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ABSTRACT

LATINO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

by

Esteban Andres Tadeo

Master of Arts in Political Science

California State University, Chico

Summer 2012

Using the 2006 Latino National Survey, this study looks at Latino political participation. The activities considered include voting in the 2004 national elections, registering to vote, contacting an official, associating with a political party, and being contacted by a campaign. The findings confirm that socio-economic variables are important for understanding political participation. A Latino’s level of education was the most important SES variable for participation. A person’s age, English level, and where the individual received their highest level of education were also significant factors. Psychological factors were also considered and the strength of a person’s partisanship showed a relationship with voting in the 2004 national elections. Members in community organizations participated significantly more than Latinos who are not in these organizations. Church attendance did not affect any political activity measured. This study also finds that Latinos who favor an immigration policy that leads to citizenship
or a workers program for Latinos are more likely to associate with the Democratic Party. Immigration policy is shown to be a polarizing issue for Latinos.
CHAPTER I

LATINO POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

In recent national elections, it has been common for media outlets to attempt to predict how Latino voters will shape the outcome. It is an important topic given the growth of the Latino population in recent decades. Latinos have grown in the United States from 35.3 million in 2000 to 50.5 million in 2010 U.S. (United States Census Bureau 2011). A study by the PEW Charitable Trust states that Latinos make up roughly 16 percent of the population and are now the largest minority group in the United States, but are only 10 percent of eligible voters. Fewer than 7 percent of Latinos, however, actually voted in the 2010 National elections (Pew Hispanic Center 2011). Latinos have a consistent record of low voter turnout even with their increasing size of the electorate. Still, given the growth of the Latino community, it is relevant to investigate what motivates this group to vote. It is necessary to understand how Latinos interact in politics if we want to know how this group will participate.

The 2006 immigration protests by Latinos and their supporters seemed to fuel increased attention to this group as political actors. The marches in 125 cities between March and May 2006 were in response to immigration legislation introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives. Scholars collectively described the protests and marches as “the largest single civil rights action in American history” (Fraga et al. 2010, 1). These same scholars have also noted that to many social scientists and students of Latinos in
America, the common reaction was “surprising” (Fraga et al. 2010, 1). The marches revealed that the Latino community was more politically engaged than observers had previously thought. The immigration protests did more than relay dissatisfaction to legislators, it also highlighted that Latino political behavior should be reexamined. Recent coverage of the 2012 elections have noted the increasing importance that the Latino vote will have compared to 2008. *Time Magazine* boldly claims that Latinos will swing the vote in 2012, due in part to their growing size and dissatisfaction with the Republican Party (Scherer and Diaz 2012). Another report by *Latino Decisions* argues that states that have historically contained high concentration of Latinos have become even more concentrated. At the same time, the Latino population has grown in states with previously low levels. This change could be especially important for Obama who carried the Latino vote by large margins in 2008. However, due to Latino Republican legislators being elected in previous elections the Republicans can have sway among some Latinos (Latino Decisions 2012). The electoral map for both major political parties suggest that Latinos will play an important role in 2012.

The failure of immigration reform and the DREAM Act legislation will also be of interest to political parties going into the 2012 election. The federal DREAM Act legislation, highly supported by Latinos, would allow undocumented immigrants to attend colleges in the United States and have an eventual path to citizenship. Several reports by *Latino Decisions* in 2010 and 2011 mention the high saliency of immigration reform and especially the DREAM Act legislation for Latinos going into the 2012 elections. When asked in 2010, Latinos responded that immigration was the second most important issue for them after the economy (latinodecision.wordpress.com 2010).
second report states that this issue is salient among Latinos in both parties, finding that 80% of Republican Latinos supported passage while 90% of Latino Democrats supported passage (latinodecision.wordpress.com 2010). The failure to pass the DREAM Act will continue to be an important issue of concern for Latinos going into the 2012 elections (Barreto 2011; Nuño 2011).

Latino Political Participation: SES and Beyond

In this section, I will discuss the various explanations of Latino political participation. I will illustrate what scholars find to be the most important factors in explaining and predicting Latino political participation. The most important predictor of Latino political participation is socio-economic status, as exemplified in many studies. I will explain why socio-economic status is so important. I will also go beyond socio-economic status to further identify factors important in Latino political participation. My aim is to get a complete picture of Latino political participation.

Past studies of Latino political participation focus largely on socio-economic status as the main contributing factor in explaining the levels of involvement. There have been some studies within the literature which argue that what is known about Latino political behavior is incomplete and continues to evolve (Hero and Campbell 1996; Arvizu and Garcia, 1996; Leighley 2001; Fraga et al. 2010). This literature focuses on the importance of sociological as well as psychological factors that affect Latino political participation. These factors cannot be ignored when attempting to understand Latino political participation.
Political participation includes voting, as well as campaign involvement, political contributions, working informally in the community, contacting government officials, demonstrations, protests, and serving on local governing boards (Verba et al. 1995). The Socio-Economic Status (SES) Model, which accounts for an individual’s education, income, and occupation, is a powerful tool in explaining a group’s political participation. Various studies illustrate that those who participate in politics have higher levels of socio-economic status (Verba and Nie 1972; Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Verba et al. 1995; Leighley 1996). One important study within the literature on political participation is *Participation in America*. The authors illustrate that those with higher levels of SES participate in politics at higher rates. Overall, SES has been shown to be a strong predictor of Latino political participation (Verba et al. 1995; de la Garza 2001; Arvizu et al. 1996). But critics contend that SES does not do an adequate job of explaining why those with higher SES participate. Factors other than SES must also be interacting for individuals that participate in politics who otherwise would not (Cho 1999, 2006; Diaz 1996). SES research has illustrated that the level of SES affects political participation.

Socio-economic status is widely used throughout studies of political participation and has been shown to be a very good predictor of why individuals participate in politics. The shortcoming of measuring SES levels in individuals is that, the results, do not actually explain why those with high SES participate. For example, we know that education is positively associated with participation but do not understand what it is about education that cause individuals to participate. One explanation of why
SES is correlated with participation is that individuals with higher SES have the resources needed to participate.

In order to demonstrate why SES correlates with political participation, Brady, Verba, and Scholzman (1995) developed a resource model approach in an article titled Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Participation and elaborated in their book, Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics. Participation requires three resources described as time, money, and skills. Time and money are easily identified and explained. Civic skills are described by the authors as ones that are necessary for political activity. They can include organizational and language skills that are essential in political participation. These skills can be learned throughout life and usually start in the home and in education. However, other institutions that enhance these skills are non-civic institutions like community organizations and church participation (Brady, Verba, and Scholzman 1995). SES is positively associated with political participation because individuals with higher levels of SES have more resources available to bear the costs of participation (Verba et al. 1995).

Resources can differ across various political acts; some activities demand more of one resource over another (Brady, Verba, and Scholzman 1995). For example, time is a resource that is more evenly distributed than money across groups of various SES levels (Verba et al. 1995). Less affluent individuals may not have the same amount of money to contribute to campaigns but they often volunteer their time to activities. This is helpful in understanding why some groups may participate in activities and abstain from others. Being asked to contribute money to a campaign requires the resource of money. It is unlikely that an individual with low SES will be able to participate in
activities that require giving money. Because time is more evenly distributed among groups, we are more likely to see individuals of various levels of SES participate in activities that require time and less money. These activities would be those like volunteering or attending rallies and meetings. The authors also show that on a whole, Latinos participate less than do other groups. This is largely due to their lower levels of SES and resource attainment. Latinos have lower education attainment and do not volunteer in community groups as highly as non-Latinos. Therefore, Latinos do not attain the resources necessary to participate in politics to the degree other groups do (Verba et al. 1995).

Some authors argue that previous to the Latino National Political Survey in 1990 there was a lack of adequate data for this group (Arvizu and Garcia 1996; Diaz 1996). Past studies did not fully account for the wide diversity of the growing Latino population. It is important to use information that considers all sub groups of Latinos to get a better indication of what factors lead to participation. Data from the National Political Latino Survey in 1990 and the more recent National Political Survey in 2006 offers rich data on Latinos. These surveys also consider Latinos who have not become naturalized citizens. This is important to get a more complete picture of political participation.

There had not been specific data on Latinos until the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS) in 1990. Using the LNPS, Hero and Campbell (1996) found interesting results for Latinos and some political activities, Latinos participate in activities like attending rallies, contributing money, and attending a public meeting similar to other groups (Hero and Campbell 1996). Also, the authors note a negative relationship for
young Latinos participating in voluntary campaigns. They determine that education, income, and age are all negatively related (and significantly so, for education and age) to volunteering for a candidate or party (Hero and Campbell 1996). The findings highlight that SES does not explain volunteering for campaign activities for young Latinos. SES was predictive in most political participation activities for Latinos but not all. In some cases, the results contradicted SES when focusing on data specific to Latinos. Also, there is not much difference in the pattern of participation with other non-Latinos (Hero Campbell 1996). Data that focuses on the Latino population is important because it accounts for the wide diversity of this group.

Citizenship status is also an important factor for Latino political participation. One reason that SES may or may not explain Latinos low level of political participation is their high immigrant population. Naturalized Latino citizens do not participate politically to the degree that native-born citizens do. Latinos low level of political participation can be explained in part by the large amount of naturalized citizens (Desipio 1996; Cho 1999; Leal 2002; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). The dominant explanation for why naturalized citizens do not participate is that they lack the resources.

Another explanation of why naturalized Latino citizens do not participate is a lack of socialization into the political process. Wendy Cho (1999) explains that SES variables are important but socialization is also a necessary for participation. Naturalized citizens’ low political socialization can help explain Latinos overall low participation even when controlling for SES. According to Cho, socialization can lead to greater efficacy to participate as well as higher partisanship to a political party which further increases the likelihood of participation. However, Cho’s study only includes variables
that measure if a person was born somewhere other than the U.S. and their lack of English skills. She uses these factors to measure the level of socialization a person has attained.

Another factor shown to increase participation is the political environment in which the immigrant arrived. Anti-immigrant legislation positively affects political participation for immigrants (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; DeSipio 2011). Immigrants vote in higher numbers and become naturalized citizens at higher rates when there is a politically charged environment targeted toward immigrant interests (Pantoja, Ramirez, and Segura 2001; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). From 2005 to 2008, statistics show that there was an increase of immigrants who became naturalized citizens (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2009). The surge in naturalization for Latino immigrants may in large part be explained by the issue of immigration. This surge was helped by immigrant community organizing in 2006 in response to a highly restrictive immigration bill passed in the U.S. House of Representatives (DeSipio 2011). Naturalization is an individually independent decision for immigrants. Some immigrants decide to become citizens while others do not. The impact of anti-immigrant legislation can lead to naturalization and political participation.

Overall, studies have shown that SES is a strong predictor of participation for Latinos. However, other factor may be equally as strong. A Latinos age shows strong correlation with participation. Older Latinos are more likely to have attained resources necessary for participation. Age is an important variable to include for this group. The level of English has also been shown to be positively related to participation. Measuring a person’s English level can show that this is an especially important skill necessary for
participation. The level of socialization a person has attained can also show higher levels of participation for Latinos. Naturalized Latino citizens are necessary to consider because they have lower levels of participation than native-born citizens.

**Hypothesis 1**

I hypothesize that the SES will predict political participation for Latino respondents. The SES is a very powerful predictor of who will participate in the political process and should identify individuals likely to take part. However, other factors such as age, English level, and the country the respondent was educated in will show positive relationship with participation as well. Age and a person’s English level will measure an individual’s resources and skills that have attained. Creating a variable to measure where a person was educated will give more evidence for the importance of socialization.

**Hypothesis 2**

I hypothesize that naturalized Latino citizens participate less than native-born citizens do controlling for SES. Citizenship status should predict participation beyond SES. Latinos who have been born in the United States are more politically socialized than naturalized citizens and should participate at a higher rate.

**Role of Community Organizations**

Participation in organizations has a variety of positive effects on political behavior (Diaz 1996; Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000; Stoll 2001). This holds true when looking at the Latino population; they share the same benefits in participation in community organizations and political participation as do other groups (Diaz 1996). Most importantly, contributions to this field of study show that participation in community
organizations provide resources that can be used as civic skills. Participation in community organizations also introduces social networks that can lead to recruitment, social pressures, and encouragement to take part in politics. In combination, these two objectives lead to increases in political participation for individuals (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000). Individuals with already low levels of civic resources may benefit politically from such organizations. Certain skills may be learned in community organizations that engage in activities enhancing political behavior. For example, organizations hold regular meetings where members are elected to leadership positions, which require processing information in order to make a decision regarding how to vote. These organizations also facilitate an environment that brings individuals together in groups to discuss important information. The community organizations that individuals participate in can teach organizational as well as language skills that can be used in politics (Verba et al. 1995). These are some of the skills that community organizations provide to members that translate into political participation.

Also, immigrants are shown to participate in community organizations without citizenship providing skills that can be used in politics. One study shows that immigrants of Mexican descent often times engage in community organizations like Parent Teacher Association meetings, while they are becoming United States citizens. These immigrants learn skills that help to navigate through certain barriers to naturalize as a citizen and become political actors (DeSipio 2011). Since community organizations do not require that individuals naturalize, immigrants often take advantage of becoming participants. Community organizations play a positive role for Latino and Latino immigrants. Immigrants also join community organizations and engage in activities that
do not include voting (DeSipio 2011). Immigrants enhance resources in community organizations that positively affect political participation (Verba et al. 1995).

**Hypothesis 3**

I hypothesize that Latinos involved in community organizations will participate in politics more than those who do not when controlling for SES.

**Role of Religious Involvement**

America is one of the most religiously observant countries in the developed world today (Putnam 2000). Many studies have focused attention on religion and political participation and typically found a positive effect for attendance and voting participation (Driskell, Embry, and Lyon 2008). There is general agreement that religious affiliation shapes political participation but the literature differs in what role religion plays. Most studies indicate that religious attendance positively affects political participation. Church attendance has been shown to be especially important for Latinos and is positively associated with voting behavior (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001).

One disagreement in the literature is what, if any, the effects of denomination have on political participation. One study suggests that there are differences across religious denominations for political participation (Verba et al. 1995). This approach emphasizes denomination of participants in churches and argues that religion is a resource enhancing institutions. Churches are unique in that they provide opportunities for individuals with very low resources to participate and enhance their skills. This differs from other organizations that may require that individuals already have certain resources to participate (Verba et al. 1995). Religious institutions enhance civic skills to members
who otherwise do not have the resources necessary to involve themselves in other ways. Not all religious denominations are equal in resource enhancing opportunities that they provide. One reason religious Latinos do not share the same benefits of political participation is that they largely belong to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church provides less leadership opportunities and less resource enhancing skills as other denominations (Verba et al. 1995). Latinos attend religious institutions at the same rate as other groups, but do not benefit politically because of their Catholic affiliation (Verba et al. 1995).

