

Latinx pre-immigration ideological preferences and party identification in the United States

Rafael A. Jimeno
Southeast DREAMS Magnet
Los Angeles Unified School District
ORCID: 0000-0002-9747-5576

Javier M. Rodriguez*
Department of Politics and Government
Institute for Democratic Renewal
Inequality and Policy Research Center
Claremont Graduate University
ORCID: 0000-0001-6429-1781

John A. Garcia
Institute for Social Research
Resource Center for Minority Data and Center for Political Studies
University of Michigan

Carlos A. Echeverria-Estrada
Department of Politics and Government
Inequality and Policy Research Center
Claremont Graduate University
ORCID: 0000-0002-8185-749X

Word count: 7,103

* Corresponding author: javier.rodriquez@cgu.edu

Abstract

Much political behavior research highlights the role of post-immigration experiences in framing Latinx immigrants' preferences in the United States. We contend that immigrants' pre-migration political socialisation also shapes their current views, political engagement, and ideological orientations. Findings from a unique set of 146 interviews on political party choice before and after migration suggest that Latinx immigrants exhibit consistency of political orientations for party choice across borders. In other words, home-country political and ideological orientations help guide choice of U.S. political party. Pre-immigration variables are thus crucial for a more comprehensive assessment of Latinx immigrant political psychology and behaviour.

Key words: Latinx politics, pre-immigration factors, immigrant incorporation, party preference, transnationalism.

Introduction

Immigrants, as political actors, try to steer their way through their host societies. This can include not only interacting with political institutions, but also interpreting behavioral norms (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003). In describing the connections between immigrants' pre- and post-migration political experiences, some researchers refer to "political baggage," or immigrant's "tool kit," that can shape the intensity and directionality of post-migration experiences (Wals, 2013; Rodriguez & Jimeno, 2007). Migration is therefore a prominent indicator of increased transnational interconnectedness, and of how that interconnectedness accelerates social transformations (Buonfino et al., 2007). Indeed, pre-migration political involvement is central in conditioning migrants' identification with and interest in home country affairs (Waldinger & Lim, 2009). We accordingly contend that immigrants' experiences with politics in their countries of origin lead to preferences that are carried over to their host country. This obtains despite how different the political systems may be.

Latinxs can identify the United States party that promotes the same beliefs they deem valuable (García, 1987); for immigrants, those beliefs have largely been shaped in the country of origin. Due to the intersections between partisanship and ideology, it is important to understand that ideological predispositions in the country of origin can anchor preferences in an immigrant's host country (Wals Aparicio et al., 2010). Additionally, we are living in an era of heightened political polarisation, reinforced by partisan elites and issue divisions (Doherty, Kiley, & Johnson, 2016; Carroll Doherty et al., 2017; Doherty, Kiley, Tyson, et al., 2016). Donald Trump's election and administration have magnified this general polarisation, thus accentuating the relevance of ideology to partisanship (Lopez & Rohal, 2017). This trend has affected most voters, yet very little is known about how these dynamics influence foreign-born immigrants as

members of the electorate. This paper examines Latinx immigrant's self-identified ideology, their home country party choice, the United States party with which they identify, and how these intersect. Of course, in some cases, the exigencies of adapting to a new country may result in immigrants opting for no party affiliation, at least in the short to medium terms.

There is no paucity of research on the sources of party identification or on the various ways it influences the American electorate. Campbell et al. (1980), for example, asserted that party identification is acquired early in life, primarily through parental socialisation, and remains stable. Fiorina (1981) argued that although the inertial quality of party identification is evident, retrospective evaluations of party performance can also exert an influence. Green et al. (2004) noted that an understanding of party choice as a social identity helps to explain why identification with a party does not diminish even when retrospective evaluations are negative. Much less, however, is known about how immigrants generally, and Latinx immigrants specifically, come to identify with a party given that a factor like parental socialisation into the American political system is highly attenuated within this population (Hajnal & Lee, 2011), if not altogether absent.

We begin by postulating a clear framework and hypotheses that address how political preferences in the country of origin can impact preferences once in the United States. We then describe the methods we employed to collect data and conduct qualitative and quantitative analyses of our sample. Both analyses demonstrate the impact of cognitions in the country of origin on Latinx immigrant partisan preferences in the United States. We conclude by discussing the implications of our findings, which suggest that some aspects of political incorporation may not be as difficult a goal to attain for immigrants as commonly thought.

Ideology and Partisanship

Taking pre-immigration ideological orientation into account acknowledges the rising prominence of ideology in studies of partisanship. For example, Doherty, Kiley, Tyson, et al. (2016) show that between 1994 and 2014, the percentage of Democrats who were liberal on value dimensions increased from 33 to 56 percent; for Republicans, conservatives increased from 45 to 53 percent. While Noel (2014) argues that political elites construct American political ideologies and ordinary voters are not ideological, ideology and partisanship are highly correlated, only growing more so over time (Barber & Pope, 2019). Ideological labels are linked to policy dimensions, and allow for identifying a person's stance on policy preferences on a bundle of policies (Huber, 1989). Additionally, less ideologically oriented individuals are either not politically engaged, or are less frequently involved (Wals, 2013).

