

Segregation or Integration? Immigrant Self-Employment in Switzerland

Anne Juhasz Liebermann · Christian Suter · Katia Iglesias Rutishauser

Abstract This article investigates whether immigrant self-employment is related more to segregation in the labour market than work as an employee (making it justifiable to speak of ethnic business) or whether, on the contrary, it reflects equality with the self-employment by the Swiss. The distinctive features of this research design are the comparison of ethnic segregation in the labour market with gender-specific segregation and the fact that, apart from migrants of the first generation, members of the second generation are also taken into consideration. The analyses show, firstly, that large differences exist between the various groups of migrants and that three patterns in immigrant self-employment become apparent. While for one person self-employment brings greater adjustment to the Swiss in comparison with working as an employee, for another it is associated with greater segregation. The third pattern reveals that self-employment can be an expression of “superstratification” (Überschichtung). Secondly, the analyses indicate that, for the self-employed, gender-specific horizontal and vertical segregation tends to be smaller than for employees. However, in the upper positions of the social space, greater gender-specific inequalities can be observed than in the lower positions, thus making “class” and “gender” intersect as structural categories of social inequality.

Keywords Ethnic business · Segregation · Integration · Ethnicity · Gender · Intersectionality

A. Juhasz Liebermann (✉)
Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaft, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universitätsstrasse 150 GB 1/129, 44780
Bochum, Germany
e-mail: anne.juhasz@rub.de

C. Suter
Institut de sociologie, Université de Neuchâtel, Faubourg de l’Hôpital 27, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland
e-mail: christian.suter@unine.ch

K. Iglesias Rutishauser
Institut de médecine sociale et préventive, centre hospitalier universitaire vaudois, rue du bugnon 17,
1005 Lausanne, Switzerland
e-mail: Katia.Iglesias@chuv.ch

Introduction

Although quite a lot of research has to date been conducted on immigrant self-employment and while the phenomenon of ethnic or immigrant business has also been receiving more and more attention from the general public too,¹ some unanswered questions still remain. Despite work on the 'ethnic niche' or the 'ethnic economy', seldom has empirical research investigated whether the economic areas and professional status of self-employed migrants indeed vary from those of a country's natives—is it therefore justifiable to speak of 'ethnic segregation' in the labour market or to refer in this sense to the existence of an ethnic economy? Another gap in the research lies in the fact that the creation of ethnic niches has scarcely ever been compared with other forms of segregation. As Schrover et al. (2007) wrote in their introduction to the special issue of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 2007, these ethnic niches and, for example, gender-specific segregation in the labour market are investigated separately with no exchange between the different research perspectives. The special issue mentioned above, therefore, deals with this exchange in a series of conceptual, qualitative empirical contributions. However, none of the articles directly compares gender-specific and ethnic segregation in the labour market on the basis of the statistical analysis of occupational segregation. With this article, we hope to close this gap: The goal is to empirically examine ethnic and gender-specific segregation in the labour market and to compare them using data from the Swiss Labour Force Survey (SLFS), which have the advantage of containing various kinds of migration-specific information. This not only permits us to calculate ethnic and gender-specific segregation in the labour market separately for the self-employed and employees, but also to differentiate between the first and the second generations of migrants and to take into account their origin. In this way, comparisons between groups are possible, which up to now could not be simultaneously taken into consideration.

Switzerland is an interesting case for migration studies; since the Second World War, more than two million people have migrated to Switzerland or live there as descendants of immigrants (Bundesamt für Migration 2012: 10). As of August 2012, 22.7 % of the resident population was of foreign origin, which amounted to 1.80 million people of the total population of 7.9 million.² Switzerland has therefore one of the highest levels of foreigners in Europe.³

Over a long period, migration in Switzerland was characterised by the fact that workers were actively recruited in the surrounding countries and brought into Switzerland as so-called guest workers. This policy of recruitment was committed to the principle of rotation: The foreign workers were the 'cyclical shock absorbers' of the economy (Kreis 1999: 34); they received a temporary residence permit for a limited amount of time, so that they could be sent away again when they were no longer needed. As guest workers—in the beginning mainly coming from Italy, and later from Spain, Portugal and Turkey—were hired as employees, there was in principle no provision for

¹ See, for example, the Conference on Entrepreneurship and Employment Creation of Immigrants in OECD Countries (OECD 2010).

² Federal Office for Migration (2012). International officials and their families, short-term residents (<12 months) and asylum seekers are not included.

³ In 2010, Switzerland's population contained 22.1 % of people of foreign origin whereas Germany, for instance, had 8.3 % and France 6.0 % (OECD 2012).

their self-employment. This is true for subsequent immigrants too, for example, in the wake of the war in Yugoslavia in the 1990s. A milestone of Switzerland's immigration policy was 2002, when the agreement between the European Union (EU) and Switzerland on the free movement of persons came into force. But even today, the hurdles for people of foreign origin who wish to become self-employed in Switzerland are relatively high⁴; nevertheless, in the last 10 to 15 years, the number of self-employed migrants in Switzerland has increased significantly. Migrants are still less often self-employed than the Swiss, indeed, but it is striking that their proportion has been rising more than that of the Swiss: In 1990, only 4.7 % of working foreigners were self-employed.⁵ Ten years later, in the year 2000, 8 % of working foreigners were self-employed. In comparison: In 1990, the proportion of self-employed Swiss was 12 %; in the year 2000, it was 14.7 %. In the second quarter of 2011, 15.3 % of the Swiss working population were self-employed compared with only 7.5 % of the working migrants.⁶ Due to the existence of false self-employment, these rates are probably overestimated. As for the immigrants, the overestimation is of particular importance in the course of the free movement of persons between Switzerland and the EU, which mainly covers the years since 2002.

As early as the 1970s, Hoffmann-Nowotny (1973) pointed out that the guest workers in the Swiss labour market carried out the least safe and least qualified work and were allotted occupational positions under those of the Swiss. Hoffmann-Nowotny described this phenomenon as *Unterschichtung* or substratification. Even today, migrants on average fill lower occupational positions in comparison to the Swiss. However, great differences exist according to the immigrants' country of origin: People from Germany, France, North America and Australia are strongly represented in the upper management range, while those from Portugal, ex-Yugoslavia and Turkey are overproportionally found in manual jobs and are therefore most seldom in management positions (Wanner 2004: 32). The rate of self-employment also varies considerably between the different groups (see "Descriptive Analyses").

Following these findings, the question arises as to how the self-employment of migrants in Switzerland should be interpreted. Does the phenomenon of substratification reproduce itself in the sense that self-employed migrants fill lower positions in the social structure than the autochthon population? Is there segregation in the self-employment sector of the labour market in the sense that migrants are overrepresented in the lower positions and work in different areas to the self-employed Swiss? Or can self-employment be interpreted as an expression of social mobility, as a process that brings equality with the

⁴ People from non-EU/EFTA countries without residence permits are given permission to take up self-employment in Switzerland only in exceptional cases (which includes highly qualified people responding to an explicit need in the labour market/refugees/family members of Swiss nationals and people with a long-term residence permit). Since June 1, 2007, people from EU/EFTA countries have been granted permission to take up self-employment and given a temporary residence permit valid for 5 years if they can provide proof of their self-employment. Before June 1, 2007, they only received a temporary residence permit if the quota was not used up. In addition, until June 1, 2007, a set-up time of 6–8 months was granted. If after that proof of self-employment was provided, a temporary residence permit for 5 years was issued (Source: Federal Office for Migration 2011). A permanent residence permit is issued to foreigners in Switzerland according to nationality after 5 or 10 years.

