3-23-2017

Latino Subgroups Political Participation in American Politics: The Other Latinos' Electoral Behavior

Angelica Maria Leon Velez
University of South Florida, aleonvelez@mail.usf.edu

Latino Subgroups Political Participation in American Politics: The Other Latinos' Electoral Behavior

by

Angelica Maria Leon Velez

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Institute for the Study of Latin American and the Caribbean
with a Concentration in Government and International Affairs
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Bernd Reiter, Ph.D.
Rachel May, Ph.D.
Heide Castaneda, Ph.D.
Steven Tauber, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 21, 2017

Keywords: Latinidad, group identity, voting behavior, Latino politics, Latino Studies

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family, they have been my biggest supporter's. To my mother who migrated to this country more than ten years ago, and worked so hard to pay for my education. You have always been there for me. I can only hope to be able to pay you back. To Brad for always being there, supporting me and my dreams.

ACNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been a great experience. A project I started in my very first semester, and that I am happy to finally see realized. Although it has been transformed in many ways, the essence of this project is the same I had when I first came to this country looking to start a master's degree. I am greatly thankful to those who never gave up on my dream, and always encouraged me to keep going, even when the dream seemed very far away. I would not be here today without my family's support.

I wish also to thank Dr. Rachel May, who welcomed me to the program, and made me feel part of a project in which she strongly believes. Dr. Heide Castaneda, who allowed me to work with her without even knowing me, and helped me immensely in shaping this thesis. I am very thankful for your time, advice, and patience answering all my questions. I would also like to thank Dr. Steven Tauber for joining this project, and taking the time to explain things that were out of my reach and understanding. Last, but not least, Dr. Bernd Reiter, who worked with me since day one. It was in your class where I realized exactly where I wanted to go with this project. You accepted to supervise a project that was "different," and for that I am grateful. Your disposition, understanding, and knowledge have not only inspired me, but helped me through this process.

To all who have contributed somehow and in any form to this project, I will always be grateful.

Angelica.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the impact of Latinidad in Latino political participation, especially in regard to voting behavior. Although Latinos often have been portrayed as a decisive electoral group, the reality is they have not fulfilled the expectations imposed upon them. Therefore, I argue Latinos with different levels of group consciousness will engage differently in politics, which affects the voting statistics of the ethnicity in Censuses, reports and surveys. The use of pan-ethnic terms and the constant stereotypes of Latinos all being "the same," has caused separation rather than cohesiveness within the minority group, which has resulted in low political engagement. I propose that those Latino immigrants and their descendants who do not have a strong attachment to the pan-ethnicity will behave differently than those who identify themselves in pan-ethnic terms.

Consequently, I have come to wonder how Latinidad impacts those who are not part of the main Latino subgroups —Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans— and have been denominated the "other Latinos" when engaging in politics? South Americans, Central Americans, and Caribbean immigrants have been smashed into a group where they do not occupy a significant place. I suggest that differences in country of origin will have an impact on how Latin American immigrants will participate in American politics. To test my hypothesis, I have made a secondary analysis of existent literature. This analysis includes crosstabulations of data obtained from the 2012 National Survey of Latinos, conducted by the Pew Research Center.

Through the analysis of the data and the existent literature, I have concluded that the pan-ethnic terms are not strongly entrenched in Latino's regular use of identity. Respondents mostly said to not have a preference for either term, still their vote intention was high. Differences are noticeable among Latinos/Hispanics that have different ancestries, however, these are sometimes stabilized by citizenship. The data proved that the identity categories used for surveys directed at Latinos/Hispanics are not specific enough, given that a considerable percentage of participants were confused about how to classify themselves, which altered the results. This current study will contribute to the work of Latino studies, that for more than 50 years have tried to get to know those who make up the Latino community, by approaching identity and Latino politics from a different perspective. A perspective where those called Latinos/Hispanics can identify themselves instead of being randomly categorized.

Chapter I
Introduction

From Latin American to Latino

Becoming a Latino is not a process that is initiated by the mere fact of immigration. However, Latin American immigrants and their descendants are racialized and stereotyped under labels that account for their *"otherness."* Either an immigrant identifies or does not with the label he/she was assigned when arriving to the United States, Latino or Hispanic will be their social labels. As an immigrant myself, I went through the racialization process all immigrants experience when arriving to the United States. As a Latin American immigrant, I was assigned an ethnic label, and for any institutional purposes I became a Latina. This label has accompanied me during the years I have been living in the United States, however, I have never felt like a Latina. I came to wonder then, do other Latin American immigrants feel the same? And if they do, how does this impact their life?

The categorization of immigrants from Latin America as Latinos or Hispanics does not come solely from state institutions; media organizations and politicians have also influenced the spreading use of the term. Consequently, other aspects related to Latin American immigrants have been stereotyped and trivialized. The vague use of the pan-ethnic terms has impacted those labeled as such. As bizarre as it sounds to have to explain to somebody that you are not Mexican or Puerto Rican, and that even when you are Latino/Hispanic you do not call your friends "ese" or eat tacos every day, those labeled with pan-ethnic categories have had to explain and clarify their origin.

Not only culture has been trivialized, Latino attitudes towards important issues, state policy, and political perspectives have been generalized as well, which has made the Latino vote an often evoked "thing" that not many know what it means or entails.

Being portrayed as a single community has not created a strong connection between subgroups, or people from different countries. Solidarity and group consciousness are relevant for political mobilization, but what happens when group identity is not strong? Can we still talk about the Latino vote, the Latino wave, the Latino power? Election after election, since Latinos/Hispanics have reached an important percentage among the American population, the power of the Latino community has been invoked, discussed, and called to be decisive. At the same time, election after election, Latinos are still a minority group with a low percentage of electoral participation. Although different elements can impact political engagement, identity has precisely become a problem when studying Latinos through the lenses of identity politics. The broadness of the Latino community entails not only differences framed by country of origin, but of race, social class, ethnicity, culture, and language.

Race is indeed a problematic issue when theorizing about Latino politics. First, because of the different racial backgrounds comprised in the Latino community, and second because of the racial hierarchies established in each Latin American country. As argued by Dávila, despite "the Pollyanna-like views shared by many Latin American nationalist leaders and laypeople alike, race and racism are very much alive in Latin America, strengthened by the very silence that has characterized discussions of race in the area." (Dávila, Latino Spin 2008: 16) The racialization of Latinos as an ethnic group is not only contested because of differences in regard to nationatity, but because of the racial connotation of being a Latino immigrant.

Unlike other minorities, the sense of a shared fate based on race and discrimination does not have the same incidence among Latinos. While a white foreign born Latino/a who migrated from Venezuela and lives in Miami with his/her family might not have an issue with being called Latino/a and might find shared traits with other co-ethnics; a black native born Dominican who lives in New York might not find the term Latino close enough to his life experiences. In the same way, an indigenous woman from Guatemala who left the country after the civil war does not hold the same social, cultural, or political visions as a Chicana who was born in Texas. The intersection of all these variables will result in different political positions that cannot be just grouped under Latino politics.

This research aims to find out to what extent the sense of Latinidad has had an effect among Latinos when participating in politics. However, the very generalization of Latinos in the United States has made this group a semi representative of three dominant subgroups: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. How does Latinidad work amongst those who are not part of the dominant groups, but mostly how has the concept impacted their political engagement. Assuming that a group based consciousness influenced the political mobilizations of Mexican and Puerto Rican immigrants in the 1960s, it is necessary to know what is the situation for those who are newer immigrants and those who arrived to the United States later on time.

Importance of the Study

This research is important because it seeks to analyze the experience of Latinos/Hispanics from a broader perspective. Much of the research, lacks broader categories of self-identification. Indeed, Latino studies have for a long time concentrated on the three major Latino subgroups. Political institutions have tried to portray the Latino community as cohesive, integrated, and multicultural. The reality is that recognition of diversity within the Latino community most of the

time does not go beyond a prime-time telenovela where the actors have different Spanish accents. It is important for Latino studies to see beyond the established categories of identification and consider self-identification.

This study is important because is an attempt to find out how those identified as "other Latinos" participate in politics. It is necessary to give visibility to those who are part of the Latino/Hispanic community and that are not represented by the pan-ethnic labels. The Latino vote has been called "decisive" in American politics, although Latino participation has been disappointing. Researchers and scholars have tried to find out why. Many causes have been proposed, including low rates of naturalization, strong ties to the country of origin, low levels of acculturation, etc. However, as the Latino studies literature points out, there is a gap regarding identity politics that needs to be covered. This thesis seeks to contribute to close the gap with regard to knowledge about those labeled as "other Latinos." Only when Latino studies understands the uniqueness of those who participate in politics, will we be able to talk about the real power of Latino American immigrants and their descendants.

Research Design and Methodology

In this thesis, I argue that the sense of Latinidad is approached differently depending on how the immigrant —or immigrant descendant— identifies himself/herself. This self-identification then impacts the levels of political participation, particularly voting behavior. Latino studies scholars (DeSipio 1996; Beltrán 2010; Oboler1995; Mora 2014) have noticed before how immigrants tend to identify themselves in terms of country of origin, more than in pan-ethnic terms. I suggest that those who identify themselves by their country of origin, will not hold the same political visions as those who have embraced the pan-ethnic terms —Latino or Hispanic—. To test my case, I made a secondary analysis of existing data. I used the 2012 National Survey of

Latinos conducted by the Pew Research center. I used the available data to cross tabulate different variables related to identity, voting behavior, and acculturation.

The report published by the Pew Research Center only offered the results of the three major subgroups and the "other Latinos". Therefore, I considered it important to make a larger analysis of the data, including other subgroups. For this reason, as independent variables, I used the questions related to ancestry and origin, in which the survey respondents identified themselves as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, other Central American, other South American, or other country. As dependent variables, I utilized a series of questions which I grouped under three categories: (1) identity, (2) voting behavior, and (3) acculturation. Then I performed an analysis of the results, comparing the responses of those who identified in the three main categories and those who identified themselves with the other labels. By doing this, I expected to find differences among respondents who were from different countries, as well as between those who identified as Hispanic or Latino with those who did not.

Concepts

Throughout this thesis, I frequently use the terms Latino and Hispanic, and sometimes I use them interchangeably. Both terms have different implications and understandings, yet they have been socially confounded into the same meaning. State institutions use both terms as descriptive of a person who can trace his or her ancestry or origin to a Spanish speaking country. (Falconi and Mazzotti 2007) However, the term Latino has become more accepted and widely used among Latin American immigrants, given that the term Hispanic has been charged with more conservative stances. (Beltrán 2010) The association with Spain, as well as the neo-colonial connotation of the term Hispanic have been causes for this rejection. As Latino studies scholars like Suzanne Oboler have argued, the term Hispanic replaced more progressive ethnic labels like

"Chicano," "Boricua," or "Nuyorican." Despite of such connotations, the term "Hispanic" has been widely utilized and it is still a reference for Latino American immigrants, which is why I considered it necessary to include it in my research along with Latino. For such reason, I have used both terms when I refer to the pan-ethnic label.

Another important concept in this document is *Latinidad*. As clearly defined by Cristina Beltrán, Latinidad is "the sociohistorical process whereby various Latin American national-origin groups are understood as sharing a sense of collective identity and cultural consciousness." (Beltrán 2010: 4) Latinidad is a vital concept in this research because it helps to explain the establishment of the pan-ethnic label and its political implications.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter 2 is an introduction to the concept of Latinidad. In this chapter I explore Latino group identity, and how the pan-ethnic terms were established in the 1960s after Chicano and Puerto Rican groups mobilized for political rights. The history of the first Latino immigrant base groups in the United States helps to explain why the pan-ethnic terms were adopted, but at the same time why they have been contested. The establishment of a pan-ethnicity has created more division than group solidarity among Latinos/Hispanics, which as I suggest is one of the causes for low political engagement. Ironically, even when pan-ethnic labels were established to obtain more visibility and resources, the very perception of homogeneity that pan-ethnic labels implied, eclipsed other subgroups that were more politically active. The vagueness of the pan-ethnic concepts poses a problem for Latino politics itself.

Chapter 3 explores the rise of Latino politics, and the role of group identity in ethnic politics. As a minority group, Latinos/Hispanics are called to follow the steps of the other representative minority in the country, African Americans. However, as the chapter explains, the social, cultural, and political conditions of the two groups are different. The latter explains why Latinos have struggled to find their place in American politics. This chapter exposes the functioning of minority politics and the different elements that are part of it, as well as the different frameworks used to study it. Finally, the chapter addresses the problems of smaller ethnic groups in a pluralist political system.

Chapter 4 contains the data analysis and the methodology that framed this research. In this chapter I made an analysis of the tables I obtained after tabulating the data from the 2012 National Survey of Latinos. Here, I also point out the results and suggestions for possible future research.

Chapter 5 gathers the final conclusions of this research. It explains why other identity categories are needed to do a more complete analysis of Latino political participation. It also addresses the issues with the design of surveys that are directed to Latinos/Hispanics respondents. Finally, I address possible future research framed by self-identification labels, instead of pre-established categories.

Chapter II

Group Identity: The Construction of the Hispanic/Latino Pan-Ethnicity

Introduction

Today Latinos represent the largest and fastest-growing minority population in the United States. According to the Pew Research Center, 41.3 million documented and undocumented immigrants were living in the U.S. in 2013, and by 2015 the United States Census Bureau estimated that Hispanics were the biggest minority in the U.S. with a population of 55.4 million vs. 45.7 million African Americans. (Pew Research Center 2016) The Latino community's influence over American society has been socially, culturally, and politically studied, with Latino political participation attracting the most interest from academics and politicians. The constant mentions about the importance and decisiveness of the Latino vote in the American electoral process, has placed large expectations of what Latinos can and should do, especially as immigration has become an important topic in the current political debate. Perhaps, one of the most discussed topics in academic circles is the role of ethnicity in the electoral process, since Latinos/Hispanics constitute an ethnically and racially diverse community.

Terms like "Latino" or "Hispanic" are no longer unknown or ignored by American society. However, it is hard to tell until what point U.S. society−including Latinos/Hispanics themselves− fully understand the category. Often related to immigration —which is not entirely wrong— Latinidad has been defined as a social, cultural, and political consciousness among the different Latino immigrant subgroups within the United States. Such consciousness can be as cohesive as it

is divisive, and does not imply unity or solidarity. (Mora 2014) This ambiguity is most pronounced in the realm of politics. Latinidad appeals to identity, and in American politics group identity has been determinant to the study of minorities and their political behavior. (McClain and Stewart 2014) In this sense, it is important to ask how accurate it can be to assume that Latinos would behave cohesively because they are labeled a minority group? Further, how can we accurately predict the electoral behavior of such a distinct group formed by immigrants that come from 22 different countries, that do not see themselves represented by an exclusive racial group, and that are culturally diverse. To understand the role of ethnicity and identity in Latino political participation and voting behavior, it is necessary to address the configuration of ethnic categories in the multicultural map that makes up the American population.

The Immigrant Ethnic Configuration: Hispanic/Latino, American, or the Hyphened Origin.

By establishing the population's identity through groups identity, it has been posited that it is possible to determine people's social and political behavior. In the same manner, categorization has been the way to organize the different identity configurations, which can be framed by race, ethnicity, religion, language, or nationality. Ethnicity and race became important concepts in American politics since they help to establish categories that allow the government to approach the population in more concrete−but often simplified−ways. As argued by Rogers Brubaker, "categories permit− indeed entail− massive cognitive, social, and political simplification." (Brubaker 2004: 71) In a country where immigration waves from different parts of the world have been taking place for the last two centuries, it can be institutionally effective to study and assess the population through groups and categories.

However, as Brubaker himself has criticized, there is a tendency for *grouping*, that in the long run can affect the reality we all perceive. He argues that race and ethnicity are ways to perceive the world not things *in* the world. He particularly considers it to be a problematic tendency "to reify such groups, […] as if they were internally homogeneous, externally bounded groups, even unitary collective actors with common purposes." (Brubaker 2004: 8) In the same way, Mary C. Waters points out that ethnicity, contrary to what many believe, is not a biological trait linked to ancestry. Instead she calls it a social phenomenon. (Waters 1996) Understanding ethnicity in such terms is important because ethnic traits should not be assumed as inherent to people who are passively grouped under a particular ethnicity. Just as with race, ethnicity is a social construction. (Portes and Rumbaut 1996; Waters 1996) In other words, what should be understood is that those elements have been socially established as grouping traits to define a population either culturally, socially, or politically. Whether there is an institutional need, or a political interest posed in this process, ethnic configurations do not always represent identities that individuals have chosen for themselves. These classifications often rely on official and institutional organizations.

In the United States case, ethnic configurations were framed by early immigrant waves of Europeans, which as Portes and Rumbaut assert, provided "the fundamental matrix of American-based politics for subsequent generations." (Portes and Rumbaut, Immigrant America 1996: 102) Through the European waves of immigration in the Nineteenth Century the United States received Italian, Irish, Polish, Russian, and German immigrants, which at the same time could be Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant, and who were mainly concentrated in northern states. These immigrants were perhaps the ones to first pose the idea of ethnicity in American politics, since African Americans were categorized as a racial group. European immigrants were the ones to have hyphened identities tied to their countries of origin. As Waters (1990; 1996) has pointed out in her

studies about ethnic groups in the U.S., white ethnicities easily acculturated to American society and by the third generation, most of the immigrant descendants were able to utilize the ethnic identity by choice. On the other hand, with other waves of immigration−especially of Latin Americans and Asians−the process has been different.

Unlike white ethnics' processes of acculturation, non-white groups of immigrants had to go through different processes to obtain social recognition. For white ethnics, it was easier to blend in with a white society, which in institutional terms secured those communities access to certain privileges, but most of all it granted them *no racialization* processes. In other words, they did not have to use their ethnicity to be socially recognized and obtain the state's support, which was not the case for African Americans and other minorities. As pointed out by Portes and Rumbaut (1996), a salient case of ethnic mobilization happened when Mexican American youth activists started to protest the state's discrimination, mirroring the civil rights movement started by African Americans. In the 1960s, consciousness about otherness empowered incipient activists to articulate a discourse where a collective identity based on race, language, and culture could be embraced, in order to become a political force. "Chicano" became then an important form of identity because it encapsulated what Mexican-Americans perceived as representative of their culture and their social ethos as immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Unlike what other ethnic groups did before them, Chicanos adopted an anti-assimilation discourse while developing racial consciousness. (Beltrán 2010) The movement brought changes within the Mexican-American community, which can be seen in the election of Mexican descendants to the House of Representatives, as well as governors and mayors in different states. Yet, despite the pan-ethnic discourse that some scholars wish to attribute to the Chicano movement, the reality is that while it did gain terrain in the political

realm, it was mostly for Mexican descendants. Despite being the largest immigrant group, Mexicans do not represent the whole Hispanic/Latino community.

The Chicano movement, as well as the incipient Puerto Rican mobilizations uncovered the state's need to categorize and define the growing number of people of Latin American descent. Even when Mexicans were the largest portion, there were also Puerto Rican and Cuban communities growing in the northeast and southeast. According to Rumbaut, "in the 1950s, the Census Bureau first published information on persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage; tabulations of people of Cuban birth or parentage were first published in 1970. Efforts to demarcate and enumerate the Hispanic population as a whole, using subjective indicators of Spanish origin or descent, date back to the late 1960s." (Rumbaut 2006: 20) But it was not until the 1970s that the U.S. Congress finally established the pan-ethnic term, "Hispanic", as part of their statistical publications. Through the Public Law 94-311 Congress mandated the collection and dissemination of "economic and social statistics" of Spanish origin or descent.

Race or Ethnicity?

After the mentioned governmental disposition, the Hispanic category has changed mostly with regards to how the Hispanic question was implemented in Census Bureau questionnaires. Hispanics have posed a challenge to American statistical institutions because it was clear since the beginning that the Hispanic category could not be described as a racial category; therefore, it was necessary to establish it as an ethnicity. Yet, given the broad racial configuration of Hispanics, not allowing those who self-identified in racial terms to do so in the Census posed a problem, which it was noticeable in census responses. Before the U.S. Census Bureau established "some other race" as a category, most Latinos identified themselves as white. This was interpreted at the time as a sign of social mainstreaming, but the reality is that a large percentage of Latin Americans see

themselves as white. When having to choose between being Latino or being white, many Hispanic immigrants valued more their racial identity than the ethnic one. While the former has been internalized, the second one has been imposed. This is inherently related to the social and racial hierarchies, as well as the sense of privilege they are carrying over from their countries of origin.

Unlike the biological criteria that the United States established as crucial for the definition of racial categories, Latino categorization of race does not solely respond to such conceptions. Clara E. Rodriguez argues, "Latinos' views of race are dependent on a complex array of factors, one of which is the racial formation process in their country of origin. Other variables also influence their views of race, for example, generational differences, phenotype, class, age, and education." (C. E. Rodriguez 2000: 7) It is not rare that Hispanics/Latinos when responding to the Census Bureau Censuses question about race provide answers such as *mestizo, mulatto, indígena,* or Indian (which does not refer to Indians in Latin America, but American Indians). The mutually exclusive categorization of race in the U.S. does not give space for Latino constructions of race that are usually more fluid. The latter does not mean that Latinos do not understand the connotation of the existent race categories, but it does mean that those terms are not descriptive of the Latinos self-identity.

As immigrants, Latinos go through processes of racialization at the time of their arrival, where they are assigned a racial category. In most cases this given identity does not match with the vision they carry of themselves. As the 2010 Census Bureau shows, "51% of Latinos say their race is either "some other race" (26%) or volunteer that their race is "Hispanic or Latino" (25%). Meanwhile, one-third (36%) say their race is white and the remainder, 10%, identify their race as black, Asian or mixed race." (Pew Research Center 2012: 15) These numbers are interesting given that the 2010 Census Bureau offered 15 different boxes to check to answer the question "what is

this person's race?" None of these boxes included classifications where Latin American immigrants could fit. That is why most of the respondents ended up answering either "some other race" or "Hispanic or Latino," which was not a valid category for the race question, as the Census Bureau explained.

Similarly, the ethnic question, also posed many issues for the Census given that the label "Hispanic" was new for those ethnic groups knitted together under the category, and the 1990 Census results demonstrated a high level of confusion among Hispanics. As Marrow points out, in the 1990 Census "significant proportions of some official Hispanic immigrant groups identified themselves as "not Hispanic," including Venezuelans and immigrant groups from the Southern cone (Paraguayans, Argentines, Uruguayans, and Chileans)." (Marrow 2007: 45) The reason for this confusion is tied to the fact that some of these sub-groups of immigrants come from countries with large European, Asian, and Middle East immigration, and subsequently with complex racial relations. Thus, immigrants of these countries do not see themselves represented by a "Hispanic" or "Latino" category either, mostly because they have classified themselves in racial terms, not in ethnic ones. This represents a conflict to those who have been mainly classified as "white" or "European" back home. In fact, many indigenous immigrants who do not speak Spanish are also categorized as Latinos or Hispanics, despite of their Quechua, Mayan, or Aymara heritage. (Falconi and Mazzotti 2007)

It is then necessary to acknowledge the differences between racial and ethnic classifications. As argued by Zulema Valdez, "ethnic identity is distinct from racial identity in the United States; each produces and reproduces different aspects of the social structure." (Valdez 2011: 470) Even when both are socially established categories, ethnicity has been socially and politically assigned as a way to recognize and organize groups of immigrants. On the other hand,

race has deeply defined the United states sociopolitical foundations. Using Anthony Marx's words, "not only did states reinforce race to unify the nation, but race also made nation-states. The political production of race and of particular forms of nation-state were linked processes." (Marx 1998: 268) In this sense, the United states used racialization as the way to establish what America was ought to be, framed by white Anglo Saxon terms. However, as the United states established its *imagined community*[1] parameters, other nations did as well. The result was a wide variety of national regimes, as well of racial classifications.

Latin America is interesting because contrary to the racial binary established by the United States, Latin American nations were not solely framed by binary racial hierarchies. As Oboler argues, "the underlying religious, racial, and social bases of colonial Latin America's history of miscegenation and consequent racial continuum were in sharp contrast to the black/white division of the United States" (Oboler 1995: 27). The intersection of race, class, and ethnicity has not been the same in Latin America as it has been in the United States. Likewise, these processes have been different throughout Latin America, and each country has used race, gender, class, status, origin and ethnicity in different ways, not only giving it different meaning but positioning them differently in social scales. To say that in Latin America class supersedes race and ethnicity can be narrow and misleading. What is certain is that the United States and Latin America have had different racial experiences, which has influenced the way in which Latin American immigrants and Latino descendants have constructed their identities. In this sense, it cannot be expected that a white Cuban immigrant experiences race in the same way as a black Dominican. Not only because of their skin color, but also because of the differentiated racial hierarchies in their origin countries.

