



Working Papers

Paper 127, February 2016

Transnational politics and political integration among migrants in Europe

Ali R. Chaudhary

This paper is published by the International Migration Institute (IMI), Oxford Department of International Development (QEH), University of Oxford, 3 Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3TB, UK (www.imi.ox.ac.uk).

IMI does not have an institutional view and does not aim to present one.

The views expressed in this document are those of its independent author.

The IMI Working Papers Series

The International Migration Institute (IMI) has been publishing working papers since its foundation in 2006. The series presents current research in the field of international migration. The papers in this series:

- analyse migration as part of broader global change
- contribute to new theoretical approaches
- advance understanding of the multi-level forces driving migration

Abstract

Why do some migrants vote in their countries of destination while others vote in the elections of their origin countries? Existing literature on migrant politics is divided into studies of political participation in receiving countries and transnational politics with migrant homelands. This separation conceals the extent to which receiving and origin-country electoral politics reflect two different processes. In this paper, I investigate whether the determinants of migrant voting in receiving and origin countries differ and the relationship between receiving and origin country voting. I emphasise how migrants are embedded in multi-layered contexts by analysing the effects of country-level contextual factors on the odds of voting in receiving and origin country national elections. Using nationally representative survey data from the LOCALMULTIDEM dataset (2004–2008), this study offers the first quantitative cross-national analysis of the determinants of migrants' receiving and origin country voting across Europe. Findings reveal the determinants of voting 'here' and 'there' do in fact vary. However, immigrants who vote in destination country elections are also likely to vote in homeland elections – suggesting that politically motivated immigrants may vote 'here' and 'there'. This research contributes to existing literature by offering comparative evidence revealing a cross-border simultaneity inherent in migrants' electoral political agency.

Keywords: transnational politics; political participation; political remittances; immigrants; voting; homeland politics

Author: Dr. Ali R. Chaudhary, Marie Curie Postdoctoral Fellow, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford, ali.chaudhary@qeh.ox.ac.uk

Acknowledgements: The research has been generously funded and supported by a Marie Curie Early Career Postdoctoral Fellowship associated with the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme Marie Curie Action Initial Training Networks (ITN) 'Transnational Migration, Citizenship and the Circulation of Rights and Responsibilities TRANSMIC'.

Contents

The IMI Working Papers Series	2
Abstract	2
1 Introduction	4
2 Background	5
2.1 Political incorporation and receiving countries	6
2.2 Transnational politics and origin countries	6
2.3 The embeddedness of migrant politics 'here' and 'there'	7
3 Data and methods	8
3.1 Dependent variables	8
3.2 Individual characteristics.....	8
3.3 Receiving and origin country contexts.....	9
4 Results.....	10
5 Discussion.....	16
5.1 Divided loyalties and complementarity	17
5.2 Migrants' simultaneous political agency	17
6 Conclusion	18
7 References	19
8 Appendix	22

1 Introduction

Why do some migrants engage in the electoral politics of their new countries of destination while other migrants engage in the politics of their origin countries? A growing body of scholarship investigates the political incorporation and cross-border political activities of international migrants and diaspora communities (Kastoryano and Schader 2014; Lyons and Mandaville 2012).¹ Previous research on transnational political engagement examines how incorporation and various contextual factors in immigrant receiving countries shape migrants' participation in origin-country politics (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003; Waldinger 2015; Waldinger and Sohel 2013). At the same time, a separate strand of scholarship explores the political dimensions of immigrant incorporation by analysing migrants' participation in the electoral politics of receiving countries (Bloemraad 2006; Heath et al. 2013; Ramakrishnan 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). Thus, the research literature on migrant politics is largely bifurcated into two disparate bodies of scholarship. While both approaches help explain the political activities of migrants, this epistemic separation conceals the extent to which the two processes may be inter-related. In other words, existing literature largely fails to account for ways in which migrants' receiving and origin country political engagement may represent complementary or contradictory processes (for an exception see Morales and Morariu 2011). The present study seeks to move beyond this analytic separation by simultaneously analysing the determinants of migrants' electoral political engagement (i.e. voting) in receiving and origin countries.

Previous efforts to investigate the determinants of transnational political engagement with migrants' origin countries focus on the relationship between incorporation and transnationalism. This literature yields two competing theoretical perspectives. In the first perspective, assimilation and political transnational engagement are understood to be disparate processes where migrants assimilating into receiving societies undergo a political re-socialization that ultimately decreases their transnational political engagement over time and across generations (Waldinger 2015, 2008; Waldinger and Sohel 2013). The second perspective argues that migrants who are successfully incorporating into the receiving country are also more likely to remain transnationally engaged with politics in their origin countries (Portes and Fernandez-Kelly 2015; Guarnizo et al. 2003). In both perspectives, researchers emphasise how migrants' political behaviours are embedded in contexts of reception and departure as well as a myriad of contextual conditions in origin and destination societies (Bloemraad 2006; Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Heath et al. 2013; Morales and Giugni 2011; Waldinger 2008).

While both perspectives offers useful insights into the relationship between incorporation and transnational political engagement, the empirical research associated with these perspectives suffers from two limitations. First, the vast majority of studies focus exclusively on the experiences of Mexican and Latin American migrants in the US, thus neglecting other migrant groups and multiple origin and receiving country contexts. Second, existing literature largely emphasises contextual factors in receiving countries at the expense of contextual conditions within immigrants' origin countries. Thus, the generalisability of previous research is unable to adequately explain how contextual conditions in multiple origin countries may shape migrant political engagement across different destination countries. While origin countries increasingly seek to engage their diasporas and migrants abroad through external

¹ I am aware of the subtle differences and potential problems using terms such as 'origin' and 'receiving' to desirable migrants' places of origin and settlement. However, the terms 'origin' and 'receiving' are used consistently for the sake of concision. It should also be noted that at times the terms are used interchangeably with 'host' and 'homeland'. These terms are presently used to distinguish between the country of residence where migrants resided during the data collection and the countries from where they emigrated.

voting and other diaspora engagement policies (see Gamlen 2008; Lafleur 2013; Portes and Smith 2012), few studies offer cross-national insights into how origin country contexts affect the transnational electoral activities of multiple migrant groups residing in different receiving countries.

