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The international migration process is simultaneously highly personal and increasingly political. How policy impacts migration and integration, both at the border and in the destination country, is a central theme in this dissertation.

This dissertation juxtaposes two ultimately distinct settings when it comes to borders and barriers that migrants face – the Nordic and the Mexico-U.S. setting. Until recently, Swedish migration policy was among the most welcoming to migrants from different parts of the world. By contrast, Mexico and the U.S. are separated by an increasingly militarised border. As prominent examples of open and closed borders, respectively, these settings provide insight into the relationship between the policy context, migration and integration.

Migrants maintain connections to the home country both in open and closed border settings, but the way in which transnational ties are upheld differs. Furthermore, the relationship between integration and social contacts is shaped by the policies impacting migrants’ communities and experiences in the destination country.
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This dissertation analyses the links between migration and integration patterns and migrants’ ties to the home and destination country. It does this in two ultimately distinct settings when it comes to the borders and barriers that migrants face: the Nordic and Mexico-U.S. settings. Until recently, Swedish migration policy was among the most welcoming to migrants from different parts of the world. Migration within the Nordic countries, in particular, is characterised by open borders. By contrast, Mexico and the U.S. are separated by an increasingly militarised border and internal policing of migrants has risen dramatically. Consequently, these settings provide contrasting and interesting examples of the relationship between the policy context and migrants’ experiences.
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This dissertation analyses the links between migration and integration patterns and migrants’ ties to the home and destination country. It does this in two ultimately distinct settings when it comes to the borders and barriers that migrants face: the Nordic and Mexico-U.S. settings. Until recently, Swedish migration policy was among the most welcoming to migrants from different parts of the world. Migration within the Nordic countries, in particular, is characterised by open borders. By contrast, Mexico and the U.S. are separated by an increasingly militarised border and internal policing of migrants has risen dramatically. Consequently, these settings provide contrasting and interesting examples of the relationship between the policy context and migrants’ experiences.

Study 1 shows that many moves are temporary and short term in the Nordic setting of free mobility. Still, the threshold to the first move is notably higher than for subsequent moves. Study 2 reveals that rising deportations of Mexican migrants in the U.S. are associated with a shift from savings brought home to the sending of remittances. Afraid of a sudden arrest or deportation, migrants maintain transnational ties by sending remittances back to Mexico rather than carrying savings across the border. Study 3 investigates the different roles that social contacts play for male and female migrants’ integration into the Swedish labour market. Whereas friends provide men with benefits in the labour market, women’s job search is often constrained by factors linked to having family in Sweden. Study 4 shows that the implementation of local level immigration enforcement in the U.S. has a
negative impact on district level average educational achievement among Hispanic students. This indicates that integration and resulting ethnic achievement gaps are shaped by increased policing and surveillance of migrants.

This dissertation reveals a series of complex relationships between migration, integration and policies. Family and kin influence migration decisions also when barriers to movement are low. In the new country, kin can assist migrants’ job search or slow it down when newly arrived migrants are expected to care for them. Policing of migrants makes it more difficult to return and may affect migrants’ abilities to invest in building a new life, as indicated by negative effects for educational outcomes among groups targeted by immigration enforcement. Taken together, these factors shape the experiences and life chances of both migrants and their children in the new country.


_Studie 1_ undersöker cirkulär migration mellan Finland och Sverige, två länder som skiljs åt av en öppen gräns. Resultaten visar att många migrationer är temporära och kortvariga. Trots den fria rörligheten är tröskeln till den första migrationen högre än för efterföljande migrationer. _Studie 2_ demonstrerar att det ökande antalet deporteringar av mexikanska migranter i USA är kopplat till förändringar i hur migranter skickar pengar till hemlandet. På grund av rädsla för att bli arresterad eller utvisad väljer många migranter att skicka pengar direkt till Mexico istället för att föra med sig besparningar över gränsen. Det politiska sammanhanget påverkar således

Avhandlingen etablerar en rad komplexa förhållanden mellan migration, integration och politiska beslut. I en kontext med öppna gränser påverkar familj och anhöriga migrationsbeslut. I det nya landet kan släktingar hjälpa migranter att hitta ett jobb men också bromsa in etableringen när nyanlända förväntas ta hand om dem. Övervakning och kontroll av migranter gör det mer riskabelt att återvända till ursprungslandet samtidigt som kapaciteten att investera i ett nytt liv också kan begränsas vilket illustreras av negativa effekter på utbildningsresultat bland de grupper som berörs av åtgärderna. Sammantaget formar dessa faktorer erfarenheter och livsschanser för både migranter och deras barn.
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Introduction

International migration is the process of moving from one country to another. While seemingly simple, the migration process is simultaneously highly personal and increasingly political. Whether moving for work, to join family abroad, or as a result of political persecution or war, migrants face new social, cultural and economic conditions in the country of destination. This interplay of agency and structure across multiple contexts influences both migrants’ and their children’s life chances, as well as the surrounding society.

How migration and integration are impacted by the policy context, both at the border and in the destination country, is a central theme in this dissertation. Free mobility implies low barriers to migration. In an open border context, circular and temporary migration may then be increasingly common. By contrast, in a context where borders restrict movement, migrants are compelled to stay longer in the destination. This, in turn, shapes migrants’ ties to the home as well as the destination country. Uncertain about their livelihood due to rising deportations, migrants may be less likely to invest in integration and establishing contacts in the destination country. Social ties that migrants have in the destination can impede or facilitate integration.

This dissertation takes an integrative approach to migration by examining high-quality registers and survey data. The four empirical studies are situated within two different policy settings: the Nordic setting, especially Sweden and Finland, and the Mexico-U.S. setting. Swedish migration policy has traditionally been among the most welcoming to migrants from different parts of the world. Nordic citizens are moreover free to move between the countries without a residence or work permit. The picture looks very different in the Mexico-U.S. context. The two countries are separated by an increasingly militarised border. In an effort to reduce border crossings and the number of undocumented migrants in the country, the federal government has also given increasing power to local authorities to apprehend and deport undocumented migrants. This has led to increased policing and surveillance of migrants in the U.S. Analysing both contexts allows me to juxtapose two ultimately distinct settings when it comes to the borders and barriers that migrants face. The overarching aim of the dissertation is to provide a deeper understanding of the interplay between the policy context and migrants’ investments in the home and destination country.
This introductory chapter situates the dissertation within a larger research context. It begins by describing the two settings and then continues by providing a theoretical frame for the dissertation. Further, it discusses the data sets and ethical considerations. This is followed by a discussion of the methodology and a brief summary of the empirical studies. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the contribution of the dissertation and future steps for research in the field.
Two Policy Settings

When focusing on a single country setting, it is often difficult to disentangle the mechanisms of interest from the particularities of the setting. This dissertation studies two settings. Here, I provide a comprehensive account of each. I begin by discussing them separately and focus on the migration history, migrants’ characteristics, as well as borders and barriers. I conclude with a comparison of the two settings.

Nordic Migration Setting

The Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) were net emigration countries in the 1800s. Emigration to the new World was particularly common among Swedes and Norwegians (Abramitzky, Boustan, & Eriksson, 2012, 2014; Moberg, 1949). It is only after the Second World War that the Nordic countries started to become net immigration countries.

In the first decade after the Second World War, extensive labour migration from the other Nordic countries to Sweden took place. Living standards were higher in Sweden than in the neighbouring countries and a demand for labour attracted workers, especially from Finland, to move to Sweden (Pedersen, Røed, & Wadensjö, 2008). As shown in Figure 1, this migration flow peaked in the early 1970s and has since then continued at a lower rate (Korkiasaari & Söderling, 2003).

In the 1950s and 1960s, Sweden also recruited foreign workers from Southern and South-East European countries as guest workers to satisfy the rising demand for labour. Guest worker migration was considered temporary not only by the Swedish government but also by governments of the home countries and migrants themselves (see Table 1 for a summary of the agreements and policies discussed in this section). Although a large proportion of guest workers returned, an increasing number of migrants settled permanently in Sweden. Moreover, spouses and children came to join many labour migrants (Castles, 1986; Skodo, 2018).

Beginning in the 1970s, refugees started arriving in large numbers in Sweden (Bursell, 2015). They came predominantly from South America and the Middle East in the 1970s and 1980s and from Somalia and ex-Yugoslavia.
in the early 1990s. Since the 1970s and continuing to today, migration to Sweden is dominated by refugee and family reunification migration (Schröder, 2007).

Figure 1. Number of foreign-born individuals residing in Sweden by region of birth 1973–2018, obtained from Statistics Sweden. Numbers for Oceania and the former USSR are not presented.
Recent migrants in Sweden are predominantly from countries outside of Europe, especially from Afghanistan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Syria and Thailand. In 2015, 51 percent of all migrants living in Sweden came from countries outside of Europe, and 14 percent of migrants were born in neighbouring Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland and Norway) (Statistics Sweden, 2016).

Migrants who arrived in Sweden in the 1950s and through to the 1970s have been relatively successful in the labour market (Alden & Hammarstedt, 2014). Over time, their economic outcomes converged with the native population. However, since the 1980s, the native/foreign-born employment gap has been considerably larger (Bevelander, 2001, 2005; OECD, 2019). This is in part due to compositional differences between earlier and more recent migrant groups. Still, it suggests that migrants face entry barriers in the Swedish labour market today (Joona & Wadensjö, 2012).

