

Integration or Assimilation: Do Norwegian Barnehager preserve Immigrant children's Native-Culture according To their parents?



Noro Rabehanitriniony

Master's thesis in Special Educational Needs

Autumn semester 2012

University of Stavanger - Norway



Universitetet
i Stavanger

DET HUMANISTISKE FAKULTET

MASTEROPPGAVE

Studieprogram: Master i spesialpedagogikk	Høst semesteret, 2012 Åpen
Forfatter: Noro Rabehanitriniony (signatur forfatter)
Veileder: Hildegunn Fandrem	
Tittel på masteroppgaven: Assimilation or Integration: do Norwegian barnehager preserve immigrant children's native-culture according to their parents? Norsk tittel: Assimilering eller integrering: hvordan opplever innvandrerforeldre at barnehagen ivaretar deres opprinnelige kultur?	
Emneord: Integration Assimilation Culture Acculturation Immigration Immigrant parents Barnehage	Sidetall: 62 + vedlegg/annet: 2 Stavanger, 23. oktober 2012

Summary

This paper presents a framework for understanding culture differences and immigrant parents' points of view and experience with barnehager. The purpose of this study was to understand and have an overview over a few immigrant parents' cultural point of view and at the same time, identify integrative and/or assimilative patterns in their children's life at a barnehage. Analyzing the immigrant parents' point of view about cultural differences based upon the integrative and assimilative perspectives can as well provide a new starting point for teaching and educational research, especially in Special Educational Needs. The priority concern of the present paper was to explore if immigrant parents claim that their children should be given the opportunity to be "themselves" at the barnehage, in addition that they get the chance to open up for new horizons. To get answers to the research question: *Integration or Assimilation: Do Norwegian Barnehager preserve Immigrant children's Native-Culture according To their parents?* A semi-structured interview was conducted. Three immigrant parents from a collectivistic-oriented culture have taken part in the research interview. All three informants were chosen from barnehager which collaborate with the University of Stavanger thanks to a project called "Skoleklar". The main findings from the research are as follows: two of the three immigrant parents interviewed were most of all concerned about transmitting their native-culture, such as mother-tongue and emotional heritages, to their children, inside the family-home and do not wish the barnehage staffs to convey their native-culture to their own children and other children at the barnehage. In other words: the two mothers can be said to practice assimilative integration, not integrative socialization, because they put a "boundary" between their children's native-culture acquisition inside the family-home and the fact of letting the barnehage staff transmit their native-culture to their own children and other children at the barnehage. The last informant however claimed that the fact of transmitting her native-culture to her children inside the family-home, as well as the fact that the barnehage staffs transmitted her native-culture to both her children and other children at the barnehage was equally important to her. The latter can be said to practice integrative socialization.

Acknowledgments

This thesis concludes my Master's thesis in Special Educational Needs, and hopefully will be the continuation of a carrier in the educational field. University years 2010-2012, my first experience at a Norwegian University, despite 8 years of residence-time in Norway, have been one of the most exciting, but at the same time one of the most challenging experience I have ever had. Fortunately, I got precious helps.

First and foremost, my supervisor Associate Professor Hildegunn Fandrem deserves special thanks for her kindness, availability, accessibility, guidance, precious advice and consideration regarding my thesis. Secondly, thanks to the barnehage directors of board who had been my "door-openers". They gave their consent and devoted their time to help me find informants. Likewise, the parents, who provided me with precious information I could use in the present paper, ought to have my acknowledgement. Without their consent and willingness to share their experience, it would have been impossible to fulfil this Master Thesis.

I also owe my deepest gratitude to my husband and my two wonderful children who have been the source of my inspiration for writing this paper. I am grateful for their support, patience and smile which always encouraged me when I was frustrated facing challenges. My thoughts go as well to my beloved parents who told me again and again how proud they are to have me. Thanks to my dear brother as well for his valuable advice, his honest feedbacks, support and encouragement.

I would like furthermore to address my gratefulness to all my professors and the staff at the Department of Humanistic Sciences at the University of Stavanger who provided me with the necessary knowledge and knowhow which enabled me to fulfil my study. I will not forget to thank my dear classmates for two unforgettable years together. And last not least, thanks to God who has planned a brighter future for me thanks to this fulfilled Master study.

Yours truly

Noro Rabehanitriniony

Stavanger, 23rd October 2012

Cover illustration: unknown artist

Table of contents

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Thematic significance.....	1
1.2 Purpose and Research Question	3
1.3 Definitions and focus.....	3
2.0 Theory	7
2.1 Culture.....	7
2.2 Collectivistic-oriented versus individualistic-oriented culture	7
2.2.1 Individualism and Collectivism in the family	9
2.2.2 Individualism and collectivism, schools and educational systems	10
2.3 Acculturation	11
2.3.1 Society of origin and society of settlement	13
2.3.2 Prior-acculturation factors.....	15
2.3.3 Two types of acculturation outcome: psychological and sociocultural adaptation	17
2.3.4 Acculturation strategies.....	18
2.4 Immigrants' integration in Norway.....	20
2.5 Integrative and assimilative socializations at the barnehage: advantages and drawbacks	22
2.5.1 Assimilative socialization.....	24
2.5.2 Integrative socialization.....	24
3.0 Methods	26
3.1 Why a Qualitative Research?	26
3.2 Research Interview.....	26
3.3 Researcher's ethical and legal responsibilities	28
3.4 Informants.....	30
3.5 Interview process.....	31

3.6 Research process and techniques	33
4.0 Results	36
4.1 Case study 1	36
4.2 Case study 2	40
4.3 Case study 3	44
5.0 Discussion	47
5.1 Family background and adaptation patterns	47
5.2 Prior-acculturation factors and acculturative strategies	49
5.3 Cultural or linguistic shock?	52
5.4 Value, interests and socialization	53
5.4.1 Sheila and the Collectivistic-oriented values	57
6.0 Conclusion	59
6.1 Main findings	59
6.2 Methodological reflection	60
6.3 Need for further research	61
6.4 Practical implications	61
References	I
Appendix	IV
Appendix 1: Interview-guide	IV

1.0 Introduction

The educational system in Norway consists of barnehage, barneskole (primary school), ungdomsskole (middle school), videregående skole (High school) and Universitet (Higher Education or University). In the present study, it was not made an attempt to translate the Norwegian word: barnehage into English. The reason is that barnehage has a unique value and system which cannot be compared or resembled to any other educational systems in the world (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2011). This unique value will be explained more thoroughly later in this study. The barnehage is a non-compulsory educational offer for pre-school children: that is children between 1 and 6 years-old. Young children are sent to the barnehage to learn to socialize with other children and adults working at the barnehage and at the same time develop social and academic skills they will need later in life. The term barnehage will therefore be used all along this study because of the main reason mentioned above.

The present study is written in English first for personal reasons: being a teacher of English and as a user of Norwegian as a fourth language, it has been a “natural” and reasonable choice to write this paper in English. Second, it is in order that those interested, in Special Educational Needs, education in general or immigration-issues, worldwide can have the opportunity to read it.

1.1 Thematic significance

The theme of the present study is an up-to-date theme thanks to globalization and immigration - issues worldwide. Besides, being an immigrant parent, having two children, going to a barnehage, it has been a personal choice and interest to explore what other immigrant parents think and experience in a daily basis. On the other hand, it can help other professionals in the Special Educational Needs to “tailor” measures that can help both immigrant parents and pre-school teachers to improve the lives of immigrant children at a barnehage, and/or to understand some immigrant parents’ attitude and point of views regarding culture differences. The barnehage law § 2, 3rd paragraph quotes that: *culture here includes art and aesthetics, common behavioral patterns, knowledge, values, beliefs, experiences and expression. Culture is about to create and renew heritage and traditions (...) children's culture is here understood*

as a culture of, for and with children. Barnehager were established in order to be a cultural arena. Both local and national cultural values, still according to the barnehage law, should be reflected in the children's childhood, barnehage have therefore the important function to develop children's cultural identity. To convey values and provide room for all children's own cultural creation is therefore the main task a barnehage has (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2011).

To fulfill this assignment, barnehage must take into account each child's social, ethnical and cultural background, including the Sami and other minority children's language and culture. Language is among one's cultural heritages. Native language constructs our identity and is closely related to our emotions. The barnehage should encourage and give minority children the opportunity to express themselves in their mother-tongue. The barnehage should in addition ensure that all children socialize in a multicultural community. Play and interaction can help to promote communication across cultures and to promote culture in general, *because culture is a way of communication between people, rather than as something static* (Eriksen, 1994). Awareness of one's own cultural heritage and involvement in others' culture will contribute to the fact that children learn to understand others' perspective and behavior. Linguistic, cultural and religious diversity will be, in addition, empowering the community at a barnehage. The barnehage should reflect and respect the religious diversity represented in the children's group. The Norwegian law emphasizes that parents have the right to bring up their children according to their religion and beliefs, but at the same time, they should allow that their children have the right to be acquainted with the society they grow up in. Norwegian and international law provide protection against religious and cultural discrimination. Kunnskapsdepartementet (2011, p.45) states that:

Ethics, religion and philosophy can help to understand people's values and attitudes. Religion and spirituality fosters ethical norms. Respect for human dignity and freedom, nature, spirit, charity, forgiveness, equality and solidarity are values expressed in many religions. These values are also the root for Norwegian religion (...) Norway is a multicultural and multireligious society.

1.2 Purpose and Research Question

The Research Question analyzed in this paper is: *Assimilation or integration: Do Norwegian Barnehager preserve Immigrant children's Native-Culture according To their parents?* The Research Question will help bring answer to the following:

- What is culture for the immigrant parents interviewed in the present study?
- Which of their native-cultural aspects differ from the cultural features described in the barnehage curriculum?
- Do immigrant parents experience cultural differences between their native- and the Norwegian culture?
- Do they feel the need that their native-culture should be valued at the barnehage?

1.3 Definitions and focus

Norway has, the past few years, become the society of settlement, or host country, for immigrants from all over the world. Those immigrants have brought their children along with them while moving to Norway, or they gave birth to children while living in Norway. If we compare how the word *immigrant* or *migrant* have been described from 1990s until nowadays, we can note the following: Haagensen, Kvisler and Birkeland (1990) state that in Norway, in the 90s, the term immigrant was not yet clearly defined and delimited. In daily language, the word immigrant described persons whose linguistic, cultural features and physical appearance stand out from the Norwegian nationals. Due to that fact, it was recorded different statistical figures and numbers for how many immigrants really reside in Norway. The statistical data, most often referred to the global term *foreign nationals* (Haagensen, Kvisler, & Birkeland, 1990) when they referred to immigrants. The number of these foreign nationals was as well dependent on the number of foreign nationals who were born or who died in Norway.