This study offers comparative evidence to explicate the relationship between receiving and origin-oriented electoral political participation. Specifically, it analyses nationally representative data for fourteen migrant groups across eight European destination cities including Madrid, Barcelona, Zurich, Geneva, Stockholm, Lyon, Milan and London.² The migrant groups are identified by their birthplace and span the following fourteen countries: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Kosovo, Algeria, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Italy, Morocco, Philippines, Peru and Turkey. Data come from individual and country-level datasets associated with the LOCALMULTIDEM comparative study (see Morales et al. 2011). The data enable me to analyse the political participation for fourteen immigrant groups residing in eight European cities spanning six different receiving countries. Multinomial logistic regression models estimate the odds of voting in receiving and origin country national elections. In addition, I analyse the effect of voting in the receiving country on the odds of voting in origin country elections as well as the effect of receiving and origin country contexts on immigrant voting.

Findings reveal the determinants of electoral political engagement vary depending on whether migrants engage in receiving or origin country politics. However, engaging in receiving country politics does not detract from transnational political engagement. In fact, findings suggest migrants who actively engage in receiving country electoral politics are more likely to vote in homeland elections compared to migrants who do not engage in receiving country politics. That is, access to political voting rights and voting in the national elections of the receiving country increases the likelihood of voting in origin country elections. In other words, migrants keen on enacting their political agency will participate in both receiving and origin country politics if they are given access through eligibility. In sum, a degree of complementarity is observed between receiving and origin country electoral political participation challenging the aforementioned epistemic separation in the literature.

2 Background

International migrants symbolically represent an important feature of contemporary politics. The political participation of immigrants is a growing topic of research within general scholarship on immigrant integration across immigrant-receiving societies in Europe and North America (Heath et al. 2013; Koopmans et al. 2005; Ramakrishnan and Espenshade 2001). At the same time, emigrants abroad play an increasingly important role in the political landscapes of their origin countries (Bauböck 2006, 1994; Boccagni, Lafleur and Levitt 2015; Gamlen 2008; Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Levitt and Jowarksy 2007; Portes and Fernandez-Kelly 2015). Despite the recognised significance of migrants in the political spheres of both origin and destination societies, existing scholarship treats migrants' involvement in receiving and origin country electoral politics as two apparently unrelated phenomena (for an exception see Morales and Morariu 2011; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003). Thus, the literature on immigrant political participation is epistemically isolated from research on migrants' transnational politics. Accordingly, existing research on migrant politics can be separated into two bodies of scholarship employing either a receiving or origin country approach.

² The migrants in the analysis come from the following origin countries: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Kosovo, Algeria, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Italy, Morocco, Peru, the Philippines, and Turkey.

2.1 Political incorporation and receiving countries

The receiving-country approach to migrant political incorporation is found in the vast literature on immigrant integration. Here researchers seek to understand the cultural, social, economic and political incorporation of migrants and their children into the receiving polity (Heath et al. 2013; Morales and Giugni 2011; Ramakrishnan 2005; Werbner and Anwar 1991). With respect to migrant political engagement in receiving countries, existing research emphasises political and civic engagement in the form of electoral politics (Heath et al. 2013; Ramakrishnan 2005) as well as non-electoral politics as in the form of civil society organisations (Bloemraad 2005, 2005; Chaudhary and Guarnizo 2016; Cordero-Guzman 2005) and contentious collective action (Chaudhary and Moss-forthcoming; Morales and Giugni 2011; Voss and Bloemraad 2011).

Within the literature on immigrant political participation, studies offer analyses of group variation in political participation within a single polity as well as cross-national analyses of migrant political participation across multiple destination polities. Studies analysing variation in immigrant political participation within a single receiving society find strong positive relationships between socioeconomic resources and political participation. That is, migrants with higher levels of socioeconomic incorporation and other forms of ethnic social capital will be more likely to participate in the electoral politics a receiving society (Ramakrishnan 2005; Verba et al. 1995). At the same time, alternative studies also find that groups with high levels of socioeconomic and ethnic resources may detach themselves from the political system (Uslaner and Conley 2003). Thus, the association between socioeconomic resources and political engagement in destination countries is inconclusive.

2.2 Transnational politics and origin countries

Following the ‘transnational turn’ within migration scholarship (Faist 2000; Levitt and Joworsky 2007; Lyons and Mandaville 2012), a number of influential studies have documented the myriad ways in which migrants engage in the electoral and non-electoral politics of their origin societies. Researchers have analysed how globalisation increases the abilities of migrant communities to mobilise around issues of territory, religion, development or other group interests (see Faist 2000; Guarnizo and Smith 1998). Several studies document and analyse migrants’ transnational political engagement from abroad. For instance, Waldinger (2015, 2008) analyses the extent to which Mexican immigrants in the US engage in Mexican politics. Similarly, Guarnizo et al. (2003) and Levitt (2001) examine how Dominican migrants engage in homeland politics from abroad. Finally, a number of studies examine how diaspora groups and migrants in Europe engage in transnational politics with their respective homelands (Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Ostergaard-Nielson 2003).

In an effort to reconcile the ‘transnational turn’ with the study of immigrant integration, two contrasting hypotheses describe the relationship between transnational political engagement and incorporation into the receiving society. The first hypothesis assumes migrants undergo a political re-socialisation after arriving in the receiving country (Waldinger 2008). Here, migrants eventually discard their political loyalties to their origin countries in order to adopt and integrate into the political structure of their new receiving countries (Waldinger 2015). Alternatively, a second hypothesis assumes successful socioeconomic incorporation into the receiving society and transnational political engagement to be complimentary and positively associated with each other (Fernandez-Kelly 2015; Guarnizo et al. 2003).

Empirical research on transnational political engagement offers support for both of the two aforementioned hypotheses. Challenging the notion that transnationalism encourages ‘dual-loyalties’ (see Portes et al. 1999), a number of studies suggest socioeconomic assimilation and transnational

political engagement are complementary processes (see Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Guarnizo et al. 2003). However, several studies find empirical support for the alternative inasmuch incorporation and transnational engagement are contradictory processes where transnational political engagement declines as migrants incorporate over time or across generations (see Morales and Morariu 2011; Waldinger 2015; Waldinger and Sohel 2013). Hence, the hypothesised relationship between incorporation and transnational engagement remains unclear and inconclusive.

Finally, a growing body of scholarship focusing on migrants' countries of origin emphasises the development potential of remittances (see de Haas 2010). In addition to the overwhelming focus on migrants' financial remittances, recent scholarship explores the phenomenon of social and political remittances. The concept of political remittances remains rather ambiguous because it has thus far been theorised as being a form of social remittance (Bocagni et al. 2015; Levitt 1998) or operationalised as financial remittances during political cycles (Ahmed 2014; O'Mahoney 2013). However, research on the rise and implementation of external voting policies (see Lafleur 2013) enables researchers to conceptualise political remittances more concretely as engaging in electoral and non-electoral political actions.