Common Nordic Labour Market
The common Nordic labour market was established in 1954. The agreement instituted free mobility of labour across national borders and includes Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. It has been in place for more than 60 years and is unique in its longevity. Citizens of a Nordic country can move within the Nordic common labour market without needing a residence or work permit. Still, in order to acquire necessary resources, such as an apartment or a bank account, migrants have to register at the destination and deregister in the home country. This is a simple procedure and can be done online today (Fpa, 2017; Statistics Sweden, 2018).¹ The establishment of the European Union and the Schengen free movement zone have expanded the area within which individuals can move without restrictions.

The Nordic countries are also culturally, geographically, historically and politically close. The education and pension systems as well as employment services are fairly similar across countries, making barriers to movement low. The Nordic languages, apart from Finnish, are also similar and citizens can communicate with each other in their mother tongues. Finnish is distinct from the other Nordic languages. In Finnish schools, Swedish is a compulsory subject, but Finland also has a minority that grows up speaking Swedish. This group warrants a more elaborate discussion due to substantial differences in migration and integration patterns between the Swedish-speaking minority and the general Finnish population.

¹ Nordic citizens are only required to register and deregister in the respective country if they intend to stay abroad for longer than twelve months. Many migrants also register shorter moves, due to the advantages linked to registering in the destination country. Migrants, who fail to comply, are automatically deregistered in the country they have left, as the registration offices of the different Nordic countries communicate with each other.
Swedish-speaking Finns

About five percent of the total population in Finland grows up speaking Swedish. For many decades, emigration rates among Swedish speakers have been higher than among Finnish speakers, while their return migration rates have been lower (Hedberg, 2004; Saarela & Finnäs, 2011). Income and employment levels of Swedish-speaking Finns in Sweden are at parity with those of native Swedes, while the labour market performance of Finnish-speaking migrants is lower (Rooth & Saarela, 2007a). However, better labour market opportunities cannot fully explain language-group differences in migration rates (Saarela & Scott, 2017). Swedish speakers identify more with Sweden than Finnish speakers and fluency in Swedish makes Sweden more attractive as a destination country for Swedish speakers (Saarela & Scott, 2019).
Table 1. Migration-related Policies in Sweden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Policy</th>
<th>Year Implemented</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Nordic labour market</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>The agreement instituted free mobility of labour across national borders and included Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Citizens of a Nordic country can move within the Nordic common labour market without a residence or work permit (Pedersen, Røed, &amp; Wadensjö, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest worker migration</td>
<td>1950s and 60s</td>
<td>Although Sweden never had an official guest worker policy, the vast majority of migrants in the 1950s and 1960s were guest workers. The Swedish government assumed that guest worker migrants would eventually return home. Immigration policy during this era has been characterised as decentralised and rather unplanned (Skodo, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy shift to refugee and family reunion migration</td>
<td>1970s and onward</td>
<td>As Swedish economic expansion began to wind down in the late 1960s, Sweden began to regulate non-Nordic labour migration, seeking to curb the arrival of guest workers and to encourage those already in the country to leave. Sweden became a major receiving country of family reunion migrants, asylum seekers and resettled refugees in the 1970s and 1980s. It is during this time, which coincided with the rise of multiculturalism, that Sweden became known as a humanitarian haven, embracing people fleeing persecution from Cold War blocs as well as migrants from non-European countries (Skodo, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden joins the EU</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The EU was founded in 1951 and Sweden joined as part of the fourth enlargement in 1995. Free movement of workers is a fundamental principle of the EU. EU citizens are entitled to work and reside in another EU country without needing a permit. Free movement also applies, in general terms, to the countries in the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway). Governments of countries already in the EU can decide whether to apply restrictions on the free movement to workers from new member states for a transitional period of up to 7 years after they join the EU. After the 2004 enlargement when ten countries joined the EU, only Sweden, Ireland and the UK gave entry to the labour market for citizens from the new member states on the same conditions as for citizens from the “old” EU member states. Currently, only Austria still has restrictions in place for Croatia (European Commission, n.d.; Wadensjö, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border controls to Denmark</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>In 2015, an unprecedented number of migrants came to Sweden to seek asylum. The Swedish government decided to introduce border controls to Denmark later that same year. 2015 signified a distinct shift in migration policy and a break from the Schengen area (Barker, 2017; Skodo, 2018).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mexico-U.S. Migration Setting

The U.S. has been a net immigration country since colonial times. However, there have been many attempts to reduce immigration over the years. Eugenics arguments figured centrally in the National Origins Act that was passed in 1924 (see Table 2 for a summary of the acts discussed in this section). It limited the number of migrants allowed entry into the U.S. through a national origins quota. While it completely excluded migrants from Asia, no quotas were established for residents of the Western Hemisphere. This led to decreases in immigration flows from Europe and Asia, while immigration from Latin American countries, and especially Mexico, increased (Eckerson, 1966).

As shown in Figure 2, the migration flow from Mexico has dominated migration to the United States for many years. Starting in the 1940s, the Bracero programme provided Mexican migrants with short-term six month visas to work in the U.S. (Clemens, Lewis, & Postel, 2018). Circular migration was common, as the programme required annual return migration. Mexican migrants worked in agriculture close to the border and moved back and forth seasonally. Circular migration entails migration between the home and destination country. Moves can be both short and long term, but include multiple cycles. After having emigrated for the first time, some migrants return to the home country. Further moves between the home and destination country are then circular moves, i.e., the second emigration and the second return migration (Newland, 2009).

The status quo changed when the Bracero programme was terminated in 1964 and Congress imposed the first ever limitation on documented migration from the Western Hemisphere as part of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965. However, given the continuing demand for labour and well-developed migrant networks, the inflow of Mexican migrants did not cease (Massey, Durand, & Pren, 2015). Social capital figured centrally in the perpetuation of movement. Non-migrants drew on social capital embedded in connections to migrants who had moved under the Bracero Programme (Massey & Espinosa, 1997; Massey & Zenteno, 1999). These decreased the uncertainties associated with moving as well as the struggle to find housing and work, while increasing the information and resources available for undertaking a trip. Unable to make the trip north legally, many Mexicans moved without documents.

---

2 Circular, repeat and shuttle migration are similar concepts that have been used interchangeably in the literature. Circular migration is the term used in this dissertation.
However, since the 1990s and continuing through the 2000s border enforcement has increased dramatically and return migration has declined among undocumented migrants (Massey et al., 2015). Since the early 2000s, the inflow has also started to slow down and the overall net rate of Mexican immigration (including both documented and undocumented) now hovers around zero (Cohn, Passel, & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2017; Orrenius, 2016). Nonetheless, the estimated number of Mexicans in the United States stands at around 11 million, representing 25 percent of all foreign-born persons. The Mexican migrant population is also spreading more widely throughout the United States, bringing Mexicans into regions with little prior experience of migration (Card & Lewis, 2005; Durand, Massey, & Capoferro, 2005; Waters & Jimenez, 2005).

Figure 2. Number of foreign-born individuals residing in the U.S. by region of birth 1960–2017, obtained from the Pew Research Center. Countries in the other category are suppressed.
The Border and Immigration Enforcement

The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) marked the beginning of a new era of anti-immigrant enforcement (Meissner, Kerwin, Chishti, & Bergeron, 2013). It was passed in the mid-1980s and, for the first time, criminalised the hiring of undocumented workers and imposed sanctions on employers who knowingly did so, while also increasing funds for border enforcement. However, the policy was slow to take effect and it was not until the mid-1990s that border enforcement was stepped up. This, coupled with high levels of economic growth in the U.S. as well as strong push factors in Mexico meant that undocumented migration continued to grow in the 1990s and early 2000s.

IRCA also authorised the legalisation of around three million former undocumented migrants. This reduced the size of the unauthorised population and brought about a short-term drop in apprehensions (Bean, Vernez, & Keely, 1989; White, Bean, & Espenshade, 1990). However, border apprehensions increased again with the launching of Operation Blockade in El Paso in 1993 and Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego in 1994 (Massey, Durand, & Malone, 2002). Both border and internal enforcement efforts accelerated exponentially after the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act in late 2001 (Rosenblum, 2011).

