

Swedish attitudes towards labour immigrants and guest workers from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland – An experimental study

Work in progress, please do not cite without permission of the authors

Paper to the AABS conference 29th of May – 1st of June 2008, Indiana University
Jonas Månsson, Centre for Labour Market Research (CAFO), Växjö University & Institute for Growth Policy Studies, Östersund (jonas.mansson@vxu.se)
Josefin Dahlander, Sida Baltic Sea unit

Abstract

There is a growing concurrence between the West European countries when it comes to attract labour immigrants from the East European countries. We have chosen to focus upon the attitudes in the Swedish society that the labour immigrants face as an important aspect of integration, which according to various theoretical perspectives affects their willingness to take up residence in Sweden and also establish on the Swedish labour market. The study illustrates the topic in accordance with which prerequisites for labour immigration from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland that exists, in light of domestic attitudes.

The significance of interaction between the inhabitants and the immigrants are being sketched through a natural experiment. In 2005 a storm struck Kronoberg, a region in the south of Sweden. The labour immigration to the region from the adjacent new EU-member countries that followed after this occurrence made it possible to focus upon two different employers groups, namely the ones that interacted directly with the immigrants and those who did not. The survey consists of 500 forestry owners in the region and their attitudes when exposed to different expressions of prejudices regarding labour immigrants. The aspects of relevance were chosen on the basis of existing literature upon the subject and accepted variables concerning degree of interaction as determining for attitude formation.

When comparing attitudes between the groups of employers, we have found important differences when it comes to aspects of attitudes concerning the immigrants' performance and labour moral. Those who have interacted with the immigrants in daily life or in job situations have more positive attitudes than those who have not had that kind of close interaction.

1. Introduction

There is a declining demographic trend all over Western Europe. Increased labour immigration is often said to be needed to secure growth and to enforce welfare systems. In Sweden, the debate has recently turned towards stimulating labour immigration from non-European countries. Yet there are still a low number of immigrants from the adjacent new EU-member countries to Sweden. The Baltic States and Poland, which today face a large scaled migration of labour, are EU members since 2004 and are included in the rules concerning free movement of labour in the union, yet with some limitations regarding a few countries. In a pure geographical respect it is reasonable to suggest that the labour immigration from the new EU-member countries to the older member-countries would have increased drastically. Today there is a situation where many workers from the adjacent countries are choosing not to take up residence in Sweden but instead in for example Ireland and Great Britain. Svedberg (2005) note that in case of labour shortage, competition may appear between the west European countries when it comes to attract the labour.

According to Rauhut (2004) the movement of labour is yet rather limited within Europe as a whole today, which from an EU perspective is seen as problematic since free movement of labour is one of the cornerstones of the treaty of the European Union. Eriksson (2004) claims that between the Nordic countries there has been subsidizes regarding labour migration for decades. According to classic migration theories, common labour markets are facilitated through language similarities, wage diffusion and increased possibilities to commute. Whether or not the Baltic Sea region exists as a common labour market area is a topic of current interest, since it as such face more difficulties in terms of language barriers and long distances.

To promote workers mobility and immigration, much research focus today upon what makes the migrants chose to take up residence in one country before another. One important reason is,

according to the literature, to be traced to matters of attitudes among the inhabitants. Brenner & Fertig (2006) show that in prolongation, attitudes in the receiving country seems determining for the pull-factors behind the migration, i.e. conceptions that makes the migrant chose to take up residence in the specific country. This increased focus upon cognition and preferences implies that an understanding has grown regarding the fact that many different aspects are important when the migrant is to decide which country to work in.

It is though difficult to point to attitudes as a direct determining factor regarding the migrants' choice of one host country before another. Yet we assume that this in a long-term perspective is of clear significance for the origin of moving patterns to some countries. Attitudes are an important component for immigrants to initially be able to get integrated on the labour market, so that networks of foreign employees can be created and facilitate for other migrants to chose the specific country instead of another. This network theory has recently received increasing support in theoretical respect. Discrimination is therefore another relevant aspect to focus upon regarding labour immigration. Several experimental studies have recently been conducted in Sweden with the aim to identify discrimination at work (see e.g. Ahmed, 2005; Carlsson and Rooth, 2006; Holm, 2000). The question is what causes the discrimination. Rooth and Åslund (2005) focus on attitude changes as an effect of September the 11th regarding possibilities on the labour market for labour immigrants and found small evidence that the effect in attitudes affected the possibilities.

