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Within one generation, Finland and Sweden have undergone significant social and demographic change, due in part to the phenomenon of international migration. Rapidly aging societies and the current economic downturn make the integration of immigrants into the labour market vitally important.

In this thesis, I compare the national immigrant integration policies of Finland and Sweden with a focus on measures that promote labour market integration. The aims are to identify similarities and differences between the policies, gauge policy efficacy, and ascertain best practices and areas that could be improved. To accomplish this, I employ qualitative and quantitative analysis, or a mixed-method approach. I conduct a comparative policy analysis of the integration policies and a secondary data analysis of official statistics related to immigrant employment from the European Union Labour Force Survey.

The comparative policy analysis showed that Finland’s and Sweden’s integration measures (i.e., what they do) are very similar, but there is a difference in administrative approach and oversight (i.e., how they do it). Finland’s policy has a greater emphasis on roles and responsibilities. The data analysis showed that immigrant employment figures improved in both countries over the period of 2000-2012, but Finland saw the most dramatic improvement. I concluded that integration policy is having a positive impact on labour market integration in both countries, but that Finland’s approach of providing actionable guidance for the ministries responsible for implementing the integration policy has had an additional impact on improving labour market integration.

Keywords

Immigration, integration, Sweden, Finland, multiculturalism, comparative policy analysis, labour market, employment
Table of Contents

1. Introduction ........................................................................................................ 6
   1.1 Aims and Research Questions ........................................................................... 7
   1.2 Scope of the Study ............................................................................................. 9
   1.3 Scholarly Contribution of the Study .................................................................. 10

2. Methodology ....................................................................................................... 12
   2.1 Data Collection Sources .................................................................................. 12
   2.2 Key Concepts and Terminology ........................................................................ 13
   2.3 Selection of “Employment” from EU Common Integration Indicators ................ 15
   2.4 Theoretical Models and Approach ..................................................................... 16
   2.5 Data Limitations ............................................................................................... 18

3. Overview of Immigration and Integration Policy .............................................. 20
   3.1 The EU Level ..................................................................................................... 20
      3.1.1 Common Integration Policy Areas and Indicators ..................................... 22
      3.1.2 The Influence of EU Policy on Finland and Sweden ................................. 25
   3.2 Immigration and Integration Policy in Finland ................................................ 25
      3.2.1 From Emigration to Immigration: The Historical Context ....................... 25
      3.2.2 The Evolving Demographics of Finland and Its Immigrants ................. 27
      3.2.3 Finland’s Approach to Integration .............................................................. 31
   3.3 Immigration and Integration Policy in Sweden ............................................... 33
      3.3.1 Pioneering Integration: The Historical Context ....................................... 33
      3.3.2 The Evolving Demographics of Sweden and Its Immigrants .................... 35
      3.3.3 Sweden’s Approach to Integration ............................................................ 37

4. Analysis ................................................................................................................ 40
   4.1 Comparative Policy Analysis .......................................................................... 40
   4.2 Comparison of Employment Data ..................................................................... 44

5. Findings .................................................................................................................. 47

6. Conclusion ............................................................................................................. 52

Bibliography .......................................................................................................... 54

Appendix: Policy Comparison Matrix .................................................................. 62

List of Figures

   Figure 1. EU Common Integration Indicators ....................................................... 24
   Figure 2. Immigration, emigration and net immigration 1971-2013 .................... 26
   Figure 3. Inflows of top 10 nationalities as a % of total inflows of foreigners ....... 27
   Figure 4. Dependency ratio in Finland 1900-2050 .............................................. 28
   Figure 5. Finnish population by age, language and sex ....................................... 29
   Figure 6. Migration inflows to Finland by permit type ....................................... 30
   Figure 7. Number of foreign nationals in Finland, 2000-2040 ............................. 30
Figure 8. Inflows of top nationalities as a % of total inflows of foreigners in Finland 36
Figure 9. Migration inflows to Sweden by permit type 37
Figure 10. Abridged integration policy matrix 41
Figure 11. Labour market outcomes in Finland, 2000-2012 44
Figure 12. Labour market outcomes in Sweden, 2000-2012 45
1. Introduction

Within one generation, Finland and Sweden have undergone significant social and demographic change thanks in part to the phenomenon of international migration. Historically, Finland and Sweden have been countries of emigration. In the past 30 years, they have become countries of net immigration (Fredlund-Blomst 2014). Sweden has garnered international attention for its generous integration policy. Immigration NGOs such as the Migration Policy Group consistently rate both Finland and Sweden very highly on their efforts to integrate immigrants into society. In its 2010 international ranking of integration policy, the Migration Policy Group’s Migration Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) listed Sweden in first place and Finland in fourth. MIPEX based its rankings on evaluations of seven integration policy areas: Labour market mobility, family reunion for third-country nationals, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality, and anti-discrimination. MIPEX has Sweden outperforming Finland in every category except Political Participation. MIPEX will release a new ranking during summer 2015.

However, in spite of the Finland’s and Sweden’s integration policies being regarded as among the best in the world, there is evidence in both countries that immigrants are not integrating quickly or easily. Employment rates and net income among immigrant communities lag behind those of native populations. Foreign-born children tend to fare worse in school and are less likely to go on to tertiary education. Isolated housing communities contribute to social exclusion. Sweden has seen riots in predominantly immigrant neighborhoods around Malmö in 2008 and Stockholm in 2013, which contributed to ongoing public debate about the effectiveness of integration policy (Fredlund-Blomst 2014).

Tensions exist both within native and immigrant populations over their socioeconomic role. Anti-immigration platforms have resonated with many Finnish and Swedish voters who view immigration as a threat to the economy and erosive to cultural traditions. Immigrants complain of high unemployment, discrimination, and social
marginalization. The issue of integration is invoked in myriad social, economic, and political situations. However, there are two economic factors that make integration all the more pressing, one concerning the immediate economic climate and the other concerning fast-approaching demographic changes in the populations of Finland and Sweden.

In the short term, Finland and Sweden, like many other countries in Europe, are currently experiencing an economic downturn. Finland has crossed the GDP deficit limit and will soon exceed the debt limit set by the EU for euro-zone member states (The Economist 2015). Integration measures require substantial financial and personnel resources. Sweden spent an estimated 1.8 billion euros on integration in 2014 (European Commission 2015b). The Finnish and Swedish governments deem the expenditure of these resources a worthwhile investment in helping immigrants enter the social and economic fold, presumably faster than they would without the measures. However, high rates of unemployment among immigrants compared to native Finns and Swedes warrants asking questions about the efficacy of the integration programmes. Especially in a depressed economic climate, it is good governance to examine the use of public funds and ask whether they are being used in the most effective way possible.

A broader issue though, is that native populations in Finland and Sweden are rapidly greying. Increased life expectancy and lower birth rates from previous generations are resulting in significant demographic changes, which will impact the economy and welfare system. Finland is the world’s fastest-ageing country. In 10 years, about one in four Finns will be over retirement age (The Economist 2015). If they can be integrated into the labour market, immigrants will be a potential boon to the Finnish and Swedish economies.

1.1 Aims and Research Questions

Compared to other European countries, Finland and Sweden recognized the importance of integration early on and were among the first countries to develop integration
policies. Sweden published its first policy on integration in 1997 (Migrationsverket 2015b) but started offering integration measures such as language courses already in the 1970s (Benito 2005, 19). Finland published its first integration policy in 1999. Both countries adopted integration policies around the same time, have enacted many similar measures, and funded a number of programmes with the goal of integrating immigrants into the economic and social fold. And yet, Finland lags behind Sweden in MIPEX’s rankings of immigrant integration policies.

What are the similarities and differences between their integration policies? What appear to be best practices and what are areas that need improvement? This thesis will aim to answer these questions through a blend of qualitative and quantitative methods. This thesis will focus on labour market integration because employment facilitates integration into other aspects of society, and is therefore a “key” indicator of overall integration. Using comparative analysis, this thesis will compare and contrast policy to promote labour market integration at the national level in Finland and Sweden to determine differences and similarities. It will identify how Finland and Sweden approach integration, and how they evaluate their integration programmes. It will then conduct a secondary analysis of data from the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) related to statistical indicators of integration to gauge policy impact.

Immigrant integration is complex, multi-faceted, and fluid. One is not either “integrated” or “not integrated.” Above all, it is a process. It is not the aim of this thesis to pick a “winner”, or to say one country has succeeded and the other failed. Nor is it the aim of this thesis to take a side about whether immigration is good or bad, or should be increased or decreased. A key premise in this thesis is that immigration is likely to be a permanent feature of our globalized world, and governments, their citizens, and immigrants are all best served by policies that address it in an expedient, responsible, and practical way.
1.2 Scope of the Study

The scope of this thesis is limited to the analysis of integration policies of Finland and Sweden at the national level with a focus on labour market integration. While this thesis provides historical context for immigration trends and policy evolution, the focus is on the last 15-20 years, from when Finland and Sweden joined the EU and published their first integration policies through present day. Finland and Sweden were chosen for comparison for two reasons. Firstly, geographical proximity and relevance, as this thesis is part of my masters studies in the University of Turku’s Baltic Sea Region Studies programme. Secondly, the great number of similarities between the countries controls for many factors that affect cross-national comparative research. The ways in which Finland and Sweden are similar and the benefits of these similarities for comparison will be explored in more detail in the following section.

