



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Straight-line assimilation in home-leaving? A comparison of Turks, Somalis and Danes

Nielsen, Rikke Skovgaard

Published in:
Housing Studies

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1080/02673037.2015.1114076](https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2015.1114076)

Creative Commons License
CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Nielsen, R. S. (2016). Straight-line assimilation in home-leaving? A comparison of Turks, Somalis and Danes. *Housing Studies*, 31(6), 631-650. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2015.1114076>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Straight-line Assimilation in Leaving Home? A Comparison of Turks, Somalis and Danes

Rikke Skovgaard Nielsen, BUILD, Aalborg University, risn@build.aau.dk

ABSTRACT The purpose of this paper is to test the evidence for spatial assimilation and straight-line assimilation in the transition of leaving home in Denmark. Based on data from the extensive Danish registers, the paper analyses the home-leaving patterns of Danes, Turkish immigrants, Turkish descendants and Somali immigrants. Two main findings emerged. First, while spatial segregation patterns of home-leavers were clear, inter-generational mobility did take place, supporting the notion of straight-line assimilation. Second, inter-generational effects were identified. While there was no indication that parental socio-economic situation affected the spatial segregation of home-leavers, substantial effects were found for the share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood: the higher the share of ethnic minorities, the higher the hazard for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood and the lower the hazard for moving to a non-ethnic neighbourhood. Similarity in the patterns of natives and the ethnic minority groups indicates that the processes taking place might be about more than assimilation between generations.

Keywords: neighbourhoods, residential mobility, migration, leaving home, spatial assimilation, straight-line assimilation

Introduction

In recent years, ethnic spatial segregation and its consequences for integration and cohesion have become central themes in political debates across Europe (Musterd & de Vos 2007; Zorlu & Mulder 2007). Spatial segregation is thought to contribute to social inequality when it is linked to deprivation (Bolt et al. 2010). Furthermore, spatial segregation is perceived as creating parallel societies, hindering integration and threatening the social cohesion of European societies. While the exact link between spatial segregation and integration is by no means easily determined, ethnic minorities are accused of self-segregation, i.e. choosing the parallel life of the ethnic neighbourhood due to unwillingness to assimilate (Bolt et al. 2010; Phillips et al. 2007). Nationalist, right-wing parties are gaining increased support by voters in many countries; Denmark being one of them. In the elections in June 2015, The Danish People Party became the second largest party in parliament. The debate on ethnic minorities, immigration, integration and segregation is a key factor in the success of the nationalist parties. In European as well as national

debates, the positive consequences of spatial segregation are often overlooked while spatial assimilation is perceived as causing social integration and consequently being a precondition for social cohesion (Stillwell & Phillips 2006; Bolt et al. 2010).

Extensive research has been carried out on various aspects of spatial segregation and its implications e.g. residential mobility between neighbourhoods (e.g. Bolt & van Kempen 2010; Schaake et al. 2014), housing careers (e.g. Abramsson et al. 2002; Magnusson Turner & Hedman 2014), and the link between segregation and integration (e.g. Musterd & De Vos 2007; Bolt et al. 2010). However, not much is known about the settlement dynamics of ethnic neighbourhoods and the mobility of the people living in them (Musterd & de Vos 2007). The primary reason is the lack of suitable data for identifying the relative importance of covariates on moving to ethnic neighbourhoods. Longitudinal data on housing careers is required and such data are scarce (Özüekren & van Kempen 2003; Magnusson Turner & Hedman 2014). While cross-sectional data can be utilised for comparing the development of segregation levels over time, it cannot identify mobility patterns (Bolt & van Kempen 2010). The Danish population registers offer a unique possibility in this respect, containing substantial yearly data for the total population of Denmark. Individuals can be followed over time, allowing for longitudinal analyses and the estimation of the relative importance of covariates.

Housing situations are part of a housing career where the links between situations are essential (Pickles and Davies 1991). Understanding housing situations as dynamic parts of a housing career is fundamental as it underscores the nature of housing as ever-changing and closely linked to other aspects of life (Mulder & Hooimeijer 1999). In relation to housing, the family and work careers are central, as they impact greatly on housing needs, motives for change and financial opportunities. Through conducting a housing career, it becomes possible for the household to adjust its housing situation to changing needs and resources (Magnusson & Özüekren 2002). Housing situations are linked over time in that early situations influence the ensuing options and preferences. This highlights the importance of early transitions such as leaving home. If segregation patterns spill over from parental household to the initial housing situation of young adults, it adds an additional perspective to the discussion of the issues of ethnic concentration namely the impact of inter-generational effects. Furthermore, as leaving home signifies the onset of a housing career and influence the ensuing housing career, establishing whether the housing careers start differently is vital for understanding the housing attainment of different ethnic groups. Despite its significance, ethnic differences in leaving home is however under-researched (Zorlu & Mulder 2011).

This paper provides empirical knowledge on the mobility patterns of home-leaving Somalis, Turks and Danes with respect to ethnic spatial segregation. The analyses will evaluate the evidence for spatial assimilation and straight-line assimilation with respect to leaving home in a Danish context. The focus is on the impact of individual and parental acculturation and socio-economic situation on whether young home-leavers move to an ethnic or a non-ethnic

neighbourhood when leaving home¹. The first step towards understanding the consequences of spatial segregation is to understand the causes and consequences of the changes in the spatial patterns of residence of ethnic minorities (Stillwell & Phillips 2006). By analysing spatial segregation patterns of young home-leavers, this paper thus provides empirical insights pertinent to the raging discussions of the consequences of spatial segregation for integration and cohesion. The purpose is not based on a notion of spatial segregation being undesirable and assimilation the goal. Rather, without going into the debate of the pros and cons of spatial segregation, the paper provides much needed empirical findings on the settlement patterns of young home-leavers and the changes and effects between generations.

Purpose of the paper

The purpose of the paper is two-fold. First, the paper investigates the extent to which the notion of straight-line assimilation can be supported in the home-leaving process of Turks and Somalis in a Danish context. The focus is on *inter-generational mobility* in the first transition in the housing career, based on the research question:

Are there indications of straight-line assimilation taking place, leading to ethnic minority home-leavers moving less often into ethnic neighbourhoods when they leave home compared to when they lived with their parents? Are there ethnic differences in indications of straight-line assimilation?

Second, the paper investigates the *inter-generational effects* in the first transition in the housing career, based on the research question:

Does the parental degree of acculturation and socio-economic situation impact on whether home-leavers move into ethnic neighbourhoods? Are there ethnic differences in terms of this?

