The Role of Country of Origin on Immigrant Voting Behavior

Eveet Gabriel
Senior Undergraduate Honors Thesis
Submitted to the Department of Political Science
University of California, San Diego

March 2020

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Seth Hill, for his feedback, guidance, and support. My first Political Science class in college, "Intro to American Politics," was taught by Professor Hill and confirmed my passion for Political Science.

I would also like to thank Professor Butler and Professor Strom for their insight and support in the Honors Seminar. I would also like to thank TA Michael Seese for helping me navigate STATA.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. Mom, Dad, thank you for immigrating to the United States and giving my brothers and I a better opportunity at life. This journey has inspired me to advocate for immigrants in my everyday life.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This thesis explores the role of the political institutions of countries of origin in shaping immigrant voting behavior. This topic has been under researched with the exception of papers that analyze 1st generation Cuban American immigrants in Florida, who fled former communist Cuba, voting for the Republican party. However, research linking immigrant voting behavior from other countries and the forms of government those immigrants migrated from is absent. I hypothesize that immigrants that migrated from former autocratic regimes are more likely to register and vote for the Republican party because they prefer a government that is less involved in their lives due to the autocratic experiences in their country of origin. I find support for my hypothesis analyzing party of registration in California for 4.9 million naturalized citizens registered to vote by their country of origin, and in survey data on 2012 and 2016 presidential vote choice. I find that immigrants from autocracies are approximately 20% less likely to register as Democrat and approximately 8% more likely to register as Republican. Immigrants from autocracies are also more likely to support Republican presidential candidates. They were 14% less likely to vote for Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama in the 2012 election while being approximately 7% more likely to vote for Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump in the 2016 election. These findings shed light on this common notion that immigrants who came from authoritarian countries (communist, dictatorship, etc.) such as Cuba and Iraq are more likely to vote for the Republican party. As immigration in the United States is ever increasing, it is important that politicians of both parties acknowledge the needs of immigrants' and know how to appeal to their voting behavior.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Immigrants in the United States are the fastest growing voting demographic among voters. They are especially growing in key battleground states with the largest number of electoral votes. Immigrants that can vote, also known as naturalized citizens, are greatly affecting elections and major political parties can no longer ignore their needs in order to secure votes (Wambu 2014). Current research has predominately looked at factors that motivate naturalized citizens to register to vote (Bass et al 2001). Some of these factors include length of time in the United States, socioeconomic status, and demographic factors such as gender, age, income, and education levels (Bass et al 2001). Research has also looked at different levels of assimilation based on country of origin and the time that it takes individuals from different countries to become naturalized citizens (Bueker 2005). However, to date unaddressed is how the experiences prior to immigration of naturalized Americans influence their politics in the United States.

In this thesis, I measure how citizens' country of origin affects party of registration and vote choice. I argue that immigrants from autocratic countries are more likely to vote and register with the Republican party where as immigrants from democratic regimes are more likely to vote and register with the Democratic party. I believe this is due to the previous and often different experiences in their countries of origin that both of these groups have faced. No one has previously demonstrated how immigrants from democracies versus autocracies register to vote or vote in presidential races once in the United States. In terms of registering to vote with a particular party, this becomes problematic in states where one does not have to list party affiliation when registering. In addition, registering to vote does not always equate to actually voting let alone voting for a particular party. As a result, I intend to build on current studies and

see if factors such as the political institutions of country of origin affect naturalized citizen's

party of registration and voting behavior.

My thesis translates into a bigger topic of how people's lived experience, native or

foreign born, affects their views in the broader political system. For example, the political

affiliation in one's childhood household is one of the strongest indicators of party affiliation.

African Americans are more likely to vote for the Democratic party as that party that has

embraced people of color's issues (Kidd et al. 2007). Those that are older and live in rural areas

are more likely to vote Republican (McKee 2008).

Similarly, I argue that the lived experience of an immigrant's country of origin affects

party registration and voting behavior. Those who immigrate from autocracies often have to do

so due to corrupt governments, violence, and poverty. Those who immigrate from democracies

are often seeking better opportunities in the United States and come from wealthier and more

educated backgrounds. In addition, those that lived in democracies have a better embracing of

the American political system since their former countries held elections more often than

autocratic countries do. Thus, those who migrate to the United States come from a variety of

countries that have different cultures, political systems, and histories. They bring these

influences with them in America and are impacted by them for decades in all aspects of life

including political beliefs and vote choice. This is especially true for over half of immigrants

who end up living in ethnic enclaves, communities of high concentrations of immigrants, where

the experiences of their former country influences their everyday life (Xie and Gough 2011). The

different experiences in different countries and political systems influences how they register to

vote and vote once in the United States.

My methodology will consist of data from three sources that consider not only factors

such as a naturalized citizen's country of origin, length of time in the United States, income

level, gender, age, race, and education but will also consider party of registration and presidential vote choice during the 2012 and 2016 elections. My first dataset is the California Voter File from Political Data Inc. The California Voter File has information on 17.3 million registered voters in California. This includes demographic information such as their gender, birthyear, income, and marital status along with information on party of registration and birthplace. Among those 17.3 million voters, this dataset has information on how over 4 million immigrants have registered to vote, including their party of registration along with a report of their country of origin.

My second dataset is from the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES). The CCES survey is an annual survey that has over 50,000 observations administered by YouGov and teams of universities across the nation. All respondents answer the 60 common content questions and smaller samples of over 1000 people answer questions that participating teams have created. Specifically, I will be looking at immigrant respondents' answers to questions that relate to immigration status, country of origin, and vote choice in both the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections.

The third dataset I analyzed was the Center of Systemic Peace's Polity IV Country Regime Trends. In order to determine the country of origin's form of government, "Polity Scores" offer a 21-point range that labels a country as a democracy, anocracy, or autocracy. This is the score I will use to measure the political institutions of the different countries of naturalized citizen's responses in the California Voter File and 2016 CCES.

Before moving on, it is important to define some of the key terms. In this paper, a democratic country is one that has a "system of government in which effective political power is vested in the people" (Johnson 2005). An autocratic country contains a "system of government" by one person with absolute power (Johnson 2005). Finally, an anocracy is a form of government that has elements of both democracies and autocracies, often mixing elements of both.

In the United States, the Republican party prefers a laissez-faire economy and traditional notions of the social aspect of society (Freeman 1986). Ideally, Republicans prefer a limited and hands-off government on the economy but one that is more involved in social issues that are not traditional (gay marriage, immigration, welfare). Meanwhile, the Democratic party, believes in a social equity for all and an economy that works for everyone in order to reduce income inequality (Freeman 1986). Democrats prefer a limited government socially but more government regulation in the economy.

Finally, it is important to define how immigration will be used in this paper. A U.S. immigrant is one that migrates from another country to the United States. Although the term immigrant can be synonymous with the term naturalized citizen, the opposite is not true. Naturalized citizens have lived in the United States for over 5 years, have passed the citizenship test, and have a basic understanding of U.S. history and government, to name just a few requirements. A right that naturalized citizen's get that other immigrants/non-naturalized citizens do not receive is the right to vote in local, state, and federal elections. From this point forward in this essay, the term "immigrant" refers to naturalized citizens in the United States to avoid confusion. This definition will be used as not all immigrants in the United States can vote with the exception of those that have obtained a naturalized citizenship.

The remainder of this thesis will be structured as follows. First, I will discuss the existing literature on immigrant voting behavior and party of registration. Subsequently, I introduce my argument and hypothesis which clarifies why I believe immigrants from autocracies are more likely to vote and register Republican and immigrants from democracies are more likely to vote and register Democratic. Next, I present elements of my research design. This strategy explains my regressions on identifying correlations between political institutions of immigrant country of origin, party of registration, presidential vote choice, and party identification. Next, I present my

findings and analysis. This section is broken down between the California voter registration,

2012 presidential vote, 2016 presidential vote, and party ID. Finally, I conclude with the larger

societal and political implications of this thesis for immigrants and elections at a time when

immigration is a focal point of several candidates' campaigns. Ultimately, this paper will answer

the question: "Do political institutions of country of origin influence naturalized citizen voting

behavior in the United States? How so?"

