by making it unattractive and by eliminating many of the reasons for which immigrants might come to the United States.

We argue that voter support for Proposition 187 is an example of cyclical nativism and that the impetus for this nativism was the sagging California economy. Previously, the relationship between economic cycles and nativist sentiment has been examined only by comparing an aggregate economic insecurity measure or immigration policy with national unemployment and GNP trends. We use exit poll data from the 1994 California vote on Proposition 187 to examine the impact of economic perceptions on support for the initiative. By controlling for a number of factors, we show that economic perceptions had a significant (perhaps overriding) influence on the passage of Proposition 187.

To understand the reasoning behind our argument, we begin by discussing the literature on initiative and proposition voting. Next, we examine the economic motivation for U.S. immigration policy, consider California's history of immigration restrictions, and place Proposition 187 in the larger context of the cyclical nativism that has characterized relations between the United States and Mexico. Then, we develop hypotheses about how nativist attitudes might be reflected in the voting behavior of specific groups, and we test these hypotheses using Voter News Service (VNS) exit poll data from the November 1994 California election. To specify an appropriate statistical model of the voting on Proposition 187 so that we can test our nativist hypotheses, we consider the political context in which the proposition passed. We find that, because the gubernatorial and senatorial candidates had highly politicized the issue of illegal immigration, support for Proposition 187 is endogenous to support for these candidates. We formulate a statistical model (a two-stage probit) which allows for this endogeneity. We conclude that, despite the politicization of this initiative in the 1994 election, the California economy had an extremely strong, if not determining, effect on the passage of Proposition 187. Finally, we discuss the larger implications of our findings for contemporary American politics.

2 Voting for Initiatives and Propositions: Economics and Information

The nativist voting argument described in this paper is predicated on the principle that nativism fluctuates with changing economic conditions in the immigrant-receiving country and is strongest during economic contractions. Although scholars have previously studied the effects of economic conditions on national elections (for example, Lewis-Beck,

1990), specifically, U.S. presidential elections (Fiorina, 1981; Kiewiet, 1983; Markus, 1988), and have agreed that economic conditions are important in determining candidate choice, there is a paucity of research linking economic conditions with voting on ballot propositions. An exception is a recent study by Bowler and Donovan (1994a) which finds that a relationship exists between economic conditions and voting on state ballot propositions in California. Specifically, voters are less likely to adopt ballot propositions when economic conditions are poor because of risk aversity. The researchers do make an exception for propositions that may pass when the economy is bad because of notoriety and subject matter. Unfortunately, Proposition 187 must be considered an exception; therefore, this study provides little insight into the behavior of California voters during the 1994 election.

However, historical examples support our nativist voting argument. One measure of nativism is immigration policy. The United States has enacted and enforced immigration restrictions to coincide with economic downturns and justified these restrictions with the nativist arguments of depressed wages, displaced workers, and scarce resources (Hutchinson, 1981, pp. 492-504). California has also viewed immigration in economic terms and has relied on nativist policies when resources were perceived to be scarce or competition for these resources intensified. For example, in 1920, California voters enacted an initiative that prohibited aliens from owning land if they were racially ineligible for citizenship under federal law. Because of the zone-and-quota system on which U.S. immigration was based at that time, this measure effectively prohibited the Japanese living in the state from owning land. Thus, in general, U.S. immigration policy and California's response to immigrants provide evidence to support this principle of economically driven cyclical nativism.

Because efforts to gain support for Proposition 187 and California's 1994 gubernatorial and senatorial campaigns emphasized Mexico as a source of illegal immigrants, we consider the specific relationship between restrictions on Mexican immigration and U.S. economic conditions. The long-term relationship between the United States and Mexico provides both historical and empirical evidence to support the principle that nativism fluctuates with changing economic conditions. Since the 1930s, there have been three cycles of increased nativism toward legal and illegal Mexican immigrants which have coincided with economic downturns brought about by wars and stagflation and have resulted in stricter immigration laws: (1) deportation of native-born Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants between 1929 and 1933, (2) Operation Wetback of the 1950s, and (3) 1980 to present. In addition, research has shown that fluctuations in the United States unemployment rate and in the level of general economic insecurity within the U.S. population are highly correlated with the rise and fall of anti-immigrant sentiment, particularly as directed against Mexican immigrants during the twentieth century (Cornelius, 1982). These general immigration trends and specific political responses support our nativist voting theory.

Although the literature on initiative and proposition voting does not provide support for the relationship between economic conditions and the passage of Proposition 187 so

that we must rely instead on historical example, it does suggest what factors determine an individual's vote choices and what information he uses when making those choices (Lupia, 1994). Voting behavior on propositions is not necessarily or consistently a function of party identification, education, race, income, or region of residence; however, political ideology may be correlated with vote choice because voters use it as an information shortcut (Magleby, 1984).

Further, the information available to the voter is different in two distinct ways from that which is available in a standard candidate election. A brief summary of the initiative appears on the ballot, and additional detailed information is provided by the state in the ballot pamphlet. In California, this pamphlet summarizes the initiative and presents arguments for and against it. However, the usefulness of this pamphlet is doubtful given its small font, confusing and complicated prose, and extensive length. Standard election information shortcuts, such as a party identification or past experience, on which candidate voting decisions are usually based, are absent (Downs, 1957; Key, 1966; Fiorina, 1981). Because the election literature routinely furnished by the registrar of voters provides too many details and the initiative campaign offers too few shortcuts, voters may rely more on media and elite endorsements to reduce the information costs of voting on propositions (Magleby, 1984; Cronin, 1989).

In this particular election, the voters had an important alternative source of information—candidate endorsements. Candidates in both the senatorial and gubernatorial races discussed Proposition 187, staked out opposing positions in their speeches and advertisements, and offered immigration policies. Both California Governor Pete Wilson and Democratic challenger Kathleen Brown developed immigration action plans that emphasized the California-Mexico border and used immigration themes extensively in their campaign ads.[3] Because of the endogeneity implied by this relationship (specifically, that an individual's vote on Proposition 187 could be influenced or affected by either or both the gubernatorial race or the senatorial race), this important source of information is controlled for in our analysis.

Now we can develop a series of hypotheses about voters which can test to see if voter support for Proposition 187 is, indeed, an example of economically driven cyclical nativism. Our argument requires that we consider not only the actions of the voter in making the link between California's poor economic conditions and immigration but also the socioeconomic characteristics of the voter which are predicted by economic conditions and nativist history. We expect (contrary to the literature on initiative voting) that race, education, area of residence, and economic conditions are important determinants in an individual's vote decision on Proposition 187.

State Economic Conditions and Personal Finances. We expect that voters who perceive the state's economic conditions as poor would be more likely to support the proposition. Because of simplistic nativist attitudes, these voters blame the existence of poor economic conditions on the presence of illegal immigrants. The condition of the California economy should be the dominant factor over an individual's personal finance

because nativist cycles are driven by poor overall economic conditions of the state or nation, not by an individual's situation.[4]

Race. History shows us that nativism is not race dependent in terms of those who attack or those who are attacked. Both in California and throughout the United States, the race or ethnicity of the group toward which nativist actions are directed has not been constant, nor has the attack always been led by any one particular racial or ethnic group. The differentiating factor has been simply immigrant versus native status. However, those voters who perceive themselves as threatened financially by illegal immigrants and those voters who are racially or ethnically similar to the immigrants being attacked should be the exception. Specifically, blacks have historically perceived themselves as competing with illegal immigrants for jobs (Muller et al., 1985; Cornelius, 1982); therefore, blacks would be expected to support the measure more than other racial groups. In addition, because the debate over Proposition 187 was focused on Mexico, one would expect the Hispanic population to vote against this initiative for two reasons: (1) California has a large recent Mexican immigrant population which may sympathize with the illegal immigrant population and (2) the Hispanic population in general may view this initiative as racist and aimed at Hispanics and, more specifically, at Mexicans.