These foreign nationals in addition, included both foreign citizens who became Norwegian citizens and Norwegian citizens who acquired foreign citizenships. All these confusions show how questionable it is to use the word immigrants as a collective term to describe a group that is very complex in terms of nationality, social affiliation, language, culture and educational background (Haagensen, Kvisler, & Birkeland, 1990).

Social anthropologist Gullestad (2002), in NOU (2010), states that the term immigrant arouses different association in different parts of Norway. In Oslo, for instance, immigrants are Muslims and Pakistani, in Finnmark, they are Tamil people, Buddhist or Orthodox Russians. In Kristiansand, however, Vietnamese and Catholics are considered as immigrants. Statistics Norway's (*Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2008*) definition of immigrants: is as follows: *Norwegian-born persons and persons who moved to Norway, but whose both parents were born abroad*. The Norwegian society has become far more complex than before due to geographical mobility and an increasing globalization trend (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2011). Furthermore, nowadays, the Norwegian community can be said to consist of the Norwegian majority and of the national minorities: Sami indigenous people, and the minorities with immigrant background.

Ways of thinking are important part of the cultural heritage people have. Both immigrants and locals can have their respective cultural features. There are immigrant people coming from both individualistic and collectivistic-oriented cultures in Norway. Most of them come from collectivistic-oriented culture and are generally from *Non- Western* countries. Specific cultural values and features which are important for individualistic-oriented and collectivistic-oriented societies would be explained more thoroughly later in this stud. In 1995, Statistics Norway divided the world map into *Western* and *Non-Western* countries for statistical purposes. The division was based upon the living conditions and migration patterns of the immigrants and their descendants, in relation to their continent of origin. The point was to create a suitable section which could help Statistics Norway to explore, in a more orderly manner, the lives of immigrants in Norway.

This classification could help to find out systematic variations in integration or marginalization patterns of these immigrants, based upon where their countries of origin are situated in the globe. The other Nordic countries use similar technique in their migration statistics. The United Nations, however, classifies the different countries in the world into *more, less and least developed countries* (Høydahl, 2007). The classification is based upon life expectancy, living standards and education in each country. There are immigrants from over 200 countries in Norway. They include western countries such as Western Europe, USA, Canada and Oceania, and non-western countries such as Asia including Turkey, Africa, South and Central America and Eastern Europe. By Eastern Europe countries is meant former

countries behind the Iron Curtain, including the former Yugoslavia (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2008). After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and later, after the expansion of the European Union (Høydahl, 2007) however, Statistics Norway revised the categorization of the western and non-western countries into two new categories:

The first category consists of: EU / European Economic Area (EEA) country, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. EU and EEA countries includes: Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Gibraltar, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway , Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia. Slovenia, Spain, UK, Switzerland, Sweden, Germany, Czech Republic, Austria and Hungary, as well as Andorra, Faroe Islands, Greenland, Monaco, San Marino and Vatican City. The second category comprises: Asia including Turkey, Africa, Latin America, and Oceania excluding Australia and New Zealand, and Europe outside the EU / EEA. European countries outside EU / EEA are included: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Belarus, Kosovo, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, Serbia and Ukraine.

What makes the difference between immigrants from the EU /EEA and the other countries mentioned above is that countries from EU and EEA come to Norway because of the labor market. Most immigrants from countries further east and from the former Yugoslavia, however, have come as refugees. An important difference between the two groups is that immigrant workers often move in and out of the country, as it suits them. Refugees, however, are far more residents in Norway because they cannot move back to their country of origin. This difference can be significant in many areas when it comes to adapting to the Norwegian society (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2008).

May, 23rd 2012, Statistics Norway (Statistisk Sentralbyrå) published another categorization of the different countries represented in Norway (Strøm & Holmøy, 2012). The categorization was based upon an economic report entitled *Makroøkonomi og offentlige finanser i ulike scenarioer for innvandring (Macroeconomics and public finance in different scenarios for the immigration)*, written by Holmøy Erling and Birger Strøm. The calculations were made on behalf of the Welfare and Migration Committee, which submitted its report in May 2011. The report's main purpose is to explore if the impacts of immigration in the long run can ease the pressure on public finances or not. In this context, researchers are studying the importance of

immigrants' country of origin, family, and economic integration (Strøm & Holmøy, 2012). The researchers divided immigrants into three groups of countries: country group 1 includes Western Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand), country group 2 includes Eastern European EU countries and country group 3 represents the rest of the world (Strøm & Holmøy, 2012). Here again, we can note that the terms Western Europe and Eastern Europe (or Non-Western Europe) have been one more time used in Statistics to differentiate immigrant people's country of origin in Norway. The informants in this study come from Non-Western countries, that is to say: they come from country group 2 regarding the last classification.

2.0 Theory

2.1 Culture

Culture is a complex word which cannot be defined in one unique manner. As a general definition however, we can borrow Hofstede (2001, p 1 and 9)'s clarification. He defines culture as *collective programming of the mind (...) that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another (...)it manifests itself, not only in values, but in more superficial ways: in symbols, heroes and rituals*. Mind here means our way of thinking, feeling and acting. These can have consequences on our beliefs, behaviors and skills. Symbols can be anything such as behaviors or objects that can have meaning and importance to those who share the same cultural background. Heroes can be persons, who can serve as role-models by conveying specific and typical norms and values respected in one given culture. At last, rituals are collective activities, socially important to keep individual within the norms of collectivity: religious and social ceremonies, as well as ways of greeting and showing respect to each other can be examples of rituals. Hofstede (2001) states that, to understand cultural differences we need to study the History of the countries we want to know more about.

2.2 Collectivistic-oriented versus individualistic-oriented culture

Hofstede's theory on *collectivism* and *individualism* (2001) is essential here, mainly because they can help us understand why specific population behaves in a particular manner. Collectivistic-oriented and individualistic-oriented cultures cannot be dissociated from *acculturation* and *acculturation strategies* (Berry, 1997). The theory of collectivistic-oriented and individualistic-oriented culture is used, in addition, in cross-cultural psychology to explain differences between cultures. Hofstede (2001 p.225) defines individualism and collectivism as follows:

Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family only (...)
Collectivism, however, stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.

He points out that in some cultures, individualism can be experienced as a *blessing* and a *source for security*, while in others; it can be seen as isolating oneself from other people. Many Americans, for instance, can see the individualism in their culture *as a major reason for the success of the United States (...) it can be seen as a value system shared especially by the majority in the middle-classes in a society*. An example of specific features within individualistic-oriented culture can be rare family ties. In China, however, by the reign of Mao Zedong for instance, *individualism was seen as evil* (Hofstede, 2011 p. 211). For Mao Zedong, individualism and liberalism were synonym of *selfishness*. The selfish behavior that Mao condemned is the fact of prioritizing personal interests above those of the collectivity. Even nowadays, Mao's anti-individualism, pro-collectivist ethos can still be deeply rooted in the Chinese tradition. Collectivism does not imply a denial of the individual's well-being or concern; it can be assumed however that preserving the group's interests can be the best guarantee for the individual's success according to Hofstede (2001). Yeh, Aurora and Wu (2006) agree with the same assumption: an essential feature of collectivistic-oriented culture, according to them, *is that individuals are entitled to reach collective goals and sacrifice their personal ones*.

Edward Hall (1976 p.212) in Hofstede (2001) has made a distinction between cultures on the basis of their ways of communicating. He introduces the differentiation between *high and low-context communication*. High-context communication means that most of the information a person wants to convey can either be explicit in a physical environment or symbolized by the person himself. The written or oral message can only reveal a part of a message itself. Low-context communication however implies that lots of information can be made explicit either orally or written. Hofstede (2001 p.212) states he agrees with Hall's differentiation. The distinction can be viewed as an aspect of collectivist-oriented versus individualist-oriented culture. Collectivist-oriented cultures can be often high-context communicative societies, whereas individualist cultures are typically low-context communicative societies. That is to say: self-evident things in collectivist-oriented cultures may have to be said or explained explicitly in individualist-oriented cultures or context.

2.2.1 Individualism and Collectivism in the family

Hofstede (2001 p.225) points out *that family is the first place where culture learning begins. Families are mini-models of society to which children learn to adapt. The society is thus a product of its families, but families are also products of their society.* Blumberg and Winch (1972) in Hofstede (2001) describes a *curvilinear hypothesis* for the relationship between family size and society progress as they develop from traditional to modern. The hypothesis claims that very traditional hunting-gathering tribes used to live in nuclear families. Agricultural societies, however, were usually composed of extended families, clans or tribal units. Nowadays, those agricultural societies have become modern urban-industrial societies but family size decreased again and extended families split up into nuclear families. Among the specific characteristics of modern nuclear families, examples like grand-parents can be sent to homes for the aged can be quoted.

People from collectivistic-oriented culture, however, can live in more extended families or clans, with grand-parents, uncles, aunts and cousins. Hofstede (2001 p.228) points out that *people in collectivist societies are integrated not only horizontally but also vertically.* In other words, family-ties can be so tight that family members can stay in close contact with their parents, grand-parents and other elders so long they are alive. Younger generations can therefore be expected to perpetuate that tradition. This is the horizontal integration meant by Hofstede (2001). When it comes to vertical integration, Hofstede (2001) states that collectivist families can have respect for the memories of deceased ancestors and are able to remember their genealogy over many generations.

In collectivistic-oriented culture, the family can constitute the main source for identity construal of a collectivistic person. At the same time, it can provide help, care and support for the members within the family circle (Yeh et. al, 2006). Among coping strategies in collectivistic culture, we can quote seeking support and advice from near family members and relatives. Baker (1979) in Hofstede (2001 p.226) states in referring to traditional China: *it is not the family which existed in order to support the individual, but rather the individual who existed to continue the family.* When faced with daily problems, individuals from a collectivistic-oriented background usually do not ask help from professionals or individuals outside the family circle (Yeh et. al 2006).

People from an individualistic-oriented culture however, can live in nuclear families, composed of the husband, the wife and their children. Children growing up in nuclear families may be taught to think of themselves as *I*, that is to say: as an independent and *self-made person* (Hofstede, 2001). Individualistic-oriented parents' goal, while educating their children, may be to teach them to be self-sufficient human-beings, right from childhood. Hofstede (2001 p.228) states however, when it comes to horizontal and vertical integration, that *people in individualist societies lack not only horizontal but also vertical integration*. Hofstede (2001) meant here that as a *normal result* of the individualistic upbringing-style, children from individualist-oriented culture can be expected to leave the family-home as soon as they have learned to take care of themselves. In addition adolescents do not necessarily or are not expected to keep close contact with their parents after they have moved from the family-home. Grand-parents can live alone and can be expected to take care of themselves as well. In case they become infirm, they can be sent to homes for the aged where professionals,. Their own children or grand-children may not be expected to take care of them.