[1] As defined by Benedict Anderson (1983), a nation it is "an imagined political community." As he argues, nations are imagined, modelled, adapted and transformed. Further, Anderson argues that is within national boundaries that racism manifest itself, justifying repression and domination. (Anderson 2006)

For instance, Dominicans have a large racial spectrum. A large number of shades can fit into a "white" classification. As put by Oboler:

> "Latin American immigrants in the United States, like people everywhere, are a very complex group whose class and race values, differentiated gender experiences, national differences, and political convictions and beliefs may interfere again and again with the construction of group solidarity among themselves […] people of Latin American descent also bring with them their socialization within Latin American hierarchical societies." (Oboler 1995: 162)

Carrying all this baggage, Latino immigrants encounter a new nomenclature, where they are no longer white, "light brown", "bronzed", "almost white", *"morenito"*, *"mestizo"*, nor "indigenous." It is not unexpected that racial and ethnic classifications in the United States result arbitrary to those Latin Americans who must use them, even more when back in their countries of origin they might have identify themselves with other ethnic categories such as Middle-eastern, Asian, or Jew.

Although each country has a different racial regime, and except for indigenous communities who have always seen themselves excluded from society, it is quite shocking for some Latin American immigrants to be excluded from mainstream white society. In her own research about Peruvians in the United States, Karsten Paerregaard concluded that,

> "many Peruvians, particularly upper and middle-class migrants, are reluctant to comply with the expectations of the receiving society by assuming the status of a minority group. They find the category Hispanic problematic because it brackets them together with the predominant minority groups in the United States, homogenizes national and cultural

> diversities, and classifies them as marginalized and stigmatized Latin American immigrants." (Paerregaard 2005: 81)

The underlying problem here is not that Latinos/Hispanics are being classified as Latino or Hispanic, it's that these labels have been racialized. Being Latino or Hispanics becomes a social problem for those who do not see themselves as a minority, who do not see themselves as "brown," and to who this classification contrast with the position they occupied in the racial hierarchies back home. Acculturation has been equated with whiteness, which leads to wonder if being American is being white? Are those of Hispanic/Latino descent condemned to be outsiders forever? Such complexities cannot and should not be obviated. It is neither accurate to dismiss Latinos racial constructions, nor it is not precise to put them all under the same "ethnic label."

It is important then to recognize that "Hispanic" or "Latino" are labels that most of the time, are imposed by the state, government institutions, the media, ethnic group leaders, and even the recipient society. As Portes and Rumbaut argue, states can create ethnic minorities by acting towards groups as they were internally bounded and externally different to mainstream society. (Portes and Rumbaut, Immigrant America 1996) "Latino" and "Hispanic" respond to official classifications that might or not appeal to peoples' identity, but that are the result of the negotiation between the state's necessity to categorize people of different descent, and the mobilization processes for political and social recognition of minorities. As Brubaker points out,

> "Ethnic categories […] not only structure perception and interpretation in the ebb and flow of everyday interaction but channel conduct through official classifications and organizational routines. Thus, ethnic categories may be used to allocate rights, regulate actions, distribute benefits and burdens, construct category-specific tributes, "cultivate" populations, or, at the extreme, "eradicate" unwanted "elements."" (Brubaker 2004: 26)

As a result, Latin American immigrants have gone through a complex process of self-identity classification, which has determined the socio-political configuration of the Hispanic/Latino community. In this sense, the cultural complexities within the pan-ethnic group, the different contexts of reception, the different times of migration, and the unequal proportions of some subgroups have impacted the lack of cohesion between sub-groups. Similarly, the external conceptions and stereotyping of Hispanics/Latinos as being all "the same," has caused internal disagreements that have ended up pushing Hispanics further away from the pan-ethnic label.

To understand the conflicts between the different subgroups within the Hispanic/Latino category, it is necessary to understand its composition, how is it structured, and the history that shaped the ethnic label as we understand it nowadays, in the pan-ethnic sense. The process requires the confluence of different elements: the social struggles of minority groups, the need of political representation, the institutional needs for categorization, and the constant growth of the immigrant population plot for the establishment of a new census category.

Hispanics/Latinos Composition: Who Are They? And Where Do They Come From?

The main subgroups defining Latino ethnicity are Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. On the other hand, South Americans, Central Americans, and Dominicans make up a large percentage of the group. The former group has been largely studied and their importance has been explicitly stated. However, it is important to recall that the other three subgroups have been growing more rapidly. For example, nationwide, the number of Dominicans does not compare to Mexicans, but the number of Dominican immigrants' living in New York City is high, which has granted them an important role in the city. According to a Pew Research Center report in 2015, "about eight-in-ten Dominicans (79%) live in the Northeast, and nearly half (47%) live in New York." (López and Patten 2015: 27) To understand the origins of the term Latinidad, and the

Latino/Hispanic label, it is necessary to assess the history of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban communities and their process of ethnic recognition, since it was partly through their political activism that recognition of Latinos/Hispanics as a demographic category was established. (Mora 2014; Beltrán 2010)

By the 1960s, there were three major minority subgroups in the United States that shared certain commonalities, and that were often referred as "*Spanish speakers"*. Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, and Puerto Ricans "made up the overwhelming majority of the Latin American diaspora, but they lived in separate parts of the country" (Mora 2014: 2) which made their political influence less certain. African Americans' fight for civil rights was not ignored by these groups that also saw themselves as politically, culturally, economically and socially isolated from mainstream American society. In this context, Chicano based civil rights organizations started to protest a government that did not recognized their rights as workers. As worded by Beltrán, in a beginning Latinidad came to represent "an effort to expose group-based inequality, providing people with shared history of racial struggle and a powerful sense of linked fate that has emerged as the basis for collective politics." (Beltrán 2010: 7) In the same way, Puerto Rican groups started to focus on political based activism. However, it was not until the 1970s that U.S. government took more seriously the activism of *"Spanish speakers."* During this time, activists saw the necessity for a bigger structure, that compelled both Mexican Americans or Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans.

The National Council of La Raza (NCLR) was not the first organization that thought of a pan-ethnic vision, but it "was the first organization to embody the notion of pan-ethnicity and actively court Puerto Rican, Mexican American, and Cuban American constituents at a national level." (Mora 2014: 51) The NCLR grew and went national, which is criticized by scholars like

Mora. She argues that going national took possible funds to invest into local communities, and it opened the door for lobbying agencies to divert attention to other issues. Indeed, the NCLR achieved one of its main goals, which was to be pan-ethnically recognized by the Census Bureau, and after the 1970 Census, being organized under the Hispanic pan-ethnic label paid off, because through minority group recognition, activist and civil rights organizations were able to apply for governmental grants and publish their own reports in regards the Hispanic community. As Beltrán puts it, "by defining themselves in terms of Latinidad, Latino political elites and their advocates believe they are better able to both secure federal resources and gain national exposure." (Beltrán 2010: 7)

It is important then to distinguish the different actors involved in the process of establishing the ethnic label. Although the government and its institutions, represented by the Census Bureau, were greatly involved, Hispanic-based organizations, activists, and bureaucrats were also implicated; in fact, they were propellers of this adoption. In this sense, even though homogenizing tendencies were clearly embedded by the Latinization of Spanish speaking immigrants, this choice was neither random nor unplanned. On the contrary, it was politically embraced. Even though those groups were struggling for recognition by the U.S. government, it was unfortunate that this recognition was only granted through a broader group identity definition. It seems like important particularities had to be, and are still being, sacrificed for a "greater" political good. Interestingly, Cuban Americans were not charmed by these grass roots movements, which made the establishment of a pan-ethnic organization a difficult task to achieve. They serve as a good example of what pan-ethnic became: an idea of inclusiveness that turned into a constant disagreement.

With a category label established, it was then necessary appeal to people in order to convince them to make use of that label. At the time —and still— Hispanic descendants did not

see themselves as Hispanics/Latinos. They kept either using the subgroup —Chicano, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban American— label, or the country of origin to describe themselves and their group identity. As Mora describes, "the charge that pan-ethnicity was an artificial construct was difficult to deflect, if only because there were no surveys that asked subgroups whether they felt pan-ethnic and no studies that examined which identity subgroups preferred." (Mora 2014: 77) However, the ethnic questions did not only pose issues with regard to cultural heterogeneity or country of origin variations, it also resulted in problems with racial identification. Again, the Hispanic label does not say anything about the individual's racial identification, and the definition of Hispanic/Latino as an ethnicity prevented many from defining themselves racially given that the Census Bureau did not allow —until the 2010 Census— double [racial/ethnic] identification.

It is also important to discuss the conflict caused by the term chosen by the Census Bureau as the category to classify Latin Americans immigrants. The term Hispanic "was tied to the notion of Hispano, a term used by the purported descendants of Spanish families in the Southwest to distance themselves from Native Americans and other groups […] having a Hispanic identity became a way for established families of Spanish and even Mexican descent to distance themselves from poor, undocumented, first generation Mexican immigrants." (Mora 2014: 107) However, the term was added by the Census Bureau in the 1970 Census. Recently, the term Latino has acquired strength, and it is largely used by media, politicians, activists, and bureaucrats. Yet, the shift of terminology has not affected or change the meaning and implications of the pan-ethnicity. Although, according to the Pew Research Center "51% say they have no preference for either term [Hispanic or Latino]. A third (33%) say they prefer the term "Hispanic" and fewer than half as many (14%) say they prefer the term "Latino."" (Pew Research Center 2012: 14) Above all, both

terms are used, and despite their different implications, they both have been assumed and institutionalized.

It is then clear why grassroots organizations, activists, and incipient Hispanic politicians advocated for the establishment of a pan-ethnicity. Social recognition and political participation, a Hispanic agenda, and government investment were the main reasons. The government needed to collect better and more accurate data about this growing group of immigrants. After this long process, it is fair to ask if such classification has worked out for the good of the Hispanic population, or if it has diminished opportunities for certain subgroups. More importantly, it is necessary to analyze how the pan-ethnic label influences "newer" Latino subgroups such as South Americans, other Central Americans, and Dominicans. Equally important is to assess other groups like Brazilians or Haitians, which are commonly grouped into Pan-ethnic labels. However, their geographical origin is not an indicator of similarity with other Latin American countries. Both countries speak languages other than Spanish, which sets them apart from the "Spanish speaking" Latino groups.

How strong is the attachment to the pan-ethnicity for all these groups and subgroups? How does the pan-ethnicity affect their political engagement? How does it work for smaller subgroups that formed years after the term was officially established? Do they see themselves represented and recognized within the pan-ethnic category? As Beltrán explains, "activists' critique of racism and political and economic inequality represents one of the most important and successful aspects of the movement's legacy […] but while both movements put forward a powerful critique of the problems facing Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, they proved less effective political strategy." (Beltrán 2010: 33) At least one that would embrace heterogeneity, not only as a cultural element but as a political tool.

The Pan-ethnicity Issue: Inclusive or Divisive?

Portes and Rumbaut argue that the ethnic identification process starts with "the application of a label to oneself in a cognitive process of self-categorization, involving not only a claim to membership in a group or category but also a contrast of one's group or category with other groups or categories." (Portes and Rumbaut, Legacies 2001: 151) In this sense, and as it has been formerly assessed, identity is framed by one's perception, as well as for the others' perceptions, then comes the categorization process. Such a process can take two routes: the individual categorization coincides with the established categories, or it does not. Although this process seemed to work with European white ethnicities, the situation clearly changed with the waves of migration from Latin America and Asia. If we consider the idea that part of the process of finding out how to identify ethnically is to answer the question of where do I come from? For those of Hispanic/Latino ancestry the answers will be numerous and different. The answer will also be different from European white immigrants. Hispanics/Latinos and Asians, have been labeled under pan-ethnic and racial categories instead of country of origin.

Even when governmental systems and institutions insist on constructing ethnic labels framed in cultural traits, Latin American immigrants and their descendants have different perspectives on their ethnic identity. It is evident that Hispanics/Latinos are aware of the label that has been imposed upon them, although it does not mean that they embrace it or use it in their regular daily routine, nor does it mean they reject it; more likely they use it whenever best suited or necessary. However, it is not uncommon to hear Latinos complain about improper or inaccurate characterizations of their identity. As argued by Flores-González, Aranda, and Vaquera, Latinos go through "processes of racialization that forces [them] to negotiate racial boundaries—or to "do race"—in a society that devalues their identities and imposes racial identities that they may not

embrace." (Flores-González, Aranda and Vaquera 2014: 1848) Further, they are regularly assigned the wrong country of origin, and have their country's culture trivialized. More explicitly, Latinos are often all included within the Mexican nationality, or it is implied that they all "eat tortillas" and "like mariachis". But the trivialization of cultural traits and homogenization of the Latinos/Hispanics does not solely come from inattentive white American citizens; contrarily, it is also a deeper issue rooted in political interests of Latino/Hispanic activists, politicians, and media entrepreneurs. (Mora 2014; Beltrán 2010) As mentioned before, the categorization of Hispanics/Latinos should be also understood as a label that only applies to Latin American immigrants and/or descendants of these within the United States context. In other words, Latino or Hispanic are not concepts that have a meaning outside the U.S. context; in other continents, Latin Americans might be just called Latin Americans, South or Central Americans, and would probably be individualized by country of origin.

The understanding of identity should go beyond the categorization of ethnicities and racial groups; however, as Herbert J. Gans pointed out, "ultimately, ethnic and racial identities exist in America because Americans label, stereotype, and rank each other in part by behavior patterns, values, and attitudes that they associate with skin color, visible facial and other physical features, and ancestral country or region of origin." (Gans 2007: 98) It seems then inexorable to try to escape the stereotyping upon people that look different to the mainstream population, either by their phenotypical characteristics or because of how they act, the place they come from, their name, or the language they speak. Arlene Dávila makes an interesting argument about the pervasiveness of dominant stereotypes upon the Latino/Hispanic category, as she reflects on the pressing urgency of media, economic, and political elite organizations to maximize an image that portrays Latinos/Hispanics as potential consumers-citizens. In this sense, Latinos are not only stereotyped

as the "other," they are expected to respond to a category not consciously adopted, but generated for them and imposed upon them. In Dávila's words "as an imposed category, Hispanic/Latina is subject to constant negotiation with regard to the multiple identifications of Hispanics as also Mexican, Colombian, or "Nuyorican."" (Dávila 2001: 90-91) The complexity of group identity for Hispanics/Latinos is then framed by the diverse characteristics of Latin Americans, who despite sharing cultural traits such as language, cannot homogeneously be described by a category. The broadness of the concept becomes then more divisive than cohesive, threatening the project of Latinidad.

Scholars have used pan-ethnicity to describe "when different ethnic or tribal groups cooperate, organize, and build institutions and identities across ethnic boundaries." (Okamoto and Mora 2014: 220) These are processes that, as they explain, "have taken place among immigrant groups who have entered host societies with regional, national origin, and language differences and, over time, have come together and developed pan-ethnic identities." (Okamoto and Mora 2014: 220) This is the case for Hispanics and Asians in the United States, who under the pan-ethnic term comprise different ethnic sub-groups. As posed by Okamoto and Mora (2014), diversity is an inherent characteristic of pan-ethnic grouping; further, they argue, it needs to be promoted. The problem is that such promotion is not complete, and still seems to be framed around the notion of Hispanics being mostly Mexican or Caribbean descendants. Culturally, such promotion might have more outlets; but politically, the Hispanic/Latino category is still monolithic, and largely represented by the three major subgroups.

As explained by Beltrán, "the process of Latinidad is both complex and contradictory, involving issues of immigration, colonialism, conquest, race, color, gender, sexuality, class, and language […] Understood as a political category, Latinidad presumes that Latinos as a group share

a common collective consciousness." (Beltrán 2010: 5) It is certainly complex and somehow dangerous to assume this if you consider the vast differences among its members; in this sense, you cannot expect a unified outcome when exposed to political decisions. *Latinidad* or *Hispanidad* says nothing about citizenship status, country of origin, economic class, or level of education. Therefore, the Hispanic/Latino category does not only entail a possible problem of cultural identity but also of political representation, which is ironic given that the category was essentially created as part of a process of socio-political recognition. In other words, there is always a chance of disconnection between those who are part of the political elite and the rest of the Latino community which they represent. In his research, Louis DeSipio has noticed that particularly in the last decades, political elites−except for Cuban elites−have adopted the pan-ethnic label as a political voice, instead of using their national-origin identities. On the other hand, he noticed at a mass level, Hispanics still identify themselves with their country of origin; although these perceptions can vary across generations. (DeSipio, Latino Civic and Political Participation 2006)

The latter is visible in a city like Miami where Latino political representation is evidently taken by a sub-group of a certain origin. As described by Aranda, Hughes, and Sabogal, despite its cultural diversity, "Miami is politically stratified as the result of unequal contexts of immigrant arrival. [Therefore] left without a voice, vote, or representation from someone of their community, many of Miami's newer immigrant residents perceive formal political exclusion as a long-term condition." (Aranda, Hughes and Sabogal 2014: 162) It is clear, by Miami's example which it is comparable to other metropolis situation, that some subgroups of immigrants have not been able to achieve complete incorporation to the political realm, and have to adjust their agendas to the political agendas of other "dominant" subgroups, such as Cubans in south Florida. Yet, scholars like DeSipio argue that the changes experienced in Latino composition and the efforts made by

political elites to promote unity have allowed the creation of what he calls a *"modestly cohesive Latino issue agenda;"* however, this modest foundation, he also acknowledges, is not a guarantee for a strong political or civic participation, and it is also not determinant for partisan identification. (DeSipio, Latino Civic and Political Participation 2006) It seems then, that Latinidad as a political force is still incipient and framed by other characteristics like demographic composition and the area of residence.

Using pan-ethnic or "umbrella" labels, either as a marketing or a political strategy, only encourages stereotypes based in the assumption that sharing a language, a colonial past, and a religion, which it is not entirely true and has become now a regular stereotype, are enough elements to talk about a homogeneous minority group.(Gimenez 2006; Dávila 2001; Beltrán 2010) Not only is the term Latino/Hispanic a misrepresentation of those who get labeled by it, but the term itself encloses a certain ambiguity since the term has received many different definitions, and different characteristics have been attributed to it. On one side, many scholars agree on a common ground that refers to a shared language, shared culture, and Hispanic ancestors. Others just talk about a shared set of values represented by culture, religion, and family values. On the other side, as defined by the Census Bureau ""Hispanic or Latino" refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race." (United States Census Bureau 2011: 2) The Census Bureau definition is clear, but not broad enough since it only attains the concept to a geographical characteristic. The conceptualization of Latinidad is very important, and I will be assessing it later, however, it is vital here to understand the conflict surrounding the very concept itself.

The terms Latino/Hispanic have ended up being indistinctively and interchangeably used, which also proves the ambiguity of the pan-ethnic labels. As Mora argues, "over time, the

ambiguous category becomes more popular as more actors enter the field and use the new classification to achieve their organizational goals […] By then, the category is completely institutionalized, and the new classification is, like other classifications, assumed to have existed." (Mora 2014: 159) In this sense, government officials, the media, and politics activist have helped to institutionalize the meaning of an ambiguous concept that seeks to define what this heap [citizens, non-citizens, foreign born, native born, first, second, or third generation, black, white, indigenous or mixed, etc.] of Latin American immigrants implies in American society. What results more interesting is the political appointment that Latinos/Hispanics have been given: "The sleeping giant." (Montoya 1999) This term is as ambiguous as the pan-ethnic one, and does not help to represent Latinidad in other concepts beyond stereotypes. Still, interests have been posed in the importance of "waking up" the giant.

Terms like Latino, Hispanic, or Latinidad reference those elements that allow the government, the media, and politicians to group Latin American immigrants or their descendants into the same category, but at the same time imply the ambiguities within the different subgroups inhabiting the Hispanic/Latino "melting pot." Thus, despite of the institutional categorizations, the concept of identity goes beyond imposed categories. As Gans points out, "*identity* is one half of a twin concept, the other half being *identification*. People not only identify themselves but are identified by others […] As a result, racial and ethnic affiliations have to be looked at with both concepts." (Gans 2007: 99) As much as the pan-ethnic terms that have been established and are utilized by government institutions, Latino political elites and the media, in both Spanish and English, it does not mean that such terms have been assimilated or accepted by the Hispanic population. What happens then when "the giant" does not wake up? How can be explained that Latinos like to watch telenovelas from Univision or Telemundo, but still follow the news from

their countries of origin? How can the politicians and political parties translate the certain cohesive cultural elements of the ethnic community into politics? It is arguable to think that the mere fact of speaking the same language would in fact shape political participation. It is important then to make an analysis of Latino group identity in order to understand the variations of this group perceptions of identity in comparison to the theories of group identity developed in the United States which have defined in the most part the political analysis of ethnic and racial groups political participation.

Latinidad: Hispanic/Latino Group Consciousness

Latinidad has served to *"essentialize"* what Latinos/Hispanics are. At the same time, Latinidad encompasses the shared characteristics of Latino/Hispanic immigrants, who trace their roots to Spanish-speaking countries. As defined by Idler, "a Hispanic in American society is someone who has a particular cultural or national origin […] a Hispanic or Latino is a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race." (Idler 2007: 125) In this sense, a shared language, a colonial past, religion, and the fact of being conquest by Spain have been the characteristics established as common and descriptive of Latinos/Hispanics. Beyond the establishment of the Hispanic/Latino category by governmental institutions, the pan-ethnicity has transformed the identity imaginary of those who claim national identity from countries of Latin America. In other words, it is necessary to acknowledge that by claiming the pan-ethnic label, Latinos/Hispanics are accepting that they not only fulfill the characteristics of Latinidad, but also that they agree with them. It is not strange that the majority of adult Hispanics prefer to identify themselves with their countries of origin, instead of using the pan-ethnic term. (Pew Research Center 2012) However, second and third generation

Latino, who have not gone through an immigration process, might have a different perspective. After processes of acculturation the self-identity term preference can vary.

As it has been mentioned before, the term Latinidad has found in electoral politics its best ally. In part, the pan-ethnic label was finally established because of the necessity of providing a more accurate sample at the time of analyzing voting behavior reports. Statistical portraits were an important reason for the development of the pan-ethnicity. (Mora 2014) However, as argued by scholars such as Mora (2014) and Beltrán (2010), the legitimization of the pan-ethnic category was not only imposed by the government, pan-ethnic advocates were highly involved in the process:

> For advocates of pan-ethnicity, the assumption is that Latinos in the United States share not only cultural and linguistic characteristics but also a political perspective […] This confliction of cultural and linguistic characteristics with a shared political perspective is not simply a phenomenon of the mass media. In academic and political forums, sympathetic to the concept of Latinidad, Latinos have long been characterized as a political community identifiable by a shared sense of mutual obligation, unity, and a commitment to the common good of the group. (Beltrán 2010: 106)

Nowhere has been the concept of Latinidad more used than in politics, and it is precisely in this sphere where misconceptions and stereotypes of Latinos/Hispanics are affecting the most their political involvement. Based on group identity politics theories, it is expected that Latinos behave alike, consequently it is also expected that Latinos will vote similarly.

Such expectation is founded in the claim that pan-ethnic identification allows proper political socialization. Thus, "enhanced political power is conflated with enhanced group identification. In this view, Latinos represent a potential electorate whose developing group

identity holds the potential for increasingly cohesive political action." (Beltrán 2010: 123-124) Contrarily, pan-ethnic identification does not seem to tell a lot about partisan identification or voting choices. This interpretative paradigm comes from an analysis of African Americans civil rights movements, but as stated before, African Americans case cannot be equated to the Latino/Hispanic process in the U.S. politics. This is not only because of the different reasons for each group to be in the United States, but also because of the cultural broadness of the latter. What is important to recognize is that Latinidad tries to work a dual paradigm. On one side, Latinidad evokes a homogeneous framework, but on the other side, recognizes the heterogeneity of those who get to be called Hispanic/Latino. The reality is that Latinidad has not been strictly defined, not because there are not enough definitions of the term, but because the concept is vague and ambiguous. When is it proper or necessary to be homogeneous, and when is it acceptable to be heterogeneous? Who dictates such switches between paradigms, and to what point is the pan-ethnic label just contributing to cultural stereotypes of Latin American descendants?

