

**Leading the Future of the Public Sector: The Third Transatlantic Dialogue  
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA**

May 31 – June 2, 2007

**Workshop 2: Diverse Leaders and Leading a Diverse Workforce**

**Leadership and Diversity: A Snapshot of  
Hispanic Representation in State  
Government throughout the United States**

Lina M. Rombalsky

Contact for Correspondence:  
Lina M. Rombalsky  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
lrombalsky@niu.edu  
815-753-0323

**Abstract**

This paper examines the current representation of Hispanics in state government throughout the United States. The analysis explores Hispanic educational attainment in relation to representative bureaucracies in state government. The findings of this paper suggest further research to be conducted in explaining bureaucratic representation beyond Hispanic growth rates in demographics. Bureaucratic representation, as a leadership tool in the achievement of common goals, appears to be challenged by underlying factors that relate to the attainment of a “critical mass” in state government demographics.

Leadership as a social dynamic is driven by context. Northouse (2001) defines leadership as a group process where leaders use influence to achieve a common goal. Leaders not only facilitate the process of goal attainment, but also provide direction. The application of leadership in state government, in the attainment common goals, is an intricate process. The leadership of state governments, as democracy catalysts, is challenged by the ever-changing demographic composition of states. The role of leaders in government becomes a function of a constant balancing of interest representation.

Leadership in state government throughout the United States can be regarded as the translation of common goals into common action. For the purposes of this paper, leadership in government is defined as the crystallization of representative bureaucracy theory in the facilitation of common goal attainment. Research suggests that the advantages of representative bureaucracy are channeled in two ways: policy-making and implementation. This paper examines the representation of Hispanics in state government in light of their increasing population rates and political influence throughout United States.

### **Representative Bureaucracy Theory**

Literature about bureaucratic representation has long been documented. J. Donald Kingsley was one of the first authors that explained representative bureaucracy through the Marxist lens. He argued that a dominant presence of the middle class within British Civil Service was inevitable given the influence of this group in society. As a result, the arrangement of the bureaucracy reflected the power structure that mirrored the power structure of the society. Paul Van Riper (1958) extended upon Kingsley's work to include the need for a representative bureaucracy to embrace similar "ethos and attitudes" of the general public. The link between public bureaucracies that mirrored demographic compositions and their bureaucrats' attitudes and ethos allowed Van Riper to argue for the importance of representative bureaucracies in democracies. Hinderer (1993) summarizes the contribution of Pitkin, Mosher, Eulau, and Karps, in further developing the importance of bureaucratic representation as the ability to "act for" the interests of the common good, regardless of group identification (Hinderer, 1993:417).

Since the genesis of bureaucratic representation literature, numerous studies have been conducted to analyze public bureaucracies and their impact on both policy-making and policy implementation. Frequently, the role of public bureaucracies in societies is used to explain social problems (Peters, 1981:56). Although the position of government in addressing social problems may vary depending on a particular political context, the role of government in ensuring equitable services is not as debatable. Under the Constitution, the United States government functions to provide services that ensure equal opportunity via the realization of the common interest.

In the growing public demand for government-supplied good and services (Bohte & Meier, 2000:35-46), democratic theory has been applied as a tool to augment the effectiveness of bureaucratic institutions as leaders in the public sector. For example, Selden, et al. (1998) examines the relationship between acting in a manner consistent with the public interest and racial and ethnic minorities in the public workforce. In particular, Selden, et al. highlights the importance of bureaucratic institutions in the phenomena of the delegation of authority in policy-making to administrative government agencies. Bureaucrats are asked to make decisions based upon their experience, expertise, judgment, and intuition in dealing with administrative discretion and provision of services (Wamsley et al., 1990). The administrative discretion

dilemma is best illustrated by the concept of “street-level bureaucracy” where policy implementation in the end comes down to the people who actually implement it (Lipsky, 1980). As a result, the problem of bureaucratic organizations may not be revolve around the dilemma of administrative discretion or the exercise of political power in the implementation of services, but rather in ensuring that their decisions reflect the public interest.

