

Christer Gerdes and Eskil Wadensjö

# **Immigrants from the New EU Member States and the Swedish Welfare State**

Christer Gerdes and Eskil Wadensjö

# **Immigrants from the New EU Member States and the Swedish Welfare State**

– SIEPS 2008:9 –

Report No. 9  
September/2008

Publisher: Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies

The report is available at  
[www.sieps.se](http://www.sieps.se)

The opinions expressed in this report are  
those of the authors and are not necessarily  
shared by SIEPS.

Cover: Svensk Information AB

Print: EO Grafiska AB

Stockholm, September 2008

ISSN 1651-8942

ISBN 978-91-86107-04-8

## **PREFACE**

On 1 May 2004 the European Union gained ten new members, eight of them from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). As had been the case with both the Greek and the Iberian accessions to the Community in the 1980s, the prospect of giving free access to workers from the newcomers provoked fears in the incumbent member states, that it would lead, for example, to an erosion of the welfare state and upset labour markets. Even though Sweden became the only member state to fully apply Community rules from 1 May 2004, the decision had been preceded by a fierce debate over whether Sweden should impose transitional rules that started in November 2003 and ended only days before the actual enlargement.

The fact that Sweden in the end chose not to apply transitional rules should provide us with invaluable evidence to help us draw conclusions for future enlargements to poorer countries, such as Turkey, Croatia and the Ukraine. In this report the authors, Professor Eskil Wadensjö and Doctor Christer Gerdes, both from the Stockholm University Linnaeus Center for Integration Studies (SULCIS), Stockholm University, employ unique data from Statistics Sweden to analyse developments in Sweden since May 2004 with regard to the migration flows from the new member states of CEE.

SIEPS conducts and promotes research and analysis of European policy issues within the disciplines of political science, law and economics. SIEPS strives to act as a link between the academic world and policy-makers at various levels.

Anna Michalski  
Acting Director, SIEPS

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Christer Gerdes is Doctor of Economics at the Swedish Institute for Social Research (SOFI), Stockholm University, and researcher at SULCIS (Stockholm Linnaeus Center for Integration Studies). His PhD thesis, *Studying the Interplay of Immigration and Welfare States* (2008), deals with immigration to Denmark and Germany and if this immigration has consequences for the welfare states of the two countries. In other studies he has treated various aspects of immigration to Denmark, Germany and Sweden.

Eskil Wadensjö is Professor of Economics at SOFI and director of SULCIS. He was dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Stockholm University between 1996 and 2005. His main research interests are the economics of international migration, labour market policy and social security. Current research topics are the economic effects of immigration to Denmark, temporary employment agencies and economic aspects of pension reform. He has published many books and articles on various subjects. Among recent books on immigration may be mentioned *Immigration and the Public Sector in Denmark*, (with Helena Orrje) Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002 and *The Common Nordic Labor Market at 50* (with Peder J. Pedersen and Marianne Røed), Nordic Council, Copenhagen, 2008. He was President of the European Association of Labour Economists (EALE) 1993–99 and Chairman of the Swedish Economic Association 1992–93 and has been member of several governmental committees.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are grateful for helpful comments by participants in seminars and conferences in Brussels, February 7, 2008, Mölle, May 21, 2008, Oslo, May 22-23, 2008 and Nyborg, August 21-22, 2008. We would also like to thank Linda Wiklund, Statistics Sweden for all help with the development of the database the study is based on and Jonas Eriksson, SIEPS for excellent logistic support.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING AV RAPPORTEN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMMIGRATION TO SWEDEN FROM THE NEW EU MEMBER COUNTRIES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3 THE NEW IMMIGRANTS AND THE LABOUR MARKET .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4 THE SHORT-TERM MIGRATION .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>5 A WELFARE MAGNET? EFFECTS ON THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>6 CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>40</b>

## **SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING AV RAPPORTEN**

Sverige var det enda land i EU som inte införde några övergångsregler för invandring från de tio länder som blev medlemmar i EU den 1 maj 2004. Sverige fattade samma beslut när Bulgarien och Rumänien blev medlemmar den 1 januari 2007. Det betyder att Sverige är ett intressant testfall för vilka effekter utvidgningen av arbetsmarknaden inom EU kommer att få.

Invandringen har ekonomiska effekter för invandringslandet. En mer omfattande invandring på grund av utvidgningen av EU har ekonomiska effekter för Sverige, positiva och negativa. Storleken av dessa effekter beror naturligtvis delvis på omfattningen av invandringen – en liten invandring betyder små effekter. Effekterna beror också på sammansättningen av invandringen och på egenskaper hos den svenska ekonomin.

Invandringen från EU10-länderna ökade redan under de tidiga åren av detta decennium, innan de hade blivit medlemmar, men ökningen var mycket snabbare 2004, 2005 och speciellt 2006 och 2007. Att ökningen fortsatte efter 2004 är en indikation på att ökningen är reell och inte bara ett resultat av att de som redan varit i landet nu registrerat sig. Invandringen från de nya EU-länderna är trots expansionen trots allt bara en mindre del av invandringen till Sverige. Utvandringen från Sverige till de nya medlemsstaterna har också ökat men är fortfarande mycket mindre än invandringen. Nettoinvandringen utgör en stor del av bruttoinvandringen.

Kvinnorna utgjorde majoriteten av invandrarna från de nya medlemsstaterna fram till och med 2005. Männens andel av invandrarna ökade gradvis från maj 2004 och det kom fler män än kvinnor från de tio nya medlemsländerna 2006 och 2007. Merparten av invandrarna är i yngre aktiv ålder (20–34 år).

Invandrarna från de tio nya medlemsländerna kommer i mycket stor utsträckning från Polen, närmare tre fjärdedelar. Betydelsen av invandringen från Polen har gradvis ökat. Vid sidan av Polen kommer många från de tre baltiska länderna och Ungern. Bulgarien och Rumänien blev medlemmar av EU den 1 januari 2007. Invandringen från Bulgarien ökade från 199 år 2006 till 1106 år 2007 och invandringen från Rumänien från 348 år 2006 till 2457 år 2007.

Invandringen från EU10 är fortfarande liten jämfört med den totala invandringen till Sverige och storleken på den svenska arbetsmarknaden. Vilka är förklaringarna till detta? En förklaring kan vara att de lediga platserna, som är en viktig bestämmningsfaktor för arbetskraftsinvandring, varit få. En annan förklaring är helt enkelt att intresset för att utvandra generellt eller



speciellt till Sverige varit mindre än vad vi förväntade oss. En tredje förklaring är att de som flyttat har valt Irland eller Storbritannien, som båda införde övergångsregler men sådana som i praktiken inte innebar några större hinder, för att det var lättare att hitta arbeten där och inte minst att engelska är språket i dessa båda länder.

Enligt våra data har de nya invandrarna en lägre sysselsättningsgrad än dem som är födda i Sverige. En del av denna skillnad kan förklaras av att personer som flyttat tillbaka fortfarande är registrerade som boende i landet. Men det finns också ett antal andra faktorer som kan bidra till att förklara skillnaden. Det är viktigt med ytterligare studier på detta område.

Information om utbildning saknas för många invandrare som kommit under de senaste åren. För dem vi har uppgifter om utbildning är utbildningsnivån högre än för dem som är födda i Sverige. De som flyttar hit är i regel unga och tillhör kohorter där längre utbildning är vanligt. De nya invandrarna finns på alla områden men är överrepresenterade inom jordbruk och byggnadsverksamhet och underrepresenterade inom utbildning (få är lärare).

Bland de invandrare som är födda i de nya medlemsstaterna är antalet arbetstimmar ungefär lika många som för dem som födda i Sverige, men bland dem som kommit från och med maj 2004 är antalet arbetstimmar klart högre än bland dem som är födda i Sverige.

Månadsinkomsten (omräknad till månadslön vid heltidsarbete) är år 2006 något högre för dem som anlänt från EU10-länder efter anslutningen till EU än för dem som är födda i Sverige. För dem som anlänt från de gamla EU-länderna under samma tidsperiod är lönerna i genomsnitt mycket högre än för dem som är födda i Sverige. Lönenivån givet utbildning och ålder är något men inte mycket lägre för de nya invandrarna från EU-länder jämfört med dem som är födda i Sverige.

De nya invandrarna från EU10-länder är något överrepresenterade bland dem som får socialbidrag men klart underrepresenterade i andra inkomstöverföringssystem. Det gäller både om man tar hänsyn till utbildning och ålder och om man inte gör det. Mycket få av de nya invandrarna får stöd till barn som är kvar i hemlandet.

Vår undersökning ger många resultat men pekar också på att det är mycket viktigt att förbättra den officiella statistiken i ett par avseenden. Det gäller både för invandrare som kommer från EU10-länder och andra invandrare, bland annat dem som kommer från de gamla EU-länderna. För det första är det viktigt att samla in uppgifter om utbildning för en mycket större del

av de nyanlända än vad som nu är fallet. För det andra är det viktigt att närmare undersöka det stora antalet invandrare som varken återfinns som sysselsatta eller som får någon form av stöd från inkomstöverförings-system. Har de flyttat ut ur landet, är de säsongarbetare och inte här under november som är mät månaden i statistiken, är de i den gråa ekonomin, är de studerande eller hemmafruar etc.?

De viktigaste slutsatserna: Invandringen från EU10-länderna har ökat mycket sedan de blev medlemmar av EU, men den utgör fortfarande endast en mindre del av den totala invandringen till Sverige. De EU10-invandrare som har arbete klarar sig väl på svensk arbetsmarknad. De nya invandrarna får endast i liten utsträckning stöd från olika slags inkomstöverföringar. Välfärdsturisterna kom inte till Sverige.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Sweden was the only European Union country that did not introduce any transitional rules for immigrants coming from the ten countries who became members on 1 May 2004. Sweden maintained that policy when Bulgaria and Romania became members of the Union on 1 January 2007. This means that Sweden is an interesting test case for the likely effects of a free labour market.