The focus is on spatial assimilation rather than for instance cultural assimilation. Thus, whether the young home-leavers are assimilated in other respects and whether there is a link between different aspects of assimilation is outside the scope of this paper. Furthermore, spatial segregation is caused by a range of factors e.g. the conditions of the local housing market; factors which the home-leavers cannot control. Rather than attempting to uncover all these factors, the purpose of this paper is to focus on a specific factor by identifying the role of intergenerational effects and intergenerational mobility.

Four groups are under study: Danes, Turkish immigrants, Turkish descendants and Somalis. Turks constitute the largest ethnic group in Denmark and one of the first groups that started migrating more systematically to Denmark as migrant workers. Turkish descendants are by far

¹ The definition of an ethnic neighbourhood will be described later in the paper.

the largest descendant group. Somalis constitute a major refugee group and one of the earliest refugee groups to arrive in Denmark. Somalis' socio-economic situation is worse than that of Turks as the unemployment rate is higher and divorces are more common, leading to a higher share of lone parent households (Kleist 2007). The size of the two groups and the differences between them make them interesting groups to study in a Danish context. Furthermore, both groups are spatially segregated, as 43% of the adult population of Turkish origin and 49% of the adult population of Somali origin live in neighbourhoods with at least 30% non-Western ethnic minorities (source: database based on Danish registers). Danes have been included in the analyses in order to be able to establish whether identified patterns are specific for the ethnic groups or resembles that of natives.

Home-leaving descendants can be seen as potentially more acculturated than home-leaving immigrants. The descendants grew up in Denmark and have been exposed to Danish culture and norms all their life. Their language level and knowledge of Danish society can be expected on an average level to be higher than that of immigrants even if home-leavers per definition have lived parts of their childhood in Denmark. Hence, by comparing Turkish immigrant and Turkish descendant home-leavers, it becomes possible to identify potential differences in their level of acculturation. The inclusion of Turks and Somalis is relevant based on the notion of place stratification being more appropriate for the most stigmatised groups and spatial assimilation for the less stigmatised (Bolt & van Kempen 2003; Schaake et al. 2014). Previous studies have identified Somalis as being at the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy in Denmark (Kleist 2007). They can thus be expected to face more discrimination than Turks, who as a group have been in Denmark for longer and are less stigmatised.

While leaving home is the transition analysed in the paper, the purpose is not to explain the home-leaving patterns of the four groups more generally. Therefore, theory and existing knowledge on leaving home is not drawn upon directly in this paper. However, as will be described later, it has been utilized when determining the variables to control for in the models. The general home-leaving patterns of the four groups have been analysed by the author in another paper (Skovgaard Nielsen, 2015).

Explanations of ethnic settlement patterns

Overall, two complementary explanations can be given for ethnic differences in housing attainment (Bolt & van Kempen 2002). On one hand, it can be caused by ethnic differences in the possibilities for realising preferences i.e. by differences in the possibilities and restraints of households regarding especially financial resources, knowledge of the housing market, discrimination as well as social networks, the latter e.g. through the shared knowledge that households draw on when house-hunting (Özüekren & van Kempen 2002; Özüekren & van Kempen 2003). On the other hand, ethnic differences in housing attainment can be caused by ethnic differences in needs and preferences. Ethnic groups might simply strive for different things within the housing market, meaning that the difference in attainment is a consequence of choice. One cause of differences between ethnic minorities and natives is a preference of some ethnic

minority groups for living with friends, family and/or co-ethnics more generally (Skifter Andersen 2006, 2010).

Several theories have been put forward for explaining the development of ethnic settlement over time. In this paper, I draw in particular on spatial assimilation theory, including the notion of straight-line assimilation. The word assimilation is here used in the meaning stated by Alba & Nee: “*In the most general terms, assimilation can be defined as the decline, and at its endpoint the disappearance, of an ethnic/racial distinction and the cultural and social differences that express it*” (1997:863). This definition does not presuppose for the process to be one-sided, it can be either one-sided or more mutual. Focus in this paper is on the assimilation of ethnic minorities with respect to *where* ethnic minorities live and not *how* they live their lives.

According to *spatial assimilation theory* (Massey & Mullan 1984; Massey 1985; Alba & Nee 1997; Zorlu & Mulder 2007), ethnic minorities concentrate in ethnic areas on arrival in a new country in order to benefit from the ethnic community and its shared knowledge. Over time, however, cultural assimilation and socio-economic assimilation leads to spatial assimilation (Gordon 1964; Bolt & van Kempen 2003; Alba & Nee 1997). Inclusion in the labour market and/or educational attainment leads to socio-economic mobility. Concurrently, ethnic minorities acquire the language, norms and cultural values of the destination country as they become settled in the destination country. A gradual acculturation takes place (Bolt & van Kempen 2010). Thus, it becomes possible and desirable to leave the ethnic neighbourhoods with socio-economic mobility providing the resources for moving and acculturation leading to preferences more similar to those of natives e.g. for non-ethnic neighbourhoods. Based on spatial assimilation theory, the notion of *straight-line assimilation* has been developed: that there is a generational dynamic in the assimilation process with the generations being the motor for change towards increased assimilation (Alba & Nee 1997). The *segmented assimilation perspective* offers a modification of the spatial assimilation theory. This suggests that there might be differences in the assimilation patterns of different ethnic groups based on their differences in resources (Zorlu & Mulder 2007). An earlier Danish study (Skifter Andersen 2006) showed significant differences between Somalis and Turks concerning their resources and their social integration measured by language knowledge, participation in the labour market and social contacts to Danes. Based on the segmented assimilation perspective, Somalis should thus be more concentrated in ethnic neighbourhoods than Turks. All in all, the spatial assimilation approach implies that newcomers should be more segregated than settled migrants; that second generation immigrants should be more spatially assimilated than first generation immigrants; and that differences can be expected between ethnic groups based on differences in resources.

An alternative understanding is offered by the *place stratification theory*. While spatial assimilation theory emphasises the individual and household levels, place stratification theory emphasises ethnic differences of the constraints faced on the housing market (Bolt & van Kempen 2003). Discrimination and the structure of the housing market hinder the progress of minorities’ housing careers and lead to spatial stratification. As a consequence, ethnic minorities are unable to realise their preferences. This will not be changed by acculturation or the

acquisition of socio-economic resources. With similar results but different causes, the *ethnic resources theory* (Portes & Bach 1985) and the *cultural preference theory* (Bolt et al. 2008) states that because ethnic minorities have access to ethnic resources in ethnic neighbourhoods respectively have a strong preference for living with co-ethnics that persists despite socioeconomic assimilation, they tend to stay in these neighbourhoods and conduct their housing careers within them (Skifter Andersen 2010).