Finally on this point, ideological orientation refers to a general predisposition toward liberal or conservative points of view. It should not be equated with ideological sophistication, which has been established as rare in the general public (Campbell et al. (1980). These ideological orientations can be applicable across geographical boundaries because there is a significant innate component to traditional left-right orientations across space and time (Alford et al., 2005).

Political Participation

Identification with a party is an important part of political participation because it serves as a heuristic that individuals can employ to understand the political world and its issues (Lau & Redlawsk, 2001). While mobilisation and participation feature prominently in much Latinx research (Barreto et al., 2004; Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2009; DeSipio, 1996; García Bedolla, 2006; Hardy-Fanta, 1993; Jones-Correa & Leal, 2001; Junn, 1999; Pantoja & Gershon, 2006; Pantoja et al., 2001; Sampaio, 2003; Stoll & Wong, 2007; Zepeda-Millán & Jordán Wallace,

2017), there has been less attention paid to the role that party identification can play. Inquiries into participation can be strengthened by the inclusion of party identification.

Pre-immigration Factors

Many Latinxs migrate to the United States after entering political life in their countries of origin. In her study of Asian American and Latinx immigrants in the United States, Wong (2000) notes length of residence does not directly correspond to age (the traditional referent for a person's likelihood of having a strong or stable party attachment). Her results highlight that time must pass before first generation immigrants can learn and understand American politics, including the major parties' platforms. However, the stable two-party system in the United States facilitates this process because by placing themselves on the right or left of the standard ideological spectrum, the Republican and Democratic Party platforms encompass a multitude of issues to capture the highest amount of support possible (Aldrich, 1995; Katz & Mair, 1995).

Scholars have underscored that immigrants whose world views are learned from and supported by their experiences in their countries of origin, will carry them over into the United States (Wals, 2011, 2013). For example, immigrants' trust in their country of origin's government increases the prospects of trusting the American government (Jones-Correa, 2016; Wals, 2011). Rodriguez and Jimeno (2007) noted that immigrants also import many of the socio-economic conditions they experienced in their countries, which in turn continue defining their level of political participation in the United States.

Connecting Factors Across Borders

Latinx immigrants bring resources with them, not just material resources but also political experiences, views, and knowledge (McCann et al., 2009; Portes et al., 2009). One such experience is their relationship to political parties. In Latin America, with few though notable

exceptions—e.g., the PRI in Mexico or the APRA in Peru—political parties are more ephemeral than in the United States (Roberts & Wibbels, 1999). Most Latin Americans face waning parties, emergent coalitions, and new movements, which may prompt less attachment to any specific party label. A focus on issue positions, candidate qualities, policy platforms, or party values may be a critical solution when deciding how to vote in such a context. Green et al. (2004) similarly compared the behaviour of voters in Italy to that of United States. In the United States, party identification is a longstanding social identity, in Italy, it is more of a transitory political identity. Similarly, Alvarez and Bedolla (2003) found the party identification of Latinxs seems to focus more strongly on issue preferences than among their Anglo counterparts.

Ideological labels can also facilitate political communication (Fuchs & Klingemann, 1990; Thomassen & Schmitt, 1997) and such labelling can help citizens make practical evaluations and choices across different policy issues (Abramowitz & Saunders, 2006; Jacoby, 2002). In Latin America, the labels of left and right are also often comparable to the notions of liberal and conservative (Zechmeister, 2006). Studies in European nations (Inglehart & Klingemann, 1976), the United States (Erikson & Tedin, 2015) and Latin America (Moreno, 2009, 2015) have shown that ideological self-placement is associated with vote choice, issue opinions, and partisan intensity.

Hypotheses

From the above considerations, we draw two hypotheses regarding the impact of cognitions in the home country on cognitions in the United States. First, having formed an ideological orientation in their countries of origin, Latinx immigrants retain it even after immigrating to the United States. And second, this retention of ideological orientations will

afford Latinx immigrants the ability to use the same ideological factors used in their countries of origin to choose a political party in the United States.

Materials and methods

To test our hypotheses, we constructed a unique questionnaire (see Appendix) that probed respondents' understanding of the terms "liberal" and "conservative", their use of those terms to identify themselves, and their party preferences in their countries of origin and the United States. The questionnaire also took account of age, level of education, knowledge of current events, length of wait to naturalise, reasons for selecting a particular party, religious affiliation, and electoral participation.

A total of 146 interviews were conducted between May 9 and August 15, 2006. Though many of our respondents were bilingual, 141 respondents chose to be interviewed in Spanish, the remaining 5 in English. We used a snowball sampling technique, thus many of our respondents were from one American state, yet their social networks spanned eleven states and encompassed 17 ethno-national backgrounds according to birthplace. A total of 88 interviews were conducted in person, 50 via telephone, 5 were handed to respondents to fill in and 3 were sent via e-mail. For those interviews conducted in person and via telephone, length ranged from 20 to 35 minutes. Order of questions was randomised and for those interviews that could not be conducted in person respondents were explicitly instructed by the interviewer not to consult their answers.