Finland and Sweden both have national integration policies that are centrally organized by a ministry that has been tasked with primary responsibility for integration. But in both countries, the municipalities still have considerable leeway in implementing the policies. I will focus on policy at the national level because there can be significant differences at the municipal level in terms of quality and availability of integration measures, and transparency of administrative procedures. This thesis will not examine local integration measures, which can vary between municipalities. This thesis will provide a breakdown of each country’s organizational structure because it’s useful to understand which agencies are tasked with integration and what the organizational structure is like.

Integration measures can promote inclusion in a variety of sectors of society, such as education, political participation, and the labour market. This thesis will focus on integration in the labour market, an indicator which will be discussed further in section 2.3.

This thesis will only focus on legal immigrants— persons who have obtained legal
residence in Finland and registered with the appropriate administrative authorities. Persons who have migrated irregularly, or illegally, are not reflected in official employment data and do not have access to integration programmes. Their welfare and integration, while important and worth studying, is outside of the scope of this thesis. Beyond legal immigrants, this thesis will not differentiate between immigrant groups (i.e., refugees, highly-skilled professionals). While immigrants’ grounds for immigration can influence their integration needs, the integration policies of Finland and Sweden at the national level do not target specific immigrant groups. Core integration measures, such as an integration plan and language training, are open to all legal, qualifying immigrants, regardless of their origins (inside or outside the EU) or their initial grounds for immigration (family ties, work, asylum, etc.).

1.3 Scholarly Contribution of the Study

There has been a growing academic, governmental, and non-governmental interest in integration, particularly in the last two decades. The subject of immigration and integration is relevant to so many different fields that it has attracted researchers from a variety of disciplines, from population demographics to economics to sociology (Reitz 2002, 1005). Many organizations collect a plethora of data related to immigrant integration, including national and international statistics agencies (i.e., Eurostat, Statistics Finland, Statistics Sweden), international organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and immigration NGOs such as the Migration Policy Institute. Several universities have opened departments with a research focus on immigration and integration, notably Oxford University’s Center of Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS). The European Union has funded several studies, which have informed its strategic guidance on integration policy for member states. Several think tanks (such as the Migration Policy Group and MIPEX), policy watch groups, and journals publish studies, country profiles, and rankings. A review of the literature from these sources indicates that while much has been written about immigration and integration, there is a lack of studies that compare the policies and statistics between different countries.
Comparing countries can help illuminate differences in their social structures and institutions (Hantrais 1995) and “cross-national studies can show what is general and what is specific about a particular phenomenon” (INTPOL 2006, 40). Factors that make cross-national comparative research difficult include differences in the demographics of each country’s immigrants and native population, and historical factors such as whether a country has a colonial past (i.e., England, France), a long running guest-worker scheme (i.e., Germany), or have always been net immigration countries (i.e., the United States, Canada, Australia). It is also difficult to compare data that were collected with varying parameters and definitions (Penninx, Spencer, and Van Hear 2008, 9).

These factors that can complicate international comparative analysis make Sweden and Finland good candidates for comparison. In addition to similarities in history, culture, climate, relative population size, economic model, demographics, and in the backgrounds of their immigrant populations (i.e., high numbers of refugees), all of which are variables that could affect the experience of immigrants in a country, there are also similarities in legal definitions and data gathering parameters. Neither country has a colonial past. Both were historically countries of emigration until the past few decades. Also, in spite of a sense of good-natured rivalry, Finland and Sweden have a long tradition of close political alliance and collaboration. Comparing each others’ experiences to look for common challenges and lessons learned is a natural, logical approach to policy development and analysis in the Baltic Sea Region.

Additionally, Finland and Sweden have both implemented significant reforms to their integration policies within the last five to six years. Therefore, the scholarly contributions of this thesis are that it is a cross-national comparison on integration policies, and that the analysis will take into account those reforms.
2. Methodology

This thesis will employ qualitative and quantitative analysis, or a mixed-method approach (Bryman 2006, 97). A mixed-method approach helps provide context for a more complete, comprehensive picture of the real-world effects of the policies in society (Bryman 2006, 106). Qualitative techniques will be applied in a comparative analysis of the immigrant integration policies. Comparative analysis of two cases aids in the understanding of social phenomena (Bryman 2004). It provides a framework for the examination of similarities and differences, and helps discover if a phenomenon experienced in two different places had the same cause (Hantrais 1995). I will employ content analysis of integration policy documents to compare and contrast them and identify key similarities and differences (Thomas 2003, 57).

The quantitative analysis will be a secondary data analysis of official statistics (Vartanian 2011, 3). As stated in section 1.1, one of the research aims of this thesis is to gauge policy efficacy. Averages and statistics never tell the full story; some influential factors will always remain difficult if not impossible to quantify, such as individual motivations and myriad life conditions (Thomas 2003, 44). However, “migration and integration policies rely heavily on high quality statistics for policy formulation and monitoring of results” (European Commission 2011, 27). It is common EU practice to look to statistics to aid in the evaluation of policies (May 2011, 74). Additionally, the secondary analysis of comparable data from two countries helps in cross-national research (Bryman 2004). Based on the findings from this qualitative and quantitative analysis, I will gauge Sweden’s and Finland’s integration policy outcomes.

2.1 Data Collection Sources

Sources for the thesis will include official statistics, academic articles, policy papers, EU policy and legal documents, NGO reports, newspaper articles, communications from Finnish and Swedish ministries responsible for integration, and translations of Finnish and Swedish integration policies. Statistical reports related to integration come from Statistics Sweden, Statistics Finland, Eurostat, and the OECD. Finland and
Sweden have enacted various integration policies, and the EU has released Europe-wide strategic guidance for integration policy.

Sources for the comparative policy analysis will be translations of official policy provided by the governments of Finland and Sweden. Official statistics for the comparison of labour market data come from the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS), carried out by Eurostat. Eurostat collects and produces statistical information for the purpose of assessing a wide range of policies (May 2011, 74). The Zaragoza Declaration, which was the first EU policy to put forward indicators of integration, recommends using harmonized data to increase comparability. Subsequent EU guidance documents all recommend using data from the EU-LFS when analyzing and comparing integration indicators (Eurostat 2011a, 11; European Commission 2013, 32).

2.2 Key Concepts and Terminology

To understand the policies and their outcomes to be analyzed in this thesis, it is essential to clarify who is considered an immigrant by the state, who qualifies to participate in immigrant integration schemes, and exactly what is meant by integration. There are differences between the definitions of certain key terms in policy, and what is meant by them in common conversation or popular media.

The terminology can also vary between academic and theoretical conceptions of immigration and integration. This variance is partly because of “an unfortunate conceptual arbitrariness in the social sciences” (Schunck 2014, 10) but mostly because over time, terms acquire stigma. “Immigrant integration has always been subject to intense normative political and public debates… Concepts like acculturation, adaptation, assimilation, integration, pluralism, multiculturalism, and the like carry with them normative connotations” (Schunck 2014, 10). The term ‘assimilation,’ for example, has come to be considered outdated. It is possible empirically for an immigrant to choose not to maintain an ethnic identity distinct from the native society. But the public usage of ‘assimilation’ contains the implication that a complete change
of identity is necessary, positive, and the sole responsibility of the immigrant, and that connotes an ethnocentric and nationalist worldview (Schunck 2014, 11).

Broadly speaking, Penninx defines integration as “the process of becoming an accepted part of society” (2004, 3). “Integration Policy is multifaceted and comprised of loosely connected sets of regulatory rules, institutions and practices in various domains of society within which migrants and natives work out their differences” (Freeman 2004, 946). This is in line with the EU’s approach to the concept of integration. For integration to be successful, the EU view is that a kind of social contract must be in place. The state is obligated to try to make the playing field as even as possible by ensuring fundamental rights and protecting against discrimination. Immigrants are expected to respect their new country’s values, even if they differ from their own, and participate actively in the integration process. This give-and-take approach is meant to help immigrants participate in social and economic life while maintaining their own cultural identity (European Commission 2003, 17; Korkmaz 2005, 4).

The two main actors in the process of integration are the immigrants and the receiving society. Their roles are unequal. Society holds a certain amount of power in how receptive it is to newcomers. Successful integration is not decided only by the actions of immigrants, or only the receiving society, but by the interactions between the two (Penninx 2004, 4). Many scholars have put forward concepts and models of integration. Penninx argues that integration can be gauged by examining the experiences of immigrants in three overlapping spheres of life: the legal and political, the socio-economic, and the cultural and religious. He argues that to improve integration, policy should focus on those areas (Penninx 2004, 4). Heckman posits that there is a hierarchy of integration dimensions, the most basic of which is “structural” and involves securing basic legal rights and having the possibility to live and work as a member of society (Heckman 1998). Most scholars agree on two things: that integration is a very complex, multi-faceted process that is ongoing and does not have an end-point; and that the socio-economic dimension is very important.
While there are no globally accepted definitions, several international organizations have put forward definitions, including the United Nations and the European Union. This thesis will utilize the definitions put forward by the EU, because Finland and Sweden utilize EU definitions and any future iterations of Finnish and Swedish immigrant integration policy will likely be influenced by EU policy guidance (Finnish Ministry of the Interior 2013, 10). Also, the employment data from the EU-LFS was collected based on EU definitions.

