

Book chapter

Extension of Voting Rights to Emigrants

Nicolas Fliess  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9664-3582> and Eva Østergaard-Nielsen

Persistent identifier of original publication

[10.1093/obo/9780199756223-0335](https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199756223-0335)

Original publication date

2021

Published in

Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science

Suggested citation

Fliess, Nicolas and Eva Østergaard-Nielsen (2021) "Extension of Voting Rights to Emigrants."
In: *Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science*. Ed. Sandy Maisel. New York: Oxford University
Press. DOI: [10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0335](https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0335).

Document version

Accepted version

Creative Commons licence

[Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Extension of Voting Rights to Emigrants

DISCLAIMER: This is a pre-print version of a book chapter published in the *Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science*, edited by Sandy Maisel, Oxford University Press, 2021.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0335>

Post-print final version:

<https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0335>

Please cite as follows:

Fliess, Nicolas and Eva Østergaard-Nielsen (2021) "Extension of Voting Rights to Emigrants." In: *Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science*. Ed. Sandy Maisel. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0335.

Authors: Nicolas Fliess (University of Sussex) and Eva Østergaard-Nielsen (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Title: Extension of Voting Rights to Emigrants

Overview

General Overview

The Normative Debate

Why do States enfranchise Emigrants?

- Cross-Regional Studies
- Latin America and the Caribbean
 - Comparative Studies
 - Single Case Studies
- MENA Region
- Sub-Saharan Africa
- Europe
- Asia

The Creation of Special Emigrant Representation in National Parliaments

The Role of Political Parties and Elite Interests in enfranchising Emigrants

Main Databases

Introduction

Emigrant voting rights can be broadly defined as the right to vote in elections granted to citizens who reside outside their country of citizenship. States offer different ways for emigrants to cast their vote, such

as voting via post, in person in diplomatic missions, or upon physical return to the country. That said, research on emigrant enfranchisement has mainly focused on the voting practices that allow citizens to cast their ballot from abroad. Voting from abroad is not a new phenomenon. Several countries had already granted external voting rights by the beginning of the 20th century. However, these countries tended to restrict such voting rights to temporarily absent citizens with specific professions, such as diplomatic staff, soldiers, or seafarers. Only after the 1950s, states began to develop a more inclusive approach towards granting electoral rights to their non-resident citizens. Currently, more than two-thirds of all countries in the world allow voting from abroad. The majority of these countries have adopted external voting only during the last 30 years. Since the early/mid-2000s, the issue of external voting has attracted more intense scholarly attention. From a theoretical perspective, external voting rights challenge the traditional link between citizenship and territoriality and raise questions about how the relationship between states and non-resident citizens changes in times of mass migration and globalization. Today, the research on emigrant voting rights is a research field in its own right and informs related lines of scholarly inquiry on sending state policies, the political behavior of mobile citizens, the impact of the extra-territorial vote on domestic politics, and the cross-border outreach of political parties.

In the following article, we present the main contributions to the field of emigrant voting rights divided into four main sections based on the main four waves of research. We begin with the normative debate, followed by the studies of why states grant emigrant voting rights. Third, we present the studies on the creation of special emigrant representation systems. Finally, we review the works that move beyond the state as the main unit of analysis by unpacking the role political parties play in the enfranchisement process. Overall, studies have drawn most prominently on the concepts of citizenship and transnationalism for theory building and their research designs. The rapidly growing literature on the consequences of emigrant enfranchisement, notably emigrant electoral participation and its impact on homeland politics, has not been included here.

Foundational Literature

The research on emigrant enfranchisement can be roughly organized into four waves. The first wave saw primarily political philosophy and law scholars engage with the topic of emigrant voting. These works discussed the normative aspects of whether non-resident citizens should be entitled to vote at all. From early on, Bauböck 2007 closely tied these debates to other suffrage trends such as local voting rights given to resident non-citizens.

The second wave involved anthropologists, sociologists, and more recently, political scientists. These studies unpacked which states enfranchise their citizens abroad and why they do so. Ellis, Navaro, Morales, Gratchew, and Braun 2007 produced the IDEA Handbook on voting from abroad, which contains the first comprehensive data collection effort on external voting on the global scale. The Handbook has been extensively used by scholars ever since. Collyer and Vathi 2007's study provides an important

theoretical conceptualization of external voting rights and was one of the first works to systematically analyze why states grant external voting rights. These works demonstrated that external voting had globally become common practice. Lafleur's 2013 book offers a great entry into the relevant academic debates. Moreover, it contains a thorough analysis of the external voting law-making process in Italy and Mexico. In their edited volume Dufoix, Guerassimoff, and De Tinguy 2010 choose a comparative case-based approach to trace the evolution of external voting across different countries. Spanish language readers are recommended to consult the edited volume by Calderón Chelius 2003.

The third wave of works stressed the nuances in enfranchisement modalities and investigated in more detail how and why states restrict the exercise of voting rights in practice. Hutcheson and Arrighi 2015 focus on EU member states, using the GLOBALCIT database. Palop-García and Pedroza 2019 concentrate on Latin America, and the Caribbean, using the EMIX dataset, and Wellman 2020 examines transnational voter suppression in Sub-Saharan Africa, using the EVRR dataset.

A final wave of studies has focused on the individual institutional actors involved in the enfranchisement process, most prominently political parties. Østergaard-Nielsen, Ciornei, and Lafleur 2019 scrutinize the positions, and statements of European parties in parliamentary floor debates concerning the enfranchisement of emigrants. Wellman 2020 analyzes how incumbent parties' relationship to the diaspora affects their willingness to organize inclusive elections abroad. By and large, research has favored qualitative methods to collect and analyze data, but more recently political scientists have started building large-N datasets for quantitative analysis.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2007. "Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting." *Fordham Law Review*, 2393–2447.

The article discusses the normative arguments for and against the extension of electoral rights in relation to multiple nationality, denizenship, ethnizenship, coerced migration, and the potential impact of the vote. Bauböck's concept of "stakeholder citizenship" suggests active suffrage should be extended to those citizens abroad whose future well-being is linked to their political origin community. This includes temporary absent citizens, conflict-forced migrants, but excludes generations born abroad without prior residency.

Calderón Chelius, Leticia. 2003. *Votar En La Distancia. La Extensión de Los Derechos Políticos a Migrantes. Experiencias Comparadas*. Mexico: Instituto Mora and Coordinación General para la Atención al Migrante Michoacano.

This edited volume features 17 case studies (13 Latin American and Caribbean countries, Spain, Portugal, Canada, USA). The chapters are organized in three main thematic sections: States that enfranchise emigrants, states that discuss such enfranchisement for the near future and states without a debate. The book offers an introduction to the topic and the main scholarly debates for readers in Spanish. Many of the cases have modified their electoral system since 2003.

Collyer, Michael, and Zana Vathi. 2007. *Patterns of Extra-Territorial Voting*. Brighton: Sussex Centre for Migration Research.

Based on an original survey of electoral institutions around the world, the paper presents one of the first systematic and comprehensive assessments of external voting practices worldwide (together with Ellis et al. 2007). The paper creates a typology of external voting organization within legislative elections and argues that remittances and diaspora size cannot explain states' motivation to grant external voting rights. The authors argue that the state-diaspora relationship is a more important factor.

Dufoix, Stéphanie, Carine Guerassimoff, and Anne De Tinguy. 2010. *Loin Des Yeux, Près Du Coeur. États et Leurs Expatriés*. Paris: Presses de Science Po.

