

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Statistics							
	Asylum arrivals, trend over time (see attached format)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp fall in 2016, continued low numbers Largest group of asylum seekers second half of 2018/2019: Turkey Quotas of UN refugees increased in 2019 (to 3000) Relocation of EU quota in 2017, 2018 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp fall in 2016, continued low numbers (decreasing) Main countries of origin 2018: Syria, Iraq 2nd, Iran 3rd Quotas of UN refugees increased in 2018 to 5000 Long processing times due to the large influx of asylum seekers in 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp fall in 2016, continued low numbers Largest group of asylum seekers second half of 2018/2019: Irak Quotas of UN refugees; Ministry of Interior proposed increased quota in 2019 (from 750 to 1050), Ministry of Finance refused Relocation from EU, Finland relocated according to the agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants for international protection in 2018 were of 70 nationalities. The total number of applications (800) was lower than in the past two years (2017: 1096 and 2016: 1133) About a quarter of applicants came from states in the list of safe countries of origin (193) The largest groups of applicants came from Iraq (112) and Albania (108) 73% of applicants were male and 27% female; 77% of applicants were adults and 23% under 18 years of age. Quotas of UN refugees increased in 2016 (56) and has remained similar since 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp drop in asylum applications from 2015→2016→2017 Stable number from 2017-2018 (3500 vs 3523) Large variance in recognition rates: 85% in 2015 to 36% in 2017 and 56% in 2018. Annual resettlement quota of 500/year dropped mid-2016; no resettlements in 2017 and 2018. 	<p>1. Sharp fall in asylum arrivals post 2015 2. UN Quota used actively 3. Marked variations in recog. Rates (SE 34, NO 69) 4.</p>
	Trend over time; arrivals of different categories of migrants (protection, families, labour, students)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downward trend in EEA labour migration Low numbers of asylum seekers Stable numbers of family migrants Overall immigration down EEA labor migration dominant post opening of EU labour market in 2002, increasing until 2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively low numbers of asylum seekers after 2015 Increase in family-related migration in 2017/2018 (permits granted) Overall immigration going down slightly Steady increase in labour migration since 2009 (sharp increase in 2018) Decrease in EU/EEA migration since 2012/2013 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour migration shows increasing trend, deliberate government policy Low number of asylum seekers Family migrants amongst the largest groups of migrants, stable number of them The immigration population has increased steady. The proportion of foreign students has remained stable over the past few years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower numbers of asylum seekers compared to 2017 and 2016 Increased number of applications for residence permits The total number of applications for first residence permits and renewals increased by 25% in 2016 and by another 25% in 2017. On January 1, 2018 there were 43,736 immigrants in Iceland or 12.6% of the population. This is an increase from last year when they were 10.6% of the population. Increase in family reunification of refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slight drop in family reunification from 2017 (7790) to 2018 (5233) Stable numbers of EU/EØS, labour and student migrants Significant positive trend in refugee and immigrant employment from 2016-2018 	<p>1. Family migrants up in SE and IC, stable in NO and SF and down in DK</p>

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Rules/policy areas							
	Description of overall design/ of current immigration regimes (post 2015, and beyond) (forward looking), One or two examples in brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New restrictive regime introduced post 2015 (implemented in 2016, 2017, 2018) Revival of cessation clauses with reference to 1951 Convention (Immigration Act 37 e), increasing the importance of "Landinfo" (Country of origin information) Increased emphasis on EU cooperation, external dimension, Dublin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Border controls introduced in December 2015, still partly in place (Öresund) New restrictive regime introduced summer 2016 by temporary law, will (with some exceptions) be prolonged for two years until 2021 Temporary residence permits, strict rules on family reunification, "applying minimum standards of EU and international law", fewer grounds for subsidiary protection and humanitarian grounds only applicable if otherwise a violation of Sweden's international obligations (Section 11 of temporary law on residence permits) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictive policies introduced as regards asylum seekers post 2015, implemented continuously In 2018, a new Government Migration Policy Programme to strengthen Labour Migration was accepted Emphasis on EU cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New legislation on foreigners in 2016 written by a cross-party committee of parliamentarians Increased emphasis on assessing individual needs of asylum seekers and improving reception conditions. Increased emphasis on EU cooperation and Dublin Emphasis on fast track procedures and safe countries of origin. Rights of stateless persons, f.ex for international protection Multiple changes, most of them of restrictive nature, to the legislation since it came into force 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of indirect deterrence measures post-2015 Expansion of measures to restrict access to family reunification Establishment and continuation of intra-EU border control post-2015 Emphasis on national measures and bilateral arrangements as opposed to international cooperation 	<p>1. Strict regimes introduced post 2015 2. Border controls (SE, DK, NO, SF) 3. Re-nationalization and EU cooperation (exception DK), all participate in EU external dimension (DK?) 4. Towards minimum standards (SE, DK).</p>
	Changes in rights for persons with UN refugee status (eg. family reunification)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention status refugees now (from 2018) have shorter grace period to apply for family reunification (from 12 til 6 months) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary residence permits for Convention refugees (3 years, only exception quota refugees) Restrictions on right to family reunification: only for established relationships, only if the refugee is "likely to be granted a permanent residence permit", stricter maintenance requirements, different rules on family reunification depending on when the refugee applied for asylum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appeal times in asylum matters have been reduced The right to a legal aid counsel has been restricted The grounds for a leave to appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court have been tightened The principles of remuneration to legal aid counsels have been altered Family reunification requirements have been tightened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New requirements for family reunification and family formation (in 2016) e.g. four year waiting/qualification period for new family members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending Bill to introduce shorter duration of residence permits Pending Bill to introduce basis for emergency cap on family reunification Pending Bill to further reduce cash benefits 	