A number of recent studies operationalise political remittances as migrants voting in their homeland elections. Key case studies analysing electoral political remittances include research on Polish and Ukrainian migrants in the UK (Ahmadov and Sasse 2014), Turks, Moroccans and Ecuadorans in multiple EU countries (see Morales and Pilati 2014; Morales and Morariu 2011) and Italian and Mexican migrants voting from abroad (see Lafleur 2013). The present study builds on this new scholarship by following suit and operationalising political remittances as voting in migrants' homeland elections. However, in contrast to the aforementioned research, the present study examines how migrants' voting behaviour in the receiving society affects the odds of voting in origin country elections.

2.3 The embeddedness of migrant politics 'here' and 'there'

Much of the existing literature on immigrant political incorporation and transnational politics assumes political processes and behaviors are embedded in multi-layered social, economic and institutional 'contexts of reception' (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003; Portes and Rumbaut 2014 [1996]). Cross-national analyses of variation in immigrant political participation emphasize how variation in contextual condition and political opportunity structures explain differences in levels of immigrant political participation across polities (Kastoryano and Schader 2014; Koopmans et al. 2005). Here political opportunity structures refer to of the relative openness or restrictiveness of national and local policies associated with residency, citizenship, and integration policies (Koopmans et al. 2005; Morales et al. 2011). Thus, in addition to individual characteristics, contextual conditions influence immigrant proclivities towards participating in the electoral politics of both their receiving and origin societies.

Previous research recognizing the embedded nature of immigrant politics within political opportunity structures generally focuses on variation in political engagement across different receiving countries (Bloemraad 2006; Kastorayno and Schader 2014; Koopmans et al 2005). Fewer studies theorize the extent to which migrants' transnational political engagement is simultaneously embedded in both the political and social contexts of their origin countries (for an exception see Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003). Moreover, the over emphasis in much of the literature on Mexican and Latin American transnational political engagement results in an under appreciation of how variation across origin country contexts may affect migrants' propensities to engage in origin country

politics.³ The present study seeks to enhance our understanding of the effects of both receiving and origin country political opportunity structures and contextual conditions on immigrant voting in multiple receiving and origin country elections by examining the voting behavior of multiple immigrants groups across several different European destination societies.

3 Data and methods

Data for the study come from a multi-city nationally representative survey (LOCALMULTIDEM) associated with a large study conducted by Morales et al. (2012, 2011) entitled ‘Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants’ Social Capital in Europe: Participation, Organizational Networks and Public Policies at the Local Level’. The original study consisted of several representative individual surveys that were conducted with approximately 19 different immigrant groups in eleven cities across seven European destination countries. All cases with missing data were coded as a separate category. Models were then estimated with and without the missing data. The missing data were determined to be missing at random after finding no significant differences in models estimated with and without the missing data. Five of the immigrant groups with less than 50 cases were removed from the analysis because they would not be able to be analysed statistically. This resulted in a total of 14 immigrant origin groups in the final sample. This resulted in a total sample size of 3,408 migrants consisting of 14 migrant groups (defined by birth in non-EU origin country) across eight European destination cities (Barcelona, Madrid, Lyon, Geneva, Zurich, Stockholm, London, Milan in six European receiving countries (Spain, France, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy and the UK). Table 1A in the Appendix provides an overview of the distribution of respondents by destination cities across Europe. Table 1B in the Appendix provides an overview of the distribution of migrants across the sample by country of origin.

3.1 Dependent variables

The key dependent variables used in the analysis measure respondents’ voting behaviour in the last national election in both the receiving and origin country. The exact question asks respondents whether they voted in the last ‘homeland’ election to measure transnational electoral politics. A similarly worded question also asks respondents whether they voted in the last ‘national’ election to measure electoral political engagement in the receiving country. Both questions have three possible response categories. These include ‘not eligible’, ‘eligible, but did not vote’ and ‘eligible and voted’. The key comparison that is required for the analysis is comparing eligible respondents who did or did not vote. Thus, the comparison between non-eligible respondents and respondents who voted are not reported in the results.⁴

3.2 Individual characteristics

A set of conventional individual-level socio-demographic and incorporation characteristics is included in the analysis in (see Table 1). These include dummy variables for gender (female=1), marital status (0,1), possession of receiving country citizenship (0, 1) and membership in any organisation or

³ It should be noted that a growing literature documents differences in diasporic policies enacted by origin states to engage with emigrants abroad (see Gamlen 2008; Lafleur 2013). However, this literature does not analyse how origin country policies or contexts affect the likelihood of migrants engaging in homeland politics.

⁴ Among the non-eligible to vote in ‘homeland’ elections there is a difference between non-eligibility resulting from origin countries that do not allow external voting and non-eligibility resulting from failure to register to vote from abroad. Therefore, respondents from origin countries not allowing external voting at the time of the survey were removed from the analysis.

association (0,1). Individual-level variables also include a continuous measure for years since first arrival in the receiving country and an ordinal measure for educational attainment (see Table 1).

3.3 Receiving and origin country contexts

In order to account for the overall effect of receiving and origin country contexts on voting behaviour, I use a series of substantive country-level variables. Receiving country indicators include a continuous measure for immigrant integration policies, which is captured by the Migration Integration Policy Index (MIPX).⁵ In addition, I merge data from the LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators Dataset (Cinalli et al. 2014) into the individual-level survey data in order to measure the overall political opportunity structures within the receiving countries in which respondents reside. The city-level dataset contains a series of measures that provide an overall score for the level of restrictiveness of a political opportunity structure in destination cities and countries as well as the degree to which immigrants can access and participate in receiving country politics. A score of (-1) is given to highly restrictive policies while a score of (+1) is given to highly inclusive policies. A score of (0) is given to policies that are seen as neutral.

Two measures of political opportunity structure (POS) are used in the analysis. These include a general-POS measure and a specific-POS. The general-POS offers an aggregate measure of 21 indicators in the receiving country/city related to the configuration of powers and mechanisms of participation in the political system. The specific-POS offers an aggregate measure of the 20 indicators that are specifically related to the political access of immigrants and ethnic groups. Both the general and specific-POS variables are measured on a 3-point scale with -1 being very restrictive, 0 being neutral and 1 being very inclusive. The scores for each of the indicators are then combined to give the aggregate general and specific-POS scores which can be any value between -1 and 1 (see Table 1A in the Appendix for average general and specific POS scores for each European receiving destination).