Contrary to the argument that denominations play a major role, others argue that religious institutions act as strong social networks that mobilize members as opposed to simply enhancing resources. These studies claim that denominations had no effect on Latino voting behavior and that church attendance was a better measure (Campbell 2004; Jones-Correa and Leal 2001). These authors argue against a resource enhancing approach to religion as an institution and instead argue that religion acts as a mobilizing institution because of the social networks they provide. Jones-Correa and Leal (2001) argue that contrary to Verba and his coauthors’ claim, Latino Catholicism has a positive, not negative, effect on political behavior. Jones-Correa and Leal test this hypothesis of a resource gap in denominations and argues that it is not a lack of resource and skill opportunities that account for low Latino political involvement, but that it is most likely due to a lack recruitment and mobilization efforts. The authors argue that there is a lack of mobilization in some churches that account for low political participation. Jones-Correa and Leal posit that church participants and political involvement may be explained better by a lack of recruitment. For example, those involved with the Catholic
Church may not be exposed to efforts to mobilize into political activities like other churches do. Therefore, it is not a lack of skills, but a lack of mobilization and recruitment benefits. By measuring the level of attendance in church instead of the denomination, shows that low political participation is due to a lack of social networks, not a lack of skills. Individuals who attend church benefit because they belong to networks that can mobilize and recruit them into political activities.

Studies of church affiliation provide evidence that those who participate are likely to involve themselves in politics due to rich social networks (Verba et al. 1995, Putnam 2000). Robert Putnam in his book *Bowling Alone* writes, “faith communities in which people worship together are arguably the single most important repository of social capital in America” (Putnam 2000, 66). Jones-Correa and Leal add that this is especially important to the Latino population because it is in some cases the only association they are involved in. Religion as a social network becomes increasingly important for Latinos who do not belong to many other organizations and can benefit from church as a political recruitment institution (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001).

Recent literature on religion and political participation has described a “religion gap,” which refers to the gap between religious and secular individuals in politics (Driskell, Embry, and Lyon 2008; Guth and Green 1986; Olsen and Green 2006; Putnam and Campbell 2010). These authors have focused their attention on how religious beliefs influence individuals’ political behavior. Religious individuals have increasingly polarized themselves into the Republican Party due to their views on social issues like same-sex marriage and abortion (Putnam and Campbell 2010; Olsen and Green 2006).
In *American Grace*, Putnam and Campbell use the term religiosity to measure how religious a person is and what effects this has on what political party they identify with. The authors illustrate that highly religious individuals have become more important as a political dividing line than their denomination (Putnam and Campbell 2010). Putnam and Campbell describe that Latinos are highly associated with the Catholic Church and typically respond to social issues that the church supports. On many other issues, however, Latinos have a much more liberal position. Latinos who are highly religious respond to being Republican at a rate of 35 percent (Putnam and Campbell 2011). This level of response is close to half of what other highly religious groups identify with the Republican Party. Although the literature has recently shown that a religious gap has been emerging and has led to a polarization between highly religious and secular individuals, more research is needed to illustrate if this is having an effect on the Latino population.

**Hypothesis 4**

I hypothesize that Latinos who attend church more will be more likely to participate in politics despite their denomination. Current research shows that attendance is a better indication of political participation than denomination for Latinos (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001).

**Hypothesis 5**

I hypothesize that Latino respondents who are more religious, will not show a stronger relationship with the Republican Party. Recent literature has shown that highly religious individuals have increasingly moved into the Republican Party because of the association of anti-abortion and same sex marriages in recent decades. However, the
literature is less clear on if this is occurring at high rates for Latinos as well. Latinos show strong ties to the Democratic Party because of the party’s stance on immigration policy.

Comparing Community and Church Participation

In this section, I will consider the roles community and church affiliation has in combination with one another. Individuals participate in community organizations and church simultaneously, as well as one and not the other. I will look at the individuals who participate in both church and community organizations as well as one and not the other.

Community and church organizations also provide social networks that, according to several scholars, increase the likelihood a participant engages in political behavior (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000; Stoll 2001; La Du Lake and Huckfeldt 1998). The idea that social networks increase social capital is grounded in social theory. Social capital theorists posit that social networks have a positive effect on political behavior (La Du Lake and Huckfeldt 1998; Putnam 2000; Stoll 2001). In a very thorough overview of social networks, Robert Putnam’s book, *Bowling Alone* asserts that, “the core idea of social capital theory is that social networks have value” (Putnam 2000, 18-19). The social networks that participants join provide several benefits to the participant. Organizations that take political stances on issues increase the likelihood that an individual within that group engages in a political issue as well (Verba et al. 1995). Participants in organizations join other individuals with like-minded views and can shape the voting behavior of the participant. Social networks also provide participants with opportunities to be recruited and mobilized into the political process (Verba et al. 1995; Jones-Correa and Leal 2001; Putnam 2000).
Mobilization occurs in community and church organizations to get participants to engage in politics. Theories of mobilization and recruitment are tied closely to community involvement and social networks. Authors have studied the effects of recruitment in communities and find a positive effect on political participation (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000). One study by Jan Leighley (1996) asks whether mobilization efforts are driven by elite decisions or if they are unintentionally driven by community group involvement. Her findings suggest that both intentional and unintentional mobilization occurs for those involved in various political and non-political organizations. Elites are active in mobilizing individuals, yet, focus on those that serve their political interests. Elites will recruit individuals they believe will suit their needs. Unintentional mobilization occurs when individuals participate to exert their own interests, absent of elite efforts. Respondents were asked only if they were members of at least one community organization so Leighley’s findings may be more significant for individuals who are members of various organizations (Leighley 1996). This is consistent with social capital theorists like Robert Putnam who measure the level of social capital an individual has and how it corresponds with their level of political involvement. The more social networks an individual participates in, the more benefits they receive.

A surge of recent literature has shown that there are many positive effects of mobilization campaigns and political participation, but scholars have also found that Latinos are largely excluded from mobilization efforts (Hero et al. 2000; Michelson 2005; Verba et al. 1995). The explanation can be found in findings that Latinos are less likely to be involved in organizations than other groups in the United States. These organizations are targeted by elites for mobilization. Studies show that Latino men and
women are not highly asked to be involved politically because of their low organizational involvement (Verba et al. 1995). Political parties either take the Latino voters for granted or ignore them altogether. This is because Latinos have typically been a small and concentrated population within the United States (Hero et al. 2000). The geographical makeup of Latinos, according to U.S. Census data, has been changing in the last decade (United States Census Bureau 2011). We can expect that political mobilization by elites will grow with the expanding Latino population. Current research, however, is necessary to test this assumption.

Canvassing and get out the vote campaigns (GOTV) are mobilization efforts used by elites and other groups to increase political participation. Canvassing and GOTV can have significant impacts on Latino turnout (Hritzuk and Park 2000; Leighley 1996; Niven 2004; Verba et al. 1995). One study examines the impact of face-to-face canvassing for a non-partisan campaign effort. The study found that face to face canvassing can have significant impacts on turnout. The effects were more profound for Latinos associated with the Democratic Party (Michelson 2003). The explanation the author provides is that Latino Democrats in the study likely perceived young Latino canvassers as being associated with the Democratic Party. Latino Democrats were more likely to respond positively because of this perception. Latino Republicans may have felt the opposite and that would have decreased their chances of participating in the canvassing campaign study (Michelson 2003). Canvassing can have a more profound effect when appealing to an individual’s political partisanship as opposed to a canvasser who does not declare a party (Michelson 2003).
Hypothesis 6

I hypothesize that Latinos who are involved in community and church organizations will be more likely to participate in political activities. Latinos who are involved in more social networks are more likely to be recruited and mobilized into participating in politics.

Hypothesis 7

I hypothesize that Latinos in community organizations are more likely to participate in politics than Latinos in church organizations. Literature shows that Latinos in community organizations participate in politics. Literature is less clear about the effects religious affiliation has for the Latino community.

Hypothesis 8

I hypothesize that Latinos involved in community organizations are asked to join in a political activity more than Latinos involved in a religious institution. Latinos involved in churches are not mobilized like Latinos involved in community organizations.

Non Social Network Factors that Affect Participation

Psychological factors have been shown to increase the likelihood of political participation for all individuals (Verba et al. 1995; Leighley and Vedlitz 1999). Partisanship and efficacy can intervene in an individual’s SES and have a positive effect on participation (Verba et al. 1995; Jackson 2009). Individuals who have stronger partisanship and are more efficacious in government are more likely to overcome hurdles in order to participate politically (Jackson 2009). Likewise, concern for policy issues can...
influence political participation and political preferences (Nicholson et al. 2006). While,
on the contrary, those individuals who do not show strong partisanship and efficacy can
feel disconnected from the political process and are less likely to participate.

Psychological factors like strong partisanship to a political party positively
affect political participation for immigrants as well. Longer duration in the United States
has been shown to strengthen partisanship to political parties for Latino immigrants
(Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001; DeSipio 2011). It has also been shown that Latinos
typically increase English proficiency over time and become more familiar with the
political process (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). It would appear that longer
duration in the United States has many benefits to the Latino population for political
participation. These benefits include stronger partisanship to a political party and greater
political efficacy.

Throughout the literature, Latinos have largely been associated with the
Democratic Party. Cubans, however, when considered separately, have greater ties with
the Republican Party (DeSipio 1996). Overall, studies suggest that the partisanship of
Latinos tends to be strong and in the direction of the Democratic Party (DeSipio 1996).
This strong tie to the Democratic Party could in large part be due to the immigrant
population of the Latino community. The longer an immigrant has been in the United
States, the closer he associates with the Democratic Party (Desipio 1996). Furthermore,
when asked, a large proportion of non-naturalized immigrants report they would vote for
the Democratic Party if they were able to (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner 1991; DeSipio
1996; de la Garza 2004). Latino immigrants’ partisanship to either of the two major
political parties over time indicates that Latinos are being socialized into the political
process. The Democratic Party has been historically associated with immigrants and the working class and the association of Latinos to the Democratic Party indicates that this idea permeates into the psyche of Latino and Latino immigrants.

Another important aspect to consider is Latinos’ levels of efficacy when considering their political participation. Efficacy can be measured either through internal efficacy or external efficacy. Internal efficacy reflects an individual’s feeling toward politics that can have an impact in the political process. External efficacy is a measure of one’s feeling toward government’s responsiveness to citizens’ needs and demands (Kahne and Westheimer 2006). Research shows that citizens’ level of internal efficacy has a positive relationship with political participation. External efficacy, however, has not shown such a relationship (Kahne and Westheimer 2006). Several studies have shown that Latinos are more externally efficacious than Anglos, but are less internally efficacious (Michelson 2000; Jackson 2009). This illustrates that Latinos have more trust in the government to respond to citizens’ needs yet do not feel empowered to get involved. Latinos’ lower level of political efficacy helps to explain their low levels of political participation. One explanation for this is that Latino non-citizens or those with little English skills do not feel they have the ability to shape politics, but they have faith that government will respond to their needs (Jackson 2009).

Ideology is somewhat of a puzzle in the Latino population. Given their large association to the Democratic Party, one would assume that they would respond as being liberal. However, Latinos, regardless of citizenship status, describe themselves as conservative (de la Garza et al. 1992; DeSipio 1996). These conservative attitudes are apparent in social issues like views on same-sex marriage and abortion. Although Latinos
respond as having a conservative ideology, their policy positions are not conservative ones. Policy concerns of Latinos tend to be more liberal than the conservative ideology they report (DeSipio 1996).

Public policy concerns in the literature show that Latinos’ responses are more concerned with social issues and a larger government role in domestic policies (DeSipio 1996). Latinos tend to show high interest in education perhaps that their population is younger than others. They also favor government centered solutions to issues of crime and health care. One surprising point is that Latinos do not respond that immigration is a significant issue of concern (de la Garza et al. 1992). More acculturated (i.e., those who have been in the country longer and have adopted some new values and norms) individuals are less likely to support immigration policies (Hood, Morris, and Shirkey 1997; de la Garza 2004; Branton 2007). Newer immigrants are more likely to show support toward immigration related issues (Branton 2007). This contradicts findings from Pew Hispanic Center, which found in a 2006 survey that 75 percent of Latinos responded that the immigration debate would fuel more Latinos to vote in the upcoming election (Pew Hispanic Center 2006). Latino Decisions also finds that support for immigration as a policy concern ranks only behind the economy for Latinos in 2010 (Barreto 2010). These reports clearly show that immigration is a top concern for Latinos. The literature may not indicate immigration as a top concern because it has mainly focused on data used before specific immigration issues became salient in politics. Issues like the DREAM Act and immigration reform have become increasingly important since 2005. Immigration has seemingly become an increasingly salient issue of concern in the last decade.
Hypothesis 9

I hypothesize that Latinos who are stronger partisans of a political party are more likely to participate in political activities.

I hypothesize that Latinos who are involved in community and church organizations will show more partisanship to a political party and more internal efficacy than those who do not. The resources that community groups and churches provide will encourage stronger partisan ties and internal efficacy.

Hypothesis 10

I hypothesize that Latinos who participate in politics will show a higher level of internal efficacy than Latinos who do not participate. Those who participate in politics should be more internally efficacious and participate as a result. While, Latinos level of external efficacy will not differ from Latinos who participate and for those who do not.

Hypothesis 11

I hypothesize that naturalized Latino citizens will respond to be associated with the Democratic Party in higher rates. Naturalized immigrants identify with the Democratic Party because of the perception that they have immigrant interests in mind. Furthermore, those who respond to be Democrats should show positive interest toward immigration policy that favor immigrants.

Conclusion

Latino political participation continues to evolve and increases in relevance. The most important predictor of Latino voting behavior is SES. The reason SES is so important is that individuals with higher SES have more resources available to bear the
costs of participation. Those with more education and jobs with higher income give individuals the skills and resources that encourage participation. However, schools and employment is not the only place individuals can attain these resources. Resources can also be attained in community organizations and church institutions. When these resources are enhanced outside of school and work, measuring for SES becomes less of a predictor of participation.

Aside from enhancing resources, these outside institutions provide social networks for individuals. These social networks encourage levels of participation in several ways. First, social networks can be mobilizing agents both from within and outside the network. A participant in a network may be asked by another person to participate in some political activity. Outside mobilization occurs when elites target social networks to participate. Secondly, social networks encourage participation through increased civic duty. Participants may feel obligated to participate because others in their social network are doing so.