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Rules/policy areas							
	Changes in rights for persons with subsidiary protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased requirements for family reunification and family formation (in 2017, 2018), e.g. age requirement, four year waiting period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary residence permits (13 months), very limited possibilities to family reunification (only possible if otherwise a violation of Sweden's international obligations, Section 13 of the temporary law on residence permits) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appeal times in asylum matters have been reduced The right to a legal aid counsel has been restricted The grounds for a leave to appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court have been tightened The principles of remuneration to legal aid counsels have been altered Family reunification requirements have been tightened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for UN refugee status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending Bill to introduce shorter duration of residence permits Pending Bill to introduce basis for emergency cap on family reunification Pending Bill to further reduce cash benefits 	Susidiary protection: 1. increased requirements for family reunification, including income requirements, age, waiting periods.
	Changes in conditions for unaccompanied minors and young migrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary protection for UAMs from ages 16-18 (then expected to return) Government "backtrack" for a limited group of UAM from Afghanistan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of age assessments Temporary legislation specifically directed at UAMs having arrived while minors but which have turned 18 during the process ("gymnasielagen") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appeal times in asylum matters have been reduced The grounds for a leave to appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court have been tightened The principles of remuneration to legal aid counsels have been altered Family reunification requirements have been tightened Short residence permits to UMAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis on the rights of the child through out the legislation and in practice Has been criticized for not being properly applied. Family of a child under the age of 18 are in some cases entitled to international protection depending on the best interest of the child. 		UAM: 1. Temorary permits until 18 (NO, SE), 2. Increased age assessment (SE), 3. Shorter appeal times (SF)
	Revocation/cessation, recent practices, national ambitions of increased use?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revocation ("tilbakekall") is key priority for Norwegian government, new resources Clause on cessation ("opphør") of refugee permits during first three years due to changes in home country Certain groups (Somalis and Afghans) are targeted High volume 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not really in focus in the Swedish context (to my knowledge) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions about revocation/cessation in connection to asylum seekers that have committed crimes 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revocation of residence permits due to changed situation in home country, p.t. Somalia, has been a priority matter in recent years and is expected to continue as result of political agreement on 'paradigm change' in Danish asylum policy 	Revocation: 1. Hot topic in NO and DK. Not in IC, SF, SE. 2. Certain groups singled out for cessation - i.e. Somalis in NO and DK. TREND? Spread to SF, SE and IC?

