ABSTRACT


Political trust – the belief in a government’s effectiveness – is crucial to a properly functioning democracy. Individuals’ perceptions that they are holding the government accountable through participation in the political system, such as voting or campaigning, can facilitate a sense of trust in the government. Conversely, if they feel like governmental procedures or outcomes are unfair, individuals can experience procedural frustration and develop a sense of cynicism or distrust towards the government. How does political trust change following a social movement – a form of political activity generally thought of as unconventional, contentious, and rising out of cynicism? I use the Latino National Survey and logistic regression to study how Latinos’ group-level political trust changed after the 2006 immigration reform protests. Additionally, I explore how the communication context, specifically the use of Spanish-language media, is associated with feelings of political trust. The results show that individuals interviewed after the initial protest had decreased odds of reporting trust in the government, while those interviewed at least two months later, after widespread protests, had higher odds of reporting political trust. The relationship, however, is contingent on the use of Spanish-language news media, an important source of information and a rallying force during this time period. Overall, this research shows that protest can address issues of procedural frustration, similar to conventional methods of political participation. By revealing the effects of a successful social movement, it also contributes to theories of social movements – specifically social identity, relative deprivation, and resource mobilization theories.
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On December 16, 2005, the United States House of Representatives passed the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, also known as H.R. 4437. This legislation contained numerous provisions creating serious impediments for anyone attempting to move to the United States, with or without the required documentation. For instance, H.R. 4437 would have increased fines and sentences for possession of fraudulent documents and required background checks for criminal records on anyone attempting to gain authorized entry to the United States. Furthermore, the language of several provisions associated many immigrants, particularly of Latino/a or Middle Eastern heritage, with drug-trafficking and terrorism (U.S. Congress).1

The backlash against this legislation was widespread. In the spring of 2006, immigrant protests sprouted across the nation in response to H.R. 4437, showing widespread solidarity among Latinos across intragroup lines of national origin (Barreto, Manzano, Ramirez, and Rim 2009). While a precise tally of protests is unknown, Benjamin-Alvarado, DeSipio, and Montoya (2009) estimate that protests occurred in at least 150 cities and included anywhere from three to five million demonstrators, making this movement the largest immigrant mobilization in the history of the United States (Abalos 2007). This included many city-level protests in traditional and new destination states, as well as two national protests days on April 10th and May 1st (Benjamin-Alvarado et al. 2009; Heiskanen 2009). Ultimately, the social movement succeeded since the Senate did not pass H.R. 4437 and the legislation officially died at the end of the 109th Congress in 2007.

1 For instance, Sec. 1004 declares that one of the primary purposes for establishing a fence along the United States-Mexican border is to stop illegal drug trafficking and Sec. 409 advises a special report on the number of immigrants from countries identified as sponsors of terrorism (U.S. Congress).
Prior research has examined what conditions lead up to and facilitate collective action, such as the protests against H.R. 4437. For instance, collective action can originate in individuals identifying with a particular group, a perception of group efficacy, or a collective emotion, such as anger (Louis 2009). These feelings often develop once individuals realize they belong to a disadvantaged group deprived of something they feel they deserve, leading to a desire to mobilize around shared grievances to address the issue (van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2010). Fewer studies, however, focus on the after-effects of protest activity on individuals. I will address this issue by examining if Latinos’ trust in the government changed in response to the protests following H.R. 4437. Was their trust in the government stable across the time-period or did the protests alter their perceptions of government? Furthermore, within-group communication is important for organization and mobilization (van Zomeren et al. 2004). As such, is the protest effect contingent on the communication context represented by the use of Spanish-language news media?

To answer these research questions, I use the Latino National Survey (LNS), a study that interviewed Latinos from November 2005 to August 2006.² I examine political trust after two important time points – the initial protest in Chicago on March 10, 2006 and a nationwide protest dubbed “The Day Without Immigrants” on May 1, 2006. I find that the protest effect mattered more for Latinos who used Spanish-language news media; the results suggest that, for those who used Spanish-language media, the initial protest effect led to a decrease in reporting political trust while the widespread effect led to an increase. This

² Since the primary investigators of the LNS could not foresee the passage of H.R. 4437 or the subsequent protests, there are no questions in the LNS that explicitly ask about H.R. 4437, protest participation, or support for or opposition to the legislation or the movement.
fluctuation in trust, I argue, is due to perceived procedural frustration and its mitigation. The initial drop in political trust indicates a cynicism towards the political process and decisions made by the government, and the later increase suggests that the visibility and widespread nature of the protests, and the subsequent defeat of H.R. 4437, led to feelings of efficacy and involvement. The moderating effect of Spanish-language news media on the relationship between protest timing and political trust throughout this time period exemplifies the importance of communication context in informing individuals about issues and motivating individuals to participate in political activity. These findings can contribute to current knowledge of social movement theories by identifying how social identity, relative deprivation, and resource mobilization theories speak to the effectiveness of this particular social movement. Depending on the theoretical framework considered, the political rhetoric, protests, and Spanish-language communication context would have highlighted different group identities, the deprivation of a specific group compared to others, or the resources available to a group, all of which can explain the initial group-level decrease and subsequent increase in political trust.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Political Trust and Cynicism

Past research has found a link between political trust or cynicism and political participation (Levi and Stoker 2000). In general, political trust is defined as “a basic evaluative orientation toward the government founded on how well the government is operating according to people’s normative expectations” (Hetherington 1998:791). Political
trust is essential for a democratic government to function properly, indicating specific support of government outputs and officials and diffuse support of the regime and system in its totality (Gamson 1968; Hetherington 1998). Conversely, cynicism is a general dissatisfaction with the political system (Pantoja and Segura 2003) resulting from a lack of confidence in political institutions and/or elected officials (van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2010).