The term ‘immigrant’ can refer to a person in the process of moving from one country to another, but generally refers to a person with a foreign background, or at least one parent born outside of the country where the immigrant currently lives. ‘Foreign-born’ refers to a person born outside of the country where he or she currently lives. ‘Foreigners’ refers to persons who do not have citizenship of the country where they currently live. ‘Employment rate’ encompasses persons between the ages of 20-64 who were employed in any way during the week that the EU-LFS was carried out. ‘Unemployment rate’ encompasses persons between the ages of 20-64 who were not employed in any way but available for work during the week in which the survey was carried out, or had a job lined up but the start date was in the coming months (European Commission 2013). A common misconception is that employment and unemployment rates are proportional. However, the unemployment rate only covers people who are actively looking for work. Typically they are registered as unemployed and receive an unemployment benefit. It does not include the percentage of the population that is not employed but is also not actively looking for work (Eurostat 2015). Examples of persons who would not be included in the unemployment rate are stay-at-home caregivers, early retirees, or those who cannot work for physical or mental health reasons.

2.3 Selection of “Employment” from EU Common Integration Indicators

Based on the Zaragoza Declaration, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3, Eurostat and the EU put forward “common indicators of migrant integration” based on
data from the EU-LFS, The European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), Eurostat migration statistics, and other statistical surveys. It identified key policy areas, including employment, education, social inclusion, and active citizenship, and statistical indicators to help evaluate those policy areas (Eurostat 2011a, 10).

Out of those indicators, this thesis will focus on employment, partly because limits on space prohibit going into all of the indicators in an in-depth, meaningful way, but mostly because access to the labour market is a key indicator. Employment facilitates the process of integration. It expands social and professional networks. It enables language proficiency through practice. It enables social inclusion by making it financially possible to buy or rent better housing. Employment is linked to inclusion and social cohesion. Unemployment is highly associated with feelings of exclusion and marginalization, and cited as the main reason for feeling disconnected from society (Regeringskansliet 2002, 4). “Problems regarding the obstacles to employment have been identified as the greatest barrier to integration for immigrants in the member states” (Korkmaz 2005, 30).

2.4 Theoretical Models and Approach

The theoretical approaches applied across the existing literature on immigrant integration vary widely depending on the discipline of the research (Spencer 2006, 12; Schunck 2014, 1). Both research and discussion in the public sphere commonly employ a normative approach to immigrant integration (Wiesbrock 2013, 10). Theories and models can be useful tools for understanding complex social processes and their effect on policy making (Wallace and Wallace 2005, 15). However, “in practice, such neat theoretical divisions may often break down when it comes to the work of understanding for the purposes of policy intervention” (May 2011, 90-91).

For example, from a normative perspective, both Finland and Sweden could be said to have policies of multiculturalism. They both consider it the right of immigrants to maintain their ethnic customs, language, and sense of identity if they so choose. Finnish
and Swedish integration policies have protections for that right written into them (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 1; Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). However, categorizing Finnish and Swedish society and policy-making within the multicultural model of integration would, by association, assign elements to those countries that they do not currently have, and ignore things that do not fit within that model. For example, Finland’s policy clearly states that the onus of responsibility to integrate in society and the labour market lies predominantly with the immigrant (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 1 (Section 3)). That approach does not fit neatly into the multicultural model. Sweden has also been shifting away “from ‘multicultural’ responses to immigration towards a stronger emphasis on integration and civic nationalism” (Geddes 2003, 101).

The assertion that a country follows a particular model should not be taken for granted. Theoretical models are polysemic and normative connotations allow immigration and integration terminology to be “easily manipulated by different actors who seek different outcomes from the discussion” (Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012, 245). The intended definitions and connotations of terms like ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘secularism’ depend on the political orientation of the speaker and the context in which they are used. While it is tempting to try to impose order over the complexity by fitting things into categories and differentiating between models of integration which drive policy and social outcomes, that is not how society operates. It is misleading and counterproductive to think of “national models as dense, homogeneous and coherent value systems” and that every integration measure is an indicator of a nation’s model (Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012, 241-242).

It is common in research on immigrant integration that focuses on a particular country to identify a national model of integration. Some research suggests that this can not only be misleading, but damaging to analysis. The notion of a model suggests consistency and stability. From a normative perspective, a nation’s model of immigrant integration is considered a national tradition; created from, influenced by, and imbedded in the history and culture of the receiving society. Additionally, the repetition of the notion
that a country follows a certain model is self-reinforcing.

“All public discussions tend to routinize the idea that France is undeniably republican or that the Netherlands is multicultural, the effects of which are real. This performative effect should not merely be explored in the realm of official institutions and policies, but also in the cognitive construction of social reality, in which all segments of society participate” (Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012, 245).

In reality, integration is a fluid process influenced by social factors, and the current state of a nation’s approach to integration is the “temporary outcome of public discussions” (Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012, 244).

A constructionist approach maintains that models of social phenomena are too static and rigid to be helpful for analysis. Social phenomena are constantly changing and are influenced by social factors and actors (Bryman 2004; Korkmaz 2005, 21). From a constructionist approach, integration should not be categorized into models. Instead, the context, conditions, and outcomes should be considered. Using a constructionist approach, I give an overview of each country’s historical experience with immigration to provide the context for the steps each country took to create and refine its immigration and integration policy. I also give an overview of integration policy at the EU level to understand how it has affected policy in Finland and Sweden so far, and how it will likely affect it in the future.

2.5 Data Limitations

There are certain limitations on the available data that are worth pointing out for the sake of transparency about their effects on the analysis. Firstly, the fact that my linguistic and cultural background differs from those of the countries I am analyzing can have an impact on comparative analysis (Hantrais 1995). Analysis of policy documents will be limited to the English translations that Finland and Sweden have published. There is undoubtedly more information available in Finnish and Swedish, but due to my limited proficiency in those languages, only English language documents will be used. Also, differences in cultural background between the analyst and the
subject can result in a fresh perspective. Perception of standard operating procedures are more likely to be critical, and alternative ways of doing things are more likely to present themselves to an analyst with a different background from what she is researching.

Employment data analyzed here comes from the EU Labour Force Survey. The pros of using data from the EU-LFS are that the collection methods are uniform and optimal for comparison, and it is the standard data source for cross-national comparison recommended by the EU. The cons are that the data is collected via survey, which always has a margin of error. Results are dependent on voluntary responses, and non-response rates tend to be higher among immigrants, which can skew results (Eurostat 2011a, 11; European Commission 2013, 32).

While deficiencies may exist in the processing and creation of official statistics, they are still a useful tool in investigating society and its relationships (May 2011, 90). After the ‘Malta Declaration on the Mainstreaming of Migration in Official Statistics,’ Eurostat and various task forces have been working to refine and standardize migration data collection across the EU (European Commission 2011, 27).
3. Overview of Immigration and Integration Policy

Before the 1990s, European countries had their own policies and approaches to immigration. The issue of immigration was increasingly hotly debated in the 1990s, which led to agreements that the EU should have a coordinated approach to immigration and integration. EU countries are not obligated to follow EU guidance on integration. There are no penalties for non-compliance. However, it is worthwhile to look at policy developments at the EU level because they are likely to influence policy developments in Finland and Sweden. This chapter will provide an overview of how integration policy has evolved at the EU level, and then discuss immigration and integration policy in Finland and Sweden, which government agencies they have tasked with carrying out integration measures, and key policy documents.

3.1 The EU Level

The Treaty of Amsterdam, signed in 1997 and implemented in 1999, first brought up the need for a coordinated approach to immigration and integration. The Treaty of Amsterdam was a sea change for how Europe handles immigration and laid the foundation for “Fortress Europe” by introducing more restrictive borders and entry requirements (Mitselegas, Monar, and Rees 2003). It was also the point at which immigration and integration began to be seen as imperative to pair together. While the Treaty of Amsterdam does not explicitly mention integration, it is the first instance of EU policy to address matters related to it, such as combating discrimination, family reunification, and rights for non-EU immigrants legally residing in EU member states (European Commission 2013a).

The next milestone in the evolution of EU policy was the Tampere Summit in 1999, during which it was agreed that there should be a common immigration policy, a common system for asylum seekers to apply for entry to the EU, and a coordinated approach to immigrant integration. The EU acquis on immigration began to grow and the European Commission began to play a more active role in introducing regulations
related to immigration. The Tampere Summit resulted in the creation of the Area for Freedom, Security and Justice. It was also decided at the Tampere summit that “a more vigorous integration policy” was needed and that more should be done to ensure immigrants’ legal rights (European Commission 2003, 4).

At the Thessaloniki Council in 2003, it was decided to create an EU framework for integration and to develop an integration handbook for policy-makers in member states (European Commission 2004, 7). Since then, the EC releases annual reports on immigration and integration. The 2004 European Council meeting in the Hague resulted in the Hague programme, which agreed that more coordination was needed to support integration and that the EU should fund initiatives toward this goal (European Commission 2013a). Also in 2004, the Justice and Home Affairs Council developed a list of “Common Basic Principles” for EU integration initiatives. Particularly relevant to access to the labour market are the third and fourth principles, which state that employment is essential to the integration process, and that attaining a basic knowledge of the local language is necessary for successful integration, respectively (Council of the European Union 2004, 20).