Cristina Beltrán describes the concept of Latinidad from an interesting approach, she argues that this concept is "itself fugitive, with roots in the transgressive histories of excluded subjects who come to understand themselves as political actors." (Beltrán 2010: 73) Further, she uses Wolin's concept of *"evanescent homogeneity"* to explain how Latinidad is an "experience of commonality whose existence is forever possible yet never guaranteed." (Beltrán 2010: 74) This conceptualization of Latinidad accurately describes what happens within the Latino/Hispanic community, where there is a sense of commonalities and shared experiences among people, which do not seem to be enough to guarantee a bloc voting or electoral behavior. In other words, the fact that Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans speak the same language or profess the same religious beliefs does not guarantee that they will have the same political agenda, nor will they

vote for the same political party. There are several conditions that can influence the attitudes of Latinos/Hispanics towards politics.

As Rouse, Wilkinson, and Garand explain in their approach of Latino attitudes variation towards immigration, there are different independent variables that are expected to influence such changes:

> (1) economic self-interest and labor competition; (2) subgroup differences based on national origin; (3) measures of ethnic attachment and acculturation (e.g., generation status, Latino and language identity, attachment to American culture); (4) political and demographic attributes; and (5) contextual variables. (Rouse, Wilkinson and Garand 2010: 858)

Even though, their research is centered in immigration issues, I consider this a good example of the variety of elements that can influence political attitudes, voting behavior, and partisanship. From these categories, national origin, acculturation, and demographic context, I believe, are important variables that are left out by the pan-ethnicity. As the Pew Research Center demonstrates, Hispanics visions and values are not constant or predictable. For instance, the usage of Spanish as a main language drastically changes per generation, as well as if the population is foreign born or native born. Accordingly, the variations are also visible in politics, religion and values. (Pew Research Center 2012)

For instance, "foreign-born Hispanics are more likely than native-born Hispanics to describe their political views as conservative—35% versus 28%. Meanwhile, native-born Hispanics are more likely than immigrant Hispanics to describe their political views as "very liberal" or "liberal"—34% versus 27%." (Pew Research Center 2012: 31) Moreover their

particular vision of certain topics such as abortion and homosexuality, are also diverse, and might not align with either "liberal" or "conservative" categories. Further, that classification might not even affect partisanship, as it is the case of Mexicans that despite their religiousness. they have been historically aligned with the Democratic party. When it comes to electoral predictions, simplistic assumptions of the Latino culture usually take over facts, and ignore the diverse reality of Latino/Hispanic voters.

Conclusion: Latino/Hispanic Unidentified

Pan-ethnic identification not only fails to represent the variety of the group members, but does not get to engage Latinos into using the pan-ethnic term. Latinos/Hispanics are not fully committed, and do not seem to embrace the pan-ethnic term as it was intended. According to the Pew Research Center:

> Only about one-quarter (24%) of Hispanic adults say they most often identify themselves by "Hispanic" or "Latino." [Further,] about half (51%) say they identify themselves most often by their family's country or place of origin—using such terms as Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Salvadoran or Dominican. And 21% say they use the term "American" most often to describe themselves. The share rises to 40% among those who were born in the U.S. (Pew Research Center 2012: 9)

Similarly, Latinos differ in their views about a shared Hispanic culture. To this point, just 29% of Latinos think that Hispanics share a common culture, on the other hand 69% say Latinos in the U.S. have many different cultures. (Pew Research Center 2012) This trend is consistent among first, second, and third generation of Latinos, although there are some variations in numbers, the tendency is to embrace more other identity terms rather than the pan-ethnic label.

As previously stated, the distribution of Hispanics/Latinos within the country is an important element for the analysis of pan-ethnic identity. Yet, the geographical distribution of Hispanics has changed in the recent years. According to Durand, Telles, and Flashman the distribution "no longer seems to obey traditional patterns of concentration, in which networks of social relationships, ethnic enclaves, and niches in labor markets function as mechanism of attraction and permanence for this population." (Durand, Telles and Flashman 2006: 88) As argued by DeSipio, geographical and demographic distribution affect the foundations of a pan-ethnic community, the fact that the distribution of Hispanics is not the same it was in previous years, the configuration of a pan-ethnic political agenda is less certain than what pan-ethnic advocates seem to accept. More important is the "newer" composition of the ethnic group, because it evidences the dissonance between the actual composition of the Hispanics and the perception of the same. The 2010 U.S. Census Bureau shows that "among the 12.3 million Hispanics who were classified as Other Hispanic in 2010, 1.4 million were of Dominican origin, 4.0 million were of Central American origin, 2.8 million were of South American origin." (United States Census Bureau 2011: 3) However, the other Latinos are still largely unrepresented, not only politically but culturally.

As posed by Beltrán, even though advocates and politicians have tried to focus their discourse on diversity and inclusion, "the political logic of pan-ethnicity continues to harbor its own homogenizing impulse." (Beltrán 2010: 100) Simply because the mere fact of speaking to Latinos supposes the existences of a cohesive group that responds to such category. The problem is not only the homogenizing nature of the label, but the vagueness of the concept. As it has been explained through these pages, the categorization of Latin American immigrants and their descendent as Latinos/Hispanics it might be institutionally accepted, but socially contested. Previous cases of immigration have demonstrated that acculturation is an unavoidable step, and

that by the third generation it is likely that those descendants of a certain ethnic group end up negotiating and shifting their identity category. Similarly, those who are foreign born are expected to maintain their attachment with the origin country. Although they might end up acknowledging the new category imposed upon them, they will probably shift identities back and forth.

The use of the pan-ethnic label is too vague. As Beltrán puts it, "if pan-ethnicity is a flawed paradigm for analyzing public health issues such as reproductive and child-rearing habits, it becomes even more problematic when trying to assess something like "Latino political interests" or a "Hispanic political viewpoint"" (Beltrán 2010: 108) Vagueness and ambiguity, are the strongest flaws of adopting a pan-ethnic label. (Mora 2014; Beltrán 2010; Gimenez 2006; Dávila 2008) However, it is certain that such adoption has worked to cluster the attention over Latinos/Hispanics, and their increasing role in American society. It is then necessary to ask if it is not Latinidad what predicts Latino political behavior, what is it? And further, if the main three subgroups —Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans— were the ones to establish this pan-ethnicity and its correspondent agenda, what is the role of the other subgroups that are also part of what is now known as Latinos/Hispanics. The complexity of the Hispanic/Latino community leads us to direct our attention to those subgroups that have not been as largely studied since their study might reframe the understanding we have of Latinidad.

Chapter III

Latino Politics: Ethnic Politics vs. American Integration

Group identity has been established as a crucial element in the acceptance and adoption of ethnic labels. Likewise, the establishment of pan-ethnic labels has been the way minority groups have achieved institutional recognition. That is why when talking about Latino politics, it is impossible to escape a discussion of identity. As a minority group, Latinos have been politically addressed and interpreted through the lenses of African American political movements, which are strongly linked to identity politics. Factors like size, geographic concentration, civil rights participation, and economic well-being influence how racial and ethnic minority groups are treated and perceived within American politics. As explained by McClain and Stewart "a consideration of these factors identifies the commonalities and the differences among the various groups that are often lumped together under the rubric 'minority group politics.'" (McClain and Stewart 2014: 31) The African-American case is perhaps the most salient when talking about minority politics in the United States, but there are important differences between Blacks and Latinos that cannot be overlooked. Identity works out as a prominent mobilization factor for African American communities, but does it work the same for Latino groups? As argued in the previous chapter, Hispanic/Latino labels have not been embraced by all members of the Latino community, and previous efforts to build a strong Latino political movement have not had the expected outcomes.

Latino Studies' scholars (DeSipio & De la Garza 1996; Dávila 2001; Mora 2014), have concluded that ethnicity has not always been a decisive factor in Latino political behavior; although other authors (Barreto 2007; 2014) defend the idea of ethnicity as the central component of Latino politics. Significant or not, it is certain the ethnicity issue turns out to be more complex than race when talking about identity politics. African American group consciousness is inherently linked to race, but Latinos group consciousness is linked to the idea of cultural commonalities. In this aspect, Rodney E. Hero explains:

> Culture may suggest a sense of shared memories and history and notions of community, and/or a distinct convergence of opinions, if only in the aggregate, about various issues of public concern; it may orient but not necessarily determine affinities in every case all the time. Latinos also have many differences attributable to experience and self-perception as an ethnic group, and as a result of immigration status, and/or attachment to one's home country, which complicates and are additional dimensions of Latinos' group sense or culture. (Hero 2007: xi)

According to Hero, the study of Latino politics has emphasized the cultural frame, instead of other aspects, which makes it especially complex given the ambiguity of the concept itself. In this sense, the association of ethnicity with culture can be either cohesive or divisive, given that it is up to the individual to recognize the commonalities or to racialize the differences. Furthermore, the discussion about Latino politics does not only imply the ethnic issues within Latinos, it also implies the separation of Latino politics from American politics. As Espino and Leal explain "the study of Latino politics is grounded in the more general study of American politics […] Latinos do not exist in Latin America; the term only has meaning within the United States." (Espino and Leal, Introduction 2007: 4) Accordingly, Hero addresses the debate recognizing the importance of

studying both since they are intrinsically related, “neither American politics nor of Latino politics are by themselves sufficient, though both are necessary to understand contemporary circumstances in the United States.” (Hero 2007: xiv) Which is clear is that the binary paradigm between black and white in traditional American politics is no longer functional, instead, a more complex multiethnic perspective is surfacing.

Minority Politics and the Immigration Implications

As previously addressed, population size, socioeconomic status, and population concentration are key factors in American politics, and especially determinant in minority politics. Despite that Latinos have surpassed African Americans as the largest minority group in the U.S., it should not be ignored that such growing has diversified the group, and the demographics of the Latino community are not only framed by the major subgroups —Cubans, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans—. As McClain and Stewart notice “immigration from Central and South America and the Caribbean has reduced the proportion of Latinos of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Origins among Latinos.” (McClain and Stewart 2014: 33) Likewise, the US Census Bureau (2011) reported that by 2011 Dominicans, Colombians, Ecuadorians, and Central American countries comprised more than 25% of the Latino population in the country. However, in electoral politics, population size is not the only important condition. There are legal restrictions framed by age and citizenship in regards who can vote. Thus, even though Latinos are a considerable large group, not all its members can vote.

Socioeconomic status is another salient condition in electoral politics is, besides is a determinant factor in people’s levels of political participation. The higher the socioeconomic level the most likely a person will vote. Historically, Latinos income and educational attainment levels are not comparable to white citizens, which turns out to be a political disadvantage. According to

the Pew Research Center, between 2000 and 2014, Hispanics/Latinos lagged behind U.S. public on income and wealth and have higher poverty rates. (Lopez, Morin and Krogstad, Latinos Increasingly Confident in Personal Finances, See Better Economic Times Ahead 2016) In this sense, Hispanic household in 2014 was $42,491, which has not changed since the Great Recession, opposed to the mainstream household income that has leveled an average of $53,700. In the same manner, poverty rates were higher among Hispanics/Latinos, while the all the other households have a rate of 14.8%, Hispanics poverty rate in 2014 was 23.6%.

The third condition, which relates to population concentration, is an important factor to consider in Latino politics. Latino communities show higher concentrations in border states like New Mexico, Texas, Arizona, Southern California, as well as in large metropolitan areas like New York city, and South Florida. As McClain and Stewart point out, "in many cities the concentrations of minority populations in certain areas could be used by these groups as powerful political and economic resources," (McClain and Stewart 2014: 47) which can be evidenced through voting, but also through participation in civil movements. On the other side, in local levels, when Latinos live in districts where there is an overlapping majority of other non-Hispanics/Latinos, the levels of participation in electoral politics tend to be lower. (Valenzuela and Michelson 2016) The Chicano movement is perhaps the most salient case of a Latino social movement seeking political empowerment. Targeting fellow Mexican immigrants or Mexican American citizens, the Chicano movement appealed to ethnic and social discrimination against Mexicans to create a broad base for the political movement. Using terms such as *"La raza"* Mexican Americans appealed to the ethnic identity to gain political terrain.

However, the Chicano movement cannot be considered a pan-ethnic movement, because it developed a solely Mexican American political agenda. Achieving a successful pan-ethnic movement has been an issue for Latinos. While the goal has been to spread a sense of ethnic solidarity, the reality is that group solidarity has developed unevenly among individuals that share the same nationality or legal status. Intra-group disagreements are more common than what the public opinion, even scholars admit. Class and race hierarchies are not completely erased from immigrants' social relations, which can be evidence in the way how some subgroups and individuals classify themselves as whiter, more educated, as *"citadinos"* —from the cities—, or better-socially related. Erynn Masi de Casanova ethnographic research in a Latino organization in Queens, New York offers salient insights in regards this matter:

> From her style of dress to the opinions she expressed, Sonia made every effort to identify herself with high-class status and whiteness. Perhaps this attempt to create social distance between her and other immigrants was a way of resisting the downward social mobility and racialization she had experienced upon moving from Colombia to the United States. Not surprisingly, given her commitment to presenting herself as different from the other Latin American immigrants with whom she came into contact at the organization, Sonia did not take part in LAIC's mobilizations, marches, or protests. (Casanova 2012: 429)

It is necessary then, to see the larger spectrum of ethnic relations within Latinos/Hispanics and do not underestimate the differences that divide them before stating any absolutes in regards their political behavior.

In the same way, it is necessary to understand the different aspects of political attitudes and participation of minority groups in contemporary American politics to explain how racial and ethnic minorities participate in politics in the United States. Pluralism is the political paradigm that

prevails in politics in the United States, and even though is supposed to be open and fair, sometimes it can be exclusionary of those who are not part of powerful and influential groups. Although some describe pluralist systems as ideal for all sorts of groups, such as neighborhood groups, student groups, educational groups, economic groups, ethnic groups, ideological groups, religious groups, and many other, what pluralist systems have done is to "encourage and reward those who band together in attempt to influence the government." (Garcia and Sanchez 2008: 18) However, as Brubaker argues "reducing the complex and dynamic heterogeneity of American society and history to a formulaic pluralism of identity groups hinders rather than helps the work of understanding the past and pursuing social justice in the present." (Brubaker 2004: 60) The pluralist system has pushed the creation of labels where more than pursuing social equality, new hierarchies are established, not only socially but politically. Given the diversity within the established minority groups in the United States, it is important to recognize that the frameworks used to assess and study such groups have not been ideal.

Thus, ethnic and racial politics need to be examined through different aspects. In this sense, political behavior can be assessed through different fronts, organizational participation, ethnic organizational participation, electoral participation, political ideology, and partisan identification. As explained by McClain and Stewart, political attitudes and participation can be addressed by:

> (1) group identity or cohesion—the extent of feelings of solidarity with other members of the group—and perceptions of discrimination; (2) political ideology, the underlying beliefs and attitudes of a group that shape its opinions and actions on political issues; (3) partisan identification, the attachment to and intensity of feeling for a particular political party; (4) voting behavior, the way people vote in elections and the forces that influence these votes;

> and (5) interest group activities, actions taken by organized groups seeking to influence public officials and policies. (McClain and Stewart 2014: 70)

Although this research will be particularly addressing two of those categories−Group identity and voting behavior−it is important to understand how the other aspects influence ethnic political behavior. These "other" categories cannot be separated from the analysis of Latino politics and its influence should not be diminished. However, as group consciousness has been established as a primordial element for political identity formation, is inherent to socio-political studies to question whether is identity decisive, and to what extent the political behavior of certain subgroups can be taken for granted within the analysis.

Political Ideology

It is not uncommon in American politics to attach a political ideology to particular groups. Class, socioeconomic status, geographic location, among others can be characteristics utilized to bestow labels such as "liberal" or "conservative." However, as argued by McClain and Stewart, "it is inappropriate to use standard political ideology labels of liberal, moderate, and conservative, which were developed from national studies that contained few nonwhites, and apply them to the black and Latino populations." (McClain and Stewart 2014: 82) It results arbitrary to define a complex group like Latinos with categories that do not fully define their attitudes or behavior. Terms such as liberal or conservative might not entirely describe Latinos/Hispanics ideologies, at least not in the same way as they describe non-Hispanics political attitudes. For instance, despite of their strong religious beliefs, Mexicans have been historically allied to the Democratic party, which is considered to be more liberal. In this case religion, does not dictate party allegiance. In the same way, Cuban immigrants who left the country running away from a "communist" country, would be expected to be liberals. On the contrary, they have carried the conservativism associated

to anti-communism. Their reasons are linked to state policies more than to the party ideology. Similarly, other subgroups of Latinos might not identify with these ideological labels.

The Pew Research Center has reported in different surveys that Latinos do not conceptualize the terms liberal and conservative in the same way whites do. In the same way, within Latino subgroups, there are clear differences between ideological orientations. It is important to remember that a big percentage of Latinos are immigrants, which means that those who migrated to the United States might have already a set of political convictions. Being a conservative or a liberal may not have the same meaning in their countries of origin as it has in the U.S. Similarly, second and third generation of Latinos will not hold the same political ideologies of their immigrant families. Although it cannot be dismissed, this variable has proven to be unsteady through the years and across generations.

Partisan Identification

Partisan identification can be similarly misleading, and sometimes arbitrarily assigned. Although many political surveys heavily concentrate in trying to figure out minority groups political parties, the Latino community poses an issue in this category. The African American community has been historically linked to the Democratic party, but Latinos ties to the main political parties in the U.S. have not been so thoroughly studied. Even though Latinos have tended to identify with the Democratic party, such assumption cannot be blindly accepted in all cases. As it has been previously addressed, Latinos constitute a large array of subgroups, who despite sharing cultural traits, differ in other aspects. In this sense, it has been established that Mexicans and Puerto Ricans will more likely to affiliate to the Democratic party, while Cubans tend to sympathize more with the Republican party. However, there have been situations where Latino vote swung from Republican to Democrat or vice versa. For example, the election of George W. Bush (R) as

President in 2000, where non-Cuban Latino voters supported his election, to then elect Barack Obama (D) eight years later. Despite political science scholars and media insist on talking about the Latino vote, it is uncertain when and why Latino voters will swing their vote. In the same way, partisan identification information of other Latino subgroups is limited.

Despite the different assertions with regard party affiliation, it is necessary to consider that partisan identification will be influenced by different factors such as national origin, gender, and socioeconomic levels. Surveys have shown that Latinos do not hold strong feelings towards a particular political party, and will be up to cross party and ethnic lines when voting; however, what is certain is that partisanship is still a strong predictor of electoral behavior in Latinos as much as it is for non-Latinos. Although political ideology is too ambiguous to be solely defined by ethnicity, most scholars agree that partisanship can be defined by ethnic boundaries. As put by Geron and Michelson, "ethnicity predicts partisanship, partisanship predicts issue positions, partisanship and issue positions affect candidate evaluations, and partisanship and candidate evaluations directly affect vote choice." (Geron and Michelson 2008: 333) This sequence seems logical and can be successfully tested, notwithstanding, what are the limits of ethnic identity?

Group Identity: The Foundations of Ethnic Politics

As posed in Chapter 1, the concept of group identity is crucial to study and understand not only Latinos as a group, but Latino politics. Known as group cohesion or group solidarity, group identity is perhaps the most important aspect analyzed in minority politics, since it is expected to be the most mobilizing element within Latinos. As McClain and Stewart point out "the more individuals identify with other members of a group, the more likely they are to participate in politics and to coalesce around candidates and policy issues they perceive as being beneficial to the group." (McClain and Stewart 2014: 78) However, the level of cohesiveness of Latinos should

not be compared to the group identity concept attached to African Americans, which is linked to discrimination and racial identification. Although discrimination is a strong mobilizing force, is still imprecise to assert that feelings of being discriminated against will affect Latinos in the same way that they impact the black community. The racial and national fragmentation of Latinos is still the stone in the shoe for those who will like to see all Latinos united as a political force. If as discussed in the first chapter, it is not possible to talk about one Latino identity, the unresolved question is then, can we talk about a Latino political identity? Further, can we talk about Latino politics?

Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans have defined their political identity not through Latinidad, but through their national origins. (DeSipio 1996) Even when labeled under the umbrella term, the demarcation of their political engagement is clear. Immigration, is perhaps the more salient issue where differences can be noticed. Mexicans have largely supported candidates and laws that alleviate the immigration process for undocumented immigrants, who mostly come from Mexico and other Central American countries. On the other side, Puerto Ricans do not actively engage in this type of issues because of their status as citizens. Similarly, Cubans, who until the beginning of 2017 were protected by the *"dry feet, wet feet"* law, have not supported immigration reforms as Mexicans have. The immigration issue has provoked constant quarrels between these major subgroups. Beyond this three-pointed discussion, it is important to wonder about those Latino subgroups that started to migrate later in time, mostly between 1970s and the 2000s, and come from different geographical contexts. If those groups keep defining themselves as South Americans, Central Americans, Argentineans, Colombians, Dominicans, etc., how accurate is to comprise them in a group where their presence tends to be overlooked. Knowing that

high levels of group solidarity influence political participation and voting behavior, it is necessary to understand how the pan-ethnicity or Latinidad has translated into Latino subgroups.

Journalists, politicians, academics, and citizens in general, have often portrayed the Latino electorate as a compact bloc that will vote accordingly to the expectations assigned to the ethnic group. Such assumptions represent a constant issue for Latino subgroups that are not as big as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. Michael Jones-Correa argues that "ethnic politics focuses on Latinos as citizens, albeit citizens whose attachments may be to their own co ethnics," (Jones-Correa, Fuzzy Distinctions and Blurred Boundaries 2007: 45) which exemplifies one of the problematics of Latino politics within American politics. The constant dichotomy of being an American citizen, a Latino, and a Mexican, or a Colombian, or a Dominican, etc. produces confusion and frustration with the political system they are supposed to embrace. As discussed before, the pluralist system has forced labels upon individuals that might be rejected, mediated, or partially accepted. The created necessity to be categorized in order to be part of the political spectrum, has taken individuals to either exert politics through channels that might not represent any benefit to them or their community, or just to not participate in politics at all, pushing themselves away from a system that expects assimilation while exerting racialization. The fact that minority groups can only be influential if perceived as an organized voting bloc, has affected the ability of Latinos to incorporate specific issues into politics. (Navarro and Mejia 2004)

Whether ethnic labels are indeed an effective way to predict voting behavior, their symbolic importance has been established. As the literature explains, high levels of group cohesion usually translate to higher levels of political participation and voting registration. Group cohesion usually means there are high levels of group identity. As explained by Benjamin Márquez, "because identities influence political behavior and help determine the distribution of power and

resources, identities are particularly important in societies like the United States." (Marquez 2007: 17) Thus, Latino politics as American politics, are studied from theories of identification. Indeed, most studies about Latino politics have been concentrated in the influence of the ethnicity identification on the Latino electorate. However, other aspects are commonly left out when studying Latino politics like race, citizenship status, immigrant generation, and country of origin. Furthermore, the broadness of sub-nationalities and subcultures of the Latino ethnicity have been poorly studied. As Beltrán explains:

> Despite the existence of such complex statements of identity and identification, in much of the current literature, Latino diversity is acknowledged only to be quickly sidestepped through a renewed emphasis on the growing size and potential influence of the Latino electorate. (Beltrán 2010: 123)

Identification is in fact an important part of political behavior, but its influence can vary. As pointed out by De la Garza, "ethnic factors are, in general, less significant than partisanship, issues, and class variables in explaining Hispanic voting." (Garza 2004: 26) For instance, while in the 1990s, ethnicity seemed to be a mobilizing factor in Latino electoral behavior; in 2004, according to the National Survey of Latinos (LNS) (Pew Research Center 2004) ethnicity was not determinant when voting for a candidate, since Latinos did not see themselves as politically united. However, there are scholars like Barreto who insist in the important role of ethnicity in mobilizing Latino voters. He argues that "ethnic candidates increase the level of physiological engagement and interest in the election among ethnic voters," (Barreto 2007: 67) which as he also asserts will mostly work upon Latinos with high levels of ethnic identification. Thus, for those Latinos with low levels of ethnic identification, electoral engagement remains standard.