In individualist-oriented cultures, *speaking one's mind is a virtue* (Hofstede 2001, p228). To tell the truth about one's feelings can make of a person a sincere and honest person. One should be careful not to hurt others when faced with confrontations, but this does not imply that conflicts are to be avoided. In those families, children may be taught that one should always tell the truth even if it hurts. Coping with daily issues and conflict can be, for individualistic-oriented families, normal. Children may be taught from childhood, and even encouraged, to express feelings and give opinions. While in collectivistic-oriented cultures, personal opinions, often, matter less or do not exist at all. Personal opinions may be predetermined by group opinions and children can be taught and can be expected to respect that (Hofstede 2001).

2.2.2 Individualism and collectivism, schools and educational systems

Hofstede (2001) states that, the purpose for education may be perceived in different manners by individualist-oriented and collectivist-oriented cultures. In the former, education may be seen as intended for preparing the individual to face society. In other words: *learning to cope with new, unknown and unexpected situations* (Hofstede, 2001 p.235). Individualists can have

a positive attitude toward what is new. For them, learning in life can never end; even after they have graduated from higher education. Through courses for instance, they may refresh their knowledge. Individualist-oriented society would try to provide students the necessary skills to get along in the modern world. In collectivist-oriented society, however, the main goal for education may be mainly to teach skills in order to have the necessary competence and knowledge in life. Education may be viewed as the best way to help a person to become an acceptable member of a collectivist-oriented society. Learning can be usually seen as a one-time process, reserved for young people only. This can be mainly because young people have to learn in order to participate in society (Hofstede 2001).

2.3 Acculturation

Acculturation has been defined by Redfield, Linton and Herskovits (1936, p.149) in Berry (1997 p.7) as: *phenomena which result when group of individuals having different culture come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups*. Despite the fact that acculturation can be viewed as an unbiased term, as explained in the definition above, mostly because changes can occur for both immigrants and local citizens, one particular group may be more prone to be affected during this process. Berry, (1997 p.7) uses the term *acculturating group* to describe the group of people who can be subject to behavioral and emotional changes when immigrating.

Knowing how people from collectivistic- and individualistic-oriented cultures think and behave is important to help us understand how they will react and adapt themselves when faced with acculturation. This is especially important because those people can have specific cultural pattern and values back-home that may differ from what they may experience in the country of settlement. Berry (1997, p.6) points out that individuals and groups can cope and behave differently when faced with acculturation. Graves (1967) in Berry (1997) has made the distinction between acculturation as a collective or group-level phenomenon and *psychological acculturation* in a more individual level. *Psychological acculturation and adaptation are employed to refer to psychological changes that occur as a result of persons experiencing acculturation*. In the acculturation process, acculturation may include behavioral change in the culture of a group. In addition, acculturation can be a change of psychology of a person. Individuals can have the ability to cope with psychological acculturation while being faced with different level of difficulty. Berry (1980) in Berry (1997 p.12) describes three

possible ways a person can experience during the process of acculturation: *behavioral shift (1)*, *culture shock (2)* and *psychopathology (3)*.

Behavioral shift (1): The first assumption, which considers psychological change to be easy to achieve, is called behavioral shift. That is: the fact of learning new manners and behaviors which fit in the new culture. It requires, at the same time, that the immigrant *unlearns* some behaviors which are no longer suitable for his life in the host country. *Moderate culture conflict* however can occur when the immigrant experiences difficulty because of behavior he has to learn but which can be inappropriate in his native culture.

Culture shock (2): When more serious psychological difficulty however takes place because of acculturation, Culture shock is the term used by Oberg (1960, p.12) to describe this phenomenon: *culture shock tends to be an occupational disease of people who have been suddenly transplanted abroad*. Culture shock is a sort of distress due to the fact that an immigrant or a foreigner loses all well-known signs or familiar symbols of social interaction he or she is being used to. Culture shock can result discomfort and the culture of the host country may be considered as *bad* because it can create discomfort and stress for one self. To recover from culture shock an immigrant has to learn to get to know the people of the host country. But this cannot be achieved without knowing the local language. This is because *language is the principal symbol system of communication (...)* and when the language is acquired, still according to Oberg (p.145), *a whole new world of cultural meanings opens up for you*.

Berry (1997) however uses the concept of *acculturative stress* to explain the same phenomenon. He describes three main reasons to support his assumptions. For the first, he states that the concept of acculturative stress can be the result of *environmental stressors* described by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) in Berry (1997). According to Berry (1997), the *psychological models of stress*, explained by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), can constitute a solid theoretical background that may help us understand the acculturative stress. Secondly, *shock* in cultural shock according to Berry (1997) *suggests only negative experiences and outcomes of intercultural contact*. Only moderate difficulties, however, can, according to him occur during the acculturation process and coping strategies are available to help acculturating groups. That is to say, the acculturating group can overcome the shock if they use the

appropriate strategies. And thirdly, the source of acculturation *is not cultural* but *intercultural*. It resides in the process of getting in touch with a new culture, according to Berry (1997).

Psychopathology (3): When severe difficulties are experienced, then psychopathology or *mental disease perspective* is used to describe the psychological state of a person (Malzberg and Lee, 1956, Murphy, 1965 and WHO, 1991 in Berry 1997). The individual's ability to cope with acculturation can be too weak to bear the changes in the new cultural context that it can lead to serious clinical depression and anxiety.

2.3.1 Society of origin and society of settlement

Berry (1997) points out that to be able to explain and understand the process of acculturation, it is essential to explore the concepts of *society of origin* and *society of settlement* and their respective cultural and *societal characteristics*. This is especially important, on one hand because immigration historical background and immigration policies of the society of settlement may contribute to how well the process of acculturation may be experienced by immigrants. And on the second hand, it can be because knowing the culture of both societies of origin and society of settlement can help us understand which aspects of *cultural distance* (Berry, 1997 p.16) or cultural differences may prevail between these two societies. People may leave their *society of origin* and move to a new country for different reasons. The society of origin may not only be the home-country but the root of all cultural heritage immigrants will take with them to a host country. Contexts such as political, economic and demographic settings of that society of origin may help to define the *migration motivation* of immigrants. Bhugra & Gupta (2001) claim that migrants can generally be divided into two distinct groups: *voluntary and forced groups*. The first group includes people who migrated for economic or family reasons, while the second group includes refugees and asylum-seekers.

The 1951 Geneva Convention defines a refugee as *someone who has a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion* in his home-country that he has to move to a new country to protect himself (Bhugra & Gupta, 2011). After the Convention's 1967 Protocol, the definition was expended. From that time on, *refugees are, in addition, persons who fled because of war or violence in their homeland* (UNHCR 2011 in Fandrem, 2011). A person asking protection from a local authority is called asylum-seekers until they are granted the right to stay in a

host-country. In Norway, in case asylum-seekers are not qualified for asylum, the Norwegian Authority nevertheless can consider whether the person may be entitled to protection or not. It can be on basis of humanitarian grounds (*humanitært grunnlag*) or because of special connection one person may have with Norway. In that case, the Norwegian Authority may suggest that they should be granted a work and residence permit. This decision can be based upon Immigration Appeals Board's Immigration Act, section 15, first paragraph, and section 8, 2.paragraph (Utlendingsnemda 2011 in Fandrem, 2011).

According to Bhugra & Gupta (2011), refugees and asylum-seekers can be at high risk of developing psychiatric disorders, and can be considered as the most vulnerable groups of the two. Traumatic experience they have lived back-home can, in addition to psychological problems due to acculturation, cause high post-traumatic disorders. Researchers such as Klepp and Aarø (1997) have proved that refugees can mostly be suffering from post traumatic stress syndrome. The problem may be not, according to them, the person's refugee status, but the events he or she has been living before and during emigration to a safer place. This high post-traumatic disorder can arouse panic, fear, grief and despair and can give psychotic flashback of what the person has been living back-home. When it comes to migration due to family reunification, Bhugra & Gupta (2011) states that even if families migrate or come together in the new culture, levels of acculturation may vary for the different members of the same family. We will learn more about that later, on the paragraph about *Prior-acculturation factors*.

Hofstede (2001, p.430) describes how different generations of immigrants adapt themselves to the country of settlement and how well they can cope with it. He states that first-generation migrant families can experience standard dilemma. *They are marginal people between two worlds, and they alternate daily between one and the other*. In everyday life, that is: at work or public offices for instance, they have to interact with locals, learn the host-culture and practices, and have to deal with local norms. At home, however they can try to maintain their native traditions and values. The father can try to preserve his traditional authority in the home, but at work his status can be often low. He can lose respect from his family because of that, and it can be even worse if he is unemployed. The mother however may be *virtually prisoner in the home, locked up when the father has gone to work*. Hofstede (2001) claims that the mother may not have contact with the locals and the host-society. She may not learn the language and can remain entirely dependent on her children and husband. In other cases,

the mother can have a job, and not the father, she may be, in that case, the one who provides for the family. The father can lose his high status back-home and his family's respect because of that. Members of the second-generation migrants, that is: children born or brought to the host-country at an early age, however, may experience conflict both from their family side and from the host-community. This is because they both reflect their native culture and upbringing-style, and the culture they have acquired from the new country. They can experience identity issue; they do no longer know whom to relate to. Third-generation migrants at last *are mostly absorbed into the host-country population, with host-country values (Hofstede 2001 p.430)*. They are only distinguishable by their foreign family-names or their specific religious and family traditions.

It is worth to pinpoint that the terms first, second and third generation immigrants are no longer used in Norway nowadays. Nevertheless, Hofstede's (2001) description can still portray the daily lives and specific characteristics of those different generations of immigrants. It would be explained later in this paper. As mentioned in the introduction of this paper, nowadays, immigrants are given a general definition: *Norwegian-born persons and persons who moved to Norway, but whose both parents were born abroad* (Kunnskapsdepartement 2011). This definition however concerns only the first and second generation of immigrants. Third generation immigrants is not included in the immigrant concept. People with immigrant background can be generally considered as *minorities* in a country, but Hofstede (2001) states that why groups of people may be considered as minorities in a country can generally be due to cultural values and cultural practices such as: historical background of both society of origin and society of settlement, mutual prejudice and discrimination between these two groups of people and language. However, people may be also called minorities depending on their economic status and how the population is spread in the country they live in. In other words, to be considered as minorities can as well be a matter of *definition*, not only a matter of ethnical background.

2.3.2 Prior-acculturation factors

There are prior-acculturation factors which can contribute to the *quality of the acculturation process* that acculturating group or individual can face in the settlement country (Hofstede, 2001). According to Berry (1997) age can be one key factor that can predict how well the

acculturation process will be for an acculturating individual. Moreover, the earlier the acculturation process starts, the better it will be still according to him. Pre-school children can be more prone to a successful acculturation because those children may have not yet acquired *a full enculturation into one's parents' culture*, and at the same time early childhood *is a period for maximal flexibility and adaptability* (Berry, 1997 p.21). In other words, pre-school children can be seen at less risk of experiencing “culture crash” because they can be still in the cultural learning process and may have not yet acquired a defined cultural pattern. They can learn both about their native culture and the culture of the society of settlement at the same time, and at an early age that they are more unlikely to experience cultural conflict.