Spatial assimilation theory would imply that if socio-demographic characteristics are controlled for, differences in settlement patterns should disappear. In contrast, place stratification theory, cultural preferences theory and ethnic resources theory should lead to ethnic concentration despite acculturation and socio-economic mobility. Natives face restraints on the housing market as well, but since they are not hindered by discrimination, the impact of economic resources should be weaker for minorities than for the majority (Bolt & van Kempen 2003). Bolt & van Kempen argue based on Alba & Nee that previous American research indicates that: *“While the place stratification model is more appropriate for the residential mobility of the most stigmatized groups (such as black immigrants in the American context), the spatial assimilation is more suitable to groups that face less discrimination, such as Asians and Hispanics”* (2003:212; Schaake et al. 2014). Consequently, it might be that the above models have different explanatory power for explaining spatial segregation patterns of different ethnic groups.

The housing situation of an individual is shaped by a complex interplay between resources, possibilities, preferences and restraints (Özüekren & van Kempen 2002; Özüekren & van Kempen 2003). The same is true for the specific situation of leaving home. Housing market conditions, housing availability, discrimination, access and allocation criteria as well as housing market segmentation are some of the major factors shaping the available housing opportunities. The same goes for the financial, cognitive and social resources of the individual. The preferences of the individual shape how the individual navigates within and chooses between the available opportunities. Register data only allows for the inclusion of some of the variables impacting on the housing situation of an individual and thus on settlement patterns more generally. However, the purpose of this paper is not to explain such patterns in all their complexity. Rather it is to focus on the specific aspect of the link between the spatial segregation of parents and that of their children.

The Danish housing market and ethnic settlement within it

More than half of the dwellings in Denmark are owner-occupied. Apart from a capital cost deduction of 30%, the access to owner-occupied housing in Denmark is determined by the financial situation of the household with very limited policy measures aimed at enhancing owner-occupation. Seven percent of Danish dwellings are cooperatives, primarily flats. While this sector is fairly small on a national scale, the regional variations are substantial with the share of cooperatives being higher in the big cities, especially Copenhagen. Access to cooperatives used to be based to a large extent on personal social network but has in recent years become increasingly market-based. Consequently, prizes have risen substantially in large parts of the

sector. A little less than a fifth of the dwellings on the Danish housing market are private rental. Private rental housing is subject to rent control, resulting in prices below market value and thus waiting lists. Consequently, landlords can be selective when choosing renters.

Public rental housing comprises one-fifth of Danish dwellings. Public rental is not need-dependent and the sector is accessible to all residents of Denmark². Units are administered through waiting lists. Rent levels are subject to strict rent control with rent levels based on the building and maintenance costs of each specific housing estate. Through free education, student allowances, student loans and housing allowances, the Danish welfare system facilitates that young adults can leave home to live independently. While affordable housing can be difficult to acquire centrally in the major cities, it is available on the outskirts.

In Denmark, ethnic neighbourhoods (i.e. more than 30% ethnic minorities) are found only in areas dominated by public rental housing (Skifter Andersen 2010). As there is no connection between location, demand and rent levels, some public rental estates are highly popular resulting in long waiting lists. Other estates on the other hand are less popular and a unit can be obtained almost instantly. While this means that house-hunters are less likely to be forced to live with relatives in crowded conditions, it also creates a housing market potentially prone to ethnic concentration. Those with the least choices in the housing market end up in the areas with the shortest waiting lists. In recent years, new allocation systems have given local authorities the power to regulate the admission to housing estates with high concentrations of unemployed, which is also used to reduce concentrations of jobless immigrants. Crowded housing conditions, limited financial means and limited networks for house-hunting are all factors leading to fewer choices in the housing market and at the same time these are characteristics that are more predominant in ethnic minority groups.

An ethnically diverse population is a fairly new phenomenon in a Danish context. Currently, the share of non-Western immigrants and descendants living in Denmark is 7.2% (2014), having risen from 1% in 1980. Likewise, the spatial concentration of ethnic minorities is still a fairly new phenomenon in Denmark. The database for this project contains a division of Denmark into approx. 9,000 neighbourhoods with in average about 600 residents³. Here it is evident that prior to 1995, neighbourhoods of more than 30% non-Western inhabitants were a phenomenon of limited prevalence and magnitude (table 1). In 2008, a quarter of a million people lived in such neighbourhoods. At the same time, the average share of non-Western inhabitants has grown substantially in all areas: the neighbourhoods have in general become more multi-ethnic.

²The Danish public housing sector is often referred to as social housing. It does function as social housing by providing housing for those in need. However, as it is accessible to all, the term public housing is used here.

³The neighbourhoods have been created by combining 100x100 meter grids based on a range of criteria e.g. physical barriers, proximity and homogeneity regarding housing tenure and type. They were originally created for a research project for the Rockwool Foundation and have kindly been shared with us. For more information see Damm et al. 2006.

TABLE 1: NEIGHBOURHOODS WITH >30% NON-WESTERN ETHNIC MINORITIES IN DENMARK, 1985-2008

The housing situation of ethnic minorities in Denmark has been described and analysed through numerous research studies (e.g. Skifter Andersen 2006, 2010; Damm et al. 2006, Børresen 2006). They show that there are significant differences between the housing situation of ethnic minorities and Danes. First, more than 60% of ethnic minority households live in public housing compared with only 20% of all households in Denmark. Second, while only 2% of all households live in ethnic neighbourhoods (>40% ethnic minorities), 22% of ethnic households do so (Skifter Andersen 2010). Skifter Andersen (2010) finds support for the spatial assimilation theory in a Danish context: a study of the in- and out-mobility in ethnic neighbourhoods shows that those moving out are more integrated and have more resources than those moving in. However, as the study is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, it is not possible to follow the transitions of individuals over time.

Data and methods

The data sources for the analyses in this paper are the extensive Danish public registers. These contain information on all individuals living in Denmark on a wide variety of fields such as family composition, housing situation, financial situation, employment situation and educational attainment. Data has been gathered since as early as 1980 and the registers thus offer unique opportunities for longitudinal analysis. Based on the registers, a database was created containing yearly data on individuals from age 16 and above for the years 1986 to 2006 for the total population of Turks and Somalis and a random 7% sample of Danes⁴.

The analyses were carried out as event history analysis by estimating Cox regression models⁵ for the time until leaving the parental home (see Allison 2010 for an in-depth description including formulas). Cox regression models are characterised by allowing for the inclusion of individuals who do not experience an event (censoring) and for the use of time-dependent variables. The Cox regression model is semi-parametric and therefore does not require the selection of a particular distribution for the time to event. Models were estimated in a 'competing risks design' of leaving home to live in a non-ethnic neighbourhood versus leaving home to live

⁴ Approx. 5,000 sequences had to be removed from the sample. The database only contains information about the dwelling for selected years. This information was imputed for the other years as e.g. dwelling type changes very rarely. However, building, combination and separation of housing units and changes in road names have led to new address codes and there was no dwelling information for these new codes. Consequently, individuals who had lived at least one year in a dwelling with no dwelling information were removed from the sample.