⁵ Source: Federal Statistical Office, Census.

⁶ Source: Federal Statistical Office, Swiss Labour Force Survey FSO (2011). In this calculation, only people who have no Swiss citizenship are identified as migrants. In our own analysis, naturalized people of foreign origin are also defined as migrants. For more on the data set, see section on "Descriptive Analyses."

positions of the Swiss and therefore as a sign of successful integration? Furthermore, what differences can be observed here between the various groups of migrants, or between the first and the second generation of migrants? Finally, if 'ethnic' segregation does exist, is it greater or smaller than gender-specific segregation in the labour market?

Middleman Minorities, Ethnic Economy or Modèle de Convergence—Various Approaches to Immigrant Self-Employment

The phenomenon of immigrant self-employment emerges in early works on the sociology of migration, where it is described as a means of social mobility (Warner and Srole 1945). The work of Edna Bonacich from 1973 is regarded as one of the classics regarding research into ethnic or immigrant business, where the self-employed migrants are called middleman minorities. The starting point for Bonacich's reflections (1973) was the observation that migrants are not only found in the lowest positions—as Marxist and neo-Marxist works in particular claim—but that certain groups of migrants also form a (separate) social class or stratum between the native working class and the elite class. In this case, they perform work which the dominant groups in society do not want to do. The specific characteristic of the class position of these migrants lies in their role as a buffer, which is particularly useful for the dominant class: “They act as a buffer for elites, bearing the brunt of mass hostility because they deal directly with the latter” (Bonacich 1973: 584). The duties, which they perform, are middleman activities, i.e. they are, for example, engaged in trade, commerce or food distribution. However, the middleman minorities take a middle position not only with regard to the kind of activity they perform, but they are also socio-economically in a middle position: In comparison with other foreign workers, they have attained social mobility, compared with the autochthon self-employed, although, their socio-economic status is lower.

The niche-economy approach also deals with the specific characteristics of immigrant self-employment, but it takes a different perspective from that of Bonacich. It does not analyze the position of the self-employed immigrants in the social structure of the host country, but rather concentrates on the qualitative peculiarities of immigrant self-employment. For example, it examines the specific wares which are offered for sale in an ethnic niche, the orientation toward the ethnic customer or also the composition of the company's employees with regard to their ethnic origin. In this context, the term 'ethnic economy'⁷ is often used in order to describe the various phenomena surrounding immigrant self-employment.

Apart from the two models already mentioned, which deal, as it were, with the peculiarities of the ethnic economy, a third model can be identified. Piguet (1999; 2010) called this the '*hypothesis of convergence*' (*modèle de convergence*), something he regarded as typical in the European context. According to this, immigrant entrepreneurial activity is an expression of their alignment with or adaptation to the autochthon population, in other words, an expression of advanced integration. Piguet argues that those migrants who vary least from the Swiss in the structure of society display a higher percentage of self-employed than those who are structurally very different from the Swiss. Özcan and Seifert (2000) also regard immigrant self-employment as an

⁷ For the various meanings of the term ethnic economy, see the explanations below.

indicator of integration. One can assume that foreign entrepreneurs have earned or procured the financial resources necessary to set up business and that they have taken into consideration the market and the location; they have, therefore, shown that they are familiar with the structure and characteristics of the host society (Özcan and Seifert 2000: 289). This interpretation contrasts with the view that, in the end, immigrant self-employment represents a forced form of employment, that is, self-employment 'out of necessity' (Bögenhold 1989). According to this view, it is principally migrants who find no job in the regular labour market that start up a business (cf. e.g. Raijman and Tienda 2000). The self-employment of migrants is in this case, therefore, not an indicator of advanced integration, but, on the contrary, an expression of the lack of structural integration.⁸

Several studies have dealt with the differences between the various groups of migrants and have emphasised that self-employed migrants do not represent a homogeneous group (for example: Fairlie and Meyer 1996; Light and Gold 2000; Waldinger et al. 1990). Without adhering to cultural essentialism, it is informative to examine the differences between the various groups of migrants. As, for example, Raijman and Tienda (2000) have shown for Chicago, different paths to self-employment can be observed among the various groups of migrants, which again implies differences with regard to the integration process. Piguet (2010) and Piguet and Besson (2005) also investigated this in their study on Switzerland, and they regard the disadvantage hypothesis (or specify hypothesis or self-employment out of necessity) as accurate for migrants from the states of Turkey and former Yugoslavia, as well as the convergence model for Italians and Portuguese.

These remarks already indicate that a lot of research has been conducted on the ethnic economy, or immigrant business, in previous years. But, as Logan et al. (1994) have established, there is more clarity about the consequences of immigrant self-employment than about the definition of what ethnic economies really are. According to Logan et al. (1994: 693), the most essential characteristic of an ethnic economy is that it is linked to a 'race', ethnicity or national origin. This means, for example, that, in a business, the owner should be of the same ethnic origin as the employees. Another criterion that is emphasised is the spatial concentration of businesses whose owners share the same ethnic origin. At the same time, orientation toward ethnic customers and the sale of ethnic products are sometimes cited as central features of an ethnic economy. A further possibility for defining an ethnic economy is, finally, that of linking it with the segregation of self-employed migrants in the labour market. By segregation, we mean here the concentration of certain groups in a certain place in the social space. In this regard, a differentiation can be made between horizontal segregation and vertical segregation, whereby horizontal segregation refers to the concentration of certain groups in specific areas of the labour market, and vertical segregation can be described as the concentration of certain groups in specific positions within the hierarchy of the stratification system. The usual variables for measuring social stratification are income, occupation and also education.

⁸ Flückiger et al. (2001) discuss discrimination against migrants and women as possible reasons for starting a business in Switzerland. However Falter (2000: 366) showed that wage-discriminated groups are not pushed into self-employment. As Falter did not differentiate between different groups of immigrants, or between male and female migrants, intragroup differences might have cancelled each other out.

In the literature, there are many analyses of horizontal and vertical gender-specific labour market segregation, that is, the varying distribution of men and women in the separate areas of the labour market and on the various hierarchical levels. For some time now, ethnic segregation has also been examined, i.e. the segregation between the autochthon population and migrants in the labour market. According to Logan and Stults (2003: 347), various forms of ethnic segregation, or clustering, can be distinguished; they call the concentration of employees in a certain economic sector an employment niche, while the term enclave economy describes those sectors where there is a concentration of both ethnic employees and ethnic owners. In contrast, others speak of ethnic enclaves when a concentration of ethnic owners and ethnic employees exists together with specializing in certain ethnic product.