Immigration has economic effects on the country of destination. An enlargement of immigration due to an expansion of the European common labour market may have various effects, positive and negative. The size of these effects depends of course on the size of the increase in immigration – a small increase in immigration means small effects. The effects also depend on the composition of the new immigration and the functioning of the economy in the country in which they are arriving.

There was an increase in immigration during the first years of the decade from the EU10 countries but a much higher increase in 2004, 2005 and especially 2006 and 2007. That the increase continued in 2005, 2006 and 2007 is an indication that it is not only a result of higher registration, i.e. a registration effect, but a real increase. The immigration from the new member states is still only a small part of the total immigration to Sweden, however. The emigration to the new member states is also increasing but it is much smaller than the immigration. Net immigration is a large part of gross immigration.

Women constituted the majority of the immigrants from the new member states in all the years of the period studied up to 2006. The immigration of men increased more from May 2004 on, so that more men than women came to Sweden from the ten new member states in 2006 and 2007. The immigrants are mainly of a young active age (20–34 years old).

The immigrants to Sweden from the ten new member states are to a very high extent from Poland, which accounts for three quarters of the new EU10 immigrants. The relative importance of immigration from Poland has gradually increased. Besides Poland, the immigration is largest from the Baltic States and Hungary. Bulgaria and Romania became members of EU from 1 January 2007. Immigration from Bulgaria increased from 199 in 2006 to 1106 in 2007 and from Romania from 348 in 2006 to 2457 in 2007.

The immigration from EU10 is still small compared with the total immigration and the size of the Swedish labour market. Why is this so? One

explanation may be that there have been few job vacancies available for newly arrived immigrants. Another explanation for the low immigration may be that the propensity to emigrate from the new member states has been lower than expected by many taking part in the public debate. A third explanation is that those migrating have chosen Ireland and the UK instead of Sweden due to the easier access to the labour market in those countries and not least that English is the language of those two countries.

According to our data, the immigrants from the new member states have an employment rate lower than that of people born in Sweden. Part of this is explained by lags in the registration of returning migrants. A number of other factors may explain other parts of the difference. Further studies are needed.

Among employed immigrants from the new member states, the working hours are about the same as for those born in Sweden, but for men from EU10 countries who arrived in May 2004 and later, the working hours are longer than for those born in Sweden.

The monthly wage income in 2006 (recalculated to monthly wage for full-time work for those working part-time) is slightly higher for the recently arrived who were born in EU10 countries than for those born in Sweden. The new arrivals from EU14 countries have considerably higher monthly wage incomes than those born in Sweden.

Information on education is lacking for many of the new immigrants. However, for those on whom we do have information, the educational level is higher than for those born in Sweden. The difference is explained by most of the new immigrants being young. They belong to cohorts with a longer education on average. The new EU10 immigrants are overrepresented in agriculture and construction and underrepresented in education (few are teachers).

The wage rate is slightly lower for new immigrants from EU10 countries than for those born in Sweden, given education and age.

The new (arriving from May 2004 onwards) immigrants from EU10 countries are slightly overrepresented in social assistance but underrepresented in other income transfer programmes, given characteristics. The number of child allowances paid to children living outside Sweden is very low.

It is important to improve the official statistics in some respects. It is important to collect information on education for a greater part of the immigrants. It is also very important to study the activities of those who are not employed in the month when employment is measured. Are those

who are not employed re-emigrants, seasonal workers not in Sweden in the month in which the employment is measured, in the grey economy, students or housewives?

The main conclusions are: The migration from the EU10 countries has increased much since they became members of the EU but it still constitutes only a small part of the total immigration to Sweden. The EU10 immigrants who have work are doing well on the Swedish labour market. The new immigrants are only to a small extent receiving support from income transfer programmes. The welfare tourists have not arrived.

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

Sweden was the only European Union country that did not introduce any transitional rules for immigrants coming from the ten countries who became members on 1 May 2004.<sup>1</sup> Sweden maintained that policy when Bulgaria and Romania became members of the Union on 1 January 2007. This means that Sweden is an interesting test case for the likely effects of a free labour market.

Immigration has economic effects on the country of destination. An enlargement of immigration due to an expansion of the European common labour market may have various effects, positive and negative. The size of these effects depends of course on the size of the increase in immigration – a small increase in immigration means small effects. The effects also depend on the composition of the new immigration and the functioning of the economy in the country in which they are arriving. In the second section, the dimension and composition of the actual migration to Sweden in the first years after the enlargement of the European Union in 2004 is in focus. In the third section, the labour market situation of the immigrants from the new member states is analysed. In the fourth section, the available information on short-term migrants from EU countries is presented. In the pre-accession debate in Sweden, social (benefit) tourism was a key issue. In the fifth section, the migrants and the public sector and especially the migrants and the welfare system are discussed. The last section concludes and also indicates some areas for further study.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ireland and the UK introduced some, but not very important, restrictions.

## 2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMMIGRATION TO SWEDEN FROM THE NEW EU MEMBER COUNTRIES<sup>2</sup>

The economic effects of the enlargement of the European Union labour market are primarily dependent on the size of the new migration and the age composition of the new migration. Crucial for all predictions of the effects are predictions of the size of the new immigration.<sup>3</sup> In this section, we will present the development of the number and composition of immigrants from the new member states to Sweden before and after the accession. It will be an incomplete picture for different reasons. One reason is that not all immigrants in Sweden are registered and, more importantly, that the share registered may have changed. It is likely that some immigrants who have lived and worked in Sweden for a period but have not been registered may have registered as a result of the legal change. It is also important to study the emigration to the new member states. The emigration to those states will mainly be return migration of earlier immigrants. The return migration will increase, given the propensity to re-emigrate, with the growth of the immigrant population living in Sweden. However, it may also increase if the deregulation of immigration makes it more attractive to return, as a result of which it will be possible to immigrate to Sweden again after a period in the home country. The decision to go back to the home country is easy to change if it is regretted.

We will first look at the flows of immigrants and emigrants from the ten new member states in the period 2001–2007. See Table 1. We have three alternative statistical series: the inflow and outflow of *citizens* of the ten new EU members, the inflow and outflow of people *born* in the ten new EU members and, finally, people *coming from and leaving to* one of the new EU member states. We have chosen the third series here, but the differences between the three series are small up to now. We will underline some of the main results and add some extra information.

---

<sup>2</sup> There are a few follow-up studies of immigration from the new member states after the enlargement of the European Union. For an early study on Ireland and Sweden, see Doyle, Hughes and Wadensjö (2006). See Dølvik and Eldring (2005) for the migration to the Nordic countries, and Commission of the European Communities (2006) comparing migration from the EU10 and the EU15 to all the EU15 countries. Note that the numbers based on residence permits in the latter study are strongly misleading regarding the immigration from EU15 countries to Sweden. Danish and Finnish citizens, who constitute the majority of immigrants from other EU15 countries to Sweden, do not need a residence permit.

<sup>3</sup> The predictions of the size and effects of migration made before the enlargement of the European Union vary greatly. See for example Boeri, Hanson and MacCormick (2002), Dustmann *et al.* (2003), Eriksson (2004), and Sinn and Ochel (2003). The study most critical to free migration for citizens of the new member states is by Sinn and Ochel (2003). They argue that migration without restriction would lead to a dismantling of the welfare state. For a survey and discussion of the different predictions, see Zaiceva (2006).

Table 1 Immigrants and emigrants according to country of origin and destination in 2001-2007

Country	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	
	Im	Em	Im	Em	Im	Em	Im	Em	Im	Em	Im	Em	Im	Em
Czech Republic														
Men	64	39	86	40	69	48	61	55	71	66	109	62	140	77
Women	66	33	65	28	54	29	59	46	62	53	100	50	110	60
Cyprus														
Men	19	23	25	31	23	22	32	34	21	39	46	39	47	49
Women	13	16	34	33	21	32	23	26	19	42	31	33	43	56
Estonia														
Men	97	36	109	43	88	56	155	69	161	88	193	91	206	80
Women	215	17	236	40	223	43	266	56	263	77	273	68	265	69
Hungary														
Men	96	69	123	71	105	63	113	88	144	91	284	104	465	109
Women	110	65	151	69	139	64	154	85	178	90	237	85	387	97
Latvia														
Men	74	31	63	25	57	33	70	29	98	28	167	50	156	43
Women	114	9	126	21	125	25	148	19	151	21	203	33	221	44
Lithuania														
Men	75	39	85	18	73	22	191	21	356	16	436	39	494	52
Women	143	11	176	5	159	16	253	19	353	10	453	32	412	36
Malta														
Men	13	9	15	32	19	10	12	20	13	17	19	45	30	35
Women	6	8	14	17	14	9	14	12	13	14	7	19	16	23
Poland														
Men	372	117	474	100	470	113	1163	161	1815	177	3474	219	4250	384
Women	536	100	712	90	664	103	1358	138	1701	173	2935	192	3290	276
Slovakia														
Men	29	5	38	15	22	12	43	16	40	18	64	19	92	13
Women	29	3	38	6	34	11	76	15	59	12	85	15	70	19
Slovenia														
Men	7	7	6	11	10	6	23	9	22	11	36	29	35	17
Women	17	10	8	13	12	4	18	7	19	10	26	24	38	18
EU10	2095	647	2584	708	2381	721	4232	935	5559	1053	9198	1248	10767	1557
Men	846	375	1024	386	936	385	1863	512	2741	551	4828	697	5915	859
Women	1249	272	1560	322	1455	336	2369	423	2818	502	4370	551	4852	698

Note. Im = immigrants, Em = emigrants.

Source: Statistics Sweden.



