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**Abstract**

*Comparative statistics on immigration and integration is of great interest to policy makers, researchers, the media and the general public in the Nordic countries. The Nordic statistical offices are in a unique position with access to administrative data that can be used to produce detailed statistics on the demography and living conditions of the immigrant population in the region. However, different concepts and definitions make cross-country comparisons difficult. Also, harmonizing data for comparative purposes is challenging. The available data on immigrants and their integration in the Nordic countries has so far been fragmented, and previous attempts to develop this area have not ended up with harmonized, updatable data sets. The paper will present a joint project on harmonization of register-based data on migration and integration in all the Nordic countries. For the first time, there is detailed comparative data available on this topic in a new database. Our paper will present the work of the project as well as the statistics and some of the results from the database. The new database includes 11 database tables on demography, education and employment of immigrants and their descendants in all the Nordic countries. The topics include, among others, level of education, drop-out rate from secondary education, employment rate, and NEET rate (not in employment, education or training) for young people. The plan is to update the data annually, so that longitudinal analyses will be possible. Our paper will also describe the harmonizing work regarding the concepts and definitions that was done during the project. The project has been funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers and implemented by the five Nordic national statistical institutes. Further development of the database is considered, where new possible subjects could be to further explore statistics on income, occupation, and demographic development.*
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# Introduction

Over the last decades the Nordic countries have experienced a large growth in the number of migrants coming to the region and migration has been the single most important driving force behind population change. The corresponding growth in the immigrant populations in the Nordic countries has also led to an increased interest in how migrants fare in the region and how they integrate into the Nordic societies. In this paper we present a joint project – between the Nordic NSIs - on how to improve the available data on migration and integration in the region through harmonizing register-based data on migration and integration in the Nordic countries. These are all based on data from the Nordic NSIs where definitions and standards have been harmonized. For the first time, there is detailed comparative data available on this topic in a new statistical database. Using the available register data at the national level, the national statistical institutes (NSIs) in the Nordic countries; Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden have, on earlier occasions, attempted to compare statistics on migration and integration with regards to education and employment among resident immigrants and their descendants. Comparative measures have been prepared and presented by the NSIs in connection with the annual Nordic government officials meeting on integration. However there has not been established a mechanism for continued updates of data in this area, thus the purpose of this project has been to build on the previous efforts to harmonize integration measures, improve the measures further, and for the first time establish a routine for annual updates. Furthermore, to publish the harmonized immigration and integration measures on a common platform. The results have been made available at the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) website <https://www.nordicstatistics.org/>.

# Why a Nordic database?

The Nordic NSIs, all have a substantial international reporting of statistics on migration and integration of migrants, either through the EU/EEA-related reporting to Eurostat, to OECDs International Migration Outlook and to different databases within the UN-system. These are all important reporting mechanisms and combined they provide a good overview and possibility for general comparisons between countries – also for the Nordic region. However, these are reporting mechanisms that only to a limited degree use administrative sources, especially for statistics on the living conditions of migrants. There are few other countries in the world that have the possibility to link data from the population register to other administrative sources, such as labour or education registers, hence for other countries, the statistics on migrant’s performance in the labour market or in education is based on household surveys. For instance, Eurostat’s data on integration come mainly from the EU labour force survey (EU-LFS) and the EU statistics on income and living conditions survey (EU-SILC), and are only to a limited degree complemented by administrative data sources.

This was part of the background for why a Nordic system for comparisons of data was needed. The Nordic NSIs are uniquely positioned with access to administrative data – and the possibility to link these data - that can be used to produce detailed statistics on the demography and living conditions of the immigrant population in the region. The richness of these data – and the possibility to give detailed statistics on different groups in society is a major advantage of the linked register system. This is especially true for statistics on the migrant population where there are huge differences – both on the demography and on living conditions - between different country backgrounds. Such details are not available in the LFS or in the SILC, simply because the sample size is not big enough (Eurostat 2019). Earlier, there has been done some attempts of Nordic comparisons, most notably Svenska regeringskansliet (2013) and Pettersen and Østby (2013). However, these projects did not cover all Nordic countries and have not later been updated with new figures. The database is well suited for longitudinal studies. So far, the statistical bank tables only have observations for one year, but when the database is expanded with additional data it will be possible to follow cohorts of migrants and their children and see how they integrate in the Nordic societies over time.

