

Who stays in their birthplace? The role of multigenerational local ties in young adults' staying behaviour

Jonne A. K. Thomassen¹  | Emma Lundholm^{2,3}  | Gunnar Malmberg^{2,3}

¹Population Research Centre, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

²Centre of Demography and Ageing Research, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

³Department of Geography, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Correspondence

Jonne A. K. Thomassen, Population Research Centre, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Groningen, Landleven 1, Groningen 9747 AD, The Netherlands.

Email: j.a.k.thomassen@rug.nl

Funding information

Vetenskapsrådet, Grant/Award Number: 2020-02542; H2020 European Research Council, Grant/Award Number: 740113

Abstract

We explore staying and migration behaviour using a multigenerational perspective on local ties. Based on Swedish register data, we take a shared birthplace between young adults and one or more of their parents and grandparents as a proxy for multigenerational local ties in the young adult's birthplace. Our aim is to investigate whether the presence of this type of longstanding, multigenerational local ties in the birthplace increases one's propensity to stay or return there during young adulthood. Using multinomial logistic regressions, we model the residential trajectories between ages 18 and 30 of individuals born in 1981, 1982, and 1983 who lived in their birthplace at age 18 (i.e., stayed in, moved from, or returned to the birthplace by age 30; $N = 185,897$). We find that the propensity for staying in one's birthplace increases with each additional parent or grandparent with whom the birthplace is shared. Overall, differences between ties shared with parent(s) and grandparent(s) are surprisingly similar, except ties that are shared with *both* parents. These have a particularly strong and positive effect. Although men seem to be tied more strongly than women to their fathers and paternal grandparents, we found no differences between men and women in their ties to mothers and maternal grandparents.

KEYWORDS

grandparents, internal migration, local ties, place of birth, staying, young adulthood

1 | INTRODUCTION

In many countries, internal migration (moving over long distances within country borders) peaks during young adulthood and then steadily declines with increasing age (Rogers & Castro, 1981). A compelling explanation for increased migration during young adulthood is based on the idea that life course transitions are experienced as triggers for migration (Bernard et al., 2014; Thomassen, 2021). Indeed, young adults typically experience many life course transitions as well as changes in their educational and labour careers that may result in a need or desire to move elsewhere (Kley & Mulder, 2010;

Mulder & Hooimeijer, 1999). While young Swedish adults portray some of the highest migration levels in Europe (Bernard & Kolk, 2020), a significant proportion of them will stay close to home.

Several scholars have called attention to a knowledge gap around immobility experiences and have argued for investigations of staying behaviour in its own right (e.g., Cooke, 2011, 2013; Coulter et al., 2016; Stockdale & Haartsen, 2018). Since then, qualitative studies have shown that staying behaviour is an ongoing process that is actively re-evaluated throughout the life course and inextricably linked to the life courses of others (e.g., Adams & Komu, 2022; Hjälms, 2014; Preece, 2018; Stockdale, Theunissen, et al., 2018;

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2023 The Authors. *Population, Space and Place* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Thomassen, 2021). Evidence that people execute active agency over their staying processes has been instrumental in advocating the study of immobility using a life course framework. Individual agency implies that staying experiences—like migration experiences—are part of people's lifelong processes of “constructing their own life course through the choices and actions they take within the opportunities and constraints of history and social circumstance” (Elder et al., 2003, p. 11).

Since the early days of migration research, scholars have conceptualized the decision to move or to stay as being based on a cost-benefit analysis in which people are most likely to move when they expect the returns from migration to exceed its costs (Sjaastad, 1962). The outcome of the decision has to make sense for the individual (Lee, 1966; Sjaastad, 1962) and, where relevant, for their household as a whole (Cooke, 2008). Local ties to places and people have been identified as important factors that deter migration and encourage staying (Fischer & Malmberg, 2001; Mulder & Malmberg, 2014). That is because migration, as opposed to residential relocation, comes at the cost of leaving one's daily activity space (Hägerstrand, 1970; Niedomysl, 2011; Roseman, 1971) and one's access to location-specific capital, such as social networks and familiarity with the surroundings (DaVanzo, 1981).

Together with other social network members, parents and grandparents—hereafter “(grand)parents” for short—make up an important share of a young adult's social environment (Bengtson, 2001; Rossi & Rossi, 1990). Notably, the literature on socialization and intergenerational transmissions shows that (grand)parents may actively and passively shape their (grand)children's preferences, aspirations, knowledge, and behaviours. For example, intergenerational transfers play a role in wealth (Semyonov & Lewin-Epstein, 2013), educational attainment, and occupational status (Blau & Duncan, 1967). With regard to residential behaviour, studies have investigated transfers between parents and children of homeownership (e.g., Lersch & Luijckx, 2015), learned migration behaviour (Bernard & Vidal, 2020; Blaauboer, 2011) and preferences for residential environments (Feijten et al., 2008). Moreover, residential locations of parents have been found to act as local ties (e.g., Thomassen, 2021) and as attractors for return migration during young adulthood (Mulder et al., 2020). The roles of grandparents in shaping young adults' residential behaviours have not been investigated in as much detail, but overall, geographic distances to living grandparents seem to remain stable during adulthood (Kolk, 2017).

We contribute to the literature by exploring staying and migration behaviour of young adults using a multigenerational perspective on local ties. This means taking into account relationships between multiple generations of a family, which may include ongoing relationships as well as relationships with members who are no longer alive or in contact with each other. We will use the term *multigenerational local ties* to describe a plethora of attachments to places and people that can be imagined as the result of multiple generations of a family engaging with, and investing in, the same residential environment—either within the individual's lifespan or beyond that.

Using Swedish population register data, we approximate the presence of multigenerational local ties as a shared birthplace¹ between the young adult and one or more of their (grand)parents. Our primary aim is to investigate whether a shared birthplace with (grand)parents increases the propensity for staying in one's birthplace during young adulthood. Using multinomial logistic regressions, we model the residential trajectories between the ages 18 and 30 of individuals born in 1981, 1982, and 1983 who lived in their birthplace at age 18 ($N = 185,897$). The dependent variable measures three possible outcomes by age 30: (i) having stayed; (ii) having left and returned; and (iii) having moved away from the birthplace.

2 | THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 | Local ties to places and people

Local ties are attachments to places and people that may deter migration and encourage immobility or return migration. Answers from an open-ended survey question revealed that respondents frequently reported local ties to their family and friends, their living environment, and their work as constraints to internal migration (Thomassen et al., 2023). Such local attachments are a result of individuals and households engaging with, and investing in, their residential and social environments over time. For example, people develop social relationships and professional networks, they become familiar with cultural traditions and local amenities, and they may establish themselves on the local labour- and housing market (Fischer & Malmberg, 2001; Haug, 2008; Mærsk, Sørensen, et al., 2021; Mulder & Malmberg, 2014). These investments may turn into sources of location-specific capital (DaVanzo, 1981). Fischer and Malmberg (2001) have also referred to these sources as work- and leisure-oriented insider advantages that are “nontransferable” and, therefore, “a sunk cost in the case of migration” (p. 358).

People may feel increasingly attached to their living environment the longer they live there and the more they engage with it. Commonly used measures of attachment to place, therefore, include the length of time spent in a place (Lewicka, 2011) and one's satisfaction with, or use of, amenities in the locality (e.g., Clark et al., 2017). People may also feel more or less attached to places at various stages of the life course. In general, migration in young adulthood is less constrained by local commitments than migration at older ages (Coulter, 2013; Fischer & Malmberg, 2001).

Across fields and studies, attachments to places have been explored using terms such as rootedness, sense of belonging, affiliation, and identity. These terms allude to affective or emotional attachments to place (Low & Altman, 1992). For example, the birthplace has been found to act as an important anchoring location in people's migration and staying behaviour. Previous studies have found that living in or near one's birthplace deters migration (e.g.,

¹Throughout this paper, we use the term “birthplace” as a shorthand for the place of residence immediately after birth.

Mulder & Malmberg, 2014) and that young adults are more likely to return to a region if their birthplace is located there (Mulder et al., 2020; Venhorst, 2013). On the basis that interactions with the social environment help to develop a sense of community, emotional attachments to place have also been measured based on the presence of social capital (e.g., Gieling et al., 2017; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Uzzell et al., 2002).

Mulder (2018) has argued that “people will usually value living close to family, and may therefore take into account the locations of nonresident family members [in their decision to move or stay]” (p. 1155). This is because geographic proximity is crucial for certain types of support exchange (Mulder & van der Meer, 2009), such as instrumental support that requires immediate or frequent care (Gierveld & Fokkema, 1998; Hünteler & Mulder, 2020). Geographic proximity also creates opportunities for regular interactions, joint activities, and face-to-face contact (Greenwell & Bengtson, 1997; Grundy & Shelton, 2001; Hank, 2007; Kalmijn & Dykstra, 2006). Nevertheless, it should also be noted that harmful or negative family relationships can present a situation in which migrating elsewhere is attractive (e.g., Bowstead, 2015).

2.2 | A multigenerational perspective on local ties

A multigenerational perspective on family relationships may include, but is not limited to, family relationships between children, their parents, and their grandparents. Based on feelings of intergenerational solidarity and family obligation, relationships between parents and children can be particularly strong and long-lasting (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Bengtson, 2001; Komter & Vollebergh, 2002; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997). Parents are typically the primary caregivers of their young children. As children get older, they become increasingly independent although some interdependencies between parents and adult children remain. After leaving the parental home, most adult children and parents stay in contact (Dykstra & Knipscheer, 1995) and continue to exchange instrumental support (Knijn & Liefbroer, 2006) and emotional support (Van Gaalen & Dykstra, 2006). As parents get older, adult children may take on caregiving tasks for their parents (Klein Ikkink et al., 1999). Thus, parents often remain important social network members across their child's life course (Bengtson, 2001; Rossi & Rossi, 1990).

While feelings of obligation between grandparents and grandchildren may be weaker than between parents and children (Rossi & Rossi, 1990), grandparents are also important social network members. When grandchildren are young, grandparents may help out with caregiving tasks (Hank et al., 2018). The frequency of contact with grandparents may decrease as grandchildren get older (Oppelaar & Dykstra, 2004) and it is less clear how the quality of this relationship evolves from this point onwards (Geurts et al., 2009). Due to increased life-expectancies, it has been argued that the lives of grandchildren and grandparents now overlap for longer than they did in the past (Bengtson, 2001; Hagestad, 1988), leading to more opportunities for interactions and support between them and the

strengthening of intergenerational relationships. However, in an empirical study using Swedish data, Lundholm and Malmberg (2009) found that this overlap did not extend due to the effect of increased intergenerational spacing.

