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Migration and Integration in Sweden

• How did the labour market integration processes evolve before Sweden became a net-immigration country?
  – Sweden became a net-immigration county only in the 1930s, but received considerable numbers of international migrants also earlier, of whom a majority settled in the larger cities.
  – These foreign migrants were accompanied by growing numbers of internal migrants, who likewise had to adopt to a new environment.
Different Views on 19th Century Labour Market Integration

- Chicago School of Sociology (1920s): the uprooted peasant
  - Newcomers on the edge of urban society.
  - Lack of crucial social network; Rural-to-urban migrants were uprooted disoriented, isolated and economically deprived.

- Thernstrom (1973): the floating proletariat thesis (Boston)
  - In-migrants were labourers with significantly smaller chances for social mobility than the natives.
  - Urban in-migrants perpetually on the move.

  - Stayers in late 19th century port cities (Marseille & Rotterdam) did much better than temporary migrants and sometimes even better than natives
Economic or Labour Market Integration of Migrants

- Is ‘the path by which labor market performance of migrants converges towards that of native born counterparts’ (Hums & Simpson 2004: 47)

- In our paper: the incidence and timing of upward social mobility of migrants in Stockholm as a proxy of economic integration, 1878-1926
  - The more migrants experienced upward mobility and the earlier it occurred, the easier it was for migrants to find their way in the labour market
  - Searching for individual and structural determinants of the incidence and timing of upward social mobility
Event History Analysis

- Cox (1978) proportional hazard model
- Analysis includes only migrants who arrived at age 18 and natives who were continuously present from birth till the 18th birthday
- Only people included who practiced an occupation at age 18 (Avoiding left-censoring)
- Only persons who were single at the start of observation.
- Downward mobility is not treated as right-censoring
- Only first upward mobility is treated as ‘failure’-event.

Conceptual Model: Event History Analysis Upward Mobility

- Native: Turning 18
- Migrant: Arrival at age 18
- Failure: Upward Mobility
- Censoring:
  - Death
  - Out-Migration
  - Turing 50
  - Marriage (women)
  - Registration End

Age 18 Time at Risk 32 Years (Max)
Variables and Hypotheses (I)

- **Mobility:** Natives had a higher ‘risk’ of upward mobility than migrants
  - Migrants had to adapt to the local labour market and obtain specific local human capital
  - Migrants lacked often a social network

- **Sex:** Men had better chances than women: Male breadwinner model
  - Women expected to stop working outside the household once they got married, which might have resulted in lower ambitions
  - Men invested in their careers, as they were responsible for the financial well-being of the family.

- **Social class:** Skilled labourers had the best chances
  - Persons within Upper-class persons had few possibilities to climb.
  - Unskilled labourers had limited human capital in terms of education and skills.
  - Skilled labourers had the right combination of human capital and “upward space”.

- **Period:** The later in time, the higher the chances for upward mobility
  - Industrialisation stimulated the development of meritocratic societies
Variables and Hypotheses (II)

- **Rural/urban:** Better chances for the urban born and raised
  » They had more urban experience and thus lower needs of adaption

- **Region**
  Swedish-born had the best chances, but Nordic migrants had better chances than other foreigners
  » Swedish-born had country-specific human capital
  » Scandinavian speakers had no or very small language problems
  » Within Sweden, we expect those migrants from close regions to have better chances than migrants from remoter regions.

- **Neighbourhood:** People in Klara had the best chances
  » Klara offered the best “mix” of migrants with human capital and an occupational structure open for social advancement
  » Södermalm and Kungsholmen: unskilled labourer areas
  » Östermalm: upper-class inhabitants that couldn’t climb higher
  » Old Town: economic recession
Data

- Our data stems from the Stockholm Historical Database (SHD)
  - A Database based on the “Roteman” registration system
  - Longitudinal population register with yearly updates (including occupational changes)
  - Unusual good source for historical studies of social mobility

- Dataset originates from a 2011 SHD-retrieval
  - Random sample which includes every first person
    - having their first date of entrance between 1878-1915
    - being present in the “covered area” when the registration began

- We selected
  - All migrants who arrived at age 18 (n=3172)
  - All natives who were continuously present until their 18th birthday (n=936)
  - Those migrants and natives that were unmarried at age 18 and practised a registered occupation
Stockholm in the late 19th and early 20th centuries