An additional set of indicators is included in the analysis to measure variation across contextual conditions in migrants' origin countries. The first is a dummy variable measuring whether the origin country allows external voting from abroad.⁶ Additional origin context variables include a dummy variable indicating whether a respondent is a post-colonial migrant and an aggregate index measure for level of democracy/autocracy in the origin country. This measure comes from the Polity IV database and is assigned to each origin country as a fixed-effect. Finally, a control measure is included to measure

⁵ The Migration Integration Policy Index measures policies to integrate migrants in all EU member states. It consists of 167 policy indicators that offer a multidimensional picture of migrants' opportunities to participate in society. The Political Dimension of MIPX offers an index to measure the degree to which receiving countries allow migrants to participate in electoral politics. The participation includes whether or not migrants have the right to vote in national, local, or regional elections as well as the right to stand for office in local elections. Countries are assigned scores for various policies. The higher the score, the more inclusive and open the access to politics, the lower the score, the more restrictive. For more information see <http://www.mipex.eu/political-participation> (accessed 19/02/2016).

⁶ The measure for external voting was constructed from data on voting from abroad compiled by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). Origin countries were coded 1 if the external voting from abroad policy was in place at the time of the last origin country election before the survey was conducted. The external voting policies apply to both presidential and legislative elections in the case of the countries used in the analysis. External voting data was accessed online at: <http://www.idea.int/elections/vfa/search.cfm> (accessed 20/10/2015).

the overall distance (km/1000) between the capitals of migrants' origin countries and the destination city they reside in at the time of the survey. Table 1B in the Appendix provides an overview of the proportion of migrants in the sample by origin country as well as information on external voting policies and overall level of democratisation as measured by the Polity score.

The analysis uses multinomial logistic regression models to analyse the effects of individual and contextual-level factors on the odds of having voted in one's last homeland or receiving country national election. The first model includes the demographic controls as well as the origin-country fixed effects. The second model adds the five measures for political opportunity structures in the receiving countries. The final and complete model adds immigrant local political participation in destination country national election.

4 Results

Table 1 provides a descriptive overview of the respondents in the sample. Beginning with electoral political engagement, results suggest migrants are generally more likely to be eligible and vote in homeland elections rather than elections in the receiving country. 28.1 per cent of migrants, who were eligible, voted in the last election in their origin country compared to 7.42 per cent who voted in the last receiving country election. Eligibility to vote certainly is a major factor explaining the differences between migrants' voting behaviour, with 84.8 per cent of the respondents not being eligible to vote in receiving country elections. However, results also indicate that fewer than half of the migrants with eligibility to vote in homeland elections chose to do so (28.1 per cent). In contrast, results indicate that of the small proportion of migrants eligible to vote in receiving country elections, approximately similar proportions of migrants chose to vote and not vote (7.42 and 7.77 per cent). Results also show there were approximately even levels of voter turnout in the previous national elections in both origin and receiving countries (see Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for total sample

Voted in last origin-country elections	
Not eligible	12.3
Eligible, did not vote*	59.6
Eligible, voted	28.1
Voter turnout in last origin-country elections	66.0(19.6)
Voted in last receiving country elections	
Not eligible	84.8
Eligible, did not vote*	7.77
Eligible, voted	7.42
Voter-turnout last receiving country elections	68.7(14.3)
Socio-demographics	
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	54.6
Married (1=yes, 0=no)	76.0
Years since arrival (cont.)	14.9 (13.2)

Educational attainment	
No primary education	5.64
Primary education	13.8
Lower secondary	22.4
Upper secondary	26.9
Post-secondary, non-tertiary	10.3
Tertiary	20.9
Host country citizenship (1=Yes)	13.1
Organizational membership (1=Yes)	39.2
Host country contexts	
MIPX (Ordinal)	56.4(9.32)
General P.O.S. (Ordinal)	.285(.235)
Immigrant P.O.S. (Ordinal)	.118 (.283)
Origin country contexts	
External voting allowed? (1=Yes)	69.8
Distance between capitals(Km/1000)	6.06(4.07)
Post-colonial migration (1=Yes)	38.7
Polity IV score	5.55(5.11)

Sources: Morales et al. (2011); LOCALMULTIDEM Individual Survey Data and Cinalli et al. (2014); LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators.

Note: All models are compared to the reference category 'eligible, but did not vote'. Multinomial logistic comparisons with the dependent variable's third outcome category 'not eligible' are not reported but available by request. Values reported as unadjusted proportions and percentages. Standard deviations appear in parentheses.

With respect to the overall socioeconomic profile of the migrants, results in Table 1 indicate that slightly over half of the respondents are women (54.6 per cent). The respondents are overwhelmingly married (76.0 per cent) and have on average lived in the receiving country for about fifteen years (14.9 per cent) with a small proportion holding the citizenship of the host country (13.1 per cent). In terms of educational attainment, one-fifth of the sample has tertiary education with another 10.3 per cent with post-secondary education. Almost half of the respondents have some level of secondary education (lower-22.4 per cent and upper-26.9 per cent) while 19.44 per cent of the respondents either have primary only or no education. The overall educational profile of the respondents reflects a diverse range. The final individual-level characteristic indicates that a substantial proportion (39.4 per cent) of the migrants hold an associational or organisational membership.

The next set of measures offer an overview of the contextual conditions in the host and origin countries. The mean Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPX) score for all six European receiving countries is approximately 56.4. While this score is higher than many other European countries, the score is lower than traditional immigration countries such as the US, Canada and New Zealand. Turning to the relative openness and restrictiveness of the general and immigrant-specific political opportunity structures in receiving countries, data suggest that most of the receiving countries are generally more

open and inclusive towards migrants with the mean score being positive for both general and specific political opportunity structures.

The final set of indicators provides an overview of contextual conditions in migrants' origin countries. The vast majority of origin countries offer external voting for migrants abroad (69.8 per cent). Results also show that the average distance between the capital of origin countries and the destination cities in which migrants reside is approximately 6000 kilometres. Results also indicate approximately 38.7 per cent of the migrants can be classified as post-colonial in that they have migrated from a former colony to a receiving country that was the former colonial ruler. Finally, the average polity score for level of democratisation is 5.55, suggesting that the origin countries from which migrants come are generally democratic. The descriptive statistics suggest the migrants in the sample reflect a diverse range of socioeconomic characteristics. However, the results do not offer analytic insights into the effects of the individual and contextual factors on migrants' propensities to vote in either origin or receiving country elections. For this, I now turn to the results from the multinomial logistic regression models.