It should be noted that some individuals experience family relationships negatively (Van Gaalen & Dykstra, 2006) and not all intergenerational relationships are equally strong. In part, differences in the strength of intergenerational relationships have been attributed to gender. Daughters tend to keep stronger relationships with parents than sons (Kalmijn & Dykstra, 2006) and mothers tend to receive more support than fathers (Ikkink et al., 1999; Rossi & Rossi, 1990). Monserud (2010) found that young adults reported preferences for contact with maternal grandmothers. Comparative research across Europe reveals that fewer parents and adult children in Sweden—and in other countries with universal welfare models—share daily interactions than in countries with family-based welfare models (Bordone, 2009; Hank, 2007). Other studies emphasize that intergenerational solidarity remains important in Sweden (Dykstra & Fokkema, 2011) and Norway (Motel-Klingebiel et al., 2005), albeit their different interpretations of family obligations compared with countries with family-based welfare models.

2.2.1 | Longstanding residential histories as multigenerational local ties

A shared residential history with (grand)parents may contribute to one's sense of belonging or rootedness in the residential location. Indeed, van der Star and Hochstenbach (2022) identified higher levels of place attachment among individuals whose parents were raised in the same region. Stockdale and Ferguson (2020) similarly found “that attachment and belonging to the home place is entangled in complex patterns of family history, farm ownership and continuing familial networks” (p. 369). A sense of belonging has previously been found to contribute to the expectation to stay in rural areas (Hofstede et al., 2022), and has been reported as a motive for staying (Ferguson et al., 2023; Haartsen & Stockdale, 2018; Stockdale & Ferguson, 2020; Stockdale, Theunissen, et al., 2018) and returning (von Reichert et al., 2014). It seems especially likely that a shared place of origin with (grand)parents increases one's propensity to stay or return. Having “family roots”—that is, whether respondents grew up in their current residential environment, and whether their partner, parents, and/or parents-in-law did so too—has indeed been found to deter migration (Clark et al., 2017).

2.2.2 | Intergenerational transfers of capital as multigenerational local ties

The professional and social lives of young adults may benefit from their (grand)parents' location-specific capital. For example, living in a place where (grand)parents were born, or have lived, implies that (grand)children may have access to a potentially broad social

network, including also other family members such as cousins, aunts, and uncles. More specifically, Thomassen (2021) found that some respondents relied on parents' networks to navigate the local labour market and to find temporary housing. This type of intergenerational transfer helped the respondents stay in their preferred locality despite experiencing the time as precarious. Mulder et al. (2020) found that young adults are also more likely to return to their place of origin if their parents still live there, especially under adverse circumstances like dropping out of tertiary education, low income, and unemployment.

In some families, intergenerational transfers of property may encourage immobility among younger generations. Respondents in a study by Hjälml (2014) indeed explained their staying behaviour as a consequence of inheriting property, and some of them intended to pass the property down to the next generation again. It is likely that, because men are more likely to be homeowners (Blaauboer, 2010), paternal (grand)parents are more likely to pass down their property than maternal (grand)parents. Moreover, intergenerational transfers of family businesses may have similar effects on the younger generation. For example, a longstanding farming tradition within the family was found to play a role in young adults' desires to stay in Northern Ireland (Stockdale & Ferguson, 2020). While intergenerational transfers are commonly studied between parents and children, the above-mentioned transfers may have been initiated a few generations back. This provides reason to investigate the relative contribution of earlier generations.

2.2.3 | Intergenerational transmissions of behaviours, preferences, and attitudes as multigenerational local ties

Socialisation theories posit that children learn from their parents' behaviour and may re-enact this behaviour in adulthood. Indeed, migration experiences in childhood have been associated with higher migration propensities in adulthood (Bernard & Vidal, 2020; Blauboer, 2011). Another study concluded that adult children's migration behaviour on having their own children is similar to the migration behaviour of their parents at childbirth (Albrecht & Scheiner, 2022). These findings suggest that migration behaviour can be transmitted from one generation to the next. It also seems likely that a history of immobility among (grand)parents may be continued in younger generations. Indeed, Bernard and Perales (2021) arrived at a similar conclusion, namely: "immobility in childhood and young adulthood not only reduces current migration levels, but may also contribute to reducing mobility among future generations by failing to accustom these cohorts to migration" (p. 470).

(Grand)parents are sources of emotional support to whom young adults may go for advice or validation when making (im-)mobility decisions. Qualitative studies have indeed found that family—and friends—are influential in young adults' (im-)mobility decisions (e.g., Stockdale, Theunissen, et al., 2018). Thomassen (2021) found that

parents who had positive experiences with migrating also stimulated their children to migrate. Conversely, (grand)parents with positive experiences of immobility may express their preferences and attitudes towards staying as beneficial for one's social inclusion and sense of belonging to a family. As a result, staying close to home is the norm within some families, which deters (grand)children from making a risky move elsewhere.

Processes of intergenerational transmission are not perfect predictors of social reproduction. Children are known to rebel against previous generations, and while they absorb family identities and narratives, they construct their own (im-)mobility trajectories (see also: Ní Laoire, 2023). Seeing friends or extended family members perform behaviour that opposes one's learned preferences may trigger a re-evaluation of the decision to stay or move (Thomassen, 2021).

2.2.4 | Living close to (grand)parents as multigenerational local ties

Finally, the current residential location of (grand)parents may act as a local tie. Geographic distances between adult children and parents are generally larger in countries with universal welfare models than in countries with family-based welfare models (Bordone, 2009; Hank, 2007). Nevertheless, ties to nearby, nonresident family members are found to constrain migration (Bjarnason & Haartsen, 2023) and contribute to intentions to remain immobile, also in countries with universal welfare models (Ferguson et al., 2023). Several studies have shown that, also in Sweden, ties to parents deter adult children's migration and encourage staying behaviour (Artamonova et al., 2020, 2021; Chudnovskaya & Kolk, 2017; Kolk, 2017; Lundholm & Malmberg, 2009; Mulder & Malmberg, 2014; Pettersson & Malmberg, 2009) as well as return migration behaviour (Mulder et al., 2020). Some qualitative studies confirm that young adults also report living close to family as a local attachment (Mærsk, Thuesen, et al., 2021; Stockdale & Ferguson, 2020; Stockdale, Theunissen, et al., 2018) and as a motive for return migration (von Reichert et al., 2014). A respondent who lived far away from her parents and grandparents stated that "[...] it is very difficult to have to experience certain [family occasions] at a distance. [...] It is not easy, not being able to visit quickly" (Thomassen, 2021, p. 8).

2.3 | A measure of multigenerational local ties and hypotheses

In this paper, we take a shared birthplace between a young adult and one or more of their (grand)parents as a proxy for multigenerational local ties in the young adult's birthplace. This measure is based on the premise that a child's place of residence at birth is almost certainly also the residential location of its parent(s) at that time. A shared birthplace between a child and a *parent* tells us that: (i) this is where the child was born; (ii) this is where the child's parent(s) almost

certainly resided at the child's birth; and (iii) this is also where the considered parent was born; which indicates that (iv) this is where the child's grandparent(s) of that lineage almost certainly resided when the parent was born. Naturally, sharing a birthplace with a parent results from the parent staying geographically immobile until the birth of their child, or from returning before the child's birth. Conversely, the lack of a shared birthplace between a child and their parent means that the parent moved away from their own birthplace and was not living there at the child's birth. As such, a shared birthplace with a (grand)parent is not a precise measure of a longstanding staying tradition, but it does imply an additionally shared residential history with the studied (grand)parent's parent(s).²

Notably, our empirical proxy measures a type of multigenerational local ties in the young adult's birthplace that is not based on current or other residential locations of (grand)parents. While such conceptualisations of multigenerational local ties likely also play a role in young adult's staying and migration behaviour, studying both types simultaneously would require full residential information of each studied generation, and this is not (yet) widely available.

2.3.1 | General hypothesis

Based on the above considerations, our general hypothesis is that *young adults who share a birthplace with any (grand)parent are more likely to stay in, or return to, their birthplace during young adulthood than young adults who do not share a birthplace with (grand)parents*. We formulate three specifications of this hypothesis that will be tested.

2.3.2 | Number of ties

Each (grand)parent with whom one shares the birthplace may serve as an additional local tie, whereas any not sharing a birthplace with (grand)parents increases the potential number of ties elsewhere. Therefore, we hypothesise that *each additional (grand)parent with whom the young adult shares a birthplace increases the propensity to stay in, or return to, one's birthplace during young adulthood (H1)*.

2.3.3 | Ties to parents versus grandparents

Based on weaker feelings of obligation between grandparents and grandchildren, compared with parents and children, we posit that *when the birthplace is shared through one generation, a birthplace shared with parent(s) is associated with higher propensities for staying in,*

or returning to, one's birthplace than when the birthplace is shared with grandparent(s) (H2a). However, if longer-standing connections to the birthplace act as stronger ties, then we could conversely expect that *a shared birthplace with grandparent(s) is associated with higher propensities than a shared birthplace with parents (H2b)*. This same line of reasoning leads us to expect that *a birthplace shared across two generations is associated with a higher propensity to have stayed in, or returned to, the birthplace during young adulthood compared with a birthplace shared through one generation (H2c)*.

2.3.4 | Paternal versus maternal lineages

Intergenerational solidarity towards maternal (grand)parents is stronger than to paternal (grand)parents. On this basis, we posit that *sharing a birthplace with mothers or maternal grandparents is associated with higher propensities for staying in, or returning to, the birthplace during young adulthood compared with sharing a birthplace with fathers or paternal grandparents (H3a)*. However, intergenerational transfers of property may occur through paternal (grand)parents more frequently. Hence, we could also expect that *birthplaces shared paternal (grand)parents to be associated with higher propensities than birthplaces shared with maternal (grand)parents (H3b)*.

2.4 | Other factors and the Swedish context

We control for other factors associated with staying or migration propensities. On the individual level, we account for sex, year of birth, and childhood migration experiences because, at least in Sweden, women have higher migration propensities than men (Lundholm, 2007) and migration rates vary by birth cohort and by previous moving experience (Bernard & Kolk, 2020). At the household level, leaving the parental home may be more difficult for the youngest child, and for children who have experienced divorce or parental loss (Thomassen, 2021). Some types of support, such as emotional and financial support, can be exchanged over a distance (Gierveld & Fokkema, 1998) and facilitate moving. Families without higher level education have more frequent contact compared with families who have participated in higher education (Kalmijn & Dykstra, 2006), and young adults from more advantageous backgrounds tend to move more (Pelikh & Kulu, 2018). We thus control for some family-background characteristics known to contribute to the opportunity structures available to young adults, such as the parents' education levels, employment status, and income. Age can be an indicator of social distances and need for care, which is why we control for the (grand)parents' ages.

