The Receipt of Transfer Payments by Immigrants in Sweden[1]

Mats Hammarstedt*

ABSTRACT

Using the native-born as a benchmark, this article examines the reliance of immigrants on Sweden's social safety net. Both in the raw data, and after conditioning on a number of explanatory variables, we find that there are differences between immigrants and natives regarding participation in the Swedish income security system.

We also find that there are differences in this respect between immigrants from different regions as well as between more recent and earlier cohorts of immigrants.

As regards unemployment insurance benefits and cash labour market assistance, no clear pattern can be discerned in the results.

In the case of early retirement pension and social assistance, however, the picture looks different. Immigrants arriving at an early date from typical labour immigration regions are over-represented in early retirement.

Immigrants, especially non-European immigrants with a recent date of arrival, are over-represented among recipients of social assistance.

The overall conclusion is that the immigrants' total rate of participation in the income security system is determined by their rate of unemployment and their state of health. On the other hand, the distribution of their participation among the different components of the income security system is highly dependent on their length of residence in Sweden and where they come from.

* School of Management and Economics, Växjö University, Sweden.

Published by Blackwell Publishers Ltd.,
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK, and
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA.

International Migration Vol. 38 (2) 2000
ISSN 0020-7985

INTRODUCTION

During the last 50 years the number of immigrants in Sweden has increased rapidly. In 1940 the proportion of foreign-born persons within the total population of Sweden was about 1 per cent. In 1970 the proportion was about 7 per cent. Today the proportion is about 11 per cent, or about 950,000 individuals. The pattern of immigration has also changed. Until the mid-1970s immigration to Sweden was primarily labour force immigration, mostly from Europe, but during the 1970s and 1980s there was an increase in the proportion of refugees and "tied movers".[2] Many of the new immigrants had been born outside Europe. In 1970, about 60 per cent of foreign-born persons living in Sweden had been born in other Nordic countries and about 90 per cent in Europe. The picture in 2000 looks quite different. About 30 per cent had been born in other Nordic countries, about 35 per cent in other European countries and about 35 per cent in non-European countries.

During the 1950s and 1960s immigrants in Sweden had a higher employment intensity than the native population. The changed character of immigration, in combination with a deterioration in the labour market during the 1970s, was the cause of declining employment intensity and increasing unemployment among immigrants in Sweden. During the 1980s the employment intensity of immigrants continued to fall despite the labour market situation in Sweden improving after the mid-1980s (Wadensjö, 1972; Ohlsson, 1975; Ekberg, 1991, 1999; Bevelander, 1995; Scott, 1995).

Besides having a lower employment intensity and higher unemployment rate than the native population, immigrants receive lower income from work than the native population (Ekberg, 1990, 1994a, 1994b, 1996; Aguilar and Gustafsson, 1991; Hammarstedt, 1998). An unemployed individual, or one whose income from work is low, becomes dependent on some alternative income source, including, in many cases, on transfers from the Swedish income security system.

A crucial issue concerning the economic "costs" of immigration is the extent to which immigrants receive transfers from the income security system. Despite the centrality of this question in contemporary debate about the net economic impact of immigration, few studies in Sweden have addressed questions such as: Do immigrants receive more, and other kinds, of transfers than non-immigrants? Are existing differences levelled out as time of residence in Sweden increases? Are there differences between different immigrant groups?

Although the Swedish welfare state is often described as being quite universal in character, the income security system is actually highly differentiated in the sense that qualification and payments depend upon the individual's position in the labour market. For example, in order to obtain benefits from an unemployment

insurance fund, a previous period of paid employment is required. Individuals without income from work, and without access to the social insurance system, are generally reduced to means-tested social assistance for their living.

The present study focuses on whether differences exist between those born abroad and native-born Swedes as regards representation in different components of the Swedish income security system. Are there differences between immigrant groups from different immigrant regions? Are there differences between immigrant groups that arrived in Sweden at different points of time? The income security system components that are studied include payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds, cash labour market assistance, early-retirement pension and social assistance.[3] Certain components of "social citizenship" in Sweden have been selected to observe the use of these components for the financial security of immigrants compared with non-immigrants, thus enabling elucidation concerning how this branch of the welfare state functions for immigrants.

The present study differs from previous ones in two important respects. First, in matching the income and population registers we use a unique dataset. Second, previous studies treat one part of the social security system at the time. The question is: Are immigrants more or less represented than natives in one part of the social security system? Our study investigates the immigrants' participation simultaneously in several parts of the social security system (unemployment insurance fund, cash labour market assistance, early retirement pension and social assistance) to answer whether participation distributed over these parts of the social security system is different than for natives.

SOME FORMER STUDIES

The research literature contains some Swedish as well as non-Swedish studies of immigration and livelihood. The studies of other countries referred to below use the same method as this study. With the help of cross-section data, variation in the rate of participation in different components of income security systems is studied. By dividing the immigrants into cohorts, i.e., by year of immigration, it has also been possible to study whether the degree of participation in different transfer systems varies between immigrants with different years of immigration, and between different cohorts of immigrants and the native population.

Blau (1984) used data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education to compare the receipt of transfers by families headed by male and female immigrants and those headed by native-born Americans. He found that the average level of transfers was considerably higher among families headed by immigrants, being almost entirely the result of higher average age of family members among the immigrant group. When age and other factors were held

constant, immigrant families were found to be considerably less likely to rely on welfare than native families, and their receipts from other social insurance programmes were found to be only slightly higher.

Using the 1980 US Census data, Tienda and Jansen (1986) found that immigrants were considerably less likely than comparable natives to receive social assistance. They also found that, with few exceptions, recent immigrants did not have a higher probability of receiving social assistance than earlier cohorts.

Borjas and Trejo (1991) used the 1970 and 1980 US Censuses to study immigrant participation in the welfare system. Data for these years made it possible to analyse cohort and assimilation effects. The study showed that recently arrived immigrant cohorts in the US used the welfare system more intensively than earlier cohorts. At the same time, the study showed that the likelihood of immigrants receiving welfare increased with the length of their residence in the US.

Baker and Benjamin (1994) used data from the 1986 and 1991 Survey of Consumer Finances in Canada to study the share of immigrant families in different sectors of the Canadian social security system. They concluded that immigrants made less use of unemployment compensation and social assistance than the native population. Furthermore, they found that assimilation led to increased access to these components of the income security system. When the number of years in Canada was held constant, it was found that recent immigrant cohorts received more transfers than immigrant cohorts that had arrived earlier.

On the basis of data from the 1970 and 1990 US Censuses, Borjas and Hilton (1996) found that immigrant households were much more likely to receive some type of welfare than native households, and that immigrant households had more and longer spells on welfare than native households.

Riphahn (1998) studied immigrants in the German social assistance programme, using data from the German socio-economic panel 1984-1996, and found that immigrants appear to increase welfare utilization with time spent in Germany. However, the study is not representative for immigrants in Germany as it includes only guest workers and no refugees.

Examples of Swedish studies of immigrants in the Swedish income security system are Gustafsson (1986) and Gustafsson, Zamanian and Aguilar (1990). Gustafsson (1986) found that the number of immigrant families receiving social assistance had increased over time, and that there were great differences in the relative number of social assistance recipients when comparing immigrants from different countries. There were especially large proportions of social assistance recipients among families from outside Europe. Gustafsson,

Zamanian and Aguilar (1990) found that every fifth immigrant family received some kind of transfer related to unemployment or labour market training, twice the rate for Swedish families. Among non-European immigrants every third family received such payments.

Franzén (1997) studied the use of social assistance among immigrants in Sweden and found that immigrants, irrespective of their country of origin, are overrepresented among social assistance recipients. On average, foreign-born immigrants receive four times the social assistance rate of native-born Swedes.

Studies of early retirement pensions include Leinö (1984) and Reinans (1987). Leinö followed immigrant cohorts from the 1960s and found high rates of early retirement pensioners among immigrants from Finland. Reinans found that the rate of new early retirement pensioners was higher among those born abroad than in the total population.