Adult immigrants, and especially women who experience acculturation late in life, can even be more at risk of psychological problems according to Beiser et.al (1988) and Carballo (1994) in Berry (1997). This may be because *a whole life in one cultural setting cannot be ignored when one is attempting to live in a new setting* (Beiser et al., 1988; Ebrahim, 1992 in Berry 1997). In addition, experiencing migration and its consequences can as well depend upon gender roles and gender roles expectations in their culture of origin and in the new society according to Bhugra & Gupta (2011, p.8). Women, who have moved to a new country to follow their husbands for example, may likely be experiencing more stress and pressure, putting them in a position of conflict between the two cultures: *It is possible that their own culture expects them to have traditional roles and carry traditional values to pass on to the next generation, but that the new culture expects them to have more modern views.*

Another prior-acculturation factor can be: education. According to Beiser et al (1988) in Berry (1997) education can appear to be a factor associated with positive adaptation. Education may, as a result, can constitute a good basis for better adaptability to the new culture. According to Blom and Henriksen (2008) in NOU (2010), an immigrant's education can affect his or her life in the host-country in general. The higher education one has, the greater the chance that one can be doing well in many other areas of life. For example, higher education can provide immigrants better opportunities to enter the labor market, and higher educated immigrants can have better-paid occupations than those with less education. It has been found out that there are large differences between different immigrant groups depending on to how much education they bring with them from their country of origin (NOU 2010). In general, it turns out that immigrant women may be less educated than immigrant men when

they come to Norway. 23 percent of adult women report that they came with no education at all, and 26 percent had only primary school. The same can be said to be true for respectively 12 and 20 percent of men. The fact that more women than men totally lack education reflects the practice in some countries of origin, where the boys' education is favored over girls' education. Women can therefore be more at risk for not being *fully integrated* (NOU 2010).

Economic status and education can be related to each other. The dilemma however is that even if education can be seen as an opportunity to provide a brighter economic future for immigrants, educational and work experience back-home can often be devaluated when immigrants move to a country of settlement. According to Aycan and Berry (1996) in Berry (1997), *a common experience for migrants is a combination of status loss and the limited status of mobility. One's departure status is frequently higher than one's entry status.* In other words: immigrants can often feel stress, status loss and low self-esteem due to the fact that their educational or professional experiences back-home may not be valued or may not be considered as worth when they move to a new country. According to Hofstede (2001), it may be due to real differences in qualifications, but it may also be due to ignorance and/or prejudice from local people in the host country.

2.3.3 Two types of acculturation outcome: psychological and sociocultural adaptation

There are two kinds of adaptation according to Searle and Ward (1990) in Berry (1997): *psychological and sociocultural adaptations* In general terms, *adaptation refers to changes that take place in individuals or groups in response to environmental demand.* These adaptations can occur at once, or they can happen in the long- run (Berry, 1997 p.13). Psychological adaptation refers to personal and cultural identity such as good mental health and personal satisfaction in the new environment. Sociocultural adaptation, however refer to the ability to cope with daily issues, such as family life, work situation and school. A third type of adaptation has been added by Aycan and Berry (1996) in Berry (1997): *economic adaptation* which refers to *the degree, to which work is obtained, is satisfying and is effective in the new culture.*

Berry (1997) emphasizes that it is essential to differentiate the two first types of adaptation: Psychological and sociocultural, even though they can usually be difficult to discern the

differences in everyday life. Psychological adaptation may be explained thanks to the context of stress and psychopathology approach mentioned earlier. While sociocultural adaptation may have with social competence to do. Social competence includes, according to Ogden (2009), five important skills that should be taught from barnehage. Children should be educated how to collaborate with others, how to show feelings and be responsible of their own acts. In addition, they should be taught what self-regulation is and how to be able to control one's feelings, especially negative ones. And at last, not at least, they should be trained to be more self-confident (Ogden, 2009).

2.3.4 Acculturation strategies

Berry (1997) stresses that the basic features of acculturation may appear to be common for *any type of immigration*. He points out however that, how well each group can cope with the process of acculturation may differ depending on the reason why they live or stay in the host country. Berry (1997) talks about three factors for immigration: *voluntariness, mobility and permanence*. The acculturation process may as well depend on the acculturation strategies immigrants choose to adopt or the strategies which can be imposed on them.

Berry (1997) claims many countries have become culturally plural because people from different cultural backgrounds came to live in those countries. Migrant workers, for instance, may have chosen to enter the acculturation process willingly in search of a better life, while refugees, as mentioned earlier in this study, may experience acculturation reluctantly because they had no choice. They had to escape from their home-country due to war or political issues back-home, for example. Both groups of people however, got into contact with a new culture because of mobility: they have migrated. For exchange students asylum-seekers or any other group who are allowed to live in a host country for a limited period of time, acculturation can be a short-time experience. Immigrants with residence permit for instance, however, can be permanently living the process of acculturation.

Berry (1997 p.9) claims that acculturation strategies are always based upon two dimensions: the first dimension always concerns issue on *cultural maintenance*, which means the fact of choosing to reject or to maintain one's native or minority culture. And the second one concerns *contact and participation*, which means the choice of adopting or rejecting the dominant group or host culture. This assumption can suppose that minorities can *freely* choose one of the four acculturation strategies: *Assimilation, separation or segregation,*

integration and marginalization. He mentions that from the *point of view of non-dominant groups* or minorities, assimilation occurs when individuals decline their minority-culture and chooses to only adopt the cultural norms of the dominant or host culture. Separation can take place when individuals reject the dominant or host culture in favor of preserving only their culture of origin. But when the same form of acculturative strategy is imposed on the minorities by the *dominant society*, then we use the word *segregation*, not separation. Marginalization is the fact of rejecting both one's culture of origin and the dominant host culture. This latter can, according to Berry (1997 p.10) *the result of attempts at forced assimilation combined with forced exclusion or segregation.*

When individuals are able to adopt the cultural norms of the host country while maintaining their native culture, we can talk about integration. It cannot however be taken for granted that minorities should be able to successfully integrate in a new society alone. Integration can only take place when *the dominant society is open and inclusive in its orientation towards cultural diversity.* He points out in addition that the key to integration is that both minorities and majorities accept to live together as *culturally different people.* Cultural background can be an essential factor that can influence acculturation strategies. Integration and separation can be more likely to happen in collectivity, that is, when members of an ethnical group may be willing to preserve their cultural norms and values. Assimilation, however, can be viewed as a more individualistic strategy. It may depend on whether acculturation was imposed by the mainstream or not. National policies and programs, still according to Berry (1997) can as well be analyzed in terms of these four acculturation approaches. Assimilationist program for instance are expecting all immigrants to become like the dominant groups. Other programs can be integrationist: they may accept and include all groups, independent of their cultural background. Segregationist, as well as marginalizing policies of unwanted groups may exist as well. Integration and assimilation will be the focus in the last part of this theoretical background. What have been found in earlier research about these two types of acculturation strategies and what are the drawbacks and advantages of such acculturation strategies will be enlightened.

2.4 Immigrants' integration in Norway

Haagensen, Kvisler and Birkeland (1990, p 36) state that the words integration and assimilation have always been defined ambiguously, and that people often misunderstood the real content and meaning of these two terms. *They have been perceived as an expression of measurement that it has been difficult to determine the content of.* Assimilation and segregation, which have been defined in the previous paragraph, can be perceived as two extremities of one line, placing integration a place between them. Using the terms integration, assimilation and segregation may become challenging when used to explore immigrants' life in relation to immigration policy measurements and immigration policy practice.

Haagensen et al. (1990) states that in research on immigrants the word integration can be seen as a *measurement* and as a *means* or as a *strategy*. Integration as a means or strategy can apply whether for the individual or group. As an individual strategy, integration can mean that members of a minority group can achieve equality with the majority population by obtaining the skills that give members of the majority group status. It can be achieved by for example acquiring the local language or studying at the local institutions or universities. Integration as a measurement, however, can be set up as the opposite of assimilation. Haagensen et al. (1990) points out that it can be problematic to use integration as a measurement. This is because in research on immigrants the word integration has been defined by different researchers in various ways. The definitions were mainly based on what the researchers find important. It can be clothing, eating habits, human relations or other things. This type of *measurement tool* used by the researcher was used to determine the level of one's integration in a given society, based on a researcher's point of view. Integration should rather be seen as a *process* that is characterized by an ongoing dialogue between the individual and family or individual family members and the community around it. The theory of integration assumes that society is divided into social groups belonging to a community. Immigrants are primarily considered as members of an ethnic group with a particular culture. This group can further be divided into smaller social systems, classes, religions or family structures. The integration process is seen as the exchange between the ethnic group and the surrounding community. In this process it is assumed that both immigrants and majority members can be active participants. *Integration is not a static concept, but an expression of movement and dynamics (Haagensen et.al 1990 p 37).*

Immigrants can be supposed to adapt themselves to the culture and way of life of the country of settlement. That is to say they can be expected to participate actively in the economic growth of the country. The Norwegian society can for instance be entitled to help the immigrants adapt themselves socially and economically, by giving equal opportunities for both local citizens and those immigrants. In the past, experts or labor migrants were the main groups who moved to Norway. It was easier for them to be *integrated* in the Norwegian society because they came to Norway with their knowledge or their general working ability as well as their willingness to work (Kjeldstadli 2003b in NOU 2010). After industrial society peaked slightly after 1970, it became more difficult for immigrants to be *fully integrated*. This may be because refugee or asylum seeker may have in principle not come to fill a special place in the Norwegian economy and the labor market. Nowadays, it can therefore be more difficult for those immigrants to economically and socially adapt themselves to the life in Norway (NOU 2010, P7).

Period of residence can in addition have an impact on how well immigrants can or wish to integrate themselves or not in the Norwegian society, according to Daugstad (2008) in NOU (2010). He was stated that about 40 percent of immigrants have lived in Norway for less than 5 years, 28 percent in 5-14 years, and 30 percent have lived here for over 15 years. The differences in length of stay between different country groups can be significant. Among the largest immigrant groups, immigrants from Poland and Afghanistan can have the shortest length of stay, respectively, 82 and 72 percent can have lived in Norway for less than five years. For immigrants from Iraq, 85 percent lived in Norway for less than ten years and among immigrants from Somalia, the figure is 75 percent. Moving pattern can vary greatly depending on the reason for immigration and it can have an impact on how well or how far immigrant people can wish to be involved or get integrated in the society of origin. The length of stay has been mentioned as a moderate factor, regarding the acculturation process by Berry (1997).

