The Determinants of Migrant Receiving and Origin Country Electoral Politics

Ali R. Chaudhary, Ph.D.
Postdoctoral Fellow, International Migration Institute
Junior Research Fellow of Wolfson College
University of Oxford
Transnational and Diaspora Politics
Existing Research on (Im)migration and Politics

• Epistemic Bi-Furcation
  • Receiving and Origin-Country Perspectives
  • Need for more conceptual cross-fertilization
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Receiving Country Perspective

• Immigrant Incorporation and Political Participation
  o Socioeconomic Status is positively correlated with electoral participation among immigrants and ethnic minorities (Verba et al. 1995)
  
  o Variation in political participation across groups within a single polity (Heath et al. 2013; Maxwell 2012; Ramakrishnan 2005;)
  
  o Variation in political participation across multiple destination countries (Brubaker 1989; Morales and Giugni 2011; Schain 2008)
  
Origin Country Perspective

- **Diasporas, Conflict and Homeland Politics**
  (Cohen 2008; Gamlen 2008; Lyons and Mandaville 2012; Pedraza 2007; Wiberg 2007; Van Hear 2006)

- **Extraterritorial Citizenship & External Voting Policies**
  (Baubock 2003, 1994; Collyer 2103; Lafleur 2013)

- **Political and (Financial) Remittances**
  (Ahmed 2014; Amadov & Sasse 2014; Dionne et al. 2014; O’ Mahoney 2013)

- **Political Transnational Engagement**
  (Guarnizo & Chaudhary 2014; Guarnizo et al. 2003; Levitt 2001; Ostergaard-Nilesen 2003; Portes and Fernandez-Kelly 2015; Waldinger 2015, 2008; Vertovec 2004)
Political Transnational Engagement

Two Competing Interpretations

A) Incorporation into receiving societies decreases transnational political engagement with origin countries (Waldinger 2015, 2008; Sohel and Waldinger 2013)

B) Incorporation and transnational political engagement are complimentary processes (Fernandez-Kelly 2015; Guarnizo et al. 2003)
Limitations in Past Research

• Analyses of immigrant incorporation focus on socio-economic integration rather than political participation in receiving countries

• Much of the literature focuses on Latin American and Caribbean migrant flows to the United States

• Lack of comparative quantitative analysis of multiple migrant groups and multiple destinations

• Insufficient focus on origin country contexts
Research Questions

• To what extent are immigrant political participation and transnational political engagement different processes?

• What is the relationship between receiving and origin country-oriented political engagement?
Data

• Morales et al. (2004-2008)
  o LOCALMULTIDEM: Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants’ Social Capital in Europe: Participation, Organizational Networks and Public Practices at the Local Level (Individual-Level Survey)

  o Total Sample (N=3476)

  o 14 Migrant Groups

  o 8 Destination Cities Across 6 Receiving Countries
Receiving Cities/Countries (8 Cities/6 Countries)

- Barcelona & Madrid (Spain)
- London (UK)
- Lyon (France)
- Stockholm (Sweden)
- Zurich & Geneva (Switzerland)
Migrant Groups/Origin Countries

• Bangladesh, India, Philippines

• Egypt, Algeria, Morocco

• Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru

• Italy, Turkey, Kosovo
Sample Distribution by Origin Countries
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Categorical Dependent Variables
Multinomial Logistic Regression

DV1 - Voted in Last Receiving Country National Election?

- Not Eligible
- Eligible, But Did Not Vote
- Eligible, Voted

DV2 – Voted in Last Homeland Election?

- Not Eligible
- Eligible, But Did Not Vote
- Eligible, Voted
Independent Variables

- Standard Individual-Level Socio-Economic and Demographic Variables

- Country-Level Controls for Receiving Cities/Countries

- Country-Level Controls for Origin Countries
Political Opportunity Structures-Receiving Cities/Countries

Data – 2014 LOCALMULTIDEM IDE POS Indicators

Relative Openness or Access to Individual and Group Rights
-1 = Most Restrictive, 0=Neutral, +1= Most Inclusive

• General POS (Openness of Political System-City Level)

• Specific POS (Policies targeting immigrants-City Level)

• 2008 MIPX – National-Level Policies

Ali R. Chaudhary, Ph.D.
02 March 2016
Origin Country Contexts

- External Voting Allowed (Dummy)
- Post-Colonial Migration (Dummy)
- Polity IV Score
- Voter Turnout in Last Election
- Distance Between Origin Capital and Destination City
Model 1
The Odds of Voting in Last Homeland Election
(Reference: Eligible, Did Not Vote)

