

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

January 24, 2023

Overview: Do Americans view lesbian and gay (LG) migrants as more deserving to enter the country than their straight counterparts? This question has yet to be evaluated, but is important to address for two reasons. First, recent changes in federal policy have contributed toward significant increases in LG migrants coming to the U.S. (Hoffmann and Velasco 2021; Vogler 2016). Despite this growth, how Americans view these types of migrant is unknown. Second, while Americans are increasingly polarized on their views toward migration, support for gay and lesbian migrants may be cross-cutting. Strong majorities now support related issues like marriage equality and even the Trump Administration discursively promoted pro-gay elements in U.S. foreign policy – enhancing the image of the U.S. as a tolerant society even during rising ethnonationalism and xenophobia. Therefore, this project proposes to investigate whether sexual minorities are evaluated as more deserving due to perceived cultural similarity to the U.S. This will help disentangle Americans’ preferences for migrants’ presumed cultural similarity from economic potential and humanitarian merit as well as delineate public opinion of this under-studied group.

Background: Two recent policy changes have contributed to a rapid rise of lesbian and gay immigrants in the United States. In 2011, President Obama moved to make queer refugees a “population of concern” for the U.S. (Vogler 2016), boosting the number of successful claims (Shaw et al. 2021). Then, in 2013, the Defense of Marriage act ended, allowing U.S. citizens to sponsor the visa of a same-sex partner for the first time (Edwards 2013). Since, numbers of same-sex couples including immigrants increased 140 percent – a dramatic increase compared to the 22 percent for their heterosexual counterparts (Hoffmann and Velasco 2021). While most scholarship on LG immigrants focuses on cases of asylum-seekers fleeing repression (Murray 2014; Sam and Finley 2015; Akin 2017; Dhoest 2019; Giametta 2020; Saleh 2020), recent work suggests that the typical LG immigrant may be privileged and coming from progressive contexts (Hoffmann and Velasco 2021, 2022). These observations raise our key research questions: To what extent do Americans leverage sexual orientation as a salient factor to determine the deservingness of potential LG immigrants? Does economic potential or humanitarian merit condition these effects?

Previous experimental work has attempted to assess how native-born respondents assess the

“deservingness” of migrants to gain legal entry to their country. This work broadly supports three theories of deservingness: *cultural similarity*, *economic potential*, and *humanitarian merit*.

We hypothesize that *cultural similarity* will be the primary mechanism through which Americans determine LG immigrant deservingness. The limited relevant research that exists research finds biases against Muslims and non-English speakers while Christians and English speakers are viewed as more deserving (Bansak, Hainmueller, and Hangartner 2016; Donnalaja 2022). This work supports “norms-based,” “sociotropic” explanations (Hainmueller and Hopkins 2015). And one such norm in development is that the U.S. is welcoming of lesbian and gay individuals – at least in international imagery (Snow and Cull 2020). Even Western right-wing parties often promote gay-friendly foreign images – if only to justify opposition to supposedly homophobic Black and Brown immigrants or to justify such foreign interventions as foreign aid conditionalities (e.g., homonationalism) (Puar 2007; Kwon, Scarborough, and Taylor 2022). Thus, just like language or religion signals cultural closeness, so too will an openly gay or lesbian sexual identity.

But theories of *economic potential* have greatest empirical support. Numerous studies find that highly educated migrants working in prestigious, high-earning professions are seen as most deserving of entry (Hainmueller and Hiscox 2010; Helbling and Kriesi 2014; Hainmueller and Hopkins 2015; Donnalaja 2022). Although economic potential is not a legal consideration when awarding refugee status, respondents find hypothetical refugees with economic potential to be more deserving (Bansak, Hainmueller, and Hangartner 2016; Lawlor and Paquet 2021).

Additionally, work on refugees has pointed to the importance of *humanitarian merit* in matters of deservingness. While Bansak, Hainmueller, and Hangartner (2016) find greater support in Europe for immigrants with greater economic potential, they also find that respondents favor immigrants coming for “humanitarian” rather than “economic” reasons. In the Danish context, Hedegaard (2022) finds that respondents are less likely to support climate migrants than typical refugees, but these two groups are both considered more deserving than economic migrants.