Non-social factors also play a role in increasing political participation. Those individuals who show stronger ties to a political party, who are more efficacious, and who have issues of concern, are more likely to participate beyond SES.

Finally, citizenship status is an important factor beyond SES to account for in Latino political participation. The Latino population is largely an immigrant population and citizenship status is important for understanding participation even when considering SES. The low levels of political socialization of Latino immigrants accounts for participation levels.
CHAPTER II

LATINO政治 PARTICIPATION:
SES AND ADDITIONAL FACTORS

In this chapter, I will focus on the first two hypotheses in my study and provide a brief review of the relevant literature. This review will include the socio-economic status model, and citizenship status of Latinos and the effects both have on political participation. In this chapter, I will focus on SES and include the additional factors of age, language acquisition, and where the individual received their highest level of education, to determine the effects each have on Latino political participation. After a review of the literature, I will report the findings from a logistic regression analysis to measure three factors of political participation. The three factors are voting, registering to vote, and contacting a government official. I will identify which factors are most important in determining Latino political participation.

In the first hypothesis, I hypothesize that the Socio-Economic Status Model (SES) will predict political participation for Latino respondents. In other words, education, income and employment status will predict Latino participation. Furthermore, factors such as age, language acquisition, and the country the respondent received their highest level of education will be important additional determinants.

In hypothesis 2, I will look at the effects of citizenship status on political participation. I hypothesize that native born citizens will participate more than naturalized
citizens do, even when controlling for SES levels. Native-born citizens should be more socialized into the political process, should have attained more civic skills, and therefore, should participate at higher rates.

The socio-economic model is a mix of sociological factors as well as economic ones that account for an individual’s level of participation. SES is an additive measurement of an individual’s education, income, and occupation. Socio-economic factors play a crucial role in political participation. The model explains that political participants with higher SES are more likely to take part than individuals with lower SES. The model usually places respondents into one of three categories, high SES, medium SES, and low SES (Verba and Nie 1972). It also posits that individuals increase their level of political participation with an increase of social economic status. This model has been used and supported in many studies and across many nations (Verba and Nie 1972; Verba et al 1995). It also is generally consistent when using education, income or occupation as a measurement for status (Verba and Nie 1972). SES is a strong predictor of political participation; individuals with higher SES are more likely to have more skills for political awareness, they often communicate with others about politics more often, and tend to interact with other individuals who participate (Verba and Nie 1972).

Individuals with higher SES are more likely to be educated, which can increase the capacity to interpret and understand complex political issues and can increase the feeling of an individual’s civic responsibility (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). Education can also further expand experience like filling out forms, meeting deadlines, as well as increasing bureaucratic competence. These skills make participation in politics easier and more likely for those who have attained them (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). There is
also a link between those of higher social status and civic attitudes. Those who have higher SES levels tend to feel a greater obligation to participate (Verba and Nie 1972).

SES has also been important in determining the voting behavior of Latinos (Arvizu and Garcia 1996; Hero and Campbell 1996). SES is generally supported when considering several non-voting forms of political participation like attending rallies, volunteering for a candidate, contributing money, signing petitions, writing officials, and attending a public meeting (Hero and Campbell 1996). SES is also positively associated with Latino voter turnout (Arvizu and Garcia 1996). It has been illustrated that SES is a powerful predictor of Latino political behavior. Latinos typically have lower levels of SES compared to other groups yet they show the same pattern as other groups when controlling for SES (Hero and Campbell 1996). It is therefore necessary to factor SES into political participation for the Latino population.

When separating the factors of SES, education is found to be one of the most important factors for predicting Latino political participation (de la Garza and Jang 2011). Specifically, de la Garza and Jang (2011) found that those with more than a high school education are more likely to vote than those with less education (de la Garza and Jang 2011). Demographic factors like education for Latinos differ somewhat from Anglos. However, it still is an important factor in determining voting behavior (de la Garza and Jang 2011). Education can increase skills by expanding the capacity to understand political issues, and promote an individual’s interest in politics, having a positive effect on participation (Brady, Verba, and Scholzman 1995). Those who are more educated are more likely to vote, register to vote, join a political campaign, and also run for elected office (Verba et al. 1995). Civic skills start early in life and increase
throughout an individual’s education. Those who are more educated have been exposed to an institution found to profoundly increase skills that make participation easier (Verba et al. 1995).

A widely accepted explanation for the strong correlation SES has with political participation is the resource model developed by Brady, Verba and Schlozman (1995). In this model, the authors invert the question of why individuals participate, and instead ask why they do not. One explanation for why individuals do not participate is that they lack the resources necessary for participation. The resource model the authors create includes time, money, and skills. Individuals with low SES do not have the level of resources necessary to participate in politics while those with higher SES do (Verba et al. 1995). SES is a strong predictor of participation because those with higher levels SES will have more resources they have attained.

Income, for example, is necessary for activities like contributing to a campaign. Those with more income are more likely to engage in political activities that others cannot because of financial restraints. Higher income would make participation in various activities more likely because those individuals are not limited by financial restrictions to participate. Income is an important factor in the resource model, and by measuring SES, the effects of income on participation are captured.

The resource model illustrates that those with higher SES levels have the resources necessary to make participation easier. Political activities can range in the resources necessary to participate; voting can be time consuming while contributing can be expensive. The more resources an individual has attained throughout life will make the activities less of a burden. Those with higher levels of SES have been in institutions that
have encouraged these resources in one way or another. Therefore, by measuring SES, we are identifying individuals’ levels of resources.

Many studies have used additive indexes to measure SES and found positive results; however, some argue that SES should be unpacked and analyzed separately. Arvizu and Garcia (1996) found that SES variables did not have a uniformly effect for participation. They found that education did not increase participation at the same rate for each additional year of schooling. Individuals with 9-11 years of school were actually found to have less voter turnout then those with lower education levels (Arvizu and Garcia 1996).

Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) state that combining SES variables actually hides the effect that each individual SES variable has. The authors state that SES variables are not additive and the effects are not linear (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). Their remedy is to look at the variables within SES separately. Unpacking SES identifies which variables within SES matter most for political participation. Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) find that education, when controlling for other SES factors, is highly correlated to voter turnout. The authors find that education is the most important factor in determining who votes. Their reasoning is that those with more education have the ability to process information and have knowledge about the political process. Income and occupation have positive effects, but they are not as important as education as a determinant.

In their study, Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) find that income, while controlling for education, shows a modest positive relationship for voting behavior. Those with higher income do not have the same economic stresses that less affluent
individuals have. The authors also state that the jobs individuals with higher income acquire may provide them with the skills to participate. More than level of education and occupation, income can influence an individual’s neighborhood, which can expose them to norms and pressures from their community to vote (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). Income is shown to be an important indicator yet not as powerful as education, when focusing on voting behavior. Income is important only so far as a comfortable living has been attained; once this is achieved, income does not have a positive effect on voting (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). When a comfortable living standard is achieved, education is a better indicator of who votes.

The last variable that Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) consider is occupation. The authors state, that like income, when education is controlled for, occupation has modest explanatory effects (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). The authors find that white-collar occupations, rather than blue-collar jobs, may provide an individual with more skills, which can be translated to voting (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). Those who are employed are more likely to have attained civic skills, as well as income, that encourage participation.

Some authors have included other variables in addition to SES to show political participation. Arvizu and Garcia (1996) looked at a “life cycle effect,” which includes factors like age, gender, immigration, and home ownership and whether these factors impacted voter turnout. The authors wanted to test the idea that as an individual gets older, they attained more possessions and have a greater interest in political participation (Arvizu and Garcia 1996). The authors found that while SES had a positive impact on voter turnout, “life cycle” factors like age and home ownership were also
significant factors. Age was found to be the most important factor in predicting turnout, followed by education (Arvizu and Garcia 1996; de la Garza and Jang 2011). Latinos over the age of 25 have been shown to participate at higher rates than younger Latinos (de la Garza and Jang 2011). Measuring age has been shown to be an important additional variable when measuring political participation for Latinos. Older Latinos are more likely to turn out to vote than younger Latinos. In political activities like writing to a public official, contributing money, attending rallies, and signing petitions, education and age are positively related (Hero and Campbell 1996). However, in volunteering for a political candidate less educated Latino youths participated slightly more than older Latinos (Hero and Campbell 1996). This highlights the importance of variables like age when considering participation for the Latino community.

Other additional factors may also be relevant when considering participation. Education and age have been shown to be important factors that determine participation, yet some argue that socialization must interact with age and education (Cho 1999; de la Garza 2001). Latino immigrants are more likely to vote based on the number of years in the United States, despite their age (de la Garza and Jang 2011). If they are not educated in the United States, they may not have learned the same political incorporation. For example, those who are educated elsewhere may not have the same communication skills, and know the procedures to participate as those educated in the United States. Individuals who are educated in the United States may feel a stronger sense of duty and obligation to vote. Measuring where an individual attained their highest level of education is an additional variable that may also have an impact on political participation.
Language acquisition is a variable that positively affects an individual’s participation. When English proficiency is added as a factor for explaining Latino political participation, it has a significant effect (Cho 1999). Those who are more capable of reading and speaking in English are more likely to participate in political activities (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Verba et al. 1995). Considering language acquisition’s effect on political participation would illustrate that the resource of learning English is a positive skill for participation. There is also evidence that naturalized citizens speak, read, and write in English at higher rates than non-naturalized citizens and are typically more educated (DeSipio 2011). This may be because of the bureaucratic process for naturalization. In order to become a naturalized citizen, there are tests and applications that an individual must complete. Those who are more educated and have more skills are more likely to naturalize. Even with higher educational levels than other immigrants, naturalized citizens, do not participate to the same degree that native-born citizens do (DeSipio 2011; Cho 1999).

In hypothesis 2 I will consider the additional factor citizenship status has on political participation when factoring in SES variables. Foreign-born citizens do not participate to the same degree as native-born citizens (Cho 1999). There are several reasons to believe that native-born citizens are more likely to participate than naturalized citizens. Foreign-born citizens typically are found in lower socio-economic brackets (DeSipio 2011). Naturalized citizens do not have the same resources that native-born citizens do (de la Garza 2004). They may also be more highly concentrated in areas that are not targeted for mobilization and recruitment (DeSipio 2011). They do not have the same language skills, ability to navigate bureaucracies, and tend to be unfamiliar and
detached from politics. Naturalized citizens, when asked, are likely to respond that the main reason they chose to naturalize is to be able to vote. Yet, studies show that they do not exercise their right to vote like native-born citizens do (DeSipio 2011). Still, it is necessary to investigate if SES factors are the main determinants of why naturalized citizens do not vote to the same degree.

Another reason foreign-born Latinos do not participate as highly as native born citizens is their low levels of socialization in the American political system (Cho 1999; Hritzuk and Park 2000; de la Garza 2004). Socialization includes things like knowledge of political parties, and a greater sense of civic duty (Cho 1999). For immigrants, time spent in the United States is positively associated with political behavior (Cho 1999). Immigrants do not have the same level of political socialization that native born citizens do.

Variables

In my analysis I use three dependent nominal variables as measurement of respondent’s political participation. A nominal variable is a variable that simply applies differences between the cases that are being reported. It does not place the categories in a rank (Pollock 2012). A dependent variable is a variable that the researcher is attempting to explain (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996). The three dependent variables I use measure voting behavior, being registered to vote, and contacting a government official. Each variable is dichotomous and offers the respondents a binary choice, either yes or no, depending if they participated in the political activity. The unit of analysis is the individual Latino respondent in the United States.
I created a dummy variable for each of my dependent variables. A dummy variable is a variable where all cases are assigned a value of 0 or 1 (Pollack 2012). Those values that are assigned a value of 1 are those that are being predicted. For example, the dependent variable for those that voted in 2004 are given a value of 1 for those that voted and 0 for those that did not.

My independent variables measure a respondent’s education, family income, occupational status, age, country in which they received their highest level of education, language acquisition, and if they were born in the U.S. or elsewhere. An independent variable is a variable that is expected to change the dependent variable; it is also called the explanatory variable (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996). I expect that the independent variables will each explain the change in the dependent variable.

The independent variable education was not recoded from the Latino National Survey dataset. For those with no education there is a value of 0, and there are 2.6% of respondents in this category. Those with an 8th grade education level or below are given a value of 1, there were 19.9% of respondents in this category. Those with some high school were given a value of 2, there were 14.5% in this category. Those with a GED are a value of 3, and there were 3.3% of respondents in this category. High school graduates have a value of 4, and there are 24.4% of respondents in this level of education. Those with some college are coded as a value of 5, and account for 19.1% of respondents. Those who completed a 4-year college degree are a value of 6, there are 9.5% with this level of education. Last, those with a graduate degree have a value of 7, there were 6.7% of respondents in this category. This variable is an ordinal scale.
For the independent variable income, the Latino National Survey asked respondents about their combined family income. The Latino National Survey creates an ordinal scale for family income, and places respondents within income ranges starting at those with family income of $14,999 and below. Those who have a family income of $14,999 in annual income or below were given a value of 0, there were 14.8% of respondents in this category. Those between $15,000 through $24,999 are given a value of 1, there were 17.7% of respondents in this level of income. The third category was those with a family income of $25,000 through $64,999 and was assigned a value of 2, there were 35% in this category. All those with a family income above $65,000 were assigned a value of 3, there were 11.7% of respondents that fell into this category. Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980) write that income is not a helpful predictor of political participation once a comfortable level of income is achieved. I placed all those with a family of income of $65,000 or more in the same category because it is well above the poverty level for most families. The variable for income is an ordinal scale.

For employment status, I coded all those who were not employed as 0 and all those who were employed as 1. This procedure was done in a previous study to measure the occupational effects of employment and a positive association with political participation was found (Arvizu and Garcia 1996). Employed respondents accounted for 69.1% of respondents. Those who fell in the unemployed category accounted for 30.9%. Employment status is a dichotomous variable.

The independent variable for age was coded so that individuals within the age of 18-25 were given a value of 0, there were 17.2% of respondents in this category. Previous studies found this age group to not vote as highly as those who were older (de la
Garza and Jang 2011). I then coded those who are 26-35 and gave them a value of 1, there are 24.2% in this age group. Those respondents within 36-45 are given a value of 2, there are 21.2% in this age group. Respondents within the age group of 46-55 are given a value of 3, there are 14.7% in this category. Those within the age group of 56-65 were given a value of 4, there are 9.6% of respondents in this category. Last were all those respondents above age 65 and are given a value of 5, there are 7.4% of respondents in this category. The variable for age is an ordinal scale variable.