Multinomial Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios)
Red Signifies Significance at .01 and .001
Robust Std. Errors Clustered by Receiving City
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Model 2
The Odds of Voting in Last Receiving Country Election
(Reference: Eligible, Did Not Vote)

Multinomial Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios)
Red Signifies Significance at .01 and .001
Robust Std. Errors Clustered by Receiving City
Model 3
Receiving Country Voting on Odds of Voting in Homeland
(Reference: Eligible, Did Not Vote)

Multinomial Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios)
Red Signifies Significance at .01 and .001
Robust Std. Errors Clustered by Receiving City
Key Findings

Receiving and Origin-Country Political Engagement are different process with different determinants

Receiving Country Political Engagement (Voting) Increases the Odds of Voting in Origin Country Elections
Conclusions

• Divided Loyalties vs. Complementarity?
  o Evidence supports both interpretations.
    • Length of residency and naturalization decrease transnational political engagement.

• However, politically active migrants who vote in receiving country are also likely to vote in homeland elections.
• Migrants intent on activating their political agency will do so if they are granted access to institutional electoral politics.

• The strong connection between receiving and origin country voting requires more theoretical synthesis between research on immigrant political integration and transnational politics.
Questions, Comments, Criticisms?
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Toward a Theory of Transnational Political Action

- Under which conditions do migrant communities engage in transnational political action.
  - Bringing the Origin State Back In
    - Typology of Origin States
    - Geopolitical Contexts (between origin and receiving state)
- Typology of Transnational Political Action
### Multinomial Logistic Regression Models

(Odds Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (1=female, 0=male)</td>
<td>.829(.073)</td>
<td>.710(.151)</td>
<td>.842(.075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (1=yes, 0=no)</td>
<td>1.31(.147)*</td>
<td>.937(.249)</td>
<td>1.31(.147)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Since Arrival (Cont.)</td>
<td>.919(.014)***</td>
<td>1.16(.045)***</td>
<td>.913(.015)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Since Arrival Squared</td>
<td>1.00(.000)***</td>
<td>.998(.000)***</td>
<td>1.00(.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment (Ordinal)</td>
<td>1.07(.034)</td>
<td>1.24(.087)**</td>
<td>1.07(.034)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (1=yes, 0=no)</td>
<td>1.03(.111)</td>
<td>1.34(.328)</td>
<td>1.02(.112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country Citizenship (1=Yes)</td>
<td>.837(.137)</td>
<td>2.54(.875)**</td>
<td>1.16(.217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Membership (1=Yes)</td>
<td>1.52(.141)***</td>
<td>1.05(.242)</td>
<td>1.52(.142)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIPX (Ordinal)</td>
<td>1.01(.008)</td>
<td>1.17(.121)</td>
<td>.866(.021)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General P.O.S. (Ordinal)</td>
<td>1.01(.213)</td>
<td>.560(.282)</td>
<td>1.00(.210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant P.O.S. (Ordinal)</td>
<td>.376(.086)***</td>
<td>.364(.664)</td>
<td>10.5(5.54)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Voting Allowed? (1=Yes)</td>
<td>3.37(.539)***</td>
<td>.282(.149)*</td>
<td>3.56(.624)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Between Capitals (Cont)</td>
<td>.855(.021)***</td>
<td>.740(.072)***</td>
<td>.779(.027)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Colonial Migration (1=Yes)</td>
<td>1.41(.201)*</td>
<td>7.99(.957)</td>
<td>.537(.104)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity IV Score</td>
<td>1.02(.026)</td>
<td>1.14(.096)</td>
<td>1.18 (.039)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in Last Homeland Election</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.61(.533)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Turnout Homeland Elections</td>
<td>104(.005)***</td>
<td>1.01(.009)</td>
<td>1.03(.004)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in Last Domestic Election</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2.27(.656)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2.65(.614)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Turnout in Last Host Election</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.15 (.05)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Voting in Last Homeland Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Vote</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Turnout</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 March 2016

Ali R. Chaudhary
Overall Voting in Last Receiving Country Election

02 March 2016
Ali R. Chaudhary
Determinants of Voting in Receiving Country Elections

- Years Since Arrival  
- Educational Attainment  
- Host Country Citizenship  
- External Voting Allowed  
- Distance
Determinants of Voting in Origin Country Elections

- Married +
- Org/Association Membership +
- External Voting Allowed +
- Postcolonial Migration +
- Voter Turnout in Origin Elections

- Years since arrival –
- Immigrant POS –
  - Distance –
Effects of Receiving Country Voting on Transnational Political Engagement

- Voting in Receiving Country Elections +
  - Not Eligible to Vote in Receiving Country Elections +
    - Voter turnout in Receiving Country +
    - Voter turnout in Origin Country +