2. Aim of the study

In this study the issue is illustrated in accordance with what prerequisites for labour immigration there is to Sweden from the Baltic countries and Poland, in terms of attitudes in Sweden towards these groups of immigrants and guest workers. We aim at studying a phenomenon above the most common push and pull factors that may contribute to or constrain an increased labour

migration to Sweden from the adjacent new EU-member countries (with a focus on the Baltic states and Poland), namely the attitudes the inhabitants in Sweden accommodates towards the labour immigrants and guest workers.

In the long run it is a matter of the society's ability to integrate the immigrants, which in accordance with theory influences their ability to take up permanent residence in Sweden and establish on the Swedish labour market. An important question is whether there are direct or indirect obstacles in the Swedish society that may makes immigrants chose other countries instead of Sweden. The object of study is here limited to include societal attitudes.

The theoretical ambition of the study is to build on cognitively based explanation models regarding integration, in terms of aggregated attitudes. Building on Allport (1954; 1979) who concludes that interaction in work situations promotes integration, we try to refine the methodology and contribute with a different method. The observed phenomenon, i.e. the consequence of interaction for attitude formation among the citizens in the host country, is here being sketched through a "natural experiment". The "treatment" is in our study interaction with Baltic and Polish immigrants and guest workers. The questions for the study is thus if we can identify attitudes and explain the variation in these attitudes between persons that have been interacted and persons that not have been interacted with guest worker from the Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

3. Previous research: perspectives on attitude formation regarding labour immigrants

Attitudes towards immigrants are in the literature classified in accordance with functional and economical factors, social factors and factors that concerns interaction. The most common factors regarding attitudes towards labour immigrants concerns primarily age, educational

background and area of residence. Allport (1954, 1979) outlined the “contact theory”, which has been guiding for much coming research regarding attitudes towards labour immigrants. One of his main findings was that interaction between inhabitants and the labour immigrants were of central importance for integration. At the same time he meant that all kind of interaction is not promoting integration. The kind of interaction he called “casual” which he meant included meetings on daily basis without direct personal contact between the inhabitants and the immigrants, instead contributes to strengthening prejudices and obstructs integration. The kind of interaction he meant holds acquaintance potential arises through common work or closer relations. The contact has to enable conversations and friendship. Some earlier research had in terms of the independent variable calculated that city residents are exposed to labour immigrants to a greater extent than residents in the country side, and stated that to be the reason for city residents to accommodate more positive attitudes. Allport (1954) then contributed with challenging this connection, and state that there might be more reasons for accommodating more positive attitudes than the simple fact of exposure.

3.1 Attitude formation

The research has since the drafting of the contact theory focused primary on other factors that might shape attitudes besides the interaction variable. So far the research has not in any considerable amount concentrated upon whether attitude formation towards labour immigrants are taking place through interaction with those, or rather through prejudices. Instead, the interest of research has been directed towards grounds for attitude formation among the inhabitants. One example is Brenner and Fertig (2006), which points to that people who has attained education and whose parents also has, accommodates more positive attitudes towards immigrants. It is yet obvious that cities are harbouring more highly educated inhabitants than the countryside does. Exposing might thus be the explain factor as well as, or in combination with educational attainment. However, Brenner and Fertig (2006) do not carry on this analysis. One reason for not

carry on relates to methodological problems. Simply expressed, attitudes are being shaped by prejudices, through experiences or a combination thereof. The question is whether there are observable differences when it comes to attitudes based on these factors. There are obvious methodological problems when it comes to decide which reasons individuals hold for their beliefs. Brenner and Fertig (2006) points to methodological problems when studying prejudices. The authors' mean that the degree of respondents' xenophobia is often not defined in a generally accepted manner, and that attitudes are not directly observable. One might hope that respondents reveal their true latent attitudes in a set of related questions to the same topic, but it is difficult to say. This also precludes straightforward analysis of the causal mechanisms behind the attitudes. The driving force behind answers on questions regarding immigrants need not necessarily be xenophobic tendencies alone, since different unobservable traits might confound the answering behaviour. Further, Brenner and Fertig (2006) mean that this constitutes a problem whenever there is no perfect congruence between these unobservable fundamental attitudes. Frolund Thomsen (2006) reviews some American experiments, where different ethnical groups were set to perform an assignment together. The experiments showed that those inhabitants that were part of the experiment held more positive attitudes towards the immigrants than those in the control groups. Frolund Thomsen (2006) yet points to the fact that the people in the groups knew they were being observed which is known to give positive effects when it comes to results.

