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1. Mapping Diversity In The County Of Stockholm
Roland Engkvist & Sandra Karlsson

1.1. Basic socio-demographic structure of Stockholm
The figures presented here are for the entire Stockholm County, in order to provide a county reference to municipal figures presented in section 1.3 and 1.4.

Population
During the period 1998 to 2012, the population in the County of Stockholm increased on an average annual basis with 1.26 per cent. Both the Swedish born and the foreign born population have increased, with 0.82 per cent and 3.12 per cent respectively on average on an annual basis. The share of foreign born in 2012 was 22.2 per cent.

Table 1: Population and area in June 2013. Source: Stockholm County council (2013) and Statistics Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Land area Km²</th>
<th>Number of municipalities (boroughs in the case of the City of Stockholm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Stockholm</td>
<td>890 000</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm County</td>
<td>2 145 000</td>
<td>6 526</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9 597 000</td>
<td>407 000</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Population development in the Stockholm County 1998 to 2012 - Swedish born and foreign-born.
Age structures - many young adults up to 40, few 55+

The most striking feature of the Stockholm County is that it has relatively large population of young children up to school age, and then again from 25 to 40 (see Figure 2). It is both a question of prevailing demographic structure and flows due to individual life cycle: The dominant inflow to the Stockholm County consists of individuals in their mid-twenties, while the out flow from the county is somewhat more evenly distributed. The Stockholm County has a net out-migration of families with preschool children as well as a net out-migration of people older than 50 years. (Stockholms läns landsting 2011a)

Figure 2: Age structure, share per year cohort, total population, County of Stockholm (blue line) and Sweden (red line) 2012

Table 2 displays the age distribution in 2012 among foreign born in the Stockholm County.

Table 2: Share of foreign born in Stockholm County 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0–9</th>
<th>10–19</th>
<th>20–29</th>
<th>30–39</th>
<th>40–49</th>
<th>50–59</th>
<th>60–69</th>
<th>70–79</th>
<th>80–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share, %</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
<td>6,1%</td>
<td>15,7%</td>
<td>21,7%</td>
<td>18,8%</td>
<td>14,9%</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
<td>3,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the foreign-born, there are age variations depending on region of origin. Table 3 shows that very few non-European immigrants are 64 years of age or older. The table also shows that the groups that are not supplemented by new immigrants are ageing; a disproportionally great share of the Finish and Nordic population are pensioners. (Regionplane- och trafikkontoret 2008)
Gender - overall balance but variations within communities

The variation of gender distribution between Swedish born and immigrants from different regions is rather limited. The distribution between regions however have some variation; there is a male surplus of men from the regions Africa, EU15 and West Asia while women are in majority from the rest of Asia, such as Thailand and the Nordic countries (table 4).

Table 4: Gender distribution in Stockholm County according to region of birth, year 2006. Source: Regionplane- och trafikkontoret 2008:17-18

1.2. The socio-economic structure of Stockholm

The socio economic figures that we present in this section cover country of birth, educational levels, income levels (in terms of earnings), and employment rates. Data are presented for municipalities and boroughs in the City of Stockholm.
**Fixed Indicator: Ethnicity by Country of birth**

Ethnicity is not possible to report in Sweden since there are no registers based on ethnicity. Therefore, we present register based demographic statistics on *country of birth*. Foreign born residents live in all parts of the County of Stockholm, with a concentration to certain boroughs in the City of Stockholm, and the municipalities of Botkyrka, Södertälje, Huddinge, and Haninge in the southern part of the county, and Solna and Järfälla in the north western part of the county. See map 1 (left hand map).

The share of foreign born population varies from 10.1 per cent in Norrtälje to 38.9 per cent in Botkyrka. The municipalities with the highest share of foreign born residents are (share within brackets): Botkyrka (38.9), Södertälje (33.9), Sundbyberg (26.9), Huddinge (26.6), Solna (26.2), Sigtuna (26.1). Within the City of Stockholm, the concentration of foreign born residents are found in: Rinkeby-Kista (56.6), Skärholmen (48.6), Spånga-Tensta (39.6), and Hässelby-Vällingby (27.5). See map 3 (right hand map).

**Map 1: Total number (left) and percentage share of foreign born (right) - municipalities, boroughs of City of Stockholm 2012. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)**

---

**Diversity in the County of Stockholm**

There are residents originating from more than 185 countries residing in the County of Stockholm. Calculated as the Herfindahl ethnic diversity index - a value between 0 and 1, where a figure close to 1 reveals a concentration of few large populations, and a figure close to 0 reveals less predominance to a limited number of populations - the figure is 0.61 for
2012. For historic reasons, the Finish community is the largest in the County of Stockholm (figure 3). Other communities are increasing rapidly, such as the Iraqi, Polish, and recently Syrian (figure 4).

Figure 3: Largest foreign born groups per country of birth in the Stockholm County 2012. Source Stockholm County Council (OGERP)

Figure 4: Largest foreign born groups per country of birth in the Stockholm County 1998-2012. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)
**Fixed Indicator: Education - tertiary level increasing, centre periphery pattern**

The international classification ISCED-97 distinguishes seven levels of education:

- pre-primary education (level 0);
- primary education (level 1);
- lower secondary education (level 2);
- upper secondary education (level 3);
- post-secondary non-tertiary education (level 4);
- tertiary education (first stage) (level 5), and;
- tertiary education (second stage) (level 6)

Over time, the share of development the county (see figure 5) reveal small changes for all levels of education except for tertiary education (level 6), which has increased from 18.4 per cent to 25.2 per cent, and for lower secondary education (level 2) which has decreased from 23.2 per cent in 1998 to 17.3 per cent. The latter category is likely to keep falling due to a reform prolonging virtually all secondary education to three years in 1994.

**Figure 5: Educational levels total population age 16 to 74 years County of Stockholm, 2000-2012, ISCED 97. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)**

While the overall trend towards increasing levels of education prevails in all parts of the county, there are significant intra-regional variations: the highest shares of tertiary education are to be found in the regional core.
Among the municipalities it varies from 45 per cent in Danderyd to 12 per cent in Norrtälje and Nynäshamn respectively. The top scores are registered for (percentage share within brackets): Danderyd (45), Lidingö (36.5), Solna (34.6), and Täby (33.3). Within the City of Stockholm, the highest shares are found in the four inner city boroughs: Östermalm (46.1), Norrmalm (45.8), Kungsholmen (45.3), and Södermalm (39.8). See map 2 (left).

Municipalities and boroughs with high shares of tertiary education levels, also tend to have among the lowest shares of population with low level education. See map 2 (right).

**Map 2: Percentage share of total population 16-74 years - municipalities and boroughs in the City of Stockholm 2012. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CED levels 5 and 6</th>
<th>CED levels 0 and 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education 3 years and above</td>
<td>Primary and pre-primary education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Specific Indicator: Income - closely related to education levels

Earnings appear to be closely related to educational levels. The municipalities with the highest levels of average annual income 2011 are: Danderyd, Täby, Lidingö, Nacka, and Vaxholm. In the City of Stockholm, the inner city boroughs also have the highest average incomes: Norrmalm, Östermalm, Kungsholmen, Bromma, and Södermalm. See map 3 and figure 6.
These figures account for income from employment or self-employment, thus excluding income from capital.

Map 3: Average annual income in SEK per individual, 2011 - municipalities and boroughs in the City of Stockholm. Source: Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)

Figure 6: Yearly average income per individual in SEK, municipality or borough, 2011. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)
Employment, social benefit patterns, and health - an ethnic bias

The employment rate is fairly high for Sweden in a European setting; according to Eurostat, the Stockholm County had the highest economic activity rates of all regions in 2012 in the range 25-64 years old.

Once again, the patterns from previous indicators emerge, with one significant difference: the highest shares are found in municipalities characterised as outbound commuter intensive municipalities, thus located outside the regional core (map 4). The municipalities with the highest rates are (percentage share within brackets): Vallentuna (67.2), Nykvarn (67), Värmdö (66.6), Ekerö (65.9), and Österåker (64.9). In the City of Stockholm, the boroughs with the highest employment rates are: Kungsholmen (70.9), Norrmalm (69.1), Hägersten-Liljeholmen (68.9), Södermalm (67.5), and Bromma (66.2).

Map 4: Employment rate, share (%) of total population 16 to 74 years old, 2011 - municipalities and boroughs in the City of Stockholm. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)

The employment rate for residents born outside of the Nordic countries, in comparison with all residents in the same area, is lower in all municipalities and in all boroughs in the City of Stockholm except for Skärholmen (figure 7). The employment rate gap varies from 1.2 per cent in Skärholmen to -13.4 per cent in Östermalm.
Already in 2006, the OECD Territorial Review concluded that the combination of low employment rates among foreign born in combination with a lack of skilled labour force due to ageing may inhibit future economic growth. In 2006, Sweden was one of the OECD countries with the highest share of unemployment among immigrants in relation to their share of the total labour force (figure 8).
The pattern with lower economy and employment rates for foreign born versus Swedish born appear to be further exacerbated when decomposing the foreign born into sub categories; it is obvious that foreign-born of extra-European descent face substantially larger hindrances to establish themselves in the labour market. Figure 9 illustrates the employment status according to region of origin, 1992-2006.

The indicators are economically inactive (red), alternative income (white), newly arrived immigrants (blue), extended sick-leave (yellow), students (purple), Instable labour force (light green), and core labour force (dark green). The countries and regions are Sweden (Sverige), Western Europe and other Nordic countries (Västeuropa och övriga Norden), North Eastern Europe (Nordöstra Europa), South Eastern Europe (Nordöstra Europa), Middle East and North Africa (mellanöstern och Nordafrika, and Other countries (Andra länder). (Socialstyrelsen 2010:67)
Foreign-born do not only as a group have lower disposable incomes, they are also overrepresented as social benefit receivers (figure 10). Immigrants are also overrepresented receivers of early retirement and long-term sick leave. (OECD Territorial Reviews: Stockholm, Sverige 2006:74-76)

Figures for 2012 reveal, though, that the share of Swedish born social benefit receivers of all receivers has increased to 39.9 per cent in the Stockholm County (43.3 per cent for Men). Still, the gap between foreign-born and Swedish born remain huge.
Health is also related to employment patterns. The proportion of unemployed among foreign born in 2010 was 5.6 percent, 4.2 percent among single mothers, in comparison to 3.3 percent for the average population aged 18-64. Foreign-born are the top receivers of sick- or activity benefits (6.5 percent), followed by single mothers (4.5 percent) and then the general public (3.7 percent). (Stockholms läns landsting 2011b)

1.3. **Structure of the housing market in Stockholm**

There are approximately 976,000 housing units in the Stockholm County. The different type of housing: private ownership (almost exclusively single unit houses), condominium (mostly in multifamily houses or terrace houses), and rental housing units in multifamily houses. The rental units are either provided by private landlords or by public housing limited companies. In 1990, most housing units were rental. In 2010, it is the condominium that predominates (figure 11). Sweden does not manage social housing, instead there are housing allowances that serve to redistribute income to families with children and families with low incomes (OECD 2006).
The major force behind this development is conversion of rental housing units into condominiums. This has happened in all municipalities. However, the bulk, 70 per cent of all conversions, has occurred in the City of Stockholm. During the period from 1992 to 2012, the construction of new housing units has further exacerbated the trend towards ownership: 46 per cent condominiums, 31 per cent rentals, and 22 per cent private ownership. (Länsstyrelsen 2013)

The housing situation is a hot social issue, due to rising real estate prices and lack of affordable housing for low income groups. Another issue is that construction of new housing units has not been sufficient considering the population development (figure 12).