In the independent variable that measured where they received their highest level of education I created a variable where the respondents who were educated outside the U.S. including Puerto Rico are given values of 0, there are 53% of respondents in this category. Respondents who were educated in the United States are given values of 1, there are 18.6% individuals in this category. There was missing data for 28.4% of respondents in the Latino National Survey. This is likely due to the LNS not including an option for the individual to respond that they either did not know, or they refused to answer. This is a dichotomous variable.

The independent variable that measures a respondent’s English acquisition is an ordinal scale variable. Individuals who responded they do not speak any English are given a value of 0, there are 12.1% of respondents in this category. Those who responded to speak a little English are given a value of 1; there are 31.7% in this category. People who responded that they speak English pretty well are assigned the value of 2; there are 10% of individuals in this category. The last option for respondents were those who speak English very well, this group is given a value of 3; there are 8% of respondents in this category.
The last independent variable created asks the respondent where they were born. This is used to measure those who were born in the United States, and those who were born outside the United States. Those who were born outside the United States were given a value of 0; there were 66.2% of individuals in this category. Those respondents who were born in Puerto Rico are given a value of 1; there were 5.4% in this category. Those who were born in the United States are given a value of 2; there are 28.4% of individuals in this category.

Methods

I will perform three logistic regressions to investigate the relationship the independent variable have with each dependent variable that measures political participation. The difference between a linear regression model and a logistic regression model, is that in logistic regression the dependent variable is binary or dichotomous (Hosmer and Lameshow 1989). In logistic regression, the dependent variable takes on a value of 0 or 1. It will take into account the non-linear relationship that the independent variables will have on the dichotomous dependent variables (Pollock 2012). Logistic regression analyzes the mean of the variables and determines the probability that the case of the independent variable will fall into either of the two cases of the dependent variable (Menard 2002). It is concerned with the probability that a case of the independent variable falls into the higher of the two values of the dependent variable (Menard 2002). Logistic regression analyzes the probability that a case of the independent variable falls into the predicted category of the dependent variable, therefore, it shows the probability that an individual either was involved in the political activity or was not (Pollock 2012).
In using logistic regression analysis, I will be able to show how strong the relationship is for each independent variable on the dependent variables. It will also identify the direction of the relationship between the dependent variables and each independent variable. It will reveal the relationship of the independent variables on the dependent variable (Pollock 2012). In an additive relationship, variables that contribute to the outcome will be shown to have a partial effect. Regression will highlight the partial effects of additive variables. Regression will also identify whether a relationship happened by chance or is indeed significant (Menard 2002).

In the regression analysis, I will report on the coefficient estimate, which shows the intercept. A positive coefficient will show a positive relationship with the dependent variable indicating that when the independent variable goes up in value, so does the dependent variable (Pollock 2012). I placed asterisks by the coefficient if the coefficient was statistically significant. One asterisk was used for coefficients with a significance level of .05, two asterisks were used for those with significant levels of .05, and three asterisks for those at .001.

I will also report on the standard error of the variables. A standard error assesses how much the sample mean differs by chance; from the population mean (Pollock 2012). This will show how close the sample that I create differs from the overall sample.

The model summary will include a -2 log likelihood (-2 LL), Nagelkerke R square, and maximum likelihood estimation. The -2LL and maximum likelihood shows how the second model that is performed differs from a null hypothesis of the variables. The -2LL is a chi square test statistic, the maximum likelihood estimation uses the -2LL
to test the null hypothesis with the new model (Pollock 2012). If the null hypothesis did not significantly differ from the new model, we cannot reject the null hypothesis and the new model does not work. If however, the new model is greater than the null model, we can say that the new model can predict the dependent variable better than the null model. The -2LL and maximum likelihood ratio will indicate the difference in the models.

Nagelkerke R square is another way to test how well model 2 did from the null hypothesis model. If the Nagelkerke R square was close to 0, we could not reject the null hypothesis because the predictive power of the new model is not significantly different from the null hypothesis. The Nagelkerke R square is a range of 0 and 1, if the new model is closer to one, we can be certain that the new model is a better predictor than the null model.

Findings

This section will describe the findings of the three logistic regressions for the dependent variables measuring political participation. Table 1 is the results of the logistic regression of the respondents who voted in the 2004 national elections. In this table, the results show that when considering all the independent variables, education, level of English acquisition, where they received their highest level of education, and age had the most explanatory effects. Age, education, and level of English had significance levels of .001, indicating their high explanatory effects.

The findings in table one show that hypothesis one is not fully supported. Education had a positive relationship with voting in the 2004 national elections. However, income and employment status did not have a significant effect on voting.
Table 1

*Logistic Regression for Vote in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.142***</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.412***</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Received Education</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.605***</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>1294.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R Square</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***.001**.01 *.05*

Income was close to a level of significance, and fell just above the .05 level.

Employment status did not have much effect on Latino voting in 2004. Each SES variable had a different effect for Latino voting; only education was statistically significant.

The additional factors of age, English acquisition, where they received their highest level of education had a significant effect on voting. Each of these additional factors had a significant effect on voting for Latinos in 2004. Age and English acquisition had a significance level of .001 indicating that they were important factors in determining
voting behavior. Also, the variable for where they received their highest level of education was significant at the .05 level. This illustrates, that additional factors of age, English acquisition, and where they received their highest level of education are important additional factors to consider for Latino voting.

Hypothesis two shows that SES and the additional factors are more important in determining who voted than where the individual was born. Hypothesis two was not supported in the findings. In this sample, Latinos born in the United States were not more likely to participate in voting than those who were naturalized when considering other factors. Although there is a positive relationship between those born in the United States and voting, the results are not statistically significant.

The result for hypothesis one and two, for voting, is summarized in logistic regression Table 1.

The next model analyzed these same independent variables on the dependent variable that measures respondents who are registered to vote. In this model, my first hypothesis was not fully supported. Education and income were significant factors in determining who registered to vote. Employment status actually had a negative effect on registering to vote. This means that having a job had an opposite effect on registering to vote. SES was significant when measuring education and income but not for employment status for Latinos.

The additional factors that were included in the model support my hypothesis that these factors are important in registering to vote. Age and English acquisition were highly important determinants of who voted when taking all factors into account. The variable that measured where the individual received their highest level of education was
also significant for registering to vote. Those who were educated in the United States were more likely to register to vote than those who had been educated elsewhere.

The second hypothesis was not supported in the finding for registering to vote. Those who were born in the United States were not more likely to participate when other factors were taken into consideration. This shows that those who were naturalized were as likely to participate when other factors were controlled for.

The result for hypothesis one and two, for registering to vote, is summarized in the logistic regression Table 2.

Table 2

*Logistic Regression for Registered to Vote*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.133**</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.379***</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Received Education</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.538***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>1090.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R Square</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05
The last logistic regression that I created was for the dependent variable contacting a government official. In this model, hypothesis one was also partially supported. Education and family income were significant in this political activity. Employment status did not have a significant effect on contacting a government official. Those who were employed were positively associated with contacting a government official, but other factors were more important in determining this activity.

The additional variables measuring an individual’s age, English acquisition, and where they were educated were highly significant factors in determining whether they contacted a government official. Those who were older, had more English skills and were educated in the United States were more likely to contact a government official. This supports hypothesis one, in that these factors are important factors aside from SES that predict this political activity.

Hypothesis two was also not supported in this political activity. Although those who were born in the United States were positively associated with contacting a government official, it was not a significant factor when controlling for other ones. In this sample when comparing those who were born in the United States and born elsewhere, there is no statistical significant difference in contacting a government official when other factors are considered.

The result for hypothesis one and two, for contacting a government official, is summarized in the logistic regression Table 3.

Overall, the findings suggest that SES factors are important in determining Latino voting behavior. Education was the most important SES determinant for describing all levels of political participation. Income was shown to have a positive effect
### Table 3

*Logistic Regression for Met, Wrote, Called Government Official*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.096**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.252***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English level</td>
<td>.313***</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Received Education</td>
<td>.375***</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.179***</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>3662.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R Square</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05

on two of the three political participation activities. Employment status was not shown to have a significant effect on any political activity. When other factors are considered, the effects of employment on political activity go away. This suggests that other SES factors as well the additional factors that were included had a better explanatory effect than employment status for the Latino sample that was used.

The additional factors that were added had a positive effect on the political activities. Age and level of English acquisition were the most significant factors in every
political activity. Where the individual received their highest level of education was also a very important factor in determining who participated.

Hypothesis two was not supported in any of the political activity. This indicates that native-born Latino citizens did not participate at higher rates as those who were naturalized in this sample. When other factors were considered, the effects that native born citizens participated at higher rates went away. Other factors were more important in determining who participates rather than if an individual was born here or elsewhere.

Discussion

The logistic regression findings show that many of the factors that were included in the model had a positive effect on political participation. The only exception was employment status for Latinos who registered to vote, which showed no significance. The findings indicate that hypothesis one was mostly supported by the models. Hypothesis two was not found to hold in any of the models that were constructed.

The socio-economic model that includes education, income, and employment varied in importance in the different political activities. When the SES variables are separated, we find that only education is statistically significant in every political activity. In this study, education is the most important SES variable for Latinos when considering political participation. These findings are similar to literature that also finds education to be the most important of these factors in political participation (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; de la Garza and Jang 2011). This may be because education has been shown to be a very important institution for enhancing skills.
Income is the second most important SES variable, it is significant when considered registering to vote and contacting an official. Income may be important for registering to vote because income has been shown to be important in the type of neighborhood one is located in. Those with more income are not moving from place to place and may be more likely to register and not have to do it again. This can also be the reason for contacting a government official. Those who are located in one neighborhood may be more likely to know their elected official and how to contact them.

Employment status was not an important determinant in any of the political activities; this may also be because Latinos are employed in jobs that do not provide the resources that can help to participate. Employment can be beneficial to political participation by increasing skills like organization, writing, participating in meetings, and bureaucratic competence. Many low-income jobs may not provide these skills. Also, those who are employed may lack the resource of having time to participate. Those with less time are less likely to participate because many activities require time.

The additional factors measuring age, English acquisition, and the country they received their highest level of education were statistically significant. When the factors of age, English acquisition, and the country the individual received their highest level of education was entered into the equation the findings show that each had a significant effect on political participation. Age was shown to be highly related to participation. Age has been shown to be a positive variable for Latinos and political participation. In this study, age may be significant because those who are older have more resources needed to participate. Older Latinos may also be more socialized into the political process and have more attachment to political parties.
The level of English acquisition was also shown to be a relevant factor in determining political participation. Those who did not speak any English are much less likely to participate in a political activity despite controlling for other factors. English may be an especially important resource for Latinos and political participation. That English level was significant when controlling for education shows that in addition to having more education, English proficiency is important in participation. This may also be because of the lack of Spanish translated campaigning as well as ballots. Further studies are necessary to investigate whether Spanish translated campaigning and ballots will increase Latino participation.

Another important variable is, where the respondent received their highest level of education as a factor in determining political participation. Those respondents who were educated in the United States were more likely to participate in a political activity than those who were educated elsewhere. This may be because education in the U.S. acts as a socializing institution into the political process (Verba et al. 1995; Cho 1999). Those who are educated in the U.S. are more likely to feel obligated to vote and have a sense of duty to participate. This variable may also be interacting with level of English acquisition. Individuals educated elsewhere may not have the level of English that can be needed to participate.

One interesting point in the findings is that hypothesis two was not held up in the models that were constructed. Native-born citizens were not more likely to participate in the political activities when other factors were considered. This differs from literature that suggests that native-born citizens participate at a higher rate than foreign-born citizens (DeSipio 2011). However, there is literature that states that when immigrants feel
threatened through perceived anti-immigrant legislation they are more likely to participate (Ramakrishnan and Espanshade 2001). This last point may be the reason native-born respondents did not participate more than foreign-born respondents. Anti-immigration legislation that was passed in the U.S. House of Representatives in 2005 led to mass protests. This may have increased the likelihood that Latino immigrants participated in political activities to the same degree as native-born citizens.

Conclusion

The socio-economic model is important for Latino political participation. Education has been shown to be the most important SES factor when looking at voting, registering to vote, and contacting a government official. Education may be a strong factor in determining participation because it is an especially rich institution for increasing skills necessary for participation. Income is the second most important SES predictor of political participation in this study. Income was significant in those who registered to vote and who contacted an official. Those with more income, likely do not have the same financial stresses that can be a barrier to participation. Employment status in this study was not a significant factor in any activity. The reason may be that those who are employed have less time to participate as a result. Time has been shown to be a resource that encourages participation. Also, Latinos may be employed in jobs that do not provide the same resources like civic skills that white-collar jobs are shown to enhance.

Several additional factors are very important in determining Latino political participation. Age, English acquisition, and the country the individual was educated in were all significant factors in political participation. These factors showed significance in
every political activity measured. Age may be shown to be an especially important factor because those who are older tend to have more resources, and are more aware of the political process. English acquisition was also a significant variable that was shown to be important in participation. English is a skill that an individual attains that make participation in political activities easier. The last variable measuring the country the respondent was educated in shows that those who were educated in the United States were more likely to participate. Those educated in the U.S. are more familiar with the political process and are more socialized. This last variable offers more evidence of the importance of socialization into the political process. Education in the United States may offer more to an individual than the resources necessary to participate. Being educated in the U.S. also increases an individual’s attachment to the political system.

The findings show that SES variables, education and income, are important determinants but that additional variables are also very important in political participation for Latinos.

When focusing on the participation of native born and foreign-born respondents the findings show that there is no difference in participation when other factors are controlled for. This may also be because of anti-immigration that was being proposed in Congress leading to the time data was gathered. This dataset may be reflecting foreign-born citizens who participate at higher rates than normal in response to unfavorable legislation.
CHAPTER III

ROLE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
AND CHURCH INVOLVEMENT FOR
LATINO POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

This chapter will consider how community organization and church involvement affect Latino political participation. In Chapter I, I briefly explained the effects these institutions and organizations have on political participation. I will further explain participation in community organizations, church involvement, and how it affects political behavior. I will also examine the argument that the more religious an individual is, the more likely they are to associate with the Republican Party, and whether this is occurring with the Latino population. I will test hypotheses three through eight and determine if membership in these organizations positively influences political participation.