The total numbers show that there is an increase in immigration during the first years of the decade but a much higher increase in 2004, 2005 and especially 2006 and 2007. That the increase continues in 2005, 2006 and 2007 is an indication that it is not only a result of higher registration, i.e. a registration effect, but a real increase. The immigration from the new member states is still only a small part of the total immigration to Sweden, however.

- The emigration to the new member states is also increasing but it is much smaller than the immigration (Cyprus and Malta are the only exceptions). Net immigration is a large part of gross immigration.
- Women constituted the majority of the immigrants from the new member states in all the years of the period studied up to 2006. That at the same time most of the emigrants were men indicates that male immigrants are returning to a higher extent. The immigration of men increased more than the immigration of women in 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007, so that more men than women came to Sweden from the ten new member states in 2006 and 2007. This shift of the composition is a result of a large increase in male immigration from Poland. The immigrants are mainly of a young active age (20–34 years old).
- The immigrants to Sweden from the ten new member states are mainly from Poland, which accounts for more than half of the immigrants. The relative importance of immigration from Poland greatly increased in 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007. Poland is the largest of the new member states and a neighbour to Sweden on the other side of the Baltic Sea.<sup>4</sup> Besides Poland, the immigration is largest from the Baltic States, especially Lithuania, and from Hungary. It could be added that immigration from Bulgaria increased from 199 in 2006 to 1106 in 2007 and from Romania from 348 in 2006 to 2457 in 2007.

The immigration has increased considerably from the new member states, especially from Poland, but it is still small compared with the total immigration and the size of the Swedish labour market. Why is this so? One explanation may be that there have been few job vacancies available for newly arrived immigrants. The Swedish unemployment rate is low compared with that in several other European countries, but the job vacancies

---

<sup>4</sup> Poland, with a fast-growing and changing economy, is not only a country of origin for international migration but also a country of destination, especially for people coming from some of the successor states to the Soviet Union. See Iglicka (2005) and Iglicka, Kazmierkiewicz and Weiner (2005). A comparison with the migration statistics of other countries for the same migration flows indicates that international migration is probably much underestimated in Polish statistics.

are few. Another explanation for the low immigration may be that the propensity to emigrate from the new member states has been lower than expected by many taking part in the public debate. An interview survey of migration intentions in the Baltic states carried out a few years before the accession date shows that the willingness to move abroad was not very high and also that only a few declared the Nordic countries (including Sweden) as the preferred destination.<sup>5</sup> A third explanation is that those migrating have chosen Ireland and the UK instead of Sweden due to the easier access to the labour market in those countries and not least that English is the language of those two countries.

We cannot exclude that immigration from other countries, registered and unregistered, may have declined as a result of the accession agreement. Employers who earlier employed immigrants from other countries may have turned to employing immigrants from the new member states.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Brunovskis, Djuve and Haualand (2003).

### **3 THE NEW IMMIGRANTS AND THE LABOUR MARKET**

We will now turn to the immigrants from the new member states and their position on the Swedish labour market. We will start with those who arrived in the period from 2003 to 2007 and who have been granted residence permits or been registered by Migrationsverket (the Swedish Migration Board). Following an EU directive, a residence permit is not necessary for EU country citizens from 30 April 2006, but immigrants from EU countries (except Denmark and Finland) still have to register at Migrationsverket. The legal change also means that residence permits do not have to be prolonged for those coming from EU countries.

Table 2 gives some basic information. We show the numbers for Poland and the Baltic states, aggregate information for all coming from the ten new member states, for Bulgaria and Romania and, as a comparison, those coming from the twelve old EU member states (according to the rules of the common Nordic labour market, citizens from Denmark and Finland do not need a residence permit or registration). The number of residence permits for citizens from the ten new member states increased in 2004, 2005 and 2006 but declined in 2007. The increase in the 2003 to 2006 period was large for the categories of employers and consultants, which may include self-employed people, for example in the building sector. However, the number of residence permits granted to students is also increasing, and even more those to relatives of people living in Sweden.

The next step is to look at the labour market situation of the new migrants. We use data containing information on all the immigrants from the new member states who are now living in Sweden. The latest year for which data are available is 2006. The population included are those who are registered as living in Sweden at the end of the year (for those coming from the new member states, the criterion is that they have a residence permit and are registered as living in Sweden on 31 December). The employment information is for September or November (depending on the sector). This means that the data set does not include information on whether people are employed or not for those who arrived late in 2006, only that they have arrived and are living in Sweden at the end of the year. We will start with the employment rates for those who were born in the ten new member states, with those born in Sweden as a comparison. See Table 3 on page 20. All who were born in one of the countries are included irrespective of whether they arrived in Sweden from May 2004 onwards or earlier.

The employment rates for those from the ten new member states are considerably lower than for people born in Sweden (but larger than for refugee

Table 2 Residence permits (from 2006 registrations) for citizens from the new EU countries in 2003-2007 according to the EES agreement

Year	Countries	Reasons for granting the residence permit						All
		Emple- yees	Emple- yers	Con- sultants	Stu- dents	Rela- tives	Sufficient means for support	
2003	Poland	2134	1	0	320	201		2656
	Estonia	363	0	0	57	53		473
	Latvia	213	0	0	36	43		292
	Lithuania	404	0	0	70	33		507
	EU10	3774	1	0	577	414		4766
	EU12	2788	131	334	2813	2484		8550
	Bulg./Rom.	328	0	0	118	231		677
2004	Poland	3156	99	141	244	1038		4678
	Estonia	383	5	26	122	160		696
	Latvia	278	13	13	74	68		446
	Lithuania	872	14	11	139	193		1229
	EU10	5151	136	209	750	1694		7940
	EU12	2570	140	312	3007	2587		8616
	Bulg./Rom.	531	0	0	100	303		934
2005	Poland	2810	251	194	281	1498		5034
	Estonia	320	12	14	91	83		520
	Latvia	207	8	18	75	72		380
	Lithuania	756	27	13	129	252		1177
	EU10	4477	321	408	815	2120		8141
	EU12	2893	197	315	3042	2254		8701
	Bulg./Rom.	529	0	0	102	350		981
2006	Poland	3927	226	355	265	2159	107	6932
	Estonia	315	12	19	82	87	4	515
	Latvia	226	8	19	69	87	11	409
	Lithuania	720	19	5	88	294	23	1126
	EU10	5718	275	489	681	2888	192	10058
	EU12	3256	183	185	2737	1832	664	8857
	Bulg./Rom.	557	0	0	70	339	0	966
2007	Poland	3103	196	87	160	2077	96	5719
	Estonia	127	3	0	41	78	9	258
	Latvia	134	1	4	26	69	15	249
	Lithuania	430	19	2	76	178	10	715
	EU10	4297	232	154	429	2623	162	7867
	EU12	2868	156	94	2288	1895	751	8052
	Bulg./Rom.	1020	52	6	102	418	92	1690

Notes. EU10 = the ten new member states; EU12 = the states who were members of the EU before May 2004 excluding Sweden, Denmark and Finland; reasons for granting a permit are estimated up to May 2004 for those coming from the new member states.

Source: Migrationsverket (Swedish Migration Board).

Table 3 Employment rate in November among those born in one of the new member states and in Sweden aged 16-64 living in Sweden at the end of 2005 and 2006

Country	Men		Women		All	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Cyprus	49.6	47.6	51.6	50.5	50.4	48.8
Czech Republic	57.1	54.0	42.6	46.9	48.1	49.8
Czechoslovakia	64.6	60.7	66.3	66.8	65.5	63.9
Estonia	51.8	50.9	55.6	53.8	54.3	52.8
Hungary	59.5	58.6	57.2	57.0	58.3	66.9
Latvia	43.6	43.3	48.3	48.6	46.2	46.9
Lithuania	58.0	59.0	48.8	51.4	52.2	54.5
Malta	56.0	62.7	53.2	70.4	54.6	66.1
Poland	61.8	61.9	58.9	58.4	59.9	59.7
Slovakia	44.5	44.6	39.3	40.7	41.1	49.0
Slovenia	62.0	66.7	56.3	58.0	59.1	62.2
EU10	60.2	60.0	57.9	57.6	58.8	58.6
Sweden	75.7	76.4	73.0	73.9	74.4	75.2

Note. As those who immigrated to Sweden in December cannot have been employed in Sweden in September the same year, the employment rates for the immigrants are underestimated. There are immigrants who have arrived from the areas of the present states Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia who are registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. It has not been possible to separate those from others registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

immigrants, according to information from the labour force surveys<sup>6</sup>). A closer look behind the figures shows that, among those not employed who are from the new member states, many do not have any income, not even an income from the income transfer programmes (unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, pensions etc.). This category may hide several different

<sup>6</sup> The Commission of the European Communities (2006) gives information on employment rates based on Labour Force Surveys for 2004 and 2005. For citizens from the EU10, the employment rate was 62 per cent in Sweden in 2005. This is a slightly higher value than that shown in Table 3. There are two main explanations for this difference. One explanation is that citizens of EU10 countries and people born in the EU10 countries are two different populations. Another explanation is that data collecting methods are different. In the labour force, only those participating in the survey are included. Those who have left the country without registering it are therefore not included. A problem with the labour force surveys is that those employed may be overrepresented among those answering, leading to a selection problem.

groups. The first group, and a not very large one, consists of those who have immigrated to Sweden in December and who could not have worked in Sweden in November the same year. The second one consists of immigrants who have (re)emigrated without notifying the tax authorities and the registration of emigration is delayed due to that. There are some studies of this group showing that quite a few immigrants have returned without registering.<sup>7</sup> Statistics Sweden has constructed a variable for us that indicates whether a person is most likely to have left the country (there is no information on any event that indicates that the person has been in Sweden during the year in any of a number of registers at Statistics Sweden). According to this study, 2.5 per cent of people who were born in an EU10 country are no longer in Sweden. The corresponding share of those who were born in an EU14 country is 3.7 per cent and for those born in Sweden 0.2 per cent. A third group consists of students (on the secondary level and in higher education) who do not combine studies with work. A fourth group consists of immigrants who are registered as immigrants in Sweden but only work for part of the year, for example seasonal work in the summer. A fifth group are people who are not working and are supported by other family members, for example housewives. A sixth group consists of people who work in the unregistered part of the economy (the shadow economy). We do not have any estimates of the size of this group.