This edited volume provides an extensive overview of emigrant suffrage around the world for readers in French. The introduction links the dynamics of different nation and state formation processes to the motivation of countries to grant expatriate voting rights. It locates this discussion within the broader political philosophy literature.

Ellis, Andrew, Carlos Navaro, Isabel Morales, Maria Gratchew, and Nadja Braun. 2007. *Voting from Abroad: The International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA).

This edited Handbook offers an easily accessible, practical introduction to the topic. It adopts a global perspective, covering all countries in the world (although each one to a different extent) and provides an overview of the different electoral systems, voting modalities, and scope of enfranchisement practices. The volume approaches emigrant voting from legal, logistical, and political perspectives.

Hutcheson, Derek S., and Jean-Thomas Arrighi. 2015. "Keeping Pandora's (Ballot) Box Half-Shut': A Comparative Inquiry into the Institutional Limits of External Voting in EU Member States." *Democratization* 22 (5): 884–905.

This study centers on two arguments. First, states have practical reasons to restrict access to external voting to avoid external votes changing election results. Second, the normative reasons imply emigrants should have a lesser say in home country politics because they have fewer stakes. The access to suffrage in the homeland interacts with population size, the citizenship law, residence requirements, registration procedures, and modes of representation.

Lafleur, Jean-Michel. 2013. *Transnational Politics and the State: The External Voting Rights of Diasporas*. New York: Routledge.

This book presents a comprehensive overview of the relevant academic debates and provides an in-depth analysis of various aspects of external voting, most prominently the motivation of states to grant transnational electoral rights (Ch. 2) using Mexico (Ch. 3) and Italy (Ch. 4) as case studies. The other chapters include a comparative analysis of emigrants' electoral behavior, transnational electoral campaigns, and special emigrant representation.

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva, Irina Ciornei, and Jean Michel Lafleur. 2019. "Why Do Parties Support Emigrant Voting Rights?" *European Political Science Review* 11 (3): 377–94.

This study focuses on political parties as central actors in the enfranchisement process and provides a systematic analysis of parties' position towards external voting and how they frame their arguments based on a comprehensive parliamentary debate analysis across 13 European countries. The analysis demonstrates that incumbent parties and more conservative parties are the most likely ones to support emigrant suffrage in Europe.

Palop-García, Pau, and Luicy Pedroza. 2019. "Passed, Regulated, or Applied? The Different Stages of Emigrant Enfranchisement in Latin America and the Caribbean." *Democratization* 26 (3): 401–21.

The authors distinguish between three different stages of the enfranchisement process: 1) passing the law, 2) regulating the law, 3) applying the law in practice. Based on data from 15 Latin American and Caribbean countries between 1965 and 2018 the analysis identifies significant differences in the timing of the first two steps which the authors explain with contestation dynamics drawing on four case studies (Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru).

Wellman, Elizabeth Iams. 2020. "Emigrant Inclusion in Home Country Elections: Theory and Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa." *American Political Science Review*, 1-15. doi:10.1017/S0003055420000866.

This study argues that incumbent parties restrict or encourage emigrant voter access depending on their expectations to gain votes from abroad. The article uses original time-series data and builds on a comprehensive multi-method approach. First, the analysis leverages the within-case variation of diaspora enfranchisement in South Africa to illustrate how partisan dynamics impact voter access abroad. Second, an original dataset is used to validate this partisan pattern for other Sub-Saharan African countries.

The Normative Debate

A central discussion point in the debate on voting rights for emigrant has been the normative question of whether citizens living abroad should be allowed to vote or not. The debate centers on arguments developed by political theorists and includes positions that on the one hand oppose external voting rights (republican position) and on the other hand are in favor of external voting rights (liberal democracy principles, stakeholder principle, rights-based, and all-subjected persons approach). Overall, scholars

argue in favor of expatriate voting rights, but also caution that states need to put certain safeguards in place. For instance, Bauböck 2003 and Rubio-Martin 2006 suggest extending emigrant voting rights only to the first generation. Bauböck 2005 highlights the democratic stakeholder citizenship principle which depicts that in order to vote from afar citizens must have serious and ongoing involvement in their country of origin. This excludes those citizens who have never lived in the country, as well as those individuals that have obtained citizenship using a money investment scheme without having ever resided permanently in the country. Bauböck 2015 argues these safeguards are important to preserve the familiar identity of the demos. Lopez-Guerra 2005 advocates to grant voting rights only to temporary absent citizens and to disenfranchise expatriates that reside abroad permanently. Owen 2011 argues that permanently absent citizens can still be subject to the decisions of their origin state, as in the case of pension systems. He highlights the importance of taking into account the question of who determines whether non-resident citizens enjoy voting rights or not. Nohlen and Grotz 2000 are in favor of external voting rights but warn against the potential damages to the legitimacy of elections that can arise from conducting elections abroad. Spiro 2006 supports emigrant voting but argues that systems of discrete representation can better represent the interests of the diaspora and that asymmetric representation is justifiable in countries with relatively large diasporas. Stoker 2011 extends the debate of external voting to supra-national elections using the EU as a case study. Finally, Barry 2006 offers a broad overview of the debate on how states reconfigure emigrant citizenship in relation to the legal rules as well as the economic and the political sphere.

Barry, Kim. 2006. "Home and Away: The Construction of Citizenship in an Emigration Context." *New York University Law Review* 81 (1): 11–59.

This article discusses the reconfigurations of citizenship resulting from the claims which emigrants and states make on each other. The analysis is structured along two dimensions. First, citizenship is defined as legal status. Second, citizenship is conceptualized as the practical transnational engagement between the individual, the state, and the civil society. The article argues that both dimensions are inherently intertwined.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2005. "Expansive Citizenship — Voting beyond Territory and Membership." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38 (4): 683–87.

This is a short essay on the transformation of territorial and membership requirements circumscribing democratic citizenship against the background of non-resident citizens and resident aliens. Drawing on republican, ethnic national, and liberal democratic notions of citizenship the essay develops the stakeholder citizenship principle, a theoretical framework for understanding the expansion of electoral rights.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2015. "Morphing the Demos into the Right Shape. Normative Principles for Enfranchising Resident Aliens and Expatriate Citizens." *Democratization* 22 (5).

Bauböck argues for a 'multilevel conception of citizenship' where residence is the principle for granting local voting rights to resident noncitizens and external voting rights to non-resident birthright citizens. The stability of territorial borders and a stable resident citizen majority are presented as important structural conditions which together allow a 'moderate morphing' of the noncitizen and resident citizen demos.

López-Guerra, Claudio. 2005. "Should Expatriates Vote?" *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 13 (2): 216–34.

The central argument of this article is that only those citizens who are subject to the laws of their country should enjoy voting rights. The author argues that having a stake in the homeland is not sufficient to gain voting rights and that long term residency should be a precondition for both nonresident citizens and immigrants. Permanent emigrants should be disenfranchised after some years.

Nohlen, Florian, and Dieter Grotz. 2000. "External Voting: Legal Framework and Overview of Electoral Legislation." *Boletín Mexicano de Derecho Comparado* XXXIII (99): 1115–45.

The authors problematize the extension of voting rights to emigrants based on the three dimensions of political representation, judicial review of extra-territorial elections, and transparency of transnational voting procedures. Their analysis draws on examples from countries across the world.

Owen, David. 2011. "Transnational Citizenship and the Democratic State: Modes of Membership and Voting Rights." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 14 (5): 641–63.