![Figure 12: Number of new housing units (grey bars) and population development (blue line)](image)

On a lower geographical level, neighbourhoods tend to be predominantly characterised by a specific tenure and/or physical type. With the use of property data, the Regionplane- och trafikkontoret (2008) has developed a series of maps displaying the tenure and physical characteristics in the Stockholm County. The classification is coherent to the ‘neighbourhoods’ (Swe: basområden). The dominating tenure and physical structure is used as a classifier (map 5).

Over 75 percent live in the categorized housing types of Private rental (red), Public rental (yellow), Condominium (orange) and Private ownership housing (dark purple). Between 50 to 70 percent of the total population in the type-areas Mixed private ownership (light purple) live in such conditions. With the available data it is more difficult to identify tenure in the Mixed multifamily housing (pink) although the physical structure is dominated by such housing structures. (Regionplane- och trafikkontoret 2008)
In Sweden, the tenure structure is connected to segregation, given that foreign born residents are overrepresented in municipal rental housing, and the Swedish born residents are overrepresented in private ownership home (single housing units) and condominiums. (Regionplane- och trafikkontoret 2008)

Figure 13 illustrates the distribution of foreign background (blue), Swedish background (red) and total (green) residents in the City of Stockholm that in 2002 lived in (in this order) Privately owned housing, Condominiums, Public rental, Private rental, rental from a private individual, and Others. It is obvious that Public rental is the prime alternative among foreign-born, while a higher share of residents with Swedish background reside in condominiums.
Figure 13: Residential segregation in Stockholm City year 2002, divided between Swedish and Foreign background. Source: Regionalplane- och Trafikkontoret 2007

Figure 14 illustrates the residential segregation according to region of origin. The list of types of housing is the same as above, starting with privately owned housing, Condominiums, Public rental, Private rental, rental from a private individual, and last Others. The countries and regions of origin considered are Sweden (light blue), rest of Western Europe (red), Eastern Europe (yellow), North Africa and Western Asia (green), rest of Africa (dark blue), rest of Asia (orange) and Latin America (pink). Figure 14 reveals a similar preference for residents with Sweden and rest of Western Europe origin. While residents of North African, African, Latin American, and Asian origin primarily live in public rental housing.

Figure 14: Residential segregation in the City of Stockholm 2002. Source: Regionplane- och Trafikkontoret 2007

Figure 5. Segmentering i Stockholms stad år 2002, efter bakgrundsregion.
1.4. Socio-spatial patterns and segregation in Stockholm

Segregation and socio-economic patterns emerge more starkly at the neighbourhood levels than at the municipal or borough levels. In order to approach the answer to this section’s main question, it is thus necessary to account for additional data on sub-municipal level. This is also necessary for selecting neighbourhoods. At the end of this section, we present feasible neighbourhoods for further in-depth analysis within the ISEC project within the Stockholm metropolitan region.

The spatial ethnic (country of origin) structure of neighbourhoods in the County of Stockholm

The ethnic segregation has definitely increased since 1990, not only in Stockholm but in the other two metropolitan areas of Sweden, Göteborg and Malmö. (Socialstyrelsen 2010). Map 6 shows the geographical distribution of the most immigrant dense neighbourhoods, including areas that have a high share and/or a fast expansion of non-Nordic residents in Stockholm County in 2005 (Andersson 2013:171). The darker the patch, the more immigrant dense or immigrant expanding the neighbourhood is. This map partly explains previous sections’ data on municipal levels: foreign-born residents’ tendency to settle down in the north western and the south western parts.

Map 6: Location of immigrant dense neighbourhoods; with high share and/or fast expansion of non-Nordic residents; in Stockholm County in 2005: Source Andersson 2013:171
A similar map (map 7) illustrates the over/underrepresentation representation of Swedish-born among in-movers to ‘neighbourhoods’ (with at least 50 in-movers) in 2002-2006, reveal an almost opposite pattern; the darkest blue indicates the highest underrepresentation of Swedish born in-movers while the darkest red areas are the neighbourhoods with the highest shares of overrepresented Swedish-born in-movers.

Hence, the most foreign born dominated neighbourhoods tend to be the neighbourhoods where the rate of foreign born rises fastest, while Swedish born in-movers tend to prefer other neighbourhoods. In terms of country of origin, there appear to be diverging tendencies in the Stockholm County, and these tendencies are most obvious at the neighbourhood level.

The spatial socio-economic structure of neighbourhoods in the County of Stockholm

Socio-economic factors, and especially the development of the labour market are the main driving forces behind the diverging ethnical segregation tendencies.

One indication is the durable situation in which poor visible foreign-born groups have replaced native born Swedes and to some extent poor non-visible foreign born in the resource deprived urban neighbourhoods. The imbalances are most notable in the suburbs, especially some neighbourhoods that economically are the most disadvantaged and most dominated by visible immigrant groups. Socialstyrelsen (2010) shows that about 40 percent of the adult population in these neighbourhoods are relatively poor and between 70 to 80 percent of people in working age are not self-sufficient. There are no high-income earner residents. On the other spectrum of the segregation, Sweden has neighbourhoods in which the conditions are reversed; areas in which only a few percent are poor, over 70 percent established in the labour market, and the proportion of foreign born is less than half of the region’s average.
The final map (map 8) and the table below (table 5) illustrate the interrelationship between high concentration of foreign born (% utlf), employment (% syss) and education (% högutb). They show that the neighbourhoods with the highest proportion of foreign born are categorized as ‘Disadvantaged areas’ (Utsatta områden, red colour), with 64 percent of the total population being foreign born. It is a rather big gap to the next neighbourhood type, the ‘Relatively Swedish-sparse middle-income neighbourhoods’ (Relativt svenskglesa medelinkomstrområden, pink colour) which has only 31.2 percent foreign born. Just as was described above, these illustrations show even clearer that there is a correlation between immigrant dense neighbourhoods, lower educational attainment (24.1 percent) and lower employment rates (57.6 percent).

Table 5: The social variable classification outcome across area types. Source: Regionalplane- och trafikkontoret 2008:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social basområdetsläge</th>
<th>Antal inv 2008</th>
<th>% kvintil1</th>
<th>% kvintil5</th>
<th>% högutb</th>
<th>% utlf</th>
<th>% syss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Välbesättade svenska områden</td>
<td>676610</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Svensktaliga områden med låg utl och medelinkom</td>
<td>621575</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relativt svenskglesa medelinkomstrområden</td>
<td>352783</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utsatta områden</td>
<td>162251</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Områden med låg sysselsättning men många högutbildade</td>
<td>102216</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Områden med få invånare</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa (områdesmedelvärden)</td>
<td>1918071</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of neighbourhoods: feasible neighbourhoods for the ICEC project

The analysis in this section clearly shows that socio-economic factors can at large explain the segregation tendencies in the Stockholm County. This segregation appear to have an ethnical (in terms of country of origin) bias; residents of Swedish and European descent (Caucasians) on the one hand and other residents (visible minorities) on the other. The latter category has lower employment rates, lower incomes, and is predominating in public housing rental areas. The socio-economic segregation thus tends to exacerbate the neighbourhood characteristics from an ethnical perspective. This says however nothing about inter-ethnic coexistence; diverse and ethnically mixed areas are per se not necessarily more or less integrated in terms of interethnic coexistence links. Nevertheless, feasible neighbourhoods ought to be selected from any of the pink and red areas in map 8.

Hence, at this point it is safe to assume that the neighbourhoods for our case studies lay within the municipalities of:

- Stockholm City: the Järva area, choosing from the neighbourhoods Rinkeby, Tensta, Husby, Akalla and Kista, Skärholmen, Rågsved (Enskede-Årsta-Vantör)
- Botkyrka: the northern part, choosing from the neighbourhoods Alby, Fittja, and Hallunda
2. Immigration and Super-Diversity in Stockholm
Mats Johansson & Ulla Moberg

2.1. Migration to Stockholm - historical overview and main components

2.1.1. The national immigration framework

Since the 1980s immigration to Sweden has been dominated by refugee immigration and tied-immigrants (see e.g. Lundh and Ohlsson, 1999, Andersson 2006b, SCB 2006). The period between 1970 and 1985 can be seen as a transitional phase from labour immigration to refugee and family immigration.

While many labour market immigrants of earlier years settled down in industrial towns or communities as a result of the demand of blue-collar workers, the refugees after the 1970s and 1980s became more concentrated to the metropolitan areas - the Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö regions. This can be illustrated by the fact that eight of the ten municipalities with the highest share of foreign born persons in 1970 were typical industrial towns outside the metropolitan areas. In 2005 seven of the ten municipalities with the highest share of foreign-born persons were municipalities in the Stockholm and Malmö regions (SCB 2004). It is very rare that the new immigrants leave metropolitan areas for other parts of Sweden (Andersson 2006b).

This ‘new’ settlement pattern resulted also in changes in the policy concerning immigration and integration. As a result, the new “countrywide strategy for refugee reception” was launched in 1985 and shifting the responsibility of the new immigrants from a government authority to the municipalities. In an attempt to hamper the concentration in the metropolitan areas, the new strategy further stated that a refugee no longer could settle down where he/she wanted to live. From 1985 to 1994, in line with this countrywide strategy, the majority of the immigrants were more than before dispersed across Sweden (SCB 2006).

This strategy had, however, only partial effects and the immigrants continued to be concentrated in metropolitan areas. The countrywide strategy was also partially abandoned in 1994 as an evaluation showed that, although the policy was successful in spreading people initially over the country, secondary migration tended to concentrate people again over the years. Since 1994, refugees are allowed to arrange for their own living and housing and 2005 only 30 percent of new immigrants were involved in the original countrywide placement strategy (SCB 2006).

Of all foreign-born persons 54 per cent lived in the three metropolitan counties in 1994, compared to 37 per cent of the total population (Ekberg and Andersson 1995). This percentage had increased up to the middle of the 00s in relation to the concentration of the population. While 64 per cent of all foreign born persons lived in the metropolitan counties, only 51 per cent of the total population lived in the same areas. These figures tell, however, nothing about the relation between labour and refugee immigration, neither of the effects of the effects of policy changes.
2.1.2. The urban immigration context

Johansson & Rauhut (2007, 2008) find some evidence for different settlement patterns between refugees and labour immigrants in their studies. Refugees are today more spread over the country than labour immigrants as a consequence of the localization of the refugee centres. This tells, however, nothing about the intra-regional distribution of refugees after their residence permit in Sweden and the concentration process to the big cities. The structural transformation has resulted in that low-productive and unqualified manufacturing jobs that labour immigrants usually pick up have almost disappeared. One effect is that the overrepresentation of the traditional industrial counties has turned over to underrepresentation. Large cities and the knowledge-based service sector have instead been more and more central for economic growth, whereas the substitution possibilities of differing kinds of labour has deceased with the exception of standardised industrial production and in the lower segment of the service sector. The result of the structural transformation is that both labour immigrants and refugees are, increasingly, headed for the large cities and metropolitan areas with a large amount of service jobs in the lower labour market segments that is especially ‘attractive’ for the new immigrants.

Migration of foreign born to Stockholm can be divided in two categories depending of their origin. One group consists of immigrants directly from abroad and another consists of people coming from other parts in Sweden. The relation between them is a consequence of rules and laws on the one hand and of social and personal networks, including job permits, on the other. It is a qualified guess that the impact from those factors vary according to labour market conditions and external factors such as wars, catastrophes, famines, etc.

