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Theoretical background

- **Émile Durkheim** – the theory of social and moral integration. The term “labour division” as a power combining people in a society (The Division of Labour in Society, 1893)

- **Herbert Spencer** – combination of individual interests as a factor joining people (The principles of Sociology, 1897)

- **Auguste Comte** – a role of the nation state in the process of social integration (System of Positive Polity, or Treatise on Sociology, 1875)
Theories: social integration and system integration

"... Whereas the problem of social integration focuses attention upon the orderly or conflictful relationships between the actors, the problem of system integration focuses on the orderly or conflictful relationships between the parts, of a social system”.


normative functionalism (Ralf Dahrendorf, John Rex, Robert Merton, Kingsley Davis, Émile Durkheim, Alvin Gouldner)
Lockwood: critics of normative functionalists

• Kingsley Davis offers limited approach to the functionalism as “... society as a system of interdependent parts, as an aversion to ‘reductionism’”. (in Lockwood, David. 1992. Solidarity and Schism. The problem of Disorder in Durkheimian and Marxist Sociology, Oxford)

• What elements are included as ‘parts’ of a social system, and the exact implications of the idea of ‘interdependence’ itself?
Robert K. Merton refers to the ‘institutions’ as though they were all uniformly supported by all groups and strata in the society. (in Lockwood, David. 1992. Solidarity and Schism. The problem of Disorder in Durkheimian and Marxist Sociology, Oxford)

Criticism: Merton treats institutions primarily as moral entities, without rigorously exploring the interplay between norms and power that is universally present in major institutional contexts.

‘the conflict theory’ by Dahrendorf and Rex. “Norms and power must be considered as general alternative modes of ‘institutionalizing’ social relationships... Power is a form of ‘scarce resource’ and is inherent in society itself.”

Institutions in Context
Lockwood: conclusion

• “The ‘conflict’ which in Marxian theory is decisive for change is not the power conflict arising from the relationships in the productive system, but the system conflict arising from ‘contradictions’ between ‘property institutions’ and the ‘forces of production’. These two aspects of integration are not only analytically separable, but also, because of the time element involved, factually distinguishable”. (in Lockwood, David. 1992. Solidarity and Schism. The problem of Disorder in Durkheimian and Marxist Sociology, Oxford)

• At particular point of time a society has a high degree of social integration (e.g. relative absence of class conflict) and yet has a low degree of system integration (mounting excess productive capacity).
What exactly should be meant by ‘social inequality’?

- Social inequality as **boundaries in social life**: “the boundary-crossing” (a minority’s member is accepted by the majority equally), or “the boundary-shifting” (whole groups are accepted as belonging to the whole society), “the boundary-blurring” (boundaries of access to the dominant group become porous) (Faist, 2012; Faist, 2010).

- Social boundaries are personified **forms of social differences** manifested in unequal access to resources (material and non-material) and social opportunities and their unequal distribution whereas symbolic boundaries are categories that are created by social actors to distinguish objects, people and practices (Dahinden, 2010).

- Social institutions differing definite **formalization level in relations**, **redistributed hierarchical roles** and coordination in mutual expectations are inalienable attribute peculiar to social and professional integration among individuals (Faist et al, 2010).

- The main function that institutions carry out is in **reduction of complexity** that means strengthening stability, social order and security. From the actors’ positions, institutions regulate individuals’ behaviour in definite social situations and work as the mediator in vexed questions. (Faist et al, 2010).
Integration?

Participation on an equal basis, and rights and obligations equal to those of the native population.

Inclusion with a consequent reduction of differences in positions and relations.

Labor market integration is the movement of minority groups such as labour immigrants into the labour market.

Incorporation of immigrants into the receiving society.

Socio-cultural aspects of immigrant integration: identification, national language use and proficiency, interethnic social contacts, and religious observance.
Integration is viewed as the totality of policies and practices.

Integration is a different matter for a rights-bearing immigrant than making “cultural integration” the condition for acquiring rights.

Two factors should be taken into account: how immigrants enter the labour market, and how they advance in their careers.

Two aspects of the integration policy: direct way on the behavior of immigrants, indirect way through the labour market.

A foreigner is often relegated to carry out jobs and tasks of a lower order, suffering from a process of disqualification.
Integration can be defined as ‘... the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and as groups’.

“Integration means an acquisition of rights, access to positions and statuses, a change in individual characteristics, a building of social relations and a formation of feelings of belonging and identification by immigrants towards the immigration society. ... It is dependent on a number of conditions ... which could generally be described as its ‘openness’ to the new group of people.”

“A ‘successful’ or progressing integration process could also be characterized by increasing similarity in living conditions and ethnic-cultural orientations between immigrants and the native population, and a decrease in ethnic stratification”.

