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Abstract

In four scientific papers, this thesis investigates the processes, in terms of movements of individuals, that have produced, reproduced and transformed patterns of residential segregation in Swedish cities between 1990 and 2000.

Paper 1 examines processes of immigrant concentration, and the role of the Swedish majority population in these processes. Neighbourhood transition and mobility are described and analysed for a selection of residential areas that have experienced increased immigrant concentration. The results show that low in-migration rate among Swedes, rather than high out-migration rate, has been the main driving force behind the production and reproduction of immigrant concentration areas.

Paper 2 investigates the hypothesis that distressed neighbourhoods retain their character of distress through selective migration. The socio-economic situations of in-migrants, out-migrants and stayers in the distressed neighbourhoods of Stockholm are analysed and compared, and the results show the hypothesis to be confirmed. The people who move in are more likely to be unemployed and dependent on social benefits, and have on average lower incomes than those who move out and those who remain in the neighbourhoods.

Paper 3 further investigates the selective character of the out-migration from distressed neighbourhoods. One important conclusion is that the out-migration flow from the distressed residential areas is socio-economically and ethnically selective. When demographic and socio-economic differences are controlled for, the likelihood of leaving the distressed neighbourhoods is much lower for an immigrant than for a Swedish-born person.

Paper 4 examines the migration flows of a whole city, Göteborg. The paper deals with some of the most common questions within segregation research; the degree of spatial concentration of different ethnic groups, processes of concentration and dispersal, the role of the minority enclaves as ports of entry to the local housing market, and how this differs between ethnic groups.
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1. Introduction

Swedish cities are, like many other Western European cities, characterized by a spatial division between the native population and different immigrant minorities. In Sweden, this ethnic residential segregation also has socio-economic connotations. To put it bluntly, Swedish high-income households live in certain parts of the cities while low-income immigrant households live in other parts, often at a considerable distance from one another. Residential segregation has intensified over the years, especially during the 1990s, when Sweden experienced a severe economic recession. This has led to an increased awareness of the problems of residential segregation, among scholars as well as in the political sphere. There is a great demand for knowledge about the causes and effects of residential segregation, and for solutions to problems associated with segregation.

Residential segregation is, however, far from an unexplored field of research. There exists a relatively well-established body of knowledge concerning the manifestations of the phenomenon, both on a general level and applied to specific cases, e.g. the three major cities of Sweden (Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö). Different theories have been proposed over the years in order to explain the phenomenon: differences in preferences between Swedes and immigrants, differences in socio-economic and other resources, and differences in restrictions, in the housing market as well as in other fields of society (more on this in Chapter 2).

This thesis is not yet another attempt at finding the explanation to residential segregation. Instead, the thesis will shed some light on how the segregated city ‘works’– how patterns of segregation are produced and reproduced, how specific areas become ‘immigrant-dense’, how the low-income character of distressed neighbourhoods is reproduced, and how positions of individuals and groups in patterns of segregation change over time. The fact that segregation patterns tend to be relatively stable over time does not necessarily mean that individuals and groups remain in the same positions within them. For some groups, spatial concentration to the least desirable parts of the city is likely to be a temporary experience, while for others these areas run the risk of becoming permanent dead ends. More knowledge is needed about issues such as these in order to understand and ‘deal with’ the segregated city. In short, more knowledge is needed about the dynamic and relational aspects of the segregated city. And this is where the thesis makes a contribution.
The thesis consists of this introductory part, followed by four scientific papers, all dealing with different aspects of the processes, in terms of movements of individuals, that produce and reproduce patterns of residential segregation. The empirical material for all four papers is taken from the GEOSWEDE00 database, which is a longitudinal, geocoded set of information comprising all individuals that were residing in Sweden between 1990 and 2000 (described in detail in Chapter 3). Thus, the empirical context of the thesis is Swedish cities during the 1990s, but the results should be of interest also for segregation research in other national contexts, especially other Western European countries with relatively large immigrant populations.

Background – residential segregation in Swedish cities

The concept of residential segregation has in Sweden become associated with a certain kind of residential areas. Generally, the concept is used in reference to residential areas situated on the outskirts of the largest cities – areas where average income levels are low, unemployment rates are high and there are high levels of welfare expenditures and signs of bad health situations for many residents. Another distinct characteristic is the concentration of immigrants, mainly of non-European origin. The proportion of native Swedes is generally much lower here than in other parts of the cities. Many of these so called ‘segregated residential areas’, but far from all, are situated in the large scale housing estates that were built between 1965 and 1974, during the so called ‘Million Homes Programme’ (MP) period – estates consisting of rental housing owned and maintained by the municipal housing companies. These ‘segregated residential areas’ are of course only one side of the segregation phenomenon. In other parts of the cities we find the high-income, primarily Swedish, owner occupation neighbourhoods that constitute the other side, and these neighbourhoods are in some ways more homogeneous than the low-income areas (Andersson, 2000a).

This intertwine of the socio-economic and ethnic dimensions of segregation is a defining characteristic of residential segregation in Sweden. The poorest residential areas nearly always have a high proportion of immigrants. Therefore, neighbourhoods that can be regarded as distressed or deprived can usually also be referred to as ‘immigrant-dense’ (invandrartäta) residential areas, which is the usual term in Sweden for what in international research is more often called immigrant concentration areas, or even minority enclaves or ethnic enclaves. However, all immigrant concentration areas are

---

1 The Million Homes Programme was a political initiative from the Social Democratic government, introduced in 1965 with the aim of overcoming housing shortages and modernizing the housing stock by constructing one million new dwelling units over a period of 10 years.
not poor. There do exist more affluent neighbourhoods with a large proportion of immigrants, often situated in close proximity to the MP estates. Södra Fittja in the southern part of greater Stockholm is one example (Andersson, 2002).

Even though much of the public debate on residential segregation has focused on the three largest cities, Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö, the phenomenon is not restricted to these cities. Small and medium-sized cities also experience segregation (see for example Bråmå, 2004). The crucial difference between large and small cities has to do with scale, and thus the effects of segregation. In a large city, the distressed and/or ‘immigrant-dense’ areas might cover whole city districts, while in a smaller city or town they usually only cover a few, separate residential areas, or just parts of residential areas. The small-scale spatial differentiation of a smaller city will not affect everyday life to the same extent as the large-scale differentiation of the larger city; meeting-places and spaces for social interaction will not be separated to the same extent (Andersson, 1999, 2000a).

The studies that make up the thesis all deal with ‘segregated residential areas’ situated in large as well as smaller Swedish cities. Most of the areas can be regarded as both distressed and ‘immigrant-dense’, though these labels should be interpreted in a relative sense. The socio-economic situation is worse there than in most other areas of the city they belong to, and the proportion of native Swedish residents is lower.

**Aim of the thesis**

Central to the thesis is the belief that the patterns of residential segregation that can be observed at specific points in time are first and foremost the results of individual migration. The distribution of different population categories over the different sub-areas of a city is mainly the result of how people have moved (or not moved), within the city as well as to and from the surrounding world. By studying these migration flows it is therefore possible to gain knowledge of how patterns of residential segregation are produced and reproduced, whether the focus of interest is on the overall population distribution within the city or on the development in specific residential areas.

Central is also the notion that residential segregation is a relational phenomenon. The concentration of certain population categories to certain parts of the city is always accompanied by a concentration of other population categories to other parts of the city. The existence of residential areas dominated by low-income immigrant households is accompanied by the existence of residential areas dominated by high-income Swedish households. Thus, segregation can never be understood by focusing only on the parts of the city where the problems of segregation are most salient. The study of migration flows makes the relational character of segregation more visible. By study-
ing flows and not just patterns, the relational character becomes much more clear – also when focusing solely on the ‘problem’ areas. It simply becomes more obvious how dependent the development in these areas is on what is happening elsewhere in the city, and in the surrounding world.

Following from this, the overarching aim of the thesis is to describe and analyse the processes, in terms of movements of individuals, that have produced and reproduced patterns of residential segregation in Swedish cities during the 1990s. This rather general aim is common for all papers. In addition to that, each paper has its own, more narrowly defined aim, often in the form of evaluating a specific hypothesis, or a set of hypotheses, deriving either from specific explanatory frameworks within segregation theory or from the Swedish debate on residential segregation. The topics vary from studies of the migration flows to and/or from specific residential areas (Paper 1 and Paper 3), via studies of the migration flows to and from a whole category of residential areas (Paper 2), to studies of migration flows within the city as a whole (Paper 4). Two of the papers focus specifically on the ethnic dimension of segregation (Paper 1 and Paper 4), while the remaining two primarily deal with the socio-economic dimension, although the ethnic dimension is touched upon as well (Paper 2 and Paper 3).

The approach is essentially descriptive. The purpose is first and foremost to describe aspects of residential segregation that have not been thoroughly investigate before, e.g. how migration changes the population composition in specific residential areas, or groups of areas, and how migration changes the population distribution between different area types within a city. This has been possible by the availability of a very rich, and internationally unique, empirical material. The detailed accounts of the character, destinations and origins of migration flows necessary for such descriptions are dependent on the availability of longitudinal, individual-based, geo-coded data of the kind found in the GEOSWEDE database.

Outline of the thesis

The introductory part

The scientific papers that constitute this thesis are essentially self-contained, i.e. they can be read and (hopefully) understood independently from one another. But since they share a common theme, they also form a larger totality together; there are findings that go beyond what each individual paper reveals. One important purpose of this introductory part is to elaborate on these issues. In addition to that, there are a number of questions that cannot be addressed – and aren’t supposed to be addressed – in the papers, given the limited space available in a scientific paper and the rather rigid structure a scientific paper is supposed to adhere to. The questions range from broader
issues related to the wider research field and the place of my research within it, to detailed questions concerning data and research design. These questions also belong in this introductory part.

The remainder of the introductory part is structured as follows: The final section of the first chapter briefly outlines the subject of each of the four papers. This is then followed by a chapter describing the theoretical points of departure for the thesis. The third chapter deals with methodological issues, data and research design. Finally, with that as a background, the fourth chapter gives a more detailed summary of each of the papers, together with concluding findings and suggestions for further research.

The papers

The first paper deals with the processes that produce and reproduce immigrant concentration areas. In nearly every Swedish city and town there are residential areas that could be considered ‘immigrant-dense’. But in most cases, it has not always been so. Over a longer or shorter period of time the areas in question have lost Swedish residents. How have this happened? And how have Swedes acted in these processes? This paper is placed as Paper 1, not because it was the first one I finished, but because this study was the first one that I started working on. The paper has been accepted for publication in Urban Studies (probably June 2006).