Education. We would expect an inverse relationship between education and nativist attitudes. Lesser-educated individuals may be more susceptible to nativist arguments or sentiments because they perceive themselves to compete directly with immigrant workers in the labor market.[5]

Area of Residence. We would expect nativist voting behavior to vary with geographical distance from the immigrant source. This theory is the immigration equivalent of the NIMBY (not in my backyard) concept. Simply, nativism is more intense, or more prevalent, closer to the California-Mexico border. Although border communities often benefit financially from illegal immigration, residents of these communities frequently report that they view immigrants as contributing to criminal activity and detracting from economic prosperity.[6] Therefore, we would assume that voters who reside in Southern California would vote in favor of the amendment with greater frequency than residents of Northern California.

3 A First Look at the Data

To test these hypotheses, we analyze Voter News Service (VNS) exit poll data from the 1994 California election by Proposition 187 vote choice and by demographic and attitudinal measures (see Tables 1 and 2). [7]

Tables 1 and 2 go here

In Table 1, when race is considered, whites supported Proposition 187 with the highest percentage of yes votes (59 percent). The black and Asian votes were split 46 percent for the measure and 54 percent against it, while Hispanics voted predominantly against, 25

percent for and 75 percent against. At this level of analysis, the race of the voter does not appear to be a reliable predictor of an individual's vote for or against the proposition except among Hispanics.

Next, we consider two measures of economic potential, educational attainment and employment status. We find that support for Proposition 187 was highest among high school graduates (63 percent in favor) and decreases as education level increases. When employment status is considered, more unemployed individuals supported the proposition than did employed voters, 59 percent compared with 41 percent. As we hypothesized, voters with lower economic potential are more inclined to support Proposition 187.

Finally in Table 1, we consider the effects of a voter's area of residence. Central Valley residents were almost evenly split between support for and opposition to the measure. Bay Area (Northern California) residents were predominately against the measure (60 percent against), and Southern California residents were strongly in favor with 61 percent supporting the measure. These preliminary findings with respect to race, educational attainment, and area of residence support our nativist argument that members of the targeted racial group will be less likely to support the measure, and that economically disadvantaged voters and those living in closest proximity to the immigrant source are more likely to support it.

Turning to Table 2, we find strong support for our hypothesis that economic perceptions influenced support for Proposition 187. Sixty-two percent of those voters who viewed their personal situation as worse voted for the measure. When asked about state economic conditions, again those who thought the state was in poor condition voted predominately (69 percent) in favor of the measure. Obviously, strong negative opinions concerning the state's economy or personal finances strengthened a voter's support for Proposition 187.

When considering the measures of partisanship, ideology, and candidate support (see Table 2), we see that 73 percent of Republicans supported the measure while only 36 percent of Democrats did. Seventy-one percent of voters who described themselves as conservatives favored Proposition 187. Moderates split almost evenly on the measure with 51 percent voting for and 49 percent voting against, and Liberals strongly voted against (69 percent). Given that propositions are not directly endorsed by a party, this is a peculiar result. However, this result may indicate that voting was influenced by the gubernatorial and senatorial races. When the gubernatorial and senatorial races are considered, individuals who voted for incumbent Republican Governor Pete Wilson (who campaigned openly for Proposition 187) overwhelmingly supported the measure with 77 percent voting in favor. While only 29 percent of those who supported Kathleen Brown, the Democratic candidate for governor, voted in favor of the measure. A similar result is found when the senate race is considered. Seventy-nine percent of Republican Senate candidate Michael Huffington's supporters favored Proposition 187 while only 35 percent of Democratic incumbent Dianne Feinstein's supporters voted in favor of the measure. These preliminary findings support the idea that voters were using information from

these other campaigns in their vote decision and were making the nativist link between poor economic conditions and immigration.

4 A Multivariate Model of Support for Proposition 187

The data presented in Tables 1 and 2 provide preliminary support for our nativist voting argument. However, it is difficult to discern from these bivariate statistics the relative importance of these voter characteristics and attitudes in determining a voter's support for Proposition 187. To make this comparision, we employ a multivariate statistical model.

Two important aspects of our multivariate model are that it has a binary dependent variable and that it allows for endogeneity. In this instance, voter response to Proposition 187 is represented by a binary dependent variable where support is coded high and opposition is coded low. We assume that the survey observations of whether or not an individual supported Proposition 187 are the realizations of this binary choice variable (Y^*). Specifically, when the voter's underlying predisposition (Y) to support this proposition is greater than some threshold (k), the voter will support the measure. Otherwise, she will oppose it. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Y^* = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad Y \geq k \\ Y^* = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad Y < k \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The form of our dependent variable necessitates use of a binary choice model. Thus, we use a binary probit model which takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob(Support Proposition 187)} &= Pr(Y = 1) \\ Pr(Y = 1) &= F(X_i \beta_j) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where X_i is our matrix of independent variables, β_j are the coefficients we estimate, and F is the cumulative normal density.

As asserted earlier, there is reason to believe that support for Proposition 187 is endogenous with respect to candidate support in both the gubernatorial and senatorial races. In other words, it is likely that voter opinions regarding Proposition 187 strongly influenced candidate choices and that candidate choice influenced voter support for or opposition to the initiative. As is true of the linear regression model, endogeneity in binary choice models results in biased coefficients and, therefore, incorrect inferences (Alvarez, 1997; Amemiya, 1978; Maddala, 1983; Rivers and Vuong, 1988).

Our expectations about endogeneity lead us to posit the following structural model for these underlying predispositions:

$$Y_{P187} = X_{i1}\beta_1 + \gamma_{1G} Y_{GR} + \gamma_{1S} Y_{SR} + \varepsilon_1 \tag{3}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_{GR} &= X_{i2}\beta_2 + \gamma_{2P}Y_{P187} + \varepsilon_2 \\
Y_{SR} &= X_{i3}\beta_3 + \gamma_{3P}Y_{P187} + \varepsilon_3
\end{aligned}
$$

where Y_{P187} is the underlying propensity to support Proposition 187, Y_{GR} is the underlying propensity to support the Republican candidate for governor (Pete Wilson), and Y_{SR} is the underlying propensity to support the Republican candidate for senator (Michael Huffington). Each of these underlying predispositions translates into the observed set of binary variables as given by the general rule in Equation 1.

Thus, we assume that the predisposition to support Proposition 187 is a function of a set of independent variables (X_{i1}) and the predisposition to support the Republican candidates in the gubernatorial and senatorial races. The candidate support predispositions in each race are themselves functions of other independent variables and the predisposition to support Proposition 187.

If we had survey measures of these three predispositions (support for Proposition 187, the Republican gubernatorial candidate, and the Republican senatorial candidate), our estimation procedure would be simple because we could utilize two-stage least squares to estimate the model parameters. Specifically, we would write reduced-form equations for each of the three predisposition measures using all of the exogenous variables in the equations above to estimate instrumental variables for the endogenous variables. Then, these instruments could be substituted for the right-hand-side endogenous variables. Finally, the parameters of the model in Equation 3 could be estimated.

