



# HOW POLITICAL RECEPTION CONTEXTS SHAPE LOCATION DECISIONS OF IMMIGRANTS

Salomon Bennour, Anita Manatschal and Didier Ruedin

## Authors

Salomon Bennour, Anita Manatschal, Didier Ruedin

Salomon Bennour holds a BA in Political Science (Lausanne University) and a MA in Socioeconomics (Geneva University). After three semesters abroad at Uppsala University (Sweden) and Tübingen University (Germany), he started his PhD at the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies (University of Neuchâtel). His PhD thesis concerns the influence of the subnational political reception context (integration and citizenship policies as well as natives' attitudes towards immigration) on immigrants' mobility, naturalization intentions and residential location choice.

[salomon.bennour@unine.ch](mailto:salomon.bennour@unine.ch)

Anita Manatschal is assistant professor in Migration Policy Analysis at the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies (SFM) at the University of Neuchâtel, where she also serves as deputy director (since 2019). Before joining the SFM, she was a postdoctoral researcher at the University of California, Berkeley, researcher and lecturer at Bern University, and visiting scholar at the European University Institute in Florence. She holds a Master's degree in Political Science, General Linguistics and Islamic Studies from the University of Zurich (2007), and a PhD in Political Science from the University of Bern (2012). Located at the intersection of political sociology and comparative politics, her research interests include migration policy research, immigrant civic and political engagement and societal norms of inclusion and exclusion. Recent publications appeared in *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Regional Studies*, *Political Psychology*, *European Union Politics*, *International Migration* or *Comparative Migration Studies*, and in various edited volumes and monographs.

[anita.manatschal@unine.ch](mailto:anita.manatschal@unine.ch)

Didier Ruedin (DPhil, Oxford) is a senior researcher at the University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland, and affiliated research fellow at the African Centre for Migration & Society at the University of the Witwatersrand. He uses experiments and quantitative analysis to examine discrimination and political reactions in policies and political debates. Personal website: <http://druedin.com>

[didier.ruedin@unine.ch](mailto:didier.ruedin@unine.ch)

© 2022 by the authors

## **Abstract**

Several academic fields study how immigrants choose their place of residence when moving to, or within destination countries. Existing studies, however, focus on isolated factors, and we do not know whether political factors matter once we have accounted for well established determinants. This paper examines the extent to which political factors, such as voting rights for foreign citizens, citizenship policies and popular support for right-populist parties, influence internal mobility decisions of immigrants, relative to other variables. We draw on a 2020 conjoint experiment in Switzerland (N=1,596) in the context of a larger survey of foreign citizens who arrived in Switzerland in the preceding 15 years. The conjoint experiment provides data on the causal effects of contextual factors on mobility decisions, allowing us to assess their relative importance. We show that inclusive political reception contexts constitute a pull factor for immigrants. Exploratory analysis indicates that the size of the effect of the political reception context on residential location choice depends on educational achievement, income, legal status, a feeling of belonging to Switzerland and social networks. We conclude that studies of immigrant location choice should routinely consider political factors.

## **Key-words**

Residential location choice

Political context of reception

Conjoint experiment

Immigrants' internal mobility

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank A. Wuffle for encouragement. Author contributions: SB, AM, DR designed the study; SB analysed the data; SB, DR, AM wrote the paper.

## 1. Introduction

In a world divided into nation states, human mobility can either be internal (within a nation state) or international (across national borders). Worldwide, many people are on the move: estimated at around 740 million internal migrants in 2009 and 272 million international migrants in 2019 (McAuliffe et al., 2019). Even if these numbers come with great uncertainty, they underline the misconception that migrants primarily come from another country. This is certainly true for destination countries in Western Europe, like Switzerland, where internal mobility explains more of the spatial distribution than international movements (Wanner, 2014). Here, we analyse internal mobility under the specific angle of pull factors (Lee, 1966). In particular, we focus on municipality attributes and how they can attract or deter internal migrants, rather than on the factors that push individuals to leave a place, or how migrants choose a destination country.

The more specific focus of this paper is on understanding whether individuals – in this case recent immigrants – “vote with their feet” (Tiebout, 1956) for political reasons. Existing explanations of internal mobility with a focus on municipality or city characteristics have largely overlooked political factors. Studies using macro perspectives focus mostly on economic and financial determinants (Alonso, 1964; Borjas, 1999; Damm, 2009; Tiebout, 1956; Sasser, 2010). We are aware of only a few studies that emphasise the role of political variables to explain immigrants’ mobility choices (Braco et al., 2018; Slotwinski and Stutzer, 2019). Their focus is however restricted to anti-immigrant attitudes of the majority population as a deterring factor on the location choice of immigrants. Here we suggest a broader view that not only incorporates attitudes, but also the broader political “context of reception” (Portes and Rumbaut, 2006), which includes integration policies and citizenship policies that may influence immigrant location choice.

To analyse whether internal mobility is influenced by political factors, the case of immigrants in Switzerland represents a good test scenario because of the federal structure of the Swiss political system. Swiss cantons (i.e. regions) and municipalities play a central role in shaping their own integration and citizenship policies (Probst et al., 2019), leading to substantial subnational heterogeneity in the political “context of reception” for foreign citizens (Manatschal, 2011). Factors such as whether access to citizenship is easy or difficult, whether foreign citizens enjoy voting rights, or whether the local population is rather open or hostile towards migrants can vary greatly from one Swiss municipality to another. More specifically, this paper concentrates on recently arrived immigrants who are already somewhat familiar with the local context and subnational heterogeneity, but at the same time less attached to a particular place than individuals who have lived in a place for longer. We stipulate that these circumstances make them more likely to “vote with their feet” for political reasons, which makes it more likely for us to observe more generic mechanisms of location choice.