There are three approaches to estimation of the integration’s index:

- Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, British Council) includes several parameters of estimation: description of laws and regulations per EU – country, focus on rules and conditions (access to labour market, nationality, family reunion, anti discrimination).

- EU Project Immigrants Integration Indicators (Eurostat): building of a common system of indicators to measure immigrant integration in Europe; focus on people and (changes in) social position.

- Integration policy (I-3 project, European Commision): synthesis of results from evaluation and monitoring research: actual situation and position of migrant citizens in society; focus on effectiveness of interventions/policies.
How does MIPEX measure migrant integration policy?

- MIPEX measures how close each country’s policies come to European standards of best practice, how governments can do their best to open opportunities to integrate.

- For each strand or policy area, MIPEX identifies the highest European standards on the most relevant policies. The combined set of the highest European standards serve as MIPEX's normative framework.

- Overall, 140 policy indicators are designed to benchmark current laws and policies against these highest European standards. For each, the normative framework is translated into three answer options.

- Within each of the six policy areas, the indicators are grouped into four dimensions which examine the same aspect of policy. The indicators were designed through a series of expert consultations.

- Thus, a country receives a 1-3 score on each indicator. The initial 1-3 scale is converted into a 0-100 scale for dimensions and strands, where 100% is best practice. Rankings and comparisons can then be made based on these scores.
Indicators containing the labour market access (positions)(2007)

**Eligibility:**
- Renewal of third-country nationals’ work permits;
- Ability to accept any employment (excluding exercise of public authority) equal to that of EU nationals;
- Ability to take up self-employed activity (excluding exercise of public authority) equal to that of EU nationals;
- Procedures for recognition of academic and professional skills and qualifications.

**LMI measures:**
- Measures to further the integration of third-country nationals into the labour market (reduce unemployment, promote vocational training, encourage language acquisition);
- State facilitation of the recognition of skills and qualifications obtained outside the EU;
- Equality of access to vocational training and study grants.

**Security of employment:**
- Renewal of work permits;
- Termination of work contract is a reason for revoking or refusing to renew work/residence permit.

**Rights associated:**
- Membership in trade unions associations and work-related negotiation bodies;
- Changes in working status/permit (different employer, different job, different industry, different permit category etc.).
Indicators containing the labour market access (MIPEX, 2007, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Market Access – Finland has level – 70%</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>Are migrants excluded from taking some jobs?</td>
<td>Sweden (100%)</td>
<td>Finland (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor market integration measures</td>
<td>What is the state doing to help migrants adjust to the demands of the labor market?</td>
<td>The Netherlands, Sweden (100%)</td>
<td>Finland (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security of employment</td>
<td>Can migrants easily lose their work permits?</td>
<td>10 countries (100%)</td>
<td>Finland (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights associated</td>
<td>What rights do migrants have as workers?</td>
<td>15 countries (100%)</td>
<td>Finland (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators containing the labor market mobility (positions) (MIPEX, 2010)

Access:
- Immediate access to employment;
- Access to private sector;
- Access to public sector;
- Immediate access to self-employment;
- Access to self-employment

Access to general support:
- Public employment services;
- Education and vocational training;
- Recognition of qualifications

Targeted support:
- State facilitates recognition of qualifications;
- Measures for economic integration of third-country nationals;
- Measures for economic integration of migrant youth and women;
- Support to access public employment services

Workers’ rights:
- Accessing trade unions;
- Accessing social security;
- Working conditions;
- Information policy
MIPEX indicators (Finland)

**Labor Market Access**: Eligibility, Labor market integration measures, Security of employment, Rights associated

- 2007
  - Labour Market Access (70%, Finland)
  - Anti-discrimination (75%, Finland)
  - Family Reunion (68%, Finland)
  - Access to nationality (44%, Finland)
  - Long-term residence (65%, Finland)
  - Political participation (81%, Finland)

- 2010
  - Labour Market Mobility (71%, Finland)
  - Anti-discrimination (78%, Finland)
  - Family Reunion (70%, Finland)
  - Access to nationality (57%, Finland)
  - Education (63%, Finland)
  - Political participation (87%, Finland)