⁵ For the variable on urbanity, a multi-level design might also have been employed. As the variable is not the primary focus, this was deselected. Consequently, the strength of the HRs for urbanity is most likely estimated too high. Furthermore, as the study population contains siblings, it could be argued that the variables relating to parental family and parental housing unit are on a different level than the individual characteristics and that a multi-level design should be used. However, an array of variables can differ between siblings: gender, number in family of brothers and sisters, education as well as characteristics of family and parental housing unit at the time of home-leaving. These variables are seen as much more influential than whether individuals belong to the same family. Thus, a multi-level design was deselected.

in an ethnic neighbourhood. Continuous models were used: while data is only registered yearly, a true but unknown ordering of event times lies behind the yearly grouped event times (Allison 2010). Tied data were handled with the EXACT method⁶, which is suitable for heavily tied data (Ibid). Cox regression models estimate hazard ratios (referred to here as HRs). The hazard can be defined as the risk that a given event of interest will happen at time t given that it has not already happened previous to time t .

The unit of analysis was the individual. While many housing career moves are made as part of a household, leaving home is in most cases an independent move and the housing situation prior to leaving home individual. Compared with other transitions in life, leaving home is a particular kind as almost everyone will experience it at some point. Therefore, it is not a matter of whether you leave home but a matter of what you leave it for and when you do it.

The event of interest is limited to the first, permanent move away from the parental home. Leaving home is a process and some individuals leave home more than once (Mitchell 2000). However, leaving home for the first time, home-returning and repeated home-leaving are distinct transitional behaviours which cannot be presumed to carry similar characteristics. Furthermore, only permanent moves defined as living outside the parental home for at least two consecutive years were analysed. Those who live outside the parental home for one year e.g. to do military service or attend a one-year continuation school then to return to the parental home are not seen as actual home-leavers. Permanent is thus not defined as not returning. Instead it is defined as having actually left the parental home to live independently, whether you return later or not.

An individual was included in the analyses if he/she lived at home when turning 17 and still did when turning 18. Immigrants were only part of the study population if they had migrated to Denmark before turning 17 and had lived with their parents at least initially after arriving in Denmark and until turning 18. Thereby, it was ensured that we knew what had happened in the adult life course of the home-leavers prior to leaving home. The individual was then followed until the first permanent home-leaving took place or until turning 30, dying or leaving the country for at least two consecutive years, in which cases the individual was censored. By definition, data was thus only right-censored. The first year an event could happen was 1986 and the last was 2006.

Making a common and general definition of what constitutes an ethnic neighbourhood is not possible. Extensive debates have taken place on appropriate definitions. To go into these here would be too far-reaching as well as besides the purpose of the study. Therefore, a simple threshold definition was chosen. Ethnic neighbourhoods were here defined as neighbourhoods where the share of inhabitants originating from a non-Western country, including Eastern Europe, is higher than 30%. Such a threshold is inevitably arbitrary (Bolt & van Kempen 2010).

⁶ For the three biggest models, EFRON had to be used. The EXACT method for those models required the allocation of more than 4 GB which was not possible with the SAS 9.3 available on the research server of Statistics Denmark. For all the other models there was however hardly any difference in the estimates based on EFRON and EXACT respectively. Therefore, it is not perceived as a problem that some models had to be estimated with EFRON.

However, as the share of non-Western immigrants and descendants living in Denmark is 7.2%, 30% identifies neighbourhoods with a substantial and noticeable over-representation of ethnic minorities compared with the average neighbourhood. As a means of controlling the strength of the results, alternative models were estimated on the basis of threshold values of 25% and 35%. The results were near identical to the models with the 30%-threshold.

Covariates

A range of covariates were included in the Cox regression models based on the literature of spatial assimilation and of patterns of leaving home. All the covariates concerned the 1st of January of the year during which home-leaving took place; except information on employment which referred to November the year before leaving home, as register data for employment are from November. The only way to be sure that the covariates could potentially have influenced home-leaving was to choose a time of measurement that preceded the event of home-leaving. The majority of the covariates are time-dependent, recognising the fact that over time, the individual and household circumstances that influence housing options change (Abramsson et al. 2002). The covariates in the models were tested for differences between categories in order to establish which categories could be combined.

Household income and households' social group are key indicators of parental socio-economic situation. Acculturation of parents is more difficult to identify with register data. However, for the purpose of this study, the share of non-Western minorities living in the parental neighbourhood was seen as an indicator of the parental degree of acculturation. Based on spatial assimilation theory, acculturation of parents would lead to them moving to neighbourhoods with a smaller share of ethnic minorities. However, place stratification theory would argue that the cause of the parental segregation is not acculturation but discrimination. In this paper, I argue that it is fair to presume that acculturation plays some part in the parental housing situation, at least in a Danish context. Ethnic neighbourhoods in Denmark are only found in public housing areas; a sector which is regulated by specific rules of allocation. If anything, the new allocation rules should lead to less ethnic concentration as the municipality and the housing associations are allowed to give priority to people in employment and education which impact ethnic minorities disproportionately as they have lower employment rates. Thus, it is reasonable to presume that one cause of parental segregation level is the level of acculturation.

Individual income and educational level⁷ of the young home-leavers are key covariates for determining the effect of own socio-economic situation. A housing career is carried out in a context that influences the possibilities of the household e.g. the general economic situation and the situation in the housing market (Özüekren & van Kempen 2003). Consequently, the cohort is a key covariate as it ties the individual to a specific historical time (Ryder 1965). Furthermore, an effect of the share of minorities in the parental neighbourhood on the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood could be caused by home-leavers moving to a unit within the same

⁷ The highest completed or ongoing level of education.

neighbourhood as their parents. Consequently, a covariate was included to control for this. Additionally, as the change in home-leaving patterns over time could lead to different effect of covariates for different cohorts, the models were checked for interaction between cohort and covariates. The only significant interaction term was that of cohort and same neighbourhood as parents. This was thus included in the models. Finally, a range of other covariates relevant for leaving home were also controlled for⁸. These variables have been identified as relevant to leaving home by previous studies (e.g. Buck and Scott, 1993; Ermisch 1999; Mitchell 2000; Mulder et al. 2002; Blaauboer and Mulder, 2010; Zorlu & Mulder 2011). While they are crucial to control for, these covariates were however not of specific interest here. Furthermore, they did not reveal differences in the hazard ratios for the ethnic groups that would explain the differences between the two neighbourhood outcomes and between the four ethnic groups. Consequently, they are not presented in the paper.

