

UDC 325.14(481)(470.1/.2)(045)

DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.35.119

Integration mechanisms for immigrants in Norway and Russia: a comparative analysis*

© Marina M. PANIKAR, Cand. Sci. (Hist.), Associate Professor

E-mail: m.panikar@narfu.ru

Northern (Arctic) Federal University, Arkhangelsk, Russia

© Flera Kh. SOKOLOVA, Dr. Sci. (Hist.), Professor

Northern (Arctic) federal university named after M.V.Lomonosov

© Alexander E. SHAPAROV, Dr. Sci. (Polit.), Professor

E-mail: a.shaparov@narfu.ru

Northern (Arctic) Federal University, Arkhangelsk, Russia

© Oleg V. ZOLOTAREV, Dr. Sci. (Hist.), Professor

E-mail: kimoopd@syktsu.ru

Syktyvkar State University named after P. Sorokin, Syktyvkar, Russia

© Vladimir M. KAPITSYN, Dr. Sci. (Polit.), Professor

E-mail: kapizin@yandex.ru

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. An essential component in the structure of the immigration policy of developed countries is the integration of migrants. The integration policy for migrants is aimed at solving the issues of adaptation, inculturation, labor mobility, naturalization, and political participation. Integration is a reciprocal process which involves the interaction of migrants and the host society. The integration policy goal is the formation of migrants' qualities and competencies that allow them to participate in the economic, social, political, and spiritual spheres of the recipient country. The failure of integration policies inevitably increases the conflict potential of the host society, leads to social exclusion, marginalization of migrants, and an increase in xenophobia. The article is devoted to the comparative analysis of the integration policy of the two Northern states — Norway and Russia. Norway has extensive experience in implementing the integration policy, occupies a leading position in the index of integration of migrants MIPEX. Russia has extensive experience in the incorporation of various ethnic groups into a national state, but the state has long ignored the solution of issues of integration and adaptation of migrants. The study aims to analyze national models and practices of integration and adaptation of migrants. The research methodology is linked to the methods of demography, sociology, political science, law, and statistics. For the comparative analysis of the immigration policies of Norway and Russia, a set of indicators reflecting the quality and status of the integration policy, MIPEX (labor market, family reunification, long-term stay, political participation, protection against discrimination, naturalization) was applied. It is concluded that the policy of integration in Russia should have different objects of regulation, be differentiated by goals and objectives.

Keywords: *immigration policy, integration of migrants, naturalization, Russia, Norway.*

Introduction

The integration of migrants is the backbone of immigration policy. In our view, only countries with workable mechanisms for naturalization and adaptation of migrants can benefit from migration and ensure migrant inclusion in the host society without violating the systemically important foundations of its identity. It should be noted that the integration involves the interaction of at least three parties: host society, migrants and the state. Each of the parties is internally dif-

* For citation:

Panikar M.M., Sokolova F.Kh., Shaparov A.E., Zolotarev O.V., Kapitsyn V.M. Integration mechanisms for immigrants in Norway and Russia: a comparative analysis. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2019, no. 35, pp. 98–117. DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.35.119

ferentiated, has both coinciding and dissimilar goals, which make integration risky and create issues. Migrants come from different countries (with a common historical background and without), they are temporary and permanent, labor, family reunification, returnees, and refugees. The state as the main actor of immigration policy includes the political level — national, regional, and in the case of the EU, supranational, and non-political — municipal. The host society consists of large and small social groups and institutions — educational, religious, economic, employers, diaspora, etc. As a conclusion: the integration policy is a multilevel process. It should have different objects of regulation, and, therefore, strategies, be differentiated in terms of goals and objectives. The failures of integration policies inevitably increase the conflictogenic potential of the host society, lead to social exclusion, the marginalization of migrants, the growth of xenophobia and the effects of divided communities.

The interest of researchers in the study of the mechanisms of integration and adaptation of migrants intensified in the early 21st century when most developed countries faced the failure of multiculturalism, which was recognized by the political establishment of Great Britain, Germany, and France. The challenges of losing national identity were accompanied by the difficulties of adapting and integrating migrants in developed countries. The failure to implement multicultural policies has been affected by changes in the ethnic pattern of migration flows, as well as by securitization of migration. Among the contemporary researchers on the integration of migrants is S. Vertovek, S. Castles [1], A. Favell [2], G. Freeman [3], A.V. Dmitriev [4], V.S. Malakhov [5], V.I. Mukomelya [6], I.S. Semenenko [7], M.A. Pitukhina [8], etc. Unlike the population, which links security and immigration issues, immigration policy researchers point to the determination of problems of social security and integration of migrants. According to M. Rosenblum, miscalculations and failures of the integration policy create threats to the security of the host society [9, p. 29].

Researchers note significant differences in naturalization policies between the states of the Old and New World. In the post-war era, the economies of developed countries actively used the labor force of migrants. Integration policies in the US and European countries had significant differences. The main difference between American and European immigration policies was in the sphere of naturalization [10]. In the US, every immigrant was a potential citizen. Hence the US strategy of assimilation arose. European countries favored labor migration mainly. They made naturalization procedures more difficult. Unfortunately, difficulties in obtaining citizenship for migrants from post-Soviet states with close cultural and historical roots, fully apply to Russia. Malakhov V.S. notes the gap in the strategies of the European and Russian legislation on citizenship: tendencies to the liberalization of the European strategies and restrictive Russian strategy [11, p. 14]. E.g., the Law “On Citizenship of the Russian Federation” (2002) abolished the institution of dual citizenship for individuals acquiring Russian citizenship. Moreover, the law does not have a *jus soli* norm (the citizenship right for migrants' kids upon reaching the age of 18).

One of the disturbing contemporary trends was the formation of an anti-immigration bloc in the government of developed countries. According to American scientists W. Cornelius, P. Mar-

tin, and D. Holyfield, opponents of immigration focus on access of illegal immigrants to social services with budget funding, incl. education and health care. In addition, counteraction to programs of socio-economic and cultural integration of migrants [12, p. 5].

Immigration policy and integration of migrants in Scandinavian countries (esp. Norway) is a subject of scientific interest for foreign researchers. So, the writings of G. Brockmann and A. Hage-lund [13], as well as E. Uppsal, S. Sogner and K. Schelstadli [14] are devoted to the study of the historical development of postwar immigration policy in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The authors explore how welfare states with inclusive social security schemes and a developed sense of egalitarianism cope with immigration pressures and their growing diversity.

A considerable body of research focuses on the specific aspects of integration and social well-being of immigrants in Norway, which leads to the conclusion of how individual, collective and institutional resources have a direct impact on Norwegian migrants and the dynamics of their social integration [15, Fladmoe A., Steen-Johnsen K.; 16, Friberg J.H., Midtboen A.H.; 17, Hardoy I., Mastekaasa A., Schone P.].