While the majority of our sample had been politically active prior to immigrating, some respondents had not. Additionally, some respondents could not define the terms "liberal" and "conservative," and did not use these terms to describe themselves or their chosen political parties, which merits further discussion. Although we are relying on these very variables to tap

ideological orientations as conceptualised herein, their absence in some respondents eliminates the potential concern that our results could be driven by sophisticates. The presence of individuals who never aligned with a party in their country of origin lowers our sample size, but an additional strength of this study is that even though we cannot generalise to the entire Latinx population, we gain insight into Latinxs who are highly interested in politics and who would thus be in a position to mobilise and incorporate other Latinxs into the political system (Verba et al., 1995).

Our approach to studying Latinx immigrants' U.S. party preference, as influenced by the ideological orientations of their preferred parties in their countries of origin, has not been attempted before (to the best of our knowledge). Our approach combines qualitative and quantitative analytical methodologies. A mixed methods approach is most appropriate to answer our research questions because it allows for developing a content analysis of the political descriptions that participants provided, alongside a regression analysis. This approach can help with establishing a causal mechanism (Weller & Barnes, 2014). The regression analysis offers a statistical test of the relationship between pre- and post-immigration ideological self-identification while controlling for possible confounders.

Due to the fact that our survey included closed- and open-ended questions, when some participants did not provide a usable response (for example, "don't know" or "not applicable") to our close-ended questions, we could turn to their open-ended responses to see if they provided any valuable feedback, which was indeed the case. We therefore take advantage of the detailed information from open-ended questions via content analysis, and of the statistical variation extant in the close-ended items via quantitative analysis, integrating both into our discussion.

Results

Sample Descriptives

We found a good degree of variation in key socio-economic and demographic variables. Of the 146 respondents, 81 (55%) were male and 65 (45%) were female. Respondents ranged in age from 21 to 78, with a mean age of 45. Levels of education also varied, 63 respondents (43 percent) had only some college education or less, 10 (7 percent) had an associate's degree or some form of vocational training, 55 (37 percent) had a bachelor's degree, and 18 (12 percent) had some graduate studies or a master's degree. Finally, the ethno-national backgrounds were also quite varied: 69 respondents (47 percent) were from Mexico, 41 (28 percent) were from South America, and 36 (25 percent) were from Central America and the Caribbean.

A change in ideology is considered to have taken place when a respondent who supported a "right wing party" in their country of origin went on to support a "left wing party" in the United States, or vice-versa. The average age of those who changed their ideology was 51; similarly, the average age of those who retained a previous ideological orientation was 48. Retention of ideological orientations was similarly distributed across the different generations in the sample.

Many respondents became citizens as soon as they became eligible, citing a desire to exercise the full rights and benefits of citizenship and disillusionment with their countries of origin as the primary reason. Respondents who acquired citizenship without delay typically did so by marriage, or because of the relatively short wait (five years) afforded to them as a function of the family reunification program.

Ideology and Issue Positions

Respondents who identified themselves as liberals often mentioned tolerance, preference for change, equitable distribution of wealth, inclusion of minority groups, and less aggressive foreign policy as indicative of liberalism. Those who identified themselves as conservatives,

however, related liberalism to a lack of family values in the population, lower levels of religiosity, and social degeneration. When asked to define the term “conservative”, respondents alluded to the same factors, but unsurprisingly the affective direction changed depending on their self-identification. These definitions align with well-established notions of liberalism and conservatism among the American public (Alford et al., 2005; Converse, 2006; Gomez & Wilson, 2001).

When questioned regarding problems or pressing current events, the majority of respondents were aware of the two most salient topics in the media during the time the fieldwork was conducted (May to August 2006). These issues were immigration reform and the war in Iraq. Both conservatives and liberals, however, also noted issues that were highly related to their specific ideological principles as salient to them. Most conservatives, for example, identified lack of family and moral values and economics (e.g., the need for a balanced budget, the cost of the war in Iraq, and the threat of unemployment) as the main problems American society was facing. Liberals reported that the lack of resources for minorities, inequality in society, and the human toll in the war in Iraq were the most pressing problems. Only 28 percent of conservatives converged with 72 percent of liberals in identifying the obstacles and disadvantages faced by minority populations (i.e., women, immigrants, and racial minorities) as a pressing problem in American society.

Support for Parties in the Country of Origin

Respondents reported various reasons for supporting a party in their countries of origin, some listed multiple reasons at once. These reasons were categorized into eleven ideological factors. Liberals and conservatives converged on only five of the eleven ideological factors: 1) to foster the rule of law, 2) to oppose the current regime, 3) to enhance personal finances, 4)

support of its foreign policy, and 5) due to its ideological label. To use an “ideological label” as a justification refers to respondents who chose a party simply because “it was the liberal party”, for example. This type of justification reaffirms previous works that identify two types of meanings for ideological labels as justification: *cognitive*, or the objective information or substantive content linked with the symbol; and *evaluative*, which is the affect elicited by the symbol (Cobb & Elder, 1973; Conover & Feldman, 1981). In this study, we refer to the latter.

Across the factors where both conservatives and liberals converged, and across those that were unique to each ideology, conservatives were more evenly distributed, with only personal finances and social conservatism as more salient than the others. A majority of liberals, however, based their preference for a party almost entirely on two factors: opposition to the current regime and ideological label (again, choosing a party because they knew it to be a liberal option).