Our contribution to the literature is twofold. First, we contribute a broader understanding of factors influencing residential location choice. While existing work has emphasised economic determinants, such as wages, employment rates or buying power as determinants of internal mobility (Dowding and John, 2002; Scott and Brindley 2012), we highlight that other macro factors can also play a role for location choice, notably the political reception context. Knowing that the political reception context affects residential location choice is essential because spatial (re-)distribution matters for the planning of municipal infrastructure, public transport or educational facilities. Second, we demonstrate that subnational integration policies shape immigrants’ mobility intentions. Integration policies provide immigrants with material resources that facilitate incorporation into the host society, such as language classes or rights to access the labour market, or symbolic resources that signal to immigrants that they are legitimate members of the host society (Bloemraad, 2013). By analysing location choice, we extend the literature on integration policies, which focused on political behaviour and integration

outcomes (see e.g. Bennour and Manatschal, 2019; Bloemraad, 2006; Ersanilli and Koopmans, 2011; Ersanilli and Saharso, 2011; Goodman and Wright, 2015; Koopmans, 2010).

## 2. Theory: Location choice of immigrants

Mobility decisions depend on push factors, which make people leave a place, and pull factors – elements in the new place of residence that attract individuals to move there (Lee 1966). Here we focus on pull factors for moves within a country – so-called internal migration. Such residential location choice is studied in many fields from geography to demography to economics (Montgomery and Curtis, 2006). Existing research covers explanations at both the micro– and macro level. The macro perspective shows how structural features can make locations more attractive (Permentier et al. 2011). The micro level, by contrast, is for instance analysed extensively by demographers or anthropologists who study individual drivers of location choice. This micro perspective demonstrates that contextual factors do not affect everyone the same way, highlighting individual preferences among other considerations (see e.g. Lympelopoulou, 2013).

Among the central micro factors driving individual location choices, the literature identifies lifecycle and lifestyle as major dimensions (Smith and Olaru, 2013). The lifecycle relates to the evolutionary demographic of a household, like the arrival of a child (Ström, 2010; Mulder and Lauster, 2010), getting married (Aassve et al. 2007), leaving a job or reaching retirement age (Ermisch and Jenkins, 1999). All of these influence residential location choice. Lifestyle components emphasise the values of individuals (Smith and Olaru, 2013), which also influence location choice. Subjective values and preferences can lead individuals to choose greener and healthier neighbourhoods, for instance, or the “vibe” of a city (Cao et al., 2009). Evidently, lifestyle and lifecycle also influence each other. Income, age, and change in employment sector can lead to a change in lifestyle, and trigger movement to a new location (Dieleman, 2001; Walker and Li, 2007).

Meso-level factors also play a role in determining individual location choice, like the types and costs of property on offer (Krizek and Waddell, 2002). More generally, however, neighbourhood characteristics are a strong determinant of location choice, as they encompass factors such as the predominant kind of lifestyle (Krizek and Waddell, 2002), the transport system (Montgomery and Curtis, 2006), access to nature (Kaplan and Austin, 2004) or recreational activities (Colwell et al., 2001). To explain individual mobility choice, studies concerned with meso-level factors look at relatively small contextual units such as a street or a neighbourhood (Van Heerden and Ruedin, 2019). A different literature at the meso level focuses on immigrants in particular, looking at ethnic enclaves or how the share of immigrants in a neighbourhood affects the mobility choices of immigrants (Damm, 2009; Guo and Bhat, 2006; Toussaint-Comeau and Rhine, 2004). These studies highlight that social networks can play an important role, as people tend to move close to existing social contacts (Guidon et al., 2019). Research highlighting the importance of social networks reveals that, beyond material considerations, mobility decisions are also motivated by social and affective factors, or a desire to feel “at home” at the new place of residence.

At the macro level, studies show how economic determinants influence location choice. In economics, in particular, we identify two distinct utility maximisation approaches: one with a focus on monetary aspects and one that includes non-monetary aspects. Utility maximisation theory stipulates that individuals tend to find an ideal trade-off between housing and commuting costs, expressed in monetary terms (Alonso, 1964). Housing costs include rent, but also tax levels (Schmidheiny and Slotwinski, 2018). The traditional application of utility maximisation theory tends to overlook more symbolic or non-monetary elements that may explain location choice (Sirgy et al., 2005), but there is nothing inherent in utility maximisation that would exclude such considerations. For

instance, a more comprehensive perspective on costs and benefits is taken by Tiebout (1956) in a classic study that emphasises a balance between living costs and quality of social services. Individuals can “vote with their feet”, deciding where to live by balancing taxes and access to local services such as public libraries, health services or education (Dowding and John, 2002).

Political science and migration studies emphasise various factors at the macro level when describing places but, to our knowledge, these have not been directly related to individual location choice at the local (rather than national) level (e.g. McAuliffe and Jayasuriya 2016; Batista and McKenzie 2021). For instance, the literature recognises different “philosophies” of national integration models (Brubaker, 1992; Koopmans & Statham, 2000; Pfirter et al. 2021). Most of this literature focuses on the effects of integration and citizenship policies, and research has expanded to consider variation at the subnational regional level, including cities and municipalities (Caponio and Borkert, 2010; Hepburn, 2011; Manatschal et al. 2020; Paquet, 2014). These studies show that subnational integration policies represent structural incentive structures which shape the behaviour and attitudes of immigrants, such as their political engagement (Cinalli and Giugni, 2011; Filindra and Manatschal 2020) or naturalisation intentions (Bennour, 2020; Politi et al., 2021).

Here we build on the literature on local policy variation and combine it with established considerations of location choice. We identified only two studies with a similar concern for the influence of the political context on immigrants’ location choice. Both show that elections or referendums won by far-right parties may greatly reduce mobility of foreign citizens to municipalities in Italy (Braco et al., 2018) and Switzerland (Slotwinski and Stutzer, 2019). In both contexts, hostile majority attitudes to immigrants act as a deterring factor for migrants, who thus choose different locations at a higher rate. While both studies demonstrate that political factors play a role in location choice, they employ a narrow approach to capturing the broader political reception context, and do not address the question of whether these political factors still matter when other well established factors are accounted for. To do so, we adopt an encompassing view on the political reception context and examine how it influences location choice among recently arrived immigrants in Switzerland. More specifically, we refer to the “context of reception” (Portes and Rumbaut, 2006) to distinguish between attitudes of the native population in a specific place (societal discrimination) and government policy (i.e. integration and citizenship policies).