Funding for both Immigration Customs Enforcement and the Border Patrol continue at record levels today. In practical terms, however, pressures on migrants have shifted from the border to the U.S. interior, as the number of undocumented migrants attempting to cross the border has plummeted. Federal initiatives, such as Secure Communities, have drawn state, county, and municipal police forces into the active enforcement of federal immigration laws (Ciancio & García-Jimeno, 2019; Cox & Miles, 2013). Many states and localities have also passed their own anti-immigrant statutes and profits have come to play an important role (Reich, 2017). A majority of spaces in the migrant detention system are owned and managed by corporations, such as the Geo Group and CoreCivic, which lobby Congress for a quota of detention beds to be filled each day (Gilman & Romero, 2018; Luan, 2018).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Act</th>
<th>Year Implemented</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Origins Act</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>It limited the number of migrants allowed entry into the U.S. through a national origins quota. The quota provided migration visas to two percent of each nationality in the U.S. as of the 1890 national census. It completely excluded migrants from Asia, while it did not establish quotas for residents of the Western Hemisphere (Eckerson, 1966).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Nationality Act</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>At the height of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s, the National Origins Act increasingly came under attack and the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed. It created a preference system based on migrants’ family relationships with U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents and, to a lesser degree, their skills. The act maintained per-country and total immigration limits, but included a provision exempting immediate relatives of U.S. citizens from numerical restrictions. The act also set a numerical limit on immigration from the Western Hemisphere for the first time in U.S. history (Chishti, Hipsman, &amp; Ball, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>This act brought about far-reaching changes in immigration law since the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The primary goal of the act was to increase border security and establish penalties for employers who hire undocumented migrants. Employer sanctions represented a fundamental policy shift from a historic laissez-faire attitude toward employer responsibility in stimulating undocumented migration. The act also provided millions of undocumented immigrants with legal status and eventual citizenship, marking the first large-scale legalisation program in U.S. immigration history. The law’s provisions on immigration enforcement and employer verification continue to be in effect today and have served as building blocks for much of the nation’s current immigration enforcement regime and debates (Meissner et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Act</td>
<td>Year Implemented</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Blockade</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>This was an effort to shut down undocumented crossings from Mexico to El Paso, Texas, by establishing an around-the-clock presence of agents in sufficient numbers to assure control along the border. Funds were also made available to repair the border fence in downtown El Paso (Massey, Durand &amp; Malone, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Gatekeeper</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>This was a similar initiative to Operation Blockade along the Mexico-U.S. border in San Diego, California (Massey et al., 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Patriot Act</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The Act was submitted in response to the events of September 11 as a counter-terrorism effort. It granted broad new authority to gather domestic intelligence, combat money laundering used in terrorist financing, and streamline judicial procedures for deporting suspected terrorists. Some legislators of both parties opposed provisions to allow the indefinite detention of noncitizens and new limits on due process in some immigration enforcement cases. However, the Bush administration pushed for an expedited legislative process and the act was passed in late 2001 (Rosenblum, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Communities</td>
<td>2008–12</td>
<td>Secure Communities started an automated screening process where every person arrested by local law enforcement officials in the U.S. is screened by the federal government for immigration status and deportation eligibility. In this way, the program increased the likelihood that noncitizens arrested for crimes by local authorities are identified by the federal government, apprehended by immigration authorities and ultimately deported. Secure Communities was implemented on a county-by-county basis and the federal government determined the sequence of the roll out. In protest of the program, sanctuary jurisdictions were established. These are cities and counties that limit local cooperation with ICE officers (Ciancio &amp; García-Jimeno, 2019; Cox &amp; Miles, 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarities between the Settings

Both Sweden and the U.S. have, for a long time, had a predominant migrant group from a neighbouring country. Finnish migrants constituted the largest migrant group in Sweden until 2016. Although Finnish migrants are overtaken by Syrian migrants today, Figure 3 shows that, in addition to a sizeable Finnish migrant population, a large second and third generation of Finnish migrants lives in Sweden today. In the United States, the majority of migrants are from Mexico. Mexican migrants accounted for 25 percent of the immigrant population in the U.S. in 2017, while the next largest migrant groups from China, India, the Philippines, El Salvador, Vietnam and Cuba made up between 6 and 3 percent, respectively (Pew Research Center, 2019b). Moreover, compelled to stay longer in the U.S., Mexican migrants are increasingly forming families north of the border (Waldinger, 2008). As a result, there is a growing U.S.-born Hispanic population and a substantial share of the children and young adults have undocumented parents (see Figure 4).

![Figure 3](image-url)  
Figure 3. Number of Finnish migrants residing in Sweden by age in 2016, obtained from Statistics Sweden.
As mentioned before, circular migration between Mexico and the U.S. has a long history. Some Finnish migrants also circulate between Sweden and Finland, though the numbers are comparatively smaller than what was observed in the Mexico-U.S. setting through to the 2000s. This is despite free mobility laws (as shown in Study 1). However, the timing of circular migration is similar in the two settings. Individuals, who move repeatedly, are likely to do so in short time intervals. Additionally, both in Finland and Mexico the threshold to first emigration is notably higher compared with that of later moves (Massey & Espinosa, 1997).

![Figure 4. Number of foreign and U.S.-born Hispanics by age in the U.S. in 2015, obtained from the Pew Research Center.](image)
Differences between the Settings

Undocumented Migration

Undocumented migrants comprise a considerably larger share of the foreign-born population in the U.S. than in Europe and Sweden. In the U.S., the undocumented population is estimated at 10.7 million, which is equivalent to about 24 percent of the foreign-born population (Pew Research Center, 2019a). According to the Commission of the European Communities, estimates of the undocumented population in the European Union lie at 8 million (Commission of the European Communities, 2009, p. 4). However, a recent report from the European Commission estimates that only 1.9–3.8 million migrants, or 7–13 percent of the foreign-born population, are undocumented in the EU as a whole (Clandestino Project, 2009, p. 12). Considering the elusive nature of the phenomenon, the group is difficult to observe. Researchers expect that the difference in numbers is driven by Romanian and Bulgarian accession to the EU. Migrants from these two countries accounted for a considerable share of undocumented migrants in the EU prior to 2007 (Envall et al., 2010). Still, the range of estimates is perhaps most indicative of the fact that undocumented migrants comprise a smaller, though substantial group, in Europe when compared to the U.S. According to the Swedish Social Rapport 2010 published by the National Board of Health and Welfare, the estimated number of undocumented migrants ranges from 10,000 to 50,000 in Sweden (Envall et al., 2010, p. 268). This is equivalent to about 1–4 percent of the foreign-born population in Sweden.

The undocumented population also differs in composition across the two settings. In the U.S., undocumented migration has for a long time comprised Mexican migrants who often live relatively close to the border (Chavez, 2013). Today, undocumented migration to the U.S. is increasingly characterised by immigration from Asia and South America. Both migrant groups have a longer journey to the U.S. and therefore face higher barriers and monetary expenses (Menjívar, 2000; Passel & Cohn, 2018). In Sweden, undocumented migrants include refugees, who have entered the country legally in order to seek asylum but whose asylum claims have been rejected. Others have entered the country illegally and never claimed asylum, or are labour migrants, students or tourists, who have overstayed their visa or residence permits (Jandl, Vogel, & Iglicka, 2008, pp. 7–10).
Borders and Barriers

Another important difference between the contexts pertains to the borders and barriers that migrants face. The border between Mexico and the U.S. is increasingly controlled. However, empirical evidence from the U.S. shows that closing national borders does not necessarily lead to a decline in the migrant stock in the country (Massey et al., 2015). Indeed, border enforcement may not only reduce entry rates but also return migration. Deterring migrants from entering with documents may also induce higher levels of undocumented migration (Donato, Durand, & Massey, 1992). Based on macro-level data from 38 country dyads, Czaika and de Haas (2017) find that enforcing visa restrictions has a relatively small, lagged negative effect on net migration flows. By contrast, lifting visa restrictions increases cross-border movement significantly.

Free movement laws marked the beginning of EU citizens’ right to work and reside in any member state. A common conception, in line with Czaika and de Haas’s (2017) findings, is that the removal of borders increased mobility. Constant and Zimmermann (2011) and Dustmann (1996) also find that return migration is more common among migrants who face low, rather than high, barriers to re-entry into the destination. Study 1 contributes to this literature by showing that many moves are temporary in the Nordic setting of free mobility; still the number of migrants who circulate is relatively small. This indicates that relocation is costly even when barriers to movement are low.\(^3\)

In recent years, increasing entry barriers into Europe have been established for persons from non-European countries. Prior research shows that the number of asylum seekers trying to come to Europe does not change considerably as a result of entry restrictions; rather asylum seekers change the route of entry (Fasani, 2019).

These results reveal considerable heterogeneity in the impact of open and closed borders on migration flows. This diversity is contingent on the migration context, encompassing both the home and destination country, and the reason for migration. In an open border setting, individuals may not move when faced with similar opportunities in the home country, but low barriers and high incentives may induce large numbers of individuals to relocate. Similarly, closed borders may make relocation increasingly dangerous and halt migration flows. However, if migrants live in desolate conditions, they may relocate in spite of these barriers.

Borders and barriers clearly also have significant ramifications for migrants’ livelihoods and experiences. Migrants change the way in which they maintain transnational ties when return migration becomes increasingly dif-

\(^3\) These findings are in line with studies from the open border context in Australia and New Zealand, which show that few individuals move even though barriers to migration are low. Nonetheless, a small proportion of people relocate at a high frequency (Poot, 2010).
ficult as a result of immigration enforcement (as shown in Study 2). Discrimination and fear of deportation can also undermine integration and impel migrants to rely more heavily on their co-ethnic network (see Studies 3 and 4).
Theoretical Framework

Migration and integration have been longstanding topics of research within the social sciences. The traditional migration literature focused on the first move and migrants’ assimilation in the destination country after arrival (Gordon, 1964; Harris & Todaro, 1970; Park & Miller, 1969; Sjaastad, 1962). With time, the return migration literature and more nuanced accounts of integration gained momentum (Alba & Nee, 1997; Borjas, 1989; Jasso & Rosenzweig, 1982; Lindstrom & Massey, 1994). Scholars criticised classic assimilation theories for implicitly assuming that migration is permanent (Dustmann, 2003; Kazal, 1995). Moreover, it was assumed that migrants need to surrender their culture and norms in order to integrate into the destination society. However, migration is often temporary and many migrants stay in touch with family and kin, who have stayed in the home country (Massey & Espinosa, 1997). Recently circular, onward and transnational migration, to name a few, have gained attention in the field (Kalter, 2011; Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007; Nekby, 2006; Zimmermann, 2014). It is important to consider this complexity in migration when analysing migrants’ investment in the home and destination country as well as how this is related to migration and integration patterns.