Internal migration of foreign-born persons to Stockholm County is a function of the number of new immigrants and where they first end up when they arrive in Sweden, if they are asylum seekers, as well as of the stock of foreign-born people residing in the country and of their orientation towards Stockholm County. But as the Figure 16 below shows there was a considerable increase in their direction towards Stockholm during the deep economic depression in the 1990’s and especially in 1994.
During part of the 1990’s austerity measures of the economy were performed and the number of available jobs decreased significantly in the whole of Sweden, but the labour market was slightly better in Stockholm County than it was in the rest of Sweden so migration to Stockholm County of both Swedes and foreign born increased a lot. After the high increase in foreign migration of asylum seekers to Sweden from the end of 2005, there’s also been an
increase in secondary internal migration towards Stockholm, as well as an increasing internal outmigration, leaving the net at a fairly constant level of 2000 per year since 1989 (fig. 16).

2.2. **Immigration and diversity in Stockholm**

In Table 6 the immigration/emigration and in-/out-migration to/from the Stockholm County for 2009 is presented with regard to their origin. Almost half (45%) of the in-migrants were coming from abroad. But as can be seen the huge majority of the migrants consists of Swedes. The external immigration of Swedes consists to a large degree of return migrants with a Swedish nationality.

As can be seen in table 6 the majority of the foreign-born in-movers to Stockholm County arrive directly from abroad. This has been changed during the past decades as a consequence of, among other things, the new immigration and settlement rules. When the ‘Whole Country Strategy’ was most successful – during the first half of the 1990s - the ‘secondary or onwards migration’ increased. This was also a reason to the decision that the strategy was revised and more or less withdrawn 1994.

By comparing the internal in- and out-migration figures of foreign-born people the pull-factor of the Stockholm County is obvious. The ‘onward in-migration’ is much higher than the ‘onward out-migration’ and this gap seems to have been accentuated since the beginning of the 00s.

**Table 6: Migrants to and from the Stockholm County with regard to origin 2009. Source: Stockholm County Council (OGERP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Immigrants, External</th>
<th>In-migrants, Internal</th>
<th>Emigrants, External</th>
<th>Out-migrants, Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4059</td>
<td>28467</td>
<td>4440</td>
<td>24961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic countries</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27 except Nordic countries</td>
<td>7230</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe except EU27 and Nordic countries</td>
<td>2305</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3676</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>8641</td>
<td>3348</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30095</td>
<td>36268</td>
<td>11201</td>
<td>30615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the immigrants refugees from Asia have increased a lot since 2005; most of them come from Iraq and the macro regions Africa and China. During 2007 more than 4000 immigrants came from Iraq. The huge upswing in Swedish immigration today is in much a result of the wars and upheavals in the Middle East (especially Syria).
### Table 7: Share (%) of foreign-born inhabitants in Stockholm County in relation to all in Sweden. Country names in Swedish. Source: Stockholm County Council (TEGRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>Year 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>% in AB</td>
<td>Total in SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marocko</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>4 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>4 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grekland</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>10 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkiet</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>31 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiopien</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>11 917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>26 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankrike</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>5 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrien</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>14 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanien</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>5 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estland</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>10 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rysland</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>6 528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovjetunionen</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>7 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kina</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>8 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italien</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>6 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storbritannien</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>14 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>13 097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>15 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>7 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irak</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>49 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>195 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>51 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydkorea</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österrike</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>6 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polen</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>40 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niederländerna</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>4 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungern</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyskland</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>38 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinena</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>5 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indien</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>11 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjeckoslovakien</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>7 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libanon</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>20 077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumanien</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11 778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norge</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>42 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugoslavien</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>72 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danmark</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>38 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroatien</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnien-Herc</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>51 530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows the concentration of various immigrant groups during the years 2000, 2005 and 2012. The largest group is the immigrants from Finland even if the number has diminished during the 00s. When interpreting the table it must be kept in mind that the foreign-born inhabitants from different countries are stock variables and it takes some time to change the ranking - instead there are some rigidity both in the numbers and concentration shares. This implies that short-term shocks might have huge impact on the immigration data but still minor or negligible on the stock data.

The impact of tradition seems also be strong in the settlement pattern. It is almost the same countries that are in the top ten during the whole 00s and the first ranked is Morocco all the years. The special thing with Morocco is the small numbers of inhabitants that might do it vulnerable to external changes but even if its share has decreased it seems that the small Moroccan colony in Stockholm County is relatively stable. Another interesting observations are the Swedish neighbours Denmark and Norway that both are placed in the bottom ten all years. The reason for this the settlement patterns close to their home countries. Danes in Skåne and Norwegians in Västra Götaland and Värmland. These two categories are like the Finns and Swedes in general of minor interest concerning the objectives of this study.

The immigration to Stockholm County is not equally distributed neither with regard to stock nor immigration. This is of course partly a function of the municipalities’ different sizes but also as an effect of tradition, social and personal networks and supply of rental flats. The foreign-born inhabitants are overrepresented in municipalities and town districts with a high rate of rental flats often built during the Million Home Programme in the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s.

Table 8 shows the importance of immigration for various municipalities in the Stockholm County. It must be kept in mind that the settlement variations with regard to ethnic groups are larger in a city like Stockholm with a lot of various town districts compared to more homogenous small municipalities such as Vaxholm, Norrtälje, Nykvarn or Ekerö with low shares of immigrants and foreign-born people.
Table 8: Percentage of foreign born inhabitants in the Stockholm County and its municipalities 2012. Source: Stockholm County Council (ÖGERP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botkyrka</td>
<td>86 274</td>
<td>33 525</td>
<td>38,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danderyd</td>
<td>31 960</td>
<td>4 580</td>
<td>14,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekerö</td>
<td>26 160</td>
<td>2 692</td>
<td>10,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haninge</td>
<td>79 430</td>
<td>18 169</td>
<td>22,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huddinge</td>
<td>101 010</td>
<td>26 889</td>
<td>26,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Järfälla</td>
<td>68 210</td>
<td>16 725</td>
<td>24,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidingö</td>
<td>44 434</td>
<td>6 782</td>
<td>15,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacka</td>
<td>92 873</td>
<td>16 630</td>
<td>17,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrtälje</td>
<td>56 634</td>
<td>5 722</td>
<td>10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykvarn</td>
<td>9 442</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>10,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nynäshamn</td>
<td>26 572</td>
<td>3 761</td>
<td>14,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>15 881</td>
<td>2 484</td>
<td>15,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigtuna</td>
<td>42 272</td>
<td>11 026</td>
<td>26,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sollentuna</td>
<td>66 859</td>
<td>13 890</td>
<td>20,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solna</td>
<td>71 293</td>
<td>18 646</td>
<td>26,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>881 235</td>
<td>201 827</td>
<td>22,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundbyberg</td>
<td>40 793</td>
<td>10 961</td>
<td>26,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södertälje</td>
<td>89 473</td>
<td>30 300</td>
<td>33,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyresö</td>
<td>43 764</td>
<td>6 409</td>
<td>14,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Täby</td>
<td>65 364</td>
<td>9 818</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upplands Väsby</td>
<td>40 723</td>
<td>10 086</td>
<td>24,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upplands-Bro</td>
<td>24 353</td>
<td>5 340</td>
<td>21,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallentuna</td>
<td>31 215</td>
<td>3 804</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
<td>11 126</td>
<td>1 133</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Värmdö</td>
<td>39 387</td>
<td>4 434</td>
<td>11,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österåker</td>
<td>40 269</td>
<td>5 272</td>
<td>13,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockholms län</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 127 006</strong></td>
<td><strong>471 926</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Diversity as a Principle of Municipal Integration Policy and Measures
Sandra Karlsson & Daniel Rauhut

The purpose of this chapter is to examine to what extent diversity and integration has been principles in the Swedish integration policy and measures at national, municipal and urban neighbourhoods. It analyses what can be said to be three strains of policy areas that in different ways touch upon the issues of migration, migrants and integration/diversity. The first is the policy area of migration, which primarily deals with refugee and immigration laws and regulations, deciding under what terms a prospect immigrant will have the right to stay; the second is the area of integration which concerns how immigrants are introduced and received into the Swedish society. The third policy area is place-based and rather than dealing with the reception and ‘welcoming’ of the newly arrived immigrants it concerns one problematic consequence of the failure of the above - namely urban residential segregation and neighbourhood distress.

Chapter 3.1 discusses the situation of the national (im)migration policy and current debate concerning Sweden’s reception policy. Chapter 3.2 explores the development of national integration and place-based policies that in many ways have been and are still intertwined. Chapter 3.3 looks into integration and diversity policies and approaches on the municipal level, starting with a conceptual discussion on relevant concepts. Chapter 3.4 explores the implementation of diversity/integration policy on the local level including a discussion on challenges and tensions in their implementation. In chapter 3.5 we examine some specific measures that have been taken in Sweden, initiated by national, municipal and European stakeholders respectively.

However, before we endeavour on this quest it is important that we first attain a basic understanding of the governance situation in Sweden. Sweden is a decentralized country in which the central government only has ministerial (policy-making) functions. Except from a few administrative functions performed by self-standing (semi-autonomous, central) state agencies most public tasks are performed by “the two-tier elected local government structure in which the Counties are responsible for public health services, including education, social services and public utilities” (Wollman 2004:647, author’s translation) The autonomy of counties and municipalities rests on their power to levy their own taxes that since 1991 is composed by local tax on earned income and pension income. In 2004 taxes represented 55 per cent of total income for municipalities and 81 per cent for the counties. (Wollman 2004)

Swedish local government has a multi-function profile and as much as 60 per cent of the country’s total amount of public sector workforce is employed on the municipal level, another 25 per cent on county level and only 17 per cent are employed directly by central state agencies (Wollman 2004). The Swedish municipalities have a far reaching independence, which, to some extent, is unique; the municipalities and their competence constitute the backbone of ‘the Swedish model’ (Birgersson & Westerståhl 1990).

One central aspect of national policy that has had indirect effects on the policy making framework for diversity and integration on municipal level is the non-socialist government’s 1991-1994 introduction of New Public Management principles (NPM) into the public administration (Bäck et al. 2012). Through the NPM perspective the institutional character of
the public administration became more market oriented and goal attainment focused (Tedros 2008). National policies were designed with more overarching goals and with less detail steering. As such, the questions concerning the implementation (as in what? how? where? who? etc.) were delegated to the individual departments and administrations, both on national and municipal level. Hence, the national integration policies constitute restrictions under which the municipal has to act; but it is in the municipalities where the integration policies are formed in reality (Bäck & Soininen 1998).

Although the municipalities are relatively powerful and autonomous they are also restricted by their scale; having limited influence upon national policies on for example employment, education, social affairs and justice that impact the life situations in the municipality (Rauhut 2008).

In Stockholm, and the two other metropolitan areas Gothenburg and Malmö, the municipal administration is further delineated by the inclusion of City Boroughs. The boroughs are primarily in control of social services, health care, child and elderly care, and primary, secondary and adult education, while the more technical issues are dealt with by central departments.

Stockholm also has a greater regional administration, the Stockholm County Council that was created in the 1970’s. The County took responsibility mainly for issues of regional planning and local and regional transport within the Greater Stockholm region, including 25 municipalities (including the City of Stockholm). (Wollmann et al 2005)

3.1. National (im)migration policy of the last two decades: a content outline and implications for diversity and integration (last 20 years)

The primary role of the national migration policy is to regulate immigration and reception of refugees. The goal of the national migration policy today is to protect the right to asylum and within the frame for the regulated immigration facilitate cross-border mobility, demand-driven labour force immigration, to collect and analyse the developmental effects of migration and deepen European and international collaborations (Faktablad 2013). The migration policy area could be said to be divided into Labour Market immigration and Asylum and Refugee immigration.