In a study upon Danes attitudes towards immigrants Frolund Thomsen (2006) observes that contact at work between the groups is important when it comes to shaping attitudes. Yet he mentions that the effect is not completely unambiguous. It is hard to say what is cause and what is effect, and there are no obvious methods to deal with the complication.

To sum up, methodology is the big challenge when it comes to study prejudices and the effect of interaction in terms of shaping attitudes. There are no fixed paths to choose for observing the

phenomenon in larger settings. Bigger attitude surveys like European Social Survey will always be burdened with insufficient categories when it comes to measuring attitudes as originating from prejudices and interaction respectively. It is yet less successful to leave out the dimension, since it might be of importance for resisting prejudices through the making of relevant policy recommendations. Therefore, we want to turn to Allport and the contact theory again, but try a micro-scaled method for being able to observe the interaction variable.

4. Case study: Labour immigration to a Swedish county after the storm “Gudrun”

To observe attitude formation in connection with interaction, a specific case has been delimited in time and space. Labour immigration to a labour market region in the county Småland is observed in connection to the work with clearing up after the storm “Gudrun” that hit the region in January 2005. From a methodological standpoint it is possible to, in a double sense, use a natural experiment. In the period after the storm a high amount of Baltic and Polish forest workers were hired to clear up in the woods. What is being observed in the study is how the forest owners/employers afterwards expresses their attitudes towards the immigrants and guest workers, in comparison with those forest owners who did not hire or cooperated with these labourer during the period. Initially, there is a use for explaining which aspects that might be the most influencing in terms of attitudes towards immigrants and guest workers.

4.1. Treatment effects on attitudes – some theoretical considerations

To study differences in attitude formation it is necessary to have either two groups, study the same group over time or, as in the best cases, have information from two groups studied over time. The effect of an intervention is then explored by comparing these two groups. In this study we are looking at differences in attitudes towards immigrants/guest workers from the Baltic countries and Poland, and we will show that studying two groups in the same period in time will, given our research design, make it possible to have an estimate of the difference in attitudes due to interaction. First, we need to set some fundamentals for the estimation of intervention, or treatment effects.

If we assume that A =attitudes, d = indicate intervention ($d=1$) or no intervention ($d=0$). Further, the two time periods are denoted t and $t+1$. Elaborating with the expected ‘attitude’ (E) due to interaction the differences described above can formally be expressed as follows;

[1] $E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_t|d=0)$ is the total intervention effect. This design had required data on both before and after as well as for both intervened and not intervened.

[2] $E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_t|d=1)$ is the intervention effect among those who experienced the intervention. In this design we would have had data on the intervention group both before and after the intervention.

[3] $E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_{t+1}|d=0)$ is differences in attitudes between those that have been intervened and those that have not, which is our case.

In our case we have information according to expression [3], thus generally it is not possible to say something about differences as an effect of interaction. However, we will argue that due to the circumstances around the set-up for our research we are able to transfer our results to [1], and measure the total effect of interaction.

The storm caused, as mentioned previously, a severe shortage of labour supply. To be able to take care of the timber several forest companies and private forest owners had to rely on immigrants and guest workers from, mainly, the Baltic countries and Poland. The situation was unique due to several reasons. Firstly, there was an active recruitment of guest workers. Secondly, the recruitment was based on a special need by a population in Sweden. Thirdly, there were no special policy measures to support integration, instead integration and interaction was based on curiosity and need for help.

Therefore we end up with a situation where;

- all forest owners in the region were randomly hit by the storm
- forest owner had small possibilities to influence the choice of workers; no self selection existed
- no external sources that encouraged interaction existed

Given these circumstances we will argue that what is measured in our study is the total effect of interaction with the guest worker population. Formally this can be seen as follows;

[4] $E(A_{t+1} | d = 1) - E(A_t | d = 0)$ i.e. the total effect, which can be divided into two components.