The Common Agenda for Integration was created to help implement the Common Basic Principles and plan some of the initiatives set out before, such as exchange of information between member states and the development of integration indicators between 2005 to 2010 (European Commission 2013b). In 2007, the EC set up the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals to support the integration efforts of member states. It allocated 825 million euros for the period of 2007 to 2013. Each member state developed a plan for how to use their share of this funding (European Commission 2013b).

The 2009 European Council meeting in Stockholm resulted in the largest programme on integration to date, known as the Stockholm Programme. The EC decided that member states should exchange knowledge with each other, coordinate on policy related to integration, and use a “common reference framework, which should improve structures
and tools for European knowledge exchange” (Council of the European Union 2009, 65). It was also agreed that “core indicators” should be developed to help monitor and evaluate integration policies and outcomes (European Commission 2013a). The Treaty of Lisbon, which came into force in 2009, provided the first legal basis for the EU to introduce incentives and other programmes to promote integration within member states. The Treaty of Lisbon also brought the Charter of Fundamental Rights into force (European Commission 2013a). This charter protects the right to practice religious and cultural traditions as long as they do not violate the fundamental rights of anyone else (European Union 2010, 8).

The Europe 2020 strategy, adopted in March 2010, sets out five EU-wide goals, three of which pertain to integration: increase the employment rate for working aged men and women (ages 20-64), including legal immigrants, to 75%; improve education, namely reducing drop-out rates and increasing attainment of tertiary education; and social inclusion measures, such as poverty reduction. The Europe 2020 strategy also sets out a set of guidelines related to employment policy and increasing immigrant access to the labour market (European Commission 2013a). The 2011 European Agenda for the Integration of non-EU Migrants proposed the development of a tool-box for member states to select integration measures that they think are most relevant and likely to succeed in their nation’s circumstances. It emphasizes the importance of actors and programmes at the local level (European Commission 2013b).

The EC has published three editions of the “Handbook on Integration for Policy Makers and Practitioners,” the latest in 2010 (European Commission 2013b). In addition to policy measures, the EU has set up several entities to work on integration, such as the European Refugee Fund, and budgeted EU funds for integration projects, conferences, studies, document development, and research initiatives (Niessen 2004, 24-25).

3.1.1 Common Integration Policy Areas and Indicators

The 2005-2010 Common Agenda for Integration resulted in the development of a EU
framework for integration, released at the Zaragoza ministerial conference meeting in 2010 (European Commission 2013b). Using this framework, the EC and Eurostat developed a pilot project to measure integration outcomes based on core indicators of integration and published the results in 2013 (European Commission 2013b). The chart below lists the five sectors that the EU considers related to integration: Employment, Education, Social Inclusion, Active Citizenship, and a Welcoming Society. It also lists the current indicators of integration in each sector that the EU has identified and accepted as part of the 2010 Zaragoza Declaration, as well as additional proposed indicators that have not yet been accepted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Social Inclusion</th>
<th>Active Citizenship</th>
<th>Welcoming Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate</td>
<td>Highest educational attainment</td>
<td>At-risk-of-poverty (and social exclusion)</td>
<td>Naturalisation rate</td>
<td>Perceived experience of discrimination (survey)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>Tertiary attainment</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Share of long-term residence</td>
<td>Trust in public institutions (survey)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity rate</td>
<td>Early school leaving</td>
<td>Self-reported health status (controlling for age)</td>
<td>Share of elected representatives (research)*</td>
<td>Sense of belonging (survey)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Low-achievers (PISA)</td>
<td>Property ownership</td>
<td>Voter turnout (research)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-qualification</td>
<td>Language skills of non-native speakers (LFS module)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employment</td>
<td>Participation in early childhood education (SILC/PISA)**</td>
<td>Child poverty (SILC)</td>
<td>Participation in voluntary organisations (survey)*</td>
<td>Public perception of racial/ethnic discrimination (Eurobarometer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment</td>
<td>Participation in life-long learning (LFS, AES)</td>
<td>Self-reported unmet need for medical care (SILC)</td>
<td>Membership in trade unions (survey)*</td>
<td>Public attitudes to political leader with ethnic minority background (Eurobarometer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>Not in education, employment or training (LFS)</td>
<td>Life expectancy (SILC)</td>
<td>Membership in political parties (survey)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term unemployment</td>
<td>Resilient students (PISA)**</td>
<td>Healthy life years (SILC)</td>
<td>Political activity (survey)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of foreign-diplomas recognised (survey)**</td>
<td>Concentration in low-performing schools (PISA)**</td>
<td>Housing cost over-burden (SILC)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of international students (research)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overcrowding (SILC)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-work poverty-risk (SILC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent poverty-risk (SILC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. EU Common Integration Indicators (European Commission 2013, 9)

From these core indicators, I chose the policy area of employment, the indicators of which are employment rate, unemployment rate, activity rate, self-employment, and over-qualification. Based on the recommendation of EU integration policy guidance documents, I will utilize EU-LFS data that was collected in a standardized way for the purpose of comparison. According to the definitions used in the EU-LFS, the activity rate is comprised of employed and unemployed persons (those either currently working or looking for work). Those who are self employed, and those who are working in a job
for which they are overqualified, are also included in the employment rate (Eurostat 2015). Examining each indicator separately has value and could provide different kinds of information (for example, comparing the self-employment rates could shed light specifically on entrepreneurialism in immigrant communities). Since this thesis is interested in gauging the efficacy of measures that promote integration into the labour market, the most crucial data to examine and compare are the employment and unemployment rates. Section 4.2, Comparison of Employment Data, contains the secondary data analysis of the employment and unemployment rates of Finland and Sweden.

3.1.2 The Influence of EU Policy on Finland and Sweden

When Sweden joined the EU in 1995, it became subject to the EU regulations regarding immigration and integration. The main effect this had was on Sweden’s asylum policy. Sweden has implemented various EU directives related to combating discrimination and ensuring immigrant workers’ rights. Since Sweden created an integration policy before the EU passed integration directives, Sweden already had many of the recommended measures in place. Sweden developed a policy framework with objectives for integration before the EU began to broach the subject.

EU integration policy has mostly had the effect of reinforcing existing policies rather than shaping new ones. Many other countries in Europe developed integration policies only after the EU issued directives (Migrationsverket 2015b). So far, the influence of EU integration policy on Finland and Sweden has been limited.

3.2 Immigration and Integration Policy in Finland

3.2.1 From Emigration to Immigration: The Historical Context

For much of its history, Finland was an emigration country, meaning more Finns moved away from Finland than foreigners moved to Finland. Before the present day, the largest influx of immigrants during Finland’s history came soon after its declaration of
independence from Russia. Starting in 1921, thousands of Soviet citizens fled across the border into Finland. “At the end of the Continuation War, Finland was home to almost 100,000 foreign nationals, which remained the record until the 1990s” (Finnish Immigration Service 2015). Finland experienced a spike in emigration during the post-WWII period as Finns went after post-war reconstruction jobs (Finnish Immigration Service 2015). Large numbers of Finns emigrated to Sweden, reaching a peak during the late 1960s to early 1970s (Heikkilä and Jaakkola 2000). As the graph below illustrates, this trend began to reverse in the 1980s and Finland is now a net immigration country.

From the post-war period through the 1970s, the majority of immigrants to Finland were labour migrants from other countries in Western Europe. In the 1970s, Finland signed on with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to accept refugees fleeing conflicts in Chile and Vietnam. In 1983, Finland drafted the Aliens Act (Finnish Immigration Service 2015). The collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s led to an influx of immigrants from the former USSR. Finland announced that Ingrian Finns, ethnic Finns who moved to, or became trapped inside the USSR, and their children could relocated to Finland as humanitarian returnees (Finnish
Conflicts during the 80s and 90s in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yugoslavia resulted in further increases in refugees. This coincided with Finland’s economy slowing during the 1990s. Higher rates of immigration plus higher rates of unemployment contributed to a deepening recession. At this time, Finland had no integration programmes or strategy in place (Forsander 2001).

### 3.2.2 The Evolving Demographics of Finland and Its Immigrants

“Finland’s post-war baby boom was early, short (lasting just a few years) and intense (the birth rate rose more than in other countries). Those baby-boomers are now reaching retirement. Add growing life expectancy and historically low immigration, and Finland is the world’s fastest-ageing country” (The Economist 2015). In a decade, about 25% of Finns will be over 65 years old, the current retirement age. Fewer people working, more people drawing pensions, and greater demands placed on the health care system may force welfare and immigration reforms. In light of this worrying demographic forecast, immigrants are a potential economic boon. Juha Sipilä, Finland’s newly elected prime
minister, has already talked about increasing the retirement age and promoting highly skilled work-based immigration (The Economist 2015).