There are two primary explanations for how people gain, maintain or lose trust in the government. First, people respond to the government’s performance, adjusting their trust according to whether or not they believe the institution is performing satisfactorily (Mishler and Rose 2001). Individuals’ feelings of trust and cynicism are then susceptible to political events, such as elections (Clarke and Acock 1989) or government scandals, like Watergate (Nye 1997), and tend to rise and fall with the economy and crime levels (Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2000). Generally, when individuals are happy with current policies they feel more trusting towards the government (Iyengar 1980). For instance, a longitudinal survey in Russia showed that citizens who perceived the economy as improving or felt the government adequately handled privatization had higher levels of political trust (Karaman 2004).

A second, complementary account for the source of people’s trust or cynicism in the government is procedural frustration. This perspective posits that, in addition to the decisions governmental institutions make, individuals are also troubled by governmental procedures they perceive to be unfair (Farnsworth 2003). Feelings of procedural frustration are associated with a sense of political efficacy, or the belief that the government is responsive to

---

3 Cynicism is interchangeable with alienation, powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, negativism, estrangement, value rejection, anomie, and distrust (Pantoja and Segura 2003).
citizens’ demands (Craig, Niemi, and Silver 1990; van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2010). People who feel efficacious believe their political engagement is not fruitless and does influence governmental procedures (Clarke and Acock 1989). It is consequently connected with a general trust in how the political system functions, primarily through fair and just processes (Niemi, Craig, and Mattei 1991). People become particularly frustrated if they feel like their voice is barred from governmental procedures or issues they care about (Farnsworth 2003). People who tend to be cynical towards the government suspect that their interactions with the institution are ineffective, leading to a lack of confidence in the political system and/or elected officials (Litt 1963; Pinkleton, Austin, and Fortman 1998).

Research exploring feelings of political trust and cynicism among Latinos in the United States is minimal, mostly focusing on the experiences of Mexican Americans. Early studies in the 1970s found that Mexican Americans trusted the government more than African Americans, but less than whites (Garcia 1973; Guzman 1970). A later study, however, found that Mexican Americans’ trust in the government was slightly higher than whites (de la Garza et al. 1992). Early research also shows that Mexican American youth increasingly developed distrust towards the government as they experienced discrimination and prejudice in their daily lives (Garcia 1973).

More recently, research concludes that first-generation Latinos are much more trusting than their later-generation counterparts, presumably due to an optimistic outlook about opportunities in the United States (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010). Michelson (2001, 2003, 2007) showed how acculturation leads to decreasing levels of trust in Mexican Americans. She argues that assimilation into mainstream American culture, including
language proficiency and exposure to racism, lead to increased levels of cynicism. Experiences of racial discrimination are particularly important; those who experienced discrimination were more likely to cite issues of racism in feelings of distrust towards the government, while those who did not perceive prejudice as a problem explained their cynicism in terms of overall government misconduct. Most importantly, those who saw discrimination as an issue saw the government as unfair because of racist and discriminatory actions towards minority groups (Michelson 2007). Responses to such perceived discrimination can create an even more salient ethnic identity – a reactive ethnicity established in the face of threats and marginalization. For instance, in the wake of California’s Proposition 187, many immigrants possessed an increased sense of group identity that promoted ethnic solidarity and collective action (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). The perceived governmental discrimination that creates a reactive ethnicity, then, can lay the groundwork for mobilization, such as the 2006 immigration reform protests.

There are two separate, yet complementary, claims for how political trust and cynicism relate to political participation (see Levi and Stoker 2000). One perspective argues that individuals who trust the government participate in the political system more than those who are distrusting, particularly in traditional political activities like voting. On the other hand, some scholars posit that distrust in the government can spark more engagement in the political system. For instance, Gamson (1968) argued that a low level of trust, especially coupled with a high motivation to influence the government, was ideal for mobilization through unconventional methods, such as protest. In this view, the 2006 immigration reform protests originated from a group of people who were cynical about the government’s
performance at the time, but also highly motivated to affect the outcome of the debate. Furthermore, the protests were comprised of a population where many are ineligible to vote, and many of those who are eligible are not registered (Nagourney 2012); thus, those who participated in the protests may have been excluded from traditional political participation, feeling a greater amount of procedural frustration. However, these accounts conceptualize trust as something leading to political participation, rather than created by it. Whether trust changes as a result of political participation, particularly collective action, remains largely unknown (see Louis 2009).