Daugstad (2008) in NOU (2010) found out that living conditions may vary for the different groups of immigrants in Norway. There is a distinction between immigrants who come from Asiatic countries including Turkey, Africa, South and Central America and Eastern Europe and people coming from other parts of the world. Immigrants from the countries listed earlier can have an over representation of people living in households with low income, and which can be more dependent on public welfare programs, compared with population living in

Norway in general. Low education and lack of basic skills among immigrants can be a serious obstacle to improve labor force participation in an increasingly knowledge-based workplace. It can as well contribute to low economic adaptation. Unemployment can be up to three times higher among those immigrants (NOU 2010). These aspects are also found in Berry's (1997) acculturation framework as moderating factors prior to acculturation, and as a factor on group level depending on the characteristic of the country of origin of the immigrants.

2.5 Integrative and assimilative socializations at the barnehave: advantages and drawbacks

Socialization takes place according to Hoem (1978):

When an individual grows into a social system (...) that is when a person lives in a process in which he can influence and can be influenced of his environment (...) in this process, values and social norms are transmitted, skills are developed and identity is shaped.

Thanks to this socialization process, culture can be transmitted to younger generations. Children and young people can at the same time learn to master social skills and knowledge which can help them become active participants in a given society. According to Sand (1996), immigrant children have to develop *bicultural identities* while interacting with the local population. That is to say, they have to learn to cope in two different manners: the first is related to the Norwegian culture such as language or other cultural competence and the second is related to their native-culture. Hoem (1978) uses the terms *values* and *interests* seen in relation with *community* or *conflict* to describe different types of socialization process. He defines *values* as an explanation for what is good and true.

Joar Aasen (2003) in Fandrem (2011) based on Hoem's (1978) investigation has made a schematic view showing the various consequences, depending on whether there is congruence in values and interest, conflict in both values and interest, or congruence / conflict in only one of these areas. In practice, it can be explained as followed: when the barnehave staff and immigrant parents for instance share the same values about children's education, it can create a *common value*, whereas when they disagree, it can lead to *conflict*. *Interest* can be related to the usefulness of an acquired knowledge in the future life a person. Sand (1996) describes an

example about immigrant children's native language learning: if immigrant parents do not want their children to acquire their native-language because the language will not be useful to pass exams in Norway, it can be a common value shared by immigrant parents and some barnehage staff. The result can be according to Aasen (2003) in Fandrem (2011), that the education content can be recognized as useful and engaging. Based on these terms interests and values, Hoem (1978) describes four socializing process: *reinforced socialization, resocialization, desocialization and shielded socialization*. These four socialization processes can have an impact on whether an immigrant child will integrate or assimilate in the new society of settlement:

- **Reinforced socialization** is based on the combination of common value and common interest between parents and barnehage. The barnehage here can take into account what the parents find important about their children's education. It can in addition allow the immigrant child to understand and master his own culture and affiliation.

- **Resocialization** on the other hand is based on the combination between value conflict and common interests. Here, both the barnehage and the parents care for the children, but the education at the barnehage may not in accordance with the parents' expectation and value back-home. The term resocialization generally means *new socialization*. It implies that the immigrant child is expected to acquire new cultural norms and affiliation. It can result that the immigrant child loses his or her native cultural identity.

- **Desocialization** is based upon common value and interest conflict. That is to say: the immigrant parents and the barnehage share a common value, but at the same time they may struggle with interest conflict. In other words: the curriculum may be view as useless but appealing.

- The last socialization process described by Hoem (1978) is **shielded socialization**. This type of socialization is based on both value-and interest conflict. The curriculum of the barnehage, for instance, can be experienced to be both *useless and valueless* by the immigrant child, the

immigrant parents or both. It can result that the immigrant child is *locked up* in his or her native culture thus it may become difficult for him or her to be *influenced*, both positively and negatively by the new cultural patterns of his or her new environment.

2.5.1 Assimilative socialization

Assimilative socialization can occur when immigrant children lose their native identity and culture. According to Engen (1994) in Sand (1996), there are different factors that can lead to assimilative socialization. For the first, immigrant children's resocialization can lead to assimilative socialization. This is mainly because Norwegian barnehage can gradually anchor the Norwegian cultural norms and value into the immigrant child's way of thinking, that the latter, unconsciously, can reject his or native affiliation and culture. This can in other words, lead an immigrant child to attempt to *suppress and hide* his or her origin.

Reinforcing both immigrant children and Norwegian children's socialization can as well lead to assimilative socialization according to Engen (1994a) in Sand (1996). Norwegian children can lack the ability to understand other's culture because they may have developed an ethnocentric attitude: that is to say they can be drowned in their own cultural universe and understanding. In addition, they can have prejudice about others' cultural pattern. This can result that they may not be prepared to live in a more multicultural society. Immigrant children, on the other hand can choose to strengthen the cultural heritage they brought from their society of origin and reject the culture of the society of settlement. Desocialization process can at last result an assimilative socialization because the immigrant children may want to *get rid of* all aspects of their native culture and adopt exclusively the culture of the society of settlement. The culture of the society of settlement may become *the only culture* that can prevail, for both immigrant and local population, with no possible cultural values distinction.

2.5.2 Integrative socialization

Integrative socialization is based on the combination of a reinforced socialization and resocialization for both immigrants and local citizens according to Engen (1989) in Sand (2008). The curriculum of the barnehage should be organized so as to help ensure that all children can experience support and may preserve their identity. They should as well be taught to expand their perspectives and learn about different and new culture. For at

immigrant children can acquire this integrative socialization, it may be required of the barnehage that they help both immigrant and Norwegian children develop a sense of belongingness and cultural identity to both minority and the Norwegian culture.

According to Sand (2008), integration can be understood differently, based on the Special Educational Needs and Migration Education perspectives. Engen (1994) uses the terms *normalisering* (normalization) and *inkorporering integrering* (embody integration) to make the difference between those two understandings: The Special Educational Needs may perceive integration as the opposite of segregation. A barnehage which supports this vision may try to *transform* the immigrant children to be *as alike as possible* the Norwegian children. This may be done by ignoring the immigrant children's native-language and culture, and to point out only *what is alike* in the two cultures, *instead of focusing on what are different*. In this perspective, integration may be viewed as *successful* when the immigrant children become *as culturally and socially alike as possible* the Norwegian children and *when cultural differences are no more noticeable* at the barnehage. But in fact, it can be interpreted as assimilation, not integration because the native culture of the immigrants may not be taken into account here.

In Migration Education perspective however, *integration can be viewed as the opposite of integration assimilation (integrative assimilering)*. In barnehager which favor that perspective, immigrant children may be entitled to preserve their mother-tongue and other cultural patterns, and diversity can be valued as a *pedagogic resource and enriching for all rather than as a barrier* (Fandrem, 2011). Sand (2008) claims that if the immigrant children become more and more alike the majorities and lose their native identity and culture, it will mean that integration has failed (Sand, 2008). When integration, understood as *group-pluralism (gruppepluralism)* is the goal, minorities' language and culture are essential. It is no use to talk about *pluralism* if it is only the majorities' language and culture which are represented in a society. She means that *it is diversity which makes pluralism*. Engen's (1989 in Sand 1996) researchers have proved that integration, based upon the Migration Education perspective, which is identical to *integrerende sosialisering (integrative socialization)* is the most effective acculturating strategy for immigrants.

3.0 Methods

3.1 Why a Qualitative Research?

To begin this methodological part, a short survey of what characterizes a Qualitative Research and why qualitative research has been chosen some technique for this study is explained. According to Silverman (2001 p.25) *the choice between different research methods should depend upon what you are trying to find out*. That is to say: researchers may decide to whether use a qualitative or a quantitative approach for their research, but the choice should be based on what kind of findings they intend to make. Silverman (2001) portrays an example on when qualitative or quantitative data should be used. If researchers for instance want to find out how people intend to vote, then a quantitative method, *like a social survey*, may seem to be the most suitable alternative. Whereas when researchers are concerned with *exploring people's life histories or everyday behavior*, then qualitative methods may be the best choice. The purpose of the present study was to explore immigrant parents' points of view and perspectives. A qualitative approach has then been the most appropriate method to use to get answers to the research question. There are different kinds of qualitative methods, such as observations, research interview, grounded theory or ethnographic analyze. Research interview is the qualitative approach chosen for the present study.

3.2 Research Interview

Qualitative interview is one of the most used techniques to gather information and data in qualitative research. Researchers, however, should evaluate in the first place if interview is the most appropriate method to choose for his research (Johannessen, Tufte, & Christoffersen, 2010). Mason (2002) in Johannessen et.al (2010 p 136) points out that researchers should be able to answer the questions listed below before they can decide to interview people. Answers to the questions, which are relevant for the present study, are given at the same time.

- *Why do I want to have a dialog with people in order to gather information which can bring answers to my research question?*

Answer: I want to get spontaneous and genuine information which explore the informants' point of view and experience with the barnehager.

- *Why do I wish to use Qualitative interview?*

Answer: I wish to explore the informants' "everyday life" with the barnehager.

- *Why do I choose to use this flexible approach instead of using a more structured form of data collection?*

Answer: I want the informants to feel free to express themselves.

- *What are the weaknesses of qualitative interviews which can restrain me from getting the answers to my research question?*

Answer: It can be challenging to get sincere answers if the informants do not feel at ease during the interview. Informants should feel relaxed to be able to express themselves. It is crucial to create a feeling of trust and empathy with the informants in order to make them confident enough and willing to take part in the interview process. The choice of the questionnaires is crucial, it is important to avoid asking questions which can hurt the feelings of the informants. The informants have the right to withdraw from the project any time during the process. It can therefore be challenging to get answers to my research questions if it may happen. At last not least, linguistic competence is crucial.

According to Kvale (1997), the purpose of a qualitative research interview is to illustrate and interpret the themes in the interview process. Kvale (in Nielsen, Brinkmann, Elmholdt, Tanggaard, Musaeus and Kraft 2008) points out in addition that qualitative interview can help to develop knowledge about persons. Interview is according to him *a conversational contact between persons rather than simply an action in which information is extracted from an informant. Interviews... allow the researcher to attain rich, personalized information (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011 p.44)*. Johannessen et.al (2008) describes that most researcher may decide to use a qualitative interview because they may want the interviewee to express him or herself more freely. The informants may at the same time be asked to *reconstitute* events: the questions the interviewer will ask should be adapted to match each informant's experience and life situation. *Precise answers* cannot be reached if the researcher uses only structured questionnaires.