This article critically engages with the main positions towards emigrant and immigrant voting in relation to the all-subjected persons principle, most prominently advanced in the work of Bauböck 2005, 2007 and Rubio-Marín 2006. Owen argues that both scholars do not consider who determines whether non-resident citizens should enjoy voting rights. To overcome what he refers to as the 'arbitrary demos problem' Owen proposes to turn to constitutional laws.

Rubio-Marín, Ruth. 2006. "Transnational Politics and the Democratic Nation-State: Normative Challenges of Expatriate Voting and Nationality Retention of Emigrants." *New York University Law Review* 81: 117–47.

The main argument of this article posits that a state's popular sovereignty is restricted to its geographic boundaries, and therefore the claim of citizens for absentee voting must be linked to territorial residence which justifies the extension of voting rights to the first generation only. In

contrast, the sending of remittances and the potential disenfranchisement in host countries are not valid arguments for external suffrage extensions.

Shaw, Jo 2017. "Citizenship and Franchise." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, edited by Ayelet Shachar, Rainer Bauböck, Irene Bloemraad, and Maarten Vink, 290-313. New York: Oxford University Press.

This work discusses the relevant literature concerning the enfranchisement of non-resident citizens and non-citizen residents. The different sections highlight the normative and practical tensions between the boundaries of suffrage, citizenry, and polity in societies and democratic theory over time. Moreover, this book chapter takes into consideration the European Union as a supra-state case, and provides many examples.

Spiro, Peter J. 2006. "Perfecting Political Diaspora." *New York University Law Review* 81 (1): 207–33.

The author argues against normative objections of enfranchising emigrants which depict emigrant voters as irresponsible, uninformed, and undisciplined. He also objects to logistical considerations such as that out-of-country voting is logistically too difficult. The remainder of the article presents a discussion of the normative arguments for assimilated emigrant representation versus discrete representation systems.

Stoker, Gerry. 2011. "Transpolitical Citizenship." In *Prospects of Citizenship*, edited by Gerry Stoker, Andrew Mason, Anthony McGrew, Chris Armstrong, David Owen, Graham Smith, Momoh Banya, Derek McGhee, and Claire Saunders, 110–32. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

This book chapter discusses external voting rights and dual citizenship based on the 'all-subjected principle', and 'stakeholder principle'. A final section applies the arguments to the case of the EU.

Why do States enfranchise Emigrants?

The question of why states enfranchise emigrants has become a central concern in the study of external voting rights and is so far the subject that has received most scholarly attention. Overall, the main determinants tested in the literature state that enfranchisement occurs in response to the emergence of a global norm, regime transitions, emigrant demands for an ongoing, formal, political incorporation in their country of origin, the strategies of homeland governments to tap into the resources of their non-resident citizens, and the electoral strategies of particular parties. Nevertheless, case-specific and regional-specific factors play an important role as well.

The Special Issue introduction of Caramani and Grotz 2015 offers a conceptual entry into the debate. The authors discuss expatriate enfranchisement in relation to other previously excluded social segments of

the society, such as women or individuals without property. Boccagni, Lafleur, and Levitt 2016 provide another conceptual overview in which emigrant voting rights are approached as political remittances. While nowadays many states have enfranchised their non-resident citizens, studies, such as Lafleur 2015, Palop-Garcia and Pedroza 2017, Turcu 2018, and Bekaj and Antara 2018, highlight how and why many countries restrict the exercise of these rights in practice. For example, they show that these restrictions can apply to the level and type of election in which emigrants are allowed to vote in, or how states tailor the voter regulations towards a specific emigrant voter profile.

Bekaj, Armend, and Lina Antara. 2018. *Political Participation of Refugees: Bridging the Gaps*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA).

This report provides an easily accessible comparative overview of the mechanisms for formal and non-formal (transnational) political participation of refugees from Afghanistan, DRC Congo, Somalia, South Sudan, and Syria. Chapter 3 (p. 72-80) specifically deals with external voting provisions for refugees, and why states have decided to implement them in practice or not.

Boccagni, Paolo, Jean Michel Lafleur, and Peggy Levitt. 2016. "Transnational Politics as Cultural Circulation: Toward a Conceptual Understanding of Migrant Political Participation on the Move." *Mobilities* 11 (3): 444–63.

The authors develop a theoretical framework to approach the diffusion of external voting rights as a form of political remittances and place particular emphasis on the state, collective and individual actors, channels, and patterns of diffusion in sending and receiving countries. The study proposes to understand external voting as produced by the circulation of norms, practices, institutional forms, and opinions taking place on different levels within transnational social fields.

Caramani, Daniele, and Florian Grotz. 2015. "Beyond Citizenship and Residence? Exploring the Extension of Voting Rights in the Age of Globalization." *Democratization* 22 (5): 799–819.

This Special Issue introductory article argues that resident alien and non-resident citizens enfranchisement are closely intertwined in a normative perspective, but exhibit very different evolutions over time. Transnational voting has globally spread fast, similar to historical waves of suffrage extension that led to the inclusion of previously excluded social segments. Controversially, the institutional provisions for emigrant voting differ much more from country to country than did previous waves of enfranchisement.

Lafleur, Jean-Michel. 2015. "The Enfranchisement of Citizens Abroad: Variations and Explanations." *Democratization* 22 (5): 840–60.

This study examines external suffrage in Latin America and the MENA region. While democratization processes combined with an emerging global norm of emigrant franchise can explain the wide spread

of transnational voting rights, they fail to explain why states introduced hurdles for emigrants to exercise their right. Therefore, it is crucial to disaggregate the state into the different actors and interests involved, such as political parties, electoral authorities, consulates and their interests.

Palop-García, Pau, and Luicy Pedroza. 2017. "Beyond Convergence: Unveiling Variations of External Franchise in Latin America and the Caribbean from 1950 to 2015." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43 (9): 1597–1616.

The authors examine variations in emigrants' effective electoral inclusion in terms of external active, and passive franchise among 22 Latin American and Caribbean states between 1950 and 2015. The analysis draws on the EMIX dataset, and the findings indicate that almost all states in their study grant extra-territorial electoral rights. However, countries largely diverge in terms of types and venues of representation.

Turcu, Anca. 2018. "Reactive Limits to Diaspora Enfranchisement Policies: A Conceptual Categorization." *Diaspora Studies* 11 (1): 1–24.

This study theorizes the varying degrees of how states limit emigrant enfranchisement and the impact of emigrant votes. The author develops four categories along the two dimensions of ambiguity and conflict, based on Matlands' ambiguity-conflict matrix. Later on, these categories are further illustrated with case studies.

Cross-Regional Studies

Focused cross-regional comparisons have been a dominant research strategy to analyze the extension of voting rights to emigrants. This approach aims to carve out similarities and differences of diaspora enfranchisement practices across countries with different political systems and migration trajectories. The work of Blais, Massicotte, and Yoshinaka 2001 is one of the earliest studies to map out expatriate voter legislations on a global scale. Collyer 2014 expands this mapping exercise using a global expert survey. Both studies emphasize the importance of historic path-dependent legacies, that arise for example out of colonialism. Rhodes and Harutyunyan 2010 and Turcu and Urbatsch 2015 works point to the importance of global norm diffusion to explain the global rise of diaspora enfranchisement laws. Both studies have used the IDEA Voting from Abroad database to conduct their quantitative analysis. Arrighi and Lafleur 2019 explore the extent to which states have enfranchised expatriates in not only national but also regional elections. Arrighi and Bauböck, 2016 discuss emigrant voting rights in relation to immigrant enfranchisement on the local level in Western democracies and Latin America. Both studies draw on the GLOBALCIT database for their statistical analysis. Finally, the edited volume of Emmerich and Olgún 2016 brings into conversation a large number of qualitative single case studies from different world regions that discuss the reasons why states extend voting rights to citizens residing abroad.