[5] $\left[E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_t|d=1) \right] - \left[E(A_{t+1}|d=0) - E(A_t|d=0) \right]$ The first expression measures the effect among those who have interacted, and the last part measures the attitude effect between those who have not interacted. Rearranging [5] gives us,

[6] $\left[E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_{t+1}|d=0) \right] - \left[E(A_t|d=1) - E(A_t|d=0) \right]$ The first part is thus differences between those who interacted and those who did not. The last part of expression [6] is sometime referred to as selection, i.e. differences between the two groups that existed prior to the storm. Given the pre-conditions for our research it is reasonable to assume that $E(A_t|d=1) - E(A_t|d=0) = 0$ and therefore

[7] $E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_t|d=0) \Leftrightarrow E(A_{t+1}|d=1) - E(A_{t+1}|d=0)$ i.e. the total effect is the observed effect comparing attitudes for those that did interact, with attitudes of those that did not interact.

To summarise; given the setting for our investigation we will claim that observed differences between the two groups of forest owners can be observed as a treatment effect, i.e. the effect on attitudes caused by interaction.

4.2 *The survey and the data*

The survey was made through a postal questionnaire and a pilot investigation was being performed through dialogue with two randomly picked forest owners. The questionnaire was sent to 500 forest owners in the county. The reply frequency was about 58 %. 81 persons stated that they have interacted with the Baltic and Polish workers, mainly through work but also through letting out rooms and houses.

With starting point in existing literature and variables in accordance with European Social Survey, the questions was constructed to capture attitudes towards a specific set of dimensions. A first set of questions relates to the dimension called *extraction*, i.e. the employers willingness to employ foreign labour in case of a common need, e.g. in a crisis situation alternatively when the crisis situation is over, compared to the will of hiring Swedish labour in the same situation. The factor is thus concerning priorities regarding extraction, related to time and space.

A second set of questions, or items, relates to *durability*. These questions aim to capture variation in the will of employing foreign labour, in terms of tax or non-tax conditions. A third set of questions relates to the dimension *long-term prospects* and is on offers regarding fixed employments, besides offers regarding seasonal employment and part-time work. A fourth set of questions was constructed to capture *experienced general risk*. This dimension concerns labour immigration as a possibility or threat towards the Swedish labour market. A fifth dimension is *experienced specific risk*. In contrast to the general risk this dimension points to the employers views on, for example, communications difficulties as a working environment risk. Finally, *helpfulness/solidarity* aim at showing whether or not the employer has been helping the migrants to gain work permits or residence permits, and also helped them to orient themselves in the Swedish society.

The questions, or items, used in the questioner is formulated as a number of proposals in which the respondent is asked to state if he/she agree or disagree on a scale from one to five.

5. Empirical analysis

We have divided the results into two parts. Firstly, we use factor analysis to make a classification and to identify those latent variables that comprise different attitudes. Given this identification we then use regression techniques to analyse if there are characteristics related to the individual that explain the variation in the identified 'attitudes'. Our main variable is 'interaction' with Baltic and Polish immigrants and guest workers.

5.1. Identification of attitudes

Since the main focus of this study is differences in attitudes we need an instrument for identifying underlying aspects of these. In the conducted survey we had 14 items representing different aspects of attitudes towards Baltic and Polish immigrants and guest workers. Our first task is to identify if there are latent variables that may represent different types of attitudes. This was done by using factor analysis. The result of this analysis is presented in table 1 below;

Table 1 Factor loading for identification of different set of attitudes. Correlation matrix and translation of the questions is presented in appendix.

Item	General Immigrant Attitudes	Labour Market Attitudes	Industrial relation attitudes	Performance and Labour Moral
Fr_5	0.226	0.034	0.113	0.801
Fr_6	0.537	0.094	-0.055	0.536
Fr_7	0.342	0.120	0.145	0.734
Fr_8	0.019	0.281	0.537	0.467
Fr_9	0.084	0.793	0.048	-0.078
Fr_10	0.046	0.785	0.073	0.314
Fr_11	0.299	0.666	0.172	0.209
Fr_12	0.132	0.070	0.772	0.072
Fr_13	-0.042	0.533	0.457	-0.102
Fr_14	0.808	0.054	0.017	0.192
Fr_15	0.484	-0.043	0.665	0.030
Fr_16	-0.186	0.195	0.653	0.122
Fr_17	0.800	0.125	0.029	0.165
Fr_18	0.821	0.100	0.062	0.242
Fr_19	0.449	0.400	0.107	0.101