While there is a broad literature on attitudes to immigrants (see Pettigrew, 2016; Rétiová et al., 2021 for reviews), we are concerned with the effects of these attitudes on immigrants and their sense of belonging (Simonsen, 2016, 2018). Thinking about contexts of reception, the attitudes of residents can be more or less welcoming of immigrants and can signal legitimacy to foreign citizens who perceive themselves as members of the host society (Maxwell, 2010). While attitudes may be expressed in many ways, drawing on recent studies (Bracco et al., 2018; Slotwinski and Stutzer, 2019), we argue that votes for the radical right are a visible and public indicator of such attitudes. We expect that immigrants prefer municipalities with less electoral support for the radical right.

Regarding integration policies that regulate the political rights of immigrants and naturalisation policies, these policies can enhance the material and symbolic resources of foreign citizens (Bloemraad, 2013). These resources can also make a municipality more attractive for immigrants, making them feel welcome on arrival (Van Hook, Brown, & Bean, 2006). In the present paper, we study the Swiss case whose policies exhibit local variance (Helbling & Kriesi, 2004, Probst et al. 2019): some cantons and municipalities allow foreign citizens to vote while others do not (Cattacin & Bülent, 2001). When they are exposed to inclusive subnational integration policies, immigrants develop a stronger attachment to the host country, a stronger sense of belonging, and a greater

intention to naturalise (Simonsen, 2016; Bennour and Manatschal, 2019; Bennour 2020). Accordingly, we expect that immigrants prefer places with inclusive integration policies that facilitate access to political participation via voting rights for foreign citizens.

Based on the theoretical reflections in this section, we clearly expect that an inclusive political reception context should increase the attractiveness of municipalities to recent immigrants. However, we consider it unlikely that all individuals are similarly responsive to the effects of political reception contexts on location choice (Lymeropoulou, 2013). We explore whether certain characteristics, such as the social integration of immigrants or their socioeconomic status, are systematically associated with differences across the models. Given the exploratory character of these investigations, we refrain from formulating specific hypotheses. Instead, we discuss these associations with the hope of sparking future work in this direction.

### 3. Data and methods

Our research concerns the location choice of recent immigrants. We focus on immigrants because they have less attachment to their place of residence relative to the general population who have lived in a place for longer. This allows for a better understanding of whether political factors can lead to “voting with their feet”. Since time spent in a place reduces the desire to be mobile (Lewicka, 2011), we restrict our analyses to immigrants who arrived in Switzerland within the preceding 15 years. They have had limited time to create strong roots in the local community, which, in turn, reduces immobility. At the same time, members in this group have already been in direct contact with the Swiss and subnational political reception context. We focus on Switzerland because of its federalist structure, which provides us with important subnational heterogeneity regarding integration and citizenship policies.

We use a conjoint experiment where participants repeatedly choose between two municipalities. Each municipality is assigned eight attributes (Table 1), which are all based on factors outlined in the literature: public transportation, access to nature, living costs, attitudes towards immigration, naturalisation requirements, presence of a co-ethnic community, voting rights for foreign citizens, and cultural and leisure infrastructures. Each attribute can have two randomly assigned levels – attractive or deterring – as a feature of the municipality. In total, there are 256 unique municipality profiles. In the analysis, we show the coefficients for the attractive features. For instance, for public transport, a “connection every half hour until midnight” is considered more appealing than “a connection every hour until 20:00”. Similarly, we consider the following attributes as more attractive: being within walking distance to nature, a municipality being 15% less expensive than the current one, a lower share of anti-immigrant party voting than in the surroundings, needing less time before applying for citizenship (2 versus 8 years), the ability to vote after a year of residence, and a rich offer of cultural and leisure activities.

In total, 1,596 recent immigrants participated in our conjoint experiment<sup>1</sup>. A conjoint experiment is ideal for testing how different meso- and macro factors influence the location choice of recent immigrants as it allowing researchers to “estimate causal effects of multiple treatment components and assess several causal hypotheses simultaneously” (Hainmueller et al., 2014, p.1). We have taken care to present realistic choices to participants to simulate real-world possibilities, while the conjoint method helps to reduce different biases found in regular surveys, such as social desirability (Horiuchi et al., 2020; Wallander, 2009).

---

<sup>1</sup> The study was pre-registered at <https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=jx56us>

<b>Attributes</b>	<b>Values</b>
Transport to main commodities (shopping, centre, schools, doctors)	<i>Connection every half hour until 24:00</i> <i>Connection every hour until 20:00</i>
Access to nature (forest, lake, river...)	<i>Walking distance</i> <i>Not in walking distance</i>
Living costs (rent, taxes, health insurance...)	<i>15% more expensive than your current municipality</i> <i>15% less expensive than your current municipality</i>
Share of SVP/UDC (anti-immigrant party)	<i>Lower than in surrounding municipalities</i> <i>Higher than in surrounding municipalities</i>
Swiss citizenship requirements	<i>8 years of residence in the municipality</i> <i>2 years of residence in the municipality</i>
People from the same country as you	<i>No proper network</i> <i>Strong social network</i>
Noncitizen voting rights in the municipality for legal permanent residents (C Permit)	<i>Possible after one year of residence in the canton</i> <i>No noncitizen voting rights</i>
Local infrastructure for cultural and leisure activities (for example: swimming pool, theatre, sport centre, museum...)	<i>Rich offer</i> <i>Limited offer</i>

**Table 1:** List of municipality attributes in the conjoint experiment, and the two possible values for each attribute.

We asked participants to imagine that they receive an attractive job offer, and to choose between two municipalities, equidistant from work, in which they would prefer to settle. We repeated this question five times, with each containing a forced choice (Figure 1, Panel A) even if the chosen option does not have a perfect profile. This results in the outcome variable of interest (0 = not chosen municipality, 1 = chosen municipality, i.e. the response to “I pick municipality A/B” in Figure 1). Participants are also asked to rank their likelihood of choosing one of the two municipalities, from 0 (very unlikely) to 10 (very likely) (Figure 1, Panel B). This scale question provides a robustness check to our main models.