Support for Parties in the United States

Latinx conservatives chose the Republican Party because they perceived it as more socially conservative (e.g., fostering family values and upholding morality), and because of its “conservative” ideological label. Latinx liberals chose the Democratic Party because they identified it as the more liberal option (ideological label); yet also due to the same criteria that most employed in their countries of origin, like concern for all social classes and opposition to the current regime. Most interesting is the emergence of a new criterion for liberals to choose a party in the United States: concern for all social groups. This manifests a new condition for many Latinxs, whereby, upon migrating to the United States, they experience a disadvantaged status (Jones-Correa, 1998) that they share with other racial or ethnic communities that may not have necessarily existed, or been directly acknowledged, in their countries of origin. Thus, Latinxs look for a party that responds to this condition.

These views of the major parties are in keeping with those images that parties themselves try to portray to Latinxs in an effort to gain their vote (Hero et al., 2000). Recent surveys by the Pew Hispanic Center (Doherty, Kiley, & Johnson, 2016; Carroll Doherty et al., 2017; Doherty, Kiley, Tyson, et al., 2016) demonstrate that Latinxs' assessment of the major political parties is driven, in part, by the party's policy standing, perceptions of receptivity, and its leadership rhetoric. Efforts at partisan outreach represent the bases for a particular partisan alignment, and their political responsiveness (Bedolla & Michelson, 2012). While Latinxs' pre-migration ideological orientations may guide them to the Democratic or Republican Party affiliation, intensity of support will depend on the party's responsiveness.

Analysis of Qualitative Results

As noted above, survey participants evoked eleven ideological factors (Column 1, Table 1) when explaining their party choice in their countries of origin. Remarkably, those same eleven ideological factors were also evoked in reference to party choice in the United States. Latinx immigrants also used "concern for all social groups" (the only new ideological factor) to choose a party there.

[Table 1 about here]

An assessment of persistent ideological factors within the U.S. system shows that 76 out of the total 94 responses (81%) evoked the same ideological factors Latinx immigrants utilised in their country of origin to choose a party in the United States. Overall, survey responses in our sample support our two hypotheses. In fact, 18 participants (34%) made direct comparisons or references between situations, political figures and parties in their countries of origin with those in the United States. While making the direct comparisons, they noted their importance for their choice of party in the United States. One participant, for example, said she voted for President

Bush because “he would help Colombia more against the guerrillas.” Another stated that her support for the Republican Party came from “Chile’s better relations with the Republicans, which means more American investment and American industry providing employment in Chile.” Another stated that she had seen Senator Ted Kennedy speak and his ‘demeanour and honesty’ reminded her of Bedolla, the *Partido Popular Cristiano* presidential candidate in Peru in 1985.

Some respondents directly compared political parties in the U.S. to parties in their countries of origin. The Green Party, for example, was compared to both the *Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria-Nueva Mayoría* in Bolivia, and *La Causa Radical* in Venezuela. One respondent compared the Republican Party to the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (PRI) in Mexico, and two respondents compared the Mexico’s *Partido Acción Nacional* (PAN) with the Democratic Party. While it may not be the case that these parties are directly comparable, the fact that respondents manifestly tried to match them across borders is at the core of our hypotheses.

There is research that highlights similar relationships for American emigrants to Australia (Finifter & Finifter, 1989), as well as different immigrant populations in Canada (Black, 1987). Finifter and Finifter (1989) analyse the impact of U.S. party identification and ideology on Australian party choice, and conclude “both political ideology and American party identification are very important influences on Australian partisanship; between the two, political ideology appears to be somewhat more important” (p. 619). These results indicate a greater consistency between party identification and political ideology than many studies of American public opinion have suggested.

Similarly, Black (1987) notes a changed context does not diminish the ability of immigrants to make inter-system associations because in his study, not only British but also three non-British groups drew on their pre-migration experience in their attempt to understand Canadian politics. Reaffirming these findings, Wals (2011) analyses Mexican immigrants in the United States and notes that “the existence of an attachment to a Mexican political party is linked with a heightened likelihood of participation in U.S. elections, and trust in Mexico’s government corresponds with trust in American government” (p. 606-607). Finally, Jones-Correa (2016) argues that Mexican immigrants’ experience with the political system in their home country increases their likelihood of interacting with the American political system.

Analysis of Quantitative Results

The relationships described thus far suggest that political preferences can be imported across borders, implying that they can remain stable despite the different socio-political context immigrants experience after coming to the United States. We also sought to test if these relationships hold a statistical relationship. We coded party identification in the United States according to ideological label (“0” for conservative parties like the Republican and Libertarian parties, and “1” for liberal parties like the Democratic and Green parties). We employed the same coding scheme for parties in the country of origin, retrieving information on the ideological leanings of these parties from various sources, including websites and manifestos established by the parties themselves. A cross-tabulation reveals a highly significant relationship between these two variables. Of course, not all our respondents had entered political life in their countries of origin prior to immigration, a situation that left us with a sample size of 78 from the original 146 interviewees.