Although we measure only the binary realizations of these dependent variables, the estimation procedure we use is almost identical to a two-stage least squares approach. We begin by writing the reduced-form equations using all of the exogenous variables in the model (we denote the set of all exogenous variables $X_{R)}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Pr(Y_{P187} = 1) &= F(X_R\delta_1) \\
Pr(Y_{GR} = 1) &= F(X_R\delta_2) \\
Pr(Y_{SR} = 1) &= F(X_R\delta_3)
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}
$$

These equations are estimated using probit, under the assumption that F is the standard cumulative normal density. From the estimates of the three δ_j, we produce predicted values for the three underlying predispositions ($\widehat{Y}_{P187}$, $\widehat{Y}_{GR}$, and $\widehat{Y}_{SR}$). Next, these predicted values are substituted for the right-hand-side endogenous variables of Equation 3, and then we estimate the model also using probit. This two-stage procedure yields consistent estimates of the model parameters in Equation 3 (Amemyia, 1978; Maddala, 1983; Rivers and Vuong, 1988) and has been used in political science research (Alvarez, 1997; Fiorina, 1981; Franklin and Jackson, 1983).

Given this estimation procedure for the model, we now consider the model specification. We discuss how we specify the independent variables for the Proposition 187 model below. In the appendix, we discuss the reduced-form estimates (see Table 5) and how we specify the gubernatorial and senatorial voting models (see Tables 6 and 7).

In our specification of voting for Proposition 187, we include several socioeconomic variables, economic and financial perceptions, political ideology, and political party affiliation. Race is included to enable us to test the way in which different racial groups responded to Proposition 187. Race consists of the four binary variables: black, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, and other minority. The white category was excluded. In addition, a gender variable was included. It is a binary variable with 1 denoting a female voter.

Respondent education level and employment status were included to provide some measure of economic deprivation and competition and to test the hypothesis that support for the measure will be inversely related to educational attainment. Educational attainment was coded as four binary variables, with less than a high school education being the excluded category. Respondent education level and employment status, as a binary variable, were included to provide some measure of economic deprivation and competition and to test the hypothesis that support for the measure will be inversely related to educational attainment. To allow for possible regional effects on voter choice, binary variables were included for three of four major regions that the survey included Los Angeles City, Los Angeles Suburbs, Other Southern California, and Central Valley. Northern California was the region excluded.

Next, the voter's assessments of the change in her personal finances from two years ago and the condition of the state's economy were included to measure the influence of economic evaluations on her vote. These variables were coded with 1-to-3 and 1-to-4 scales with 1 denoting worse or poor, respectively.

Political party affiliation and political ideology were included to measure these influences on the vote. Both of these variables were included as two binary variables, Democrat and Independent for political party affiliation and Independent and Liberal for political ideology with Republican and Conservative being the excluded categories, respectively. Also, the instruments calculated for an individual's gubernatorial and senatorial votes were included.

Given this estimation technique and model specification, our argument about nativist voting can be tested, and we can determine whether or not the race, education, opinion of California's economic condition, and area of residence coefficients are, as hypothesized, reliable predictors of an individual's vote on Proposition 187. In the next section, we present the estimated results of this model specification.

5 Determinants of Support for Proposition 187

5.1 Two-stage probit results

The two-stage probit results are presented in Table 3. To demonstrate the importance of controlling for the endogeneity imposed by the information sources in this election, we present and compare probit and two-stage probit results. The following discussion of

the coefficient estimates is brief, given the difficulty inherent in attempting to interpret these coefficients, particularly the inability to compare the relative influence of the coefficients on a voter's choice. For these reasons, our discussion emphasizes the statistically significant coefficients and the preliminary implications of these results for our proposed nativist voting argument. Next, we present a more thorough discussion in which an average voter is selected allowing probabilities to be computed, and then we compare the relative magnitude of voter characteristics and attitudes on Proposition 187 voting.

Table 3 goes here

First, when we compare both sets of coefficients from the probit and two-stage probit models, the most significant and important difference is with respect to the party identification and political ideology coefficients. In the two-stage model, which allows for the inclusion of an individual's vote in senatorial and gubernatorial races, the party identification coefficients are not significant, as the literature on initiative voting predicts; however, when these votes are not included, these coefficients are significant, which can yield a misleading result. Specifically, it was not party identification that was significant in determining an individual's vote choice but rather an individual's gubernatorial vote that was significant in determining his support of Proposition 187. Voters are using these elite endorsements (in this instance, candidate policy positions) as shortcuts or cues in their vote choice, which is consistent with previous research (Lupia, 1994).

The other interesting difference between the probit model and two-stage probit model results is the significance of the race coefficients. In both models, the Hispanic or Latino coefficient is significant and negative as expected because they are the targeted racial group. However, in the two-stage probit analysis, the black coefficient is also significant. This finding is supported by the fact that blacks have traditionally perceived themselves as being financially threatened by recent immigrants. These differences between the models suggest that controlling for the imposed endogeneity of candidate endorsements is important, and by doing so, results are produced which are consistent with both the existing initiative voting literature and our nativist voting argument.

Now, we consider the other significant coefficients in the two-stage probit model. The voter's perception of the state's economy is statistically significant and that of personal finances is not. These results are as expected and support the nativist voting argument that voters are associating a poor economy with illegal immigration. The statistical significance of the education variable is also as predicted. Education has a negative effect on the probability that a voter will support the measure, and this effect increases with educational attainment. Finally, all of the Southern California region variables (Los Angeles City, Los Angeles Suburbs, and Other Southern California) are significant and positive. This result confirms the hypothesis that support of the measure is linked to a voter's proximity to the California-Mexico border.

5.2 Relative magnitudes of the estimated effects

To better understand the degrees to which these different variables influence a voter's probability of supporting Proposition 187, we first define an average or hypothetical voter. This hypothetical voter is a white, female, Southern California resident with an average education (some college but no degree). She thinks her family's financial situation is the same as it was two years ago and that the state's economy is not so good. In addition, she considers herself a Democrat and, in most political matters, a moderate.

Formulating an average voter when a model contains so many variables that cannot be easily averaged, such as party affiliation, is a difficult task because there is no correct method or rule to apply. The following logic was used in formulating this hypothetical voter. This particular voter seemed to best represent the exit poll sample. For example, more whites voted than any other racial group. More women voted than men. There were more voters from Southern California than from the Bay Area (Northern California). Women were on average affiliated with the Democratic Party, and the average voter was given the most prevalent political ideology of moderate. In addition, she was given the most common economic perceptions of all the voters surveyed.

Now, using these fixed voter opinions and characteristics, we can calculate probabilities that show the effect of changing one independent variable at a time on the probability of supporting the measure (see Table 4). This technique allows us to test our hypotheses that race, economic perceptions, and area of residence are important in determining Proposition 187 voting and that political party affiliation and political ideology are not.

Table 4 goes here

If we change the hypothetical voter's race, the results are convincing evidence for the hypothesis that those voters who perceived themselves as threatened financially by illegal immigrants should strongly support the measure and those voters who are racially similar to the immigrants being attacked should oppose the measure. For example, if the average voter's race is changed from white to Hispanic, ceteris paribus, she will oppose the measure. Her probability of supporting the measure decreases from 57 percent to 34 percent. But, if she is black her probability of supporting the measure increases from 57 percent to 68 percent. However, if her race is changed from white to Asian, there is practically no change in the probabilities, 57 percent compared with 58 percent.