Hypothesis three seeks to investigate whether community organizations increase political participation. This hypothesis states that, Latinos involved in community organizations will participate in politics more than those who do not when controlling for SES. Community organizations provide several benefits to participants. These organizations can increase civic skills, provide social networks, and act as mobilizing agents for political recruitment (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000). These are the major reason that those who participate are more likely to engage in politics.
Community organizations provide individuals with civic skills that aid in the political participation process. In Chapter II, I explained the resource model of participation that was developed by Verba et al. (1995). According to this model, one reason individuals are more likely to participate is because they have attained higher levels of civic skills. Civic skills can include, reading, writing, speaking and also skills like organizing, and taking part in meetings. Those who possess these skills should find politics less challenging to take part in (Verba et al. 1995). Civic skills can be learned throughout life, and education is an especially beneficial institution for enhancing these skills. Once education is over, other institutions like the workplace, voluntary associations, and churches can sharpen these skills (Verba et al. 1995). Adults can increase their skills through the institutions and community groups they take part in. This is likely why those who are involved in these organizations are more likely to take part in political activities.

Community organizations also provide social networks that encourage individuals to take part in political activities (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000). These social networks increase political participation by providing exposure to political stimuli (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000). Social networks provide individuals with what has been called in social science, social capital. The idea behind social capital is that the networks that people are a part of are beneficial in many ways to the individual. Social capital theorists’ main argument is that social networks matter (Putnam 2000). The greater the number of people with social capital the more benefits these individuals will receive. Social capital is important and positive to many things in life. In politics, it may
also have a positive effect. The more social capital a person has the more likely they will be to engage in political activities (Putnam 2000).

Social capital has been shown to be beneficial to the Latino community as well (Diaz 1996; Hritzuk and Park 2000). One study found that membership in community organizations is positively associated with voting behavior for the Latino community (Diaz 1996). Another study by Hritzuk and Park (2000) investigated the relationship that community organizations have with six political activities including voting, volunteering for a political party, contributing money to a political campaign, attending a rally, contacting an official, and participating in a protest. The authors found a positive relationship with these political activities and involvement in community organizations (Hritzuk and Park 2000). Overall, the literature shows that Latinos in community organizations encourage participation in political activities.

Another explanation for why community involvement increases participation is that they increase the likelihood of mobilization and recruitment into political activities (Verba et al. 1995; Leighley 1996; Putnam 2000). Community organizations can increase the chances that an individual participates in politics through individual mobilization and through mobilization by political parties and interest groups (Leighley 1996). Participants are encouraged to participate by other members and can also learn the procedures to make participation easier (Putnam 2000; Leighley 1996). Those who are in a community group have peers and make friends who may themselves participate. Being around these peers and friends who participate may also make participation more likely by pressuring the individual to take part (Putnam 2000). These people who notice others take part may feel obligated to do the same.
Community groups are also targeted by elites, and interest groups, and mobilized into politics (Leighley 1996). Elites and interest groups understand that these groups can be mobilized and are likely to participate in political activities. Community groups usually contain like-minded people and are already assembled and can be easily targeted. Elites may target these groups based on their own self-interests. A community group that may have a political leaning may be more likely to be asked to participate by a political party.

Latino immigrants have also been shown to participate in community organizations like Parent Teacher Associations (DeSipio 2011). Membership in PTA is shown to be especially attractive to immigrants (DeSipio 2011). Immigrants involve themselves in PTA because there is no necessity to acquire citizenship (DeSipio 2011). Immigrants who do not have citizenship or are in the process of becoming a citizen can participate in PTA meetings. These members gain benefits of participation that has a positive effect for political activities.

Religious organizations offer several benefits to people for participating in political activities. The role religious organizations play with political participation is much like community group membership. Churches, like community groups, enhance resources and civic skills. They also provide social networks that are valuable for political participation. They may also be a strong mobilization and recruitment institution (Verba et al. 1995; Putnam 2000; Hritzuk and Park 2000; Jones-Correa and Leal 2001). Religious institutions are also shown to be especially beneficial to those with low SES and fewer resources (Verba et al. 1995). Membership in church is especially beneficial for individuals with low resources who often do not belong to any other organization.
(Verba et al. 1995). These individuals are especially impacted by the benefits that church membership provides.

Some argue that church denominations differ in the resources they provide and that the reason religious Latinos do not participate as highly as other groups is because they belong to the Catholic Church in very high numbers, which does not enhance skills like protestant and other churches do (Verba et al. 1995). However, more recent studies specific to Latinos have shown that a better way to measure the benefits of church involvement is to focus on the frequency individuals attend (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001). When looking at attendance as opposed to denomination, research shows that there is a positive relationship between membership and political participation (Jones-Correa and Leal 2001). In one study by Jones-Correa and Leal (2001) the authors found that denomination had the opposite effect for political participation than previous studies. The authors showed that Catholics participated more than Protestants.

Hypothesis 4 will look at the role attendance in church has on Latino political participation. I hypothesize that Latinos who attend church more will be more likely to participate in politics regardless of their denomination.

Although an individual’s political party preference is not a political activity I would like to measure the findings in recent studies that show a relationship between highly religious people and their association with the Republican Party. Research has found that religious individuals differ in their political party preference. Highly religious individuals have been shown to favor the Republican Party while secular individuals are more likely to favor the Democratic Party (Putnam and Campbell 2010; Olsen and Green 2006). This phenomenon has been titled the “religion gap” and has been growing in
importance in recent decades. The claim that highly religious individuals will associate with the Republican Party will be tested in hypothesis 5. I hypothesize that Latino respondents who are more religious, will not associate with Republicans. Recent literature has shown that highly religious individuals have increasingly moved into the Republican Party because of the association of anti-abortion and same sex marriages in recent decades. However, the literature is less clear on if this is occurring at high rates for Latinos as well. Latinos show strong ties to the Democratic Party because of the party’s stance on immigration policy.

Participation in community organizations and church attendance is beneficial to increasing the likelihood of participation. There are fewer studies that compare individuals who participate in both church activities and community organizations. Those who are involved in both may be more likely to participate in political activities because they belong to more social networks that encourage political activity. In hypothesis 6 I look at the effects of participation in both community organizations and church. I hypothesize that Latinos who are involved in community and church organizations will be more likely to participate in political activities. Latinos who are involved in more social networks are more likely to be recruited and mobilized into participating in politics (Putnam 2000; La Du Lake and Huckfeldt 1998). Latinos who belong to more social networks, found in community organizations and churches, should be more active in political activities. They are more likely to be exposed to pressures and encouragements to participate by others in their social networks. These factors should increase the likelihood that members involved in church and community groups participate in political activities.
Hypotheses 7 and 8 will compare community organization involvement with church attendance. In hypothesis 6, I hypothesize that Latinos in community organizations are more likely to participate in politics than Latinos in church organizations. Latinos in church organizations are likely to have fewer skills like English, writing and reading skills than those in community organizations because of the high amount of immigrants who go to church (Verba et al. 1995). Churches play a unique role in American politics because they have large attendance from immigrants and low skilled citizens; these churches may help to increase these resources (Verba et al. 1995). However, because we should find people with already low levels of resources in church, those in community organizations should participate at higher rates.

In hypothesis 8, I hypothesize that Latinos involved in community organizations are asked to join in a political activity more than Latinos involved in a religious institution. Latinos involved in churches are not mobilized like Latinos involved in community organizations. Latinos involved in churches may not have the resources necessary to participate. Money has been shown to be an important resource in contributing to a political campaign (Brady, Verba, and Scholzman 1995). Latinos who attend church may lack financial levels that would be needed to contribute to a political campaign.

Variables

The dependent variables used are the ones used in Chapter II to measure political participation. These include voting in the 2004 national election, registering to vote, and contacting a government official. For a description of these variables, see
Chapter II. In addition, I also included several other dependent variables that measure being contacted to vote or contribute to a political campaign and being a registered Republican.

The dependent variable being contacted, asks respondents whether they were contacted in 2004 to contribute or to vote for a political campaign. This variable is dichotomous and gives the respondents a yes or a no option. I recoded this variable to create a dummy variable that assigns a value of 0 for those respondents who were not contacted and a value of 1 for those who were. The respondents who were contacted accounted for 35.2% of respondents, and those who were not contacted accounted for 62.1% of respondents. I did not include those who replied they did not know, which accounted for 2.7% of respondents.

The dependent variable measuring whether a respondent is Republican asks the respondent what party they are registered as. The LNS gives the option of Democrats, Republicans, Independent, some other party, or that the state they reside in does not require them to register for a political party. In this variable, I excluded those who responded Independent, some other party, or state does not require. I only included those who responded Democrats or Republicans, creating a dummy variable. For those who responded Democrats, I coded them as 0. Fifty percent of respondents were Democrats. I then coded Republicans as 1 because they are who I am trying to predict in the model. These respondents accounted for 18.1% of the population. I did not include those who responded to be Independent, which was 11.3% of respondents. I also did not include those who stated, some other party, no state requirement, and those who did not know. These respondents totaled 21% of the population.
The independent variables I use are the SES variable as well as the additional variables of age, and English acquisition. For a description of how I coded these variables see Chapter II. I included the independent variables that measure participation in community groups, church attendance, attending a Parent Teacher Association meetings, religious denomination, and political ideology. I also created a variable that measures whether a person participated in a community group and attended church.

The independent variable that measures participation in a community group gives the respondent the option of not participating, participating in one, and participating in more than one community group. I coded this variable as those who were not involved in a community organization as 0, this accounted for 78.7% of respondents. I coded those involved in one community group as 1, there were 12.8% in this category. Those with more than one community group association was assigned a value of 2, there were 6.7% in this category. Those who responded they did not know were not included in the model. This is an ordinal variable.

The independent variable that measures church participation gives the respondent several options. Those who replied that they never go to church were given a value of 0, 12.3% of respondents fell in this category. Respondents who only attend church on major holidays were given a value of 1, there were 13.1% of people in this category. The next options were those who responded they went to church once a week, coded 3 and were 38.6%. The last option was those who went more than once a week, coded 4, and accounted for 16.6%.

I also include an independent variable that measures whether a respondent went to a PTA meeting or not. This is a dichotomous variable. I created this variable into
a dummy variable with those who went to a PTA meeting coded 1 and those who did not coded 0. I excluded those who did not know. There were 24.4% of respondents who went to a meeting and 8% who did not attend a meeting. The LNS had missing information for 67.4% of respondents in the entire population.

To measure a respondent’s religious denomination, I included the independent variable that asks respondents which religious tradition they most identify with. The respondents were given many different options. I created a variable that assigns those who associate with the Catholic Church a value of 0. There were 71.3% of respondents in this category. I then assigned those who responded to be associated with the Assemblies of God, Southern Baptist, Pentecostal, and other Protestants a value of 1. There were 13.7% of respondents in this category.

In order to measure a respondent who associates with the Republican Party, I also included the independent variable that measures a person’s ideology. This question gave respondents options of being either conservative, liberal, middle of the road, don’t think of self in these terms, and do not know. Those who responded to be liberal and those who stated they were middle of the road are given a value of 0, those who responded to be conservative are given a value of 1. Those who respond to be liberal or middle of the road are 29.6% of the population. Those who said they were conservative account for 22.9%. Logistic regression is based on the assumption that there is an order of these variables, because those who replied that they do not think of themselves in these terms, or do not know cannot be placed in an order I could not use them. This is a dichotomous variable.
To compare those involved in community organizations and those who attend church I created an additive index. An additive index is a variable that is coded identically, and measures a similar concept of several variables (Pollack 2012). I coded the variables identically and used the compute command in SPSS to create the additive variable. For people in community groups, I assigned a value of 1 for those who participated in community groups. I also assigned a value of 1 for those who attended church once per month or more often. This additive variable assigns a 0 for respondents who have not participated in a community organization or attended church. It assigns a value of 1 if the respondent did one of these activities. The additive index adds the individuals who have both been involved in a community group and went to church more than once per month. Those who did not either participate in a community organization or attend church accounted for 20.6%. Those in at least one community group or attended some church accounted for 61.4%. Individuals who participated in at least one community group and attended church at least once per month accounted for 14.8%.

Methods

I will use logistic regression analysis to test my independent variables on my dependent variables. For a description of logistic regression, see Chapter II. I will use the same three dependent variables I used in Chapter II: voting in 2004, registering to vote, and contacting a government official. I will include the independent variables that measure participation in community organizations, PTA meetings, and church.

In addition to the three dependent variables measuring participation, I will also include two more dependent variables. These dependent variables measure whether a
respondent was asked to contribute or vote for a political campaign and whether they registered as Republican. I will use the dependent variable that measures being asked to contribute or vote to a political campaign to measure which variables explain who is asked to contribute or vote by political parties. I will use the dependent variable that asks respondents whether they are registered as Republican to investigate if Latinos who go to church more often associate with the Republican Party.

Findings

In Table 1 the logistic regression model shows that those who are involved in community groups were very likely to vote in 2004. This shows supports for hypothesis 3. Latinos involved in community organizations are more likely to engage in voting as a political activity. The independent variable measuring community group participation is statistically significant in this model when controlling for other factors. This shows that for the political activity of voting those involved in community groups are more likely to vote than those who do not participate. However, the results also find that those specifically involved in parent teacher meetings are not significant for voting like the other community groups do.

The findings in Table 4 indicate that those who attend church more often do not vote in higher numbers. This does not support hypothesis 4. When considering other factors, there is no significance to attending a church more often and voting. Religious denomination also was not significant.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported either. The additive variable that was created was not significant. Those who attend churches and also attend a community organization
Table 4

*Logistic Regression for Voted in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.476***</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.312*</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>.540*</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Church</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Meeting</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Denomination</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>466.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>67.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05

are not more likely to vote. This variable was not included in the tables because keeping it in changed the results of the other independent variables.

Hypothesis 7 is supported in Table 4; those who participate in a community organization are more likely to vote than those who attend church. There was a high level of significance for community group participation and voting. There was actually a negative relationship for those who attended church and voted. This illustrates that being
involved in a community group positively affects voting, while attending church for Latinos does not have such an effect.

Table 5 shows the results for those who are registered to vote. This model shows that there was no significant finding for those who were members in community groups, went to a PTA meeting, or involved in church. When controlling for other factors we do not find a significant relationship for these variables on registering to vote.

Table 5

*Logistic Regression for Registered to Vote*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.475*</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Church</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Meeting</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Denomination</td>
<td>-0.353</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>381.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>78.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ****.001** *.01 *.05
Findings in Table 5 do not support hypothesis 3 and 4. For registering to vote as a political activity, participation in community groups and attendance in church do not have a significant effect. Other factors like education and level of English are more important indicator.

The results also do not support hypotheses 6 and 7. Community participation and church attendance were both not shown to be significant. Hypothesis 6 is not supported, which illustrates that those who participate in both community groups and church do not participate at a higher rate. Hypothesis 7 stating that people will participate at higher levels than those who attend church also was not supported.