It is well-known that the availability of, and one's satisfaction with, amenities and jobs in the place of residence plays an important role in the decision to move or stay, alongside macrolevel factors such as the housing and labour markets (Niedomysl & Clark, 2014). In Sweden, the three largest cities and a small number of other urban centres have direct access to universities, colleges, and more diverse

²For example, a shared birthplace between a child and a *grandparent* tells us that: (i) this is where the child was born; (ii) this is also where the child's parent(s) almost certainly resided at the child's birth; and (iii) this is also where the considered grandparent was born; which indicates that (iv) this is where the child's great-grandparent(s) almost certainly resided when the grandparent was born.

labour markets. We thus control for whether the young adult's municipality of birth is rural or urban. Furthermore, the historical migration patterns in Sweden will have shaped the geographical distribution of multigenerational local ties, where some cohorts will have ended up farther away from their birthplaces, parents, and grandparents—especially the urbanization generation of the 1960s (Malmberg & Pettersson, 2007). The long-term migration trends in Sweden, as in the rest of Europe, have resulted in population growth in the major urban areas. The most intense urbanization trend occurred in the 1960s, followed by a period of counter-urban moves in the 1970s, and decreasing migration rates in the 1980s and 1990s (Bengtsson & Johansson, 1994; Lundholm, 2007). During the 1990s, migration rates among people aged 18–30 increased in Sweden, with many moves made by women, and to and from places with higher education institutes (Bernard & Kolk, 2020; Chudnovskaya & Kolk, 2017; Kulu et al., 2018). At the same time, Sweden saw falling migration rates among people aged over 30, especially among families with children, and partly as a consequence of the high proportion of dual income households (Lundholm, 2007) that are associated with lower migration propensities compared with single income households due to both partners' work locations acting as local ties (Mulder & Malmberg, 2014). Nevertheless, cross-national comparisons reveal relatively high migration levels in Sweden in recent years (Bernard & Kolk, 2020).

3 | DATA AND METHODS

3.1 | Data and sample

We used Swedish register data provided by Statistics Sweden. Each register contains pseudonymized information about the entire Swedish population, which can be linked using individual identifiers. From the Population register, we collected key demographic information, such as sex, birthplace, and year of birth and death. We collected annually updated socioeconomic information from the LISA register, and annual residential information and household characteristics from two thematic registers. Information about family members was linked through parent, children, and sibling identifiers using the multigenerational registers comprising all people who were alive in, or born after, 1932 in Sweden. A small percentage ($\approx 0.1\%$) of individuals in the registers are given reused identifiers and we excluded their information from our analyses.

Our interest is in staying and migration behaviour during young adulthood, which we define as between the ages of 18 and 30. We chose these thresholds for two reasons. First, we start our observation at age 18, because in Sweden, most 18-year-olds still live in a parental home as upper secondary education finishes at age 19. Second, we end our observation at age 30. This threshold is chosen based on the age at which most people make their first move; in Sweden, the spatial mobility levels of individuals aged 18–22 are largely determined by first migrations, whereas spatial mobility levels at ages 23–29 are mostly the result of second moves (Kulu

et al., 2018). Therefore, the period between ages 18 and 30 is well-suited to capture the acceleration, peak, and steep decline in age-specific internal migration propensities in Sweden (Lundholm, 2007) and thus continuing the observation past age 30 would lead to minimal new cases in the stayer-group.

We selected all Swedish-born individuals from three birth cohorts: 1981, 1982, and 1983. Young adulthood started in 1999 for the oldest cohort and ended in 2013 for the youngest cohort. We selected these birth cohorts because when the authors started this project, these cohorts were among the first for whom: (1) all residential information was being registered annually starting from birth, and (2) all information necessary to construct parental background characteristics was available at age 18. We restricted the selection to individuals for whom full residential trajectories were available from birth until age 30, which excluded individuals ($\approx 35\%$) who had immigrated to Sweden, who were no longer alive or had emigrated before age 30, and who were assigned reused identifiers. This selection process provided us with a starting N of 251,631.

We restricted this sample to individuals who lived in their municipality of birth at age 18 ($n = 192,416$). In doing so, most of the sample had continuously lived there, whereas some belonged to a small number of childhood return-migrants ($n = 9505$). Excluding childhood migrants ($\approx 25\%$) from the initial selection was necessary to ensure that the sample was equally at risk of staying or moving—and potentially returning—to their birthplace. We also excluded individuals who no longer lived in a parental home at age 18 ($n = 6371$) and cases where the father's death occurred before the individual's birth ($n = 165$). Where possible, missing information about a parent was imputed from the other parent; we dropped cases where information was missing for both parents ($n = 28$). The final sample for our empirical analyses consisted of 185,897 young Swedish adults.

3.2 | The dependent variable

The dependent variable in our analysis measures staying and migration behaviour between the ages of 18 and 30 based on three outcome-categories: (i) *having stayed in*; (ii) *having returned to*; and (iii) *having moved away from the birthplace by age 30*. While the period between ages 18 and 30 is well-suited to capture staying propensities during young adulthood, it only captures a snapshot of their migration behaviour. For example, some who are considered migrants at age 30 may have returned to the birthplace at earlier ages or may intend to return to their birthplace at later ages. Therefore, we should be cautious to interpret the results of the returners and the movers as representing the snapshot at age 30.

We use "birthplace" as a shorthand for *the municipality of residence immediately after birth*. In Sweden, children are registered at their mother's parish of residence at the time of birth (Wannerdt, 1947), which is a submunicipality-level geographic area. We take the municipality as the geographic unit of analysis for two reasons: (1) leaving the municipality involves a change in daily activity space, which is more difficult to ensure using neighbourhoods or parishes; and (2) the magnitude of moving out

of the municipality of comparable nature across generations, whereas the magnitude of absolute moving distances depends on available means of transportation and adequate infrastructure. To ensure that all observed changes in the municipality of residence between ages 0 and 30 were attributable to migration movements—and not due to administrative changes such as code-changes, name-changes, mergers, and splits—we standardized all municipalities to resemble as closely as possible the administrative layout of Sweden in 2013. Municipalities that split into two or more municipalities were artificially “merged,” which is why our analyses are based on 272 municipalities ranging from 3195 to 750,348 inhabitants. This is slightly fewer than the 290 municipalities formally existing in 2013 (see: Supporting Information: Appendix Table A2 listing all 272 municipalities and those that were “merged”).

3.3 | The main explanatory variables

Our main explanatory variables measure a shared birthplace between a young adult and one or more of their (grand)parents to approximate the presence of multigenerational local ties. To identify shared birthplaces across three generations, we matched the (grand)parents' birth parishes to the administrative layout of Sweden in 2013 and compared these records to the young adult's birthplace. While some birth parishes of (grand)parents were illegible, their annual residential information contained a much higher number of records that were affected by typical data errors or gaps related to census intervals. This was a key reason for using shared birthplaces as a proxy for multigenerational local ties and, at that stage, disregarding full residential trajectories of (grand)parents.

3.3.1 | Step-by-step process to identify shared birthplaces

First, from the 5911 string-names as registered by priests, we deduced 2527 unique parishes of birth for all known (grand)parents, but 302 string-names were illegible. The identified parishes of birth represented a total of 1059 municipalities.

Second, we harmonized all 1059 birth municipalities of (grand)parents to reflect all municipality-level administrative changes that occurred between 1932 and 2013. This process reduced the factual number of the (grand)parents' birth municipalities to 338. We then standardized the 338 municipalities to resemble as closely as possible the administrative layout of Sweden in 2013; 66 municipalities could not be matched, because it ceased to exist and became part of two other municipalities, and later experienced another administrative change (see: Supporting Information: Appendix Table A3 for a list of municipalities that could not be matched). This results in 272 municipalities of birth that could be compared across three generations.

Third, we compared the birthplace of the young adults to birthplaces of their (grand)parents, which resulted in six dummy variables measuring: *a shared municipality of birth between the young*

adult and the studied (grand)parent (1), and no tie to this (grand)parent (0). The maximum number of ties one can have is six (to two parents and four grandparents).

There are three reasons why we may identify “no ties” between a young adult and their (grand)parents: (i) when one's birthplace is simply not shared with a (grand)parent; (ii) when information about the (grand)parent's birthplace was missing, or (iii) when the (grand)parent's birthplace was one of 66 municipalities that could not be matched to the 2013 administrative layout. Missing values can be attributed to (grand)parents who have never lived in Sweden, had immigrated, were given reused identifiers, or contained illegible parish records. The number of young adults for whom one or more (grand)parents' birthplaces are missing was quite high ($n = 74,976$; of which 27,875 were for parents and 73,658 for grandparents). The number of young adults for whom we could not match one or more of their (grand)parents' birthplaces to the present-day layout of Sweden was lower ($n = 28,192$; of which 9862 for parents and 24,964 for grandparents). We did not exclude individual cases for whom we could not identify shared birthplaces with a (grand)parent, because they can still share their birthplace with remaining (grand)parents.

In total, we could not identify the presence of *any* shared birthplaces for 63,192 (33.99%) of the young adults in our sample. In 29,061 of those cases, all six (grand)parents were identified as being born in other municipalities. For 9223 cases, either the municipalities of birth of all six (grand)parents were missing ($n = 9153$) or we could not match any of their (grand)parents' birthplaces to the present-day layout of Sweden ($n = 70$). For the remaining 24,908 young adults, a combination of the above-mentioned situations resulted in *no identified ties*. We performed a sensitivity check in which we excluded the cases where information about the birthplace was missing; where the birthplace could not be matched; and where we excluded both sets of cases from the “0” category. The substantive findings were robust across the metrics chosen to identify “no ties.”

3.3.2 | Three specifications measuring the main explanatory variables

To test the hypotheses, we combined the information on the six dummy variables to create three categorical variables, each measuring a specification of the main explanatory variables. First, we measure the *number of ties* as an ordinal variable ranging from zero to six ties. Second, we measure *ties to parents versus grandparents* in 10 categories. Third, we measure *ties through paternal versus maternal lineages* in 13 categories. The categories that are included under each of the specifications are listed as part of Table 1.

3.4 | Control variables

The same set of control variables are included in all models presented in the paper. On the individual level, we included: a dummy for sex; a categorical variable for *birth year 1981, 1982, or 1983*; a dummy for

TABLE 1 Descriptive statistics of the three specifications of multigenerational local ties and the control variables.