Next, we consider the effect of the voter's economic perceptions on Proposition 187 voting. The results show that, of the voter characteristics which could be changed or influenced during the course of a political campaign, an individual's economic perceptions have the single largest effect on vote decision. When all voter characteristics are considered, only being Hispanic changes an individual's probability of supporting the measure more. An individual's perceptions of the state's economy can change her from an opponent to a supporter of the measure. Specifically, if she thought that the state's economy was poor instead of good, she was 20 percent more likely to support the measure. The first difference calculations also confirm the previous results that the voter's perception of the state's economic conditions has a greater effect on her vote than her

views of her family's finances. There was no change in her level of support if she perceived her own financial situation was worse instead of better. These results show that economic perceptions had a significant influence on the passage of Proposition 187 and, therefore, strongly support our nativist voting argument.

Then, we consider the effects of political ideology and political party affiliation on the average voter's probability of supporting Proposition 187. Changing her political ideology from liberal to conservative causes a 9 percent increase in support, 54 percent compared with 63 percent. However, this result implies that support for the measure is independent of ideology, meaning that being liberal, ceteris paribus, cannot make an average individual an opponent of the measure. When the average voter's party affiliation is changed from Democrat to Republican, her probability of supporting the proposition changes from 57 percent to 56 percent. Party affiliation was not important in determining vote choice. This result is consistent with the initiative voting literature.

Finally, we consider regional differences by changing the hypothetical voter's area of residence from Southern California to the Bay Area. This change is significant. Now, no matter what, the hypothetical voter will vote no on the measure, 46 percent compared with 57 percent. This finding provides additional evidence of the hypothesized regional variation in support for the measure.

These results indicate that an average voter's opinion of the California economy, race, and area of residence were very important, as hypothesized by our nativist voting argument, in determining her vote. Specifically, by changing only one of these characteristics, the average voter can be changed from a supporter to an opponent of Proposition 187. These results strongly support our argument that voters were making the nativist association between the economy and immigration.

5.3 How important was California's economic condition?

To verify that individuals are making the nativist link between poor economic conditions and immigration, we want to test further the importance of a voter's economic evaluation in determining the election outcome. To do so, we use the data and the probit coefficient estimates to calculate the expected election outcomes as we change voter perceptions of the state's economy. The model predicts 57 percent would vote for and 43 percent against the measure given the actual voter preferences. However, if all respondents had viewed the California economy as poor, keeping all other voter characteristics unchanged, then 68 percent of them would have supported the measure. Similarly, if all respondents had viewed the economy as excellent, ceteris paribus, then the measure would have been defeated with 64 percent voting against the measure (Figures 1 and 2). Specifically, individuals who thought the economy was bad were more likely to support the measure, and as the percentage of individuals who viewed the economy as bad increased, the measure had a greater probability of passing. These results strongly suggest that voters were making the nativist link between poor economic conditions and immigration.

Figure 1 goes here

Now, to test further the role of economic perceptions in the electoral success of Proposition 187 and to verify that the above results are not simply an artifact of these hypothetical extreme voter perceptions, we assume a distribution of economic perceptions and randomly assign economic perceptions to the voters, holding all other voter characteristics constant. First, we assume that the distribution of economic perceptions during better economic conditions would mirror the distribution of economic perceptions given by the respondents. For example, of those voters who voted on Proposition 187, the distribution of economic perceptions was as follows: 20 percent poor, 60 percent not so good, 19 percent good, and 1 percent excellent. Hypothesizing better economic conditions, we changed the distribution of economic perceptions to be 20 percent excellent, 60 percent good, 19 percent not so good, and 1 percent poor. Then, these perceptions were randomly reassigned to the voters, holding all other characteristics constant. When the election results are recalculated, given these new economic perceptions, the measure does not pass, with 54 percent voting against the measure. This result clearly demonstrates that voter perceptions of California's economy, independent of all other voter characteristics, were important in the passage of Proposition 187 and could determine the outcome of the election. These findings support our nativist voting argument. Clearly, California voters were making the nativist link between poor economic conditions and immigration.

6 Conclusions and Discussion

Our analysis shows that the voter's view of California's economy is important in determining support for or opposition to Proposition 187 and that voters were making the nativist link between poor economic conditions and immigration. Among voter characterisitics which could change during the course of an election, a voter's economic perceptions have the single largest effect on vote choice, and these perceptions can transform an opponent into a supporter. Our analysis also confirms that it is a voter's perception of the state's economy, not her own personal financial situation, that mattered, as we predicted, because nativist cycles are driven by poor overall economic conditions of the state or nation, not by an individual's situation. Further, when model election results are considered, we find that changing economic perceptions by a random process while holding all other voter characteristics constant can change the election outcome. Simply, economic perceptions mattered. Individuals were making the nativist link and blaming poor economic conditions on the presence of illegal immigrants.

In addition to economic perceptions, we hypothesized that race, area of residence, and education would be important factors in a voter's support of Proposition 187. With respect to race, we found, as hypothesized, that those voters who perceive themselves as threatened financially by illegal immigrants support the measure more and those voters who are racially similar to the immigrants being attacked oppose the measure more than other racial groups. Specifically, Hispanics voted strongly against the proposition, and blacks were more likely to support the proposition. With respect to area of residence,

all levels of analysis show that Southern California residents support the measure more than Northern California residents as predicted by our nativist voting theory, which hypothesized that support for the measure would vary with proximity to the immigrant source. We found that by changing an average voter's area of residence from Southern California to the Bay Area (Northern California), ceteris paribus, we could change a supporter of the initiative into an opponent. Finally, we also found that there was a negative relationship between education and support for the initiative so all of our hypotheses were shown to be supported by the data. Clearly, economic perceptions, race, area of residence, and education were all important factors in determining voter support for Proposition 187.

This thorough analysis of the data supports the proposed nativist voting argument that poor economic conditions in California caused a nativist response to the Mexican illegal immigrant population, which resulted in the passage of Proposition 187. Therefore, voters who supported California's Proposition 187 were concerned about the state's declining economy and viewed illegal immigrants as exacerbating if not causing this decline. These results also validate previous survey findings of the NIMBY immigration theory, which suggests that proximity to the immigrant source can increase the degree or intensity of the nativism in the community. In addition, we offer a new method of measuring nativist-sentiment voting which can be employed in future research. Previously, the relationship between economic cycles and nativist sentiment has been examined only by comparing an aggregate economic insecurity measure or immigration policy with national unemployment and GNP trends.

Our nativist voting argument also appears to offer an explanation of the issues debated during the 1994 California gubernatorial election and of the outcome. Although typically an incumbent cannot be reelected during bad economic times, Governor Pete Wilson was able to overcome this problem by focusing his campaign on illegal immigrants and blaming them for the state's precarious financial situation. This skillful maneuvering afforded him another term in office. The election became a referendum not on the incumbent but on immigration.

Arizona, Florida, and Virginia have approved similar immigration measures. To further validate our results and provide additional support for our nativist voting argument, it would be interesting to compare the economic conditions in these states at the time of the passage of these measures to see if similar economic conditions yielded similar election outcomes.