The Norwegian experience of the settlement of inter-ethnic relations and migration policy arouses the interest of Russian scientists. The scientific development of the theme from a historical perspective was completed by E.S. Kotlova, as well as the analysis of the main models of the ethnic policy of Norway [18, p. 21]. Mechanisms of sociocultural adaptation and integration of migrants in Norway and Denmark are presented in the article by N.S. Chukalova. The study, carried out in a comparative context, allows identifying the country features of the policy of integration of immigrants [19, p. 33]. Continuing the practice of comparative research, the authors of this article aim to carry out a comparative analysis of the current integration policy of Norway and Russia on the based on comparable indicators adopted in the international community.

The methodological basis of the research was structural-functional, institutional, historical and systemic approaches. Methods of demography, sociology, political science, law and migration statistics were used. Comparative analysis of integration policies of Russia and Norway is carried out through the methodology of the MIPEX index as a set of indicators reflecting the quality and current situation of state immigration policy.

Integration policy in the structure of immigration policy

Current migration policy is designed to meet the challenges of filling the country's demographic and labor potential, creating conditions for the integration of migrants into Russian society, redistribution of labor resources. T. Hammar wrote about two components in the structure of immigration policy: immigration control policies (rules and procedures for selection and admission of foreign nationals and stateless persons), immigration reception policies (employment, housing, social benefits, opportunities to receive education) [20, p. 7]. The approach of T. Hammar allows dividing immigration policies by types and forms of political regulation. V.I. Mucomel considers

immigration, integration and naturalization policies as successive stages of admission, placement, and transformation of the migrant into a full member of the host society [21, p. 258].

Thus, the immigration policies of developed countries have two structural components. One includes measures to receive migrants — characteristics, rules, procedures, selection systems, and quotas. The second component is the policy of integration and socialization. It is the solution of problems related to the labor market, inculturation, family reunification, etc.

Integration is a recurring process that involves the interaction of migrants and the host society. Integration policy aims at developing the skills and competencies of migrants to participate in the economic, social, political and spiritual spheres of the host society. Adaptation is an integral part of the integration of migrants and a prerequisite for it. Adaptation refers to the process of the initial adaptation of migrants to the norms and practices of the host society. Inculturation is part of the adaptation, i.e., assimilating the cultural patterns of the host society by immigrants. In contrast to integration, the adaptation is unidirectional and involves efforts of migrants themselves, particularly in learning the language of the new country and communicative taboos. The integration can result in full integration (assimilation) and partial integration, which is limited only to the adaptation of migrants to the new cultural environment, and migrants do not become part of the society of the host country.

Migration policies of modern countries dispose of various instruments aimed at the adaptation and integration of migrants. Among the tools of adaptation and integration of migrants, Kapitsyn V.M. calls pre-migration training programs in sending countries, networks, and associations of migrants, integration programs, incl. individual integration plans, integration tests, exams, indexes, oaths, municipal consultants and inter-cultural mediators [22, p. 164]. Experts note that due to the weakness of the state integration policy in Russia, the functions of adaptation and integration of migrants are assumed by institutions of civil society, human rights defenders' organizations, labor collectives, associations of migrants, and diaspora¹. As a result, migration to Russia is largely illegal. First, it concerns temporary labor migration.

The conflict potential of host countries is an inevitable consequence of the social exclusion of migrants. Growing contradictions in the labor markets of developed countries, hidden restrictions for social mobility, pressure on the political establishment from the national electorate will strengthen the introduction of restrictions on the use of migrant labor. Conflicts determined by socio-economic factors will take the form of ethnic, racial and religious contradictions. The threat of deepening and widening conflicts between indigenous populations and migrants will objectively reinforce restrictive trends in immigration policies. Conflict potential is already being used to mobilize their supporters by right-wing parties, esp. in Scandinavia. If the average value of electoral support for right-wing radical parties in 2017 in Europe was 12.8%, for Scandinavian countries it was much

¹ Iontsev V.A., Ivakhniuk I.V. Models of integration of migrants in modern Russia CARIM-East RR 2013/12; Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute, 2013. URL: http://www.carim-east.eu/media/CARIM-East-RR-2013-12_RU.pdf (Accessed: 21 December 2018).

higher than the average European level — 16.3% [23, Shaparov A.E., Kalachnikova M.Yu., p. 74]. Right radical parties are consistently elected to the national parliaments of the Scandinavian countries, holding leading positions there: in Denmark, they got the 2nd place, in Norway and Sweden — the 3rd place among parliamentary parties. Immigration can increase conflict potential in host countries. The state is obliged to propose an adequate integration strategy integrated into a set of basic state policies in the social sphere: educational, national, regional, cultural, etc. The main objective of the integration component of the state immigration policy is to ensure social order, integrity, and security of the host society. The complexity of achieving the social goal predetermines the complex multi-level nature of immigration policy in modern conditions.

Examples of integration policies for migrants in Norway and Russia will be discussed below. A comparison tool we used is the Migration Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), developed by the Spanish non-governmental organization Centre for International Relations of Barcelona and European Migration Policy Study Group. Currently, this index is calculated in 28 EU countries, and in several non-EU states — Serbia, Norway, Switzerland, Canada, USA, Australia, Japan, and South Korea. The MIPEX project was intensive in 2004-2015. Over the years, the objects of research have significantly expanded, and the number of indicators has increased. The project is ongoing. The index analyzes the indicators of integration in eight social areas: access to the labor market (labor market mobility, access to vocational retraining, rights of employees); family reunification; education (equality of opportunity, inter-cultural education; political participation; long-term stay (access to status, conditions for obtaining it); access to citizenship; access to health services; protection against discrimination (mechanisms) protection against discrimination, equality policy). Common criteria for assessing integration policies allow for comparative analysis and identification of leaders and outsiders among countries in the certain areas of integration policy. The project is carried out for more than a decade, which allows analyzing the evolution of integration policies of the studied countries.

Table 1

Migration profile of Russia and Norway 2000—2017²

Country	Number of international migrants (thous. people)		Share of international migrants (% of the population)		Share of women among international migrants (%)		Average age of international migrants	
	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017
Norway	292	799	6.5	15.1	50.5	47.8	34.9	36.3
Russia	11 900	11 652	8.1	8.1	49.7	50.9	44.5	44.5

Integration policy for migrants in Norway

Norway is one of the countries attractive to migrants and it has made significant progress in their integration. According to the MIPEX, the country had 69 out of 100 possible points in 2015

² International Migration Report 2017. URL: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2017_Highlights.pdf (Accessed: 20 December 2018).

and, along with Finland, ranked fourth in the world, followed by Sweden, Portugal, and New Zealand. The experience gained in this area, we believe, can be useful for Russia, where the policy of social and cultural adaptation of migrants is only put on the agenda.