Acculturation and socio-economic mobility between generations

In the transition from living in the parental home to the first independent living situation, there were in fact indications of straight-line assimilation. For the three ethnic minority groups of the study, the share living in ethnic neighbourhoods was smaller post than prior to leaving home. The greatest change happened for Turkish descendants, where the share fell from 41% to 30%. For Somalis it fell from 46% to 38%; for Turkish immigrants from 34% to 27%. Still, there were major differences compared with Danes as only 2% of Danish home-leavers moved into ethnic neighbourhoods when leaving home. These differences indicate persistent spatial segregation patterns despite acculturation and socio-economic mobility between generations. It supports the notion that spatial assimilation is a process that takes time (Bolt & van Kempen 2010).

Turning to the link with parental spatial segregation, it was clear that those living in an ethnic neighbourhood with their parents were much more likely to move into ethnic neighbourhoods when leaving home (table 2). Even for Danes, this was the case. Home-leavers moving to the same neighbourhood as their parents only accounted for part of this. There thus seem to be an effect of living in an ethnic neighbourhood with your parents; indicating the existence of inter-generational effects.

TABLE 2: TRANSITIONS BETWEEN NEIGHBOURHOODS WHEN LEAVING HOME, IN %

The notion of ethnic differences was supported by an estimation of Cox regression models without covariates except ethnic background (table 3). Somalis were 26 times more likely than Danes to move into an ethnic neighbourhood. Turks were 11 times as likely to move into an

⁸ Additional variables included: Social group (employed, retired, unemployed or studying), civil status and gender of home-leaver; tenure type of parental housing unit, size of parental household (2-5 people, more than 5 people), relative size of parental home (at least one room per person, less than one room per person), whether the young adult lived with both parents, mother or father and finally whether the parental home was located in Copenhagen, the three biggest cities outside CPH or other.

ethnic neighbourhood and half as likely to move into a non-ethnic neighbourhood as Danes. The ethnic differences were major. When including covariates in the model, however, the effect of ethnic background became substantially smaller. The difference in hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic and a non-ethnic neighbourhood respectively was thus partly explained by covariates e.g. by differences in socio-economic situation. Nevertheless, the differences in the hazard ratios did not disappear. When controlling for key covariates, Somalis were three times as likely and Turks almost twice as likely as Danes to move into an ethnic neighbourhood. Turks were half as likely as Danes to move into a non-ethnic neighbourhood.

TABLE 3: RESULTS FROM COX REGRESSION MODELS FOR ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Inter-generational effects of acculturation and socio-economic mobility

In this section I turn to the question of whether the parental degree of acculturation and socio-economic situation impact on home-leavers moving into ethnic neighbourhoods or non-ethnic neighbourhoods respectively. The Cox regression models are presented in table 4. As noted, a range of other variables are controlled for in the model but not presented here.

TABLE 4: RESULTS FROM COX REGRESSION MODELS, SELECTED HAZARD RATIOS

With regards to parental household income, the analyses showed that a higher household income led to less likelihood of leaving home both for ethnic and non-ethnic neighbourhoods. This is in line with the feathered-nest hypothesis that young adults living in parental homes of high standards stay longer in the parental home (Mulder et al. 2002). For Somalis, parental household income had no effect which could be due to the lower share with a household income above the lowest category. For each of the ethnic groups, the hazard ratios for the income groups were very similar for ethnic and non-ethnic neighbourhoods. Thus, there is no indication that the parental economic situation impacts on the neighbourhood outcome of the home-leaver and thus no indication that a better economic situation of the parents leads to less likelihood of moving into an ethnic neighbourhood. Parental employment situation did impact on the home-leaving of their children but a clear effect in terms of moving to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood was not found.

The income level of the home-leavers themselves showed very similar patterns across ethnic groups: an income above the reference category of up to approx. EUR 5400 led to a higher hazard ratio for leaving home to both neighbourhood types. The only exception was for the Somalis of the highest income category where the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood was close to one and the effect insignificant from the lowest category. This could be due to the low share of Somalis with an income in the highest category. Educational attainment of home-leavers showed no clear difference between educational level and spatial segregation, except for 'further education' leading to a higher hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood for Somali and

Turkish immigrants. There are thus very limited indications of individual socio-economic situation impacting on whether the home-leaver moves to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood. This is in line with previous research indicating a much weaker link between socio-economic integration and spatial segregation than often suggested (Bolt et al. 2010).

The share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood, on the other hand, had a major impact on the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood. The tendency was clear and similar across the ethnic categories: the higher the share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood, the higher the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood. Turkish immigrants living with their parents in a neighbourhood with 90-100% of ethnic minorities of non-Western origin were 23 times as likely to move to an ethnic neighbourhood as those who lived in neighbourhoods with 0-10% ethnic minorities⁹. In a study of young men and women of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin, Phillips et al. (2007) have identified a preference for maintaining a distance to the heart of the community in order to secure privacy and independence. However, the young adults of the study did not wish to move too far away as the community offers family and community support. One reason for the link between growing up in an ethnic neighbourhood and moving there when leaving home could thus be a desire to maintain the community and family support of one's childhood. Interestingly, the pattern was similar for Danish home-leavers: living in a neighbourhood of 70-80% ethnic minorities made the home-leavers almost 15 times more likely to move to an ethnic neighbourhood than if they had lived in a 0-10% neighbourhood. Note that this is not caused by home-leavers moving to the same neighbourhood as their parents as this has been controlled for separately. A potential explanation could be that the experience of living in an ethnic neighbourhood as part of the parental household leads to less prejudice against such neighbourhoods.

The hazard ratios for Turkish descendants were markedly lower than those for Turkish immigrants. Thus it seems that the share of minorities in the parental neighbourhood affects immigrants more than descendants. For all the four groups, the higher the share of ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood, the lower the hazard ratio for moving to a non-ethnic neighbourhood. Thus, on one hand the analyses can be argued to support the notion that low parental acculturation leads to a higher hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood. On the other hand, Danes showed a similar pattern which can hardly be ascribed to parental acculturation. Two opposing explanations can be put forward: either the cause of the patterns differs between the ethnic groups. Or the cause is the same, meaning that parental acculturation is not the cause of the Somali and Turkish patterns. A third option is that it is a combination. In any case, the similarity of the patterns warns us against presuming that parental acculturation is the (only) cause.

⁹ The share of Somalis and Turks living with their parents in neighbourhoods with 0-10% non-Western ethnic minorities is approx. 20% for the total data selection (treating the data selection of those living in the parental home as person years).