The literature that examines the consequences and determinants of representation for historically marginalized groups tends to conceptualize and operationalize representation as either the presence or behavior of these groups (Weldon, 2002:1154). The need to reconcile bureaucratic government with democratic values has been subject of much discussion in government literature (Selden, et al. 1998:718) Nachmias and Rosenbloom (1978) argue that there are at least four democratic theory dimensions that need to be addressed in analyzing the relationship between social dynamics and bureaucrats attitudes and behavior: 1) to ascertain that the extent to which members of different social groups are found in the bureaucratic organization, 2) the differences in the attitudes of these groups needs to be accounted (in the assumption that various groups are at least moderately well represented in a proportional sense), 3) to determine the magnitude of differences among the bureaucrats and the relevant social group in the population as a whole, 4) to be aware that bureaucrats from a given social background may reflect the values and attitudes of that group in the content of decisions that are made (968).

Numerous studies focused on the transition to move from presence to “acting for,” even when studies have demonstrated that in order to “act for” there needs to be a critical mass in place. For example, a myriad of studies illustrated the significant barriers between the presence of marginalized groups in bureaucratic organizations and “acting for” the interests of those groups. One argument is that Hispanics are often segregated into positions the lack the responsibility to influence organizational decision-making process and outcomes (non-management positions). Another argument is that organizations “socialize” their members in which agency-sanctioned attitudes are strongly encouraged (Meier, 1993). Nonetheless, the multiple role expectations placed by bureaucratic organizations result in cross-pressures between the job expectations and the bureaucrat’s attitudes and behaviors (Selden, et al. 1998:720)

For the purpose of this paper, the presence, rather than the behavior of Hispanics in state government will be examined. Because the attainment of bureaucratic representation has shown to be a process in reaching an “acting for” degree of representation, this paper focuses on the analysis of presence as the genesis to effective bureaucratic representation.

### **The Status of Hispanic Representation throughout the United States**

Current 2006 demographics indicate that Hispanics are the fastest growing minority group in the United States. Table 1 below shows that the current demographic composition of Hispanics in the United States (in proportion to the number of non-Hispanics) ranges from a high 43 percent in New Mexico to a low 0 percent in Maine. The highest Hispanic demographic proportions also concur with the top five largest states, suggesting that the largest states are more likely to have large proportions of Hispanics. The top ten states with the largest proportion of Hispanics are: New Mexico, Texas, California, Arizona, Nevada, Florida, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, and Illinois.

**Table 1**

<b>State</b>	<b>Total Population</b>	<b>Hispanics</b>	<b>Hispanics %</b>	<b>Non-Hispanics</b>	<b>Non-Hispanics %</b>
Alabama	4,524,295	128,814	2.8%	4,395,481	97.2%
Alaska	658,758	28,948	4.4%	629,809	95.6%
Arizona	6,047,213	1,964,662	32.5%	4,082,551	67.5%
Arkansas	2,759,934	127,495	4.6%	2,632,439	95.4%
California	35,939,668	12,537,418	34.9%	23,402,250	65.1%
Colorado	4,640,517	904,696	19.5%	3,735,821	80.5%
Connecticut	3,486,676	355,243	10.2%	3,131,433	89.8%
Delaware	844,437	59,337	7.0%	785,101	93.0%
Florida	17,885,620	3,703,596	20.7%	14,182,024	79.3%
Georgia	9,044,837	777,771	8.6%	8,267,066	91.4%
Hawaii	1,279,003	84,084	6.6%	1,194,920	93.4%
Idaho	1,442,263	134,435	9.3%	1,307,827	90.7%
Illinois	12,607,996	1,448,844	11.5%	11,159,153	88.5%
Indiana	6,140,761	295,941	4.8%	5,844,820	95.2%
Iowa	2,908,756	135,561	4.7%	2,773,195	95.3%
Kansas	2,694,731	175,856	6.5%	2,518,876	93.5%
Kentucky	4,052,044	54,388	1.3%	3,997,656	98.7%
Louisiana	4,088,262	79,399	1.9%	4,008,864	98.1%
Maine	1,320,244	5,987	0.5%	1,314,257	99.5%
Maryland	5,568,836	396,997	7.1%	5,171,840	92.9%
Massachusetts	6,327,811	517,971	8.2%	5,809,840	91.8%
Michigan	9,981,846	357,799	3.6%	9,624,047	96.4%
Minnesota	5,129,280	191,670	3.7%	4,937,611	96.3%
Mississippi	2,853,620	85,065	3.0%	2,768,556	97.0%
Missouri	5,709,542	156,661	2.7%	5,552,881	97.3%
Montana	928,137	20,877	2.2%	907,260	97.8%
Nebraska	1,765,883	149,663	8.5%	1,616,220	91.5%
Nevada	2,447,622	542,423	22.2%	1,905,199	77.8%
New Hampshire	1,300,979	17,994	1.4%	1,282,985	98.6%
New Jersey	8,725,273	1,502,590	17.2%	7,222,683	82.8%
New Mexico	1,938,215	842,813	43.5%	1,095,402	56.5%
New York	19,022,205	3,059,955	16.1%	15,962,251	83.9%
North Carolina	8,561,103	614,521	7.2%	7,946,582	92.8%
North Dakota	626,120	9,503	1.5%	616,617	98.5%
Ohio	11,334,079	317,892	2.8%	11,016,187	97.2%
Oklahoma	3,505,021	189,900	5.4%	3,315,121	94.6%
Oregon	3,627,458	328,664	9.1%	3,298,794	90.9%
Pennsylvania	12,280,598	521,889	4.2%	11,758,709	95.8%
Rhode Island	1,053,826	119,031	11.3%	934,795	88.7%
South Carolina	4,180,680	131,497	3.1%	4,049,183	96.9%
South Dakota	768,137	21,795	2.8%	746,343	97.2%

