DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 8065

Economic Integration of Intermarried Labour Migrants, Refugees and Family Migrants to Sweden: Premium or Selection?

Nahikari Irastorza
Pieter Bevelander

March 2014

Forschungsinstitut
zur Zukunft der Arbeit
Institute for the Study
of Labor

Economic Integration of Intermarried Labour Migrants, Refugees and Family Migrants to Sweden: Premium or Selection?

Nahikari Irastorza
MIM, Malmö University

Pieter Bevelander
MIM, Malmö University
and IZA

Discussion Paper No. 8065
March 2014

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

IZA Discussion Paper No. 8065
March 2014

ABSTRACT

Economic Integration of Intermarried Labour Migrants, Refugees and Family Migrants to Sweden: Premium or Selection?

We use Swedish register data to compare the employment and income of immigrants who intermarry natives versus those of immigrants who intramarry other immigrants in Sweden. We conduct the same analyses on three subsamples: labour migrants, refugees and family migrants. We find that intermarried immigrants outperformed intramarried ones in employment rates and salaries before and after marriage, in 1997 and 2007 respectively, and the same in true for each of the three subsamples analyzed. There is a statistically significant difference in income growth between intermarried and intramarried immigrants within that time period, but this difference is only significant for the subsample of family migrants. Finally, the upward mobility in employment status between 1997 and 2007 is higher for intermarried immigrants than for intramarried ones, with this being also the case for each of the three groups of labour migrants, refugees and family migrants. Our findings provide evidence to support both the selection hypothesis and the intermarriage premium hypothesis for the whole group of immigrants to Sweden. They also fully support the selection hypothesis for labour and family migrants but only partially for refugees; whereas they fully confirm the intermarriage premium hypothesis for family migrants but only partially for refugees and labour migrants.

JEL Classification: J1 J12

Keywords: immigrants, binational couples, economic integration, intermarriage premium, Sweden

Corresponding author:

Nahikari Irastorza
MIM
Malmö University
205 06 Malmö
Sweden
E-mail: nahikari.irastorza@mah.se

Introduction

The idea of intermarriage as a way of diminishing social barriers between immigrants and natives or between the majority and minorities of a society and thus, as a promoter of social cohesion and integration, is becoming rooted among researchers and policy makers (e.g. Bossard 1939, Kennedy 1943, Price 1982, Alba and Golden 1986, Alba 1995, Alba and Nee 1997, Giorgas and Jones 2002). A high level of intermarriage has also been associated with decreasing dissimilarities in labour market outcomes between immigrants and natives (Gevrek 2009). Intermarriage with natives is supposed to enhance immigrants' human and social capital specific to the country of residence, which in turn would decrease their liability of foreignness[1] and improve their job opportunities and conditions. However, these ideas are not always supported by empirical studies. In fact, whereas intermarriage patterns between immigrants and natives, or between natives of different races and ethnicities have been largely explored, few researchers have looked at the social and economic consequences of these unions such as their marital stability and the labour market outcomes of intermarried people.

Furthermore, there is an ongoing academic debate on the positive effect of intermarriage on immigrants' labour market performance. Although the few scholars that analyzed this topic (e.g. Kantarevic 2004, Meng and Gregory 2005, Meng and Meurs 2006, Dribe and Lundh 2008, Gevrek 2009, Nekby 2010, Dribe and Nystedt, forthcoming) agree that intermarried immigrants' employment rates and job income are higher than those of intramarried immigrants', there is no consensus on the causes of these differences. More specifically, the literature does not provide conclusive results as to whether intermarriage facilitates immigrants' integration and hence, increases their opportunities in the local labour market (*intermarriage premium hypothesis*) or to whether there is reverse causality between intermarriage and labour market outcomes, i.e. immigrants who are more integrated, and have better language skills and labour market outcomes before marriage may be more likely to marry natives than their counterparts (*selection hypothesis*). We aim to contribute to this debate by analyzing the link between intermarriage and immigrants' economic performance in Sweden. Furthermore, according to Kantarevic (2004), these contradictory results may be caused by differences in the characteristics of the immigrant population among countries of residence. In order to control for potential differences in human capital and socio-demographic attributes of immigrants to Sweden, we replicate the same analysis on three immigrant subsamples: labour migrants, refugees and family migrants.

International migration has increased countries' ethnic and cultural diversity worldwide. Sweden is no exception to this trend and has experienced substantial positive net migration since World War II. In 2012, about 14 percent of the population was born

[1] The concept of "liability of foreignness" was used by Irastorza (2010) to describe the additional difficulties immigrants face when entering the job market or starting up a business in a new country such as poor local language skills, the lack of human and social capital endowments specific to that country, the non-familiarity with and experience at the local labour market, and discrimination.

abroad. The result of this growth in the foreign-born population is also visible in the number of intermarriages. According to our data, in 2007, more than 10 per cent of marital unions in Sweden were comprised of a native-born and a foreign-born partner. Likewise, 31 per cent of married immigrant men and women intermarried with natives. Based on these numbers, we argue that the social and economic integration of intermarried couples in Sweden has become significant enough that deserves to be addressed. In an attempt to do so, we build on human and social capital theories to analyze the employment rates and job income of immigrants married to Swedish-born individuals (i.e. intermarried immigrants). Immigrants married to immigrants (i.e. intramarried immigrants) and Swedish-born individuals married to Swedish-born (i.e. intramarried Swedes) are included in the analysis as control groups[2]. Swedish individual level register data is used to address the following questions: (1) are there significant differences in the likelihood of being employed between immigrants married to natives and immigrants married to other immigrants in Sweden?; (2) are there significant differences in job income between immigrants married to natives and immigrants married to other immigrants in Sweden?; (3) if the answers to the first two questions are positive, can we attribute these differences to their intermarriage with natives?; and (4) are there differences in these patterns among labour migrants, refugees and family migrants?

Our paper extends previous studies by (i) using longitudinal data to analyze intermarried immigrants' economic integration before and after marriage[3]; (ii) testing not only the selection hypothesis or the intermarriage premium hypothesis exclusively but both of them; and by (iii) adding new variables to the equation such as the type of migration and the Inequality-adjusted Human Capital Index (IHDI) of the country of origin of each spouse. The IHDI is expected to capture differences in living standards across countries of origin that may affect immigrants' economic integration in Sweden: the higher the IHDI of immigrants' birth countries, the higher their probabilities of being employed and their job income. As for the type of migration, we compare labour migrants' economic integration to that of refugees' and family migrants', with the expectation that the former will outperform the other two groups. Furthermore, we test the intermarriage premium hypothesis and the selection hypothesis on three subsamples based on immigrants' status when they entered Sweden, namely, labour migrants, refugees and family migrants. In this case, we expect that family migrants sponsored by their partners and thus, who are not likely to have any previous experience in the Swedish labour market, will show higher gains from intermarriage than labour migrants and refugees, who may have been living in Sweden for a few years before meeting their spouses.

[2] Although unions comprised of immigrants from different countries of origin and of Swedish-born individuals from different ethnic groups may also be considered as intermarriages, for purposes of simplicity, in this paper the term "intermarriage" will only refer to marital unions between immigrants and Swedish-born individuals. Likewise, "intermarried immigrants" will describe foreign-born individuals married to native Swedes.

[3] Nekby (2010) and Dribe and Nystedt (forthcoming) also used longitudinal data to analyze the intermarriage premium on the job income of immigrants living in Sweden. Nevertheless, we extend these analyses by (i) adding another dependent variable, namely, employment status, (ii) applying a different empirical strategy and (iii) conducting the same analysis on labour migrants, refugees and family migrants.

This paper is organized as follows: the next section reviews the literature on the economic integration of intermarried immigrants and presents the debate around the intermarriage premium and the selection hypotheses; data and methodology used in the empirical study are described in section three; next we present and discuss our main findings; the last section concludes.