In quantitative empirical studies on immigrant self-employment, ethnic segregation usually means, for practical reasons, the overrepresentation of migrants of a certain origin in specific economic sectors (see for different definitions and measurements of segmentation in the ethnic labour market Wang and Pandit (2007)). As corresponding information on spatial segregation or on the products is missing, segregation in the labour market is thus used as the sole criterion for the existence of an ethnic economy (e.g. Alba and Nee 2004; Wilson 1997). However, in these works, it is primarily the (economic) consequences of the ethnic economy that are of interest; ethnic segregation as such is hardly ever analyzed in detail. So it remains unclear whether the overrepresentation of certain migrants in specific economic sectors should be described as strong or weak. As mentioned above, a further problem is that ethnic segregation, meaning the creation of ethnic niches, has not been compared with other forms of segregation, and empirical work on this comparison remains rare. Even if intersectionality, i.e. the analysis of the interrelation between gender, ethnicity, class and other categories of social inequality has become mainstream (Yuval-Davis 2010: 187), empirical investigations of these interrelations are seldom undertaken. Two of the few studies which investigate ethnic and gender-specific segregation simultaneously, and compare them directly with each other, are those by Wright and Ellis (2000) and Piguet (1999), in which horizontal ethnic segregation in the labour market is compared with gender-specific segregation, based on data from the Swiss census in 1990. Piguet (1999) comes to the conclusion that ethnic segregation is lower than gender-specific segregation (both for the self-employed and employees). According to his findings, there is no obvious evidence of an ethnic economy in Switzerland, although detailed analysis of certain national origins show diversified processes and certain kinds of ethnic business (see also Piguet 2010). In the study by Wright and Ellis (2000) on the situation in Los Angeles in 1990, gender-specific segregation is greater than ethnic segregation in many cases there too. However, there are inter-ethnic differences with regard to the extent of gender-specific segregation. The authors demonstrate that gender-specific differences are large, especially directly after arrival in the USA, but with time they become smaller for almost all the migrant groups examined. There are some studies, though, in which gender-specific segregation in the labour market is calculated and compared with ethnic segregation in the labour market. However, these seldom examine to what extent gender-specific segregation exists in the various migrant groups; moreover, surveys which investigate the differences between the self-employed and employees in this connection are missing. This question is interesting for many reasons, not least because the female

migrant's step towards self-employment is seen as an expression of emancipation (cf. Apitzsch and Kontos 2008; Hillmann 1999). There is a further gap in research with regard to the differences in ethnic and gender-specific segregation existing between members of the first and the second generation. Self-employment in the second generation has scarcely been examined at all. One exception is the study by Goldberg and Şen (1997) on Germany, in which the authors conclude that self-employment in the second generation takes place in different economic sectors from that in the first generation. While members of the first generation mainly work in the classical areas of an ethnic economy (like, e.g. wholesale or manual trades), members of the second generation are more active in areas where they can benefit from their 'bi-cultural' resources: these include freelance professions (e.g. lawyers, translators) but also occupations in the area of import/export (Goldberg/Şen 1997: 78). Similar are the results of Rusinovic (2008) who shows that, in The Netherlands, the proportion of persons who work in the 'traditional' ethnic niches as self-employed is much lower in the second generation than it is in the first generation.

Finally, it should be noted that, although horizontal segregation in the labour market has been the subject of previous studies on immigrant self-employment, vertical stratification has rarely been examined, despite the fact that Bonacich drew attention to the special socio-economic position of self-employed migrants quite early on.

After the above-mentioned reflections, the following questions need to be examined: *Firstly*, we are interested in whether ethnic segregation can be observed in Switzerland with regard to immigrant self-employment. Should this be the case, then greater segregation between migrants and the Swiss should be found for the self-employed than for employees. Furthermore, ethnic segregation should be greater than gender-specific segregation. *Secondly*, we wish to investigate how great gender-specific segregation is within the migrant groups examined and what differences exist between the self-employed and employees. Are the differences between the sexes smaller for the self-employed than for employees or are they, on the contrary, larger? *Thirdly*, and finally, the differences between the first and the second generation of foreigners will be examined. Are there such differences with regard to segregation between migrants and Swiss in the labour market? Are there indications that an integration process takes place from one generation to the next?

Data and Methods

Data and Operationalization

Our survey uses data from the SLFS 2003, whose questionnaire contains detailed questions on the individual's occupational situation. In 2003, an additional migration module was included, through which the origin of a person could be traced back as far as the birthplace of his or her parents. This makes it possible to identify those people of foreign origin who have become naturalised in Switzerland and who therefore normally appear in the statistics as Swiss. Furthermore, the migration module helps to establish who belongs to the second generation. For the purposes of this survey, therefore, the concept of migrant has been interpreted broadly: It encompasses all those who were born abroad, independent of their current citizenship. Those people who were born in Switzerland and whose parents both came to Switzerland as migrants are counted as the

second generation. Because of the relatively small number of cases for members of the second generation, these were not examined separately according to national origin. While the advantage of the SLFS data lies in the fact that members of the second generation can be identified even if they have been naturalised, the disadvantage is that no information on spatial concentration, nor on the origin of employees in a business, is available.⁹ For this reason, the only criterion that can be included in the survey for the existence of ethnic segregation in the labour market is the economic sector.

Methods

For the analysis of segregation between the Swiss and persons of foreign origin, both horizontal and vertical segregation are calculated, where horizontal segregation relates to the distribution of men and women in the economic sectors. The variable ‘economic sector’ is used for this calculation. The fact that the categories within this variable are rather general is due to our theoretical design: In order to investigate how ethnicity and gender intersect, at the same time taking origin and migrant generation into consideration, various subgroups were formed from the group of self-employed migrants. A more precise subdivision of the variable ‘economic sector’ would have led to cell numbers that were too small, due to the sample size of self-employed migrants.

Vertical segregation refers to the vertical stratification and was calculated using the variable ‘practiced occupation classified according to the main occupational groups (ISCO, major groups (one digit))’, which corresponds to a vertical hierarchy according to occupational position (See Table 1 in the Annex).

For the calculation of segregation, the dissimilarity index,¹⁰ the standardised dissimilarity index¹¹ and the association index¹² were used. One important advantage of the dissimilarity index is that it is easy to interpret.¹³ It shows how many women or men

⁹ Another part of our research project included an analysis of the social networks of the entrepreneurs, which showed that they had many social contacts with Swiss nationals even if there were differences between the sexes and the generations (Suter et al. 2006). Concerning spatial segregation, empirical studies have shown that this occurs in Switzerland because of the social stratification of the immigrants and not due to ethnic community building (Heye and Leuthold 2005: 3).

¹⁰ Dissimilarity index $I_d = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{M_i}{M} - \frac{F_i}{F} \right|$, whereby n symbolises the number of economic sectors, M the total of men and F the total of women.

¹¹ Standardised Dissimilarity index $I_{d-std} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{\frac{M_i}{M_i+F_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{M_i}{M_i+F_i}} - \frac{\frac{F_i}{M_i+F_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{F_i}{M_i+F_i}} \right|$, whereby n here too symbolises the number of economic sectors, M the total of men and F the total of women. In the text, standardised dissimilarity index is shortened to SDI.

¹² Association index $I_{ass} = \exp \left(\frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1n \frac{F_i}{M_i} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1n \frac{F_i}{M_i} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}$, whereby n symbolises the number of economic sectors, M the total of men and F the total of women.

¹³ The dissimilarity index has been criticised from various sides. However, there is a very high correlation between the various masses of nominal segregation (Dissimilarity index from Duncan und Duncan, standardised dissimilarity index from Gibbs and ratio index from Charles or Charles und Grusky) (Semyonov and Jones (1999). Wang and Pandit (2007) argue that there is still no consensus about how to measure and identify ethnic labour market concentration patterns. For different measurements of occupational segregation with connections to Switzerland, see also Flückiger and Silver (1999).

would have to change sector if no divergence in their distribution over the economic sectors were to exist. Using the aforementioned formula, we get a percentage value which corresponds to the percentage of men and women who would have ‘to be moved’ in order to achieve equal distribution in the various economic sectors.