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Existing literature on immigrant voter behavior consists predominantly of what factors encourage immigrants to register to vote (Rosenblum and Tivig 2014; Bass and Casper 2001; 1999; Jang 2009). One of these factors is length of time in the United States (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Nicholson 2018; Bass and Casper 2001; 1999). As immigrants spend more time in the United States, they are more likely to register to vote. In addition, some research has been done that analyzes increase in favoring the Democratic party and Democratic candidates as naturalized citizens spend longer in the United States (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Donato and Perez 2016; Bass and Casper 1999). This could be due to the fact that Democratic candidates are more likely to be immigrants or advocate for immigrant issues (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010).

Voting behavior might also be a result of the institutions that immigrants become exposed to as their time in the United States increases (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Donato and Perez 2016). They are more likely to get exposed to the education system as they spend more time in America, and just like most other Americans born in the United States, an increase in educational attainment means that one's chances of favoring the Democratic Party increases (Bass and Casper 1999). Another factor is socioeconomic status (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Donato and Perez 2016; Bueker 2005). As a naturalized citizen's socioeconomic status increases, depending on how that increase happened, it leads to favoring the Democratic party. Often times, this increase in socioeconomic status parallels the educational attainment of an individual; thus, making one more likely to register and vote for the Democratic party. Meanwhile, those that immigrated wealthier are more likely to register and vote for the Republican party.

Country of origin is another factor that determines whether one registers for either of the two parties for Latino immigrants (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Bueker 2005). It has been somewhat documented that naturalized citizens who fled previous socialist countries or other

forms of failed autocratic governments, are more likely to prefer conservative since they prefer a government that is not as involved in their personal lives due to a lack of distrust in the government based on their prior lived experiences before immigrating. For example. 1st generation Cuban immigrants, most of whom live in Florida, predominately register to vote with the Republican party (Donato and Perez 2016; Girard et al 2012). For these Cuban Americans, vote choice during elections also aligns with the party that they registered with, Republican.

One reason that country of origin and immigrant voting behavior has not been thoroughly studied is because some scholars argue that the lived experience of immigrants may matter for a short period of time but other factors such as educational attainment and economic circumstances eventually influence voting behavior to a greater degree (Rosenblum and Tivig 2014; Bueker 2005). However, my statistical analysis shows that immigrants' political pasts matter more than scholars formerly thought.

One study that looks at how country of origin predicts the likelihood of voting (turning out to vote) for those who immigrated to Canada discovers that this factor is just as strong as education and age factors (Pikkov 2012). In this study, it is discovered that the post-migration treatment and changes in lived experience are not the only factors that contribute to voting patterns, but origin effects play significant roles even in 2nd generation Canadians. One reason for this pattern not only in Canada, but arguably in the United States as well, is the tendency of immigrants to live in ethnic enclaves (Forment 1989; Xie and Gough 2011). These communities are composed of high percentages of people from the same community (Xie and Gough 2011). This is seen with Cuban Americans in Miami, Florida; Italian Americans in parts of Manhattan, New York, and Christian Iraqi Immigrants, Chaldeans, in Eastern portions San Diego. Thus, one's country of origin and cultural practices tend to stick with them even post-immigration to host countries; continuing to influence their political and voting behavior.

A longstanding argument is that the increasing size of the immigrant population and their descendants will lead to a new Democratic majority (Starr 1997; Teixeira 2003). This is known as "The Emerging Democratic Majority" theory. Essentially, this theory argues that immigrants, people of color, and other minorities will vote and register predominately for the Democratic Party. It argues that by 2050, eleven of the 15 largest states will by "majority minority" and these states will predominately vote and register with the Democratic Party. What this argument does, however, is group millions of people all together based on their immigration background. In reality, voting is more nuanced. My evidence suggests some caution on this conclusion as the partisan preferences of immigrants depends to some degree on lived experience in country of origin. Benefit to the Democratic Party may not be as obvious as commonly assumed.

My thesis will contribute to the existing literature as this will be the first time that one has mapped out different naturalized citizen's party of registration based on country of origin. I will then analyze some of the factors that lead to different immigrant groups to prefer either of the two major parties – Republican or Democrat – in presidential elections. This contribution is important as immigrants are the fastest growing group in the United States. Although they vote in smaller percentages than those born in the United States, being an immigrant is still the fastest growing voter demographic (Wambu and Nkabinde 2016; Bass and Casper 2001). It is even expected that by the year 2050 immigrants in American will exceed the amount of U.S. born white people in the country (Wambu and Nkabinde 2016). Thus, my research will contribute to existing literature on immigrant's voting needs. Moving forward politically, candidates need to consider the needs of immigrants and specifically campaign to them. This will quickly become vital in politicized elections as immigration has been a hot topic in 21st century elections, so immigrants are coming out to vote in larger percentages as the issues the candidates are running on directly affect immigrants and their families now more than ever.

Chapter 3: Argument and Hypothesis

My hypothesis is best broken into two parts:

> Hypothesis 1: Those who immigrate from Autocratic regimes are more likely to vote and register with the Republican party than the Democratic Party.
>
> Hypothesis 2: Those who immigrate from Democratic regimes are more likely to vote and register with the Democratic party than the Republican Party.

I argue that those who come from previous autocratic regimes are more likely to vote and register with the Republican party as they prefer a non-involved government in their personal lives (Hypothesis 1). This best aligns with the Republican party's preference of a limited and hands-off approach to economic issues but more involvement and regulation in the social realm.

Take Cuban Americans who lived under the Communist Fidel Castro regime for example. It is well documented that the economic failures of an attempt at communism in the Cuba Revolution from 1953 to 1959 led to the poverty and shortage of basic needs of millions of people (Sweig 2002). The Cuba Archive project documents that at least 11,000 people died as a result of the regime. Today, 1st and even 2nd generation Cuban Americans are extremely likely to vote for Republican candidates due to their or their families' prior lived experience in Cuba (Bishin and Klofstad 2012; Girard et al 2012). This is just one example of a former autocracy where the immigrants in America continue to vote for the Republican party.

My analysis will show that this is also seen with other autocratic countries. These immigrants who lived in the former autocratic countries consistently vote for Republican candidates due to fear of what happened in their country of origin happening again in America. They see the Democratic party and candidates to similar to their socialist, communist, and

dictator like parties where the government was involved in every aspect of one's life politically, socially, and economically and worry about the consequences.

Meanwhile, those who immigrated from democratic regimes are more likely to vote and register with the Democratic party as they prefer a more involved government (Hypothesis 2). This aligns with the Democratic party's platform to regulate the economy while there is more deregulation in the social realm. For example, immigrants from Australia, Finland, and Denmark are likely to vote for the Democratic party due to their lived experiences with a democracy in their former countries. In their former democratic country, they enjoyed the privileges of more frequent, open, and honest elections. They do not have to fear for government involvement because they have encountered negative experiences with their former democratic government to less of an extent than immigrants from autocracies have.

What would be the empirical implications of this argument? Here are a few suggestions. For starters, it ties back to the idea that people's lived experiences tell a broader story in how they register to vote and vote even when in the United States. For immigrants from autocracies, this illustrates a notion that their lack of distrust and fear of a former autocratic country still transcends after immigration. Thus, this entices them to vote for the Republican party. For immigrants from democracies, their past lived experiences are probably not as traumatizing as those who immigrated from an autocracy. As a result, they are enticed to vote for the Democratic party and actually favor an active government.

Chapter 4: Research Design

To test my hypotheses, I will be using the political behavior of naturalized immigrants from two existing datasets: California Voter File and the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES). Each of these datasets includes measures of an individual's country of origin. In order to quantify if a country is a democracy, anocracy, or autocracy, I merge a third data set, the Center for Systemic Peace's' Polity IV Individual Country Regime Trends for the years 1946 - 2013. Generally, the "Polity score" is what is used in Political Science research to analyze the form of government (democratic, anocratic, autocratic) for countries that have populations greater than 500,000 people annually over the period 1946 – 2013.

The Polity scores offer a 21-point scale (-10 to 10) that label a country as a full democracy (10), democracy (6 to 9), open anocracy (1 to 5), closed anocracy (-5 to 0), autocracy (-10 to -6). To simplify this, I will be grouping the full democracy and democracy countries, the open and closed anocracy countries, and the autocracies will remain as a stand-alone field. Thus, I will have three categories: Democracy (6 to 10), Anocracy (-5 to 5), and Autocracy (-10 to -6). This is how Polity classifies these scores as well.