Finland’s changing demographics are illustrated in the following graphic.
Finland joined the European Union and signed on to the Schengen agreement in 1995 which allowed the free movement of people among signatory nations. This resulted in an increase in EU/EEA citizens in Finland (Finnish Immigration Service 2015). Behind free movement for EU/EEA citizens, the most common reason for applying for a residence permit is family ties. This includes marriage with a Finnish citizen and family reunification for residence permit holders, including refugees (OECD 2014a, 252). 2012 saw the largest number of immigrants to Finland since it declared independence in 1917. As of 2013, foreigners made up about 3.5% of Finland’s total population. Today Finland is home to one of Europe’s largest Somali communities (Finnish Immigration Service 2015) but overall, compared to other European countries, it has relatively low rates of immigration. “Net immigration contributed twice as much to population increase as births.” The largest immigrant groups are Estonians and Russians. The main country of origin for asylum seekers is Iraq. Less than half of asylum applications result in a residence permit. Finland increased the quota of refugees it would take in from Syria in 2014 from 200 to 500 people (OECD 2014a, 252).
Population forecasts estimate that by 2030, there will be about half a million foreign born people living in Finland (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2012, 4). The unemployment rate among immigrants is about three times as high as native Finns (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2012, 9). Trends indicate that the number of immigrants to Finland will continue to increase annually (OECD 2014a, 252). In light of Finland’s rapidly changing demographics, integration of immigrants into the labour market is of clear importance.
3.2.3 Finland’s Approach to Integration

In the 1990s, Finland began to address immigration and integration in a coordinated way. The first organization Finland tasked to be responsible for dealing with immigration was the Ministry of Labour. This indicated how essential work was seen to be to successful integration and reflected that the majority of immigrants to Finland at that time were still labour migrants. (Heikkilä and Jaakkola 2000). Today, the Ministry of Employment and the Economy is primarily responsible for integration in Finland. Other ministries that carry out tasks related to integration at the national level are: Education and Culture, Social Affairs and Health, Environment, Interior, and Finance. At the regional and local level, the following organizations have authority: Employment and Economic Development Centres (of which there are fifteen in Finland), which are under the Ministry of Employment and the Economy; Employment Offices, which provide training, personal integration plans, and job search assistance; Municipalities, which coordinate with employment offices and other local actors; Regional Councils; Regional State Administrative Agencies (European Commission 2013c).

The “Act on the Integration of Immigrants and Reception of Asylum Seekers”, introduced in May 1999, was Finland’s first integration law. It emphasized equality, the freedom to maintain native language and culture, and the need for the state to furnish newcomers with the skills and resources they would need to engage fully in Finnish society (Heikkilä and Jaakkola 2000). It included provisions for the creation of individual action plans tailored to immigrants’ needs for language training, education, and applied job training (Seppelin 2010, 1-2). However, it grouped integration together with protocol for the reception of immigrants who wished to claim asylum in Finland, victims of human trafficking, and legal representation of unaccompanied minors. The Act was very broad and did not include much actionable or specific information about agency roles and responsibilities. In 2010, the 1999 Act was replaced with the “Act on the Promotion of Immigrant Integration” (Laki kotoutumisen edistämisestä).

One of the changes in the new Act, which came into force in 2011, is a requirement for the government to develop a national integration programme every four years. This
resulted in the “Government Resolution on the Government Integration Programme: The Government's focus areas for 2012-2015.” This programme emphasizes the need to promote employment, provides quantifiable objectives (i.e., raise the immigrant employment rate to 60%), and specifies concrete measures to accomplish the stated objectives (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2012, 9). These include increasing capacity for initial assessments, language training, and vocational training to cut down wait times; streamlining the process for obtaining recognition of a degree or Finnish equivalents of qualifications earned in other countries, and affirmative action for immigrants: “Positive discrimination in the recruitment of immigrants will be promoted, especially within the public administration” (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2012, 23-25).

Finland has several pieces of legislation related to immigration and integration, such as the 2003 Nationality Act (Kansalaisuuslaki), the 2004 Non-Discrimination Act (Yhdenvertaisuuslaki), the 2004 Aliens Act (Ulkomaalaislaki), and the 2011 Act on the Applicant's International Protection at Reception (Laki kansainvälistä suojelua hakevan vastaanotosta). But the 2010 Promotion of Immigrant Integration Act governs national integration efforts, and that is the policy I will analyze in chapter 4 and compare to Sweden’s integration policy.

Funding for integration measures is allocated on an annual basis during budget planning (Finnish Ministry of the Interior 2013, 23). Not all of the funding comes from Finland itself. The EU, which earmarks funds for the promotion of integration and combating discrimination in member states, also provides funding for various integration programmes and research projects (European Commission 2013b). The Ministry of Employment and the Economy collects data related to ethnic relations and integration indicators, and publishes a report every four years (only in Finnish) (Finnish Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2013). The Ministry of the Interior has carried out pilot studies and is developing a system to follow up with immigrants who have undergone integration measures. Findings so far indicate that job security is the most important factor that promotes integration into Finnish society (Seppelin 2010, 4).
As in many other countries, immigration is a highly contentious and politicized issue in Finland. Finland held parliamentary elections in April 2015, and the issues of immigration and integration were central themes in candidate debates. The Finns party, which campaigns on an anti-immigration platform had the second highest percentage of votes. The Centre party, which won the majority, has a more open stance on immigration and has expressed support for attracting more highly skilled immigrants to Finland. Finns have elected foreign born MPs in previous elections, but they were from the neighboring countries of Sweden and Estonia. In this most recent election, two foreign born candidates, originally from Turkey and Afghanistan, were elected to be Members of Parliament, representing “a different wave of immigration to those that preceded them.” (Yle News 2015). As immigrants become increasingly integrated and active in Finnish society, Finnish attitudes are likely to change as well.

3.3 Immigration and Integration Policy in Sweden

3.3.1 Pioneering Integration: The Historical Context

Immigration in Sweden increased for two main reasons during the post-war period. Firstly, labour migration to meet labour shortages from the 1940s through the 70s, and secondly, refugee migration as part of Sweden’s humanitarian foreign policy from the 1970s through today (Korkmaz 2005, 52). During post-WWII reconstruction, Sweden, like many countries in Europe, experienced a labour shortage. Labour migrants were not needed for rebuilding, as in many other European countries. Sweden sustained relatively little damage to its infrastructure during the war. Instead, Sweden experienced a manufacturing boom to supply Europe’s demand for goods. Labour migrants came from neighboring Nordic countries, including Finland, but also from Southern Europe, and they worked predominantly in factories (Migrationsverket 2015b).

Through the 1960s, integration was thought to happen gradually on its own and there were no government-directed efforts to achieve it (Korkmaz 2005, 54). Sweden freely accepted foreign labour migrants, and even actively recruited them at times. The open
door started to close in the 1960s, with the creation of government departments and processes for dealing with immigration (Westin and Dingu-Kyrklund 1995). Sweden particularly began to regulate labour migration. The Aliens Decree of 1965 required individuals from outside the Nordic countries who wanted to immigrate to Sweden for work to apply for a work permit in their home country (Geddes 2003, 107). To come to Sweden for work, permit applicants from outside of the Nordic countries needed to show proof of a job offer in a field that the Swedish government had identified as having a domestic labour shortage. This led to a decrease in labour immigration and an increase in family reunification immigration (Migrationsverket 2015b).

Although it was tightening controls on immigration, Sweden took a generous and welcoming approach to its immigrants. Starting in the 1960s, the government arranged for free Swedish language courses for immigrants, and arranged for immigrant school children to be able to study their native language for a set amount of time each week. The Swedish government formed a working group to focus on issues related to immigration, and established the Finnish-Swedish Council to focus on the needs of Finnish immigrant communities in Sweden (Korkmaz 2005, 54).

In 1969, an administrative reorganization resulted in the creation of the New Immigration Board, which took over immigration matters that were spread around other government departments, such as the issuing of permits, applications for citizenship, and measures aimed to facilitate integration (Migrationsverket 2015b). In the 1970s, municipalities and organizations offered services for immigrants, such as language courses, and applied for reimbursement from the state. In 1973, immigrants gained a right to attend Swedish language courses during standard work hours while still getting paid by their employers. The government paid for libraries to expand their selections of books in foreign languages, and churches and religious organizations set up by immigrant groups began to achieve the same status, treatment, and protection as the Church of Sweden. The Finnish minority in Sweden established the Finnish People’s University (Benito 2005, 19).
Starting in the 1970s, Sweden began to give financial support to immigrant advocacy organizations, allow immigrants voting rights, and provide regular instruction in immigrants’ native language during primary education. It created an Ombudsman for Discrimination to handle claims of discrimination from immigrants. (Benito 2005, 20). Sweden began to incorporate integration measures into its official immigration policy in the mid-1970s. The political climate in Sweden during this time influenced the development of its integration policy. Sweden’s egalitarian values of equality and personal freedom, and the importance of social harmony, cooperation, and universalism in its social welfare system influenced Sweden’s decision to make it a matter of policy for immigrants to have freedom in choosing how much or how little of Swedish culture they wanted to absorb (i.e., how much they wanted to assimilate) (Korkmaz 2005, 56). The main message of Swedish integration policy was civic unity combined with ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity. During that time period, Sweden’s population was still relatively homogenous. The response of the Swedish public, and from international governments, was largely positive. It was even held up as a possible model for other countries (Favell 2003, 23).