For the exploratory analyses, we had the opportunity to link the participants of our conjoint experiment to the Migration-Mobility Survey (MMS) 2020. The MMS is based on a representative sample of individuals who have moved to Switzerland in the preceding 15 years. It includes questions on demographics, socioeconomic variables, migratory history, citizenship, education and labour market integration. With this broad set of variables, we can explore individual characteristics of the immigrants that may shape the extent to which they are influenced by the political reception context. The MMS was conducted in six different languages (English, German, French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese), which also allows us to include non-language-assimilated immigrants in our study. The data collection took place between October 2020 and February 2021.



A.

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?

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

- I pick municipality A
- I pick municipality B

B.

How likely is it that you would choose to live in Municipality A?

Very unlikely 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely



How likely is it that you would choose to live in Municipality B?

Very unlikely 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely



**Figure 1:** Example of conjoint experiment with forced choice shown to participants (bottom of Panel A) and the scale shown to participants (Panel B).


For the exploratory analyses, we had the opportunity to link the participants of our conjoint experiment to the Migration-Mobility Survey (MMS) 2020. The MMS is based on a representative sample of individuals who have moved to Switzerland in the preceding 15 years. It includes questions on demographics, socioeconomic variables, migratory history, citizenship, education and labour market integration. With this broad set of variables, we can explore individual characteristics of the immigrants that may shape the extent to which they are influenced by the political reception context. The MMS was conducted in six different languages (English, German, French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese), which also allows us to include non-language-assimilated immigrants in our study. The data collection took place between October 2020 and February 2021.

All recent immigrants in the sample were born abroad; 49.4% are men and 50.6% women, and 50.6% of the respondents are EU nationals. As is to be expected with a sample of recently arrived immigrants in Switzerland (Wanner, 2014), the sample is highly educated: 71.4% of the sample has a tertiary education. This means that the sample is not representative of the entire foreign-born population in Switzerland, which we never aimed for. To run our models, we use version 4.1.1 of *R* with the *cjoint* (Hainmueller et al., 2014) and *cregg* (Leeper, 2020) packages. This allows us to identify average marginal component effects (AMCE) which express the causal effect of each attribute on individual location choice. AMCE maintains all components equal and shows how a change in an attribute's level affects individual preferences.

#### 4. Findings: Political factors influence location choice

The model in Figure 2 demonstrates how the political reception context influences the location choice of recent immigrants. This is the case for all variables that capture the reception context. For instance, lower naturalisation requirements increase the attractiveness of a municipality compared to a place with stricter conditions: a reduction of six years before applying for naturalisation raises the probability of choosing a locality by 10.4%. The attitudes of the native population also explain the location choice of immigrants: relative to a locality with a higher anti-immigrant vote share than in the surroundings, a municipality with a lower far-right party share is 9.6% more attractive for recent immigrants. The right to vote in the canton after one year increases the chance of choosing a municipality by 7.2%, compared to a place without voting rights.

Non-political variables are also associated with the location choice of recent immigrants: a locality within walking distance to nature is 17.4% more likely to be chosen than a location without walkable access to nature. Because the data were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is possible that this value is higher than it would otherwise have been, though a qualitative study carried out before the pandemic suggests that access to nature was highly valued by Swiss residents at that time as well (Efonayi-Mäder et al. 2020). A municipality with more regular public transport connections is favoured by 12.6% compared to less frequent connections. Respondents are 11.5% more likely to choose a location with 15% more buying power in comparison with a place that reduces their buying power by 15%. Also, a rich offer in cultural and leisure activities, as well as a strong social network of co-ethnics, make a municipality more attractive.



**Figure 2: AMCE for the entire sample**  
 Notes: Lines correspond to 95% confidence interval. Outcome variable is picking a municipality with these attributes, conjoint experiment with forced choice, Switzerland 2020–21. N=1,596 recent immigrants, 7,980 choices. Choices are clustered by participants.

As a robustness check, we run the same model with scales as outcomes (Figure A1 in the Appendix). Contrary to the forced choice, the scale allows for equal preferences, as well as distinguishing between strong and weak preferences. These analyses confirm the relevance of the political reception context in explaining immigrants' location choice, as immigrants tend to favour municipalities with an inclusive political reception context.

## 5. Exploratory analyses: The role of socioeconomic variables, legal status and social integration

In the following section, we explore whether the importance of the political reception context for location choice varies by immigrant characteristics. We examine socioeconomic variables, legal status and social integration. Individuals with high educational credentials or a high monthly household income may value the political reception context differently from individuals with low education levels or incomes. What is more, non-EU immigrants have a less stable political status, which may mean that they value access to more political rights differently from EU citizens. Regarding the degree of social integration (e.g. interest in Swiss news and events, feeling of belonging to Swiss society, intention to remain in Switzerland), we expect that these may also lead to

differentiated evaluations of the political context for the location choice of immigrants. Related to this point, social networks may also moderate the influence of political factors on residential location choice<sup>2</sup>. We include these analyses to spark future investigation; we did not develop a strong theoretical case and refrain from doing so post-hoc.

Political factors shape the location choice of immigrants for most subcategories considered. Figure A2 in the Appendix shows that voting rights influence location choice across all subgroups of educational attainment. By contrast, the attitudes of natives only affect the location choice of individuals with tertiary and vocational diplomas. Immigrants with tertiary and secondary educational achievements are also the only group influenced by naturalisation requirements for their residential choice. Regarding income and country of origin, Figures A3 and A4 in the Appendix show that all subcategories are significantly influenced by every component of the political reception context. Figures A5 to A7 in the Appendix further demonstrate that naturalisation requirements and native attitudes matter for all immigrants, irrespective of their interest in Swiss news, plans to stay in Switzerland or feeling of belonging to the host country. By contrast, voting rights do not seem to influence the location choice of those uninterested in Swiss news, who plan to leave the country or who do not feel they belong to Switzerland. Finally, Figures A8 and A9 in the Appendix show that social integration influences all subcategories in terms of positive contacts with the local population and feelings of loneliness. In sum, we find that the influence of the political reception context is not necessarily homogeneous across subcategories.