According to Barreto's argument about ethnic identification and Latino voters, there are three conditions that have made ethnicity a central player in Latino politics:

> First, the Latino community has witnessed and increase in ethnic-based discrimination, making it more likely that ethnicity will have a distinct influence on the political behavior of Latinos […] Second, the number of viable Latino candidates for public office has increased dramatically over the past decade, creating the opportunity for ethnic identity to emerge in the political sphere. Third, rapid growth in naturalization, registration, and voter turnout among Latinos has given legitimacy to the size and significance of the Latino electorate. (Barreto 2007: 68)

As McClain and Stewart point out, although discrimination is an element commonly used to measure African American's group cohesion, in the case of Latinos the circumstances can be somehow different, since Latinos perception of ethnic discrimination is not always the same. According to the 2000 National Survey of Latinos in America "82 percent of Latinos responded that discrimination against Latinos is a problem in America;" (Barreto 2007: 75) yet, "according to the 2007 Pew Foundation Latino National Survey, regardless of national origin, the majority of Latinos believed they had not personally been discriminated against because of their ethnicity." (McClain and Stewart 2014: 79) While it may be true that discrimination can be a determinant factor in group identity, it seems to play a circumstantial role, different to what happens with other minority groups like African Americans. Since sense of discrimination is an unsteady variable, and can change from time to time depending on how adverse state policies are, discrimination cannot be considered as a dependable variable that will produce electoral political participation. Rather, scholars like DeSipio argue that assimilation plays a more salient role in Latino politics, since the higher the level of assimilation of American politics is, the less likely of ethnicity to be

influential. In this case, ethnicity would only play an important role under unique circumstances like discrimination, or as Barreto suggests when there is a presence of a viable Latino candidate.

However, as I have pointed out previously, it is necessary to fill the gap in regards the study of group identity of the growing Latino subgroups that comprise South Americans, Central Americans, and Dominicans. Thus, considering the different theoretical frameworks, as well as the different research approaches developed by other scholars, I propose to approach the subgroups analysis, not from the assumption of ethnicity identification to be the sole factor impacting Latino political behavior, but instead to acknowledge the differences within the ethnicity where country of origin and citizenship status play a significant role. As Marquez points out "there is an urgent need for survey research that probes the complexity of Latino identity politics and clarifies the degree to which Latinos are receptive to a given identity construction." (Marquez 2007: 22) It is then important to find out to what extent are Latinos subgroups cultural similarities enough to lower the gap of their differences? Knowing that those differences can be accentuated by the group's reception experience, the government policies of the recipient society, and the educational attainment of the immigrant subgroup.

As pointed out by Barreto and Segura the country of origin influences Latino attitudes towards American politics in three different ways:

> First, embarking on the path to migration and citizenship is a profoundly self-selecting choice. Those who migrate are arguably different from their countrymen who do not, and moving from immigrant status to citizenship is even more demanding […] Second, foreign-born citizens may hold beliefs and expectations about politics that are rooted in their home-country experience […] Finally, for obvious reasons, immigrants who arrive after school age become familiar with the US political system as adults. (Barreto and Segura 2014: 25)

Likewise, citizenship status plays a major role in Latino political behavior, not only for the obvious reason that only citizens can vote but also because not being a native citizen implies that political acculturation has occurred in adulthood. Barreto and Segura agree that political engagement of foreign-born Latinos is lower than in native-born Latinos:

> Foreign-born citizens—naturalized immigrants—generally come to the United States with only limited familiarity with the US political system, its key players, and US political history. Unlike those attending K–12 school in this country, naturalized citizens begin their engagement with the US political system as adults with almost no background information. (Barreto and Segura 2014: 55-56)

Consequently, assuming the Latino community is a homogeneous group, not only hurts Latino politics but American politics as a whole. The fact that American society does not know or recognize the differences within the ethnic groups that are part of the United States social picture only perpetuates prejudice and stereotypes, which as many recognize, prevent Latinos from fully enjoy their rights, as well as to fulfill their duties as citizens. The ignorance about the Latino community conformation ends up causing separation of the Latino community from the mainstream politics. As Connaughton argues, "Latinos may have a different image of themselves than parties present them as having. But like other marginalized groups, if Latinos do not work at defining themselves politically, elites will do it for them. Consequently, elites will control the relationship. (Connaughton 2005: 142) These elites should not only be understood as Anglo political elites, as mentioned in Chapter 1, Latino elites have also been established. In this sense, Cubans, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans have acquired a relevant power within Latino politics, leaving the other subgroups unrepresented, and mostly relegated. Further, as Valdez points out, the problem is not solely represented by identity politics, but also by how these identities are

established. Instead of fluid and dynamic, identities have been constrained by single choice categories. (Valdez 2011)

The constant questions are then, how do Latinos vote? Who are they likely to vote for? Are they Democrats or Republicans? And once again, all these questions are solely answered through the cases of the Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban populations, and then generalized as ethnic behaviors. As Beltrán points out, "the fascination with the Latino vote displaces larger questions of power and the fact that most Latinos remain alienated spectators to America's political system." (Beltrán 2010: 126) In the case of smaller subgroups from Central and South American countries tends to happen even more, given that their attachment to the pan-ethnicity is not strong and their time of acculturation has not been as long compared to other subgroups. It becomes then important to find out how does the pan-ethnicity —Latinidad— influences those subgroups political participation, since they are clearly not part of the voting demographic statistics.

Voting Behavior: Latinos Low Turnout Rates

Political participation is not only determined by electoral processes. However, the idea of voting is perhaps the most salient concept when people think about politics and democracy. Although political participation also includes activism and organizational engagement, voting is the only process statistically measured by the U.S. government, other kinds of political engagement tend to rely on partisan and non-governmental organizations. As argued by DeSipio and de la Garza:

> Voting is just one way of exerting influence, but unlike many others—such as making campaign contributions, lobbying, taking part in personal networks, and running for

> office—it offers the poor, less well educated, and less politically sophisticated an opportunity to participate at high levels. (DeSipio and de la Garza 2002: 399)

Scholars, politicians, and the media have insisted in the determinant role Latinos can play in elections, and as it has been seen in the past elections, Latinos are indeed an important force in states like Florida and California where there are large concentrations of Latino enclaves. However, Latino registration and voting levels are significantly lower than those of other minorities as African Americans, and certainly lower than those of White race. As pointed out by McClain and Stewart, "in 2012, approximately 235 million Americans were eligible to vote. Non-Latino African Americans accounted for 12.20 percent of the total voting age population, and Latinos for 14.96 percent of that population;" (McClain and Stewart 2014: 101) yet, only a 48 percent of voting-age Latino citizens actually voted, against a 66.2 percent African American turnout.

It results necessary to Latino and American politics scholars and politicians, to assess the lower participation rates of minorities in electoral processes. Rates that are shaped by three conditions: age, socioeconomic status, and educational level. As well other conditions like citizenship status, language comprehension, and knowledge of U.S. politics, affect registration and voting turnout for Latinos. Given the situation, and without dismissing the importance of social movements and activist groups, it is important to realize the accurate composition of the Latino community, and to what extent and how the different subgroups within the minority participate in politics. Establishing to what extent is the Latino electorate as decisive as it has been portrayed for years becomes crucial nowadays but more importantly, it is necessary to find out how do such assumptions of decisiveness apply to the different subgroups that shape the pan-ethnicity.

According to the Pew Research Center, 23.3 million Hispanics were eligible voters in 2012, and this number is projected to grow to 27.3 million by 2016. The fact that 27 million Latinos are eligible voters does not mean they would indeed vote in the next elections. Academics have offered different explanations of why Latinos do not vote at the high levels they are expected to do, and conclusions have been diverse. The first explanation is related to the economic conditions of Latinos. This situation is mainstreamed by the lower levels of education and income, as well as by occupation and age. As argued by Garcia and Sanchez, "Latinos have a greater share of those socioeconomic characteristics that ordinarily depress voter turnout in populations, including the white population." (Garcia and Sanchez 2008: 139) Further, scholars like DeSipio argues that formal channels of inclusion, such as naturalization, do not guarantee political participation. Naturalization rates greatly influence the Latino vote, but other variables remain important like acculturation levels —which can affect the decision of naturalizing or not—, legal status —since many undocumented immigrants cannot become citizens—, and country of origin.

Latino Representation: Co-Ethnic Support vs. Issues Approach

Jason P. Casellas uses two notions of representation in his article *Latino Representation in Congress* which he takes from Hanna F. Pitkin: *descriptive* and *substantive*. According to Casellas, "descriptive representation involves Latinos having a Latino represent their district, while substantive representation involves a representative of any race or ethnicity voting the way Latino constituents prefer." (Casellas 2007: 220) Similarly, Garcia and Sanchez portray descriptive representation as a "very common type of measurement that determines representation is based on a simple counting or enumeration of the number of representatives who are of Hispanic heritage;" (Garcia and Sanchez 2008: 201) and substantive representation as the kind that "involves representatives being actively engaged in articulating Latino (or other) group interests in the group

policy-making arena." (Garcia and Sanchez 2008: 207) Pitkin also distinguishes a third type of representation, symbolic representation where "legislators have the confidence of those they represent and are trusted." (Orey, King and Bilingsley 2016: 57) In accordance to these postulates, Latinos are at serious disadvantage: first because the numbers of Latino representatives in governmental institutions are not numerical congruent with the percentage of Latinos in the country; and second, because Latinos are not "politically monolithic". In this sense, Latinos are not solely committed to one political party, but are up to switch lines if needed. The problem is that many politicians appeal to Latino communities seeking for their vote, but their compromise with these communities is not transcendental. Solely committing to the Latino electorate can be perceived as somehow divisive.

Descriptive or symbolic representation does not imply that all the members of each national origin group would be benefited by the election of a co-ethnic. (Aranda, Hughes and Sabogal 2014) In fact, in cities like Miami, where the political presence of certain groups is stronger than other subgroups minorities, co-ethnic representation means little for those who do not belong to the particular national origin group of the elected official. As Beltrán reflects, "advocates and politicians who claim to speak for or on behalf of Latinos continue to put forward theories of empowerment that rely in presumptions of Latinos as a cohesive electorate." (Beltrán 2010: 100) By no means should this be interpreted as a recommendation for the opposite situation, one in which there are no Latino/Hispanic immigrants or Latino descendants participating in politics. However, portraying descriptive representation as the ideal situation lacks validity.

Perhaps, as scholars like Barreto and Geron argue, low political participation of Latinos may be related to the lower quantity of representatives in the government, but it is uncertain under what conditions would they follow this pattern and when would they not. Barreto argues that "the

presence of a viable Latino candidate may represent a circumstance in which shared ethnicity becomes a salient factor in Latino political behavior;" (Barreto 2007: 86) but what is a viable candidate? Viability is not framed by ethnicity in the first place, so co-ethnic rhetoric will presumably only work if the person ready to vote considers the candidate's promises fulfill his expectations, in the case the voter has indeed calculated his decision to vote. Once again, there are other elements interjecting the voter decision. Race, class, and socio-economic status would greatly affect the conscious decision. Despite the different reasons, most academics who work with Latino politics, acknowledge there is an important misrepresentation of the Latino community and that such gap needs to be fulfilled in order to have a better understanding of the different subgroups within the Latino ethnicity. Further, the distribution and constitution of government institutions like Congress, contribute to the lower representation of minority groups like Latinos. Rodolfo Espino points out that legislative victories that have benefited minority groups, such as the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, have not been only achieved by the minority groups will, but "because the majority of white Americans shared the same sentiments, thus allowing the legislation to pass" (Espino, Is there a Latino dimension 2007: 199). It is necessary then to understand how Congress and other governmental institutions of representation influence Latino political behavior.

Since U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives "are responsible not only for making laws but also for determining budget allocations to the entire federal government," (McClain and Stewart 2014: 158) their work is of vital importance for Latino and other minority groups issues. By 2004 only two Latino descendants were elected for Senate, Ken Salazar (Mexican American) of Colorado, and Mel Martinez (Cuban American) of Florida. In 2008, Ben R. Lujan from New Mexico was elected as a member of the House of Representatives, which completed a total of

twenty-seven Latinos in the House of Representatives in the 111th Congress. By 2014, three Latino descendants were serving as U.S. Senators, Robert Menendez, Marco Rubio, and Ted Cruz. All of them of Cuban American descent but representing three different states, New Jersey, Florida, and Texas, respectively. Interestingly, two of them, Marco Rubio and Ted Cruz presented their campaigns for the Republican Party nomination for President in 2016. The House of Representatives also increased the number of Latinos for the 113th Congress, with thirty representatives. Unfortunately, none of those representatives were of other origin but Mexican, Cuban, or Puerto Rican. By 2016, only one Congress representative is from an origin different from Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban; Norma Torres of Guatemalan origin (foreign born immigrant) is the only representation of subgroups like central Americans —different than Mexicans—, and South Americans.

Is also interesting the percentage of statewide Latino officials, and Latino governors and majors. By 2010, 32.4 percent of State officials were Latinos comprised in the following states: Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, New Jersey, Illinois, and New York. In regards Latinos who served as governors, there have been only three states that have had full term elected Latino descendant governors: New Mexico, Arizona, and Florida. According to McClain and Stewart, "New Mexico is the only state in which Latino political representation is at least equal to the state's Latino population proportion," (McClain and Stewart 2014: 172) which it is reflected by its six Latino descendant governors.

Conclusion: The "Other Latinos" Underrepresentation in the Pluralist System

It is a fact that racial and ethnic minority groups are growing, and that as Latinos concentrate in certain states or specific areas, their political influence can be more visible. But being "the number one" it means more than just being the largest minority group in the country.

As argued by Garcia and Sanchez, "when Latinos became 'número uno,' no longer could they be ignored or overlooked in the historical black and white picture of America. Latinos could not possibly continue to be the 'invisible minority.'" (Garcia and Sanchez 2008: 58) However, the understanding of Latinos as a broad ethnic group is still limited, which at the same time, limits the understanding of Latino politics. While the terms "Latino" or "Hispanic" are regularly used by the media, there is little understanding of the Latino community, not only culturally but socially, and politically. As I have argued before, the different conceptions held of Latinos, stereotypes, and expectations might not be suitable for the whole community. The Latino community comprises individuals from 22 different Latin American countries, and as much as they share cultural traits, their sociopolitical process in the United States has been different. It is that the reason why my research focuses on those Latino subgroups that are still far from the Latino politics mainstream.

Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, and Puerto Ricans continue to be the most studied groups among Latinos, not only because of their size but also because of his long history of immigration. However, I wonder how the "other Latinos", that group shared by Central Americans, South Americans, and Dominicans, exert political participation in a pan ethnic Latino polarized political realm. Segura and Bowler point out the importance of minority groups engagement in American politics, which further makes me wonder about those minorities within the minority. But more importantly, it is inescapable to think beyond ethnicity and wonder if those who do not strongly identify as Latinos participate in politics by other meanings or through other channels, distinct to those established by and used by the political elites.

> How−and indeed whether−minority populations engage with the mainstream political process are crucial issues for American public and political life in the coming years. If minority populations become somehow separated from the mainstream of politics−either

> because the mainstream politics does not respond or because minority populations, choose not to engage−the resulting distance could present long-term problems for legitimacy of American political institutions as a whole. (Segura and Bowler 2005: 3-4)

The analysis of Latino politics should then go further ethnic politics, since it has been acknowledged by Latino scholars that group cohesion is not the strongest condition of the Latino community, and a lot less of the subgroup identified as “other Latinos”.

This thesis concerns the extent to which the pan-ethnic frame influences the “other Latinos” political participation. I will consider whether or not there are other conditions that might be more salient in predicting voting behavior of those Latino subgroups. I have identified a gap between those who strongly identify with being Latino and those who do not. While it may be true that the mentioned subgroups are not comparable in size with the main three —Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans—, population concentration of some of them will become meaningful in a near future. This makes this analysis necessary for those who study and want to have a better understanding of Latinos in the United States.

Chapter IV

Data Analysis: Are there Significant Differences Between Latino/Hispanic Subgroups?

The insistence of the media, political elites, and state institutions on portraying a Latino voting bloc as an electorally decisive group (Mora 2014; Beltrán 2010) has been the strongest inspiration for this project. Not only are Latinos far from being a bloc, but also their political engagement is unpredictable, diverse, and significantly low. I argue Latinos/Hispanics political participation practices have not been thoroughly studied. Quantitative and qualitative research have addressed political participation from different fronts: voting behavior, turnout intention, grassroots movements, identity based politics, among others. However, such analyses have mainly been done from a pan-ethnic perspective, and just recently from a racial approach. If identity consciousness is the most likely indicator of political participation, yet pan-ethnic identification is not as strong as it is often portrayed, then is there a better predictor of electoral behavior for Latinos?

Latino voting turnout numbers are lower than other minority groups in the country (Geron and Michelson 2008; Lopez, Motel and Patten 2012), and even when called the most important vote on every election, Latinos are disappointedly not inclined to vote. There are different theories, and much research has been done about this issue. However, as I have proposed, the problem is assuming Latin American immigrants and their descendants are a voting bloc, and thus we need to study them. To find out if the so called "other Latinos" participate in politics differently from

the recognized main subgroups, Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans, I have used data from the 2012 National Survey of Latinos to analyze the existent data.

The National Survey of Latinos (NSL) is a nationally representative survey of Hispanic adults conducted annually since 2002 by the Pew Research Center. According to the Pew Research Center, "the NSL explores the attitudes and opinions of the nation's fast growing Latino population on topics ranging from identity to politics to immigration policy to education to religion and health care, among others." (Pew Research Center 2012) The NSL is the most reliable source of information where respondents were only Latinos/Hispanics, and where they were requested to answer questions related to identity, politics, and policy issues. Most of the data available where voting behavior was measured, tend to group Latinos under umbrella terms, without keeping record of their countries of origin, which is strongly relevant for this case of study.

This thesis considers the question of how the concept of Latinidad shapes political participation of Latinos who are not part of the Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban communities. Although political participation can be approached differently, it is important to define in clearer terms how the "other Latinos" vote, and what their electoral views are, given that the "other Latinos" perspectives about politics have been largely influenced and framed by the three major subgroups visions. Thus, is necessary to find out:

1. To what extent does the concept of Latinidad influence practices of citizenship, like voting, for Latinos who are not Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban?
2. To what extent do Latinos who are not Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban establish a political agenda influenced by group identity?

To answer these questions, I established different variables that could measure identity, politics, economy, and social integration. Given that the purpose of this research is to identify the influence of the pan-ethnicity upon Latinos/Hispanics, and the differences between the major Latino subgroups and those denominated as "other Latinos" with regard to political participation, questions referencing country of origin and ancestry were used as independent variables. While questions about politics, voting, political agenda, economy, and acculturation were used as dependent variables.

Data and Sample

I used the 2012 National Survey of Latinos (NSL) to investigate how the sense of Latinidad affects the political participation of Latinos who are not Mexican, Cuban, or Puerto Rican. The NSL is a bilingual telephone survey of Latino adults (older than 18 years) residing in the United States, covering a variety of questions about political and socioeconomic experiences. The survey was conducted between September 7, 2012 and October 4, 2012. The size of the sample was 1,765 individuals, drawn from a nationally representative random sample of Latino households across the United States. The survey was conducted during ex-president Barack Obama's (D) first term, while he was campaigning to be elected for a second term. (Pew Research Center 2012)

Dependent Variables: Political Participation and Group Identity

Political Participation

In order to assess political participation, I used three different dependent variables: First I considered the "other Latinos" vote intention in the Presidential election of 2012. Second, I used a variable to reflect the perspective of the "other Latinos" about important issues discussed in the Presidential campaign of 2012. Lastly, I also considered the "other Latinos" perspective in regards

their sense of citizenship and pan-ethnic identity. Each of those variables contain a series of questions which were cross-tabulated with the independent variables (ancestry and nativity).

Voting behavior

As defined by McClain and Stewart, voting behavior refers to "the way people vote in elections and the forces that influence these votes." (McClain and Stewart 2014: 76) To asses this variable, I rely in a set of questions that the Pew National survey used to measure voting:

1. If the presidential election were being held today, would you vote for the Democratic ticket of Barack Obama and Joe Biden; the Republican ticket of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan; or other candidates? This response was coded (1) for the Democratic ticket of Barack Obama and Joe Biden and (2) for the Republican ticket of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan; (3) other candidate, (4) will not vote, (D) don't know, and (R) if refused.
2. Do you yourself plan to vote in the election this November? This question addresses vote intention without linking the vote to a candidate or party. The question was coded (1) for Yes and (2) for No, (D) don't know, and (R) if refused.
3. In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else? The answer was coded (1) Republican, (2) Democrat, (3) Independent, (4) Something else, (D) don't know, and (R) if refused.
4. Which party do you think has more concern for (Hispanics/Latinos), or is there no difference? This answer is coded as (1) The Democratic Party, (2) The Republican Party, (3) No difference, (D) don't Know, (R) if refused.
5. Now in thinking about the 2012 Presidential election, in your opinion, will the (Hispanic/Latino) vote have a major impact, a minor impact or will it have no impact at all

in determining who wins the 2012 Presidential election? The answers were coded as (1) Major impact, (2) Minor impact, (3) No impact at all, (D) don't Know, and (R) if refused.

Political agenda

In the process to establish public policies, certain issues are prioritized by government institutions; as well, voters have their own opinions about issues that the government, the media, and politicians discuss *on* and *off* electoral campaigns. (McClain and Stewart 2014) I consider it important to know if the different subgroups had different perspectives about specific issues, since this could become a decisive factor when voting. To analyze this variable, I cross-tabulated the following questions:

1. Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. For each item I name, please tell me how important this issue is to you personally. Is the issue of (a, b, c, d) extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?
    a. Education
    b. Jobs and the Economy
    c. Health care
    d. Immigration

    Each question had the same set of answers, which were coded as (1) Extremely important, (2) Very important, (3) Somewhat important, (4) Not too important, (D) don't know, and (R) if refused.

Acculturation

As explained by Portes and Rumbaut, "immigrants, even those of the same nationality, are frequently divided by social class, the timing of their arrival, and their generation […] Depending on the timing of their arrival and context of reception, immigrants can find themselves confronting diametrically different situations, and hence the course of their assimilation can lead to a number of different outcomes." (Portes and Rumbaut, Legacies 2001: 45) Thus, I considered important to acknowledge the effects of senses of acculturation and/or belonging. The NSL includes different questions where acculturation can be measured, from which I have included two questions: The first one inquires respondents about their citizenship status; and the second one measures the sense of discrimination and/or adaptation by asking them about their experience as Latinos/Hispanics in the United States. Experience measured by economic, cultural, and educational facts.

1. Are you a citizen of the United States? This variable was coded as (1) Yes, (2) No, (D) don't know, (R) if refused to answer.
2. In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino)– helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to [a, b, c]?
    a. finding a job
    b. getting a promotion
    c. gaining admission into schools and colleges

The three questions displayed the same set of answers, which were coded as (1) Helps, (2) Hurts, (3) Makes no difference, (D) don't know, (R) if refused.

Group Identity: Pan-ethnicity vs. Country of Origin

To analyze group identity, I used the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" as dependent variables. Then the information was cross-tabulated with three interrelated independent variables: ancestry, native born, and country of origin.

1. The terms Hispanic and Latino are both used to describe people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?

Independent Variables: Ancestry and Country of Origin

Ancestry and country of origin are used in this study as independent variables given that it is the purpose of this document to elucidate the differences in between subgroups within the Latino/Hispanic population. The National Survey of Latinos addresses these two variables in the following questions:

1. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country? Are you and your ancestors from Central America, South America, or somewhere else?
    a. What other country?

    This variable was coded (01) Mexican (Mexico); (0)2 Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico); (03) Cuban (Cuba); (04) Dominican (the Dominican Republic); (05) Salvadoran (El Salvador); (06) Other Central American (Central America); (07) Other South American (South America); (97) Other country [specify other country]; (DD) don't know; (RR) Refused. If born in another country the answers were coded as follow: (01) Argentina, (02) Barbados, (03) Belize, (04) Bolivia, (05) Brazil, (06) Chile, (07) Colombia, (08) Costa Rica, (09) Cuba, (10) the Dominican Republic, (11) Ecuador, (12) El Salvador, (13) the Falkland

Islands, (14) Guatemala, (15) Guyana, (16) Haiti, (17) Honduras, (18) Mexico, (19) Nicaragua, (20) Panama, (21) Paraguay, (22) Peru, (23) Portugal, (24) Puerto Rico, (25) Spain, (26) Suriname, (27) Uruguay, (28) Venezuela, (29) French Guyana, (30) Jamaica, (31) Trinidad/the Caribbean Islands, (32) Italy, (33) Africa, (97) Other, (DD) don't know, (RR) refused.

2. Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country? The answers for these questions were coded (1) Puerto Rico, (2) U.S., (3) Another country, (D) don't know, (R) refused.
3. In what country were you born? If born in another country, answers were coded as in question 1(a).

By cross-tabulating the information above I was able to summarize the relationship between the variables to find out significant differences between Hispanic/Latino subgroups in regards political participation and voting behavior. As Latino politics' scholars, have largely discussed, there are distinct variables which can impact vote decision making, such as educational, socioeconomic, and cultural conditions. (DeSipio and De la Garza 1996; de la Garza 2004; Barreto 2007; Geron and Michelson 2008; Portes and Rumbaut 2001) I have included the mentioned variables, which will tell about the impact of these conditions over Latino electoral preferences. Lastly, it is important to analyze group identity, which will complement the analysis by testing if those subgroups that prefer to identify themselves in pan-ethnic or country of origin terms, hold the same vision about politics.

Data Analysis

Although the Pew Research Center itself analyzed the information obtained from the NSL, and published numerous articles about different topics with regard to the Hispanic/Latino community, none of these separated the Latino/Hispanic subgroups into categories. Given this study's hypothesis, new tables were created through cross tabulation. It is also necessary to mention that not all tables showed significant differences between categories, however the results do lead to telling conclusions in regards electoral behavior of the different Latino subgroups.

Group Identity — Independent Variable

Table 1.1 show results within the major subgroups along with Dominicans and Salvadorans, South Americans, and other Central Americans about pan-ethnic term preference. Overall more than half (53.9%) had no preference for either term. 30.5% chose the term Hispanic, and a 14.3% chose Latino. This trend repeated among all major subgroups, except for South Americans where 50% preferred the term Latino over Hispanic. However, this information can be contested in the sense that many respondents were classified under the category "other country." Which can be attributed to the lack of specificity in regards country of origin. When contrasted with Table 1.3 it can be evidenced that the numbers changed when countries from South America are individualized. There, South American countries show a tendency for the category "no preference". Only Perú and Brazil showed a preference for the term "Latino". The case of Brazil is interesting given that Brazilians have contested the pan-ethnic terms before. However, as Maxine Margolis points out in her research about Brazilian identity in the United States, "Brazilians are not only embracing American ethnic stereotypes, but American ethnic hierarchies as well." (Margolis 2007: 217) With regard to Central American countries, a clear majority had no preference for either term; similarly, a 51% of Dominicans said to have no preference with regards

the term they use to describe themselves. These tables chi-square value is .000 which shows there is a 100% confidence the relationship exists.

Although the question is not expressly stated as rejecting either term, the fact that most of subgroups had *no preference* can be a result of a lack of group consciousness related to the pan-ethnic terms. In this sense, by choosing the *no preference* category, respondents might have consciously avoided the pan-ethnic terms, since no other options were given. As Valdez suggests "survey instruments and quantitative research designs often constrain the identity of respondents to a single force choice category of ethnicity, pan-ethnicity, or race. Such studies neglect to consider how the group members themselves might choose to self-identify if given the option, or to adjudicate differences between them." (Valdez 2011: 467) Despite the claims about the preference between one term or the other adducing social, political, or cultural issues against either Latino or Hispanic, the interchangeable use of the terms has been quite constant. Scholars and politicians often use both, but Latinos/Hispanics do not seem to have a clear picture of what these terms mean or entail. I suggest then, if group consciousness was strong enough, respondents would have preferred one of the terms, instead of indicating n*o preference.*

Political Participation—Dependent Variables

Electoral Behavior

When assessing electoral behavior, results are diverse. Some tables were more significantly conclusive than others, which is directly related to the broadness of the categories of each question. The respondents were asked about their political party identification, their intention to vote in the presidential election of 2012, and about their perception of Latinos/Hispanics in politics. Each question was analyzed in three ways: first, by major subgroups, which includes

Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans, as well as Dominicans, Salvadorans, Other Central Americans, and Other South Americans. Second, by nativity where respondents were categorized as born in Puerto Rico, born in the U.S., and born in another country. From the last group, a third analysis was made individualizing those who identified themselves as foreign born by their countries of origin.

Table 2.1 where respondents were asked about their vote intention in the Presidential elections for 2012 between former president Barack Obama (D) and Mitt Romney (R), shows that a 61.4% of Latinos/Hispanics had the intention to vote for Obama and Joe Biden; a 19.1% was going to vote for Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan; and a 5.1% preferred not to vote. However, some differences can be noticed when looking at every major subgroup. Although Mexicans are known for being strong Democrats, only a 60.6% said he or she was going to vote for Obama, the number results low in comparison to Dominicans (78.8%), Salvadorans (73.5%), and South Americans (77.8%). These numbers are interesting because even when all the political strategies are mostly directed to the three major subgroups (Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans), the higher percentages of vote intention came from other subgroups. In this sense, Republicans are evidently lagging behind Democrats with regards to Latino/Hispanic vote, except in the Cuban community, which according to the table seems to follow the pattern established for their group, to vote for Republican candidates. As this table shows, most of the vote intention for each party candidate came from subgroups considered as less politically important. The Chi-Square value of this table is .001, which translates to a 99.9% of confidence in the significance of the variables relationship.

Table 2.2 is consistent with the previous results. Overall, the majority (60.9%) of Latinos/Hispanics born in the U.S. had the intention to vote for the Democratic candidates. In comparison, a 61% of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics, excluding Puerto Ricans, had the intention

to vote for Barack Obama. The abstention rate was also lower in foreign born Latinos than in native born. The chi-square value in this table was .093 which means it cannot be assured that the relationship between variables is significant. Table 2.3 on the other hand, shows higher tendencies leaning towards the democratic candidates. Even the lowest percentages were higher than Mexicans overall. Respondents from countries like Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru showed lower percentages than other countries like Argentina, Bolivia, or Venezuela in their intention to vote for Democrats, but overall the abstention category was lower in foreign born than in other subgroups. Individuals from other Central American countries and El Salvador showed lower numbers in support for the democratic candidates, which did not mean that they supported the other candidates, on the contrary responses in the categories "will not vote" or "don't know" grew. The table's chi-square value was 0.010 showing a significant relation between variables.

Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 asked participants to answer if they planned to vote in the 2012 Presidential elections. Interestingly, only the tabulation of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics were significant. Table 3.1 chi-square value was .617, and table 3.2 value was .158; table 3.3 on the other side showed a significance value of .004. The latter can be an evidence of the necessity to assess country of origin as a category to analyze political behavior, and include it as part of the main categories of analysis. Table 3.1 shows consistent results among all major subgroups, although the Other Central American countries (91.7%) and Other South American countries (100%) have the highest percentages of vote intention. Table 3.2. results are similar, although foreign born Latinos/Hispanics intention to vote is higher than in native born. Table 3.3 shows more variations in regards vote intention, Colombian (72.2%), Ecuadorian (62.5%), Costa Ricans (75%), and Nicaraguans (72.7%) respondents intention to vote is lower than the average (82.5%). Even when the percentage is more than half, these numbers should be considered given that most

of the time, Latino/Hispanics that are foreign born tend to live in cultural enclaves, where matters such as politics are often socialized.

Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 address party affiliation. As expected, Latinos/Hispanics consider themselves Democrats. The current data shows many Cubans as Democrats, the percentage is not high (36.9%), but it is higher than the percentage of Cubans that see themselves as Republicans (27%). Lately, it has been argued that the time of the Republican Cubans is coming to an end. As argued by Dario Moreno and James Wyatt (2016) after the election of 2012, "no matter who won the Cuban Vote in 2012, the reality is that the Cuban ethnic vote has shifted from being staunchly Republican for the last 20 years to becoming a toss-up between each party in 2012. Many are still wondering how one of the most loyal Republican demographic groups in the country could so quickly become a swing vote." (Moreno and Wyatt 2016: 255)

Younger Cubans, and second and third generations of Cuban ancestry do not see politics in the same way their migrant families did, in this sense, the foreign policy towards Cuba and Fidel Castro's regime may not be a strong motivator for younger Cuban voters. It is also important to remember the NSL survey uses a representative sample of Latinos/Hispanics, however, there is always the possibility that not many Cubans participated, or that a fortuitous majority of Democrats responded. This table chi-square value .000 indicates there is a significant relationship between the observed data and the assigned variables. Notwithstanding, the Cuban case is not the only case where the numbers are not extremely high. In this sense, even when Latinos/Hispanics are expected to be mainly Democrats, table 4.1 shows the percentages are not that high. On the contrary, in most cases less than half see themselves as Democrats. Many respondents declare themselves to be independent, or something else. Different from other variables, in this question, the category "don't know" showed double digit numbers.

Table 4.2 and 4.3 show some similar results. For instance, table 4.2 shows that native born Latinos/Hispanics are more likely to be Democrats (49.1%) than foreign born (44.5%). On the contrary, foreign born Latinos/Hispanics are more likely to see themselves as independent (23.5%). Table 4.2 chi-square value is .000 indicating its significance, as well as table 4.3, which chi-square value is .005. Similarly, when foreign born data is brake down, numbers show that tendencies to the Democratic Party are consistent, but not significantly high. With exception of Bolivia (100%) and Costa Rica (75%), no other country passes the 70 percent bar. The latter does not mean the majority identify better as a Republican, rather, foreign born Latinos/Hispanics preferred other categories such as independent, something else, and don't know. Those three options are somehow vague and do not offer further information of what other political affiliations the respondents might have. Given that table 4.3 accounts for foreign born respondents, it is possible that they still have attachments to politics and political parties from their countries of origin. What is certain is that the main political parties in the United States are not fully embraced by the foreign Latino population. Party affiliation is one of the characteristics that usually predict voting, but if a large share of Latinos/Hispanics do not have a strong party affiliation, it can be expected a low electoral participation from Latinos.

Following this thought, Table 5.1 shows the perspective of Latinos/Hispanics with regard to which party has more concern for Hispanics/Latinos issues. Answers again lean towards the Democratic party, although once again, numbers are not significantly high. Even for Puerto Ricans, who are historically Democrats, only 62.6% said that the Democratic Party care more about Latino concerns. Most respondents did not see the Republican Party as preoccupied enough for Latino issues, although a considerable portion (27.9%) sees no difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. From this table, Dominicans (73.6%) and Other South Americans (75%)

are the ones who think of the Democratic Party as more preoccupied for Latino concerns. On the other side, Other Central Americans (35%) and Salvadorans (41.7%) are the ones with a lower perception of the Democratic Party. However, even when their perception of the Republican Party is not high either, Other Central Americans showed the highest percentage of perception of the Republican party (20%). Table 5.1 chi-square value is .002, which indicates that a significant relationship exists. When comparing native born Latinos/Hispanics with foreign born ones, there was not a significant relationship among data and variables as the Table 5.2 chi-square value (.129) indicates. That was also the case of Table 5.3 where the data was tabulated with foreign born respondents' country of origin. In this case, the chi-square value was .715.

Lastly, when asked about Latinos/Hispanics perception about the impact the ethnic group was going to have in the presidential elections, the respondents were given four different categories to respond: major impact, minor impact, no impact, or don't know. As table 6.1 shows, overall a 67.8% of the respondents said Latinos/Hispanics would have a major impact, with Other Central Americans (80%) being the ones with the largest percentage of the share. On the other side, other South Americans (25%) where the ones who had the largest percentage saying Latinos/Hispanics would have a minor impact. Overall a 5.3% said Latinos/Hispanics would have no impact at all, and a 5.8% responded to not know.

The results of Table 6.1 showed no significant relationship, chi-square value was .483. On the contrary, Table 6.2 chi-square value (.000) shows a significant relationship. According to the table, while a 71.7% of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics said, the community was going to have a major impact, a 62.8% of native born said the same. When foreign born Latinos/Hispanics responses were individualized by country of origin, Bolivians and Costa Ricans were the ones to be surer that Latinos/Hispanics would have a major impact in the elections. Ecuadoreans (63.2%),

Chileans (33.3%), and Panamanians (60%) showed the lowest percentages expecting a major impact. What is interesting is that most of the foreign-born respondents did not considered that Latinos will not have an impact at all. Table 6.3 high chi-square value (.875) indicates no significant relation between the data and the established variables.

Political Agenda

Tables 7.1 Issues: Education, 7.2 Issues: Jobs and Economy, 7.3 Issues: Health Care, and 7.4 Issues: Immigration, show different results of Latinos/Hispanics views of important issues discussed in the campaign for the presidential elections of 2012. Each issue was cross tabulated with different dependent variables: major Latino/Hispanic subgroups (ancestry); U.S. born and foreign born Latinos/Hispanics; and lastly foreign born Latinos countries of origin. Table 7.1.1 shows there are no major differences between the three major subgroups, Mexicans (46.8%), Cubans (45.9%) and Puerto Ricans (49.3%) when rating education as extremely important. However, Other South Americans rate education as extremely important by a 75%, the second group to find education extremely important by a large percentage are Dominicans (65.3%). Other response categories are very important, which takes and overall percentage of 44.6%, somewhat important (5.2%), not too important (1.4%). The chi-square value in this table (.950) shows no significant relationship.

Table 7.1.2 shows a difference of perception in between native born and foreign born, while a 55.7% of native born Latinos/Hispanics see education as an extremely important issue, a 43.3% of foreign born says the same. Contrarily, a 35% of native born Latinos/Hispanics say is very important, while a 51.7% of foreign born says the same. Tables 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 chi-square value is .000 for both, indicating a significant relationship. Table 7.1.3 shows mixed results, despite most of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics no matter what their country of origin is, said

education was either extremely important or very important, it is possible to see differences between responses from one country to the other one. Except for Costa Rica, most of Central American respondents including Mexico, preferred the category very important instead of extremely important. Similarly, South American respondents also seemed to considerer education an important issue, but not of extreme importance.

Table 7.2.1 Jobs and the Economy, are perceived in a similar way as Education. Numbers have slight changes in between major subgroups, although from the three major subgroups, Puerto Ricans are the ones to find Jobs and economy more "extremely important." A 60.6% of Puerto Ricans said jobs were extremely important compare to a 45.5% Mexicans, and a 55% of Cubans. However, a large part of the share said economy was very important. Other South Americans and Other Central Americans also followed the same path, mostly rating jobs and the economy as very important instead of extremely important. Dominicans on the other side rate jobs mainly "extremely important" with a 56.9%. As it happened with table 7.1.1, the chi-square value of Table 7.2.1 is high (.581), and indicates no significant relationship among data and variables. Table 7.2.2 shows that 57.6% of U.S. born Latinos/Hispanics found jobs and the economy extremely important, compared to a 41.4% of foreign born. Table 7.2.2 chi-square values is .000.

Table 7.2.3 shows that when analyzed by country of origin, numbers are consistent with the other tables. In this sense, except for Chile (66.7%), Dominican Republic (51%), and Ecuador (63.2%), the other countries rated jobs and the economy rather very important than extremely important. Given that most of immigrants' purpose when migrating is finding a job and being able to provide for their families, it is interesting that an issue like jobs and economy are not listed as an urgent top priority. Although respondents considered very important, in a time where people

were leaving an economic crisis behind, a major interest in the economy would have been expected. Table 7.2.3 chi-square value (.346) shown no significant relationship.

Table 7.3.1 measures the importance Latinos/Hispanics gave to Health care as part of the presidential debate for 2012 elections. In this case, as the table shows, Other Central Americans (60%) and Other South Americans (58.3%) rated health care as extremely important with larger percentages. A higher number of Dominicans (54.2%) and Cubans (42.3%) also gave health care the level of extremely important. Mexicans on the other hand, did not largely rate health care as an extremely or very important issue. Their responses were divided, and none reached more than 50%. As with the previous variables, Education and jobs and the economy, Table 7.3.1 chi-square value (.577) shows no significant relationship among data. Table 7.3.2 shows that a larger share of native born Latinos/Hispanics (51.5%) think of health care as extremely important compared to foreign born Hispanics/Latinos where a 40% rated health care as extremely important. Table 7.3.2 chi-square value (.000) indicated a significant relationship, as well as Table 7.3.3 (.000). When results are analyzed by country of origin, Table 7.3.3 shows some mixed results. For example, foreign born Dominicans do not follow the overall pattern, and the majority rated healthcare as very important instead of extremely important. A 61% of Salvadorans also see health care as very important but not extremely important, which is also the case for respondents of other Central American countries like Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Response percentages are mixed within South American countries.

Immigration importance perception is shown by Tables 7.4. These tables show interesting responses where it is noticeable that the immigration issue is not as important as the other issues mentioned before, besides it has more varied responses. According to Table 7.4.1, none of the major Latino/Hispanic subgroups rated immigration as an extremely important issue, overall a

33% of the respondents said immigration was extremely important. Numbers were higher in the very important category; however, the percentage was not higher than 44%; further, somewhat important (14.1%) and not important (7%) showed larger digits for the first time since measuring political agenda issues. Different from the previously assessed variables, immigration tables all show a significant relationship of data with variables. Table 7.4.1 chi-square value is .017, Table 7.4.2 value is .000, and 7.4.3 value is .005. When comparing, native born and foreign born Latinos/Hispanics, results show that U.S. born Latinos consider immigration a less important issue than foreign born Latinos, however, the latter group does not significantly see immigration as an extremely important issue. When analyzed by country of origin, foreign born Latinos are consistent with the overall results, except for Chileans, where a 100% said to considered immigration as extremely important, and Colombians where a 46.4% rated it as extremely important as well, the rest of respondents rated it very important instead. Some others were divided evenly, like Guatemala, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Panama.

Acculturation

To measure acculturation, I used citizenship as a dependent variable because becoming a citizen is a measurable and visible indication of incipient political acculturation. When measuring electoral behavior, only citizens can vote, but more than that, becoming a citizen represent a commitment with the recipient country where individuals accept to be part of the different scenarios of public life. When the immigrant decides to become a citizen, he/she is acknowledging the recipient country as a new home, which should be a reason to participate actively of the decision making in political processes since the immigrant will be directly affected or benefited by decisions politicians and the government make. As part of this variable, I also included cross tabulations of the perceptions Latinos/Hispanics had of being Latino or Hispanic in the United

States. To measure this variable, three different categories were measured: Finding jobs, getting a promotion, and gaining admission to school or college. I included these questions because if immigrants are acculturated enough they should not see any differences in between the mainstream population and themselves.

Tables 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3 tabulate the number of respondents that are American citizens. The first table 8.1 breaks down the data between the major subgroups, and it shows differences not only between the major subgroups, but within the "other" subgroups. Puerto Ricans are for obvious reasons, all citizens; a 61.5% of Cubans said to be citizens compared to a 34.2% of Mexicans who said to be citizens. Citizenship is not judged here as an element of legality, but as an element required to participate of electoral processes. After Puerto Ricans, Latinos of South American (66.7%) and Dominican (61.5%) descent are the ones with the largest number of citizens. Salvadorans (34.5%) and other Central Americans (50%) numbers of citizens are comparable to Mexicans. This table chi-square value is .000 which indicates a relationship between data and variable.

Table 8.2 shows, foreign born Latinos/Hispanics number of citizens are lower than 50%; however, when analyzed individually there are some countries that are pushing the balance to one side more than other. Table 8.2 chi-square significance value is .962, which indicates no significant relationship. Table 8.3 shows that foreign born Latinos/Hispanics from countries like Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Venezuela said to be mainly citizens; on the other side, most Central American foreign born Latinos said they were not citizens, including Mexicans. The fact that Mexicans are usually the largest subgroup notably affects the percentage of non-citizens in the table. The reality is that South American and

Dominican foreign born Latinos/Hispanics tend to be citizens in a larger number. Table 8.3 chi-square value is .000 indicating significant relationship.

Tables 9.1.1, 9.1.2, and 9.1.3 show the perceptions of Latinos/Hispanics of their ethnic label as helpful, hurtful or indifferent when trying to find a job. Although, within the major subgroups overall being Latino/Hispanic does not make a difference when finding a job, differences between the subgroups are noticeable. For instance, while a 32.9% of Mexicans, a 33% of Puerto Ricans, and a 35.1% of Cubans said being a Latino/Hispanic helps them to find a job, a 50% of Other Central Americans and a 41.7% of Other South Americans said the same. Ancestry tends to be problematic in some tabulations because many respondents did not classify themselves as either Central or South Americans, but said other country instead. However, when tabulated with native and foreign born Latinos/Hispanics, results are clearer. U.S. born Latinos/Hispanics think of the ethnic label as less helpful than foreign born expressed, they also think of being Latino/Hispanic as an element that makes no difference when finding a job. When the variable is crossed with each country of origin the numbers are consistent with the previous tables. Apart from foreign born Cubans, all the other respondents seemed to agree that being a Latino/Hispanic was helpful when finding a job.

In tables 9.2.1, 9.2.2, and 9.2.3 information was crossed to find out if respondents felt that being Latino/Hispanic helped, hurt, or made no difference when getting a promotion. Different from the prior tables, a larger share of respondents said being Latino/Hispanic did not make any difference when trying to get a promotion. Overall a 44.2% used the category “no difference” to answer, followed by “helps.” Similarly, a 55.6% of U.S. born Latinos/Hispanics answered it made no difference, although a 38.8% of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics said being Latino/Hispanic helps rather than being ignored. It can be argued that Latinos/Hispanics do not see themselves

discriminated for being Latinos, on the contrary they see that can either help them or in the worst case, it would not make any difference when either trying to find a job or get a promotion in the current job. This is particularly interesting given that discrimination can foster political mobilization. When asked about how the ethnic label will impact admission to school or college, responses are not conclusive. Table 9.3.1 shows that a small majority perceives that being Latino/Hispanic makes no difference when applying to school. When the variable is contrasted between U.S. born and Foreign born Latinos/Hispanics, the major difference is that a larger share of U.S. born Latinos/Hispanics (41.3%) think the ethnic label makes no difference when it comes to apply to college or school. In comparison, a 38.1% of foreign born Latinos/Hispanics think the same, and a 39.8% think it might help.

Discussion

First, it is necessary to acknowledge that even when some variables offered more insightful and significant results than others, each variable and category showed consistent tendencies within the ethnic subgroups. In some of the categories, it was not possible to establish a big difference in between the major subgroups (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans) and the subgroups categorized as "Other." There were some variables where differences are noticeable. In the first place, group identity was a telling variable. Different from what is expected, a larger share of Latinos/Hispanics said not to have a pan-ethnic (Latino/Hispanic) term preference. The latter can be the result of different situations: detachment of pan-ethnic labels and/or a stronger attachment to country of origin/nationality terms; little knowledge of the pan-ethnic terms meaning and/or confusion; or adoption to the recipient label nationality, American.

As I have suggested, the fact that surveys such as the NSL (National Survey of Latinos) do not offer identity categories that include country of origin or hyphened racial labels in their questionnaires, causes that most respondents end up rejecting pan-ethnic labels when answering these surveys. I suggest, for instance, that if a native-born Latino/Hispanic that considers himself/herself a Chicano/a, a Cuban-American or a Colombian is not given these options in a questionnaire or survey, this person will say "he/she" does not have a preference between the terms given, before choosing a term he/she does not identify with. Following this line of thought, I argue that using pan-ethnic labels identification as a predictor of any kind of social or political behavior is not reliable. The vagueness of a category such as "no preference" and the lower percentages of those who identify either as Latino or Hispanic are an indication of the uncertainty of using Latinidad as a political predictor.

When analyzing political participation, and comparing the percentage of respondents who identified themselves as Democrats and the percentage of those who said will vote for the Democratic candidate Barack Obama in the presidential election of 2012, the numbers did not exactly add up. The number of democrats was lower than the number of voters for the democratic team. This indicates that party identification is not always a vote predictor. The three subgroups with the highest number of respondents who said would vote for Obama and Biden were South Americans (77.8%), Dominicans (78.8%) and Salvadorans (73.5%), while the number of respondent of the same subgroups who identified themselves as Democrats were 50% for South Americans, 63.9% Dominicans, and 41.7% Salvadorans. The latter shows that even when party affiliation is a strong predictor of voting, there are other shares of people who do not identify with one of the main political parties, but that have the intention to vote. The case of Dominicans is also interesting, according to the tables, Dominicans are solid Democrat voters, even more than

Mexicans that are so often portrayed as such. There are variations in between subgroups, however, what it remains constant is the low number of Latinos/Hispanics that considered themselves Republicans, that see the Republican Party as interested in Latino issues, or that will be willing to vote for a republican candidate.