Despite, the Polity scores being taken annually from the years 1946 – 2013, the country scores averages from just 1990 to 2010 were taken in this paper. Those 20 years were considered because it is not certain the actual year that immigrants immigrated from their country.[1] In addition, that shorter time span ensures that country of origin is the factor most affecting party of registration behavior and vote choice since the longer one stays in America, the more likely they are to be influenced by other factors rather than just the political institution of country of origin (Bueker 2005; Bass and Casper 1999; 2001). Finally, limiting to those 20 years displays a more accurate portrayal of the political institutions of country of origin since government changes can

---

[1] See Appendix, Figure 1.1 for all the countries included.

be made over time. These 20-year average scores will be made into dummy variables that I will join to immigrant's answers in the California Voter File (Dataset 1) and 2016 CCES (Dataset 2). Moreover, to keep things simple, I just have one explanatory variable. By having one explanatory variable, I am assuming that the change in the outcome when moving from democracy to anocracy is on average the same as the change in the outcome when from anocracy to autocracy. That means the coefficient estimate is evaluating both of my hypotheses.

How do these 2-part datasets relate to my hypothesis and argument? In the first dataset, the California Voter File, according to hypothesis 1, I should see that immigrants from autocratic countries (ie;Vietnam, Iraq, Cuba) are registering with the Republican party. According to hypothesis 2, immigrants from democratic countries (ie; Australia, Canada, New Zealand) should registering to vote for the Democratic party. Finally, immigrants from anocratic countries (ie; Haiti, Egypt, Pakistan) should be somewhere in between these results.

In the second dataset, the 2016 CCES, according to hypothesis 1, I should see that immigrants from autocratic countries are registering with the Republican party, are voting for Republican presidential candidates, and are identifying as Republican when looking at 3-point party identification. According to hypothesis 2, immigrants from democratic countries are registering with the Democratic party, are voting for Democratic presidential candidates, and are identifying as Democratic when looking at 3-point party identification.

One concern of such research design is omitted variables. It can be argued that if I find a relationship between country of origin and party preference, it might be because of some other factor such as income, gender, or age. For example, immigrants from autocratic countries often come from lower income levels and less education (Bueker 2005). It could be that those are the motivating factors that form ones' voting and party of registration behavior. It is researched that males, those that are more educated, have higher incomes, and are older are more likely to vote

in elections (Freeman 2004). This is seen with different countries of immigration as well such as those immigrating from East Asia being more educated and wealthier than those immigrating from Latin America (Bueker 2005). In my analysis below, I run regressions with many controls such as gender, age, education, income, and marital status to prove my argument that the political institutions of country of origin play a role in how one votes and registers to vote.

A second concern and challenge is that party of registration might not equate to vote choice. The CA Voter File measures party of registration but not vote choice. My second dataset, the 2016 CCES takes care of this. There is less precision and smaller sample in that dataset so the combination of the 2 datasets provides more comprehensive evidence.

A third concern is that the Voter File has observations only from California. While California has the largest immigrant population in the country, it is known for being more liberal than other states. Thus, the democratic immigrants from California might not reflect the rest of country. Again, the CCES ameliorates this concern by including immigrants from all states.

Implications

Each of my two datasets has advantages and disadvantages. The difference between the two datasets is that the Voter File has voter registration information for those in California. California is one of the states where registrants are given the option to register to vote with a party. The second dataset introduces a new element to the puzzle. For starters, it is not limited to California but all the states in the country. In addition, it has information not solely on party registration but also vote choice and three-point party ID as well. The 2016 CCES will provide information on how respondents voted for the federal president in the 2012 and 2016 elections. It is important to note that the CA Voter File yielded 4,432,795 immigrant observations while the CCES dataset yielded 1,421. Thus, the Voter File is more precise since it has information on

more people and countries. The CCES dataset is a smaller sample that features less countries; thus, there is less certainty in that dataset which is why analyzing both datasets is vital.

Dataset 1 – CA Voter File

The first dataset, California Voter File, is from Political Data Inc. which analyzes how voters from different countries of origin are registered to vote as of 2018 in the state of California. This Voter File is one of the only datasets that has information on registrants' country of origin, party codes (registration), household party type, title codes, ethnic codes, and absentee ballot return score. This data yielded 4,940,265 observations with country code, all of whom were registered California voters that immigrated to the United States. It is important to note that the Voter File had information on approximately 17.3 million registered voters but 4,950,265 was how many voters the file indicated were born in another country and listed country of origin when registering to vote. When combining these country codes with countries that were also had a Polity score, I was left with 4,891,630 observations from 174 countries.[2] I created a subset of this dataset that will analyze just the country of origin and party codes. I also excluded the codes that align with the United States, states in the United States, and other states and/or provinces of other countries as I am more interested in analyzing countries of origin and not different provinces. I will also exclude the variables that align with voter registrants that indicated they are from "blank," "foreign born," "other," "unlisted," and "unidentifiable" countries.

My data will also include the party codes that align with registration with the Democratic party, Republican party, Decline to State, and an Other category. This will specifically help me analyze how country of origin affects the way that naturalized citizen's vote. I will then analyze the prevailing form of government in that country by creating one variable based on the Polity Score. The variable codes aligning with a "Democrat regime" as a 1, aligning with "Anocratic

---

[2] See Appendix, Figure 1.1 for all the countries included.

regime" as 2, and aligning with "Autocratic regime" as 3. Whether a country is democratic, autocratic, or anocratic will be based on the previous data from the Polity Country Regime Trends. As a result, I will be able to draw conclusions about how those with that were born in democratic and autocratic regimes are registering to vote once in the United States.

Dataset 1 - Variables

For the first dataset, my independent variable is the form of government in the country of origin that the naturalized citizen is from. This includes whether that country has a democratic, anocratic, or autocratic form of government based on the corresponding Polity score. My dependent variable is the party of registration among the Democratic party, Republican party, Decline to State, and an Other Category. My control variables are gender, age, income, and marital status. In this dataset, if hypothesis 1 holds, we should see immigrants from autocracies register to vote with the Republican party versus the Democratic Party. If hypothesis 2 holds, we should see immigrants from democracies register to vote with the Democratic party versus the Republican party.

Dataset 2 – 2016 CCES

The second dataset is from the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey (CCES). Specifically, I will create a subset of the dataset that will analyze survey questions that specify which respondents are immigrants and naturalized citizens. I will then use that information and merge it to a series of questions where respondents traced their heritage to Hispanic and Asian countries. Although this dataset is limited to 14 Asian and Hispanic countries, fortunately, the survey selected the Hispanic and Asian countries with the largest immigration the U.S.[3] The inference about country of origin being made here is that if respondents answered, "I am an immigrant to the United States and a naturalized citizen," to the citizenship question then odds

---

[3] See Appendix, Figure 1.2 for list of countries analyzed.

are their answers to the series of heritage questions asking "From which country or region do you trace your heritage and ancestry" are their countries of origin that they immigrated from.

In order to find out which party the survey takers are registered with and identify with, I will use a question that asks for party affiliation which analyzes what party these survey takers are registered to vote with and a separate 3-point party ID question. In terms of vote choice, I will analyze how this subset answered questions about who they voted for in the 2012 and 2016 federal presidential elections. This subset will help me analyze how country of origin is affecting naturalized citizen party affiliation, party identification, and voting behavior.[4]

Dataset 2 – Variables

For the second dataset, my independent variable is the form of government in the country of origin that the naturalized citizen is from, whether an autocracy, anocracy, or democracy from the Polity Country Regime Trends. My dependent variables in this dataset are vote choice among the Democratic party, Republican party, and all other parties/ no party preference in the 2012 election and the 2016 election.

In this dataset, there are demographic related control variables. This includes marital status, gender, birthyear, education level, race, and income. In this dataset, if hypothesis 1 holds, we should see immigrants from autocracies are less likely vote for Barack Obama in the 2012 presidential vote and more likely to vote Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential vote as they favor Republican presidential nominees. If hypothesis 2 holds, we should see immigrants from democracies are more likely to vote for Obama in the 2012 presidential vote while being less likely to vote Trump in the 2016 presidential vote as they favor Democratic presidential nominees.

---

[4] See Appendix, Figure 1.2 for a detailed list of the survey labels and variables used.