Economic Integration of Intermarried Immigrants

According to previous studies on the labour market performance of immigrants to Sweden, immigrants' and their children's employment rates and job income are lower than those of natives (Nordin and Rooth 2009; Bevelander 2010; Bevelander & Pendakur 2014). This pattern has been explained by the lower human capital attributes of immigrants, by Sweden's particular immigration policies and the consequent composition of the immigrant population in this country[4], as well as by discrimination. Whereas immigrants' economic integration as well as their intermarriage patterns have been widely studied, very few scholars have looked at the effect of marrying natives on the labour market opportunities of the foreign-born. Furthermore, there is no consensus on the causality and magnitude of this effect: while some scholars (e.g. Meng and Gregory 2005, Meng and Meurs 2006, Gevrek 2009, Dribe and Nystedt, forthcoming) confirm this hypothesis after controlling for human capital attributes and the potential endogeneity of intermarriage, others (e.g. Kantarevic 2004, Nekby 2010) reject it arguing that immigrants who marry natives are self-selected. Finally, it has been argued that certain immigrants may have some "unobservable" characteristics such as physical appearance and social abilities that can affect both their labour market outcomes and their probability to intermarry (Gevrek 2009, Nekby 2010).

Intermarriage Premium Hypothesis

Among those who support the intermarriage premium hypothesis, Meng and Gregory (2005) used the 1 per cent samples of the 1981, 1986, 1991 and 1996 Australian population and housing census to analyze the economic assimilation role of intermarriage between immigrants and individuals born not only in Australia but also in other English-speaking countries such as New Zealand, the United Kingdom (U.K.), the United States (U.S.) and Canada. In order to check for the potential self-selection of intermarried immigrants, they first examined the effect of human capital factors (as a proxy for earnings), time elapsed since migration and the effect of non-economic factors such as the probability of meeting a potential partner within immigrants' own age-ethnic-religious groups, and the sex ratio of immigrants' own age-ethnic-religious groups, on immigrants' likelihood to intermarry. The predicted values resulting from the intermarriage equations are then plugged into the earnings equations. They found that, after controlling for human capital endowments and endogeneity of intermarriage, intermarried immigrants still earn significantly higher incomes than intramarried immigrants. Natives who intermarry do not receive this premium, nor do immigrants who

[4] According to our data, in 2007, the year of study in our research project, 36% of foreign-born people living in Sweden had entered the country as refugees or asylum seekers, 53% under the family reunion program, whereas labour migrants only represented 4% of the immigrant population.

marry immigrants from different countries than their own. They concluded that the intermarriage premium is mainly attributable to a faster speed of assimilation rather than any difference in labour market quality between intermarried and intramarried immigrants at the point of arrival.

Meng and Meurs (2009) applied the same methodology and instruments as the ones used by Meng and Gregory (2005) on a 1992 immigration survey dataset to analyze the effect of intermarriage and language proficiency on the economic assimilation processes of immigrants to France. However, in this case, intermarriage is defined as marital or cohabiting relationships between immigrants and individuals born in France. They report that intermarried immigrants earn around 17 per cent more than the intramarried and that after controlling for individual characteristics and endogeneity of intermarriage, the premium rises up to 25- 35 per cent. Like Meng and Gregory (2005), they also found that the intermarriage premium is substantially higher for women and they explain this gender difference by Baker and Benjamin's (1997) family investment strategy hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, intermarried women finance and prioritize their husbands' training over their own careers by accepting jobs that offer low or no possibilities to advance. On the contrary, immigrant women who marry natives can focus on their own careers. Meng and Meurs (2009) also report that intermarriage premium is substantially higher for individuals who have better grasp of French language before migration than for those whose language skills are poor. They conclude that a better pre-acquisition of language facilitates a better utilization of the local labour market knowledge obtained from the native partners.

Gevrek (2009) uses cross-sectional Dutch survey data ("Social position and use of public utilities by immigrants") collected in 1994, 1998 and 2002 to investigate the role of interethnic marriage on immigrants' economic integration in the Netherlands. This survey is asked among first and second generation immigrants from the four largest ethnic minorities in the Netherlands: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and Antilleans. Second generation immigrants are defined as those who were born in the Netherlands but have at lest one foreign-born parent. Accordingly, intermarriage is understood as marital or cohabiting relationships among first or second generation immigrants and natives. As in the case of Meng and Gregory (2005) and Meng and Meurs (2009), he first examines factors affecting the intermarriage decision and includes two instrumental variables, namely, group size and sex ratio, into the model. Next, he incorporates the intermarriage equation into the earnings and employment models. He concludes that, accounting for the potential endogeneity of intermarriage, marrying natives has a positive effect on first generation and, to a lesser degree, on second generation immigrants' employment and income.

As far as we know, three studies have been conducted on intermarriage and the economic performance of immigrants in Sweden: while two of them (by Dribe and Lundh 2008, and Dribe and Nystedt, forthcoming) support the intermarriage premium hypothesis, the third one (by Nekby 2010) rejects it. Dribe and Lundh (2008) conduct an exploratory analysis of the positive association between intermarriage and economic integration in Sweden. They use cross-sectional register data from 2003 for the total immigrant

population of Sweden to analyze marital exogamy (especially intermarriage between immigrants and natives) among 39 different immigrant groups. They also look at the link between intermarriage and economic integration, with the results indicating a strong association between intermarriage with natives and economic integration in terms of employment and income. Immigrant men and women married to natives not only had higher chances of employment but they also had higher salaries. They found no association between immigrants' income or chances of being employed and non-native exogamy. They argue that their findings are consistent with the family investment strategy hypothesis and human capital explanation, implying that the human capital of a native spouse and access to native networks contribute to immigrants' human and social capital accumulation (devaluated as a consequence of migration) and hence, speed up their integration into the host societies. However, as their data did not allow them to check for the self-selection hypothesis and the endogeneity of intermarriage, they could not establish any causal relationship between intermarriage and economic integration.

As an extension of this study, Dribe and Nystedt (forthcoming) use longitudinal register data of the entire immigrant male population born between 1960 and 1974 and residing in Sweden between 1990 and 2009 to analyze the link between intermarriage and income. They establish two types of unions: endogamous (when both parties are born in the same country) and exogamous (those comprised of an immigrant and a native Swede). Exogamous marriages with two immigrants of different origin are not considered in the analysis. Based on a distributed fixed effects model, they follow individuals for several years before and during their marriage, in order to capture possible effects of intermarriage on individual income development. Their main findings can be summarized as follows: (i) intermarried immigrants earn more than endogamously-married immigrants, and both groups earn more than the never-married immigrants; (ii) the intermarriage premium is more pronounced for immigrants coming to Sweden in late adolescence or later, than for those who come at a younger age; (iii) the magnitude of the intermarriage premium is highly dependent on the country of origin: while Nordic and European immigrants earn no intermarriage premium neither before nor after marriage, immigrants from the Middle East and North Africa experience an intermarriage premium of about 15-20 percentage points after five years of marriage, of which close to nothing is visible before marriage; and (iv) out of the intermarriage premium advantage of about 13 percentage points (compared to the marriage premium of the endogamously married) after 10 years of marriage, more than half was already visible at the time of marriage. Moreover, their results show that the earnings advantage for intermarried immigrants grows steadily from several years before marriage until more than five years after marriage. They conclude that, although much of the intermarriage premium seems to be a result of selection effects, intermarriage could be an important vehicle for the economic mobility of the most marginalized immigrant groups. However, they also note that many couples in Sweden live together for a few years before they marry and thus, their results may underestimate the true intermarriage premium.

Selection Hypothesis

The main argument made by those who reject the intermarriage hypothesis is that there is a reverse causality between intermarriage and income, i.e. immigrants with better-paid jobs are more likely to marry natives than their counterparts.

Based on longitudinal register data on the entire foreign-born population living in Sweden during any of the years between 1998 and 2005, Nekby (2010) reports contradictory results to those presented by Dribe and Nystedt (forthcoming). Nekby defines intermarriage as a marital union between an immigrant and a native and uses two other marriage types as control groups: intramarriage between immigrants from the same country and intramarriage between immigrants from different countries. Based on fixed effects estimations, she concludes that the marriage premium is similar or larger for immigrants intramarried to immigrants from the same country than for intermarried immigrants. In order to control for the effect of time-varying characteristics such as host language proficiency, she also estimates staggered fixed effects models of income, using variation in the timing of marriage. She found significant increases in earnings prior to marriage for immigrants in all types of relationships in comparison to the increases of those within respective marriage types who were married for at least four years. She concludes that there is no causal impact of a change in civil status per se on immigrants' earnings nor a post-marriage effect on intermarried immigrants' earnings; and that the intermarriage premium found in earlier studies are, in the Swedish context, largely due to unobserved selection. In line with Dribe and Nystedt (forthcoming), we argue that it is possible that the human and social capital spill-over effect from the native to the foreign-born partner mostly occurs in the time period between the beginning of their relationship and the first four years of their marriage, in which case, the intermarriage premium effect would be underestimated.