Arrighi, Jean Thomas, and Rainer Bauböck. 2016. "A Multilevel Puzzle: Migrants' Voting Rights in National and Local Elections." *European Journal of Political Research* 56 (3): 619–39.

This article analyzes trends in suffrage extension to non-resident citizens and resident aliens on the national and local level. The analysis of 31 European and 22 American countries reveals level-specific franchise patterns, according to which citizenship but not residency remains an important access requirement at the national level. In contrast, at the local level residency remains important while citizenship has, largely, lost significance. Both findings challenge existing theoretical conceptions in democratic theory.

Arrighi, Jean Thomas, and Jean Michel Lafleur. 2019. "Where and Why Can Expatriates Vote in Regional Elections? A Comparative Analysis of Regional Electoral Practices in Europe and North America." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (4). Taylor & Francis: 517–38.

This is a systematic account of external voting rights on the regional level in 17 European states, Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. The study finds that external voting on the national level has only partially been diffused vertically to the regional level. The authors identify a vast diversity in external regional electoral arrangements and use Flanders and Scotland for further in-depth analysis in order to unpack the factors shaping these patterns.

Blais, André, Louis Massicotte, and Antoine Yoshinaka. 2001. "Deciding Who Has the Right to Vote: A Comparative Analysis of Election Laws." *Electoral Studies* 20 (1): 41–62.

This is one of the first studies to include the dimension of external voting in the analysis of potential restrictions to universal suffrage. Based on a global sample of 63 democracies, the authors find that in 1996 most countries let non-citizens vote although to varying degrees. Former UK colonies are less open to enfranchise emigrants while established democracies appear more in favor to do so.

Collyer, Michael. 2014. "A Geography of Extra-Territorial Citizenship: Explanations of External Voting." *Migration Studies* 2 (1): 55–72.

Based on a global survey, this study finds that the majority of countries allows external voting. Moreover, the article highlights three patterns of electoral systems for emigrants voting. Countries that allow voting only upon return are mostly low-income countries that want to symbolically include emigrants. Countries with special representation include many former colonies. Countries that disenfranchise emigrants are characterized by difficult state-diaspora relationships.

Emmerich, Gustavo Ernesto, and Victor Alarcón Olgún. 2016. *Sugragio Transnacional y Extraterritorial. Experiencias Comparadas*. Mexico, D.F.: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana. Unidad Itzapalapa.

This edited volume presents past and new trends in emigrant voting rights in eight Latin American countries as well as Romania and Italy. Each chapter offers insights into processes of extraterritorial voter legislations and some chapters analyze those in relation to emigrants' electoral participation levels and their vote choice. Two additional chapters deal with the voting rights of immigrants.

Lafleur, Jean-Michel. 2011. "Why Do States Enfranchise Citizens Abroad? Comparative Insights from Mexico, Italy and Belgium." *Global Networks* 11 (4): 481–501.

This comparative study demonstrates that states enfranchise emigrants in order 1) to include them as an emigrant lobby, 2) to stimulate loyalty for economic benefits, and 3) that implementation dynamics are shaped by democratization processes and the electoral strategies of political parties. The uncertainty of the impact of the emigrant vote encourages parties to curtail the influence of emigrant votes via voting modalities, or specific configurations of the electoral system.

Rhodes, Sybil, and Arus Harutyunyan. 2010. "Extending Citizenship to Emigrants: Democratic Contestation and a New Global Norm." *International Political Science Review* 31 (4): 470–93.

The authors locate the analysis of the extension of emigrant voting rights in political science theories of former suffrage extension waves that included formally marginalized groups. The analysis shows that higher levels of regime competition lead to an extension of citizenship rights to emigrants. The timing of enfranchisement indicates support for a global norm dynamic. Finally, higher levels of development increase the likelihood of emigrant suffrage extension.

Turcu, Anca, and R. Urbatsch. 2015. "Diffusion of Diaspora Enfranchisement Norms: A Multinational Study." *Comparative Political Studies* 48 (4): 407–37.

The main argument of this article posits that states' cost-benefit structures are insufficient to explain the rise of external voting and highlights the importance of global norm diffusion mechanisms. The authors provide various ways of how to operationalize global norm diffusion, run several robustness tests and find overwhelming support for the global-norm hypothesis.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Much of the literature on why states grant voting rights to emigrants analyzes enfranchisement dynamics in Latin America and the Caribbean. These studies highlight the importance of the historical, political, and migratory context in the country of origin and the host countries, the latter traditionally being the United States. Many of these works use a comparative research design carving out the intra-regional differences. In contrast case studies have been used to a lesser extent, yet point to important country-specific dynamics. Levitt, and Dehesa 2003, Escobar 2007, and the edited volume by Navarro, Robles, Almaraz, Sánchez, and Escuita 2016 bridge both approaches, and provide a good entry into the field.

Finally, Escobar 2017 offers an up-to-date state of the art on external voting rights in the Latin American context.

Escobar, Cristina. 2007. "Extraterritorial Political Rights and Dual Citizenship in Latin America." *Latin American Research Review* 42 (3): 43–75.

This article argues that dual citizenship was granted as a result of immigrants' integration in host countries while external electoral rights are the result of the inclusion of emigrants in the political home country community following democratization processes. Yet, variations exist across countries depending on the main actors involved, namely the state, parties, and the diaspora.

Escobar, Cristina. 2017. "Migration and Franchise Expansion in Latin America. GLOBALCIT, Comparative Reports, 2017/01." GLOBALCIT, Comparative Reports, 2017/01.

This work offers a combined comparative analysis of dual citizenship and external electoral policies in Latin America. This report explains variation between countries in scope and timing of those policies based on differences in migratory patterns, migrants' socio-economic profiles, historic state-diaspora relationships and the political and electoral system of the origin state. The analysis centers on the state, political parties, and immigrant communities in the U.S.

Levitt, Peggy, and Rafael de la Dehesa. 2003. "Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26 (4): 287–611.

This article systematically maps sending states' diaspora policies with a special emphasis on external voting drawing on Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Mexico. The authors attribute convergence in policy out-reach to countries' structural economic (inter-) dependence and the emergence of new international norms while divergence in policies is driven by national-level dynamics, the size of the emigrant community, the institutional capacity of states and the role of political parties.

Navarro, Carlos, Alejandra Robles, Julia Almaraz, Mariana Sánchez, and José Luis Escuita. 2016. *El Voto En El Extranjero En 18 Países de América Latina*. Mexico; D.F.: Instituto Nacional Electoral (INE).

This book offers an overview on the external voting modalities, and the electoral systems in 18 Latin American countries. The second part of the book deals with the practical implications of organizing elections abroad (Ch. 6, 7), the transnational campaigns of political parties (Ch. 8), and voter participation rates in practice (Ch. 9).

Comparative Studies

In Latin America and the Caribbean, democratization processes have been important drivers for the franchise extension to non-resident citizens as discussed in more detail in the work of Itzigsohn and

Villacrés 2008. Bermudez, Escrivá, and Moraes 2014 analyze emigrant voting rights as part of states' broader policy approach towards emigrants. Belton 2019 scrutinizes the franchise extension to emigrants and immigrants in the Commonwealth Caribbean, an often neglected geographical region in the research field. In contrast, the works of Margheritis 2017, and Pallister 2020 emphasize the importance to further unpack the state. Similarly, Erlingsson and Tuman 2017 claim that leftist governments in the region are most likely to grant external voting rights, using the IDEA Voting from Abroad database and a longitudinal, large-N dataset.