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Rules/policy areas							
	Irregular migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable estimates on number of migrants in Norway without permits Norway participates in EU external dimension initiatives, stemming irregular migration e.g. in North Africa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of irregular migrants in Sweden is estimated to have increased due to stricter asylum rules Irregular migrants have the right to health care and education (different rules for adults and children) but implementation is inconsistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growing concern about the number of irregular migrants in Finland 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few estimates of irregular migrants in DK Significant number of persons in removal centres absconding; assumption that they leave for other EU member states. 	Irregular migrants: 1. On the agenda in SE, previously in NO and not in DK. 2. In SF growing concern. 3. Rights for irregular migrants a topic in NO and SE
	EU migrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falling numbers of EU labor migrants over the last three years Population has positive view of Polish migrants (by far the most numerous group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor EU migrants (mostly of the Roma community) begging in the streets is considered a big problem all over the country, local attempts at prohibiting begging Cooperation with countries of origin (Romania, Bulgaria) not very successful Attitudes towards this group increasingly negative compared to a few years back 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falling number of EU migrants the latest years; Estonians the biggest group of EU migrants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Polish migrants the most numerous group of the increasing group of immigrants in Iceland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No general controversies, apart from restrictive response to instances with homeless EU migrants and to Danish citizens' invocation of EU law to secure residence in Denmark for third country family members 	EEA migrants: 1. In NO positive view 2. fewer arrivals SF, NO, 3. In SE Roma, beggars, negative trend - attitudes, 4. more arrivals in DK
	Return and readmission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return and assisted voluntary return are key priorities for the Norwegian government With fewer arrivals, numbers of returns are down Returning to Kabul, stating internal flight alternative Government sets target number for forced returns Strong focus on readmission agreements, tilt towards informal agreements/arrangements with third countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number on forced returns Returns to Afghanistan, also for young adults who have spent most of their lives in Iran 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return and assisted voluntary return important for the government Returns still higher than before 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration a priority but has been difficult in practice. Same applies to forced returns as the numbers of asylum seekers are limited and therefore quite costly to return. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Returns a priority issue for DK government Emphasis is on "motivational measures" limiting rights in order to induce voluntary returns; yet little to support that these have the intended effect – analysis of residents at one centre the last two years show that more people end up getting residence permits in DK than return to countries of origin Vice versa, same analysis shows that a large number of people in return position abscond from the removal centres – investigative journalism reports suggest that they apply for asylum in other EU countries, in some cases successfully. Within recent years upgrading of readmission efforts with special ambassador and liaison officers appointed for this issue at the MfA and dedicated unit working on this at Ministry of Immigration. 	1. return priority in all countries, 2 all but ic return to afgh, 3. difficult to motivate for AVR, 4. focus on readmission (NO, DK, SF)

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Rules/policy areas							
	Temporary permits (including effects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often UAM aged 16-18 get temporary permits until they turn 18, then expected to return General ambition to let the first three years be de facto temporary Immigration authorities must review after three years whether cessation/return is possible, and screen for revocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary residence permit is now the main rule for individuals who are assessed under the temporary law (as stated above)- the law applies to those who sought asylum after 24th November 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UAM get often temporary permits, then expected to return 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A residence permit for refugees are granted for a period of four years and may be renewed after that period, unless conditions are for withdrawing it a refusing to renew for example if necessary for the security of the state or public interest. Refugees can also, conditions met, after 4 years applied for a permanent residence permit. The first four years are de facto temporary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General emphasis on temporariness in political debate; new temporary category of asylum (mainly aimed at Syrians) introduced and length of residence permits shortened for other categories. For temporary asylum category, residence permit is one year, after that extendable by two years; forcing immigration authorities to regularly review cases Since 2017, immigration authorities have further revoked nearly 1000 residence permits for Somali refugees and their dependents 	1. Increased use of TP, 2. Focus on UAM (NO, SF), 3. part of political debate (DK, NO), towards tp as default in Nordics?
	Family migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of changes since post 2015, including age requirement (24 y), four year quarantine, and reduced "exempt-window" for refugees (from 12 to 5 months) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasingly strict regulations, in particular for those applying for family reunification with refugees/subsidiary protection status (see above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant changes post 2015; reduced exempt-window for refugees; income requirements for persons with subsidiary protection Income requirements apply also to children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New legislation on foreigners (2016) introduces multiple changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional restrictions adopted in 2016-2018, clearly aiming at reducing access to family reunification for 'non-western' immigrants 	Clampering down on this category of migrants across the Nordics
	Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensified qualification measures Individualized integration program (not working) Continued geographical dispersion policy of approved asylum seekers, securing non-concentration for first five years after approval Super reception centres (Integreringsmottak) – specialized centres for qualified/motivated asylum seekers 	<p><i>Not my field of expertise, will have to look into it further</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individualized integration program (works to some extent) Problems with employment, language skills, with racism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newly introduced plans from the ministry of social affairs for uniform and improved reception of refugees (both asylum seekers and quota refugees) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since 2016 more cooperation with employers in terms of organizing e.g. language training and new "integrationsgrunduddannelse" allowing for employment of refugees and family reunified persons at lower "internship" salaries with a view to re-/up-qualification of skills Since 2018 focus on "ghetto areas"; policies include tearing down older social housing complexes, changed allocation practices at municipalities, lower social welfare rates for persons living in these areas, increased penal brackets for certain forms of crime committed in these areas and compulsory public daycare for children living in these areas 	1. Individualized qualification programs (SF, DK, SE?), 2, racism SF, 3. Ghetto areas, DK