Table 2 presents results from multinomial logistic regression models (odds ratios). The categorical dependent variables used in each model contain three distinct categories (0=not eligible to vote; 1=eligible, but did not vote; 2=eligible, did vote). All are included as distinct categories in the multinomial logistic models. However, the analysis and reported results focuses exclusively on two-way comparisons between eligible migrants who did or did not vote. The first column of Table 2 presents results for a model (Model 1) estimating the odds of having voted in a migrant's last homeland election. The second model (Model 2) estimates the odds of having voted in the last domestic election in the receiving country. The third and final model (Model 3) estimates the effects of voting in receiving country elections on the odds of having voted in a migrant's last homeland election.

When examining the factors associated with transnational political engagement with migrants' homelands, results suggest incorporation and inclusive contexts of reception decrease the odds of migrants' voting in homeland elections (see Model 1, Table 2). With each additional year since arrival in the receiving country, the odds of voting in the last homeland election decrease by a factor of .919. Similarly, the more inclusive the immigrant-specific institutional political opportunity structure within the receiving city/county, the lower the odds of having voted in the last homeland election. (.376). The only individual-level characteristics positively associated with voting in homeland election is whether or not a migrant is married and whether or not migrants are members of any type of organisation or association. Thus, results from model 1 suggest the likelihood of voting in homeland elections generally declines over time and in receiving countries/cities with inclusive political opportunity structures. However, the context of reception only offers one side of the story.

Table 2. Multinomial logit regression models for origin and receiving country electoral politics (odds ratios)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Voting in origin elections	Voting in receiving elections	Voting in receiving and origin elections
Socio-demographics			
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	.829(.073)	.710(.151)	.842(.075)
Married (1=yes, 0=no)	1.31(.147)*	.937(.249)	1.31(.147)*
Years since arrival (cont.)	.919(.014)***	1.16(.045)***	.911(.015)***
Educational attainment (ordinal)	1.07(.034)	1.24(.087)**	1.07(.034)*
Employed (1=yes, 0=no)	1.03(.111)	1.34(.328)	1.02(.112)
Host country citizenship (1=Yes)	.837(.137)	2.54(.875)**	1.16(.217)
Organisational membership (1=Yes)	1.52(.141)***	1.05(.242)	1.52(.142)***
Host country contexts			
MIPX (ordinal)	1.01(.008)	1.17(.121)	.866(.021)***
General P.O.S. (ordinal)	1.01(.213)	.560(.282)	1.00(.210)
Immigrant P.O.S. (ordinal)	.376(.086)***	.364(.664))	10.5(5.54)***
Origin country contexts*			
External voting allowed? (1=Yes)	3.37(.539)***	.282(.149)*	3.56(.624)***
Distance between capitals (Cont.)	.855(.021)***	.740(.072)**	.779(.027)***
Post-colonial migration (1=Yes)	1.41(.201)*	7.99(9.57)	.537(.104)**
Polity IV score	1.02(.026)	1.14(.096)	1.18 (.039)***
Voted in last origin election	----	1.61(.533)	----
Voter turnout origin elections	104(.005)***	1.01(.009)	1.03(.004)***
Domestic political behaviour			
(Ref: eligible, but did not vote)			
Voted in last receiving election	----	----	2.27(.656)**
Not eligible	----	----	2.65(.614)***
Voted last receiving election	----	----	1.15(.05)***
<hr/>			
Total sample (N)	3476	3476	3476
Wald	8495.5***	711.69***	10829.3***
df	32	36	38
Pseudo R2	.217	.499	.244

Sources: Morales et al. (2011); LOCALMULTIDEM Individual Survey Data and Cinalli et al. (2014) LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structure Indicators. Note: All models are compared to the reference category 'eligible, but did not vote'. Multinomial logistic comparisons with the dependent variable's third outcome category 'not eligible' are not reported but available by request. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Turning to origin country contexts, a number of factors appear to increase the likelihood of transnational political engagement. Key contextual conditions in origin countries appear to be positively associated with whether or not a migrant voted in their last homeland election. Not surprisingly, migrants from origin countries with external voting policies are associated with greater odds of having voted in the last homeland election (see Model 1, Table 2). Similarly, migrants from origin countries that were former colonies of their respective new destinations societies also increase the odds of voting in homeland elections. This finding suggests that post-colonial migrants may maintain stronger transnational ties than non-postcolonial migrants with respect to transnational electoral politics. Overall voter turnout in previous origin country presidential and parliamentary elections is also associated with a greater likelihood of voting in homeland elections. Finally, the distance between the capitals of origin countries and the destination cities where migrants reside appears to decrease the odds of voting in homeland elections by a factor of .855 (see Model 1, Table 2). Thus, the greater the distance between migrants' places of origin and destination, the lower the odds of engaging in transnational electoral politics. In sum, findings from Model 1 indicate that while time spent abroad and inclusive political opportunity structures may decrease transnational political engagement, origin country political contexts such as external voting policies and voter turnout in origin country elections are associated with a higher likelihood of having voted in homeland elections. However, the extent to which these same individual and contextual factors affect migrants' political participation in receiving country elections remains unclear.

Model 2 (Table 2) presents multinomial logistic regression results for migrants' likelihood of voting in receiving country national elections. By examining the effects of these same independent variables on migrants' domestic political participation, the analyses investigate the extent to which the determinants of transnational and domestic electoral politics converge. In contrast to transnational homeland politics, results indicate that number of years since arrival, educational attainment and having citizenship in the receiving county increase the odds of voting in receiving country elections (see Model 2, Table 2). Interestingly, being married or a member of an organisation or association do not have the same effect on receiving country politics as observed for transnational political engagement. Similarly, contexts of reception, whether they be inclusive or restrictive, do not appear to significantly affect migrants' likelihood of voting in domestic politics. Thus, while a wealth of literature documents how political opportunity structures shape several forms of political collective action, findings here suggest these opportunity structures do not necessarily affect receiving-country electoral voting among migrants.

With respect to origin country contexts, results suggest that neither post-colonial historical relationships, voter turnout out nor level of origin-country democracy/autocracy have any significant effect on migrants' voting in the receiving society. However, results do indicate that the existence of external voting policies may decrease migrants' odds of voting in domestic elections. Similarly, the greater the distance between migrants' origin country capitals and the destination cities in which they reside, the lower the odds of their voting in domestic electoral politics (see Model 2, Table 2).

The results from Model 2 suggest the determinants for migrants' transnational political participation in homeland electoral politics and their propensities to vote in receiving societies diverge considerably. Thus, results indicate that transnational political engagement and political participation in the receiving society are distinct processes, reflective of the aforementioned disparate literatures. However, the results presented thus far do not offer any insights into the relationship between domestic and transnational electoral political participation. In now turn to results presented in Model 3 (Table 2) to reveal the nature of this relationship.