California and several other states with large electoral colleges (Arizona, Florida, Texas, Illinois, New York, and New Jersey) are filing suits against the federal government to recover costs associated with providing educational, health care, and social services to illegal immigrants. Collectively, their actions may result in additional initiatives of this type and have a substantial impact on national immigration policy as presidential candidates formulate immigration policies to appease these states.

Although Proposition 187 may have had no immediate political fallout, it may have

long-term implications for California politics. This measure has acted as a catalyst among the Hispanic legal immigrant population of Los Angeles, causing many of these immigrants to become citizens and acquire the right to vote. At the time of the city's last mayoral election, one in three adult residents was not a citizen. The Los Angeles district office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is currently receiving approximately 25,000 citizenship applications a month, nearly half of which are Hispanic in origin. This change will affect not only Los Angeles city politics but also California state politics as this newly empowered political force gains strength. Also, in recent years, California Republican candidates have been able to expect up to 40 percent of the Hispanic vote, but Proposition 187 has seriously eroded this support. The Republican Party is gaining a reputation as the anti-immigrant party. In a poll taken recently at a citizenship class in Los Angeles County, 90 percent of the students said they would register Democrat (Hayes-Bautista and Rodriguez, 1995). This shift in support may change the political composition of many districts and some entire counties.

7 Endnotes

1 This belief of labor market competition is not supported by economic labor market research. Several examples are Bean et al. (1988), Borgas (1984), Grossman (1982), and Killingsworth (1983).

2 Currently, this proposition is being challenged in both state and federal courts. In November 1995, U.S. District Court Judge Mariana R. Pfaelzer ruled that most sections of Proposition 187 are unconstitutional and that the state could not deny federally funded health care and social services to illegal immigrants. Also, Judge Pfaelzer cited the 1982 U.S. Supreme Court case, *Plyler vs. Doe*, in ruling that school-aged illegal immigrants cannot be denied access to a free public education and wrote that it was unlawful to demand that teachers and health care providers report suspected illegal immigrants. The judge let stand the sections of Proposition 187 which dealt with tougher penalities concerning the making and using of counterfeit documents. The State of California intends to appeal this decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. For a further discussion of the legal issues, see LaVally (1994).

3 In the 1994 campaigns for both U.S. senator and governor, immigration issues were prominent in the campaign rhetoric of the candidates as well as in the media coverage of these races (Alvarez, 1995). As part of the Brown proposal, it was suggested that there be a $1.00 toll for crossing the border to raise money for hiring more state and federal border inspectors. The Wilson proposal called for additional support to be provided by the National Guard for the INS and for direct negotiations with Mexico to end illegal immigration. For a complete discussion of the various immigration plans proposed by candidates in both the gubernatorial and senatorial races, see California Senate Office of Research (1994). In addition, the candidates used immigration images in their campaign advertisements. For example, Wilson ran commercials in support of his candidacy and strong stand against illegal immigration which showed Mexicans attempting to enter California illegally by running across the border between the United States and Mexico. In the Senate race, both candidates traded accusations of using illegal immigrants as household laborers.

4 This emphasis on sociotropic voting over pocketbook voting is also consistent with the economic voting literature. See, for example, Lewis-Beck (1990) and Kinder and Kiewiet (1981).

5 Sniderman and Piazza (1993) show that there is an inverse relationship between education and racial attitudes. Therefore, although there is a difference between racism and nativism, it would be reasonable to expect a similar relationship between nativism and education.

6 For a more thorough discussion of this issue, see Cornelius (1982). He provides a specific example of this phenomenon through data gathered during a survey of San Diego residents.

7 The Voter News Service (VNS) exit poll was part of the nationwide survey effort conducted by the VNS (a consortium of national media and public opinion polling organizations) in which 3,147 registered voters leaving voting booths in California were asked to respond to a short questionnaire. These data were obtained from the Roper Center.

8 References

Alvarez, R. Michael. 1995. "The Dynamics of Issue Emphasis: Campaign Strategy and Media Coverage in Statewide Races." California Institute of Technology, manuscript.

———. 1997. *Information and Elections.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Amemiya, Takeshi. 1978. "The Estimation of a Simultaneous Equation Generalized Probit Model." *Econometrica*, vol. 46, pp. 1193–1205.

Atkeson, L. R. and R. W. Partin. 1995. "Economic and Referendum Voting: A Comparison of Gubernatorial and Senatorial Elections." *American Political Science Review*, vol. 89, pp. 99–107.

Bean, Frank D., B. Lindsay Lowell, and Lowell J. Taylor. 1988. "Undocumented Mexican Immigrants and the Earnings of Other Workers in the United States," *Demography*, vol. 25, no. 1 (February), pp. 35–49.

Borgas, George J. 1984. "The Impact of Immigrants on the Earnings of the Native-Born." In *Immigration: Issues and Policies*, ed. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., and Marta Tienda. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus, pp. 83–126.

———. 1987. "Immigrants, Minorities, and Labor Market Competition," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 40, no. 3 (April), pp. 382–92.

Bowler, Shaun, and Todd Donovan. 1994a. "Economic Conditions and Voting on Ballot Propositions," *American Politics Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1 (January), pp. 27–40.

———. 1994b. "Information and Opinion Change on Ballot Propositions," *Political Behavior*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 411–35.

California Senate Office of Research. 1994. *Addressing Immigration Issues in California.* Briefing paper. March.

Childers, Emma. 1994. "The Politicization of Immigration," *Friends Committee on Legislation of California Newsletter*, vol. 43, no. 6 (June).

Cornelius, Wayne A. 1982. *America in the Era of Limits: Nativist Reactions to the New Immigration.* Research Report Series, no. 3. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California.

Cornelius, Wayne A., and Jorge A. Bustamante, ed. 1989. *Mexican Migration to the United States: Origins Consequences, and Policy Options. Dimensions of United States-Mexican Relations*, vol. 3. San Diego: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California.

Cronin, Thomas E. 1989. *Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum, and Recall.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dicamillo, Mark. 1994. *Majorities of Voters Unaware of Three of Four Controversial Ballot Initiatives: Early Support for Proposition 184 and 187.* Release Date: Thursday, July 28, 1994. San Francisco, Ca.: Field Institute.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy.* New York: Harper & Row.

El Paso Times. 1994. "Should We Close Our Borders?" USA weekend insert. September 23–5, 1994.

Field Institute. 1994. *A Digest on How the California Public Views a Variety of Matters Relating to Immigration.* San Francisco, Ca.: Field Institute.

Field, Mervin, and Mark Dicamillo. 1994a. *Anti-Illegal Immigrant Measure Proposition 187 Continues to Draw Strong Voter Support.* Release Date: Tuesday, September 27, 1994. San Francisco, Ca.: Field Institute.

———.1994b. *Big Drop in Support for Proposition 187.* Release Date: October 27, 1994. San Francisco, Ca.: Field Institute.

Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American Elections.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fiscal Letter. 1994. "California's Prop 187 Focuses on Illegal Immigrants." Vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 79.

Franklin, Charles H., and John E. Jackson. 1983. "The Dynamics of Party Identification," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 77, pp. 957-73.

Greene, William H. 1990. *Econometric Analysis.* 2d. ed. New York: Macmillan.

Grossman, Jean Baldwin. 1982. "The Substitutability of Natives and Immigrants in Production," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 64, no. 4 (November), pp. 596–603.

Guskind, Robert. 1994. "Border Backlash," *National Journal*, vol. 26, no. 23 (June 4),pp. 1296–1300.