THE LABOUR MARKET SITUATION

Table 1 (page 258) shows the labour market situation for different immigrant groups in Sweden. Unfortunately, the Swedish Labour Force Surveys do not contain data about foreign-born persons, only foreign citizens. Therefore, we do not have data on employment rates for the years 1985 and 1990. Instead, our data are from a special version of the Swedish Labour Force Survey for foreign-born persons for the year 1992 (see Ekberg, 1994c). It is reasonable to believe that unemployment rates were higher in 1992 than in 1985 and 1990. However, the rank order in unemployment between the immigrant groups can be expected to be the same in 1985 and 1990 as in 1992, and it is the rank order in unemployment that is important since we are studying the extent to which there are differences between different immigrant groups in participation rates in different parts of the income security system.

Table 1 shows that the relative unemployment rate for natives is 4.7 per cent. The unemployment rate is, with few exceptions, higher for immigrants than for natives. From this we can expect immigrants to be dependent on the income security system to a greater extent than the native population.

HYPOTHESES

As noted above, the individual's participation in or access to these components depends on his/her position in the labour market. In the case of immigrants, period of residence in Sweden is likely to be decisive for their share in, or access to, the various components. For example, unemployment insurance is not accessible to those who have recently entered the labour market, such as young

persons and immigrants, since it takes at least one year after commencing work to qualify. Cash labour market assistance is accessible to those who have no unemployment insurance or who do not fulfil the requirements for membership in an insurance fund.[4] The employment condition, however, must normally be fulfilled. An individual who has recently completed his/her education, or whose insurance coverage has expired, can, however, receive cash labour market assistance. In other words, cash labour market assistance is not accessible to recent immigrants.

We might thus expect that few immigrants who have arrived in recent years have received payments from recognized unemployment insurance funds and cash labour market assistance. An increase in period of residence in the country should increase the likelihood of finding employment and thereby qualifying for payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds and cash labour market assistance. Longer residence in the country should also increase the likelihood of finding a job, which in turn would lead to lower utilization of the above systems. Therefore, it is difficult to predict how period of residence in the country affects the likelihood of obtaining payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds and cash labour market assistance. Instead, this turns into an empirical question.

Those individuals who do not have access to jobs, and who do not qualify for payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund or cash labour market assistance, will instead be reduced to social assistance. In contrast with other components of the income security system, social assistance is not connected with special conditions such as old age, sickness or unemployment. Instead, social assistance, as already noted, is paid after means-testing to meet needs that cannot be satisfied, for example, by wages, payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds or cash labour market assistance. Against this background, a high degree of participation in social assistance among recently arrived immigrants is to be expected.

Early retirement pension is meant for those whose capacity for work is completely or partially reduced before they are eligible for their old age retirement pension. There must in principle be a medical basis for this reduced capacity for work; however, the older the individual, the more consideration is given to other factors. We may therefore expect a high rate of early retirement among immigrants arriving in the early years from typical labour immigration regions such as the Nordic countries and Southern Europe.

DATA

In this study, data were obtained from a Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare database for the total population based on the 1985 and 1990 Censuses

and the income-register for the years 1985-1992. From the database, the National Board of Health and Welfare has drawn a sample of every tenth individual born between the years 1921 and 1974 (599,890 individuals). Our working sample includes all immigrants aged 16-64 in the sample drawn by the National Board of Health and Welfare. For 1985, the number of immigrants is 50,390 and for 1990, 56,246. Our sample also includes a control group of natives aged 16-64.[5] For 1985 the number of natives is 17,544 and for 1990, 17,235.

As the study is conducted at the level of the individual, it creates no problems as regards benefits from recognized unemployment insurance funds, cash labour market assistance and early retirement pensions, since these are all granted to and registered in the name of the individual. Problems arise, however, when we look at social assistance, which is received on a household basis, since our data do not enable us to combine individuals into households. In our data, social assistance is registered for the individual, for the so-called "register leader", i.e., it is registered for one of the family members. However, the system of choosing the register leader is not systematic, and varies from one municipality to another. Therefore, in the case of social assistance we conduct a study based on all individuals as well as one restricted to individuals living alone.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

To provide a background to the study, we begin by presenting the descriptive statistics summarizing immigrant participation in the income security system. Table 2 (page 259) shows the proportions of immigrants from different immigration regions (and of the native population) that received transfers in 1985 and 1990. In 1985, as well as in 1990, the differences were small between the native Swedish population and the foreign-born from different immigration regions as regards payments from recognized unemployment insurance funds and cash labour market assistance. The proportions receiving payment from these sources decreased somewhat between 1985 and 1990.

The situation is different for early retirement and social assistance. A higher proportion of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, than of native Swedes, retired early. Very few immigrants coming from distant immigration regions, such as Africa, Asia and Latin America, retired early. The rate of early retirement within the various immigrant groups, as well as among native Swedes, changed very little between 1985 and 1990. Data on social assistance reveals that immigrants from distant immigration regions are clearly over-represented. For immigrants from Africa, Asia and Latin America, the rate of social assistance amounted to about 25 per cent in both 1985 and 1990.

The native Swedish population, as well as immigrants from Western Europe, have relatively few social assistance recipients. Among immigrants from

Northern, Southern and Eastern Europe the share of social assistance recipients is slightly higher than for the native Swedish population. A comparison of rates of social assistance between the years 1985 and 1990 shows stability within the different immigrant groups. If the share of recipients among different immigrant cohorts is studied instead (Table 3, page 260), we find, for both 1985 and 1990, great similarities between those born abroad who immigrated to Sweden before 1967, and the native Swedish population as regards payments from recognized unemployment insurance funds, cash labour market assistance and social assistance. The shares for pre-1967 immigrants as well as for native Swedes are relatively low. However, as regards early retirement, those immigrating prior to 1967 have higher rates than native Swedes. One explanation may be that these immigrants were over-represented in heavy jobs and bad work environments.

The immigrant cohort of 1968-1975 also shows great similarities with the native Swedes. Both in 1985 and 1990, the differences are small between those who immigrated between 1968 and 1975 and the native Swedish population for all the components investigated. For the immigrant cohort of 1968-1975, the rate of early retirement is lower than for those who immigrated prior to 1967. For immigrants arriving in Sweden *after* 1975, there is a totally different picture. Their share of social assistance is much higher than for either immigrants arriving during earlier periods or the native Swedish population. This applies to both 1985 and 1990. In addition, early retirement share is low among late-arriving immigrants.

ESTIMATES OF RATES OF PARTICIPATION IN THE INCOME SECURITY SYSTEM

The aim of our econometric study is to elucidate in greater detail how the Swedish income security system functions for immigrants. With the assistance of a 1985 and a 1990 cross-section study, an inquiry was made into whether there are differences between immigrants and the native Swedish population as regards their participation in the above-mentioned components of the income security system, when factors like age, gender etc. are held constant. Are there differences between immigrant groups from different immigrant countries? Are there differences between immigrant groups arriving in Sweden at different times? If so, how can these differences be explained?

In the study, immigrants have been divided by immigration region.[6] Regions include the Nordic countries, Western Europe,[7] Southern Europe, Eastern Europe and others.[8] In addition, the immigrants are divided into cohorts:[9] those who arrived before 1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990.[10]

We estimate the following probit specification of P_i, the probability that an individual i receives transfers from the income security system component in question:[11]

$P(\text{Benefit} = 1) = \Phi (\alpha + \beta_1 \text{ age} + \beta_2 \text{ age}^2 + \sum\sum\beta_{jk}X_jZ_k + \sum \beta V_i + \varepsilon_i)$
$X = \{X_1 ..... X_5\}$ and $Z = \{Z_1 ..... Z_4\}$ are dummy variables, where

$X_j = 1$ for immigrants from immigration region j, and 0 for others.
$Z_k = 1$ for immigrants at time of immigration k, and 0 for others.

The age and age^2 variables are included in order to measure how age affects the likelihood of receiving a benefit. Since native Swedes form a control group for both cohort and region, it is not possible to include cohorts and regions separately in the regression. Instead, we study the combination between cohort and region. With the help of hypothesis tests we then study whether there are any cohort and/or regional effects.[12, 13]

X_jZ_k thus represents an individual who immigrated from region j at the point of time k. V_i represents all the other explanatory variables used in the study.[14] These are marital status (cohabitant or non-cohabitant), gender, and a variable for whether the individual lives in an urban area or not.[15]

The following hypotheses can then be tested using likelihood ratio tests:

(i) H_o: *There is no period effect*, i.e., there is no difference between immigrants with different times of immigration in the probability of receiving a transfer from the income security system component in question.