Chapter 5: Results and Analysis

Results – *Dataset 1 – CA Voter File & Polity IV*

In order to quantitively test my hypothesis, I began with my dataset involving the Polity IV Country Regime Trends from the years 1990 to 2010 and the California Voter file dataset. Once again, I followed Polity's three value classification and labeled countries as such: Democracy (6 to 10), Anocracy (-5 to 5), and Autocracy (-10 to -6) before merging this dataset to the California Voter File dataset. Of the countries that had Polity scores, 174 were matched with countries on the dataset for the California Voter File.[5] This file was refined to include only voters that were born outside of the United States and were now registered voters; thus, making them naturalized citizens, leading to 4,891,630 observations without controls and 4,432,795 observations all else being equal. To measure the relationship between political institutions of country of origin and party support, I run regressions of party registration on the type of country in which one immigrated from.

---

[5] Figure 1.1 in the Appendix displays a list of the countries that were matched in both of the Polity scores and the California Voter File.

	(1) DEM	(2) REP	(3) DTS	(4) Oth	(5) DEM Control	(6) REP Control	(7) DTS Control	(8) Oth Control
Autocracy	-0.104***	0.037***	0.063***	0.004***	-0.098***	0.039***	0.056***	0.004***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Male					-0.030***	0.014***	0.012***	0.004***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Age					0.001***	0.002***	-0.003***	-0.000***
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Avg. Income					-0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	-0.000
					(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Marital Status					-0.009***	0.084***	-0.067***	-0.008***
					(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Constant	0.622***	0.120***	0.230***	0.028***	0.672***	-0.077***	0.360***	0.045***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Observations	4,891,630	4,891,630	4,891,630	4,891,630	4,432,795	4,432,795	4,432,795	4,432,795
R-squared	0.025	0.006	0.010	0.000	0.039	0.034	0.028	0.002

Standard errors in parentheses
*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Figure 1. Regression Results, California Voter File – Impact of Immigrating from Autocracies on CA Party Registration[6]

---

[6] Columns (1) – (4) display figures without any controls on the male gender, age, income, or marital status. The regressions in columns (5) – (8) represent the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on party of registration for California voters with added controls for the male gender, age, income, and marital status.

Figure 1 represents the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on party of registration for California voters. When looking at the non-controlled observations in the Democratic regression (column 1), the probability of registering as a Democrat decreases by 10.4 percentage points per one unit change in x. Thus, moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 10.4 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 20.8 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat.

This is a significant figure that holds my original hypotheses true that one's likelihood of registering as a Democrat decreases when immigrating from an autocracy. All else equal (column 5), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 9.8 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, one is 19.6 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat. This is a significant figure that shows that immigrants from autocracies are not likely to register for the Democratic Party.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood of registering as a Republican (column 2), when moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 3.7 percentage points more likely to register as a Republican. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 7.4 percentage points more likely to register as Republican. This positive correlation supports hypothesis 1 - that one's likelihood of registering as a Republican increases when immigrating from an autocracy. All else equal (column 6), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 3.9 percentage points more likely to register as a Republican. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, one is 7.8 percentage points more likely to register as a Republican. Although the likelihood of autocratic immigrants not registering with the Democratic party was greater in the Democratic regression, the Republican regression's positive

correlation still indicates that autocratic immigrants favor the Republican party over the Democratic party.

Another interesting finding was respondents who "Decline[d] to State" their party affiliation. In California, voters are given the option to register to vote with "No Party Preference" (NPP). These voters were also formerly known as "Decline to State" (DTS) voters. When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood to decline to state their party of registration (column 3), it is displayed that moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 6.3 percentage points more likely to decline to state their party choice. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 12.6 percentage points more likely decline to state their party choice. All else equal (column 7), this figure only slightly decreases. When moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 5.6 percentage points more likely to decline to state their party choice. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, one is 11.2 percentage points more likely to decline to state their party choice.

This is an interesting finding as it notes a significant number of voters decline to affiliate with a political party. For autocratic immigrants, this correlation is even stronger than those who registered as Republican. The significance of this ties back to my argument that people's lived experience impacts their political behavior. Among immigrants from autocracies, there is a general lack of trust for one to affiliate with a party. Previously, these immigrants could get persecuted, arrested, or fined for being on the wrong side of the government (Löwy and Hedges 2016; Bianco and Horko 2018). Thus, many immigrants, in their former countries, would go along with the party that held the most power or not publicly voice their political affiliations for fear of the consequences. This indicates that even in America, this general fear and distrust of political institutions still exists, leading immigrants to decline to state their party affiliation and not favor a particular party.

As expected, not a lot of observations were made for "other" parties. When looking the non-controlled observations, one's likelihood of registering with an "other" party, the probability of registering as such increases by 0.4 percentage points when moving from democratic to anocratic countries while doubling to 0.8 percentage points when moving from democratic to autocratic countries (column 4). The same numerical figures exist when considering all other factors (column 8). This is essentially a zero relationship.

Analysis - *Dataset 1 – CA Voter File & Polity IV*

The regression results in Figure 1 support my hypotheses that as one immigrates from an autocracy, there is a positive relationship when it comes to registering with the Republican party and negative relationship with registering with the Democratic Party. The data also displayed there was a positive relationship among declining to state what party they are registered with and when registering for other parties. Controlling for variables that often influence party of registration choice – gender, age, income, and marital status - the patterns did not change.

With controls, the likelihood that immigrants from autocracies register with the Democratic party increased from -20.8 percentage points to -19.6 percentage points (1.2 percentage points more) but the overall negative relationship still exists (column 1,5). On registering for the Republican party, the controls increased the likelihood that immigrants from autocracies register with the Republican party from 7.4 percentage points to 7.8 percentage points (0.4 percentage points more), thus, slightly strengthening the previous non-controlled positive correlation (column 2,6). The added controls did not increase the likelihood of immigrants registering for "Other" parties (column 4,8). Finally, the controls maintained the positive correlation between declining to state what party one is registered with, but the likelihood did decrease from 12.6 percentage points to 11.2 percentage points (1.4 percentage point less) (column 3,7). Among regressions for Democratic party registration, Republican party

registration, other party registration and those that declined to state, the controls that had the most significant affect were the male gender and whether one is married or not. This aligns with former political science research of gender and marital status impacting party affiliation behavior (Abrajano and Alvarez 2010; Weisberg 1987; Pew Research Center 2018). However, the political institutions of country of origin maintained their influence on voting behavior.

Results - *Dataset 2 – 2016 CCES & Polity IV*

The second dataset that I analyzed introduced the element of vote choice and party identification into my theory. Once again, I began with my refined dataset that included the individual averages from the years 1990 to 2010 for Polity IV Country Regime Trends.[7] democracy, anocracy, and autocracy were measured just as they were in the CA Voter File. The second dataset that I used in this process were the respondent's answers from the 2016 CCES survey. I refined this dataset to respondent's who had answered that they were naturalized citizens to a question about citizenship status. There was also a series of questions in the survey that asked respondents "From which country or region do you trace your heritage or ancestry" in which respondents could choose among several Hispanic originating countries and Asian originating countries. It is a safe assumption that if one identifies as an immigrant citizen in the first question, then their answer to their country of origin in the second sets of questions is the country that they immigrated from. Merging these two datasets left me with 1,427 observations with no controls and 1,421 observations all else equal.

---

[7] See Appendix, Figure 1.1 for all the countries included.

	(1) DEM	(2) REP	(3) DTS	(4) Oth	(5) DEM Control	(6) REP Control	(7) DTS Control	(8) Oth Control
Autocracy	-0.016	0.040***	0.006	-0.030**	-0.019*	0.040***	0.001	-0.022*
	-0.01	-0.008	-0.005	-0.012	-0.01	-0.008	-0.006	-0.013
Married					-0.038*	-0.015	0.006	0.047*
					-0.02	-0.016	-0.011	-0.025
Male					-0.024	0.014	0.002	0.008
					-0.019	-0.015	-0.01	-0.024
Birthyear					-0.002***	-0.003***	0	0.005***
					-0.001	-0.001	0	-0.001
Education					0.002	-0.007	0.005	0
					-0.007	-0.005	-0.004	-0.009
White					-0.008	-0.002	0.002	0.008
					-0.042	-0.032	-0.023	-0.052
Black					0.164	0.006	-0.021	-0.149
					-0.114	-0.088	-0.063	-0.141
Hispanic					0.067	0.008	0.011	-0.086
					-0.06	-0.047	-0.033	-0.075
Asian					-0.087	-0.093**	0.024	0.156**
					-0.061	-0.047	-0.033	-0.075
Income					0	0	0	0
					0	0	0	0
Constant	0.176***	0.018	0.030***	0.776***	3.957***	6.190***	0.518	-9.665***
	-0.019	-0.015	-0.011	-0.024	-1.388	-1.069	-0.764	-1.718
Observations	1427	1427	1427	1427	1421	1421	1421	1421
R-squared	0.002	0.019	0.001	0.004	0.013	0.073	0.013	0.042

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure 2: Regression Results, CCES 2016 – Impact of Immigrating from Autocracies on Immigrant's Party Registration[8]

[8] Columns (1) – (4) display figures without any controls on marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, or income. The regressions in columns (5) – (8) represent the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on party of registration with added controls for marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, and income.