Other interesting findings emerged from the estimated Cox regression models. For Turks and Danes, a clear pattern was found for the effect of cohort. The older cohorts had higher hazard ratios for moving to a non-ethnic neighbourhood. For Danes, the older cohorts also had lower hazard ratios for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood. As the older cohorts in general had left home at a time when there were fewer ethnic neighbourhoods, this is not surprising. Furthermore, moving to the same neighbourhood as your parents generally led to a higher hazard ratio for leaving home. However, for the three ethnic minority groups the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood was more than double the hazard ratio for moving to a non-ethnic neighbourhood if moving to the same neighbourhood as the parents. Thus, it seems that inter-generational effects are indeed at play. Previous research has identified the tendency amongst some ethnic groups of living in extended households i.e. families functioning as one household despite living in separate dwellings (Phillips 2009). Thus, young adults might continue to be part of the parental household despite having moved elsewhere. While this kind of home-leaving behaviour is not possible to identify with register data, young adults moving to the same neighbourhood as their parents could indicate extended households.

Moving to the same neighbourhood as the parents was the only covariate with significant interaction with the cohort. For the older cohorts, the effect of moving to the same neighbourhood on the hazard ratio for moving to either an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood was approximately halved for all groups. It thus seems that moving to the same neighbourhood is more common today than it was previously, for Danes and Turks alike. Further research is needed to understand this change over time.

Conclusion

The housing situation of an individual is shaped by a complex interplay between resources, possibilities, preferences and restraints. The same is true for the specific situation of leaving home. The purpose of this paper, however, was not to explain such patterns in all their complexity. Rather it was to focus on the specific aspect of the link between the spatial segregation of parents and children. More specifically, the purpose of was to analyse the inter-generational mobility and the inter-generational effects in the home-leaving patterns of Somalis, Turkish immigrants, Turkish descendants and Danes and the extent to which different patterns can be identified between the ethnic groups. If segregation patterns spill over from parental household to the initial housing situation of young adults, it adds an additional perspective to the discussion of the issues of ethnic concentration namely the impact of inter-generational effects in creating ethnic concentration. Furthermore, establishing whether housing careers start differently is vital for understanding the housing attainment of different ethnic groups.

The first part of the analysis found evidence to support straight-line assimilation taking place: for all three minority groups, the share of home-leavers moving to an ethnic neighbourhood was lower than for their parents. However, it was still significantly higher than for Danes. Furthermore, those living in an ethnic neighbourhood with their parents were much more likely to move into ethnic neighbourhoods when leaving home. There were major ethnic

differences in the hazard ratio for moving to an ethnic neighbourhood; however these diminished substantially when controlling for key covariates. These results indicate that despite acculturation and socio-economic mobility between generations, spatial assimilation is a slow process. Further studies on the continued progress of ethnic housing careers are needed to establish whether or not the higher hazard ratio for starting in an ethnic neighbourhood leads to careers conducted only in ethnic neighbourhoods.

The second part of the analysis found no indication of parental economic situation impacting on the neighbourhood outcome of the home-leaver. In contrast, the share of ethnic minorities living in the neighbourhood of the parental home had a clear and major impact: the higher the share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood, the higher the hazard ratio for moving into an ethnic neighbourhood and the lower the hazard ratio for moving into a non-ethnic neighbourhood. Interestingly, this effect existed for ethnic minorities and Danes alike. Bolt & van Kempen (2010) argue that proponents of spatial assimilation theory: *“assume that the effect of socio-economic status will be comparable among ethnic minorities and indigenous groups alike”* (pp. 218-219). This seems indeed to be the case for home-leavers on the Danish housing market, thus supporting the notion of spatial assimilation as opposed to place stratification theory. However, whether the explanation for these similar patterns is the same cannot be identified in analyses of register data. Qualitative studies would be able to add insights into the individual reasons of the home-leavers for moving to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood. In any case, the similarity in the patterns warns us against presuming that parental acculturation is the (only) cause of the settlement patterns of home-leavers with respect to moving to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood.

The share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood affected Turkish immigrants more than it did Turkish descendants. This could indicate that home-leaving descendants are more spatially assimilated than home-leaving immigrants i.e. lending support for the notion of straight-line assimilation. The share of ethnic minorities in the parental neighbourhood also affected Turkish immigrants more than Somali immigrants. Accordingly, there is no indication that the spatial assimilation model is less relevant for the more stigmatised group, the Somalis, compared to the less stigmatised group, the Turks. On the contrary. Overall, however, the ethnic differences were minor, meaning that the segmented assimilation perspective did not seem to be of relevance to the home-leaving patterns of the groups under study here.

Overall, the empirical findings of the paper provide crucial insights into the settlement patterns of young home-leavers and the effects and mobility between generations. The findings of the paper give reason to question some of the presumptions regarding the link between spatial segregation, integration and cohesion. First, spatial assimilation and straight-line assimilation is taking place, meaning that ethnic neighbourhoods are not the closed parallel societies that they are sometimes made out to be in political and public debates. Second, socio-economic situation has very limited impact on whether young home-leavers move to an ethnic or a non-ethnic neighbourhood – contrary to what would be expected based on the presumed link between integration and spatial segregation. Third, the similarities of the patterns of the Danes and the

three ethnic minority groups indicate that simplified notions of self-segregation of ethnic minorities cannot stand alone in explaining the spatial segregation of young home-leavers. Finally, if the experience of young Danes growing up in ethnic neighbourhoods was in accordance with the public image of closed parallel societies it seems unlikely that these young Danes would move to ethnic neighbourhoods when leaving home. Rather, it could indicate that these ethnic neighbourhoods have more to offer and are less closed ethnic communities than they are given credit for.

References

- Abramsson, M., Borgegård, L.-E. & Fransson, U. (2002) Housing careers: Immigrants in Local Swedish Housing Markets, *Housing studies*, 17(3), pp. 445-464.
- Alba, R. & Nee, V. (1997) Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration, *International Migration Review*, 31(4), pp. 826-874.
- Allison, P.D. (2010) *Survival Analysis Using SAS. A Practical Guide* (Cary: SAS Institute).
- Blaauboer, M. & Mulder, C.H. (2010) Gender differences in the impact of family background on leaving the parental home, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25, pp. 53-71.
- Bolt, G. & van Kempen, R. (2002) Moving Up or Moving Down? Housing Careers of Turks and Moroccans in Utrecht, the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 17(3), pp. 401-422.
- Bolt, G & van Kempen, R. (2003) Escaping poverty neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, *Housing, Theory and Society*, 20(4), pp. 209-222.
- Bolt, G., van Kempen, R. & M. van Ham (2008) Minority Ethnic Groups in the Dutch Housing Market: Spatial Segregation, Relocation Dynamics and Housing Policy, *Urban Studies*, 45, pp. 1359-1384.
- Bolt, G. & van Kempen, R. (2010) Ethnic segregation and residential mobility: Relocations of minority ethnic groups in the Netherlands, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2), pp. 333-354.
- Bolt, G., Özüekren, A.S. & Phillips, D. (2010) Linking integration and residential segregation, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2), pp. 169-186.
- Buck, N. & Scott, J. (1993) She's Leaving Home: But Why? An Analysis of Young People Leaving the Parental Home, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 55(4), pp. 863-874.
- Børresen, S.K. (2006) *Etniske minoriteters bosætning. Hvad viser forskningen?* SBI 2006:03. Hørsholm: Danish Building Research Institute.
- Damm, A.P., Schultz-Nielsen, M.L. & Tranæs, T. (2006) *En befolkning deler sig op?* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal).
- Ermisch, J. (1999) Prices, Parents, and Young People's Household Formation, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 45, pp. 47-71.
- Gordon, M. (1964) *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press).