	Total (N = 185,897) Column % or mean (SD)	Stayed in birthplace until age 30 (N = 72,076) Row % or mean (SD)	Returned to birthplace by age 30 (N = 28,676) Row % or mean (SD)	Moved away from birthplace by age 30 (N = 85,145) Row % or mean (SD)
Total	100	38.77	15.43	45.80
<i>Three specifications of multigenerational local ties</i>				
Number of ties				
No ties	33.99	31.63	14.42	53.95
One tie	14.63	38.61	15.88	45.51
Two ties	17.04	40.58	15.81	43.61
Three ties	15.69	42.20	16.31	41.49
Four ties	8.57	46.94	15.71	37.33
Five ties	6.63	47.29	16.21	36.50
Six ties	3.45	48.62	15.22	36.16
Ties to parents versus grandparents				
No ties	33.99	31.63	14.42	53.95
Ties to one parent	10.25	39.60	15.85	44.55
Ties to two parents	1.90	46.29	16.55	37.16
Ties to one grandparent	4.38	36.28	15.96	47.76
Ties to two or more grandparents	1.44	38.65	15.75	45.60
Ties to one parent and one grandparent	13.90	40.02	15.76	44.22
Ties to one parent and multiple grandparents	13.62	41.36	16.02	42.62
Ties to both parents and one grandparent	4.41	46.67	16.89	36.43
Ties to both parents and multiple grandparents	12.66	47.42	15.93	36.65
Ties to all six (grand)parents	3.45	48.62	15.22	36.16
Paternal or maternal lineage-ties				
No ties	33.99	31.63	14.42	53.95
Tie to father only	5.44	38.79	15.66	45.55
Tie to mother only	4.82	40.52	16.07	43.41
Ties to both father and mother	1.90	46.29	16.55	37.16
Ties to paternal grandparents only	2.88	35.39	15.88	48.73
Ties to maternal grandparents only	2.41	37.69	15.43	46.88
Ties to both paternal and maternal grandparents	0.52	41.24	18.25	40.52
Ties to a parent and a grandparent, but no lineage	1.37	42.26	16.04	41.71
Ties through paternal lineage	12.01	39.01	15.62	45.37
Ties through maternal lineage	9.76	41.25	15.98	42.77
Ties through paternal lineages, and some other ties	5.94	45.31	16.64	38.05

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Total (N = 185,897) Column % or mean (SD)	Stayed in birthplace until age 30 (N = 72,076) Row % or mean (SD)	Returned to birthplace by age 30 (N = 28,676) Row % or mean (SD)	Moved away from birthplace by age 30 (N = 85,145) Row % or mean (SD)
Ties through maternal lineage, and some other ties	5.82	46.43	16.09	37.48
Ties through paternal and maternal lineages	13.14	47.58	15.82	36.60
<i>Control variables about the index persons</i>				
Sex				
Men	52.78	44.08	14.14	41.78
Women	47.22	32.84	16.86	50.30
Birth year				
1981	33.47	38.06	15.47	46.48
1982	33.42	38.71	15.57	45.72
1983	33.12	39.56	15.24	45.20
Migration in childhood				
Yes, and returned	5.11	34.97	17.40	47.63
No	94.89	38.98	15.32	45.70
Living with parent(s) at age 18				
Yes, with both parents	69.82	37.30	15.48	47.22
Yes, with father	6.83	40.64	15.32	44.04
Yes, with mother	23.35	42.62	15.29	42.09
<i>Control variables about (grand)parents</i>				
Father's age				
Under 44	19.62	43.48	16.20	40.32
Between 45 and 54	62.10	37.47	15.50	47.03
55 and over	15.95	37.48	14.29	48.23
Died	1.93	42.65	14.45	42.90
missing	0.40	43.44	15.97	40.60
Mother's age				
Under 44	38.18	42.75	15.85	41.41
Between 45 and 54	54.42	36.24	15.28	48.48
55 and over	6.59	36.57	14.37	49.07
Died	0.73	39.32	13.97	46.71
missing	0.08	38.41	15.23	46.36
Father's highest education				
Primary	26.77	45.38	14.81	39.81
Secondary education	46.71	40.19	15.49	44.32
Tertiary <2 years	6.19	31.62	16.48	51.90
Tertiary >2 years	18.81	28.63	15.73	55.64
PhD	1.24	29.07	16.51	54.41

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Total (N = 185,897) Column % or mean (SD)	Stayed in birthplace until age 30 (N = 72,076) Row % or mean (SD)	Returned to birthplace by age 30 (N = 28,676) Row % or mean (SD)	Moved away from birthplace by age 30 (N = 85,145) Row % or mean (SD)
Incomplete	0.28	52.30	14.94	32.76
Mother's highest education				
Primary	18.50	48.31	14.41	37.28
Secondary education	49.92	40.81	15.44	43.75
Tertiary <2 years	2.67	32.93	16.04	51.03
Tertiary >2 years	28.40	29.54	16.05	54.41
PhD	0.38	31.49	12.77	55.74
Incomplete	0.13	58.30	15.32	26.38
Father is unemployed				
No	91.95	38.09	15.50	46.41
Yes	8.05	46.51	14.60	38.89
Mother is unemployed				
No	91.97	38.03	15.51	46.47
Yes	8.03	47.32	14.51	38.17
Father's disposable income in 100.000 SEK	2.30 (1.26)	2.17 (1.16)	2.34 (1.30)	2.41 (1.32)
Mother's disposable income in 100.000 SEK	1.83 (0.71)	1.78 (0.68)	1.85 (0.71)	1.88 (0.75)
Paternal grandfather's age				
Under 75	17.45	41.53	16.07	42.40
Between 75 and 84	19.09	36.43	15.51	48.06
85 and over	5.69	34.87	15.25	49.89
Died	47.43	37.64	15.34	47.02
Missing	10.33	45.76	14.68	39.57
Paternal grandmother's age				
Under 75	31.13	40.97	15.81	43.21
Between 75 and 84	26.23	36.00	15.55	48.44
85 and over	6.70	34.38	15.34	50.29
Died	27.60	37.59	15.18	47.23
Missing	8.34	46.69	14.46	38.85
Maternal grandmother's age				
Under 75	42.43	40.75	15.80	43.45
Between 75 and 84	23.67	35.29	15.35	49.36
85 and over	4.69	33.54	14.91	51.55
Died	22.52	37.87	15.27	46.85
Missing	6.68	45.27	14.20	40.52
Maternal grandfather's age				
Under 75	26.07	41.45	16.16	42.39
Between 75 and 84	19.34	35.97	15.84	48.19

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Total (N = 185,897) Column % or mean (SD)	Stayed in birthplace until age 30 (N = 72,076) Row % or mean (SD)	Returned to birthplace by age 30 (N = 28,676) Row % or mean (SD)	Moved away from birthplace by age 30 (N = 85,145) Row % or mean (SD)
85 and over	4.33	34.86	14.50	50.64
Died	41.99	37.62	15.09	47.29
Missing	8.26	44.79	14.34	40.87
Number of siblings	2.06 (1.34)	2.09 (1.38)	2.08 (1.35)	2.03 (1.31)
Number of young siblings	1.11 (1.14)	1.10 (1.16)	1.08 (1.13)	1.12 (1.12)
<i>Control variables about the municipality of birth</i>				
<i>Level of urbanity</i>				
Rural	22.41	31.80	14.72	53.48
Dense area	54.01	40.29	15.55	44.17
Urban area	23.57	41.94	15.82	42.24
<i>Merged</i>				
Yes	13.95	43.03	14.72	42.24
No	86.05	38.08	15.54	46.38

Note: The χ^2 tests and *F* tests were significant at the 99.9% ($p = 0.000$) confidence level for all variables. Control variables measured at age 18.

migration experience in childhood; and two continuous variables, one for the number of siblings and one for the number of younger siblings. Information about the parental background is measured at age 18: a categorical variable for *living with two parents, the father, or the mother*; two categorical variables for the mother's and the father's *highest education level*; two dummies for the parents' *employment status*; and two continuous variables for their respective *disposable incomes in 100,000 SEK*—here, the range is limited by having no negative values and an upper limit at the 99% percentile. For the father, mother, and four grandparents we included *age* as a categorical variable. The age-variables include categories for “missing” and “dead,” which is necessary to avoid list-wise deletion of young adults for whom a specific (grand)parents was entirely missing from the data set (i.e., 858 parents and 61,479 grandparents) or had died before the young adult reached 18 years of age (i.e., 4662 parents and 257,800 grandparents). We classified the municipalities of birth according to their *level of urbanity* using a categorical classification provided by Tillväxtverket³: rural (less than 50% urban), dense (more than 50% urban), or urban (more than 80% urban and part of Stockholm, Göteborg, or Malmö). We present an additional crosstabulation between this classification and the number of ties in Supporting Information: Appendix Table A1. Finally, using a dummy variable, we control for municipalities that were “merged” in the standardization process (see: Supporting Information: Appendix Table A2).

³We used a classification for the level of urbanity of municipalities provided by Tillväxtverket (the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth): <https://tillvaxtverket.se/tillvaxtverket/statistikochanalys/statistikomregionallutveckling/regionallindelningar/staderochlandsbygder.1844.html>.

3.5 | The analytical strategy

We model the staying, returning, and migration propensities of young adults by means of multinomial logistic regressions. We run a separate multinomial logistic regression for each specification of the main explanatory variables: Model 1 *number of ties*; Model 2 *ties to parents versus grandparents*; and Model 3 *paternal versus maternal lineages*. We present the results of each model in two ways. First, we present the results for each specification using “no ties” as the reference category (see: Model 1A, 2A, and 3A). These results provide insights regarding our general hypothesis. Second, we present the results of the first two specifications using a different reference category (see: Model 1B and 2B). These results allow us to make statements regarding the hypotheses specified in Section 2.4. To save space, we show the coefficients for the control variables only once, in Model 1B. We corrected the standard errors for the clustering of young adults in their municipalities of birth, which is the highest level at which the independent variables were specified. Finally, we report on the significant results of some additional checks using sex of the young adult as an interaction term (see: Model 3B).