[Table 2 about here]

While some respondents demonstrated inconsistency, the majority of the sample demonstrated consistency (n=54). There were 34 respondents (44 percent of the sample) who were consistent liberals, and 20 respondents (26 percent of the sample) who were consistent conservatives. A chi-square test of association showed this relationship is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

We next sought to test if the relationship between these variables had an impact independent of other possible confounders. In a logistic regression we included some key variables as predictors of choosing a political party (liberal) in the United States: level of education (scaled from 1 for some elementary school to 10 for a doctoral degree)¹, age (continuous), gender (“1” for male, “0” for female), ideological label of party in the home country (“0” for conservative, “1” for liberal), whether or not the respondent was able to define the terms ‘Liberal’ and ‘Conservative’ (coded “0” when unable, and “1” when able), and their ideological self-identification (“0” for Conservative, “1” for Liberal).

[Table 3 about here]

Two variables were statistically significant predictors of choosing a liberal party in the United States. Ideological self-identification was the strongest predictor, and statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). Having chosen a liberal party in the country of origin remained marginally statistically significant, even after controlling for the effects of other typical confounders ($p < 0.1$). Using an odds-ratio metric for interpretation, our estimated coefficient of interest suggests that Latinx immigrants who chose a liberal party in their home countries were almost three times as likely (OR=2.8) to choose the Democratic or Green parties in the United States as those who

¹ We tested several coding alternatives of the educational scale; results were practically identical. This variable was therefore used in its natural scaling—up to a doctoral degree—given that sophisticates hold strong, stable partisan views and tend to be at the core of ideological polarization (Zaller, 1992).

chose a conservative party in their countries of origin. Being male and level of education had negative relationships with choosing a liberal party, yet their coefficients did not reach statistical significance. Age and the ability to successfully define the words “Liberal” and “Conservative” were also statistically insignificant. The fit of the model is quite good; 75.6 percent of the cases were correctly predicted and the model produced a 32.9 percent reduction in error.

Discussion

This paper puts forth evidence that Latinx immigrants are not political blank slates upon arrival in the United States. The political stock they bring with them from their countries of origin facilitates incorporation. The results from the qualitative analysis supported both of our hypotheses, which stated that 1) having formed an ideological orientation in their countries of origin, Latinx immigrants retain it even after immigrating to the United States; and 2) this retention of ideological orientations will afford Latinx immigrants the ability to use the same ideological factors used in their countries of origin to choose a political party in the United States.

In the quantitative analysis, having chosen a liberal party in the country of origin was a significant predictor of choosing a liberal party in the United States after controlling for several conventional confounders. Our parameter estimates suggest that Latinx immigrants who chose a liberal party in their home countries were almost three times as likely to choose the U.S. Democratic or Green parties as those who chose a conservative party in their countries of origin. While the impact of consistency on a whole host of political behaviours may yield compelling results, the relationship of interest here is whether or not a particular ideological orientation makes it more likely to choose an equally situated political party in the United States.

We know from extant research that ideology and party choice do not correspond precisely as variables. It is also difficult to determine if the party identification preceded the ideological self-placement of individuals, or vice-versa. For this reason, looking at the ideological orientation of the political party chosen in the country of origin is instructive, because it necessarily precedes party choice in the United States.

Understanding and engaging in politics can be challenging, more so in a new system and political culture. The use of a heuristic, or cognitive shortcut, has been shown to help people understand politics (Lau & Redlawsk, 2001). Latin Americans continue entering the United States, many gain citizenship and with it, the ability to fully participate in the political system. The political stock immigrants bring with them can serve as an above-mentioned cognitive shortcut. As globalization and transnationalism deepen, conditions in Latin American nations may influence the shape of the United States' political landscape (Pantoja et al., 2013). Continuing expansions of dual citizenship options (Staton et al., 2007) equip immigrants with a fuller portfolio to navigate the American political system.

We have contended that pre-immigration factors may not be the only determinants of immigrants' political integration in the United States, but their initial political experiences serve to socialise their political learning in the destination country as well as helping them to traverse their way through a dynamic political climate. Understanding how these two intersect is material for sustained research. These results can prompt further investigations into the influence that politics in the country of origin have on Latinx immigrants in the United States beyond party choice.

There are some methodological issues worth noting. In general, small-sample studies have known limitations, and the present study is not immune to them, however there are also key

advantages. Given the small sample size of our study, it is possible that our statistical inferences from the multiple regression analysis rely on model extrapolations. Small sample analyses also tend to show lower reliability, lower precision estimates (i.e., issues of statistical power), and higher risk of omitted variable bias. As such, interpretation of results should proceed with caution. Nevertheless, the quality of the model fit, the stability of estimates, and the consistency of both the bivariate chi-square test of association and our logistic regressions, suggest confidence that the findings are not drastically driven by many of the small-sample idiosyncrasies named above. We also ran our statistical model using various alternative code specifications of confounders, and results were practically identical to those reported here. We were also able to control for key confounders of party choice established in the literature, and our findings cross-validate existing findings in recent research that did have the opportunity to include more variables.

