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1. Theoretical Framework

Important diversity of research fields on residential location choice

Focus on pull factors

Top-down perspective mostly economic and financial determinants
1. Theoretical Framework

Lack of studies on political factors acting as pull factors
   - Existing research: deterrent effects of natives’ attitudes toward immigration on immigrants’ location choice (Braco et al., 2018; Slotwinski and Stutzer, 2019)

Broader “political context of reception” (Portes and Rumbaut, 1996) → “societal discrimination, government policy, ethnic community strength and immigrants’ human capital attributes”
1. Theoretical Framework

How political reception contexts shape immigrants’ location decisions?

⇒ *Hypothesis 1*: An inclusive political reception context increases the attractiveness of a municipality for noncitzens.
1. Theoretical Framework

For whom does the reception context matter most? i.e. which groups of noncitizens are the most responsive to the reception context?

Finer grained perspective using Maslow’s pyramid of needs
- 5 human needs
- Need to fulfill basic needs before passing to the next one
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Fulfilled for all participants

Physiological needs
- air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction

Source: simplypsychology.org
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Focus on Financial security

Physiological needs

- Safety needs: personal security, employment, resources, health, property
- Physiological needs: air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction
1. Theoretical Framework

Focus on support of a social network

- Love and belonging: friendship, intimacy, family, sense of connection
- Safety needs: personal security, employment, resources, health, property
- Physiological needs: air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction
1. Theoretical Framework

Focus on highest educational achievement

Psychological needs

Esteem
respect, self-esteem, status, recognition, strength, freedom

Love and belonging
friendship, intimacy, family, sense of connection

Safety needs
personal security, employment, resources, health, property

Physiological needs
air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction
1. Theoretical Framework

Receptiveness towards political reception context

- **Self-actualization**: desire to become the most that one can be
- **Esteem**: respect, self-esteem, status, recognition, strength, freedom
- **Love and belonging**: friendship, intimacy, family, sense of connection
- **Safety needs**: personal security, employment, resources, health, property
- **Physiological needs**: air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction
2. Research questions and Hypotheses

For whom does the reception context matter most? i.e. which groups of noncitizens are the most responsive to the reception context?

➔ Hypothesis 2: Noncitizens who satisfied their basic physical needs, as well as their social needs, can afford to care for satisfying their higher needs for self-actualization, and thus be most receptive for political reception context.
3. Methodology

Migration Mobility Survey 2020 (representative of the last 15-years immigrants)

MMS linked with Conjoint analysis

1596 respondents (immigrants living in Switzerland)

“Estimate causal effects of multiple treatments components and assess several causal hypotheses simultaneously” (Hainmueller et al., 2014)

➔ Prevent social desirability
### 3. Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaching main commodities (shopping centre, schools, doctors)</td>
<td>Connection every half hour until 24:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connection every hour until 20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to nature (forest, lake, river,…)</td>
<td>Walking distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in walking distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living costs (rent, taxes, health insurance,…)</td>
<td>15% more expensive than your current municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% less expensive than your current municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of SVP/UDC (anti-immigrant party)</td>
<td>Lower than in surrounding municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher than in surrounding municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss citizenship requires</td>
<td>8 years of residence in the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years of residence in the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of the same country as you</td>
<td>No proper network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong social network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizen voting rights in the municipality for legal permanent residents (C Permit)</td>
<td>Possible after one year of residence in the canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No noncitizen voting right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local infrastructure for cultural and leisure activities (for example: swimming pool, theatre, sport center, museum,…)</td>
<td>Rich offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited offer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imagine you have an attractive long-term job offer. You plan to accept the job and settle nearby, and can choose to live in one of two municipalities, which are at equal distance from your new employment. On the following pages, you’ll have to choose between two municipalities. In which municipality would you prefer to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Municipality A</th>
<th>Municipality B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaching main commodities (shopping centres, schools, doctors, ...)</td>
<td>Connection every hour until 20:00</td>
<td>Connection every hour until 20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to nature (forest, lake, river, ...)</td>
<td>Not in walking distance</td>
<td>Walking distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living costs (rent, taxes, health insurance, ...)</td>
<td>15% more expensive than your current municipality</td>
<td>15% more expensive than your current municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of SVP/UDC (anti-immigrant party)</td>
<td>Lower than in surrounding municipalities</td>
<td>Higher than in surrounding municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss citizenship requires</td>
<td>8 years of residence in the municipality</td>
<td>8 years of residence in the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from the same country as you</td>
<td>Strong social network</td>
<td>Strong social network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-citizen voting rights in the municipality for legal permanent residents (C Permit)</td>
<td>No noncitizen voting right</td>
<td>No noncitizen voting right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local infrastructure for cultural and leisure activities (for example: swimming pool, theatre, sport center, museum, ...)</td>
<td>Rich offer</td>
<td>Rich offer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I pick municipality A
- I pick municipality B
3. Methodology

Monthly Household Income in thousand CHF - distribution

Highest completed education - distribution

Friends/Relative support in Switzerland - distribution
4. Findings
4. Findings

Average Marginal Component Effects
4. Findings

-Hypothesis 1: An inclusive political reception context increases the attractiveness of a municipality for noncitizens.

-Confirmed
4. Findings

Difference in marginal means – Income (Financial needs)
4. Findings
Difference in marginal means – Social Network (Belonginess needs)
4. Findings

**Difference in marginal means – Highest educational achievement (Self-esteem needs)**

*Hypothesis 2:* Noncitizens who satisfied their basic physical needs, as well as their social needs, can afford to care for satisfying their higher needs for self-actualization, and thus be most receptive for political reception context.

Only partially confirmed

→ Need further analyses
5. Conclusion

Political reception context matters to explain immigrants’ mobility even when other factors are accounted for.

Differences among subgroups may exist. However, also possible that political reception contexts matter for all noncitizens

⇒ Additional analyses (other categorizations or subjective perceptions rather than materialistic ones)

Financial and Belongingness needs influence receptivity towards natives’ attitudes

Self-Esteem needs influence receptivity towards citizenship policies

⇒ it can be that material/symbolic resources influence differently immigrants’ location choice depending on the fulfillment of needs
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