4 | RESULTS

4.1 | Descriptive findings

As shown in Table 1, just under 40% of the young adults in our sample had not moved away from their birthplace by age 30. Another

15% had moved and then returned to their birthplace by age 30, while the remaining 45% had moved away and not returned. About two-thirds of the young adults share their birthplace with at least one of their (grand)parents, while we did not observe ties for the remaining third (33.99% in Table 1). With regard to *the number of ties*, we find that it is most common to share ties with two (grand)parents (17.04%) and that sharing a birthplace with all six (grand)parents is least likely (3.45%). With each additional (grand)parent with whom the birthplace is shared, we observe an increase in the percentage of stayers, and naturally, a decrease in the percentage of movers. At three or more ties, the share of stayers is larger than the share of movers. Second, considering *ties to parents versus grandparents*, we see that a birthplace shared only with parent(s) is more common (12.15%) than one shared only with grandparent(s) (5.82%). Nearly half of young adults have ties to both generations (48.04%). The proportion of stayers is particularly large among young adults who share a birthplace with both parents and multiple grandparents. Third, a shared birthplace through *the paternal and the maternal lineage* is the most common (13.14%). For those sharing a single lineage tie, a shared birthplace through the paternal lineage is more common (12.01%) than through the maternal lineage (9.76%). A relatively high percentage of stayers share a birthplace with both parents, which is similar to those who share a birthplace through both lineages. For returners, the patterns are generally less distinct and more fluctuating than with the other categories.

4.2 | The results of the multinomial logistic regression models

We found positive, statistically significant, coefficients for all categories of the three specifications compared with having “no ties” (see: Table 2, Models 1A, 2A, and 3A). These findings confirm our general hypothesis that sharing a birthplace with any (grand)parent increases young adults' staying and returning propensities compared with living in a birthplace that is not shared with any (grand)parents.

4.2.1 | Number of ties

We observed steadily increasing, positive coefficients for each additional tie compared with the “no ties” reference category (Table 2, Model 1A). These results show that any number of ties larger than zero is associated with higher propensities for staying in, or returning to, the birthplace by age 30. The pattern also provides a reason to investigate the relative contribution of each additional tie, which requires contrasted coefficients per additional tie (shown in Table 3, Model 1B). We find, for example, that the initial contribution of having one tie is associated with a 0.452 higher propensity (or: an odds ratio of $\exp[0.452] = 1.571$) for staying in the birthplace compared with zero ties. Thereafter, the contrasted coefficients can be interpreted as the effect of one additional tie compared with the previous number of ties. For each subsequent tie, we find a

positive, statistically significant coefficient. This supports H1 concerning staying propensities.

With regard to the return-group, we find that having one tie is associated with a 0.292 higher propensity than having zero ties. Thereafter, the contributions of each additional tie are positive, but small, until the fifth tie. However, the contribution of a fourth tie and upwards are not statistically significant, and the coefficient for having six ties compared with five ties is negative. Thus, in terms of H1, our results show that each additional tie until the third significantly increases the propensity for returning to the birthplace by age 30.

4.2.2 | Ties to parents versus grandparents

In Table 2 (Model 2A), we find particularly large coefficients for any combination of ties that includes *both* parents. In Table 4 (Model 2B), we unpack whether sharing ties to both parents (i.e., the reference category) differs from other one-generational ties, and from two-generational ties. We indeed find that all one-generational ties—which include ties to one parent, one grandparent, and multiple grandparents—are associated with lower propensities for staying compared with sharing one's birthplace with both parents. However, regarding the propensity for returning, the difference between young adults who share ties to both parents and those who share ties to multiple grandparents is not statistically significant. Moreover, differences between young adults sharing ties to one parent and sharing ties to one grandparent also did not prove statistically significant (results not shown). While our results show that birthplaces shared with both parents significantly increase a young adult's likelihood to stay or return (H2a), they also reveal surprisingly similar propensities between other one-generational categories—supporting neither H2a or H2b.

With regard to H2c, we find that two-generational ties are indeed associated with higher propensities to stay than one-generational ties. However, this increase seems to be the result of a larger number of ties, and less the contribution of an additional generation. Namely, when two-generational ties include only *one* parent and *one* grandparent, the coefficients are negative and significantly different from when ties shared with *both* parents. Only those who share ties to *both* parents and *multiple* grandparents show higher and statistically significant propensities for staying in the birthplace than those who shared ties to *both* parents. We find no other significant coefficients for returning to the birthplace. More than our results regarding H2a and H2b, these findings are in line with the literature regarding weaker feelings of obligation towards grandparents compared with parents (Rossi & Rossi, 1990).

4.2.3 | Paternal versus maternal lineage ties

We expected to find different staying and returning propensities depending on the sex of the (grand)parents with whom ties are shared (H3a and H3b). In Table 2 (Model 3A), the results using “no

TABLE 2 Three multinomial logistic regressions: having stayed in; returned to; or moved away from (reference category) municipality of birth by age 30.

	Stayed in birthplace until age 30		Returned to birthplace by age 30	
	B	SE	B	SE
<i>Model 1A</i>				
Number of ties (ref: no ties)				
One tie	0.452***	0.063	0.292***	0.044
Two ties	0.588***	0.065	0.356***	0.051
Three ties	0.699***	0.063	0.450***	0.042
Four ties	0.883***	0.064	0.505***	0.055
Five ties	0.954***	0.061	0.583***	0.045
Six ties	1.041***	0.074	0.553***	0.056
<i>Model 2A</i>				
Ties to parents versus grandparents (ref: no ties)				
Ties to one parent	0.458***	0.066	0.287***	0.050
Ties to two parents	0.760***	0.098	0.489***	0.085
Ties to one grandparent	0.432***	0.063	0.303***	0.045
Ties to two or more grandparents	0.593***	0.079	0.373***	0.067
Ties to one parent and one grandparent	0.564***	0.060	0.342***	0.049
Ties to one parent and multiple grandparents	0.682***	0.057	0.425***	0.039
Ties to both parents and one grandparent	0.843***	0.078	0.560***	0.053
Ties to both parents and multiple grandparents	0.918***	0.060	0.539***	0.046
Ties to all six (grand)parents	1.036***	0.073	0.550***	0.056
<i>Model 3A</i>				
Paternal or maternal lineage-ties (ref: no ties)				
Tie to father only	0.451***	0.072	0.271***	0.053
Tie to mother only	0.468***	0.063	0.306***	0.055
Ties to both father and mother	0.761***	0.098	0.490***	0.085
Ties to paternal grandparents only	0.421***	0.072	0.305***	0.049
Ties to maternal grandparents only	0.474***	0.063	0.274***	0.052
Ties to both paternal and maternal grandparents	0.748***	0.102	0.624***	0.113
Ties to a parent and a grandparent, but no lineage	0.637***	0.087	0.389***	0.075
Ties through paternal lineage	0.566***	0.058	0.338***	0.049
Ties through maternal lineage	0.620***	0.052	0.386***	0.037
Ties through paternal lineages, and some other ties	0.820***	0.074	0.535***	0.057
Ties through maternal lineage, and some other ties	0.856***	0.066	0.516***	0.047
Ties through paternal and maternal lineages	0.950***	0.062	0.551***	0.044
<i>Model summaries</i>				
N	185,897	185,897	185,897	
Prob > χ^2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Pseudo R^2	0.0408	0.0409	0.0409	
Log pseudolikelihood	-180,681.7	-180,672.0	-180,668.2	

Note: The same control variables are included as in Model 1B shown in Table 3 (coefficients not shown). Control variables measured at age 18.

*** $p < 0.001$.

TABLE 3 Multinomial logistic regression for number of ties and control variables: having stayed in; returned to; or moved away from (reference category) municipality of birth by age 30.

	Stayed in birthplace until age 30		Returned to birthplace by age 30	
	B	SE	B	SE
<i>Model 1B</i>				
Number of ties (contrasts)				
One (ref: zero ties)	0.452****	0.063	0.292****	0.044
Two (ref: one tie)	0.136****	0.022	0.064**	0.027
Three (ref: two ties)	0.111****	0.020	0.094****	0.025
Four (ref: three ties)	0.185****	0.026	0.055*	0.032
Five (ref: four ties)	0.071**	0.033	0.078	0.049
Six (ref: five ties)	0.087**	0.041	-0.030	0.051
Control variables				
Women (ref: men)	-0.515****	0.025	-0.026*	0.014
Birth year (ref: 1981)				
1982	0.068****	0.015	0.031*	0.016
1983	0.114****	0.014	0.024	0.017
Migration in childhood (ref: no)				
Yes, and returned	-0.279****	0.025	0.021	0.032
Living with parent(s) (ref: with both)				
Yes, with father	0.041*	0.024	-0.003	0.031
Yes, with mother	0.132****	0.020	0.018	0.021
Father's age (ref: between 45 and 54)				
Under 44	0.054***	0.020	0.057**	0.026
55 and over	-0.036	0.028	-0.077***	0.025
Died	0.001	0.050	-0.029	0.060
Missing	-0.057	0.081	0.071	0.101
Mother's age (ref: between 45 and 54)				
Under 44	0.083***	0.026	0.037	0.023
55 and over	-0.021	0.028	-0.017	0.033
Died	0.003	0.067	-0.076	0.087
Missing	0.059	0.186	0.022	0.229
Father's highest education (ref: primary)				
Secondary education	-0.153****	0.015	-0.050**	0.020
Tertiary <2 years	-0.398****	0.038	-0.099**	0.040
Tertiary >2 years	-0.367****	0.080	-0.121**	0.051
PhD	-0.209**	0.090	0.007	0.077
Incomplete	0.072	0.082	0.088	0.126
Mother's highest education (ref: primary)				
Secondary education	-0.237****	0.021	-0.070***	0.024
Tertiary <2 years	-0.483****	0.055	-0.142***	0.048
Tertiary >2 years	-0.527****	0.060	-0.139***	0.042
PhD	-0.335****	0.083	-0.370*	0.193

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	Stayed in birthplace until age 30		Returned to birthplace by age 30	
	B	SE	B	SE
Incomplete	0.226	0.159	0.266	0.167
Father is unemployed (ref: employed)	0.102****	0.019	0.056**	0.024
Mother is unemployed (ref: employed)	0.132****	0.025	0.039	0.029
Father's disposable income in 100,000 SEK	-0.070***	0.021	-0.010	0.013
Mother's disposable income in 100,000 SEK	-0.070**	0.029	-0.018	0.017
Paternal grandfather's age (ref: under 75)				
Between 75 and 84	-0.043**	0.021	-0.048*	0.028
85 and over	-0.037	0.034	-0.037	0.051
Died	-0.002	0.020	-0.023	0.027
Missing	0.186****	0.042	0.096**	0.047
Paternal grandmother's age (ref: under 75)				
Between 75 and 84	-0.060***	0.020	-0.011	0.021
85 and over	-0.089***	0.027	-0.009	0.034
Died	-0.040**	0.017	-0.013	0.023
Missing	0.121**	0.049	0.039	0.051
Maternal grandmother's age (ref: under 75)				
Between 75 and 84	-0.061***	0.019	-0.021	0.021
85 and over	-0.084***	0.032	-0.026	0.040
Died	-0.010	0.016	0.013	0.024
Missing	0.041	0.050	0.009	0.081
Maternal grandfather's age (ref: under 75)				
Between 75 and 84	-0.055***	0.017	-0.043*	0.023
85 and over	-0.036	0.033	-0.125***	0.039
Died	-0.034**	0.015	-0.078****	0.019
Missing	0.121***	0.036	0.004	0.057
Number of siblings	-0.007	0.007	0.029****	0.007
Number of young siblings	0.009	0.013	-0.013	0.016
Level of urbanity (ref: rural)				
Dense	0.551****	0.085	0.305****	0.047
Urban	0.907****	0.203	0.500***	0.153
Merged in standardization (ref: not)	0.279*	0.163	0.071	0.095
Constant	-0.291*	0.167	-1.451****	0.103
<i>Model summaries</i>	Model 1B			
N	185,897			
Prob > χ^2	0.0000			
Pseudo- R^2	0.0408			
Log pseudolikelihood	-180,681.7			

Note: Control variables measured at age 18.