Finally, Kantarevic (2004) examines the relationship between intermarriage, defined as a marital union between foreign-born and native-born individuals, and economic assimilation among immigrants in the U.S. Based on a model in which earnings of immigrants and the composition of their marital union are jointly analyzed as in the studies by Meng and Gregory (2005), Meng and Meurs (2009) and Gevrek (2009) and by using similar instruments, he evaluates the selection hypothesis on 1970 and 1980 U.S. census samples of Integrated Public use Microdata Series. He concludes that after controlling for self-selection the intermarriage advantage vanishes and he suggests that differences in the composition of the immigrant population between the U.S. and Australia may explain the contradictory results of this study versus the one conducted by Meng and Gregory (2005).

The studies presented above analyze the labour market performance of intermarried versus intramarried immigrants by testing the selection hypothesis in different Western countries. Whereas some of them support the intermarriage premium hypothesis after controlling for the potential endogeneity of intermarriage, others reject it. Kantarevic (2004) suggested these contradictory results may respond to differences in the characteristics of the immigrant population among countries of residence. We try to control for differences in human capital and socio-demographic attributes of immigrants to Sweden by replicating the same analysis on three immigrant subsamples: labour

migrants, refugees and family migrants. We also argue that differences in defining immigrants and intermarriage, as well as the choice of instrumental variables used to control for the endogeneity of intermarriage may also contribute to explaining these conflicting findings.

Data and Methodology

Migration flows to Sweden have responded to changes in migration policies and can be classified in three periods: until the mid-seventies, immigrants were attracted by a high demand for foreign labour, a trend that was enhanced by the gradual liberalisation of immigration policies. People who migrated to Sweden during this period came from neighboring countries such as Finland, Norway, Denmark and Germany and to a lesser extent from Mediterranean countries. As a result of the oil crisis and the lower demand for labour in the subsequent period, Sweden shifted towards a more restrictive labour migration policy. Therefore, from the mid-seventies until the mid-nineties immigration flows primarily consisted of refugees and family reunion migrants from outside Europe. The main immigration source countries in this period were Bosnia-Hercegovina, Chile, Iran, Iraq and Vietnam. Finally, Sweden's entry into the EU in 1995 increased migration flows from other EU countries. According to our data, in 2007, immigrants from Finland, Iraq, Former Yugoslavia, Poland, Iran, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Denmark, Norway and Germany constituted more than 50 per cent of the foreign-born population in Sweden.

Swedish register data (STATIV) from 1997 and 2007 are used to analyze the employment rates and job income of intermarried immigrants relative to those of intramarried immigrants and natives. These data contains information on the entire population of Sweden at the individual level and is updated every year. Unlike most of previous studies which had to create and rely on instrumental variables, our data allow us to identify individuals over time and thus, to compare intermarried immigrants' labour market performance before and after marriage.

We first selected a sample comprised of 1,935,205 married, 25 to 60 year-old individuals (out of which 20 per cent are immigrants) from the 2007 STATIV dataset. Intermarried immigrants represent 11.5 per cent of the initial sample, 14.5 per cent of them are intramarried immigrants and 74 per cent correspond to intramarried natives. Next, we identified these individuals in the 1997 data and deleted the non-matching individuals. Finally, we selected individuals who were single in 1997 and identified them again in the 2007 data. This selection allows us to compare intermarried immigrants' labour market performance before and after marriage. Our final sample includes 395,101 immigrants (11.32 per cent) and natives (88.68 per cent) who were registered as married in 2007 but as singles in 1997. Intermarried immigrants represent 13.5 per cent of this sample, 6.6 per cent are intramarried immigrants and Swedish couples constitute 79.8 per cent. Compared to the initial sample, our final sample includes less intramarried immigrants or foreign-born couples. Descriptive statistics of our final samples are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. The main differences between men and women concern their employment, income, education and the origin of the partner: although women are better educated than men, men's annual gross income is 35 per cent higher than that of women, their

employment rate is also higher and more men have foreign-born partners than women. As for immigrants, a similar income gap is observed between men and women. Furthermore, there is a significant income gap between intermarried and intramarried immigrants, especially for women. Most intermarried immigrants moved to Sweden under a family reunion program and had lived in Sweden seven to eight years longer than the intramarried ones, who came to Sweden as refugees or, to a lesser extent, under a family reunion program. The relative number of men is higher within the intermarried group than within the intramarried group. Intermarried immigrants are better educated than their counterparts and most of them work in high-skilled or middle-skilled jobs whereas intramarried immigrants are more represented in the middle-skilled and the low-skilled occupations. The relative number of intramarried immigrants living in the three major cities in Sweden is higher than the number of intermarried immigrants. Finally the mean IHDI of the countries or birth of intermarried immigrants is significantly higher than that of their counterparts. As intermarried immigrants are married to Swedish-born people, the difference is even more obvious in the case of the mean IHDI of partners' birth countries. To sum up, our data shows that intermarried immigrants have richer human capital endowments and higher skilled jobs, have lived in Sweden for a longer period of time and come from more developed countries than intramarried immigrants.

Our dependent variables are described as follows: *Employed* is a binary variable that shows whether an individual is employed or not. *JobIncome* is the logarithm of an individual's job income when this income is higher than 0. *MobilityinEmployment* is a categorical variable describing any potential change in individuals' employment status from 1997 to 2007 and it can take four values: 1 if the individual is unemployed in 1997 but employed in 2007 (i.e. if there is an upward mobility), 2 when there is no change in employment status and the individual remains employed, 3 when there is no change in employment status and the individual remains unemployed and 4 if the individual was employed in 1997 but unemployed in 2007 (i.e. if there is a downward mobility). Our last dependent variable, *IncomeGrowth*, is a numerical variable computed by subtracting 1997's gross income from the 2007 one. The main explanatory variables of our analysis include variables describing the human and social capital of individuals, as well as environmental or context-related variables. Some of these variables are binary variables describing whether both partners and the parents of the reference person were born in Sweden or abroad, the citizenship of the reference person and other migration-related variables such as the number of years in Sweden, the type of migration (i.e. asylum seeking, family reunion or labour migration), years since migration, and the Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI) of the country of birth of the each partner. While the Human Development Index (HDI) is an index of potential human development that could be obtained if achievements in three basic dimensions, namely health, education and income, were distributed equally, the IHDI captures the actual level of human development (accounting for inequality in the distribution of achievements in these three areas across people in a society). In other words, the HDI represents a national average of human development and as such, it does not capture disparities in human development across the population within the same country. Based on a distribution-sensitive class of composite indices, the IHDI represents not only the average achievements of a country on health, education and income, but also how those achievements are distributed among its citizens by discounting each dimension's average

value according to its level of inequality (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2013). Our control variables include the age, gender, years since marriage, the number of children and education of individuals, their occupation, the city of residence and local employment rates. Finally, in order to capture individuals' pre-marital labour market experience, we added the binary variable *Employed1997*, which describes their employment status in 1997, when they were single.

We ran a set of binomial logistic regression analysis on the dependent variable *Employed* to test if being married to a Swedish-born person has a significant effect on immigrants' likelihood of being employed. The binomial logistic regression predicts the probability of an event happening; in this case, the probability of an individual to be employed. Next, we applied another set of linear regressions on the dependent variable *Jobincome* in order to assess the potential effect of intermarriage with natives on immigrants' earnings. All regressions were also run separately for men and women, and immigrant men and women. The reason for separating men and women responds to the intersectionality between gender and origin (in this case, immigrant versus native) found in previous studies such as Baker and Benjamin's (1997) as well as the ones presented in the literature section. Different models respond to the multicolinearity of some variables. Finally, Chi-Square tests and T-tests were conducted in order to measure whether there is a statistically significant correlation between the higher employment and income levels of to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried single immigrants in 1997. If a statistically significant relationship favorable to intermarried immigrants is found between the 1997 labour market outcomes of immigrants who were single in 1997 but intermarried in 2007 versus immigrants who intramarried, then our results would support the selection hypothesis.