- Kleist, N. (2007) *Spaces of recognition: an analysis of Somali-Danish engagement and diasporic mobilization*. PhD thesis, Institute of Sociology, University of Copenhagen.
- Magnusson, L. & Özüekren, A.S. (2002) The Housing Careers of Turkish Households in Middle-sized Swedish Municipalities, *Housing Studies*, 17(3), pp. 465-486.
- Magnusson Turner, L. & Hedman, L. (2014) Linking Integration and Housing Career: A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Groups in Sweden, *Housing Studies*, 29(2), pp. 270-290.
- Massey, D.S. & Mullan, B.P. (1984) Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 89(4), pp. 836-873.
- Massey, D.S. (1985) Ethnic residential segregation: a theoretical synthesis and empirical review, *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, pp. 315–350.
- Mitchell, B.A. (2000) *Integrating Conceptual, Theoretical and Methodological Developments in Home-leaving Research* (Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research).
- Mulder, C.H. & Hooimeijer, P. (1999) Residential relocations in the life course. In: L. J. G. Wissen & P.A. Dykstra (Eds) *Population Issues. An interdisciplinary focus*, pp. 159-186 (New York: Springer).
- Mulder, C.H., Clark, W.A.V. & Wagner, M. (2002) A comparative analysis of leaving home in the United States, the Netherlands and West Germany, *Demographic Research*, 7, pp. 565-592.
- Musterd, S. & De Vos, S. (2007) Residential Dynamics in Ethnic Concentrations, *Housing Studies*, 22(3), pp. 333-353.
- Phillips, D., Davis, C. & Ratcliffe, P. (2007) British Asian Narratives of Urban Space, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(2), pp. 217-234.
- Phillips, D. (2009) Creating Home-Spaces: Young British Muslim women's Identity and Conceptualisations of Home. In: P. Hopkins & R. Gale (Eds) *Muslims in Britain: Race, Place and Identities*, pp. 3-36 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Pickles, A.R. & Davies, R.B. (1991) The empirical analysis of housing careers: a review and a general statistical modelling framework, *Environment and Planning A*, 23(4), pp. 465–484.
- Portes, A. & Bach, R.L. (1985) *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press).
- Ryder, N.B. (1965) The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change, *American Sociological Review*, 30(6), pp. 843-861.
- Schaake, K., Burgers, J. & Mulder, C.H. (2014) Ethnicity, Education and Income, and Residential Mobility Between Neighbourhoods, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(4), pp. 512-527.
- Skifter Andersen, H. (2006) *Bo sammen eller spredt? Etniske minoriteters boligønsker og motiver for bosætning*. SBI 2006:17. Hørsholm: Danish Building Research Institute.
- Skifter Andersen, H. (2010) Spatial Assimilation in Denmark. Why Do Immigrants Move to and from Multi-ethnic Neighbourhoods? *Housing Studies*, 25(3), pp. 281-300.
- Skovgaard Nielsen, R. (2015) Leaving home in Denmark: a comparison of differences between Turks, Somalis and Danes, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 30(4), pp. 613-630.

- Stillwell, J. & Phillips, D. (2006) Diversity and Change: Understanding the Ethnic Geographies of Leeds, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32(7), pp 1131-1152.
- Zorlu, A. & Mulder, C.H. (2007) Initial and Subsequent Location Choices of immigrants to the Netherlands, *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, IZA DP No. 3036. Bonn: The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA)
- Zorlu, A. & Mulder, C.H. (2011) Ethnic Differences in Leaving Home: Timing and Pathways. *Demography*, 48, pp. 49-72.
- Özüekren, A.S. & van Kempen, R. (2002) Housing Careers of Minority Ethnic Groups: Experiences, Explanations and Prospects, *Housing Studies*, 17(3), pp. 365-379.
- Özüekren, A.S. & van Kempen, R. (2003) Special issue editors' introduction: dynamics and diversity: housing careers and segregation of minority ethnic groups. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 20(4), pp. 162-171.

Table 1: Neighbourhoods with >30% non-Western ethnic minorities in Denmark, 1985-2008

| Year | >30% | | | <30% | | | Total | | |
|------|--------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| | No. of areas | No. of residents | Mean non-Western inhabitants | No. of Areas | No. of Residents | Mean non-Western inhabitants | No. of areas* | No. of residents | Mean non-Western inhabitants |
| 1985 | 15 | 7,910 | 35.4% | 9,213 | 4,969,617 | 1.4% | 9228 | 4,977,527 | 1.4% |
| 1990 | 49 | 24,640 | 36.1% | 9,182 | 5,110,769 | 2.3% | 9231 | 5,135,409 | 2.5% |
| 1995 | 131 | 76,578 | 42.5% | 9,224 | 5,043,464 | 3.0% | 9355 | 5,120,042 | 3.6% |
| 2000 | 287 | 171,872 | 43.8% | 9,068 | 5,158,148 | 4.0% | 9355 | 5,330,020 | 5.2% |
| 2005 | 401 | 223,506 | 44.3% | 8,926 | 4,871,338 | 4.8% | 9327 | 5,094,844 | 6.5% |
| 2008 | 444 | 236,426 | 45.5% | 9,943 | 5,059,187 | 5.2% | 9387 | 5,295,613 | 7.1% |

*Changes in address codes over time have meant that some addresses cannot be linked to an area. This in turn means that some of the very small areas cannot be included for all years. Source: database based on Danish registers.