Also interesting are the higher percentages of South Americans, Central Americans, and Dominicans who identified as Democrats compared to Mexicans. Mexicans represent the largest share of the Latino/Hispanic community in the U.S., which means they can contribute with more votes. The latter has made that Political Parties concentrate more on promoting and campaigning among them, however, as the results show, there are significant numbers indicating that other subgroups might be more strongly affiliated to a political party than what the traditional Latino/Hispanic subgroups like Mexicans or Cubans are. Attribute a political party preference to all Latinos/Hispanics is misleading. As the tables showed, large groups of respondents identified themselves as independent or something else, especially among those who identified themselves as foreign born. In fact, table 4.3 shows that Panamanian tend to have a stronger affiliation to Republicans, as well Guatemalans and Chileans party affiliation was evenly distributed, making it hard to assign a single label to them.

When inquired about important issues discussed during the presidential campaign, responses where somehow consistent. Some variations were noticeable, although most of them consisted in that some subgroups chose *"very important"* instead of *"extremely important"*. Still, there were differences between the three major subgroups and the ones catalogued as "Other." While no more than 50% of Mexicans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans said that Education was extremely important for the elections, more than 50% of Dominicans, Other Central Americans, and Other South Americans said it was extremely important. When asked about jobs, the economy,

and health care, results are not significantly different, which means that education can be more of a deal breaker among Latinos/Hispanics than the economy or health care. The other issue they were inquired about was immigration, which has been for decades portrayed as a vital issue for Latinos/Hispanics. As the tables show, less than 50% of the major subgroups and the "other" Latinos/Hispanics said immigration was extremely important, as well less than 50% said it was very important. Not even most foreign born Latinos considered the issue as extremely important, and when analyzed by country of origin, only a larger percentage of Chileans and Colombians said it was extremely important. This is important because other issues were rated as extremely important by a larger percentage of respondents rather than immigration, which should be considered by the media, politicians, and political parties' organizations.

Going through the established variables for acculturation, it is noticeable that much of Latinos/Hispanics do not see the ethnic label as an impediment for either finding a job, getting promoted or getting into school. Which is an indicator that discrimination is not a factor that has moved them to participate in politics. However, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Central Americans are the ones that had the most respondents saying that being Latino/Hispanic could hurt any of the mentioned processes. Percentages are not significantly high, but there are higher than in other subgroups, which makes sense with the political history of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in the United States. Still, numbers are not that high to make a statement.

I have expected to find more notable differences among respondents in regards voting behavior, however, even when gaps are not extremely wide there are certain points to highlight: Hispanic or Latino are not terms inherently attached to those labeled under them; Political party affiliations of South Americans, Central Americans, and Dominicans are more consistent than in the other major subgroups, even when not targeted by the political parties' campaigns with the

same strength as they target the major subgroups. Further, Dominicans are becoming a solid Democrat subgroup, with what it seems to be an active electoral engagement, which is supported by the high percentage of Dominicans who said to be planning to vote. Even when South Americans and Central Americans are diverse subgroups, congruencies can be found within those two subgroups, more than with the three major subgroups. Many respondents did not identify their ancestry with the major categories, instead a lot of them chose *"another country"*, which altered the cross tabulation. This situation might have impacted the percentages of the "Other" Latinos/Hispanics given that their countries of origin were not listed as a primary group. Analyzing the latter situation, I suggest that to obtain better and more accurate results from the variables utilized in this study is necessary to include more countries as main ancestry categories. By the amount of respondent who chose another country as an ancestry category, it looks like respondents did not know what to answer when asked about their ancestry and their country of origin was not listed. Subcategories such as Other Central Americans or Other South Americans do not seem to be viable alternatives.

Finally, being able to obtain more precise information where subgroups and countries of origin were separated from the main Latino subgroups was itself an important gain. However, it is necessary to keep conducting research where these subgroups are detached from each other, which will allow better understanding of Latinos/Hispanics in the U.S. Which also makes necessary that more data is collected under such conditions, as well as more data should be available. Although the National Survey of Latinos has been conducted for many years now, data is only available until 2013. In unpredictable and heated political times like the ones American society is living, understanding the political behavior of the largest minority in the country should be a priority.

Table 1.1. Pan-Ethnic term preference—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
The terms Hispanic and Latino are both used to describe people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	316	55	30	27	21	4	0	79	3	3	538
		32.2%	27.1%	27.0%	37.5%	29.2%	20.0%	0.0%	28.5%	27.3%	42.9%	30.5%
	Latino	117	32	20	7	9	7	6	53	0	1	252
		11.9%	15.8%	18.0%	9.7%	12.5%	35.0%	50.0%	19.1%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	No preference	531	113	61	38	41	9	5	143	8	3	952
		54.2%	55.7%	55.0%	52.8%	56.9%	45.0%	41.7%	51.6%	72.7%	42.9%	53.9%
	Don't Know	13	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	18
		1.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	Refused	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	73.742[a]	36	.000
Likelihood Ratio	54.203	36	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	.389	1	.533
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 1.1a. Pan-Ethnic term preference—Other Country[Specify]

		Specify Other country											
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Ecuador	Guatemala	Honduras	Nicaragua	Panama
The terms Hispanic and Latino are both used to describe people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	0	0	1	0	1	9	0	5	7	2	4	0
		0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	26.5%	0.0%	27.8%	25.0%	10.0%	18.2%	0.0%
	Latino	1	0	1	3	1	7	1	3	8	4	3	1
		16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	33.3%	20.6%	25.0%	16.7%	28.6%	20.0%	13.6%	16.7%
	No preference	5	1	2	1	1	18	3	10	13	14	15	5
		83.3%	100.0%	50.0%	25.0%	33.3%	52.9%	75.0%	55.6%	46.4%	70.0%	68.2%	83.3%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		6	1	4	4	3	34	4	18	28	20	22	6
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Portugal	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Africa	United States	Other country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
The terms Hispanic and Latino are both used to describe people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	0	25	0	3	1	0	8	5	0	1	79
		0.0%	43.9%	0.0%	27.3%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	38.5%	0.0%	50.0%	28.5%
	Latino	1	1	1	3	0	1	1	3	0	0	53
		33.3%	1.8%	50.0%	27.3%	0.0%	100.0%	6.3%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%
	No preference	2	30	1	4	0	0	7	5	1	1	143
		66.7%	52.6%	50.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	43.8%	38.5%	100.0%	50.0%	51.6%
	Don't Know	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%
	Refused	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%
Total	100.0%	3	57	2	11	1	1	16	13	1	2	277
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 1.1a

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	95.238[a]	88	.281
Likelihood Ratio	85.770	88	.547
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.752	1	.186
N of Valid Cases	277		

Table 1.2. Pan-Ethnic term preference—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
The terms Hispanic and Latino are both used to describe people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	32	245	260	0	1	538
		30.5%	32.3%	28.9%	0.0%	100.0%	30.5%
	Latino	17	85	150	0	0	252
		16.2%	11.2%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
	No preference	54	423	474	1	0	952
		51.4%	55.7%	52.7%	100.0%	0.0%	53.9%
	Don't Know	1	5	12	0	0	18
		1.0%	.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	Refused	1	1	3	0	0	5
		1.0%	.1%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.640[a]	16	.288
Likelihood Ratio	18.891	16	.274
Linear-by-Linear Association	.296	1	.586
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 1.3. Pan-Ethnic term preference—Foreign born country of origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	7 25.0%	0 0.0%	23 25.8%	20 39.2%	5 26.3%	15 25.4%	7 25.9%	4 18.2%
	Latino	1 12.5%	1 100.0%	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	1 33.3%	4 14.3%	0 0.0%	18 20.2%	5 9.8%	5 26.3%	6 10.2%	8 29.6%	2 9.1%
	No preference	7 87.5%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	16 57.1%	4 100.0%	48 53.9%	26 51.0%	9 47.4%	37 62.7%	12 44.4%	16 72.7%
	Don't Know	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Refused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Total		8 100.0%	1 100.0%	3 100.0%	3 100.0%	3 100.0%	28 100.0%	4 100.0%	89 100.0%	51 100.0%	19 100.0%	59 100.0%	27 100.0%	22 100.0%

		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
2. Do you happen to prefer one of these terms more than the other?	Hispanic	154 31.6%	4 20.0%	0 0.0%	7 33.3%	1 50.0%	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 12.5%	1 100.0%	3 11.5%	2 50.0%	3 60.0%	261 29.0%
	Latino	70 14.4%	4 20.0%	2 40.0%	9 42.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 25.0%	0 0.0%	7 26.9%	1 25.0%	1 20.0%	150 16.6%
	No preference	253 52.0%	12 60.0%	3 60.0%	5 23.8%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	1 100.0%	4 50.0%	0 0.0%	15 57.7%	1 25.0%	1 20.0%	475 52.7%
	Don't Know	10 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 1.3%
	Refused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 12.5%	0 0.0%	1 3.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 .3%
Total		487 100.0%	20 100.0%	5 100.0%	21 100.0%	2 100.0%	4 100.0%	1 100.0%	8 100.0%	1 100.0%	26 100.0%	4 100.0%	5 100.0%	901 100.0%

Continue from table 1.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	168.955[a]	96	.000
Likelihood Ratio	105.873	96	.231
Linear-by-Linear Association	.358	1	.550
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 2.1. Candidate Choice—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
If the presidential election were being held TODAY, would you vote...?	for the Democratic ticket of Barack Obama and Joe Biden	393	143	30	41	25	7	7	108	7	1	762
		60.6%	70.4%	39.5%	78.8%	73.5%	58.3%	77.8%	56.3%	77.8%	20.0%	61.4%
	for the Republican ticket of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan	125	24	33	6	4	3	2	37	1	2	237
		19.3%	11.8%	43.4%	11.5%	11.8%	25.0%	22.2%	19.3%	11.1%	40.0%	19.1%
	Other candidate	19	5	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	31
		2.9%	2.5%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
	Will not vote	36	13	1	1	1	0	0	11	0	0	63
		5.5%	6.4%	1.3%	1.9%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
	Don't Know	63	11	9	4	2	1	0	27	1	2	120
		9.7%	5.4%	11.8%	7.7%	5.9%	8.3%	0.0%	14.1%	11.1%	40.0%	9.7%
	Refused	13	7	1	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	28
		2.0%	3.4%	1.3%	0.0%	5.9%	8.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Total		649	203	76	52	34	12	9	192	9	5	1241
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	80.245[a]	45	.001
Likelihood Ratio	81.157	45	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.759	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	1241		

Table 2.2. Candidate choice—Native/Foreign Born

		4. Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?			
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Total
13. If the presidential election were being held TODAY, would you vote...?	for the Democratic ticket of Barack Obama and Joe Biden	70	462	230	762
		66.7%	60.9%	61.0%	61.4%
	for the Republican ticket of Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan	13	151	73	237
		12.4%	19.9%	19.4%	19.1%
	Other candidate	1	25	5	31
		1.0%	3.3%	1.3%	2.5%
	Will not vote	8	41	14	63
		7.6%	5.4%	3.7%	5.1%
	Don't Know	9	67	44	120
		8.6%	8.8%	11.7%	9.7%
	Refused	4	13	11	28
		3.8%	1.7%	2.9%	2.3%
Total		105	759	377	1241
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.238[a]	10	.093
Likelihood Ratio	16.864	10	.077
Linear-by-Linear Association	.967	1	.325
N of Valid Cases	1241		

Table 2.3. Candidate Choice— Foreign born country of origin

		In what country were you born?										
		Argentina	Bolivia	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
If the presidential election were being held TODAY, would you vote...?	Barack Obama and Joe Biden	4	2	1	12	3	17	24	5	17	2	2
		80.0%	100.0%	50.0%	66.7%	75.0%	31.5%	77.4%	62.5%	81.0%	25.0%	33.3%
	Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan	0	0	1	2	0	25	4	0	1	5	1
		0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	11.1%	0.0%	46.3%	12.9%	0.0%	4.8%	62.5%	16.7%
	Other candidate	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Will not vote	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
		20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	25.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	1	0	8	2	3	1	1	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	14.8%	6.5%	37.5%	4.8%	12.5%	33.3%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	3.2%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		5	2	2	18	4	54	31	8	21	8	6
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?										
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Refused	Total
If the presidential election were being held TODAY, would you vote...?	Barack Obama and Joe Biden	108	5	2	7	2	3	4	0	7	3	230
		66.3%	45.5%	40.0%	63.6%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	61.0%
	Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan	24	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	73
		14.7%	9.1%	60.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	19.4%
	Other candidate	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
		1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	Will not vote	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	14
		2.5%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	3.7%
	Don't Know	21	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	44
		12.9%	9.1%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	7.1%	0.0%	11.7%
	Refused	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11
		2.5%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	2.9%
Total		163	11	5	11	2	3	5	1	14	3	377
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 2.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	135.560[a]	100	.010
Likelihood Ratio	120.436	100	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	.021	1	.884
N of Valid Cases	377		

Table 3.1. Intention to vote—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Do you yourself plan to vote in the election this November?	Yes	525	163	66	44	28	11	9	165	8	5	1024
		80.9%	80.3%	86.8%	84.6%	82.4%	91.7%	100.0%	85.9%	88.9%	100.0%	82.5%
	No	103	34	8	5	5	1	0	16	0	0	172
		15.9%	16.7%	10.5%	9.6%	14.7%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9%
	Don't know	21	6	2	3	1	0	0	10	1	0	44
		3.2%	3.0%	2.6%	5.8%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	11.1%	0.0%	3.5%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		649	203	76	52	34	12	9	192	9	5	1241
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.237[a]	27	.617
Likelihood Ratio	26.503	27	.491
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.261	1	.261
N of Valid Cases	1241		

Table 3.2. Intention to vote—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?			
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Total
Do you yourself plan to vote in the election this November?	Yes	84	622	318	1024
		80.0%	81.9%	84.4%	82.5%
	No	18	114	40	172
		17.1%	15.0%	10.6%	13.9%
	Don't know	3	23	18	44
		2.9%	3.0%	4.8%	3.5%
	Refused	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	.3%	.1%
Total		105	759	377	1241
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.296[a]	6	.158
Likelihood Ratio	9.446	6	.150
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.049	1	.306
N of Valid Cases	1241		

Table 3.3. Intention to Vote— Foreign born country of origin

		In what country were you born?										
		Argentina	Bolivia	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Do you yourself plan to vote in the election this November ?	Yes	4	2	2	13	3	47	29	5	18	8	5
		80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	72.2%	75.0%	87.0%	93.5%	62.5%	85.7%	100.0%	83.3%
	No	1	0	0	3	1	6	1	0	3	0	1
		20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	11.1%	3.2%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	16.7%
	Don't know	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	1.9%	3.2%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		5	2	2	18	4	54	31	8	21	8	6
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?										
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Refused	Total
Do you yourself plan to vote in the election this November?	Yes	138	8	5	9	2	3	5	0	9	3	318
		84.7%	72.7%	100.0%	81.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	64.3%	100.0%	84.4%
	No	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	40
		11.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	10.6%
	Don't know	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	18
		4.3%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	7.1%	0.0%	4.8%
	Refused	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
Total		163	11	5	11	2	3	5	1	14	3	377
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 3.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	93.220[a]	60	.004
Likelihood Ratio	48.081	60	.866
Linear-by-Linear Association	.423	1	.515
N of Valid Cases	377		

Table 4.1. Party self-identification—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?	Republican	116	22	30	7	10	4	1	32	0	2	224
		11.8%	10.8%	27.0%	9.7%	13.9%	20.0%	8.3%	11.6%	0.0%	28.6%	12.7%
	Democrat	436	126	41	46	30	10	6	134	5	3	837
		44.5%	62.1%	36.9%	63.9%	41.7%	50.0%	50.0%	48.4%	45.5%	42.9%	47.4%
	Independent	222	20	25	11	17	1	4	67	4	0	371
		22.7%	9.9%	22.5%	15.3%	23.6%	5.0%	33.3%	24.2%	36.4%	0.0%	21.0%
	Something else	113	24	6	5	6	2	0	27	1	0	184
		11.5%	11.8%	5.4%	6.9%	8.3%	10.0%	0.0%	9.7%	9.1%	0.0%	10.4%
	Don't Know	76	7	6	3	8	2	0	11	1	2	116
		7.8%	3.4%	5.4%	4.2%	11.1%	10.0%	0.0%	4.0%	9.1%	28.6%	6.6%
	Refused	17	4	3	0	1	1	1	6	0	0	33
		1.7%	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	1.4%	5.0%	8.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	95.259[a]	45	.000
Likelihood Ratio	97.881	45	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.645	1	.422
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 4.2. Party self-identification— Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?	Republican	12	115	97	0	0	224
		11.4%	15.2%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
	Democrat	63	373	400	1	0	837
		60.0%	49.1%	44.5%	100.0%	0.0%	47.4%
	Independent	11	149	211	0	0	371
		10.5%	19.6%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%
	Something else	10	93	81	0	0	184
		9.5%	12.3%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
	Don't Know	5	23	88	0	0	116
		4.8%	3.0%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%
	Refused	4	6	22	0	1	33
		3.8%	.8%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%	1.9%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	116.176[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	75.403	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.190	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 4.3. Party Self-identification—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
In politics, today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?	Republican	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	24	5	0	5	4	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	27.0%	9.8%	0.0%	8.5%	14.8%	4.5%
	Democrat	3	1	3	0	1	18	3	34	33	9	24	9	8
		37.5%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	64.3%	75.0%	38.2%	64.7%	47.4%	40.7%	33.3%	36.4%
	Independent	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	21	7	7	17	9	7
		25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	17.9%	0.0%	23.6%	13.7%	36.8%	28.8%	33.3%	31.8%
	Something else	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	5	2	4
		12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	3.6%	25.0%	1.1%	5.9%	0.0%	8.5%	7.4%	18.2%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	6	3	2	7	2	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	6.7%	5.9%	10.5%	11.9%	7.4%	9.1%
	Refused	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	0
		25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	5.3%	1.7%	3.7%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?	Republican	42	2	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	97
		8.6%	10.0%	60.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
	Democrat	202	9	2	10	2	3	1	4	0	15	2	5	401
		41.5%	45.0%	40.0%	47.6%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	57.7%	50.0%	100.0%	44.5%
	Independent	118	3	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	211
		24.2%	15.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	23.4%
	Something else	54	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	81
		11.1%	15.0%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%
	Don't Know	59	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	88
		12.1%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	9.8%
	Refused	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	23
		2.5%	5.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	2.6%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 4.4

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	164.188[a]	120	.005
Likelihood Ratio	159.965	120	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.400	1	.237
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 5.1. Party perception—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Which party do you think has more concern for (Hispanics/Latinos) - or is there no difference?	The Democratic Party	517	127	56	53	30	7	9	154	5	3	961
		52.8%	62.6%	50.5%	73.6%	41.7%	35.0%	75.0%	55.6%	45.5%	42.9%	54.4%
	The Republican Party	95	13	20	3	7	4	0	26	0	0	168
		9.7%	6.4%	18.0%	4.2%	9.7%	20.0%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
	No difference	279	55	25	12	28	8	3	75	4	3	492
		28.5%	27.1%	22.5%	16.7%	38.9%	40.0%	25.0%	27.1%	36.4%	42.9%	27.9%
	Don't Know	86	8	7	4	7	1	0	19	2	1	135
		8.8%	3.9%	6.3%	5.6%	9.7%	5.0%	0.0%	6.9%	18.2%	14.3%	7.6%
	Refused	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	9
		.3%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	100.172[a]	88	.177
Likelihood Ratio	75.366	88	.829
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.371	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	277		

Table 5.2. Party Perception—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Which party do you think has more concern for (Hispanics/Latinos) - or is there no difference?	The Democratic Party	63	445	452	0	1	961
		60.0%	58.6%	50.3%	0.0%	100.0%	54.4%
	The Republican Party	6	74	88	0	0	168
		5.7%	9.7%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
	No difference	32	187	272	1	0	492
		30.5%	24.6%	30.3%	100.0%	0.0%	27.9%
	Don't Know	4	50	81	0	0	135
		3.8%	6.6%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
	Refused	0	3	6	0	0	9
		0.0%	.4%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.459[a]	16	.129
Likelihood Ratio	24.043	16	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.539	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 5.3. Party Perception—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Which party do you think has more concern for (Hispanics/ Latinos) - or is there no difference?	The Democratic Party	5	1	2	1	3	11	2	46	36	11	26	11	9
		62.5%	100.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	39.3%	50.0%	51.7%	70.6%	57.9%	44.1%	40.7%	40.9%
	The Republican Party	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	14	4	2	5	2	2
		12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	7.1%	25.0%	15.7%	7.8%	10.5%	8.5%	7.4%	9.1%
	No difference	1	0	1	1	0	13	0	19	8	2	23	12	9
		12.5%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	46.4%	0.0%	21.3%	15.7%	10.5%	39.0%	44.4%	40.9%
	Don't Know	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	3	4	5	2	2
		12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	25.0%	7.9%	5.9%	21.1%	8.5%	7.4%	9.1%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Which party do you think has more concern for (Hispanics/ Latinos) - or is there no difference?	The Democratic Party	234	9	1	14	2	4	1	4	0	16	1	3	453
		48.0%	45.0%	20.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	61.5%	25.0%	60.0%	50.3%
	The Republican Party	43	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	88
		8.8%	10.0%	40.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	11.5%	25.0%	0.0%	9.8%
	No difference	160	7	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	1	273
		32.9%	35.0%	20.0%	23.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	100.0%	19.2%	50.0%	20.0%	30.3%
	Don't Know	48	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	81
		9.9%	5.0%	20.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	20.0%	9.0%
	Refused	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
		0.4%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.7%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 5.3