Finally, it is typical for studies of Latinx political behavior to seek to generalise to the entire Latinx immigrant community. Our findings, however, only apply to Latinx immigrants who had a political life prior to the process of migration. The value of our sample and the methods employed to analyse the data are standard among cherished hypothesis-generating studies that use, yet go beyond, statistical significance. The results bring useful insights about ideology and party choice. A larger confirmatory study would nevertheless be prudent. There is fertile ground for future research in this direction. Our results imply that using their pre-immigration political stock, a fuller and speedier political incorporation is possible for immigrants generally, and Latinx immigrants in particular.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the services and financial support of the Inequality and Policy Research Center (IPRC) at Claremont Graduate University.

Declaration of Interest

The authors confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with the research design, the analysis of the data, and the findings of the article we are submitting.

References

- Abramowitz, A. I., & Saunders, K. L. (2006). Exploring the bases of partisanship in the American electorate: Social identity vs. ideology. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(2), 175-187.
- Aldrich, J. H. (1995). *Why parties?: The origin and transformation of political parties in America*. University of Chicago Press.
- Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American Political Science Review*, 99(2), 153-167.
- Alvarez, R. M., & Bedolla, L. G. (2003). The foundations of Latino voter partisanship: Evidence from the 2000 election. *The Journal of Politics*, 65(1), 31-49.
- Barber, M., & Pope, J. C. (2019). Does party trump ideology? Disentangling party and ideology in America. *American Political Science Review*, 113(1), 38-54.
- Barreto, M. A., Segura, G. M., & Woods, N. D. (2004). The mobilizing effect of majority–minority districts on Latino turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 98(1), 65-75.
- Bedolla, L. G., & Michelson, M. R. (2012). *Mobilizing inclusion: Transforming the electorate through get-out-the-vote campaigns*. Yale University Press.
- Benjamin-Alvarado, J., DeSipio, L., & Montoya, C. (2009). Latino mobilization in new immigrant destinations: The Anti—HR 4437 Protest in Nebraska's Cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(5), 718-735.
- Black, J. H. (1987). The practice of politics in two settings: Political transferability among recent immigrants to Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 20(4), 731-753.
- Bunfino, A., Byrne, L., Collett, E., Cruddas, J., Cuperus, R., Dijsselbloem, J., Dubet, F., Einaudi, L., Hillerbrand, E., & Kronig, J. (2007). Rethinking Immigration and Integration: a New Centre-Left Agenda. *Policy Network*, 36.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1980). *The American voter*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1973). The political uses of symbolism. *American Politics Quarterly*, 1(3), 305-338.
- Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1981). The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications. *American Journal of Political Science*, 617-645.

- Converse, P. E. (2006). The nature of belief systems in mass publics (1964). *Critical review*, 18(1-3), 1-74.
- DeSipio, L. (1996). Making citizens or good citizens? Naturalization as a predictor of organizational and electoral behavior among Latino immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18(2), 194-213.
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., & Johnson, B. (2016). *A Divided and Pessimistic Electorate*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.people-press.org/2016/11/10/a-divided-and-pessimistic-electorate/>
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., & Johnson, B. (2016). *A divided and pessimistic electorate: Voters skeptical of progress in many areas - even jobs - since 2008*. Pew Research Center, November.
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., & Johnson, B. (2017). *The partisan divide on political values grown even wider: Sharp shifts among Democrats on aid to needy, race, immigration*. Pew Research Center, October.
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., & Johnson, B. (2017). *The Partisan Divide on Political Values Grows Even Wider*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.people-press.org/2017/10/05/the-partisan-divide-on-political-values-grows-even-wider/>
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., Tyson, A., & Johnson, B. (2016). *The Parties on the Eve of the 2016 Election: Two Coalitions, Moving Further Apart*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.people-press.org/2016/09/13/the-parties-on-the-eve-of-the-2016-election-two-coalitions-moving-further-apart/>
- Doherty, C., Kiley, J., Tyson, A., & Johnson, B. (2016). *The parties on the eve of the 2016 election: Two coalitions, moving further apart*. Pew Research Center, September.
- Erikson, R. S., & Tedin, K. L. (2015). *American public opinion: Its origins, content and impact*. Routledge.
- Finifter, A. W., & Finifter, B. M. (1989). Party identification and political adaptation of American migrants in Australia. *The Journal of Politics*, 51(3), 599-630.
- Fiorina, M. P. (1981). *Retrospective voting in American national elections*. Yale University Press.
- Fuchs, D., & Klingemann, H.-D. (1990). The left-right schema. *Continuities in political action: A longitudinal study of political orientations in three western democracies*, 203-234.
- García Bedolla, L. (2006). Noncitizen Voting and Immigrant Political Engagement in the United States. In T. Lee, S. K. Ramakrishnan, & R. Ramírez (Eds.), *Transforming politics*,