Figure 2 represents the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on party registration. When looking at the non-controlled observations in the Democratic regression (column 1), it is displayed that as there is a one unit change in x, the probability of registering as a Democrat decreases by 1.6 percentage point. Thus, moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 1.6 percentage point less likely to register as a Democrat. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 3.2 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat. This is a significant figure that holds my original hypothesis that one's likelihood of registering as a Democrat decreases if they immigrated from an autocracy. All else equal (column 5), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 1.9 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, this doubles and one is 3.8 percentage points less likely to register as a Democrat.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood of registering as a Republican (column 2), moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 4.0 percentage points more likely to register as a Republican and 8.0 percentage points more likely to register as Republican moving from democracy to autocracy. The figure is the same even with added controls making it a significant point that immigrants from autocracies are 8 percentage points more likely to register with the Republican party.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood to "Decline to State" in the CCES survey (column 3), the probability of declining to state increases by 0.6 percentage points when moving from democratic to anocratic countries while increasing by 1.2 percentage points when moving from democratic to autocratic countries. With controls, this number significantly decreases. All else equal (column 7), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 0.1 percentage points more likely to decline to state when registering. Moving from a

democracy to autocracy, this doubles and one is 0.2 percentage points more likely to decline to state when registering. This is essentially a 0 relationship.

When registering with the "other" category (column 4), one is 3.0 percentage points less likely to register with other parties when moving from democratic to anocratic countries while being 6.0 percentage points less likely to register with other parties when moving from democratic to autocratic countries. All else equal (column 8), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 2.2 percentage points less likely to register with other parties. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, one is 4.4 percentage points less likely to register with other parties. In all the regressions in this dataset, the controls that had the greatest effect were race and marital status.

Analysis – *Dataset 2 – 2016 CCES & Polity IV*

This regression results in Figure 2 support my original hypothesis as immigrants from autocracies are 8 percentage points MORE likely to register with the Republican party (column 6) and 3.2 percentage points LESS likely to register with the Democratic party (column 5). Besides registering with the Democratic party, the other significant negative relationship among autocratic immigrants was when it comes to affiliation with Other parties. Immigrants from autocracies are 4.4 percentage points less likely to register with parties other than the two major parties (Democratic and Republican) compared to immigrants from democracies (column 8). There was essentially a zero relationship with declining to state what party one was registered with.

Compared to the California Voter File (Figure 1), these results are similar among support for the Republican party when it comes to registration as both autocratic immigrants register with the Republican party by approximately 8 percentage points more in both datasets. However, in the California Voter File, there was a significant negative correlation among support for the

Democratic party among autocratic immigrants being approximately 20 percentage points less likely to register with the Democratic party whereas in the 2016 CCES, autocratic immigrants are 3.2 percentage points less likely to register with the Democratic party, making the figure not as big. In addition, in the California Voter File, declining to state one's party of registration was more significant with autocratic immigrants being 11.2 percentage points more likely to decline to state their party affiliation while there is essentially no relationship in the 2016 CCES. Finally, there was essentially a zero relationship with registering for other parties in the California Voter File but in this survey, immigrants from autocracies were 4.4 percentage points less likely to support other parties.

Although there are slight differences in this regression compared to the California Voter File, the overall patterns exist. Immigrants from autocracies are registering with the Republican party in high values and are less likely to register with the Democratic parties. There are minor differences when it comes to declining to state one's party and registering with other parties in the two datasets. One possible reason for these differences between Figure 1 and 2 is the level of observations. In the California Voter File, there are almost 5,000 times as many observations than the CCES dataset. In addition, less countries in the CCES dataset were labeled as autocracies and more were labeled as democracies, possibly increasing Democratic party of registration. One other explanation is the historical background of when this survey was taken. In 2016, presidential candidate Trump, and one can argue the whole Republican party had a tough on immigration stance. Many immigrants felt that the party was against them; thus, probably increasing their odds of registering with the Democratic party and changing the significant negative correlation among autocratic immigrants and registering with the Democratic party as seen in the California Voter File.

	(1) 2012 Vote	(2) 2012 Vote Control
Autocracy	-0.056*** -0.014	-0.070*** -0.014
Married		0.022 -0.028
Male		-0.026 -0.026
Birthyear		-0.003*** -0.001
Education		0.065*** -0.009
White		0.027 -0.056
Black		0.362** -0.154
Hispanic		-0.136* -0.082
Asian		0.112 -0.082
Income		0 0
Constant	0.525*** -0.027	6.287*** -1.879
Observations	1427	1421
R-squared	0.012	0.063

Standard errors in parentheses
*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Figure 3: Regression Results, 2016 CCES - Impact of Immigrating from Autocracies on voting for Barack Obama in the 2012 Presidential Vote Choice[9]

---

[9] Column (1) displays figures without any controls on marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, or income. The regressions in column (2) represents the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on vote choice in the 2012 election with added controls for marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, and income.

Figure 3 represents vote choice among CCES survey respondents in the 2012 election. This is significant to analyze as party registration does not always indicate vote choice. When looking at the non-controlled observations during the 2012 vote (column 1), it is displayed that the probability of voting for Democratic Candidate and Presidential winner, Barack Obama, decreases by 5.6 percentage points when moving from democracy to anocracy. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 11.2 percentage points less likely to vote for Obama. Thus, my original hypotheses believing that autocratic immigrants are less likely to vote for Democratic nominees holds true.

This figure is even greater when considering controlled variables. All else equal (column 2), it is displayed that the probability of voting for Obama now decreases by 7.0 percentage points when moving from democracy to anocracy. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 14 percentage points less likely to vote for Obama. This pattern is vital to my argument as it shows that autocratic immigrants are less likely to vote for Democratic nominees. The most impactful controls in this figure are gender and race.

	(1) 2016 Vote	(2) 2016 Vote Control
Autocracy	0.044*** -0.011	0.037*** -0.011
Married		0.061*** -0.022
Male		0.007 -0.02
Birthyear		-0.004*** -0.001
Education		0.007 -0.007
White		0.051 -0.044
Black		-0.191 -0.121
Hispanic		-0.072 -0.064
Asian		0.016 -0.065
Income		0.001** 0
Constant	0.110*** -0.021	8.810*** -1.479
Observations	1427	1421
R-squared	0.012	0.068

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure 4: Regression Results, 2016 CCES - Impact of Immigrating from Autocracies on voting for Donald Trump in the 2012 Presidential Vote Choice[10]

---

[10] Column (1) displays figures without any controls on marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, or income. The regressions in column (2) represents the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on vote choice in the 2016 election with added controls for marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, and income.

Up until this point, when looking at vote choice, my hypothesis is accurate. Figure 4 displays that even with a decisive figure on immigration that candidate Donald Trump was, immigrants from autocracies still supported what the many deemed an "anti-immigrant" candidate. When looking at the non-controlled observations during the 2016 vote (column 1), it is displayed, the probability of voting for Republican Candidate and Presidential winner, Trump, increases by 4.4 percentage points when moving from democracy to anocracy. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 8.8 percentage points more likely to vote for Trump. Despite Trump having unsupportive policies on immigration, here, it is displayed that autocratic immigrants are still likely to vote for Trump despite his stance on illegal immigration.

All else equal (column 2), it is displayed that the probability of voting for Trump now slightly decreases but the positive correlation still exists. When moving from democracy to anocracy, the probability of voting Trump increases by 3.7 percentage points. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 7.4 percentage points more likely to vote for Trump. The most significant controls here were marital status and race. With controls here, even with Trump's anti-immigrant rhetoric, is displayed that immigrants from autocracies were willing to vote for Trump more than voting for Democratic candidate Obama. The support among immigrants from autocracies for Republican candidates and them not supporting Democratic candidates is seen when looking at how the same immigrant survey respondents answered the questions about how they voted in the 2012 presidential election (Figure 3) versus the 2016 presidential election (Figure 4).It is evident that the same survey respondents are not willing to vote for Democratic presidential candidates but are willing to vote for Republican presidential candidates even when they have a harsher stance on illegal immigration.