Below, I present the theoretical perspectives that guide the empirical analyses in the dissertation and position them within the broad framework of transnational migration theory. This theory focuses on ties migrants maintain with their home countries while establishing new ties at the destination (Faist, 2012; Glick Schiller, Basch, & Blanc, 1995; Kivisto, 2001). Transnational migration theory is recurrent in this section, but the discussion is not limited to this perspective and additionally incorporates other relevant theories. The section is organised as follows: I begin by discussing migration behaviour, which is the natural point of departure. I then describe migrants’ transnational ties and finally provide an account of assimilation and integration theories.
Migration Behaviour

Initiation and perpetuation of movement

The factors impacting the decision to move are manifold, but a rather intuitive way of conceptualising the decision to migrate is through push and pull factors. *Push factors* are those that compel migrants to move from the home country, while *pull factors* induce migrants to relocate to the destination country. Factors can range from family-related to economic reasons. For political migrants and asylum seekers, the decision to migrate is predominantly driven by push factors, such as war or political unrest. Here, I focus on voluntary migration.

*Neoclassical economics* emphasises economic aspects in the decision to migrate. Migrants are assumed to relocate because of higher expected lifetime earnings in the destination country (Harris & Todaro, 1970; Sjaastad, 1962). While the theory has received much attention and is compelling for its simplicity, empirical evidence from Europe and the U.S. shows that cost benefits alone cannot account even for voluntary migration flows (Kalter, 2011; Massey, 1987). *New economics of migration* challenges the individualistic perspective often taken in theories of push and pull factors and neoclassical economics by arguing that migration decisions are made by families and households. The theory posits that families engage in migration to minimise risks and to loosen constraints associated with a variety of market failures (Stark & Bloom, 1985). Migrants are moreover assumed to stay in contact with family in the home country and to send part of their earnings home. However, often times decisions are impacted by a complex set of factors and migrants and families cannot always plan strategically (De et al., 2016; Lindley, 2009). Moreover, the above theories cannot explain why migration flows persist in the absence of economic or institutional incentives or when border enforcement makes it increasingly dangerous and/or costly to move.

*Network theory* and *chain migration* fill this gap and argue that non-migrants draw on social capital embedded in connections to migrants (Hugo, 1981; MacDonald & MacDonald, 1964; Massey, 1990). These connections lower the uncertainties involved in migration and can assist the newly arrived in organising housing and work at the destination (Hagan, 1998; Menjívar, 2000). Massey and collaborators have empirically shown that migration flows between Mexico and the U.S. became self-perpetuating and continued despite rising border control (Massey & Espinosa, 1997; Massey &

---

4 See Massey et al. (1993) for a more detailed overview of the theories mentioned and macro-level theories that are not elaborated here.

5 For instance, Brandén (2014) and Brandén and Haandrikman (2018) show that couples decide whether and where to move.
Zenteno, 1999). Likewise, Kalter (2011) shows that the Polish migration flow to Germany continued at similar rates even in the absence of earnings differences between the two countries, largely due to migrants’ social capital. Although these theories provide important insights into the mechanisms perpetuating migration, migration flows are rarely, if ever, initiated by migrant networks.

Return migration
The first migration is often linked to considerable uncertainty. Faced with unexpected difficulties, some migrants decide to move back home. For instance, migrants may return if they move abroad for work but cannot find a job.

In an analysis of return migration among guest workers in Germany, Constant and Massey (2002) compare neoclassical economics and new economics of migration’s predictions about the reason to return. As mentioned before, according to neoclassical economics, migrants relocate, because of higher expected lifetime earnings in the destination country. In this way, they can be described as income maximisers. By contrast, new economics of migration expects that migrants send remittances home, or move abroad planning to return when they have earned enough money to bring back in savings. In this way, new economics of migration predicts that migrants are target earners and return home when they have reached their target.

The two theories come to different hypotheses about return migration. On the one hand, income maximisers are expected to return only in response to unmet expectations, i.e., a negative shock, as their aim is to get higher lifetime earnings abroad. On the other hand, target earners return sooner if they have high earnings in the destination country, as this allows them to meet their earnings target faster.

Constant and Massey (2002) empirically distinguish between income maximisers and target earners by differentiating between migrants who remit and those who do not, i.e., income maximisers do not remit, while target earners do remit. Their results reveal that the determinants of return migration are distinct among remitting and non-remitting migrants. For instance, non-remitters are less likely to return if their spouse is in the destination country, while the opposite holds for remitters. Although a spouse at the

---

6 Based on this perspective, return migration is often assumed to result from “mistakes” in the initial migration decision (Borjas & Bratsberg, 1996; Duleep, 1994; Rooth & Saarela, 2007b).

7 The motivations hypothesised by the two theories are not mutually exclusive and research suggests that both play a role in migrant decision-making (Garip, 2012). Another factor complicating this setup is that target earners might change their mind when they have met their earnings target and stay in the destination country. Similarly, income maximisers might stay in the destination country despite low earnings because they are too proud to admit that they did not “make it.”
destination provides the migrant with a larger social network, the presence of a second worker also reduces the time required to reach an earnings target and, in this way, may enable target earners to return sooner. This shows that migrants are heterogeneous with respect to their motive to return migrate. The factors at play in any decision to migrate are complex, but the motivation underlying return and temporary migration decisions is still more intricate, as it builds on previous choices.

Circular migration

Migrants may emigrate again after returning. Migrants who make multiple moves back and forth between the home and destination country may do so because they have social contacts in the two countries, or because they move abroad for work and return to spend time with family and friends.

Transnational ties are both factors that perpetuate movement and a direct consequence of migration (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). Not only does the likelihood to move increase as a rising number of family members relocate, migrants also acquire skills, contacts, and knowledge specific to the migration process and the destination with every move (Kalter, 2011; Massey & Espinosa, 1997). In this way, the process of migration itself creates new and more specific resources accessible only to those who have made the trip. These resources increase the likelihood to make another trip abroad. For example, seasonal migrants, who move back and forth between Mexico and the U.S., tend to return to the same farm, where they know the employer and have established housing arrangements. This makes it easier to make another move.

Alternatively, migrants may make multiple moves due to location-fixed factors. For instance, a spouse and children may not be mobile and stay put in the home country, while migrants’ job opportunities are at the destination. Previous research shows that family and friends are important reasons for returning, whereas labour market attachment to the destination country keeps migrants there (Constant & Zimmermann, 2011, 2012; DaVanzo, 1981; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002). Migrants may additionally make multiple moves to spend time with family in the home country, while maintaining their work affiliation in the destination country.

---

8 Onward migration is another option. The discussion here focuses on circular migration, as this is a migration outcome analysed in the dissertation.
Transnational Ties and Remittances

Transnational ties entail temporary migration as well as connections maintained to the home country through money transfers, political engagement, or telephone calls with friends or relatives still at home (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). Economic transnational ties often take the form of remittances or savings, when migrants send or carry foreign earnings back to the home country. There is an extensive literature on remittances and savings, in part because changes in remittance patterns carry important implications for economic growth and development in migrant origin countries. According to the World Bank (2018), remittances to Tonga, for instance, amounted to 40 percent of GDP ($183,000) in 2018. In Mexico, remittances totaled $35.6 billion and amounted to 2.9 percent of GDP. In addition to the direct effects of spending by migrants and their families, remittances have important indirect effects on the economy in migrant origin countries (Durand, Kandel, Parrado, & Massey, 1996; Durand, Parrado, & Massey, 1996; Massey & Parrado, 1994, 1998). By helping families overcome budget constraints, remittances facilitate household consumption and investments to improve wellbeing and productivity at both the local and national levels (Taylor et al., 1996a, 1996b).

Over time in the destination country, migrants’ remittance and saving behaviour often declines, as significant social relationships tend to shift from the home to the destination country (Waldinger, 2008). While barriers to integration through discrimination compel migrants to maintain strong transnational ties (Glick Schiller & Fouron, 1999; Stepick, 1998), nuclear family members, who join migrants abroad, tend to reduce transnational ties, in part because migrants have fewer resources available to remit or save (Marcelli & Lowell, 2005; Massey & Basem, 1992). Previous research shows that regular involvement in transnational activities characterises only a minority of migrants and that even occasional involvement is not a universal practice (Guarnizo, Portes, & Haller, 2003; Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002).