To ensure differences between subgroups are not biased by the reference category of each attribute, we follow the analytic strategy by Leeper et al. (2020): we calculate the difference in marginal means between the subgroups with a 95% confidence interval, also known as a “nested model comparison”. These models tell us if statistically significant differences exist among subgroups regarding the influence of the political reception context. In addition, these estimates allow us to compare the differences of marginal means within a single attribute – e.g., exclusive naturalisation policy – across subgroups. Figures 3 and 4 show that significant differences exist between subgroups with respect to the impact of the political context on location choice.


Panel a) in Figure 3 shows that individuals with tertiary education are more likely than those with a secondary education to favour municipalities where natives have inclusive attitudes. Conversely, a higher share of right-populist votes appears to deter immigrants with the highest levels of education, but has less of an impact on those who left education after secondary school. However, we find no substantial difference between individuals with a tertiary or primary/vocational diploma with regard to the influence of natives’ attitudes. Panel b) in Figure 3 complements these considerations with a focus on naturalisation requirements. Individuals with tertiary education favour municipalities with inclusive citizenship practices more than individuals with secondary education. Similar

---

<sup>2</sup> The variables we use for this exploration are shaped by their availability in the MMS. Education is categorical (Tertiary education: 71.4%; Secondary: 11.6%; Primary: 5%; Vocational: 12%). Immigrants from a non-EU country represent 49.4% of the sample (50.6% are EU nationals). Monthly income is measured at the household level: less than CHF 3,000 to 6,000: 25.7%; CHF 6,000 to 9,000: 22.9%, CHF 9,000 and more: 51.4%. Subjective attachment to Switzerland is measured using three variables: The first is derived from asking “On a scale from 0 (‘not at all’) to 7 (‘to a very high extent’), to what extent are you interested in news and current events in Switzerland”. We combine response values 0 to 3 into a single category (“rather uninterested”, 11.6% of the sample), with the remainder classified as “interested”. The second variable asks about plans to settle in Switzerland, differentiating between “plan to leave” (15.3%), “plan to stay” (45.8%), and “uncertain” (38.9%). The third variable asks: “To what extent do you agree with the following statements: ‘Globally, I feel myself belonging to Swiss society’”. We combine the two disagreement options into “no belonging” (23.8% of the sample) and the remainder into “belonging”. To capture social networks, we ask: “How often do you have you positive contacts with Swiss people?”, with “never” and “from time to time” combined into “rarely” (21.4% of the sample), and the remainder into “often/very often” (78.6%). Together, subjective attachment to Switzerland and immigrants’ social networks provide a measure social integration. A binary variable captures feelings of loneliness (59.2% do not feel lonely).


differences exist between individuals with tertiary education and immigrants with a primary and vocational education (Figure A10 in the Appendix).

A different pattern appears in Panel c) of Figure 3 relating to monthly household income. The poorest have a significantly stronger preference than the richest for a more inclusive setting. Panel d) in Figure 4 shows that recent immigrants coming from a non-EU country are much more influenced by citizenship policies than EU citizens. Non-EU citizens prefer more inclusive citizenship policies (i.e. 2 years of requirement) and are also more deterred by exclusive policies (i.e. 8 years of requirement) than EU citizens.



**Figure 3:** Difference in marginal means for subgroups depending on educational attainment, country of origin and income  
 Notes: Lines correspond to 95% confidence interval. Outcome variable is picking a municipality with these attributes, conjoint experiment with forced choice, Switzerland 2020–21. N=1,596 recent immigrants, 7,980 choices. Choices are clustered by participants.

Panels a) and b) in Figure 4 show that interest in news/events in Switzerland moderates the influence of political factors on immigrants' location choice. Compared to uninterested immigrants, individuals interested in Swiss news tend to prefer inclusive political contexts. This holds true with regard to attitudes of natives and voting rights. Conversely, immigrants interested in Swiss news are more deterred by exclusive political contexts than their counterparts. Panels c) and d) in Figure 4 show that people with long-term projects in Switzerland favour a more inclusive political context than their counterparts who plan to leave Switzerland, irrespective of the measure used (naturalisation requirements, voting rights). Panels e) and f) show that a sense of belonging is associated with greater preference for the most inclusive policy pole for a future location, regarding both naturalisation requirements and voting rights.



**Figure 4:** Difference in marginal means for subgroups depending on immigrants' links to Switzerland and social networks.  
 Notes: Lines correspond to 95% confidence interval. Outcome variable is picking a municipality with these attributes, conjoint experiment with forced choice, Switzerland 2020–21. N=1,596 recent immigrants, 7,980 choices. Choices are clustered by participants.

Considering the social networks of immigrants, we find that individuals with positive contact with Swiss people are more prone to favouring places where the public support for far-right parties is lower, relative to people who do not have regular positive contact (Panel g) in Figure 4). In Panel h), we show that feeling lonely moderates the influence of attitudes on the location choice of recent immigrants. Individuals who do not feel lonely seem to prioritise locations with a lower far-right share, while exclusive attitudes deter socialised immigrants more than lonely immigrants. At the same time, the exploration of subgroups also yielded “non-findings”, which we report for transparency: gender, being a parent and relationship status (single or in a relationship) do not influence how immigrants react to the political context of reception. Similarly, age and time spent in Switzerland only marginally influence recent immigrants. Contrary to our expectations, neither residence permits nor the experience of discrimination influence how political factors affect location choice. We expected that residence permits would reflect

vulnerability and discrimination would result in immigrants feeling unsafe, and thus having an increased willingness to live in an inclusive place<sup>3</sup>.

## 6. Discussion and conclusion

Using a conjoint experiment with recent immigrants in Switzerland, we show that the political reception context shapes location choice, even when well established macro factors, like economic differences, are taken into consideration. With this, we complement existing studies on location choice that focus on specific factors and neglect the relevance of the political context. While some studies suggest that political factors are important for the choice of destination country (Braco et al., 2018), and political factors certainly play a role for asylum seekers in search of political stability (Collier, 2013), here we demonstrate that the political context also matters for the internal mobility decisions of recent migrants. This shows that individuals do indeed “vote with their feet” for political reasons, and not only for economic reasons or other “quality of life” or lifestyle factors related to the infrastructure, cultural offer or closeness to nature of a given place (Florida, 2004).