Paper 2 is an article that I have written together with my supervisor, Professor Roger Andersson. We investigate a widely held assumption within segregation research, namely the hypothesis that distressed neighbourhoods retain their character of distress through selective migration. The distressed character of the neighbourhoods is believed to be reproduced by the out-migration of relatively well-off residents, who are then replaced by poorer, more marginalised groups. The article is published Housing Studies (July 2004).

The third paper is another Andersson – Bråmå collaboration, this time a chapter in a volume where researchers involved in the European research project RESTATE have published findings from work conducted within the project (van Kempen et al, 2005). Here, we have the opportunity to further investigate the selective character of the out-migration from distressed neighbourhoods, and the main question concerns the differences between stayers and out-migrants.

Finally, Paper 4 is the last paper that was written. It constitutes something of a follow-up of different subjects that have been touched upon in the preceding papers. The perspective is rather different from the other papers in that it deals with a whole city, Göteborg, and the migration flows between different area types within it. The paper deals with some of the most common questions within segregation research; the degree of spatial concentration of different ethnic groups, processes of concentration and dispersal, the
role of the minority enclaves as ports of entry to the local housing market, and how this differs between ethnic groups. Paper 4 has not been published anywhere else yet, but will be submitted to an appropriate scientific journal, probably *Population, Space and Place*. 
2. Theoretical points of departure

Explaining ethnic residential segregation

Residential segregation has for long been a central subject within urban and social geography. But not only geographers have been interested in segregation. On the contrary, when studying residential segregation you have to relate to theories from many different subjects within the social sciences and the humanities. Research on residential segregation also encompasses different fields of interest, from research concerned with causes to studies on the effects of neighbourhood-level social composition on individual life chances, from aggregate level studies of patterns to research on individual residents’ experiences from living in the segregated city.

One of the main issues within segregation research has always been to explain why the residential patterns of immigrants and other ethnic minorities differ from that of the majority population, i.e. why minority group members tend to live concentrated to certain parts of the city. In this section, I will give a brief description of what I see as the most influential explanatory frameworks concerning the ethnic dimension of residential segregation. The account begins with the Chicago school sociologists and their explanatory framework, urban ecology, since this has been the major influence for the understanding of ethnic residential segregation in general, and the understanding of processes of segregation in particular. Their notion of a close association between the degree of assimilation and the degree of spatial dispersal is still influential, and most alternative interpretations have originated from a critique of this notion. The other two frameworks described here represent two major lines of critique. According to the first, spatial dispersal is not always desired, while according to the second, it is not always possible. The ordering of the perspectives is not strictly chronological, but reflects the order in which these frames of explanation have been introduced in Swedish segregation research and debate (more on this further below).

Urban ecology

Urban (or human) ecology is the term applied to the theory developed by sociologists at the University of Chicago during the 1910s and 1920s (the Chicago School), with Robert Park as the leading scholar. The Chicago School sociologists applied concepts and theories obtained from the study of animal and plant ecology to the study of human communities. Society was
thought of as an organism, where each constituent part is symbiotically linked to all others in a web of relations formed around competition and cooperation. Competition over limited resources sorts individuals based on their abilities, and individuals with similar abilities are formed into groups. These ‘natural groups’, or communities, find appropriate occupational and residential niches in society, in much the same way as animal or plant species settle in places where the environment favours their specific genetic composition (Johnston et al, 1994, pp. 61-64).

Based on this theory, Ernest Burgess developed a model of the physical structure of the city. According to Burgess, the sorting mechanisms provided by competition resulted in a city made up of well defined geographical zones, e.g. the central business district, the zone in transition where ‘weak’ groups lived, a belt of working-class areas, and, furthest from the city centre, a ring of suburbs housing the middle-class (ibid).

Burgess was also interested in the processes within the city, and saw similarities in how the introduction of new commercial enterprises and new population groups affected the city. The arrival of newcomers was believed to lead to processes of invasion and succession resembling the ecological processes put in motion when a new species invades an ecosystem. When a new group of immigrants arrived in the city they were forced to take up residence in the most run-down, socially deprived parts of the inner city (the zone in transition), thus invading the habitat of earlier immigrant groups. These earlier groups would, in turn, invade better residential areas, further from the city centre, as they gradually became assimilated into American society. Seen from the perspective of one specific zone of the city, then, there would over time be a succession of new groups replacing earlier groups (Burgess, 1925/1976). These processes of invasion and succession were perceived to have a system-stabilising function. They were believed to reproduce the internal structure of the city rather than change it. By continuously rearranging the population groups within the city the processes enabled the city to remain in equilibrium, and thus to retain its harmonious state (ibid.).

Burgess saw his model as an ideal type, and argued that these zones could be found in practically all cities (ibid). During the following decades, many scholars from various fields within social science, not least geography, set out to identify these zones in other cities across the world. It gradually became apparent that the model was less general than Burgess had believed. Though areas with essentially the same function as those described by Burgess could be found in most cities, the spatial organisation varied between cities, and countries, and had its roots in historical, space-specific development (see for instance Schnore, 1965). The underlying ecological theory has also been the subject of much criticism, both on the grounds of its ‘biologism’ and because of its normative content, i.e. the implicit notion that what was functionally harmonious was also ‘good’ (Johnston et al, 1994, p. 63).
Despite these criticisms, Burgess’ model of invasion and succession remains to date the most influential attempt at constructing a model of the city as a system, describing its constituent parts and their roles within this totality, as well as the directions and compositions of the flows between different sub-parts.

Questioning spatial dispersal I – voluntary ethnic clustering

The ‘voluntary ethnic clustering’ perspective (or ‘multicultural’ perspective) emerged as a critique of the assimilationist view of the urban ecology framework, i.e. the underlying assumption that all minority group members were to – and wished to – be assimilated into the dominant majority culture. These views, it was argued, legitimate the cultural hegemony of the dominant ethnic group (Dunn, 1998; Cater and Jones, 1989, pp. 152-154). Central to this ‘multicultural’ perspective is a belief that all aspects of assimilation might not be desired by all minority group members. Following Boal (1987), socioeconomic assimilation, meaning proportionate distribution of income, occupation and education, will be desired but not necessarily cultural assimilation, i.e. the incorporation of behavioural patterns of the host society.

According to the ‘voluntary ethnic clustering’ frame of explanation, then, spatial concentration to the minority enclaves continues because minority group members choose to remain closely together even when they have a choice to move to other parts of the city. The reason for this is that the ethnic enclave brings a number of advantages to its residents. The ethnic enclave can function as a territorial base for mutual support and for the development of ethnic institutions and businesses, it can serve as a base for the preservation and promotion of the members’ own cultural heritage, traditional cultural patterns and group identity, and it can function as a base for political action (Boal, 1976; see also Knox and Pinch, 2000, pp. 234-238).

This explanatory framework was strong in British segregation research during the 1970s and early 1980s, where the residential patterns and housing situations of various Asian groups were interpreted in terms of culturally founded preferences, where the ‘myth of return’ played an important role (van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998; Cater and Jones, 1989, pp. 152-154).

It should be noted that the difference between this frame of explanation and that of the urban ecologists is not so much a difference in how the settlement patterns of newly arrived immigrants are understood. Proponents of the urban ecology perspective saw this as a result of both cooperation and competition – cooperation within each ‘natural group’ and competition between them. But for the urban ecologists, living in minority enclaves was seen only as a temporary phenomenon, an inevitable phase on the way to assimilation. Once you had the means, you would invariably choose to move out – and this is essentially what the ‘multicultural’ perspective questions.
Questioning spatial dispersal II – enforced ethnic clustering

The second line of critique of the urban ecology notion of spatial dispersal is not one unitary theory, but rather a shared perspective among different scholars who, with different theoretical underpinnings, argue that the continued spatial concentration of minority groups has to do with restrictions rather than preferences. Minority groups members, it is argued, are forced to remain in the minority enclaves because they are denied entrance into the host society. Thus, spatial concentration to the minority enclaves is a kind of ‘enforced ethnic clustering’ – the result of different types of restrictions, in the housing market as well as in other spheres of society, that obstruct assimilation and/or spatial dispersal.

One perspective within this framework is the ‘managerialist’ approach, with leading names such as Rex and Moore (1967) and Pahl (1975). ‘Managerialism’, which is more of a research programme than an actual theory, focuses on key actors in the housing market, labelled ‘gatekeepers’ or ‘urban managers’, and the formal and informal rules, regulations and practices that control access to different parts of the housing market. Examples of influential gatekeeper institutions include banks and other financial institutions, estate agents, property developers and building societies (Cater and Jones, 1989, pp. 51-53; Knox and Pinch, 2000, pp. 180-196) Local authorities also have considerable power over who gains access to ‘their’ housing stock, and to which parts. Immigrants might be disqualified because of insufficient length of residence in the city (Rex and Moore, 1967) or because they are foreign citizens (Giffinger, 1998).

Another perspective originated from American studies that had shown that the model of assimilation and dispersal never seemed to have applied to the African-American minority (see Massey and Denton, 1993, for an overview). This led critics to claim that assimilation was less valid a model when applied to inter-racial, as opposed to inter-ethnic, relations. Evidence showed that it was much more difficult for sub-populations whose alien status is more visible and permanent to gain entrance to, and acceptance by, the host society (Cater and Jones, 1989, p. 144). During the 1970s, radical American scholars argued, with influence from the black nationalist movement, that this was a result of racism that had its roots in centuries of colonisation, by which non-white peoples had been politically subjugated and economically exploited by white nations (ibid., p. 148).

The view that residential segregation of minority groups has a racial rather than ethnic basis was later taken up by British scholars (Smith, 1989, is perhaps the most well-known example). According to this view, segregation is the result of racism that pervades society and serves to maintain white supremacy, and the concomitant subordination of non-whites. Racism and discrimination are thus considered to be structural phenomena. This structural (or institutional, the terms vary) discrimination permeates the legal
framework and government policies, as well as the practices of key institutions in the housing market. Residential segregation is one effect among many of the exclusionary practices that result from this discrimination, but segregation also serves to reproduce racism and sustain material inequalities between racial categories (Knox and Pinch, 2000, p. 229).