Nonetheless, the relationship between integration, remittances and savings is more intricate (Roberts, Frank, & Lozano-Ascencio, 1999). Depending on the motivation to remit, remittance behaviour is differently impacted by integration (Carling, 2014). For instance, migrants who remit to finance the construction of a house in the home country may send less money back when they have integrated and established strong connections at the destination. However, the level of integration likely played a smaller role for Samoan migrants who remitted in response to the 2009 tsunami to help family and friends in the home country (De et al., 2016). In this way, investment in the home country or the destination can have a contradictory or mutually rein-

---

9 There is a debate as to whether remittances encourage development or lead to exacerbated inequalities in migrant origin countries. See Haas (2010) for an extensive review.
forcing impact (Tsuda, 2012). For instance, migrants often need to enter a job before they can start remitting. Resourceful co-ethnic communities can also foster the exchange of goods and facilitate engagement with contacts, politics and culture in the home country. In this way, they may promote not only economic but also social and political remittances. In large co-ethnic communities, formal organisations are sometimes established that stimulate such transnational ties, as governments in migrant origin countries see this as an opportunity to spur the monetary flow into the country and to gain political support (Levitt, 2001).

Integration
Migrants’ transition into the destination country has long been a topic of interest among migration scholars (Park & Burgess, 1921; Warner & Srole, 1945). Classic assimilation theory posits that migrants become more alike the native mainstream with time at the destination and over generations (Gordon, 1964). Retention of cultural norms and strong connections to the home country were assumed to undermine integration, as it is supposed to be difficult to invest in multiple cultures. However, as shown before, the relationship between transnational ties and integration is complex.

Current scholarship defines integration as the process of how migrants come to resemble natives over time and vice versa (Drouhot & Nee, 2019; Waters & Pineau, 2015). According to neo-assimilation theory, “[the] definition of assimilation considers the agency of both immigrants and natives in the maintenance or the erosion of the distinctions between them. It designates a mutual process of convergence” (Drouhot & Nee, 2019, p. 179). Standard measures of integration employed by social scientists include socioeconomic status, defined as educational achievement and labour market outcomes – which are the outcomes in focus in this dissertation – spatial concentration, language ability and intermarriage.

---

10 Neo-assimilation theory’s definition of assimilation is similar to definitions of integration (Drouhot & Nee, 2019; Waters & Pineau, 2015). Assimilation is sometimes argued to assume a one-sided process in which migrants gradually lose the cultural norms and values of their origins and adopt those of the destination society, while integration describes migrants’ and the native population’s adaption to the society as it is changed by migration. However, assimilation, integration and incorporation are often used interchangeably in the literature. This dissertation uses the term integration, except when discussing specific assimilation theories.
Social contacts and integration

A considerable literature has analysed the impact of having a co-ethnic network on migrants’ integration in the country of destination (Joona & Wadensjö, 2012; Kalter & Kogan, 2014; Logan, Alba, & Stults, 2003; Portes & Bach, 1985; Wilson & Portes, 1980). In particular, studies have investigated whether employment in ethnic enclaves brings higher returns to migrants’ human capital than working in the destination country’s open economy and scholars disagree on whether ethnic enclaves benefit workers (Jensen & Portes, 1992; Sanders & Nee, 1996). On the one hand, social contacts have been argued to improve migrants’ labour market outcomes by providing the newly arrived with information about job offers (Aguilera & Massey, 2003; Lafortune & Tessada, 2012). In this way, co-ethnic contacts and clustering can provide important resources in the destination country and promote integration. On the other hand, co-ethnic communities can also lock migrants in when they have opportunities outside of the group (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

Co-ethnic contacts are often compared to contacts with natives. Establishing contacts with natives is seen both as an indicator of integration and simultaneously recognised to be a driver of economic and cultural integration. According to classic assimilation theory, intermarriage presents the ultimate proof of assimilation (Waters & Jimenez, 2005). Empirical studies also find that the relationship between intermarriage and labour market outcomes is positive, although the association disappears when selection is controlled for. This suggests that unobservable factors both increase the probability of intermarrying and present an attribute on the labour market.11

There is a related European literature on the predictors of contacts with natives and their impact on migrants’ labour market outcomes (Drouhot & Nee, 2019). In Germany, contacts with natives are positively related to migrants’ employment, while social contacts more generally do not appear to promote labour market integration (Kanas, Chiswick, van der Lippe, & van Tubergen, 2012). In the Netherlands, contacts with natives are also positively related with migrants’ job entry (Lancee, 2010). Gender attitudes, such as opinions about living together unmarried, contacts between men and women and sexual openness, are moreover shown to be positively related to income for female, but not for male migrants (Lancee, 2010).

It is assumed then that a native spouse and native contacts are more resourceful than co-ethnic contacts. However, there is considerable heterogeneity in how resourceful natives and co-ethnic communities are. While some Asian and Jewish enclaves in the U.S. have considerable funds and many are

---

11 Although some research indicates an intermarriage premium (Celikaksoy, 2007; Dribe & Nystedt, 2015), a number of studies show that the positive effect of intermarriage on economic integration disappears once selection is accounted for (Bevelander & Irastorza, 2014; Nekby, 2010; Nottmeyer, 2010).
small business owners, other communities provide the newly arrived with few opportunities in the foreign labour market (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

Moreover, there is important variation in how resources are distributed within groups. Older migrants may be given higher status within the community than younger migrants. Similarly, male migrants may have higher chances of receiving funds for a business start-up than female migrants. In addition, women who move to join a partner abroad may gain important insight into the foreign labour market and simultaneously be constrained by traditional values and gender attitudes (Khoudja & Fleischmann, 2015, 2017). Zontini (2010) illustrates that kin and caring work predominantly falls on women’s shoulders in Italian migrant families in the U.K. This is experienced as an unwanted burden by some women. Moreover, rigid norms and values are maintained in many of these families, forcing especially women to comply. In short, social contacts in the home and destination country can be a valuable resource for integration but may also present a constraining factor depending on migrants’ gender.

Long-Term Integration

According to neo-assimilation theory, migrants integrate, or converge with natives as ethnic, racial, religious and other differences as determinants of life chances decline between the groups (Alba & Nee, 1997, 2003; Drouhot & Nee, 2019). Despite variation between migrant groups, research on socio-economic advancement, intermarriage and spatial concentration suggests that differences between migrants and natives grow smaller in the second and third generation (Waters & Jimenez, 2005). The integration process can take multiple generations and the theory therefore mainly focuses on the second and third generation. Indeed, analysing integration as a process that takes multiple generations gives a better indication of the social strata that migrants end up in. Nonetheless, integration outcomes of first generation migrants are also important, considering that the speed at which the first generation is able to integrate economically conditions the opportunities available for the second generation (Heath, Rothon, & Kilpi, 2008).

In contrast to neo-assimilation theory, segmented assimilation theory posits that there are three potential integration trajectories (Portes & Zhou, 1993). First, integration can be associated with economic upward mobility, similar to neo-assimilation theory. Second, integration can be negatively related to migrants’ economic outcomes and wellbeing. For instance, Hispanic migrants who move to the United States tend to have better health than the native population, but over time their health declines as they adopt negative health behaviours common to the native population (Gordon-Larsen, Harris, Ward, & Popkin, 2003). Third, migrants can deliberately retain their culture and customs while integrating economically. Jewish enclaves are
typical examples of selective assimilation that have long presented an interest in sociological research (Park & Miller, 1969; Wirth, 1928). Chinese migrants in Southeast Asia and German merchants in medieval Stockholm similarly retained their language and cultural norms, while integrating economically (Willmott, 1966; Wubs-Mrozewicz, 2004).

Although the empirical evidence on segmented assimilation is mixed, the theory is helpful when thinking about the structural constraints that migrants face in the destination country. For instance, comparing black and Hispanic migrants to the native white population in the U.S., Villarreal and Tamborini (2018) find a considerable gap in black and Hispanic migrants’ earnings compared to native whites’, even after twenty years in the country. However, when black and Hispanic migrants are compared to the native black and Hispanic population, respectively, migrants’ earnings converge with natives over time. These findings indicate that race impacts migrants’ integration in the U.S. (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). Segmented assimilation theory then provides an intuitive framework for studying heterogeneity in integration outcomes.¹²

Transnational migration scholars provide a third perspective arguing that some migrants continue to be active in their home countries at the same time that they become part of the destination country (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). The extent to which the second and third generation maintain transnational ties has been questioned (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001) and studies find considerable variation in socialisation and connections to the home country among later generations (Waters & Jimenez, 2005).

In the United States, migrants’ documentation status plays a decisive role in the structural constraints that migrants face (Drouhot & Nee, 2019). Evidence from an ethnographic project in Kansas sheds light on some of the mechanisms through which increased surveillance and policing of migrants can impede integration (Cervantes, Alvord, & Menjívar, 2018). Among the examples mentioned in the study is Ofelia, age 37, who, on the one hand, enjoyed living in the United States with her family and being able to send some money to her two sons who had stayed in Guatemala. On the other hand, she also described feeling scared and surveilled by the police that often drove up and down her street multiple times a day. She explained, “We are always worried that all of a sudden they could grab us.” Like Ofelia, other Maya Guatemalan study participants expressed fear about being apprehended, particularly when driving or walking outside (Cervantes et al., 2018, pp. 188–189). This study illustrates how undocumented migrants’ daily lives are

¹² Neo-assimilation theory similarly incorporates segregating dynamics in order to account for heterogeneity in the integration process (Drouhot & Nee, 2019).
affected by rising deportations in the U.S. Fear of leaving the house clearly reduces contacts with the native majority.  