Nevertheless, these tests would not allow us to completely reject the intermarriage premium hypothesis since self-selected immigrants may still benefit from the human and social capital spill-over effects of intermarriage in a greater extent than intramarried immigrants. Therefore, in order to test the intermarriage hypothesis, we included two variables describing individuals' employment status and income of 1997 in our 2007 dataset. Next, we computed two new variables *MobilityinEmployment* and *IncomeGrowth* describing potential changes in individuals' employment status and their income growth from 1997 and 2007. To conclude, Chi-Square tests and T-tests were run to check whether a statistically significant relationship exists between these two variables (i.e. *MobilityinEmployment* and *IncomeGrowth*) and immigrants' choice of marriage (i.e. intermarriage or intramarriage). If a statistically non-significant relationship or a statistically significant relationship favorable to intramarried immigrants is found in employment status change and income growth of intermarried versus intramarried immigrants within the same time period, then we could also reject the intermarriage premium hypothesis. In order to control for differences in human capital and socio-demographic characteristics among immigrants to Sweden, the same analyses are conducted on three additional subsamples based on foreign-born individuals' immigration status when they entered Sweden: labour migrants, refugees and family migrants.

Findings: Self-selection or Intermarriage Premium?

Preliminary analyses of our data show that the probability of being employed and that of gaining a higher income are lower for immigrants than for natives (see Tables 3 and 4). The same is true for people married to immigrants versus natives. As expected, country of origin's IHDI also matters: the higher the IHDI, the more likely individuals' are to be employed and to earn a higher income. According to this finding, immigrants coming from countries with a higher IHDI than Sweden (namely, Norway and Australia) are more likely to achieve better labour market outcomes than Swedish-born people. Surprisingly, Swedish citizenship has a slightly negative effect on income. The effects of all these origin-related variables are stronger for men than for women, and the betas of the income models are very low.

Our human capital and socio-demographic control variables behave as expected: being a man, having a higher education and living in Stockholm, Malmö and Göteborg as well as in municipalities with higher employment rates increase individuals' employment opportunities and those of having a higher income. People who work in high-skilled occupations are also more likely to obtain a higher income than those who work in middle-skilled and low-skilled occupations. Finally, labour market experience, as described by employment status in 1997, has a robust effect on individuals' employment and income, with this effect being stronger for men than for women. Other differences between men and women are as follows: whereas having children increases men's likelihood of getting employment and a high salary, it has the opposite effect for women. Men with high secondary and low university education have higher chances of getting a job than men with higher and lower education, whereas in the case of women the same applies for those with low and high university education. Living in the three major cities increases women's chances to be employed but, perhaps due to the strong effect of local male employment rates, these variables are not significant for men. The positive effect of working on high-skilled occupations on income is higher for women than for men.

The negative impact of the variables *Foreignborn* and *ForeignbornPartner* on married individuals' employment and income opportunities led us to further explore the effect of these and other migration-related variables, including the link between intermarriage and labour market performance, on a subsample comprised of immigrants. The results of these regressions are reported in Tables 5 and 6. The development level of the country or origin, measured by the IHDI, and being a Swedish citizen have a significant positive effect on immigrants' employment and a very modest one on income. On the contrary, being married to a foreign-born person decreases immigrants' employment opportunities and their salary. In other words, immigrants intermarried to natives are more likely to show better labour market outcomes than immigrants married to other immigrants. Time elapsed since migration has a positive effect on employment and income and, as expected, labour migrants are more likely to be employed and gain a higher salary than other migrants. While the effects of the IHDI variable and those of being a Swedish citizen and being married to a foreign-born person are stronger for immigrant men's employment opportunities than women's, the development level of the country of birth of the partner has a similar positive effect on both. Interestingly, intramarried immigrant women are more likely to earn a higher income than the intermarried ones and this could be explained either by the family investment strategy hypothesis described by Baker and Benjamin's (1997) or by the simple fact that their partners may not make enough money

to support the family and hence, immigrant women need to work more hours than they would if they were intermarried. Finally, being a labour migrant has a positive effect on immigrant men's job income but it is not significant for women.

As for the human capital and socio-demographic control variables included in the analyses, being a man, not having young children, having a high university education and premarital labour market experience, and higher local employment rates have the expected positive effects on married immigrants' likelihood of employment. The main difference between men and women is that whereas male immigrants with young children are more likely to be employed, the effect of this variable is not significant for women. Married male immigrants, the highly educated, those who work in middle-skilled occupations, had a job in 1997, or live in one of the three major Swedish cities or in municipalities with high employment rates are more likely to have higher salaries than their counterparts. Immigrant women with young children earn a lower salary than immigrant women with no children. One possible explanation for this finding is that immigrant women with children may work fewer hours than their counterparts. The effect of this variable is not significant for men.

To sum up, intermarried immigrants' employment opportunities and income are higher than those of intramarried immigrants and thus, the answers to our first two research questions are positive. Our results also show that immigrants' premarital labour market experience, as measured by their employment status in 1997, has an effect on married immigrants' employment and income in 2007. Nevertheless, these findings do not provide enough evidence to support or reject the selection and intermarriage hypotheses. In order to answer our third question about the causes of the differences in the labour market performance between intermarried versus intramarried immigrants, we first compare the pre-marriage employment and income of the same individuals in 1997. The results of these tests (Chi-Square and T-test) are presented in Tables 7 and 8. According to the contingency table describing the employment status and the origin of the future partner shown in Table 7, whereas 67.5 per cent of single immigrants to be intermarried between 1998 and 2007 were employed, this was the case for only 41.6 per cent of single immigrants to be intramarried within the same time period. The continuity correction factor of the Chi-Square test confirms that there is a strong correlation between the two variables analyzed: being employed and the origin of the future partner. In other words, the differences found in the contingency table are statistically significant. Finally, Table 8 shows the 1997 mean annual income of single immigrants to be intermarried versus intramarried between 1998 and 2007. The table indicates that to-be-intermarried immigrants' earnings were already higher when they were single in 1997 than those of to-be-intramarried immigrants. According to the T-test for equality of means, the difference in the mean income between these two groups is significant. Thus, our results support the selection hypothesis and previous studies by Kantarevic (2004) and Nekby (2010).

However, since self-selected immigrants may still benefit from the human and social capital spill-over effects of intermarriage more than intramarried immigrants do, we also ran additional Chi-Square and T-tests in order to reject or confirm the intermarriage premium hypothesis (Tables 9 and 10). We tested the correlation between potential changes in employment status and the origin of the partners between 1997 and 2007 to

find that 34.3 per cent of intramarried immigrants who were unemployed in 1997 had a job in 2007, whereas this was only the case for 23.7 per cent of intermarried immigrants. The employment status of 69.9 per cent of intermarried immigrants versus 58.2 per cent of intramarried ones did not change: 61.2 per cent of intermarried immigrants compared to 34.1 per cent of intramarried ones remained employed, while 8.7 per cent of intermarried and 24.1 per cent of intramarried immigrants stayed out of employment. In sum, these findings show that intermarried immigrants kept or improved their employment status more than intramarried immigrants did, as 84.9 per cent of intermarried versus 68.4 per cent of intramarried immigrants remained employed or accessed employment during that time period. The Chi-Square test presented in Table 9 shows that the differences between the two groups are statistically significant. Finally, we applied a T-test to assess whether there is a statistically significant relationship between the income growth of intermarried versus intramarried immigrants within the same decade. The results presented in Table 10 indicate that there is, with intermarried immigrants' salary increase being higher than their counterparts'. Thus, our findings also confirm the intermarriage premium hypothesis measured by income growth, in Sweden and previous studies by Kantarevic (2004) and Nekby (2010).

In order to answer our fourth research question about potential differences in the above described patterns among immigrants based on their status when they entered Sweden, the same analyses were conducted for labour migrants, refugees and family migrants[5] separately and the results are shown in Tables 11 to 22. As we did before, we first compare the pre-marriage employment and income of to be intermarried versus to be intramarried individuals in 1997. According to our findings, 80.7 per cent of single labour migrants who later married native Swedes, as opposed to 52.7 per cent of them who later married other migrants, were employed in 1997. This was the case for 46.4 per cent of to-be-intermarried versus 29.6 per cent of to-be-intramarried refugees; and also for 49.6 per cent of versus 35.6 per cent of family migrants who were to marry Swedish-born and foreign-born individuals, respectively. Although labour migrants experienced the biggest gap, the Chi-Square tests reported in Tables 11, 13 and 15 show that these differences are statistically significant for the three groups analyzed. We complete these analyses by looking at the annual mean income of to-be-intermarried and to-be-intramarried single immigrants classified under the same categories. Our results show that the annual mean income was higher for labour migrants, refugees and family migrants whose future spouses were born in Sweden that for their counterparts. However, this difference is not statistically significant for refugees. With this exception, our overall findings support the selection hypotheses for labour migrants, refugees and family migrants.