3.3.2 The Evolving Demographics of Sweden and Its Immigrants

The collapse of the Soviet Union and conflicts in Africa, the Middle East, and the Balkans during the 1980s and 90s contributed to an increase in asylum seekers throughout Western Europe (Migrationsverket 2015b). Sweden’s Social-Democratic government declared that it would take in asylum seekers out of a sense of responsibility to defend social justice and equality (Savage 2010, 53). When Sweden joined the EU and the Schengen Area in 1995, immigration from other European countries increased (Migrationsverket 2015b).

In 2013, 15.9% of Sweden’s population of 9 million was foreign-born. About half a million people born in Sweden were born to two foreign-born parents. Together that is 21% of the total population. The numbers of immigrants reached a peak in 2013 (OECD 2014a, 300). The majority of people immigrating from other EU countries come for
work or family ties, especially marriage. The majority of people immigrating from outside the EU come from the Middle East and Asia, and the main reasons are asylum and family ties, especially family reunification. The average age of immigrants from Africa and Asia is about 30 years old. The average birth rate among foreign-born women is higher than Swedish women (Statistics Sweden 2008, 143).

Recently, Sweden has accepted large numbers of refugees fleeing conflict in Syria (Fredlund-Blomst 2014). About 20% of incoming immigrants in 2013 were Syrians and Somalians. Only about one third of asylum applications result in a residence permit. Still, numbers of refugees almost doubled from 16,700 in 2012 to 29,000 in 2013. Numbers of EU/EEA applicants, family ties applicants, and work permit applicants all decreased. Most immigrants coming for work were for low-skilled or manual labour (OECD 2014a, 300).
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*Figure 8. Inflows of top nationalities as a % of total inflows of foreigners in Finland (OECD 2014a)*

The employment rate is significantly higher among native Swedes than the foreign-born. However, this difference varies depending on the average amount of time an
immigrant has lived in Sweden. Those living in Sweden for less than five years have very low employment rates. The longer foreign born men and women have lived in Sweden, the closer their employment rates and income levels come to the native population (Statistics Sweden 2008, 145). After 10 years, 2 out of 3 refugees are employed (Statistics Sweden 2014a, 75). Immigrants from Africa have on average the lowest employment rates and those coming from other Nordic countries have the highest. Lower levels of education correspond with lower employment levels, both among immigrants and native Swedes. However, many immigrants with higher education are underemployed, meaning they work in jobs that require less than their education level (Statistics Sweden 2008, 145). Current statistics show that about 30% of employed immigrants are over-qualified for their jobs (OECD 2014b, 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration inflows (foreigners) by type</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
<th>% distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit based statistics (standardised)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (incl. accompanying family)</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free movements</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Migration inflows to Sweden by permit type (OECD 2014a)

High rates of immigration combined with a rapidly aging population mean that “Sweden cannot afford to waste the valuable skills embodied in immigrants and their children. If they are effectively integrated, migrants can represent an important resource to support economic growth” (OECD 2014b, 6). Immigrants are already crucial to Sweden’s economy and welfare. About one in four doctors in Sweden were trained outside of Sweden (OECD 2014b, 6).

3.3.3 Sweden’s Approach to Integration

Sweden published its first official policy on integration in 1997, and divided the office that had been administrating immigration matters into two separate organizations: the Swedish Integration Board and the Immigration Board (Benito 2005, 20). Sweden
began to allow dual citizenship in 2001, and allowed automatic citizenship to be granted to children who had one Swedish parent (Migrationsverket 2015b). An anti-discrimination law was introduced in 2003. In 2008, Sweden developed a strategy that laid out factors essential to integration: “Faster introduction for new arrivals; More in work, more entrepreneurs; Better results and greater equality in schools; Better language skills and more adult education opportunities; Effective anti-discrimination measures; Development of urban districts; Common basic values in a society characterized by increasing diversity” (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). In an effort to expedite integration, Sweden passed legislation in 2009 that stipulates which government entities are responsible for performing certain integration activities (Regeringskansliet 2009b, 1).

Sweden’s Ministry of Employment (Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet) has the primary responsibility for integration, and coordinates the efforts of other agencies, including the Ministries of Education and Research, Justice, and Health and Social Affairs (European Commission 2013d). The following organizations carry out integration measures at the national, regional, and local level in Sweden.

Sweden has several pieces of legislation related to immigration and integration, including the 2008 “Empowerment against exclusion – the Government’s strategy for integration” (Egenmakt mot utanförskap – regeringens strategi för integration), the 2008 “Act on Discrimination” (Ett starkare skydd mot diskriminering), and the 2009 “Policy for the introduction of newly arrived immigrants” (Nyanlända invandrarens arbetsmarknadsetablering – egenansvar med professionellt stöd). Of these, the policy most closely related to access to the labour market are the 2008 Government’s Strategy for Integration. The Swedish government published an abridged version of this Act in English. I will analyze it and compare to Finnish policy in chapter 4.

The Swedish government provides grants for research and activities related to integration to NGOs, and provides funding to municipalities that apply for §37 funding from the County Administrative Board for integration related activities. However, some
integration measures cross over into general programmes that don’t just target immigrants. “[T]here is no specific ‘integration budget’” (European Commission 2013d). However, spending in 2014 was estimated to be 1.8 billion euros and the same amount is expected to be allocated in 2015 (European Commission 2015b).

Statistics Sweden publish annual reports on integration, each year with a new topic (i.e., upper secondary school, retirement age). While various aspects of integration have been researched, “there has been no comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of integration policies” (European Commission 2013d). From the evaluation that has been carried out, the results have been limited (European Commission 2013d).

The Swedish Agency for Public Management evaluated the 2010 policy reform that was supposed to accelerate the introduction of newly arrived immigrants. It found that the reforms had only had half of their hoped-for impact. The report recommended that the agencies responsible for integration needed to improve their coordination and ability to reach consensus, and that policies should be further reformed to be more concrete and specific (European Commission 2013d).
4. Analysis

4.1 Comparative Policy Analysis

In this section, I will compare and analyze the key policies of Finland and Sweden related to immigrant integration in the labour market. In Finland, the 2010 Promotion of Immigrant Integration Act governs national integration efforts. In Sweden, the guiding policy at the national level is the 2008 Government’s Strategy for Integration. The Finnish government published an English translation of its Act, and Swedish government published an abridged English version of its Act. Both note that only the original versions are legally binding (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 1), but for the purposes of this thesis they are suitable for comparison of integration measures.

Both Finland and Sweden appear to take a proactive approach to policy review. These integration policies are not set in stone. Amendments occur, and decisions to stop certain integration measures are sometimes announced separately from the policies (i.e., in conjunction with the release of annual budgets). Revisions are ongoing and this analysis reflects the latest information available at the time of writing.

To conduct the comparative policy analysis, I went through Finland’s and Sweden’s integration policies line by line and identified all of the integration measures related to promoting access to the labour market. I found that Finland and Sweden offer many of the same integration measures. To depict which integration measures are offered by both countries and which are offered by only one, I developed a policy comparison matrix for a side by side comparison of the information. The matrix below is an abridged version for quick reference. I’ve included an expanded version that has policy citations and quotes from the policy texts as an appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Measure</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide general information and guidance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an initial assessment of education and skills to determine needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide civic orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supplementary basic education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supplementary higher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide language training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination work and language placements</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide skills / vocational training for adults</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and monitoring of an integration plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a personal point of contact/guide</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support while participating in integration measures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer salary subsidies to entice employers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance on starting a business</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate qualifications obtained in another country</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Abridged integration policy matrix

As the policy matrix shows, Finland and Sweden offer many of the same integration measures. Both countries target newly arrived immigrants but allow all immigrants who are either refugees, or have been granted legal permanent residence, regardless of their reasons for immigrating, access to integration measures (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 1 (Section 2); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). They both provide a financial benefit to support immigrants while they are going through their integration programme (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 6 (Section 19); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). In both countries, participation in integration measures is voluntary. Participation is required in order to receive financial benefits, but non-participation does not jeopardize legal status (Ministry of Employment and the
They both start the process with an initial assessment of an immigrant’s background, education and skill level, and work history. They both provide civic orientation about society and language training (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 3-4 (Sections 9-11); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1).

Language instruction in Finland and Sweden is provided by the municipalities. The availability of course places and the quality of instruction can vary from place to place (OECD 2014b, 7). Finland had a two-year pilot scheme from 2011 to 2013 to try outsourcing training related to integration to private companies (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 17). I have not been able to find results from the pilot scheme so they may not currently be available to the public.

Both the Finnish and Swedish policies emphasize the importance of exchange of information between ministries (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 11 (Section 36); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). But Finland’s policy contains a provision to set up a ‘Cooperating Body’ or a group of expert representatives from the various Finnish ministries tasked with integration, which is a more concrete measure to achieve the goal of interagency communication.

Both Finland and Sweden have processes for immigrants to obtain recognition of foreign degrees and qualifications (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 6 (Section 20); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 3). Sweden has taken advantage of this to a higher degree by identifying shortages of skilled personnel in health and medical sectors. Sweden has implemented a programme to identify immigrants who have experience in those sectors, identify any gaps in their skill sets and qualifications, arrange for supplementary education and training, and getting them to work (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 3).