Belton, Kristy A. 2019. "Muddy Waters: Citizenship and the Right to Vote in the Commonwealth Caribbean Migratory Context." *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 57 (1). Taylor & Francis: 93–122.

This work analyzes citizenship as a requirement to access voting rights among non-resident citizens and non-citizen residents in the context of the Commonwealth Caribbean. The author finds that the countries in this region do not follow global suffrage trends, given that noncitizens enjoy much more inclusive electoral rights than do the citizens residing abroad.

Bermúdez, Anastasia, Ángeles Escrivá, and Natalia Moraes. 2014. "Opportunities and Costs of the Political Transnational Field in the Context of Colombian, Peruvian and Uruguayan Migration to Spain." *Revista Via Iuris* 16: 141–57.

This article compares sending state out-reach to emigrants in the cases of Colombia, Peru, and Uruguay with a special emphasis on external voting rights and dual citizenship. The analysis highlights that the historical, political and migratory context shape states' motivation to grant their citizens residing abroad the right to vote.

Erlingsson, Hafthor, and John P. Tuman. 2017. "External Voting Rights in Latin America and the Caribbean: The Influence of Remittances, Globalization, and Partisan Control." *Latin American Policy* 8 (2): 395–312.

Using the IDEA Voting from Abroad database, and applying Cox proportional hazard regression models, this study analyzes determinants for the implementation of external voting rights in Latin America between 1980 and 2012. The study finds a non-linear remittance effect and that leftist governments are most likely to extend suffrage.

Itzigsohn, José, and Daniela Villacrés. 2008. "Migrant Political Transnationalism and the Practice of Democracy: Dominican External Voting Rights and Salvadoran Home Town Associations." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (4): 664–86.

Based on the Dominican Republic and El Salvador, this article critically assesses how different forms of political transnationalism intersect with states' motivation to extend suffrage to their citizens residing

abroad. The article pays particular attention to migrants' translocal development engagement as well as the democratisation processes and history of emigration in the countries of origin.

Margheritis, Ana. 2017. "The Inclusion Paradox of Enfranchising Expats in Latin America." *International Migration* 55 (2): 126–43.

This article analyzes why the extension of electoral rights in the cases of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay has remained little inclusive and presents some explanations. The main factors include the specific notions of nationality across the cases, the bureaucratic capacity of state institutions, the degree of organisation of civil society actors, as well as the importance of regional, neoliberal government projects.

Pallister, Kevin. 2020. "Migrant Populations and External Voting: The Politics of Suffrage Expansion in Central America." *Policy Studies* 41 (2–3). Taylor & Francis: 271–87.

This is an in-depth comparative analysis of El Salvador and Guatemala. The study identifies five factors that have shaped the timing of the implementation processes of expatriate voting rights in these two countries: Persistent emigrant lobbying, diffusion of international norms, parties' strategic calculations, states' resource constraints, and a busy electoral reform agenda that prioritized issues other than diaspora voting rights.

Single Case Studies

Several in-depth single case studies have engaged with the extension of voting rights to emigrants in Latin America. Hallett, and Baker-Cristales 2010 explore the reasons why the Salvadorian state denied non-resident citizens the right to vote (El Salvador enacted expatriate voting only in 2013). Domenech and Hinojosa 2009 unpack how government reservations towards emigrant voting were overcome in Bolivia, which enfranchised expatriates in 2009. Calderón Chelius 2017 explores the modifications of voting modalities in Mexico after external voting rights had been granted. Finally, Frizzo and Mascitelli 2017 trace in their book the development of external voting in Brazil from its beginnings up to the present day. Their analysis draws on qualitative interviews with policymakers, official documents, parliamentary debates, and other primary and secondary sources.

Calderón Chelius, Leticia. 2017. "Avances En La Implementación Del Voto Extraterritorial Mexicano. Entre Dudas y Certezas." *América Latina Hoy* 76: 75–92.

This article analyzes the consequences of the electoral reforms for distance voting in Mexico that preceded the 2006 and 2012 elections. It emphasizes the role of the administrative and bureaucratic actors involved.

Domenech, Eduardo, and Alfonso Hinojosa. 2009. "Emigración, Estado y Sociedad En Bolivia: La Reivindicación Del 'Voto En El Exterior.'" In *Población y Desarrollo. Bolivia y Los Fenómenos de La Migración Internacional*, edited by Manigeh Roosta, 84–107. Laura Salazar de la Torre: CIDES-UMSA.

This book chapter presents a thorough analysis of the emigrant enfranchisement process in Bolivia drawing on official documents and secondary sources. The analysis highlights as important factors the increasing visibility which migrants have acquired over the years preceding the implementation of the law, the historic relationship the Bolivian state had adopted with its citizens residing abroad, and the role of the MAS movement party.

Frizzo, Denise, and Bruno Mascitelli. 2017. *Brazilians Abroad: Emigrant Voting and Political Engagement*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

This book offers detailed insights into the history of external voting in Brazil. It uses original data, including interviews with migrants, association leaders, policy makers, and an online survey. The analysis puts a strong emphasis on the perspective of migrants.

Hallett, Miranda Cady, and Beth Baker-Cristales. 2010. "Diasporic Suffrage: Rights Claims and State Agency in the Salvadoran Trans-Nation." *Urban Anthropology* 39 (1–2): 175–211.

Based on transnational ethnographic fieldwork in El Salvador and the United States, this article investigates the tensions which arise between emigrant citizens who demand electoral inclusion, home country states which are reluctant to grant external voting rights, and the non-moving population who disfavors expatriate voting.

MENA Region

Some studies have focused on the enfranchisement processes in the Middle East and North Africa. By showing that these, often authoritarian, states grant voting rights to their citizens residing abroad, and why they do so, these studies move beyond some of the main explanatory approaches in the existing literature which center on processes of democratization and norm diffusion. Brand 2010, Jaulin and Nolan 2015 highlight how the political elite implements diaspora voting rights to consolidate their power and to strategically control the non-resident population. In addition to that Brand 2014 argues that civil society actors played an important role in demanding the right to vote in the MENA region, a pattern similar to the one in democratic countries. Overall, most of these studies are situated in a post-Arab Spring context and address the important question of how political change impacts the motivations of (former) authoritarian states to politically include their non-resident citizens. Jaulin 2016 has explored this question for the Tunisian case by analyzing the first elections held abroad after the transition to democracy.

Brand, Laurie A. 2010. "Authoritarian States and Voting from Abroad: North African Experiences." *Comparative Politics* 43 (1): 81–99.

This study presents the first in-depth analysis on why authoritarian states grant external voting rights using a comparative research design (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia). Brand argues that states portray external voting as a thickening of citizenship, but actually they use external voting as a tool to monitor, and control emigrants as well as to cultivate their loyalty and to reinforce the strength of the hegemonic party, in particular during politically difficult times.

Brand, Laurie A. 2014. "Arab Uprisings and the Changing Frontiers of Transnational Citizenship: Voting from Abroad in Political Transitions." *Political Geography* 41: 54–63.

This study examines how the Arab Spring affected provisions for external voting rights in Tunisia, Libya, Morocco, Yemen, and Jordan. The case selection includes countries with and without implemented external voting rights and the comparative analysis highlights the crucial role of civil society actors inside and outside the country, as well as the differences in how rights are implemented.

Jaulin, Thibaut, and Suzan Nolan 2015. "The Limits to External Voting Expansion in Arab Countries." *Afrique Contemporaine* 4 (256): 104–6.