* $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$; **** $p < 0.001$.

TABLE 4 Multinomial logistic regressions for ties to parents versus grandparents: having stayed in; returned to; or moved away from (reference category) municipality of birth by age 30.

	Stayed in birthplace until age 30		Returned to birthplace by age 30	
	B	SE	B	SE
<i>Model 2B</i>				
Ties to parents versus grandparents (ref: ties to two parents)				
No ties	-0.760****	0.098	-0.489****	0.085
One-generational ties				
Ties to one parent	-0.302****	0.048	-0.202****	0.057
Ties to one grandparent	-0.328****	0.061	-0.186***	0.071
Ties to two or more grandparents	-0.168**	0.075	-0.116	0.086
Two-generational ties				
Ties to one parent and one grandparent	-0.196****	0.056	-0.147**	0.062
Ties to one parent and multiple grandparents	-0.078	0.065	-0.064	0.067
Ties to both parents and one grandparent	0.082*	0.049	0.071	0.060
Ties to both parents and multiple grandparents	0.157****	0.060	0.050	0.066
Ties to all six (grand)parents	0.276****	0.073	0.061	0.083
<i>Model summaries</i>				
	Model 2B			
N	185,897			
Prob > χ^2	0.0000			
Pseudo R ²	0.0409			
Log pseudolikelihood	-180,672.0			

Note: The same control variables are included as in the model 1B shown in Table 3 (coefficients not shown). Control variables measured at age 18.

* $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$; **** $p < 0.001$.

ties" as the reference category show that one-generational ties shared with mothers ($B = 0.468$) or maternal grandparent(s) ($B = 0.474$) is associated with slightly larger coefficients than one-generational ties shared with fathers ($B = 0.451$) or paternal grandparent(s) ($B = 0.421$). However, the differences between these coefficients are not statistically significant (results not shown). This reinforces a previous finding that one-generational ties to (grand)parents are more similar than expected, and suggests that the sex of the considered (grand)parent(s) is not further associated with young adults' staying and returning propensities.

When the birthplace is shared across two generations, we find larger coefficients for ties shared through maternal lineages ($B = 0.620$) than paternal lineages ($B = 0.566$), and here the difference is significant ($p = 0.032$, results not shown). However, when ties run through the maternal lineage and some additional paternal (grand)parents, the differences between young adults with ties to maternal lineages ($B = 0.856$) and paternal lineages ($B = 0.820$) are insignificant (results not shown). Although intergenerational relationships with maternal (grand)parents are typically stronger than with paternal (grand)parents (Ikkin et al., 1999; Monserud, 2010; Rossi & Rossi, 1990), and our results suggest that there may be a slight preference for maintaining ties to maternal rather than paternal

lineages, we do not find support for hypothesis H3a or H3b. Perhaps, the strength of maternal relationships is mediated by the effect of intergenerational transfers of property through male lineages.

4.2.4 | Additional models including interaction terms

To determine whether our results were affected by differences between women and men, we ran additional checks using sex of the young adult as an interaction term. The model interacting sex and *paternal and maternal lineage ties* shows a better model fit than the model without the interaction (Likelihood-ratio (LR) = $\chi^2(24) = 43.14$; Prob < $\chi^2 = 0.01$). In Table 5 (Model 3B), the first four columns show the results stratified for women and men. For women, the coefficients are consistently larger for ties to maternal (grand)parents than to paternal (grand)parents – and these differences are statistically significant (results not shown). For men, a mixed pattern is observed, and the differences are not statistically significant. Overall, we find similar patterns for returning propensities. In the final two columns of Table 5, the p values reveal whether differences between women and men are significant. Compared with men, women are less likely to stay in their birthplace when ties are shared

TABLE 5 Multinomial logistic regression for paternal or maternal lineage ties, stratified by sex: having stayed in; returned to; or moved away from (reference category) municipality of birth by age 30.

	Women		Returned		Men		Returned		Gender differences	
	Stayed	SE	B	SE	Stayed	SE	B	SE	Stayed	Returned
	B		B		B		B		p	p
<i>Model 3B: stratified by sex</i>										
Paternal or maternal lineage-ties (ref: no ties)										
Tie to father only	0.406***	0.069	0.282***	0.051	0.484***	0.082	0.259***	0.070	0.019	0.414
Tie to mother only	0.483***	0.074	0.303***	0.073	0.455***	0.061	0.309***	0.056	0.736	0.917
Ties to both father and mother	0.804***	0.079	0.489***	0.086	0.727***	0.125	0.492***	0.110	0.514	0.788
Ties to paternal grandparents only	0.436***	0.098	0.288***	0.066	0.407***	0.064	0.322***	0.066	0.438	0.825
Ties to maternal grandparents only	0.466***	0.074	0.297***	0.072	0.476***	0.069	0.250***	0.065	0.330	0.535
Ties to both paternal and maternal grandparents	0.723***	0.137	0.624***	0.139	0.773***	0.113	0.629***	0.139	0.312	0.928
Ties to a parent and a grandparent, but no lineage	0.611***	0.097	0.318**	0.102	0.667***	0.105	0.464***	0.094	0.312	0.334
Ties through paternal lineage	0.523***	0.058	0.281***	0.054	0.602***	0.062	0.399***	0.057	0.000	0.049
Ties through maternal lineage	0.649***	0.053	0.379***	0.042	0.594***	0.059	0.393***	0.045	0.964	0.983
Ties through paternal lineages, and some other ties	0.803***	0.074	0.500***	0.062	0.837***	0.080	0.570***	0.065	0.026	0.382
Ties through maternal lineage, and some other ties	0.850***	0.072	0.507***	0.063	0.862***	0.068	0.525***	0.052	0.100	0.959
Ties through paternal and maternal lineages	0.956***	0.070	0.555***	0.050	0.947***	0.059	0.545***	0.049	0.010	0.442
<i>Model summaries</i>	Model 3B: Women				Model 3B: Men				Interaction model	
N	87,780				98,117				185,897	
Prob > χ^2	0.0000				0.0000				0.0000	
Pseudo R^{20}	0.0347				0.0358				0.0410	
Log pseudolikelihood	-85,701.8				-94,830.5				-180,646.6	

Note: The same control variables are included as in the model 1B shown in Table 3 (coefficients not shown). Control variables measured at age 18. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

with their father, their paternal lineages, or when ties run through both lineages. Moreover, men are more likely than women to return to a birthplace that is shared through the paternal lineage. Thus, women seem slightly less tied to paternal (grand)parents than men, but they do not differ from men in their ties to maternal (grand)parents.

The model interacting *sex of the young adult* and the *number of ties* also showed a better model fit compared with the model without this interaction term (Likelihood-ratio model $1 = \chi^2(12) = 25.96$; Prob < $\chi^2 = 0.025$). Women have generally lower propensities for staying in the birthplace than men, although the differences were only significant if they had one tie ($B = -0.066$; $p = 0.038$), three ties ($B = -0.115$; $p = 0.001$), or five ties ($B = -0.096$, $p = 0.032$). The pooled model including *sex* and *ties to parents versus grandparents* was not statically different from the model without the interaction term.

4.2.5 | Control variables

Regarding the control variables (shown once in Table 3, Model 1B), we observe lower propensities for staying for women than for men—but returning does not differ between the sexes. The two younger cohorts are more likely to stay than the oldest cohort tested—but we find no differences in returning. Childhood return-migrants are less likely to stay, but no more or less likely to return than childhood stayers. Living with one's mother at age 18 is associated with a higher propensity for staying compared with living with both parents. We find negative associations with staying and parents' education level, employment status, and income. The number of siblings is positively associated with returning, but not with staying. All results are as expected from the literature; we thus refer to Section 2.4 for an interpretation. We highlight here that the propensity to stay, or return, to the birthplace was higher for young adults born in dense

and urban municipalities compared with those born in rural municipalities. This is in line with the literature that has identified urban areas as attractive places for young adults (i.e., due to the presence of higher education institutes). However, we also found that young adults from urban areas have fewer shared birthplace-ties than those from dense or rural areas (see: Supporting Information: Appendix Table A1). As such, our results show that—taking into account that individuals from urban areas are more likely to stay—we find that staying and migration behaviour during young adulthood is influenced by shared birthplaces with (grand)parents.

5 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

With this paper, we aim to contribute to the (im-)mobility literature by applying a multigenerational perspective on local ties to explore who stays in their birthplace. We use a novel, yet simple, empirical measure that approximates the presence of multigenerational local ties as a shared birthplace between a young adult and one or more of their (grand)parents. Overall, the results of the multinomial logistic regressions show that sharing a birthplace with any (grand)parent, compared with having no such ties, increased the propensity for staying in, or returning to, the birthplace for young Swedish adults. Our work is an example of the increasing possibilities for studying complex interdependencies in people's life courses due to the rapidly expanding availability of appropriate data (Falkingham et al., 2020).

Our results regarding all three specifications demonstrate that the number of ties matters. For example, we found that each additional (grand)parent with whom the birthplace was shared significantly increased the propensity for staying in one's birthplace until the age of 30. The propensity for returning to the birthplace by age 30 increased significantly for the first three additional ties. Regarding the other two specifications, we consistently found larger coefficients for categories with a larger number of ties: that is, ties to *both* parents, *multiple* grandparents, *both* generations, one lineage with *additional* ties to the other lineage, and ties through *both* the paternal and the maternal lineages.