As a last step, we tested whether any of these three groups also experienced an intermarriage premium or not. As reported in Tables 17, 19 and 21, the relative number of labour migrants, refugees and family migrants who remained or became employed between 1997 and 2007 was higher for those who intermarried than for the ones who intramarried other immigrants; whereas the percentage of immigrants classified in any of these three subgroups who remained out of employment is higher for the intramarried

[5] Note that family migrants can be sponsored not only by their spouses or partners but also by other relatives such as the parents.

ones than for their counterparts. According to the Chi-Square tests shown in these tables, these differences are statistically significant. Finally, the T-tests presented in Tables 18, 20 and 22 illustrate that the income gain occurred between 1997 and 2007 was higher for labour migrants, refugees and family migrants who married Swedish-born individuals than for those who married other immigrants. Nevertheless, the difference in income growth is only significant for family migrants. To sum up, these findings provide evidence to partially support the intermarriage premium hypothesis for labour migrants and refugees and, as expected, to fully support it for family reunion migrants.

Conclusions

This paper explores the relationship between intermarriage and immigrants' labour market performance. We aimed to contribute to the ongoing debate on the existence of an intermarriage premium for intermarried immigrants by using longitudinal data to analyze their economic integration before and after marriage; and by including new explanatory variables into the equation such as the type of migration and the Inequality-adjusted Human Capital Index (IHDI) of the country of origin of each spouse. Some interesting conclusions can be made based on these analyses: whereas being foreign-born and having a foreign-born partner decreases individuals' probability of employment and their job income, immigrants from countries with higher IHDI than Sweden are more likely to find a job and to have a higher salary than individuals born in other countries, including Sweden. As expected, immigrants' probability of being employed and that of having a higher salary increase if they enter Sweden as labour migrants as opposed to refuges and family migrants. We also found differences in the effect of some variables such as having children between immigrant men and women's employment and income, which could be explained by the family investment strategy hypothesis suggested by Baker and Benjamin (1997). Finally, the analysis of the 1997 data shows statistically significant employment and income differences between single immigrants who were to intermarry versus those who were to intramarry between 1998 and 2007, with those to-be-intermarried having superior labour market outcomes than their counterparts even in 1997, when they were single. We argued that these results support the selection hypothesis. In order to test whether self-selected intermarried immigrants still benefit from their partners' human and social capital to a greater extent than intramarried immigrants do, we analyzed the mobility in employment status and income growth of these two subsamples from 1997 to 2007. We found that both the 2007 employment situation relative to that of 1997 was more favourable for intermarried immigrants than for intramarried ones; likewise, our results show that the former experienced a higher income growth than the latter. Hence, these findings not only provide evidence to support the selection hypothesis but also to confirm the intermarriage premium hypothesis for immigrants living in Sweden. We completed our analysis by replicating these tests on three subsamples: labour migrants, refugees and family migrants. Whereas the results of these tests provide evidence to fully support the selection hypothesis for labour and family migrants and to partially support it for refugees, they fully confirm the intermarriage premium hypothesis for family migrants and only partially for refugees and labour migrants.

The notion of intermarriage as a promoter of social cohesion and integration is becoming popular among researchers and policy makers. It has also been argued that a high level of

intermarriage reduces dissimilarities in labour market outcomes between immigrants and natives (Gevrek 2009). The rationale behind this idea is that intermarriage with natives is supposed to enhance immigrants' human and social capital specific to the country of residence, which in turn would decrease their liability of foreignness and improve not only their job opportunities and conditions but also their overall level of understanding and knowledge of the new country. Our findings show that intermarried immigrants, not only had better labour market outcomes than intramarried ones when they were single, but also that, after marriage, these outcomes improved to a greater extent for the former than for the latter. These results seem to suggest that, at least in the economic sphere, intermarriage plays an integrative role for immigrants married to Swedes.

References

Alba, R. (1995) 'Assimilation's quiet tide', *The Public Interest* 119: 3-18.

Alba, R. and Golden, R.M. (1986) 'Patterns of ethnic marriage in the United States', *Social Forces* 65(1): 202-223.

Alba, R. and Nee, V. (1995) 'Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration', *International Migration Review* 31(4): 826-874.

Baker, M. and Benjamin, D. (1997) 'The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Labour-Market Activity: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations', *American Economic Review* 87: 705-727.

Bevelander, P. (2010) 'The immigration and integration experience: The case of Sweden', in Segal, U.A., Mayadas, N.S., and Elliott, D. (eds.) *Immigration worldwide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bevelander, P. and Pendakur, R. (2014) "The Labour Market Integration of Refugee and Family reunion Immigrants: A Comparison of outcomes between Canada and Sweden", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* Vol 40 (5): 689-709.

Bossard, J. H. S. (1939) 'Nationality and nativity as factors in marriage', *American Sociological Review*, 4: 792-98.

Dribe, M. and Lundh, C. (2008) 'Intermarriage and Immigrant Integration in Sweden', *Acta Sociologica*, 51(4): 329-354.

Dribe, M. and Nystedt, P. (forthcoming in 2014) 'Is there an Intermarriage Premium for Male Immigrants? Exogamy and Earnings in Sweden 1990–2009', *International Migration Review*.

Gevrek, E. (2009) 'Interethnic marriage and the labor market integration of immigrants', available at http://econ.arizona.edu/docs/Job%20Market/Gevrek_2009_Revised.pdf (accessed June 10, 2013).

Giorgas, D. and Jones, F. L. (2002) 'Intermarriage patterns and social cohesion among first, second and later generation Australians', *Journal of Population Research*, 19(1): 47-64.

Irastorza, N. (2010) *Born entrepreneurs? Immigrant self-employment in Spain*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Kantarevic, J. (2004) 'Interethnic marriages and economic assimilation of immigrants', *IZA Discussion Paper* 1142.

Kennedy, R. J. R. (1943) 'Premarital residential propinquity and ethnic endogamy', *American Journal of Sociology*, 48 (5): 580-584.

Meng, X. and Gregory, R.G. (2005) 'Intermarriage and the economic assimilation of immigrants', *Journal of Labour Economics* 23(1): 135-175.

Meng. X. and Meurs, D. (2009) 'Intermarriage, language and economic assimilation process: A case study of France', *International Journal of Manpower* 30: 127 – 144.

Nekby, L. (2010) 'Inter- and intra-marriage premiums revisited: It's probably who you are, not who you marry!', *IZA Discussion Paper* 5317.

Nordin, M. and Rooth, D. (2009) 'The ethnic employment and income gap in Sweden: Is skill or labor market discrimination the explanation?', *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 111(3): 487-510.

Price, C.A. (1982) *The fertility and marriage patterns of Australia's ethnic groups*. Canberra: Department of Demography, The Australian National University.