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Rules/policy areas							
	Consequences of current regimes (individual, societal and for immigration management), perspectives and trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trend towards emphasis on national self-interest (rather than rights), 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong focus on “not going back to previous policy” and on harmonization with EU policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasis on national self-interest and economic sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New legislation was ambitious and set with cross-political references. Much was referred to human rights and the legislation had to be rights-oriented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trend towards economic and managerial logics at the expense of normal rule of law principles 	<p>1. National self interest (general, + NO, + DK) (sustainability), 2. Solutions at EU level (NO, SE, SF), 3, temporariness DK, NO, 4. No way back (SE) / paradigm shift (DK), 5. Less focus on individual rights 6. Switch to quota (SF, NO, not DK).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Towards a temporary regime, externalization of borders, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current temporary law is likely to be made permanent to some extent – new parliamentary inquiry to present suggestions before 2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of rights is downplayed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the same time there was an increase in the reception of quota refugees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trend towards temporariness for all types of refugees 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Switch from asylum seekers to quota refugees (and talk of a limit on the total aggregate number) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some discussion on externalization and on the scope of the right to seek asylum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common European solutions also emphasized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The experience of the new legislation varies, and Parliament has had to make changes to make certain provisions work as planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concurrent focus on quota refugees despite lower number of spontaneous asylum-seekers 	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions on a switch from asylum seekers to quota refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been criticized that various provisions provided for by law have not yet been implemented. 		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certain groups feared that the new legislation would lead to an increase in asylum applications, but this does not seem to be the case. However, there seems to be an increase in family unions that could potentially result in negative feedback. 			

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Discourses	(What has received attention over the past three years?)						
	Dominant topics in media and academia (2018/2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability and cost of immigration (absorption) (media) Migration management in Europe (Norway's role) – Mediterranean trends Immigration and the welfare state (academia) The migration – integration nexus Revocation (including citizenship) Immigration and crime Labour Party's restrictive migration management program (e.g. EU camps in North Africa/third countries) Asylum seekers versus quota refugees Discourse on intolerant aspects of Islam/Muslim practice/Isilamsism (gender equality) Negative social control in immigrant communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migration management on the EU level and harmonization and burden-sharing ("Sweden should not do more than its fair share") "What will a new migration policy include" Immigration and the welfare state The cost of migration (in certain media) Failed integration and its consequences, including crime UAM-s, Afghans in particular, and Sweden's responsibility towards them Increased pressure on immigrants to integrate (talk of language test etc.) Negative social control in certain areas, gender aspects in particular Honour crime Incorporation of the CRC and the rights of asylum seeking children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migration management in Europe, Mediterranean situation Cost of immigration, in connection to welfare state services Immigration and crime Government's restrictive asylum policies inside and outside Finland Muslims and gender equality The role of populist parties in designing the immigration policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerable applicants for protection and immigrants (academia and media) Immigration and crime (academia and media) Integration (academia) Discourse on intolerant aspects of Islam/Muslim practice/Isilamsism (gender equality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migration and asylum a dominant theme in political debates both prior to and post 2015 Several political parties have launched significant political reform programmes in the area of asylum and immigration Use of language concerning "paradigm change" across several political parties Significant political debate about Global Migration Compact; DK PM ultimately signed it. 	<p>1. Global Compact on migration - hefty debates (DK, NO, 2. Islam and intolerance (IC, SF, SE, NO), 3. Sustainability and the welfare state (NO, SE, SF SE (DK)), 4. Immigration and crime. 5. Negative social control / honor</p>
	Depiction of/ understandings of challenges connected with immigration, arrivals, composition, policies and experiences (incl. Integration)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fears of politicians is that failed integration may create: increased tension between immigrant groups and majority population ("svenske tilstander") Be unsustainably economic burden long term (expensive) Youth crime, gangs (including second generation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Segregation within/between communities, cities, schools etc, increased criminality) Unsatisfactory border controls Lack of quality in Migration Agency processes and decisions, jeopardizing legitimacy of decisions and the legal rights of the individual (rättssäkerheten) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asylum seekers are seen as economic burden Labour related immigration is seen as crucial for filling the sustainability gap (ageing population) Sexual criminality Problems with gender equality; risk that the newcomers do not understand or respect 'Finnish values' Marginalization of young men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unsustainably economic burden long term of refugees and their families (especially vulnerable individuals). Connected to the emphasis on integration and creating valuable members of society. Strain on the welfare system and services in municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic burden on welfare state Increased crime Lack of integration and assimilation to Danish culture 	<p>1. Divided on challenges - SE more system / majority, 2. SF, NO, DK, IC : crime 3. Economic burden, 4. Culture, values (DK, SF)</p>