Norway is a country with a rapidly growing migrant population. Only in the period 2000–2017 the proportion of migrants in the structure of the population increased almost twice: from 6.5% to 15.1% (Tab. 1). Currently, there live people from 220 countries, mainly from Europe (49%), Asia (32%) and Africa (9%). Work, education, and family reunion are the main causes of immigration. Thus, according to the statistics of Norway, for the period 1990–2016, 33% of immigrants used a work visa, 36% — family reunification and 10% — higher education [24, Sandnes T., p. 38]. Forced migrants constitute a significant group of arrivals. Only in 2015–2017 Norway received about 23.8 thous. refugees and humanitarian migrants. Half of them fell at the peak of the European migration crisis in 2016.³

Norway's immigration policy has come a long way and evolved. Officially, the policy of integration of migrants started with the adoption of the Integration Act 2003, but a number of Norwegian researchers claim that Norway initially adhered to the policy of integration of migrants, despite the fact that it was called the policy of multiculturalism [25, Alghasi S., Hylland Eriksen T., Ghorashi H., p. 12]. Indeed, the assimilation model of ethnic policy, which was implemented in Norway until the late 1970s, laid the foundation of modern integration policy. According to E.S. Kotlova, from the point of view of the Norwegian state, assimilation was perceived as a positive phenomenon. In the context of the establishment and strengthening of the nation-state, this policy has contributed to the growth of national identity based on Norwegian culture, which, after long years of life in the Unias with Denmark and Sweden had to “reinvent” [18, p. 21].

In White Paper on Migration 1980 and 1996 (i.e., drafts of official documents of government structures, informational and analytical reports and reports in specific areas are submitted to the Parliament of Norway for further procedures), the Government has made several proposals for the integration of migrants. In the White Paper 1980, studying the Norwegian language to involve migrants in the social and cultural life was underlined. The next White Paper 1996 set out the obligations of immigrants to participate in the labor market to achieve financial independence and equality, which led to the regulation of entry for all categories of migrants [13].

Issues of state regulation of migration and creation of a holistic system of integration and adaptation were updated at the beginning of the 21st century, i.e., in 2004, when Norway entered the European Economic Area and got a strong flow of labor migrants from Poland and the Baltic countries. The flows of refugees from the world's hot spots increased significantly: Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, African and Asian countries.

³ The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI). Asylum Decisions by the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (First Instance) by Citizenship and Outcome, January — December 2017. URL: <https://www.udi.no/en/statistics-and-analysis/statistics/asylum-decisions-by-citizenship-and-outcome-2017/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

The current Norwegian integration policy is regulated by several legal acts. The main laws are the Immigration Act (2008), the Adaptation of Migrants Act (2003), the Education Act (2012) and the Citizenship Act (2005). The Immigration of Foreign Nationals to the Kingdom of Norway Act 2008 defines the legal status of an immigrant and guarantees him equal rights and obligations. It specifies the conditions and procedure for entry of migrant workers and refugees, obtaining a residence permit and Norwegian citizenship⁴. The Citizenship Act of 2005 establishes the principle of citizenship for immigrants and their children⁵. The Act lays down the basic conditions for obtaining citizenship. These include: compliance with temporary residence conditions, lack of criminal record and debt obligations, 7 years of permanent and legal residence in Norway, renunciation of previous citizenship. According to the amendments introduced in September 2008, applicants for citizenship are no longer required to attend 300 hours of Norwegian language courses if they provide a certificate of language proficiency. Children under the age of 18 become Norwegian citizens only after the naturalization of their parents if they have resided in the country for two years. For children from Scandinavian countries applying for Norwegian citizenship, this residency rule does not apply.

According to the Migration Integration Act 2003, the main objective of Norway's integration policy is to provide basic Norwegian language skills, to understand Norwegian society and to train to participate fully in the labor and social life of the country⁶. This Act was fundamental for the Government has developed an integration program. The program is primarily targeted at political refugees, persons granted residence permits for humanitarian reasons and their families. Immigrants are required to attend Norwegian language courses (250 hours) and social studies (50 hours). You can only take part in the training during the first 3 years of residence in Norway. Immigrants between the ages of 56 and 67 have the right but are not obliged, to attend this course. It is important that participation in the training program is equal to full employment. Such training programs are created for each participant individually, considering their educational and professional needs. There is a possibility to suspend participation in the program due to new circumstances, such as an offer of employment. It is not necessary for such persons to resume their participation in the educational program if they have documented their proficiency in the language. Migrant workers are not eligible to participate in the program free of charge, but they are required to pass it or to confirm their knowledge of Norwegian to obtain a residence permit or citi-

⁴ Norway. The Immigration Act (2008) /No. 35 of 2008/Ministry of Employment and Inclusion/International Labour Organization. URL: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/natlex4.detail?p_lang=en&p_isn=88330 (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

⁵ Norge. Ikraftsettelse av lov (2005)/LOV-1965-06-18-4. Statsborgerskap og statsborgerforskriften. 2005. URL: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2005-06-10-51> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

⁶ Norway. The Act on an introduction program and Norwegian language training for newly arrived immigrants — the Introduction Act (2003) /Amended by the Act of 11 March 2005 No. 13 (in force) from 1 September 2005 pursuant to the Decree of 11 March 2005 No. 228, section number amended from section 22. Government.no. URL: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/immigration/innsikt/Verkemiddel-i-integreringsarbeidet/introduksjonsprogram/id2343472/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

zenship. Persons who are in Norway under EU citizenship regulations are not entitled and are not obliged to receive free Norwegian language courses and social studies instruction.

The Education Act 2012 defines the procedure, forms and methods of work of educational institutions with migrant children who must learn Norwegian during 2-3 years of schooling⁷. The law provides for the training and retraining of teachers in multicultural education. Teachers participating in these training programs should have knowledge of two languages: Norwegian and the native language of the immigrant. The website of the National Centre for Multicultural Education, which operates at the University of Oslo, has created online resources for teachers and parents in the field of multicultural education. The Centre also launched a website that contains educational resources for schools and parents in Norwegian and 13 other languages spoken by immigrants. Each language has its own subpage, where a set of subjects and information is displayed in both Norwegian and the native language of the migrant⁸.

The regulations have been drawn up by the Government of Norway in accordance with international agreements and treaties to which Norway is a party. First, it is the Schengen Agreement (2001), which regulates passport-free or selective control at the borders of the states within the Schengen area. The Dublin Convention (2001), which establishes the responsibility for considering applications to the country where the forced migrant was originally sent to seek asylum within the framework of the UN Geneva Convention 1951, as well as the Agreement on the European Economic Area (2004), which implies “four freedoms” — the free movement of goods, capital, services and people within the European Single Market⁹.

At present, Norway's migration policy is implemented at several levels of government. The Norwegian Parliament Storting provides strategic guidance and regulatory framework for immigration policy. It also sets quotas for the reception of refugees, the amount of funding for municipalities that accept and resettle refugees. The responsibility for the implementation of the state immigration policy at the national level is divided among four ministries: The Ministry of Justice and Public Order, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Children, Youth and Family. The Ministry of Justice and Public Security, through the Department of Migration, is responsible for developing and coordinating legislation and policies for all categories of immigrants, asylum — seekers and refugees, as well as directing the Directorate of Immigration (UDI) and the Immigration Appeals Board (UNE).