United Nations Development Programme (2010) "Human Development Report 2010. The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development". Retrieved December 9, 2013, from http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2010_EN_Complete_reprint.pdf

Table 1. Descriptive statistics: 25-60 year old individuals married between 1998 and 2007

	All	Men	Women
Employed	89.76%	92.49%	86.57%
Annual Gross Income (SEK)	295,953	351,520	231,012
Foreign-born	11.32%	11.36%	11.27%
Swedish Citizen	97.26%	97.27%	97.24%
Foreign-born Partner	15.48%	18.01%	12.52%
Foreign-born Father	19.36%	19.25%	19.47%
Foreign-born Mother	18.34%	18.24%	18.45%
Age	42.56	42.65	42.45
Years of Marriage	4.93	4.69	5.22
Male	53.89%	-	-
Children	1.46	1.48	1.43
Primary Education	9.87%	11.50%	7.97%
Low-secondary Education	47.21%	48.76%	45.41%
High-secondary Education	8.12%	10.01%	5.91%
Low-university Education	33.02%	27.62%	39.32%
High-university Education	1.62%	1.97%	1.22%
High-skilled Occupations	53.51%	53.71%	53.27%
Middle-skilled Occupations	41.97%	41.92%	42.04%
Low-skilled Occupations	4.06%	3.56%	4.65%
Stockholm	9.81%	9.68%	9.95%
Göteborg	5.13%	5.16%	5.09%
Malmö	2.43%	2.48%	2.38%
Other Municipalities	82.63%	82.68%	82.57%
IHDI2012	0.84	0.83	0.84
IHDI2012_Partner	0.83	0.82	0.83

Table 2. Descriptive statistics: 25-60 year old immigrants married between 1998 and 2007 (2007)

	Intermarried			Intramarried		
	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women
Employed	84.95%	88.15%	82.51%	68.47%	72.75%	61.57%
Annual Gross Income (SEK)	264,678	322,454	220,662	186,214	209,593	148,539
Years since Migration	26.7768	27.1104	26.5133	19.6226	19.4691	19.9047
Labour Migrant	3.83%	5.96%	2.24%	1.12%	1.12%	1.12%
Refugee	21.19%	24.62%	18.64%	60.81%	65.90%	51.89%
Family Reunion	61.60%	54.69%	66.72%	29.79%	24.16%	39.65%
Student	0.70%	0.69%	0.70%	0.22%	0.22%	0.22%
Age	43.76	43.25	44.15	44.66	44.30	45.23
Years of Marriage	5.16	4.79	5.45	5.94	5.40	7.04
Male	43.24%	-	-	61.71%	-	-
Children	1.30	1.49	1.15	1.17	1.23	1.08
Primary Education	12.12%	13.10%	11.37%	22.81%	21.13%	25.51%
Low-secondary Education	44.31%	46.89%	42.35%	44.54%	45.92%	42.32%
High-secondary Education	6.04%	7.10%	5.23%	4.15%	4.61%	3.41%
Low-university Education	34.30%	28.74%	38.54%	25.39%	25.60%	25.04%
High-university Education	2.69%	3.38%	2.16%	1.77%	1.89%	1.58%
High-skilled Occupations	49.55%	51.81%	47.84%	27.22%	27.34%	27.02%
Middle-skilled Occupations	44.01%	43.17%	44.65%	57.46%	59.08%	54.77%
Low-skilled Occupations	6.30%	4.73%	7.48%	15.28%	13.53%	18.21%
Stockholm	13.10%	12.70%	13.41%	18.86%	19.05%	18.57%
Göteborg	5.97%	6.22%	5.78%	10.97%	11.34%	10.36%
Malmö	3.40%	3.77%	3.12%	6.64%	6.47%	6.92%
Other Municipalities	77.53%	77.31%	77.69%	63.53%	63.14%	64.16%
IHDI2012	0.74	0.75	0.74	0.60	0.58	0.62
IHDI2012_Partner	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.59	0.58	0.60

Table 3. Logistic Regression: Dependent *Employed*

	ALL						MEN						WOMEN					
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6		
	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Foreignborn	-0.28	0.00	0.76	-	-	-	-0.43	0.00	0.65	-	-	-	-0.17	0.00	0.84	-	-	-
IHDI2012	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01
SwedishCitizen	0.26	0.00	1.30	0.47	0.00	1.61	0.37	0.00	1.45	0.63	0.00	1.88	0.16	0.03	1.17	0.31	0.00	1.36
ForeignbornPartner	-0.44	0.00	0.65	-	-	-	-0.45	0.00	0.64	-	-	-	-0.33	0.00	0.72	-	-	-
IHDI2012_Partner	-	-	-	0.02	0.00	1.02	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01
Age	0.10	0.00	1.11	0.11	0.00	1.11	0.06	0.06	1.06	0.06	0.04	1.06	0.09	0.00	1.09	0.09	0.00	1.10
AgeSq	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
YrsofMarriage	0.01	0.09	1.01	0.01	0.09	1.01	0.03	0.01	1.03	0.02	0.03	1.02	0.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.57	1.00
YrsofMarriage_Sq	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.65	1.00	0.00	0.15	1.00	0.00	0.26	1.00	0.00	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.37	1.00
Male	0.87	0.00	2.40	0.89	0.00	2.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Children	0.03	0.01	1.03	0.04	0.00	1.04	0.14	0.00	1.15	0.16	0.00	1.17	-0.04	0.01	0.97	-0.03	0.02	0.97
LowsecondaryEducation	0.33	0.00	1.38	0.31	0.00	1.37	0.25	0.00	1.28	0.23	0.00	1.26	0.40	0.00	1.49	0.40	0.00	1.49
HighsecondaryEducation	0.12	0.01	1.12	0.10	0.02	1.10	0.36	0.00	1.44	0.35	0.00	1.42	-0.04	0.49	0.96	-0.05	0.39	0.95
LowuniversityEducation	0.76	0.00	2.13	0.74	0.00	2.09	0.61	0.00	1.85	0.60	0.00	1.82	0.86	0.00	2.37	0.86	0.00	2.35
HighuniversityEducation	0.71	0.00	2.02	0.67	0.00	1.95	0.30	0.01	1.35	0.26	0.03	1.29	1.16	0.00	3.20	1.14	0.00	3.14
Stockholm	0.17	0.00	1.19	0.21	0.00	1.23	0.00	0.93	1.00	0.04	0.48	1.04	0.31	0.00	1.37	0.33	0.00	1.39
Göteborg	0.23	0.00	1.25	0.25	0.00	1.28	0.08	0.24	1.08	0.10	0.13	1.11	0.35	0.00	1.42	0.36	0.00	1.44
Malmö	0.27	0.00	1.31	0.26	0.00	1.30	0.22	0.04	1.24	0.21	0.05	1.23	0.38	0.00	1.47	0.38	0.00	1.46
LocalEmployment	0.03	0.00	1.03	0.03	0.00	1.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalMaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.00	1.05	0.05	0.00	1.05		-	-	-	-	-
LocalFemaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03	0.00	1.03	0.03	0.00	1.03
Employed1997	1.09	0.00	2.96	1.08	0.00	2.94	1.33	0.00	3.79	1.32	0.00	3.75	0.92	0.00	2.50	0.92	0.00	2.50
Constant	-2.83	0.00	0.06	-5.31	0.00	0.01	-2.22	0.01	0.11	-4.96	0.00	0.01	-1.82	0.00	0.16	-3.59	0.00	0.03
Sig.		0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00	
Cox & Snell R^2		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02	
Nagelkerke R^2		0.08			0.08			0.10			0.10			0.05			0.05	
Df		18			18			17			17			17			17	

* Reference categories are Primary education and Other municipalities.

Table 4. Linear Regression: Dependent *Ln_Income*

	ALL						MEN						WOMEN					
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6		
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)	6.04	0.04	0.00	5.75	0.04	0.00	6.67	0.06	0.00	6.27	0.06	0.00	5.91	0.07	0.00	5.89	0.07	0.00
Foreignborn	-0.03	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-0.08	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	0.01	-	-	-
IHDI2012	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.65
SwedishCitizen	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.62	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.53	-0.01	0.01	0.09
ForeignbornPartner	-0.03	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-	-	-
IHDI2012_Partner	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.32
Age	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
AgeSq	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
YrsofMarriage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
YrsofMarriage_Sq	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02
Male	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Children	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.00	0.00
LowsecondaryEducation	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00
HighsecondaryEducation	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.00
LowuniversityEducation	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00
HighuniversityEducation	0.29	0.01	0.00	0.28	0.01	0.00	0.26	0.01	0.00	0.26	0.01	0.00	0.32	0.01	0.00	0.32	0.01	0.00
Middleskilled	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00
Highlyskilled	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.01	0.00	0.35	0.01	0.00	0.44	0.01	0.00	0.44	0.01	0.00
Stockholm	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00
Göteborg	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00
Malmö	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.01	0.00
Localemploymentrate	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalMaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalFemaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Employed1997	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00
Sig.	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
R^2	0.26			0.26			0.20			0.20			0.16			0.16		
Df	20			20			19			19			19			19		

* Reference categories are Primary education, Low skilled occupations and Other municipalities.