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark	Comparative analysis
Discourses	(What has received attention over the past three years?)						
	Suggested causes of these challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregation, • Lack of first generation integration • Welfare state not designed to absorb non-natives (competence levels, language) • Composition of competence of immigrants • High number of asylum arrivals during certain periods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed integration • Long processing times have negative effects on the individuals and how they can begin integrating into Swedish society • Too many asylum seekers in a certain period of time • Negative attitudes towards immigrants • Insufficient resources for the Migration Agency and the border police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural differences, particularly as regards religion and gender • Welfare state guarantees certain services and rights to all, creates tensions when economy is not strong • Many asylum seekers have poor education, difficulties to catch up and get a job • High number of asylum seekers in 2015 created a panic that still continues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear roles of government vs. municipalities • No long term plan for migration in Iceland • Composition of competence of immigrants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregation • "ghetto" areas • Lack of job opportunities/matching of competencies (despite statistics showing improved labour market integration) • Uncertainty regarding future asylum numbers 	Segregation, failed integration, ghettos, competence, high numbers, negative attitudes (SE), welfare state,
	Suggested solutions/measures/programs of action, .e. what is needed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict asylum policies, • Strict family immigration regulation • Intensified integration measures • Stricter conditions for permanent residency and citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus and funding on border control • Being tougher on crime/organized crime in certain areas • Teaching "Swedish values" • Making the temporary law permanent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict asylum policies, more open labour immigration policies • Strict family immigration regulation • Intensified integration measures • Stricter conditions for permanent residency and citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing two different discourses – one believing there is need for strict policies and national interests then those that want to focus on human rights. Politicians want to analyze what the Icelandic society needs and how that can be made compatible with human rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trend towards political rationale involving: • National political actions as opposed to multilateral policymaking • Temporary stay for all types of refugees, including existing groups of resettled refugees • As a result of B, focus on non-integration and specialist tracks for asylum-seekers and recognized refugees. 	1. National solutions (DK), 2. Strict fam reunificaiton, 3. Values (including Swedish)., 4. stricter policies, 5. Split public (IC) 6. temporary stay
	Ideal societal situation/goal (is this formulated?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neo - assimilation strategy • Maintain universal welfare state rights (not split between newly arrived and others) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seldom articulated, but government's aim is to support labour migration and control asylum • Important also to bring asylum costs under control and to integrate effectively those who have been granted asylum 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clash between liberal market-driven labour integration strategy and non-integration strategy de facto limiting all refugees from access to regular labour market, housing and education 	

	Topic	Norway	Sweden	Finland	Iceland	Denmark
Discourses	(What has received attention over the past three years?)					
	Taboo concepts and topics (words, phrases that can not be used)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-culturalism (government encourage difference) Cultural relativism Race (Racism) Anti-democracy, promote gender inequality 	<p>Depends on who you ask! Many argue that there a lot of things you cannot say in Sweden (for fear of not being PC) but those who complain often have very good platforms from which to express their views. Debates however have become increasingly polarized, not least in 2018 and the months leading up to the September elections. The Being blatantly racist is still taboo.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paperless; government encourages to skip that concept 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally very few. "Nazi" might be one example.
	Perspectives on immigration and crime, examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immigrant over-representation in certain categories of crime Violent crime instances among newly arrived UAM (Alta and Trondheim 2018) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some focus on honour crime UAM-s and sexual offences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immigrant over-representation in certain property crimes, violent crimes and sexual offences In property crimes and assaults the victim is often another immigrant, in sexual offences Finnish minors are over-represented (cases in Oulu, Helsinki 2018) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public and media discourse on crime generally not hostile towards immigrants. Individual crime instances, including immigrants, have not caused public alarm or anti-immigrant sentiments. Foreigners over-represented in prisons (15-20 percent of inmate population) about half being transit visitors. Statistics on local crime and immigrants not included in published crime statistics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immigrants over-represented in regard to certain forms of crime Significant increase in labour market integration for refugees and other groups of migrants; though still gap between these groups and Danish citizens in general