# What are the challenges when making comparisons?

The Nordic countries all have similar systems where the general population and migration statistics are based on data from a central population register. However, the definitions that are used to define foreign background differ between the different countries. For instance, in the official statistics Sweden uses the term “foreign-born”, whereas Norway and Denmark also consider the country of birth of the parents of a person when defining who is a migrant. The different definitions have observable consequences. For instance, there were 1,784 million foreign born residing in Sweden on 31 December 2016 whereas if you apply the definition used in Norway, where the parents also must be foreign-born, the number is reduced to 1,687 million.

It should be added that only few countries have register information about parent’s country of birth, hence the most commonly used international definition of a ‘migrant’ is to refer to the ‘foreign born population’, however the Nordic population registers all have this information available, hence for the purpose of this project we have chosen to use the definition ‘foreign-born with two foreign-born parents’. To compare, the definitions and categories need to be the same, hence identifying a set of common definitions has been central to this project. The most important was to agree on how to classify the population by ‘immigrant background’. For this classification we ended up with using the following three categories; Foreign born with two foreign born parents, in the following text this category is also referred to as migrants, Descendants (native-born with two foreign-born parents) and ‘Rest of the Population’.

Country background is defined in the following way in the database: Foreign-born with two foreign-born parents = their own country of birth. Descendants = mother's country of birth, or father's country of birth if mother's is unknown. Rest of the population = Reporting country i.e. one or both parents' country of birth is the reporting country. In addition, there are different ways to group countries/world regions where we have agreed on a uniform approach.

The Nordic countries have different requirements for who counts as a resident, these are for instance 6 months in Norway. A year in Sweden, 3 months for non-EU citizens in Denmark and 6 months for EU citizens. This is an area where data have not been harmonised.

# Which areas are compared?

The work of the project has resulted in 11 new tables that have been made available at the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) website <https://www.nordicstatistics.org/>. All tables contain the harmonised variable population category which divides the domestic population in the Nordic countries into foreign-born with two foreign-born parents (immigrants), descendants and Rest of population. The foreign-born and descendants populations can be broken further down by country background. Country background distributes on a broad level all foreign-born and descendants by region for example EU28/EEA or Rest of Europe. It is also possible to distribute the immigrant and descendent populations by individual country background for example Poland or Afghanistan. However the distribution on individual country background is only available for the 20 largest immigrant populations across all the Nordic countries. This limit has been set, as the size of the individual immigrant populations by county background varies in the Nordic countries.

The 11 new tables cover three main areas. That is demographic-, education- and employment statistics. The main demographic table breaks down the population further by sex and age which provides the basic conditions for analyzing differences and similarities of the composition of the immigrant population in the Nordic countries. The demographic tables also provide data on the immigrant population by length of stay in the reporting country which illustrates that the Nordic countries has varying historical experience with different immigrant groups. Finally the demographic tables also provide data on immigrants from outside EU/EEA countries by residence permit. This table clarifies the composition of the immigrant population by refugees, labour immigrants and students etc. From an analytical point of view data on residence permit is an important data source as it gives information on the accrual reason for migration. For example it reveals if the migrant has immigrated due to conflicts or for economic reasons. This is a useful variable to take into account when measuring integration into society – for example when employment rate is examined. However the tables on residence permits are only available for Norway and Sweden as these where the only countries that had adequate data on residence permits when the project was launched. Denmark did not provide data on residence permits as there was an ongoing domestic project with improving information on residence permits at the time when this project was launched. However for future comparative studies on immigration, data on residence permits should have a central position as these data provides unique information.

The education tables first and foremost provide data on the education attainment for the immigrant population. This can be considered as an important measure of the integration potential among immigrants as employment rate often goes hand in hand with educations capabilities. The educations statistics also covers data on the share immigrants with at least two years of stay in the reporting country that is enrolled in upper secondary and tertiary education. In a comparative context this statistics draws attention to the differences between the native and the migrant population but also reveals differences between the Nordic countries regarding the amount of EU/EEA immigrants who study in the individual Nordic countries. This is an interesting perspective as it draws attention to possible differences in push and pull effects between the Nordic countries in regard to attract international students.

Lastly the employment tables provide information on employment rate for immigrants which can be considered as one of the most important measures for integration. In a domestic context the data on employment rate shows differences between the immigrant population and the native population. However when used in a comparative context the data also provides the opportunity to make a relative comparison as it is possible to examine this difference between immigrants and the native population in one Nordic country compared to the difference between immigrants and the native population in other countries. This can give a hint of whether one county is more successful than others when it comes to integrating immigrants on the labor market. However it is important to be aware of the fact that this measure does not take into account differences in economic growth, various structures in the labor market, differences in integration policies and the composition of the immigrant population between the Nordic countries. These are all important factors that influences on immigrants employment rate and they should be taken into consideration when data is interpreted. Finally the employment tables also focus its attention on the young immigrants and descendants. This is done by examining the share of 20-29 year old which are neither in employment nor education. This is a useful integration measure as it draws attention to integration challenges for the youth across the Nordic countries.