The main difference between these two interpretations of the ‘enforced ethnic clustering’ idea is that the ‘managerialist’ approach is primarily actor-oriented rather than structural. It emphasises the role of institutions, and individuals working within them, as active agents who, by formulating rules and establishing practices, have a substantial influence on who is allowed and who is denied access to different neighbourhoods and/or housing market segments. ‘Managerialists’ rarely interpret the practices of urban managers and gatekeepers as part of a larger structure of supremacy and subordination. If minority group members are treated unfairly, it is usually either interpreted as an unintended effect of formal rules and procedures, or as the intended results of individual racism or prejudice. Pahl, for instance, argued that gatekeepers would allocate resources according to their own “implicit goals, values, assumptions and ideologies” (Pahl, 1975, p. 265), which meant that racist or stereotyped opinions might influence their decisions.

**Swedish interpretations**

Ever since it became apparent that there was an ethnic dimension to segregation in Swedish cities, as well as a socio-economic, the main issue within Swedish segregation research has been to explain the differences between the residential patterns of ‘the immigrants’ and those of the native Swedish population. Explanations have varied over time, but often one explanation has dominated over others, thus constituting something of an ‘official’ explanation for that specific period. The distance between research and politics has never been very large, which means that new research findings and interpretations quickly have found their way to the political sphere. The reports of various immigration, metropolitan and housing policy commissions is therefore as good a source as any for tracing how the explanations have changed over time.

Initially, the dominant view was that ethnic segregation in reality was a form of socio-economic segregation. Immigrants shared the situation of other groups who, because of a lack of social and economic resources, had a disadvantaged position in the housing market (SOU 1974:69; SOU 1984:36; SOU 1986: 5). During the 1980s, this view was challenged by the interpretation that put more emphasis on immigrants’ own desire to ‘stick to their own kind’. The general argument was that this was a strategy adopted by the newly arrived, as a way of mobilising intra-ethnic resources and finding security in a new country (see for example Andersson-Brolin, 1984; Biterman, 1989). While these alternative interpretations differ in terms of whether
the main reason has to do with constraints or preferences, both views share the general belief that spatial concentration is a temporary phenomenon linked to being a newcomer in Sweden. As I see it, the early interpretations are therefore more in line with the urban ecology notion of a strong association between assimilation and spatial dispersal than with the multicultural view of voluntary ethnic clustering, even though there were proponents of a more strictly multicultural view as well (see for example Pripp, 1991). Be that as it may, the combination of views that emphasised the transient nature of segregation and interpretations that focused on immigrants’ free choice tended to nurture the view that ethnic residential segregation was rather unproblematic. It was ‘their’ own choice, and even if it was not, it would disappear anyway as time went on.

Gradually this ‘unproblematic’ interpretation began to be questioned, as more and more findings suggested that the assimilation (or integration) of newer (refugee) immigrants into Swedish society was no longer the smooth process as it used to be, or was believed to have been, for earlier (mostly labour) immigrants. Gaining entrance to the labour market was seen as the key issue for successful integration, and thus for a reduction in levels of segregation (SOU 1990:36; SOU 1996:55; SOU 1998:25). The Commission on Metropolitan Areas, for instance, stated in their report on residential segregation that the basic underlying nature of the segregation was not ethnic, but instead economic and social. Although the ethnic dimension is manifest, what we have in reality is class-based segregation between people who have gained entrance to the labour market, and therefore also to the welfare system, and an outsider class (SOU 1997:118). The question of why so many immigrants were unemployed was rarely discussed in relation to residential segregation, but there was a strong tendency elsewhere in the public debate during that time to relate this to a lack of knowledge and skills among immigrants (see Mattsson, 2001).

In the debate following the publication of Metropolitan Commission report, critics argued that the ethnic dimension of segregation cannot be dismissed that easily (see for instance Andersson, 1998). Several studies had indicated the existence of an ethnic hierarchy that manifests itself in most domains within society. In terms of ethnic residential segregation, this hierarchy is expressed in high levels of segregation for ethnic groups from for example Africa and Western Asia, while the residential patterns of European groups closely resemble that of the Swedish majority (Molina 1997, Bevelander et al 1997, Andersson 1998). Furthermore, these differences cannot be reduced to differences in resources or time spent in Sweden. With inspiration from the structural strand of the ‘enforced ethnic clustering’ perspective, it is argued that the differences are the result of structural discrimination or racism against people with foreign, and especially non-European, background in Swedish society (Molina 1997; SOU 2005:41; SOU 2005:56). Though this is very much an ongoing debate at the moment, there are signs
that this interpretation is on the way of becoming the new ‘official’ explana-
tion.

The question of why the residential patterns of minority groups differ
from that of the majority population will always have a central place within
research on residential segregation. If you consider segregation to be a prob-
lem – not all these explanations do – and you want to do something about it,
you have to tackle the mechanisms behind segregation. Aggregate level stud-
ies of segregation processes cannot directly address mechanisms. For one
thing, they do not reveal anything about the motives behind peoples’ actions.
But descriptions of processes can – and must – be part of any understanding
of the phenomenon. Any explanation of residential segregation must be ca-
pable of accounting not only for the observed patterns of segregation but
also the processes that produce and reproduce them.

A dynamic approach to residential segregation

Residential segregation – pattern and process

As will have become apparent at this point in the account, the concept of
residential segregation has to do with uneven population distribution across
the different sub-parts of a city or a region. Definitions usually state that the
concept refers either to a pattern of spatial differentiation or to the processes
that produce and reproduce this pattern (see for example Johnston et al,
1994, p. 547). Residential segregation, understood as a pattern of spatial
differentiation, is a phenomenon that can be measured, provided that there
exists some criterion for classifying individuals, and information on the
population composition in different sub-areas based on this criterion. Mea-
sures of socio-economic segregation use criteria based on some kind of indi-
cators of socio-economic status, e.g. income, employment status, level of
education, benefit dependency, or occupational status (or combinations of
two or more of these). In studies of ethnic residential segregation, the classi-
fication is generally based on racial or ethnic belonging or origin, or on a
division between majority and minority status, or between natives and immi-
grants.

When residential segregation is studied, as opposed to activity segrega-
tion (see for instance Boal, 1978), measurements are usually based on the
location of the dwellings where people reside. Measurements of residential
segregation say something, but far from everything, about whom a person
might reasonably be expected to interact with on a daily basis, since few
persons spend all their time in the immediate vicinity of their dwelling.
There are considerable variations in this regard according to age and life
situation in general. Adults, as a rule, spend less time in their neighbourhood
than children, as do those employed in comparison with the unemployed.
Following from the definition, residential segregation is an aggregate level phenomenon. It can only be measured on the macro level. If measurements use residential areas or neighbourhoods as sub-areas, which is most common, it is the city that is segregated and not the individual neighbourhoods. This might seem an insignificant detail, but I believe it has consequences for how the phenomenon is understood. To refer to residential areas where the problems of residential segregation are most salient as the ‘segregated neighbourhoods’ will direct the attention away from the relational character of the phenomenon, and thus nurture a belief that segregation is a phenomenon that is isolated to these ‘problem neighbourhoods’ – a problem in those neighbourhoods, for those neighbourhoods – when a more accurate description would be to say that the situation there is only a reflection of the problems in society at large.

The process conception of segregation might seem rather straightforward at first glance. According to Johnston et al (1994, pp. 477) a process is “[a] flow of events or actions which produces, reproduces or transforms a system or a structure.” A segregation process, then, would be a flow of events or actions which produces, reproduces or transforms segregation patterns. On a basic level, the events or actions in question are the movements, births and deaths of individuals, and, in the case of socio-economic segregation, individual changes in socio-economic status. To apply a dynamic perspective to the study of residential segregation, then, would simply mean to study the processes, in terms of movements, births and deaths of individuals, that produce, reproduce or transform patterns of segregation. This is essentially what I mean by a dynamic approach to segregation. The papers in this thesis describe processes, mainly in terms of individual migration, that produce and reproduce patterns of segregation.

In reality, however, it does not actually stay with that. On the next level we find all those events and actions that change the conditions in which decisions about actions are taken. Some events and actions will of course be of greater importance than others, for instance changes in the amount of available housing in a city. The political decision to build one million new dwellings, and the subsequent construction of new residential areas between 1965 and 1974, has doubtless been one of the more influential events in changing the patterns of residential segregation in Swedish cities, by, in effect, relocating the ‘distressed neighbourhoods’ from the run-down areas near the city centres to the new, large-scale MP estates on the urban fringe.

But almost all types of events and actions can potentially be of importance. For one thing, the behaviour of others will be highly influential. Every decision to move, or not to move, is based on a number of factors – and the existing (or anticipated) population composition of different sub-areas of the city is one of them. If ordinary people did not believe that it was important who your neighbours are, cities would probably have a dramatically different character (Andersson, 1999). Thus, segregation at one point in time can be a
contributing cause to increased segregation at a later stage. The division between cause and effect gets blurred. What constitutes an effect at one stage becomes a cause in the next (Andersson, 1997).

The most commonly used approach in studying the dynamics of residential segregation has been to compare patterns of segregation at different points of time, and draw conclusions about the events and actions that have produced changes in the patterns (Boal, 1976; Deurloo and Musterd, 1998; Friedrichs, 1998; Kemper, 1998; van Kempen and van Weesep, 1998; Kesteloot and Cortie, 1998; Murdie and Borgegård, 1998; Musterd and Deurloo, 2002; Bolt et al, 2002). This will always be an indirect way of studying processes, however. Comparisons of patterns over time can never fully establish what parts of the observed changes have been caused by migration and what parts have been caused by natural population growth and decline (Simpson, 2004). In order to fully capture the dynamics of segregation, the analysis must be based on longitudinal data that enable calculations of migration flows and other population changes. This is generally acknowledged by researchers (see for example Johnston et al, 2002b), so the preoccupation with patterns must largely be blamed on a general lack of more suitable data in most countries.

Models of neighbourhood-level dynamics

Research on residential segregation has over the years resulted in a number of theories and models that explicitly focus on the dynamic aspects of segregation, the most well-known being Burgess’ model of invasion and succession described earlier. Below, I will give a brief account of a selection of models that focus specifically on neighbourhood-level dynamics. They propose descriptions and explanations of processes that change the population composition of individual residential areas, either focusing on the ethnic composition or the socio-economic. The models below, together with Burgess’ model, have all been part of my frame of reference while working on the thesis. All of the papers use (more or less explicitly) one or more of these models as theoretical points of departure.