Rather than examine political trust as an outcome, some studies investigate how political participation can increase external efficacy. If individuals feel like they cannot hold the government or political officials accountable, they have no reason to trust the government (van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2010). These studies generally show that individuals who believe they are involved in the political process, thus making elected officials responsible for their actions, feel a higher sense of political efficacy and political trust. For instance, Finkel (1985) found that voting and campaigning increased feelings of external efficacy, and Timpone (1998) argued that external efficacy increased after individuals registered to vote. Furthermore, access to political information via the internet increases perceptions of external efficacy since it allows citizens to easily interact with elected officials (Kenski and Stroud 2006). One study also showed that Latinos cited lower levels of cynicism when they were represented by elected officials of Latino origin due to a belief that co-ethnic representatives were more capable of protecting the interests of the minority population (Pantoja and Segura 2003). Implicit in studies of political efficacy is how individuals
experience an increase in political trust if they perceive political procedures as fair due to opportunities for constituent input. A sense of procedural frustration declines the more people feel active in political decision-making.

Located outside the realm of formal political participation, protests are generally thought to arise from high levels of cynicism towards the government (Gamson 1968; Rosenau 1974). Recently, however, some scholars have discussed protests as an increasingly normalized event added to the repertoire of other political activities (Norris, Walgrave, and Van Aelst 2005). Those who wish to participate with the political system may engage in any form of political participation, as long as it is directed towards influencing the policy process (Shingles 1981). While it may still express discontent, protest participation may also indicate a healthier state of democracy by becoming another channel of conventional political expression (Norris et al. 2005). For example, protesters cited similar motivations as those who participated in more conventional aspects of politics, such as voting and campaigning (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). Thus, despite the origins for the 2006 immigration reform protests, the visibility of or participation in the protests may have increased perceptions of political trust due to the feeling that the disadvantaged group in question, Latinos, were participating in the political process.

In addition to alleviating procedural frustration, the protests may have also had a demonstration effect (Glasberg and Shannon 2011) by indicating to Latinos that there was a wide range of political support from a variety of organizations, ranging from migrant-serving

---

4 This is not to say that all protest behavior is indicative of a healthy democracy. Certainly, different mobilizing contexts and individual motivations will differ from participant to participant, movement to movement, and country to country. For more about how context matters, see van Stekelenburg, Klandermans, and van Dijk (2009).
non-profit organizations (Benjamin-Alvarado et al. 2009; Cordero-Guzmán et al. 2008) to religious groups, particularly the Catholic church (PBS 2006). The large number of group members and sympathetic parties willing to engage in collective action on behalf of the disadvantaged group displayed instrumental social support, potentially increasing a feeling of the group’s political efficacy (van Zomeren et al. 2004). A belief of strength in numbers (Anderson 2010) would have led Latinos to feel that the United States government could not ignore their democratic demands, and trusted them to respond accordingly.

To fully explore the dynamics of political trust through protest effects, I offer two hypotheses.

*H1: Latinos interviewed after the initial protest, but before the widespread protest, had decreased levels of trust in the government.*

I believe this will occur for three main reasons. First of all, the initial protest on March 10, 2006 likely brought national visibility to H.R. 4437, whereas most of what Congress discusses and legislates remains unknown. Since political trust is altered by governmental performance (Mishler and Rose 2001), the salience of H.R. 4437 at this time point would have made Latinos question the decisions of the U.S. government. Secondly, protest is traditionally considered to develop from cynical views towards the government (Gamson 1968), so there may be a very low likelihood of reporting trust in the government at this time point. Both of these reasons lead to my third justification – the salience of H.R. 4437 and cynicism towards the government would lead to procedural frustration at this time point. Feeling helpless in the political process, in addition to disagreeing with the legislation, would lead to particularly low levels of political trust after the initial protest.
Secondly, I hypothesize that:

\[ H2: \text{Latinos interviewed after the widespread protest had increased levels of trust in the government.} \]

As the protests became more widespread, it is possible that respondents’ procedural frustration was alleviated due to the visibility of the protests; the collective action would have given them a voice in the political process where they previously felt disenfranchised. Furthermore, the demonstrations showed a large amount of support for defeating H.R. 4437, potentially increasing the feeling of political efficacy within group members through the belief that there is strength in numbers and the government could not ignore their concerns.

The Role of Political Media

Additional factors contribute to political trust and cynicism beyond an assessment of a government’s effectiveness and feeling like one has a voice in the political process. In particular, I examine how the communication context (van Zomeren et al. 2004), specifically engagement with news media (Pinkleton et al. 2012), affected Latinos’ trust in government during this time period. Due to the role of Spanish-language media in mobilizing people to participate in the protests (Félix, González, and Ramírez 2008), I believe it may have been influential in how Latinos adjusted their levels of political trust.

Communication among group members is crucial for realizing disadvantage and organizing mobilization. Specifically, there can be a “facilitating effect of group-based anger on collective action through within-group communication” (van Zomeren et al. 2004:662). Spanish-language media had a large role in strategically disseminating information about
H.R. 4437 and the protests during the spring of 2006 (Cepeda 2010). For instance, two Spanish-language radio stations, two Spanish-language television stations, and several Spanish-language newspapers disseminated information about a demonstration in Salt Lake City, Utah attended by over 40,000 people (Sanchez 2006). Radio was particularly crucial to the mobilization since Latinos listen to radio roughly three hours per day more than their white counterparts (Baum 2006). Many established, respected, and well-known Spanish-language DJs informed listeners about H.R. 4437, its effects, and the protests, encouraging listeners to actively participate in the protests and engage in debate and discussion with family members and friends (Félix et al. 2008). Accordingly, those who primarily used Spanish-language media were particularly likely to have known about the protests, and consequently participate in them. Furthermore, after the protests ended in May, DJs on Spanish radio stations continued to urge listeners to naturalize and register to vote (Félix et al. 2008), encouraging Latinos to engage in the political process and hold politicians accountable.