A brief account of external voting rights in the Arab world that proposes some alternative explanations to the democratization and globalization argument that help explain in-regional cross-country variances across Arab countries. The author draws attention to the role of diaspora voting rights as a way for states to legitimize their power, and emphasizes the importance of regime type, regime changes, and political crisis.

Jaulin, Thibaut. 2016. "Geographies of External Voting: The Tunisian Elections Abroad since the 2011 Uprising." *Comparative Migration Studies* 4 (14): 1–19.

This study focuses on external voting in Tunisia and analyzes transnational voting patterns in the context of authoritarian succession, regime consolidation, and democratic transition. This article shows how the evolvement of external voter legislation is often dependent on the domestic process of political change.

Sub-Saharan Africa

There are relatively fewer studies on the enfranchisement of emigrants in Sub-Saharan Africa. The works of Hartman 2015 and Jaulin 2015 demonstrate, however, the benefits of conducting comparative research on the determinants for external voting rights in a region that is characterized by a large diversity of political systems, democratization, and nation formation processes (see also Wellman 2020 under *General Overview*). Bekoe, Burchard 2016, Wellman and Whitaker 2021 zero in on Kenya as an emblematic case where governments and parties successfully undermined access to transnational voting

because of economic or strategic electoral considerations. In contrast, Smith 2015 maintains that over time states may liberalize access to the voter box abroad using Senegal as a case study.

Bekoe, Dorina A., and Stephanie M. Burchard. 2016. "The Kenyan Diaspora in the United States and the 2013 Elections: When Money Does Not Equal Power." *Diaspora Studies* 9 (2): 128–40.

This article explores the relations between diaspora actors and national governments concerning the demand for external voting rights. The authors argue that divisions within the diaspora undermine its bargaining power to request more political participation. In turn the government maintains a diaspora agenda that prioritises economic development over political involvement. The study focuses on the 2013 Kenyan elections, but also refers to other African cases.

Hartmann, Christof. 2015. "Expatriates as Voters? The New Dynamics of External Voting in Sub Saharan Africa." *Democratization* 22 (5): 906–26.

This study provides the first comprehensive account of external voting rights in Sub-Sahara Africa covering all countries, including four in-depth case studies. It identifies two main waves of enfranchisement. The early wave followed state independence or electoral liberalization. The second and more recent wave occurred in response to domestic struggles. Migration patterns, remittances, and competitive party systems appear as important determinants for the implementation of emigrant voting rights.

Jaulin, Thibaut, and Étienne Smith. 2015. "Les Diasporas Africaines Aux Urnes. Généralisation et Pratiques Du Vote à Distance Introduction Thématique." *Afrique Contemporaine* 256 (4): 11–34.

This Special Issue introductory article for readers in French focuses on how external voting in Africa can be understood in the context of contemporary societal transformations. The authors identify patterns of emigrant suffrage extensions in Africa and refine some of the main explanatory approaches in the literature which argue states instrumentalize external suffrage to harness the diaspora, or that external voting occurs in response to democratization and international norm diffusion processes.

Smith, Étienne. 2015. "Sénégal, La Diaspora Fait-Elle l'élection?: Le Vote à Distance de 1992 à 2012." *Afrique Contemporaine* 256 (4): 51-72.

This article traces the evolution of external voting in Senegal. The country's democratisation process, the economically powerful diaspora, and partisan interests are the main factors to understand how and why external voting has been implemented, adapted, and made more inclusive over time in Senegal. While the diaspora vote had, so far, only a limited impact on the election outcomes, the article emphasises their symbolic importance.

Wellman, Elizabeth Iams, and Beth Elise Whitaker. 2021. "Diaspora Voting in Kenya: A Promise Denied." *African Affairs* Forthcoming.

This study challenges the assumption that high electoral competition encourages the inclusion of diaspora voters. Because Kenyan parties distrust each-other, and face great uncertainties as to how many Kenyans live abroad, and which party they favor they have agreed to enfranchise the diaspora only partially. The obstacles to cast a vote abroad are many as evidenced by the fact that only few residency countries have for polling stations at all.

Europe

Numerous studies investigate external voting in Europe. Most often researchers adopt a cross-regional perspective in conjunction with, for example, Latin American or North American cases (see *Cross-regional studies*). However, Pogonyi 2014 and Waterbury 2018's research on Eastern European countries draws attention to an important region-specific determinant, namely the role historic kin minorities play for the reasoning of states to grant voting rights to expatriates. The study of Şahin-Mencütek and Erdoğan 2016 confirms that some of the main explanatory variables from the literature apply to the Turkish case too, albeit to varying degrees. Honohan 2011 sheds light on the motivations of states to keep emigrants disenfranchised using Ireland as a 'negative case study'. Finally Mascitelli and Battiston 2009 highlight the role of host country governments in the process of conducting transnational elections focusing on the first Italian legislative elections organized abroad.

Honohan, Iseult. 2011. "Should Irish Emigrants Have Votes? External Voting in Ireland." *Irish Political Studies* 26 (4): 545–61.

This study offers an extensive discussion on the normative arguments for and against the enfranchisement of emigrants. The author then delves into the ongoing suffrage debate in Ireland and expounds on the reasons as for why Ireland has remained one of the few countries in Europe that still have not allowed expatriate voting.

Mascitelli, Bruno, and Simone Battiston. 2009. "Challenging the Australian Government Approach towards Expatriate Voting: The Case of Italy." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 44 (3): 513–19.

This study zeroes in on the attitude of host country governments towards the conduction of foreign elections on their territory. The analysis scrutinises the concerns of the Australian government to have Australian Italians running for the newly created extra-territorial constituency in Italy. The study draws on the correspondence between the government institutions between 1994 and 2007, and several elite interviews.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs. 2014. "Four Patterns of Non-Resident Voting Rights." *Ethnopolitics* 13 (2): 122–40.

This article argues that countries extend emigrant franchise depending on their type of emigration trajectory, and their relations with citizens abroad. Based on the experiences in East, Central and Southeast Europe, the author identifies four main types of migrants that encourage states to implement external voting rights: Temporary absentees (including refugees), economic migrants, exiles of past undemocratic regimes, and kin-minorities.

Şahin-Mencütek, Zeynep, and M. Murat Erdoğan. 2016. "The Implementation of Voting from Abroad: Evidence from the 2014 Turkish Presidential Election." *International Migration* 54 (3): 173–86.

The authors shed light on the processes that led to the enfranchisement of Turkish non-resident citizens. The argument is threefold. Emigrant lobbying is important, but not sufficient to encourage states to extend voting rights to expatriates. The electoral considerations of government parties are a necessary factor to take into account. Finally, broader diaspora engagement policies are a mediating factor.

Waterbury, Myra A. 2018. "Caught between Nationalism and Transnationalism: How Central and East European States Respond to East–West Emigration." *International Political Science Review* 39 (3): 338–52.

This article looks at general diaspora engagement policies in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Poland, but pays special attention to the extension of voting rights. The main argument posits that the demographic profile of the diaspora, as well as pre-existing political and institutional structures shaped by the relationship of states with their historical kin communities in neighboring countries, can best explain the variance across the four cases.