Even if the employment rate estimations have to be interpreted with care, information on working hours and wages for those employed do not suffer from such limitations. Another problem is that the number coming from some of the countries is small, which means that one or a few extreme values (actual or erroneous) may have a large effect (see for example the number of working hours for men born in Malta in Table 4). In Table 4 on page 22, information on working hours in 2005 and 2006 are shown. There are only small differences between those born in Sweden and those born in the new member states or in the old member states if we include all irrespective of the year of arrival. If we study only those who arrived in May 2004 or later, the working hours are longer for men who were born in EU10 or EU14 countries. There is a variation in working hours among the ten countries and between the two years, which may be explained by the small number of observations.

---

<sup>7</sup> See for example Edner and Johansson (2006). Statistics Sweden has also made estimates of the share of different groups who have emigrated but are still registered as living in Sweden. The shares vary greatly between different groups and are over 10 per cent for some groups.

Table 4 Working hours among those born in one of the new member states and in Sweden aged 16-64 in September or November 2005 and September or November 2006

Country	Men		Women		All	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Cyprus	136.8	136.7	105.7	125.7	121.1	131.3
Czech Republic	137.2	142.5	129.1	106.0	132.6	119.7
Czechoslovakia	135.4	134.9	116.9	118.2	124.0	124.3
Estonia	138.5	135.7	119.8	116.7	124.9	121.6
Hungary	137.8	132.7	123.1	120.1	129.0	125.1
Latvia	139.9	134.7	114.7	115.4	120.4	119.4
Lithuania	146.4	141.7	105.1	110.7	115.7	119.1
Malta	167.6	158.3	139.5	114.6	153.0	138.0
Poland	138.5	137.3	118.2	119.7	123.6	124.5
Slovakia	140.0	130.2	101.9	104.3	116.9	112.6
Slovenia	134.1	143.2	112.3	107.9	122.2	123.2
EU10	138.1	136.3	118.5	118.9	124.4	124.1
EU10, May 2004-	150.6	146.3	123.5	117.2	138.2	129.2
EU14	140.8	138.0	121.1	121.9	129.1	128.5
EU14, May 2004-	154.7	142.4	136.9	119.8	148.8	132.0
Sweden	141.8	138.7	116.7	117.9	127.4	126.8

Notes. Only those employed are included. There are immigrants who arrived from the areas of the present states Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia who are registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. It has not been possible to separate those from others registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

Table 5 shows the monthly average wage (recalculated to the full-time monthly wage for those not working full-time) for people who were born in the EU10 member states, the EU14 member states and Sweden. The average monthly wage is slightly higher for men and women born in the other member states than in Sweden, both for those from EU10 and for those from EU14. Also, there are differences here between those coming from different EU10 countries, and it should also be stressed here that some groups contain only a small number of individuals. There are differences in the composition according to age and education, which may contribute to explaining the differences. New arrivals born in EU14 countries have higher labour incomes than those born in Sweden.

Table 5 Monthly wage (for those working less than full-time the wage is recalculated to full-time wage) among those born in one of the new member states and in Sweden aged 16-64 in September or November 2005 and in September 2006 or November 2006; thousands SEK

Country	Men		Women		All	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Cyprus	27.1	30.1	18.3	21.4	22.6	25.8
Czech Republic	25.4	27.2	21.8	24.6	23.5	25.6
Czechoslovakia	31.3	34.1	23.8	25.9	26.7	28.8
Estonia	27.7	29.8	21.0	22.1	23.0	24.1
Hungary	27.2	28.5	22.0	23.5	24.1	25.5
Latvia	27.8	31.3	21.9	22.1	23.3	24.0
Lithuania	25.6	30.1	19.8	22.2	21.4	24.4
Malta	24.4	25.5	18.8	19.2	21.5	22.6
Poland	26.7	28.8	21.1	22.5	22.6	24.3
Slovakia	32.6	32.6	23.3	25.0	27.1	27.4
Slovenia	25.7	25.3	19.6	20.7	22.4	22.7
EU10	27.4	29.3	21.4	22.9	23.3	24.8
EU10, May 2004-	23.8	28.3	19.9	23.8	21.9	25.6
EU14	27.4	28.7	21.4	22.9	23.8	25.3
EU14, May 2004-	35.4	35.2	24.7	25.4	31.6	30.8
Sweden	27.0	28.3	20.8	22.2	23.5	24.8

Note. Only those employed are included. There are immigrants who arrived from the areas of the present states Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia who are registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. It has not been possible to separate those from others registered as immigrants from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

Table 6 on page 24 shows that the educational level is higher on average among those coming from the new member states than for those born in Sweden. There are large variations between the different states. Note also that we lack information for a much larger share of the immigrants than for those born in Sweden. It is mainly for the newly arrived that information on education is missing. This leads to difficulties in estimating the effects of education on the labour outcome for new immigrants in Sweden.

Table 7 on page 25 shows the industry distribution for those who were born in EU countries and, as a comparison, those who were born in Sweden. The distribution is very much the same for all who were born in EU10 or



Table 6 Distribution of people born in one of the new member states and in Sweden according to education in 2005 (a) and 2006 (b); per cent

Education																
	1		2		3		4		5		6		9			
Country	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	All	
Cyprus	10	9	13	14	45	41	5	6	19	18	1	2	6	9	100	
Czech Republic	2	2	4	3	29	27	6	6	37	36	6	5	17	22	100	
Czechoslovakia	4	5	8	8	43	41	7	6	34	34	3	4	1	2	100	
Estonia	4	2	9	8	30	28	6	6	38	37	3	3	11	15	100	
Hungary	6	5	7	7	48	46	6	6	27	28	2	2	3	5	100	
Latvia	2	1	9	8	22	20	6	6	41	38	4	4	16	23	100	
Lithuania	1	1	5	5	18	16	5	5	41	35	5	5	26	33	100	
Malta	8	7	14	16	36	36	5	5	25	26	1	1	10	10	100	
Poland	4	3	8	7	43	40	6	5	30	29	2	2	7	13	100	
Slovakia	5	5	7	9	23	20	4	4	31	28	6	5	26	29	100	
Slovenia	11	10	12	11	50	49	4	4	18	18	1	1	4	7	100	
EU10	4	4	8	8	42	39	6	6	31	30	2	2	7	12	100	
EU10, May 2004-	1	1	1	2	25	23	4	3	30	27	1	1	38	43	100	
EU14	9	8	11	11	44	43	5	5	28	29	2	2	2	3	100	
EU14, May 2004-	1	2	2	3	13	14	3	3	44	43	5	5	31	30	100	
Sweden	4	4	16	16	47	47	6	6	24	25	1	1	1	1	100	

Note. Educational classification; 1 primary school less than 9 years, 2 primary school 9(10) years, 3 secondary school, 4 higher education less than two years, 5 higher education two years or more, 6 post-graduate education, 9 lacking information

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

EU14 countries as for those born in Sweden. The main difference is that those born in EU10 countries are overrepresented in the health care sector and those from EU14 countries in manufacturing. If we study only those who arrived in May 2004 or later, the differences are larger. Those born in EU10 countries are most overrepresented in agriculture and construction and most underrepresented in education. Those born in EU14 countries are overrepresented especially in financial and business services.

We have estimated Mincer equations with the logarithm of the monthly full-time wage as the dependent variable, and as independent variables age, age squared, female, educational levels and either dummy variables for being an immigrant who was born in an EU10 country or a dummy variable for coming from any of them (see Table 8 on pages 26 and 27).

Table 7 Distribution of people born in one of the new member states and in Sweden according to industry in 2005 and 2006; per cent (values for 2005/values for 2006)

Country	Industry											All
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Cyprus	3/2	0/0	11/13	0/0	4/3	19/18	11/10	18/14	15/17	16/19	3/4	100
Czech Republic	2/1	2/2	18/17	0/0	1/1	15/15	9/12	15/12	20/20	15/17	2/3	100
Czechoslovakia	2/2	0/0	17/17	1/0	2/2	15/14	14/14	13/13	22/24	8/8	5/5	100
Estonia	2/2	1/1	11/10	1/0	5/6	19/18	16/15	12/12	19/20	10/9	5/5	100
Hungary	1/2	0/0	18/17	1/1	3/3	18/17	14/15	13/13	19/20	9/8	4/5	100
Latvia	2/3	4/4	10/11	1/1	3/3	14/13	12/15	14/13	22/22	12/11	6/5	100
Lithuania	3/2	15/13	12/13	0/0	5/8	12/12	13/15	12/11	18/16	7/7	2/3	100
Malta	2/1	0/0	23/18	0/0	2/1	15/15	21/16	21/16	6/11	9/21	2/0	100
Poland	2/1	1/2	16/15	1/0	5/7	17/16	14/15	11/10	23/22	8/8	4/4	100
Slovakia	2/2	0/0	14/17	0/0	2/2	15/13	15/16	11/11	30/29	12/11	1/0	100
Slovenia	1/1	0/0	31/28	0/0	4/3	19/18	13/17	8/7	14/16	7/6	4/4	100
EU10	2/2	2/2	16/15	1/0	4/6	17/16	14/15	11/11	22/22	8/8	4/4	100
EU10, May 2004-	2/2	9/7	14/14	0/0	16/19	16/15	18/19	3/3	11/11	9/9	1/1	100
EU14	1/1	1/1	21/20	1/1	5/5	16/15	13/14	12/12	18/19	8/8	4/4	100
EU14, May 2004-	2/2	2/1	15/14	0/0	6/6	17/17	20/21	11/12	14/14	11/11	1/2	100
Sweden	1/1	2/2	17/16	1/1	6/6	19/19	14/14	11/11	16/16	7/7	6/6	100

Note: Industry classification; 0 not classified, 1 agriculture, forestry, fishing, 2 manufacturing, mining, 3 public utilities, 4 construction, 5 trade, communication, 6 financial services, business services, 7 education, 8 health care, 9 personal and cultural services, 10 public administration.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

Remember that we lack observations due to the lack of information on education for many recently arrived individuals. The result for the coefficient of the EU10 dummy is a negative value indicating a negative wage premium of about 3 per cent for women and 4 per cent for men.<sup>8</sup> When dummies for the different countries are included in the estimations, the coefficients vary. They are negative in most but not all cases (those born in Sweden are the reference group). The coefficients are negative for some groups with many recent arrivals – Poland, Hungary and the Baltic states. The largest significantly negative wage effect is found for immigrants from Lithuania.