It was only in the middle of the 1960’s that immigrants were considered as a special target group by the Swedish government; their presence in the country were starting to adhere to a more stable character, with greater numbers and attention from the union movement to put a halt to free labour immigration (Borevi 2004). The first regulation of immigration to Sweden was set in 1968 (Proposition 1968:142:97), with a remark that immigrants were to uphold the same standards and inclusion in the welfare state as the rest of the population (Borevi 2004). The regulation stated that immigrants before arriving to the country should have their residence permit prior to arrival. Permits were only to be issued in the case that external labour force was required which reduced the labour immigration significantly (NE 2013). Immigrants were also accepted on the grounds of family reunification and refugees. Since then, an uncontroversial description of the Swedish immigration policy is to say that it has primarily been determined by the need for labour, but also by solidarity when international conflicts and tragedies have occurred (Demker & Malmström 1999, Lundh 2005).
The national operative Swedish Migration Board has the greatest responsibility for Migration Politics (Budget 2014: 9919 million SEK), shared with the Swedish National Court Administration (tribunal costs) and the Kammarkollegiet (framework agreement) (Ekonomistyrsningsverket 2013). The Swedish Migration Board is the budgetary coordinator of the compensation that is allocated to the municipalities for the reception of refugees\(^1\), as well as compensation for the residential costs that come with such reception, available (for application) EU funding for Asylum Seekers and Refugees and allocated budget (for application) for ‘migration measures’. The compensation fee for the reception of each refugee is standardized. However, the reception, the number and types of refugees (e.g. unaccompanied children), is negotiated with each individual municipality, a task that is performed by the regional County Administrative Board. The municipalities are constrained by the national politics in the matters of compensation and their responsibility to provide refugees with adequate shelter. In the meanwhile they also have a lot of freedom to negotiate the terms of reception, a freedom that has led to a skewed regional concentration of refugees to certain municipalities.

With the current conflict in Syria and immigrants arriving also from elsewhere the pressure on available municipal reception is increasing. It is especially hard to allocate the increasing numbers of unaccompanied children. The government has therefore issued the Swedish Migration Board to constrain the freedom of municipalities, obliging the about 50 municipalities that currently do not receive any unaccompanied children to provide shelter for about ten under 2014 (DN 2013).

**Key legislation**

The first Law on Swedish Citizenship is from 1950 (1950:382), directing the requirements for upholding the residence, work permits and asylum regulations. The Swedish Immigration law concerns issues on permits of residence, deportation, refusal of entry and citizenship. Many of its regulations are developed in consideration of regulations set by the European Union (Utlänningslag 2005) and international treaties.

The new Immigration law in 2006 was based on the “intention of securing a rule of law system that both the asylum seeker and the general public could confide in” (Stern 2008:128). However, the law that was thought of as ‘the greatest reform to immigrant law’ only became seen as a revised, clarified and extended version of the previous law from 1989. The greatest changes to the law were made in the organization of instance and process order, instating a new Court of Migration that took over some of the responsibilities from the Swedish Migration Board. According to a report by the Red Cross (Stern 2008) the biggest political extension was the inclusion of considering residence permits for those ‘in need of protection’, such as people in risk of prosecution on the grounds of gender or sexual orientation. The law also emphasized a lower identification burden for children.

---

\(^1\) It was by the “Whole Sweden Strategy” launched in the mid 1980’s that municipalities became responsible for the reception of refugees. With this change the state instated a compensation system to municipalities for the reception. (Förordning 1984:683; prop. 1985/86:98)
3.2. National policies and their implications for the municipal diversity and integration policy making framework

Integration policy

Current Swedish integration policies are transsectorial since its objectives and goals transect various policy areas. This implicates that several Government ministries and agencies are involved in execution of initiatives, monitoring and evaluation efforts.

The first regulation of migration also touched upon the notion of integration - how immigrants were to be introduced and accepted into the Swedish society. The regulation (prop. 1968:142, bet. 1968:StatsU196, rskr. 1968:405) held a universalistic integration perspective, safeguarding the individual’s right to uphold the same standards and inclusion in the welfare state as the rest of the population (Borevi 2004); in many ways that meant, as it still does today, labour market establishment. The Swedish Immigration Board (1969-2000) was launched to manage the issues, as well as the issues concerned with migration and asylum. Already in 1968 the integration policy was divided between general welfare measures (individual universalistic) and immigrant policy mainly concerned with introduction to Swedish society and learning Swedish.

In 1968 no support was supposed to be given according to values of cultural diversity however there were some pre-regulation programs that remained intact even after the regulation had set in. These programs were ad hoc and fulfilled both individual universalistic (employment for all individuals) and cultural group diversity (native language education and support to different religions) perspectives (Dahlström 2004). Independent of, and, according to Dahlström (2004) with little attention to this incongruence, the integration politics were soon criticised of promoting assimilation.

The critique led to an investigation (Invandrarutredningen, 1968) to explore immigrants’ life situations and proposing initiatives to facilitate adjustment to the Swedish society (SOU 1974:69). However nothing changed until 1975 when the political perspective was adjusted to recognize cultural diversity (i.e. immigrant culture and language), combined with the general universalistic social welfare perspective (prop. 1975:26, bet. 1975:InU6, rskr.1975:160). Again, only small adjustments were made in the actual measures taken (Dahlström 2004). In 1986 the government downplayed its responsibility for promoting cultural diversity returning again to the universalistic social welfare agenda (Dahlström 2004).

The difference between the two strands of policy perspectives was not explicit so in 1990 the social-democratic Government distinguished between immigration policy (support measures for newly arrived) with a cultural diversity perspective and general welfare policies designed to support the need of weaker social groups (Prop. 1990/91:195). However, upon the instatement of a centre-right government in 1991 the new agenda was soon abolished and the integration policy area held a low profile until 1997 when the recently elected social-democratic government (in 1996) took a stronger hold on their diversity agenda with their new ‘diversity’ terminology (SOU 1996:55): The new political goals for immigrant policy were Ethnic and Cultural Diversity (Prop. 1997/98:16, bet. 1997/98: SfU6, rskr. 1997/98:68).

One of the biggest changes to earlier policies was the emphasis on concrete goals. Contrary to what one might assume though no measures to support cultural diversity were included. As previously the agenda only considered introductory measures to support newly arrived
immigrants and general social welfare with particular support to socioeconomically weak groups. Organizationally, as described in the section above, in this period the integration political area was moved to the new Swedish National Board of Integration (1998-2007) under the management of the Ministry of Justice.

In their study Bäck et al (2012) disappointingly point out that the policy practice shifted back to an assimilation perspective; emphasizing that despite the changed terminology the policies were actually countering future attempts to move towards a multi-cultural society or a society based upon diversity principles (Bäck et al. 2012). In a similar vein Dahlström (2004) argues that irrespective of the changes in terminology and agenda very little effect reached the practical implementation of the integration measures set in place even before 1968.

The last initiative by the social-democratic government before they lost the election in 2006 to the centre-right coalition (the ‘Alliance’) was the launch of a new transsectorial system for monitoring and analysis. The system was designed to further the systematization of policy goals and indicators (Regeringskansliets årsbok 2003). It goes without saying if the centre-right Government benefitted from the investigation; either way, in 2007 the new Government liquidated the Swedish National Board of Integration, detailed a new Integration Package (prop. 2007/08:1, bet.2007/08:AU1, rskr. 2007/08:27; Regeringskansliets årsbok 2007) and launched the Ministry of Integration and Equality (2007-2011). The new Government downplayed ‘diversity’ and reinstated ‘integration’ as the goal for integration policy by breaking ‘exclusion’.

The refugee focused integration agenda emphasized the need for fast housing and labour market establishment and decreased welfare dependency. Even though the overarching aims were expressed in terms of a structural perspective the goals were set on an individual level aiming at stimulating the individual refugee to activate him or herself in this matter. Based on this agenda the outcome of an investigation on how to deal with immigrants and refugees was the report *Empowerment against exclusion - the Government’s strategy for integration* (Skr. 2008/09:24; 2009/10:233) that still today is the working document for integration policy. As in the social-democratic proposal in 1990 and the actual, not rhetoric, agenda of 1997 the integration policy of 2008 emphasizes the importance of ‘diversity’ but includes only introductory measures to support newly arrived immigrants and general social welfare with particular support to socioeconomically weak groups. Introductory support is only given to immigrants during their first two years and there are no explicit measures to support cultural diversity.

The centre-right government was re-elected in October of 2010 and in his Statement of Government the Prime Minister Fredrik Reinfeldt highlighted that “Integration is based on employment and the opportunity to provide for oneself. That is why the government’s social political principle for employment is also integration politics” (Regeringsförklaringen, 2010:17, author’s translation). The Prime Minister declares that there are great deficiencies in the systems for immigrant establishment in Sweden, which is illustrated by high unemployment, social problems, low educational attainment and labour market discrimination particularly in some suburbs of greater cities.

---

2 Equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all regardless ethnic and cultural backgrounds; increased supply and labour demand; and, improvement of the match between available employment and labour market needs. (Skr. 2008/09:24)
Even though the problem in the statement is suggested to have a structural and spatial composition the measures that are meant to bring solution to the problems are designed on the individual level; namely on individual refugees’ potentials and driving forces (table 9).

Table 9: Introductory Integration Measures of 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Language skills motivation by financial bonuses upon examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earlier establishment on the labour market (Pilot for mentors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge infusion on employment, Swedish language and how society works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good schools; more resources to schools in distressed NH’s to stimulate grade improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residences where one feel comfortable and secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved SFI with strengthened link to the labour market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entry-level jobs (Instågshjelp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentorship and support to immigrants’ entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study on possibility of relief of taxes in New-start Zones (nystartzoner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasize the strength of the Swedish citizenship by having a ceremony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Regeringskansliets årsbok 2010)

To strengthen the labour market perspective the Government early in 2011 made another organizational change; liquidating the Ministry of Integration and Equality and incorporating integration policy into the Ministry of Employment (Regeringskansliets årsbok 2011), under the current Minister of Integration Erik Ullenhag (The Liberal Party).

In light of the historical development in Sweden it can be said that the main agenda for Swedish integration- and minority policies by tradition have been based upon assimilation, i.e. the immigrant must give up his or her cultural heritage and become ‘Swedish’ (Municio 2001; Borevi 2002; Bäck et al. 2012) The programs tell a different story, since they are of mixed characters, but surprisingly little attention has been given to explore the discrepancy between goals and measures (Dahlström 2004). The implemented measures have been minimally affected by the political agenda which has resulted in a number of constant and stable types of implemented measures that depending on the political agenda at the time are more or less in line with the political agenda (Dahlström 2004).

Place-based policy

One of recent history’s most impacting place-based measure was the construction of the Million Program Homes in the 1960’s to 1970’s. It can be argued that the program was a place-based ‘integration’ effort since its aims were to improve the physical environment and to provide adequate quality housing for the working class (Palander 2006), migrants from rural areas and labour immigrants from abroad. Thereafter, most of the forthcoming place-based policies and measures have been designed trying to reverse the ever increasing and complex social problems that persist in some of these neighbourhoods.

Already in the 1980’s the focus shifted as integration efforts had to deal with the worrisome social environments. Measures emphasized the promotion of social cohesion and the creation of public meeting places (Borevi 2004). In the middle of the 1990’s ‘segregation’ was brought to the public agenda in the form of the Blomman initiative (1995-1998). ‘Segregation’ was
identified as the spatial clustering and separation of unemployed ethnic minorities that could be resolved by achieving increased employment of the immigrant population, social cohesion, increased participation at neighbourhood level, integral perspectives, coordination and cooperation between actors, bottom-up perspective and long-term focus (Integrationsverket 2002; Borevi 2004). Despite all effort the by now ‘wicked problems’ (see e.g. Williams 2012) continued to escalate illustrated by increasing unemployment, gaps between socioeconomic and ethnic groups (Palander 2006), as well as poor educational achievement, poor health, criminality and low democratic participation (Bunar 2011).