Varimax rotation number of factors is determined by the eigenvalue criterion

The four factor model obtained by the analysis explains almost 63 per cent of the variation in the data and the factor pattern is quite strong. Only one item load on more than one factor and only one item does not load on any factor. The first factor load on item 6, 14, 17 and 18 and we interpret this factor as more of general attitudes towards guest workers from the Baltic States and Poland. The factor points to whether the forest owner makes a difference between the groups of Swedish and Baltic and Polish workers when it comes to hiring staff and to perform duties together. It also points to certain difficulties in terms of language confusion that the forest owner experiences. Another aspect regards influences to the Swedish society that the workers contribute

with. We use the label *general immigrant attitudes* for this factor. The second factor, loading on item 9, 10, 11 and 13 can be interpreted as attitudes towards the labour market and its institutions. The factor points to the need for immigrants on the labour market and views upon increased immigration of labour. It also points to rights and privileges on the labour market and whether those shall be the same for the Swedish labour and the labour immigrants/guest workers. Further, it concerns working environment requirements and wages. This factor is labelled *labour market attitudes*. The third factor load on item 8, 12, 15 and 16 that are questions relating to *industrial relations*. The factor points to positive effects for the Swedish economy due to immigration of labour. It also points to future prospects in terms of labour immigration. And finally factor 4 loads on item 5, 6 and 7 which is items relating to *performance and moral*.

5.2. Differences in attitudes

Given the different attitude dimensions above we turn to the main question for our study:

Does interaction change attitudes?

To investigate this question we use a linear regression analysis. Our dependent variables are the identified factors, and their factor scores, presented above and our aim is to explain the variation in these factors. The explanatory variables are presented in table 2.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics on explanatory variables

	Interacted N = 81		Not interacted N = 210	
	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std.Dev
Age	59.25	13.41	59.89	11.35
Upper secondary school	0.32	0.47	0.33	0.47
University	0.27	0.45	0.26	0.44
Female	0.16	0.37	0.29	0.45
Married/cohabitant	0.80	0.40	0.84	0.36
Children at home	0.30	0.46	0.25	0.44
Income	4.09	1.90	4.30	1.87
Forest Size	0.47	0.50	0.32	0.47

Overall there are small differences between the groups, indicating that our assumption about random selection in the need for guest workers from the Baltic States and Poland is correct. The average age is quite high, about 59 years among those who interacted and about 60 for those who did not. The education variable indicates a person's highest education. 32 percent of those who interacted have upper secondary school as highest education and 33 percent of those who did not. There are slightly more persons that have a university degree that have interacted with the guest workers, 27 percent compared to 26 percent. Even though the overall differences are small one characteristic that seems to make a difference when it comes to interaction is gender. Significantly fewer women have interacted than men. In fact, as few as 16 per cent, of those females who answered the questionnaire, had interacted with the Baltic and Polish workers. An explanation for this might be that forestry still is a male dominated occupation and females rarely have the main responsibility for the forest. This explanation receives some support since 80 per cent of the forest owners answering the questioner and had interacted. We also have a variable indicating if the person responding the question had children staying at home. Income is measured on a 7 grade scale in 50.000 SEK intervals and treated as a semi continuous variable. The average around 4 indicate an income in the range of 250 000 - 300 000 SEK (appx. \$42 000 - \$50 000). Finally we have an indicator for the total ownership of forest. This indicator takes the value 1 if a person has a forest size in excess of 500 acres. There are a higher percentage of forest owners that interacted that have 'large' forests. This could to some extent explain why they interacted. In table 3 we present the analysis of our investigation

Table 3 Regression results.

Dependent variable/factor	General Immigrant Attitudes		Labour Market Attitudes		Industrial relation attitudes		Performance and Labour Moral	
	Standard		Standard		Standard		Standard	
	<i>Coefficient</i>	Error	<i>Coefficient</i>	Error	<i>Coefficient</i>	Error	<i>Coefficient</i>	Error
Interact	0.040	0.134	0.009	0.142	0.223	0.142	0.765	0.130
Constant	<i>-0.938</i>	0.531	0.805	0.565	0.183	0.562	-0.775	0.515
Age	0.004	0.007	-0.016	0.007	-0.001	0.007	0.008	0.006
Upper secondary school	0.252	0.166	0.119	0.176	-0.214	0.175	-0.013	0.161
University	0.650	0.196	-0.305	0.209	-0.718	0.208	0.011	0.191
Female	-0.196	0.163	<i>-0.318</i>	0.174	0.125	0.173	-0.409	0.158
Married/cohabitant	0.062	0.184	-0.096	0.196	0.065	0.195	0.004	0.179
Children at home	-0.170	0.171	-0.109	0.182	0.180	0.181	<i>0.326</i>	0.166
Income	0.088	0.042	0.069	0.044	0.002	0.044	0.014	0.040
Forest Size	0.312	0.135	0.226	0.144	-0.221	0.143	-0.122	0.131
Adj R2	0.130		0.070		0.060		0.175	