Table 6 shows the results for those involved in community groups and church and whether they were more likely to contact a government official. The results show that there is a high significance for those who participate in community groups and those who attend a PTA meeting and contacting an official. Hypothesis 3 is supported in this model. Individuals who participate in community organizations and specifically in PTA meetings are more likely to contact an official.

The results were not significant for those who attended church. Hypothesis 4 is not supported in this model. Respondents who attend church more often are not more likely to participate when controlling for other factors.

When entering the additive variable of participation in community groups and church there was no significance. Hypothesis 6 cannot be supported because those who attend church are not more likely to participate in this political activity. When combining those who participate in community organizations and in church, the relationship is not significant.
Table 6

*Logistic Regression for Met, Wrote, Called Government Official*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.273*</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.414***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>.724***</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Church</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Meeting</td>
<td>.586*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Denomination</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>1286.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>74.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05

Community group members do participate in contacting government officials more than those who attend church more often. This is also the case for attendees of a PTA meeting. Hypothesis 7 is supported in this model; the results show that community group members participate in this activity more often than those who go to church.

Model 7 is the results for Latino respondents who had been contacted by a political campaign to contribute money or to vote (Table 7). The findings reveal that
Table 7

*Logistic Regression for Been Contacted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.562*</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.740***</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.372*</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>.559*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Church</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Meeting</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Denomination</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>366.534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>78.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05

those in a community group are more likely to be asked to contribute money or vote for a political party. Church attendees are not more likely to be asked to do either of these activities by a political party, when controlling for other factors. Interestingly, attending a PTA meeting had a negative effect on this activity.

Hypothesis 3 was supported in these findings, showing that those who participate in community groups are more likely to be active in this political activity.
Hypothesis 4 was not shown to be supported by the results in model 7. Church attendees were not more likely to be asked to contribute when other factors were considered.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported in this model. Those who are active in both community groups and church attendance were not more likely to participate. When the additive variable was entered into the model, the variable for those who participate in a community organization lost its significance. The results show that when participation in community groups and church are combined the relationship is not significant, indicating that these individuals do not participate when controlling for other factors.

There is also evidence in model 7 that supports hypothesis 7. There are significant results for those who participate in community groups and there is not a significant finding for individuals who go to church. This shows that those in community organizations are more likely to participate than church attendees.

Model 8 tests individuals who participate in church and whether they associate with the Republican Party (Table 8). The findings show that who attend church more often are not more likely to associate with the Republican Party. The model shows that Ideology is the best indicator for why individuals associate to the Republican Party. These findings do not support hypothesis 5. Those who are more likely to attend church have not statistical significant relationship with associating with the Republican Party. Ideology is the single factor that was shown to be significant when other factors were controlled for.
Table 8

*Logistic Regression for Republican Party ID*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-0.547</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Church</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Meeting</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Denomination</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>.971*</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>123.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***.001**.01 *.05*

Discussion

The results of the logistic regression models show that community group participation has an effect on almost every political activity. Participants in community groups are more likely to vote, contact a government official, and be contacted by a government official. The only activity that those in a community group are not shown to
have a significant level is for those who are more likely to register to vote. Those who are in a community group are more likely to be asked to participate than those who attend church. However, those who attend a PTA meeting are negatively associated with being asked to participate by a political campaign. This may be because Latino immigrants have been shown to attend PTA meetings and do not have the demographics that would be targeted by campaign to participate.

Those who were likely to participate in a Parent Teacher Association meeting were also more likely to have contact with a government official, yet these respondents had a negative relationship for being contacted to either contribute or be asked to vote. This finding may be because those in a PTA meeting may include respondents who are immigrants. Immigrants do not have high levels of English skills or high levels of income; both of these factors were significant in the model. Some immigrants may not have these resources that would allow to be targeted to contribute or vote as highly. When looking specifically at PTA meetings as participation in a community group, the results show that they are more likely to contact a government official but not to do other political activities. PTA meetings may provide skills that help Latinos contact government official. Education is also a very high issue for Latinos so we may be seeing that these individuals are participating in an activity they care a lot about and contacting officials as a result.

Respondents who attended church more often were not more likely to participate in political activities in the models constructed. Church attendance had a negative relationship with voting and the findings for the other political activities were not significant. When considering other factors, those who attend church do not
participate in politics at a higher rate. Hypothesis 4 was not supported in the findings, church attendees do not participate at a higher rate than those who do not attend.

When looking at both community participation and church attendance there was not a significant result in any political activity. Church attendees did not have any significant level of participation; this may have been the reason that the additive index that was created did not have significance when entered into the model. I expected that church attendance be positively correlated with political participation and the additive model would show that those in community organizations and who go to church often would participate at a higher rate. This was not the case because those who went to church were not more likely to participate.

Respondents who attend church more often do not associate with the Republican Party at a significant level. When controlling for a respondents political ideology the significance of other factors go away. This shows that for Latinos, political ideology is a better indicator of association with the Republican Party. Latinos who go to church at high rates are not more likely to be a Republican. This may also be because Latinos are highly associated with the Catholic Church and they associate with the Democratic Party in higher numbers. These Latinos are also likely to be immigrants who support the Democratic Party more than the Republican Party.

Conclusion
Involvement in community organizations positively effects political participation for Latinos. These organizations may provide Latinos with more skills that help in participating in political activities. These organizations provide members with
social networks that encourage participation. These are possible reasons why Latinos get involved at higher rates. These findings are also interesting because the models are controlling for factors that have been shown to be important for Latino political participation. When controlling for education, age, and English level, there is still a significant effect of community participation and political activities. Membership in these organizations can positively affect Latino political activities even while controlling for important factors.

Respondents who reported to specifically attend PTA meetings were more likely to contact a government official, but did not show significance in any other activity. This indicates that respondents who attend these meetings differ from those that participate in community organizations. When controlling for community groups and other factors, those involved in just PTA meetings contact government officials at higher rates, but do not do other political activities as often. These individuals may feel education is an important issue and contact government officials as a result.

Latinos who go to church are not more likely to participate in any political activity measured in this chapter. Many studies show that church attendance can boost political participation. This sample did not support these findings when controlling for factors found to be important in participating in politics. Even controlling for denomination, no significance was found.

The results also showed that Latinos who attend church more are not more likely to associate with the Republican Party. Recent literature suggests that the general population is splitting political parties with the religious in the Republican Party and the secular in the Democratic Party (Putnam and Campbell 2010; Olsen and Green 2006).
Less evidence has been shown for Latinos. In my model, I found that this is not occurring in the Latino population. This indicates that Latinos do not associate their religious beliefs with a political party.
CHAPTER IV

NON-SOCIAL NETWORK FACTORS
THAT AFFECT PARTICIPATION

Psychological factors like the strength of one’s partisanship and the efficacy one has toward the political process are variables that are associated with higher levels of political participation. This chapter will look at the role these psychological attachments have on Latino political participation. In addition, I will test whether the status of a Latinos’ citizenship status leads them to associate more with the Democratic Party. I will perform several regression models in order to test hypotheses nine through eleven and determine how these factors interact with political activities. I will also go over literature that gives a more in depth look at how these factors influence Latinos as political actors.

The psychological relationship an individual has with politics has been shown to be a positive element for participating in voting and other activities. According to Verba et al. (1995) the more interested and engaged someone is with politics the more likely the will want to participate. Alternatively, people do not participate because they do not want to, or they lack psychological engagement. These psychological factors include the strength of partisanship to a political party, and whether someone is efficacious toward politics. These traits can indicate who is likely to vote and be involved.
Partisanship is a process that occurs over an individual’s life and leads to an attachment to a political party. Individuals often associate with politics at an early age and can be introduced by parents, family members, and friends causing a strong connection to political parties (Verba et al. 1995; Hero et al. 2000; Alvarez and Bedolla 2003). This process is called socialization and can lead to psychological attachments and strong feelings toward politics. Those with higher levels of psychological attachments typically participate at higher rates (Alvarez and Bedolla 2003; Verba et al. 1995).

Measuring a person’s feelings toward government and political parties can reveal how likely they are to engage in politics.

Hypothesis 9 measures a respondent’s feelings toward a political party. I hypothesize that Latinos who are stronger partisans of a political party are more likely to participate in political activities. Partisanship has been shown to be an encouraging factor for Latino political behavior as well (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlmaner 1991; de la Garza and Jang 2011; Pantoja, Ramirez, and Segura 2001; de la Garza 2001; Hero et al. 2000; Jackson 2009, 2011; Alvarez and Bedolla 2003). Understanding the relationship Latinos have with political parties is useful in understanding their degree of participation.

There are several ways to measure partisanship. One way is to analyze why individuals prefer one party to another. For example, people with higher income may lead a person to favor the Republicans over Democrats. This approach does not tell us if these individuals will participate at higher rates. The other approach is to focus on the strength of partisanship. This approach has been shown to identify how active someone is in politics. One study by de la Garza and Jang (2011) found that the strength of Latino partisanship was an indicator of voting behavior. Latinos who responded that they were
strong partisans to a political party were shown to vote at higher rates than those who did not respond to be strong partisans. They further state that strong partisans will vote despite their level of education. Therefore, the strength of partisanship an individual has can overcome SES and lead to higher voting.

Latino immigrants show different patterns of partisanship than native-born citizens but are positively impacted by strong partisanship. Foreign-born citizens become stronger partisans the longer they have been in the United States (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner 1991; Branton 2007). Party identification for Latino immigrants is based on the policy stances of the two political parties. Immigrants prefer the Democratic Party because their perception is that Democrats have immigrant interests in mind (Alvarez and Bedolla 2003). The longer duration an immigrant is in the U.S. the more they prefer the Democratic Party (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner 1991). Cubans are an exception and have shown more attachment to the Republican Party (de la Garza 2004).

Political efficacy is another psychological factor that can encourage a person to participate in activities (Verba et al. 1995; Michelson 2000; Jackson 2009). Efficacy can be measured by internal and external efficacy (Jackson 2009). Internal efficacy is a person’s feeling that they can personally affect politics in a positive way. For example, their vote and participation matter. Internally efficacious people generally have a feeling that politics is not too complicated and is worth being involved. External efficacy is the feeling that government is doing a fine job. Externally efficacious people think that government is working adequately. Individuals who are only externally efficacious have been shown not to participate in higher rates (Michelson 2000; Jackson 2009). Latinos
are likely to be more externally efficacious and less internally efficacious than Anglos which leads to lower levels of involvement (Michelson 2000; Jackson 2009).

Hypothesis ten will measure an individual’s political efficacy and the effects it has on participation. I hypothesize that Latinos who participate in politics will show a higher level of internal efficacy than Latinos who do not participate. Those who participate in politics should be more internally efficacious and participate as a result. While, Latino’s level of external efficacy will not be positively related to participation. Latinos who respond to be internally efficacious should be interested in politics, have a sense of obligation, and feel they have a personal effectiveness to be involved.

Hypothesis 11 will consider how citizenship status affects partisanship to a political party. The Democratic Party has been perceived by Latinos to be the party that is more concerned with immigrant interests than the Republican Party (Cain, Kiewiet, and Uhlaner 1991). This may be a leading reason why immigrants favor the Democratic Party.

Issues like immigration, although not shown to be a top concern, can be an important issue for Latinos (Pantoja, Ramirez, and Segura 2001; Branton 2007; de la Garza 2004). Latinos may favor the Democratic Party over the Republican Party because of immigration policy. The Democratic Party is perceived to be more concerned with immigrant friendly policy than the Republican Party. One study confirms that naturalized Latinos are more likely than native-born citizens to affiliate with the Democratic Party (Branton 2007). Naturalized Latino immigrants also tend to associate with the Democratic Party because of other characteristics. They are more likely to be part of the working class, have lower levels of income, and are more concerned with social issues.
These lead immigrants to associate with the Democratic Party due to the view that it is the party that is concerned with these issues.

I will test this assertion in hypothesis 11. I hypothesize that naturalized Latino citizens will respond to be associated with the Democratic Party in higher rates. Naturalized immigrants identify with the Democratic Party because of the perception that they have immigrant interests in mind. Furthermore, those who respond to be Democrats should show positive interest toward immigration policy that favor immigrants.

Variables

The dependent variables that I included in the models are those that measure political participation. The three activities measure respondents that voted in 2004, registered to vote, or have contacted a government official. For explanation on how I coded these variables see Chapter II. In addition to the dependent variables that measure a respondent’s political participation, I also included the dependent variable that measures party identification.

The dependent variable measuring the political party an individual associates with asks the respondent, “Generally speaking to you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, some other party, or what?” This variable was recoded into a dichotomous variable with those who responded to identify with the Republican Party as 0. This accounted for 11.2% of respondents. I then coded those who identify with the Democratic Party as 1. Respondents in this category accounted for 35.7%. The respondents who replied either they were independents, did not care, or did not know were not used. The respondents who identified as independents are 16.6%. Individuals
who replied they did not care accounted for 16.3% and those who either did not know or some other political party were 20.1% of respondents. The three categories measuring partisanship that were not included accounted for 53% of respondents. This is a high amount of Latinos to leave out of the model. However, these respondents cannot be included in a logistic model because they cannot be placed in any sort of order. I could only use those who felt closer to the Democratic Party and Republican Party in order not to break any assumptions that logistic regression has.

The independent variables used were those that measure for an individual’s SES. These include a respondent’s highest level of formal education, family income, and employment status. I also included additional factors that were shown to be important factors in participation. These factors include age, and the respondent’s English level. For a description of how I coded these variables see Chapter II.

The variable measuring an individual’s ideology was included as an independent variable. This variable is created from respondent’s who were asked, “generally speaking, in politics do you consider yourself as conservative, liberal, middle-of-the-road, or don’t you think of yourself in these terms?” Those who responded they were conservative were given a value of 0. These respondents accounted for 22.9% of the entire population. All respondents who replied to be middle-of-the-road were given a value of 1. Middle-of-the-road respondents accounted for 16.9%. I then coded individuals who responded to be liberal as 2, these respondents accounted for 12.7% of the population. Latino who responded, don’t you think of yourself in these terms, and do not know were not included. These two categories had 47.5% of Latinos. This is a high
amount to leave out of the model but these individuals could not be placed in any order for logistic regression analysis so they could not be used.

The independent variables measuring a respondent’s partisanship was created from the question, “do you consider yourself a strong (Democrat, Republican, Independent, some other party, or what) or not a very strong (Democrat, Republican, Independent, some other party, or what)?” I created a dummy variable which assigns a value of 0 for those who are not strong partisans. There are 48% respondents in this category. I then assigned a value of 1 to those who responded that they were strong partisans. There are 52% respondents in this category. This question did not give respondents the option to answer that they did not know, or to refuse to answer.