Asia

A vast number of countries in Asia have implemented external voting rights in practice, often already for a long time. Yet research of emigrant voting rights in Asia is significantly lagging behind. Several case studies address this lacuna. Carter 2011 approaches the subject of external voting in East Timor from a legal, normative perspective. Matsui 2007 looks through a similar lens at the voter legislations for Japanese emigrants. Low 2018 adopts a bottom-up approach and focuses on the activities of a transnational advocacy group that demands distance voting rights for Malaysian citizens residing abroad. Bavoleo 2018, Jaca and Torneo 2021 delve into the transnational voting behavior of Korean, and Filipino emigrants, respectively. Both studies include a historical background section on the evolution of external voter legislation in each country.

Bavoleo, Bárbara. 2018. "Korean Voters Overseas: Its History and the Development of the First Electoral Experience in Argentina." *México y La Cuenca Del Pacífico* 7 (19): 45–60.

This case study in Spanish highlights the historic development of emigrant voting rights in South Korea, which is one of the few countries that reversed its voter regulations, and then re-instated them decades later. The second part of the article zeroes in on the first elections after diaspora voting had been re-instated. The analysis puts special emphasis on voters residing in Argentina.

Carter, Caroline. 2011. "The Right to Vote for Non-Resident Citizens: Considered through the Example of East Timor." *Texas International Law Journal* 46 (3): 655.

This article assesses the granting of voting rights to non-resident citizens from a human rights-based approach, yet the author argues that the type of election and the general reasons for enfranchisement need to be considered. The arguments are illustrated using East Timor as a case study.

Jaca, Georgeline B., and Ador R. Torneo. 2021. "Explaining (Non) Participation in Overseas Voting: The Case of Overseas Filipino Voters in Japan in the 2016 Elections." *Diaspora Studies* 14 (1): 45–74.

This article offers some insightful background information on the history of the overseas voter legislations in the Philippines. In this regard, this study is particularly useful to those students and researchers who aim to explore out-of-country voting in the, so far heavily under-researched, Southeast Asian context.

Low, Choo Chin. 2018. "MyOverseasVote: Liberalism and Extraterritorial Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 22 (7). Routledge: 745–68.

This article delineates how transnational migrant collectives from Malaysia successfully organized to demand overseas voting rights, and how this demand interlinked with normative concerns raised in public discourses and parliamentary debates.

Matsui, Shigenori. 2007. "The Voting Rights of Japanese Citizens Living Abroad." *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 5 (2): 332–42.

This article traces the evolution of emigrant enfranchisement in Japan adopting a legal perspective. The analysis highlights the importance of the Supreme Court who ruled the disenfranchisement of non-resident citizens to be unconstitutional.

Special Emigrant Representation in National Parliaments

Some states have opted for a system of discrete representation that reserves seats in the national parliament for non-resident citizens. Collyer 2014 argues that these systems of representation provide a tool for states to maintain sovereignty over their citizens who reside abroad. His study systematically maps those states with special emigrant representation demonstrating that, as of October 2013, 13 countries worldwide have implemented this system indicating that it is a more recent trend. Indeed, as of August 2020, three more countries need to be added to this list, namely Guinea-Bissau (2014), Niger

(2016), and Senegal (2016). Moreover, in some other countries, the relevant law has been passed but not yet applied in practice (e.g. Angola, Lebanon, Peru). Palop-García 2017 broadens this scope and investigates systems of emigrant representation in Latin America on different institutional levels. Laguerre 2013 offers a comparative analysis of the implementation process of diaspora representation systems in three European countries. Lisi, Belchior, Abrantes, and Azevedo 2015 investigate the extra-territorial electoral system of Portugal, which reserves seats for emigrant MPs already since 1976.

Collyer, Michael. 2014. "Inside out? Directly Elected 'Special Representation' of Emigrants in National Legislatures and the Role of Popular Sovereignty." *Political Geography* 41. Elsevier Ltd: 64–73.

This study argues that special emigrant representation challenges the understanding of states as fixed territorial entities and conventional ideas of how sovereignty, democracy, and territoriality are interlinked. Collyer argues that states use extra-territorial representation to continuously define their citizens abroad as members of the state community in territorial terms, as well as to limit the potential impact of emigrant voting.

Laguerre, Michel. 2013. *Parliament and Diaspora in Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

The book theorizes the inclusion of the diaspora into the 'cosmonational parliament of the cross-border nation' drawing on a comparative research design that includes France, Italy, and Croatia. The analysis builds on multi-sited fieldwork that include elite interviews, extensive archival research and the analysis of parliamentary debates. It offers detailed accounts on the implementation processes of extra-territorial representation in these countries, and its broader implications for political party behavior.

Lisi, Marco, Ana Maria Belchior, Manuel Abrantes, and Joana Azevedo. 2015. "Out of Sight, Out of Mind? External Voting and the Political Representation of Portuguese Emigrants." *South European Society and Politics* 20 (2): 265–85.

The authors trace the evolution of external voting provisions in Portugal using a range of first and secondary data sources. Diverging interests of political parties and a disengaged civil society appear as the main factors responsible for an electoral system that has remained unfavorable towards representing emigrants since its implementation in 1976.

Palop-García, Pau. 2017. "Ausentes, Pero Representados: Mecanismos Institucionales de Representación de Emigrantes En América Latina y Caribe." *América Latina Hoy* 76: 15–34.

This article provides an exhaustive empirical account of the two main institutional mechanisms of emigrant representation: Active and passive electoral rights in legislative elections, and participation in national government advisory councils on the national level as well as those linked to consulates.

The discussion uses original data from 22 Latin American and Caribbean states, provided by the EMIX dataset, and draws on the academic debates on transnationalism and minority representation.

The Role of Political Parties and Elite Interests in enfranchising Emigrants

Over the course of the last two decades, many studies have taken into consideration the role of political parties in the enfranchisement process of emigrants. However, more recently some studies have placed the political party and elite interests in the very center of their analysis of the extension of suffrage to non-resident citizens. These studies unpack the relevance of domestic patterns of party competition, party-emigrant linkages, and the relationship between party ideology and rights of emigrants. Tether's 1994, and Collard's 2019 studies of the British case, as well as Wellman's 2015 research in South Africa, demonstrate that parties often try to block the implementation of external voting in contexts where an enfranchised emigrant electorate would benefit rival parties, and vice-versa. Indeed, Burgess 2018, 2020, and Paarlberg 2020 argue that the relationship which parties maintain with the citizens abroad shapes the institutional arrangement of the voting system, which can either encourage or suppress voter participation from abroad. Using an original large-N dataset Turcu and Urbatsch 2020 demonstrate that government parties who supported cross-border voting win disproportionate higher vote shares abroad. The edited volume of Kernalegenn and van Haute 2020 offers insights into how external voter regulations shape the cross-border behavior of political parties during electoral and non-electoral times.

Burgess, Katrina. 2018. "States or Parties? Emigrant Outreach and Transnational Engagement." *International Political Science Review* 39 (3): 369–83.

This article argues that either states or parties are the main drivers for the extension of voting rights to emigrants. Based on a most-different case design (Philippines, Mexico, Lebanon, Dominican Republic), this study demonstrates that each configuration yields different outcomes with regard to how emigrants engage with home country politics.

Burgess, Katrina (2020). *Courting Emigrants: How States make Diasporas and Diasporas make States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This book presents a framework for comparative analysis of emigrant voting rights as part of diaspora making strategies of states and political parties and as a channel of influence for emigrants from afar. Chapters go in-depth with the cases of Turkey, Dominican Republic, the Philippines and Mexico.

Collard, Susan. 2019. "The UK Politics of Overseas Voting." *Political Quarterly* 90 (4): 672–80.