However, the established relationship between news media usage and the development or maintenance of political trust is complicated. For instance, some scholars argue that utilizing news media in general leads to higher levels of cynicism towards governmental policy debates and campaigns, primarily due to negative framing (Capella and Jamieson 1996). Other research indicates that the facilitation of trust or cynicism is contingent upon the medium. While those who watch television news tend to have higher levels of cynicism towards the government, people who read newspapers or other print media

---

5 The comparative lack of Asian American participation in these protests can also be associated with disadvantages this ethnic group had in using ethnic media to accrue supporters (see Rim 2009).
tend to have a higher degree of political trust (Hetherington 1998; Kanervo, Zhang, and Sawyer 2005; Moy and Pfau 2000). Additionally, people who listen to talk radio possess more cynicism towards public officials and the governmental system (Hollander 1995). In general, Spanish-language media is shown to increase perceptions of efficacy through broadcasts encouraging listeners to advocate for programs that benefit Latinos, providing information about naturalization and voter registration, and including political material during campaign times (Casillas 2010).

In the context of the 2006 immigration reform protests, Spanish-language radio, television, and newspapers informed consumers about the issues at hand and encouraged them to act upon it. The positive demonstration effect, discussed earlier, may have also been stronger for Latinos who consumed Spanish-language media as coverage discussed how many people attended rallies, the people and organizations who opposed H.R. 4437, and so forth. I predict that the protest effect assessed in Hypotheses 1 and 2 will matter more for individuals who used Spanish-language media. Specifically:

**H3:** The initial protest effect will lead to a larger decrease in the likelihood of reporting political trust for those who used Spanish-language media compared to English-language media.

**H4:** The widespread protest effect will lead to a larger increase in the likelihood of reporting political trust for those who used Spanish-language media compared to English-language media.
DATA AND METHODS

To explore these hypotheses, I use the 2006 *Latino National Survey* (LNS). This survey asked Latino respondents about their political attitudes, political preferences, social experiences, and demographic characteristics. The sample was stratified by geographic region, with 17 states and Washington D.C. selected based on the size of their Latino population. Four states – Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, and North Carolina – were specifically selected because of their status as “new immigrant destinations;” areas with a large increase in the immigrant population in recent years (Singer 2004). All respondents were of Latino origin and interviewers were bilingual so they could conduct the interview in a respondent’s preferred language. Overall, 8,634 respondents completed the survey, but national-level weights make the results generalizable to the entire Latino population in the United States.

The LNS contains a natural experiment suitable for exploring how group-level perceptions of the government shifted during this politically tumultuous time. Data collection spanned from November 17, 2005 to August 4, 2006, whereas the legislation passed the House of Representatives on December 16, 2005 and the first protest occurred on March 10, 2006. 6 The survey is cross-sectional and includes no questions about H.R. 4437 or the subsequent protests. However, the natural experiment allows for a comparison of respondents’ opinions at different periods throughout the life of H.R. 4437.

**Variables**

---

6 Most commonly, the March 10th protest in Chicago, IL is identified as the first protest in this movement. However, other sources say that the protests began in February of 2006.
Table 1 includes descriptive statistics of the variables. My dependent variable consists of a dichotomous measure of political trust,\textsuperscript{7} with 1 indicating political trust in the government (including those who responded that they trusted the government “just about always” and “most of the time”) and 0 denoting a lack of trust from those who responded that they trust the government “some of the time” or “never.” I construct a dichotomous, rather than an ordinal, dependent variable because it is not only more parsimonious, but also because I am interested in the presence or absence of political trust rather than the level of political trust.

[Insert Table 1 Here]

I rely on three dichotomous independent variables – two variables measuring the timing of the interview (1 = after the initial protest and before the widespread protest; 1 = after the widespread protest) and the language of media used for news information (1 = Spanish-language media). I created the dichotomous variables indicating protest timing from the interview date, available for each respondent. For the first timing variable, I included everyone interviewed between March 15\textsuperscript{th} and May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2006 (n=691). I believe that parting the respondents at this time point, five days after the first protest, allows for the March 10\textsuperscript{th} protest to gain attention in news media so that most of the respondents would have heard about the legislation and the movement, but it is still before a majority of the protests that occurred in April and May. For the second protest timing variable, I include everyone interviewed on or after May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2006, the day directly after the May Day protests called “The Day without Immigrants” and “The Great American Boycott” (n=4,553). This protest is

\textsuperscript{7} “How much of the time do you trust the government to do what is right – just about always, most of the time, some of the time, or never?”
considered the apex of the social movement in opposition to H.R. 4437, making it an appropriate date at which to examine the effects of widespread protest. I removed any respondents interviewed before the legislation passed the House of Representatives (n=497) so that comparisons of political trust are more direct.