<b>State (cont'd)</b>	<b>Total Population</b>	<b>Hispanics</b>	<b>Hispanics %</b>	<b>Non-Hispanics</b>	<b>Non-Hispanics %</b>
Tennessee	5,867,031	195,333	3.3%	5,671,698	96.7%
Texas	22,819,486	8,329,564	36.5%	14,489,922	63.5%
Utah	2,523,518	284,012	11.3%	2,239,506	88.7%
Vermont	621,767	4,554	0.7%	617,214	99.3%
Virginia	7,453,830	523,093	7.0%	6,930,736	93.0%
Washington	6,249,888	425,190	6.8%	5,824,698	93.2%
West Virginia	1,799,060	7,624	0.4%	1,791,436	99.6%
Wisconsin	5,447,054	217,178	4.0%	5,229,877	96.0%
Wyoming	510,817	34,545	6.8%	476,272	93.2%

Source: Current Population Survey, March 2006 Supplement

In state government representation, Hispanics are lagging when compared to the current demographic composition (see Table 2). The states with the highest proportion of Hispanics are: New Mexico, Texas, California, Arizona, New York, Connecticut, Florida, Massachusetts, Washington, and Wisconsin. On the other hand, the state governments with the lowest proportionality of Hispanic employees are: Ohio, Georgia, Missouri, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, West Virginia, Montana, South Dakota, and Vermont. Although the ranking of state government employment demographic proportionalities seem to coincide with the ranking of the Hispanic proportionalities for the entire state, the differences the degree of proportionalities is evident.

**Table 2**

<b>State Government</b>	<b>Total Employee Population</b>	<b>Hispanics</b>	<b>Hispanic Percent</b>	<b>Non-Hispanics</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Percent</b>	<b>Hispanic Mismatch</b>
Alabama	114,399	0	0.0%	114,399	100.0%	-2.8%
Alaska	28,257	615	2.2%	27,642	97.8%	-2.2%
Arizona	145,172	26,138	18.0%	119,034	82.0%	-14.5%
Arkansas	100,674	3,322	3.3%	97,352	96.7%	-1.3%
California	694,337	132,373	19.1%	561,965	80.9%	-15.8%
Colorado	83,132	3,430	4.1%	79,702	95.9%	-15.4%
Connecticut	68,614	6,629	9.7%	61,985	90.3%	-0.5%
Delaware	38,963	1,675	4.3%	37,288	95.7%	-2.7%
Florida	239,442	19,165	8.0%	220,277	92.0%	-12.7%
Georgia	251,525	0	0.0%	251,525	100.0%	-8.6%
Hawaii	69,035	1,710	2.5%	67,325	97.5%	-4.1%