Results

Descriptive Analyses

As already explained, migrants are in general less often self-employed than the Swiss. It is important, however, to differentiate between the various groups of migrants. Thus, according to the SLFS 2003 survey, people of foreign origin who became naturalised were even more frequently self-employed than the Swiss (20.7 % of the naturalised persons were self-employed versus 19 % of the Swiss). As this group appears in many statistics as Swiss, the proportion of self-employed Swiss is overestimated, while that for people of foreign origin is underestimated.

It is interesting to note that members of the first and second generations of migrants are self-employed to practically the same degree according to the SLFS 2003 survey, 13.5 % of the first generation, and 13.7 % of the second generation are self-employed. This is surprising in as much as the second generation is on average considerably younger than the first and the probability of becoming self-employed increases with age. Moreover, women are less often self-employed than men, a pattern which is observed in other countries too, although the percentage of self-employed women has grown considerably in the past few years (see Table 2 in the Annex).

As can be seen in Table 2, the proportion of self-employed also varies according to the migrants’ group of origin.¹⁴ Comparatively high portions of self-employed are shown for migrants from central European countries, while migrants from southern and eastern European countries are less frequently self-employed than the Swiss or central Europeans. Differences are also found with regard to the age structure, the educational status, the naturalization rate and the material circumstances in which the groups live: On average, migrants from eastern Europe are not only younger than, for example, the Swiss; they have also the lowest educational qualifications, as well as the lowest percentage of naturalizations and live to only a very small degree in homes they own. The highest educational qualifications belong, as expected, to migrants from central European countries. Interestingly, the largest portion of naturalised persons is shown for people from countries outside Europe. And finally, with regard to the members of the second generation, most of these come, as expected, from countries in southern Europe.

Ethnic Segregation

First we examine ethnic segregation.¹⁵ As explained above, various authors assume that migrants who become self-employed move into an ethnic niche, and thus, in

¹⁴ The groups were formed on the assumption that they differ with regard to time of entry, reason for migration and the living situation in Switzerland. For the coding, see Table 3 in the Annex.

¹⁵ See the explanations in the section “Methods”.

comparison to work as an employee, the segregation between migrants and the autochthon population is increased. In order to check this assumption, the horizontal and vertical segregation between the Swiss and various migrant groups were calculated for the self-employed and for employees. In this way, it was possible to establish whether self-employment is accompanied by higher or lower segregation in comparison to work as an employee. In Table 4, the corresponding indices are shown.

These figures show how many people in a group would have to change their position if equal distribution existed between this group and the control group in the social positions examined. The value of 29.26 % for employees (horizontal segregation, including the agricultural sector) means, for example, that more than 29 % of female or male employees would have to change their position, if there were to be no differences between the two groups.

First, a word of explanation regarding *horizontal segregation*: For employees, the greatest segregation is that between the Swiss and migrants from eastern Europe (with a standardised dissimilarity index value (sDI) of 20.65 % and 23.99 %, respectively, when excluding the agricultural sector). In comparison with this high value, segregation between the Swiss and migrants of other origin can almost be described as low. It is important to note, however, that segregation between the Swiss and migrants from eastern Europe is surpassed by gender-specific segregation (sDI, 29.26 % and 27.40 %, respectively, excluding the agricultural sector). Women are, for example, highly overrepresented in the health and social services, while they are underrepresented in manufacturing and industry.

In contrast to employees, it makes a considerable difference for the self-employed whether people who work in the agricultural sector are included in the analysis or not. This can be put down to the fact that most farmers are Swiss due to the usual practice of passing on the farms to the next generation. If they are excluded from the analysis, then gender-specific segregation is greater than ethnic segregation for the self-employed too (gender-specific segregation; sDI, 29.29 %). Here, segregation between the Swiss and migrants from eastern Europe is almost as high as gender-specific segregation, while the differences between the Swiss and other migrants are comparatively low.

Next, we shall look at how horizontal segregation varies between employees and the self-employed (see Table 5 in the Annex). If the agricultural sector is included in the analysis, then the horizontal segregation differences between members of the first and second generation are smaller for the self-employed than for employees. In other words, for the self-employed, the positions of the first and second generation are closer together than for employees. In all other comparisons, horizontal segregation is greater for the self-employed than for employees. We can, therefore, say that, all in all, ethnic segregation is greater for the self-employed than for employees. If, however, the agricultural sector is excluded from the analysis, then horizontal segregation is smaller in almost all cases for the self-employed than for employees. Significantly more segregation for the self-employed than for employees is found between the Swiss and naturalised migrants.

For vertical segregation, the largest difference is found between the Swiss and the migrants from eastern Europe with a value of 37.88 % (sDI) followed by gender-specific segregation (sDI, 29.78 %). Women and migrants from eastern Europe are underrepresented in management and the academic professions, whereas they are

overrepresented, for example, in the service and sales sectors as well as in unskilled jobs. For employees, though, the differences between the Swiss and members of the second generation or migrants from central European countries are comparatively irrelevant.

In contrast, for the self-employed, the greatest vertical inequality is not between migrants and the Swiss but between the sexes (sDI, 32.08 %). In second place follows the inequality between the Swiss and migrants from eastern Europe (sDI, 25.89 %). The lowest vertical segregation is found for the self-employed between the Swiss and migrants from central European countries (sDI, 2.36 %).

Contrasting tendencies are apparent when examining vertical segregation and the differences between employees and the self-employed, as this comparison clearly shows greater segregation for the self-employed than for employees between the Swiss and members of the second generation, between the Swiss and naturalised migrants¹⁶ and, finally, between the Swiss and migrants from the 'rest of the world'. The reversed pattern, namely, significantly lower segregation for the self-employed than for employees, is found in the comparison of Swiss and migrants from southern Europe or members of the first generation.

Discussion

The analysis of horizontal segregation shows, first of all, that ethnic segregation varies depending on whether or not the agricultural sector is included.

When omitting the agricultural sector, there is high segregation between the Swiss and migrants from eastern Europe, but this is nevertheless exceeded by gender-specific segregation. Regarding the differences between the various groups of migrants, it seems that the groups that have been in Switzerland longer (i.e. southern Europeans) are closer to the positions of the Swiss when self-employed than when working as employees. For them, self-employment is a means of getting out of allocated positions in the substratum and achieving social mobility, and in this way, it is an expression of integration or 'convergence' (Piguet) to the Swiss. For the other groups, particularly migrants from eastern Europe, it is completely the opposite: Ethnic segregation is greater in self-employment than for employees. Migrants from eastern Europe not only work in different economic areas than the Swiss do, they also take positions of a lower status than the Swiss. Apparently, the differences and inequalities between them and the Swiss are larger for self-employment than for employees; self-employment seems to be a self-employment 'out of necessity' (Bögenhold), which argues for the disadvantage- or specificity-hypothesis (Piguet). Reasons for these different patterns are certainly differences in terms of individual social characteristics of the immigrants. But of great importance are also differences due to the time of arrival in Switzerland and therefore the different 'age' of the communities (which influence their amount of social, cultural and economic capital) as well as different motives for migration and different future perspectives in the host country.