The Directorate of Immigration (UDI) is the central agency for immigration management. Its tasks include review of applications for entry, stay and work in the country, asylum applications in Norway, management of refugee reception centers and liaison with local authorities on the in-

⁷ Norge. Lov om grunnskolen og den vidaregåande opplæringa (2012) (opplæringslova)/LOV-1998-07-17-61. Departement Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2012. URL: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

⁸ National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO). URL: <http://nafo.oslomet.no/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

⁹ Agreement on the European Economic Area (1994) /Decision 94/1/EC, ECSC on the conclusion of the agreement on the European Economic Area. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM%3Aem0024> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

tegration of immigrants, the granting of Norwegian citizenship, the implementation of programs for the deportation of migrants. Within the Directorate of Immigration, there are special departments, incl. a department for dealing with refugees, a department for other categories of migrants and their naturalization in the country. In carrying out its functions, the Directorate of Immigration works with: Norwegian missions abroad involved in the processing applications for entry visas and work and stay permits; the Employment Service for issuing permits to employment, the police responsible for border control and deportation and the issuance of temporary work permits, the municipalities in implementing the policy of integration of immigrants, the Council on Immigration appeals, whose function is to review the decisions of the Directorate of Immigration, and by immigrant social organizations.

The Ministry of Education and Science is the key body responsible for implementing policies for the integration and adaptation of migrants. The Directorate for Integration and Diversity (IMDi), under its responsibility, is responsible for the development and implementation of adaptive courses for immigrants, the teaching of the Norwegian language, the extension of knowledge about the country, its history, legislation, for the improvement of their professional competence, promotes dialogue and understanding between the indigenous people, citizens of the country and immigrants, and works on the prevention of discrimination. IMDi was established in 2006 through separation from the Directorate of Immigration to act as a center of competence and driving force for integration and diversity. The Directorate for Integration cooperates with municipalities, government agencies, immigrant organizations and groups, and the private sector. IMDi also has several financial instruments at its disposal, such as grants to municipalities and voluntary organizations working to promote diversity and integration. The Office has branches in Narvik, Trondheim, Bergen, Kristiansand, Jovica, and Oslo¹⁰.

The Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs has overall responsibility for policies on migrant workers and promotes the integration of migrants into the economic life of the country. It also includes migrants covered by the Agreement on the European Economic Area (2004)¹¹. In turn, the Department of Children, Youth and Family Affairs of the Ministry of Children and Equality is helping to regulate child migration issues, particularly the placement of children, who entered the country unaccompanied by adults¹².

Municipalities have an important role to play in the implementation of the integration policy. Migrants live, work and form cultural ties with the host community in municipalities. It is the municipalities that decide on the number of immigrants they can accept, their resettlement, the forms and methods of adaptation and integration, the education of migrant children in schools,

¹⁰ Directorate for Integration and Diversity of Norway. Official website. URL: <https://www.imdi.no/en/about-imdi/imdis-work> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹¹ Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs of Norway. Official website. URL: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/asd/id165/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹² Ministry of Children and Equality of Norway. Official website. URL: <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/bld/id298/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

based on the from the existing capabilities. The main tasks of each municipality are: inclusion of immigrants, especially refugees, in adaptive programs (within 3 months of obtaining a residence permit), dissemination of information on Norwegian culture and economic devices (e.g., information on the tax system) and equal rights and opportunities with the residents of the municipality.

Municipalities, considering the specificities of immigrant groups and their country of origin, have the right to choose their own models for the implementation of policies for the integration of migrants within the framework of general provisions. They receive transfers through the national income distribution system. Funds are distributed among municipalities due to several factors. Among them: the number of migrants in the municipality, their ratio by type of migration, and the proportion of refugees. The county councilors being government representatives are responsible for guiding and overseeing the integration. Among the municipalities of Norway, the largest number of migrants is concentrated in Oslo, Swansea, Gamvik and Drammen, where their share among the population reaches 30% [24, p. 33]. It is a clear tendency for migrants to settle in economically developed cities, where employment opportunities are greater.

Norwegian immigration policy has included civil society institutions and nongovernmental organizations. Substantial information and legal support for the adaptation and integration of the most vulnerable groups of migrants is provided by the Norwegian Asylum Seekers Organization (SPLA), a nongovernmental organization "Juice Bous", created by students of the Law Faculty of the University of Oslo, the Norwegian Red Cross Society [19, p. 33].

In general, the policy of integration of migrants in Norway is based on the integrated interaction of government bodies at different levels and social organizations, which is the guarantee of its effectiveness.

The increasing flow of displaced people, the integration and adaptation of which is carried out at the expense of the state, places a heavy burden on a budget of the country. According to a study by a Norwegian non-profit organization, the Human Rights Service (HRS) Foundation, the direct expenditure of the Ministry of Justice and Public Security in 2017 amounted to NOK 59.3 billion, 23.5 billion of them was used for immigration policy. Between 2006 and 2017, the Board of Immigration Appeals increased its expenditure 2.8 times: from NOK 117 million to NOK 328 million; the Directorate of Integration and Diversity — 3 times, from NOK 83 million to NOK 262 million. NOK 12.1 billion were spent on ensuring policy at the level of municipalities, NOK 9.3 billion of which were spent on care of minor migrants, NOK 1.7 billion on benefits, NOK 427 million were allocated to specialists health care services (incl. dental services usually paid by the client), NOK 236 million invested in the provision of free legal aid, NOK 193 million to overcome child poverty¹³. For comparison, expenditures of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Calculation in 2017 amounted to NOK 167 million (0.005% of Norway's GDP), while the share of expenditure on inte-

¹³ Innvanding, integrering og statens utgifter/Human rights service. URL: <https://www.rights.no/2017/09/innvanding-integrering-og-statens-utgifter/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

gration policy is 0.6% of the country's GDP. Thus, the Kingdom spends considerable resources to achieve the effective integration of migrants, which indicates the importance of this direction of the state activities.

The effectiveness of Norway's public policy on the integration and adaptation of immigrants is highly appreciated based on the key MIPEX indicators, according to which Norway occupies one of the leading positions¹⁴.

Employment and income levels are indicators of the social and economic integration of immigrants into the host community. According to Statistics Norway at the beginning of 2018, the unemployment rate among migrants was 6.1%, which is 0.8% lower than in 2014.¹⁵ This is a high rate, but the unemployment rate among migrants is markedly higher than among the citizens (1.8–1.9%)¹⁶. The migrant's employment depends on work experience and the availability of education. Generally, the highest unemployment rate is among refugees from African countries, who have lower levels of education and professional qualifications. Accordingly, they are mostly represented in professions that do not require education. Employment rates are markedly higher among migrants who had adaptation courses. Thus, 70% of male migrants were able to find employment within a year after the end of the program, among women this indicator is lower (50%, average 61%)¹⁷.