Table 5. Logistic Regression: Dependent *Employed* (Immigrants' subsample)

	All foreign-born						Foreign-born men						Foreign-born women					
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6		
	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
IHDI2012	-	-	-	0.01	0.01	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.03	1.01	-	-	-	0.00	0.43	1.00
SwedishCitizen	0.38	0.00	1.46	0.48	0.00	1.62	0.53	0.00	1.70	0.65	0.00	1.92	0.17	0.18	1.18	0.23	0.07	1.25
ForeignbornPartner	-0.38	0.00	0.69	-	-	-	-0.46	0.00	0.63	-	-	-	-0.31	0.00	0.73	-	-	-
IHDI2012 Partner	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	1.01
ForeignbornFather	0.35	0.65	1.42	0.40	0.62	1.49	0.50	0.65	1.65	0.75	0.49	2.13	0.32	0.77	1.38	0.25	0.83	1.28
ForeignbornMother	-0.60	0.34	0.55	-0.56	0.37	0.57	-0.95	0.37	0.39	-0.93	0.38	0.39	-0.40	0.61	0.67	-0.36	0.65	0.70
YrsinceMigration	0.09	0.00	1.09	0.09	0.00	1.10	0.09	0.00	1.09	0.09	0.00	1.10	0.09	0.00	1.10	0.10	0.00	1.10
YrsinceMigrationSq	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	1.00
Labourmigrant	0.64	0.06	1.90	0.59	0.09	1.80	0.57	0.19	1.77	0.49	0.26	1.64	0.76	0.17	2.13	0.73	0.19	2.07
Refugee	-0.15	0.26	0.86	-0.12	0.38	0.89	-0.26	0.14	0.77	-0.24	0.19	0.79	0.02	0.93	1.02	0.05	0.83	1.05
Familyreunion	-0.18	0.18	0.84	-0.16	0.22	0.85	-0.17	0.35	0.84	-0.16	0.38	0.85	-0.14	0.49	0.87	-0.12	0.55	0.89
Age	-0.07	0.27	0.93	-0.06	0.37	0.94	-0.15	0.09	0.86	-0.14	0.12	0.87	-0.01	0.96	1.00	0.01	0.95	1.01
AgeSq	0.00	0.41	1.00	0.00	0.54	1.00	0.00	0.15	1.00	0.00	0.19	1.00	0.00	0.91	1.00	0.00	0.82	1.00
YrsofMarriage	0.02	0.09	1.02	0.02	0.16	1.02	0.04	0.19	1.04	0.03	0.29	1.03	0.02	0.42	1.02	0.01	0.52	1.01
YrsofMarriage Sq	0.00	0.24	1.00	0.00	0.37	1.00	0.00	0.42	1.00	0.00	0.58	1.00	0.00	0.47	1.00	0.00	0.57	1.00
Male	0.33	0.00	1.40	0.36	0.00	1.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Children	0.04	0.22	1.04	0.06	0.03	1.06	0.11	0.01	1.12	0.14	0.00	1.15	-0.06	0.15	0.94	-0.04	0.33	0.96
LowsecondaryEducation	0.33	0.00	1.39	0.29	0.00	1.34	0.32	0.00	1.38	0.27	0.01	1.32	0.36	0.00	1.43	0.34	0.00	1.40
HighsecondaryEducation	-0.06	0.67	0.94	-0.10	0.46	0.90	0.07	0.71	1.07	0.03	0.89	1.03	-0.22	0.31	0.80	-0.25	0.26	0.78
LowuniversityEducation	0.56	0.00	1.74	0.49	0.00	1.63	0.56	0.00	1.76	0.51	0.00	1.66	0.56	0.00	1.75	0.51	0.00	1.66
HighuniversityEducation	0.87	0.00	2.39	0.78	0.00	2.18	0.83	0.01	2.30	0.74	0.02	2.09	0.90	0.01	2.47	0.84	0.01	2.31
Stockholm	-0.08	0.30	0.92	0.01	0.94	1.01	-0.09	0.39	0.92	0.01	0.92	1.01	-0.04	0.75	0.96	0.02	0.86	1.02
Göteborg	0.04	0.65	1.05	0.06	0.53	1.06	0.02	0.89	1.02	0.03	0.81	1.03	0.11	0.49	1.12	0.13	0.42	1.14
Malmö	0.22	0.21	1.24	0.12	0.49	1.13	0.14	0.54	1.15	0.03	0.91	1.03	0.37	0.19	1.44	0.30	0.28	1.35
LocalEmployment	0.04	0.00	1.04	0.04	0.00	1.04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalMaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.05	0.00	1.05	0.04	0.00	1.04	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalFemaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04	0.01	1.04	0.04	0.01	1.04
Employed1997	0.73	0.00	2.08	0.71	0.00	2.04	0.78	0.00	2.17	0.75	0.00	2.11	0.62	0.00	1.85	0.61	0.00	1.84
Constant	-0.34	0.86	0.71	-1.90	0.31	0.15	1.66	0.52	5.26	-0.19	0.94	0.83	-1.65	0.55	0.19	-2.77	0.32	0.06
Sig.		0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00	
Cox & Snell R^2		0.02			0.03			0.03			0.03			0.02			0.02	
Nagelkerke R^2		0.06			0.06			0.06			0.08			0.05			0.05	
Df		24			25			23			24			23			24	

* Reference categories are Other migrants, Primary education and Other municipalities.

Table 6. Linear Regression: Dependent *Ln_Income* (Imigrants'subsample)

	All foreign-born						Foreign-born men						Foreign-born women					
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6		
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.
(Constant)	6.59	0.27	0.00	6.44	0.28	0.00	7.10	0.36	0.00	6.86	0.36	0.00	6.39	0.42	0.00	6.40	0.42	0.00
IHDI2012	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.41
SwedishCitizen	0.02	0.01	0.15	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.47	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.03	0.02	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.06
ForeignbornPartner	-0.02	0.01	0.10	-	-	-	-0.05	0.02	0.00	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.14	-	-	-
IHDI2012 Partner	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.38	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.22	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.27
ForeignbornFather	0.11	0.12	0.36	0.11	0.12	0.35	0.06	0.16	0.72	0.07	0.16	0.66	0.20	0.17	0.25	0.20	0.17	0.24
ForeignbornMother	-0.02	0.07	0.78	-0.01	0.07	0.87	-0.11	0.10	0.27	-0.10	0.10	0.29	0.10	0.10	0.33	0.10	0.10	0.32
YrsinceMigration	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.38	0.01	0.01	0.36
YrsinceMigrationSq	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.64
Labourmigrant	0.15	0.03	0.00	0.15	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.04	0.00	0.20	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.77	0.02	0.06	0.77
Refugee	-0.03	0.02	0.17	-0.02	0.02	0.24	-0.02	0.02	0.38	-0.02	0.02	0.42	-0.03	0.03	0.24	-0.03	0.03	0.26
Familyreunion	-0.03	0.02	0.08	-0.03	0.02	0.10	-0.02	0.03	0.36	-0.02	0.03	0.42	-0.06	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.03	0.05
Age	0.01	0.01	0.24	0.01	0.01	0.16	0.00	0.01	0.98	0.00	0.01	0.77	0.02	0.02	0.19	0.02	0.02	0.18
AgeSq	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.11
YrsofMarriage	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.87
YrsofMarriage Sq	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.38
Male	0.20	0.01	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Children	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.22	0.00	0.01	0.60	-0.04	0.01	0.00	-0.04	0.01	0.00
LowsecondaryEducation	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.86	0.00	0.02	0.90
HighsecondaryEducation	-0.02	0.03	0.45	-0.02	0.03	0.40	0.01	0.03	0.84	0.01	0.03	0.85	-0.05	0.04	0.26	-0.05	0.04	0.24
LowuniversityEducation	0.11	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.02	0.00	0.16	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.17	0.03	0.02	0.20
HighuniversityEducation	0.24	0.03	0.00	0.24	0.03	0.00	0.23	0.04	0.00	0.22	0.04	0.00	0.25	0.04	0.00	0.25	0.04	0.00
Middleskilled	0.41	0.02	0.00	0.40	0.02	0.00	0.44	0.02	0.00	0.43	0.02	0.00	0.38	0.03	0.00	0.38	0.03	0.00
Highlyskilled	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.02	0.00	0.13	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.00
Stockholm	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.40	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.00
Göteborg	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.37	0.02	0.03	0.36
Malmö	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.18	0.04	0.04	0.31	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.07	0.05	0.13
LocalEmployment	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalMaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	-	-	-	-	-	-
LocalFemaleEmployment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.04
Employed1997	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.00
Sig.	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00		
R^2	0.18			0.18			0.17			0.17			0.16			0.16		
Df	26			27			25			26			25			26		

* Reference categories are Other migrants, Primary education, Low skilled occupations and Other municipalities.