The exploratory analyses across subgroups show that recent immigrants react differently to the political reception context depending on various characteristics. We included this exploration both to understand patterns of immigrant integration and to spark future research on location choice. For instance, we provide experimental substantiation for Florida’s assertion in his work on the “creative class” (2004), showing that highly educated individuals favour inclusive political reception contexts, but we also show that income does not seem to play a role in defining this creative class or its location choice. We also note that coming from an EU country moderates the influence of naturalisation policies on location choice. This finding is in line with Peters et al. (2016), for instance, who show that non-EU nationals are more inclined to naturalise than EU nationals and, by implication, are more influenced by the inclusiveness of local citizenship regimes.

In the exploratory analysis, we reveal a high level of social integration: an emotional attachment to the host country is associated with a preference for an inclusive political reception context (Simonsen, 2016). This may reflect the fact that immigrants with stronger links to Switzerland may also prefer to stay in Switzerland for a longer period of time (Haas and Fokkema, 2011), but could also indicate homophily in the sense that immigrants who emotionally invest in the country of destination seek an environment where this is appreciated. Social networks also moderate the political reception context, notably in terms of attitudes towards immigration. Individuals who have friends and positive contact with Swiss people prefer places where the native population have more inclusive attitudes to immigration.

While we paint a rich picture on how the effects of the political reception context vary by subgroup, overall we find that immigrants with the most capital – human or social – are those most influenced by the political reception context. Therefore, a possible interpretation is that the most privileged among immigrants can “afford” to care more about the inclusiveness of the political reception context. This finding resonates with the work of Putnam (1993) suggesting that social and human capital are relevant to explaining civic engagement and political participation. Thus, municipalities displaying an inclusive political reception context may be more noticeably attractive for immigrants with important human and social capital. The only exception we can find here relates to non-EU citizens who are less privileged than EU nationals, in terms of stability of stay and entry rights. This difference in legal rights helps to emphasise the point that location choice also plays a functional role, as suggested by studies on economic determinants, but one that includes the political sphere.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that asylum seekers and temporarily admitted persons are not part of the sample.

In terms of our aim of sparking new research, we think, for example, of the need to consider different aspects of the political reception context. For instance, we can imagine that our findings would be different had we included language courses rather than voting rights, especially since language courses are relevant to only part of the immigrant population. We suggest that this study could possibly be replicated in other contexts that exhibit variation in integration policies and citizenship regulation, whether due to regional differences within federal countries or for other reasons. We strongly suggest that the sample be broadened to the entire immigrant population of the host country, beyond newly arrived immigrants. While we argue that the focus on recently arrived immigrants has distinct advantages, location choice by established immigrants with strong local networks may follow different logics.

In conclusion, we urge future research on immigrant mobility to consider the role that political factors may have. In this way, we believe that research on human mobility will be better placed to inform the allocation of local resources to successfully plan for infrastructure and amenities, including public transport. In the meanwhile, the finding that inclusive places attract immigrants with a deeper attachment to the host country highlights how negative attitudes to immigration, and support for radical right-wing parties, are a barrier to the social integration of immigrants, perversely undermining the very outcome that some members of society so vehemently demand of their immigrant communities.

## **7. Data availability statement**

Data from the conjoint experiment will be made available on Zenodo on publication; data from the survey are available on request.

## 8. Bibliography

- Alonso, W. (1964). Location and land use. toward a general theory of land rent. Location and land use. Toward a general theory of land rent.
- Aassve, A., Betti, G., Mazzuco, S., and Mencarini, L. (2007). Marital disruption and economic well-being: A comparative analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 170(3), 781-799.
- Batista, C., and McKenzie, D. (2021). Testing Classic Theories of Migration in the Lab. *IZA Discussion Paper* 14717:1–49.
- Bennour, S. (2020). Intention to become a citizen: Do subnational integration policies have an influence? Empirical evidence from Swiss cantons. *Regional Studies*, 54(11), 1535-1545.
- Bennour, S., and Manatschal, A. (2019). Immigrants' feelings of attachment to Switzerland: Does the cantonal context matter? In *Migrants and expats: The Swiss migration and mobility nexus* (pp. 189-220). Springer, Cham.
- Bhat, C. R., and Guo, J. Y. (2006). Comprehensive analysis of built environment characteristics on household residential choice and automobile ownership levels (No. 06-0990).
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). Citizenship lessons from the past: The contours of immigrant naturalization in the early 20th century. *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5): 927-953.
- Bloemraad, I. (2013). "The great concern of government": Public policy as material and symbolic resources. In J. Hochschild, J. Chattopadhyay, C. Gay, & M. Jones-Correa (Eds.), *Outsiders no more? Models of immigrant political incorporation* (pp. 195–208). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borjas, G. J. (1999). Immigration and welfare magnets. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(4), 607-637.
- Bracco, E., M. De Paola, C.P. Green and V. Scoppa. (2018). The effect of far right parties on the location choice of immigrants: Evidence from Lega Nord Mayors. *Journal of Public Economics* 166: 12-26.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Caponio, T., and Borkert, M. (2010). *The local dimension of migration policymaking*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Cattacin, S., and Bülent, K. (2001). *Le développement des mesures d'intégration de la population migrante sur le plan local en Suisse*. Forum suisse pour l'étude des migrations. Neuchâtel: University of Neuchâtel.
- Cao, X., Mokhtarian, P. L., and Handy, S. L. (2009). Examining the impacts of residential self-selection on travel behaviour: a focus on empirical findings. *Transport Reviews*, 29(3), 359-395.
- Cinalli, M., and Giugni, M. (2011). Institutional opportunities, discursive opportunities and the political participation of migrants in European cities. In *Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe* (pp. 43-62). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Collier, P. (2013). *Exodus: How Migration Is Changing Our World*. Allen Lane.
- Damm, A. P. (2009). Ethnic enclaves and immigrant labor market outcomes: Quasi-experimental evidence. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 27(2), 281-314.
- Dieleman, F. M. (2001). Modelling residential mobility; a review of recent trends in research. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 16(3), 249-265.