Model 3 uses the same dependent variable as Model 1 with the same reference category in order to estimate the odds of voting in the last origin country election. The key difference between Model 1 and Model 3 is the introduction of respondents' voting behaviour in the receiving country. While results from models 1 and 2 suggest that domestic political participation and transnational politics are different processes shaped by distinct determinants, results in Model 3 suggest political participation in the receiving society increases migrants' propensities to vote in their homeland elections. Both having voted in the last receiving country election and lacking eligibility to vote in receiving country elections increase the odds of voting in homeland elections by factors of 2.27 and 2.65, respectively (see Model 3, Table 2). In other words, both migrants who are active in receiving country politics and migrants not eligible to vote are more likely to vote in their homeland elections when compared to migrants who are eligible but do not vote in domestic politics. This suggests that both successful political incorporation and restrictive policies barring migrants from participating in receiving country politics increase the likelihood of transnational political engagement. In addition, voter turnout in domestic receiving country elections is also positively associated with homeland voting, suggesting that a more politically active receiving society may increase migrants' propensities to engage in the electoral politics of their homelands. Thus, a political re-socialisation where migrants encounter a thriving democracy with active political participation may increase rather than decrease cross-border political engagement with origin countries.

With respect to individual-level characteristics, results are consistent with Model 1 with marriage and organisational membership being positively associated with voting in homeland elections. Years since arrival is again negatively associated with voting in homeland elections. However, in contrast to Model 1, results for Model 3 suggest that educational attainment is positively associated with voting in homeland elections after controlling for migrants' receiving country voting. With respect to contexts of reception in receiving countries/cities, results are inconclusive. As the Migrant Integration Policy Index score increases, the odds of voting in homeland elections decrease. However, as the immigrant-specific institutional political opportunity structure score becomes more inclusive, the odds of voting in homeland elections increases by a factor of 10.5 (see Model 3, Table 2). The different scales of measurement used in the two indices may explain these contradictory findings. Whereas the MIPX index measures national-level, integration policies, the immigrant-specific POS measure is derived from local-level polices and contexts associated with the destination cities in the data.

Results also illustrate the importance of origin-country contexts. Similar to Model 1, results indicate external voting policies and voter turnout in origin country elections are associated with an increased odds in voting in the origin country (see Model 3, Table 2). Model 3 also suggests that with each additional increase in an origin-country's level of democratisation (i.e. Polity IV score), the odds of voting in homeland elections increases by a factor of 1.18. However, in contrast to Model 1, results indicate that postcolonial migrants are less likely than non-postcolonial migrants to vote in homeland elections, after controlling for domestic electoral political participation. In sum, results from all three models suggest both receiving and origin country voting are shaped by particular individual and contextual-level factors.

5 Discussion

The results presented here offer empirical evidence revealing that migrants' electoral political participation in receiving origin countries are in fact distinct processes with their own sets of individual and contextual-level determinants. Rather than assuming an epistemic separation between migrants' political engagements oriented towards receiving and origin countries, this study empirically analyses the effects of individual and contextual level factors on both types of voting behaviour. By simultaneously analysing the effects of individual and contextual-level factors on electoral political engagement in origin and receiving countries, results reveal that immigrant political participation and transnational political engagement are in fact two distinct processes with divergent determinants embedded in the contextual conditions of 'here' and 'there'.

Whereas marriage and organisational membership are likely to increase migrants' transnational political engagement, these factors have no effect on migrants' political engagement in receiving countries. Possible reasons why marriage may increase transnational voting could include whether or not a migrant's spouse lives in the origin or receiving country. If a migrant's spouse continues to live in the origin country, that migrant may be more inclined to participate in the political system from abroad. Unfortunately, data do not let me distinguish where the respondents' spouse resided at the time of the survey. With respect to political participation in the receiving country, standard measures of incorporation are positively associated with electoral political engagement. As the time spent in the receiving country increases, so does the propensity to engage in national electoral politics. In contrast, as time spent in the receiving country increases, the likelihood of engaging in origin country politics decreases. This is consistent with previous studies finding a negative relationship between assimilation and transnational political engagement over time (Waldinger 2015, 2008).

Turning to contextual-level factors in origin and receiving countries, results indicate while political opportunity structures in receiving societies may help facilitate many types of political engagement (i.e. organisations/civil society, advocacy, protest) they have no significant effect on migrant voting in receiving countries. In other words, while an inclusive and open political opportunity structure may generate key opportunities for particular forms of non-electoral politics, results presented here suggest the opportunity structures do not directly affect migrants' propensities to vote in receiving country elections. However, this finding should be interpreted with a degree of caution given that having citizenship is the strongest indicator of receiving country voting. Therefore, while aggregated immigrant integration policies may not increase migrants' odds of voting in receiving countries, access and recognition of to institutional belonging in the form of citizenship strongly determines both eligibility and propensity to vote in the receiving country.

With respect to origin country contexts, results suggest receiving and origin country electoral politics are contradictory processes. Unsurprisingly, while external voting policies are positively associated with increasing odds of voting in origin countries, they are negatively associated with migrant voting in receiving country elections. The only factor that appears to affect origin and receiving politics the same way is the distance between the capitals of origin countries and the cities migrants currently reside in. In both cases, the further the distance between the origin and destination, the lower the odds of engaging in both origin and receiving country electoral politics. Results also indicated that the overall level of democratisation in the origin country also increase migrants' propensities to vote in origin country elections. In sum, the results presented here offer empirical evidence suggesting that political participation in the receiving country and transnational origin country politics are in fact two distinct processes that are determined by different individual and contextual-level factors. Concomitantly, voting behaviours are embedded and shaped by the institutional policies and environment of receiving and origin societies

5.1 Divided loyalties and complementarity

The relationship between incorporation and transnational political engagement is described as either being a case of divided loyalties or complementarity (Guarnizo et al. 2003; Levitt 2001; Waldinger 2015, 2008; Waldinger and Sohel 2013). Previous research using the case of Mexican and Latin American migrants in the US finds support for both the divided loyalties and complementarity interpretations. Additionally, Morales and Moraiu (2011) analysis of migrants in Europe finds that migrants who take part in voting in their origin country elections from abroad are less likely to vote in receiving country elections – further challenging the complementarity hypothesis. Rather than finding evidence in support of one over the other, the results from the present study suggest both hypotheses are accurate depending on whether one emphasises individual or contextual-level factors.