Both policies mention curriculum standards (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 6 (Section 20); Regeringskansliet 2009a, 3). Finland’s National Board of
Education has developed standardized national core curricula for language training, and for literacy education (basic reading and writing skills). Language courses in Sweden utilize standardized learning goals and compulsory final tests. One of Sweden’s 2009 reforms was to introduce a monetary incentive for immigrants to successfully complete language training within a certain period of time (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 3). An evaluation of the programme found that the bonus did not improve grades or graduation rates very much outside of Stockholm. The bonus programme was stopped in 2014. (OECD 2014b, 8)

Sweden’s policy includes some specific integration measures that Finland’s does not, including combination work and language placements, known as “Step-in Jobs” that are meant to help immigrants apply and practice their Swedish language skills while gaining work experience; a personal “Introduction Guide” that immigrants could pick and who worked on a commission basis to mentor immigrants and help them find work; and provisions to offer salary subsidies to employers to entice them to hire immigrants (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 2). When immigrants first arrive in Sweden they also have an “introduction dialogue” to get them on board with resettlement around Sweden in an effort to prevent concentrations of immigrants in small geographical areas (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 2). However, the “Step-in Job” and the “Introduction Guide” programmes were discontinued after a few years because of evidence that they were ineffective at promoting employment (OECD 2014b, 12).

While the integration measures stated in the policies are similar, the more striking difference is in the administrative approach between Finland and Sweden. Two key ways in which the policies differs are in who it states has the primary responsibility for integration, and the level of detail about roles and responsibilities. Swedish policy states that “the state has a particular responsibility” for integration (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). The Swedish approach is that it is primarily the job of government to integrate newcomers. Finnish policy has a different tone. The Finnish Act says that the state will “provide services that encourage immigrants to acquire for themselves the skills and knowledge needed in society” (Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010, 1
(Section 3)). The onus is on the individual, not the government. Information about organizational structure and oversight is much more detailed in Finland’s integration policy. The Finnish act has a clear breakdown of responsibility, mentioning which organization is tasked with monitoring and following up depending on the situation and location. It emphasizes oversight and revision to adapt the integration measures based on evidence of how effective they are. It specifies funding sources and agency reporting requirements. Swedish policy has a more high-level, theoretical approach.

### 4.2 Comparison of Employment Data

The employment and unemployment rates of immigrants are considered by the EU to be statistical indicators of integration. The employment rate includes those who are engaged in full or part time gainful employment of any kind, including, for example, military service or a paid traineeship. The unemployment rate refers to those who are not engaged in gainful employment of any kind but who are actively looking for work. This does not include people who are neither employed nor actively job seeking, which is why the employment and unemployment rates are not proportional (Eurostat 2015).

According to the most recent available EU-LFS data, the employment rate in Finland among foreign born men rose from about 50% in 2000 to almost 70% in 2012. It also rose among foreign born women, from 39% in 2000 to about 56% in 2012. The unemployment rate among foreign born men decreased from over 36% in 2000 to about 15% in 2012. Among foreign born women it decreased from over 21% to 17%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment/population ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born men</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born men</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born women</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born men</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born men</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born women</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11. Labour market outcomes in Finland, 2000-2012 (OECD 2014a)*
In Sweden, the employment rate among foreign born men increased from about 60% in 2000 to 67.5% in 2012, and increased slightly among foreign born women, from just under 55% in 2000 to over 58% in 2012. The unemployment rate among foreign born men increased from 13.5% in 2000 to almost 17% in 2012. Among foreign born women unemployment also went up, from about 11% in 2000 to about 15% in 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment/population ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born men</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born men</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born women</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born men</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born men</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born women</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born women</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12. Labour market outcomes in Sweden, 2000-2012 (OECD 2014a)*

So, in Finland employment went up significantly, especially among foreign men, and unemployment went down. In Sweden, employment also went up, but so did unemployment (indicating a possible increase in part-time or sporadic work).

It’s important to keep in mind that employment and unemployment rates are a percentage of the whole group of immigrants. For example, in Sweden, between 2006 and 2012, 124,000 jobs were added. 113,000 of the new workers were foreign-born and 11,000 were born in Sweden. “This means that foreign born persons account for over 90 percent of the growth in employment over the past five years” (Statistics Sweden 2013, 128-129). This increase in employment isn’t immediately obvious in the employment rates because Sweden’s immigration rate is so high and the number of immigrants is constantly increasing, even as more immigrants enter the job market (Statistics Sweden 2013, 129).
However, that should not discount the significant jump in the employment rate and
decrease in unemployment among immigrants over the same time period in Finland,
whose immigration numbers have also been steadily increasing, though not at the same
volume as Sweden. Based on these statistical indicators, policies in both countries
appear to have had a positive impact on integration in the labour market.
5. Findings

The previous two chapters provided a discussion of Finland’s and Sweden’s experiences with immigration, a comparative analysis of the differences and similarities in their integration policies, and a secondary data analysis of employment integration indicators. Based on this research, the policies in both Finland and Sweden appear to have had a positive impact in promoting labour market integration. However, more could be done to boost employment. This chapter will distill my key findings, identify apparent best practices, and identify areas for improvement.

Increase communication with employers. Training programmes in Finland and Sweden are not sufficiently practical or applied. More effort should be made to consult with employers and trade unions about the needs of the labour market and how to make the hiring of immigrants more attractive. As Seppelin argues, integration programs should focus on the needs of the labour market and preparing immigrants for work (2010, 4).

More effort should be made to make employers aware of skill sets available among immigrants. “Employer demand for migrant skills is, in large part, limited by a lack of information about the skills of migrants. Better identification and selection of suitable migrant candidates may help overcome this” (OECD 2014b, 12).

Additionally, feelings of prejudice against hiring immigrants do not evaporate simply because of anti-discrimination policies. In spite of such policies in Sweden, Finland, and at the EU level, there are frequent complaints that employers mask discrimination to avoid punishment. A more proactive approach to make employers stakeholders in integration could help inform targeted vocational and skills training, and contribute to the erosion of prejudice.

Hiring regulations should be eased for employment schemes. Well-meaning regulations designed to protect workers can make it more difficult for new workers to enter and get a foothold in the labour market. For example, high starting salaries and a highly
regulated labour market make it difficult to transition into work (OECD 2014b, 18). Easing regulatory restrictions on employers, especially as part of integration employment schemes, would make hiring immigrants more attractive and feasible, especially for small businesses. For example, the conditions of certain Swedish pilot employment programmes were too stringent and set them up to fail. In Sweden’s “Step-in Jobs” programme, the government ostensibly subsidized 80% of the immigrant’s salary to entice employers to hire more immigrants. However, the subsidy was only available for a limited time and it was capped so low that it was only suitable for low-paying jobs. The employer was required to meet insurance obligations, and let participants attend language training during work hours. Only about half the target amount of jobs were added through this programme (OECD 2014b, 12).

**Increase oversight of immigrant job searches and offers.** Integration programmes in Finland and Sweden require immigrants to actively apply to jobs. However, some apply to jobs for which they know they are not qualified and they know they will not be hired. They apply anyway to meet minimum job search requirements. There should be enough oversight of job applications that the responsible agencies are able to identify when there is a pattern of unrealistic job applications with intent to deceive the system. Similarly, there should be more oversight for rejection of job offers. Up until the last year in Sweden, if an immigrant participating in an introduction programme received an “appropriate” job offer (meaning it was in line with the immigrant’s professional and academic background) and turned it down, there were no questions and no effect on benefits. According to an OECD report, a new rule introduced in August 2014 obliges immigrants participating in an introduction programme who receive a job offer appropriate for their skill and education level to accept it (2014b, 16).

**Volunteer work should be an option as part of an integration programme.** Volunteer work provides opportunities to practice language, expand social and professional networks, learn new skills, learn about work culture, and feel a sense of connection and contribution to society. Incorporating volunteer work or community service into integration programmes, at least as an option for immigrants, would benefit both them
and the local communities. It would increase the visibility of immigrants in society and create more opportunities for interaction between immigrants and Finns. NGOs could play a role in arranging volunteer work as an avenue for integration.

**Quality and availability of language training must be increased.** Lacking fluency in the local language makes it difficult to secure employment, and to develop personal and professional networks which aid in job searches. Availability of courses vary depending on location, but wait times for a place on a course are often long. Quality also varies depending on location.

Finland’s Future of Migration Strategy 2020 states that the quality of language instruction should be improved and curricula should provide “language training that meets the needs of working life” (Ministry of the Interior 2013, 19). Sweden has earmarked funds for this purpose in its 2015 budget. Approximately 10,000 immigrants who have already been granted residence permits are living in reception centers in Sweden while waiting for accommodation in a municipality. Sweden has allocated funds to assess and validate skills and education levels, and to start offering language training while immigrants are still waiting in reception centers (European Commission 2015b).