	(1) Party ID DEM	(2) Party ID DEM Control	(3) Party ID REP	(4) Party ID REP Control	(5) Party ID IND	(6) Party ID IND Control
Autocracy	-0.096***	-0.085***	0.051***	0.052***	0.048***	0.033**
	-0.013	-0.014	-0.011	-0.011	-0.013	-0.013
Married		-0.033		0.036*		-0.008
		-0.028		-0.022		-0.026
Male		-0.054**		0		0.075***
		-0.026		-0.021		-0.024
Birthyear		0.002**		-0.002***		-0.001
		-0.001		-0.001		-0.001
Education		0.008		-0.006		0.024***
		-0.009		-0.007		-0.009
White		-0.029		0.041		0.007
		-0.057		-0.045		-0.053
Black		0.23		-0.088		-0.156
		-0.155		-0.123		-0.145
Hispanic		0.008		-0.072		0.059
		-0.082		-0.065		-0.077
Asian		-0.047		0.031		-0.01
		-0.082		-0.066		-0.077
Income		-0.001***		0		0.001
		0		0		0
Constant	0.591***	-3.248*	0.098***	4.680***	0.213***	1.067
	-0.027	-1.886	-0.021	-1.499	-0.025	-1.761
Observations	1427	1421	1427	1421	1427	1421
R-squared	0.034	0.053	0.016	0.034	0.01	0.032

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure 5: Regression Results, 2016 CCES - Impact of Immigrating from Autocracies on Party Identification[11]

---

[11] Columns (1), (3), (5) display figures without any controls on marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, or income. The regressions in columns (2), (4), (6) represent the impact of immigrating from an autocracy on 3-point party ID with added controls for marital status, male gender, birthyear, education, race, and income.

Figure 5 represents respondent's answers to a question about 3-point party ID. I run analysis similar to that of party registration (Figure 1,2), separately analyzing the choice to identify as Democrat, Republican, or Independent as dependent variables. That is, for the Democratic columns one and two, the dependent variable is 1 if the respondent identified as Democrat, 0 otherwise. This means that coefficients can be interpreted as the proportional change in likelihood of identifying as a Democrat for a one-unit change in the explanatory variable.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in the Democratic regression (column 1), moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 9.6 percentage points less likely to identify as a Democrat. Moving from democracy to autocracy, this figure doubles and immigrants are 19.2 percentage points less likely to identify as a Democrat. This is a significant figure that holds my original hypothesis that one's likelihood of identifying as a Democratic decreases if they immigrated from an autocracy. All else equal (column 2), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, this high number only slightly decreases as one is 8.5 percentage points less likely to identify as a Democrat. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, this doubles and one is 17 percentage points less likely to identify as a Democrat.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood of identifying as a Republican (column 3), moving from democracy to anocracy, one is 5.1 percentage points more likely to identify as a Republican and 10.2 percentage points more likely to identify as Republican moving from democracy to autocracy. This relationship is essentially the same with controls. With the added controls (column 4), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, one is 5.2 percentage point more likely to identify as a Republican. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, one is 10.4 percentage points more likely to identify as a Republican.

When looking at the non-controlled observations in one's likelihood to identify as an independent (column 5), the probability of identifying as an Independent is 4.8 percentage points when moving from democratic to anocratic countries while increasing by 9.6 percentage points when moving from democratic to autocratic countries. With the added controls (column 6), when moving from a democracy to anocracy, this likelihood decreases but one is still 3.3 percentage points likely to identify as an Independent. Moving from a democracy to autocracy, the likelihood of identifying independent is 6.6 percentage points.

My hypothesis here is more supported than when looking at party of registration (Figure 2) respondents' answers in this survey. All else equal, here, immigrants from autocracies are less likely to identify as a Democrat by 17.0 percentage points where as they were registering with the Democratic party less by only 3.8 percentage points (Figure 5, column 2 vs Figure 2, column 5). When looking at Republican party identification and registration, the results among the two datasets are more similar. All else equal, when moving from democracy to autocracy, the probability of identifying as a Republican is 10.4 percentage points and the probability of registering with the Republican party is 8 percentage points (Figure 5, column 4 vs Figure 2, column 6). When looking at Independent party identification and registration, the results are stark. All else equal, when moving from democracy to autocracy, autocratic immigrants are 6.6 percentage points MORE likely to identify as an Independent while they are 4.4 percentage points LESS likely to register with Independent parties (Figure 5, column 6 vs Figure 2, column 8).

This differences and similarities point to the decisive nature that the 2016 election was. The same respondents were identifying with the Independent party more than they were registering with it and were identifying with the Democratic party significantly less than they were registering with it. The only thing that makes sense when comparing the two figures is

Republican party identification and party of registration. There are a few reasons for this. The main 2016 presidential candidates (Hillary Clinton - D vs Donald Trump – R) had opposing opinions on immigration. Historically, it is shown that Independent candidates do not win. Thus, it is possible that some immigrants who identified as Independent registered with the two main parties and chose a candidate that they most somewhat identified with as they had a better winning chance. All in all, it is still evident when looking at vote choice (Figure 3), that immigrants from autocracies still were more likely to vote a Republican candidate (Figure 4) rather than a Democratic candidate (Figure 3).

Chapter 6: Discussion

Dataset	Dependent Variable	Relationship to Autocracy
California Voter File	Party Registration: Democratic	-19.6 percentage points
	Party Registration: Republican	7.8 percentage points
	Party Registration: Decline to State	11.2 percentage points
	Party Registration: Other	0.8 percentage points
2016 CCES	Party Registration: Democratic	-3.8 percentage points
	Party Registration: Republican	8 percentage points
	Party Registration: Decline to State	0.2 percentage point
	Party Registration: Other	-4.4 percentage points
	2012 Presidential Vote -Obama	-14.0 percentage points
	2016 Presidential Vote – Trump	7.4 percentage points
	Party ID: Democrat	-17.0 percentage points
	Party ID: Republican	10.4 percentage points
	Party ID: Independent	6.6 percentage points

Figure 6: Summary of Results

Figure 6 above summarizes the major results in this paper with their relationship to autocratic countries. When looking at party registration, there are mainly similarities and some slight differences among the California Voter File and the 2016 CCES. In both datasets, when looking at registration with the Republican party, immigrants from autocracies are approximately 8 percentage points more likely to register with the Republican Party. When it comes to registration with the Democratic party, in the CCES survey, immigrants from autocracies are approximately 3.8 percentage points less likely to register with the Democratic Party. This is

lower than being 20 percentage points less likely to register with the Democratic Party as displayed in the California Voter File but the negative correlation exists nonetheless.

When looking at declining to state what party one is registered with, there is essentially no relationship in the CCES dataset, whereas in the Voter File, immigrants from autocracies were 11.2 percentage points more likely to decline to state their party of registration. Finally, when looking at registration with other parties, immigrants from autocracies were 4.4 percentage points less likely to register with other parties in the CCES which is different than the essentially zero relationship in the Voter File. These are all minor differences that any two datasets with different observation numbers would yield but the overall patterns among the two major parties – Republican and Democratic exists. It is evident that immigrants from autocratic countries would register with the Republican Party more than the Democratic Party.

When it came to presidential elections, immigrants from autocracies were 14 percentage points less likely to vote for Democratic candidate and winner Obama in the 2012 election. When it came to Republican candidate and winner Trump in the 2016 election, immigrants from autocracies were approximately 7 percentage points more likely to vote for him. When it comes to party identification, immigrants from autocracies still were more likely to identify as Republican than Democratic. In fact, they were even more likely to identify as Independent than Democratic.

Thus, in the 2016 CCES, immigrants from autocracies were more likely to register and identify with the Republican party, are less likely to register and identify with the Democratic Party and other Independent parties, and have no relationship with declining to state their party of registration. Moreover, immigrants from autocracies did not vote for Obama but voted for Trump more despite Trump having a stronger anti-immigrant rhetoric. Meanwhile, in the California Voter File, respondents from autocracies were more likely to register as Republican

and decline to state their registration, were significantly less likely to register with the Democratic party, and had no relationship to Other parties. While the results draw slightly different conclusions, that does not mean that they can be dismissed. The California Voter File has almost 5000 times as many observations than the 2016 CCES but raises questions about how immigrants are voting. The California Voter File is also from 2018, making it more recent than the 2016 CCES so this pattern among immigrants from autocracies favoring the Republican party and Republican candidates while the opposite is true for immigrants from democracies still exists even post an anti-immigrant president. Although there is less precision in the 2016 CCES, the combination of these datasets addresses any omitted variables such as whether party of registration actually equates to vote choice. It is also shown in the 2016 CCES that party of registration, for the most part, does equate to vote choice in the 2012 and 2016 elections which would have not been evident if only one dataset was used.