(ii) H_o: *There is no regional effect*, i.e., there is no difference between immigrants from different regions in the probability of receiving a transfer from the income security system component in question.

(iii) H_o: *There is neither period nor regional effect*, i.e., there is no difference between immigrants with different times of immigration or between immigrants from different regions in the probability of receiving a transfer from the income security system component in question.

(iv) H_o: *There is no immigration effect*, i.e., there is no difference between immigrants and natives in the probability of receiving a transfer from the income security system component in question.

Payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds

Swedish unemployment insurance is in principle voluntary. It does not benefit those who have just entered the labour market, for example, young persons or immigrants, since conditions for membership as well as for employment have to be fulfilled before the person is entitled to benefits.

Estimates of the likelihood of obtaining payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund in 1985, and 1990, respectively (Table 4, page 261),[16] show that the likelihood of obtaining payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund decreases with age. The likelihood ratio tests show that all the hypotheses described above are rejected for 1985 as well as for 1990.[17] Thus the rate of participation in payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund varies between immigrant groups from different immigration regions, as well as between different immigrant cohorts. While Table 4 does not give an unambiguous picture of participation in payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund, it is clear that recent immigrants have a lower level of participation than the native Swedish population, the explanation being that the former do not qualify for benefits.

Immigrants from the *Nordic countries*, with the exception of those Nordic immigrants who arrived in Sweden during 1986-1990, receive payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund to a greater extent than native Swedes. But the difference is in all cases smaller than 3 percentage points. *Western European immigrants*, on the other hand, generally have a lower share than the native Swedish population in receiving payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds. For example, Western European immigrants who arrived in Sweden between 1981 and 1985 have a lower share than the Swedish population in 1985, but a higher share than the Swedish population in 1990. Since the Western European immigrants in 1985 have a higher share than the native Swedish population in cash labour market assistance (Table 5, page 262), their low share in the recognized unemployment insurance funds must be explained by the fact that they did not then qualify for payment from such a fund. *Eastern and Southern European immigrants*, with the exception of immigration cohorts of recent years, have a higher share than the native Swedish population in the recognized unemployment insurance funds. The difference in 1985 between native Swedes and immigrants from Eastern Europe 1976-1980 exceeds 6 percentage points.

In 1985, the 1981-1985 immigration cohort shows a lower rate of participation than the native Swedish population. Since this cohort at the same time has a higher share in cash labour market assistance (Table 5), and a considerably higher share in social assistance (Tables 7 and 8, pages 264-265), the explanation of low share in payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds is that these immigrants do not qualify for payment from such funds. Looking at 1990, we find that the 1981-1985 immigration cohort generally has a higher representation in recognized unemployment insurance funds than the native Swedish population. At that time, the 1981-1985 cohort in some cases has a lower representation in cash labour market assistance than the native Swedish population. This indicates the existence of a substitution between payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund and cash labour market assistance for the 1981-1985 immigration cohort between 1985 and 1990. In

1985, as well as in 1990, the likelihood of receiving payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund is smaller for individuals who cohabit than for non-cohabiting individuals.

The estimates also show that the likelihood of receiving payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund, in 1985 as well as in 1990, is greater for women than for men. The likelihood of receiving payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund is also greater for individuals who do not live in urban areas than for those who do. One possible explanation of the latter finding, besides the fact that there may be differences in local labour market conditions, is that the degree of coverage of the insurance funds differs from one part of the country to another. Membership of unemployment insurance funds is, for example, lower in the metropolitan counties.

Cash labour market assistance

Cash labour market assistance is paid to individuals who do not have, or do not fulfil the requirements for, membership in an unemployment insurance fund. However, the employment condition should normally be fulfilled. The size of the cash labour market assistance depends on the number of hours per week an individual is unemployed. The level of labour market assistance is determined by the Swedish parliament.

Estimates concerning cash labour market assistance are presented in Table 5. There is less likelihood of receiving cash labour market assistance with increasing age. The likelihood ratio tests show that for 1985, as well as 1990, all the hypotheses can be rejected.[18] For 1985, the estimates show that all the immigrant groups had a higher rate of cash labour market assistance than the native Swedish population. The highest rates occurred among immigrant groups with a late immigration year. The differences between immigrants and native Swedes are, however, small and do not in any case exceed 3 percentage points.

For 1990, early immigrants from the Nordic countries have a lower share in cash labour market assistance than the native Swedish population. However, the differences are not statistically significant. Other immigrant groups, with the exception of immigrants arriving from Western Europe between 1981 and 1985, also turn out to have a higher share in cash labour market assistance in 1990 than the native Swedish population, even though in 1990, too, the differences are small. The reason for the immigrants' relatively higher share of cash labour market assistance than of payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds is probably that it is easier to qualify for cash labour market assistance than for unemployment insurance.

For 1985, the likelihood of receiving cash labour market assistance is greater for individuals who do not cohabit. Furthermore, the likelihood of receiving

cash labour market assistance is greater for women than for men. The likelihood is also greater for individuals who do not live in urban areas than for those who do. All these differences are statistically significant. For 1990 the results are the same, but the differences are not statistically significant.

Early retirement pension

The early retirement pension is meant for persons whose working capacity is reduced, wholly or partly, before they are entitled to the old age pension. Early retirement pensions may be granted for a certain period, a so-called sickness allowance, or for an unspecified time. Early retirement pensions and sickness allowances may be received from the basic national retirement scheme (folkpension) as well as from the national supplementary pensions scheme (ATP). Estimates of the likelihood of receiving an early retirement pension are presented in Table 6 (page 263). As expected, the likelihood of receiving an early retirement pension increases with age. The estimates further reveal that there are great differences between immigrants from different regions as well as between different immigrant cohorts. The likelihood ratio tests show that for both 1985 and 1990 all the hypotheses can be rejected.[19]

The highest rate of participation is for immigrants from regions having a strong character of labour immigration. Early immigrants from typical labour immigration regions often ended up in heavy jobs, and therefore it is not surprising that they display a high percentage of early retirement. In 1985, for example, the share of immigrants from Southern Europe arriving before 1975 is over 9 percentage points higher than that for the native Swedish population. The probability that immigrants from the Nordic countries receive early retirement pension is over 2 percentage points higher than for native Swedes in 1985. For immigrants from Eastern Europe who arrived in Sweden before 1975 the share is also higher than for the native Swedish population. On the other hand, the share of early immigrants from Western Europe in early retirement is low. This is probably due to their occupations; immigration from Western Europe to a large extent comprised well-educated workers.

Looking at cohort effects in 1985 we find that the immigrant cohorts that arrived in Sweden during the period 1981-1985 have a lower share in early retirement than the native Swedish population. This is expected, since these groups do not qualify for early retirement pension. If, however, we study the degree of participation in early retirement for 1990, immigrants from Northern, Southern and Eastern Europe are now more represented than the native Swedish population. It may seem surprising that, even after a brief period of residence in the country, immigrants have a higher share in early retirement than the native Swedish population. It is highly likely that part of the explanation is that in some cases immigrants arrived in Sweden early and then re-emigrated, after which they immigrated anew to Sweden. These immigrants are registered

for the year when they last immigrated. The effect of this is that some immigrants with a late year of arrival, who are among those early retired, are individuals who immigrated on an earlier occasion.[20]

In 1990, too, the early retirement rate for immigrants from typical labour immigration regions and with an early immigration year is higher than for the native Swedish population. Thus, immigrants from Southern, Eastern and Northern Europe arriving before 1976 have a higher rate of early retirement than the native Swedish population. For immigrants from Southern Europe the difference is substantial and exceeds 10 percentage points.

For 1985 as well as for 1990 it is clear that immigrants with a late date of arrival have low rates of participation in early retirement pension. The state of health in these immigrant groups is hardly likely to be better than the state of health in the native population. The explanation is probably that they do not fulfil the requirements for early retirement pension, and are therefore reduced to means-tested social assistance.