Hayes-Bautista, David E., and Gregory Rodriguez. 1995. "The Unintended Political Earthquake Set Off by Prop. 187," *Los Angeles Times.* November 12, p. M6.

Higham, John. 1955. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Hutchinson, E. P. 1981. *Legislative History of American Immigration Policy, 1798–1965.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Key, V. O. 1966. *The Responsible Electorate.* New York: Vintage.

Kiewiet, D. Roderick. 1983. *Macroeconomics and Micropolitics: The Electoral Effects of Economic Issues.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Killingsworth, Mark R. 1983. "Effects of Immigration into the United States on the U.S. Labor Market: Analytical and Policy Issues." In *U.S. Immigration and Refugee Policy: Global and Domestic Issues*, ed. Mary M. Kritz. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, pp. 249-68.

Kinder, D. R., and D. R. Kiewiet. 1981. "Sociotropic Politics: The American Case," *British Journal of Political Science*, vol. 11, pp. 129–61.

LaVally, Rebecca. 1994. *Analysis of the Nelson-Ezell Undocumented Immigration Initiative: Illegal Aliens: Ineligibility for public Services: Verification and Reporting: Initiative Statute.* Sacramento: California Senate Office of Research.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S. 1990. *Economics & Elections: The Major Western Democracies.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Los Angeles Times. 1988. "Negatives Cited in Times Poll on Immigrants." Monday, September 19, pp. A1 and A16.

———. 1994a. "Perspectives on Proposition 187: Shame on Them, Picking on Children." Tuesday, September 6, p. B9.

———. 1994b. "Make It 'SOS' for Snake-Oil Salesman." Thursday, September 15, p. B11.

———. 1994c. "Perspective on Immigration: Latinos Want a Tighter Border, Too." Friday, September 23, p. B11.

———. 1994d. "Perspective on Immigration: Why Damn a Great State Resource?" Wednesday, September 28, p. B11.

———. 1994e. "Perspective on Immigration: Scaling the Heights of Irrationality." Monday, October 3, p. B11.

———. 1994g. "Charting Wilson's Transformation on Immigration." Wednesday, November 2, pp. A3, A17, A18.

———. 1994h. "Candidates Focus on Immigration and Clinton." Sunday, November 6, p. A3.

Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 88, no. 1, pp. 63–76.

Maddala, G. S. 1983. *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics.* Econometric Society Monographs, No. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magleby, David B. 1984. *Direct Legislation: Voting on Ballot Propositions in the United States*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Markus, Gregory B. 1988. "The Impact of Personal and National Economic Conditions on the Presidential Vote: Pooled Cross-Sectional Analysis," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 32, no. 1 (February), pp. 137–54.

Muller, Thomas, Thomas Espenshade, and Donald Manson. 1985. *The Fourth Wave: California's Newest Immigrants*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

Popkin, Samuel L. 1991. *The Reasoning Voter: Communications and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: The Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Rivers, D., and Q. H. Vuong. 1988. "Limited Information Estimators and Exogeneity Tests of Simultaneous Probit Models," *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 39, pp. 347–66.

Romero, Phillip J. 1994. *Shifting the Costs of Failed Federal Policy: The Net Fiscal Impact of Illegal Immigrants in California*. Sacramento, Ca.: Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

Rosin, Hanna. 1994. " Raisin Hell," *New Republic*, vol. 211, no. 20 (November 14), pp. 15–16.

San Francisco Examiner. 1989. "U.S. Paying Dearly for Failing to Protect Its Borders." Sunday, October 29, p. A2.

Schmidt, David D. 1989. *Citizen Lawmakers: The Ballot Initiative Revolution*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sniderman, Paul M., and Thomas Piazza. 1993. *The Scar of Race*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

U.S. News & World Report. 1985. "The Disappearing Border." August 19, pp. 30-42.

9 Appendix

The Reduced-Form Estimates

The reduced-form estimates are presented in Table 5. As discussed in Section 4, the reduced-form equations permit us to calculate the instrumental variables for the right-hand-side endogenous variables—the predisposition to support Proposition 187, the Republican gubernatorial candidate, and the Republican senatorial candidate—which appear in our voting model. The reduced-form equations must include all of the exogenous variables in the three equations of our model (Equation 3). Therefore, in addition to the voter characteristic and attitudinal variables of race, gender, educational attainment, work status, area of residence, opinion of California's economic condition, opinion of personal financial situation, political ideology, and political party affilation (for a thorough discussion of these variables and how they were coded, see Section 4 of the paper), we also included the relevant gubernatorial and senatorial issue variables discussed in the specification of the senatorial and gubernatorial models (see discussion below). Next, using these estimated coefficients, we imputed the propensities for each voter to support the initiative and the Republican senatorial and gubernatorial candidates. Finally, using these calculated values, we estimated the specified Proposition 187, senatorial, and gubernatorial models.

Table 5 goes here

Specification of the Senatorial and Gubernatorial Models

To specify the senatorial and gubernatorial models, we include the voter characteristic and opinion variables used in the Proposition 187 model (see Section 4): race, gender, educational attainment, work status, area of residence, opinion of California's economic condition, opinion of personal financial situation, political ideology, and political party affiliation. In addition, because both senatorial and gubernatorial candidates politicized the issue of illegal immigration, a voter's propensity to support Proposition 187 is also included in both of these models. Finally, we also included the relevant senatorial and gubernatorial issue variables. The survey asked each voter which one of two issues from a list of nine mattered most in his vote for U.S. senator and California governor. For the senatorial vote, the issues were sex of candidate, opponent's campaign spending, candidate's experience, Clinton's performance as president, crime, immigration, candidate knows California, taxes, and economy/jobs. For the gubernatorial vote, the issues were the environment, education, crime, immigration, death penalty, sex of candidate, welfare reform, taxes, and economy/jobs. In both models, we excluded the two issues of immigration and economy/jobs because of concern about endogeneity and multicollinearity, respectively. We coded identically all of the issue variables as binary variables. If a voter marked an issue as important in his vote choice, then the issue was coded as a 1 for the voter; otherwise, the issue was coded 0 for the voter. The estimated results of these models are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

Tables 6 and 7 go here

When we consider the results of the senatorial and gubernatorial models, respectively

Tables 6 and 7, we find that blacks and other minorities are significantly less likely to support the Republican candidate in both of these races than whites, which is consistent with the tradition of minorities identifying with the Democratic party and supporting its candidates. In the senatorial model, the voter's opinions concerning California's economy and his personal finances are not significant, which is consistent with the fact that the U.S. senate is a national office, not a state office, so that the state's economy should be independent of this decision. However, in the gubernatorial model, the voter's opinion concerning the state's economy was significant in determining candidate support (Atkeson and Partin, 1995).

The political ideology and political party affiliation of the voter coefficents are significant and negatively signed in both models meaning that Democrats or liberals are more likely to support the Democratic candidate than they are to support the Republican candidate. This result is consistent with voting theory that voters use shortcuts, such as party identification and ideology, in partisan races to help make a candidate choice (Popkin, 1991). In the senatorial model, the southern California variable is significant and positive, which suggest that residents in this area were more likely to support the Republican candidate than the Democratic candidate. This result is supported by this region's traditional conservatism and by the fact that the Democratic candidate, Dianne Feinstein, is from San Francisco in Northern California.