What can differentiate qualitative interview from other data gathering techniques is that qualitative interview is a *face-to face dialogue* between a researcher and a research participant. To get as genuine and rich data from the interview as possible, it is therefore crucial that the interviewee is willing to share his or her experiences and views with the interviewer (Kvale in Nielsen et al., 2008). The functions of the informant and the researcher are socially defined as followed: *the interviewer has the power over the informants (...) the interviewer defines the situation, introduces the topics of the conversation and...steers the course of the interview.* Due to this power imbalance, the interviewer would need to show *empathy* to the informants so that the latter is eager to tell experiences and thoughts he or she would not share in *normal circumstances*. Benefits an interviewer and an interviewee gain from the interview will logically differ due to *this power inequality* between those two persons. The researcher may gain professional, academic rewards or recognition that comes from publication of books, while *the informants can benefit from the experience of having someone thoughtfully and carefully listen to what they have to say* (Kvale in Nielsen et. al, 2008 p.190). Ethical and ontological concerns are, therefore, crucial in such cases, in order *not to exploit the informants*. Researchers' ethical and legal responsibilities will be described in the following paragraphs.

3.3 Researcher's ethical and legal responsibilities

Ethics is about principles, rules and guidelines for assessing whether actions are right or wrong (Johannessen et. al 2010, p 89). Ethics is a relation between individuals, that is to say it dictates what we can or cannot do with each other. All kinds of research have to follow strict ethical norms. Research in social science is especially concerned with these strict ethical norms because they directly deal with individuals' life and relation between people. Data collection, such as interview in the present study, needs to be treated with research ethics guidelines which are specific for such procedure. This is because the fact of exploring people's life during the research process and the findings or new knowledge which can reflect the informants' *life reality* can cause both emotional and behavioral issues for these informants. All through this paper, the informants' identity and the barnehave name will be made anonymous. That is to say, their real name will be replaced by pseudonyms. This is to preserve their identity and privacy. In addition, the informants 'country of origin will not be revealed.

Researchers should restrain from exploring themes or special aspect of life which can do harm to individuals and society in general (Johannessen et. al, 2010). The purpose of the present study was to explore immigrant parents' perspectives and to investigate if they think and feel barnehage preserve their children's native-culture or not. The target group for the present research was immigrant parents from collectivistic-oriented culture. Due to personal and sensitive ethnical and cultural data collection discussed in the present study, approval from the *Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste* or NSD (Norwegian Social Science Data Services) was needed before the barnehage manager or board of staff and the informants were made aware of the present project. Data collection could be done only after that the project has been approved.

NSD claims that if a researcher intends to gather personal data by using a computer, then the project is subject to notification. Any kind of information that may be linked to a person is considered as personal data. Data may be linked to a person *through that person's name, a number referring to a list of names, or through a combination of background information (Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste, 2012)*. If the data contains sensitive personal information or cultural and ethical problematic, then the project may be subject to notification even if the data is not processed on a computer. In addition, if the personal information is systematically saved so that information concerning a person may be retrieved, then the project is subject to notification. Using a computer to process or to store audio recordings of people's voices makes of a project a subject to notification as well. In addition to the filled notification form, the interview guide, the informative e-mail addressed to the barnehage board of staff and the informants had to be sent to NSD for approval as well.

When the project had been approved, a hierarchical procedure had, in addition, to be followed before proceeding to the interview. The barnehage boards of staff were the first informed about the project. Even if the project was approved by NSD, it was essential to ask for their permission before the immigrant parents could be interviewed. Not only the managers need to give their consent, but they will be the key person who will help to take contact and inform the interviewees about the project. The informants have, in their turn, the right to agree to take part or not in the project. The informants have been chosen based upon specific criterion. More about the informants will be described in the next paragraphs.

3.4 Informants

There are some principles researchers should follow when selecting target groups. *Purposeful sampling* or strategic selection (Johannessen, 2010 p.106) can be one of the main selection methods used to recruit informants for a qualitative research. This is mainly because the specific characteristics of qualitative research are to get as much as possible data from a limited number of informants. Purposeful sampling means that the researchers first may define who their target group would be, it can be people from a same cultural background for example, then the next stage may be to select those from that specific target group, who would participate in the research. A standard number of interviewee in a qualitative research can generally be between 10 and 15, but in practice, this number can be limited or reduced depending on the research question or the amount of time researchers can dispose. It is worth to remind that the informants have the right to withdraw from the project at any stage of the process. For the present study, five informants were expected to agree to participate in the interview process. Due to different challenges met along the process however, only three informants actually participated in the interview. Further explanation will be brought in the third part of this paper.

The barnehager from where the interviewees were selected have not been chosen at random. They are barnehager which cooperate with the University of Stavanger thanks to a project called "Skoleklar". The informants were furthermore selected according to a purposeful sampling. The informants were immigrant parents belonging to collectivistic-oriented culture. They come from countries, classified by Statistics Norway (2008) as second category. First category and second category countries (Statistisk Sentralbyrå, 2008) have been defined in the introduction of this paper. But it is worth to remind that the second category includes: Asia including Turkey, Africa, Latin America, and Oceania excluding Australia and New Zealand, and Europe outside the EU / EEA. In European countries outside EU / EEA are included: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Belarus, Kosovo, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, Serbia and Ukraine. However, by taking into account the last categorization which occurred May this year, the country of origin of the informants would fall into the country group 2 and 3, which include Eastern European EU countries and the rest of the world.

Statistics Norway follows the economic and social trends of the immigrants in Norway in order to be able to assess the integrative or/and marginalization patterns of these immigrants according to Strøm and Holmøy (2012). The immigrant parents' points of view in this study however were analyzed in order to depict specific cultural features that may differ from the Norwegian culture. Three specific characteristics have been the criteria for the informants. The first criterion was that all informants should come from a collectivistic-oriented culture. This was in order to collect as much as possible information which can differ from the Norwegian culture. It is worth to recall that the Norwegian culture is a more individualistic-oriented culture. The second criterion is that the informants should speak Norwegian or English. At last not at least, they should have lived at least three years in Norway. The goal of the present study was to get as genuine information as possible from people who have had enough contact and experience with the barnehage and the Norwegian system. All three informants have been living between three and twelve years in Norway. Having lived one's whole life in Norway may however influence or fake the credibility of the informant's answer. *Residence time in a new country may have an influence on immigrants' way of thinking and behavior* (Daugstad, 2008 in NOU (2010)).

3.5 Interview process

Semi-structured interview (Johannessen et. al 2010) was used in this research. It means that the interview was based on an interview-guide (ref. attachment number one), while the questions, themes and order of the questions varied. Researcher can ask questions from the interview-guide without following a logical order. In addition to ask predetermined questions, the interviewer can ask follow-up questions designed to investigate more deeply into the informant's perspectives (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011). According to Kvale (1997), there are six *independent* steps in the interview process. Independent, here, means that there is not necessarily a logical or chronological order in the process itself or some steps may not be used during the interview process. These six steps are described as follows:

- The **first possible step** in the interview process can be the informant's spontaneous description of his or her experiences. Neither the interviewer nor the informant brings

here an explanation or interpretation of what has been said. Spontaneous reflections were brought by the informants during the interview.

- The **second possible stage** can be when *the informant discovers new perspectives of his life during the interview*. That is to say, here, the informant can be able to make a connection between his or her past and present life. The present step did not take place during the interview process. It may happen without at the interviewer interpreted what has been said. Hancock & Algozzine (2011) claim that the interviewer should limit her or his comments as much as possible to give more time for the informant to express him or herself.

- The **third possible stage** can be when the interviewer tries to deduce what the informant meant. He or she then gives a feedback to check if he or she misunderstood what have been said or not. The informant has here the opportunity to *correct* the misinterpretation the interviewer may have made or make *a self-correction* of his or her own sayings. In this stage there can be a continuous dialogue between the interviewer and the informant until they reach an agreement about what was really meant by the informant. This third step occurred during the interview. It was a helpful support which enabled to get more precise information about specific themes.

- The **fourth possible stage** can be the interpretation of the transcribed interview. The interviewer may do it alone or with the help of other researchers. First, the interview notes are transcribed, that is to say, they are given a *structure* with the help of qualitative data analysis programs. Structure here means that the different themes discussed during the interview are classified. Secondly, the interviewer *prepares* the notes so that they are ready for the analysis. In other words, the interviewer may remove repetitive statements and makes a distinction between what are relevant or not for his or her research and the theoretical background used for the research. And at last, the analysis itself takes place. It is meant to develop the interviewer's understanding of what the informant said. The researcher brings here new perspectives or points of view to the phenomenon. Data analysis programs have not been used during the interpretation of the results. Data analysis has been processed manually and

without help from other researchers. More about this stage will be explained later in this chapter.

- The **fifth possible stage** can be *re-interviewing*. When the researchers are done with the analysis and the interpretation of the interview notes, they can send the analysis to the informant. This latter can then continue the self-correction he or she did in the third stage, and at the same time, they are given the opportunity to comment the interviewer's interpretation of the interview. They can as well deepen what he or she has been saying during the first interview. I did not have the opportunity to re-interview the informants in the present study.

- The **sixth and last possible stage** of the interview process can be the *social outcome* the findings from a research may generate. That is to say, at the end of the research, both the researcher and the informant may be influenced by the new knowledge and findings and may behave according to these new perspectives. Kvale (1997 p. 123) points out *that research interview can, in that way, be similar to the therapeutic interview*. This sixth step will be more thoroughly explained at *the practical implication part* by the end of this paper.

3.6 Research process and techniques

Johannessen et al. (2001), claims that in an analytic process, a researcher needs to sustain his or her findings by highlighting the *transferability, credibility, reliability* and *conformability* of such findings. Transferability in qualitative study is what generality is for quantitative study. Transferability, on the other hand, is the ability of a researcher to succeed to establish *descriptions, concepts, interpretations and explanations* that can be useful in other field-studies than those studied. Letting other researcher or other expert analyze the same data and control whether they reach the same interpretation of it can be one method to verify the credibility of the findings. Each researcher has his or her unique interpretation of a phenomenon. However, one way to enhance the reliability of a finding is to give the readers a thorough verification of the context or the phenomenon studied. *It can be in the form of a case description - and an open and detailed presentation of the procedure of the research process.*

At last, not at least, conformability is about to ensure that the findings are not just a result of the researcher's subjective attitudes. Conformability can be reached if the researcher supports the findings with literature and, or at the same time use the respondents' utterances from the survey.

The analytic process in the present study would be as followed: the three cases would be confronted to each other. This is in order to analyze similarities and differences between the different statements, based upon specific themes. The main themes explored are: family background, educational, upbringing and cultural features and acculturative strategies. The theoretical background, written earlier in the present study, which can explain, support or contradict the phenomenon, would be, at the same time, confronted to the interviewee's utterances. It is worth to pinpoint that no software has been used to gather the different utterances which fall under a same theme or subtheme. It has been done manually. The interviews have been printed out, the utterances which fall under the same theme have been highlighted with the same color, thereafter had they been clipped and pasted together. This technique has proved to be more effective to me. It gave a better overview over the different themes and tasks to be analyzed. The direct citations, the interview and some theoretical background have been translated from Norwegian into English. Online dictionaries, provided by the online library of the University of Stavanger to translate some technical terms have been used. Usual terms used during the different lectures at the university have been easier to translate. My supervisor also helped me translate some technical terms. Some original terms in Norwegian or the name of some Norwegian institutions have been preserved and the translation in English has been written in parenthesis. This is in order to let the Norwegian readers control the reliability or credibility of the translation.