The income level of immigrants shows a positive trend. Over the period 2003–2017, it grew by 1.3% but lags the national average. Thus, the average annual income of a resident of Norway in 2017 was NOK 367.4 thous., while a migrant from the EU/EEA, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand — NOK 299.1 thous. Immigrants from Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe (non-EEA), except for Australia and New Zealand, had an average income of NOK 249.7 thous.¹⁸. Differences in income are due to many factors: level of education, professional qualifications, language knowledge, etc.

The political and legal aspect of integration can be determined by the number of persons who have acquired citizenship and their participation in elections. In 2008–2017, 136,7 thous. migrants received Norwegian citizenship, that is 17% of their total number. In 2017, 9,8 thous. out of 21,6 thous. migrants passed the naturalization process¹⁹. An important indicator of integration is political participation. Thus, 55% of immigrants who received Norwegian citizenship took part in the parliamentary elections in 2017. Traditionally, there is a high proportion of people from Eu-

¹⁴ Migrant Integration Index. 2015. Norway. URL: <http://www.mipex.eu/norway> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹⁵ Registered unemployed among immigrants. Statistics Norway. URL: <https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/07115/tableViewLayout1/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹⁶ Registered unemployed among non-immigrant population. Statistics Norway. URL: <https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/07115/tableViewLayout1/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹⁷ Immigrant integration/Kompetanse Norge. URL: <https://www.kompetansenorge.no/English/Immigrant-integration/> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

¹⁸ Stein L. Jorunn, F. Fattigdom og levekår i Norge Tilstand og utviklingstrekk — 2017/NAV Rapport No. 4-2017. 79 p. URL: <http://fayllar.org/fattigdom-og-levekr-i-norge-tilstand-og-utviklingstrekk-2017.html> (Accessed: 25 December 2018).

¹⁹ Overgang til norsk statsborgerskap /Statistisk sentralbyrå, 2017.URL: <https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/statsborger> (Accessed: 19 December 2018).

rope who participate in elections. However, the participation of ethnic Norwegians is 23% higher than that of immigrants. The participation of residents and migrants in municipal elections is significantly lower, accounting for 64% and 42%, respectively. The active civil position is more pronounced among migrant workers [26, Dokka A.G., pp. 147–148].

All immigrants in Norway are included in social and cultural adaptation and take courses in the Norwegian language and culture. Thus, according to the National Agency for Competence Policy (VOX), the number of successfully written Norwegian language proficiency tests increased by 9 times over the period 2006–2017. However, language proficiency tests are more successfully passed by those with an education. Thus, in 2017, 55.9% of migrants with secondary education and only 1.1% without education were successfully tested for language proficiency²⁰.

It should be noted that the equality of migrants and their protection against discrimination is not fully ensured in Norway. It was noted that this figure was one of the lowest in Norway (59%).

The integration process is a two-way street, and its effectiveness depends not only on the host state. An integral part of integration is the adaptation of migrants themselves to the new social environment, i.e., to what extent they are willing and able to accept and respect the norms, traditions, and rules of the receiving society while preserving their cultural and national identity. Representatives of individualist European cultures tend to adapt easily due to the identity of basic values and models of behavior. Serious difficulties in adaptation are experienced by carriers of opposite spiritual and moral traditions. It is relevant, first, for people from Asian and African countries, who consider collectivism and family clan relationships as key principles of interaction. There is a desire of migrants from these countries to segregate, to isolate themselves from the host society, to unite on ethnic and religious principles, which hamper the adaptation. The officially declared policy of equality of cultures creates conflicts such as protests against some of the host country's traditions under the pretext of insulting the religious feelings of immigrants (requirement of cancellation of Christmas trees, the permission of polygamy, etc.). The incentive to adapt refugees to the social and economic life is also offset by significant social benefits, which exceed the basic needs of migrants.

All these behaviors cannot but cause legitimate resentment on the part of the host society. According to polls, in 2018, more than 70% of Norwegians generally recognize that immigrants are useful for society in terms of their contribution to the development of the economy and cultural enrichment of the country. 57% of respondents generally disagree with the assertion that immigrants are a source of social uncertainty. Compared to 2009, this indicator increased by 5%, which indicates the growth of confidence in immigrants, but at the same time, the integration policy pursued by the state. Currently, 53% of the respondents supported the measures taken by the state

²⁰ Educational level, sex and test result for persons who have taken the Norwegian language test for adult immigrants 2014 – 2017/ Statistics Norway. URL: <https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/11318/>(Accessed: 19 December 2018).

in relation to immigrants. Only 29% spoke in favor of making policies towards migrants more complex, whereas in 2009 this figure reached 49%²¹.

In general, the Norwegian integration policy is comprehensive and highly effective. Although the number of indicators of the integration index decreased significantly in 2015 compared to 2007. Among them: long-term stay in the country and acquisition of citizenship by 4 points, participation in the political life of the country and the possibility of family reunification by 6 points. Compared to 2010, the employment rate of migrants of working age decreased by 6 points, to 56.5% and the risk of poverty increased by 49%²². This is due to several factors. Norway's immigration system failed to cope with the large influx of refugees in the context of the European migration crisis. In addition, entry rules have been tightened, especially for family reunification. Under the amendments to the Immigration Act, only spouses, and their young children were entitled to family reunification, not relatives, as they used to be. The minimum annual income for a family member who calls his relatives to Norway has been raised from NOK 250,000 to NOK 297,000. One of the most important innovations is setting the minimum age of 24 years from which a spouse could invite her partner to Norway. The requirement was formally introduced to prevent forced marriages. It is known that in several third world countries parents "conspire", connecting young groom and bride together against their will. However, the law was aimed at restricting the entry of foreigners into Norway. According to statistics, most mobile immigrants, incl. family immigrants are persons under the age of 24. The DNA test for spouses without children was established by law. This initiative was adopted after selective testing of Somali spouses, among whom this entry position prevails. The results showed that 40% of childless spouses were not married together but were close relatives. Following the release of DNA tests, 25% of requests for family reunification from Somali, Eritrean, Turkish and other nationalities were voluntarily withdrawn²³.

Integration policy in Russia

Russia has extensive experience in the incorporation of various ethnic groups into the nation-state. Most often, numerous peoples became part of a single country due to the territorial expansion of Russians. The term "colonization", in our view, reveals more accurately the essence of the incorporation of numerous ethnic groups, focusing on the purposeful nature of the impact on this process by the of the state in the Russian conditions. According to Russian researchers, the integration into the Russian state of the Finn-Ugric and Turkic peoples of the European North, the Volga area, the Urals and Siberia took place both through their cultural and linguistic assimilation through Orthodoxy and civil naturalization with the spread of all rights and obligations of the Russian subjects [27, p. 16]. The colonization received a new impetus and content during the Soviet

²¹Holdninger til innvandrere og innvandring. Statistics Norway. URL: <https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvhold> (Accessed: 20 December 2018).

²²Migrant Integration Index. Norway. URL: <http://www.mipex.eu/norway> (Accessed: 20 December 2018).