State Government (Cont'd.)	Total Employee Population	Hispanics	Hispanics Percent	Non-Hispanics	Non-Hispanics Percent	Hispanic Mismatch
Idaho	38,220	1,220	3.2%	37,000	96.8%	-6.1%
Illinois	173,891	4,422	2.5%	169,469	97.5%	-8.9%
Indiana	118,455	2,532	2.1%	115,923	97.9%	-2.7%
Iowa	107,929	3,693	3.4%	104,236	96.6%	-1.2%
Kansas	79,691	2,608	3.3%	77,083	96.7%	-3.3%
Kentucky	154,351	807	0.5%	153,544	99.5%	-0.8%
Louisiana	125,812	0	0.0%	125,812	100.0%	-1.9%
Maine	36,033	547	1.5%	35,486	98.5%	1.1%
Maryland	110,778	1,759	1.6%	109,020	98.4%	-5.5%
Massachusetts	107,823	7,127	6.6%	100,696	93.4%	-1.6%
Michigan	162,307	4,296	2.6%	158,011	97.4%	-0.9%
Minnesota	116,555	2,319	2.0%	114,236	98.0%	-1.7%
Mississippi	114,749	0	0.0%	114,749	100.0%	-3.0%
Missouri	153,681	0	0.0%	153,681	100.0%	-2.7%
Montana	34,907	0	0.0%	34,907	100.0%	-2.2%
Nebraska	42,452	435	1.0%	42,017	99.0%	-7.5%
Nevada	35,145	1,147	3.3%	33,997	96.7%	-18.9%
New Hampshire	26,594	719	2.7%	25,875	97.3%	1.3%
New Jersey	199,766	7,662	3.8%	192,104	96.2%	-13.4%
New Mexico	58,432	23,169	39.7%	35,263	60.3%	-3.8%
New York	344,426	39,928	11.6%	304,498	88.4%	-4.5%
North Carolina	242,476	3,009	1.2%	239,467	98.8%	-5.9%
North Dakota	23,377	504	2.2%	22,872	97.8%	0.6%
Ohio	175,950	0	0.0%	175,950	100.0%	-2.8%
Oklahoma	105,639	4,509	4.3%	101,129	95.7%	-1.1%
Oregon	84,946	1,775	2.1%	83,171	97.9%	-7.0%
Pennsylvania	181,828	5,954	3.3%	175,873	96.7%	-1.0%
Rhode Island	17,639	503	2.9%	17,136	97.1%	-8.4%
South Carolina	168,750	1,900	1.1%	166,850	98.9%	-2.0%
South Dakota	19,158	0	0.0%	19,158	100.0%	-2.8%
Tennessee	123,966	1,033	0.8%	122,933	99.2%	-2.5%
Texas	507,475	102,679	20.2%	404,795	79.8%	-16.3%
Utah	78,394	1,136	1.4%	77,258	98.6%	-9.8%
Vermont	16,237	0	0.0%	16,237	100.0%	-0.7%
Virginia	140,274	2,442	1.7%	137,832	98.3%	-5.3%
Washington	174,748	8,171	4.7%	166,577	95.3%	-2.1%
West Virginia	47,173	0	0.0%	47,173	100.0%	-0.4%
Wisconsin	124,003	5,519	4.5%	118,484	95.5%	0.5%
Wyoming	18,424	752	4.1%	17,672	95.9%	-2.7%

Source: Current Population Survey, March 2006 Supplement. U.S. Census.

The Hispanic mismatch column, for example, illustrates the degree of bureaucratic representation among state governments based on their state total Hispanic demographic composition. The top five most bureaucratic represented are: New Hampshire, Maine, North

Dakota, Wisconsin, and West Virginia. Conversely, the lowest bureaucratic representation was found in: Nevada, Texas, California, Colorado, and Arizona. It is worth noting that high bureaucratic representation in this sample is not as insightful as the states that were found to have low bureaucratic representation. The difference between these two groups is that the low group was also found to have the largest number of Hispanics, while the high group shows a low number of Hispanics in their demographic composition. These findings suggest that bureaucratic representation may be related to total size of the state demographics. Interestingly, these data finding challenge the conventional wisdom about size and proportion of Hispanics and bureaucratic representation. This analysis demonstrates that for the most part size of Hispanics in an area does not always translate to bureaucratic representation.