Social assistance

In contrast with other components in the income security system, social assistance is not dependent on specific requirements such as old age, sickness or unemployment. Instead, social assistance is means-tested and granted to satisfy needs that cannot be met in any other way, for example, by market earnings. Its size is determined by the municipalities, and varies from one municipality to another.

When studying the estimates of receiving social assistance, it should be noted that while the household receives social assistance, it is the individual who is entered in the administrative register. This means, for example, that an immigrant who has been registered as a recipient of assistance in our data material may be married to, or cohabiting with, a native Swede. In that case the immigrant, not the Swede, is registered in the study as a social assistance recipient. The opposite case may also arise, or a situation where two immigrants from different immigration regions live together and receive social assistance, but only one is registered as a recipient of assistance. The study of social assistance recipients was carried out on both the data material as a whole and those living single. The likelihood ratio tests for both the studies of social assistance show that for 1985 and 1990 we can reject all the hypotheses.[21]

The study based on the material as a whole (Table 7) shows that the likelihood of receiving social assistance is greater for the immigrant population than for the native Swedish population, with the exception of Western European immigrants who immigrated before 1975. For both 1985 and 1990, immigrant cohorts with a late immigration year have a much higher probability of

receiving social assistance than both early immigrants and native Swedes. For non-European immigrants with a late year of arrival, the probability is more than 30 percentage points higher than the probability for the native population. For immigrants from Eastern Europe with a late year of arrival, the probability exceeds the probability of the native population by more than 20 percentage points. The probable explanation of the high share for those arriving late is that these individuals have not entered the labour market and do not qualify either for payment from a recognized unemployment insurance fund, or for cash labour market assistance. The estimates also show that with a longer time of residence in Sweden, the likelihood of receiving social assistance decreases. The rate among immigrant cohorts arriving before 1975 is in many cases only slightly higher than for the native Swedish population, and that applies to both 1985 and 1990.

In addition, it is clear that the non-European immigrants' probability of receiving social assistance is much higher than for either native Swedes or European immigrants. The probable explanation is that non-European immigrants have been hit the hardest by employers increasing demands over time regarding knowledge of the Swedish language and Swedish institutions.

The study shows that cohabiting individuals are less likely to receive social assistance than non-cohabiting individuals. The difference is significant for both 1985 and 1990. Furthermore, men are more likely to receive social assistance than women. The differences are significant for both 1985 and 1990. Difference between the genders is also found in the study based on single individuals (Table 8), but it may be that men are more often "register leaders" than women. This might partly explain men's greater likelihood of receiving social assistance. Individuals who reside in urban areas have a higher rate of social assistance than individuals in non-urban areas. The difference is significant for both 1985 and 1990.

The estimates for single individuals (Table 8) do not reveal any noticeable differences compared with the study based on all individuals. For single individuals, the likelihood of receiving social assistance is also greater for immigrants than for the native Swedish population, and greatest for immigrants with a recent year of immigration and coming from a distant immigration region.

There may be various reasons why a higher share of immigrants than of the native Swedish population receives social assistance. Perhaps immigrants are more often unemployed and/or receive lower wages than native Swedes. Also, immigrants who have arrived recently, in many cases refugees, often lack access to other income security system components.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Swedish income security system is highly differentiated in the sense that access and payments depend upon the individual's position in the labour market. For example, in order to be entitled to transfers from an unemployment insurance fund, a previous period of paid employment is required. Individuals without income from work, and without access to the social insurance system, are generally reduced to means-tested social assistance for their subsistence.

This brings to the fore the question of the immigrants' situation in the income security system of the welfare state. We have selected certain components of "social citizenship" in Sweden and examined patterns in the use of these components for the income security of immigrants and natives. This enabled us to elucidate how this branch of the welfare state functions for immigrants.

Our study has shown that there are statistically significant differences between immigrants and native Swedes as well as between different immigrant groups and different immigrant cohorts as regards their share in, or access to, recognized unemployment insurance funds, cash labour market assistance, early retirement pensions and social security assistance both in 1985 and in 1990.

As regards recognized unemployment insurance funds and cash labour market assistance, no clear pattern can be discerned in the results. This could be explained by the fact that recently arrived immigrants do not qualify for participation in those components of the income security system, and are therefore reduced to the means-tested parts of the system. As period of residence in the country increases, the probability of qualifying for recognized unemployment insurance funds or cash labour market assistance increases, and so does the probability of finding employment. This could explain why no clear pattern emerges in the results.

As regards early retirement pension and social assistance, immigrants arriving at an early date from typical labour immigration regions are over-represented in early retirement. One explanation may be that these immigrants were over-represented in heavy jobs and bad working conditions. Immigrants with a late year of arrival have low rates of participation in early-retirement pension. There is nothing to suggest that the state of health of these immigrant groups is better than for the native population. The explanation is probably that immigrants with a late year of arrival do not fulfil the qualifications for early retirement pension, and are therefore reduced to means-tested social assistance. Immigrants, especially non-European immigrants with a recent date of arrival, are heavily over-represented among recipients of social assistance. One explanation for this could be that they are not qualified for the income-related parts of the income security system.

Our study has shown that the immigrants' total, or overall, participation in the income security system is determined by their unemployment rate and their state of health. But the distribution of their participation among different components of the system is highly dependent on their period of residence in Sweden and on where they come from. Our study shows that European immigrants who immigrated early are relatively well integrated into the Swedish welfare-state system, in the sense that they qualify for payments from the income-related social security system. For recently arrived immigrants, however, the picture is different. In most cases they do not qualify for the income-related parts of the social security system of the welfare state. This frequently forces them to become dependent on the means-tested social assistance.

A policy conclusion from this study is that it is important for immigrants to be integrated in the Swedish labour market. Besides being decisive for an individual's income from work, the labour market position is also decisive for an individual's access to the income-related parts of the social security system. During the 1980s, unemployment among immigrants in Sweden increased despite the fact that the labour market situation in Sweden improved from mid-1980 onwards. We do not know all the reasons for this but we must question Swedish immigration policy. Have the labour market measures directed to refugees been adequate to their background and to the demand in the Swedish economy? Furthermore, the waiting period to obtain a permit for asylum seekers increased considerably during in the 1980s. In some cases it took years between immigration to Sweden and obtaining a permit to stay. The immigrant was not allowed to work during the waiting period. Has Swedish immigration policy tended to make the immigrants passive?

NOTES

1. I wish to thank Inga Persson, Jan Ekberg and Lars Behrenz for valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper. I also wish to thank Curt Wells for valuable help with the econometric parts of the paper.
2. "Tied movers" are relatives of already admitted immigrants.
3. A brief description of the components in question is given in connection with the empirical analysis of each of the programmes.
4. For a brief description, see the empirical analysis of payment from recognized unemployment insurance fund and cash labour market assistance.
5. We have drawn a sample of natives as a control group from the sample of the National Board of Health and Welfare.
6. For a more detailed description, see Table 9, page 266.
7. Also includes immigrants from the US, Canada and Oceania.
8. Including Africa, Asia and Latin America. Since these groups are relatively small and further display similarities, the immigrants are analysed jointly.

9. For a description, see Table 9.
10. The latter period applies only to the study of the 1990 situation.
11. All estimates have been made with the help of the logit model as well. The results turned out to be the same with both models.
12. None of the analyses presented show any strong multicollinearity. The correlation between the independent variables does not in any case surpass 0.30.
13. For all the estimates the standard errors are corrected by White's correction in order to deal with heteroscedasticity. See White (1980).
14. For a list of all the explanatory variables, and how they are coded, see Table 9.
15. Individuals´ educational levels are known only in the 1990 Census. To facilitate comparisons between 1985 and 1990, the educational variable is therefore excluded from the study. Probit estimates for 1990 with the educational variable included are presented in Hammarstedt (1998). The coefficients for the other variables changed only slightly when the educational variable was included.
16. The marginal effects are calculated at the mean value of the explanatory variables. For a detailed exposition of how the marginal effects have been calculated see Greene (1997), chapter 19.
17. See Table 4.
18. See Table 5.
19. See Table 6.
20. For a discussion about this and similar problems in the population statistics, see Ekberg (1995).
21. See Table 7 and Table 8.