Table 7. Chi-Square test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried immigrants' employment (1997)

Employment in 1997

		Origin of the future partner		
		Foreign-born	Swedish-born	Total
Not employed	N	15333	5993	21326
	%	58.4%	32.5%	47.7%
Employed	N	10909	12473	23382
	%	41.6%	67.5%	52.3%
Total	N	26242	18466	44708
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2931.399[a]	1	0.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	2930.358	1	0.000		
Likelihood Ratio	2977.872	1	0.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				0.000	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2931.333	1	0.000		
N of Valid Cases	44708				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3579.19.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 8. T-test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried immigrants' income (1997)

Group statistics (Annual gross income in SEK)

Income by origin of the future partner	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Swedish-born	12472	188,715	990.838	8.872
Foreign-born	10908	163,126	879.773	8.424

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Gross income	Equal variances assumed	.101	.751	-20.751	23378	.000	-255.888	12.331	-280.058	-231.717
	Equal variances not assumed			-20.916	23372.678	.000	-255.888	12.234	-279.867	-231.908

Table 9. Chi-Square test of intermarried versus intramarried immigrants' mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

Mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

	Intermarried immigrants		Intramarried immigrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upward mobility	4382	23.7%	9008	34.3%	13390	29.9%
No change: employed	11305	61.2%	8959	34.1%	20264	45.3%
No change: out of employment	1611	8.7%	6325	24.1%	7936	17.8%
Downward mobility	1168	6.3%	1950	7.4%	3118	7.0%
Total	18466	100.0%	26242	100.0%	44708	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3623.188[a]	3	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	3736.391	3	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	70.147	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	44708		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1287.85.

Table 10. T-test of intermarried versus intramarried immigrants' income growth (1997-2007)

Group Statistics

Income growth	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intramarried immigrants	8877	132,656	1526.30791	16.19978
Intermarried immigrants	11237	142,160	2092.06563	19.73559

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Income growth	Equal variances assumed	24.999	.000	-3.591	20112	.000	-95.04181	26.46434	-146.91409	-43.16952
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.722	19990.077	.000	-95.04181	25.53285	-145.08830	-44.99531

Table 11. Chi-Square test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried labour migrants' employment (1997)

Employment in 1997

		Origin of the future partner		
		Swedish-born	Foreign-born	Total
Not employed	N	41	97	138
	%	19.3%	47.3%	33.1%
Employed	N	171	108	279
	%	80.7%	52.7%	66.9%
Total	N	212	205	417
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.843[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	35.591	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	37.625	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	36.755	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	417				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 67.84.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 12. T-test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried labour migrants' income (1997)

Group statistics (Annual gross income in SEK)

Income by origin of the future partner	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Foreign-born	108	205,452	1018.403	97.996
Swedish-born	171	248,014	1498.154	114.567

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Gross Income 1997	Equal variances assumed	6.945	.009	-2.597	277	.010	-425.622	163.897	-748.263	-102.981
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.823	275.475	.005	-425.622	150.760	-722.411	-128.833

Table 13. Chi-Square test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried refugee migrants' employment (1997)

Employment in 1997

		Origin of the future partner		
		Swedish-born	Foreign-born	Total
Not employed	N	618	7647	8265
	%	53.6%	70.4%	68.8%
Employed	N	534	3218	3752
	%	46.4%	29.6%	31.2%
Total	N	1152	10865	12017
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	135.857[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	135.079	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	128.083	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	135.846	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	12017				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 359.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 14. T-test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried refugee migrants' income (1997)

Group statistics (Annual gross income in SEK)

Income by origin of the future partner	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Foreign-born	3217	138,086	753.435	13.284
Swedish-born	533	146,856	729.328	31.591

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Gross income 1997	Equal variances assumed	1.956	.162	-2.500	3748	.012	-87.706	35.077	-156.478	-18.934
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.559	732.974	.011	-87.706	34.270	-154.985	-20.427

Table 15. Chi-Square test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried family reunion migrants' employment (1997)

Employment in 1997

		Origin of the future partner		
		Swedish-born	Foreign-born	Total
Not employed	N	1766	3467	5233
	%	50.4%	64.4%	58.9%
Employed	N	1739	1913	3652
	%	49.6%	35.6%	41.1%
Total	N	3505	5380	8885
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	173.239[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	172.658	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	172.710	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	173.219	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	8885				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1440.66.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 16. T-test of single to-be-intermarried versus to-be-intramarried family reunion migrants' income (1997)

Group statistics (Annual gross income in SEK)

Income by origin of the future partner	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Foreign-born	1913	140,649	747.536	17.091
Swedish-born	1739	163,396	956.943	22.948

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Gross income 1997	Equal variances assumed	17.260	.000	-8.042	3650	.000	-227.475	28.285	-282.931	-172.020
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.950	3282.791	.000	-227.475	28.613	-283.576	-171.374

Table 17. Chi-Square test of intermarried versus intramarried labour migrants' mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

Mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

	Intermarried immigrants		Intramarried immigrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upward mobility	37	17.5	68	33.2	105	25.2
No change: employed	164	77.4	98	47.8	262	62.8
No change: out of employment	4	1.9	29	14.1	33	7.9
Downward mobility	7	3.3	10	4.9	17	4.1
Total	212	100	205	100	417	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.142[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	47.883	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.964
N of Valid Cases	417		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.36.

Table 18. T-test of intermarried versus intramarried labour migrants' income growth (1997-2007)

Group statistics

Income growth	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intramarried immigrants	97	253,781	2681.03506	272.21787
Intermarried immigrants	163	286,865	5998.81869	469.86374

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Income growth	Equal variances assumed	2.071	.151	-.513	258	.608	-330.84201	644.63298	-1600.25416	938.57014
	Equal variances not assumed			-.609	242.835	.543	-330.84201	543.02348	-1400.47939	738.79538

Table 19. Chi-Square test of intermarried versus intramarried refugee migrants' mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

Mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

	Intermarried immigrants		Intramarried immigrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upward mobility	498	43.2%	4815	44.3%	5313	44.2%
No change: employed	473	41.1%	2644	24.3%	3117	25.9%
No change: out of employment	120	10.4%	2832	26.1%	2952	24.6%
Downward mobility	61	5.3%	574	5.3%	635	5.3%
Total	1152	100.0%	10865	100.0%	12017	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	216.420[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	227.221	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.704	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	12017		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 60.87.

Table 20. T-test of intermarried versus intramarried refugee migrants' income growth (1997-2007)

Group statistics

Income growth	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intramarried immigrants	2612	144,916	1410.66632	27.60182
Intermarried immigrants	467	146,437	1419.93874	65.70693

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Income growth	Equal variances assumed	2.039	.153	-.214	3077	.830	-15.21141	70.94429	-154.31438	123.89155
	Equal variances not assumed			-.213	641.409	.831	-15.21141	71.26893	-155.16004	124.73721

Table 21. Chi-Square test of intermarried versus intramarried family reunion migrants' mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

Mobility in employment status (1997-2007)

	Intermarried immigrants		Intramarried immigrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upward mobility	1345	38.4	2088	38.8	3433	38.6
No change: employed	1551	44.3	1561	29.0	3112	35.0
No change: out of employment	421	12.0	1379	25.6	1800	20.3
Downward mobility	188	5.4	352	6.5	540	6.1
Total	3505	100	5380	100	8885	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	339.974[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	351.221	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	61.892	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	8885		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 213.02.

Table 22. T-test of intermarried versus intramarried family reunion migrants' income growth (1997-2007)

Group statistics

Income growth	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intramarried immigrants	1547	132,230	1398.37112	35.55308
Intermarried immigrants	1544	163,709	2084.58740	53.05135

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Income growth	Equal variances assumed	22.832	.000	-4.931	3089	.000	-314.78621	63.83937	-439.95812	-189.61430
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.929	2697.222	.000	-314.78621	63.86288	-440.01136	-189.56107