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	87.718[a]	96	.715
Likelihood Ratio	85.286	96	.775
Linear-by-Linear Association	.273	1	.601
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 6.1. Latinos/Hispanics impact on elections—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Now in thinking about the 2012 Presidential election, in your opinion, will the (Hispanic/Latino) vote have a major impact, a minor impact or will it have no impact at all in determining who wins the 2012 Presidential election?	Major impact	651	144	76	56	47	16	6	191	5	5	1197
		66.4%	70.9%	68.5%	77.8%	65.3%	80.0%	50.0%	69.0%	45.5%	71.4%	67.8%
	Minor impact	220	34	17	12	14	3	3	61	2	2	368
		22.4%	16.7%	15.3%	16.7%	19.4%	15.0%	25.0%	22.0%	18.2%	28.6%	20.8%
	No impact at all	53	9	9	2	4	1	1	12	3	0	94
		5.4%	4.4%	8.1%	2.8%	5.6%	5.0%	8.3%	4.3%	27.3%	0.0%	5.3%
	Don't know	53	15	9	2	7	0	2	13	1	0	102
		5.4%	7.4%	8.1%	2.8%	9.7%	0.0%	16.7%	4.7%	9.1%	0.0%	5.8%
	Refused	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
		.3%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.689[a]	36	.483
Likelihood Ratio	33.084	36	.608
Linear-by-Linear Association	.829	1	.363
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 6.2. Latinos/Hispanics impact in elections— Native/Foreign born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now in thinking about the 2012 Presidential election, in your opinion, will the (Hispanic/Latino) vote have a major impact, a minor impact or will it have no impact at all in determining who wins the 2012 Presidential election?	Major impact	74	477	645	0	1	1197
		70.5%	62.8%	71.7%	0.0%	100.0%	67.8%
	Minor impact	14	200	154	0	0	368
		13.3%	26.4%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.8%
	No impact at all	5	47	41	1	0	94
		4.8%	6.2%	4.6%	100.0%	0.0%	5.3%
	Don't know	11	34	57	0	0	102
		10.5%	4.5%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%
	Refused	1	1	2	0	0	4
		1.0%	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.579[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	41.301	16	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.830	1	.362
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 6.3. Latinos/Hispanics impact in elections—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Now in thinking about the 2012 Presidential election, in your opinion, will the (Hispanic/Latino) vote have a major impact, a minor impact or will it have no impact at all in determining who wins the 2012 Presidential election?	Major impact	7	1	3	3	1	20	4	63	43	12	40	19	17
		87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%	71.4%	100.0%	70.8%	84.3%	63.2%	67.8%	70.4%	77.3%
	Minor impact	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	11	7	6	9	5	2
		12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	14.3%	0.0%	12.4%	13.7%	31.6%	15.3%	18.5%	9.1%
	No impact at all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	4	3	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	11.1%	4.5%
	Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	8	1	1	6	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	9.0%	2.0%	5.3%	10.2%	0.0%	9.1%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now in thinking about the 2012 Presidential election, in your opinion, will the (Hispanic/Latino) vote have a major impact, a minor impact or will it have no impact at all in determining who wins the 2012 Presidential election?	Major impact	340	17	3	19	1	2	0	6	1	19	1	4	646
		69.8%	85.0%	60.0%	90.5%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	75.0%	100.0%	73.1%	25.0%	80.0%	71.7%
	Minor impact	91	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	0	4	0	1	154
		18.7%	10.0%	40.0%	4.8%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	25.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	20.0%	17.1%
	No impact at all	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	42
		4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	50.0%	0.0%	4.7%
	Don't know	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	57
		6.2%	5.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	25.0%	0.0%	6.3%
	Refused	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 6.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	80.346[a]	96	.875
Likelihood Ratio	78.918	96	.897
Linear-by-Linear Association	.289	1	.591
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 7.1.1. Issues: Education—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Education extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	459	100	51	47	34	11	9	140	5	2	858
		46.8%	49.3%	45.9%	65.3%	47.2%	55.0%	75.0%	50.5%	45.5%	28.6%	48.6%
	Very important	457	87	49	22	34	9	3	115	6	5	787
		46.6%	42.9%	44.1%	30.6%	47.2%	45.0%	25.0%	41.5%	54.5%	71.4%	44.6%
	Somewhat important	51	12	9	3	3	0	0	14	0	0	92
		5.2%	5.9%	8.1%	4.2%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%
	Not too important	11	3	2	0	1	0	0	8	0	0	25
		1.1%	1.5%	1.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
	Don't Know	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		.1%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.634[a]	45	.950
Likelihood Ratio	33.484	45	.897
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.909
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.1.2. Issues: Education—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Education extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	44	423	389	1	1	858
		41.9%	55.7%	43.3%	100.0%	100.0%	48.6%
	Very important	56	266	465	0	0	787
		53.3%	35.0%	51.7%	0.0%	0.0%	44.6%
	Somewhat important	4	54	34	0	0	92
		3.8%	7.1%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%
	Not too important	1	15	9	0	0	25
		1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
	Don't Know	0	1	1	0	0	2
		0.0%	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
	Refused	0	0	1	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.075[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	58.703	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.060	1	.303
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.1.3. Issues: Education—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Is the issue of Education extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	4	0	1	0	1	14	3	41	30	12	27	10	9
		50.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	75.0%	46.1%	58.8%	63.2%	45.8%	37.0%	40.9%
	Very important	4	1	2	3	1	12	1	41	19	7	31	15	13
		50.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	33.3%	42.9%	25.0%	46.1%	37.3%	36.8%	52.5%	55.6%	59.1%
	Somewhat important	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	2	0	1	1	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	3.6%	0.0%	5.6%	3.9%	0.0%	1.7%	3.7%	0.0%
	Not too important	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												Total
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	
Is the issue of Education extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	190	11	2	12	1	2	0	2	1	11	2	5	391
		39.0%	55.0%	40.0%	57.1%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	100.0%	42.3%	50.0%	100.0%	43.4%
	Very important	274	9	2	8	0	2	1	5	0	12	2	0	465
		56.3%	45.0%	40.0%	38.1%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	62.5%	0.0%	46.2%	50.0%	0.0%	51.6%
	Somewhat important	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	34
		4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
	Not too important	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9
		0.4%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

Continue from Table 7.1.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	535.755[a]	120	.000
Likelihood Ratio	82.292	120	.997
Linear-by-Linear Association	.162	1	.688
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 7.2.1. Issues: Jobs and the Economy—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Jobs and the Economy extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	446	123	61	41	33	7	6	138	6	2	863
		45.5%	60.6%	55.0%	56.9%	45.8%	35.0%	50.0%	49.8%	54.5%	28.6%	48.9%
	Very important	473	75	44	28	34	12	6	124	4	4	804
		48.3%	36.9%	39.6%	38.9%	47.2%	60.0%	50.0%	44.8%	36.4%	57.1%	45.6%
	Somewhat important	41	2	3	2	3	1	0	11	1	0	64
		4.2%	1.0%	2.7%	2.8%	4.2%	5.0%	0.0%	4.0%	9.1%	0.0%	3.6%
	Not too important	16	3	3	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	28
		1.6%	1.5%	2.7%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	14.3%	1.6%
	Don't Know	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.449[a]	45	.581
Likelihood Ratio	41.602	45	.617
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.834
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.2.2. Issues: Jobs and the Economy—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Jobs and the Economy extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	52	437	372	1	1	863
		49.5%	57.6%	41.4%	100.0%	100.0%	48.9%
	Very important	48	274	482	0	0	804
		45.7%	36.1%	53.6%	0.0%	0.0%	45.6%
	Somewhat important	3	33	28	0	0	64
		2.9%	4.3%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
	Not too important	2	13	13	0	0	28
		1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
	Don't Know	0	2	3	0	0	5
		0.0%	.3%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
	Refused	0	0	1	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	55.415[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	57.239	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.494	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.2.3. Issues: Jobs and the Economy—Foreign born country of origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Is the issue of Jobs and the Economy extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	3	0	1	1	2	13	2	52	26	12	25	10	11
		37.5%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%	46.4%	50.0%	58.4%	51.0%	63.2%	42.4%	37.0%	50.0%
	Very important	5	1	2	2	1	15	2	35	24	6	31	17	11
		62.5%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	33.3%	53.6%	50.0%	39.3%	47.1%	31.6%	52.5%	63.0%	50.0%
	Somewhat important	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	5.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	Not too important	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												Total
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	
Is the issue of Jobs and Economy extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	172	9	2	8	2	2	1	3	1	10	2	4	374
		35.3%	45.0%	40.0%	38.1%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	37.5%	100.0%	38.5%	50.0%	80.0%	41.5%
	Very important	289	10	3	11	0	1	0	3	0	12	1	0	482
		59.3%	50.0%	60.0%	52.4%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	46.2%	25.0%	0.0%	53.5%
	Somewhat important	17	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	28
		3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
	Not too important	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	13
		1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	25.0%	20.0%	1.4%
	Don't Know	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.2%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 7.2.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	125.550[a]	120	.346
Likelihood Ratio	92.234	120	.972
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.097	1	.043
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 7.3.1. Issues: Health care—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Health care extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	410	105	58	39	28	12	7	131	5	3	798
		41.8%	51.7%	52.3%	54.2%	38.9%	60.0%	58.3%	47.3%	45.5%	42.9%	45.2%
	Very important	468	79	41	30	41	7	4	123	3	4	800
		47.8%	38.9%	36.9%	41.7%	56.9%	35.0%	33.3%	44.4%	27.3%	57.1%	45.3%
	Somewhat important	68	14	9	2	3	1	1	19	1	0	118
		6.9%	6.9%	8.1%	2.8%	4.2%	5.0%	8.3%	6.9%	9.1%	0.0%	6.7%
	Not too important	28	4	3	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	42
		2.9%	2.0%	2.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	18.2%	0.0%	2.4%
	Don't Know	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
		.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
	Refused	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.524[a]	45	.577
Likelihood Ratio	41.713	45	.612
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.549	1	.213
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.3.2. Issues: Health care—Native/Foreign Born

		4. Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Health care extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	46	391	360	0	1	798
		43.8%	51.5%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%	45.2%
	Very important	52	269	479	0	0	800
		49.5%	35.4%	53.3%	0.0%	0.0%	45.3%
	Somewhat important	5	69	44	0	0	118
		4.8%	9.1%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
	Not too important	2	26	13	1	0	42
		1.9%	3.4%	1.4%	100.0%	0.0%	2.4%
	Don't Know	0	3	2	0	0	5
		0.0%	.4%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
	Refused	0	1	1	0	0	2
		0.0%	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	102.821[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	70.583	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.127	1	.288
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.3.3. Issues: Health care—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Is the issue of Health care extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally ?	Extremely important	4	0	2	1	2	15	2	50	23	10	21	9	8
		50.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%	53.6%	50.0%	56.2%	45.1%	52.6%	35.6%	33.3%	36.4%
	Very important	4	1	1	1	1	13	2	32	28	9	36	18	13
		50.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	46.4%	50.0%	36.0%	54.9%	47.4%	61.0%	66.7%	59.1%
	Somewhat important	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	4.5%
	Not too important	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Is the issue of Health care extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	165	8	2	6	1	3	1	4	1	17	1	5	361
		33.9%	40.0%	40.0%	28.6%	50.0%	75.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	65.4%	25.0%	100.0%	40.1%
	Very important	283	11	2	12	0	1	0	3	0	7	1	0	479
		58.1%	55.0%	40.0%	57.1%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	26.9%	25.0%	0.0%	53.2%
	Somewhat important	28	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	44
		5.7%	0.0%	20.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%
	Not too important	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	14
		1.8%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	50.0%	0.0%	1.6%
	Don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.1%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 7.3.3

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	363.560[a]	120	.000
Likelihood Ratio	110.118	120	.730
Linear-by-Linear Association	.027	1	.869
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 7.4.1. Issues: Immigration—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Immigration extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	324	55	37	29	25	6	4	100	1	2	583
		33.1%	27.1%	33.3%	40.3%	34.7%	30.0%	33.3%	36.1%	9.1%	28.6%	33.0%
	Very important	460	82	48	29	32	10	5	106	3	2	777
		46.9%	40.4%	43.2%	40.3%	44.4%	50.0%	41.7%	38.3%	27.3%	28.6%	44.0%
	Somewhat important	128	36	12	8	7	4	2	45	5	2	249
		13.1%	17.7%	10.8%	11.1%	9.7%	20.0%	16.7%	16.2%	45.5%	28.6%	14.1%
	Not too important	53	22	13	4	7	0	1	23	1	0	124
		5.4%	10.8%	11.7%	5.6%	9.7%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	9.1%	0.0%	7.0%
	Don't Know	13	7	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	28
		1.3%	3.4%	.9%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	9.1%	14.3%	1.6%
	Refused	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
		.2%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		980	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	67.320[a]	45	.017
Likelihood Ratio	58.853	45	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	.235	1	.628
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.4.2. Issues: Immigration—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Now I'm going to read you a list of issues that might be discussed during this year's presidential campaign. Is the issue of Immigration extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	25	234	322	1	1	583
		23.8%	30.8%	35.8%	100.0%	100.0%	33.0%
	Very important	51	295	431	0	0	777
		48.6%	38.9%	47.9%	0.0%	0.0%	44.0%
	Somewhat important	13	153	83	0	0	249
		12.4%	20.2%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%
	Not too important	10	66	48	0	0	124
		9.5%	8.7%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
	Don't Know	5	10	13	0	0	28
		4.8%	1.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
	Refused	1	1	2	0	0	4
		1.0%	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		105	759	899	1	1	1765
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	70.720[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	67.906	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.619	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1765		

Table 7.4.3. Issues: Immigration—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Is the issue of Immigration extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	1	0	1	1	3	13	2	32	22	9	23	10	8
		12.5%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	46.4%	50.0%	36.0%	43.1%	47.4%	39.0%	37.0%	36.4%
	Very important	6	1	1	2	0	5	2	38	24	9	27	10	12
		75.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	17.9%	50.0%	42.7%	47.1%	47.4%	45.8%	37.0%	54.5%
	Somewhat important	1	0	1	0	0	5	0	8	2	1	4	4	2
		12.5%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	0.0%	9.0%	3.9%	5.3%	6.8%	14.8%	9.1%
	Not too important	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	10	1	0	5	3	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	11.2%	2.0%	0.0%	8.5%	11.1%	0.0%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	1.1%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?												
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Puerto Rico	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Is the issue of Immigration extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important to you personally?	Extremely important	166	9	1	6	1	1	0	1	1	8	2	3	324
		34.1%	45.0%	20.0%	28.6%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%	100.0%	30.8%	50.0%	60.0%	36.0%
	Very important	257	10	1	11	0	0	1	3	0	9	1	1	431
		52.8%	50.0%	20.0%	52.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	37.5%	0.0%	34.6%	25.0%	20.0%	47.8%
	Somewhat important	38	1	2	1	0	3	0	3	0	5	1	1	83
		7.8%	5.0%	40.0%	4.8%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	19.2%	25.0%	20.0%	9.2%
	Not too important	17	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	48
		3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
	Don't Know	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
		1.4%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
	Refused	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		487	20	5	21	2	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	901
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 7.4.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	163.917[a]	120	.005
Likelihood Ratio	120.294	120	.475
Linear-by-Linear Association	.560	1	.454
N of Valid Cases	901		

Table 8.1. Citizenship—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
Are you a citizen of the United States?	Yes	172	4	56	32	20	8	6	76	1	0	375
		34.2%	100.0%	61.5%	61.5%	34.5%	50.0%	66.7%	47.2%	33.3%	0.0%	41.7%
	No	329	0	35	20	37	8	3	85	2	1	520
		65.4%	0.0%	38.5%	38.5%	63.8%	50.0%	33.3%	52.8%	66.7%	50.0%	57.8%
	Don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	.2%
Total		503	4	91	52	58	16	9	161	3	2	899
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	277.026[a]	27	.000
Likelihood Ratio	63.166	27	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.617	1	.432
N of Valid Cases	899		

Table 8.2. Citizenship—Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?			
		Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Are you a citizen of the United States?	Yes	375	0	0	375
		41.8%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%
	No	518	1	1	520
		57.7%	100.0%	100.0%	57.8%
	Don't Know	2	0	0	2
		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
	Refused	2	0	0	2
		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%
Total		897	1	1	899
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.461[a]	6	.962
Likelihood Ratio	2.193	6	.901
Linear-by-Linear Association	.657	1	.418
N of Valid Cases	899		

Table 8.3. Citizenship—Foreign Born Country of Origin

		In what country were you born?												
		Argentina	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras
Are you a citizen of the United States?	Yes	5	0	2	0	2	18	4	54	31	8	21	8	6
		62.5%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	66.7%	64.3%	100.0%	60.7%	60.8%	42.1%	35.6%	29.6%	27.3%
	No	3	1	1	3	1	10	0	35	20	11	37	19	16
		37.5%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%	35.7%	0.0%	39.3%	39.2%	57.9%	62.7%	70.4%	72.7%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	Refused	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total		8	1	3	3	3	28	4	89	51	19	59	27	22
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		In what country were you born?											
		Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Spain	Uruguay	Venezuela	French Guyana	Other	Don't Know	Refused	Total
Are you a citizen of the United States?	Yes	163	11	5	11	3	0	5	1	14	0	3	375
		33.5%	55.0%	100.0%	52.4%	75.0%	0.0%	62.5%	100.0%	53.8%	0.0%	60.0%	41.7%
	No	323	9	0	10	1	1	3	0	12	3	1	520
		66.3%	45.0%	0.0%	47.6%	25.0%	100.0%	37.5%	0.0%	46.2%	75.0%	20.0%	57.8%
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	.2%
	Refused	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
		0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	.2%
Total		487	20	5	21	4	1	8	1	26	4	5	899
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Continue from Table 8.3.

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	282.534[a]	69	.000
Likelihood Ratio	105.120	69	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.278	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	899		

Table 9.1.1. Perception of discrimination[job]—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to finding a job?	Helps	163	67	39	26	24	10	5	97	4	3	438
		32.9%	33.0%	35.1%	36.1%	33.3%	50.0%	41.7%	35.0%	36.4%	42.9%	34.2%
	Hurts	107	49	23	11	14	4	3	66	1	2	280
		21.6%	24.1%	20.7%	15.3%	19.4%	20.0%	25.0%	23.8%	9.1%	28.6%	21.9%
	Makes no difference	205	78	45	30	33	5	4	107	5	1	513
		41.4%	38.4%	40.5%	41.7%	45.8%	25.0%	33.3%	38.6%	45.5%	14.3%	40.1%
	Don't Know	15	9	3	5	1	1	0	6	1	1	42
		3.0%	4.4%	2.7%	6.9%	1.4%	5.0%	0.0%	2.2%	9.1%	14.3%	3.3%
	Refused	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7
		1.0%	0.0%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%
Total		495	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.339[a]	36	.930
Likelihood Ratio	25.192	36	.911
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.123	1	.289
N of Valid Cases	1280		

Table 9.1.2. Perception of discrimination[job]— Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to finding a job?	Helps	42	150	246	0	0	438
		40.0%	28.2%	38.4%	0.0%	0.0%	34.2%
	Hurts	26	118	136	0	0	280
		24.8%	22.2%	21.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%
	Makes no difference	37	238	238	0	0	513
		35.2%	44.7%	37.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.1%
	Don't Know	0	24	17	1	0	42
		0.0%	4.5%	2.7%	100.0%	0.0%	3.3%
	Refused	0	2	4	0	1	7
		0.0%	.4%	.6%	0.0%	100.0%	.5%
Total		105	532	641	1	1	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	234.274[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	44.166	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.051	1	.152
N of Valid Cases	1280		

Table 9.2.1. Perception of discrimination[promotion]—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to getting a promotion?	Helps	146	56	38	30	27	7	4	83	1	3	395
		29.5%	27.6%	34.2%	41.7%	37.5%	35.0%	33.3%	30.0%	9.1%	42.9%	30.9%
	Hurts	108	46	23	11	12	5	1	61	0	1	268
		21.8%	22.7%	20.7%	15.3%	16.7%	25.0%	8.3%	22.0%	0.0%	14.3%	20.9%
	Makes no difference	220	90	46	30	32	6	6	125	10	1	566
		44.4%	44.3%	41.4%	41.7%	44.4%	30.0%	50.0%	45.1%	90.9%	14.3%	44.2%
	Don't Know	16	11	4	1	1	2	1	7	0	2	45
		3.2%	5.4%	3.6%	1.4%	1.4%	10.0%	8.3%	2.5%	0.0%	28.6%	3.5%
	Refused	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%
Total		495	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.916[a]	36	.088
Likelihood Ratio	43.985	36	.169
Linear-by-Linear Association	.009	1	.926
N of Valid Cases	1280		

Table 9.2.2. Perception of Discrimination [Promotion]—Native/Foreign Born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to getting a promotion?	Helps	39	107	249	0	0	395
		37.1%	20.1%	38.8%	0.0%	0.0%	30.9%
	Hurts	25	105	138	0	0	268
		23.8%	19.7%	21.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%
	Makes no difference	36	296	233	1	0	566
		34.3%	55.6%	36.3%	100.0%	0.0%	44.2%
	Don't Know	5	21	19	0	0	45
		4.8%	3.9%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
	Refused	0	3	2	0	1	6
		0.0%	.6%	.3%	0.0%	100.0%	.5%
Total		105	532	641	1	1	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	278.226[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	78.793	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.598	1	.058
N of Valid Cases	1280		

Table 9.3.1. Perception of Discrimination[school]—Ancestry

		Now I want to ask you about you and your family's heritage. Are you Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, or are you and your ancestors from another country?										
		Mexican (Mexico)	Puerto Rican (Puerto Rico)	Cuban (Cuba)	Dominican (the Dominican Republic)	Salvadoran (El Salvador)	Other Central American (Central America)	Other South American (South America)	Other country	Don't Know (your country of origin)	Refused (your country of origin)	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to gaining admission into schools and colleges?	Helps	184	70	38	31	24	7	5	109	5	2	475
		37.2%	34.5%	34.2%	43.1%	33.3%	35.0%	41.7%	39.4%	45.5%	28.6%	37.1%
	Hurts	78	27	14	11	14	4	2	43	0	3	196
		15.8%	13.3%	12.6%	15.3%	19.4%	20.0%	16.7%	15.5%	0.0%	42.9%	15.3%
	Makes no difference	208	99	53	30	30	8	5	117	5	1	556
		42.0%	48.8%	47.7%	41.7%	41.7%	40.0%	41.7%	42.2%	45.5%	14.3%	43.4%
	Don't Know	21	6	6	0	3	1	0	8	1	1	47
		4.2%	3.0%	5.4%	0.0%	4.2%	5.0%	0.0%	2.9%	9.1%	14.3%	3.7%
	Refused	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
		.8%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%
Total		495	203	111	72	72	20	12	277	11	7	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.101[a]	66	.941
Likelihood Ratio	54.099	66	.852
Linear-by-Linear Association	.411	1	.522
N of Valid Cases	277		

Table 9.3.2. Perception of discrimination[school]—Native/Foreign born

		Were you born on the island of Puerto Rico, in the United States, or in another country?					
		Puerto Rico	U.S.	Another country	Don't Know	Refused	Total
In general, do you think being (Hispanic/Latino) helps, hurts, or makes no difference when it comes to gaining admission into schools and colleges?	Helps	42	177	255	1	0	475
		40.0%	33.3%	39.8%	100.0%	0.0%	37.1%
	Hurts	21	57	118	0	0	196
		20.0%	10.7%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%
	Makes no difference	39	273	244	0	0	556
		37.1%	51.3%	38.1%	0.0%	0.0%	43.4%
	Don't Know	2	23	22	0	0	47
		1.9%	4.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
	Refused	1	2	2	0	1	6
		1.0%	.4%	.3%	0.0%	100.0%	.5%
Total		105	532	641	1	1	1280
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	245.860[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	44.981	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.102	1	.750
N of Valid Cases	1280		

Chapter V
Conclusions

Pan-Ethnic Labels: Are They the Solution for Political Inclusion?

Pan-ethnic labels, also known as "umbrella" terms, have been used for decades by politicians, media organizations, and state institutions. Consequently, these terms have gotten entrenched in society, which has allowed the spread of the terms and its cultural institutionalization. However, what has been utilized as the way to group and classify people with certain characteristics for institutional purposes has appeared to be insufficient to thoroughly understand the group that has been named in the United States as Latinos/Hispanics. The growth of the Latino community has made Latino issues a reoccurring conversation, mostly when elections are near. The Latino electorate has been charged with large expectations. Which they have not been able to fulfill. Different arguments have been stated as to the reason why Latinos do not participate in politics in the way they are expected. These include lack of citizenship, lack of co-ethnic candidates, lower rates of naturalization, strong attachment to countries of origin politics, disinterest in American politics, and generational causes among others. As some Latino politics scholars have noticed, the notions of Latinidad, and the insistence of labeling those immigrants from Latin America as Latinos/Hispanics, has caused more division than cohesion.

Although identity has been presented as the main element defining minority politics in the United States, it has been mistakenly taken for granted that Latin American immigrants identify themselves as Latinos/Hispanics. Twenty years ago, Luis DeSipio (1996) pointed out that Latino

immigrants tend to identify themselves in country of origin terms rather than in pan-ethnic terms; nowadays the situation has not changed dramatically. As the tabulations of this study showed, more than half of the respondents in the 2012 National Survey of Latinos had no preference between Latino/Hispanic, and a large number of them identified themselves by their country of origin as their ancestry, dismissing terms like South Americans or Central Americans. The vagueness of the category "no preference," and the smaller percentage of those who chose either Latino or Hispanic, is a signal of the ambiguity of the terms.

Understanding the role of identity in minority politics in the United States is of vital importance to understanding how Latino politics have been set up. A strong sense of group identity translates to high levels of solidarity and group cohesion, which in theory results in civic and political engagement. Census institutions, state agencies, and political organizations can often tell that a person who identifies himself/herself as black will vote in a certain manner, and will be affiliated to a certain political party because of the sense of groupness among African Americans. Notwithstanding, that does not mean the same will happen with a person who identifies as Latino or Hispanic. The issue starts at the very moment a person is classified under the pan-ethnic term, which can be identified through different scenarios: First, if the official documents, surveys and census do not include a broad array of categories that include countries of origin to identify themselves; and second, if the individual does not see a proper category. That person might end up choosing a random category without giving it much thought. By not offering a proper term of identification, Latin American immigrants jump from one term to the other, in a meaningless process. Meaningless because there is not a strong attachment to the term, which would make political predictions inaccurate.

