

# TESS Proposal: Skill, Sexuality, and Immigrant Deservingness

Nathan I. Hoffmann, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles  
Kristopher Velasco, Department of Sociology, Princeton University

December 12, 2022

Previous work shows that Western publics usually prefer “high-skill” over “low-skill” immigrants, but also view refugees fleeing for their lives as “deserving.” We’re curious how lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity moderates these relationships. Does the public find LGB immigrants to be more deserving of visas if they’re fleeing violence than if they work in prestigious occupations? And does it consider refugees fleeing due to their sexual identity more deserving (perhaps because of some notion of cultural similarity) than those fleeing political persecution?

To test this, we envision presenting survey respondents with six profiles. We will vary skill (low/high), reason for migration (work/asylum), and sexual identity (straight/LGB). We will set this up as a conjoint survey experiment with vignettes, following Lawlor and Paquet (2021) and Donnalaja (2022), where respondents are forced to choose one of the two profiles.

It could also be interesting to look at how effects vary by respondents’ education level and political affiliation.

## 1 Literature Review

Questions of immigrant deservingness have a recent but vibrant history. Researchers consider two interrelated types of deservingness: deserving legal status, and deserving welfare benefits. In the legal status line of research, Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) provide some of the first (albeit non-experimental) work on the topic using the 2003 European Social Survey ( $n = \text{about } 28,000$ ). They study answers to the following question in 22 countries: “To what extent do you think [respondent’s country] should allow people from [source] to come and live here?” They find that more highly educated and occupationally skilled respondents are more likely to support immigration – even high-skilled immigration, in contrast to conventional wisdom about labor force competition. They argue that results are driven by differences in cultural beliefs and values.

In a more rigorous test in the U.S. context, Hainmueller and Hiscox (2010) conduct a survey experiment on 1,601 respondents to answer questions about randomly assigned, hypothetical immigrants with different skill levels. They aim to test two theories: a labor market competition model, which supposes that workers oppose immigrants with similar skills to their own, and the fiscal burden model, which predicts that higher-income people should oppose immigration in countries with more generous welfare. Their results are at odds with both theories: both low- and high-skill natives want high-skill immigrants

Helbling and Kriesi (2014) conduct another survey experiment of 1,864 people in Switzerland. They randomize the skill level of hypothetical visa applicants, then ask respondents to give a general assessment from 0 to 100. Results corroborate those of Hainmueller and Hiscox (2010): they find no support for a labor competition, and only weak support for a fiscal burden model.

Hainmueller and Hopkins (2015) assess the first conjoint survey experiment ( $n = 1,407$ ) to address this set of questions. Rather than asking respondents to assess an immigrant profile in isolation, their conjoint design forces respondents to choose one out of two hypothetical applicants to admit to the U.S. They find that respondents view highly educated immigrants favorably, and are more likely to reject those without employment plans, who enter without authorization, are Iraqi, or do not speak English. Results vary little by respondent characteristics. The authors frame their results as supporting “norms-based,” “sociotropic” explanations.

Bansak, Hainmueller, and Hangartner (2016) focus on *refugee* deservingness to immigrate to Europe. They use a conjoint experiment of 18,000 Europeans in 15 European countries. They find greater support for immigrants with better “economic potential” (higher-skill occupations, stronger language skills, younger), but at the same respondents favor immigrants coming for “humanitarian” rather than “economic” reasons. There is also distinct anti-Muslim sentiment.

Donnalaja (2022) tests citizenship deservingness in the UK in a conjoint survey experiment of 1,597. She finds a penalty for Muslims and people with no occupation. Although respondents were less likely to award citizenship if they had voted to leave the EU, were older, less educated, and lower, variation by respondent attributes were small.

Fraser and Murakami (2022) consider refugees in the Japanese context, with a rating-based conjoint survey experiment on 2,953. They also ask respondents a series of questions to assess their “humanitarianism.” They find respondents with high humanitarianism are more likely to support admitting refugees than economic migrants, and prefer refugees fleeing natural disaster and war than political repression. However, Hedegaard (2022) finds opposite results in Denmark: Respondents are less likely to support climate migrants than typical refugees. But these two groups are both considered more deserving than economic migrants.