Regarding the differences between the first and the second generations, these are smaller for the self-employed than for employees. Thus, contrary to the findings of Goldberg and Şen for Germany, the economic sectors in which members of the first and second generations become self-employed show comparatively little difference in Switzerland.

¹⁶ Naturalised people of foreign origin and members of the second generation are not congruent. Of the naturalised self-employed, 64.4 % belong to the first generation and 35.6 % to the second generation.

The findings further indicate that for employees practically no vertical segregation can be observed between the Swiss and members of the second generation or between the Swiss and naturalised migrants, which can be interpreted as an indicator of the equality achieved by these groups. The comparatively high vertical segregation between these two groups and the Swiss for the self-employed is *not*, as one might expect, due to the fact that they have not yet been successful in closing up to the positions of the Swiss. Rather on the contrary, this reflects a situation where these two groups have ‘overtaken’ the Swiss with regard to occupational position. In this case, we can speak of superstratification or the creation of a superstratum. For the second generation and naturalised immigrants, self-employment seems therefore to be a means of social mobility (Warner and Srole) and a means of breaking through the glass ceiling they are facing as people of foreign origin in Switzerland.

If, however, the agricultural sector is included in the analysis, ethnic segregation is stronger than gender-specific segregation for the self-employed in quite a few cases. Therefore, compared with being employed, self-employment does not generally imply an alignment of the Swiss and migrant positions, in fact, stronger segregation between these two groups can be observed. Actually, it is the agricultural sector in Switzerland that can be described as a real ‘ethnic business’, because the Swiss mainly work in it as employers, and access to this sector is practically barred for people who do not come from the Swiss farming milieu.

Gender-Specific Segregation

In the following, we examine¹⁷ whether the same gender-specific segregation¹⁷ exists for the self-employed as for employees and whether there are differences according to the country of origin (see Table 6 in the Annex).

Looking first at *horizontal gender-specific segregation*, we find that this is comparatively high in all cases, independent of whether the agricultural sector is included in the analysis.

For the self-employed, the lowest gender-specific segregation exists for members of the first generation (sDI, 22.50 %) and ‘all migrants’ (sDI, 24.18 %), the highest for the self-employed second generation (sDI, 32.48 %) and Swiss nationals (sDI, 31.47 %).

If we compare employees and the self-employed (including agriculture), then gender-specific segregation is lower in some of the self-employed groups than in employees. This applies to the Swiss and ‘all migrants’, and also, even if less distinctive, to migrants from southern Europe, eastern Europe and western Europe. In the other groups, though, the pattern is reversed, i.e. gender-specific segregation is greater for the self-employed than for employees. But if agriculture is excluded, the gender-specific segregation is greater in the group of the self-employed for the Swiss, and again, the second generation and immigrants from central European countries. On the other hand, the gender-specific segregation is lower for members of the first generation.

Next, we look at vertical gender-specific segregation (see Table 7 in the Annex).

Here, the greatest vertical gender-specific segregation both for employees and the self-employed is found in the Swiss group. High levels also exist in the group of immigrants from central European countries and the second generation. Furthermore, it is obvious that

¹⁷ See the explanations in the section on “Methods”.

for the majority of self-employed groups there is lower gender-specific segregation than for employees. This pattern is shown most clearly for migrants from the 'rest of the world', but is also apparent for migrants from eastern Europe, naturalised migrants and members of the first generation. The reversed pattern, i.e. greater segregation for the self-employed than for the employees, is found among migrants from southern Europe and also to a lesser extent by the second generation and migrations from central Europe.

Discussion

The analysis of *vertical* gender-specific segregation shows that in some groups segregation along the socio-economic status line is lower for the self-employed than for employees. Taking the step towards self-employment seems, therefore, to bring about the alignment of men and women in hierarchical positions. Interestingly, this applies to the first generation of migrants and to migrants from eastern Europe, for example. However, no alignment of men and women is found with regard to the self-employed of the second generation and migrants from central and southern Europe, or for the Swiss, where greater gender-specific differences exist than for people of foreign origin anyway. In those groups who are well established in Switzerland, becoming self-employed is accompanied by a higher segregation of men and women in hierarchical positions.

Horizontal gender-specific segregation lies at a relatively high level in most groups, and, in some cases, it is even considerably larger for the self-employed than for employees. Surprisingly, this difference is particularly large for the naturalised, and also for the second generation. In other words, for these groups, self-employment implies a more marked gender-specific pattern than for those who are employed. There are apparently typical areas in which men and women in these groups become self-employed. Naturalised women are self-employed to a relatively high degree (40 %) in the health and social services as well as in the area of personal services, whereas 47 % of naturalised men are self-employed in the areas of real estate, renting and related activities, and IT, as well as in the wholesale, retail and repair trade.

It is remarkable that migrants from eastern Europe are the only group in which both vertical and horizontal gender-specific segregation are lower for the self-employed than for employees. For the same group, we saw previously that self-employment goes along with high ethnic segregation. In contrast, the comparatively well-integrated and established second generation is the only group in which horizontal and vertical gender-specific segregation are clearly greater for the self-employed than for employees. For self-employed men of the second generation, real estate activities and IT, as well as the wholesale, retail and repair trade, are the areas in which many have become self-employed. Detailed analyses show that car dealing and car repairs are apparently the sectors which second-generation men particularly prefer (although in this area many men of the second generation work as employees). Women of the second generation, on the other hand, become self-employed more often than average in the sector of 'other services', three quarters of them working as hairdressers, beauticians or in similar professions. Furthermore, women of the second generation often set up their own businesses in the area of commerce and repairs (primarily in the retail trade). The analysis

of the gender-specific segregation shows therefore that the higher the social position, the larger the gender gap. Concerning integration, we see that social mobility and alignment go hand in hand with gender-specific segregation, whereas social exclusion is accompanied by a decrease in gender-specific segregation. This suggests that social mobility and integration are linked to 'gender-specific' assimilation, given the very high gender-specific segregation in Switzerland (Kriesi, Buchmann and Sacchi 2010). Besides cultural reasons, it might be that in higher regions of the social space, networks and access to financial capital, which are not distributed equally between men and women, play a more important role than in lower regions of the social space. Other reasons could be the different preferences of men and women and the feminisation of certain jobs (Schrover et al. 2007).

Conclusion

The analysis of ethnic and gender-specific segregation brought to light the following two phenomena: First, ethnic segregation is generally speaking lower for the self-employed than for employees when excluding the agricultural sector, but large differences exist according to the migrant group concerned. Second, gender-specific segregation is in some cases lower for the self-employed than for employees, although there are some groups where the opposite can be observed.

Point 1 With regard to ethnic segregation, three different patterns can be distinguished: Firstly, for migrants from southern Europe, there is lower horizontal and vertical ethnic segregation for the self-employed than for employees. This means that, compared with employees, a tendency toward alignment between migrants and the Swiss can be observed for the self-employed, and self-employment can, therefore, be described as a sign of integration. Secondly, there are groups in which segregation is greater for the self-employed than for employed people. Large differences exist between migrants from eastern Europe and the Swiss with regard to the economic sector in which they are active and occupational prestige, so that in this case we can speak of very high segregation. As these differences are more marked for the self-employed than for employees, we can say that in this group self-employment is not an expression of integration, but on the contrary represents segregation. The same applies to migrants from countries outside Europe, even if for this group the differences between them and the Swiss are smaller than for the eastern Europeans. A third pattern is found for migrants from central Europe, the second generation and naturalised migrants. Although, contrary to expectations, self-employment was associated with greater segregation than being employed, we were able to show that these groups have on average higher occupational prestige than the self-employed Swiss. This means that as the self-employed these groups have overtaken the Swiss by forming a superstratum.