# Examples of statistics that can be compared

The following section focuses on some of the results that have come out of the project. Initially the focus will be on demographic composition across the Nordic countries and the employment rate and education enrollment among immigrants. Subsequently the focus will be directed towards the descendants and the specific characteristics of this group.

## 4.2 million immigrants and descendants in the Nordic countries

The data shows that the number of immigrants and descendants in the Nordic countries is 4.2 million (including about 450,000 internal Nordic immigrants and descendants). This corresponds to 16 percent of the total population in the Nordic countries. However there is difference in how much of the population immigrants and descendants make up to in the individual Nordic countries. For example, the proportion of immigrants and descendants is highest in Sweden with approximately 22 percent while the lowest share is found in Finland with around 7 percent.

*Figure 1 - Immigrants and descendants in the Nordic countries. 2017*



Source: Table CITI03 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

In Denmark, Sweden and Norway the two largest groups of immigrants and descendants have background in EU/EEA countries and Asia. These two groups accounts for the vast majority of immigrants and descendants in Denmark (71 percent), Sweden (56 percent) and Norway (65 percent). Norway has a smaller proportion of immigrants and descendants from Asia than Denmark and Sweden, but a larger proportion of immigrants and descendants from EU/EEA compared to Denmark and Sweden.

*Figure 2 – Composition of immigrants and descendants in the Nordic countries by region. 2017*



Note: EU28/EEA are exclusive the nordic counties

Source: Table CITI03 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

Finland has a rather large amount of immigrants and descendants from European countries outside EU/EEA. This is due to the fact that in Finland many people from Russia and the former Soviet Union reside in Finland. Iceland differs from the other Nordic countries in that almost two out of three immigrants and descendants come from other EU/EEA countries.

Broken down by country background it is seen that Iceland is largely influenced by immigration from Poland, Lithuania and Germany. In contrast Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland there are also many immigrants and descendants from typical refugee countries.

Sweden´s largest group of immigrants and descendants from a typical refugee country comes from Iraq followed by Syria. In Norway the largest group of immigrants and descendants from a typical refugee country has background in Somalia. In Denmark immigrants and descendants from Syria constitutes the largest group from a typical refugee country, and they are almost all immigrated following the refugee crises in 2015. That is why descendants only make up a small part of the group. In 2014 there were approximately 8000 people in Denmark with background in Syria while the number was around 38.000 in 2017.

*Table 1 Top 10 – immigrants and descendants in the Nordic countries by country background. 2017*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Denmark** |  |  | **Sweden** |  |  | **Norway** |  |  | **Finland** |  |  | **Iceland** |  |
| Turkey | 61 603 |  | Finland | 226 823 |  | Poland | 108 255 |  | Sovjet union | 65 889 |  | Poland | 15 828 |
| Poland | 44 722 |  | Iraq | 188 024 |  | Lithuania | 42 491 |  | Estonia | 50 545 |  | Lithuania | 2 111 |
| Syria | 37 684 |  | Syria | 173 377 |  | Somalia | 41 463 |  | Somalia | 18 254 |  | Philippines | 1 954 |
| Germany | 33 384 |  | Poland | 106 333 |  | Sweden | 39 266 |  | Iraq | 17 369 |  | Germany | 1 258 |
| Iraq | 31 657 |  | Jugoslavia | 105 433 |  | Pakistan | 36 700 |  | Russia | 13 274 |  | Thailand | 1 153 |
| Romania | 26 531 |  | Iran | 89 393 |  | Iraq | 32 304 |  | Jugoslavia | 10 913 |  | Latvia | 974 |
| Lebanon | 26 240 |  | Somalia | 89 189 |  | Germany | 27 593 |  | China | 10 705 |  | United Kingdom | 902 |
| Pakistan | 24 139 |  | Turkey | 78 704 |  | Eritrea | 23 618 |  | Vietnam | 9 979 |  | Vietnam | 880 |
| Bosnia-Herz. | 22 935 |  | Bosnia-Herz.. | 77 967 |  | Philippines | 22 892 |  | Thailand | 9 308 |  | USA | 837 |
| Somalia | 20 652 |  | Germany | 57 531 |  | Vietnam | 22 658 |  | Turkey | 8 572 |  | Portugal | 765 |
| Others | 408 137 |  | Others | 1 029 918 |  | Others | 486 511 |  | Others | 149 979 |  | Others | 13 808 |
| **Total** | **737 684** |  | **Total** | **2 222 692** |  | **Total** | **883 751** |  | **Total** | **364 787** |  | **Total** | **40 470** |

Source: Table CITI03 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

Note: For Sweden data refers to the 31. December 2016.