Neighbourhood tipping and white flight

The first model deals with neighbourhood-level processes of ethnic or racial minority concentration. The concepts ‘neighbourhood tipping’ and ‘white flight’ originate from American research on residential segregation, and especially from studies on the relations between the white, Anglo-American majority and the black, African-American minority. Empirical macro-level studies had shown that it was relatively common that neighbourhoods over a relatively short time changed their residential composition from ‘white’ to ‘black’, and this process was referred to as ‘neighbourhood tipping’. The process was believed to involve a threshold or critical point, that when
reached made the process inevitable: When blacks started to move into a white neighbourhood it triggered a process of out-migration of whites. This out-migration would continue at a steady rate until a critical point was reached. After that, the out-migration of whites would accelerate. This critical point, i.e. the proportion of blacks that would make the neighbourhood tip from white to black, was termed the ‘tipping point’, and the accelerated out-migration of whites was called ‘white flight’ (see for instance Goering 1978).

The reason behind this flight of whites was (and is) believed to be a more or less explicit dislike of black neighbours and neighbourhoods. However, opinions diverge as to whether this aversion is motivated by racial prejudice (Farley et al, 1994; Zubrinsky and Bobo, 1996) or by a desire to avoid neighbourhoods with certain characteristics. According to the ‘racial proxy’ hypothesis it is the neighbourhood’s socioeconomic status rather than the race of its residents that is important (Harris 1999, 2001). People (both whites and blacks) prefer well-educated, affluent neighbours; whites only have better opportunities to escape the poor neighbourhoods.

Thomas Schelling has constructed a set of models that describe the kind of processes that would result in this type of tipping (Schelling, 1978; see also Granovetter and Soong, 1988, and Clark, 1991). The most well-known of Schelling’s models (the Bounded-Neighbourhood Model; Schelling, 1978, pp. 155-166) outlines a world inhabited by two groups of people. Within both these groups the tolerance towards living with members of the other group varies, from very low to very high. There also exists an area in which members of both groups would want to live, as long as the proportion of the other group does not exceed the individual tolerance level. People will stay in the area until the composition changes so that the individual threshold is reached, then they will choose another location. Given these initial conditions, it is possible to simulate changes in the population composition over time in the area. At the initial step, the tolerance level will be exceeded for some individuals. These will then move out, and individuals who do not disapprove of the population composition will move in. The new population composition at step two will be too much for other individuals, who will then move out, and so on. One of Schelling’s main arguments is that it only takes a few individuals with very low tolerance levels for the process to start, and once started it tends to be self-perpetuating towards either a group 1 or a group 2 dominance, since these outcomes represent the only stable equilibria.

Schelling’s model is based on a simplified notion of the motives for moving out or moving in, where the population composition is the only thing that matters. In reality, this will of course only be one aspect among others that affects the decision on whether or not to move, or where to move. But at least, Schelling’s model and the whole neighbourhood tipping/white flight framework stress that it is important, and that segregation to some extent can
be viewed as its own cause. What lies behind patterns of segregation that can be observed at one point in time is actually a process – a process where individual decisions affect the outcome in ways that are often neither predicted nor desired by the individuals themselves.

In the analysis of processes of immigrant concentration in Swedish residential areas (Paper 1) the neighbourhood tipping/white flight model is used as a theoretical frame of reference. I did, however, not find the high and accelerated out-migration of majority population members typical of the neighbourhood tipping notion in the processes that have produced and reproduced immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities. Instead, the process seemed mainly to be driven by low in-migration (see Chapter 4).

**Spirals of decline**

While the research described in the previous section concerned the ethnic or racial dimension of segregation, this section deals with the socio-economic dimension, i.e. ‘segregated areas’ interpreted as distressed or deprived neighbourhoods, and the processes that produce the character of distress or deprivation. The label distressed or deprived neighbourhoods is used in relation to residential areas faced with a complex web of interrelated problems such as physical decay, low demand and high turnover rates, management difficulties, declining services, social and economic exclusion among the residents, i.e. high levels of unemployment and benefit dependency, poverty, conflicts, crime and drug abuse (Power 1996, 1997; Hall 1997; Skifter Andersen 2003).

The processes that cause concentrated and intensified deprivation are often referred to as ‘spirals of decline’, ‘downward spirals’ or ‘vicious circles’, and are usually described as a combination of physical and social problems that reinforce one another – hence the notion of a circle or a spiral. What makes these processes interesting in this context is that the spiral of decline also entails a succession of residents, so that the population composition changes from a socio-economically average (or somewhat below average) level, to a high incidence of marginalised households. Moreover, this residential succession is believed to be driven by selective migration; better-off residents move out to be replaced by poorer, more marginalised households. Friedrichs (1991) relates findings of this ‘middle-class leakage’ in German large housing estates already in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and Power reports on a history of out-migration of well-off residents in housing estates in the UK (Power, 1996) as well as in other Western European countries (Power, 1997). The same kind of processes were also reported in a study of 500 deprived social housing estates in Denmark (see Skifter Andersen, 2003, pp. 98-124). In Paper 2, we set out to investigate whether this type of selective migration can be found also in the distressed neighbourhoods of Stockholm (see Chapter 4).
Just like in the neighbourhood tipping model described above, the population composition of the neighbourhoods is seen as both a cause and an effect in the process of decline. The process is often believed to be initiated by low attractiveness, either related to the physical conditions of the estate, i.e. inferior or unsuccessful planning, or a peripheral or otherwise disadvantaged location (or both). Low attractiveness will lead to low in-migration and thus to empty flats, and high residential turnover. This will eventually lead to in-migration of families with little choice. The changes in population composition will mean that problems related to the more salient low-income character of the neighbourhood will be likely to appear, e.g. declining services, disturbance and accelerated physical deterioration due to vandalism and careless use. This, in turn, will result in an even worse reputation and accelerated residential succession (Power, 1996; Power 1997, pp 269-311; Skifter Andersen, 2003, pp. 98-107).

Skifter Andersen stresses that processes of social and physical decay in residential areas at the bottom of the urban hierarchy cannot be seen as a problem isolated to these areas. The development there is an effect of, and affects, the development in other parts of the city. Segregation is a consequence of decisions taken by individuals in their search for a place to live, and these decisions involve evaluations of physical as well as social and cultural aspects of different locations. When these qualities are unevenly distributed over different parts of the city, so that the differences between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ neighbourhoods are pronounced, segregation will increase. Processes of increased physical and social decay, i.e. spirals of decline, in specific neighbourhoods will increase these differences, and thus increase segregation (Skifter Andersen, 2003, pp. 125-129).

Although the spiral of decline is a concept that primarily refers to the socio-economic dimension of segregation, Skifter Andersen’s research, based on the development in Danish housing estates, shows that the ethnic dimension is very much involved in these processes. The proportion of residents belonging to ethnic minorities was found to be of decisive importance for the reputation of the estates among residents, and this factor seemed to be even more important for how the estates were judged by potential in-movers. A high proportion of Third World immigrants increased the out-migration rates and decreased the in-migration rates among high-resource groups (ibid., pp. 107-122). Though the study does not specify the ethnic composition of these high-resource groups, the results indicate that there is a significant element of ‘white flight’ and ‘white avoidance’ involved the process. Skifter Andersen concludes that the evidence “…supports the uncomfortable conclusion that some Danes do not want to live together with other ethnic groups” (ibid., p. 122).
The production and reproduction of immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities

The third example of a model describing neighbourhood-level processes has elements in common with both the other two. It concerns the Swedish case in particular, i.e. the production and reproduction of immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities, and has been developed as an attempt to bring together available knowledge in the field into a ‘complete picture’. The model was first presented in Andersson and Molina (1996), but is also published in Andersson (1998) from which this account is primarily taken. The study that eventually became Paper 1 started out as an attempt to ‘test’ parts of this model (see Chapter 4).

The model deals with four different kinds of migration and migration influences (see Figure 1). The first can be seen as the initiation of the process. Once the first type has started the process, the other three follow and are assumed to take place simultaneously.

1. Segregation-generating migration

Nearly all residential areas that have high immigrant concentrations today used to have lower concentrations in the past. Ethnically selective migration flows during the last 10, 20 or 30 years have resulted in the present situation. In the model this is referred to as ‘segregation-generating migration’. The process can be said to start when the neighbourhood reaches a level of immigrant concentration that is higher than the city average. From what is known from earlier studies of residential areas of this type, high turnover rates and high levels of vacancies seem to be prerequisites for the initiation of these processes. Especially the existence of vacancies seems to be crucial, since newly arrived refugees, as well as other population segments lacking economic resources, are often directed to these vacancies.

2. Segregation-generated migration

The persistent loss of Swedish residents will have effects on the neighbourhood and the remaining inhabitants. Some households, probably not too many, will move out because they feel uncomfortable with the increasing numbers of foreigners \textit{per se}. Others will move out due to second-order effects in local social institutions, or perhaps just because the area has acquired a bad reputation. For families with children, the situation in the schools will probably be a major concern. A school with a growing number of non-native
Figure 1. A model of the production and reproduction of immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities.


children will require extra resources in order to maintain the quality of the education, and this is not always provided. It is especially more well-off families who tend to move out in this still early process of ethnically selective migration. This second type of migration is labelled ‘segregation-generated migration’, since it is an immediate result of the segregation generated in the first phase of the model.

There seem to exist thresholds in these processes; this type of migration seems to be more common in areas where the proportion of immigrants approaches or exceeds 20 percent, especially if the proportion of non-European
immigrants is high. Another threshold seems to be found at immigrant proportions around 40-50 percent. Many areas that had such immigrant percentages at the beginning of the 1990s developed rather rapidly into immigrant enclaves, where the remaining Swedish families were very few.

Segregation-generated migration is primarily believed to have a basis in existing socio-material conditions, but there is a symbolic side to the process as well. The symbolic production takes place both within and outside these particular residential areas (Molina, 1997). As the residential area starts to acquire a ‘doubtful reputation’, a process that often takes place outside the area itself, people within the area will also be affected. Residents with extensive social networks outside the area will probably be more affected that those who have more local, bounded social networks. Unemployed immigrants will more often be found in the latter category, while dual-career, Swedish families would belong to the former. These families will probably also have better opportunities to move.

3. Institutionally generated migration
The housing market is situated in an institutional and economic framework, where political decisions about tax levels, household and housing subsidies, immigration and immigrant policy constantly affect the migration decisions of individual households. In the model, all these different types of influences are brought together under the heading ‘institutionally generated migration’.

4. Network-generated migration
Migration flows may also be caused by the immigrants’ desire to live close to relatives, friends and other people with the same cultural background as themselves. Andersson argues that the claim that immigrants want to live near their fellow countrymen has been pushed too far in the Swedish case, considering the multi-ethnic character of immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities. However, the social network is still a very important information source in migration decisions. Although the label ‘network-generated migration’ in the model only refers to the in-migration of immigrants, it should not be interpreted as though network-oriented migration only occurs in the minority groups. On the contrary, this is probably a common migration motive also among the majority group members. It could be hypothesized, though, that the social/cultural network is more important for newly arrived immigrants, since they cannot rely upon a fund of appropriate local experiences, memories, mental maps and knowledge of the institutional system.