²³Smirnov A. Postoronim v'ezd vospreshchyon [Unaffiliated entry is forbidden]. *Novie izvestiya*. URL: <https://newizv.ru/news/world/18-03-2014/198751-postoronim-vezd-vospreshen> (Accessed: 04 March 2018). [In Russian]

period, when workers, engineering, scientific and managerial qualifications were in demand for industrialization. The practice of attracting labor resources to the North, Siberia, the Far East, numerous suburbs has gained great development. The policy of colonization received an important administrative and organizational resource in the form of party and Komsomol bodies. The economic development of new territories took place and through violent migrations.

After the collapse of the USSR, for a long time, the integration of migrants was not a task of migration policy. Adaptation and integration have been carried out in civil society through resettlement and human rights organizations. Integration of migrants into Russian society was formulated relatively recently, in 2012, in the “Concept of the State Migration Policy of Russia for the period up to 2025”, and then only as a task, rather than the objectives of migration policy. However, it would be wrong to assert that the state has been removed from solving the problems of incorporating migrants into Russian society. Back in February 1993, the laws of the Russian Federation “On refugees” and “On forced migrants” were adopted. They are aimed at regulating forced migration and had an avalanche character after the collapse of the USSR. An important tool for the integration could be the program of resettlement of compatriots, adopted in 2006.²⁴ When resettling, the participant of the state program and members of his family receive a guarantee and social support, in particular, the cost of moving to a permanent place of residence is paid, a one-time settlement allowance. At the introduction of the program, it was announced that about 300 thous. people will arrive in Russia during the first 3 years of the program (but, at the beginning of 2010, there arrived about 17 thous. people). In 2012, the resettlement program for compatriots was approved in a new edition and became permanent. Compatriots were free to choose the territory of the settlement, without focusing on vacancies of employers; in the territories of priority settlement, the payments increased by 2 times (from 120 thous. up to 240 thous. rubles). The number of territories participating in the program increased (at the end of 2017 — 60 territories of the Russian Federation). It is important that the new version of the program has eliminated the requirement of a place of work, which has expanded the range of potential participants. At the same time, the legislator left the requirement of permanent registration at the place of residence, which seriously complicates the process of naturalization. According to the head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, given in November 2017, just over the past 10 years, almost 675 thous. compatriots returned to Russia.²⁵

According to experts, migrant workers in Russia have minimum guarantees in the field of social protection: by ratifying the European Social Charter²⁶, Russia has made a minimum com-

²⁴ «О мерах по оказанию содействия добровольному переселению в Российскую Федерацию соотечественников, проживающих за рубежом» (“On measures to facilitate the voluntary resettlement of compatriots living abroad to the Russian Federation”). Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of June 22, 2006 №637 URL: <https://xn--b1aew.xn--p1ai/document/8391252> (Accessed: 20 December 2018). [In Russian]

²⁵ TASS Information Summary. 13.11.2017. URL: <https://tass.ru/obschestvo/4723756> (Accessed: 24 December 2018). [In Russian]

²⁶ Ratification of the European Social Charter (Revised) of 3 May 1996. Federal Law of the Russian Federation from 03.06.2009 № 101-FZ URL: <http://base.garant.ru/12167396/> (Accessed: 24 December 2018). [In Russian]

mitment under this document: migrant workers are guaranteed only non — discriminatory tax treatment and the possibility of sending money to their homeland [28, p. 18]. Until 2012, insurance premiums were paid from payments in favor of foreign citizens and stateless persons only within the framework of compulsory insurance against industrial and occupational accidents or diseases. No other contributions should have been paid from such persons. In accordance with the amendments, since 2012, persons temporarily staying on the territory of Russia, who have entered into a labor force and were included as insured under compulsory pension insurance contract for an indefinite period, or fixed-term employment contract for a period of not less than 6 months. Since 2013, foreign citizens temporarily staying on the territory of Russia are considered to be insured persons under compulsory pension insurance provided that they have entered into an employment contract for an indefinite term, or fixed-term employment contract (fixed-term employment contracts) of at least 6 months, i.e. in total during a calendar year²⁷. According to Doctor of Economics I.D. Ivakhnyuk, in Russia there is a simplified understanding of integration and attempts to assign responsibility for integration exclusively to migrants. Since 2015, Russia introduced a test on knowledge of the Russian language, history, and basic legislation of the Russian Federation for foreign citizens. This instrument of integration policy is mandatory for persons intending to obtain a residence permit or citizenship. At the same time, in the case of temporary migrant workers, the language test could provoke their departure into illegal employment, making integration difficult. This measure demonstrates a simplified, unilateral understanding of the essence of integration, shifts responsibility for it exclusively to migrants, underestimates the importance of social protection of migrants as conditions for their integration²⁸.

The CIS states enjoy a visa-free regime, and their citizens can work in the Russian Federation under a patent. An important stage for Russia's migration policy was the creation in 2014 of the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) that ensures freedom for movement of goods, services, capital and labor. Since 2015, when the Treaty on the establishment of the EAEU came into force, citizens of the participating countries (Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia) received some employment privileges. Esp., labor migrants, i.e., citizens of the CIS member states buy a patent for work in the Russian Federation, they are equated in labor rights with citizens of the Russian Federation.

The possibilities of naturalization of migrants have become more difficult compared to the early 2000s. In 2009, changes were made to the “Law on Citizenship of the Russian Federation”. The Law abolished the possibility of obtaining Russian citizenship in a simplified procedure for foreigners and stateless persons and sharply decreased number of naturalized (from 394 thous. peo-

²⁷ «O vnesenii izmenenij v ot del'nye zakonodat el'nye akty Rossijskoj Federacii po voprosam obyazatel'nogo pensionnogo strahovaniya» (“On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation on Mandatory Pension Insurance”) Federal Law No. 243-FZ of December 3, 2012. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. 07.12.2012 URL: <https://rg.ru/2012/12/07/oms-dok.html> (Accessed: 22 December 2018). [In Russian]

²⁸ Ivakhnyuk I.V. Predlozheniya k migracionnoj strategii Rossii do 2035 goda. (Proposals for the migration strategy of Russia until 2035). INF Report. 2017, September. P. 9 URL: <http://russiancouncil.ru/activity/publications/predlozheniya-k-migratsionnoj-strategii-rossii-do-2035-goda/> (Accessed: 23 December 2018). [In Russian]

ple in 2009 to 111 thous. people in 2010) [29, Chudinovskikh O.C., p. 29]. The system of issuing temporary residence permits and residence permits remains complex and bureaucratic. Russian legislation is aimed at attracting and using temporary foreign workers with short terms of employment contracts (up to 1 year).

Experts note the extremely low quality of migration statistics in Russia. There is no information on the number of working foreign citizens, on the areas of their work, on their education and qualification level, on gender and age composition, on the terms of stay in Russia — both on federal, regional and local levels. The decision was taken in 2011 to change the criterion of attribution of foreign citizens arriving in Russia to permanent and long-term migrants from “12 months and more” to “9 months or more.” As a result, the category of permanent migrants, which is commonly understood in demographic statistics as a source of change in the number of resident populations, has been expanded to include numerous temporary workers migrants, which completely distorted the pattern of permanent migration²⁹.