Immigrants from Poland make up a large part of the immigrant population in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Iceland. It is worth noting that there is twice as many poles in Norway as in Denmark. This may be due to a positive economic growth in Norway, which may have attracted many labor market immigrants from eastern European EU-countries. The majority of Polish immigrants and descendants in Sweden and Denmark are also work immigrants, but some are also political refugees who immigrated before the collapse of the Soviet Union (Nordic Economic Policy Review 2017 and The Rockwool Foundation 1999).

**5.2 Many immigrants from other Nordic countries are enrolled in tertiary education in Denmark**

There is a relatively large difference between 20-24 years old immigrants that is enrolled in tertiary education in the Nordic countries. The highest proportion is found in Denmark where 34 percent of the 20-24 year old immigrants are enrolled in tertiary education. Norway has the second highest amount with 24 percent while Sweden has the lowest amount with approximately 18 percent.

*Table 2 Immigrant between 20 and 24 years in the nordic countries enrolled in tertiary education by region. 2016*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Finland |
|  | percent | | | | |
| **Immigrant total** | **34** | **18** | **24** | **21** |
| Nordic countries | 49 | 32 | 27 | 17 |
| EU/EEA | 42 | 24 | 24 | 14 |
| Rest of Europe | 30 | 23 | 35 | 31 |
| Africa | 25 | 10 | 18 | 6 |
| Asia | 27 | 18 | 25 | 23 |
| North America and Oceania | 16 | 32 | 42 | 30 |
| South and Central America | 20 | 17 | 25 | 20 |

In particular immigrants from other Nordic countries and EU/EEA countries are enrolled in tertiary education in Denmark. A total of 49 percent of the 20-24 year old immigrants from other Nordic countries and 42 percent of the EU/EEA immigrants are enrolled in tertiary education in Denmark. This is significantly higher than in the other Nordic countries. One possible explanation for this could be that Denmark has a favorable supporting system for tertiary students in a Nordic context.

## Lower employment rate among immigrants from Africa and Asia in all Nordic countries

Immigrants are employed to a lesser extent than the rest of the population in all four Nordic countries where data on employment is available, i.e. Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. The share of employed among immigrants differ between the countries. In 2016, the share was close to 65 percent in Norway, around 60 percent in Denmark and Sweden and slightly more than 50 percent in Finland. At the same time, the share employed among the rest of the population, i.e. neither immigrants nor descendants, is lower in Finland than in the other countries, which may indicate a less favorable labor market situation in general. The share employed among the rest of the population was just over 70 percent in Finland, compared to around 80 percent in Denmark and Norway and close to 85 percent in Sweden.

The level of employment among immigrants depend on for example gender, age, country background, reason for immigration, years of residence and level of education. The composition of immigrants, in terms of these factors, can differ considerably between countries and therefore it may be more relevant to study the share employed broken down by one or more of these factors.

When studying the share employed by country background, grouped into seven regions, the pattern is similar in the Nordic countries. In all four countries, the share employed is lowest for those born in Africa and Asia and in most cases the share is highest for those born in the Nordic countries and EU/EEA. The differences in employment between persons born in different regions can be explained by for example different reasons for immigration. Persons born in Europe often immigrate because of work while it is common to immigrate as a refugee from several countries in Africa and Asia.

*Table 3 Share employed among immigrants in the Nordic countries, by region of birth. Ages 20–64. Year 2016. (percent)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Nordic country (excl. reporting country) | EU/EEA | Rest of Europe | Africa | Asia | North America and Oceania | South and Central Amerika | Immigrants, total |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 63 | 63 | 53 | 42 | 45 | 47 | 57 | **53** |
| Finland | 68 | 60 | 48 | 29 | 37 | 40 | 41 | **46** |
| Norway | 79 | 70 | 64 | 42 | 52 | 61 | 61 | **61** |
| Sweden | 70 | 66 | 66 | 45 | 49 | 60 | 69 | **57** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 64 | 73 | 62 | 50 | 56 | 60 | 62 | **63** |
| Finland | 67 | 65 | 59 | 44 | 49 | 52 | 52 | **56** |
| Norway | 80 | 75 | 69 | 50 | 60 | 72 | 69 | **68** |
| Sweden | 66 | 70 | 74 | 55 | 56 | 67 | 74 | **63** |