We find that any combination of ties including *both* parents have a particularly strong, positive effect on staying. Despite this being in line with the assumption of weaker feelings of family obligation towards grandparents compared with parents (Rossi & Rossi, 1990), sharing a birthplace with (grand)parents from either generation acts as strong local tie when compared with the young adults who merely shared the same residential location for 18 years with parents (i.e., those without ties in our sample). These findings encourage further explorations of the unique facets that contribute to the anchoring role of (shared) birthplaces, as done by studies on “longstanding farm traditions” (Stockdale & Ferguson, 2020) and property inheritance (Hjälms, 2014).

We find slightly larger coefficients for ties that run through maternal lineages compared with paternal lineages, but no evidence for stronger ties to maternal (grand)parents altogether. Additional checks using an interaction term with the sex of the young adult

revealed that men have a higher propensity for staying than women, when they share ties with paternal (grand)parents. Perhaps this finding reflects the effects of intergenerational property transfers through male lineages. We did not find any differences between men and women in terms of ties to maternal (grand)parents. This is surprising given that the literature on intergenerational relationships suggests that daughters maintain stronger relationships with (grand)parents than do sons (Kalmijn & Dykstra, 2006) and that maternal (grand)parents receive more support from daughters (Ikkinck et al., 1999; Rossi & Rossi, 1990) and are preferred over paternal (grand)parents for interaction (Monserud, 2010).

To investigate the relative contribution of a shared birthplace to that of a shared residential history (i.e., those without ties to parents in our sample), we only included young adults who lived at their birthplace at age 18. While this answers to an important gap in the literature, our results can thus not be generalized to the full population of young adults in Sweden. The excluded childhood migrants ($\approx 25\%$) are likely a highly selective group of children (Kuyvenhoven et al., 2022) that has higher propensities to migrate again in adulthood (Bernard & Perales, 2021; Bernard & Vidal, 2020). For future research, it would be useful to explore multigenerational local ties in childhood migration propensities, and how these affect migration behaviour in adulthood.

We chose to end our observations at age 30. While the period between ages 18 and 30 is well-suited to capture staying propensities during young adulthood, the threshold affected our ability to interpret the results of the returners in a meaningful manner. An interesting new avenue for future research is to investigate the role of multigenerational local ties on return migration. For example, this may be done by extending the observation period past childbearing ages (i.e., 35–40), which leads to an increase in observations for the return-group who are now captured in the migrant-group. Perhaps, this reveals an even stronger role of multigenerational local ties than what we have found thus far.

We investigated behaviours during young adulthood based on characteristics observed at younger ages. While this research design was chosen for its effectiveness at avoiding endogeneity, it also comes with two important consequences. One, we cannot include information between ages 18 and 30, because these could be endogenous to the outcome. And two, we cannot take into account current residential locations of (grand)parents by age 30, because of multicollinearity with the main explanatory variables. Our empirical proxy based on shared birthplaces uniquely allowed for this design, because it requires no information at later ages. Although we found clear influences of a shared birthplace, our findings thus likely relate to lower bound effects of multigenerational local ties in a broad sense. As the data in population registers continue to grow and are increasingly digitized, the full residential histories of more cohorts will become available. This will make it possible for future research to investigate the role of multigenerational local ties in staying or migration behaviour using other proxies—especially the relative contribution of current locations of family members. New studies should remain careful to avoid endogeneity and multicollinearity.

To our knowledge, our work is among the first to explore local ties using a multigenerational approach with register data. A recent working paper using Finnish register data arrived at similar conclusions to ours: having ancestral ties encourages staying behaviour (Monti & Saarela, 2023). A downside of using register data is that attempting to standardize residential environments (i.e., birthplaces) across generations comes with unavoidable data loss because it is impossible to match some (grand)parents' birthplaces due to administrative changes over time. Other data sources could possibly prove more reliable in identifying a shared birthplace across generations. For example, survey questions or life-calendar interviews can be designed to ask about (dis)continuities between the respondent and their (grand)parents' residential environments. Indeed, studies have used survey data to explore family roots (Albrecht & Scheiner, 2022; Clark et al., 2017), but have yet to take grandparents into account.

To conclude, our findings suggest that a shared birthplace with one's (grand)parents acts as a significant local tie in the staying and migration behaviour of young adults. While one cannot identify the ways in which (grand)parents influence young adults' lives using register data, the existing literature suggests that multigenerational local ties may result from intergenerational transfers of property and location-specific capital, create a sense of belonging, and shape the preferences, attitudes, and behaviour of young adults. We encourage future research to further explore the influence of these multigenerational interdependencies in staying and migration behaviour. Qualitative research could investigate how shared residential histories within a family influence the decision-making processes of young adults. Qualitative data sources would also be adequate to investigate individual agency in one's (im-)mobility decisions in light of negative family relationships, small-town gossip, and social exclusion. Quantitative approaches could investigate other types of multigenerational local ties and explore whether these act as a socioeconomic resource or as a constraint on people's labour market outcomes. Overall, the positive association between staying and longstanding residential histories between multiple generations suggest that facilitating family-friendly policies regarding property—including farms, forestland, and family businesses—could help retain people in depopulating areas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study is part of the FamilyTies project, funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement No. 740113). The contributions of Gunnar Malmberg and Emma Lundholm are part of the Nearness of Family project, funded by the Swedish Research Council (Grant Agreement No. 2020-02542).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research data are not shared.

ORCID

Jonne A. K. Thomassen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1226-0558>

Emma Lundholm  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2014-7179>

REFERENCES

- Adams, R.-M., & Komu, T. (2022). Radically ordinary lives: Young rural stayers and the ingredients of the good life in Finnish Lapland. *YOUNG*, 30(4), 361–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/11033088211064685>
- Albrecht, J., & Scheiner, J. (2022). Leaving, staying in and returning to the hometown. *Raumforschung Und Raumordnung/Spatial Research and Planning*, 80(4), 414–433. <https://doi.org/10.14512/rur.132>
- Artamonova, A., Brandén, M., Gillespie, B. J., & Mulder, C. H. (2021). Adult children's gender, number and proximity and older parents' moves to institutions: Evidence from Sweden. *Ageing and Society*, 43, 342–372. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X21000556>
- Artamonova, A., Gillespie, B. J., & Brandén, M. (2020). Geographic mobility among older people and their adult children: The role of parents' health issues and family ties. *Population, Space and Place*, 26(8), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2371>
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x>
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(4), 856. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352993>
- Bengtsson, T., & Johansson, M. (1994). Internal migration. In T. Bengtsson (Ed.), *Population, Economy, and Welfare in Sweden* (Vol. 28, pp. 65–85). Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315589282-12>
- Bernard, A., Bell, M., & Charles-Edwards, E. (2014). Life-course transitions and the age profile of internal migration. *Population and Development Review*, 40(2), 213–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2014.00671.x>
- Bernard, A., & Kolk, M. (2020). Are young Swedes moving more? A cohort analysis of internal migration by move order. *European Journal of Population*, 36(3), 601–615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-019-09542-z>
- Bernard, A., & Perales, F. (2021). Is migration a learned behavior? Understanding the impact of past migration on future migration. *Population and Development Review*, 47(2), 449–474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12387>
- Bernard, A., & Vidal, S. (2020). Does moving in childhood and adolescence affect residential mobility in adulthood? An analysis of long-term individual residential trajectories in 11 European countries. *Population, Space and Place*, 26(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2286>
- Bjarnason, T., & Haartsen, T. (2023). Closest Family in the household or in the community? The role of family in residential satisfaction among intended stayers in Iceland. *Population, Space and Place*, e2714. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2714>
- Blaauboer, M. (2010). Family background, individual resources and the homeownership of couples and singles. *Housing Studies*, 25(4), 441–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673031003711493>
- Blaauboer, M. (2011). The impact of childhood experiences and family members outside the household on residential environment choices. *Urban Studies*, 48(8), 1635–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010377473>
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Bordone, V. (2009). Contact and proximity of older people to their adult children: A comparison between Italy and Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 15(4), 359–380. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.559>