Prior evidence moreover shows that immigration enforcement not only leads to distress among undocumented migrants, due to the rising risk of deportation, but even impacts documented migrants and U.S. citizens. Studies find that migrant parents are less likely to sign their children up for safety net programs, such as Medicaid or food stamps, even when they are eligible (Alsan & Yang, 2018; Vargas, 2015; Watson, 2014). This suggests that children of migrants may incur negative health consequences. Although it is possible to enroll in Medicaid after a negative health shock, ex-post enrolment may involve more difficulties in treating the condition and higher costs compared to ex-ante enrolment. Apprehension and insecurity linked to increased immigration enforcement can also have negative consequences for children and young adults’ educational outcomes (Amuedo-Dorantes & Lopez, 2015, 2017). In this way, immigration enforcement may have wider-reaching impacts and exacerbate social differences also in terms of future income and labour market outcomes.

Two underlying questions are recurrent throughout the studies presented in the next chapters of the dissertation: What are the determining factors for migration behaviour and the maintenance of transnational ties? And, what impacts do these factors have for migrants’ integration in the destination country?

---

Data

Migration behaviour and integration outcomes are inherently difficult to capture using common types of research data. Register and survey data are typically collected in a single context, while migrants are defined by their mobility. There are a number of additional obstacles to observing migrants, such as language barriers, discrimination and insecure documentation status. Consequently, several types of data are needed to get a better understanding of the migration and integration process. This dissertation takes a complementary approach, aiming to use the most appropriate data available to answer the research question at hand. The empirical studies are based on four different data sets: linked Finnish and Swedish register data, survey data collected on both sides of the Mexico-U.S. border from the Mexican Migration Project, the Swedish Level of Living survey of Foreign-born and their Children, and administrative data on educational achievement at the district level in the U.S. compiled by the Stanford Education Data Archive.

Linked Finnish and Swedish Register Data

Finland and Sweden both have a long tradition of keeping individual level register data on their population covering a rich variety of indicators. The linked data set used in this dissertation is unique in combining administrative Finnish and Swedish register data. The data were constructed by integrating records of Finnish migrants in Sweden from population registers in both Sweden and Finland for the period 1988 to 2005. The two data sets were linked by the identification of migrants based on their unique personal identity numbers (PIN). Migrants who move back and forth between Finland and Sweden can be identified through the linkage and observed on both sides of the border. Migration is measured by registration and deregistration from the population registers in each country. The linkage provides the opportunity to verify that migrants who deregister in Finland appear in the Swedish register and vice versa. Results from this verification exercise show that, for 98 percent of all moves, the timing of the migration in each country’s register differs by less than two months.

Through the linkage, researchers can model time to event separately for each move. Namely, the risk of making the first emigration, first return mi-
gration, second emigration and second return migration can be estimated one by one and compared. Time varying attributes, such as labour market attachment or marital status, can be observed in both countries before and after the move. In this way, migrants’ commitment to Sweden or Finland can be proxied through a change in employment or marital status that occurs between moves. This captures whether a migrant gets or loses a job, or alternatively marries or divorces in that period.

In short, this data set provides a rare opportunity to study migrants’ selection into moving as well as into return, onward and circular migration (Nekby, 2006; Rooth & Saarela, 2007b) by providing information on a near-complete sample of the population in the home country (i.e., the population at risk).

**Mexican Migration Project**

The Mexican Migration Project (MMP) has been an extremely influential data collection project. It was started by Douglas S. Massey and Jorge Durand in 1982 and aimed to use ethnosurveys to provide reliable information on the extent of undocumented migration, its determinants and its relationships to parallel documented migration flows between Mexico and the United States. Currently, the data set includes 27,274 households selected from 170 communities in 24 Mexican states.¹⁴ Households are interviewed each year during the winter months, when seasonal migrants tend to return to Mexico. The interviews gather detailed social, demographic, and economic information on the household and its members. For household heads, who have migrated, detailed questions about their last trip to the U.S. are also administered, focusing on employment, earnings, and the use of U.S. social services.

Following completion of the Mexican surveys, interviewers travel to destination areas in the United States to administer identical questionnaires to migrants from the same communities sampled in Mexico who have settled north of the border. These surveys are combined with those conducted in Mexico to generate a representative binational sample. Despite the non-representative nature of MMP’s selection of sample communities, empirical assessments indicate that they provide a remarkably accurate profile of the U.S. migrant population from Mexico (Massey & Zenteno, 1999).

The MMP data set is unique in the reliability with which it measures documentation status. Given the elusive nature of undocumented migration, census data, surveys and deportation statistics provide very imperfect coverage of the phenomenon (Bean et al., 1989, pp. 82–84). By using ethnosurveys and carefully setting out the sampling frames, the MMP overcomes...
some of the other data sets’ limitations. Still, a disadvantage of relying solely on information provided by the MMP is that it focuses on retrospective information. In some interviews, respondents are asked about information concerning family members, which has been shown to increase recall problems and error (Cheong & Massey, 2018).

Level of Living Survey of Foreign-born and their Children

The Level of Living Survey of Foreign-born and their Children (LNU-UFB) is a supplement to the Swedish Level of Living Survey (LNU). It was designed to examine the living conditions of migrants in Sweden and contains questions that are identical to those found in the LNU survey, as well as extensive information on respondents’ migration experiences, language fluency, employment and social contacts in the home country and in Sweden.

The data were collected through face-to-face and telephone interviews conducted in 2010–2012. A representative sample of the foreign-born population aged 18–75 was selected from Swedish register data. This was done using a stratified sampling technique to ensure that migrants from different regions of origin were represented in the data. The sampling frame included seven region of origin groups, each of which was divided into three age categories (18–30 years, 31–55 years, and 56–74 years). Each age category was comprised of 350 potential respondents, and each region of origin group was composed of 1,050 persons who were approached to participate (Göransson & Johansson, 2012; Wadensjö, 2013). In total, 3,451 interviews were conducted. The non-response rate was 50 percent (to be compared to the non-response rate of 38 percent for the LNU 2010 survey). Most interviews were conducted in Swedish, but five percent were conducted in a different language and some respondents used an interpreter or a relative to assist with translations (Wadensjö, 2013).

This data set provides valuable information on migrants in Sweden, such as their social contacts at arrival. Much of the empirical evidence on migrants’ experiences and integration in Sweden is based on register data, which are collected for administrative purposes and do not include direct information on social contacts, among other things. In this way, the LNU-UFB provides important complementary information to register data. Moreover, the survey data are linked to Swedish register data covering a ten-year period, which provides the opportunity to combine the two data sets. Nonetheless, this data source has similar limitations to the MMP considering that both surveys collect retrospective information and respondents are asked to

---

remember events relatively far back. The sample also consists of migrants who lived in Sweden for a minimum of five years and thus captures migrants, who have been able to settle in reasonably well, while excluding the most disadvantaged who are more likely to move on or back home within the first five years of arrival.

Aggregate Education Data

The Stanford Education Data Archive (SEDA) provides publicly available information on students’ achievement scores across the United States. The SEDA data are constructed using information on standardised tests that each state in the U.S. is required to administer in public schools. The data are published at the district level (which are geographic units smaller than counties and many of which include four to thirteen schools) and for ethnic and gender subgroups.

States have flexibility in designing and administering the standardised tests. States also set their own standards regarding the proficiency level in each grade and subject. In order to improve comparability, the SEDA data transform district level averages into a common national scale based on overall state performance and on district performance on the state exam relative to other districts in the state (see Reardon et al. 2018 for more details).

The data provide achievement measures for each district, grade, year and subject in which there are at least 20 students in each cell or group (i.e., at least 20 Hispanic students in each grade, year and subject within a district). Values for observations with less than the required sample size are suppressed for privacy reasons. In addition, SEDA data omit observations in which: the state test participation rate is less than 95 percent; students in the same state, grade, year and subject took different tests; or states did not report sufficient data (Reardon et al., 2018, pp. 13–14). This data set is novel in providing near complete coverage on educational achievement among students in public schools in the U.S. Still, a limitation is that individual level data are aggregated at the district level due to privacy concerns.

---

Ethical Considerations

Research that handles personal data is required to ensure the integrity of participating individuals and to protect against various forms of harm (Swedish Research Council, 2019). In addition, the value of the research should surpass any risks that informants and respondents may be exposed to. In the dissertation, all analyses are done at the aggregate level and reported as averages, frequencies and results of multivariate analyses. The research in this dissertation may moreover inform policies that can facilitate integration. This is valuable for migrants and the destination country.

The data materials analysed consist of pseudonymised secondary data. This means that personally identifiable information is replaced by one or more artificial identifiers, or pseudonyms. The data linkage of the Finnish and Swedish registers was done by the respective national statistical agencies and was delivered in a pseudonymised format, removing all individual identifiers. The permission number from Statistics Sweden is 8547689/181453 and from Statistics Finland is TK-52-215-11.

The LNU-UFB data were collected by the Swedish Institute of Social Research at Stockholm University. Ethical approval to collect the data was granted by the Stockholm Regional Ethical Review Board. Research subjects were asked for consent and informed about the aim of the research. The use of the LNU-UFB data for this dissertation was approved by the responsible project manager at Stockholm University. A document stating that the researcher will maintain confidentiality of the respondents, use the data only for scientific research and will not disseminate the data, together with an outline for the planned research, granted approval.