Source: Table WORK30 from [**www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration**](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/)**.**

Since the share employed varies between born in different regions, the composition by region of birth is of importance for the total share employed among immigrants. The distribution of immigrants by region of birth differs between the Nordic countries. In Sweden and Denmark, Asia is the largest region of birth among immigrants, with around 40 percent of the immigrants aged 20–64. In Finland just under 30 percent of the immigrants are born in Asia and slightly fewer are born in EU/EEA and the rest of Europe respectively. In Norway, EU/EEA is the largest group and they constitute 36 percent of the immigrants. In Norway and Finland, a higher proportion born in Europe contributes to raising the employment rate among immigrants somewhat in relation to Sweden and Denmark. If we compare the share employed between countries by region of birth, the share employed is still highest in Norway and lowest in Finland for most regions. This means that the ranking between countries would have been the same even if the distribution between regions of birth had been the same in all four countries.

**Employment generally increases with time of residence**

A factor that affects the employment rate of immigrants is years of residence in the country. Here the patterns are somewhat different between the Nordic countries. In all countries, the share employed is lowest for those with 0–3 years of residence. In Sweden, the share employed is higher the longer the stay but in the other countries the relationship between length of stay and employment is less pronounced. For immigrant men in Finland, the proportion of employed persons is approximately the same for those with a residence time of 4–7 years, 8–15 years and more than 15 years. In both Denmark and Norway, the proportion of employed persons is lower for those with more than 15 years of residence compared to those with 8–15 years of residence. This applies to both sexes and for virtually all regions of birth both in Denmark and in Norway. This indicates that the lower level of employment for those with the longest stay cannot be explained only by difference in the composition of birth regions within groups with different long periods of stay.

*Figure 3 Share employed among immigrants in the Nordic countries, by years of residence. Ages 20–64. Year 2016*

 

Source: Table WORK31 from [**www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration**](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/)**.**

When comparing the share employed by years of residence between the countries, Sweden and Finland have a comparatively low share employed among persons with the shortest length of stay, while the share employed is highest for persons with the longest stay in Sweden. This can, to some extent, be explained by different composition among immigrants with different length of stay. Among those with 0–3 years of residence, the share employed is considerably lower in Sweden and Finland than in Denmark and Norway. In Sweden and Finland, a large proportion of those with a short length of stay are born in Asia or Africa, while the EU/EEA is the most common region of birth in Denmark and Norway. At the same time, the proportion of employed persons is often lower in Finland and Sweden than in Denmark and Norway when individual regions of birth are studied. This means that even if the distribution by region of birth had been the same in all countries, Finland and Sweden would have had a lower share employed among people with a short period of residence. The same applies to persons with the longest stay, longer than 15 years, where the share employed is highest in Sweden for most regions of birth.

Figure 3 shows employment by time of residence for immigrant from Asia and Africa, who in many cases as refugees or family reunifications. The regions are selected because many immigrants from Africa and Asia are largely immigrants for reasons other than labor. Therefore it is interesting to examine their participating on the labor marked in connecting to the time of residence.

*Figure 3 Employment rate for 20-64 year old immigrant in the nordic countries from Asia and Afrika by lenght of stay. 2016*



Source: Table WORK31 from [**www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration**](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/)**.**

It is seen that the employment generally increases in Sweden the longer the residence time. In contrast, both Denmark and Norway immigrants with more than 15 years of stay have a decline in employment rate for immigrants with more than 15 years of stay in the country. The development can cover over the fact that immigrants with 8-15 years of residence can be differently composed regarding to age, education attainment and background country. Therefore the results should be interpreted with caution.

**5.5 Descendants are very young in all the Nordic countries**

It is a general trend in all the nordic countries that the descendabrs are relatively young. This is because immigration to the Nordic countries only really has been a phenomenonm since the 1960s. Since immigration before the 1960s was relatively limited, most of the descendants is youngher than 50 years old. For example, descendants from Asia and Africa are very young. About 90 percent of descendants from Asia and Africa are in Denmark, Norway and Sweden less then 30 years old. And in Finland and Iceland about 99 percent of all descendants from Asia and Africa is under 30 years old.