The analysis examines the role of political parties in the enfranchisement of emigrants and subsequent revision of these rights in the United Kingdom. The analysis reveals that party politics dominated the implementation and law adaption process because the political parties had specific

expectations about who would electorally benefit the most from an overseas electorate, and made expatriate voting a highly contested partisan issue.

Kernalegenn, Tudi, and Emilie van Haute, eds. 2020. *Political Parties Abroad: A New Arena for Party Politics*. New York: Routledge.

This edited volume offers an entry point for those interested in the connections between external voting and political party behavior. The different case studies cover a wide range of geographical regions, political regimes, and electoral systems. Moreover, each chapter offers some background information on the external voter legislation in each country.

Paarlberg, Michael. 2020. "Anti-Party Skew and Variation in Diaspora Outreach by Mexican Parties." In *Political Parties Abroad*, edited by Tudi Kernalegenn and Emilie van Haute, 57–74. London: Routledge.

This study interlinks the highly restrictive voting regime in Mexico with the effort of political parties to mitigate the influence of diaspora voters. Because the PRI party assumed emigrants would support rival parties, it actively opposed external voting. However, pressure from the diaspora, civil society and other actors eventually forced the party to reconsider. In consequence, PRI supported the implementation of diaspora voting rights, but introduced bureaucratic hurdles to voting.

Tether, Philip. 1994. "The Overseas Vote in British Politics 1982–1992." *Parliamentary Affairs* 47: 73–93.

A very informative account of parties' positions concerning the extension and modelling of the overseas franchise system in the U.K. between 1982 and 1992. The second part of the article deals with the campaign activities of political parties abroad.

Turcu, Anca, and R. Urbatsch. 2020. "European Ruling Parties' Electoral Strategies and Overseas Enfranchisement Policies." *European Journal of Political Research*, 59(2): 269-289.

This study looks at whether the granting of external voting rights can create lasting positive, electoral gains for the political party that implemented the law and hence incentivizes parties to support emigrant enfranchisement. In their study on 23 European countries, the authors find that parties win disproportionate higher vote shares abroad when they have been incumbent at the time when external voting rights were granted.

Wellman, Elizabeth Iams. 2015. "Diaspora Voting in South Africa: Perceptions, Partisanship and Policy Reversal." *Afrique Contemporaine* 256 (4): 35–50.

This work investigates when and why states extend or abolish external voting using South Africa as an emblematic case. In South Africa, a democratization process led initially to an inclusion of diaspora voters while the electoral strategies of the political parties in power led to an exclusion of the diaspora hereafter. Finally, civil society actors were crucial for reinstating the voting right.

Main Databases

There are several datasets available for researchers interested in external voting. Each database differs in its geographical coverage, and the indicators it provides.

The IDEA Voting from Abroad database has been the first database on expatriate voting and has global coverage. Consequently, much of the work cited in this article has drawn on this database for background information, and some of the large-N quantitative studies have even used it to build the dependent variable for their regression analysis, see for example “Rhodes and Harutyunyan 2010 under *Cross-Regional Studies*”, and “or Turcu and Urbatsch 2015 under * Cross-Regional Studies *”. The Extraterritorial Voting Rights and Restrictions (EVRR) dataset is a still ongoing project coordinated by Allen, Wellman, and Nyblade 2020. Once finalized the dataset will enable researchers to analyze the *de jure* and *de facto* implementation of external voting around the world and across time using a large number of fine-grained election indicators.

Other databases have adopted a less global focus. The GLOBALCIT database includes comprehensive information on the different aspects of emigrant voting practices in the Americas, Europe, and Oceania. Moreover, the webpage hosts an immense number of country reports which contain relevant information on diaspora voting and beyond. Schmid, Piccoli, and Arrighi 2019 introduce the ELECLAW dataset which builds on the GLOBALCIT database. The ELECLAW dataset offers a condensed and quantified coding scheme of expatriates’ electoral rights suitable for statistical analysis. The EMIX dataset focuses on diaspora policies in Latin America, and the Caribbean and has a strong emphasis on the electoral rights of emigrants. Pedroza and Palop-García 2017 offer an introduction to the dataset. The IMISEM dataset extends these data collection efforts beyond Latin America, and, once finalized, will additionally include countries in Europe, and Asia.

Allen, Nathan, Elizabeth Iams Wellman, and Benjamin Nyblade. 2020. “EVRR Codebook v4” Extraterritorial Voting Rights and Restrictions Dataset Project.

The Extraterritorial Voting Rights and Restrictions (EVRR) is a global time-series dataset on external voting for 196 countries over 67 years (1950 – 2017). It covers 20 indicators of external voting procedures that capture the voting modalities and registration requirements for different election types. Furthermore, the dataset distinguishes between the legal adoption of extraterritorial voting rights (*de jure*), and their implementation in practice (*de facto*).

The Extraterritorial Voting Rights and Restrictions (EVRR) [<https://evrrdataset.com>]

IDEA online Database

The Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) Voting from Abroad online database is based on the original IDEA Handbook from 2007, and is continuously updated. It provides information on voting legislations for expatriate voting regarding election type and voting modalities, covering 216 countries. It should be noted that the first year of implementation in the database mainly refers to de jure and less consistently to de facto implementation. *Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. Voting From Abroad Database[<https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voting-abroad>]*

IMISEM

This still ongoing project collects data on migrants' political inclusion in origin and host countries. It will provide access to information on expatriate suffrage and other indicators for 30 countries covering Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia. *German Institute for Global and Area Studies. Every Immigrant Is an Emigrant: How Migration Policies Shape the Paths to Integration (MISEM) [<https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/project/every-immigrant-is-an-emigrant-how-migration-policies-shape-the-paths-to-integration>]*

GLOBALCIT

This database includes extensive information and data on various aspects of the electoral rights of expatriates. It covers the National Electoral Laws Database, and the Conditions for Electoral Rights database (covering Europe, the Americas, and Oceania) on active and passive electoral rights enjoyed by non-resident citizens, noncitizen residents, and citizen residents on all election levels. Finally, various country reports pay special attention to the electoral rights of non-resident citizens. *Global Citizenship Observatory (GLOBALCIT)[<https://globalcit.eu>]*

Pedroza, Luicy and Palop-García, Pau. 2017. "Diaspora policies in comparison: An application of the Emigrant Policies Index (EMIX) for the Latin American and Caribbean region." *Political Geography* 60: 165-178.

This dataset covers 22 states in Latin America and the Caribbean. It contains quantitative information on suffrage as one of many indicators on the diaspora policies of countries of origin: Active voting rights for emigrants (for which elections, conditions for voting, voting methods available, registration method, specific mode of representation), and passive voting rights (for which elections, under which mode of representation).

German Institute for Global and Area Studies. Emigrant Policies Index (EMIX): New Dataset on Diaspora Policies[<https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/data/emigrant-policies-index-emix-dataset>]

Schmid, Samuel D., Lorenzo Piccoli, and Jean Thomas Arrighi. 2019. "Non-Universal Suffrage: Measuring Electoral Inclusion in Contemporary Democracies." *European Political Science* 18 (4): 695–713.

The ELECLAW dataset measures differences in passive and active electoral inclusion between 1) expatriates, 2) resident citizens, and 3) non-citizen residents in the Americas, Europe and Oceania. Its indicators capture restrictions to eligibility and access in three types of election (presidential, legislative, referendum) and on different levels of government (supranational, national, regional, local). The dataset draws on the GLOBALCIT and its National Electoral Laws Database, and the Conditions for Electoral Rights database.

Global Citizenship Observatory (GLOBALCIT). Electoral Law Indicators [<https://globalcit.eu/electoral-law-indicators/>]