REFERENCES

Aguilar, R., and B. Gustafsson
1991 "The earnings assimilation of immigrants", *Labour*, 5: 37-58.

Baker, M., and D. Benjamin
1994 "The receipt of transfer payments by immigrants to Canada", *Journal of Human Resources*, 4: 650-676.

Bevelander, P.
1995 *Labour Force Participation of Immigrants in Sweden 1960-1990*, Licentiate dissertation, Institutionen för ekonomisk-historia, Lund.

Blau, F.D.
1984 "The use of transfer payments by immigrants", *International Labour Relations Review*, 37: 222-239.

Borjas, G.J., and L. Hilton
1996 "Immigration and the welfare state: immigrant participation in means-tested entitlement programs", *Research in Labour Economics*, 14: 253-282.

Borjas, G.J., and S.J. Trejo
1991 "Immigrant participation in the welfare system", *Industrial Labour Relations Review*, 44: 195-211.

Ekberg, J.
1990 "Immigrants – their economic and social mobility", in I. Persson (Ed.), *Generating Equality in the Welfare State*, Oslo University Press, Oslo.

Ekberg, J.
1991 *Vad hände sedan? En studie av utrikes födda på arbetsmarknaden,* (*What happened next? A study of foreign-born in the labour market*), ACTA Wexionensia, Ser. 2, Economics and Politics 3, Växjö.
1994a "Economic progress among immigrants in Sweden", *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare,* 3: 148-157.
1994b "Är invandrarna fattiga ?" ("Are the immigrants poor?"), *Ekonomisk debatt,* 22: 169-177.
1994c "Sysselsättning och arbetsmarknadskarriär bland invandrare", ("Employment and labour market career among immigrants"), *Underlagsrapport till invandrarpolitiska kommitén,* Växjö.
1995 "Höj nivån på befolkningsstatistiken", ("Increase the quality of the population statistics"), *Ekonomisk debatt,* 23: 329-337.
1996 "Labour market career among young Finnish immigrants in Sweden: a longitudinal study", *International Migration,* 34: 371-384.
1999 "Immigration and the public sector", *Journal of Population Economics*, 12: 278-297.
Franzén, E.
1997 "Invandrare och socialbidrag", ("Immigrants and social assistance"), *Socialvetenskaplig tidsskrift,* 4: 279-304.
Greene, W.H.
1997 *Econometric Analysis*, Prentice-Hall International, New Jersey.
Gustavsson, B.
1986 "Bidragstagarna: antal och inkomster", ("Recipients of allowances: numbers and incomes"), *Ds Fi 1986:16,* Stockholm.
Gustavsson, B., M. Zamanian, and R. Aguilar
1990 *Invandring och Försörjning,* (*Immigration and Maintenance*), Daidalos, Göteborg.
Hammarstedt, M.
1998 *Studier kring invandrares arbetsinkomster och inkomsttrygghet*, Licentiatavhandling, (*Essays on immigrants*' *income from work and participation in the Swedish social insurance system,* Licentiate dissertation), Rapporter från Högskolan i Växjö: 12.
Leinö, T-L.
1984 "Inte lika men jämlika?", ("Not alike but equal?"), *Institutet för Social Forskning, Rapport nr 6,* Stockholm.
Ohlsson, R.
1975 *Invandrarna på Arbetsmarknaden*, Avhandling, (*Immigrants in the Labour market*. Dissertation), Ekonomisk- historiska Föreningen, Lund.
Reinans, S.
1987 "Förtidspensioneringar bland invandrare", ("Early retirement among immigrants"), in S. Reinans and H. Swedner (Eds), *Förtidspensionering bland invandrare,* (*Early retirement among immigrants*), Stockholm.
Riphahn, R.T.
1998 "Immigrant participation in social assistance programs: evidence from German guestworkers", *IZA Discussion Paper*, No. 15.

Scott, K.
1995 *Migrants in the Labour Market. Employment Patterns and Income Development of Immigrants to Sweden 1970-1990,* Licentiate dissertation, Institutionen för ekonomisk historia, Lund.
Statistics Sweden
1992 *Arbetskraftsundersökningen,* (The Swedish labour Force Survey), Stockholm.
Tienda, M., and L. Jansen
1986 "Immigration and public assistance participation: dispelling the myth of dependency", *Social Science Research*, 15: 372-400.
Wadensjö, E.
1972 *Immigration och samhällsekonomi.* Avhandling, (*Immigration and Economy*. Dissertation), Lund Economic Studies nr 8, Lund.
White, H.
1980 "A heteroscedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroscedasticity", *Econometrica*, 48: 817-838.

TABLE 1

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR DIFFERENT IMMIGRANT GROUPS AND NATIVE SWEDES IN 1992 (16-64 YEARS OF AGE)

Immigration region	Time of immigration	Unemployment rate (per cent)
Nordic countries	-1979	6.3
	1980-1983	10.2
	1984-1992	9.2
Western Europe	-1979	3.8
	1980-1983	2.3
	1984-1992	10.2
Eastern Europe	-1979	6.7
	1980-1983	8.6
	1984-1992	13.8
Southern Europe	-1979	7.5
	1980-1983	4.0
	1984-1992	13.3
Other countries	-1979	7.2
	1980-1983	11.2
	1984-1992	26.0
Natives		4.7

Notes: The unemployment rates are standardized with respect to age. The unemployment rate is defined as the number of unemployed in relation to the labour force in each group.

Source: The Swedish Labour Force Survey (1992).

TABLE 2

THE RATE OF PARTICIPATION OF DIFFERENT IMMIGRANT GROUPS IN DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE SWEDISH INCOME SECURITY SYSTEM IN 1985 AND 1990 (16-64 YEARS OF AGE)

Year/immigration region	Rate of participation (per cent)			
	Payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds	Cash labour market assistance	Early retirement	Social assistance
1985				
Nordic countries (26,047)[a]	6.7	1.5	9.6	8.0
Western Europe (5,765)[b]	3.6	1.8	6.2	4.1
Eastern Europe (5,669)	5.6	2.4	10.3	10.4
Southern Europe (7,190)	6.1	2.6	12.1	9.4
Latin America (1,617)	4.9	3.2	1.7	27.7
Africa (988)	8.5	3.9	2.1	24.1
Asia (3,114)	6.5	3.9	1.3	25.8
Native-born Swedes (17,544)	5.8	1.7	5.9	3.8
N = 67,934				
1990				
Nordic countries (24,385)	5.0	0.5	10.8	6.0
Western Europe (5,590)[b]	3.5	0.7	7.3	2.8
Eastern Europe (6,061)	5.3	1.8	8.4	9.7
Southern Europe (7,710)	4.7	1.0	15.1	7.7
Latin America (2,906)	4.9	2.2	1.6	23.6
Africa (1,846)	7.5	2.9	1.4	29.6
Asia (7,748)	7.9	3.0	1.0	28.7
Native-born Swedes (17,235)	4.4	0.5	5.5	2.8
N = 73,481				

a. The figures within parentheses indicate the number of individuals in each group.

b. Also includes immigrants from the US, Canada and Oceania.

TABLE 3

THE RATE OF PARTICIPATION OF DIFFERENT IMMIGRANT COHORTS IN DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE SWEDISH INCOME SECURITY SYSTEM IN 1985 AND 1990 (16-64 YEARS OF AGE)

Year/immigration region	Rate of participation (per cent)			
	Payment from recognized unemployment insurance funds	Cash labour market assistance	Early retirement	Social assistance
1985				
Immigrants - 1967 (23,348)[a]	5.1	1.8	13.4	4.9
Immigrants 1968-1975 (12,744)	6.9	2.0	7.8	9.0
Immigrants 1976-1980 (7,651)	9.6	3.4	3.1	14.2
Immigrants 1981-1985 (6,647)	4.2	4.2	0.7	25.7
Native-born Swedes (17,544)	5.8	1.7	5.9	3.8
N = 67,934				
1990				
Immigrants - 1967 (19,221)	3.6	0.4	16.5	3.3
Immigrants 1968-1975 (12,020)	5.5	0.7	9.6	6.1
Immigrants 1976-1980 (7,234)	6.7	0.9	4.6	8.7
Immigrants 1981-1985 (5,779)	9.5	2.0	2.9	12.8
Immigrants 1986-1990 (11,992)	5.0	3.1	0.4	29.4
Native-born Swedes (17,235)	4.4	0.5	5.5	2.8
N = 73,481				

a. The figures within parentheses indicate the number of individuals in each group.