Pan-ethnic Labels: Predictors of Voting?

Finding data where Latinos/Hispanics were inquired not only to indicate their ancestry and/or nativity, but to answer questions related to political engagement is not an easy task. The 2012 NSL was by far the most adequate source of information. However, there were still gaps in the information that did not allow more definite conclusions. First, it is necessary to consider that even when country of origin was part of the information collected in the survey, it was a category recorded for those who said to be foreign born, or that did not categorize themselves in one of the major subgroups categories given in the ancestry question —Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, Other Central America, and Other South American— and said to be from another country.

With the purpose of finding out if *Latinidad* had a strong impact in how those labeled as Latinos/Hispanics participated in politics, more specifically when voting, I decided to cross tabulate variables of identity —ancestry and nativity—, and questions related to political participation, political agenda, and acculturation. After analyzing a vast number of tables, I could establish the following:

1. There is not a congruent relationship between self-identification with pan-ethnic terms and voting behavior. For instance, while a large percentage of self-denominated Dominicans did not to prefer a pan-ethnic term, Dominicans intention to vote in the presidential election of 2012 was one of the highest. In the case of the major Latino subgroups —Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans— more than 50% of the respondents who self-identified with those terms said not to have a pan-ethnic term preference. Conversely, their intention to vote was higher than 80%. The other subgroups showed similar results. There was not a preference for either pan-ethnic term, and the voting intention was high. The latter suggest that a strong identification with the pan-ethnicity does

not define voting per se. If so, by the lower percentages of respondents identifying either as Hispanic or as a Latino, vote intention would have presented the same values. Despite the rejection of the pan-ethnic terms, respondents said to have planned to vote, more than that they have also decided which candidate they were voting for. However, the latter can indicate that ethnic identification is happening in other levels where country of origin is more influential than the umbrella terms.

2. With regard to those who self-identified as South Americans, Salvadorans, Dominicans, and Central Americas, the data is still unclear. As the results of the study show, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans have been established as ancestry categories, but they are also nationalities, which allows respondents to clearly identify their ancestry when asked. On the other side, categories such as South American or Central Americans are still too broad. Although respondents were given the option to choose a broader subgroup, many of them insisted on naming their countries of origin. The visibility of the three main groups allows us to have a better picture of the data while the tendency to group the other respondents into bigger categories, results in confusion, which can strongly impact the data. In this sense, despite the majority of respondents who classified themselves as Other Central Americans and Other South Americans said they had no preference for any of the pan ethnic terms, there was also a larger percentage who responded who prefer Latino or Hispanic, compared to Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. However, the number of respondents who classified themselves with these broader labels are significantly lower compared to those who chose "other country" as a category. Category in which the majority of respondents were either Central or South Americans. When analyzed individually, the respondents from these countries mainly said to have no preference for Latino or Hispanic.

Although surveys like the NSL have a deeper approach to Latin American immigrants and their life in the United States, there is a gap in regards self-identity and group consciousness when creating surveys that are directed to Latinos/Hispanics. Not only that more countries of origin are not included as main categories, but also that racial and cultural identities are not conceived as identity categories. For instance, Central and South American countries have large populations of indigenous people, who as immigrants have had to use a label that does not define their culture, language, or ethnicity. Similarly, a large percentage of immigrants from the Dominican Republic, which has become one of the largest communities of Latin American immigrants in the U.S., consider themselves to be black, and their racial consciousness is stronger than their pan-ethnic one. As suggested by scholars like Valdez (2011) it is important to distinguish if immigrants from Latin American identify themselves racially or ethnically, and if that ethnic identification is pan-ethnic or if it is linked to a sub-continent group, a country of origin group, or a particular *etnia* or indigenous tribe. In her own research, Valdez suggests that "panethnic-identified Latinos may attach a different meaning to their group membership than racial-identified Latinos, with consequent differences in political participation." (Valdez 2011: 479) This is the reason why it is of vital importance to open the spectrum of categories in surveys and other type of studies when trying to assess Latinos/Hispanics political participation.

Voting Behavior Among Latinos/Hispanics

3. About voting behavior, it could be said that Latinos/Hispanics do vote equally, or at least in a similar way. According to the tabulations of this study, a 61.4% of the respondents, who have been identified by the organization that conducted the study as Latinos/Hispanics, said that for the presidential election of 2012 they intended to vote for the duo formed by Barack Obama and Joe Biden. Although, there are some variations, visible larger shares of each ancestry category were

planning to vote for the Democratic candidates. Yet, 60% is not a number that indicates an overwhelming majority, which makes it necessary to revise the results within categories, and most of all to consider that other factors can be impacting their electoral choice. Since those considerations are not included in the survey questionnaire, it is not safe to assert that all Latinos/Hispanics vote the same, or that they are expected to vote for a certain party or a certain candidate. On the contrary, differences are noticeable in between subgroups, perhaps not dramatic differences, but there are perceptual changes within subgroups which translate to thousands of people. To illustrate, when asked for whom would they vote in the 2012 election, respondents from Dominican Republic, Salvador, and South America vote preference for Obama and Biden reached and average of 70%, while respondents who identified as Mexican and Cuban intention to vote for the same candidates was of 60.6% and 39.5% respectively. A variable like this shows similar tendencies of vote between subgroups because they all show larger percentages of vote intention for the democratic duo, but the differences is important and can signify a difference depending on the state those other subgroups are located.

It is important to see the tabulations in regard to political party considerations, intention to vote, and candidate choice. Even when a larger percentage of respondents said to have planned to vote for a Democratic candidate, not the same percentage of respondents said to consider themselves part of the Democratic Party. In the same manner, numbers do not match in regard to self-identified Republicans and votes for the Republican candidates Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan. Political party self-identification does not seem to be a voting predictor either. It is important to recognize the difference between self-categorization and party affiliation, given that party affiliation requires a more active participation either monetarily or ideologically. However, party self-identification is important because not many citizens engage actively in party organizations,

which does not mean they do not see themselves as part of a certain party. The 2012 NSL results are telling in this respect as well, because despite the larger percentage of Democrats among Latinos/Hispanics, there is a growing group, larger than Republicans, of those who considered themselves to be independent. These tabulations indicate that throughout all Latinos/Hispanics subgroups, there is a misconception of their political affiliation. While being portrayed as predominantly Democrats, those of Latin American origin or descent, are more disperse in regards party self-categorization than what is believed. Subgroup differences are little; however, a higher percentage of central Americans identifying as Republicans it is noticeable. These tables evidence the voluble characteristics of Latinos/Hispanics as a group, but also as subgroups.

Immigration and Other Issues

4. Immigration is not a decisive factor for Latinos/Hispanics. An average of 30% of the respondents said immigration was an extremely important issue to discuss in the Presidential election for 2012; an average of 40% said it was very important; and a 14% said it was somewhat important. Latinos/Hispanics rate immigration in similar levels of importance to other issues, even lower. Not even a larger number of foreign born respondents said immigration to be extremely important. Other issues like jobs, the economy, or health care, were rated as extremely important. I am not suggesting that immigration is overrated, but it has been used as a political bait, and a media stereotype. It should not be obviated that when Latino/Hispanics migrate to the United States, they do it searching for better life conditions, better jobs, and health services. Similarly, those who are native born, do not see immigration as an urgent issue.

The Citizenship Impact

5. From 1,765 respondents, 899 were born in another country, of those, 375 said to be citizens. This sample counts then with a 70.31% of citizens between native and foreign born. According to the tabulations, a larger percentage of foreign born Cubans, Dominicans, and South Americans said to be citizens, along with Puerto Ricans who are born citizens. The fact that most respondents said to be citizens is important because citizenship is determinant on how immigrants interact with the host society. Although variations were perceived in regards group consciousness and pan-ethnic perceptions, other variables were similar among all subgroups. The number of citizens among this survey sample might not be representative of the actual number of citizens in 2012. This digit does impact the percentages, and responses given in the survey. Voter intention and political agenda are directly influenced by citizenship status. Citizenship can be the factor equalizing responses among subgroups more than pan-ethnicity or country of origin.

Since most respondents said to be citizens, either born or naturalized, their visions in regards politics and state issues are markedly different. This can be evidenced in the tabulations that account for the perception held by respondents in regards discrimination. When asked if being Latino or Hispanic “help”, “hurt,” or “made no difference” at the time of finding a job, getting promoted or getting into school, most of the respondents said it either helped or made no difference. Among this sample, discrimination is not a perceived problem, at least not in important proportions. Similarly, respondents said to consume news form English and Spanish channels, most of them in equal proportion, with some exceptions. What can be observed here is a high level of acculturation, which is framed by citizenship. In this sense, I have come to notice that when citizenship is constant, other variables might not exert the same force as if citizenship was not controlled.

After analyzing the different tables and considering different scenarios, it is not precise to say that Latinidad and/or the self-identification as Latino/Hispanic have a major impact in voting behavior. As scholars have argued, there are other variables that might have more influence towards voting than pan-ethnic consciousness. Respondents of the 2012 NSL were aware of the pan-ethnic terms, however, they did not express to be strongly attached to them. The apparent detachment to the pan-ethnic terms did not diminished their vote intention, or impacted their party identification. However, as the data shows there are not major changes perceived in between subgroups when different variables are tested. The latter can signify that it might not be inaccurate to say that Latinos do behave similarly. Yet, as I pointed out, the number of respondents that were citizens was larger than the ones who were not, which has a major impact in the data.

Possible Future Research

To obtain a better spectrum of the issue here posed, I suggest that future research conducted among Latinos/Hispanics consider not only a broader scale of categories of self-identification, but also a bigger sample. It is also important that qualitative research accompanies quantitative studies, because only in depth research will be able to assess more details in regards identity perception and identity politics. Further, social and political scientist, as well as census and think tank organizations, should conduct research in other elections periods different to presidential elections, given that local and state elections might have more opportunities to have Latino/Hispanic immigrants or descendants of immigrants as candidates. It is certainly necessary to see if co-ethnic identification has an impact in voting choices.

As far as my own research, I see these current results as the beginning of an ongoing research, where I can test with deeper methods to what extent do Latinos/Hispanics are conscious of their group identity, and if this has any impact in their political behavior. Having a wide picture

was necessary to recognize patterns and possible gaps in the theories of identity politics in regards Latinos/Hispanics. Hitherto, I have been able to show the unsteadiness of the responses of certain variables tabulations, which leads me to think that there is still a gap to fill as to minority politics focus on Latinos/Hispanics. As I have argued in previous chapters, Latino politics need a different outlook than minority politics. Trying to fit concepts and theories that were developed during African Americans fight for civil rights, has proven to be ineffective. New research should be directed to develop other methods and theories that understand better the composition of the so-called Latino/Hispanic community.

Race and racialization of Latinos need to be furtherly studied. The Latino label as an ethnic label is itself problematic, and its racialization in the United States has impacted immigrants and immigrant descendants' identity formation. The problem is as broad as the large spectrum of self-identification categories of those labeled as Latinos. Nationalities, sub-nationalities, racial categories, ethnicities, social classes, gender, etc. are a few variables that impact the identity of Latin American immigrants. These categories are not exclusive, and one individual might consider multiple of these options when self-identifying. It is important to mention that under this pan-ethnic label fits a vast group of people, and that the category does not solely refer to immigrants or descendants of immigrants. There are also groups of people who never migrated, those who were inhabitants of the land that once belonged to Mexico, and who stayed after the United States acquired the territory. Although they never actually had to go through a migration process, their ancestry is tied to Latin America. They are a different group, and although they are linked to the pan-ethnicity, because of their complexity I did not addressed them in this research.

Along with racial and other important categories, as I learned from the results and data analysis of this study, citizenship is indeed an element that can impact the boundaries of Latinidad beyond nativity issues. However, those ancestry and country of origin differences are both determinant to access of citizenship, as Castro, Felix, and Ramirez point out "the very historical and cultural specificity of each Latino national origin subgroup in the United States has structured their political socialization and access to citizenship or lack thereof, in part accounting for differences in political ideology, party affiliation, and policy preferences." (Castro, Felix and Ramirez 2016: 234) It is then important to consider citizenship and country of origin as inherent variables to assess any type of information that talks about Latinos/Hispanics in the U.S. I consider interesting and applicable to further research in Latino Politics to apply the categories suggested by Idler considering national identities and citizenship status, as follow:

> "The first group of Hispanics is composed of American citizens who identify themselves with the American nation […] A second group is composed of American citizens who identify themselves with their nation of origin in Latin America […] The third group of Hispanics: those who are not American citizens and do not identify themselves with the American nation […] And the fourth and last group consists of those who are not American citizens, but identify themselves with the American nation." (Idler 2007: 126-127)

These categories proposed by Idler combine ancestry, country of origin, and citizenship status into identity categories which can help to shorten the gaps of the actual classifications utilized by census and think tan organizations.

Lastly, the current political environment should be another encouraging reason for Latino political scientist, sociopolitical scholars in general, politicians, and media entrepreneurs to assess Latino politics in a different way. The fact that the largest minority group in the country is the one

with the lowest electoral participation rates should be more than an accepted fact, or a drawer phrase everybody use when talking about Latinos/Hispanics in elections. This research was planned to identify causes for such a problem, but in the next years Latino politics research should morph into new forms where not only causes are sought, but new approaches are posed.

References

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities.* Rev. ed. London ; New York: Verso.

Aranda, Elizabeth M., Sallie Hughes, and Elena Sabogal. 2014. *Making a Life in Multiethnic Miami: Immigration & the Rise of a Global City.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Barreto, Matt A. 2007. "Role of Latino Candidates in Mobilizing Latino Voters: Revisiting Latino Vote Choice." In *Latino politics : identity, mobilization, and representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), 63-89. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Barreto, Matt A., and Stephen A. Nuño. 2011. "The Effectiveness of Coethnic Contact on Latino Political Recruitment." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (2): 448-259. doi:10.1177/1065912909352774.

Barreto, Matt, and Gary Segura. 2014. *Latino America: How America's Most Dynamic Population is Poised to Transform the Politics of the Nation.* New York: Public Affairs.

Beltrán, Cristina. 2010. *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Etnicity Without Groups.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Casanova, Erynn Masi de. 2012. "Organizing Identities: Immigrant New Yorkers Negotiating Latinidad." *Sociological Forum* 27 (2): 419-440. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01324.x.

Casellas, Jason P. 2007. "Latino representation in Congress : to what extent are Latinos substantively represented?" In *Latino politics : identity, mobilization, and representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), 219-231. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Castro, Lorena, Adrian Felix, and Ricardo Ramirez. 2016. "The Limits of Latinidad? Immigration Attitudes across Latino National Origin Groups." In *Minority Voting in the United States: African American, Women, and Latino/Latina Voters*, by Kyle L. Kreider and Thomas J. Baldino (Eds.), 233-253. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Connaughton, Stacey L. 2005. *Inviting Latino Voters : Party Messages and Latino Party Identification.* New York: Routledge.

Cruz, José E. 2004. "Latinos in Office." In *Latino Americans and Political Participation: A reference Handbook*, by Armando Xavier Mejia Sharon A. Navarro (Eds.), 173-226. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Dávila, Arlene. 2008. *Latino Spin: Public Image and the Whitewashing of Race.* New York: NYU Press.

—. 2001. *Latino, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of People.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

De la Garza, Rodolfo O. 2004. "Latino Politics." *Annual Review Political Science* 7: 91-123. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104759.

De la Garza, Rodolfo O., and Louis DeSipio. 1996. *Ethnic Ironies: Latino Politics in the 1992 Elections.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

DeSipio, Louis. 2006. "Latino Civic and Political Participation." In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, by Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchel (Eds.), 447-479. Washington: The National Academic Press.

DeSipio, Louis, and Rodolfo O. de la Garza. 2002. "Forever Seen as New: Latino Participation in American Elections." In *Latinos : remaking America*, by Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco and Mariela M. Páez (Eds.), 398-409. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Durand, Jorge, Edward Telles, and Jennifer Flashman. 2006. "The Demographic Foundations of the Latino Population." In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, by Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchel (Eds.), 66-99. Washington: The National Academic Press.

Espino, Rodolfo. 2007. "Is there a Latino dimension to voting in Congress?" In *Latino Politics : Identity, Mobilization, and Representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Espino, Rodolfo, and David L. Leal. 2007. "Introduction." In *Latino politics : identity, mobilization, and representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), 1-13. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Falconi, José L., and José A. Mazzotti. 2007. "Introduction." In *The other Latinos: Central and South Americans in the United States*, edited by José L. Falconi and José A. Mazzotti, 1-18. Cambridge: Harvard University David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Flores-González, Nilda, Elizabeth Aranda, and Elizabeth Vaquera. 2014. "“Doing Race”: Latino Youth’s Identities and the Politics of Racial Exclusion." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58 (14): 1834–1851. doi:10.1177/0002764214550287.

Gans, Herbert J. 2007. "Ethnic and Racial Identity." In *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration since 1965*, by Mary C. Waters and Reed Ueda (Eds.), 98-109. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Garcia, F. Chris, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2008. *Hispanics and the U.S. political system : moving into the mainstream.* New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Geron, Kim, and Melissa R. Michelson. 2008. "Latino partisanship, political activity and vote choice." In *Latinas/os in the United States: Changing the Face of América*, by Havidán Rodríguez, Rogelio Sáenz and Cecilia Menjívar (Eds.), 325-339. New York: Springer.

Gimenez, Martha E. 2006. "With a Little Class: A Critique of Identity Politics." *Ethnicities* (Sage Publications) 6 (3): 423-439. doi:10.1177/1468796806068580.

Hattam, Victoria. 2005. "Ethnicity & the Boundaries of Race: Rereading Directive 15." *Daedalus* (The MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts & Sciences) 134 (1): 61-69. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027961.

Hero, Rodney E. 2007. "Preface." In *Latino Politics: Identity, Mobilization, and Representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), ix-xiv. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Idler, José Enrique. 2007. *Officially Hispanic: Classification Policy and Identity.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Jones-Correa, Michael. 2007. "Fuzzy Distinctions and Blurred Boundaries: Transnational, Ethnic, and Immigrant Politics." In *Latino politics : identity, mobilization, and representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), 44-60. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Jones-Correa, Michael. 2007. "Swimming in the Latino sea: The other Latinos and politics." In *The Other Latinos: Cnetral and South Americans in the United States*, by José L. Falconi and José A. Mazzoti (Eds.), 21-38. Cambridge: Harvard University David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

López, Gustavo, and Eileen Patten. 2015. *The Impact of Slowing Immigration: Foreign-Born Share Falls Among 14 Largest U.S. Hispanic Groups.* Washington D. C.: Pew Research Center.

Lopez, Mark Hugo, Rich Morin, and jens Manuel Krogstad. 2016. *Latinos Increasingly Confident in Personal Finances, See Better Economic Times Ahead.* Washington D. C.: Pew Research Center. Accessed 2016. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/06/08/latinos-increasingly-confident-in-personal-finances-see-better-economic-times-ahead/.

Lopez, Mark Hugo, Seth Motel, and Eileen Patten. 2012. *A Record 24 Million Latinos Are Eligible to Vote, But Turnout Rate Has Lagged That of Whites, Blacks.* Voting trends, Washington D. C.: Pew Research Center.

Margolis, Maxine L. 2007. "Becoming Brazucas: Brazilian Identity in the United States." In *The Other Latinos: Central and South Americans in teh United States*, by José Luis Falconi and José Antonio Mazzotti (Eds.), 213-230. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Marquez, Benjamin. 2007. "Latino Identity Politics Research: Problems and Opportunities." In *Latino Politics: Identity, Mobilization, and Representation*, by Rodolfo Espino, David L. Leal and Kenneth J. Meier (Eds.), 17-26. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Marrow, Helen B. 2007. "Who are the Other Latinos, and Why?" In *The Other Latinos: Central and South Americans in the United States*, by José Luis Falconi and José Antonio Mazzoti (Eds.), 39-77. Cambridge: Harvard University David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Marx, Athony W. 1998. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of teh United States, South Africa, and Brazil.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McClain, Paula D., and Joseph Stewart. 2014. *"Can We All Get Along?" Racial and Ethnic Minorities in American Politics.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Montoya, Lisa J. 1999. "The Sleeping Giant in Latino Electoral Politics." In *Reflexiones 1999: New Directions in Mexican American Studies*, by Richard Flores. Austin: CMAS Books.

Mora, G. Cristina. 2014. *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats, and Media Constructed a New American.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Moreno, Dario, and James Wyatt. 2016. "Cuban American Partisanship: A Secular Realignment?" In *Minority Voting in the United States: African American, Women, and Latino/Latina Voters*, by Kyle L. Kreider and Thomas J. Baldino (Eds.), 254-269. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Navarro, Sharon A., and Armando Xavier Mejia. 2004. *Latino Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Oboler, Suzanne. 1995. *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and teh Politics of (Re) Presentation in teh United States.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

—. 2006. *Latinos and Citizenship: The Dilemma of Belonging.* New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Okamoto, Dina, and G. Cristina Mora. 2014. "Panethnicity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40: 219–239. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043201

Orey, Byron D'Andra, Athena M. King, and Gloria J. Bilingsley. 2016. "The Evolution and Devolution of the Voting Rights Act: Black Descriptive and Substantive Representation." In *Minority Voting in the United States: African, Woman, and Latino/Latina Voters*, by Kyle L. Kreider and Thomas J. Baldino (Eds.), 56-76. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Paerregaard, Karsten. 2005. "Inside the Hispanic Melting Pot: Negotiating National and Multicultural Identities Among Peruvians in the United States." *Latino Studies* 3: 76-96.

Pew Research Center. 2004. *National Survey of Latinos* . Survey, Washington D. C.: Pew Research Center.

Pew Research Center. 2012. *National Survey of Latinos.* Survey, Washington D. C.: Pew Research Center.

—. 2016. "Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends." *Pew Research Center.* January 19. Accessed 2016. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/01/19/millennials-make-up-almost-half-of-latino-eligible-voters-in-2016/.

—. 2012. "When Labels Don't Fit: Hispanics and Their Views of Identity." *Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends.* April 14. Accessed September 10, 2016. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/when-labels-dont-fit-hispanics-and-their-views-of-identity/.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut, . 2001. *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America.* Berkeley and New York: University of California Press & Russell Sage Foundation.

—. 1996. *Immigrant America: A portrait.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rodriguez, Clara E. 2000. *Changing Race : Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United States.* New York: New York University Press.

Rodriguez, Havidán, Rogelio Sáenz, and Cecilia Menjívar. 2008. *Latinas/os in the United States: Chnaging the Face of América.* New York: Springer.

Rouse, Stella M., Betina Cutaia Wilkinson, and James C. Garand. 2010. "Divided Loyalties? Understanding Variation in Latino Attitudes Toward Immigration." *SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY* 91 (3): 856-882.

Rumbaut, Rubén G. 2006. "The Making of People." In *Hispanics and the Future of America,* by Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchel, 16-65. Washington: The National Academy Press.

Segura, Gary M., and Shaun Bowler. 2005. "Introduction." In *Diversity in Democracy: Minority Representation in the United States,* by Gary M. Segura and Shaun Bowler (Eds.). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Suro, Roberto. 2002. *Counting the "Other Hispanics": How Many Colombians, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Guatemalans and Salvadorans Are There in the United States?* Washington: Pew Research Center.

United States Census Bureau. 2011. "The Hispanic Population: 2010."

Valdez, Zulema. 2011. "Political Participation Among Latinos in the United States: The Effect of Group Identity and Consciousness." *Social Science Quarterly* 92 (2): 466-482. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2011.00778.x

Valenzuela, Ali A., and Melissa R. Michelson. 2016. "Turnout, Status, and Identity: Mobilizing Latinos to Vote with Group Appeals." *American Political Science Review* 110 (4): 615-630. doi:doi.org/10.1017/S000305541600040X.

Vigil, James D. 1996. "Que Viva la Raza: The Many Faces of the Chicano Movement, 1963-1971." In *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America*, by Silvia Pedraza and Rubén G. Rumbaut (Eds.), 224-237. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Waters, Mary C. 1996. "Optional Ethnicities: For Whites Only?" In *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America*, by Silvia Pedraza and Rubén G. Rumbaut (Eds.), 444-454. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Waters, Mary C., and Reed Ueda. 2007. *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration Since 1965.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.