Interview has been crucial for this research but which difficulty did I meet while looking for interviewees and during the interview process and what can be the cause of such challenges? In order to avoid translating my interviewees' statements and the utterances, I have, in the first place, chosen to have an interview in English. The interview-guide has been written in English and I informed the board of staff at the barnehave that I am looking for people who can speak English at the first place, but to be interviewed in Norwegian was as well a possible option in case they cannot speak English. I was informed; however, before the interview took place that none of them could speak English. They "can" express themselves in Norwegian, according to the board of staff at the different barnehave. I took for granted that immigrants

who came to Norway can speak English. Language barrier could have been one challenge while having the interview because two of the three informants could not clearly express themselves in Norwegian either. Prompts or further explanations have been needed in order to get as precise information as possible. Some questions have not been answered at all. Meanwhile, what have been positive is that they brought some spontaneous information related to the theme of the research sometimes. Those utterances have been valuable and useful. They highlighted some important points I have not asked about.

4.0 Results

It is worth to pinpoint here that four barnehager, renamed as barnehage A, barnehage B, barnehage C and barnehage D have been contacted and informed about the project in order to recruit informants: barnehage boards of director from barnehage A and barnehage B have been eager to let the immigrant parents at their respective barnehage to take part in the interview. However, two immigrant parents from barnehage A did not wish to be interviewed. At last, the barnehage boards of director from barnehage C and D did not give their consent about interviewing immigrant parents at their barnehager. It took two and a half months to recruit the three informants for the present study. In the present study, the findings were displayed and treated as separate *case studies* (Johannessen et.al, 2010). That is to say: the interviewees' *stories* were told one after the other. The stories told about each informant's specific points of view and experience. It would be only in the analytic part the responses would be confronted to each other and of course, to the theoretical background. It was intended to interview 5 parents in order to collect as much information as possible. However, due to some immigrant parents' negative responses to take part in the interview, as well as because of some barnehage board of directors' refusal to let the immigrant parents to be interviewed; it was not made possible. All three interviews have been conducted in Norwegian. The same interview-guide has been used for all informants, that is to say they have been asked the same questions. However, it can be noticed that some questions remained without answers in one or two interviews. The reason was that the different informants have different language skills that they sometimes could not reply to some questions. None of them can speak English.

4.1 Case study 1

The first informant was a woman. She would be renamed Julia in this paper. Julia moved to Norway 3 years ago. Her husband however has been living for 5 years in Norway. It was decided that the husband would come first to Norway in order to find a job. Norway was the country of settlement chosen by this family because of better job opportunities and better salaries here. Once the husband found a job and was well-established, the family applied for a family-reunification visa. Their daughter was two years and a half and Julia was pregnant of their second child when the rest of the family moved to Norway. The baby-boy was born in Norway. At present the two children are going to the same barnehage: the girl is now 6 years-

old and the boy will soon be four years-old. The family moved to the municipality, where the barnehage is situated, two years ago. The reason was that they have bought a flat. The family enjoys living in Norway and do not plan to move back to their home-country in the future.

Both Julia and her husband are working. The husband is working from 7.30 am until 4.30 pm, whereas the wife has different schedule every week. Because of their work situation, they spend less time with their children: they are at the barnehage from 8.00 am until 5.00 pm every day. They spend most of their day in contact with Norwegian-speaking people. The children both enjoy coming to the barnehage according to Julia. When her children began at the barnehage, there was an assistant who translated the course for them and help them during 1 year for 3 hours, once a week. The municipality paid for the assistants. They had mother-tongue training as well at the barnehage in the previous municipality.

Julia said: my daughter learned to speak in correct Norwegian faster since she moved to the present barnehage. At her former barnehage, she spoke in our mother-tongue with other classmates who come from the same country of origin as us. At the present barnehage, however, she has no classmates from our country of origin and has to speak in Norwegian all the time. I noticed, my children have been capable to learn and master the Norwegian language very fast.

Julia said it is a good thing that her daughter can speak Norwegian fluently. It is important according to her. Julia experiences at work and in everyday life that she struggles because of her poor ability to speak the Norwegian language. Fortunately, she has got three colleagues from the same country of origin as her, and they can help her sometimes by speaking in their native-language. Julia said that she has got difficulty to understand what people are saying when they speak in Norwegian dialects or when they speak fast. It is difficult to talk on the phone in Norwegian: ten months of Norwegian courses are not enough, still according to her.

Julia said: mastering the Norwegian language can be very helpful for my children. Immigrant children should go to a barnehage to learn the Norwegian language and the Norwegian culture. It is crucial in order to avoid cultural and linguistic shocks later at school.

It is especially important for immigrant children she said. For children who live at their home-country, it can be an optional alternative, according to Julia, and it is not risky for the child's future even if he or she stays at home as a young child. At her home-town, for example, children do not go to the local kindergarten because there are not enough kindergartens available for all the children from the neighborhood. At the same time, it is very expensive. The grand-mothers or mothers stay at home and take care of the children or grandchildren according to Julia.

Even if Julia's children speak Norwegian fluently; Julia and her husband still think it is important that their children can speak their mother-tongue. They encourage their children to speak their mother-tongue at home by talking only in their native-language with them. In order for their daughter to master her native-language, she is sent to a private school every week-end to learn to speak her mother-tongue, to learn more about religion, mathematics, history and geography. Julia's children read books in their mother-tongue as well at home. Despite the fact that the daughter is learning to speak her native-language, the girl always answers in Norwegian even if her parents talk to her in their native-language. The little girl in addition speaks in a Norwegian dialect the parents do not understand. This makes the communication at home worse. Julia's son however, is good at neither Norwegian nor his mother-tongue. Julia notices no behavioral differences between her children and other children back-home when they are on vacation at their country of origin for instance. She only perceives that her children does not master their native-language and have difficulties sometimes to communicate with other fellow nationals. The little girl tries to translate what she understands to her younger brother, who merely understands what people say, when they are on holidays back-home.

Julia said: my daughter speaks Norwegian fluently whereas her native-language level is intermediate. She seldom speaks our native-language at home. The reason may be because she spends too much time at the barnehage. My husband and I cannot do otherwise, because we both have to work. For us, it is important that our children can speak our native-language. We feel therefore sad that our daughter does not want to speak our native-language.

Julia thinks it is unnecessary that other children learn about specific aspect of her native-culture at the barnehage. Julia thinks that there are too many different cultures at the

barnehage that it would be very difficult for small children to learn about all those different cultures. The only thing the children know and understand for sure is that other parents speak other languages than Norwegian when they come to pick up their children at the barnehage. Julia said that her daughter was very sad and in shock the first few days of her stay at her first barnehage because the other children were speaking many different languages she did not understand. She cried all the time the mother claimed. It has been difficult for her to know which language she should speak. We live in Norway and it is normal that everyone should speak Norwegian according to Julia.

Julia said: to teach other children at the barnehage one song in our mother-tongue once a year can be sufficient. It is difficult for small children to learn about others' culture. They are still too young to understand cultural differences. Norwegian is a common language for all children at the barnehage. Norwegian should be the only language spoken at the barnehage.

Julia claimed that she allows her children to take part in all kinds of activities at the barnehage. The activities are not different from what other children back-home are used to. She allows her children to go to birthday-parties and they invite other children at home as well when their children have birthday. At the barnehage, they have activities like: dance, song, trip and so on. Children in Norway are privileged to have the opportunity to do all kinds of activities all year long according to Julia. They have appropriate clothes that can protect them from cold and all types of weather. At her country of origin, the children cannot go outside from November until Mars she said because they are not well-equipped. Julia added that her family and she did not experience culture shock when moving to Norway, because her culture back-home does not really differ from the Norwegian culture. She talked about Christmas celebration back-home as an example. In other cultures, they do not have that tradition according to her. Neither the mother nor the father can speak English, thus they had really difficulty to express themselves when they spoke to people when they first moved to Norway. Each time they have an appointment with the barnehage staff for example, a translator was needed. Nowadays, they can speak in Norwegian but still experience some difficulties sometimes.

Julia said: what have been difficult for us the first years was not to adapt ourselves to the new culture, but to speak the new language. I am satisfied with my children's life

at the barnehage. My children are well- integrated at the present barnehage. I mean: there is no discrimination here.

4.2 Case study 2

The second informant was a woman as well. She would be renamed Sheila in the present study. Sheila came alone, as a refugee, in Norway in 1990 at the age of 18. She is married to a man from the same country of origin as her. They met in Norway. They have two daughters of 10 years and 6 years-old. This family has a Norwegian citizenship. Both Sheila and her husband came to Norway as refugees. There was war in their home-country. Sheila has studied at a Norwegian University. She is now working at a Norwegian Company. Both Sheila and her husband have a full-time job thus sending their children at the barnehage, has not even been questionable for the couple. Sheila claimed in addition that sending their daughter at a barnehage will do her children well. This can also be valid for all immigrant children according to her.

Sheila said: the fact of going to a barnehage can for example ease the transition from barnehage to school. It is as well crucial that immigrant children are well-integrated into the Norwegian society; that is why it is important for them to go to a Norwegian barnehage to learn about the Norwegian culture and language. Children have the ability to learn the Norwegian language very fast. It is not only through spoken language, but through mimic and gestures and by expressing themselves through emotions that children learn a new language.

Even though Sheila's daughters speak and use the Norwegian language actively at the barnehage and that Sheila and her husband do the same at their respective workplaces, it does not prevent the family from speaking their mother-tongue actively at home.

Sheila said: We speak our mother-tongue whenever we are together. It is important because our children need to know our root and our culture. Speaking our native-language is one way to keep that root alive. (...) For us, integration means to preserve one's own culture, but at the same time learn and get to know other's culture (...) it would be inappropriate if I speak in Norwegian to my children. I do speak Norwegian fluently, but language and emotions are tight, close to each other

(...) I will never express myself like how a real Norwegian would do (...) I am only competent to teach my children my mother-tongue.

Sheila's children can speak their mother tongue fluently, but sometimes, they can lack vocabularies. Her daughters would say the word in Norwegian and Sheila and her husband would translate and teach the new word to them in their mother-tongue. However, when the two girls play together, they speak in Norwegian. The parents always encourage their daughters to speak in their mother-tongue as well when playing, while the pedagogue at the barnehage recommends them not to do so. The pedagogue claimed, according to Sheila, that the Norwegian language is, in that context, the girls' *lekespråk*: Which means language used while playing.