Next, when the issues that were important to the voter in his senatorial candidate choice are considered (sex of candidate, spending by candidate's opponent, experience, and candidate's knowledge of California), they correspond to the election issues and dynamics (the large amount of money spent during the election by both candidates, the fact that one candidate was a woman, Dianne Feinstein was an incumbent, and Republican candidate Michael Huffington was considered an outsider because of his recent move from Texas to California). The issues that were significant in gubernatorial candidate choices are the environment, education, sex of candidate, and the death penalty. These issues correspond to the issues discussed in the campaign. Democratic candidate Kathleen Brown produced an education proposal and was a strong proponent of environmental causes while Wilson, a staunch conservative, opposed additional educational spending and supported the death penalty. Finally, an individual's vote on Proposition 187 was not significant in determining a voter's gubernatorial candidate choice while it was significant in determining a voter's gubernatorial candidate choice. Specifically, if a voter favored Proposition 187, he was significantly more likely to vote for Republican gubernatorial candidate Pete Wilson, who campaigned for the measure. This result supports our argument that it is necessary to consider the politcal context in which the proposition passed. Simply, voter opinion regarding Proposition 187 influenced candidate choices, and candidate choice influenced voter support for or opposition to the initiative.

Table 1: Proposition 187 voting by voter characteristics

Survey Question	**Yes on 187**		**No on 187**	
	%	N	%	N
Gender				
Male	57.7	512	42.3	376
Female	50.2	489	49.8	485
Race				
White	59.5	823	40.5	561
Black	45.5	76	54.5	91
Hispanic/Latino	25.4	51	74.6	150
Asian	46.1	35	53.9	41
Other	57.1	16	42.9	12
Education Level				
Did not complete H.S.	45.3	39	54.7	47
H.S. Graduate	63.1	169	36.9	99
Some College	60.2	351	39.8	232
College Graduate	48.6	252	51.4	266
Postgraduate Study	40.3	121	59.7	179
Employment Status				
Employed	51.2	640	48.8	611
Unemployed	59.2	375	40.8	258
Area of Residence				
Los Angeles City	53.4	102	46.6	89
Los Angeles Suburbs	58.1	104	41.9	75
Southern California	61.3	473	38.7	298
Bay Area	40.0	144	60.0	216
Central Valley	50.1	192	49.9	191

Note: Percentages are row percentages.

Table 2: Proposition 187 voting by voter attitudes

Survey Question	**Yes on 187**		**No on 187**	
	%	N	%	N
Opinion of Personal Financial Situation				
Better Today	43.3	189	56.7	247
Worse Today	62.2	300	37.8	182
About the Same	52.9	468	47.1	417
Perception of California's Economic Condition				
Excellent	62.5	5	37.5	3
Good	49.4	87	50.6	89
Not So Good	51.0	284	49.0	273
Poor	69.1	134	30.9	60
Political Party Affiliation				
Democrat	36.2	285	63.8	502
Republican	72.9	490	27.1	182
Independent	56.6	142	43.4	109
Other	43.5	37	56.5	48
Political Ideology				
Liberal	31.2	127	68.8	280
Moderate	51.0	388	49.0	373
Conservative	71.4	417	28.6	167
Vote for Governor				
Pete Wilson (R)	77.4	732	22.6	214
Kathleen Brown (D)	28.5	243	71.5	609
Vote for Senator				
Michael Huffington (R)	79.3	602	20.7	157
Dianne Feinstein (D)	34.5	324	65.5	615

Note: Pecentages are row percentages.

Table 3: Probit and two–stage probit estimates of Proposition 187 support

Variables	Probit Coefficients	Two-Stage Probit Coefficients
Constant	1.44**	0.79**
	(0.29)	(0.33)
Hispanic/ Latino	−0.83**	−0.59**
	(0.16)	(0.19)
Black	−0.04	0.28*
	(0.17)	(0.19)
Asian	−0.01	0.06
	(0.24)	(0.25)
Other Race	−0.16	0.01
	(0.16)	(0.16)
Personal Finance	−0.03	0.00
	(0.07)	(0.07)
State Economy	−0.26**	−0.25**
	(0.07)	(0.08)
Democrat	−0.76**	0.03
	(0.12)	(0.21)
Independent	−0.29**	0.12
	(0.13)	(0.17)
Liberal	−0.65**	−0.22
	(0.14)	(0.18)
Moderate	−0.25**	−0.14
	(0.11)	(0.12)
Woman	−0.23**	−0.10
	(0.09)	(0.10)
High School Graduate	0.07	−0.17
	(0.20)	(0.21)
Some College	−0.02	−0.16
	(0.18)	(0.19)
College Graduate	−0.27*	−0.30*
	(0.18)	(0.19)
Postgraduate Study	−0.40**	−0.35**
	(0.20)	(.21)
Los Angeles City	0.54**	0.44**
	(0.19)	(0.19)
Los Angeles Suburbs	0.67**	0.48**
	(0.19)	(0.19)
Other	0.49**	0.28**
Southern California	(0.13)	(0.14)
Central Valley	0.17	0.10
	(0.14)	(0.15)
Employed	−0.11	−0.03
	(0.10)	(0.10)
Senatorial Vote		0.06
		(0.10)
Gubernatorial Vote		0.31**
		(0.12)

Note: Maximum-likelihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parentheses. *Probit*: Log likelihood = -517.40; Number of Observations = 924; Percent correctly predicted = 71.5%.

Two-Stage Probit: Log likelihood = -507.57; Number of observations = 924; Percent correctly predicted = 71.8%.

*Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.10$ level.

**Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.05$ level.

Table 4: The effects of voter characteristics and attitudes on Proposition 187 voting

Variables of interest		Probability estimates		Probability difference
Voter race				
White	Black	0.57	0.68	−0.11
White	Hispanic/ Latino	0.57	0.34	0.23
White	Asian	0.57	0.58	−0.01
Opinion of California's economic condition				
Excellent	Poor	0.38	0.67	−0.29
Good	Poor	0.47	0.67	−0.20
Opinion of personal financial situation				
Better	Worse	0.57	0.57	0.00
Political ideology				
Liberal	Conservative	0.54	0.63	−0.09
Party identification				
Democrat	Republican	0.57	0.56	0.01
Area of residence				
Southern California	Bay Area	0.57	0.46	0.11

Note: The hypothetical voter in this example is a white, female, Southern California resident with an average education (some college but no degree). She thinks her family's financial situation is the "same" as it was two years ago and the state's economy is "not so good." In addition, she considers herself a Democrat and, in most political matters, is a "moderate."