TABLE 4

PROBIT ESTIMATES OF PAYMENT FROM A RECOGNIZED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND IN 1985 AND 1990

	1985		1990	
	Coefficient	Marg. eff.	Coefficient	Marg. eff.
Constant	-1.325** (0.0368)		-1.590** (0.0403)	
Age	-0.343** (0.1262)	-0.056** (0.0031)	0.986** (0.1397)	-0.057** (0.0034)
Age^2	-0.144 (0.1172)		-1.578** (0.1317)	
Nordic -75	0.094** (0.0208)	0.011** (0.0025)	0.107** (0.0238)	0.010** (0.0023)
Nordic 76-80	0.198** (0.0357)	0.026** (0.0051)	0.107* (0.0428)	0.010* (0.0044)
Nordic 81-85	0.015 (0.0472)	0.002 (0.0053)	0.094 (0.0601)	0.009 (0.0061)
Nordic 86-90	-	-	-0.042 (0.0464)	-0.004 (0.0038)
Western -75	-0.118** (0.0380)	-0.012** (0.0036)	0.019 (0.0431)	0.002 (0.0039)
Western 76-80	-0.112 (0.0946)	-0.011 (0.0087)	-0.136 (0.1094)	-0.011 (0.0075)
Western 81-85	-0.563** (0.1189)	-0.039** (0.0048)	0.073 (0.0969)	0.007 (0.0095)
Western 86-90	-	-	-0.212* (0.0897)	-0.015** (0.0054)
Eastern -75	-0.030 (0.0400)	-0.003 (0.0042)	0.042 (0.0488)	0.004 (0.0045)
Eastern 76-80	0.416** (0.0512)	0.063** (0.0110)	0.108 (0.0717)	0.010 (0.0074)
Eastern 81-85	-0.208** (0.0716)	-0.019** (0.0057)	0.373** (0.0565)	0.045** (0.0085)
Eastern 86-90	-		-0.000 (0.0615)	-0.000 (0.0054)
Southern -75	0.029 (0.0327)	0.003 (0.0037)	-0.028 (0.0395)	-0.002 (0.0033)
Southern 76-80	0.149** (0.0543)	0.019* (0.0051)	0.157** (0.0593)	0.016* (0.0066)
Southern 81-85	-0.195* (0.0783)	-0.018** (0.0063)	0.340** (0.0664)	0.040** (0.0097)
Southern 86-90	-		-0.184* (0.0748)	-0.014** (0.0048)
Others -75	-0.021(0.0550)	-0.002 (0.0059)	0.030 (0.0524)	0.003 (0.0048)
Others 76-80	0.301** (0.0409)	0.042** (0.0067)	0.292** (0.0439)	0.003** (0.0058)
Others 81-85	-0.415** (0.0574)	-0.041** (0.0039)	0.493** (0.0392)	0.057** (0.0063)
Others 86-90	-		0.049 (0.0323)	0.004 (0.0030)
Cohabitant	-0.019 (0.0165)	-0.002 (0.0019)	-0.045** (0.0168)	-0.004** (0.0017)
Gender	-0.012 (0.0158)	-0.001 (0.0018)	-0.037* (0.0164)	-0.003 (0.0016)
Urban	-0.049* (0.0241)	-0.006* (0.0029)	-0.102** (0.0270)	-0.011** (0.0030)
N	67,934		73,471	
-2 Log Likelihood	30,354.64		28,804.86	

Standard errors within parentheses.

** Significant at 1 per cent.

* Significant at 5 per cent.

Results of likelihood ratio tests of hypotheses (i)-(iv). Five per cent critical value within parentheses.

1985: (i) X^2 (10) = 233.42 (18.31)
(ii) X^2 (12) = 125.58 (21.03)
(iii) X^2 (14) = 305.18 (23.69)
(iv) X^2 (15) = 312.14 (25.00)

1990: (i) X^2 (15) = 189.78 (25.00)
(ii) X^2 (16) = 94.78 (26.30)
(iii) X^2 (19) = 235.64 (30.14)
(iv) X^2 (20) = 261.62 (31.41)

TABLE 5

PROBIT ESTIMATES OF RECEIVING CASH LABOUR MARKET ASSISTANCE IN 1985 AND 1990

	1985		1990	
	Coefficient	Marg. eff.	Coefficient	Marg. eff.
Constant	-1.653** (0.0505)		-2.482** (0.0762)	
Age	-0.291 (0.1981)	-0.038** (0.0042)	1.116** (0.2714)	-0.014** (0.0025)
Age^2	-0.771** (0.2125)		-1.856** (0.2890)	
Nordic -75	0.003 (0.0352)	0.000 (0.0011)	-0.039 (0.0565)	-0.000 (0.0007)
Nordic 76-80	0.021 (0.0591)	0.001 (0.0019)	-0.189 (0.1157)	-0.002 (0.0009)
Nordic 81-85	0.174** (0.0623)	0.006* (0.0026)	0.165 (0.1157)	0.003 (0.0021)
Nordic 86-90	-	-	0.361** (0.0762)	0.007** (0.0020)
Western -75	0.108 (0.0584)	0.004 (0.0022)	0.140 (0.0900)	0.002 (0.0015)
Western 76-80	0.212 (0.1160)	0.0008** (0.0055)	0.199 (0.2569)	0.003 (0.0036)
Western 81-85	0.406** (0.0896)	0.016** (0.0061)	-0.104 (0.2388)	-0.001 (0.0023)
Western 86-90	-	-	0.475** (0.1083)	0.011** (0.0040)
Eastern -75	0.031 (0.0699)	0.001 (0.0022)	0.200** (0.0974)	0.003 (0.0019)
Eastern 76-80	0.381** (0.0818)	0.018** (0.0052)	0.265* (0.1285)	0.005 (0.0030)
Eastern 81-85	0.510** (0.0674)	0.028** (0.0053)	0.561** (0.0944)	0.015** (0.0041)
Eastern 86-90	-		0.779** (0.0744)	0.028** (0.0046)
Southern -75	0.092 (0.0515)	0.003 (0.0018)	0.104 (0.0797)	0.002 (0.0012)
Southern 76-80	0.412** (0.0689)	0.020** (0.0046)	0.160 (0.1195)	0.003 (0.0022)
Southern 81-85	0.448** (0.0777)	0.023** (0.0056)	0.353** (0.1231)	0.007* (0.0035)
Southern 86-90	-		0.541** (0.0902)	0.014** (0.0037)
Others -75	0.134(0.0750)	0.005 (0.0030)	0.375** (0.0842)	0.008** (0.0024)
Others 76-80	0.398** (0.0563)	0.019** (0.0035)	0.332** (0.0823)	0.007** (0.0021)
Others 81-85	0.275** (0.0564)	0.011** (0.0028)	0.557** (0.0680)	0.015** (0.0027)
Others 86-90	-		0.704** (0.0499)	0.028** (0.0021)
Cohabitant	-0.149** (0.0256)	-0.006* (0.0029)	-0.042 (0.0313)	--0.001 (0.0006)
Gender	-0.120** (0.0251)	-0.004** (0.0009)	-0.009 (0.0300)	0.000 (0.0006)
Urban	-0.085* (0.0376)	-0.003* (0.0015)	-0.089 (0.0555)	-0.002 (0.0013)
N	67,934		73,481	
-2 Log Likelihood	12,179.62		8,030.25	

Standard errors within parentheses.

** Significant at 1 per cent.
* Significant at 5 per cent.
Results of likelihood ratio tests of hypotheses (i)-(iv). Five per cent critical value within parentheses.