- transforming America: The political and civic incorporation of immigrants in the United States*. University of Virginia Press.
- García, J. A. (1987). *Mexicanos and Chicanos: Examining Political Involvement and Interface in the US Political System*. University of Arizona, Mexican American Studies and Research Center.
- Gomez, B. T., & Wilson, J. M. (2001). Political sophistication and economic voting in the American electorate: A theory of heterogeneous attribution. *American Journal of Political Science*, 899-914.
- Green, D. P., Palmquist, B., & Schickler, E. (2004). *Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters*. Yale University Press.
- Hajnal, Z. L., & Lee, T. (2011). *Why Americans don't join the party: Race, immigration, and the failure (of political parties) to engage the electorate*. Princeton University Press.
- Hardy-Fanta, C. (1993). *Latina politics, Latino politics: Gender, culture, and political participation in Boston*. Temple University Press.
- Hero, R., Garcia, F. C., Garcia, J., & Pachon, H. (2000). Latino participation, partisanship, and office holding. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33(3), 529-534.
- Huber, J. D. (1989). Values and partisanship in left-right orientations: Measuring ideology. *European Journal of Political Research*, 17(5), 599-621.
- Inglehart, R., & Klingemann, H.-D. (1976). Party identification, ideological preference and the left-right dimension among Western mass publics. *Party identification and beyond*, 243-273.
- Jacoby, W. G. (2002). Liberal-conservative thinking in the American electorate. *Research in Micropolitics: Political Decision Making, Participation, and Deliberation*, 6, 97-147.
- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between two nations: The political predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Cornell University Press.
- Jones-Correa, M. (2016). 4 Does Prior Socialization Define Patterns of Integration? Mexican Immigrants and Their Political Participation in the United States. *Just Ordinary Citizens?: Towards a Comparative Portrait of the Political Immigrant*, 83.
- Jones-Correa, M. A., & Leal, D. L. (2001). Political participation: Does religion matter? *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(4), 751-770.
- Junn, J. (1999). Participation in liberal democracy: The political assimilation of immigrants and ethnic minorities in the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(9), 1417-1438.

- Katz, R. S., & Mair, P. (1995). Changing models of party organization and party democracy: the emergence of the cartel party. *Party politics*, 1(1), 5-28.
- Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2001). Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision making. *American Journal of Political Science*, 951-971.
- Lopez, M. H., & Rohal, M. (2017). *Latinos and the new Trump administration: Growing share say situation of U.S. Hispanics is worsening*. Pew Research Center.
<https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2017/02/23/latinos-and-the-new-trump-administration/>
- McCann, J. A., Cornelius, W. A., & Leal, D. (2009). Absentee voting and transnational civic engagement among Mexican expatriates. *Consolidating Mexico's democracy*, 89-108.
- Moreno, A. (2009). *La decisión electoral: votantes, partidos y democracia, México*. Miguel Ángel Porrúa.
- Moreno, A. (2015). *El votante mexicano: democracia, actitudes políticas y conducta electoral*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Noel, H. (2014). *Political ideologies and political parties in America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003). The politics of migrants' transnational political practices. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 760-786.
- Pantoja, A. D., & Gershon, S. A. (2006). Political orientations and naturalization among Latino and Latina immigrants. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(5), 1171-1187.
- Pantoja, A. D., Jimeno, R. A., & Rodriguez, J. M. (2013). The Political Consequences of Latino Immigrant Transnational Ties. *Immigration and the Border: Politics and Policy in the New Latino Century*.
- Pantoja, A. D., Ramirez, R., & Segura, G. M. (2001). Citizens by choice, voters by necessity: Patterns in political mobilization by naturalized Latinos. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(4), 729-750.
- Portes, A., Escobar, C., & Arana, R. (2009). Divided or convergent loyalties? The political incorporation process of Latin American immigrants in the United States. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(2), 103-136.
- Roberts, K. M., & Wibbels, E. (1999). Party systems and electoral volatility in Latin America: a test of economic, institutional, and structural explanations. *American Political Science Review*, 93(3), 575-590.

- Rodriguez, J., & Jimeno, R. (2007). *The Non-Participant Across Borders* Annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, La Riviera Hotel, Las Vegas, NV.
- Sampaio, A. (2003). Crossing Disciplinary Borders: Re-examining Latino/a Studies and Latin American Studies in the 1990s. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Staton, J. K., Jackson, R. A., & Canache, D. (2007). Dual nationality among Latinos: What are the implications for political connectedness? *Journal of politics*, 69(2), 470-482.
- Stoll, M. A., & Wong, J. S. (2007). Immigration and civic participation in a multiracial and multiethnic context. *International Migration Review*, 41(4), 880-908.
- Thomassen, J., & Schmitt, H. (1997). Policy representation. *European Journal of Political Research*, 32(2), 165-184.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Harvard University Press.
- Waldinger, R., & Lim, N. (2009). Connectivity and collectivity: immigrant involvement in homeland politics. *Unpublished paper*.
- Wals Aparicio, S. C., Mondak, J. J., Kuklinski, J. H., Althaus, S. L., Rudolph, T. J., Gaines, B. J., & Cho, W. T. (2010). *Immigrants' Political Suitcases: A Theory of Imported Socialization* [University of Illinois]. WorldCat.org. Urbana, IL.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2142/14589>
- Wals, S. C. (2011). Does what happens in Los Mochis stay in Los Mochis? Explaining postmigration political behavior. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(3), 600-611.
- Wals, S. C. (2013). Made in the USA? Immigrants' imported ideology and political engagement. *Electoral Studies*, 32(4), 756-767.
- Weller, N., & Barnes, J. (2014). *Finding pathways: Mixed-method research for studying causal mechanisms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, J. S. (2000). The effects of age and political exposure on the development of party identification among Asian American and Latino immigrants in the United States. *Political Behavior*, 22(4), 341-371.
- Zechmeister, E. (2006). What's left and who's right? A Q-method study of individual and contextual influences on the meaning of ideological labels. *Political Behavior*, 28(2), 151-173.
- Zepeda-Millán, C., & Jordán Wallace, S. (2017). Do Latinos Still Support Immigrant Rights Activism? Examining Latino Attitudes a Decade After the 2006 Protest Wave. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(4), 770-790