To measure a person’s internal efficacy two variables were used. The first variable was created from the question that asks, “People have different ideas about the government in the United States. Please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of these statements. “People like me don't have any say in what the government does. Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?” These respondents were given choices of either, strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, and agree, or respond they did not know. I assigned a value of 0 for those individuals who strongly agreed with this statement, these respondents accounted for 29.1% of the entire population. I assigned a value of 1 for those who somewhat agreed to this statement. These respondents were 22.1% of the entire population. I assigned a value of 2 for respondents who somewhat disagreed with this statement which accounted for 18.2% of respondents. I then coded those who strongly disagreed with this
statement as 3. There were 20.6% of respondents in this category. I did not include those individuals who replied they did not know which included 10% of Latinos.

The next independent variable that measures internal efficacy was created from the question, “People have different ideas about the government in the United States. Please tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of these statements. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. Do you agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with this statement?” These respondents were given choices of either, strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, and agree, or respond they did not know. I coded this variable like the earlier variable. Individuals who strongly agreed were assigned 0, 33.7%. Those who somewhat agreed were assigned a 1, and were 26%. Those who somewhat disagreed were assigned a 2 amounting to 14.6%. Those who strongly disagreed are assigned a 3, and had 18% of respondents. Respondents who replied they did not know were excluded.

The last independent variable I created measures a respondent’s external efficacy. This variables was created from the question, “How much of the time do you trust the government to do what is right - just about always, most of the time, some of the time or never?” The respondents were given options to respond, never, some of the time, most of the time, or always. I assigned a value of 0 for those who replied never, this accounted for 18.6% of respondents. I assigned a 1 for those who responded some of the time, accounting for 49.8%. Those who replied most of the time are assigned 2, accounting for 19.3%. The individuals who responded always are a value of 3, with
12.3% of respondents. This question did not allow respondents to reply they did not know or refuse to answer the question.

The independent variable measuring a respondents naturalization status was created from the question, are you a naturalized American citizen? This variable is dichotomous. A value of 1 was assigned to respondents who replied they are naturalized, there are 33.2% of respondents in this category. Individuals who are not naturalized are assigned a value of 0, there are 66.8% in this category.

Methods

Four logistic regression models were created to investigate the hypotheses. For an explanation of logistic regression see Chapter II. I use cross-tabulation analysis to further examine hypothesis 11 and to investigate the results of the regression analysis in Table 12. I created two cross-tabulations in order to measure ethnicity and respondents who naturalized as well as ethnicity and party identification. Cross-tabulation analysis is a table showing the relationship of variables; it compares all combination of categories of one variable with another (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996). Cross-tabulation was used to analyze the relationship between the ethnicity of the respondent and if they became a naturalized citizen or not. I also created a cross-tabulation between ethnicity and party identification to see the relationship ethnicity has with being a Democrat or a Republican.

Findings

Table 9 shows the results for the first hypothesis measuring a person’s partisanship and voting in the 2004 national elections. In this table, individuals who
Table 9

*Logistic Regression for Voted in 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.109*</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.223*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>0.552***</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.542***</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Partisan</td>
<td>0.371*</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say in Government</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government too complicated</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Government</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>765.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>76.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05

responded to be strong partisans were more likely to vote. The results show significance for strong partisanship and voting in the 2004 national elections. These results support hypothesis 9 and show that the stronger a person’s attachment is to a political party the more likely they are to vote.

Hypothesis 10 was not supported in the findings for voting in 2004. When other factors are considered, having more internal efficacy did not show any significance
with voting. This finding illustrates that efficacy is not an important determinant in voting for Latinos when we control for other variables.

Table 10 is the regression results for respondents who are strong partisans and who are registered to vote. In this table there is no significant relationship with being a strong partisan and being registered to vote. Other factors like education, English level, and age have more explanatory power than partisanship in this political activity.

Table 10

*Logistic Regression for Registered to Vote*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.653***</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.471***</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Partisan</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say in Government</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government too complicated</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Government</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log likelihood</td>
<td>572.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>85.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***.001**.01 *.05
Model 10 did not show a significant result for any of the efficacy variables. This model does not support hypothesis 10. Latinos who have more internal efficacy did not participate in registering to vote when other factors are controlled for. The variable for external efficacy did show a negative relationship but this variable was not significant.

Table 11 measures respondents who contacted a government official. This table shows that being a strong partisan was not significant with contacting a government official.

Table 11

*Logistic Regression for Met, Wrote, Called Government Official*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.449***</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>.497***</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Partisan</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say in Government</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government too complicated</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Government</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>846.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>73.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***.001**.01 *.05*
official. When considering other factors partisanship to a political party is not significant to this political activity. Hypothesis 9 is not supported in this political activity.

This model also shows the results for those with internal and external efficacy and if they contacted a government official. This model does not support hypothesis 10 because the internal efficacy variables did not have a significant relationship with this political activity. The internal efficacy variables were actually negative with this contacting an official. External efficacy showed a negative relationship which was hypothesized but this was not a significant result.

In the last regression model, I tested hypothesis 11. The results indicate that naturalized Latinos have a significantly negative relationship with being in the Democratic Party. Naturalized Latinos are less likely to be Democrats when other factors are considered. The results do show that having a pro-immigration policy stance is significant with being a Democrat. Latinos who have favorable views toward immigration policy are likely to be in the Democratic Party.

In order to further analyze these results I created two cross-tabulations. Since the variable for naturalized citizens include all ethnicities I compare ethnicity with naturalization and party identification. The first cross-tabulation result indicates that Cubans are more likely to become naturalized citizens than any other group. These respondents naturalize 71.3% and the closest to them are Puerto Ricans at 62.5%, yet the sample size in this category was only 8 respondents. In the next cross-tabulation I found that Cubans are the most likely to identify with the Republican Party than other groups. The results show that 36% of Cubans respond to being closer to the Republican Party,
this is much more than other groups. These findings show that Cubans may be an outlier in the variable for those who are naturalized citizens.

Discussion

The variable for strong party identification was significant for voting in the 2004 national elections. This variable was not significant in any other political activity. Hypothesis 9 was partially supported in the findings. Partisanship seems to be a factor in encouraging voting behavior but this does not transcend to other political activities like registering to vote or contacting a government official for Latinos. This shows that the stronger attachment one has with a political party the more likely they are to vote despite controlling for other factors.

Efficacy did not show any significance in any political activity for Latinos when other factors were considered. In some activities like registering to vote a negative relationship existed for the variable measuring internal efficacy. This finding was surprising considering that those who are have more internal efficacy should be more likely to participate and feel a greater obligation to be involved. External efficacy also was shown to have negative relationships with all activities. These results indicate that like previous studies have shown, external efficacy does not encourage participation. Overall, efficacy internal or external is not a significant determinant of participation in any activity.

The Logistic regression model for naturalized citizens who identify with the Democratic Party showed that there was a negative significant relationship for those who were naturalized. The results may be because the Latino National Survey (Fraga et al.
2006) includes all ethnicities in the variable that measures those who are naturalized. To analyze this further I created a cross-tabulation of ethnicities and naturalization. I found that Cubans had the highest percentage out of any group to naturalize. They naturalized at 71.3% and the closest to them were Puerto Ricans at 62.5% but their sample size was only 8 people total because Puerto Ricans do not need to naturalize. The lowest percentage ethnicity group to respond to naturalize were Mexicans who also were the largest group, they naturalized at 27.3% while 72.7% did not. Cubans are the most likely of any ethnic group to naturalize.

I also did a cross-tabulation on ethnicities and party identification. The results indicate that Cubans are the highest ethnicity group to respond to be in the Republican Party at 36%. The cross-tabulation results indicate that the findings for naturalized citizens in the Democratic Party may have been skewed by including Cubans that typically associate with the Republican Party. The question which asks about naturalization did not separate naturalized citizens and where they were from. I could not separate Cubans from this variable to analyze if this was the reason for my results.

One other reason that the findings may have been opposite of the hypothesis is the data that was used for measuring party identification. Latinos who consider themselves closer to the Democratic Party were 36% while those in the Republican Party were only 11% accounting for 970 respondents. This means that over 50% of respondents did not consider themselves closer to either party. This is a lot of respondents to not include in the regression model and could be a reason for the results.

An interesting finding in model 12 however, was the relationship of Latinos who held favorable immigration views and their association to the Democratic Party.
Latinos who believe that immigration policy should be favorable to immigrants are likely to be in the Democratic Party. This reveals that Latinos may believe that the Democratic Party is the party that has immigrant interests in mind. Latino immigrants may be more inclined to participate in politics when they perceive policy to be threatening to them. When there is a political environment that immigrants perceive threatening the Democratic Party may benefit.

Conclusion

The regression analysis tables indicate that for Latinos, strong partisanship is a significant factor for voting. Latinos who have a strong association with a political party are more likely to vote even when considering other characteristics. Partisanship did not show a significant result for any other political activity when we control for other variables. Latinos are likely to vote if they feel a strong affiliation with a political party. Current surveys show that over 50% of Latinos are tending to affiliate as Independents (Jones 2012). The survey goes on to state the when pushed harder about their partisanship they side with Democrats. Latinos may be losing their strong identification with either party going into 2012 elections. This lessening of identification with a political party may result in lower turnout for Latinos.

The models created in this chapter also reveal that efficacy is not a significant factor for Latino political participation. Latinos who are more internally efficacious are not more likely to participate when controlling for other characteristics. External efficacy was also not shown to be a significant factor in why Latinos participate. Latinos may be
less internally efficacious than other groups but these results suggest that it is not a significant variable in participation.

Naturalized Latinos were not found to be more likely to associate with the Democratic Party. Actually, the opposite was true. Latinos were significantly less likely to participate if they were naturalized. These results may be spurious however. One reason for this may be that the dependent variable measuring association with a political party had a small sample size. Additionally the independent variable that measured Naturalized Latinos did not allow for a separation of ethnicities. After further analysis, the findings show that Cubans were more likely to naturalize and associate with the Republican Party. Cubans may have been an outlier in the variable and skewed the results.

The results for Table 12 indicate that a better measure for association with the Democratic Party may be favorable views toward immigration policy. Latinos who responded that policy toward immigrants should be a path to citizenship or some sort of workers program were more likely to be close to Democrats. This variable included all ethnicities. This variable may be a better indicator of association with the Democratic Party than citizenship status. This finding is especially interesting because the LNS was created during the time Latinos were protesting proposed immigrant legislation in congress. This may show that Latinos are more aware of political issues than previous studies have shown. It also indicates that Latinos are being polarized into a political party because of this issue. When tension is high concerning this legislation Latinos may find a home in the political party they believe is more sympathetic to immigrants.
Table 12

*Logistic Regression for Democratic Party*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Citizens</td>
<td>-0.543**</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Policy</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>.939***</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Likelihood</td>
<td>778.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NagelKerke R Square</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***.001**.01 *.05
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Important Factors of Participation

Many analysts predict that the Latino vote will play a significant role in the 2012 national elections and change U.S. politics for years to come. It is necessary to look at what characteristics are most important in determining Latino political participation. Using data from the Latino National Survey (Fraga et al. 2006) this chapter will go over the main factors influencing participation in political activities. I will also indicate the contributions this study has made to further our understanding of Latino political participation as well as what this means for the 2012 national elections.

The Latino population has become the largest minority group in the United States in the last decade. This development has ignited many to analyze the role Latinos will have in the 2012 national elections. In this study, I examine several different political activities and the factors that best predict Latino involvement.

Voting is one of the most studied activities in political science. Socio-economic status that includes one’s educational level, income, and employment has been established as highly associated with voting behavior. In this study, I have found that socio-economic status variables are significant in voting for Latinos. Education was the most important of these factors. Every model in this study confirms higher education is significant with voting. Education is a powerful predictor of voting because those who
have a higher level of formal education are more likely to have more skills and resources necessary to participate. Education increases language proficiency as well as filling out papers, meeting deadlines, and becoming civically knowledgeable. These are all skills that encourage someone to vote. Formal education can also provide the sense that people are obligated to vote and there is a civic duty to do so. Voting also includes information costs to the individual that those with higher education may be more likely to process.

The level of one’s family income was shown to be a significant factor in voting, yet this was significant in only one logistic model created. Income can be a main determinant of one’s neighborhood. This can increase the chances that a person votes because they do not move as often and see their neighbors voting, which can increase the chances they do so as well. Also, individuals with more income are less likely to have financial obstacles that can prevent others from participating. These obstacles can include taking off work to vote, being unable to.

The last SES variable that was considered is the employment status of Latinos. This variable did not show any significance it any model created. Latino who respond to be employed are not more likely to vote as a result. The reason employment status was not shown to be significant may have been the way the variable was used. I created a variable that predicted that those who were employed would be more likely to participate. I did not differentiate between what type of employment the individual had and if they were more likely to be active. When considering employment status Latinos who simply stated they were employed at some level did not engage in voting when controlling for other characteristics.
Latino voting behavior was also greatly affected by their age, English acquisition, and where they received their highest level of education. Older Latinos are more likely to participate in voting than younger ones. A person’s age may be important because they are more likely to understand the political process. Older individuals are more likely to know the process of voting than younger ones. They may also be more concerned with issues like crime, education, healthcare, and immigration. Higher concern over these issues can increase the chances of participation. Older Latinos also may have more attachment to a political party. Partisanship is associated with age for Latinos and can lead to higher levels of participation.

The level of one’s English is also an important variable in voting for this group. Those who can speak in English at higher levels are more likely to read, write and comprehend the language. This skill is highly important for Latino involvement. Other studies have confirmed that skills can enhance voting. English acquisition may be the most important of these skills because they can follow political debates, understand salient issues, and can read ballots. These are essential skills in participating in elections that are primarily in English.

A surprising variable that was shown to be significant in this study was where the person received their highest level of education. This variable was significant in voting when controlling for education and English. The finding highlights that receiving an education in the United States leads to voting despite the level of education and English skills. One explanation is that being educated in the United States can have a socializing effect on an individual (Cho 1999). It can increase the feeling of obligation to vote as well as create the feeling of attachment to politics. Those who are educated in the
U.S. are taught that voting is important. They also are taught the political process and about the political parties. These factors can enhance participation.