Though the argument has many similarities with the ‘multicultural’ frame of explanation, I interpret Andersson’s notion of ethnic clustering as more in line with the urban ecology understanding of ethnic enclaves as temporary ports of entry for new immigrants than the view that they are the results of voluntary ethnic clustering. The choice to initially settle in an immigrant
concentration area can hardly be considered voluntary, in the proper sense of the word, because of the constraints involved. Also, this part of the model deals specifically with the in-migration of immigrants – not the question of whether or not they choose to remain once they have the means to make a proper choice.
3. Data and methods

Quantitative versus qualitative methods

Various quantitative techniques have always been central methodological tools within segregation research – and deservedly so, considering the aggregate level character of the phenomenon itself. Traditionally, quantitative methods have been (and are) used for mapping and describing patterns of segregation, and for formulating aggregate level explanations, i.e. law-like theories ‘explaining’ the phenomenon in terms of aggregate level regularities. Qualitative methods have, on the other hand, been essential for the formulation of ‘actual’ explanations, in terms of mechanisms that can account for these regularities. Thus, both quantitative and qualitative methods have been indispensable for the understanding of the phenomenon and its causes.

In that sense, segregation research has always been a field characterised by methodological pluralism, not only in practice but as an ideal. Judging from the pluralist nature of the work of individual scholars within the field, most segregation researchers seem to support the view that both sets of methodological tools are needed, but for different purposes; the choice of method has to be determined by the actual research problem and its objectives (for support for the ideal of methodological pluralism, see for instance Danermark et al, 1997, pp. 220-258; Djurfeldt et al, 2003, pp. 18-24; Holt-Jensen, 1999, p. 112; Esaiasson et al, 2004, p. 9).

I totally agree with this view. The choice of quantitative methods for the studies in the thesis was a logical consequence of my interest in questions concerning how the movements of individuals produce and reproduce patterns of residential segregation. That interest was, in turn, motivated by the general lack within segregation research of studies focusing on the dynamics of segregation. I also happened to find myself in a very favourable position to actually make a contribution, since I had at my disposal a database of the kind that many segregation researchers have requested but few have had the opportunity to use.

As I mentioned earlier, the approach in the thesis is essentially descriptive, but a description can never be an end in itself. The ultimate intention with a description must always be to use it in the search for explanations (Esaiasson et al, 2004, p. 25). In order to explain a phenomenon, you must first describe it, and the more thorough the description the better the chances of finding an explanation (ibid., p. 24). In that sense, I see my research as a
complement to other research within the wider field that is segregation research. By adding to the knowledge of the dynamics of segregation, the phenomenon is given a more thorough description, that, in turn, can provide new starting points for further research by pointing out urgent questions that need to be addressed with primarily other (i.e. qualitative) methods. At the same time, descriptions of dynamic aspects of segregation can be a complement to research that has already resulted in the formulation of theories, by opening up for evaluations of the explanatory power of these theories against what is known about processes of segregation, and not only patterns.

The GEOSWEDE database

One reason for the lack of research on how migration flows produce and reproduce patterns of residential segregation is that studies of migration flows (and other population changes) requires more detailed data than the otherwise commonly used data on neighbourhood-level population composition. What is needed is longitudinal, geocoded data where individuals form the basic units rather than residential areas. This makes it possible not only to calculate population composition, but also to track individuals’ movements in space and time.

The data used throughout this thesis is taken from the GEOSWEDE00 database, which is an internationally unique set of information comprising all individuals that have resided in Sweden sometime between 1990 and 2000.2 The database has been custom-designed by Statistics Sweden for a consortium consisting of the Institute for Housing and Urban Research and the Department of Social and Economic Geography, both at Uppsala University, and the Swedish National Institute for Working Life. The database includes information taken from a number of different registers. Figure 2 describes the basic design of the database. The dashed line denotes the data sets that have been used in the thesis.

---

2 The ‘00’ in the name refers to the end year (2000). Since the studies here reported have been finished the database has been updated with data for 2001 and 2002, and yet two more years will be added in 2006, making GEOSWEDE04 the most up-to-date version of the database.
As can be seen, individuals make up the basic units. Each individual is anonymous and only identified by a numerical code, and this individual code is the key connecting various variables in different data sets to each person. Apart from data that do not change over time (mostly demographic data), and event data such as information about immigration, emigration, and death, most other variables are available on a yearly basis. For instance, changes in a persons socio-economic situation can be followed from one year to another, and information about where a person has been living is available for each year, given both as geographical coordinates and as a neighbourhood code, which also reveals in which municipality and county
the neighbourhood is located. The latter is of course essential both for determining the population composition of sub-areas on different geographical scales (neighbourhood, city, county etc) and for calculating migration flows.

The GEOSWEDE database only includes individuals who were registered as residents in Sweden at least one of these eleven years, and the geographical variables refer to where the person was living at the end of the year. Normally you will not be formally registered if you intend to stay in Sweden less than one year. This means that persons who have stayed in the country for a shorter period are not included, not even if they were actually living in the country at the end of the year. More importantly, people are not formally registered until they have a residence permit. Therefore, refugee immigrants seeking asylum are not included even though they are staying in the country. They will ‘appear’ in the database if and when they are granted asylum, and thus receive a residence permit. For immigrants and emigrants, data are only available for the years when the person was actually staying in Sweden. It is, for instance, not possible to compare an immigrant’s socio-economic situation before and after immigration to Sweden.

Operational definitions of central concepts

All aggregate level studies of residential segregation are dependent on the existence of a) a geographical subdivision of the city, and b) a classification of individuals into categories according to the criteria studied. In reality, geographical space is inherently continuous and not neatly divided into appropriate spatial units, and ethnic groups (and social classes) are not easily identifiable and mutually exclusive ‘social units’. Both geographical and social space are also, to a certain extent, prone to change over time. This means that reality has to be subjected to a certain amount of ‘classificatory violence’ in order to create neat spatial and social subdivisions (Boal, 1987; Andersson and Molina, 1996). The following sections describes how I have chosen to deal with, firstly, the Swede – immigrant dichotomy, and, secondly, geographical space.

Swede – immigrant

The categorisation of people – a ‘necessary evil’

During recent years there have been numerous appeals among Swedish social scientists to abandon the use of categorisations that divide people into ‘Swedes’ and ‘immigrants’. The use of these categories, it is argued, has done more harm than good in research and policy. These categorisations have contributed to a conception of immigrants that represent ‘them’ as a homogeneous group that is inherently different from Swedes, and a corre-
sponding idea of Swedish homogeneity based on an imagined, unitary Swedish identity and culture – notions that, in turn, have reinforced the division between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (see for example Svanberg and Tydén, 1999; Molina, 2000; Mattsson, 2000; SOU 2005:41).

Unfortunately, the use of categories such as these is a ‘necessary evil’ in quantitative research on residential segregation. Thus, the radical response to this criticism would simply be to abandon this type of research. Obviously, I do not agree with the opinion that the use of categories will inevitably be more harmful than beneficial. I do agree that some early studies within Swedish ‘immigrant research’ was problematic in this respect, but as I see it, the main problem was not the use of categories per se, but the unreflected use and the one-sided focus on ‘them’ and their alleged shortcomings, together with the striking absence of questions regarding the other side of the relation – the institutions and structures of Swedish society and the opinions and behaviour of ‘ordinary Swedes’.

Besides, the use of these categories in the past might actually be a reason to continue to use them, though in more considered ways. If the unreflected use of the ‘immigrant’ category – in ‘immigrant research’, ‘immigrant policy’ and the media covering on the ‘immigrant issue’ and ‘immigrant-dense’ residential areas over the years – has contributed to a division between Swedes and immigrants, then this will have affected peoples’ migratory behaviour, and thus patterns of ethnic segregation. This is, supposedly, what is meant by the notion that there is a symbolic side to processes of segregation, apart from the socio-material (see the section on Andersson’s model in Chapter 2).

Different categorisations for different purposes
While actual ethnic belonging is not registered, the GEOSWEDE database does provide information on country of birth for all individuals as well as country of birth of their parents, and these variables can be used as approximations of ethnic origin. All papers in the thesis use one or more of these variables as the basis for distinguishing between Swedes and immigrants and, as in Paper 4, for further subdivisions according to country or region of origin. Different criteria have been used in different paper, however. In Paper 2 and 3, the classification is based on country of birth only, thus distinguishing between Swedish-born and foreign-born persons. Intuitively it makes most sense to classify as immigrants only those who have actually immigrated.

In Paper 1, on the other hand, it was essential to come up with a good approximation of what constitutes ethnic Swedes, since it is the migratory behaviour of the Swedish majority population that is in focus. This classification should preferably be rather narrow, so that it includes not those who perceive themselves as Swedish but rather those who are likely to be regarded as such by other Swedes. Therefore, I decided to base the criteria on
a combination of the individual’s own country of birth and that of his or her parents. Thus, all those who were born in Sweden and have at least one parent who was born in Sweden were classified as Swedes, and all others as immigrants. This type of ‘ethnic origin’ classification was also used in Paper 4, for essentially the same reason, though there was also a further subdivision of the immigrant population according to region of origin.

Residential area / neighbourhood

The GEOSWEDE database provides a number of alternative geographical coding systems, the 100 meter grid and the neighbourhood code being the most relevant ones for applications dealing with residential segregation. I have used the latter alternative throughout the thesis. One central premise (or the central premise) within research on residential segregation is that the population composition of a person’s immediate surroundings is of importance – otherwise the whole question would be irrelevant. It is either important because it is seen as a result of something, e.g. forced or voluntary clustering, or because it has effects on a person’s life-chances. In most cases ‘immediate surroundings’ has been interpreted in terms of the neighbourhood or residential area where a person lives, although person-specific environments are occasionally used in studies of neighbourhood effects (see for instance Ostendorf et al, 2001; Musterd et al, 2005). Based on information on the geographical location of the dwelling where the person lives, given in coordinates, an environment is defined as the area within a certain distance from the dwelling.