Comparative analysis of the integration policy of Norway and Russia

For our research, the fact of comparative evaluation of Russia's integration policy in 2010 is important, esp., the use of the international indicators of the MIPEX integration index³⁰. As a tool, the researchers used the questionnaire 2007. (experts V.I. Mukomel, A.E. Shaparov, Yu.F. Florinskaya, O.V. Popova). The questionnaire included 6 indicators: access to the labor market, family reunification, long-term stay, political participation, citizenship and protection against discrimination. According to experts, in such areas of integration as access to the labor market, long-term stay, and citizenship, Russia almost did not differ from most European countries. On such indicators as political participation, protection against discrimination and family reunification, Russia has lagged most European countries. According to the results obtained, the assessment of Russia's integration policy at that time was 50% of compliance with the ideal European standards, and in the ranking of countries at that time Russia would occupy the 16th place, being in the middle of the list (the maximum rating in 2007 had Sweden — 88%, the minimum — Latvia with 30%) [30, Mukomel V.I., p. 420].

In 2017, MIPEX evaluation methods were again applied to Russia. The work was coordinated by the National Research University of the Higher School of Economics and the quality was checked by the central research group MPG MIPEX. The data for Russia is based on the situation as of January 1, 2015 and is compared with MIPEX data for 38 countries in the MIPEX web database. Data collection was carried out by the International Laboratory of Socio-Cultural Research at the

²⁹ Ibid. P. 54

³⁰ Prokhorova A. Politika integracii migrantov v Rossii: primer ocenki s ispol'zovaniem indeksa integracii MIPEX [The policy of integration of migrants in Russia: example of assessment with the use of the MIPEX integration index] Demoskop Weekly. 2011. № 479 — 480. URL: <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2011/0479/analit05.php> (Accessed: 22 December 2018). [In Russian]

Higher School of Economics, head V. Ponizovsky (among experts V. Mukomel, V. Postavalin, O. Vorobyova)³¹.

Table 2

Evaluation of the policy of integration of migrants in the EU, Norway and Russia according to the indicators of MIPEX³²

Indicators	European Union 2015	Norway 2007	Norway 2015	Russia 2007	Russia 2015
Labor market mobility	57	90	90	50	40
Family reunion	61	69	63	-	42
Education	37	-	65	-	18
Political participation	40	88	82	25	9
Permanent residence	61	74	70	66	33
Access to nationality	47	52	52	57	40
Anti-discrimination	63	59	59	35	20
Health	42	-	67	-	18
Overall rating	51	72	69	50	28

Experts note that Russia in 2010-2017 seriously worsened the quality of integration policy on several key indicators: access to the labor market, citizenship and long-term residence, which was hardly offset by progress in other areas. Currently, according to the total number of points of key indicators assessing the quality of integration policy, Russia (28 points) was in one of the last places, losing Latvia (31 points) and ahead of only Turkey (25 points).

Today, Russia has no anti-discrimination legislation. Migrants face difficulties in protecting their rights. Access to justice is difficult for migrants. According to experts, as in 2007, and at the present time, Russia's integration strategy can be characterized as "differentiated separation", based on a clear differentiation of rights and opportunities of temporary migrants and citizens of the country [31, Vykhovanets O.D., Prokhorova A.V. et al., p. 144]. While state integration policies often focus on the inculcation of migrants (language learning, adaptation to cultural norms, knowledge of history), opinion of researchers, the fundamental aspect of the integration of migrants is economical. The opposite is the discrimination of migrants in the labor market, its conditions, and remuneration, great difficulties in defending their rights through the justice system, stigmatization of migrant workers in the media and public views significantly offset the efforts of the state to adapt migrants to sociocultural socialization. As a conclusion, the economic

³¹ Next MIPEX country: Russia. URL: <http://www.mipex.eu/next-mipex-country-russia> (Accessed: 22 December 2018).

³² MIPEX-2015 <http://www.mipex.eu/next-mipex-country-russia> (Accessed 22 December 2018); Demoskop Weekly <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2011/0479/analit05.php> (Accessed: 22 December 2018). [In Russian]

integration of migrants and the efforts of the state to protect against discrimination of migrants should become the basis of Russia's integration policy.

Conclusion

The total fertility rate in both countries under review (2017). Norway — 1.85 and Russia — 1.61³³) predetermines their dependence on immigration as a factor of preserving simple reproduction of the population (to keep the population at one level the SKR should be not less than 2.15). Both countries are attractive to international migrants, whose share of the population will continue to increase. Whether migration becomes a factor in the development of the host society, or a source of conflict and security threats depends on the effectiveness of the integration policies of migrants, the main actor is a state.

The analysis showed that the model of integration of migrants in Norway is not ideal. It was difficult to obtain citizenship and enter the country because of family reunification. Immigrants are not fully protected against discrimination. The education and health of migrants needed to be improved. Quality indicators of integration policy worsened three points for the period 2007-2015. (Table 2).

In general, Norway has built a multilevel and comprehensive system of integration of migrants, while in Russia it is only in its formative stage. Norway's integration policy, characterized by flexibility and mobility, has been able to withstand the onslaught of the European migration crisis and maintain a leading position in the world. In Russia, according to the data of the Migration Integration Index — MIPEX for 2007–2015, the quality indicators of integration policy have worsened twice (Table 2). Moreover, the decrease of integration indicators migrants occurred in such important areas as access to the labor market, citizenship, protection against discrimination and long-term residence, and was not compensated for by progress in other directions

To improve the effectiveness of Russia's policy in the field of integration of migrants, it is necessary to conceptualize the immigration policy, its legal and organizational management support with the division of responsibilities and powers, and development of mechanisms for its implementation. The introduction of anti-discrimination measures at work and wages, ensuring access to health care, education, and legal services are among the pressing tasks of the state policy. Successful integration of migrants is a prerequisite for the growth of the Russian economy and the development of the main spheres of life of Russian society.

References

1. Castles S., Korac M., Vasta E., Vertovec S. Integration: Mapping the Field. *Home Office Online Report*, 2005, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 115–118.
2. Favell A. Integration Nations: The Nation-State And Research On Immigrants In Western Europe. *The multicultural challenge. Comparative Social Research*, 2003, vol. 22, pp. 13–42.

³³ The World Factbook 2018. The total fertility rates. URL: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2127.html> (Accessed: 24 December 2018).