Bureaucratic representation among the states with high Hispanic rates appears to uncover a high mismatch dynamics. Table 3 below depicts the percent of bureaucratic representation mismatch among the top ten states with the highest Hispanic proportionalities in their total demographics. Although the states with the highest proportion of Hispanics also show high rates of mismatch in bureaucratic representation, the state of New Mexico appears to be the clearest exception.

**Table 3**

<b>Top 10 States in Terms of Hispanic Population Percent</b>				
	<b>Hispanic States</b>		<b>Hispanic State Government Mismatch (Bureaucratic Representation)</b>	
	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Percent</i>
New Mexico	1	43.5%	1	-3.8%
Texas	2	36.5%	9	-16.3%
California	3	34.9%	8	-15.8%
Arizona	4	32.5%	6	-14.5%
Nevada	5	22.2%	10	-18.9%
Florida	6	20.7%	4	-12.7%
Colorado	7	19.5%	7	-15.4%
New Jersey	8	17.2%	5	-13.4%
New York	9	16.1%	2	-4.5%
Illinois	10	11.5%	3	-8.9%

## **Education and Bureaucratic Representation**

Cameron and Heckman (2001) argue that the educational attainment differential between whites and non-whites impact the on-going high degrees of racial inequality in the United States. In particular, they found that parental income is a strong predictor in educational attainment (455-499). Other studies have concentrated on demonstrating the importance of bilingual education in facilitating higher levels of educational attainment among Hispanics (Orfield, 1986) and the social context of schools (Weiher, 2000). As a result, educational attainment has shown to continually feed into the vicious cycle of racial inequality. With Hispanics, for example, both meritocracy and social networks have been found to be important in securing a job (Petersen, et al. 2000).

Hispanics have been found at a disadvantage in educational attainment when compared to whites and African Americans (McDonald, 2001). Education not only diminishes the differences

in securing a job, but also in closing the racial gap in income among whites and minority groups (the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, winter 2002-2003). One of the most documented education problems has been the high percent of high school dropout among Hispanics. For example, since 1984, the high rates of Hispanics dropping out of high have remained fairly constant—almost 50 percent of Hispanics in the United States end up dropping out of high school.

In an effort to deal with the low percent of Hispanic high school graduates (in light of the increasing growth rate of Hispanics in the total population), special attention has been given to ensuring that those that graduate from high school also graduate from college. For example, given the movement towards more diversity and representation, numerous studies have been conducted to examine the underlying factors that lie between the links of higher education attainment, jobs, and Hispanics. Dalton et al. (1987) and Sisneros (1993) demonstrate the effort of public administration schools to recruit minorities in responding towards the social and political pressure for more bureaucratic representation. Other research in the area has focused on the importance of affirmative action policies in the compelling need for more diversity in the workforce (Baez, 2003).

Although the intent of this paper is not to examine education policy, the importance to examine Hispanic educational attainment in relation to bureaucratic representation is clear. The importance of uncovering the link between the high rates of Hispanic high school dropout and representative bureaucracy is critical given that 96.9 percent of state employees have a high degree or higher. Table 4 below illustrates the percent of Hispanics that have at least a high school degree. The top five states in highest percents in educational attainment (high school degree or higher) and Hispanics are: Maine, West Virginia, Vermont, Hawaii, and New Hampshire. Conversely, the lowest percents in Hispanic educational attainment are found in the states of Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Delaware, and Mississippi. As with calculating the mismatch in bureaucratic representation, the differences between high and low percents in Hispanic educational attainment is not as meaningful if total state population is not taken into account. Table 5 illustrates Hispanic educational attainment in the states with the highest Hispanic population.

**Table 4**

<b>Education Attainment in Hispanics and Non-Hispanics throughout United States</b>						
	<b>Hispanics</b>				<b>Non-Hispanics</b>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Less than High School</b>	<b>LTH %</b>	<b>High School and Greater</b>	<b>H.S.+ %</b>	<b>Less than High School</b>	<b>High School and Greater</b>
Alabama	37,752	44.16%	47,744	55.84%	550,973	2,736,845
Alaska	3,690	19.51%	15,224	80.49%	35,940	408,170
Arizona	487,760	40.22%	724,844	59.78%	263,765	2,868,126
Arkansas	31,860	44.57%	39,625	55.43%	306,144	1,670,565
California	3,356,827	42.34%	4,571,990	57.66%	1,437,669	16,376,306
Colorado	228,932	41.21%	326,547	58.79%	135,206	2,707,749
Connecticut	80,137	34.54%	151,869	65.46%	218,143	2,162,758