The MMP data is publicly available on the condition that researchers agree to use the data only for research or educational purposes, will not try to identify any individual, household or migrant community and will not give access to the MMP database to other users who do not agree to respect these confidentiality terms (for more details see https://mmp.opr.princeton.edu). Similarly, the SEDA data are publicly available on the condition that researchers agree to protect the privacy of individuals (Reardon et al., 2018, p. 35). The data are aggregated to the district level and cells with fewer than 20 students are omitted. A small amount of random noise is moreover added to each mean to ensure that the raw counts of students in each proficiency cate-
gory cannot be recovered from published estimates (for a more detailed account see Reardon et al. (2018, p. 21)).
Methodology

A variety of quantitative methods are used in the empirical analyses in this dissertation. The research questions are derived from theory and prior empirical research. Empirically testable hypotheses further delimit the analysis. The methods are chosen to assess these hypotheses with the data at hand. The choice of the specific statistical techniques is based on the research question and hypotheses as well as the format, content and availability of the data. Studies 1 and 3 rely on event history analysis as they focus on transition problems (transition into another migration and into the labour market in the respective chapters), while Studies 2 and 4 analyse the impact of increased immigration enforcement by comparing groups that are affected by the rising risk of deportation to groups that are not expected to be affected to the same extent. Although this dissertation focuses on quantitative methods, the chapters incorporate findings from qualitative studies, which inform both the formulation of the research questions and the interpretation of the results.

Event History Analysis

Event history analysis studies events – here, the transition into another move or into a job – and takes the time until experiencing the event into account (Allison, 2014; Blossfeld, Golsch, & Rohwer, 2007; Cleves, Gould, & Marchenko, 2016). The study population comprises individuals who can be defined as “under risk” of experiencing the event studied.

These are important considerations when analysing temporary migration (the focus of Study 1) and short-term integration (the focus of Study 3). First, factors that increase the probability of another migration or entry into a job are of interest. Second, gaining better insight into the timing of the event is important. For instance, it reveals whether migrants move back and forth in short intervals, or stay in a country for longer spells and then return or emigrate again. The timing is also significant when studying labour market integration. A long job search is likely more straining than a short job search. Third, the population under risk needs to be carefully defined. This is especially a concern when studying temporary migration. Only those who have made the previous moves are at risk of making another move. Namely, only individuals who return migrated to Finland are at risk of making a second
emigration to Sweden, i.e., circulating. Event history analysis allows researchers to follow individuals from the time they have made the return move until making the second emigration or no longer being under risk for other reasons, such as death or emigration to a third country. Fourth, changes occurring during the observation period can be incorporated using time-varying covariates. In this way, event history analysis provides a flexible framework to control for observed differences between individuals. When following migrants from arrival in Sweden to entry into their first job, home country-specific factors can then be disentangled from destination-specific risk factors. Transitioning into parenthood in Sweden can impact time to first job and the propensity to return migrate to Finland.

**Difference in Differences**

A considerable literature has studied the effect of a policy change by comparing two groups that are hypothesised to respond differently to the change of interest (Angrist & Pischke, 2015). The group that is impacted by the policy change is classified as the treatment group, whereas the control group comprises individuals who are not targeted by the policy. The impact of the policy is assessed by comparing the treatment and control group.

Individuals who are targeted by a policy often differ from those who are not in a number of respects. For example, undocumented migrants, who are the main target of immigration enforcement in the U.S., tend to be younger and have lower disposable incomes than documented migrants (see descriptive statistics in Study 2). Multivariate analyses relate a response variable to a set of explanatory variables. Controlling for other explanatory variables, the policy impact is estimated net of these factors. Study 2 compares the association between annual deportations and the likelihood and amount remitted and saved among documented and undocumented migrants. Undocumented migrants present the treatment group in the study, as they are directly impacted by the rising risk of deportation. Documented migrants constitute the control group, considering that they are not the primary target of deportations.

However, often we cannot control for all explanatory variables of interest (Wooldridge, 2013). For instance, undocumented migrants may be less risk averse than documented migrants (Williams & Baláž, 2012). Seeing that many undocumented migrants cross the border illegally, we may hypothesise that the most apprehensive do not undertake such a trip and either stay at home, or move with documents if possible. Risk aversion and other unobservable characteristics are seldom recorded in data sets. Consequently, we need to be cautious when interpreting the results of multivariate analyses using observational data, especially in terms of causality.
The difference in differences (DD) method addresses some of these concerns. The idea underlying the empirical strategy is that, in the absence of treatment, the treated group develops in parallel to the control group (Lechner, 2010). In order to be able to interpret difference in differences coefficients as causal effects, we need to assume that the group impacted by the policy implementation would have continued to trend similarly as it did before the implementation. Study 4 analyses the impact of a policy implementation in the U.S. – Secure Communities – that has led to a dramatic increase in deportations. The treatment group comprises districts that have implemented Secure Communities. Control districts are those that have not yet implemented Secure Communities. Seeing that the program was implemented nation-wide, all districts are treated by the end of the observation period.

Assuming that the treatment group would have continued to trend similarly in the absence of treatment, the trend observed in the control group provides a plausible counterfactual. This can be assessed by plotting the treatment and control groups in the pre-treatment period. If the trends of the two groups are parallel prior to treatment, a subsequent change occurring in the treatment but not the control group is then interpreted as a result of the policy change (Angrist & Pischke, 2009, p. 230).

Another strategy is to compare the impact of the policy implementation on another group that is not expected to be impacted by the policy. This can be done using triple difference in differences models. If the program appears to have large effects on this group, it would suggest that inferences are biased by other shocks that impact not only the treatment group but also other groups, or the presence of unobserved variables that are related to the implementation of the policy.
Summary of the Studies

Study 1: Circular migration in a context of free mobility: Evidence from linked population register data from Finland and Sweden

Free mobility among EU member states is a contentious issue in the public debate in many countries. However, due to data constraints, little is known about the mechanisms underlying it. This study analyses linked Finnish and Swedish register data to investigate whether the determinants of circular migration differ from those of the first and return move. The objectives of the study are threefold. First, it assesses whether the timing of circular migration between Finland and Sweden reflects what has been observed in other settings. Second, the study compares whether and how the risk of making circular moves differs from the risk of first emigration and first return migration, respectively. Third, the relationship between migrants' demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and these different types of moves is analysed.

The results show that many moves are temporary and short term. In other words, individuals who move repeatedly are likely to do so in short time intervals. However, the findings also reveal that the threshold to first emigration is notably higher compared with that of later moves (the first and second return migration and second-time emigration). This finding indicates that barriers to the first move remain high even in a setting of free mobility. Thus, in support of previous research, the results suggest that relocating is costly and a decision that takes ample consideration, even when no legal barriers inhibit movement (DaVanzo, 1981; Goldstein, 1964; McCann, Poot, & Sanderson, 2010; Vadean & Piracha, 2009). These findings may also go part of the way in explaining low rates of mobility observed in the years following the introduction of free mobility within the EU (Recchi, 2005).

Moreover, in the Finnish-Swedish context, the patterns of circular migration reflect those of the first emigration and first return, respectively. Swedish speakers are more prone to emigrate for the first and second time, whereas Finnish speakers have a higher risk of return migration. Results also show that unmarried and divorced individuals are more likely to move to the neighbouring country, whereas married individuals have a higher propensity to return migrate. This shows that connections to the home or destination measured by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics play a significant role in migration decisions.
Study 2: Assessing the Effect of Increased Deportations on Mexican Migrants’ Remittances and Savings Brought Home

This study examines the effect of federal deportations in the United States on the transnational ties of Mexican migrants. Using data from the Mexican Migration Project, we show that rising deportations lead to a shift away from saving and toward remitting as the preferred channel for undocumented migrants to transfer U.S. earnings back to Mexico. At the same time, among documented migrants, deportations reduce both the likelihood of bringing savings back home and the amount saved, with no corresponding increase in remittances.

The results underline the importance of studying migrants’ remitting and saving behaviour together. Immigration enforcement is not only related to a stronger tendency to remit and more remittances as suggested by previous studies (Amuedo-Dorantes & Mazzolari, 2010; Amuedo-Dorantes & Putitanaun, 2014; Vaira-Lucero, Nahm, & Tani, 2012), but also to a lower likelihood of bringing savings back to Mexico and lower amounts saved. This effect may be in part due to the fact that keeping savings in the U.S. until return migration is riskier than sending money back directly. It may also be that, in the face of the rising risk of apprehension, returning to bring savings back to Mexico is not an option anymore (Massey et al., 2015).

Changes in the remitting and saving behaviour are smaller among documented migrants than among undocumented migrants. Still, the propensity to save and the amount of savings brought back to Mexico also decrease among documented migrants as deportations rise. This finding indicates that documented migrants may be impacted indirectly by deportations owing to having undocumented family members or friends. Immigration enforcement can moreover lead to wider-reaching discrimination, where documentation status makes no difference. Overall, the results reveal that shocks at the destination lead to changes in the way economic transnational ties are upheld by undocumented migrants and to a decline in savings brought home by documented migrants.

