The Correlation between Attitudes towards Immigrants and Voting Behavior

Yun-Tsz Tsai

Introduction

It is not unheard that one's party preference are highly associated with one's opinions on certain issues. Parties that are on the right end of the spectrum are more likely to be anti-immigrants while parties that are on the left end of the spectrum tend to have more open policy on immigrants. As a result, it will be reasonably to assume that if an individual has negative view on immigrants is more likely to support a party whose ideology aligns with this and vice versa.

In this study, I will investigate the correlation between individuals' views on immigrants and their voting behavior with a focus on Finnish population. The hypothesis is formulated as follows,

Do peopel who have more negative views on immigrants more likely to vote for praties that are right-leaning?

The data being used in this study is from round 11 (2023/24) of European Social Suvery (ESS).

link to find the list of variables in this data set https://ess.sikt.no/en/datafile/242aaa39-3bbb-40f5-98bf-bfb1ce53d8ef

2

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Voter Arributes

Characteristic	Overall $N = 1,165^1$	$NCP N = 255^{1}$	$SDP N = 290^1$	$\mathbf{TF} \ \mathrm{N} = 175^{1}$	Other $N = 445$
Gender					
Male	569 (49%)	128 (50%)	135 (47%)	115 (66%)	191 (43%)
Female	596 (51%)	127 (50%)	155 (53%)	60 (34%)	254(57%)
Age	56 (39, 69)	57 (43, 71)	64 (44, 73)	51 (36, 63)	51 (37, 67)
Higher Education		, ,	, ,	, ,	, ,
0	643~(55%)	107 (42%)	192 (66%)	126~(72%)	218 (49%)
1	522 (45%)	148 (58%)	98 (34%)	49 (28%)	227(51%)
Opinions on Immigrants	7 (5, 8)	7 (5, 8)	7 (6, 8)	5 (3, 7)	7 (6, 8)

¹Source: European Social Survey Round 11, Higher values in *Opinion on Immigrants* suggest more positive views.

ಬ

Table 2: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Party Choice

	(1)			(2)		
	Social Democratic Party	True Finns	Other	Social Democratic Party	True Finns	Other
(Intercept)	1.27	11.69	1.12	1.01	58.77	2.38
	[0.67, 2.42]	[6.18, 22.10]	$[0.61,\ 2.05]$	$[0.41,\ 2.50]$	[22.71, 152.07]	[1.05, 5.41]
imbgeco	0.98	0.62	1.07	1.03	0.65	1.09
	[0.90, 1.08]	[0.56, 0.69]	[0.98, 1.16]	[0.94, 1.13]	[0.59, 0.73]	[1.00, 1.19]
gndrFemale				1.23	0.54	1.36
				[0.88, 1.74]	[0.36, 0.84]	[0.99, 1.85]
gndrNo answer				1.00	1.00	1.00
				[1.00, 1.00]		[1.00, 1.00]
edlvdfi1				0.37	0.32	0.61
				[0.26, 0.54]	[0.20, 0.50]	[0.44, 0.85]
agea				1.00	0.98	0.98
				[0.99, 1.01]	[0.97, 0.99]	[0.98, 0.99]
Num.Obs.	1165			1165		
R2	0.052			0.085		
R2 Adj.	0.051			0.084		
AIC	2952.0			2869.1		
BIC	2982.4			2945.0		

Table 3: Goodness of Model Fit

Metrics	Model 1	Model 2
Likelihood Ratio Test	NA	100.9
Pseuso R ²	0.1	0.2
Share of Correct Prediction (%)	41.9	44.1