<sup>8</sup> As we use the logarithm of wage as the outcome variable, the effect of a change in one of the explanatory variables is estimated by the antilog given by  $\exp(\text{estimated coefficient}) - 1$ .

Table 8 Wage equation estimates with log monthly wage for full-time work in 2006 as the dependent variable

	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All
Constant	8.995 (0.0042)	9.269 (0.0028)	9.247 (0.0028)	8.990 (0.0046)	9.267 (0.0028)	9.247 (0.0025)
Female			-0.185 (0.0005)			-0.185 (0.0005)
Age	0.0392 (0.0002)	0.0227 (0.0001)	0.0299 (0.0001)	0.0392 (0.0002)	0.0227 (0.0001)	0.0300 (0.0001)
Age squared	-0.00037 (0.000003)	-0.00021 (0.000002)	-0.00028 (0.000001)	-0.00037 (0.000003)	-0.00021 (0.000002)	-0.00028 (0.000001)
Primary school 9 or 10 years	0.073 (0.0018)	0.062 (0.0014)	0.067 (0.0011)	0.073 (0.0018)	0.062 (0.0014)	0.067 (0.0011)
Secondary school	0.152 (0.0017)	0.102 (0.0012)	0.127 (0.0010)	0.152 (0.0016)	0.103 (0.0012)	0.117 (0.0010)
Higher education less than two years	0.337 (0.0021)	0.247 (0.0018)	0.299 (0.0014)	0.337 (0.0021)	0.247 (0.0018)	0.299 (0.0014)
Higher education two years or more	0.391 (0.0017)	0.308 (0.0012)	0.346 (0.0011)	0.391 (0.0017)	0.308 (0.0012)	0.346 (0.0011)
Post-graduate education	0.632 (0.0030)	0.628 (0.0035)	0.626 (0.0023)	0.532 (0.0030)	0.628 (0.0035)	0.626 (0.0023)
Czech Republic				-0.125 (0.041)	-0.020 (0.028)	-0.058 (0.024)
Czechoslovakia				0.020 (0.014)	0.043 (0.009)	0.032 (0.008)

Cyprus	-0.038 (0.035)	-0.052 (0.027)	-0.040 (0.022)
Estonia	-0.034 (0.019)	-0.069 (0.009)	-0.059 (0.008)
Hungary	-0.075 (0.011)	-0.017 (0.006)	-0.041 (0.006)
Latvia	-0.001 (0.032)	-0.070 (0.014)	-0.056 (0.013)
Lithuania	-0.065 (0.030)	-0.117 (0.013)	-0.102 (0.012)
Malta	-0.066 (0.075)	-0.110 (0.027)	-0.084 (0.041)
Poland	-0.047 (0.005)	-0.042 (0.003)	-0.046 (0.002)
Slovakia	0.080 (0.053)	0.008 (0.032)	0.033 (0.028)
Slovenia	-0.037 (0.023)	-0.057 (0.016)	-0.047 (0.013)
EU10	-0.044 (0.004)	-0.036 (0.002)	-0.040 (0.002)
R squared	0.250	0.266	0.305
Number of observations	675238	876168	1551406

Note. Standard errors within parentheses. People born in Sweden and immigrants born in EU10 are included in the estimations.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

We have re-estimated the equations with dummies for the period of arrival. For women we obtain that the earlier the EU10 immigrants arrived, the smaller the wage disadvantage (see Table 9 on the next page). Men born in EU10 countries who arrived in 2000–06 surprisingly have a positive wage premium compared with those born in Sweden. For those who arrived in the period 2000–06, the difference is minus 4 per cent for women and plus 3 per cent for men. For those who arrived before 1970, there is no difference compared with those born in Sweden for men and a positive difference for women (4 per cent).

In the next step, we will look at the migrants born in EU10 countries who arrived in May 2004 or later and compare them with immigrants born in EU14 countries who arrived in the same period and with those born in Sweden.

The estimations in Table 10 on page 30 show a negative sign on wages for immigrant women who were born in the EU10 member countries and who arrived in 2004 or 2005. The difference may be due to that some immigrants are not coming to the occupations they are trained for so that, at least in the short run, they are over-educated. For women who immigrated in 2006 and for men independent of whether they immigrated in 2004, 2005 or 2006, we find no significant wage differences compared with those born in Sweden. More surprising is that the male immigrants who were born in one of the EU14 countries given age and education have higher wages than those born in Sweden. One explanation may be that they have educations that lead to high wages given the level of education.

An explanation to the pattern described here may be that reservation wages for the prospective migrants differ depending on the wage level in the country of origin. Those coming from countries with low wages are accepting lower wages than those who come from countries with high wages, higher than those in Sweden for some EU14 countries. We have included GDP per capita as a rough measure of the wage level in the different measures.<sup>9</sup> The variable is highly significant and has the expected positive sign. The variables which indicate that the individuals have emigrated from an EU10 country are no longer significantly different from zero, but the EU14 variables are still positive and significant.

---

<sup>9</sup> The figures for GDP per capita are taken from Eurostat news release 19/2008.

Table 9 Wage equation estimates with log monthly wage for full-time work in 2006 as the dependent variable and time of arrival in Sweden among the explanatory variables

	Men	Women	All
Constant	8.994 (0.0042)	9.268 (0.0028)	9.246 (0.025)
Female			-0.185 (0.0005)
Age	0.0392 (0.0002)	0.0227 (0.0001)	0.0300 (0.0001)
Age squared	-0.00037 (0.000003)	-0.00021 (0.000002)	-0.00028 (0.000001)
Primary school 9 or 10 years	0.073 (0.0018)	0.062 (0.0014)	0.067 (0.0011)
Secondary school	0.152 (0.0016)	0.102 (0.0012)	0.127 (0.0010)
Higher education less than two years	0.337 (0.0021)	0.246 (0.0018)	0.299 (0.0014)
Higher education two years or more	0.391 (0.0017)	0.307 (0.0012)	0.346 (0.0011)
Post-graduate education	0.632 (0.0030)	0.627 (0.0034)	0.625 (0.0023)
Arrived before 1970 born in EU10	0.011 (0.012)	0.042 (0.009)	0.028 (0.007)
Arrived 1970-74 born in EU10	-0.067 (0.012)	0.012 (0.007)	-0.017 (0.006)
Arrived 1975-79 born in EU10	-0.071 (0.013)	-0.021 (0.006)	-0.039 (0.005)
Arrived 1980-84 born in EU10	-0.081 (0.010)	-0.017 (0.005)	-0.041 (0.005)
Arrived 1985-89 born in EU10	-0.077 (0.009)	-0.054 (0.005)	-0.066 (0.004)
Arrived 1990-94 born in EU10	-0.065 (0.015)	-0.081 (0.005)	-0.081 (0.005)
Arrived 1995-99 born in EU10	-0.057 (0.020)	-0.085 (0.006)	-0.080 (0.007)
Arrived 2000-06 born in EU10	0.030 (0.012)	-0.043 (0.007)	-0.015 (0.006)
R squared	0.250	0.266	0.305
Number of observations	675238	876168	1551406

Note. Standard errors within parentheses. People born in Sweden and immigrants born in EU10 are included in the estimations.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

Table 10 Wage equation estimates with log monthly wage for full-time work in 2006 as the dependent variable and time of arrival in Sweden among the explanatory variables

	Men	Women	All	All
Constant	8.999 (0.0041)	9.276 (0.0027)	9.252 (0.024)	8.912 (0.014)
Female			-0.185 (0.0004)	-0.184 (0.0004)
Age	0.0393 (0.0002)	0.02255 (0.0001)	0.0300 (0.0001)	0.0300 (0.0001)
Age squared	-0.00037 (0.000003)	-0.00021 (0.000002)	-0.00028 (0.000001)	-0.00028 (0.000001)
Primary school 9 or 10 years	0.066 (0.0016)	0.057 (0.0012)	0.061 (0.0012)	0.061 (0.0011)
Secondary school	0.144 (0.0015)	0.086 (0.0012)	0.120 (0.0010)	0.120 (0.0009)
Higher education less than two years	0.329 (0.0019)	0.240 (0.0017)	0.291 (0.0013)	0.292 (0.0013)
Higher education two years or more	0.387 (0.0016)	0.303 (0.0011)	0.342 (0.0009)	0.341 (0.0009)
Post-graduate education	0.623 (0.0028)	0.619 (0.0032)	0.617 (0.0021)	0.617 (0.0021)
Arrived in 2004 born in EU10	-0.008 (0.030)	-0.069 (0.016)	-0.044 (0.015)	0.000 (0.015)
Arrived in 2005 born in EU10	-0.037 (0.028)	-0.069 (0.018)	-0.053 (0.016)	-0.004 (0.016)
Arrived in 2006 born in EU10	-0.038 (0.026)	0.024 (0.024)	0.001 (0.017)	0.028 (0.018)
Arrived in 2004 born in EU14	0.032 (0.017)	-0.006 (0.014)	0.016 (0.012)	0.019 (0.011)
Arrived in 2005 born in EU14	0.044 (0.019)	-0.000 (0.011)	0.024 (0.011)	0.028 (0.011)
Arrived in 2006 born in EU14	0.097 (0.017)	0.017 (0.011)	0.062 (0.11)	0.065 (0.011)
ln(GDP per capita in home country)				0.033 (0.001)
R squared	0.248	0.266	0.303	0.303
Number of observations	718957	939079	1658036	16556138

Note. Standard errors within parentheses. People born in Sweden and immigrants born in EU10 and EU14 who have arrived in Sweden in 2004, 2005 or 2006 are included in the estimations.