In my opinion, the residential area alternative is preferable, for various reasons. Person-specific environments are entirely based on Euclidean distance and do not take into account physical barriers like roads and rivers that might hinder contact. Residential areas also often function as formal or informal organisational units for different forms of services, e.g. schools and commercial services, and will thus influence people’s activity patterns, service utilisation and consumption. Even if there are individual differences associated with age and life situation in general, the probability of meeting and being influenced by people living in the same residential area will be greater than meeting people who actually live closer, but in another residential area on the other side of, for instance, a large thoroughfare.

The neighbourhood codes in GEOSWEDE are based on the so called SAMS area division (Small Area Market Statistics), constructed and maintained by Statistics Sweden. The area division covers the whole country and divides it into discreet, non-overlapping geographical areas that are ‘as homogeneous as possible’ with respect to the character of the housing stock.

---

3 As mentioned earlier, there are also municipality and county codes which can be derived from the neighbourhood code, and a parish code.
(type, construction period, tenure). Thus, the SAMS units capture the notion of neighbourhood rather well. In urban areas, the SAMS division is for the most part based on an older neighbourhood division that was originally constructed by the municipalities as an aid in the planning process (schooling, care of the elderly, etc). In rural areas, the SAMS units are based on postal districts or parishes, which are generally larger (Andersson, 2000b).

Since each municipality has been responsible for constructing their own neighbourhood division, the area sizes vary between cities. The average number of residents per SAMS is just under 1000. The Stockholm areas are generally much larger than average, with a mean of 4,800 residents, but with large intra-city variations. In the other two largest cities, Göteborg and Malmö, the average area size is much smaller (between 500 and 700 residents). The difference in size is of course a problem in certain applications, especially when you want to compare the development in different cities. In relation to the neighbourhood (or residential area) concept, some Stockholm areas might be considered ‘too large’, while some areas in Göteborg and Malmö might be regarded as ‘too small’. However, the SAMS area division constitutes the best readily available neighbourhood division there is at the moment.

Modelling the dynamics
In Chapter 2, I suggest a definition of a segregation process as consisting of a flow or sequence of movements, births and deaths, which produces, reproduces or transforms segregation patterns. Singular events and actions can be captured and described as a flow by grouping all events of a certain kind that has happened during a specific period in time. Seen in this way, a migration flow consists of all movements with the same origin and/or destination that has taken place during a specific time period. An inflow, then, is a set consisting of all migration events that have taken place between two points in time that share the same destination, while an outflow is a set of migration events sharing the same origin. Births and deaths can be grouped in a similar way, based on the geographic area where they have taken place (though the term ‘flow’ is perhaps not as appropriate in these cases).

In GEOWSEDE, the highest resolution in time, i.e. the shortest period that is possible to use, is one year, since geographical data are available on a yearly basis. Though I have used annual data in some cases, e.g. for calculations of year-to-year changes in the population composition of residential areas (Paper 1) and for annual migration and turnover rates (Paper 1 and 2), I have found this to be too detailed when analysing migration flows, especially if you also want to make use of the full ten year scope the material

---

4 The so called NYKO (Nyckelkodsråden).
allows. But more importantly, a period of at least three years is in many cases needed in order to ensure adequate sizes also of different sub-populations, which in turn is a prerequisite for reliable statistical calculations.

In Paper 2, which was the first one that was finished, two five-year periods was chosen (1990-1995 and 1995-2000). It was appropriate in this case because of the changes in macro-economic conditions in Sweden between the first and the second half of the 1990s. Since this turned out to work well and – more importantly – since there are advantages to be gained by using the same basic approach in more than one study, I (or we, in Paper 3) decided to use the same periods as the basis for calculations of migration flows also in the other studies. This makes it easier to relate the results of one study to those of the other ones. However, it is only in Paper 1 and 2 that both the 1990-1995 and the 1995-2000 period are studied; the other studies (Paper 3 and 4) only cover the second period.

It should be noted also that the designations of the periods vary somewhat between the papers, e.g. 1995-2000 or 1996-2000. Both, however, refer to the same period and the same type of calculations. In both cases residence in 1995 has been compared with residence in 2000 to identify the migrants. But since data on residence refer to the situation at the end of each year, a person who was living in one place in 1995 and another in 2000 has obviously moved sometime after the last day of 1995 but before the last day of 2000, i.e. 1996-2000. So it is only a question of how you choose to express it.
4. The papers – empirical foci, findings and conclusions

Summaries of the papers

In this section, I provide a summary of each of the papers, including a brief background on the initial motivation behind each study. The studies could be said to relate to a wider theoretical framework as well as a more specific Swedish framework. The papers are written for publication in international scientific journals, and are thus intended for an international audience. The wider theoretical framework is therefore given in the papers while the account here deals more specifically with the Swedish framework.


The central questions in Paper 1 are: How do immigrant concentration areas in Swedish cities acquire their high proportion of immigrants? How is this ‘immigrant density’ maintained? Or more specifically: How has the Swedish majority population acted in the processes that produce and reproduce immigrant concentration areas? Thus, the paper deals with neighbourhood-level processes, and the ethnic dimension of segregation rather than the socio-economic. Described more formally, Paper 1 sets out to establish whether processes of increased immigrant concentration are primarily driven by imbalances in the out-migration flow (‘Swedish flight’) or in the in-migration flow (‘Swedish avoidance’). The paper uses the neighbourhood tipping/white flight framework as a theoretical point of departure, hence the reference to ‘flight’ and ‘avoidance’.

The choice of subject for this paper stems first and foremost from a general lack of knowledge about the role of ‘ordinary Swedes’ in processes of segregation in Swedish cities. In Sweden, as in many other countries, most attempts to explain ethnic residential segregation have been centred on the (voluntary or enforced) behaviour of the minority groups (see Chapter 2). This almost one-sided focus was by the end of the 1990s questioned by several researchers. Molina (1997, p. 227) argued for a need to discard the taken-for-granted view that residents of high-status residential areas have no part to play in processes of segregation. Instead, she proposed that the focus
should be turned towards those groups who, because of their advantaged position in terms of resources, play a more active role in the production of the segregated city. Andersson (1997) argued more explicitly for the need to change focus from the immigrant population to the Swedish majority population and their movements and choices. Andersson’s model described earlier, and especially the first two migration flows of the model, is to be seen as an attempt at describing the role of the Swedish majority population in the production of immigrant concentration areas. The model had, however, not been subject to systematic testing at that stage, and the study that subsequently became Paper 1 set out to do that.

The paper focuses on the development in residential areas across Sweden that have had a considerable drop in the share of Swedish residents, i.e. a decrease of 25 percentage points or more, between 1990 and 2000. Among these, two groups of residential areas are selected: The first group includes all areas that had a share of Swedish residents in 1990 that was close to average, i.e. above 75 percent. This group was chosen in order to study processes that initially produce immigrant concentration areas. The other group consists of those areas that already in 1990 had a low share, i.e. 60 percent or less, and these areas were included in order to investigate the processes that reproduces and enhances immigrant concentration in already ‘immigrant-dense’ areas. Since there has been a strong belief that immigrant concentration is a phenomenon only experienced in rental areas, it was interesting to note that both groups also included areas with other forms of tenure (cooperative housing, home ownership, and mixed housing). Furthermore, only about half the first group consisted of residential areas in the three largest cities.

In order to establish whether the decrease is primarily caused by imbalances in the out-migration flow (‘flight’) or imbalances in the in-migration flow (‘avoidance’), out-migration and in-migration rates for Swedes and immigrants are compared for all areas in each group. This broad analysis is then followed by detailed examinations of the development in a selection of residential areas (two in the first group and one in the second), where annual population changes and migration flows are analysed.

Andersson’s model assumes the process to be driven primarily by high out-migration of Swedes, especially in the second step of the model, segregation-generated migration. The loss of Swedish residents during the first phase is supposed to result in increased out-migration of Swedes. The process is also assumed to have thresholds, in terms of immigrant proportions, that when reached will lead to an acceleration in the out-migration of Swedes. All in all, this part of the model has many similarities with the white flight/neighbourhood tipping framework.

However, there is always an in-migration side to these processes as well. High out-migration of Swedes need not be the most important force behind the process; low in-migration could be just as important. In fact, my results
show that the main driving force behind both the production and reproduction of immigrant concentration areas during the 1990s has been low immigration of Swedes rather than high out-migration. Out-migration rates were not found to be that much higher among Swedes than among immigrants. In some cases they were actually lower. Neither could I detect any clear signs of thresholds in the processes, i.e. accelerated out-migration of Swedes at certain levels of immigrant presence. In-migration rates, however, were found to be significantly and persistently lower among Swedes than among immigrants, in nearly all examined residential areas. ‘Avoidance’, then, seems to be more suitable a label than ‘flight’ for describing the role of the Swedish majority population in these processes.

What seems to initiate processes of immigrant concentration initially is low in-migration during a number of years, prior to the large influx of immigrants. In fact, it is highly probable that this constitutes a prerequisite for the process, since low in-migration creates vacancies for immigrants to move into. The low in-migration suggests that these areas have been rejected by potential in-movers (both Swedes and immigrants) even before the population composition has begun to change. The reasons behind this initial avoidance remains to be investigated, but it would not, at this stage in the process, be related to the ethnic composition of the residents.

The methods used in the paper (and throughout the thesis) do not actually reveal anything about the motives of the individuals that take part in these migration flows. But if I am allowed to speculate, based on what is said about this in the model, I would say that at least one point actually makes more sense when interpreted against my findings. Though segregation-generated migration is primarily believed to have a socio-material basis, there is also a symbolic side to the process (see for instance Ericsson et al, 2002). The model emphasises the effects that symbolic production will have on the residents of the areas; people living there will be affected when their neighbourhood acquires a ‘doubtful reputation’, and Swedes, seeing as they generally have more extensive social networks, will be more affected by what others outside the area think of it. While this might be true, I would say that symbolic production has a much larger part to play in relation to in-migration. The low in-migration of Swedes from other parts of the city is most likely an effect of bad reputation (at least in part), both in the production and reproduction stages. And while many of these areas probably were among the least attractive already before the process began, a high share of immigrants probably does nothing to improve the reputation of an already rather unattractive neighbourhood in the eyes of many ‘ordinary’ Swedes.

Paper 2 deals primarily with the socio-economic dimension of processes of segregation, and the focus is on the whole category of what might be called distressed neighbourhoods in the Stockholm region. The main questions of the paper are: Are the migration flows of the distressed neighbourhoods in Stockholm selective? If so, what does that imply for the chances of successfully combating segregation by means of an area-based urban policy mainly targeted at individuals living in these neighbourhoods?