I created a second independent variable, the use of Spanish-language media, from a question asking respondents what kind of media they use most often for news information.\(^8\) I transformed this into a dichotomous variable where 1 refers to those who mostly use Spanish-language media and 0 denotes those who use English-language media or both outlets equally. Previous research shows that English- and Spanish-language media cover immigration issues quite differently, with Spanish-language media covering immigration in a more positive light than English-language counterparts (Branton and Dunaway 2008). Because of this, I believe it is important to include bilingual media users with English media users to delineate more completely between English- and Spanish-language effects.

I created interaction terms between Spanish-language media and the timing of the interview to test Hypotheses 3 and 4, which will assess whether or not the protests and Spanish-language media acted together to facilitate shifts in political trust by questioning governmental action after the initial protest or alleviating procedural frustration after the widespread protests. Since those who listened to Spanish-language media were most likely to be targeted by a message encouraging mobilization, they may be the most likely to have group-level shifts in their perceptions of a trustworthy government.

---

\(^8\) “For information about public affairs and politics, would you say you rely more heavily on Spanish-language television, radio, and newspapers, or on English-language TV, radio, and newspapers?”
I also include several demographic, immigration status, and political controls. In addition to controlling for age and sex, I control for education level and annual household income. The latter two variables are particularly important when considering political activity as these individual-level resources contribute to traditional political participation, such as voting (Masuoka 2006). Thus, those of a higher income or with more education may be less swayed by the protests as they are more likely to feel effective in conventional channels of politics.

Additional binary controls account for generational status and perceptions of discrimination. Generational status is important since later generations of Latinos tend to feel less connected to an ethnic identity (Sanchez and Masuoka 2010), and thus may be less swayed by messages sympathizing with those fighting H.R. 4437. Secondly, controlling for experiences of discrimination is important (see Michelson 2001, 2003, 2007) since those who have experienced discrimination may be more likely to be politically cynical, perceiving governmental institutions and officials as racist.

Several variables capture political opinions and behavior. First, whether or not a person has interest in politics may affect their perceptions of political trust. While political apathy and cynicism are not synonymous, it is important to consider that people indifferent towards politics may report a low or high trust in the government simply because they do not care. Second, I control for the potential for traditional political behavior by including a

---

9 In early models I controlled for country of origin. None of these variables were significant, however, so I removed them from analysis.

10 Education level is an ordinal variable ranging from 0 to 7 where 0 is “No formal education completed” and 7 is “Completed professional or graduate degree.” Income is also an ordinal level variable ranging from 1 to 7 where 1 indicates “Annual household income below $15,000” and 7 indicates “Annual household income above $65,000.”
dichotomous variable capturing respondents who are registered to vote.\textsuperscript{11} People who are registered to vote tend to feel more efficacious (Timpone 1998), so they may not experience the same procedural frustration as those who are not granted traditional avenues of political participation. Lastly, I include binary variables gauging political party affiliation, where 1 = Republican or 1 = Independent/Other and Democrat is the reference category.

\textit{Estimation Technique}

The use of logistic regression is appropriate here since the response variable is dichotomous.\textsuperscript{12} The results, then, are presented as the odds of the respondent reporting that they trust the government. I also computed collinearity diagnostics for independent and control variables, which showed that there were not multicollinearity issues amongst variables.\textsuperscript{13}

Additionally, before recoding variables and analysis, I utilized multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE) to fill in missing data.\textsuperscript{14} Imputation was necessary due to the pattern of missing data on certain variables. Data was not missing at random since most of the respondents with missing values in control variables reported a lower sense of political trust. For instance, of the 1,801 respondents who declined to report their annual household income, 71\% of those respondents reported trusting the government “some of the time” or “never”, indicating high levels of cynicism in the cases that would be removed with listwise

\textsuperscript{11} I explored interaction effects between this variable and the timing of interview, but results proved non-significant.

\textsuperscript{12} I also ran analyses using ordinal logistic and generalized ordered logistic models. Significant results are maintained across models, so I present logistic regression for simplicity.

\textsuperscript{13} The variance inflation factor (VIF) ranged from 1.02 to 1.24.

\textsuperscript{14} There was no missing data on my dependent variable of political trust.
deletion. Using MICE, I replaced the missing data with the average of five imputed variations of the variable.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the results. To begin with, model 1 reveals the effects of the control variables on the odds of a respondent reporting a sense of political trust. As for the control variables that reached significance, women consistently report trusting the government less than men. Converse to what Michelson (2001, 2003, 2007) found, respondents who experienced discrimination are marginally more likely to report trusting the government than those who have not experienced discrimination. This is a puzzling effect maintained across models, warranting attention in future research. It is possible, however, that such a high number of individuals reporting discrimination experiences (87%) inflated the effect of such experiences on political trust. Lastly, we see that people who were interested in politics or identified as Republican were significantly more likely to report political trust.

[Insert Table 2 Here]

Turning to Model 2, this model shows the variables accounting for initial and widespread protest effects, measured through timing of respondents’ interviews. While it does appear that protest effects caused a slight divergence in political trust at both interview time points, the results are statistically insignificant. Therefore, I reject both my first (respondents interviewed after the initial protest but before the widespread protests would have decreased levels of political trust) and second hypotheses (respondents interviewed after the widespread protest would have increased levels of political trust). I constructed these
hypotheses to test if initial and widespread protest effects would maintain or create group-level trust in the government. The lack of such an effect at either time point may indicate that the movement was not as extensive and the collective action was not as powerful as later interpretations of the movement would suggest.