The ‘segregated’ neighbourhoods became important political concerns and in 1999 the social-democratic Government instated a new National Policy Area for Metropolitan Regions (Swe. Storstadspolitik). The strategy was place-based and decentralized; the Government handed over the main responsibility to the concerned municipalities by signing agreements known as Local Development Deals. The first project, the Metropolitan Initiative (1999-2006), was a top-down initiative, coordinated by a centrally steered Metropolitan Delegation to which the municipalities had to answer (1997/98:165, bet. 1998/99:AU2, rskr. 1998/99:34).

Its overarching aims were to ‘provide metropolitan regions with favourable conditions for long-term sustainable growth and thereby contribute to job creation within the region and other parts of the country’ and ‘to break social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation in metropolitan regions and promoting equal and equitable living conditions for all urban residents’ (1997/98:165, bet. 1998/99:AU2, rskr. 1998/99:34).

When the centre-right Government won the national election in 2006 it soon discontinued the National Policy Area for Metropolitan Regions (Regeringskansliets årsbok 2006; Dir. 2006:66, Ju 2006:0). It did not believe in the urgency of dealing with the problem separately and launched a new Urban Development Policy (prop. 2007/08:1, bet. 2007/08:AU1, rskr.2007/08:27) that instead of standing on its own was coupled with the Integration policy and as such placed in control of the newly composed Ministry of Integration & Equality (2007-2011). The core issue was still the same distressed neighbourhoods although the terminology was changed from ‘segregation’ to ‘urban exclusion’.

The first phase (2008-2011) of the urban development agenda continued with similar Local Development Deals however with an increased weight on employment establishment and growth. The aim was to transform the neighbourhoods into prosperous areas, and contribute to competitiveness, economic and sustainable development in the city and the region (Statskontoret 2010; Tillväxtverket 2012).

After the re-election of the centre-right Government in October of 2010 the Government took one step further in connecting ‘integration’ and ‘urban exclusion’ with each other and also with the political agenda solution of employment establishment and growth; it dissolved the Ministry of Integration and Equality (2007-2011) and hence moved the issues to the Ministry of Employment (2011-current). Integration and urban development policy became part of a new ‘unit for integration and urban development’.

At the turn of the year 2010/2011 the Urban Development initiative and the Local Development Deals ended (IJ2010/1966/IU) and a second phase was initiated that focused on learning what effects the initiative have had on urban exclusion. From 2012 the Urban Development policy focuses on valuation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing and
dissemination of knowledge. The place-based policies started out with ethnic and socioeconomic perspectives but in 2012 only the socioeconomic remains in the terminology.

In addition to municipality cooperation the Government has appointed several public actors and agencies with tasks related to the knowledge accumulation³.

The rhetoric in Swedish national place-based, or area-based, policies and measures has shifted from an explicit consideration of the ethnic variable to a position in which ethnicity is not included in either aims, goals or in the list of indicators⁴ that the Swedish Agency for Public Management is appointed to follow for the coming years. It has also moved towards a labour market and growth solution which was consolidated through the move of both integration and urban development to the Ministry of Employment.

Another shift that has taken place is from the understanding of the problem as an issue of ‘segregation’ to one of ‘urban exclusion’. An analysis of national place-based measures indicates that independent of the change in terminology they are principally adhering to the same problem identification: The achievement of ‘integration’, conceptualized by the terms justice, labour and education for immigrants (Integrationsverket 2000, 2002).

The place-based policies and measures also tend to focus on the individual rather than the structural level whereby local change has been hard to come by; change happens for individuals that tend to move away from the depleted neighbourhoods. The social-democratic ‘segregation’ terminology was not adequately targeted by their individual level measures. The centre-right Government’s choice of ‘urban exclusion’ however while remaining with similar measures as the social-democrats can be argued to have a more stringent connection between problem identification and possible solutions/measures. An individual level approach can however not claim to have any structural impact.

Finally, place-based urban policies, whether they are called metropolitan or urban, are concerned with the ‘segregated’, the ‘excluded’; thus the distressed neighbourhoods and their inhabitants (Andersson et al 2007; Björklund 2007; Tillväxtverket 2012). Never have they looked to the other end of the spectra by including the relational ‘other’ of ethnic and socioeconomically challenged neighbourhoods.

### 3.3. Stockholm city addressing “integration & diversity”

**Integration or diversity? - Conceptual differences**

There are principally two conceptual issues that concern the Swedish integration and place-based policies. The first is the distinction between ‘integration’ and ‘diversity’; and the second is what Stigendal (2006) refers to when he argues that the ‘problem is the solution’, namely the coherency in the link that is made between the problem identification and the strategy chosen to solve the problem.

---

³ Statkontoret (evaluation), SCB (Statistical data on integration of borough level), Sweco (evaluation), Folkhälsoinstitutet, Försäkringskassan, Polisen, Brå (Statistics, borough level), Skolverket (support a selection of schools), Boverket (report findings in knowledge-overviews).

⁴ Share of population in employment, long-term welfare benefit reception; young that neither work nor study; primary and secondary school students eligible for higher education; the relative difference between the share of employed among in- and outmovers; and, the share of reported crime and feelings of insecurity and fear of crime (Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet 2013)
The integration policy area started off with trying to achieve ‘integration’, then to safeguard ‘diversity’, and today to promote a kind of diversified integration. Independent of the terminology, as Dahlström (2004) so vividly has pointed out, these shifts in terminology have had little impact on the practical implementation of policy measures. The implemented measures independent of the policy perspective at the time represents a mix of perspectives, ranging from universalistic to cultural diversity promotion.

The policy area of integration has never been explicit in the definition of a problem. It was initiated in response to the increasing immigrant population in Sweden, firstly concerned mainly with labour immigrants and then later when this group started to grow also to refugees. The measures applied to achieve ‘integration’ have always been related to employment and labour market establishment; specifically promoting the individual’s establishment on the labour market. As time has passed the labour market focus has grown stronger until it was introduced into the Ministry of Employment which can be interpreted as a stabilization of that movement.

The term ‘diversity’ has been use in different periods in the policy area to promote the acceptance of group differences, specifically ethnic and cultural diversity. However, even though Sweden sometimes is recommended for its ‘diversity agenda’ research and this analysis show that the practical implications of the agenda have been minimal and the measures for ‘integration’ and ‘diversity’ are very much the same (see e.g. Dahlström 2004).

The second conceptual issue relates to the place-based policies and their use of the terms ‘segregation’ and ‘urban exclusion’ and proposed solutions. Until 2008 place-based policies defined the problem to be one of ‘segregation’ and the solution to be one of ‘integration’, i.e. labour market establishment. The current policy still upholds a belief that ‘integration’, i.e. labour market establishment is the solution, but argues that ‘urban exclusion’ is the problem. This puts us in a situation in which ‘integration’, i.e. labour market establishment is the universal golden path in both integration and place-based policy, independent of, we would argue, whether the agenda is termed ‘integration’, ‘diversity’, ‘segregation’, and/or ‘urban exclusion’.

This situation may become troublesome if we try to solve the problem of ‘segregation’ with measures targeted for labour market employment. If ‘integration’ (labour market establishment) is the solution to ‘segregation’ (the geographical separation of unequal social categories), as well as it is the solution to ‘urban exclusion’ (in a social justice perspective, the unavailability of a social group to access a ‘universal right’, i.e. employment) then that would implicate that ‘segregation’ and ‘exclusion’ alike would be resolved if everyone had access to the labour market and obtained employment. However, this theory does not explain why excluded (unemployed) individuals cluster and it would therefore be inadequate as a solution to the problem distinguished by the spatial clustering and separation of social categories.

**Institutional setting and relevant actors**

The national strategies on (im)migration, integration and place-based policies are, as already have been discussed above, a transsectorial business which cannot be better illustrated than by the budgetary allocation of national funds. An overview of the public stakeholders that are appointed by the Government to participate, and thus receive direct funding, show 11
independent stakeholders\textsuperscript{5} in the policy area of integration/place-based, including itself, and yet three for (im)migration. Some of these stakeholders are additionally provided with funds that they in turn can allocate. The Government itself for example has in the Urban Development policy involved 9 additional stakeholders only for the accumulation, production and distribution of knowledge.

None of the national integration funds are directly allocated to municipalities. Instead they have to apply according to national agreements with specific agencies that handle such fund, as for example the Swedish Migration Board. This application-strategy sets a framework for the public stakeholder’s room of manoeuvre. However, as we have seen in earlier chapters the Swedish municipalities also have a great deal of autonomy as a result of the local taxation system.

Each municipality have their own tax revenue and internal organization, which is different in any given municipality. The municipality is principally responsible for managing social services, technical, physical and environmental development and monitoring, parts of the basic health care, child and elderly care (also immigrants get old), primary and secondary school and adult education (e.g. Swedish for immigrants). They may allocate funds and establish administrative areas depending on their local context.

In addition to the national guidelines it is then up to each municipal framework to decide what kind extra efforts are required and who to involve. The local collaborators for the municipalities are public bodies and agencies ranging from the national to the local level, as well as private, commercial and civil sector actors. It is however important to remember that the municipalities today often face budgetary restrictions which may make them ‘retract to their basic assignment’; such ‘extra’ efforts are seldom thought of as part of that package and measures of ‘prevention’ and ‘integration’ are often the first to go.

It is important also to remember the international level actors. The European Union has for some time now recognized the ever more pressing challenges of urban segregation in European cities. Funds have been allocated that municipalities and other both regional and local stakeholders may apply for. Meanwhile, as we have seen in the text above very much of the legal framework for immigration is defined according to international and European agreements. This creates a situation in which the municipalities, although they are autonomous per se, will need to adjust their agendas if they require an extra resource boost - which often is required since integration as we have seen often are thought of as ‘extra activities’.

\textit{Principles of urban diversity policies and explanation of the policy approach}

When it comes to policies and measures initiated by the municipalities themselves it is almost impossible to provide a complete description since efforts are voluntary and thus very varied. Some municipalities, mainly those with few refugees and immigrants might not even consider such initiatives - nor have they been involved in any of the place-based national measures. However, with a quick look on the web sites of the more immigrant dense municipalities it is evident that they struggle hands-on with these issues on a daily basis and therefore have

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{5} In Swedish: Statens skolverk, Ungdomsstyrelsen, Kammarkollegiet, Boverket, LST Kronobergs län, Regeringen, Regerinskansliet, Migrationsverket, Arbetsförmedlingen, CSN, Rådet för Europeiska Socialfonden Sverige (ESF), Tillväxtverket, Migrationsverket, Domstolsverket (Ekonomistyrningsenheten 2013)
much more to gain in developing their own agenda. Botkyrka is one such example that has developed its own Intercultural policy (Botkyrka 2010).

With this diversity in mind we will only briefly describe Botkyrka’s policy to provide an insight in how a multicultural, diverse and actually segregated municipality in the Stockholm region may confront its challenges. The policy, i.e. strategy, of the municipality of Botkyrka is very much a result of everyday experiences. The municipality constantly receive residents from all over the world in the same time as it also has inhabitants that even though they have what is called a ‘different ethnical background’ are born in Sweden. The latter group is often both in public and private spheres referred to as ‘non-swedes’ which affects their identity and sense of belonging. Even though Botkyrka as such is a multicultural municipality it is also very segregated, between the lines of gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity and religion.

The development of an intercultural strategy, leaving the older concept of multiculturalism behind, is a conscious act aiming at opening up the organization to more diverse perspectives, including cooperation with other local actors and citizens. The use of the concept ‘interculturalism’ emphasizes ‘interaction’; and a society in which people from different socioeconomic and ethnic groups live close together but are no longer alienated and ignorant of each other. The purpose of this change in discourse is to “find solutions to deal with cultural diversity in the context of basic democratic values and based on international conventions of human rights”. The strategy put emphasis on sustainability, perseverance and coordination and cooperation between public, private and civil sector actors, as well as coordination between national, regional and local efforts (Botkyrka 2010).