Descriptions of spirals of decline (see Chapter 2) often mention selective migration as part of the processes that have produced and enhanced the character of distress in these neighbourhoods. By selective migration is meant that the composition of the out-migrants differs from that of the in-migrants, and that of those staying in the neighbourhoods. In this case, the neighbourhoods are believed to lose those residents who are relatively better off, and the in-migrants who replace them are assumed to be poorer and more marginalised. While there have been indications of this in some residential areas in Swedish cities (Andersson, 2000c), this study provides a more thorough investigation of the selective character of the migration flows of distressed neighbourhoods.

If Swedish distressed neighbourhoods indeed suffer from that kind of ‘middle-class leakage’, this will have consequences for what can be achieved by the Swedish area-based urban policy (and area-based measures in general). The overall aim of the urban policy that was launched in 1999 was to ‘break’ segregation and to work for equal and comparable living conditions for the inhabitants of the three largest cities, and this aim was to be achieved by channelling state support to a selection of residential areas especially exposed to problems of segregation. This overall aim was also reformulated into eight more specific goals addressing subjects such as unemployment, welfare dependency, education and health. All in all, the policy was primarily directed towards the individuals living in the distressed residential areas rather than towards the areas themselves (the policy is further described and analysed in Palander, 2006). As Andersson has argued before (Andersson, 2001, 2002, pp. 102-103), if the areas targeted are affected by this kind of selective migration, the area-based urban policy might succeed in helping individuals, but it will not succeed in changing the profile or the structural position of the targeted areas. It will therefore also fail in achieving the overall goal of ‘breaking’ segregation.

Included in the analysis are those residential areas in Stockholm County that were targeted for support in the urban policy, and thus officially recognised as distressed or, according to Swedish political vocabulary, ‘exposed’ (utsatta). For this group of residential areas, employment levels, benefit de-
pendency rates and income levels are compared for three groups: those who have moved into the areas, those who have moved out, and those who have stayed in the areas. Because of large differences in the macro-economic conditions between the first and the second half of the 1990s, the analysis is divided into two periods, 1990-1995 (characterised by economic recession) and 1995-2000 (when the economy started to recover).

The results in this part confirm the hypothesis about selective migration. The socio-economic situation is indeed found to be worse among the in-movers than among the out-movers and stayers, both at the beginning and the end of each period. Those who have moved into the distressed neighbourhoods generally have lower incomes and are more likely to be unemployed and dependent on social benefits than those who have left the neighbourhoods and those who have stayed put. Furthermore, this selectivity was nearly as obvious during the recovery period as during the recession period. The out-movers constitute the socio-economically strongest of the groups and the in-movers the weakest, with the stayers somewhere in between these extremes.

The lack of native Swedes is, apart from the problems associated with distress, perceived to be a major problem in these neighbourhoods. The concentration of immigrants is believed to be unfavourable for the acquisition of skills in the Swedish language, and this in turn will constitute an obstacle to the integration of the immigrants into Swedish society. Therefore, there was also a goal in the urban policy about strengthening the position of the Swedish language in the distressed areas. But this goal runs the same risk of failing as the goals addressing social distress, if the immigrant-concentration character of the neighbourhoods is reproduced by selective migration, i.e. if Swedes and more established immigrants move out and are replaced with more recently arrived immigrants.

In order to investigate this kind of selectivity we analysed the overall changes in population composition between 1990 and 2000. This analysis shows that there has been an overall loss of Swedish residents during the period as well as changes in the ethnic composition of the immigrant population. Along with Swedes, older, established immigrant groups have lost population while more recently arrived groups consisting mostly of refugee immigrants have grown. We also compared years spent in Sweden among foreign-born out-movers, in-movers and stayers, in the same manner as in the socio-economic analysis, and the results confirm that in-moving immigrants on average have spent less time in Sweden than out-moving immigrants.

To sum up, Paper 2 very clearly shows that the migration flows to and from the distressed neighbourhoods in Stockholm have been socio-economically selective. The out-migration flow has consisted of relatively well-off residents, while the in-movers who have replaced them were more likely to be unemployed and dependent on social benefits and had on aver-
age lower incomes. It also suggests ethnic selectivity, although this is not as thoroughly investigated. The changes in the overall population composition suggest an over-representation of Swedes and immigrants from established immigrant groups among the out-migrants and an over-representation of newly arrived refugee immigrants among the in-migrants. What is clear however, is that in-moving immigrants on average were more recently arrived than out-moving immigrants. All in all, this poses crucial challenges for area-based interventions directed towards helping individuals. An area-based policy of this kind might succeed in countering the effects of segregation for individual households, but it will not succeed in changing the neighbourhoods’ character of socio-economic distress and immigrant concentration.

The study was never intended to evaluate the success of the area-based policy; for the most part, what is described in the study took place before the policy was implemented. It is therefore interesting to note that selective migration has actually been a problem for those working with the policy; they tended to ‘lose results’ by the out-migration of socio-economically stronger households and the subsequent in-migration of weaker households (see Palander, 2006).

Paper 3: Who leaves Sweden’s large housing estates?

In Paper 3, the analysis of the selective character of the out-migration from distressed neighbourhoods is taken a step further. A different methodological approach, logistic regression, is used in order to compare the characteristics of those who move out of distressed neighbourhoods and those who remain. The study was carried out as part of the EU-financed, pan-European research project RESTATE,5 which ran between November 2002 and October 2005. The project is one among several during recent years that have looked into the problems of distressed neighbourhoods and the policy measures launched in order to deal with the problems (UGIS and NEHOM are others, see Vranken et al, 2002, and Holt-Jensen, 2000, respectively). The RESTATE project focused specifically on the situation in the large housing estates built in the decades following the Second World War, and the history and current situation of housing estates in ten European countries were compared within the project (see van Kempen et al, 2005).

Since the study in Paper 3 was part of this project, the choice of residential areas to study was already made; included are the four Swedish case study areas of the project, Tensta and Husby in Stockholm and Råslätt and Öxnehaga in Jönköping. They are all typical examples of the large housing estates built during the MP period, and all share (to a certain degree) the

5 RESTATE is an acronym for ‘Restructuring Large-scale Housing Estates in European Cities: Good Practices and New Visions of Sustainable Neighbourhoods and Cities’.
rather typical profile of these areas: low socio-economic status among the residents and a low proportion of native Swedes. In order to address the question of who leaves this area type, and not just these particular areas, a comparison was made between those who stayed in the areas and two types of out-migrants: those who left the estates to take up residence in another similar residential area, and those who left for higher-income, non-rental areas. The analysis was based on data on the population of the estates in 1995 and information on where they were living in 2000.

Cluster analysis was used in order to identify residential areas that were similar to these estates and distinguish them from higher-income, non-rental areas. Five variables were used in the clustering calculation: percentage living in rental multi-family dwellings, percentage living in single-family home ownership, percentage born abroad, percentage employed, and average work-related income. Among the resulting four clusters, the rental, low-income cluster to which the four estates belonged was easily distinguishable from the other three, not only in terms of housing stock and socio-economic profile but also in terms of ethnic composition (percentage born abroad).

The method used in the analysis of stayers and out-migrants from the estates, logistic regression, enables you to weigh different individual characteristics against each other. For instance, the effect of minority – majority status can be weight against socio-economic and demographic attributes. In this case, a number of demographic and socio-economic variables were included in the model, such as age, family status, level of education, employment status, benefit dependency and disposable income, together with information on country of birth, separating between those born in Sweden, other European countries and non-European countries.

The results show that the person least likely to leave the estates was an older, married person who had been living on the estate for more than three years, and who had a low level of education. The most likely out-migrant, consequently, was a young, high-educated single person who had moved to the estate recently. But apart from these characteristics that were common for all out-movers, there were also distinct differences between those who moved to another similar residential area and those who left the rental, low-income cluster for other types of areas. For the latter, being employed and not being dependent on social benefits also seemed to increase the likelihood of moving. Also, being born in Sweden, especially in comparison with being born outside Europe, increased the likelihood of moving. In fact, this variable proved to be one of the most important factors for this type of out-migration. In the case of moving between different rental, low-income areas, the effects of the country of birth variable were not very pronounced, and there were few indications that being well-endowed in terms of economic resources increased the likelihood of moving.

One important conclusion that can be drawn from this study, then, is that the out-migration flow from the distressed residential areas is not only socio-
economically selective but also ethnically selective. Even when demographic and socio-economic differences are controlled for, the likelihood of leaving these types of neighbourhoods is much lower for an immigrant than for a Swedish-born person, and especially so if the immigrant was born outside Europe.

This finding might seem contradictory to the results in Paper 1, since it indicates ‘Swedish flight’, while the results of Paper 1 showed ‘avoidance’ to have been more important in processes of immigrant concentration. This apparent contradiction can, however, be explained by differences in ‘scale’ between the two papers. Paper 1 deals with out-migration from specific residential areas, while the results here concern out-migration from the whole rental, low-income cluster. My conclusion is therefore that what differs between Swedes and immigrants is not out-migration rate per se, but rather the destination of the moves (the results of Paper 4 give further support to this conclusion; see below).

Husby is a good example for a comparison, since this residential area was studied in both papers. The most common destination for a Swede moving out of Husby was a residential area outside the rental, low-income cluster, but among non-European out-movers, moving within the cluster was just as common as leaving it. Furthermore, the analysis of Husby in Paper 1 showed differences in migration rates between Swedes and immigrants both in the in-flow and the out-flow, the differences in the in-flow were simply much larger. The analysis in Paper 3 only deals with the out-flows. If the in-flows were to be investigated in a similar manner (i.e. using logistic regression), the effects of the country of birth variable would probably be even more pronounced than those found in the out-flows.


The fourth paper, finally, deals with the dynamics of residential segregation within a whole city, Göteborg, and how migration and natural population growth and decline change the population composition in different area types in the city over a five year period. As in Paper 1, the ethnic rather than socio-economic dimension of segregation is studied, and a more detailed ethnic categorisation than the Swedish – immigrant dichotomy of the other papers is used.

Paper 4 constitutes in many ways a follow-up of different subjects that have been brought to the fore in the other three papers but have not been thoroughly investigated there. One is the differences between different ethnic groups within the large, heterogeneous immigrant category. It is likely that there are substantial variations between immigrants with different ethnic background in the degree of concentration to the so called ‘immigrant-dense’
residential areas, and also in their migratory behaviour. In order to investigate this, first and second generation immigrants were classified according to region of origin, in six wide ‘ethnic’ categories. Thus, the migration flows of seven population categories, including the Swedish host population, were analysed.