Table 2: Transitions between neighbourhoods when leaving home, in %

| | Somalis | | Turkish immigrants | | Turkish descendants | | Danes | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | From ethnic n'hood | From non-ethnic n'hood | From ethnic n'hood | From non-ethnic n'hood | From ethnic n'hood | From non-ethnic n'hood | From ethnic n'hood | From non-ethnic n'hood |
| Move to same ethnic n'hood | 12.5 | - | 18.0 | - | 12.9 | - | 9.5 | - |
| Move to different ethnic n'hood | 40.9 | 25.1 | 33.0 | 14.0 | 35.1 | 18.4 | 14.7 | 2.0 |
| Move to same non-ethnic n'hood | - | 6.2 | - | 14.2 | - | 10.1 | - | 6.0 |
| Move to different non-ethnic n'hood | 46.3 | 68.6 | 49.0 | 71.0 | 52.0 | 71.0 | 75.8 | 92.0 |
| Total | 99.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

N = 115,937.

Table 3: Results from Cox regression models for ethnic background

| | Model without covariates | | Model with covariates* | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| | Ethnic n'hood | Non-ethnic n'hood | Ethnic n'hood | Non-ethnic n'hood |
| Danes | - | - | - | - |
| Turkish immigrants | 10.556**** | 0.581**** | 1.825**** | 0.567**** |
| Turkish descendants | 10.958**** | 0.512**** | 1.798**** | 0.585**** |
| Somali immigrants | 26.375**** | 1.046 | 2.907**** | 1.056 |

*HR's for covariates not shown. The covariates included are the same as in the model shown in the next section.

- = reference category. **** $p < .0001$. N= 115,937.

Table 4: Results from Cox regression models, selected hazard ratios

| Variables | Somali immigrants | | Turkish immigrants | | Turkish descendants | | Danes | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | Ethnic | Non-ethnic | Ethnic | Non-ethnic | Ethnic | Non-ethnic | Ethnic | Non-ethnic |
| z(t) HH income: up to approx. EUR 46,900 (PH) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) HH income: approx. EUR 46,900-67,000 (PH) | 1.019 | 1.099 | 0.756*** | 0.806**** | 0.819** | 0.788**** | 0.764** | 0.838**** |
| z(t) HH income: approx. EUR 67,000-87,100 (PH) | 0.505^ | 0.660 | 0.613**** | 0.603**** | 0.479**** | 0.634**** | 0.831^ | 0.844**** |
| z(t) HH income: above approx. EUR 87,100 (PH) | 0.242 | 1.028 | 0.427**** | 0.491**** | 0.414**** | 0.528**** | 0.802* | 0.910**** |
| z(t) HH: employed (PH) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) HH: Unemployed or outside work force (PH) | 0.898 | 1.077 | 1.253** | 1.064 | 1.116 | 0.971 | 1.761**** | 1.167**** |
| z(t) HH: studying (PH) | 1.424^ | 0.888 | 1.201 | 1.024 | 1.140 | 1.118 | 1.218 | 1.147**** |
| z(t) HH: retired (PH) | 2.795* | 1.976 | 1.955 | 1.843* | 0.996 | 1.229 | 0.933 | 1.331** |
| z(t) Income: up to approx. EUR 5400 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) Income: approx. EUR 5400-10,700 | 3.056**** | 2.958**** | 1.805**** | 1.640**** | 1.877**** | 1.521**** | 2.199**** | 2.086**** |
| z(t) Income: approx. EUR 10,700-16,100 | 2.714*** | 3.537**** | 1.636**** | 1.638**** | 1.833**** | 1.453**** | 2.226**** | 2.388**** |
| z(t) Income: above approx. EUR 16,100 | 0.973 | 2.131* | 1.869**** | 1.698**** | 1.897**** | 1.866**** | 2.113**** | 2.733**** |
| z(t) Basic schooling | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) Vocational training | 0.725 | 0.780 | 0.884 | 1.045 | 0.972 | 0.970 | 0.705**** | 0.949**** |
| z(t) Upper secondary ('Gymnasium') | 1.081 | 0.802 | 1.297* | 1.259** | 1.153 | 1.286**** | 0.946 | 1.001 |
| z(t) Further education | 3.121^ | 0.653 | 2.184**** | 1.206 | 1.171 | 1.141 | 1.239^ | 1.263**** |
| z(t) 0-10% ethnic minorities (PH) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) 10-20% ethnic minorities (PH) | 0.896 | 0.860 | 1.512** | 0.904^ | 1.116 | 0.959 | 1.667**** | 0.998 |
| z(t) 20-30% ethnic minorities (PH) | 1.027 | 0.906 | 1.821**** | 0.848** | 1.422* | 0.899 | 2.678**** | 0.944^ |
| z(t) 30-40% ethnic minorities (PH) | 1.534 | 0.712^ | 3.849**** | 0.564**** | 2.421**** | 0.674**** | 6.962**** | 0.751**** |
| z(t) 40-50% ethnic minorities (PH) | 1.979* | 0.466*** | 4.740**** | 0.446**** | 2.708**** | 0.654**** | 7.335**** | 0.709**** |
| z(t) 50-60% ethnic minorities (PH) | 2.192** | 0.460** | 4.147**** | 0.332**** | 3.346**** | 0.505**** | 7.407**** | 0.679**** |
| z(t) 60-70% ethnic minorities (PH) | 2.352** | 0.502* | 4.262**** | 0.411**** | 2.419**** | 0.564**** | 5.755**** | 0.654* |
| z(t) 70-80% ethnic minorities (PH) | 2.623** | 0.381*** | 5.328**** | 0.245**** | 2.869**** | 0.492**** | 14.525**** | 1.133 |
| z(t) 80-90% ethnic minorities (PH) | 1.913^ | 0.444* | 5.732**** | 0.537* | 2.473**** | 0.310**** | 0.000 | 0.293 |
| z(t) 90-100% ethnic minorities (PH) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 23.059** | 0.000 | 4.143* | 0.656 | 0.000 | 0.012 |
| z(t) Different n'hood than parents | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| z(t) Same n'hood as parents | 4.342**** | 1.432 | 5.256**** | 1.756*** | 5.991**** | 1.945**** | 1.825**** | 2.021**** |
| x Cohort 1980-1988 | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| x Cohort 1974-1979 | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 1.179^ | 1.353**** | 1.037 | 1.390**** | 0.629**** | 1.146**** |
| x Cohort 1968-1973 | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 0.843 | 1.312**** | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 0.304**** | 1.205**** |
| Interaction same n'hood*cohort 1980-1988 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Interaction same n'hood*cohort 1974-1979 | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 0.523*** | 0.524*** | 0.371**** | 0.635** | 0.628* | 0.573**** |
| Interaction same n'hood*cohort 1968-1973 | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 0.341**** | 0.655* | <i>Not relevant</i> | <i>Not relevant</i> | 0.214*** | 0.560**** |
| N | 1,404 | | 5,624 | | 6,422 | | 102,487 | |

*p < .05 **p < .01 *** p < .001 **** p < .0001 ^ p < .1 - = ref. category; x = time-independent variables; z(t) = time-dep. variables; PH = parental home; HH = head of household