1985: (i) X^2 (10) = 79.83 (18.31)
(ii) X^2 (12) = 65.40 (21.03)
(iii) X^2 (14) = 151.32 (23.69)
(iv) X^2 (15) = 180.06 (25.00)

1990: (i) X^2 (15) = 126.67 (25.00)
(ii) X^2 (16) = 100.55 (26.30)
(iii) X^2 (19) = 336.81 (30.14)
(iv) X^2 (20) = 415.36 (31.41)

TABLE 6

PROBIT ESTIMATES OF RECEIVING EARLY RETIREMENT PENSION IN 1985 AND 1990

	1985		1990	
	Coefficient	Marg. eff.	Coefficient	Marg. eff.
Constant	-2.614** (0.0555)		-2.990** (0.0734)	
Age	1.012** (0.1710)	0.182** (0.0209)	0.954** (0.2158)	0.120** (0.0202)
Age^2	1.545** (0.1367)		2.164** (0.1627)	
Nordic -75	0.263** (0.0219)	0.022** (0.0018)	0.314** (0.0233)	0.018** (0.0014)
Nordic 76-80	0.255** (0.0525)	0.021** (0.0051)	0.317** (0.0589)	0.018** (0.0044)
Nordic 81-85	-0.256** (0.0916)	-0.013** (0.0036)	0.362** (0.0843)	0.022** (0.0069)
Nordic 86-90	-		-0.345** (0.0921)	-0.010** (0.0019)
Western -75	-0.158** (0.0354)	-0.099** (0.0018)	-0.148** (0.0367)	-0.005** (0.0012)
Western 76-80	-0.268 (0.1582)	-0.013* (0.0059)	0.163 (0.1344)	0.008 (0.0076)
Western 81-85	-1.286** (0.4072)	-0.027** (0.0016)	-0.548 (0.3018)	-0.013** (0.0034)
Western 86-90	-		-0.841* (0.3376)	-0.015** (0.0019)
Eastern -75	0.193** (0.0340)	0.015** (0.0029)	0.154** (0.0385)	0.007** (0.0021)
Eastern 76-80	-0.145 (0.1163)	-0.008 (0.0056)	0.197* (0.0966)	0.010 (0.0058)
Eastern 81-85	-1.329** (0.2209)	-0.027** (0.0013)	0.062 (0.1051)	0.003 (0.0049)
Eastern 86-90	-		-1.562** (0.2616)	-0.016** (0.0009)
Southern -75	0.749** (0.0308)	0.094** (0.0053)	0.968** (0.0318)	0.105** (0.0056)
Southern 76-80	0.311* (0.0787)	0.027** (0.0085)	0.674** (0.0770)	0.056** (0.0103)
Southern 81-85	-0.294* (0.1230)	-0.014** (0.0044)	0.350** (0.1069)	0.021* (0.0086)
Southern 86-90	-		-0.287* (0.1119)	-0.009** (0.0025)
Others -75	0.011 (0.0717)	-0.001 (0.0047)	-0.005 (0.0708)	-0.000 (0.0029)
Others 76-80	-0.155 (0.0814)	-0.009* (0.0039)	0.185* (0.0739)	0.009* (0.0043)
Others 81-85	-1.301** *0.1845)	-0.027** (0.0013)	-0.277** (0.1051)	-0.008** (0.0024)
Others 86-90	-		-1.617** (0.1533)	-0.016** (0.0009)
Cohabitant	-0.365** (0.0178)	-0.029** (0.0021)	-0.296** (0.0184)	-0.013** (0.0009)
Gender	-0.081** (0.0168)	-0.006** (0.0012)	-0.116** (0.0173)	-0.004** (0.0007)
Urban	-0.022 (0.0262)	-0.002 (0.0019)	-0.079** (0.0283)	-0.003* (0.0013)
N	67,934		73,481	
-2 Log Likelihood	28,462.58		27,068.62	

Standard errors within parentheses.

** Significant at 1 per cent.

* Significant at 5 per cent.

Results of likelihood ratio tests of hypotheses (i)-(iv). Five per cent critical value within parentheses.

1985: (i) X^2 (10) = 322.78 (18.31)
(ii) X^2 (12) = 696.34 (21.03)
(iii) X^2 (14) = 1,016.70 (23.69)
(iv) X^2 (15) = 1,137.16 (25.00)

1990: (i) X^2 (15) = 504.96 (25.00)
(ii) X^2 (16) = 1,102.72 (26.30)
(iii) X^2 (19) = 1,656.84 (30.14)
(iv) X^2 (20) = 1,816.34 (31.41)

TABLE 7

PROBIT ESTIMATES OF RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE IN 1985 AND 1990

	1985		1990	
	Coefficient	Marg. Eff.	Coefficient	Marg. eff.
Constant	-1.922** (0.0402)		-2.223** (0.0440)	
Age	1.814** (0.1185)	-0.044** (0.0035)	2.207** (0.1176)	-0.009** (0.0033)
Age^2	-2.227** (0.1209)		-2.303** (0.1183)	
Nordic -75	0.332** (0.0237)	0.029** (0.0020)	0.265** (0.0275)	0.018** (0.0019)
Nordic 76-80	0.539** (0.0358)	0.056** (0.0049)	0.424** (0.0428)	0.033** (0.0043)
Nordic 81-85	0.698** (0.0402)	0.083** (0.0069)	0.525** (0.0569)	0.046** (0.0070)
Nordic 86-90	-		0.668** (0.0391)	0.066** (0.0054)
Western -75	0.055 (0.0429)	0.037 (0.0037)	-0.061** (0.0539)	-0.029 (0.0025)
Western 76-80	0.165 (0.0947)	0.012 (0.0080)	0.179 (0.1027)	0.011 (0.0074)
Western 81-85	0.212** (0.0806)	0.016* (0.0074)	0.023 (0.1290)	0.001 (0.0070)
Western 86-90	-		0.343** (0.0757)	0.025** (0.0071)
Eastern -75	0.213** (0.0425)	0.016** (0.0037)	0.087 (0.0537)	0.005 (0.0032)
Eastern 76-80	0.548** (0.0623)	0.057** (0.0093)	0.326** (0.0736)	0.023** (0.0068)
Eastern 81-85	1.208** (0.0474)	0.210** (0.0135)	0.574**)0.0595)	0.052** (0.0079)
Eastern 86-90	-		1.315** (0.0446)	0.218** (0.0122)
Southern -75	0.242** (0.0341)	0.019** (0.0030)	0.157** (0.0411)	0.010** (0.0027)
Southern 76-80	0.719** (0.0474)	0.087** (0.0085)	0.568** (0.552)	0.051** (0.0071)
Southern 81-85	1.048** (0.0505)	0.164** (0.0128)	0.700** (0.0630)	0.072** (0.0099)
Southern 86-90	-		1.171** (0.0471)	0.176** (0.0116)
Others -75	0.512** (0.0473)	0.052** (0.0065)	0.438** (0.6482)	0.035** (0.0051)
Others 76-80	0.861** (0.0376)	0.117** (0.0076)	0.596** (0.0434)	0.055** (0.0056)
Others 81-85	1.505** (0.0332)	0.311** (0.0103)	0.966** (0.0374)	0.124** (0.0071)
Others 86-90	-		1.730** (0.0274)	0.364** (0.0068)
Cohabitant	-0.756** (0.0160)	-0.102** (0.0018)	-0.719** (0.0160)	-0.092** (0.0023)
Gender	0.155** (0.0157)	0.017** (0.0017)	0.175** (0.0153)	0.019** (0.0017)
Urban	0.252** (0.0300)	0.024** (0.0024)	0.229** (0.0351)	0.021** (0.0028)
N	67,934		73,481	
-2 Log Likelihood	32,739.06		34,701.54	

Standard errors within parentheses.

** Significant at 1 per cent.

* Significant at 5 per cent.

Results of likelihood ratio tests of hypotheses (i)-(iv). Five per cent critical value within parentheses.