**Tailor introduction programmes more to immigrants’ skill and education levels.** An immigrant’s background (i.e., education level, work experience, language ability) affects his or her integration needs. The notion of separating immigrants into categories may run contrary to the values of equality and egalitarianism that are central to Finnish and Swedish culture. However, research indicates that ‘one-size-fits-all’-style introductory programmes that put all immigrants, regardless of cultural or educational background, through the same civic training and language courses have high drop out rates (Spencer 2006, 35). There should be more differentiation between immigrant groups in order to tailor training and address their specific needs more closely (Seppelin 2010, 4). For example, in language training, grouping participants who have low literacy skills with participants who have tertiary education can make it difficult for all
participants to learn (Heikkilä and Peltonen 2002, 7-8).

Standardize and speed up the process of obtaining recognition for qualifications and degrees earned abroad. Policy measures such as an established process for gaining recognition of degrees and qualifications have helped integrate highly-skilled immigrants into the labour market. However, such a recognition process so far only exists for certain prioritized sectors, such as healthcare (OECD 2014b, 6). If similar processes could be extended to more sectors, this would help immigrants who have already trained in a profession or obtained a foreign degree to enter the job market more quickly, and help cut down on underemployment by enabling immigrants to get jobs that match their qualifications and skill levels. The problem still exists that even when degrees and qualifications have been officially recognized, Finnish and Swedish employers still do not value them as highly as those earned at Finnish or Swedish institutions. This may only be remedied by time, as gradually more employers work with employees who received their education or training in another country, and by increasing communication with employers about immigrants’ skills and their needs, as mentioned in the first key finding.

Ensure integration measures have appropriate oversight and realistic conditions. Some of Sweden’s integration measures sound very innovative but fail due to poor structure and oversight. Sweden’s 2008 Strategy for Integration includes individual ‘introduction guides’ meant to help immigrants on a personal level to find work (Regeringskansliet 2009a, 1). Introduced in 2010, the guides would be paid on a commission basis for each immigrant they helped become employed. Complaints from immigrants about the comportment of the guides and “evidence of various forms of criminal activity among the guides” resulted in the Public Employment Service stopping this service in 2014. Since the service has been stopped, it does not appear in the policy comparison matrix but it is important to note that this particular approach was tried and apparently failed (European Commission 2015a).

The Swedish National Audit Office conducted an evaluation of the ‘introduction guide’
programme. It estimated the cost of the programme between 2011-2016 to be over 2.8 billion SEK, more than 300 million euros (Swedish National Audit Office 2014, 1). It found that there was too little oversight of the guides, the guides focused on socializing rather than the intended target of labour market integration, and evidence of the programme leading to increased employment levels was minimal (Swedish National Audit Office 2014, 2-3).

The clearer the policy, the better. One of the key differences between the integration policies of Finland and Sweden is the level of administrative detail. An act of government serves as a guide to the agencies responsible for carrying it out. The clearer a policy is, the greater likelihood it has for successful implementation. Clear roles and responsibilities, actionable goals and objectives, and specific reporting requirements minimize confusion between agencies about who is supposed to be doing what, and what they should be aiming for.
6. Conclusion

Integration policy reform in both Finland and Sweden have shifted the focus away from multiculturalism and the sheltering of ethnic identity toward the importance of socio-economic parity and the responsibilities of immigrants to participate. Multiculturalism influenced the creation of policy in both countries, but reforms over the years have resulted in a change in focus. Today, policy in Finland and Sweden emphasizes education, skills training, language attainment, and civic orientation (Geddes 2003, 124).

Integration is a complex, fluid process influenced by a multitude of factors. It can extend through not only the lifetime of individual immigrants but over generations. There are no shortcuts for quick and easy integration. However, the consensus among researchers is that employment is the most important factor in integrating immigrants into society. Integration programmes require significant investment of government resources and it is important to evaluate whether the resources are being put to good use. This thesis aimed to find out the similarities and differences between national level policy in Finland and Sweden related to immigrant integration in the labour market. It also aimed to see what employment indicator data said about the impact of those policies. A comparative policy analysis showed that the integration measures (i.e., what they do) are very similar, but there is a difference in administrative approach and oversight (i.e., how they do it). Finland’s policy emphasizes accountability and management of time and resources. Sweden’s policy emphasizes new, innovative ideas but it does not provide much information about implementation or oversight. A secondary analysis of employment data from the EU-LFS showed that immigrant employment rates have risen in both Finland and Sweden between the period of 2000-2012. Finland saw the most dramatic improvement. This indicates that integration policy is having a positive impact on labour market integration in both countries. It also indicates that Finland’s approach of providing clear guidance on roles, responsibilities, and oversight for the ministries responsible for implementing integration policy has had an additional impact on improving labour market integration.
Based on the research in this thesis, apparent best practices for integration include making policies actionable, increasing oversight of integration efforts, and trading ‘one-size-fits-all’ introduction programmes for programmes more tailored to immigrants’ educational and professional backgrounds. Areas in need of improvement include community engagement, and the quality and availability of language training. Making employers bigger stakeholders in integration by increasing their awareness of immigrant skill sets, and talking to them about their needs and the needs of the labour market could help improve training. Integration may become easier as access to language training improves, Finnish and Swedish society become more international, and employers become more open to foreign qualifications. But analysis in this thesis shows that the most important factor with the most immediate impact is that integration policy guidance is concrete and specific.

Immigration will always be a politically sensitive and divisive issue. Forecasts and statistical trends indicate that immigration is likely going to be a long-term issue in Europe (Council of the European Union 2004, 15). Changing demographics make it all the more pressing to tap in to the economic potential of immigrants. If immigrants can effectively integrate into the labour market, they represent a vast potential to shore up the economies of Finland and Sweden against the coming waves of pensioners.
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**Appendix: Policy Comparison Matrix**

This matrix shows a side by side comparison of the English versions of the national integration policies published by the governments of Finland and Sweden. Finland’s 2010 “Act on the Promotion of Immigrant Integration” is cited elsewhere in this thesis as “Ministry of Employment and the Economy 2010” and Sweden’s “Swedish Integration Policy Factsheet” is cited elsewhere in this thesis as “Regeringskansliet 2009a.” Since only two documents are compared here, the section numbers and page numbers will be provided for the source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Measure</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Policy Text</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Policy Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide general information and guidance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 7 (1) and Section 8</td>
<td>“Immigrants are provided with information about their rights and obligations in Finnish working life and society.” and “…provide immigrants with appropriate guidance and advice concerning measures and services promoting integration and working life”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td>“New Start Offices” offer support and guidance, including on entrepreneurship.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an initial assessment of education and skills to determine needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 9 (1)</td>
<td>“The initial assessment involves, to the extent necessary, the examination of the immigrant’s previous education, training, employment history and language skills”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 2</td>
<td>“The Swedish Migration Board surveys the education and work experience of asylum seekers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide civic orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 20 (1)</td>
<td>“Immigrants over the compulsory education age are, if necessary, provided with social, cultural and life management skills as part of integration training.”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 1</td>
<td>“New arrivals who have an introduction plan are to take part in civic orientation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supplementary basic education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 11 (2) and Section 20 (2)</td>
<td>“It may also be agreed that the integration plan includes teaching of the immigrant’s mother tongue, the teaching of reading and writing skills, studies complementing basic education.” and “The teaching of reading and writing skills is provided in accordance with the national core curriculum for illiterate adult immigrants drawn up by the National Board of Education.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supplementary higher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 21 (1)</td>
<td>“Integration training may also be arranged as self-motivated studies.”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 3</td>
<td>“Offering supplementary higher education courses for qualified individuals with experience in needed fields.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide language training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 20 (2)</td>
<td>“Finnish or Swedish courses are provided in</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 1</td>
<td>Language training with standardized learning goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accordance with the national core curriculum for the integration training of adult immigrants drawn up by the National Board of Education.”

<p>| Provide skills / vocational training for adults | X | Section 20 (1) | “Integration training may also include… vocational planning and career guidance.” | X | p. 3 | “Vocational training for adults.” |
| Development and monitoring of an integration plan | X | Section 11 (1) | “An integration plan is a personalised plan drawn up for an immigrant covering the measures and services.” | X | p. 1 | “… produce a personal introduction plan together with the new arrival. This plan is based on the individual’s previous education and work experience and should always contain courses in the Swedish language, civic orientation and employment preparation activities.” |
| Financial support while participating in integration measures | X | Section 19 (1) | “Integration assistance is financial support paid to an immigrant so that he/she has secure means of support for the duration of the participation in the measures carried out as part of the integration plan.” | X | p. 1 | “An introduction benefit that are equal for everyone regardless of where one lives will be introduced. This introduction benefit is paid to newly arrived immigrants who actively participate in introduction measures. The benefit is designed so that it pays the recipient to work alongside his or her introduction activities.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation support</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>p. 2</th>
<th>“…support re-settlement from municipalities receiving many immigrants to municipalities receiving fewer immigrants and where there is access to a good labour market. The individual is free to choose his or her place of residence, but is given the ability to access introduction activities that can lead to employment, sufficient income to support himself or herself and a good quality of life for the whole family.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer salary subsidies to entice employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 2</td>
<td>“New start jobs are subsidised employment introduced for individuals and groups who are particularly detached from the labour market.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance on starting a business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 2</td>
<td>Entrepreneur support (advisory services, mentoring, financing support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate qualifications obtained in another country</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 20 (1)</td>
<td>“Integration training may also include identification of previously acquired skills, recognition of qualifications and degrees.”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>p. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>