The results are interesting because of Trump being such a decisive figure on immigration during his presidential campaign. One would expect that immigrants from any country would be less likely to vote for an anti-immigrant candidate despite a pre-existing historical pattern of supporting that party but that is not the case. Even with the California Voter File which was analyzed in 2018, when Trump had been president for almost 2 years, this historical pattern still holds despite him increasing border security and his harsh rhetoric on immigration. Moving forward, the stance on immigration that the Republican party and candidates have is yet to be determined. It could go several ways. If Republican candidates maintain this harsh stance on immigration, it could be the case that autocratic immigrants will no longer vote for Republican candidates nor register or identify with the Republican party. However, if the next Republican presidential candidate has a softer stance on immigration, the pattern might still persist, and autocratic immigrants might support that Republican president in great numbers.

The other possibility is the positions that Democratic candidates take could alienate autocratic immigrants to not vote for them. When looking at the 2020 presidential election, some of the popular Democratic candidates are identifying as "Democratic Socialists." Due to some autocratic immigrants past experiences in their countries of origin with Socialism, they might not want to support a Democratic Socialist due to fear of government involvement in different aspects of one's life. This is being seen right now with Bernie Sanders, a self-proclaimed "Democratic Socialist" running for the 2020 presidential election, losing every single county in Florida to Joe Biden, someone who has not publicly endorsed socialist values (New York Times, 2020). Florida has a large concentration of immigrants from Cuba, which Polity classifies an autocracy, and according to my hypothesis and results, these autocratic immigrants are less likely to favor Democratic candidates and especially not Democratic Socialists. Regardless, the voting decisions of immigrants are important to look at especially now in order to determine their voting preferences as both of the two major parties continue to polarize.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

In this paper, I analyzed immigrant party of registration behavior and vote choice based on the political institutions of their country of origin. This was done using two datasets where I observed immigrants' political beliefs and choices (CA Voter File, 2016 CCES) and one dataset that classifies their country of origin (Polity). The outcome of this thesis is a quantitative analysis that shows how different immigrants are voting or registering to vote in the United States based on their countries of origin. Overall, the findings were consistent with the hypothesis I laid out earlier in the paper when it comes to party of registration in California, 2012 and 2016 presidential vote choice, and party identification. The pattern is not as conclusive in party of registration in the 2016 CCES survey.

The findings demonstrate that when it comes to voter registration, if one immigrates from an autocracy, they are more likely to register with the Republican party. If one immigrates from a democracy, they are more likely to register with the Democratic party. I then looked at vote choice. When looking at vote choice in the 2012 election, the findings suggest that immigrants from autocracies are less likely to vote for Obama than immigrants from democracies. Meanwhile, immigrants from democracies were more likely to vote for Obama than immigrants from autocracies. In the 2016 election, immigrants from autocracies still voted for Trump more than immigrants from democracies. Finally, I looked at 3-point party ID and discovered that immigrants from autocracies are still likely to identify as Republican and significantly less likely to identify as Democratic. Obviously, country of origin is not the only factor that goes into naturalized citizen political and voting behavior as voting is more nuanced than that, but these findings still demonstrate that it often plays a critical role.

Future research should continue monitoring how immigrants from countries of origins with different political institutions continue to vote to truly see if autocratic immigrants will

continue voting Republican and democratic immigrants continue voting Democratic. In addition, those who are "Declining to State" their party of registration should also be researched to see if these correlations exist among autocratic immigrants and general fear and/or distrust of political institutions. Finally, other variables should be looked at such as varying length of time in the United States among people of the same country to see if their political ideologies do change the longer, they live in the United States and if the role of their country of origin is no longer as significant as they become more used to the American political system.

When it comes to the potential implications of this paper, at the very least, I expect the findings to start conversations of how immigrant's lived experience defines their broader political affiliation and vote choice even post immigration to the United States. As both the Democratic and Republican parties continue to polarize with what seems like opposite stances on immigration, both groups have to learn how to navigate this significant group of voters. Immigrant voters can no longer be ignored or alienated by either of the parties since they will soon surpass registered white voters. The immigrant voting bloc is key to any major parties' survival.

References

"1. Trends in Party Affiliation among Demographic Groups." 2018. *Pew Research Center for the People and the Press* (blog). March 20, 2018. https://www.people-press.org/2018/03/20/1-trends-in-party-affiliation-among-demographic-groups/.

Abrajano, Marisa A., and R. Michael Alvarez. 2010. "Voting Behavior." In *New Faces, New Voices*, 125–51. The Hispanic Electorate in America. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7sdnj.9.

Bass, Loretta E., and Lynne M. Casper. 1999. "Are There Differences in Registration and Voting Behavior between Naturalized and Native–Born Americans? U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division Working Paper #28." *US Census Bureau*, February, 18.

———. 2001. "Impacting the Political Landscape: Who Registers and Votes among Naturalized Americans?" *Political Behavior* 23 (2): 103–30.

Bianco, Lucien, and Krystyna Horko. 2018. "Dictators." In *Stalin and Mao*, 293–336. A Comparison of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions. Chinese University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2n7pjq.14.

Bishin, Benjamin G., and Casey A. Klofstad. 2012. "The Political Incorporation of Cuban Americans: Why Won't Little Havana Turn Blue?" *Political Research Quarterly* 65 (3): 586–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912911414589.

Bueker, Catherine Simpson. 2005. "Political Incorporation among Immigrants from Ten Areas of Origin: The Persistence of Source Country Effects." *The International Migration Review* 39 (1): 103–40.

Donato, Katharine M., and Samantha L. Perez. 2016. "A Different Hue of the Gender Gap: Latino Immigrants and Political Conservatism in the United States." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 2 (3): 98. https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.3.06.

Forment, Carlos A. 1989. "Political Practice and the Rise of an Ethnic Enclave." *Theory and Society* 18 (1): 47–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00160688.

Freeman, Jo. 1986. "The Political Culture of the Democratic and Republican Parties." *Political Science Quarterly* 101 (3): 327–56. https://doi.org/10.2307/2151619.

Freeman, Richard B. 2004. "What, Me Vote?" In *Social Inequality*, edited by Kathryn M. Neckerman, 703–28. Russell Sage Foundation. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610444200.23.

Girard, Chris, Guillermo J. Grenier, and Hugh Gladwin. 2012. "Exile Politics and Republican Party Affiliation: The Case of Cuban Americans in Miami." *Social Science Quarterly* 93 (1): 42–57.

Jang, Seung-Jin. 2009. "Get Out on Behalf of Your Group: Electoral Participation of Latinos and Asian Americans." *Political Behavior* 31 (4): 511–35.

Johnson, Paul. 2005. "Autocracy: A Glossary of Political Economy Terms - Dr. Paul M. Johnson." Auburn University. 2005. http://webhome.auburn.edu/~johnspm/gloss/autocracy.phtml.

———. 2005. "Democracy: A Glossary of Political Economy Terms - Dr. Paul M. Johnson." Auburn University. 2005. http://webhome.auburn.edu/~johnspm/gloss/democracy.phtml.

Kidd, Quentin, Herman Diggs, Mehreen Farooq, and Megan Murray. 2007. "Black Voters, Black Candidates, and Social Issues: Does Party Identification Matter?*." *Social Science Quarterly* 88 (1): 165–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00452.x.

Löwy, Michael, and Inez Hedges. 2016. "TYRANNIES, FROM PATRIARCHAL AUTOCRACY TO IMPERSONAL APPARATUSES." In *Franz Kafka*, 29–48. Subversive Dreamer. University of Michigan Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.8858335.6.

McKee, Seth C. 2008. "Rural Voters and the Polarization of American Presidential Elections." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (1): 101–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508080165.

Nicholson, Michael David. 2018. "Immigrants' Identities and Host-Country Participation: The Role of Linked Fate." UC San Diego. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3wr617bv.

Pikkov, Deanna L. 2012. "The Practice of Voting: Immigrant Turnout, the Persistence of Origin Effects, and the Nature, Formation and Transmission of Political Habit," 221.