It is therefore important to disentangle cultural theories of immigrant deservingness from economic or humanitarian explanations. Doing so has yet to be convincingly executed. Part of the

issue is that many of these aspects of countries and individuals are correlated. Immigrants originating in wealthier countries tend to be considered to have both more economic potential and cultural similarity. Humanitarian migrants usually originate in less wealthy countries that are regarded as having less cultural similarity or economic potential. And besides religion, few studies have assessed cultural similarity theory.

We propose using a conjoint survey experiment to isolate these components of deservingness. Despite the recent rise of LG immigrants in the U.S., sexuality has been under-explored in studies of immigrant deservingness.¹ We will use sexual minority status as a measure of cultural similarity that overcomes these issues. Sexual minorities are present throughout the world, avoiding issues of country-level correlates. The present era is characterized by rapidly changing policies and attitudes regarding sexual minorities, as well as substantial global heterogeneity. A large majority of Americans now support same-sex marriage and other rights for same-sex couples (Ofosu et al. 2019). The proposed study will be one of the first survey experiments to consider immigrant sexuality explicitly.

To assess the degree to which sexuality matters as a sign of cultural similarity, we will randomize two other attributes: language and religion. We further expect heterogeneous effects by respondent attributes. We hypothesize that Democratic, highly educated, and sexual/gender minority respondents will view LG profiles as more deserving.

Research Design: We will use a conjoint survey experiment, which allows isolation of these components (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014). Respondents will read two vignettes describing hypothetical immigrants and choose the one they prefer to gain entry to the United States (Lawlor and Paquet 2021; Fraser and Murakami 2022).

For the immigrant profiles, we will vary four attributes. Two are controls: gender has two levels (man and woman) and country GDP has two levels (middle-income and low-income). The other attributes test our hypotheses. Skill has three levels (has an MD and works as a cardiologist;

¹Lawlor 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, and 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.

has a high school degree and works as a restaurant manager; and has a primary school education and works in custodial). Language has two levels (speaks English and does not speak English), religion has two levels (Christian and Muslim), and sexuality has two levels (gay and lesbian). Finally, reason for migration has two levels (because he/she could not find work; because he/she fears government persecution). In all, this creates 192 potential profiles for respondents to evaluate.

We will present respondents with two vignettes, and they will indicate which one they see as more deserving of being admitted to the United States. One example profile might read: “Immigrant 1 is a woman from a middle-income country. She has a primary school education and works as a teacher. She speaks English, is Muslim, and identifies as lesbian. She had to leave her country because she could not find work.”

After choosing which profile they wish to see admitted to the U.S., respondents will give a rating between 1 and 7 of each profile’s deservingness and a rating of perceived sharing of American values. Further details about the survey instrument are in the Appendix.

In addition to estimating average marginal component effects (AMCEs) for the attributes of interest ([Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014](#)), we will test for the presence of heterogeneous effects for subsamples of respondents ([Leeper, Hobolt, and Tilley 2020](#)), including by political ideology, educational level, and sexual/gender identity.

We are requesting a U.S. citizen subsample and the LGBT question from the Core Adult Profile. Each respondent will be shown the survey instrument twice, for a total of ten questions plus two sets of vignettes. With these 12 items and the subsample request, we anticipate a sample size of 1,710 evaluating 3,420 sets of profiles, which our power analysis suggests is sufficient to detect our effects of interest.

Pretest Results: Our pilot study...

Contribution: This study contributes to literature on immigrant deservingness and sexual minorities. Despite the rapid rise of LG immigrants in the U.S., we know little about how the American public views these immigrants. Furthermore, previous studies of immigrant deservingness have rarely considered how cultural similarity might shape respondents’ choices. This research

will clarify this area for scholars of immigration and sexual minorities, inform policymakers of public opinion, and provide activists for immigrant and queer rights with tools to shape their advocacy work.