3.4. Diversity policy in the urban neighbourhoods

Implementation of policies in the local urban context

The implementation of national (im)migration, integration and place-based policies in urban neighbourhoods differs between the policy areas. One of the central tasks for municipalities in relation to integration policy is the reception of refugees. The municipalities are responsible for providing adequate housing, Swedish language skills, education and civic orientation. Local variances exist both in strategies and content depending on several factors, some of which are size and level of urbanization, budgetary possibilities and also needs and potentials exemplified by the Botkyrka case above.

The national place-based policies are generally top-down constructions with bottom-up approaches which mean that the concerned municipalities most often are managing the projects tying also to involve citizens. The EU funds are also both top-down and bottom-up creatures in a way since funds are available upon application but only within the specific interests that have been expressed on the EU level. In the same time as providing a resource input EU funds also restrict municipalities.

Steering and funding are two aspects whose developments are significant and temporarily evolving. Briefly, national measures have gone from being steered by some specially instated organization or working group with a lot of funds to develop extraordinary initiatives to be allocated in the midst of the municipal administration and provided with the most meagre
budget in order to avoid such extraordinary initiatives that have a tendency to die out when funds are withdrawn (c.f. Integrationsverket 2002; Tillväxterverket 2011, 2012).

Decentralization and intersectorial and multilevel cooperation are the guidelines for such efforts. This means that the main implementer most often is the municipality and that they include methods of collaboration with local citizens and bottom-up perspectives (Integrationsverket 2000, 2002).

The implementation of policy in the local neighbourhood is a dynamic process in which the national and local and public and private are influenced by and influence each other; sometimes purposefully but at other times unwarily.

**Challenges and tensions in the implementation of policies in the neighbourhood context**

There are a few challenges that deserve special mentioning concerning integration policy implementation. One is the voluntary municipal reception of refugees, negotiated with the County Administrative Board. As a result some municipalities receive many refugees, while some receive very few, or none. Coupled with the compensation issue this gets even more complicated. The Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SKL 2013) argues in its most recent report on the budgetary compensation that the amount is too small to provide the required services. This means that municipalities, especially those that receive many refugees, have to take resources from their income tax to support refugees, which then causes restraints on other services. A small municipality with a high refugee reception might therefore risk budgetary instability and the refugee reception could come to represent a risky business. Another challenge is the provision of civic orientation and Swedish language skills. For a small municipality it may prove more costly and difficult to obtain quality standard since course may not be given that often.

The place-based policies and measures have through the years been criticised in a number of aspects. One central concern is the apparent inability of the initiatives to break ‘segregation’ or ‘urban exclusion’. Both researchers and evaluations comment on the problem-solution discrepancy; that local place-based strategies are applied to solve a structural problem. They argue that it is improbable if not impossible that neighbourhood scale measures would have the capacity to ‘break segregation or to ‘create integration’ (c.f. Palander 2006; Boverket 2010; Integrationsverket 2001; Andersson et al 2010).

A common argument is that place-based neighbourhood policies and measures should devise “goals that are more appropriate to this geographical level” (Integrationsverket 2002:05, p. 23-24, author’s translation). Place-based initiatives have shown to have local impacts, but not on such structural scale. Research show for example improvement of residential environments and living conditions; thereby increasing feelings of safety and security (Boverket 2010; Palander 2006). Another critique of place-based policies is the often conflicting aims and ineffective implementation (see e.g. Andersson 2006a; Cars 2006; Andersson et al. 2010).
3.5. Interventions on the neighbourhood scale: measures and projects


Characterization and procedures

The inception of the new National Policy Area for Metropolitan Regions (Swe. Storstadspolitik) was thought of as “the first step in a process in which the state, the regions, counties and municipalities should work together to promote growth in the metropolitan distressed neighbourhoods” (Tillväxtverket 2012:94). The two goals were (1) to provide the cities with potentials for long-term sustainable growth and thereby contribute to new employment opportunities both in the metropolitan region and other parts of the country, and (2) to break the social, ethnical and discriminating segregation in the metropolitan regions and promote equity and equal life conditions for all citizens (1997/98:165, bet. 1998/99:AU2, rskr. 1998/99:34; Integrationsverket 2002). The measures were allocated special financial resources.

The biggest and most recent national ABI is the Metropolitan Development Initiative (MDI), sometimes called the Local Development Deal (the first) due to its strategy to sign agreements with municipalities in the Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö regions. Together they spent about 400 million Euros in 24 of the most deprived urban neighbourhoods (Integrationsverket 2002; Bunar 2011). The municipalities to participate in the Stockholm region are the City of Stockholm, Botkyrka, Haninge, Huddinge and Södertälje (Integrationsverket 2002).

The second overarching goal of the MDI, to break segregation, i.e. promote integration, and combat unemployment was based on the notion that the issue had to be dealt with through a ‘whole-city’ perspective, mixing social and physical/structural measures. However, it did not only lose its ‘whole-city’ perspective, nor was any physical/structural measures taken. The implemented measures were directed towards growth and ethnic and socioeconomic integration; measures that were principally directed at labour and education for immigrants. (Integrationsverket 2000, 2002) As such, it became not much different from its predecessors.

Impact of policies and measures on social cohesion and interethnic coexistence

The problem to be solved in the measures was segregation; described as residential segregation of social, ethnic and discriminative dimensions (Integrationsverket 2002). Segregation was understood as the result of social, economic and ethnic variables and is seen as a threat to society.

Certain activities showed successful to affect the life situations on the local level but these local initiatives have not been considered powerful enough to affect the greater structural determinants of segregation (Tillväxtverket 2012; Palander 2006; Stigendal 2006). One of the greatest obstacles to neighbourhood effects is the mobility of the residents. People that are strengthened by different activities tend to move away when life situations are improving. To

---

6 The whole-city perspective is based on the notion that the neighborhood is embedded in the greater context of the city and the region etc., and thus requires intersectional measures. Measures are inclusive, considering education, public health, language skills and safe and attractive cities and neighborhoods. (Integrationsverket 2000, 2002)
measure neighbourhood impact, which often has been the case, thus prove inadequate since the built up resources are lost to other areas (Integrationsverket 2002). Individual level measures thus have limited chances to improve the situation of segregation as well as the neighbourhood per se.

The Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning (Boverket 2010) recognizes the great challenge to change a structural problem on the local scale, arguing that “it cannot be the residential areas’ responsibility to solve the segregation problem... it must be an issue for the whole municipality or the region” (Boverket 2010:36, author’s translation). Seconded by Andersson and Musterd (2005:386), saying that “we should keep in mind that problems in the neighbourhood are seldom problems of the neighbourhood” (Author’s translation)

Integration consequences for the population with a migration background/migration history

The MDI measure was intended to work specifically in distressed neighbourhoods in which there is a high concentration of ethnic minority populations. A central assumption was that these neighbourhoods were starting to show a type of class society based on ethnicity, i.e. immigrant populations (Integrationsverket 2002). The Swedish National Board of Integration (Integrationsverket 2002) report collected results from a number of evaluations and showed that there was little that the measure could do to affect the processes that created and maintained the ethnic and socioeconomic segregation; rather the affecting factors are structural.

The tools available in the initiative were foremost in support to individuals and to compensate for the worse-off conditions that come with residing in a distressed neighbourhood; they were not methods and tools suitable for fending off the mechanisms of selective emigration of the socioeconomically stronger residents, immigration of newly arrived immigrants, discrimination and racism that maintain the ethnic and socioeconomic segregation (Integrationsverket 2002:94). The report concludes that there is a need to reconsider what type of measures would be most adequate for development efforts that take their point of departure in the local level (Integrationsverket 2002). One suggestion is that neighbourhood scale initiatives could aim to resolve local level issues since such strategies could make a big difference in the lives of people that reside in these neighbourhoods (Integrationsverket 2002).

Monitoring and evaluation of measures

The participation in the MDI conditioned the municipalities to undertake evaluations. These and other special issue reports have then been evaluated in the national evaluation conducted by the then presiding the Swedish Immigration Board, to be transferred later to the new Swedish National Board of Integration. The first national report was “The National Evaluation of the Metropolitan Development Imitative: Goal Attainment and Indicators” (Integrationsverket 2001). The national evaluation was completed with the publication of “On the Right Path? Final Report from the National Evaluation of the Metropolitan Development Initiative” (Integrationsverket 2002).
Other special issue reports are:

- Organization for Democracy and Participation;
- Goal Attainment Analyses and Indicators;
- The Development in the 24 MDI Residential Neighbourhoods;
- Suburb in Focus - Interventions for Millions;
- Million Housing Program and the Media - Conceptions about Individuals and Suburbs (Miljonprogram och media - Föreställningar om människor och förorter).

One measure taken within the framework of the initiative was the development of an individual level database platform named STATIV. When the Swedish National Board of Integration that managed the database was dissolved in 2007 it was transferred to Statistics Sweden (SCB) who continues to gather the information yearly. STATIV collects data from SCB, the Migration department and the Public Employment Service on the basis for immigration, demography, education, occupation, and geographical divisions.

Other local evaluations were conducted by local actors and universities, principally by Södertörn University, the Multicultural Centre in Fittja/Botkyrka, Lund University, School of Social Work, Malmö University, Gothenburg University, Chalmers University, and IMER (Integrationsverket 2002).


Characterization and procedures

The centre-right Government’s Urban Development policy launched in 2007 was inserted under the umbrella of the Ministry of Integration & Equality (prop. 2007/08:1, bet. 2007/08:AU1, rskr.2007/08:27). The Government continued with the strategy of Local Development Deals strategy but changed the terminology from breaking ‘segregation’ to breaking ‘urban exclusion’, a term that in many ways can be assumed more adequate for fomenting ‘integration’. The overarching goals were employment, education, safety and growth; where growth was the most central. The measures was not allocated special financial resources but was required to develop within the frame for the regular budget.

When the first phase came to an end in 2010/2011 (IJ2010/1966/IU) the Government decided that it was time to look over what effects the previous term had had on ‘urban exclusion’. The Urban Development Policy from 2012 focus on valuation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing and dissemination of knowledge (table 10).
The new Local Development Deals were announced among the previous participants, this time specifying that eligible neighbourhoods had to display employment rates lower than 52 percent, long-term welfare subsidize higher than 4.8 percent, and high school competence less than 70 percent. 15 of the applicant boroughs could display such conditions and were included as the URBAN15.

A difference from earlier initiatives is that the Urban Development initiative of 2012 has (in writing) a greater apprehension of the borough as part of a context; that it is central to not only focus on the borough but also the city, the region and the country. It considers initiatives at the structural, neighbourhood and individual level. (Regeringen 2013)

The initiative is still ongoing thus there are yet no available measures of the impact on social cohesion and interethnic coexistence, nor any results indicating the level of integration consequences for the population with a migration background/migration history

**Monitoring and evaluation of measures**

The monitoring and evaluation is a continuous process in the phase two, especially linked to the evaluations of the first phase. The actors to participate in the accumulation of knowledge, appointed by the Government, are principally the Swedish Agency for Public Management (evaluation), Statistics Sweden (Statistical data on integration of borough level), Sweco (evaluation, consultant), The Public Health Agency of Sweden, the Swedish Social Insurance Board, the Swedish Police, The Swedish National Council of Crime Prevention (Statistics, borough level), The Swedish National Agency for Education (support a selection of schools), The Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning (report findings in knowledge-overviews). Evaluations are available on the government homepage (Regeringen 2013).