- Bowstead, J. C. (2015). Forced migration in the United Kingdom: Women's journeys to escape domestic violence. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 40(3), 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12096>
- Chudnovskaya, M., & Kolk, M. (2017). Educational expansion and intergenerational proximity in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 23(1), e1973. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1973>
- Clark, W. A. V., Duque-Calvache, R., & Palomares-Linares, I. (2017). Place attachment and the decision to stay in the neighbourhood. *Population, Space and Place*, 23(2), e2001. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2001>
- Cooke, T. J. (2008). Gender role beliefs and family migration. *Population, Space and Place*, 14(3), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.485>
- Cooke, T. J. (2011). It is not just the economy: Declining migration and the rise of secular rootedness. *Population, Space and Place*, 17(3), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.670>
- Cooke, T. J. (2013). Internal migration in decline. *The Professional Geographer*, 65(4), 664–675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2012.724343>
- Coulter, R. (2013). Wishful thinking and the abandonment of moving desires over the life course. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 45(8), 1944–1962. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45314>
- Coulter, R., Ham, M., & Findlay, A. M. (2016). Re-thinking residential mobility: Linking lives through time and space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(3), 352–374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515575417>
- DaVanzo, J. (1981). Repeat migration, information costs, and location-specific capital. *Population and Environment*, 4(1), 45–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01362575>
- Dykstra, P. A., & Fokkema, T. (2011). Relationships between parents and their adult children: A West European typology of late-life families. *Ageing and Society*, 31(4), 545–569. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X10001108>
- Dykstra, P. A., & Knipscheer, C. P. M. (1995). The availability and intergenerational structure of family relationships. In C. P. M. Knipscheer, J. De Jong Gierveld, T. G. Tilburg, & P. A. Dykstra (Eds.), *Living arrangements and social networks of older adults* (pp. 38–58). VU University Press. <https://research.vu.nl/en/publications/living-arrangements-and-social-networks-of-older-adults>
- Elder, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan, (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3–19). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48247-2_1
- Falkingham, J., Evandrou, M., & Vlachantoni, A. (2020). Demographic change and the lifecourse: An introduction. In J. Falkingham, M. Evandrou, & A. Vlachantoni (Eds.), *Handbook on demographic change and the life course* (pp. 1–5). Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
- Feijten, P., Hooimeijer, P., & Mulder, C. H. (2008). Residential experience and residential environment choice over the life-course. *Urban Studies*, 45(1), 141–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098007085105>
- Ferguson, S., Haartsen, T., Steinführer, A., & Catney, G. (2023). The role of non-resident family ties in rural staying. *Population, Space and Place*, 30(3), e2708. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2708>
- Fischer, P. A., & Malmberg, G. (2001). Settled people don't move: On life course and (im-)mobility in Sweden. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 7(5), 357–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijpg.230>
- Van Gaalen, R. I., & Dykstra, P. A. (2006). Solidarity and conflict between adult children and parents: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(4), 947–960. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00306.x>
- Geurts, T., Poortman, A. R., van Tilburg, T., & Dykstra, P. A. (2009). Contact between grandchildren and their grandparents in early adulthood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(12), 1698–1713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X09336340>
- Gielsing, J., Vermeij, L., & Haartsen, T. (2017). Beyond the local-newcomer divide: Village attachment in the era of mobilities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 55, 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.08.015>
- Gierveld, J. J., & Fokkema, T. (1998). Geographical differences in support networks of older adults. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 89(3), 328–336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9663.00032>
- Greenwell, L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Geographic distance and contact between middle-aged children and their parents: The effects of social class over 20 years. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 52B(1), S13–S26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/52B.1.S13>
- Grundy, E., & Shelton, N. (2001). Contact between adult children and their parents in Great Britain 1986–99. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 33(4), 685–697. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a33165>
- Haartsen, T., & Stockdale, A. (2018). S/elective belonging: How rural newcomer families with children become stayers. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(4), e2137. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2137>
- Hägerstrand, T. (1970). What about people in regional science? *Ninth European Congress of the Regional Science Association*, 24, 7–21.
- Hagestad, G. O. (1988). Demographic change and the life course: Some emerging trends in the family realm. *Family Relations*, 37(4), 405–410.
- Hank, K. (2007). Proximity and contacts between older parents and their children: A European comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 157–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00351.x>
- Hank, K., Cavrini, G., Di Gessa, G., & Tomassini, C. (2018). What do we know about grandparents? Insights from current quantitative data and identification of future data needs. *European Journal of Ageing*, 15, 225–235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-018-0468-1>
- Haug, S. (2008). Migration networks and migration decision-making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 585–605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830801961605>
- Hjältn, A. (2014). The 'stayers': Dynamics of lifelong sedentary behaviour in an urban context. *Population, Space and Place*, 20, 569–580. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1796>
- Hofstede, H., Salemink, K., & Haartsen, T. (2022). The appreciation of rural areas and their contribution to young adults' staying expectations. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 95, 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.07.018>
- Hünteler, B., & Mulder, C. H. (2020). Geographic proximity to parents, intergenerational support exchange, and migration within Germany. *European Journal of Population*, 36(5), 895–918. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-020-09558-w>
- Ikkink, K. K., van Tilburg, T., & Knipscheer, K. C. P. M. (1999). Perceived instrumental support exchanges in relationships between elderly parents and their adult children: Normative and structural explanations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(4), 831. <https://doi.org/10.2307/354006>
- Kalmijn, M., & Dykstra, P. A. (2006). Differentials in face-to-face contact between parents and their grown-up children. In P. A. Dykstra, M. Kalmijn, T. C. M. Knijn, A. E. Komter, A. C. Liefbroer, & C. H. Mulder (Eds.), *Family solidarity in the Netherlands* (pp. 63–88). Dutch University Press.
- Kasarda, J. D., & Janowitz, M. (1974). Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 39(3), 328–339. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2094293>
- Kley, S. A., & Mulder, C. H. (2010). Considering, planning, and realizing migration in early adulthood. The influence of life-course events and

- perceived opportunities on leaving the city in Germany. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 25(1), 73–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-009-9167-8>
- Knijf, T. C. M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2006). More than kind: Instrumental support in families. In P. A. Dykstra, M. Kalmijn, T. C. M. Knijf, A. E. Komter, A. C. Liefbroer, & C. H. Mulder (Eds.), *Family solidarity in the Netherlands* (pp. 89–106). Dutch University Press.
- Kolk, M. (2017). A life-course analysis of geographical distance to siblings, parents, and grandparents in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 23(3), e2020. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2020>
- Komter, A. E., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2002). Solidarity in Dutch families: Family ties under strain? *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(2), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x02023002001>
- Kulu, H., Lundholm, E., & Malmberg, G. (2018). Is spatial mobility on the rise or in decline? An order-specific analysis of the migration of young adults in Sweden. *Population Studies*, 72(3), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2018.1451554>
- Kuyvenhoven, J., Das, M., & de Valk, H. A. G. (2022). Towards a typology of childhood internal mobility: Do children of migrants and non-migrants differ? *Population, Space and Place*, 28(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2515>
- Lee, E. S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3(1), 47–57. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2060063>
- Lersch, P. M., & Luijckx, R. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of homeownership in Europe: Revisiting the socialisation hypothesis. *Social Science Research*, 49, 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.08.010>
- Lewicka, M. (2011). Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31(3), 207–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.10.001>
- Low, S. M., & Altman, I. (1992). Place Attachment. In I. Altman & S. M. Low (Eds.), *Place Attachment* (pp. 1–12). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-8753-4_1
- Lundholm, E. (2007). Are movers still the same? Characteristics of interregional migrants in Sweden 1970–2001. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98(3), 336–348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2007.00401.x>
- Lundholm, E., & Malmberg, G. (2009). Between elderly parents and grandchildren—Geographic proximity and trends in four-generation families. *Journal of Population Ageing*, 2, 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12062-010-9022-4>
- Malmberg, G., & Pettersson, A. (2007). Distance to old parents: Analyses of Swedish register data. *Demographic research*, 17(23), 679–704. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2007.17.23>
- Monserud, M. A. (2010). Role markers of adulthood and young adults' ties to grandparents. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 8(1), 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770903520650>
- Monti, A., & Saarela, J. (2023). *Geographic immobility across three generations of natives in Finland in Finland*.
- Motel-Klingebiel, A., Tesch-Roemer, C., & Von Kondratowitz, H. J. (2005). Welfare states do not crowd out the family: Evidence for mixed responsibility from comparative analyses. *Ageing and Society*, 25(6), 863–882. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X05003971>
- Mulder, C. H. (2018). Putting family centre stage: Ties to nonresident family, internal migration, and immobility. *Demographic Research*, 39(43), 1151–1180. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2018.39.43>
- Mulder, C. H., & Hooimeijer, P. (1999). Residential relocations in the life course. In L. van Wissen & P. A. Dykstra (Eds.), *Population Issues: An Interdisciplinary Focus* (pp. 159–186). Springer.
- Mulder, C. H., Lundholm, E., & Malmberg, G. (2020). Young adults' return migration from large cities in Sweden: The role of siblings and parents. *Population, Space and Place*, 26, e2354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2354>
- Mulder, C. H., & Malmberg, G. (2014). Local ties and family migration. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 46(9), 2195–2211. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a130160p>
- Mulder, C. H., & van der Meer, M. J. (2009). Geographical distances and support from family members. *Population, Space and Place*, 15(4), 381–399. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.557>
- Mærsk, E., Sørensen, J. F. L., Thuesen, A. A., & Haartsen, T. (2021). Staying for the benefits: Location-specific insider advantages for geographically immobile students in higher education. *Population, Space and Place*, 27(4), e2442. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2442>
- Mærsk, E., Thuesen, A. A., & Haartsen, T. (2021). Symbolic mobility capital to fight the social stigma of staying: How young adults re-imagine narratives of 'leaving' during higher education. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 26(2), 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2021.1986624>
- Ní Laoire, C. (2023). Young people, intergenerationality and the familial reproduction of transnational migrations and immobilities. In J. Waters & B. Yeoh (Eds.), *Handbook on Migration and the Family* (pp. 118–134). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789908732.00014>
- Niedomysl, T. (2011). How migration motives change over migration distance: Evidence on variation across socio-economic and demographic groups. *Regional Studies*, 45(6), 843–855. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343401003614266>
- Niedomysl, T., & Clark, W. A. V. (2014). What matters for internal migration, jobs or amenities? *Migration Letters*, 11(3), 377–386. <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v11i3.231>
- Oppelaar, J., & Dykstra, P. A. (2004). Contacts between grandparents and grandchildren. *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, 40(2), 91–113. <http://repub.eur.nl/pub/18220>
- Pelikh, A., & Kulu, H. (2018). Short- and long-distance moves of young adults during the transition to adulthood in Britain. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(5), e2125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2125>
- Pettersson, A., & Malmberg, G. (2009). Adult children and elderly parents as mobility attractions in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 15(4), 343–357. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.558>
- Preece, J. (2018). Immobility and insecure labour markets: An active response to precarious employment. *Urban Studies*, 55(8), 1783–1799. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017736258>
- von Reichert, C., Cromartie, J. B., & Arthun, R. O. (2014). Reasons for returning and not returning to rural U.S. communities. *The Professional Geographer*, 66(1), 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2012.725373>
- Rogers, A., & Castro, L. J. (1981). *Model migration schedules*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1532474>
- Roseman, C. C. (1971). Migration as a spatial and temporal process. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 61(3), 589–598. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2569235>
- Rossi, A. S., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent-child relationships across the life course*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351328920>
- Semyonov, M., & Lewin-Epstein, N. (2013). Ways to richness: Determination of household wealth in 16 countries. *European Sociological Review*, 29(6), 1134–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jct001>
- Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationships in American families. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 429–460. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231213>
- Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5), 80–93. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1829105>
- van der Star, M. E., & Hochstenbach, C. (2022). Continuity among stayers: Levels, predictors and meanings of place attachment in rural shrinking regions. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 96(November), 369–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.11.010>

- Stockdale, A., & Ferguson, S. (2020). Planning to stay in the countryside: The insider-advantages of young adults from farm families. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 78(June), 364–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.06.029>
- Stockdale, A., & Haartsen, T. (2018). Editorial introduction: Putting rural stayers in the spotlight. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(4), e2124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2124>
- Stockdale, A., Theunissen, N., & Haartsen, T. (2018). Staying in a state of flux: A life course perspective on the diverse staying processes of rural young adults. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(8), e2139. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2139>
- Thomassen, J. A. K. (2021). The roles of family and friends in the immobility decisions of university graduates staying in a peripheral urban area in the Netherlands. *Population, Space and Place*, 27(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2392>
- Thomassen, J. A. K., Palomares-linares, I., Venhorst, V. A., & Mulder, C. H. (2023). Local ties as self-reported constraints to internal migration in Spain. *European Journal of Population*, 39, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-023-09661-8>
- Uzzell, D., Pol, E., & Badenas, D. (2002). Place identification, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(1), 26–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916502034001003>
- Venhorst, V. A. (2013). Graduate migration and regional familiarity. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 104(1), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12000>
- Wannerdt, A. (1947). *Folkbokföringen: Handbok för pastorexpeditionen*. Enköpings-posten.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Thomassen, J. A. K., Lundholm, E., & Malmberg, G. (2024). Who stays in their birthplace? The role of multigenerational local ties in young adults' staying behaviour. *Population, Space and Place*, 30, e2710. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2710>