- Dowding, K., John, P., and Mergoupis, T. (2002). Fiscal mobility in metropolitan England.
- Efionayi-Mäder, D., Fehlmann, J., Probst, J., Ruedin, D., and D'Amato, G. (2020). *Mit- und Nebeneinander in Schweizer Gemeinden – Wie Migration von der ansässigen Bevölkerung wahrgenommen wird*. Bern: Eidgenössische Migrationskommission EKM.
- Ermisch, J. F., and Jenkins, S. P. (1999). Retirement and housing adjustment in later life: evidence from the British Household Panel Survey. *Labour Economics*, 6(2), 311-333.
- Ersanilli, E. and R. Koopmans. (2011). Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants. *West European Politics* 34 (2): 208–234. doi: 10.1080/01402382.2011.546568
- Ersanilli, E and Saharso, S. (2011). The settlement country and ethnic identification of children of Turkish immigrants in Germany, France, and the Netherlands: What role do national integration policies play? *International Migration Review*, 45(4), 907–937. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2011.00872.x
- Filindra, A., and Manatschal, A. (2020). Coping with a changing integration policy context: American state policies and their effects on immigrant political engagement. *Regional Studies*, 54(11), 1546-1557.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic books.
- Goodman, S. W., and M. Wright. (2015). Does mandatory integration matter? Effects of civic requirements on immigrant socio-economic and political outcomes. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(12): 1885-1908.
- Guidon, S., Wicki, M., Bernauer, T., and Axhausen, K. (2019). The social aspect of residential location choice: on the trade-off between proximity to social contacts and commuting. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 74, 333-340.
- De Haas, H., & Fokkema, T. (2011). The effects of integration and transnational ties on international return migration intentions. *Demographic research*, 25, 755-782.
- Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., and Yamamoto, T. (2014). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis*, 22(1), 1-30.
- Helbling, M., and Kriesi, H. (2004). Staatsbürgerverständnis und politische Mobilisierung: Einbürgerungen in Schweizer Gemeinden. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 10(4), 33–58.
- Hepburn, E. (2011). “Citizens of the region”: Party conceptions of regional citizenship and immigrant integration. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(4), 504–529.
- Horiuchi, Y., Markovich, Z. D., and Yamamoto, T. (2020). Does conjoint analysis mitigate social desirability bias? *MIT Political Science Department Research Paper* No. 2018-15.
- Jaeger, D. A. (2000). Local labor markets, admission categories, and immigrant location choice. Manuscript, College of William and Mary.
- Kaplan, R., and Austin, M. E. (2004). Out in the country: sprawl and the quest for nature nearby. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 69(2-3), 235-243.
- Koopmans, R., and Statham, P. (2000). *Challenging immigration and ethnic relations politics: Comparative European perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
- Koopmans, R. (2010). Trade-offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(1): 1-26.

- Krizek, K. J., and Waddell, P. (2002). Analysis of lifestyle choices: Neighborhood type, travel patterns, and activity participation. *Transportation Research Record*, 1807(1), 119-128.
- Lee, E.S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3(1), 47-57.
- Leeper, T. J., Hobolt, S. B., and Tilley, J. (2020). Measuring subgroup preferences in conjoint experiments. *Political Analysis*, 28(2), 207-221.
- Leeper, T.J. (2020). *cregg: Simple Conjoint Analyses and Visualization*. R package version 0.4.0.
- Lewicka, M. (2011). Place Attachment: How Far Have We Come in the Last 40 Years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31(3):207–30.
- Lymperopoulou, K. (2013). The area determinants of the location choices of new immigrants in England. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(3), 575-592.
- Manatschal, A. (2011). Taking cantonal variations of integration policy seriously—Or how to validate international concepts at the subnational comparative level. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17(3), 336-357.
- Manatschal, A., Wisthaler, V., & Zuber, C. I. (2020). Making regional citizens? The political drivers and effects of subnational immigrant integration policies in Europe and North America. *Regional Studies* 54 (11): 1475-1485. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2020.1808882>.
- Maxwell, R. (2010). Evaluating migrant integration: political attitudes across generations in Europe. *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 25-52.
- McAuliffe, M., & Jayasuriya, D. (2016). Do asylum seekers and refugees choose destination countries? Evidence from large-scale surveys in Australia, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. *International Migration*, 54(4), 44-59.
- McAuliffe, M., Khadria, B., and Bauloz, C. (2019). *World migration report 2020*. IOM.
- Montgomery, M., & Curtis, C. (2006). Housing mobility and location choice: A review of the literature (Working Paper No. 2). Perth: Curtin University of Technology. Retrieved from [http://urbanet.curtin.edu.au/local/pdf/ARC\\_TOD\\_Working\\_Paper\\_2.pdf](http://urbanet.curtin.edu.au/local/pdf/ARC_TOD_Working_Paper_2.pdf)
- Mulder, C. H., and Lauster, N. T. (2010). Housing and family: An introduction. *Housing Studies*, 25(4), 433-440.
- Paquet, M. (2014). The federalization of immigration and integration in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 47(10), 519–548.
- Peters, F., Vink, M., and Schmeets, H. (2016). The ecology of immigrant naturalisation: A life course approach in the context of institutional conditions. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(3), 359–381.
- Permentier, M., Bolt, G., and Van Ham, M. (2011). Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and perception of neighbourhood reputation. *Urban studies*, 48(5), 977-996.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2016). In pursuit of three theories: Authoritarianism, relative deprivation, and intergroup contact. *Annual review of psychology*, 67, 1-21.
- Pfirter, L., Borrelli, L.S., Ruedin, D., and Kurt, S. (2021). “Citizenship Models and Migrant Integration – Rethinking the Intersection of Citizenship and Migrant Integration through (b)Ordering.” Pp. 52–65 in *Handbook of Citizenship and Migration*, edited by M. Giugni and M. Grasso. London: Edward Elgar.
- Politi, E., Bennour, S., Lüders, A., Manatschal, A., and Green, E. G. (2021). Where and Why Immigrants Intend to Naturalize: The Interplay Between Acculturation Strategies

and Integration Policies. *Political Psychology*. Online view. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12771>.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2006). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Univ of California Press.