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

## **4 THE SHORT-TERM MIGRATION**

To be registered as living in Sweden, the person has to declare the intention to stay in Sweden for at least one year. Those arriving without such an intention but with an intention to stay for three months or more also have to register if they come from an EES country (with the exception of those coming from one of the Nordic countries). In 2004, the number of people registered for such a stay, who had income from employment, was 1400. Of them, 318 were from an EU10 country, and about half of them from Poland. In 2005, the corresponding numbers were 1425 and 295. Also in this year, about half of the EU citizens registered were from Poland. In 2006, the number registered as coming temporarily from EU10 was 375: the majority of them from Poland. This shows that relatively few immigrants who come to Sweden to work indicate that they intend to stay for less than one year.



## **5 A WELFARE MAGNET? EFFECTS ON THE PUBLIC SECTOR OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION**

In the international debate, “welfare magnets”<sup>10</sup> has been a catchword just like “social (benefit) tourism” became one in the Swedish debate. The term suggests that immigrants, at least to some extent, are coming because the country of destination has a highly developed welfare state with generous compensation for those who are out of work. Some studies have related the selection of migrants to different countries or parts of a country (states in the United States) to the generosity of the compensation schemes. Other studies have especially studied immigrant representation in some parts of the welfare system, for example social assistance.

It is important to note that those schemes constitute only a minor part of the total public sector budget. People living in a country, natives and immigrants, pay taxes and they receive different forms of income transfer and public consumption like education and health care. The costs for some forms of public consumption like education and health care can be referred to the individual using them, the costs for other forms of public consumption are related to the size of the population (and increase by that as a result of immigration) and, finally, some costs are pure public goods that do not vary with changes in the size of the population. The difference between the change in the taxes and the sum of change of the income transfers and public consumption due to migration is the net transfer to the public sector from the migrants.

The net transfer from the immigrants to the public sector may be positive or negative. A factor supporting the presumption of a positive value of the net transfer is that the new immigrants generally are of an active age and that the public sector mainly redistributes from people of an active age to people of a passive age (children and young people, and retired people). However, there are also different forms of transfers within the group of people of active age, mainly between those who have a job and those who do not have a job or those who have a job but are not working, if they are on sick leave, for example.

---

<sup>10</sup> Borjas (1999) is the main advocate for this view, using data on immigration to different states in the US. Passel and Zimmermann (2001) do not find support for the welfare magnet hypothesis in a study of the settlement pattern of immigrants in the US. Pedersen, Pytlikova and Smith (forthcoming) do not obtain support for the welfare magnet hypothesis in their study, which is based on international migration between a large number of countries.

Studies of the net transfers from immigrants to the public sector in countries like Sweden show that the net transfers are positive for labour migrants coming from Western countries but negative for refugee immigrants coming from non-Western countries.<sup>11</sup> The negative transfer for refugee immigrants is explained by few of them being integrated into the labour market. This suggests that, if immigrants from the new member states become integrated into the labour market, the net transfers will most likely be positive, i.e. going from the immigrants to the public sector. Empirical studies are necessary to determine the actual outcome. The bottom line of this discussion is that it is not sufficient to look at one programme, for example social assistance, to determine if the new immigration is a burden on the welfare state. Higher costs for social assistance for immigrants than for those born in Sweden may be more than compensated for by the taxes paid by the new migrants if they are working to a large extent.

As mentioned, the parts of the welfare states most discussed in connection with the expansion of the European Union are not very large items in the budget of the public sector. Nevertheless, it may be of interest to follow up what has happened in the two areas most discussed: social assistance and support for family members (children) not living with the parent in Sweden but in another European Union country.

It is possible to study the income transfers for immigrants coming from different areas with the data available. We have divided the EU immigrants into two groups – those coming from EU10 countries and those coming from EU14 countries. Table 11 on page 34 shows that the immigrants who arrived in 2004–2006, especially those who came from EU10 countries, are overrepresented in social assistance and underrepresented in most other income transfer programmes compared with those born in Sweden. Note that most of those who arrived in 2005 (2006) have only been in Sweden for less than one year in 2005 (2006). The underrepresentation in some of the programmes of the newly arrived may be due to the good labour market situation in 2004–2006, the rules for being eligible for support or a combination of those two factors.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Wadensjö (1973), Ekberg (1983, 1998, 1999) and Gustafsson and Österberg (2001) for Sweden, Coleman and Wadensjö (1999), Wadensjö (2000, 2000a, 2002), Wadensjö and Orrje (2002) and Wadensjö and Gerdes (2004) for Denmark, and Gott and Johnston (2002) for the UK. Some surveys of studies in the field are found in Wadensjö and Orrje (2002), Leibfritz, O'Brien and Dumont (2003) and Chonicki (2004).

Table 11 Percentage share of different forms of income transfer in 2005 and 2006 according to country of origin (values for 2005/values for 2006)

Group	Share of different forms of income support					
	Social assistance	Unemployment benefits	Labour market support	Sickness benefits	Disability pension	Study allowances
Arrived from EU10 country in 2006	-/3.9	-/1.0	-/1.2	-/1.3	-/1.0	-/2.0
Arrived from EU10 country in 2005	5.3/7.7	0.9/3.7	1.4/4.9	1.1/3.9	0.2/0.5	1.4/4.8
Arrived from EU10 country in 2004	9.5/7.5	2.8/5.7	5.0/6.1	3.3/5.7	0.2/0.6	5.5/14.1
Arrived from EU10 country in 2003	11.1/9.6	5.4/6.3	8.3/5.7	4.9/6.4	1.0/1.8	18.5/24.7
Arrived from EU10 country before 2003	7.9/7.3	12.0/10.9	5.4/5.6	14.6/13.5	16.8/17.5	10.3/9.1
Arrived from EU14 country in 2006	-/3.4	-/1.9	-/1.3	-/1.7	-/2.4	-/2.3
Arrived from EU14 country in 2005	3.9/4.7	1.5/3.5	0.9/3.2	0.9/2.3	1.2/1.8	1.5/3.4
Arrived from EU14 country in 2004	4.9/4.9	4.2/5.1	3.3/3.8	2.5/4.0	1.4/2.1	4.1/6.3
Arrived from EU14 country in 2003	4.1/4.5	6.8/6.9	3.1/2.6	4.2/5.0	1.6/2.8	6.2/7.4
Arrived from EU14 country before 2003	4.8/5.6	9.3/8.8	3.8/4.3	14.6/13.8	18.8/20.0	3.8/3.5
Born in Sweden	3.5/3.3	10.0/9.1	3.6/3.8	12.0/11.1	8.6/8.4	15.2/15.1

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

Table 12 shows the amounts granted for those who received income transfers in 2005 and 2006. The amounts vary with the length of stay in Sweden. The longer the stay, the higher are the amounts.

Table 12 Average amount in different forms of income transfer for those who receive the respective form of income transfer in 2005 and 2006 according to country of origin; in thousand SEK (values for 2005/values for 2006)

Group	Average amount for different forms of income support for persons with support					
	Social assistance	Unemployment benefits	Labour market support	Sickness benefits	Disability pension	Study allowances
Arrived from EU10 country in 2006	-/18.9	-/35.7	-/18.4	-/28.3	-/104.0	-/34.1
Arrived from EU10 country in 2005	15.4/21.8	20.9/29.6	14.2/17.7	15.8/20.7	108.2/123.3	23.1/27.1
Arrived from EU10 country in 2004	19.4/20.6	29.3/32.2	17.6/17.3	23.2/26.2	72.1/79.3	28.2/33.1
Arrived from EU10 country in 2003	21.1/22.3	39.3/34.1	19.0/19.5	26.9/37.7	129.9/117.4	35.3/40.9
Arrived from EU10 country before 2003	26.2/30.0	57.7/54.9	59.3/53.7	49.2/49.5	99.0/100.1	35.3/36.2
Arrived from EU14 country in 2006	-/22.5	-/49.0	-/26.9	-/41.8	-/97.6	-/38.2
Arrived from EU14 country in 2005	16.9/25.8	27.7/37.9	11.8/18.6	32.6/38.2	97.8/91.7	35.8/48.1
Arrived from EU14 country in 2004	24.0/25.1	39.2/42.2	18.0/23.9	32.2/31.9	97.1/101.1	45.4/39.0
Arrived from EU14 country in 2003	23.4/24.0	40.9/41.2	26.0/28.8	41.5/43.7	89.8/92.9	38.5/34.0
Arrived from EU14 country before 2003	22.9/26.5	60.3/57.2	61.1/56.4	48.7/49.0	107.1/106.8	35.5/30.6
Born in Sweden	18.8/20.6	50.7/47.4	50.1/47.4	43.1/43.0	98.4/99.7	26.0/27.4

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

In the next step, we have calculated the amount of income transfers per person aged 16–64 years. It shows that the amounts of social assistance are low compared with the other forms of income transfer. Adding the different items shows that recent arrivals on average are receiving relatively low amounts of income transfer.