1985: (i) X^2 (10) = 1,073.96 (18.31)
(ii) X^2 (12) = 673.36 (21.03)
(iii) X^2 (14) = 2,136.86 (23.69)
(iv) X^2 (15) = 2,926.32 (25.00)

1990: (i) X^2 (15) = 2,538.02 (25.00)
(ii) X^2 (16) = 1,463.02 (26.30)
(iii) X^2 (19) = 5,343.00 (30.14)
(iv) X^2 (20) = 6,662.72 (31.41)

TABLE 8

PROBIT ESTIMATES OF RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE
(SINGLE INDIVIDUALS) IN 1985 AND 1990

	1985		1990	
	Coefficient	Marg. eff.	Coefficient	Marg. eff.
Constant	-1.576** (0.0975)		-1.607** (0.0903)	
Age	-0.478 (0.2537)	-0.160** (0.0157)	-0.066 (0.2446)	-0.081** (0.0115)
Age^2	-0.244 (0.2435)		-0.332 (0.2362)	
Nordic -75	0.379** (0.0463)	0.069** (0.0081)	0.277** (0.0473)	0.040** (0.0068)
Nordic 76-80	0.409** (0.0703)	0.076** (0.0150)	0.362** (0.0778)	0.056** (0.0140)
Nordic 81-85	0.479** (0.0866)	0.093** (0.0204)	0.357** (0.1091)	0.055** (0.0203)
Nordic 86-90	-		0.400** (0.0710)	0.063** (0.0132)
Western -75	0.227** (0.0754)	0.037* (0.0135)	0.006 (0.0863)	0.001 (0.0102)
Western 76-80	0.322 (0.1949)	0.057 (0.0411)	0.024 (0.2263)	0.003 (0.0276)
Western 81-85	-0.262 (0.2126)	-0.030 (0.0202)	0.023 (0.2494)	0.003 (0.0303)
Western 86-90	-		-0.480 (0.2510)	-0.038** (0.0129)
Eastern -75	0.194* (0.0790)	0.031* (0.0137)	0.049** (0.0912)	0.006 (0.0114)
Eastern 76-80	0.487** (.1324)	0.095* (0.0325)	0.425** (0.1325)	0.069* (0.0269)
Eastern 81-85	1.574** (0.1001)	0.477** (0.0372)	0.558** (0.1103)	0.098** (0.0254)
Eastern 86-90	-		1.282** (0.1007)	0.330** (0.0364)
Southern -75	0.282** (0.0765)	0.048** (0.0146)	0.078 (0.0854)	0.010 (0.0111)
Southern 76-80	0.838** (0.1412)	0.198** (0.0456)	0.495** (0.1525)	0.084* (0.0336)
Southern 81-85	0.967** (0.1548)	0.242** (0.0539)	0.696** (0.1522)	0.134** (0.0407)
Southern 86-90	-		1.051** (0.1240)	0.245** (0.0418)
Others -75	0.561** (0.0975)	0.114** (0.0250)	0.556** (0.0872)	0.098** (0.0196)
Others 76-80	0.856** (0.0883)	0.204** (0.0276)	0.612** (0.0901)	0.112** (0.0214)
Others 81-85	1.555** (0.0750)	0.470** (0.0269)	0.902** (0.0745)	0.195** (0.0215)
Others 86-90	-		1.804** (0.0522)	0.536** (0.0158)
Gender	0.181** (0.0338)	0.039** (0.0039)	0.043 (0.0319)	0.008 (0.0062)
Urban	0.394** (0.0781)	0.070** (0.0110)	0.179* (0.0720)	0.032** (0.0116)
N	10.507		13,571	
-2 Log Likelihood	8,072.29		9,239.29	

Standard errors within parentheses.

** Significant at 1 per cent.
* Significant at 5 per cent.
Results of likelihood ratio tests of hypotheses (i)-(iv). Five per cent critical value within parentheses.

1985: (i) X^2 (10) = 261.56 (18.31)
(ii) X^2 (12) = 231.26 (21.03)
(iii) X^2 (14) = 480.52 (23.69)
(iv) X^2 (15) = 681.67 (25.00)

1990: (i) X^2 (15) = 542.29 (25.00)
(ii) X^2 (16) = 618.42 (26.30)
(iii) X^2 (19) = 1,346.20 (30.14)
(iv) X^2 (20) = 1,679.60 (31.41)

TABLE 9

LIST OF VARIABLES

Name of variable	Explanation
Dependent variables	
Payment from recognized unemployment insurance fund	1 Receives transfer from the component in question
Cash labour market assistance Early retirement pension Social assistance	0 Does not receive transfer from the component in question
Independent variables	
Age	(The individual's age - 16) / 48
Im -75	1 Immigrated before 1975 0 other
Im 76-80	1 immigrated before 1976-1980 0 other
Im 81-85	1 immigrated before 1981-1985 0 other
Im 86-90	1 immigrated before 1986-1990 0 other
Nordic countries	1 immigrated from the Nordic countries 0 other
Western Europe[a]	1 immigrated from Western Europe 0 other
Eastern Europe[b]	1 immigrated from Eastern Europe 0 other
Southern Europe[c]	1 immigrated from Southern Europe 0 other
Others[d]	1 Non-European immigrant 0 other
Cohabitant	1 if cohabiting (married and non-married) 0 if not cohabiting
Gender	1 Male 0 Female
Urban area[e]	1 Urban area 0 other

a. Includes Great Britain, France, Germany (the former FDR), Austria, Switzerland, Netherlands, Belgium, Ireland, Luxembourg, Liechtenstein, United States, Canada and Oceania.

b. Includes Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Hungary, former Czechoslovakia, the former Soviet Union and the former German Democratic Republic.

c. Includes Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Monaco, Malta, San Marino, The Vatican, Turkey and former Yugoslavia.

d. Includes other countries.

e. 1985: Defined according to the 1980 urban area definition.
1990: Defined according to the 1990 urban area definition.

PERCEPTION DES PAIEMENTS DE TRANSFERT PAR LES IMMIGRÉS EN SUÈDE

Utilisant comme critère de comparaison la situation des personnes nées dans le pays, l'auteur examine la mesure dans laquelle les immigrés peuvent se prévaloir du système de sécurité sociale suédois. Sur la base des données brutes et après application d'un certain nombre de variables explicatives, on constate qu'il existe des différences entre les immigrés et les Suédois nés dans le pays quant à leur participation respective au régime suédois de garantie de ressources.

On constate aussi qu'il existe des différences à cet égard entre les immigrés provenant de régions différentes ainsi qu'entre les groupes d'immigrés récents et plus anciens.

En ce qui concerne les indemnités de chômage et l'assistance en espèces aux travailleurs, on ne peut discerner de tendance précise dans les résultats.

Mais dans le cas des prestations de retraite anticipée et de l'aide sociale, la situation paraît différente. Les immigrés venus antérieurement de régions connues comme sources d'immigration de main d'œuvre sont sur-représentés en ce qui concerne les retraites anticipées.

Les immigrés, et en particulier les immigrés non-européens arrivés récemment, sont sur-représentés dans le groupe des bénéficiaires d'aide sociale.

On peut dans l'ensemble en conclure que le pourcentage total de participation des immigrés au système suédois de garantie de ressources est déterminé par leur taux de chômage et leur état de santé. D'autre part, leur taux de participation aux divers éléments du système de garantie de ressources revenu dépend pour beaucoup de leur durée de séjour en Suède ainsi que de leur pays d'origine.

EL RECIBO DE PAGOS DE TRANSFERENCIA POR INMIGRANTES EN SUECIA

Utilizando como referencia una persona nacida en el país, este artículo examina en qué medida los inmigrantes recurren a la red de seguridad social de Suecia. Valiéndose de datos generales, y tras haber condicionado una serie de variables explicativas, se determina que existen diferencias entre los inmigrantes y los nativos en cuanto a la participación en el sistema de seguridad social de Suecia.

También hay diferencias a este respecto entre inmigrantes de diferentes regiones, así como entre inmigrantes recientes y grupos de inmigrantes anteriores.

En lo que atañe a los beneficios de desempleo y a la asistencia en efectivo del mercado laboral, los resultados no permiten discernir un patrón claro.

No obstante, en el caso de una jubilación anticipada y de asistencia social, el panorama es diferente. Los inmigrantes que llegaron con anterioridad de las regiones típicas de inmigración laboral están sobre representados en el retiro anticipado.

Los inmigrantes, especialmente aquéllos de fuera de Europa que llegaron hace poco, están sobre representados entre los beneficiarios de la asistencia social.

La conclusión global es que la tasa total de participación de los inmigrantes en el sistema de seguridad social está determinada por su tasa de desempleo y el estado de su salud. Por otra parte, la distribución de su participación entre los distintos componentes del sistema de seguridad social depende en gran medida de la duración de su residencia en Suecia y de su proveniencia.