Probst, J., D'Amato, G., Dunning, S., Efonyi-Mäder, D., Fehlmann, J., Perret, A., Ruedin, D., and Sille, I. (2019). *Kantonale Spielräume im Wandel*. SFM-Bericht. 73. Neuchâtel: Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies.

Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rétiová, A., Božič, I. R., Klvaňová, R., and Jaworsky, B. N. (2021). Shifting Categories, Changing Attitudes: A Boundary Work Approach in the Study of Attitudes toward Migrants. *Sociology Compass* 15(3):e12855. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12855>.

Sasser, A. C. (2010). Voting with their feet: relative economic conditions and state migration patterns. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 40(2-3), 122-135.

Schmidheiny, K., and Slotwinski, M. (2018). Tax-induced mobility: Evidence from a foreigners' tax scheme in Switzerland. *Journal of Public Economics* 167: 293-324.

Scott, S., and Brindley, P. (2012). New geographies of migrant settlement in the UK. *Geography*, 97(1), 29-38.

Simonsen, K. B. (2016). How the host nation's boundary drawing affects immigrants' belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(7), 1153-1176.

Simonsen, K. B. (2018). What It Means to (Not) Belong: A Case Study of How Boundary Perceptions Affect Second-Generation Immigrants' Attachments to the Nation. *Sociological Forum* 33(1):118–38. doi: 10.1111/socf.12402.

Sirgy, M. J., Grzeskowiak, S., & Su, C. (2005). Explaining housing preference and choice: The role of self-congruity and functional congruity. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 20(4), 329-347.

Slotwinski, M. and A. Stutzer. (2019). The deterrent effect of an anti-minaret vote on foreigners' location choices. *Journal of Population Economics* 32(3): 1043-1095.

Smith, B., & Olaru, D. (2013). Lifecycle stages and residential location choice in the presence of latent preference heterogeneity. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(10), 2495-2514.

Ström, S. (2010). Housing and first births in Sweden, 1972–2005. *Housing Studies*, 25(4), 509-526.

Tiebout, C. M. (1956). A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy* 64(5): 416-424.

Toussaint-Comeau, M., & Rhine, S. L. (2004). The relationship between Hispanic residential location and homeownership. *Economic Perspectives-Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago*, 28(3), 2.

van Heerden, S., and Ruedin, D. (2019). How Attitudes towards Immigrants Are Shaped by Residential Context: The Role of Neighbourhood Dynamics, Immigrant Visibility, and Areal Attachment. *Urban Studies* 56(2):317–34. doi: [10.1177/0042098017732692](https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017732692).

Van Hook, J., Brown, S. K., & Bean, F. D. (2006). For love or money? Welfare reform and immigrant naturalization. *Social Forces*, 85(2), 643–666. doi:10.1353/sof.2007.0029


Walker, J. L., & Li, J. (2007). Latent lifestyle preferences and household location decisions. *Journal of Geographical Systems*, 9(1), 77-101.

Wallander, L. (2009). 25 years of factorial surveys in sociology: A review. *Social Science Research*, 38(3), 505-520.


Wanner, P. (2014) : Une Suisse à 10 millions d'habitants. Enjeux et débats. Lausanne : Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes.

## 9. Appendix


- Natives' attitudes:  
 (Baseline = Higher than in surrounding municipalities)  
 Lower than in surrounding municipalities
- Co-ethnic network:  
 (Baseline = No proper network)  
 Strong social network
- Living costs:  
 (Baseline = 15% more expensive than your current municipality)  
 15% less expensive than your current municipality
- Local infrastructure:  
 (Baseline = Limited offer)  
 Rich offer
- Citizenship requirements:  
 (Baseline = 8 years of residence in the municipality)  
 2 years of residence in the municipality
- Access to nature:  
 (Baseline = Not in walking distance)  
 Walking distance
- Public transport:  
 (Baseline = Connection every hour until 8pm)  
 Connection every half hour until 12am
- Voting rights:  
 (Baseline = No noncitizen voting right)  
 Possible after one year of residence in the canton




**Figure A1:** Robustness check with scale as outcome – AMCE – Entire sample – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A2:** Marginal means depending on highest educational achievement – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A3:** Marginal means depending on monthly household income – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A4:** Marginal means depending on country of origin – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A5:** Marginal means depending on interest in Swiss news and events – (95% confidence interval)



**Figure A6:** Marginal means depending on the plan to stay in Switzerland – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A7:** Marginal means depending on the feeling of belonging to Switzerland – (95% confidence interval)




**Figure A8:** Marginal means depending on positive contacts with Swiss people – (95% confidence interval)





**Figure A9:** Marginal means depending on feelings of loneliness – (95% confidence interval)



**Figure A10:** Marginal means depending on highest educational attainment – (95% confidence interval)

## Electronic reference

Bennour, Salomon; Manatschal, Anita; Ruedin, Didier. «How political reception contexts shape location decisions of immigrants», Working Paper series MAPS [online], 1 | 2022, [https://www.unine.ch/files/live/sites/maps/files/shared/documents/wp/WP\\_1\\_2022\\_Bennour\\_Manatschal\\_Ruedin.pdf](https://www.unine.ch/files/live/sites/maps/files/shared/documents/wp/WP_1_2022_Bennour_Manatschal_Ruedin.pdf).

ISSN : 1662-744X

La reproduction, transmission ou traduction de tout ou partie de cette publication est autorisée pour des activités à but non lucratif ou pour l'enseignement et la recherche.  
Dans les autres cas, la permission de la MAPS est requise.



### Contact:

MAPS - Maison d'analyse des processus sociaux  
Rue A.-L. Breguet 1  
CH - 2000 Neuchâtel  
Tél. +41 32 718 39 34  
[www2.unine.ch/maps](http://www2.unine.ch/maps)  
[maps.info@unine.ch](mailto:maps.info@unine.ch)