Participants in community organizations encourage Latinos to vote. Those who are members of these organizations are shown to participate. Community organizations are likely to include other individuals who vote, creating social networks that encourage participation. Social networks can increase the likelihood of voting because it leads to mobilization from within the group. Members may provide information, pressure, and encouragement to vote. These social networks are important for some Latinos who are not knowledgeable of the political process. Community organizations may also provide resources that enhance civic skills. These members are involved in meetings, organized events, and even take part in voting that can build resources shown to make voting easier. These resources may make engaging in voting easier for those who have learned them through their membership.

Latinos who respond to be strong partisans are likely to vote more than ones who do not associate as highly with a political party. The relationship an individual has with a political party increases the chances they will vote even when considering other factors. This shows that a person’s psychological tie to a political party can overcome an individual’s socio-economic status as well as other factors. This was only shown to be significant in voting. Stronger partisans may be more likely to be interested in politics, and be more aware of what is going on, and have more feeling that taking part in voting is important. A person’s political efficacy was not shown to be an important factor in any activity when other variable are being controlled for. This may be because Latinos who are strong partisans are also those that are more efficacious. Controlling for partisanship
as a variable could be the reason why we do not see a significant relationship between
efficacy and voting. Still, the results show that strong partisans are more likely to vote.

Latinos who register to vote have some similar characteristics from Latinos
who vote. Like voting, those who registered to vote have higher levels of education and
income. Education was shown to be the most important SES variable to predict registered
Latinos. Education increases this activity because those who are more educated are likely
to be familiar with the process of filling out forms, and overcoming the hurdles that
registration can have. Overall, higher educated Latinos have the resources and skills to
register at higher rates than those with less education.

Higher income individuals were also more likely to be registered. These
individuals may be more likely to register because they are more likely to own a home
and not have to re-register as frequently as individuals who move often. These Latinos
may also be part of neighborhoods where others vote and register in higher numbers. This
would encourage Latinos to vote because they see their friends and neighbors engaging in
this activity.

A person’s age, English level, and where they received their highest level of
education were also shown to be indicators of registering to vote. Older Latinos are more
likely to be registered voters. Like other groups, Latinos who are 18-25 do not register as
highly as older Latinos. Older Latinos are more likely to own a home and do not have to
re-register to vote as often as younger Latinos. The level of one’s English is important for
registering to vote. This skill was shown to be a significant factor in every model created
for registering to vote. This skill may also measure Latinos who can read and write in
English that make navigating registration forms easier. These individuals should also be
able to inquire information about how and where to register and make the activity easier to accomplish. Latinos who were educated in the U.S. also registered in higher numbers than those educated elsewhere.

Contacting a local government official as a political activity was more likely to be done by Latinos who are more educated and wealthier. In this activity, income was significant in every model. Income had more predictive power than education in this activity. The study did not look at what these individuals are contacting officials for, however, higher income individuals may be concerned with issues like crime, education, and other social issues affecting them. Latinos who have higher income may be contacting officials for the issues that many Latinos report to care deeply about. These concerns often have to do with crime in their neighborhoods, schools, and the economy. These issues have been shown to be top concerns for Latinos. Higher income Latinos may feel that they have more to gain from these issues getting better. Owning a home may increase the concern one has for crime and drugs in their communities. These are issues Latinos are concerned with and more affluent individuals may feel a greater sense of improving these issues.

Older Latinos who speak English well and were educated in the United States are also highly likely to contact officials. Age in this activity like others is a very important determinant of participation. Older Latinos are more likely to contact a government official than younger ones. These Latinos may be more likely to own homes, have a job, and feel part of a community, which increase the chances of contacting officials. These Latinos also vote in higher numbers and may be more knowledgeable of the political process. This can include having contact with an official to express concern
over an issue. The level of one's English is also a very important indicator in this activity. Knowing how to read, write, and speak in English can increase the chances a Latino contacts an official. This may be because Latinos who do not have the English skills also do not feel comfortable contacting an official. The act of contacting an official can be more challenging for someone who cannot speak English. This challenge can be too great of a deterrent and lead to a lack of participation.

Being involved in community organizations and especially in PTA meetings increases the chance a Latino contacts an official. This highlights the importance that membership to these organizations have for Latinos. These members may learn skills while they are involved that can be translated to this activity. These skills can include things like signing petitions, voting, being in meetings, and organizing that can make Latinos more aware of the political system. Members of these organizations may also benefit from social networks that motivate individuals to participate. These social networks can give members support by sharing information on how to contact an official. It can also produce pressure to individuals to be involved. Members of these organizations may see their fellow members doing these activities and feel empowered to do so as well.

When looking at who is asked to contribute or to be involved in political activities income, age, English levels, and being involved in a community group are significant factors. Income, age, and English levels are predictable factors in who is asked to participate in this activity. Latinos who have more money are likely to be asked because they have the means to participate. Less affluent individuals are not as likely to be asked because they would not be capable of contributing. Older Latinos with more
English proficiency are likely to be asked to vote because this is a strong factors showing who participates. It also may be because being asked to contribute is done by an English speaker. This language barrier may be a reason those with higher English levels are asked more often. Members in community organizations are also more likely to be asked to vote or contribute money. This finding is interesting because it implies that elites and those involved with voter mobilization and campaign contributions target these members to get involved. Members for community organizations may be targeted to participate because they are already organized and may show interest to certain policy or legislation. These participants are also likely to vote or contribute because they already do so in the community organizations that they are a part of.

The argument that highly religious individuals have been moving into the Republican Party was not supported in this study. Highly religious church goers have been shown be unsupportive of same-sex marriages and abortion rights. These individuals have found a home with the Republican Party causing a split with secular voters. However, this study did not find support for this argument. Highly religious Latinos have not been associating with the Republican Party in higher numbers. This may be because Latinos show more support for other issues that the Democratic Party is perceived to focus on. Latinos show more support for government responses to issues like crime, education, and to other social services. These issues along with immigration are likely more important to most Latinos than social issues likely same-sex marriage and abortion. There was no significant difference in the partisanship between individuals who went to church more often or who were Protestants with the Republican Party.
Latinos who are employed and are favorable to pro-immigrant legislation are likely to be Democrats. This indicates that ideology was not the only factor for Latinos who associated with the Democratic Party. Latinos who replied that they were employed in some way were likely to be Democrats. Most Latinos have lower paying jobs and are more likely to be in working class positions. This relationship illustrates that Latinos may believe that Democrats have working class interests in mind. This also shows that Latinos are attracted to the Democratic Party because of economic interests they hold. Latinos also are more likely to be Democrats if they favor pro-immigrant legislation. This highlights Latinos attitudes toward immigration policy and their views on the political parties. Immigration policy may be a polarizing issue for Latinos and their views on the issue can determine what political party they choose.

It is also important to consider the time period that this data is used. The Latino National Survey (Fraga et al. 2006) was conducted during the Latino protests of 2006. These protests were in response to anti-immigrant legislation in Congress during this period. HR4437 was passed by Congress with over 90% of Republicans in favor and over 80% of Democrats opposed. Data was collected by LNS during this time. This shows that Latinos in times of political threat may side with a political party that they perceive to be more favorable. Further research is necessary to evaluate if this occurs in times when Latinos do not feel threatened by policy.

This study summarizes the main contributing factors for Latino political participation. Studies have been done to measure Latino political behavior but the last dataset specific to Latinos was the Latino National Political Survey in 1990. It was important to re-evaluate Latinos as political actors in the last decade when there was a
large growth of Latinos. Like previous studies this one affirms that factors like education, age, English levels, partisanship levels, income, and community involvement have a positive effect on participation. The Latino population is younger than other groups so as they get older they can be predicted to show more political engagement in future activities. Community organizations can enhance levels of engagement. Community organizations can be strengthened in order to provide Latinos with important resources to participate. Focusing on community participation can increase Latino political participation in the short term. These organizations are shown to increase voting and contacting government officials to express concern over an issue, which are important skills that Latinos can learn in order to increase their levels of participation. Encouraging participation in these organizations can have significant effects on future political activities.

Some findings in this study have led to contributions to current literature on Latino political behavior. One variable that measured where the individual received their highest level of education was found to be significant in political participation. Latinos educated in the United States were more likely to participate as a result even while controlling for educational levels as well as English skills. This finding provides some evidence that those who are educated in the United States are more likely to participate. This may be due to a socialization effect that school institutions provide. These individuals may feel a stronger obligation to participate and a higher sense of civic duty than those educated elsewhere. Latino students educated in the U.S. may be more socialized in the political process than those educated elsewhere. This shows that for
Latinos, those who have a high level of education attained outside the U.S. may not participate as highly as those educated in the United States.

Members of religious organizations were not shown to participate in higher rates in the findings. This is contrary to earlier studies that showed denomination and attendance can have significant effects for participating. Contrary to those studies, I did not find any significance for Latinos who either went to church in high numbers or differed in denomination. This result shows that Latinos who go to church are not more likely to participate in political activities. One reason for this may be that Latino immigrants are highly likely to participate in church. These individuals do not have the skills and characteristics that lead to more participation. When considering other factors religion was not a significant factor. This does not support the arguments that churches enhance skills of participants or that they provide rich social networks.

Latinos who are employed are shown to associate with Democrats in higher numbers. Employed Latino partisanship with Democrats indicates that Latinos see the Democratic Party more favorable to working class interests. This finding further indicates that Latinos are more politically aware than previous studies have shown. Employment status of Latinos shows that this is an important characteristic of why they lean toward the Democratic Party. This finding is important because many argue that Latinos typically have low knowledge of the political system. This contradicts those arguments by showing that Latinos will side with a political party they see as closer to their interests. The findings also are contrary to claims that Latinos will be closer to Republicans because of their shared opposition to same-sex marriage and anti-abortion views. Employment status shows that this is a more powerful reason they are Democrats.
The social issues mentioned may not be polarizing Latinos like other groups. Instead, Latinos see their employment status as reason to associate as Democrats. One important contribution is that anti-immigrant legislation can have a polarizing effect for Latinos. Some scholars have shown that threatening immigration policy legislation can increase Latinos to vote, but do not show that this can enhance the attachment to a political party (Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). This study confirms that Latinos are aware of political issues and can be polarized into a political party as a result. This finding suggests that when rhetoric and policies are targeted at Latinos unfavorably, they may be more likely to associate with the party that is seen as more friendly to the immigrant issues.

Mobilizing Latinos using immigration issues may pay off for the Democratic Party. Anti-immigrant legislation has not been shown to be a major issue for Latinos when other issues like the economy and health care are mentioned, however, these findings show that this issue can be a factor in associating with Democrats. Mobilization will be especially important for the Democratic Party. Getting Latinos to the polls will play a big part in Democrats success in the 2012 elections. The Democratic Party’s future political strategy should be to focus on immigrant friendly policies to attract Latino voters. Issues like the Dream Act and deportation are ones that Latinos care deeply about and may keep them in the Democratic Party for years to come. This assumes however that the Republican Party maintains their stance as less friendly to immigrant interests. If Republicans change this stance they may attract more Latinos to their party. Currently, Latinos view Republicans as hostile to this cause and are finding a home in the Republican Party as a result.
These findings will have important implications for the 2012 national election. Latinos who are older, more educated, have higher income, speak English, have strong partisanship, and belong to community organizations will be more likely to participate in voting. These individuals will likely be the ones who can have a significant impact on voting in this election. Registering to vote is also an important hurdle for Latinos. Those who are older, more educated, have more income, and speak English will be more likely to register to vote. These Latinos show a higher tendency to overcome procedures of becoming a registered voter.

Democrats may have more incentive to get Latinos to participate. Latinos who are involved in community organizations, and who are employed may be specific targets for Democrats. Those in community organizations are more likely to vote and Latinos who are employed are more likely to be Democrats. Republicans on the other hand will not have the same results with engaging Latinos to participate. Latinos who go to church are not more likely to participate. They are also not more likely to associate with the Republican Party. Furthermore, Republican’s anti-immigrant rhetoric will polarize Latinos into the Democratic Party.

Future studies on Latino political behavior should focus on several things. The role religious organizations have with participation need to be evaluated in future studies. Religious organization in this study does not show a relationship with political behavior. This differs from previous studies which show that religion has been an encouraging factor for participation. Future studies should evaluate if attendance of religion or denomination play any role in Latino politics. This study suggests that other factors are becoming more important in determining involvement in political activities. This should
take into account the growing population of Latinos the time spent in the United States. Latinos may be finding other institutions that encourage participation in place of religious ones. Future studies should be done in order to investigate this further.

Anti-immigrant legislation should also be re-evaluated in future studies. Considerations should be made to include how age interacts with this issue. Younger Latinos may be affected differently by immigration issues. Young Latinos may be polarized as a result of issues like the Dream Act that may affect them or people they know. It is important to analyze if this polarization is occurring with younger generation Latinos. The LNS was conducted during a time when Latinos were protesting anti-immigrant policies. This may have created a unique time to study Latino Political behavior. It is necessary to further analyze the role anti-immigrant legislation has for Latinos. This study has found that it is a polarizing issue for Latinos and causing them to further associate with the Democratic Party. Further studies should focus on anti-immigrant legislation on the local, state and national levels. This can help determine if national issues are polarizing Latinos at the local level as well. This is especially important in swing states.

One note of caution for further studies includes considering ethnicities. How someone identifies themselves may have different outcomes in the way they interact with politics. Latinos are a very diverse population. It can be useful to analyze which issue this group has in common yet it is important to not over generalize the population.

Latinos have been called the sleeping giant because of their size and lack of participation. The Latino protest in 2006 led many scholars and analyst to reconsider Latino political behavior. This event as well as data from the Latino National Survey
(Fraga et al. 2006) shows that Latinos are more politically aware than previous studies have shown. Although Latinos have major factors that show a lack of participation the argument that they are not engaged is becoming less credible. Latinos seem to be on the path to becoming a strong voice in the U.S. political process for years to come.

Dataset

In order to investigate my assertions, I will use variables derived from the 2006 Latino National Survey (LNS) (Fraga et al. 2006). This survey was conducted from November 17, 2005 through August 4, 2006 and contains 8,634 interviews of self-identified Latino or Hispanic respondents residing in the United States. This survey was conducted in order to highlight changes in growth and diversity of the Latino population since 1990. Citizens as well as non-citizens were chosen in States with high Latino populations in order to get a rich understanding of the Latino community. The dataset captures Latinos evolving demographics, political behavior, community, and church involvement, as well efficacy, political knowledge, and other factors relevant to this thesis. The LNS was conducted by some of the leading scholars in the field of Latino Politics: Luis R. Fraga, John A. Garcia, Rodney Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, and Gary M. Segura. The universe of analysis for the LNS was approximately 87.5 percent of the United States population. The margin of error for each state is plus or minus 5 percent and the national margin of error was plus or minus 1.05 percent.
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