Appendix
2006 Political Survey of Latino Immigrants

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I would like to remind you at this time that all the information you share will be anonymous, and your identity kept confidential. I will begin with some routine demographic questions that will help in comparing all respondents before moving to the portion of the interview hoping to understand your political preferences, attitudes and behavior. Please provide as much detail as possible when responding.

- Participant's Sex: _____
- First Name (**Last Name Optional**): _____
- City and State of Residence: _____
- Date: _____

1) What is your age?

2) How would you describe yourself? (**Latino, Hispanic, White, Mestizo, African-descendant or something else?**)

3) What is your country of origin?

4) What is your highest level of education? (**Some high school, high School graduate, some college but no degree, college graduate, graduate school, or other?**)

5) Do you belong to a Church? If so, which one? (**Catholic, Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, Mormon, Jehovah's Witness, or other?**)

6) Are you active in your Church? If the answer is "yes," how do you participate and with what frequency?

7) Did you belong to a Church in your country of origin? If so, which one?

8) Were you active in your Church? If so, how did you participate and with what frequency?

9) Some people consider themselves "Liberal," others consider themselves "Conservative," while some do not use either of these two terms. How would you define the terms "Liberal" and "Conservative?" (**Please define each separately**). Do you use one of these terms to describe yourself, if so, which one and why?

10) Before moving to the United States, did you participate in politics in your country of birth? If so, how did you participate and with what frequency?

11) Did you belong to a political party in your country of origin? Which one?

12) Do you consider the political party you mentioned in Question #11 to be “Liberal,” “Conservative,” or something else?

13) Why did you choose this party instead of the other(s) available?

14) How long after you were eligible for U.S. citizenship did you wait to naturalize? Is there a reason that you did, or did not, wait?

15) What year was the last presidential election in the United States that you participated in? Whom did you vote for and why?

16) Do you consider yourself a Republican or Democrat? Why?

17) Do you consider the party you chose in Question #16 to be “Liberal,” “Conservative,” or something else? Why?

18) What issues or problems in American politics or American society would you say are most important? What issues or problems do we need to do more about as a country? Why?

Thank you again for your participation in this study.

Tables

| Ideological Factors | Country of Origin | United States | Exact Match Recurrence | Recurrence with Additional Factors | New Incidence |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Persistent Ideological Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Ideological Label</i> | 18 | 23 | 15 | 1 | 7 |
| <i>International Policy</i> | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| <i>Religion</i> | 6 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| <i>Effectiveness of Government</i> | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>National Economy</i> | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Personal Finances</i> | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>Opposition to Current Regime</i> | 11 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| <i>Concern for All Social Classes</i> | 6 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| <i>Change</i> | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| <i>Rule of Law</i> | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Freedom of Expression</i> | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i> | 66 | 76 | 44 | 13 | 19 |
| New Ideological Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Concern for All Social Groups</i> | 0 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 11 |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i> | 0 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 11 |
| <i>TOTAL RESPONSES</i> | 66 | 94 | 44 | 20 | 30 |
| <i>Frequency</i> | | 100% | 47% | 21% | 32% |

Table 1: Ideological Factors Bearing on Party Choice in the United States.

| | <i>Conservative Home Country Party</i> | <i>Liberal Home Country Party</i> |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Conservative U.S. Party</i> | 20 (60.6%) | 11 (24.4%) |
| <i>Liberal U.S. Party</i> | 13 (39.4%) | 34 (75.6%) |

Pearson Chi2(1) = 10.396

Pr = 0.001

Phi= 0.365

Phi-square= 0.133

N= 78

Table 2. Cross Tabulation of Ideology of Parties chosen in the United States and the Country of Origin

| | Coefficient (S.E.) | P-value |
|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>Sex (Male)</i> | -0.210 (0.571) | 0.714 |
| <i>Age</i> | 0.017 (0.022) | 0.437 |
| <i>Education</i> | -0.168 (0.191) | 0.380 |
| <i>Ability to Define Liberal and Conservative</i> | 1.142 (0.881) | 0.195 |
| <i>Self-reported Ideology (Liberal)</i> | 1.728 (0.630) | 0.006 |
| <i>Ideology of Party in Country of Origin (Liberal)</i> | 1.022 (0.580) | 0.078 |
| <i>Constant</i> | -1.846 (1.482) | 0.213 |
| Correctly Predicted | 75.64% | |
| Reduction in Error | 32.90% | |
| Observation | 78 | |

Table 3. Logistic regression of predictors of choosing a liberal party in the United States