- **Demographic development**
  - Stockholm’s population grew from 93,000 inhabitants in 1850 to more than 500,000 in 1930
    - Migration important: high share of non-native born
    - Some foreign, but mainly rural Swedish migrants

- **Sweden’s capital turned into the country’s first industrial district**

- **Stockholm’s port played an important role in the city’s economic development**
  - Employment opportunities
  - Steamship connections
Results and Reservations

• Important to underline: the outcomes refer only to
  – natives who were continuously present in Stockholm, unmarried and practiced an occupation at age 18
  – migrants who arrived as singles at age 18 and practiced an occupation on arrival.

Because of these selection results might not apply for

• migrants who arrived earlier or later
• natives who were not continuously present in Stockholm
• people who were married at age 18
• people who were unemployed or still studying at their 18th birthday
• foreign migrants are highly underrepresented, because of the applied selection criterions.

– With this in mind, we found the following remarkable results
Migrants had a higher hazard ratio for upward mobility than natives.
Males had lower hazard ratio's than females
People from the middle class, and skilled workers had a smaller risk of experiencing upward mobility compared to unskilled workers.

Results for elite not reliable, because of small number of observations.
People who were born in the countryside enjoyed considerably better chances of experiencing upward mobility than people who grew up in a city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.0715</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-1890</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1905</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1915 (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunnkyrka</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klara</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kungsholmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodermalm</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostermalm (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad and Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm City (Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. of subjects | 3434 | 3424 | 3081 | 3424 |
| No. of Failures | 639  | 639  | 593  | 639  |
| Log likelihood  | -4659.7727 | -4658.0262 | -4261.6419 | -4655.3918 |
| LR ch2          | 53.50 | 56.99 | 57.24 | 62.26 |
| Prob>Chi2       | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
Overview of Results

- Migrants have a higher risk than natives
- Females had a higher risk than males
- Chances for upward mobility were smaller among skilled workers and people from the middle class compared to unskilled workers
- The ‘risk’ of upward mobility was higher in the period 1890-1905 compared to the years 1905-1915.
- Apart from Södermalm, the results in model 2 were not significant for neighborhood.
  - People in Södermalm had a 19.9% higher chance of upward mobility compared to the inhabitants of Östermalm
- Migrants from Stockholm County and wider Central Sweden had better chances of climbing up the social ladder than natives (according to model 4)
- The results for international migrants and migrants from other regions within Sweden were not significant.
  - In the case of international migrants this can be ascribed to a limited number of observations.
Conclusions

- Stockholm was a very open society with little room for discrimination, as all kinds of minority groups ranging from women, unskilled workers and all sorts of newcomers enjoyed higher chances for social upward mobility than the majority groups.

- The economic integration of newcomers within Sweden, especially also former country dwellers seems to have happened smoothly.
  - In line with Leo Lucassen (2004) and Sewell (1985)
  - Contradicts the findings of the Chicago School of Sociology.

- Conclusions are preliminary
  - migrants who upon arrival became unemployed or were still studying do not make part of the analysis and could alter the over-all picture.
  - to make better grounded conclusions, it would be wise to investigate also other proxies of economic integration like unemployment rates and wage levels.
  - But for the moment it looks like what Chriswick has described for post-war migrants in America is also applicable to migrants in Stockholm in the period: 1878-1915:
    - "economic migrants are described as tending on average to be more able, ambitious, aggressive, entrepreneurial, or otherwise more favourably selected than similar individuals who choose to remain in their place of origin." (Chriswick 1999:181)
How do we proceed?

• Include also other age groups to check whether our results are also applicable to the larger Stockholm population.
  – Age at arrival can then be added as a control variable.

• Try to get an even better insight into the determinants of upward mobility among migrants
  – for example, include information on the last residence, the travelled distance to Stockholm and the household composition.

• Analyse downward mobility with the same dataset.

• Include interaction-effects into the analysis, especially migrants#social class & social class#neighbourhood

• We are still preparing a comparison of social mobility in Stockholm, Antwerp and Rotterdam. A different approach will be necessary. Postponed for Vancouver 2012