Italic = significant at 10 percent level, bold = 5 percent, bold and italic = 1 percent

The main indicator concerns if a person has interacted or not while other variables are control variables. A positive coefficient for the interaction variable implies that a person that has interacted to a larger extent agree with the proposal. For factor one and four this also means a more positive attitude in terms of the different dimensions. For factor two and three strongly agree can be interpreted as that the forest owners' attitude is more negative.

For the factor that represents general attitudes towards immigrants we do not have any effect of interaction, i.e. there is no difference in the general attitude towards labour immigration/guest workers based on interaction. It can however be noticed that persons with a university degree, high income and relatively large forest size holds a more positive attitude.

We do not have any interaction effect for the factor that represents *labour markets attitudes*. The items that makes this dimension focuses more on the problems with guest workers. Thus a positive sign means less positive attitudes. The variation regarding this dimension is poorly explained by the variables at hand. Only seven per cent of the variation in this attitude dimension is explained by the variables. The only variable that is significant is age, meaning that older

persons are more positive to immigrants from the Baltic States and Poland due to labour market issues.

This is also the case regarding the factor relating to *industrial relations*. It should be noted that also this variable should interpret the opposite way. The negative sign on university degree means for example that persons with university degree are less likely find language obstacles as a problem.

Finally, there is the factor representing *performance and work moral*. This factor is to a quite large extent explained by the variables. Almost 18 percent of the variation in the factor is explained by the covariates, despite the fact that only three variables are significant. The three variables are; interaction, gender and children staying at home. Interaction

There is a surprisingly large negative effect for gender, which here indicates that females holds a less positive attitude towards the guest workers. Finally, having children staying at home imply more positive attitudes. This variable is probably to a large extent connected to the forest owners own possibility to take care of the forest. Persons with children staying at home have less such possibilities.

6. Conclusion and concluding remarks

Regarding the variables direct expressions of attitudes towards labour immigrants, labour market aspects and industrial relations there are no significant differences between the groups. When it comes to the view upon the workers ethics and productivity, the results show that there are differences in attitudes between the groups. It is therefore possible to say that the forest owners that worked together with the immigrants hold more positive attitudes than those who did not have close interaction of that kind.

The study shows that in this specific case, interaction is of significance for attitude formation. Since theory points to attitudes of inhabitants as important for integration, it is reasonable to suggest that more positive attitudes are improving the prerequisites for quicker integration. A reasonable policy suggestion in this connection might be to further facilitate the rules for immigrants and guest workers in different aspects, if Sweden is to attract labour migrants from adjacent countries. The obstacles in the Swedish labour market that exists today in terms of attitudes will, assuming the results from this study also correspond with the larger setting, gradually faint away and enable for the indispensable networks of immigrants to establish and promote immigration further.

References

Ahmed, A. (2005) *Essaeyes on the Behavioral Economics of Discrimination*, Published Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Economics and statistics, Växjö university

Allport, Gordon W. (1954, 1979) *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Perseus Books

Brenner, Jan, Fertig Michael (2006) Identifying the determinants of attitudes toward immigrants: a structural cross-country analysis. Working paper no 2386. Bonn: Institute for the study of labour.

Carlsson, M. and Rooth, D. (2006) "Evidence of ethnic discrimination in the Swedish Labour Market using experimental data", IZA Discussion paper 2281

Dolvik, Jon Erik, Eldring, Line (2005:566) *Arbets- och tjenstemobilitetetter EU-utvidelsen. Nordiske forskjeller og fellestrekk*. Köpenhamn: Nordiska Ministerrådet

Doyle, Nicola, Hughes, Gerard, Wadensjö, Eskil (2006:5) *Freedom of movement for workers from Central and Eastern Europe. Experiences in Ireland and Sweden*. Stockholm: Svenska institutet för Europapolitiska studier (Sieps)

Eriksson, Jonas (2004:2u) *Nettomigrationen från de nya EU-medlemsländerna – utvärdering och progrnostisering*. Stockholm: Svenska institutet för Europapolitiska studier (Sieps)