**Labor Market Mobility**: Access, Access to general support, Targeted support, Workers’ rights

- 2007
  - Best practice
  - Finland
  - Worst practice found in 28

- 2010
  - Best practice
  - Finland
  - Worst practice found in 31

Institutions in Context
## MIPEX, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Market Mobility (%)</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Access to general support</th>
<th>Targeted support</th>
<th>Workers’ rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable (80–100)</td>
<td>Sweden, Portugal, the Netherlands, Spain</td>
<td>Sweden, Portugal, the Netherlands, Spain, Czech Republic, Finland, Denmark, Italy, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Sweden, Portugal, Italy, Spain, Romania, Belgium, Greece, Luxembourg, Estonia</td>
<td>Sweden, Germany, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly favorable (60–79)</td>
<td>Germany, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Romania, Estonia</td>
<td>Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Malta</td>
<td>The Netherlands, Finland, Czech Republic, United Kingdom, Poland</td>
<td>Portugal, the Netherlands, Finland, France, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway favorable (41–59)</td>
<td>Austria, Czech Republic, United Kingdom, Belgium, Greece, France, Luxembourg, Poland, Lithuania, Slovenia, Malta, Hungary</td>
<td>Romania, Poland, Austria</td>
<td>Germany, Austria, France, Lithuania, Slovenia, Malta, Latvia, Denmark</td>
<td>Spain, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly unfavorable (21–40)</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Ireland, Latvia, Cyprus, Slovakia</td>
<td>Belgium, Greece, Slovenia, Ireland, Latvia, Estonia</td>
<td>Hungary, Cyprus, Slovakia</td>
<td>Romania, Belgium, Italy, United Kingdom, Lithuania, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable (1–20)</td>
<td>France, Luxembourg</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Ireland</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia, Malta, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Cyprus</td>
<td>Greece, Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically unfavorable (0)</td>
<td>Cyprus, Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labour market integration: empirical results

Example 1. Initial Labour Integration of Russian-speaking Students in Finland


Methods: hierarchical cluster analysis (within-group linkage), discriminant analysis.

Hypothesis: Initial labour market integration is facilitated in case if immigrants (students) are engaged into the society by means of appropriate education and labour activity, absence of external factors as ‘dependents’ load’, etc.
Table 1. Characteristics of types on integration among Russian-speaking immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>How many years have you lived in Finland?</th>
<th>How many years have you studied for your current degree?</th>
<th>Previous degree (or equivalent)?</th>
<th>How well do you intend to know Finnish/Swedish by the time you graduate?</th>
<th>If you are currently working, is your work-related to your studies?</th>
<th>Rank the top 3 biggest obstacles to getting a job in Finland; Knowledge of Finnish/Swedish</th>
<th>Rank the top 3 biggest obstacles to getting a job in Finland; Inappropriate wrong field of study</th>
<th>Respondent's age (reclassified)</th>
<th>Respondent's gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-integrated</td>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>3-9 years</td>
<td>&quot;none&quot; - 68.4%</td>
<td>&quot;excellent&quot; - 89.5%; &quot;good&quot; - 10.5%</td>
<td>&quot;fully&quot; - 46.7%; &quot;not at all&quot; - 40%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 61.5%; third importance - 30.8%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 28.6%</td>
<td>20-24 - 36.8%; 25-29 - 36.8%; 30-34 - 10.5%; 35-39 - 10.5%</td>
<td>female - 78.0%; male - 21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially well-integrated</td>
<td>3-9 years</td>
<td>1-6 years</td>
<td>&quot;other&quot;, &quot;none&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;excellent&quot; - 84.6%</td>
<td>&quot;not at all&quot; - 72.7%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 57.1%, second position - 28.6%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 75%</td>
<td>from 20 to 24 - 61.5%; from 25 to 29 - 23.1%; from 30 to 34 - 15.4%</td>
<td>male - 61.5%; female - 38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately integrated</td>
<td>1-3 years, 5-6 years</td>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>BA and MA - 38.9% each; other and none - 11.1% each</td>
<td>&quot;excellent&quot; - 50%; &quot;good&quot; - 38.9%</td>
<td>&quot;fully&quot; - 69.2%; &quot;something&quot; - 23.1%</td>
<td>second importance - 75%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 66.7%; third position - 33.3%</td>
<td>25-29 - 61.1%; 20-24 - 27.8%; 30-34 - 11.1%</td>
<td>female - 66.7%; male - 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly integrated</td>
<td>1-4, 6 years</td>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>BA - 63.2%, MA - 36.8%</td>
<td>&quot;basic knowledge&quot; - 57.9%; &quot;adequate&quot; - 36.8%</td>
<td>&quot;fully&quot; - 66.7%; &quot;something&quot; - 33.3%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 44.4%; third importance - 38.9%</td>
<td>biggest importance - 66.7%</td>
<td>20-24 - 47.4%; 25-29 - 36.8%; 30-34 - 15.8%</td>
<td>male - 52.6%; female - 47.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. The results of discriminant analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Results (b,c)</th>
<th>CLU5_2 Average Linkage (Within Group)</th>
<th>Predicted Group membership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-validated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Cross validation is done only for those cases in the analysis. In cross validation, each case is classified by the functions derived from all cases other than that case.
b. 93.7% of original grouped cases correctly classified.
c. 90.2% of cross-validated grouped cases correctly classified.
Labour market integration: empirical results

Example 2: **Occupational Belonging as a Pre-Determinant of the Workplace Flexibility among Immigrants in Finland**