Table 13 Average amount in different forms of income transfer according to country of origin independent of whether they received the respective form of income transfer in 2005 and in 2006; in thousand SEK (values for 2005/values for 2006)

Average amounts for different forms of income support per person in different groups						
Group	Social assistance	Unemployment benefits	Labour market support	Sickness benefits	Disability pension	Study allowances
Arrived from EU10 country in 2006	-0.7	-0.3	-0.2	-0.4	-1.0	-0.7
Arrived from EU10 country in 2005	0.8/1.7	0.2/1.1	0.2/0.9	0.2/0.8	0.2/0.6	0.3/1.3
Arrived from EU10 country in 2004	1.8/1.5	0.8/1.8	0.9/1.1	0.8/1.5	0.1/0.5	1.6/4.7
Arrived from EU10 country in 2003	2.3/2.2	2.1/2.2	1.6/1.1	1.3/2.4	1.3/2.0	6.5/10.1
Arrived from EU10 country before 2003	2.0/2.2	6.9/6.0	3.2/3.0	7.2/6.7	16.6/17.5	3.6/3.3
Arrived from EU14 country in 2006	-0.8	-1.0	-0.3	-0.7	-2.3	-0.9
Arrived from EU14 country in 2005	0.7/1.2	0.4/1.3	0.1/0.6	0.3/0.9	1.2/1.6	0.5/1.5
Arrived from EU14 country in 2004	1.2/1.2	1.6/2.2	0.6/0.9	0.8/1.3	1.4/2.1	1.9/2.7
Arrived from EU14 country in 2003	1.0/1.1	2.8/2.8	0.8/0.7	1.7/2.2	1.4/2.6	2.9/2.8
Arrived from EU14 country before 2003	1.1/1.5	5.6/5.0	2.3/2.4	7.1/6.7	20.1/21.3	1.3/1.3
Born in Sweden	0.7/0.7	5.1/4.3	1.8/1.8	5.2/4.8	8.5/8.3	3.9/4.0

Source: The SIEPS database constructed for this study is based on individual register data from Statistics Sweden and the Swedish Migration Board.

We have also studied the propensity to receive income transfers during the year, keeping age, gender and education constant by probit regressions (the detailed results are not reported in this report). We find that the recent EU10 migrants are overrepresented in social assistance but underrepresented in the other forms of income transfer combined. The pattern is the same for recent EU14 migrants but to a lesser extent.

According to EU rules, support for children living in another country may be paid to parents living in Sweden who are citizens of another EU country.<sup>12</sup> We have studied the number of child allowances paid to immigrants from other EU countries. In 2005, support for 77 children was paid out, 10 to parents born in EU10 countries and 67 to parents born in EU14 countries. Social (benefit) tourism for child allowances has not, therefore, been a “pull” factor for immigrants from the new member states.

---

<sup>12</sup> See RFV (2004) and Lönnqvist (2005).

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

Four years have passed since ten countries became members of the European Union. Four years is a very short period for following up what has happened and in practice the period is even shorter. For some types of data, we have information for 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007, i.e. for three years and eight months. For other types of data, we have information for only 2004, 2005 and 2006, i.e. for less than three years. As it takes time to react to a new legal framework, we cannot expect the full effect of the change to have taken place yet. However, we believe that information for this short period may contribute to a better knowledge of the likely effects of the deregulation of migration from the new member states.

- The migration increased from the new member states after the enlargement of the European Union. It was more than four times larger in 2007 than in 2003. The immigration of men has increased more than that of women. The immigrants are mainly coming from Poland. Among the other countries, Hungary and the three Baltic states are the most important countries of origin.
- The number of residence permits granted (or resident registrations recorded) to citizens in the ten new member states increased up to 2006 but declined somewhat in 2007. Residence permits may be granted for different reasons. All forms of residence permit have increased. The increase is largest for relatives of people living in Sweden.
- According to our data, the immigrants from the new member states have an employment rate lower than that of people born in Sweden. Part of this is explained by lags in the registration of returning migrants. A number of other factors may explain other parts of the difference. Further studies are needed.
- Among employed immigrants from the new member states, the working hours are about the same as for those born in Sweden, but for men from EU countries who arrived in May 2004 and later, the working hours are longer than for those born in Sweden.
- The monthly wage income in 2006 (recalculated to monthly wage for full-time work for those working part-time) is slightly higher for the recently arrived who were born in EU10 countries than for those born in Sweden. The new arrivals from EU14 countries have considerably higher monthly wage incomes than those born in Sweden.
- Information on education is lacking for many of the new immigrants. However, for those on whom we do have information, the educational level is higher than for those born in Sweden. The difference is

explained by most of the new immigrants being young. They belong to cohorts with a longer education on average.

- The new EU10 immigrants are overrepresented in agriculture and construction and underrepresented in education (few are teachers). The new EU14 immigrants, on the other hand, are overrepresented in financial and business services.
- The wage rate is slightly lower for new immigrants from EU10 countries than for those born in Sweden, given education and age. This is in contrast to new immigrants from EU14 countries who earn higher wages than those born in Sweden, given age and education.
- The new (arriving from May 2004 onwards) immigrants from EU10 countries are slightly overrepresented in social assistance but underrepresented in other income transfer programmes, given characteristics. The number of child allowances paid to children living outside Sweden is very low.
- It is important to improve the official statistics in some respects. It is important to collect information on education for a greater part of the immigrants. It is also very important to study the activities of those who are not employed in the month when employment is measured. Are those who are not employed re-emigrants, seasonal workers not in Sweden in the month in which the employment is measured, in the grey economy, students or housewives?



## REFERENCES

- Boeri, Tito, Hanson, Gordon and MacCormick, Barry (eds.) (2002), *Immigration Policy and the Welfare System*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Borjas, George J. (1999), "Immigration and Welfare Magnets", *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 607–37.
- Brunovskis, Anette, Djuve, Anne Britt and Haualand, Hilde Maria (2003), *Facing a Baltic Invasion? Mobility of Baltic Labour towards the Nordic Countries*, Fafo, Oslo.
- Chonicki, Xavier (2004), "The Economic Impact of Immigration for the Host Countries", *Brussels Economic Review*, Vol. 47, pp. 9–28.
- Coleman, David and Wadensjö, Eskil with contributions by Bent Jensen and Søren Pedersen (1999), *Immigration to Denmark. International and National Perspectives*, Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.
- Commission of the European Communities (2006), "Report on the Functioning of the Transitional Arrangements Set Out in the 2003 Accession Treaty (Period 1 May 2004–30 April 2006)", Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.
- Dølvik, Jon Erik and Eldring, Line (2005), *Arbeids- og tjenstemobilitet etter EU-utvidelsen. Nordiske forskjeller og fellestrekk*, TemaNord 2005:566.
- Doyle, Nicola, Hughes, Gerald and Wadensjö, Eskil (2006), *Freedom of Movement for Workers from Central and Eastern Europe. Experiences in Ireland and Sweden*, SIEPS 2006:5.
- Dustmann, Christian, Casanova, Maria, Fertig, Michael, Preston, Ian and Schmidt, Christoph M. (2003), "The Impact of EU Enlargement on Migration Flows", Home Office Online Report 25/03. [www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/rdsolr2503.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/rdsolr2503.pdf)
- Edner, Bodil and Nils Johansson (2006), *Kartläggning av "folkbokföringsfelet"*, Skatteverket (the Swedish National Tax Board), Stockholm.
- Ekberg, Jan (1983), *Inkomsteffekter av invandring*, Acta Wexionensia, Serie 2, Economy & Politics, Växjö.

- Ekberg, Jan (1998), "Hur påverkar invandring inkomster för infödda?" in Torben Bager & Shahamak Rezaei (eds.), *Invandringens ekonomiske konsekvenser i Skandinavien*, Sydjysk Universitetsforlag, Esbjerg.
- Ekberg, Jan (1999), "Immigration and the Public Sector: Income Effects for the Native Population in Sweden", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 12, pp. 278–97.
- Eriksson, Jonas (2004), "Nettomigrationen från de nya EU-länderna – utvärdering och prognostisering", SIEPS 2004:2u.
- Gott, Ceri and Johnston, Karl (2002), "The Migrant Population in the UK: Fiscal Effects", RDS Occasional Paper, No. 77, Home Office, London. [www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/occ77migrant.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/occ77migrant.pdf)
- Gustafsson, Björn and Österberg, Torun (2001), "Immigrants and the Public Sector Budget – Accounting Exercises for Sweden", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 14, pp. 689–708.
- Iglicka, Krystyna (2005), "The Impact of the EU Enlargement on Migratory Movement in Poland", Reports & Analyses 12/5, Center for International Relations, Warsaw.
- Iglicka, Krystyna, Kazmierkiewicz, Piotr and Weiner, Agnieszka (2005), "Poland" in Jan Niessen, Yongmi Schibel & Cressida Thompson (eds.), *Current Immigration Debates in Europe: A Publication of the European Migration Dialogue*, MPG, Brussels.
- Leibfritz, Willi, O'Brien, Paul and Dumont Jean-Christophe (2003), "Effects of Immigration on Labour Markets and Government Budgets – An Overview", CESifo Working Paper No. 874.
- Lönnqvist, Anders (2005), "Utbetalning av familjeförmåner med stöd av EG-lagstiftningen under 2004", Försäkringskassan Analyserar 2005:3.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and Zimmermann, Wendy (2001), "Are Immigrants Leaving California? Settlement Patterns of Immigrants in the Late 1990s", Urban Institute, Washington, research report. [www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/are\\_immigrants\\_leaving\\_ca.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/are_immigrants_leaving_ca.pdf)
- Pedersen, Peder, Pytlikova, Mariola and Smith, Nina (forthcoming), "Selection or Network Effects? Migration Flows into OECD Countries 1990-2000", *European Economic Review*.
- RFV (2004), "Återrapportering av regeringsuppdrag att redovisa ärenden avseende familjeförmåner (EU-ärenden)", S2003/10128/2F, Dnr 11139/03.