The length of time since first arrival in the receiving country is negatively associated with engaging in transnational electoral politics. That is, as the time migrants spend in the receiving country increases, their likelihood of voting in their homeland elections decreases. Again, this finding supports research arguing that transnational political linkages between migrants and their origin countries dissipate over time (Waldinger 2015, 2008; Waldinger and Sohel 2013). Moving to the contextual factors in receiving countries, it appears European destinations with inclusive and open political opportunity structures decrease rather than increase migrants' propensities to engage in the electoral politics of their origin countries. Thus, length of time abroad and inclusive political structures may decrease migrants' likelihood of engaging in transnational electoral politics.

At the same time, marriage and civic engagement through organisational or associational membership appear to increase migrants' transnational political engagement. These contrary findings suggest that while the 'divided loyalties' hypotheses may apply to most migrants, it may not explain the political behaviour of married migrants who are politically active and civic minded. Thus, migrants holding membership in any type of organisation or association are more likely to engage in transnational politics. The divided loyalties hypothesis is further complicated when taking into account the impact of contextual factors in the origin country.

In contrast to much of the receiving country-oriented scholarship focusing exclusively on contexts of reception, the present study examined a host of origin country contexts. After accounting for individual factors and receiving country contexts, results suggest external voting from abroad policies and overall level of democratisation significantly increase the likelihood of voting in origin country elections. In addition, voter turnout in both receiving and origin country elections appears to increase the likelihood of voting in homeland elections. This suggests that as more people participate in electoral politics in either origin or destination, migrants will be more likely to engage in the electoral politics of their home countries. Thus, the political re-socialisation that migrants undergo upon arriving in the receiving country may not necessarily decrease transnational political engagement. Rather, their political re-socialisation into a vibrant democratic environment with high levels of voter turnout may influence and cause migrants to increase their political participation in both receiving and origin country electoral politics.

5.2 Migrants' simultaneous political agency

The strongest evidence in support of the complementarity hypothesis emerges when examining the effect of voting in the receiving country on the odds of voting in homeland elections. Previous research finds that migrants that are successfully assimilating and incorporating into their respective receiving society are also likely to engage in transnational politics (Guarnizo et al. 2003; Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014). However, the hypothesised relationship between incorporation and transnational political

engagement often uses socio-economic measures to gauge incorporation rather than migrants' political participation in receiving countries. Findings presented here specifically focus on the relationship between electoral political participation in migrants' receiving and origin countries.

Results presented here reveal migrants who voted in the last elections of their receiving country are also likely to have voted in the last elections of their origin countries. In addition, migrants who are not eligible to vote in receiving country elections are also more likely to vote in homeland elections than migrants who are eligible but do not engage in receiving country politics. This suggests migrants who seek to enact their political agency through electoral participation will do so if granted eligibility at home or abroad. In other words, eligible migrants who vote in receiving country elections as well as migrants lacking this eligibility are more likely than eligible non-voters to engage in transnational homeland politics. Thus, a degree of complementarity may exist between receiving and origin country voting when observed among migrants keen on activating their political agency.

6 Conclusion

International migrants increasing comprise key constituents in the electoral politics of both receiving and origin countries. However, the research lexicon on migration and politics reflects an epistemic bifurcation where literature on the political participation of migrants in receiving countries is separated from scholarship on migrants' transnational political engagement with their origin countries. The present study transcends this divide by simultaneously analysing the determinants of electoral political participation in receiving and origin countries. Furthermore, this research explicitly examines the effects of migrants' electoral participation in receiving countries on their proclivities to engage in the politics of their origin countries. Findings reveal migrant political engagement is a multidimensional process with different factors driving electoral political participation in receiving and origin countries. Individual-level characteristics offer support for the divided-loyalties hypothesis inasmuch that as the length of time since arrival increases, migrants' transnational political engagement with their origin countries declines. However, findings also reveal that migrants who voted in receiving country elections are also highly likely to have voted in their origin countries—suggesting a complimentary between receiving and origin-oriented political participation among politically eligible migrants

This research contributes to the growing literature on immigrant political incorporation and transnational politics in several ways. First, this study moves beyond analyses of one-way flows between Mexico and Latin America to the United States by analysing the political engagement of 14 migrant groups in multiple destinations across Europe. Accordingly, the results from this study offer a greater level of generalisability than previous case studies and analyses of Latin American migrants in the US. Second, this research bridges the disparate literatures on political incorporation and transnational political engagement by analysing the extent to which the determinants of receiving and origin country electoral political participation vary. Third, this study contributes to the theoretical debates surrounding the hypothesized relationship between incorporation and transnational engagement by specifically analysing the effects of voting in receiving countries on migrants' electoral participation in origin countries. Finally, the complementarity observed between migrants' electoral participation in receiving and origin countries suggests some migrants may activate their political agency by simultaneously engaging in two national spheres of politics. Thus, migrants with high levels of political agency will seek to enact and channel their political power regardless of the territorial boundaries of the polity in which they reside.

7 References

- Ahmadov, A.K. and G. Sasse. 2014. "Migrants' Regional Allegiances in Homeland Elections: Evidence on Voting by Poles and Ukrainians" in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Published Online 12/06/2014 DOI 10.1080/1369183X.2014.987110
- Ahmed, F. (2014) 'The Perils of Unearned Foreign Income: Aid, Remittances and Government Survival' *American Political Science Review* 106(1):146–165.
- Baubock, R.. (2006). "Stakeholder citizenship and transnational political participation: a normative evaluation of external voting." *Fordham Law. Review.* 75 (2006): 2393.
- Bauböck, R. (1994). *Transnational citizenship: membership and rights in international migration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bloemraad, I. (2005) 'The Limits of de Tocqueville: How Government Facilitates Organisational Capacity in Newcomer Communities.' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(5):865–87.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the US and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boccagni, P., Lafleur, J.-M. and Levitt, P. (2015) 'Transnational Politics as Cultural Circulation: Toward a Conceptual Understanding of Migrant Political Participation on the Move'. *Mobilities* DOI: 10.1080/17450101.2014.1000023
- Castelli P. and Morales, L. (2014) *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators (WP1): Guidelines for Data Collection*. University of Leicester.
- Chaudhary, A.R. and L.E. Guarnizo (2016) "Pakistani Organisational Spaces in Toronto and New York City" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126084
- Chaudhary, A.R. and D.M. Moss (forthcoming) "Towards a Theory of Transnational Political Action" Unpublished Working Paper
- Cinalli, Manlio, Laura Morales, Geraldine Bozec, Ranji Devadason, Nina Eggert, Miruna Morariu, Amparo Gonzales, Katia Pilati, Virginia Ros, Ildiko Zakarias. 2014. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators (WP1) Dataset*. Leicester: University of Leicester.
- Cordero-Guzman, H. (2005) "Community-Based Organisations and Migration in New York City" *Journal for Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 31(5):889-909
- Morariu, M., Gonzales, A., Pilati, K., Ros, V. and Zakarias, I. (2014) *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators (WP1) Dataset*. Leicester: University of Leicester.
- De Haas, Hein. (2010) "Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective" in *International Migration Review*, 44(1): 227-264
- Faist, T. (2000) *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gamlen, A. (2008) 'The Emigration State and the Modern Geopolitical Imagination'. *Political Geography* 27(8):840–856.