- Sweco (consultancy) evaluation of local processes
- The Public Health Agency of Sweden report, part 1 on health
- The Public Health Agency of Sweden report, part 2 on experience exchange
- the Swedish Social Insurance Board report on the urban development work
- The Police report on the urban development work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fewer individuals in exclusion, residing in boroughs characterized by exclusion;</td>
<td>Valuation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing and dissemination of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fewer boroughs characterized by exclusion;</td>
<td>• Improved living conditions in boroughs with widespread exclusion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• more boroughs, as well as cities and metropolitans that are characterized by economic growth, and;</td>
<td>• decreased socio-economic disparities within cities and regions; and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Swedish Public Employment Service report the urban development work
The Swedish Agency for Public Management evaluation: Urban development - an evaluation of public authorities participation in the Local Development Deals


Characterization and procedures

The Suburban Regeneration Initiative (Swe: Ytterstadssatsningen, 1995-1998) was initiated by Stockholm city and implemented parallel to the “Blomman”-Initiative. The measure involved 13 of the city’s most distressed (sub)urban neighbourhoods aiming principally to achieve increased employment, safe and attractive living environments, improved schools and school grounds, as well as establishing a mix of forms of tenure. Even though the measure had been given high standards for ‘social’ development forthcoming budgetary cutbacks resulted in dominance of measures of a more physical character (Björklund 2007). The initiative which was initiated with a long-term perspective was cut short and abandoned only three years later.

In 2003 it was time for yet another Stockholm city initiated measure, the City District Regeneration Initiative (Swe: Stadsdelsförnyelsen, 2003-2006) which shared many of the characteristics of its predecessor. The overall aim was to promote integration, increase growth and to create just childhood conditions but contrary from the earlier initiative it did not only target distressed neighbourhoods; nine of the city’s 18 boroughs were involved. Another difference was that it instead of ‘solving problems’ adopted the rhetoric to enhance potentials and possibilities for development. (Björklund 2007)

Impact of policies and measures on social cohesion and interethnic coexistence

Cars (2006) is rather critical towards this type of integration projects that are based on the renovations of apartments, rebuilding of neighbourhoods and refreshments of the surroundings and exterior in areas with numerous social problems. He argues that as soon as the projects are finished the renewed area start the downward spiral again. Renovating depleted neighbourhoods does not change the situation for the numerous immigrants that are locked-in into bad areas and thereby into a housing segregation process (Carlén & Cars 1991; Byström and Cars 2007).

Moreover, providing housing with a high standard to immigrants does not promote integration or access to the labour market, nor to improving language skills and knowledge about how the Swedish society works (Rauhut 2008).

Writing this report we found no available studies on monitoring and evaluation of the initiative.
3.5.4. European policy: The European Regional Development Fund’s (ERDF) - The Special Metropolitan Initiatives (de särskilda storstadsinsatserna) (2007-2013)

Characterization and procedures

In 2007 the Swedish government launched a new National Strategy for Regional Competitiveness, Entrepreneurship and Employment (2007-2013). The strategy is the backbone for the initiatives employed within the structural funds; among them the European Regional Development Fund\(^7\) (ERDF) that holds the financing for the Special Metropolitan Initiatives (SMI). Sweden has eight regional programs located in three metropolitan regions: Stockholm, West-Sweden and Skåne-Blekinge. The aim of the SMI is to strengthen the connections between increased growth and decreased segregation. The measures taken in the metropolitan regions aim at strengthening international competitive innovation systems and clusters, promote local development in distressed neighbourhoods (Swe: utanförskapsområden), promote increased integration and stimulate cooperation and exchange of experiences with other metropolises in Sweden and internationally. (Tillväxtverket 2012)

The goal for the Stockholm initiative is to strengthen the Stockholm region’s international competitiveness through support of small enterprises, by developing innovative environments, business development, and accessibility. In contrast to the other regions, that direct a special initiative to the metropolitan development agenda, Stockholm argues that it has included that perspective as an overarching principle in all efforts.

The SMI safeguards three horizontal criteria, whereof one is integration (plus gender equality and environment). In the Stockholm program integration is conceptualized as ethnic integration, aiming at that women and men with foreign backgrounds shall become more present in the labour market and as entrepreneurs. Tillväxtverket (2012) comments that this definition is much narrower than the one provided in the general program: “Hence, it is in the effect of their foreign background that people shall be integrated, not because of their situation of poverty or youth” (Tillväxtverket 2012:37, author’s translation). The program has no particular mention of cohesion.

Impact of policies and measures on social cohesion and interethnic coexistence

The original aim of the European Commission’s initiative for the European Cohesion Policy (Swe: Sammanhållningspolitik) advocated for a model built on social market-economic values and included goals for both economic and social cohesion (Swe: sammanhållning). Difficulties in defining social cohesion led first to the interpretation ‘solidarity with the poorest and most excluded’, to finally getting lost altogether. Rather, the European Cohesion Policy adopts a place perspective on cohesion, in the sense that the main purpose is to strengthen the relation between places, i.e. decrease the differences between places in different regions, rather than between people in one region. In this perspective it becomes somewhat closer to the idea of decreasing segregation than the national initiatives.

\(^7\) The ERDF was launched in 1975 and was together with the European Social Fund included into the Swedish cohesion policy (sammanhållningspolitik) year 1988 (Tillväxtverket 2012)
The SMI adheres to the political agenda of the Lisbon Strategy of 2005, focusing on “delivering stronger, lasting growth, and more and better jobs” (Tillväxtverket 2012:25). The formulation of the social cohesiveness thus becomes an economic issue.

None of the three Swedish regional programs makes any specific mention to Cohesion in their aim to strengthen their regions competitiveness. With its place-based perspective and focus on integration as an ethnic variable segregation becomes central; especially visualizing and targeting those neighbourhoods on the ‘negative’ pole; neighbourhoods (places) with a concentration of unemployed people with foreign backgrounds.

**Integration consequences for the population with a migration background/migration history**

The Stockholm program, as discussed briefly above, interprets the horizontal criterion Integration as ethnic integration. The consequence of this is a sort of stigmatization process in which only ethnic, i.e. individuals with foreign background are eligible for activities. The generally unemployed or young people are not considered (Tillväxtverket 2012), nor is it in line with the national policy to only consider general welfare measures.

The final report from the on-going evaluation by the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth discloses that the initiative has not managed to involve individuals with foreign background to the same extent as native swedes. This would, if not adjusted, imply that the initiative has not achieved its purpose on that account (Tillväxtverket 2011). Although social cohesion is present it gets lost in the translation from policy to implementation. Segregation, in its current conceptualization, is an inadequate replacement.

The Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth are cautious in their evaluation of possible effects, commenting that it is difficult to obtain any visible results in such a short time frame and by using the current performance measures and indicators. Additionally, one great hindrance they identified is a duality in approaches, on the one hand seeing the reduction of segregation as an investment, and on the other seeing it as a cost, where growth is regarded as superior to social cohesion (consistent with the Lisbon strategy of 2005). As a solution the evaluators “call for a social investment perspective to reconcile the two objectives of increasing growth and decreasing segregation” (Tillväxtverket 2012:115). A consequence of this duality is that although the initiative acclaim to promote the social goals there is a lack of interest in achieving them.

**Monitoring and evaluation of measures**

The ERDF Special Metropolitan Initiatives have been evaluated by The University of Malmö together with APel Fou during a two year project (2011-2012) looking specifically at the effects of the initiative on increased growth and decreased segregation, in the three regions (Tillväxtverket 2012). On-going evaluations have also been conducted for the eight regional programs and their projects. The four on-going evaluation reports for Stockholm were developed by the IM-group and PwC (Tillväxtverket 2011).
4. Summary

Socio-demographic structure

- During the period 1998 to 2012, the population in the Stockholm County increased on an average annual basis with 1.26 per cent. The share of foreign born in 2012 was 22.2 per cent.
- Foreign born residents live in all parts of the County of Stockholm, with a concentration to certain boroughs in the City of Stockholm, and the municipalities of Botkyrka, Södertälje, Huddinge, Haninge, Solna and Järfålla.
- The variation of gender distribution between Swedish born and foreign-born is marginal. The distribution between regions however have some variation; there is a male surplus of men from the regions Africa, EU15 and West Asia while women are in majority from the rest of Asia, such as Thailand and the Nordic countries.
- The composition of the foreign-born is transforming: foreign-born groups that are not supplemented by new immigrants are ageing and thus decreasing, while new groups increase rapidly, such as Syria, Iraq, China.
- On the county level, the diversity index is 0.61, but there are huge variations within the county; both in terms of shares and numbers, foreign-born tend to be overrepresented in neighbourhoods located in the south western and north western municipalities and boroughs of the City of Stockholm, while they are underrepresented in the peripheral parts of the county and especially in the northern and north-eastern parts of the county.

Socio-economic structure

- Municipalities and boroughs with high shares of tertiary education levels, also tend to have among the lowest shares of population with low level education. These municipalities also have the highest levels of annual income (in 2011).
- Foreign-born as a group has lower employment rates, higher social benefit rates, and health and wellbeing tend to be lower among foreign-born.
- Neighbourhoods where foreign-born already are highly overrepresented tend to become even more so over time. However, the vast majority of foreign-born live in areas/neighbourhoods where Swedish born and foreign born are more evenly distributed.

Structure of housing market and residential segregation

- There are approximately 976 000 housing units in the Stockholm County. In 2010 the most common tenure was condominium.
- Sweden does not manage social housing, instead there are housing allowances that serve to redistribute income to families with children and families with low incomes.
- Swedish neighbourhoods tend to be predominantly characterised by a specific tenure and/or physical type. In combination with the fact that foreign born residents are overrepresented in municipal rental housing, while Swedish born residents are overrepresented in private ownership home (single housing units) and condominiums, it can be argued that the urban fabric fosters ethnic residential segregation.
- Ethnic segregation has increased in Stockholm since the 1990’s; poor visible foreign-born groups have replaced poor native born Swedes and to some extent poor non-
visible foreign born in deprived urban neighbourhoods. The most economically disadvantaged neighbourhood are most dominated by visible immigrant groups.

- Segregation goes both ways and Sweden also has neighbourhoods in which the conditions are reversed; areas in which only a few percent are poor, over 70 percent established in the labour market, and the proportion of foreign born is less than half of the region’s average.

Structure of the migrant population

- Since the 1980s immigration to Sweden has been dominated by refugee immigration and tied-immigrants. To a greater extent than the labour migrants the refugees moved to the metropolitan areas. The new immigration patterns led to a “countrywide strategy for refugee reception” in 1985 which shifted the responsibility of handling immigrants from the state to the municipalities.

Integration and diversity policies in Sweden and Stockholm

- Sweden has three strains of policy areas that in different ways touch upon the issues of migration, migrants and integration/diversity. The first is the policy area of migration, which primarily deals with refugee and immigration laws and regulations, deciding under what terms a prospect immigrant will have the right to stay; the second is the area of integration which concerns how immigrants are introduced and received into the Swedish society. The third policy area is place-based and rather than dealing with the reception and ‘welcoming’ of the newly arrived immigrants it concerns one problematic consequence of the failure of the above - namely urban residential segregation and neighbourhood distress.

- The goal of the national migration policy today is to protect the right to asylum and within the frame for the regulated immigration facilitate cross-border mobility, demand-driven labour force immigration, to collect and analyse the developmental effects of migration and deepen European and international collaborations.

- Sweden’s first regulation of migration (1968) held a universalistic integration perspective, safeguarding the individual’s right to uphold the same standards and inclusion in the welfare state as the rest of the population; in many ways that meant, as it still does today, labour market establishment.