Delaware	19,166	50.50%	18,787	49.50%	72,208	526,569
Florida	731,977	27.38%	1,940,983	72.62%	1,119,557	9,872,409
Georgia	262,242	51.58%	246,129	48.42%	795,570	5,243,007
Hawaii	8,378	15.50%	45,688	84.50%	95,555	809,211
Idaho	34,841	45.81%	41,209	54.19%	79,985	871,733
Illinois	378,765	41.83%	526,761	58.17%	768,928	7,472,680
Indiana	80,677	45.03%	98,499	54.97%	492,809	3,794,763
Iowa	35,501	47.11%	39,852	52.89%	168,624	1,936,170
Kansas	38,955	35.45%	70,945	64.55%	154,351	1,708,314
Kentucky	8,413	26.28%	23,595	73.72%	585,893	2,386,584
Louisiana	21,968	37.93%	35,956	62.07%	588,907	2,319,827
Maine	187	4.02%	4,462	95.98%	106,072	905,277
Maryland	107,889	38.64%	171,342	61.36%	422,355	3,415,168
Massachusetts	95,519	28.34%	241,536	71.66%	367,577	4,026,173
Michigan	61,738	29.64%	146,548	70.36%	709,764	6,389,355
Minnesota	42,158	36.66%	72,836	63.34%	229,120	3,480,361
Mississippi	24,060	49.60%	24,444	50.40%	352,920	1,640,412
Missouri	18,263	22.19%	64,028	77.81%	535,023	3,624,298
Montana	3,626	31.31%	7,954	68.69%	57,603	630,812
Nebraska	36,026	40.16%	53,685	59.84%	76,662	1,141,866
Nevada	144,440	42.39%	196,316	57.61%	126,488	1,301,220
New Hampshire	1,852	15.64%	9,987	84.35%	80,476	893,240
New Jersey	317,641	31.18%	701,186	68.82%	515,633	4,898,782
New Mexico	168,171	29.65%	398,951	70.35%	89,257	754,349
New York	735,747	35.79%	1,320,227	64.21%	1,423,190	10,722,994
North Carolina	204,670	52.09%	188,215	47.91%	804,735	5,044,471
North Dakota	2,011	35.05%	3,728	64.97%	49,743	417,492
Ohio	62,682	32.06%	132,818	67.94%	960,186	7,308,109
Oklahoma	43,967	37.74%	72,541	62.26%	270,536	2,218,121
Oregon	75,858	41.51%	106,898	58.49%	195,924	2,319,733
Pennsylvania	111,615	34.01%	216,523	65.99%	1,047,783	7,907,929
Rhode Island	32,539	45.22%	39,420	54.78%	93,172	623,710
South Carolina	27,722	31.18%	61,201	68.82%	514,843	2,509,950

State	Hispanics				Non-Hispanics	
	Less than High School	LTH Percent	High School+	H.S.+ %	LTH	High School+
South Dakota	5,013	44.25%	6,317	55.76%	52,599	503,302
Tennessee	68,949	52.27%	62,961	47.73%	751,505	3,479,969
Texas	2,326,431	44.07%	2,952,746	55.93%	1,043,253	9,723,540
Utah	72,813	43.15%	95,939	56.85%	89,897	1,462,964
Vermont	388	11.79%	2,903	88.21%	40,019	433,123
Virginia	158,437	46.28%	183,880	53.72%	576,015	4,616,313
Washington	91,774	37.95%	150,071	62.05%	341,992	4,059,663
West Virginia	485	8.79%	5,030	91.21%	251,458	1,132,724
Wisconsin	54,116	39.51%	82,849	60.49%	319,061	3,605,792
Wyoming	7,478	34.85%	13,982	65.16%	27,800	336,773

Source: Current Population Survey, March 2006 Supplement

Not surprisingly, educational attainment and bureaucratic representation are found to be in sync, with the exception to high level of educational attainment in the State of Florida as compared to the other states. A possible explanation to this exception, and to be further researched, is the differences among Hispanics based on their ethnicities. Nonetheless, for the purposes of this paper, the link between Hispanic educational attainment and the bureaucratic representation mismatch is beyond doubt. New Mexico, New York, Illinois, and Arizona are the states with the highest rates of Hispanic educational attainment, which also coincide with relative-high bureaucratic representation rates. Conversely, Texas has one of the largest Hispanic populations, one of the lowest rates of representation, and is the state with lowest percent of Hispanics with high school degrees or higher (among the largest states with Hispanic populations).