Rosenblum, Nancy L., and Andrea Tivig. 2014. "Political Incorporation in America: Immigrant Partisans." *Citizenship Studies* 18 (2): 125–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2014.886390.

Starr, Paul. 1997. "An Emerging Democratic Majority." In *The New Majority*, edited by Stanley B. Greenberg and Theda Skocpol, 221–37. Toward a Popular Progressive Politics. Yale University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt32bhnr.14.

Sweig, Julia. *Inside the Cuban Revolution: Fidel Castro and the Urban Underground*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Teixeira, Ruy. 2003. "Post Industrial Hopes Deferred: Why the Democratic Majority Is Still Likely to Emerge." *The Brookings Review* 21 (3): 40–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/20081118.

Wambu, Grace, and Zandile P Nkabinde. 2016. "IMMIGRANTS' PARTICIPATION IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS," 8.

Weisberg, Herbert F. 1987. "The Demographics of a New Voting Gap Marital Differences in American Voting." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 51 (3): 335–43.

Xie, Yu, and Margaret Gough. 2011. "Ethnic Enclaves and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Demography* 48 (4): 1293–1315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0058-8.

Appendix

Figure 1.1: 20-year averages of Polity scores that match countries in California Voter File

Note 1: Polity plots all variations of countries with name changes and those that no longer exist
Note 2: Democracy (6 to 10), Anocracy (-5 to 5), and Autocracy (-10 to -6)

Afghanistan	-4.63636	Chad	-2.7619	Gabon	-3.42857
Albania	5.80952	Chile	8.7619	Gambia	-2.7619
Algeria	-1.80952	China	-7	Georgia	5.3
Angola	-2.33333	Colombia	7.42857	Germany	10
Argentina	7.57143	Comoros	4.47619	Germany East	.
Armenia	4.2	Congo Brazzaville	-2.33333	Germany West	10
Australia	10	Congo Kinshasa	.809524	Ghana	3.28571
Austria	10	Costa Rica	10	Greece	10
Azerbaijan	-5.85	Croatia	3.15	Guatemala	6.57143
Bahrain	-8.14286	Cuba	-7	Guinea	-1.95238
Bangladesh	4.2381	Cyprus	10	Guinea-Bissau	2.19048
Belarus	-3.85	Czech Rep.	9.72222	Guyana	4.7619
Belgium	9.61905	Czechoslovakia	8	Haiti	1.80952
Benin	5.95238	Denmark	10	Honduras	6.57143
Bhutan	-7.42857	Djibouti	-1.80952	Hungary	10
Bolivia	8.52381	Dominican Rep.	7.33333	India	8.7619
Bosnia	0	East Timor	6.55556	Indonesia	1.19048
Botswana	7.66667	Ecuador	7.2381	Iran	-3.09524
Brazil	8	Egypt	-5.14286	Iraq	-8.14286
Bulgaria	8.47619	El Salvador	7.04762	Ireland	10
Burkina Faso	-2.47619	Equatorial Guinea	-6	Israel	6
Burundi	.761905	Eritrea	-6.55556	Italy	10
Cambodia	1.2381	Estonia	7.7	Ivory Coast	-2.42857
Cameroon	-4.38095	Ethiopia	-.636364	Jamaica	9.14286
Canada	10	Fiji	3.04762	Japan	10
Cape Verde	8.47619	Finland	10	Jordan	-2.38095
Central African Republic	1.09524	France	9	Kazakhstan	-4.7

Kenya	1.04762	New Zealand	10	Sudan	-5.90476
Korea North	-9.80952	Nicaragua	7.71429	Suriname	4.85714
Korea South	7.2381	Niger	3	Swaziland	-9.14286
Kosovo	8	Nigeria	0	Sweden	10
Kuwait	-7.1	Norway	10	Switzerland	10
Kyrgyzstan	-1.2	Oman	-8.61905	Syria	-7.95238
Laos	-7	Pakistan	2.14286	Taiwan	7.95238
Latvia	8	Panama	8.80952	Tajikistan	-3.3
Lebanon	6	Papua New Guinea	4	Tanzania	-2.04762
Lesotho	4.90476	Paraguay	6.85714	Thailand	6.38095
Liberia	1.85714	Peru	5.47619	Togo	-2.90476
Libya	-7	Philippines	8	Trinidad and Tobago	9.66667
Lithuania	10	Poland	9.04762	Tunisia	-3.71429
Luxembourg	10	Portugal	10	Turkey	7.47619
Macedonia	7.35	Qatar	-10	Turkmenistan	-8.95
Madagascar	6	Romania	7.47619	UAE	-8
Malawi	2.95238	Russia	4.42105	USSR	0
Malaysia	3.66667	Rwanda	-4.80952	Uganda	-3.57143
Mali	5.7619	Saudi Arabia	-10	Ukraine	6.45
Mauritania	-4.95238	Senegal	3.52381	United Kingdom	10
Mauritius	10	Serbia	8	United States	10
Mexico	5.61905	Serbia and Montenegro	6	Uruguay	10
Moldova	7.6	Sierra Leone	.857143	Uzbekistan	-9
Mongolia	9.04762	Singapore	-2	Venezuela	6.04762
Montenegro	9	Slovak Republic	8.72222	Vietnam	-7
Morocco	-6.47619	Slovenia	10	Yemen	-2.28571
Mozambique	2.85714	Solomon Islands	6.8	Yemen North	-5
Myanmar(Burma)	-7.04762	Somalia	-.333333	Yemen South	-7
Namibia	6	South Africa	8.42857	Yugoslavia	-3.21429
Nepal	3.28571	Spain	10	Zambia	3.90476
Netherlands	10	Sri Lanka	5.14286	Zimbabwe	-4.28571

Figure 1.2 – Questions from 2016 CCES used

Variable	Label
immstat	Citizen
CL_partyaffiliation	Catalist – Party Affiliation
CC16_326	President 2012
CC16_410a	President Vote[12]
CC16_421a	3 pt party ID
Asian_origin_3	Asian_origin - China
Asian_origin_4	Asian_origin – Japan
Asian_origin_5	Asian_origin - India
Asian_origin_6	Asian_origin – Philippines
Asian_origin_7	Asian_origin – Taiwan
Asian_origin_8	Asian_origin – Korea
Asian_origin_9	Asian_origin – Vietnam
Asian_origin_10	Asian_origin – Pakistan
Asian_origin_12	Asian_origin – Cambodia
Asian_origin_13	Asian_origin - Thailand
Hispanic_origin_3	Hispanic_origin - Mexico
Hispanic_origin_5	Hispanic_origin - Cuba
Hispanic_origin_6	Hispanic_origin – Dominican Republic
Hispanic_origin_10	Hispanic_origin - Spain

---

[12] This question refers to the 2016 Presidential Vote.

Figure 1.3 – Creating subsets of the 2 datasets

In this paper, I had to create subsets of both the California Voter File (dataset 1) and the 2016 CCES Survey (dataset 2). These subsets narrowed the respondents to just those who were immigrants and naturalized citizens. In the California Voter File, there is a column that states the respondent's country of origin via a code that Political Data Inc. created that correspondents with different states, countries, territories, and regions of the world. In order to create my naturalized citizen subset, I took these codes and refined them to include only foreign countries. Almost all of the countries corresponded with countries on Polity. Appendix, Figure 1.1 lists the countries considered. Thus, I was left with approximately 5,000,000 observations in which the respondents were naturalized citizens out of the approximately 17,000,000 registered California voters in the Voter File.

For the 2016 CCES survey, I created my subset of data based on a series of questions. I analyzed the survey question labeled "Citizen" and those who selected the answer choice "I am an immigrant to the USA and a naturalized citizen" (variable: immstat). For those who selected that answer choice, I then analyzed their corresponding answers to a series of question(s) that asked "From what country or region do you trace your heritage" where respondents traced their heritage back to Latin or Asian countries (variables: Hispanic_origin_3 – Hispanic_origin_5, Hispanic_origin_10; Asian_origin_3 – Asian_origin_13). Not all countries in the world were represented through this methodology but fortunately, the survey selected the Hispanic and Asian countries with the largest immigration the U.S. The inference about country of origin being made here is that if respondents answered, "I am an immigrant to the United States and a naturalized citizen," to the first question then odds are their answer to the series of heritage questions are their countries of origin and immigration. Appendix Figure 1.2 contains a detailed list of the survey labels and variables used.