References

- Akin, Deniz. 2017. "Queer Asylum Seekers: Translating Sexuality in Norway." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43 (3): 458–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1243050>.
- 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>.
- Dhoest, Alexander. 2019. "Learning to Be Gay: LGBTQ Forced Migrant Identities and Narratives in Belgium." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (7): 1075–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1420466>.
- 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>.
- Edwards, Benjamin P. 2013. "Welcoming a Post-DOMA World: Same-Sex Spousal Petitions and Other Post-Windsor Immigration Implications." *Family Law Quarterly* 47 (2): 173–89.
- 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>.
- Giametta, Calogero. 2020. "New Asylum Protection Categories and Elusive Filtering Devices: The Case of 'Queer Asylum' in France and the UK." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (1): 142–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1500172>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 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>.
- Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2014. "Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments." *Political Analysis* 22 (1): 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpt024>.
- 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>.
- Hoffmann, Nathan I., and Kristopher Velasco. 2021. "Making Migration Sexy: Immigrants in Same-Sex Couples in the United States." SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/hxjkt>.
- . 2022. "Policy Effects on Mixed-Citizenship, Same-Sex Unions: A Triple-Difference Analysis." SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/hx38t>.
- Kwon, Ronald, William J Scarborough, and Caroline Taylor. 2022. "Multidimensional Attitudes: Homonationalist and Selective Tolerance Toward Homosexuality and Muslim Migration Across 21 Countries." *Ethnicities*, March, 146879682210783. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968221078345>.
- 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>.
- Leeper, Thomas J., Sara B. Hobolt, and James Tilley. 2020. “Measuring Subgroup Preferences in Conjoint Experiments.” *Political Analysis* 28 (2): 207–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2019.30>.
- Murray, David A. B. 2014. “Real Queer: ”Authentic” LGBT Refugee Claimants and Homonationalism in the Canadian Refugee System.” *Anthropologica* 56 (1): 21–32.
- Ofori, Eugene K., Michelle K. Chambers, Jacqueline M. Chen, and Eric Hehman. 2019. “Same-Sex Marriage Legalization Associated with Reduced Implicit and Explicit Antigay Bias.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116 (18): 8846–51. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1806000116>.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Duke University Press.
- Saleh, Fadi. 2020. “Queer/Humanitarian Visibility: The Emergence of the Figure of The Suffering Syrian Gay Refugee.” *Middle East Critique* 29 (1): 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2020.1704501>.
- Sam, Kosal, and Susan Finley. 2015. “A Teacher’s Journey: A First-Person Account of How a Gay, Cambodian Refugee Navigated Myriad Barriers to Become Educated in the United States.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 28 (6): 714–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2015.1017858>.
- Shaw, Ari, Winston Luhur, Ingrid Eagly, and Kerith J Conron. 2021. “LGBT Asylum Claims in the United States.” Williams Institute.
- Snow, Nancy, and Nicholas J. Cull. 2020. *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. Edited by Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull. Second. 2nd edition. | New York, NY : Routledge, 2020.: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429465543>.
- Vogler, Stefan. 2016. “Legally Queer: The Construction of Sexuality in LGBQ Asylum Claims.” *Law & Society Review* 50 (4): 856–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12239>.

Appendix

Survey Instrument

Include panel question on LGBT identity. Each respondent will be shown two sets of profiles. For each set, they will be asked the following five questions:

1. Please carefully read the following two descriptions of potential immigrants to the United States. 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] comes from a [GDP] country, [Skill]. [He/she] [Language], is [Religion], and identifies as [Sexuality]. [He/she] had to leave [his/her] country because [he/she] [reason].

Randomize:

Attribute	Vignette text
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• man• woman
Country GDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• middle-income• low-income
Skill	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• has an MD and works as a cardiologist• has a high school degree and works as a restaurant manager• has a primary school education and works as a cleaner
Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• speaks English• does not speak English
Religion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Christian• Muslim
Sexuality	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• gay/lesbian• straight (that is, not gay/lesbian)
Reason for migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• feared government persecution• could not find work due to high unemployment

Example:

Immigrant 1	Immigrant 2
Immigrant 1 is a woman from a middle-income country. She has a primary school education and works as a teacher. She speaks English, is Muslim, and identifies as lesbian. She had to leave her country because she could not find work.	Immigrant 2 is a man from a low-income country. He has an MD and works as a cardiologist. He does not speak English, is Christian, and identifies as straight (that is, not gay). He has to leave his country because he feared government persecution.

Based on their descriptions, which of these two immigrants would you personally would prefer to see admitted to the United States?

- Immigrant 1
- Immigrant 2

The following two questions are about **immigrant 1**:

2. *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?*
3. *On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 signifies having no shared values and 7 signifies a great deal of shared values, to what degree do you think immigrant 1 has shared values with the U.S.?*

The following two questions are about **immigrant 2**:

4. *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?*
5. *On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 signifies having no shared values and 7 signifies a great deal of shared values, to what degree do you think immigrant 1 has shared values with the U.S.?*

Power analysis