**Table 5**

Top 10 States in Terms of Hispanic Population Percent						
	Hispanic States		Hispanic State Government Mismatch		High School and Greater	
	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent
New Mexico	1	43.5%	1	-3.8%	2	70.3%
Texas	2	36.5%	9	-16.3%	10	55.9%
California	3	34.9%	8	-15.8%	8	57.7%
Arizona	4	32.5%	6	-14.5%	5	59.8%
Nevada	5	22.2%	10	-18.9%	9	57.6%
Florida	6	20.7%	4	-12.7%	1	72.6%
Colorado	7	19.5%	7	-15.4%	6	58.8%

New Jersey	8	17.2%	5	-13.4%	3	68.8%
New York	9	16.1%	2	-4.5%	4	64.2%
Illinois	10	11.5%	3	-8.9%	7	58.2%

Source: Current Population Survey, March 2006 Supplement

## Conclusion

The Hispanic bureaucratic representation mismatch in state government suggests that high proportion of Hispanics in the state total population does not reliably translate into higher bureaucratic representation. Although Hispanic educational attainment may rely on a myriad of social factors (e.g. income, values, and social context), low levels of education (rather than percent of Hispanics in the total population) coincide with bureaucratic representation levels. While the findings of this paper are solely descriptive, they suggest that stronger efforts are needed to achieve bureaucratic representation via higher educational attainment levels in Hispanics.

## References

- Baez, Benjamin. 2003. Review: Affirmative Action, Diversity, and the Politics of Representation in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 1: 96-107.
- Bohte John and Kenneth J. Meier. Summer 2000. The Marble Cake: Introducing Federalism to the Government Growth Equation, *Publius* 30, 3:35-45.
- Cameron, Stephen V. & James J. Heckman. 2001. The Dynamics of Educational Attainment for Black, Hispanic, and White Males. *Journal of Political Economy*, 109, 3:455-499.
- Hindera, John J. 1993. Representative Bureaucracy: Further Evidence of Active Representation in the EEOC District Offices. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3, 4:415-429.
- Kingsley, J. Donald. 1944. *Representative Bureaucracy*, Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch.
- Lee, Dalton S. & Joseph Cayer. 1987. Recruitment of Minority Students for Public Administration Education. *Public Administration Review*, 47, 4: 329-335.
- Lipsky, M. 1980. *Street-level Bureaucracy; Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- McDonald, Steven J. 2001. How Whites Explain Black and Hispanic Inequality. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 65, 4:562-573.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1993. Latinos and Representative Bureaucracy: Testing the Thompson and Henderson Hypotheses. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3, 4: 393-414.
- Northouse, Peter G. 2001. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Orfield, Gary. 1986. Hispanic Education: Challenges, Research, and Policies. *American Journal of Education*, 95, 1: 1-25.
- Peters, B. Guy. 1981. The Problem of Bureaucratic Government. *The Journal of Politics*, 43, 1:56-82.
- Petersen, Trond, Saporta, Ishak, & Marc-David L. Seidel. 2000. Offering a Job: Meritocracy and Social Networks. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 3: 763-816.
- Sisneros, Antonio. 1993. Hispanics in the Public Service in the Late Twentieth Century. *Public Administration Review*, 53, 1: 1-7.
- Van Riper, Paul. 1958. *History of the United States Civil Service*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wamsley, Gary, Robert N. Bacher, Charles T. Goodsell, Phillip S. Kronenberg, John A. Rohr, Camilla M. Stivers, Orion F. White, and James F. Wolf. 1990. *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Weihert, Gregory R. 2000. Minority Student Achievement: Passive Representation and Social Context in Schools. *The Journal of Politics*, 62, 3:886-895.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2002. Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policymaking, *The Journal of Politics*, 64, 4:1153-1174.