For some, self-employment is accompanied by better alignment with the Swiss, while for others it is linked with stronger segregation. Following Raijman and Tienda (2000) and consistent with Piguet (2010), it can be stated that in Switzerland also self-employment displays various patterns according to the migrant group, which implies differences in the processes of integration. Based on the history of migration in Switzerland, we can assume that these differences are linked to the differing lengths

of stay of the groups, as migrants of southern European origin have been resident in Switzerland on average longer than migrants from eastern Europe.

Point 2 Gender-specific segregation tends to be lower for the self-employed than for employees. In self-employment, therefore, there is a reduction in the differences or inequalities between the sexes. It appears that self-employed women venture into positions or sectors which are otherwise reserved for men. How gender-specific differences come to be smaller in self-employment and to what extent this is due to women's emancipatory motives, as Hillmann (1999) and Apitzsch and Kontos (2008) claim, requires further (qualitative) study.

Even if this finding of lower gender-specific differences for the self-employed than for employees can also be observed in some sectors for naturalised citizens and members of the second generation, in general, horizontal gender-specific segregation is greater for the self-employed than for employees in these groups. This contradicts the hypothesis that, in principle, the length of stay leads to a reduction in gender-specific segregation (see, Wright und Ellis 2000). At the same time, vertical gender-specific segregation declines for naturalised persons, which could mean that, although the women in this group become self-employed in different sectors than men do, self-employment enables them to reduce the distance to men with regard to hierarchical position. The situation for the second generation is different: This is the only group in which both horizontal and vertical segregation are greater for the self-employed than for employees. As we established that on the whole members of the second generation overtake the Swiss as self-employed, it must be added that this superstratification apparently increases gender-specific differences and inequalities in this group.

All in all, the results show that the self-employed migrants in Switzerland do not constitute a homogeneous group or a separate social class. Firstly, there is a group which can be described as structurally integrated and which, with regard to occupational prestige, has overtaken even the Swiss. Secondly, it is possible to distinguish a pattern showing that, compared with work as an employee, self-employment brings better alignment with the Swiss, and, in this respect, it can be described a sign of integration. Thirdly, there is a pattern indicating that self-employment is linked with greater segregation, which means that a sub-stratum is formed. So in our opinion, and again consistent with Piguet, self-employment in Switzerland cannot generally be said to be an indicator of integration, but has different functions or forms for different groups of immigrants. And even if some immigrants do perform an activity that Bonacich would call a middleman activity, the notion of a middleman minority is neither adequate for those immigrants who form a 'superstratum' nor for those who occupy a very low-status position as self-employed. In Switzerland, the role of 'buffer' is mainly allocated to employees to absorb cyclical shocks.

It is remarkable that for precisely those groups in which self-employment can be described as an expression of integration or superstratification, gender-specific differences are greater for the self-employed than for employees, while they are smaller for the other groups. This indicates that class- and gender-specific differences crossover, so to speak. Accordingly, gender-specific inequalities and differences in the upper positions of the social space are greater than

those on the lower levels, which, amongst others, can be explained by different networks of men and women.

Our findings suggest different policy implications: (a) The fact that we were able to distinguish different patterns of self-employment of immigrants implies that self-employment cannot generally be seen as a means to integration. Thus, it should not be promoted as a strategy for overcoming joblessness. But for migrants wishing to start their own business, legal barriers should be removed and access to capital should be eased. (b) The results concerning the differences between the different groups of immigrants have two further implications: First of all, varied policies on defined target groups are needed. (Self-employed) migrants are not a homogenous group; policies have to take into account the differences with regard to their origin and generation, but also their time of arrival and the characteristics of their community. Second, ethnic segregation has to be understood as intersecting with other patterns of segregation. In the case of Switzerland, it is the gender-specific segregation that is of particular importance, while the class position is of great importance as well. Differentiated policies have to consider the complexity of intersectionality by linking traditional fields such as ethnicity and gender and by formulating measures that overcome structural boundaries and cultural frameworks.

Acknowledgment The research conducted here was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant numbers 405140–69098 and 100017_143320).

Appendix

Table 1 Variables for the calculation of horizontal and vertical segregation

Horizontal segregation (economic sector)	1	Agriculture and forestry/mining and quarrying/electricity and water supply
	2	Manufacturing and industry/building industry
	3	Wholesale and retail trade, repair trade/restaurant and hotel trade
	4	Transport, storage and communication/financial intermediation and insurance/real estate, renting and related activities, IT
	5	Public administration/education/health and social work/other services/private households/extraterritorial organizations and bodies
Vertical segregation (practiced occupation: classified according to the main occupational groups (ISCO, major group (one digit))	1	Managers (e.g. senior civil servants, department managers in a company, managing directors)/academic and freelance professions (e.g. architects, IT specialists)
	2	Technicians and similar occupations (e.g. electrotechnicians, EDP operators)/office staff (e.g. bookkeepers, travel agent employees)/jobs in services and sales (e.g. hairdressers, salespeople)
	3	Skilled agricultural workers/craft and related trade workers/machine operators (incl. taxi drivers, fitters)/labourers and unskilled workers (e.g. cleaners, home helps)

Table 2 The proportion of self-employed according to group of origin, 2003

	Swiss	Central Europeans	Southern Europeans	Eastern Europeans	People from outside Europe
Proportion of self-employed (in percent)	19.0 % ^a (22.4 %) ^b	16.0 % (16.4 %)	12.4 % (12.4 %)	10.7 % (11.0 %)	10.8 % (11.1 %)
Women	15.9 % (18.6 %)	13.2 % (13.7 %)	10.2 % (10.2 %)	9.0 % (9.4 %)	10.5 % (10.9 %)
Men	22.0 % (26.0 %)	18.3 % (18.5 %)	13.8 % (13.9 %)	11.9 % (12.1 %)	11.1 % (11.3 %)
Number of cases unweighted	18,071	3,624	5,928	2,842	1,571

Swiss Labour Force Survey, SLFS, weighted data

^a Without agricultural sector

^b With agricultural sector

Table 3 Coding countries of origin (states and und regions, Swiss Federal Office of Statistic 2003)

Central Europe	Denmark, Finland, Island, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Poland, Slovakia, Belgium, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Monaco, The Netherlands, UK
Southern Europe	Portugal, Spain, Greece, Italy, Malta, Andorra
Eastern Europe	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, Slovenia, Serbia and Montenegro
States outside of Europe	States in Africa, South- and Central America, Asia, Oceania, North America

Table 4 Ethnic horizontal segregation, dissimilarity and association indices, 2003

Segregation between	Horizontal segregation (incl. agriculture)		Horizontal segregation (excl. agriculture)	
	Employees	Self-employed	Employees	Self-employed
Women and men (all)	28.67 % ^a	25.48 %	28.27 %	29.78 %
	1.99 ^b	1.83	1.80	1.84
	29.26 % ^c	25.03 %	27.40 %	29.29 %
Swiss and South European migrants	17.34 % ^a	22.33 %	17.42 %	8.04 %
	1.43 ^b	3.30	1.39	1.19
	16.69 % ^c	21.15 %	16.47 %	8.17 %
Swiss and East European migrants	25.27 %	32.80 %	25.81 %	26.23 %
	1.60	2.48	1.60	1.65
	20.65 %	31.03 %	23.99 %	25.09 %