Research on immigrant welfare deservingness has yielded similar findings: When deciding whom to give benefits, citizens prefer economically active, culturally similar immigrants. Reeskens and van der Meer (2019) implement a vignette survey experiment on 23,000 Dutch respondents. They focus on welfare deservingness for unemployed immigrant and Dutch-born hypothetical profiles, with each respondent evaluating only one vignette. They find that immigrants are invariably rated as less deserving than native-born, even when they have otherwise favorable characteristics such as actively looking for a job or unemployed due to unfair firing.

Magni (2022) considers what factors reduce welfare discrimination against immigrants in the U.S., UK, France, and Italy. A conjoint survey experiment asked 5,000 respondents which of two hypothetical unemployed individuals were more deserving of welfare support. Results show that natives are clearly favored over immigrants. Among immigrants, those with a long work history are considered more deserving, but higher education and a proactive work attitude do not decrease the gap.

Lawlor and Paquet (2021) consider both welfare and legal status deservingness in conjunction, assessing how evaluations of migrant deservingness vary between refugees and asylum seekers in Canada. They use a conjoint survey experiment with vignettes for 1,153 Canadians. They ask whether a hypothetical refugee and hypothetical asylum seeker should be allowed to stay, and how many of five government services they should have access to. They find that, for refugees, the

economic contribution is more important than economic deservingness (e.g., actively looking for employment). But for asylum seekers, inclusion of deservingness cues (persecution due to sexual orientation or religion) outweigh economic contributions.

There have also been a number of studies on topics closely related to deservingness. Grigori-eff, Roth, and Ubfal (2020) use an experiment to find that providing accurate information about immigration to U.S. citizens improves their attitudes toward current authorized immigrants. Kyr-iakidou (2021) uses focus groups to uncover hierarchies of deservingness for Greek respondents in conceptualizing the European refugee crisis. van der Meer and Reeskens (2021) consider welfare deservingness in the Netherlands, but only in blanket comparisons between immigrants and natives, finding that immigrants are rated as less deserving (corroborating Reeskens and van der Meer 2019). With a specific focus on asylum seekers associated with terrorism, Rowen, Blinder, and Hamlin (2022) conducts a (non-conjoint) survey experiment on 1,000 U.S. respondents, asking to evaluate whether low- or high-level Taliban members who qualify for refugee status deserve a visa. They find that a majority of respondents did not want to deny visas to low-level Taliban associates, but high status were seen as not deserving of asylum.

## 1.1 Summary

Hainmueller and Hopkins (2015) provide support for a cultural similarity argument: respondents were unfavorable toward Iraqi immigrants and those who do not speak English. They frame their results as supporting “norms-based,” “sociotropic” explanations. Despite these results, few other studies have considered cultural dimensions of deservingness, continue to focus on (and corroborate) economic deservingness. Few studies have directly assessed cultural similarity, outside of religion.

Furthermore, none of these studies explicitly focuses on queer migrants. Lawlor and Paquet (2021) include persecution due to sexual orientation (along with religion) as a “humanitarian deservingness cues” for hypothetical asylum seeker profiles, but not for refugee profiles. They do not disaggregate these two cues. Hedegaard (2022) list “sexuality” as a possible form of persecution for hypothetical refugee profiles, along with race, religion, nationality, or political orientation.

## 2 Method

We will use a conjoint vignette survey. Then general structure is similar to Hainmueller and Hopkins (2015), but we use the vignette variation showcased by Helbling and Kriesi (2014), Lawlor and Paquet (2021) and Fraser and Murakami (2022).

Please carefully read the following two descriptions of potential immigrants to the U.S. Then indicate which one you personally would prefer to see admitted to the United States.

Immigrant [1/2] wishes to be admitted as an immigrant to the U.S. [He/she] [skill]. He has left [country] because [he/she] [reason].