Next, before examining the interaction effects suggested in hypotheses 3 and 4, I look at the main effects of Spanish-language media in Model 3. Overall, it appears that the odds of respondents who consume Spanish-language media to report trusting the government are 12.2% lower than respondents who use English or bilingual media, all else held constant; this effect is marginally significant ($\alpha < 0.10$). Some scholars consider the language of media used by immigrants as a proxy for how assimilated an immigrant is into mainstream United States society (Waters et al. 2010). Thus, respondents who use English or bilingual media may be more assimilated than counterparts who use Spanish-language media. More assimilated individuals are potentially more familiar with how to engage in the United States political system, feeling more efficacious and leading to an increased level of political trust. Additionally, assimilation indicates a distance from the immigration experience (Sanchez and Masuoka 2010), possibly making Latinos who use English-language media less sympathetic with the predicaments facing less-assimilated and recently immigrated persons. Considering this, the effect of Spanish-language media on political trust may be due to Spanish media’s coverage of issues facing particularly disadvantaged Latinos.

Lastly, Models 5 and 6 show the interactions between the timing of the interview and Spanish-language media use, testing my third and fourth hypotheses – H3: the initial protest effect will lead to a larger decrease in the likelihood of reporting political trust for those who
used Spanish-language media compared to English-language media, and H4: the widespread protest effect will lead to a larger increase in the likelihood of reporting political trust for those who used Spanish-language media compared to English-language media. These hypotheses concentrate the existence of a protest effect in those who used Spanish-language media, and thus were most likely to experience a mobilizing message due to the coverage of Spanish media during this time period (Félix et al. 2008). Both interactions reach significance in the expected directions. In Model 5, the coefficient of interest indicates that the effect of the initial protests on those who used Spanish-language media led to 44.8% decreased odds of reporting trust in the government, compared to respondents who used either media source before the first protest and those who used English-language media during the second time period. Model 6 shows that the widespread protest effect on those who used Spanish-language media led to 37.7% increased odds of reporting political trust, compared to respondents who used either media source before the first protest and those who used English-language media after the widespread protest. As a result, it is clear that Spanish-language media had an important moderating effect in how individuals learned about and responded to H.R. 4437 and the protests. Not only does this solidify the mobilizing nature of Spanish-language media during this time period, it also lends further credence to my previous argument about individuals who use English-language media being more assimilated, and thus less sympathetic, to the issues facing more recently arrived immigrants.
Figure 1 presents predicted probabilities\textsuperscript{15} for the interaction terms, including the changes in political trust for those who used English-language or bilingual media as a comparison. Overall, there is a dynamic relationship between the protest effects and political trust for respondents who used Spanish-language media. Comparatively, those who used English-language media have relatively steady levels of political trust, with a slight, overall decrease of 0.02 between the first and third time points. At the first time point, before the initial protest, the probability of Spanish-language media users to report trusting the government is 0.06 lower than the probability of English-language or bilingual media users. The probability of Spanish-language users reporting political trust reaches a nadir after the initial protest – a drop of 0.09 from the probability at the first time point that widens the gap between Spanish-language and English-language media users to 0.13. At the third time point, the probability of Spanish-language media users reporting political trust reaches similar levels as those who used English-language media, indicating the importance of the communication context for political activity and the alleviation of procedural frustration.

Including multiple time variables is important in order to parse out the differential effects throughout the life course of the protest activity and H.R. 4437. In an earlier model (not shown) with only one time point accounting for respondents interviewed after the initial protest, the effect reached significance and indicated that Spanish-using respondents interviewed after the initial protest had a group-level increase in the odds of reporting

\textsuperscript{15} I acquired predicted probabilities by using the “prvalue” command in Stata. All probabilities are for first-generation men who have experienced discrimination, are interested in politics, are not registered to vote, claim to be Democrats, and are of average age, education level, and income. The predicted probabilities for before the first protest are from a regression model not presented with a dichotomous indicator for before the initial protest and an interaction effect between timing of the interview and use of Spanish-language media.
political trust. This model was clearly too simplistic, obscuring the nuanced relationship between collective action and political trust during a tumultuous time period. In future research with the LNS, I hope to add more time points in order to broaden the analysis of protest activity and political trust.

[Insert Figure 1 Here]

DISCUSSION

In 2006, the United States saw the historical mobilization of immigrants fighting for comprehensive immigration reform. This movement was in response to H.R. 4437, proposed legislation with a variety of restrictive provisions. With this analysis, I investigated the possibility of a protest effect on Latinos’ trust in the government. My analysis lends support to two of my hypotheses positing that the protest effect would be stronger for those who used Spanish-language media. Indeed, Spanish-using respondents interviewed after the initial protests had significantly decreased odds of reporting political trust, while those interviewed after the widespread protests had significantly increased odds.