Fetzer, Joel S (2000) *Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States, France and Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Frolund Thomsen, Jens Peter (2006) *Konflikten om de nye danskere*. Köpenhamn: Akademisk Förlag

Gicquel, Catherine F, Makarov, Victor, Zolkos Magdalena (red.) (2005) *The challenge of mobility in the Baltic Sea region*. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-verlag BWV

Holm, J. (2000) "What's in a name? An Ethnical discrimination experiment" Working paper 2000:3, Department of Economics, Lund University

Rauhut, Daniel (2004:16) *Replacement migration to Sweden. An overview of possible sender countries*. Östersund: Institutet för tillväxtpolitiska studier (ITPS)

Rooth, D. and Åslund, O. (2005) "Orsakar till främlingsfientlighet diskriminering på arbetsmarknaden? Erfarenheter efter 11 September", *Ekonomisk debatt*, Volö. 33. pp.5-15

Svedberg, Marcus (2005:8) "Tillväxten gynnas av olikheterna kring Östersjön" i *Tillväxtpolitisk utblick*. Östersund: Institutet för tillväxtpolitiska studier (ITPS)

Public prints

SOU 2006:87, "Arbetskraftsinvandring till Sverige – förslag och konsekvenser"

SOU 2002:116, "EU:s utvidgning och arbetskraftens rörlighet"

Appendix 1: Correlation matrix

	Fr_5	Fr_6	Fr_7	Fr_8	Fr_9	Fr_10	Fr_11	Fr_12	Fr_13	Fr_14	Fr_15	Fr_16	Fr_17	Fr_18	Fr_19
Fr_5	1.000	0.466	0.515	0.350	0.052	0.264	0.263	0.214	0.021	0.339	0.220	0.106	0.319	0.393	0.252
Fr_6		1.000	0.557	0.131	0.142	0.220	0.294	0.126	0.043	0.484	0.267	-0.022	0.470	0.476	0.255
Fr_7			1.000	0.393	0.143	0.317	0.310	0.192	0.085	0.401	0.314	0.143	0.398	0.471	0.249
Fr_8				1.000	0.138	0.358	0.375	0.392	0.327	0.164	0.290	0.317	0.205	0.223	0.293
Fr_9					1.000	0.498	0.439	0.170	0.353	0.079	0.105	0.147	0.126	0.120	0.184
Fr_10						1.000	0.571	0.184	0.305	0.161	0.130	0.215	0.203	0.180	0.330
Fr_11							1.000	0.266	0.239	0.304	0.271	0.192	0.300	0.367	0.358
Fr_12								1.000	0.287	0.144	0.482	0.284	0.129	0.118	0.107
Fr_13									1.000	0.014	0.134	0.348	0.063	0.056	0.207
Fr_14										1.000	0.288	-0.033	0.550	0.702	0.355
Fr_15											1.000	0.261	0.355	0.362	0.243
Fr_16												1.000	-0.070	0.028	0.100
Fr_17													1.000	0.660	0.353
Fr_18														1.000	0.360
Fr_19															1.000

General immigrant attitudes

- Fr_6 I am indifferent regarding Swedes and Baltic guest workers in hiring/working together
- Fr_14 It's hard to forecast the needs on the labour market therefore I am positive to an extended labour immigration.
- Fr_17 It's good for the Swedish society with new influences e.g. those contributed by the Baltic guest workers
- Fr_18 Labour immigration and guest workers have a positive effect on the Swedish economy

Labour market attitudes

- Fr_9 Baltic guest workers seldom pay taxes
- Fr_10 Baltic guest workers ignore working regulations
- Fr_11 Baltic guest workers generally accept lower compensation compared to Swedes
- Fr_13 Baltic guest workers take jobs from Swedes

Industrial relations

- Fr_8 Language difficulties make it hard to work with Baltic guest workers
- Fr_12 It's important that those hiring Baltic guest workers sign collective agreements
- Fr_15 Baltic guest workers should have the same rights and rules as Swedish workers.
- Fr_16 Workers from the Baltic countries are invited to temporary/seasonal employment, otherwise jobs should be reserved for Swedes.

Performance and moral

- Fr_5 Baltic guest workers was needed after the storm
- Fr_6 I am indifferent regarding Swedes and Baltic guest workers in hiring/working together
- Fr_7 Baltic guest workers are generally very productive