- Gender
  - he/him
  - her/she
- Country
  - Saudi Arabia
  - Russia
- Skill
  - has an MD and works as a cardiologist
  - has a high school degree and manages a restaurant
  - has a primary school education and works as a day laborer
- Reason
  - identifies as gay. [He/she] and had to leave [his/her] country because homosexuality is criminalized and [he/she] feared for [his/her] life.
  - identifies as gay. [He/she] and had to leave [his/her] country because [he/she] has spoken out against the authoritarian government and feared for [his/her] life.
  - identifies as gay. [He/she] and had to leave [his/her] country because [he/she] could not find work.
  - identifies as straight. [He/she] and had to leave [his/her] country because he has spoken out against the authoritarian government and feared for [his/her] life.
  - identifies as straight. [He/she] and had to leave [his/her] country because [he/she] could not find work.

On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 signifies that the U.S. should absolutely not admit immigrant 1 and 7 signifies that the U.S. should definitely admit this immigrant, how would you rate immigrant 1?

Using the same scale, how would you rate immigrant 2?

## References

- Bansak, Kirk, Jens Hainmueller, and Dominik Hangartner. 2016. "How Economic, Humanitarian, and Religious Concerns Shape European Attitudes Toward Asylum Seekers." *Science* 354 (6309): 217–22. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag2147>.
- Donnalaja, Victoria. 2022. "British Nationals' Preferences Over Who Gets to Be a Citizen According to a Choice-Based Conjoint Experiment." *European Sociological Review* 38 (2): 202–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcab034>.
- Fraser, Nicholas A. R., and Go Murakami. 2022. "The Role of Humanitarianism in Shaping Public Attitudes Toward Refugees." *Political Psychology* 43 (2): 255–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12751>.
- Grigorieff, Alexis, Christopher Roth, and Diego Ubfal. 2020. "Does Information Change Attitudes Toward Immigrants?" *Demography* 57 (3): 1117–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-020-00882-8>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 2007. "Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Toward Immigration in Europe." *International Organization* 61 (2): 399–442. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818307070142>.
- . 2010. "Attitudes Toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 104 (1): 61–84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990372>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2015. "The Hidden American Immigration Consensus: A Conjoint Analysis of Attitudes Toward Immigrants." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 529–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12138>.
- Hedegaard, Troels Fage. 2022. "Attitudes to Climate Migrants: Results from a Conjoint Survey Experiment in Denmark." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 45 (1): 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12213>.
- Helbling, Marc, and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2014. "Why Citizens Prefer High- Over Low-Skilled Immigrants. Labor Market Competition, Welfare State, and Deservingness." *European Sociological Review* 30 (5): 595–614. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcu061>.
- Kyriakidou, Maria. 2021. "Hierarchies of Deservingness and the Limits of Hospitality in the 'Refugee Crisis'." *Media, Culture & Society* 43 (1): 133–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720960928>.
- Lawlor, Andrea, and Mireille Paquet. 2021. "Deservingness in Context: Perspectives Toward Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Canada." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, October, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2021.1994376>.
- Magni, Gabriele. 2022. "Boundaries of Solidarity: Immigrants, Economic Contributions, and Welfare Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science* n/a (n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12707>.
- Reeskens, Tim, and Tom van der Meer. 2019. "The Inevitable Deservingness Gap: A Study into the Insurmountable Immigrant Penalty in Perceived Welfare Deservingness." *Journal of European Social Policy* 29 (2): 166–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928718768335>.
- Rowen, Jamie, Scott Blinder, and Rebecca Hamlin. 2022. "Victim, Perpetrator, Neither: Attitudes on Deservingness and Culpability in Immigration Law." *Law & Society Review* 56 (3): 369–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12619>.
- van der Meer, Tom, and Tim Reeskens. 2021. "Welfare Chauvinism in the Face of Ethnic Diversity:

A Vignette Experiment Across Diverse and Homogenous Neighbourhoods on the Perceived Deservingness of Native and Foreign-Born Welfare Claimants.” *European Sociological Review* 37 (1): 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcaa037>.