Study 3: Gender and Contacts at Arrival among Refugee and Family Reunion Migrants: Resources and Constraints

The social capital literature underlines the positive relationship between social contacts and job matching. Contacts can provide migrants with important resources in the job search that pertain to information on job openings or putting in a word with the boss (Kanas et al., 2012; Lancee, 2010; Lin, 2001; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). However, evidence from qualitative studies and studies based on single migrant groups or cities shows that there are clear differences in access and returns on social contacts along gender lines (Greenwell, Valdez, & DaVanzo, 1997; Hagan, 1998).
This study investigates gender differences in the association between pre-migration contacts and time to first job in Sweden. Data from the Level of Living Survey of Foreign-born and their Children provide retrospective information on pre-migration contacts – whether migrants have family, friends, both family and friends or no contacts at arrival. Among men, friends appear to promote labour market entry and are associated with about a two-year shorter job search than no contacts. By contrast, women with pre-migration contacts do not appear to have shorter time to first job. Some female migrants with family at the destination actually take longer to enter a job than men without contacts. Instead of focusing on their economic integration, women with family contacts may face expectations to care for others in the family, or have lower ambitions to search for a job (Khoudja & Fleischmann, 2015, 2017; Zontini, 2010). Social contacts in the destination country can thus be a valuable resource for integration but also present a constraining factor. In particular, they play different roles for male and female migrants. These findings indicate that low levels of labour force participation among female migrants in Europe may be impacted by gender differences in the returns on pre-migration contacts (Bevelander & Groeneveld, 2012).

Study 4: Immigration Enforcement and Apprehension: The Impact of Secure Communities on Hispanic Students’ Educational Achievement in the United States

Apprehension and insecurity linked to increased immigration enforcement can have negative consequences for children and young adults’ educational achievement. This study analyses a specific policy implementation, Secure Communities, and investigates its impact on minority groups’ educational achievement. Since the Secure Communities program was rolled out on a county-by-county basis over four years starting in 2008, it has led to substantial increases in deportations in the United States. Increased stress and anxiety linked to the risk of deportation impacts undocumented migrants directly (Cheong & Massey, 2018; Juárez et al., 2019; Wang & Kaushal, 2018). Documented migrants and U.S. citizens are moreover impacted through fear that undocumented family members or friends will be deported (Dreby, 2014; Gonzales, Heredia, & Negron-Gonzales, 2014).

Using Data from Stanford Education Data Archive (SEDA) that provide standardised test scores at the district level for Hispanic, white and black students for the years 2009–2015, this study investigates the effect of Secure Communities on educational achievement in English language arts and math of Hispanic students and their white and black peers. Results reveal a negative effect of Secure Communities on Hispanic students’ district level achievement in English language arts. Results from triple difference in differences models also indicate decreases in Hispanic students’ district level achievement in both English language arts and math, when compared to
white students. These findings show that district level achievement gaps between white and Hispanic students decline at a lower rate than what we would have otherwise observed. The estimates need be interpreted with care, however, as district means are analysed and individual-level processes cannot be inferred from aggregate data.

Nonetheless, they suggest that undocumented migrants and their children may face increased barriers to integration, as surveillance and policing of undocumented migrants has risen. According to an analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data by the Pew Research Center, an estimated 340,000 of the 4.3 million babies born in the United States in 2008 were offspring of undocumented parents (Passel & Taylor, 2010). Questions surrounding these children and young adults’ wellbeing and livelihood are a contentious issue in the United States (Abrejano & Hajnal, 2015).
Discussion

This dissertation studies two contrasting policy settings: the Nordic and Mexico-U.S. settings. Swedish migration policy has been characterised by low entry restrictions. Nordic citizens, in particular, can move freely between the Nordic countries and do not need a residence or work permit. By contrast, surveillance and policing of Mexican migrants both at the border and within the United States has increased dramatically over recent years.

Across these two settings, the dissertation analyses factors related to migration behaviour and the maintenance of transnational ties. In the Nordic setting of free mobility, the decision to migrate is influenced by individuals’ cultural affinity to Finland or Sweden, indicated by mother tongue, and family formation and dissolution. Migration from Mexico is largely driven by job prospects and connections to family and friends who have made a prior move to the U.S. (Massey & Espinosa, 1997; Massey & Zenteno, 1999). Return migration between Finland and Sweden is common. It is especially prevalent among Finnish speakers and married individuals. In the face of rising deportations in the U.S., return and circular migration has, by contrast, decreased among undocumented migrants (Massey et al., 2015). Fear of apprehension instead compels Mexican migrants to stay longer in the U.S. and to change the way in which they sustain transnational ties. While migrants grow more likely to send remittances through wire transfers, savings carried across the border decrease. These findings suggest that migrants maintain connections to the home country both in open and closed border settings, but the way in which transnational ties are upheld differs.

Family, social contacts and policies are also important predictors of short and long-term integration. In Sweden, social contacts at arrival facilitate labour market entry among male migrants from different parts of the world. By contrast, some female migrants’ job search is constrained by family. This is partly linked to the different roles that men and women assume in the family. Social contacts, family and co-ethnic peers can thus be a valuable resource for integration but may also come with additional obligations in caring for kin and family.

Family and peers are likewise important in the U.S. setting. One way in which Mexican migrants experience increased stress or apprehension is linked to fear that a family member or close relative will be deported. In particular, rising surveillance of migrants negatively impacts average educa-
tional achievement among Hispanic students in the U.S. This may be due to greater marginalisation of Hispanics and increased worry that a parent will be deported. These findings reveal that the relationship between integration and social contacts is furthermore shaped by the policies impacting migrants’ communities and experiences in the destination country.

Limitations and Future Research

This dissertation analyses two different policy settings. Even if there are similar settings and contexts in some neighbouring countries, the conclusions may not be generalizable to other contexts. Still, the studies contribute to the accumulated knowledge in the field and provide insight into context-specific, as well as more general, factors that shape migrants’ experiences.

Another concern regarding the generalisability of the findings presented in this dissertation regards the time frame analysed. The studies that focus on the Nordic setting extend to 2010. Still, the period from 2015 and onward came with significant changes in Europe both in terms of migration flows and policies. Going forward, it will be interesting and informative to study how well evidence on the time period before 2015 predicts current migration behaviour and integration in Sweden and Europe more broadly.

When it comes to future research, I begin by discussing two specific ideas that are largely data driven and then open up the discussion to a wider perspective. First, there are laudable reasons for aggregating the U.S. educational data (SEDA) used in this dissertation at the district level and thereby securing anonymity and protecting individuals’ integrity. However, gaining access to individual-level data will be valuable in future research. Such data are available for specific U.S. states (Monarrez, 2016) or for outcomes such as enrolment and dropout rates (Amuedo-Dorantes & Lopez, 2015, 2017). Still, these data sources do not come without limitations. As an example, administrative records at the individual level are only available for some states, but focusing on a specific state narrows the scope of the research considerably. In addition, the American Community Survey provides important information on enrolment and dropout rates, but lacks insight into test scores. Going forward, it will be important to build on a variety of these data sources to gain greater insight into the mechanisms producing the rela-

17 The studies that focus on the U.S. context analyse data through to 2016.
18 Detailed information about the American Community Survey is available online (https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs). This data source moreover provides linkages between children and parents, but has limited information on documentation status. A combination of measures on Hispanic identification, foreign-born and country of birth have been used to approximate parents’ documentation status in prior research (Amuedo-Dorantes & Lopez, 2015, 2017; Torche & Sirois, 2019; Watson, 2014).
tionship between immigration enforcement and educational achievement gaps in the U.S.

Second, linked Finnish and Swedish register data allowed me to capture circular migration in the Nordic setting and to observe migrants on both sides of the border. However, family formation and dissolution had to be proxied in the empirical analyses. In future steps, it will be fruitful to exploit existing Finnish and Swedish register data that provide multi-generational linkages in order to develop a better understanding of the role that spouses and families play in the decision to migrate in a setting of free mobility. Furthermore, this will allow us to expand the research body on outcomes, such as the school to job transition, marriage patterns and residential segregation, among the second and third generation (see also Aradhya, 2018; Heath et al., 2008).

More broadly, it will be important to refocus quantitative migration studies in a number of respects. First, it will be important to incorporate both the home and destination country more prominently in empirical and theoretical research. Migration and integration inherently extend beyond the national context. In this way, focusing solely on one country provides only a partial understanding of these dynamics. Second, selection processes in circular migration will need to be studied more thoroughly. Among other things, this will be important for gaining a deeper understanding of long-term integration, which is strongly impacted by selective out-migration (Abramitzky et al., 2014; Lubotsky, 2007). Third, the intended and unintended consequences of institutions and policies governing migration between the home and destination country should receive more attention in the field and can be important for developing our understanding of the considerable heterogeneity observed in migration and integration experiences across contexts and between migrant groups (see also Drouhot & Nee, 2019). This underscores that we are only at the beginning of this inspiring journey towards a brighter and more knowledgeable future.

19 The MMP provides data on both sides of the border. Another prominent example of data collected to encompass both the home and destination country is the Polish Migration Project (Massey, Kalter, & Pren, 2008).
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