*Figure 4 Descendants from Asia and Africe in the nordic countries by age. 2017*



Source: Table CITI03 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

**5.5 30-34-year-old descendants have higher employment than immigrants**

Due to the descendants disproportionate age distribution in relation to the population as a whole, it is not possible to apply the employment rate for 20-64-year olds to compare descendants with immigrants and the rest of the population. This is due to that the descendants are overrepresented at the youngher age groups where employment is reletalively low and underrepresented at the older age groups, where employment is high. Therefore it makes sence to narrow that age group when the descendants employment is examined.

If one focus on the 30-34-year old descendants, it is a general trend in all the nordic countries that descendants have higher employment than immigrants with the same background region. In all countries especially descendants with background Asia stands out with a higher employment rate than immigrants. The biggest difference is found in Finland, where 30-34-year-old descendants from Asia have an employment rate that is 35 percent points higher than immigrants from the same region.

The employment rate is also significantly higher among descendants from Africa in Denmark, Norway and Sweden when compared with immigrants from the same region. The biggest difference is found in Sweden, where 30-34-year old descendants from Africa have an employment rate of 74 percent, which is 25 percentage points higher than immigrants from Africa.

*Table 4 Employment rate for 30-34-year old in the Nordic countries by background region.2016*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Denmark | Sweden | Norway | Finland |
|  | percent | | | |
| **Descendants total** | **70** | **80** | **75** | **75** |
| Nordic countries | 74 | 80 | 85 | . |
| EU/EEA | 73 | 77 | 77 | . |
| Rest of Europe | 70 | 82 | 72 | . |
| Africa | 63 | 74 | 69 | . |
| Asia | 71 | 82 | 75 | 80 |
| North America and Oceania | . | 62 | . | . |
| South and Central America | . | 78 | 66 | . |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Immigrants total** | **63** | **60** | **67** | **51** |
| Nordic countries | 71 | 68 | 83 | 66 |
| EU/EEA | 73 | 68 | 74 | 61 |
| Rest of Europe | 69 | 75 | 72 | 55 |
| Africa | 48 | 49 | 49 | 40 |
| Asia | 55 | 54 | 59 | 45 |
| North America and Oceania | 57 | 62 | 68 | 44 |
| South and Central America | 58 | 71 | 68 | 47 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rest of population** | **81** | **88** | **84** | **78** |

Note: There is no data for Iceland. EU/EEA countries are exclusive the Nordic countries. Cells with less than 50 individuals are marked by (.)

Source: Table EDUC30 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

The difference is least between immigrants and descendants from EU / EEA countries, which reflects that both 30-34-year-old immigrants and descendants from EU / EEA countries have relatively high employment in all the Nordic countries. Although descendants generally have a higher employment rate than immigrants, their employment rate remains lower than the rest of the population, cf. Table 4.

**5.6 Relatively many young descendants are neither employmed nor in education**

As the descendants generally is a very young population, it is also relevant to determine how many descendants that are neither employed nor in education. Here it is seen that almost 1 out of 3 descendants between the ages of 20 and 29 in Finland are neither employed nor in education, which is a higher proportion than the rest of the population. The same trend is also seen in Danmark, Norway and Sweden.

*Table 5 Share of 20-29-year-old descendants who are neither employed nor in education 2016*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Denmark | | Sweden | Norway | Finland | |
|  | | percent | | | |
| **Descendants total** | **24** | | **18** | **19** | **29** | |
| Nordic countries | 20 | | 20 | 19 | 33 | |
| EU/EEA | 21 | | 20 | 18 | 23 | |
| Rest of Europe | 21 | | 16 | 16 | 25 | |
| Africa | 31 | | 23 | 25 | 39 | |
| Asia | 24 | | 17 | 18 | 26 | |
| North America and Oceania | . | | 25 | . | . | |
| South and Central America | 27 | | 19 | 23 | . | |
|  |  | |  |  |  | |
| **Rest of the population (excl. immigrants)** | **16** | | **13** | **14** | **18** | |

Note: There is no data for Iceland. EU/EEA countries are exclusive the Nordic countries. Cells with less than 50 individuals are marked by (.)

Source: Table LABO30 from [www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration](https://www.nordicstatistics.org/integration-and-migration/).

The highest proportion who are neither employmed nor in education are generally found among descendants from Africa. The biggest difference is in Finland, where the proportion of descendants from Africa who are neither employed nor in education is 21 percentage points higher than for the rest of the population.

The results shows that even though descendants do far better than immigants, there is still some way to go before they are at the same level as the rest of the 20-29-year-old population.

Sources:
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