*(based on the European Social Survey, 2002-2010, 5 Rounds). N=151.*

**Method:** hierarchical cluster analysis (within-group linkage).

**Hypothesis:** occupational belonging is decisive for explaining the workplace flexibility that, in one turn, is crucial for the labour market integration of immigrants in Finland. A strong dependence between occupational belonging and the workplace flexibility explains where, why and in which groups the flexibility is more effective and leads to effective labour market integration.
Example 2: main results

- Result 1: Discrimination on a gender belonging in the labour process is crucial for the workplace flexibility. Especially this circumstance concerns women who have low-skilled occupations.
- Result 2: Educational level of workers allow possessing occupations that are equal to this level, however, this equivalence is exclusion from the rule in many cases.
- Result 3: Wage segregation that is typical for low-paid occupations predetermines homogeneous structure of labour incomes for specific occupational niches. At the same time, higher occupational positions and higher flexibility in workplace predetermine diversity of labour incomes.
- Result 4: Higher occupational belonging implies more critical perception of own monetary incomes and its significance in the life.
Example 2: main results (cont.)

- Result 5: Critical perception of own incomes is associated with lower satisfaction with the life.
- Result 8: Occupational segregation that is typical for low-paid sectors predetermines preferences to smaller segregated enterprises as workplaces among immigrants.
- Result 9: Occupational segregation is associated with geographical segregation of immigrants. This segregation concerns not only small towns but also separate dislocations in big cities.
- Result 10: Longer period of living in a country is favourable for increasing workplace flexibility among professionals and crucial for low-skilled workers with low workplace flexibility.
- Result 11: Occupational segregation predetermines higher probability of unemployment among labour immigrants.
Labour market integration: empirical results

Example 3: **Working Time Flexibility as a Challenge for Labour Market Integration of Immigrants in Finland**

*(based on the European Social Survey, 2002-2010, 5 Rounds). N=192.*


**Hypothesis:** flexibility in working time among labour immigrants has a direct influence upon specificity of employment and leads to different models of integration’s behavior at the labour market.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of time</th>
<th>Type of model</th>
<th>Explanation of a model</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>“Dis-orientation”. Flexibility of working time lead to underemployment with insufficient professional realization and full dissatisfaction with other issues of employment</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>“Orientation to profession”. Flexibility of working time lead to non-standard working regime parallel to high satisfaction with own professional activity and poor satisfaction with working conditions, health or income</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>“Orientation to profession and working conditions”. Flexibility of working time leads to non-standard working regime parallel to high satisfaction with own educational and professional position in combination with high satisfaction with working conditions, income or health</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>“Orientation to working conditions”. Flexibility of working time leads to non-standard working regime and lower occupational and educational status in combination with satisfaction with working conditions, health or income</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>“Time and working conditions”. Flexibility of working time leads to standard officially fixed working regime (as well as undertime or overtime) in combination with high satisfaction with working conditions, income, health and poor satisfaction with occupational-educational position</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>“Only time is factor”. Flexibility of working time leads to standard officially fixed working regime (as well as overtime) in combination with dissatisfaction with occupational, educational positions, health and working conditions.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>“Time and profession”. Flexibility of working time leads to standard officially fixed working regime (as well as undertime and overtime) in combination with satisfaction with occupation and education and dissatisfaction with health and working conditions</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>“Time, profession and working conditions”. Flexibility of working time lead to full employment with sufficient professional realization and full satisfaction with other issues of employment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Institutions in Context*
Classification of variables as more appropriate to factors (according to the ESS Rounds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year, Round</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 (1)</td>
<td>Contracted hours and total normal hours</td>
<td>Education; occupation;</td>
<td>Employment contract; establishment size</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 (2)</td>
<td>Contracted hours and total normal hours;</td>
<td>Education; occupation</td>
<td>Health; industry</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establishment size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 (3)</td>
<td>Contracted hours and total normal hours;</td>
<td>Establishment size</td>
<td>Occupation; income; education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (4)</td>
<td>Contracted hours and total normal hours</td>
<td>Occupation; education</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Industry; health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>establishment size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (5)</td>
<td>Contracted hours and total normal hours</td>
<td>Establishment size;</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Occupation; industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education; income;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first case: 1 and 6 models (factor 1 – ‘Time’, factor 2 – ‘Occupation and education’, factor 3 – ‘Working conditions’)

First factor model "Dis-orientation"

Sixth factor model "Only time is factor"

Institutions in Context 40

Institutions in Context 41

Institutions in Context 42
Conclusions

Determinants of labour market integration in Finland for Russian-speaking immigrants?

Factors which have an influence upon process of labour market integration of Russian-speaking immigrants in Finland?

‘Successfulness’ of labour market integration for Russian-speaking migrants working in Finland?

‘Paths’ of labour market integration for Russian-speaking immigrants working in Finland?

Measures and indicators to be applied in the process of analysis of the labour market integration for immigrants?
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