The residential area typology used in the study is based on a classification scheme proposed by Poulsen, Johnston and Forrest (see Poulsen et al, 2001) and subsequently used by the same authors in studies of patterns of ethnic residential segregation in English cities (Johnston et al 2002a, 2002b). The typology is based on population composition and takes into consideration both the relative size of host population and the relative sizes of different ethnic minority groups, thus distinguishing between two types of majority-dominated areas and a number of different minority-dominated area types (though only two were found in Göteborg).

One question that I specifically wanted to address was the role of the immigrant concentration areas as ports of entry to the local housing market, and if this differed between ethnic groups. Results from the first three papers, as well as from earlier research (Andersson, 2000b, 2000c), indicated that a large part of the in-migration to the distressed, ‘immigrant-dense’ residential areas consists of newly arrived immigrants who either had no prior address in Sweden, or had moved there after only a short time in another (usually smaller) city or town in Sweden. Furthermore, many of the in-migrants seem to stay there only a for few years before moving on to other parts of the city. Paper 4, therefore, deals not only with the ethnic composition of the migration flows but also with the origins and destinations of the flows. Net migration flows between different area types within the city are analysed, as well as net migration flows into different area types from the surrounding world.

Another aspect that I wanted to investigate in more detail was the effects of differences in rates of natural growth and decline in processes of segregation. The results from Paper 1 suggested lower natural growth rates among Swedes than among immigrants to be an important factor, beside migration, in processes of immigrant concentration, but neither the scope or the aim of that study enabled a thorough investigation there. In this study, then, not only population changes brought about by migration are analysed, but also the effects of natural growth and decline. And this was indeed found to be an important factor. The high natural growth rates of some minority populations in the minority enclaves have contributed to the concentration of these populations to these areas.

Thus, a number of subjects are touched upon in the study, from general issues concerning the reproduction and transformation of patterns of ethnic segregation, and the role of the minority enclaves as ports of entry to the local housing market, to more detailed questions about changes in the degree of concentration or dispersal of specific ethnic groups. The results show that the notion that the immigrant concentration areas function as ports of entry
for newly arrived immigrants seems to hold true for most immigrant groups; a large part of the in-migration to the city is directed towards these areas, and the local migration flows of all ethnic groups are directed away from the immigrant concentration areas towards other parts of the city. Seen in this way, the development of the levels of segregation, and the development in the immigrant concentration areas, will depend on the balance between the in-flow to the immigrant concentration areas from outside the city and the out-flow from them to other parts of the city. The main reason for the continuing and sharpening residential segregation in Göteborg during the period studied is, then, that the local net out-flow from the minority enclaves has not been able to match the growth in minority presence caused by non-local in-migration and natural growth.

All minority groups do not seem to need these ports of entry, however. While the in-flows of immigrants groups such as the African and Western Asian are largely directed towards the immigrant concentration areas, a significant part of the in-flow of the Western European group is directed towards ‘Swedish’ residential areas. And even though spatial dispersal does occur in all minority populations, the process seems to be slower and more difficult for some groups than for others.

Concluding findings and suggestions for further research

Despite different labels – immigrant concentration areas, distressed areas, large housing estates, minority enclaves – it is essentially the same type of residential areas that are in focus in all the papers. What they have in common is, firstly, that they have a low proportion of native Swedes, at least in a relative sense. The proportion is noticeably lower than average for the city they belong to. Secondly, in most of these areas there is a higher incidence of households with social and/or economic problems than in other residential areas in their city. In that sense they can be regarded as distressed, also that in a relative sense (though the label might be a bit strong in some cases). But, as I mentioned earlier, all areas with a low proportion of Swedes do not have problems of distress. There are examples, mainly in the largest cities, of high- or medium income areas dominated by home ownership or cooperative housing that are ‘immigrant-dense’. Some of the immigrant concentration areas of Paper 1 and some of the minority enclaves of Paper 4 fit into that category.

What results from all the papers show is the selective character of in- and out-migration to and from these distressed, ‘immigrant-dense’ residential
areas. The out-migration flow consists of relatively well-off persons, native Swedes and ‘established’ immigrants, while those who move in to a large extent are newcomers to the city or the housing market with smaller social and economic resources. A substantial part of the in-migration flow consists of newly arrived immigrants who have either moved in directly from abroad or have moved in from a first address in another (smaller) city or town. Though it has not been investigated directly in the thesis, it is reasonable to assume that a substantial share of the native Swedish in-migrants are new to the housing market and/or the city as well.

All in all, what is shown in the papers is these areas’ role as ports of entry to the city and the housing market for newcomers with small social and economic resources. Many of the residents stay only a few years in these areas before moving on. Though in this respect, there seems to be large differences between native Swedes and immigrants from other parts of the Western world, on the one hand, and non-Western immigrants, on the other. For those Swedes who actually move in, living in this area type seems to be a temporary experience before moving on and moving up in the housing market hierarchy to more affluent, non-rental, ‘Swedish’, parts of the city. For those non-Western immigrants who manage to make a housing career this seems to be a much more gradual process, probably entailing many subsequent moves between similar areas before reaching ‘the other side of the city’.

Judging from the results in Paper 3, this difference in out-migration propensity is not a question of differences in social and economic resources alone. The results here are thus in line with other recently published studies on the segmentation in the housing market and the housing careers of immigrants (Murdie and Borgegård, 1998; Magnusson and Öüzüekren, 2002). This might, of course, be interpreted as a sign of voluntary choice, i.e. that many non-European immigrants prefer to stay in immigrant concentration areas, even though they have the means to move to other parts of the city. As I see it, however, there are a number of circumstances that contradict that interpretation. The most important one still has to do with the character of the residential patterns. If voluntary ethnic clustering is an important factor, why are ethnic enclaves, in the proper sense of the world, so difficult to find in Swedish cities?

Therefore, the differences in out-migration propensity put questions about restrictions and discrimination to the fore. It is well known from research in other national contexts that members of ethnic minorities are often subject to different forms of restrictions and discriminatory behaviour in the housing market (see for instance Massey and Denton, 1993; van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998). It has been argued before that there is a general lack of knowledge about these matters in a Swedish context (SOU 2005:56; Molina, forthcoming), and even though there are signs of an increased interest recently in investigating these matters (see for example Walter, 2005), I can only agree. Further knowledge is needed about the workings of the Swedish
housing market and the existence of direct and indirect forms of discrimination, in the housing market as well as in other spheres of society that might have an effect on peoples’ chances of equal opportunities in the housing market.

The selective character of the migration flows to and from the distressed, ‘immigrant-dense’ residential areas is essentially what has produced and reproduced the character of the areas, and, from what can be seen here, there is little to indicate that these processes will not continue in already affected areas. This naturally raises questions about what can be done to ‘break’ the processes, i.e. to change the character of the migration flows. In the case of distressed areas, there are essentially two ways to achieve this. The first would be to make relatively well-off households stay, which would change the character of the out-migration flow as well as reduce overall turnover rates, and the second would be to change the character of the in-migration flow, i.e. to make households with a better socio-economic situation move in. While the latter might be what housing companies dream of, the former would probably have better chances of succeeding. But since a large part of the out-migration seems to be housing-career related, the areas would need to provide better opportunities for area-based housing careers than what is usually the case now. In other words, the housing stock of the areas would need to be more varied in terms of apartments sizes, housing types and tenure forms. In many cases, improvements will also be needed in the quality and availability of various institutions and services in the areas. However, it is worth noticing that there is a possible conflict between the aim of reducing out-migration and efforts to work for equal opportunities and freedom of choice in the housing market for everybody. The residents of distressed neighbourhoods cannot be expected to be the ones who have to solve the problems of these neighbourhoods.

Furthermore, should the effort to ‘break’ the development in one residential area succeed, then there is the question of what will happen in the rest of the city. Will another area take over the position at the bottom of the housing market hierarchy, and as part of entry to the city? Or will the in-migration be directed towards a larger number of areas, and thus affect each area less? This is probably in large part a question of how pronounced the differences are between attractive and less attractive areas of the city. As Skifter Andersen (2003, pp. 126-127) argues, large differences between ‘bad’, ‘good’ and ‘ordinary’ areas are likely to increase segregation, since the ‘bad’ areas will be excluded from many peoples’ frames of reference. And when this happens, the ‘vacuum’ to fill for households with limited choice will be geographically concentrated to only a few unattractive residential areas.

What about the ‘problem’ of immigrant concentration, then? Is it really a problem that the proportion of native Swedes in a residential area is low? Well, it need not be – but it need not not be, either. The fact that the population of a residential area mainly consists of people born abroad, and their
children, is not a problem in itself – provided that this is what the residents want. What can be a problem, however, is that the concentration seems to be prone to continue once the proportion of immigrants reaches a level well above the city average. There might not be actual thresholds in these processes, but the development towards further immigrant concentration seems nevertheless very hard to break because of the low in-migration of Swedes. Those who moved into such an area at an early stage of the process might have chosen it because they wanted to live in a more ‘Swedish’ neighbourhood, or because they liked the mixed character of the area. But after a few years they will find themselves in an environment that is dramatically different from the one they moved into. Also in this perspective, then, it would be precipitate to assume that all immigrants living in ‘immigrant-dense’ residential areas have chosen to take up residence there because of a desire to ‘stick to their own kind’.

But more importantly, this shows that the tendency among ‘ordinary Swedes’ to avoid residential areas with higher than average immigrant proportions is actually a problem in relation to segregation. The fact that this is something that affects all kinds of residential areas, and not just low-income, rental dominated areas, indicates that this is not just a question of differences in resources. Within American research on white flight, macro-level studies of processes of neighbourhood tipping have had a micro-level, qualitative counterpart in the surveys and interview studies that have been conducted in order to investigate preferred neighbourhood compositions among white and black respondents (see for example Farley et al, 1978, 1994). A number of surveys on the general attitudes of Swedes towards immigration and immigrants have been conducted over the years (Westin, 1982, 1984, 1987; Lange and Westin, 1993), but as far as I know, there have not been any studies that more specifically examine attitudes in relation to housing. So, this is also something that would be worth investigating in the future.

Even though the findings from this thesis raises a number of new questions and suggestions for further research, I hope that the thesis has managed to contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon of residential segregation, first and foremost by enhancing the knowledge about the dynamics of segregation – the processes that produce and reproduce patterns of segregation, and especially the processes that produce and reproduce distress and immigrant concentration in individual neighbourhoods. I also hope that the thesis has managed to convey a greater awareness of the relational character and the workings of ‘the other side if the city’ – that groups that are not normally mentioned in relation to segregation also have a key role to play in these processes.
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