Table 4 (continued)

Segregation between	Horizontal segregation (incl. agriculture)		Horizontal segregation (excl. agriculture)	
	Employees	Self-employed	Employees	Self-employed
Swiss and Central European migrants	0.32 %	2.62 %	0.27 %	2.01 %
	1.02	1.06	1.01	1.04
	0.87 %	2.51 %	0.29 %	1.98 %
Swiss and People from outside Europe	11.76 %	28.49 %	11.26 %	16.65 %
	1.79	2.43	1.27	1.52
	18.30 %	26.59 %	11.88 %	16.56 %
Swiss and first generation of migrants	15.40 %	20.56 %	15.36 %	6.17 %
	1.40	2.54	1.33	1.13
	16.33 %	20.07	15.38 %	6.20 %
Swiss and second generation of migrants ^d	11.73 %	22.57 %	11.50 %	6.18 %
	1.317	3.85	1.25	1.15
	12.33 %	21.12 %	9.11 %	5.91 %
Swiss and naturalized migrants	4.43 %	24.80 %	3.88 %	13.00 %
	1.34	2.23	1.09	1.36
	9.40 %	23.62 %	4.45 %	12.80 %
First generation of migrants and second generation of migrants (only people of foreign origin)	11.76 %	9.67 %	11.90 %	9.36 %
	1.29	1.05	1.29	1.28
	9.72 %	14.82 %	11.92 %	9.59 %
Swiss and non-naturalized migrants	16.82 %	21.66 %	16.84 %	6.48 %
	1.41	3.06	1.36	1.14
	16.68 %	21.07	16.29 %	6.63 %

Swiss Labour Force Survey 2003, SLFS, weighted data, *n* between 175 and 14,901

^a Dissimilarity index

^b Association index

^c Standardized dissimilarity index

^d Members of the second generation are people who were born in Switzerland and whose parents were both born abroad, as well as those people who were born abroad, but who completed most of their schooling in Switzerland. Members of the first generation are people who were born abroad and who completed most of their education and training abroad.

Table 5 Ethnic vertical segregation, Dissimilarity and Association indices, 2003

Segregation between	Vertical segregation (incl. agriculture)	
	Employees	Self-employed
Women and men (all)	32.80 % ^a	32.28 %
	1.66 ^b	1.7
	29.78 % ^c	32.08 %
Swiss and South European migrants	20.85 % ^a	7.27 %
	1.47 ^b	1.16
	24.14 % ^c	7.93 %
Swiss and East European migrants	33.98 %	25.27 %
	1.87	1.55
	37.88 %	25.89 %
Swiss and Central European migrants	2.05 %	2.51 %
	1.05	1.04
	2.61 %	2.36 %
Swiss and people from outside Europe	6.08 %	15.79 %
	1.13	1.3
	7.71 %	13.76 %
Swiss and first generation of migrants	17.20 %	7.25 %
	1.34	1.13
	17.86 %	6.68 %
Swiss and second generation of migrants ^d	1.99 %	16.77 %
	1.03	1.32
	1.80 %	14.71 %
Swiss and naturalized migrants	4.08 %	19.80 %
	1.10	1.42
	5.46 %	17.75 %
First generation of migrants and second generation of migrants (only people of foreign origin)	17.81 %	9.52 %
	1.36	1.2
	16.32 %	9.60 %
Swiss and non-naturalized migrants	16.86 %	3.79 %
	1.33	1.07
	17.89 %	3.52

Swiss Labour Force Survey 2003, SLFS, weighted data, *n* between 175 and 14,901

^a Dissimilarity index

^b Association index

^c Standardized dissimilarity index

^d Members of the second generation are people who were born in Switzerland and whose parents were both born abroad, as well as those people who were born abroad, but who completed most of their schooling in Switzerland. Members of the first generation are people who were born abroad and who completed most of their education and training abroad

Table 6 Gender-specific horizontal segregation according to country of origin and generation, Dissimilarity and Association index, 2003

Segregation between	Horizontal segregation (incl. agriculture)		Horizontal segregation (excl. agriculture)	
	Employees	Self-employed	Employees	Self-employed
Swiss men and Swiss women	28.90 % ^a	26.04 %	28.36 %	31.94 %
	2.05 ^b	1.87	1.83	1.87
	30.90 % ^c	26.95 %	28.84 %	31.47 %
Male migrants and female migrants (all nationalities and generations)	28.00 %	21.54 %	27.87 %	21.65 %
	1.99	1.7	1.84	1.69
	27.09 %	21.00 %	25.55 %	24.18 %
First-generation women and first-generation men (all nationalities)	30.17 %	25.30 %	30.01 %	24.10 %
	1.98	1.91	1.83	1.65
	28.13 %	29.34 %	26.72 %	22.50 %
Second-generation women and second- generation men (all nationalities)	23.95 %	32.48 %	23.95 %	32.52 %
	1.8	2.15	1.74	2.1
	23.45 %	30.75 %	24.39 %	32.48 %
Male migrants and female migrants from southern Europe	28.40 %	29.40 %	27.96 %	29.45 %
	2.4	2.233	1.92	1.99
	33.71 %	31.09 %	25.55 %	30.39 %
Male migrants and female migrants from eastern Europe	33.02 %	33.65 %	32.79 %	34.72 %
	2.21	2.07	1.97	1.98
	31.45 %	29.08 %	29.13 %	27.12 %
Male migrants and female migrants from central Europe	28.60 %	26.66 %	28.17 %	31.80 %
	1.97	1.87	1.80	1.86
	29.74 %	26.68 %	28.42 %	31.10 %
Male migrants and female migrants from the rest of the world	25.50 %	27.42 %	25.51 %	24.94 %
	1.82	2.26	1.72	1.59
	23.87 %	31.31 %	23.19 %	24.89 %
Naturalized women and men	25.41 %	30.44 %	25.35 %	29.31 %
	1.71	2.03	1.66	1.70
	23.33 %	31.91 %	24.89 %	23.66 %

Swiss Labour Force Survey 2003, SLFS, weighted data, *n* between 175 and 14,901

^a Dissimilarity index

^b Association index

^c Standardized dissimilarity index

Table 7 Gender-specific vertical segregation according to country of origin and generation, Dissimilarity and Association index, 2003

Segregation between	Vertical segregation (incl. agriculture)	
	Employees	Self-employed
Swiss men and Swiss women	34.82 % ^a	34.47 %
	1.74 ^b	1.78
	32.27 % ^c	34.96 %
Male migrants and female migrants (all nationalities and generations)	25.41 %	22.45 %
	1.47	1.43
	23.65 %	21.28 %
First-generation women and men (all nationalities)	25.24 %	19.52 %
	1.48	1.37
	23.53 %	19.09 %
Second-generation women and men (all nationalities)	31.62 %	32.73 %
	1.66	1.88
	29.51 %	31.64 %
Male migrants and female migrants from southern Europe	28.72 %	32.12 %
	1.54	1.63
	26.42 %	30.09 %
Male migrants and female migrants from eastern Europe	27.06 %	21.50 %
	1.51	1.42
	22.54 %	20.32 %
Male migrants and female migrants from central Europe	33.98 %	33.77 %
	1.72	1.75
	31.57 %	33.77 %
Male migrants and female migrants from the rest of the world	23.92 %	7.11 %
	1.43	1.14
	21.38 %	6.89 %
Naturalized women and men	30.08 %	23.28 %
	1.60	1.44
	26.87 %	21.38 %