Sinn, Hans-Werner and Ochel, Wolfgang (2003), "Social Union, Convergence and Migration", *JCMS*, Vol. 41, pp. 869–896.

Wadensjö, Eskil (1973), *Immigration och samhällsekonomi*, Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Wadensjö, Eskil (2000), "Immigration, the Labour Market, and Public Finances in Denmark", *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, Vol. 7, pp. 59–84.

Wadensjö, Eskil (2000a), "Om fördelning via offentlig sektor: en fördjupad analys" in Gunnar Viby Mogensen & Poul Chr. Matthiessen (eds.), *Integration i Danmark omkring årtusindskiftet*, Aarhus University Press, Århus.

Wadensjö, Eskil (2002), "Ekonomiska effekter av invandringen" in Gunnar Viby Mogensen & Poul Chr. Matthiessen (eds.), *Invandrerne og arbejdsmarkedet*, Spektrum, København.

Wadensjö, Eskil and Orrje, Helena (2002), *Immigration and the Public Sector in Denmark*, Aarhus Universitetsforlag, Århus.

Wadensjö, Eskil and Gerdes, Christer (2004), "Immigrants and the Public Sector in Denmark and Germany" and "Some Socioeconomic Consequences of Immigration" in Torben Tranæs & Klaus Zimmerman (eds.), *Migrants, Work and the Welfare State*, University Press of Southern Denmark, Odense.

Zaiceva, Anzelika (2006), "Reconciling the Estimates of Potential Migration into the Enlarged European Union", IZA DP No. 2519.

## **SIEPS PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE IN ENGLISH**

### **2008**

---

2008:8

*The EU as a Global Actor in the South*

Authors: Björn Hettne, Fredrik Söderbaum and Patrik Stålgren

2008:6–7

*Institutional Competences in the EU External Action:*

*Actors and Boundaries in CFSP and ESDP*

Authors: Lisbeth Aggestam, Francesco Anesi, Geoffrey Edwards, Christopher Hill and David Rijks

2008:5

*Transforming the European Community's Regulation of Food Safety*

Author: Morten Broberg

2008:4

*Turning the EU Budget into an Instrument to Support the Fight against Climate Change*

Authors: Camilla Adelle, Marc Pallemmaerts and David Baldock

2008:3

*Can Reforming Own Resources Foster Policy Quality?*

Author: Jorge Núñez Ferrer

2008:2

*The EU Budget Review:*

*Mapping the Positions of Member States*

Editors: Tamás Szemplér and Jonas Eriksson

2008:1

*Common Energy Policy in the EU:*

*The Moral Hazard of the Security of External Supply*

Authors: Chloé le Coq and Elena Paltseva

2008:2op

*The 2008 Slovenian EU Presidency:*

*A New Synergy for Europe? A Midterm Report*

Authors: Danica Fink-Hafner and Damjan Lajh

2008:1op

*The Purse of the European Union: Setting Priorities for the Future*

Contributors: Iain Begg, André Sapir and Jonas Eriksson

2008:8epa

*The potential impact of the Lisbon Treaty on*

*European Union External Trade Policy*

Author: Stephen Woolcock

2008:4epa

*The Lisbon Treaty and EMU*

Author: Sideek Mohamed Seyad

2008:3epa

*The Lisbon Treaty and the Area of Criminal Law and Justice*

Author: Ester Herlin-Karnell

2008:2epa

*A Better Budget for Europe: Economically Efficient, Politically Realistic*

Author: Filipa Figueira

2008:1epa

*The Future of the Common European Asylum System:*

*In Need of a More Comprehensive Burden-Sharing Approach*

Author: Eiko Thielemann

## **2007**

---

2007:6

*EU for the Patients: Developments, Impacts, Challenges*

Author: Dorte Sindbjerg Martinsen

2007:3

*Does a Family-Friendly Policy Raise Fertility Levels?*

Author: Anders Björklund

2007:2

*The Euro – What's in it for me?*

*An Economic Analysis of the Swedish Euro Referendum 2003*

Authors: Lars Jonung and Jonas Vlachos

2007:1

*Bargaining Power in the European Council*

Author: Jonas Tallberg

2007:1u

*New Criminal Law Developments in the Community Legal Order*

Author: Hanna Goeters

2007:2op

*Why Europe? Possibilities and Limits of European Integration*

Authors: Andreas Føllesdal, Jo Shaw, Andrew Moravcsik, Fredrik Langdal  
and Göran von Sydow

2007:1op

*The 2007 German EU Presidency: A Midterm Report*

Authors: Sebastian Kurpas and Henning Riecke

2007:6epa

*Flexicurity – An Answer or a Question?*

Author: Lars Calmfors

2007:5epa

*Agenda 2014: A Zero-Base Approach*

Author: Daniel Tarschys

2007:3epa

*A New Proposal for a Regulation on Mutual Recognition of Goods  
– Towards a Harmonized Administrative Order?*

Author: Jane Reichel

2007:2epa

*Spillover or Activist Leapfrogging?*

*Criminal Competence and the Sensitiveness of the European Court  
of Justice*

Author: Maria Bergström

2007:1epa

*Better Regulation of Mobile Telecommunications*

Authors: Johan Stennek and Thomas P. Tangerås

## **2006**

---

2006:12

*The Legal Basis Game and European Governance*

Author: Joseph Jupille

2006:11

*Budget Allocation in an Expanding EU – A Power Politics View*

Author: Mika Widgrén

2006:10

*International Agreements in EU Neighbourhood Policy*

Author: Marius Vahl

2006:5

*Freedom of Movement for Workers from Central and Eastern Europe:  
Experiences in Ireland and Sweden*

Authors: Nicola Doyle, Gerard Hughes and Eskil Wadensjö

2006:4

*The Dynamics of Enlargement:*

*The Role of the EU in Candidate Countries' Domestic Policy Processes*

Author: Andreas Bågenholm

2006:2

*Armed and Ready?*

*The EU Battlegroup Concept and the Nordic Battlegroup*

Author: Jan Joel Andersson

2006:1

*Leader or Foot-Dragger?*

*Perceptions of the European Union in Multilateral International Negotiations*

Author: Ole Elgström

2006:1op

*The Austrian EU Presidency: A Midterm Report*

Author: Paul Luif

## **2005**

---

2005:10

*The Role of the National Courts in the European Union:*

*A Future Perspective*

Author: Xavier Groussot

2005:9

*Is the Commission the Small Member States' Best Friend?*

Authors: Simone Bunse, Paul Magnette and Kalypso Nicolaïdis

2005:8

*What Remains of the Stability Pact and What Next?*

Author: Lars Calmfors

2005:7

*European Integration and Trade Diversion: Yeats revisited*

Authors: Ari Kokko, Thomas Mathä and Patrik Gustavsson Tingvall

2005:5

*From Policy Takers to Policy Makers:*

*Adapting EU Cohesion Policy to the Needs of the New Member States*

Editors: Jonas Eriksson, Bengt O. Karlsson and Daniel Tarschys

2005:4

*The Enigma of European Added Value:*

*Setting Priorities for the European Union*

Author: Daniel Tarschys

2005:2op

*The 2005 UK Presidency: Beyond the British Question?*

Author: Edward Best

2005:1op

*The 2005 Luxembourg Presidency:*

*A Presidency Devoted to the Stability and Growth Pact and to the Lisbon Process*

Authors: Patrick Dumont and Philippe Poirier

## **2004**

---

2004:9

*The Political Dynamics of Turkish Accession to the EU:*

*A European Success Story or the EU's Most Contested Enlargement?*

Author: Kirsty Hughes

2004:1u

*European Governance*

*– an Overview of the Commission's Agenda for Reform*

Authors: Josefin Almer and Matilda Rotkirch

2004:1op

*The Netherlands 2004 EU Council Presidency*

*– Dutch EU Policy-Making in the Spotlights*

Author: Mendeltje van Keulen

## **2003**

---

2003:19

*Industrial Structure and Industry Location in an Enlarged Europe*

Author: Karolina Ekholm

2003:18

*Coming of Age? Economic Management of the European Union*

Authors: Per Molander and Allan Gustafsson

2003:17

*Reinventing Cohesion: The Future of European Structural Policy*

Author: Daniel Tarschys

2003:14

*Decentralized Agencies and the IGC: A Question of Accountability*

Authors: Carl Fredrik Bergström and Matilda Rotkirch

2003:9

*Reforming the Council: A Work in Progress*

Authors: Helen Wallace and Fiona Hayes-Renshaw

2003:8

*Simply Simplification? The Proposal for a Hierarchy of Legal Acts*

Authors: Carl Fredrik Bergström and Matilda Rotkirch



2003:7

*The Invisible Transformation of Codecision:  
Problems of Democratic Legitimacy*

Authors: Henry Farrell and Adrienne Héritier

2003:1

*The Open Method of Coordination:  
A New Governance Architecture for the European Union?*

Author: Claudio M. Radaelli

2003:1op

*Contrasting Transatlantic Interpretations:  
The EU and the US towards a Common Global Role*

Author: Ludger Kühnhardt



Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies

Svante Arrhenius väg 21 A  
SE-104 05 Stockholm  
Tel: +46-(0)8-16 46 00  
Fax: +46-(0)8-16 46 66  
E-mail: [info@sieps.se](mailto:info@sieps.se)  
**[www.sieps.se](http://www.sieps.se)**