- Guarnizo, L. E. and Chaudhary, A. R. (2014) 'The Determinants of Transnational Political Engagement Among Dominican and Colombian Migrants in Southern Europe'. *International Migration Institute Working Paper Series* No. 82.
- Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A. and Haller, W. (2003) 'Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants'. *American Journal of Sociology* 108(6):1211–48.
- Guarnizo, L. E. and Smith, M. P. (1998) 'The Locations of Transnationalism.' *Comparative Urban and Community Research* 6.
- Heath, A.F., Fisher, S. D., Rosenblatt, G., Sanders, D., and Sobolewska, M. (2013) *The Political Integration of Ethnic Minorities in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kastoryano, R., and Schader, M. (2014) 'A Comparative View of Ethnicity and Political Engagement'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 40:241–60.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M. and Passy, F. (2005) *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lafleur, J. (2013) *Transnational Politics and the State, The External Voting Rights of Diasporas*. London: Routledge.
- Levitt, P. (1998) 'Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion.' *International Migration Review* 32(4): 926–948.
- Levitt, P. (2001) *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levitt, P. and Jaworsky, N. (2007) 'Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:129–56.
- Lyons, T. and Mandaville, P. (eds.) (2012) *Politics From Afar, Transnational Diasporas and Networks*. London: Hurst and Co.
- Morales, L., and Pilati, K. (2014) 'The Political Transnationalism of Ecuadorians in Barcelona, Madrid and Milan: The Role of Individual Resources, Organizational Engagement and the Political Context.' *Global Networks* 14(1): 80–102.
- Morales, L., and Giugi, M. (eds.) (2011) *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe: Making Multicultural Democracy Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morales, L. and Jorba, L. (2010) 'Transnational Links and Practices of Migrants' Organisations.' In: Bauböck, R. and Faist, T. (eds.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 267–94.
- Morales, I. and Morariu, M. (2011) 'Is "Home" a Distraction? The Role of Migrants' Transnational Practices in the Political Integration into Receiving-Country Politics'. In Morales, L. and Giugin, M. (eds.) (2011) *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe: Making Multicultural Democracy Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003) 'The Politics of Migrants' Transnational Political Practices.' *International Migration Review* 37(3): 760–786.
- O'Mahoney, A. (2013) 'Political Investment: Remittances and Elections.' *British Journal of Political Science* 43(4): 799–820.

- Portes, A. and Fernandez-Kelly, P. (2015) *The State and the Grassroots: Immigrant Transnational Organizations in Four Continents*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Portes, A. and Smith, L. D. (2012) *Institutions Count: Their Role and Significance in Latin American Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. and R. Rumbaut. (2014) *Immigrant America, A Portrait 4th Edition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A, Guarnizo, L. E., Landolt, P. (1999) 'The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 217–37.
- Ramakrishnan, K. (2005) *Democracy in Immigrant America; Changing Demographic and Political Landscapes*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Ramakrishnan, K. and Bloemraad, I. (2008) 'Making Organizations Count: Immigrant Civic Engagement in California Cities,' In: Ramakrishnan, K. and Bloemraad, I. (eds.) (2008) *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ramakrishnan, K. and Espenshade, T. J. (2001) 'Immigrant Incorporation and Political Participation in the US.' *International Migration Review* 35(3): 870–909.
- Uslaner, E. M. and Conley, R. S. (2003) 'Civic Engagement and Particularized Trust: The Ties That Bind People to their Ethnic Communities,' *American Politics Research* 31(4): 331–360.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L. and Brady, H.E. (1995) *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Voss, K. and I. Bloemraad.(Eds) 2011. *Rallying for Immigrant Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Waldinger, R. (2015) *The Cross-Border Connection: Immigrants, Emigrants, and Their Homelands*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Waldinger, R. (2008) 'Between "Here" and "There": Immigrant Cross-Border Activities and Loyalties'. *International Migration Review* 42(1): 3–29.
- Waldinger, R. and Soehl, T. (2013) 'The Bounded Polity: The Limits to Mexican Emigrant Political Participation.' *Social Forces* 91(4): 1239–1266.
- Werbner, P. and Anwar, M. (1991) *Black and Ethnic Leaderships in Britain: The Cultural Dimensions of Political Action*. London: Blackwell.

8 Appendix

Table 1A: Proportion of migrants and key contexts in European destinations

	Barcelona	Madrid	London	Lyon	Stockholm	Milan	Zurich	Geneva
Proportion of migrants	17.3	22.8	7.83	1.78	3.22	22.7	10.9	13.5
General P.O.S.	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.5
Specific P.O.S.	0.3	0.2	0.6	-0.4	0.5	-0.3	0.3	0.0
MIPX	62	62	54	50	81	60	42	42

Source: 2004–2008 LOCALMULTIDEM Individual Survey; 2014 LOCALMULTIDEM and IDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators; 2008 Migration Policy Index.

1B: Proportion of migrants by origin country and key origin country contexts

	BD	BO	CL	CO.	CS.	DZ	EC	EG	IN	IT	MA	PH	PE	TR
Proportion of migrants	3.1	2.7	4.3	4.7	7.6	2.8	21.1	6.5	4.65	11.6	11.3	7.1	5.1	7.5
External voting	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Polity IV	6.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	2.0	7.0	-3.0	9.0	10.0	-6.0	8.0	9.0	7.0

Source: LOCALMULTIDEM Individual Survey; Polity IV; International IDEA.

Country codes are as follows: Bangladesh (BD); Bolivia (BO); Chile (CL); Colombia (CO); Kosovo (CS); Algeria (DZ);

Ecuador (EC); Egypt (EG); India (IN); Italy (IT); Morocco (MA); Philippines (PH); Peru (PE) and Turkey (TR).