I attribute this to two factors: shifts in procedural frustration and a demonstration effect. Procedural frustration exists when people feel alienated from the political process because they believe their voices are not heard and their opinions do not count. I argue that the protests arose from a sense political cynicism and procedural frustration as many Latinos saw the United States government legislating their lives without their input. This is indicated by the low levels of political trust after the initial protests, shown in Figure 1, and is a relationship previously theorized by Gamson (1968). Then, the visibility of widespread anti-
H.R. 4437 protests alleviated procedural frustration by giving those opposing the legislation a voice. Some scholars consider protests an increasingly conventional form of political participation, making the motivations and effects of participating in collective action similar to voting or contacting an elected official. Thus, protest participation would have a similar effect in making individuals feel like they have a political voice, are capable of influencing the political system, and can trust governmental procedures and officials. Figure 1 also exemplifies this by the increase in likelihood of reporting political trust at the third time point.

A demonstration effect occurs when members of a social movement see widespread support for their cause. The nationwide protests against H.R. 4437 in over 150 cities with millions of participants showed widespread support for the movement. Not only were other immigrants mobilizing, including Latinos, Asians, and Middle Easterners (Heiskanen 2009), but there was support from established non-profit organizations and religious groups as well. I argue that Latinos’ political trust also increased in reaction to this demonstration effect since it is harder for the government to ignore such widespread participation. Additionally, the demonstration effect likely had an additional role in alleviating procedural frustration. The effect showed the widespread support for the immigration reform movement, leading to a perception of increased group efficacy and a belief that the group and its members had the ear of politicians, thus facilitating a sense of political trust. Figure 1 again supports this explanation as indicated by the increased odds of reporting trust in the government at the third time point after the more widespread protests, particularly May 1, 2006.
The communication context is a crucial step in this process since only respondents who used Spanish-language media showed evidence of a protest effect. Individuals being targeted for mobilization is a critical step in any social movement (Klandermans 1997), which was a role that Spanish-language media filled during this time period. Not only were those who consumed Spanish-language media informed about the issues at hand, they were also encouraged to participate in politics through protest activity and registering to vote (Félix et al. 2008). This encouragement from the media likely informed listeners that their political participation was important and that the government would listen to them once they expressed themselves. The within-group communication was not only important for the social movement itself, but also imperative for how Latinos perceived the purpose of their political activity and the way they felt about the government. The relative stability of perceptions of political trust in respondents who used English-language or bilingual media can either indicate how assimilated these individuals were (Waters et al. 2010), so that they did not find H.R. 4437 and the protests important, but also hints at the differential coverage of immigration issues identified in English and Spanish news outlets (Branton and Dunaway 2008).

CONCLUSION

Through this research, I showed how trust in the government is dynamic across a time period of political unrest marked by protest. The shifting perceptions of political trust relate to the creation or salience of procedural frustration, and the subsequent alleviation of that procedural frustration. In the historical case I examined, procedural frustration was connected
to protest effects among Latinos who used Spanish-language media during the nationwide movement against H.R. 4437. These findings can contribute to our overall understanding of theories of social movements. The purpose of a social movement is to produce social change from the bottom up by empowering oppressed individuals to come together and challenge those in control (Glasberg and Shannon 2011). Overall, then, we can consider the 2006 immigration reform protests successful on both counts. First of all, the increase in political trust in respondents who used Spanish-language media – the population most likely to have heard a mobilizing message – suggests that they felt empowered to engage in politics, expecting the government to respond to their demands. Secondly, H.R. 4437 was not passed by the Senate, officially dying at the end of the 109th Congress, making for a successful social movement. To further explore the implications of this research, I will discuss how my findings contribute to three specific theories of social movements: social identity, relative deprivation, and resource mobilization theories.

Social identity (SIT) and relative deprivation (RDT) theories both focus on the collective identification of group members based on shared characteristics (Glasberg and Shannon 2011; Tajfel and Turner 1979; van Zomeren and Iyer 2009). For racial and ethnic minorities, this collective identity often exists due to a multitude of factors from psychological, sociopolitical, and cultural elements related to their ethnoracial minority status in any given society (McClain et al. 2009). For a social identity to contribute to collective action, individuals must perceive that their identification with a group is due to sociostructural characteristics that determine their social position (van Zomeren and Iyer 2009). Additionally, RDT suggests that people will only experience anger and pursue
collective action if they perceive their group as relatively deprived compared to expected conditions or another group because of how their group is identified (Klandermans 1997).

Thus, within an SIT framework, my results point to a motivation created by a collective social identity to protest H.R. 4437. The variety of racial classification systems experienced by Latinos in home countries (Bonilla-Silva 2010) and the range of phenotypical diversity present in Latinos (Golash-Boza 2006) can make the development of a collective identity based on a “Latino experience” in the United States difficult. However, previous research shows that Spanish-language media creates a stronger panethnic identity (Dávila 2001; Rodríguez 1999). Hence, Spanish-language media is conceptualized as a way to foster a sense of collective identity within Latinos, motivating them to take action when necessary.

Considering Spanish-language media within RDT requires a turn to the different coverage of immigration issues between English- and Spanish-language news outlets. Previous research shows that these sources vary by the scope of the story (Moran 2006) and the positive or negative light directed towards immigration issues (Branton and Dunaway 2008). During this particularly tumultuous time period, coverage of immigration, the legislation, and the protests may have been particularly polarized. The relative group position of Latinos may have become particularly salient to those consuming Spanish-language media, further inspiring individuals to participate, and leading to the subsequent shifts in political trust.