3. Freeman G. Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies. *International Migration Review*, 2004, no. 38, pp. 945–969.
4. Dmitriev A.V., Pyadukhov G.A. Integratsiya trudovykh migrantov v megapolise: lokal'nye modeli, kontekst identichnosti (metodologiya i metody issledovaniya) [Integration of labor migrants in a megacity: local models, context of identity (methodology and research methods)]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya* [Sociological Studies], 2013, no. 5, pp. 49–55.
5. Malakhov V.S. *Integratsiya migrantov: Kontseptsii i praktiki*: monografiya [Migrant Integration: Concepts and Practices]. Moscow, "Liberal'naya Missiya" Publ., 2015, 272 p. (In Russ.)
6. Mukomel' V.I. Problemy integratsii vnutrirossiyskikh inoetnichnykh migrantov [Integration problems of internal ethnic migrant workers]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya* [Sociological Studies], 2016, no. 5, pp. 69–79.
7. Semenenko I.S. Integratsiya inokul'turnykh soobshchestv v razvitykh stranakh [Integration of cultural communities in developed countries], *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [World Economy and International Relations], 2006, no. 10, pp. 58–68.
8. Pitukhina M.A. Razvivaya osnovy mirovoy migratsionnoy politiki: vklad Rossii [Developing International Migration Policy: Russia's Contribution], *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [World Economy and International Relations], 2015, no. 12, pp. 99–104.
9. Rosenblum M.R. Immigration and U.S. National Interests. Historical Cases and the Contemporary Debate. In: *Immigration Policy and Security: U.S., European, and Commonwealth Perspectives*. Eds. by T. Givens, G. Freeman, D. Leal. N.Y.: Routledge Publ., 2009, 175 p.
10. *Immigration, Integration, and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective*. Eds. by A. Chebel d'Appollonia, S. Reich. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press Publ., 2008, 496 p.
11. Malakhov V.S. *Integratsiya migrantov: evropeyskiy opyt i perspektivy Rossii* [Migrant Integration: European Experience and Prospects for Russia]: rabochaya tetr. Moscow, Spetskniga Publ., 2014, 24 p.
12. *Controlling immigration: a global perspective*. Ed. by W. Cornelius, P. Martin, J. Hollifield. Stanford University Press Publ., 2014, 510 p.
13. Brochmann G., Hagelund A. *Immigration Policy and the Scandinavian Welfare State 1945–2010. Migration, Diasporas and Citizenship*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Publ., 2012, 275 p.
14. Opsahl E., Sogner S., Kjelstadli K. *Norsk innvandringshistorie: I kongenes tid 900–1814*. Norway, Oslo: Pax Forlag, 2003, 213 p.
15. Fladmoe A., Steen-Johnsen K. Is Ethnic Diversity Bad for Any Dimension of Social Capital? Trust, Networks and Voluntarism in Norwegian Communities. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 336–366.
16. Friberg J.H., Midtboen A.H. Ethnicity as skill: immigrant employment hierarchies in Norwegian low-wage labour markets. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 1463–1478.
17. Hardoy I., Mastekaasa A., Schone P. Immigrant concentration and student outcomes in upper secondary schools: Norwegian evidence. *European societies*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 301–321.
18. Kotlova E.S. Lavirovanie sredi aysbergov: modeli etnicheskoy politiki Norvegii [Maneuvering between icebergs: ethnic policy models in Norway]. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2015, no. 21, pp. 17–32.
19. Chukalova N.S. Mekhanizmy sotsiokul'turnoy adaptatsii i integratsii migrantov v Norvegii i Danii v XXI v. [Mechanisms of socio-cultural adaptation and integration of immigrants in Norway and Denmark in the 21 century]. *Vestnik KRAGSiU. Seriya Teoriya i praktika upravleniya*, 2017, no. 19 (24), pp. 25–40.
20. *European immigration policy: A comparative study*. Ed. by T. Hammar. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press Publ., 1985, 315 p.
21. Mukomel' V.I. *Migratsionnaya politika Rossii: postsovetskie konteksty: monografiya* [Russian Migration Policy: Post-Soviet Contexts]. Moscow, Dipol'-T Publ., 2005, 351 p. (In Russ.)
22. Kapitsyn V.M. Regulyatory adaptatsii migrantov (voprosy metodologii i klassifikatsii) [Regulators of Adaptation of Migrants (Issues of Methodology and Classification)], *Rossiyskiy zhurnal pravovykh issledovaniy* [Russian journal of legal studies], 2018, no. 1 (14), pp. 158–166.
23. Shaparov A.E., Kalachnikova M.Yu. Immigratsionnaya povestka pravoradikal'nykh partiy v Skandinavskikh stranakh [Immigration agenda of right radical party in the Scandinavian countries]. *Sredne-*

- ruskiy vestnik obshchestvennykh nauk* [Central Russian Journal of Social Sciences], 2018, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 73–84.
24. Sandnes T. *Innvandrere i Norge 2017*. Statistisk sentralbyrå, Oslo: Kongsvinger Publ., 2017, 193 p.
 25. Alghasi S., Hylland Eriksen T., Ghorashi H. Introduction, in *Paradoxes of Cultural Recognition: Perspectives from Northern Europe (Research in Migration and Ethnic Relations Series)*. Ed. by S. Alghasi, T. Hylland Eriksen and H. Ghorashi. Hardcover Publ., 2009, 318 p.
 26. Dokka A.G. *Valgdeltakelsen blant innvandrerne økte svakt*. Statistisk sentralbyrå, 2017, 193 p.
 27. *Politika immigratsii i naturalizatsii v Rossii: sostoyanie del i napravlenie razvitiya: analiticheskiy doklad* [The policy of immigration and naturalization in Russia: state of affairs and development management: an analytical document]. Ed. by S.N. Gradirovskiy. Moscow, «Nasledie Evrazii» Publ., 2005, 309 p. (In Russ.)
 28. *Politika integratsii migrantov v Rossii: vyzovy, potentsial, riski* [Migrant integration policy in Russia: challenges, potential risks]. Moscow, Spetskniga Publ., 2013, 34 p. (In Russ.)
 29. Chudinovskikh O.C. *Gosudarstvennoe regulirovanie priobreteniya grazhdanstva Rossiyskoy Federatsii: politika i tendentsii: monografiya* [State regulation of the acquisition of citizenship of the Russian Federation: policy and trends]. Moscow, HSE Publ., 2014, 76 p.
 30. Mukomel' V.I. *Adaptatsiya i integratsiya migrantov: metodologicheskie podkhody k otsenke rezul'tativnosti i rol' primayushchego obshchestva* [Adaptation and integration of migrants: methodological approaches to assessing the effectiveness and role of the host society]. *Rossiya reformiruyushchayasya: Ezhegodnik*. Ed. by M.K. Gorshkov. The Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Novyy khronograf Publ., 2016, no. 14, pp. 411–467.
 31. Vykhovanets O.D., Prokhorova A.V., Savinkova Yu.K., Starchak M.V., Yatsenko E.B. *Transformatsiya identichnosti trudovykh migrantov kak odna iz sostavlyayushchikh stanovleniya grazhdanskogo obshchestva v Rossii: monografiya* [Transformation of the identity of migrant workers as one of the components of civil society in Russia], Moscow, Nasledie Evrazii Publ., 2014, 144 p..