Table 5: Reduced-Form Estimates

Variables	Proposition 187 Probit Coefficients	Gubernatorial Probit Coefficients	Senatorial Probit Coefficients
Constant	1.21**	1.53**	1.72**
	(0.31)	(0.39)	(0.38)
Hispanic/ Latino	−0.84**	−0.82**	−0.16
	(0.17)	(0.21)	(0.20)
Black	−0.10	−1.17**	−0.51**
	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Asian	−0.06	−0.57**	0.10
	(0.25)	(0.29)	(0.30)
Other Race	−0.12	−0.37**	−0.38**
	(0.16)	(0.22)	(0.23)
Personal Finance	−0.03	−0.04	−0.03
	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.09)
State Economy	−0.23**	0.02	−0.09
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.09)
Democrat	−0.58**	−1.79**	−1.63**
	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Independent	−0.19*	−1.02**	−0.74**
	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.16)
Liberal	−0.58**	−0.84**	−0.86**
	(0.15)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Moderate	−0.13	−0.11	−0.36**
	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.14)
Woman	−0.22**	−0.27**	−0.22**
	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)
High School Graduate	0.10	0.75**	0.24
	(0.21)	(0.27)	(0.25)
Some College	0.02	0.52**	−0.03
	(0.19)	(0.24)	(0.22)
College Graduate	−0.19	0.32	−0.19
	(0.19)	(0.25)	(0.23)
Postgraduate Study	−0.32*	0.10	−0.26
	(0.21)	(.27)	(0.26)
Los Angeles City	0.50**	0.17	0.41**
	(0.19)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Los Angeles Suburbs	0.57**	0.27	0.50**
	(0.20)	(0.24)	(0.23)
Other	0.41**	0.50**	0.57**
Southern California	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Central Valley	0.16	0.17	0.23
	(0.15)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Employed	−0.17*	−0.26**	−0.16
	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.13)
Senate Issue 1	0.02	−0.58**	−0.53*
Sex of Candidate	(0.25)	(0.37)	(0.38)
Senate Issue 2	−0.21	−0.01	−0.39**
Opponent's Spending	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.22)

(Table 5: Reduced-Form Estimates, continued)

Variables	Proposition187 Probit Coefficients	Gubernatorial Probit Coefficients	Senatorial Probit Coefficients
Senate Issue 3	−0.31**	−0.24**	−0.75**
Candidate's Experience	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Senate lssue 4	0.12	−0.35**	0.05
Clinton's Performance	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.22)
Senate lssue 5	0.01	−0.16	−0.16
Crime	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Senate lssue 7	−0.28**	−0.60**	−1.10**
Candidate Knows CA	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.17)
Senate lssue 8	0.08	0.01	0.05
Taxes	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.21)
Governor Issue 1	0.11	−0.43**	−0.03
Environment	(0.18)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Governor Issue 2	−0.21**	−0.65**	−0.10
Education	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.16)
Governor Issue 3	0.42**	0.60**	0.23**
Crime	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Governor Issue 5	0.08	0.57**	0.43**
Death Penalty	(0.18)	(0.26)	(0.23)
Governor Issue 6	0.69**	−0.51	−1.05**
Sex of Candidate	(0.29)	(0.48)	(0.70)
Governor Issue 7	0.49**	0.07	−0.01
Welfare Reform	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.20)
Governor lssue 8	0.22*	0.19	0.14
Taxes	(0.16)	(0.22)	(0.21)

Notes: Proposition 187 Model: Maximum-likelihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parentheses. Log likelihood = -487.71; Number of observations = 924; Percent correctly predicted = 73.81%. Coding of dependent variable is as follows: Yes on Proposition 187 = 1; No on Proposition 187 = 0.

Governor Model: Maximum-likelihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parentheses. Log likelihood = -279.11; Number of observations = 900; Percent correctly predicted = 87.56%. Coding of dependent variable is as follows: a vote for Republican candidate Pete Wilson = 1; a vote for Democratic candidate Kathleen Brown = 0.

Senate Model: Maximum-likelihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parcntheses. Log likelihood=-295.62; Number of observations=861; Percent correctly predicted = 84.90%. Coding of dependent variable is as follows: a vote for Republican candidate Michael Huffington = 1; a vote for Democratic candidate Dianne Feinstein = 0.

*Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.10$ level.

**lndicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.05$ level.

Senate Issues 6 and 9 and Governor Issues 4 and 9 were excluded from the analysis (see appendix for discussion).

Table 6: Senate voting by voter characteristics and attitudes

Constant	1.54**
	(0.46)
Hispanic/Latino	0.04
	(0.27)
Black	−0.48**
	(0.23)
Asian	0.19
	(0.30)
other	−0.41**
	(0.23)
Personal Financial	−0.03
	(0.09)
California's Economy	−0.03
	(0.11)
Democrat	−1.44**
	(0.23)
Independent	−0.63**
	(0.18)
Liberal	−0.90**
	(0.18)
Moderate	−0.39**
	(0.14)
Woman	−0.18*
	(0.13)
High School Graduate	0.19
	(0.24)
Some College	−0.02
	(0.22)
College Graduate	−0.16
	(0.23)
Postgraduate Study	−0.18
	(0.27)
Los Angeles City	0.27
	(0.27)
Los Angeles Suburbs	0.33
	(0.27)
Southern California	0.45**
	(0.19)
Central Valley	0.21
	(0.19)

(Table 6: Senate voting by voter characteristics and attitudes, continued)

Senate Issue 1	$-0.85**$
Sex of Candidate	(0.32)
Senate Issue 2	$-0.37**$
Opponent's Spending	(0.22)
Senate Issue 3	$-0.69**$
Candidate's Experience	(0.15)
Senate Issue 4	0.01
Clinton's performance	(0.22)
Senate Issue 5	-0.09
Crime	(0.16)
Senate Issue 7	$-1.03**$
Candidate knows CA	(0.18)
Senate Issue 8	0.01
Taxes	(0.19)
Proposition 187 Vote	0.27
	(0.21)

Note: Maximum-liklihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parentheses. Log likelihood = -300.04; Number of Observations 861; Percent correctly predicted = 84.55%. Coding of dependent variable is as follows: a vote for Republican candidate Michael Huffington = 1; a vote for Democratic candidate Dianne Feinstein = 0.
*Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.10$ level. ***Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.05$ level.

Table 7: Governor voting by voter characteristics and attitudes

Constant	0.54
	(0.50)
Hispanic/Latino	−0.15
	(0.30)
Black	−1.07**
	(0.24)
Asian	−0.43*
	(0.29)
Other	−0.24
	(0.22)
Personal Finance	−0.01
	(0.09)
California's Economy	0.21**
	(0.12)
Democrat	−1.19**
	(0.29)
Independent	−0.75**
	(0.20)
Liberal	−0.83**
	(0.18)
Moderate	−0.22*
	(0.15)
Woman	−0.08
	(0.14)
High School Graduate	0.69**
	(0.26)
Some College	0.54**
	(0.24)
College Graduate	0.49**
	(0.26)
Postgraduate Study	0.42*
	(0.30)
Los Angeles City	−0.29
	(0.30)
Los Angeles Suburbs	−0.17
	(0.30)
Southern California	0.13
	(0.21)
Central Valley	0.02
	(0.20)

Table 7: Governor voting by voter characteristics and attitudes, continued)

Governor Issue 1	−0.46**
Environment	(0.25)
Governor Issue 2	−0.52**
Education	(0.17)
Governor Issue 3	0.16**
Crime	(0.20)
Governor Issue 5	0.39*
Death Penalty	(0.26)
Governor Issue 6	−1.33**
Sex of Candidate	(0.45)
Governor Issue 7	−0.34*
Welfare Reform	(0.26)
Governor Issue 8	−0.11
Taxes	(0.22)
Proposition 187 Vote	0.81**
	(0.30)

Note: Maximum-liklihood estimates with estimated standard errors below in parentheses. Log likelihood = -285.06; Number of Observations 900; Percent correctly predicted = 86.89%. Coding of dependent variable is as follows: a vote for Republican candidate Pete Wilson = 1; a vote for Democratic candidate Kathleen Brown = 0.
*Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.10$ level. ***Indicates an estimate that is significant at the $p = 0.05$ level.