Finally, resource mobilization theory (RMT) suggests that even when groups and individuals experience threats and deprivation, they will not participate in collective action unless they perceive access to resources that will help them create a shared definition of the
situation and appropriate response (Glasberg and Shannon 2011). These can include moral, cultural, social-organizational, human, and material resources (Edwards and McCarthy 2004). Within this framework, the protests arose not only due to a perceived collective identity or the realization of deprived conditions, but also because those who protested felt the group had the appropriate resources to affect the political system and encourage social change. Spanish-language media itself served as a resource that helped potential activists create a shared definition of the situation, and it also provided information about additional resources, such as organizational allies and political events.

Each of these theories points to a different pathway for changing patterns in political trust due to procedural frustration. SIT suggests that the decrease in political trust resulted from realizing a Latino social identity was related to an overall social position in the United States, then increased when widespread collective action based on such a social identity attempted to tackle that social position. RDT implies that trust in the government decreased when group inequalities based on a Latino identity were made salient, then increased when group members believed those with political power would address such discrepancies. Lastly, RMT suggests that political trust decreased when Latinos thought they may not have enough resources to impact political procedures after the initial protest, but increased after widespread protests solidified group resources. In this political context of challenging H.R. 4437, all of these theoretical relationships depended on Spanish-language media’s mobilizing communication context.

My study has two main limitations. First of all, as a symptom of the survey data, there is no way to know who actually participated in, supported, or even heard about the protests.
Thus, while no analysis could assess the opinions of those who actually participated in or supported the protests, the survey still allows for inferences about overall opinions of the adult Latino population in the U.S. during this time period. Second, it is clear from previous research (see Félix et al. 2008) and my results that Spanish-language media influenced the Latino community during this time period. While we know this facet of the media encouraged discussion of the issues and participation in the events, we do not know exactly what media outlets were saying, nor how it compared to the way English-language media covered the issues. This has potential for a future project comparing how English- and Spanish-language media differentially cover large, nation-wide events that affect the Latino community, especially since English-language media often covers immigration issues in a negative light (Branton and Dunaway 2008; Santa Ana 1999). Furthermore, such a project could analyze not only how Spanish-language media framed the US government at this time, but also if the effects I find speak only to Spanish language in general, rather than Spanish-language media. If Latinos using English-language media is an indicator for assimilation (Waters et al. 2010), the protest effect identified may not exist within a communication context, but instead show the reactions of a less-assimilated population most vulnerable to the consequences of restrictive immigration legislation.

In addition to a comparison of news media coverage of this debate, I propose other opportunities for future research along this vein. For instance, interviews with organizers or those who participated in these protests can provide more insight into what motivated protest participation: were they critical of the government after the legislation passed and how did they feel after the initial and widespread protests? Did they see Spanish-language media as a
crucial informative and mobilizing force? To move beyond the political issues at hand, monthly or annual surveys can be used to assess how other political opinions changed due to racist, classist, or sexist legislation and social movements that responded to them. For instance, how did women’s opinions about the Virginia government change after attempts to require transvaginal ultrasounds for any woman seeking an abortion, a proposed bill many people rallied against in the state capital? Although this movement was much smaller, acting on a state scale, and with a different group (women), it had a similar outcome as the legislation passed without the transvaginal requirement and with exceptions for victims of rape (Celock 2012). Similarities and differences between my findings and studies of other social movements can further understandings of the effects of legislation, protest effects, and the success, or lack thereof, of a movement.

Political trust in a government that gives preferential treatment to people based on race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and country of origin, to name a few, needs to be continually examined and understood. In particular, when there are social movements to oppose actions of a discriminatory social structure, such as those surrounding H.R. 4437, scholars need to not only understand what led to those social movements, but also how political opinions changed because of them. The realm of politics is continually changing, and issues of race, class, and gender are constantly developing and challenged. To fully understand this process, scholars should continue to explore political opinions via trust in the government, partisanship, and support or opposition to specific political issues.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

**Table 1: Variables and Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Trust</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the Protests</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the Protests</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Media</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female=1)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminated Against</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in Politics</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered to Vote</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Other</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Effect</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread Effect</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Language Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.882†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial * Spanish Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.552*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread * Spanish Media</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.377*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Controls**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female=1)</td>
<td>0.879*</td>
<td>0.878*</td>
<td>0.884*</td>
<td>0.883*</td>
<td>0.884*</td>
<td>0.881*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminated Against</td>
<td>1.189†</td>
<td>1.192†</td>
<td>1.196†</td>
<td>1.199*</td>
<td>1.201*</td>
<td>1.198*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in Politics</td>
<td>1.177*</td>
<td>1.174*</td>
<td>1.171*</td>
<td>1.168*</td>
<td>1.166*</td>
<td>1.163*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered to Vote</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1.255**</td>
<td>1.257**</td>
<td>1.260***</td>
<td>1.263***</td>
<td>1.264***</td>
<td>1.265***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Other</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo $R^2$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exponentiated Coefficients

† $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$
Figure 1. Predicted Probabilities of Reporting Political Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Before Protest</th>
<th>Initial Protest</th>
<th>Widespread Protest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.2904</td>
<td>0.2039</td>
<td>0.3284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Bilingual</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
<td>0.3385</td>
<td>0.3263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>