Swiss Labour Force Survey 2003, SLFS, weighted data, *n* between 175 and 14,901

^a Dissimilarity index

^b Association index

^c Standardized dissimilarity index

References

- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2004). Assimilation und Einwanderung in den USA. *IMIS-Beiträge*, 23, 21–39.
- Apitzsch, U., & Kontos, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Self-Employment Activities of Women and Minorities. Their Success or Failure in Relation to Social Citizenship Policies*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Bögenhold, D. (1989). Die Berufspassage in das Unternehmertum. Theoretische und empirische Befunde zum sozialen Prozess von Firmengründungen. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 18(4), 263–281.
- Bonacich, E. (1973). A theory of middleman minorities. *American Sociological Review*, 38(5), 583–594.
- Bundesamt für Migration (BFM) (2012). Migrationsbericht 2011. Bern.
- Fairlie, R. W., & Meyer, B. D. (1996). Ethnic and racial self-employment differences and possible explanations. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 31(4), 757–793.
- Falter, J.-M. (2000). Self-employment and wage discrimination in Switzerland. *Schweiz Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik*, 136(3), 349–369.
- Federal Office for Migration (2011). Free movement of persons Switzerland–EU/EFTA http://www.bfm.admin.ch/content/bfm/de/home/themen/fza_schweiz-eu-efta.html. Accessed December 15, 2011.
- Federal Office for Migration (2012). http://www.bfm.admin.ch/content/bfm/de/home/dokumentation/zahlen_und_fakten/auslaenderstatistik/aktuelle_ergebnisse.html. Accessed October 4, 2012.
- Flückiger, Y., & Silber, J. (1999). *The Measurement of Segregation in the Labor Force*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Flückiger, Y., Ferro Luzzi G. & Falter, J.-M. (2001). Le travail indépendant en Suisse. Berne: FNRS–PP “Demain la Suisse” (Rapport scientifique).
- Goldberg, A., & Şen, F. (1997). Türkische Unternehmer in Deutschland. Wirtschaftliche Aktivitäten einer Einwanderungsgesellschaft in einem komplexen Wirtschaftssystem. In H. Häussermann & I. Oswald (Eds.), *Zuwanderung und Stadtentwicklung* (pp. 63–84). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Heye, C. & Leuthold, H. (2005). Theory-based social area analysis: An approach considering the conditions of a post-industrial society. In: J. A. Tenedorio & R. P. Juliao (Eds.), 14th European Colloquium on Theoretical and Quantitative Geography. Proceedings.
- Hillmann, F. (1999). A look at the hidden side: Turkish women in Berlin's ethnic labour market. *International Journal of Urban and Region Research*, 23(2), 267–282.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, H.-J. (1973). *Soziologie des Fremdarbeiterproblems. Eine theoretische und empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Schweiz*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke.
- Kreis, G. (1999). Die Schweiz wird zum Einwanderungsland. In W. Leimgruber & W. Fischer (Eds.), *Goldene Jahre. Zur Geschichte der Schweiz seit 1945* (pp. 33–57). Zürich: Chronos.
- Kriesi, I., Buchmann, M., & Sacchi, S. (2010). Variation in the job opportunities for men and women in the Swiss labor market 1962–1989. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 28, 309–323.
- Light, I., & Gold, S. (2000). *Ethnic Economies*. San Diego: CA, Academic Press.
- Logan, J. R., Alba, R. D., & McNulty, T. L. (1994). Ethnic economies in metropolitan regions: Miami and beyond. *Social Forces*, 72(3), 691–724.
- Logan, J. R., & Stults, B. J. (2003). Enclaves and entrepreneurs: Assessing the payoff for immigrants and minorities. *International Migration Review*, 37(2), 344–388.
- OECD (2010). Open for business: Migrant entrepreneurship in OECD Countries. OECD Publishing (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/978264095830-en>).
- OECD (2012). International Migration Database. <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=MIG>.
- Özcan, V., & Seifert, W. (2000). Selbständigkeit von Immigranten in Deutschland—Ausgrenzung oder Weg der Integration? *Soziale Welt*, 51(3), 289–302.
- Piguet, E. (1999). *Les migrations créatrices. Etude de l'entrepreneuriat des étrangers en Suisse*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Piguet, E. (2010). Entrepreneurship among immigrants in Switzerland. In OECD (ed.), Open for business: Migrant entrepreneurship in OECD countries (pp. 149–179). OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/978264095830-en>.
- Piguet, E., & Besson, R. (2005). L'emploi indépendant des personnes d'origine étrangère. In W. Haug & P. Wanner (Eds.), *Migrants et marché du travail. Compétences et insertion professionnelle des personnes d'origine étrangère en Suisse* (pp. 111–147). Neuchâtel: Bundesamt für Statistik.
- Raijman, R., & Tienda, M. (2000). Immigrants pathways to business ownership: A comparative ethnic perspective. *International Migration Review*, 34(3), 682–706.
- Rusinovic, K. (2008). Transnational embeddedness: Transnational activities and networks among first- and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs in The Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(3), 431–451.

- Schrover, M., Leun, J., & Quispel, C. (2007). Niches, labour market segregation, ethnicity and gender. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(4), 529–540.
- Semyonov, M., & Jones, F. L. (1999). Dimensions of gender occupational differentiation in segregation and inequality: A cross-national analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 46(2), 225–247.
- Suter, C., Schubert, R., Juhasz, A., Hettlage R. & Soland, B. (2006). Der Weg zur Integration? Die Rolle der selbständigen Erwerbstätigkeit von Migrantinnen und Migranten in der Schweiz. NFP 51 “Social Integration and Social Exclusion”. Final scientific report. Bern.
- Swiss Labour Force Survey (2003). Swiss Federal Office of Statistics: Neuchâtel.
- Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H., & Ward, R. (1990). Opportunities, group characteristics, and strategies. In R. Waldinger, H. Aldrich, & R. Ward (Eds.), *Ethnic Entrepreneurs* (pp. 13–48). Newbury Park/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Wang, Q., & Pandit, K. (2007). Measuring ethnic labour market concentration and segmentation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(8), 1227–1252.
- Wanner, P. (2004). *Migration und Integration. Ausländerinnen und Ausländer in der Schweiz. Eidgenössische Volkszählung 2000*. Neuchâtel: Bundesamt für Statistik.
- Warner, W. L., & Srole, L. (1945). The ethnic groups in the class system. In W. L. Warner & L. Srole (Eds.), *The Social System of American Ethnic Groups* (pp. 67–102). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wilson, F. D. (1997). Ethnic concentrations and labor market opportunities. CDE Working Paper, No. 97–17.
- Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2000). The ethnic and gender division of labor compared among immigrants to Los Angeles. *International Journal of Urban and Region Research*, 24(3), 583–600.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2010). Jenseits der Dichotomie von Anerkennung und Umverteilung: Intersektionalität und soziale Schichtung. In H. Lutz, M. T. Herrera Vivar, & L. Supik (Eds.), *Fokus Intersektionalität* (pp. 186–201). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.