- Swedish integration policy has through the years moved back and forth, at times considering cultural diversity, individual universalistic (employment for all individuals) and/or cultural group diversity (native language education and support to different religions) perspectives. Critical voices argue however that the policies have had little if no effect on practice and that integration policy independent of their set-up always have held an assimilation perspective.

- With the election of the centre-right coalition (the ‘Alliance’) in 2007 the concept of cultural ‘diversity’ that had been in use since 1990 was replaced by the concept of ‘integration’ which had been used before 1990. The current goal for integration policy is to break ‘exclusion’.

- Place-based policy as a means to deal with ‘segregation’ (concept used for the first time in the 1990’s) in certain urban neighbourhoods was first used in a wider extent as a devised solution to the increasing social problems in neighbourhoods built during the Million Homes Program (1965-1975).

- ‘Segregation’ was in the 1990’s identified as the spatial clustering and separation of unemployed ethnic minorities that could be resolved by achieving increased
employment of the immigrant population, social cohesion, increased participation at neighbourhood level, integral perspectives, coordination and cooperation between actors, bottom-up perspective and long-term focus.

- In 2008 the core issue for place-based policy was still the same distressed neighbourhoods although the terminology was changed from ‘segregation’ to ‘urban exclusion’. The revised policy included an increased emphasis on employment establishment and growth; with the aim to transform the neighbourhoods into prosperous areas, and contribute to competitiveness, economic and sustainable development in the city and the region. Since 2008 ethnicity is no longer considered a factor in the efforts to ‘break exclusion’.

- Place-based initiatives have shown to have local impacts, but critical voices argue that they have never and cannot break ‘segregation’ och ‘urban exclusion’. Thus the argument calls for a change of aim towards “goals that are more appropriate to the geographical level” of the neighbourhood.

- Stockholm city, as all Swedish municipalities, has its own tax revenue and internal organization. Each municipality is principally responsible for managing local issues and has the power to decide how to allocate funds and establish administrative areas depending on its local context; thus it is up to each municipality to decide if and what kind of ‘integration’ efforts are required and who to involve. It is however important to remember that the municipalities today often face budgetary restrictions which may make them ‘retract to their basic assignment’; such ‘extra’ efforts are seldom thought of as part of that package and measures of ‘prevention’ and ‘integration’ are often the first to go.

**Interventions at the neighbourhood level**

- The implementation of national (im)migration, integration and place-based policies in urban neighbourhoods differs between the policy areas. One of the central tasks for municipalities in relation to integration policy is the reception of refugees. The municipalities are responsible for providing adequate housing, Swedish language skills, education and civic orientation. Local variances exist both in strategies and content depending on several factors, some of which are size and level of urbanization, budgetary possibilities and also needs and potentials

- Reception of refugees is voluntary and individually negotiated with the County Administrative Board. As a result some municipalities receive many refugees, while some receive very few, or none. This means that municipalities, especially those that receive many refugees, have to take resources from their income tax to support refugees, which then causes restraints on other services. A small municipality with a high refugee reception might therefore risk budgetary instability and the refugee reception could come to represent a risky business.
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Annex:

A1. The Socio-territorial structure of Stockholm

Map A.1: Map of Stockholm County Municipality borders and names. Source: Stockholm County Council
As a municipality, the City of Stockholm is subdivided into 14 district councils, which carry responsibility for primary schools, social, leisure and cultural services within their respective areas (Map A.2).

Map A.2: City of Stockholm - the 14 boroughs. Source: Stockholm County Council

The centralised decision-making on standards leads to a reduction of the flexibility of implementation by local governments. However, the high degree of local autonomy, a longstanding aspect of Swedish political culture, is institutionalized in the 1974 constitution (OECD 2006).

Municipalities’ spending also occupies a very large role in the Swedish welfare system, given heavy outlays on lower and upper secondary education, child care, elderly care, infrastructure, waste and energy, and recreational and cultural activities (See Figure A.1). In 2012, the total net cost spending by the municipalities in the Stockholm County amounted to
almost 91 billion SEK. Furthermore, municipalities often own several public companies, mainly in housing and real estate (www.skl.se/kommuner_och_landsting).

Figure A.1: Share of net cost spending all municipalities in the Stockholm County, 2012. Source: SSD Sweden Statistical Database, Statistics Sweden

The regional level - a fragmented structure

Since the 1862 constitutional reform, counties have had an elected council which is independent from the national government. County councils (or Region Councils) are primarily responsible for a large part of Sweden’s healthcare. The bulk of budgetary means in the County Councils (Regional Councils) are channelled to health care. In 2012 it amounted to almost 89%. Public transportation, regional development, culture, and political administration constitute the remaining costs. The Stockholm County Council spent almost 71 billion SEK in 2012, whereof approximately 85 per cent on health and dental care services. (Stockholms läns landsting 2012)

There are other bodies active at the regional level, such as the County Administrative Board, regional boards and agencies, federations of local authorities (see Figure A.2). However, none of them have the right to collect or set taxes, nor are they elected. Though, in terms of responsibility for implementing national policies on the regional level, there are (depending of policy field) different roles and responsibilities for these regional bodies and the county council.
A2. The political-administrative system

The Kingdom of Sweden is a constitutional monarchy. The Head of State has only ceremonial duties and executes no political power. The Speaker of the Parliament appoints and dismisses governments. The Parliament (Riksdagen) has 349 seats. The Parliament chooses the prime minister, who then appoints the government department heads (cabinet ministers). Legislative powers is only exercised by the Riksdag executive power is exercised by the prime minister and the cabinet. Legislation may be initiated by the cabinet or by members of the Riksdag. Members are elected on the basis of proportional representation on a four-year term. The Constitution can be altered by the Riksdag, which requires a simple but absolute majority with two separate votes, separated by general elections in between. Sweden has four constitutional laws: the Instrument of Government, the Act of Royal Succession, the Freedom of the Press Act and the Fundamental Law on Freedom of Expression (Birgersson & Westerståhl 1990).

Government and Governance in Sweden

Sweden is a unitary state, divided into 21 counties and 290 municipalities. There are three directly elected levels of government: the Riksdag (Swedish national parliament) at the national level; county councils (or regional councils) at the county level, and; municipal councils at the municipal level (Figure A.2). Personal income taxes are equally raised exclusively at these three levels, and tax levels are set independently at each level of government.

Figure A.2: Administrative structure in Sweden. Source: Stockholm County Council

---

8 See chapter 3.2 for a thorough analysis of division of responsibilities between different types of administrative government.
Central government - small but abundance of national agencies

The central government is composed of eleven ministries. The Prime Minister leads and coordinates the work of the government. The eleven ministries handle government business in their respective fields of responsibility, while the Office for Administrative Affairs provides the administrative services required by the Government Offices. Approximately 4,350 members of staff are employed at the Government Offices, of whom around 200 are political appointees. (Government Offices of Sweden, 2013)

Central boards and national agencies

The national government also consists of autonomous boards and agencies sorting under the ministries. These agencies compensate for the smallness of the central government. The agencies are subordinate to the Government and responsible for implementing public policies, overseeing the provision of many public services, and discharging a range of regulatory functions. Every year the Government takes a decision on the preconditions for agencies’ operations. There are currently approximately 350 government agencies. (Government Offices of Sweden, 2013)

Municipal level

Given Sweden’s delegation of responsibilities to the local level, coupled with a comparatively large fiscal autonomy, it could be argued that there is a high degree of autonomy and room for manoeuvre for Sweden’s 290 municipalities in delivering services that respond to local needs.

National Politics

The Social Democratic party has played a leading political role since 1917, and after 1932, cabinets have been dominated by the Social Democrats. Only five general elections (1976, 1979, 1991, 2006 and 2010) have given the centre-right bloc enough seats in the Riksdag to form a government. However, due to poor economic performance since the beginning of the 1970s, and especially since the fiscal crisis of the early 1990s, Sweden’s political system has become less one-sided, and more like other European countries (Bäck et al. 2012). Contrary to most European countries, minority governments are far more common than majority governments due to a system of negative parliamentarism, i.e. as long as a majority of the parliament does not vote against the government the bill will pass (Sannerstedt 1989, Mattsson 1996).

In the 2006 general election, the Alliance for Sweden - consisting of the centre-right parties Moderaterna, Folkpartiet, Centern and Kristdemokraterna - won a majority of the votes. Together they formed a majority government under the leadership of the Moderate party's leader, Fredrik Reinfeldt. In the 2010 general election the Alliance contended against a unified left block consisting of the Social Democrats, the Green Party and the Left Party. As none of the political blocs gained a majority, the Alliance remained in office. In the 2010
election the rightwing extremist Sverigedemokraterna (Sweden Democrats) - with roots in the White Arian Resistance movement - was elected to the Parliament (SCB 2014; Lodenius & Larsson 1991).

Table A.1: Cabinets in Sweden since 1970-2014. Majority governments in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Prime Minister</th>
<th>Coalition parties **</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olof Palme II</td>
<td>Olof Palme</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1970-1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olof Palme III</td>
<td>Olof Palme</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1973-1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin I</td>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin</td>
<td>C+M+FP</td>
<td>1976-Oct 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ola Ullsten</td>
<td>Ola Ullsten</td>
<td>FP *</td>
<td>Oct 1978-1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin II</td>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin</td>
<td>C+M+FP</td>
<td>1979-May 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin III</td>
<td>Thorbjörn Fälldin</td>
<td>C+FP *</td>
<td>May 1981-1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olof Palme IV</td>
<td>Olof Palme</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1982-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olof Palme V</td>
<td>Olof Palme</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1985-Feb 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson I</td>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Feb 1986-1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson II</td>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1988-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson III</td>
<td>Ingvar Carlsson</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1994-March 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göran Persson II</td>
<td>Göran Persson</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göran Persson III</td>
<td>Göran Persson</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2002-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrik Reinfeldt I</td>
<td>Fredrik Reinfeldt</td>
<td>M+FP+C+KD</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrik Reinfeldt II</td>
<td>Fredrik Reinfeldt</td>
<td>M+FP+C+KD *</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minority government  
** V = Vänsterpartiet (former Communist Party); S = Socialdemokraterna (Social Democratic Party); MP = Miljöpartiet (Green Party); C = Centern (Centre Party - Agrarian Party); FP = Folkpartiet (Liberal Party); KD = Kristdemokraterna (Christ Democratic Party); and M = Moderaterna (former Conservative Party)

Politics in the City of Stockholm

The Stockholm City assembly essentially function as Stockholm's parliament. Its 101 councillors are appointed following general elections, held at the same time as the elections to the Parliament (Riksdagen) and county councils. The elected majority has a Mayor and seven Vice Mayors. The Mayor and each majority Vice Mayor is a head of a department, with responsibility for a particular area of operation, such as City Planning. The opposition also has four Vice Mayors, but they hold no executive power. Together the Mayor and the 11 Vice Mayors form the Council of Mayors, and they prepare matters for the City Executive Board (www.stockholm.se).
Table A.2: Election results and majorities in the City of Stockholm assembly since 1970-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election year</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>NYD</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>KD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Election participation rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M+FP+C</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V+SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V+SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V+SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M+FP+C+KD(+NYD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>S+V+MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>M+FP+KD+SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>S+V+MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M+FP+KD+C</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M+FP+KD+C</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V = Vänsterpartiet (former Communist Party)  
S = Socialdemokraterna (Social Democratic Party)  
MP = Miljöpartiet (Green Party)  
SP = Stockholmspartiet (Stockholm Party - local party)  
NYD = Ny Demokrati (New Democracy - populist party)  
C = Centern (Centre Party - Agrarian Party)  
FP = Folkpartiet (Liberal Party)  
KD = Kristdemokraterna (Christ Democratic Party)  
M = Moderaterna (former Conservative Party)