Sheila said: both my husband and I however are convinced that it is important to preserve both our native culture and mother-tongue. Our children should always speak our mother-tongue at home. For us, culture is: habits, customs, language and emotions. (...) It is important to make our children conscious of their origin now that they are still very young. This is because the more they grow up; the more they will feel and behave as Norwegian.

The family goes on vacation at their home-country every year in order to keep up with their family and their cultural heritage. But despite the fact that Sheila wants her children to preserve their native-culture, she claims that her native-culture and the Norwegian culture have much in common. As an example, she quotes that her home-country is a multireligious country like Norway. Her parents have a *mixed marriage* according to her, that is to say they have and practice two different religions. Sheila and her husband however have no attach to religion. Sheila's daughter, though, learn about Christianity at the barnehage, but it does not bother her husband and her. *They can choose the religion they want when they grow older* according to her. Due to the fact that her native-culture and the Norwegian culture are so alike, Sheila claims she did not experience culture-shock at all when she moved to Norway. It was the language which have been challenging according to her. It was frustrating to hear people talk in an unknown language that she decided to learn to speak the language as soon as she arrived in Norway. *Language is part of the integration process* according to Sheila.

What can stand from Sheila's native-culture and the Norwegian culture, however, is feature such as family relationships according to her. She hopes and would love that her daughters would continue to learn and speak her native-language. She hopes as well that her children would learn to take care of their families and other relatives as they grow older. For her, the family includes not only the parents and their children; it is composed of the grand-parents and other relatives. To illustrate her relationship with her parents, she quotes that she speaks with her parents on the phone every single day. The long distance does not prevent them from having close family relationships according to her. Except from the linguistic and the emotional heritage Sheila's daughters hopefully will take over from their parents, Sheila claimed that her daughters would have to find out for themselves what they want to keep or not from their native-culture.

Sheila said: I hope my daughters will inherit the feelings and close relationships, they would retain the close ties we have learned them (...) we sacrifice a lot for our family and relatives. People have different culture but for me and my family; emotions are the most essential. We have tight bond in the family. Family is everything.

Family relationship in Norway is different according to Sheila. Here in Norway, at 18 years and sometimes, even at 16 years-old, the children are expected to leave the family-home and they are expected to take care of themselves only from then on. The relationship with the parents would gradually be weakening she continues.

Sheila claimed that the parents here in Norway, when growing old, are sent to a hospice. Professionals take care of them. At my home-country, they do not do that. If the children still live at the home-country when the parents are getting old, they will take care of them. If they no longer live at the home-country, other family members or relatives would do. The old parents would not be sent to a hospice.

Norwegian people are *cold* according to her. They do not have a notion of tight family bond. As an example she quotes that when her parents came on vacation in Norway, her Norwegian colleagues asked her where her parents would be staying during their vacation. It was a *strange* question, according to her, because for her it was obvious and normal that her parents will live with her and her family at their family-home, not anywhere else. The colleagues

asked as well how long the parents would stay. They were surprised to hear that the parents are staying for three weeks. Sheila claimed: *my Norwegian colleagues said it could be challenging for parents and grown-up children to live under the same roof for such a long period of time.*

When asked if she wanted the barnehome staff to talk about her native-culture to the other children, Sheila claims:

I do not feel that it is needed. The reason is that it is each immigrant parent's task to teach their own children about their native-culture. It depends on each parent's initiative to do it or not. I would not expect or demand that the barnehome staff would convey my native-culture to other children. (...) There are many different nationalities at the barnehome and the staff is very skilled in dealing with multiculturalism. The children at the barnehome can for example learn words in my native-language through games. My children appreciate that the teachers do that. (...) What is important for me, however, is that the barnehome staff would teach social skills such as to appreciate and value others, to understand, know and accept that people can be different to all children (...) and most of all friendship is crucial.

Sheila does not comprehend why some immigrant parents do not send their children at a barnehome. They live like in a *ghetto* according to her. They behave as if they are still living at their home-town that they only get in touch with their fellow- citizens. This behavior can influence the children's attitude according to her.

Sheila said: *I am really against that attitude! Immigrant parents should not expect that the Norwegian society would adapt itself to the immigrants 'lives. . We have to adapt ourselves when we live in a new country. It is the immigrants who should question themselves what he or she can do to be integrated in the Norwegian society. If they give it a try, they will get something positive in return!*

It is not only the barnehome staff's job to encourage immigrant parents to send their children at a barnehome according to her. The whole Norwegian society and communities are responsible to make it happen. Media can be, for example, one means of informing immigrant parents on how important it is to send immigrant children at a barnehome.

Sheila asserted that: *immigrant parents should know that: to be able to take care of our own culture, it is important that we learn about other's culture (...) immigrants should be more open to the Norwegian culture.(...) People come and move to Norway for different reasons she said. There are people who were willing, others who were forced because they did not have a choice. However, whatever the reason why they come to Norway, they have to make an effort to adapt themselves.*

Sheila is satisfied with her children's life at the barnehage. The staff is competent and professional according to her. Her children have never experienced negative incidents at the barnehage. To describe her experience with the barnehage, she uses the words: transparency (*åpenhet*), good communication (*bra kommunikasjon*) and closeness (*tett på*). The theme of the present study is essential according to Sheila. She was willing to take part in the interview, not because she has lots of things to say, but she wanted to share her vision. Sheila quotes that she experiences in her everyday and professional life that people have different culture and points of view. Her Norwegian colleagues and friends have their culture, and the immigrant colleagues, friends and acquaintances have theirs too. It is interesting to experience and know how well people are willing to adapt and integrate into the Norwegian culture, independent of their residence time, according to her. She concluded with an example:

I have a colleague who came as a baby in Norway. He grew up and has lived all his life here. He speaks Norwegian fluently and behaves like a Norwegian in every single way. He however got married with a woman from his home-country. He even travelled to his home-town to choose his wife. At my biggest surprise, however, he does not want his wife to learn the Norwegian language and does not want her to get in touch with the Norwegian people and society. She should stay at home, according to him and just take care of him and their children, because that is what a wife is for.

4.3 Case study 3

The third informant was a couple but it was only the woman who answered to my questions. She will be renamed Swang in this study. They are refugees. The husband came first and has been living 13 years in Norway. Thanks to a family reunification visa, Swang and their oldest son could come and join her husband in 2005. She has now been living 7 years in Norway.

The couple has two sons of respectively 4 years and 6 years-old. They are going to the same barnehage. The oldest son began at the barnehage when he was 4 years-old, while the youngest son began when he was 2. Both Swang and her husband are working. Swang quotes they have decided to send their sons to the barnehage because:

First of all my sons are bilingual children. They need to learn the Norwegian language. (...)To master the Norwegian language will always be helpful for our sons because they are going to grow up in Norway. At the same time, my sons need to develop their social skills through play and communication with the other children and adults at the barnehage. The third reason is my husband and I, are both working. We have no one to take care of the children while we are at work. We have no relatives who can take care of them.

At their home-country, she continued, people do not send the children to a kindergarten. The reason is that the mothers are housewives. They stay at home and take care of the family. In case the mother too is working, then the grand-parents look after their grand-children. Swang and her husband could notice that if compared with the children of the same age back-home, their children are more skilled. The reason she said is because they go to the barnehage and have acquired social and academic competences at a young age. The couple's sons enjoy coming to the barnehage, according to Swang. They tell about what they have done, what they have eaten and who their friends and best-friends are at the barnehage when they come home.

For Swang, culture is tradition, language, religion and food. For her, it is important that her family preserves their native-culture but at the same time they need to know about the Norwegian culture because they live here in Norway. Swang quotes: *caring for our native culture would mean preserving our identity.* The family speaks only their mother-tongue at home. The children answer in their mother-tongue as well, not in Norwegian. The oldest son can speak his mother-tongue fluently and better than his younger brother. The reason is according to the mother because he began only at 4 years-old at the barnehage and has had a long enough mother-tongue education at home. The mother did not work at that time and was taking care of her son at home. The youngest son however mixes Norwegian and his mother-tongue while speaking because he started at the age of 2 at the barnehage according to the mother.

Swang said: *it is both negative and positive that my sons can speak the Norwegian language. It is negative because they little by little forget our mother-tongue, meanwhile it is positive because they have the ability to master the language and can talk to people.*

Swang claims that her husband and she appreciate that the barnehage staff talk about their culture to other children at the barnehage. In fact, the barnehage organizes special days where they talk about the different cultures represented at the barnehage. One specific country is presented to the whole barnehage during that special day. The parents bring traditional food, the children are taught the country's songs and they have fun together. It is essential and crucial according to Swang that the barnehage arranges such event so that the children can get to know each other's culture and in that way they are not afraid of others who are different from them. It is as well crucial for all the children at the barnehage, according to Swang to understand why some children do not eat specific food because of their culture, for example. Swang claims she and her husband did not experience culture-shock when they first moved to Norway.

Swang said: *it was just the unusual and unknown social and educational system in Norway that was new for us. (...) Immigrant parents do not send their children at a Norwegian barnehage because they are afraid. They are afraid of the system in Norway. It is reputed abroad that the Child Welfare (Barnevern) and the Educational and Psychological Services (PPT) in Norway are strict. They have lots of rules and regulations about children's education and lives.*

Most immigrant mothers here, like the mothers back-home, do not work but stay at home to take care of the family according to Swang. They do not feel the need to send their children at the barnehage because they are available for them. The third reason is that immigrant parents do not know what a barnehage is and why it is important to send their children there still according to Swang. Swang would recommend other immigrant parents to send their children to a barnehage because she and her husband are satisfied with what the barnehage is doing for her children and family. Swang suggests that each municipality in Norway should take the responsibility to inform immigrant parents about what a barnehage is. The municipality can do that through the introduction course they have for refugees and new-comers in Norway according to her.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 Family background and adaptation patterns

The informants were women who come from two different family backgrounds: two of them: Sheila and Swang were refugees and the other one has moved to Norway with her family in search of a better standard of living. Berry (1997) mentions three factors for immigration: *voluntariness, mobility and permanence*. Migrant workers may have chosen to enter the acculturation process eagerly, while refugees may experience acculturation unenthusiastically because they were forced to leave their home-town. Bhugra & Gupta (2001) agree with the same assumption and assert that migrants are commonly divided into two distinct groups: *voluntary and forced groups*. The first group consists of migrants for economic or family reasons, while the second group comprises refugees and asylum-seekers. Researchers like Klepp and Aarø (1997) in addition have proved that refugees can be mostly distressed and can develop emotional and mental disorders, not because of their refugee status, but due to the transition from the home-country to a safer place, which is the country of settlement. Acculturation process while settling down to a new country can in addition worsen the mental health of the refugees (Klepp & Aarø, 1997). As a refugee, Sheila could have experienced challenges all her life and she could be more subject to stressful and unsuccessful life; however, her attitude proves, on the contrary, to be positive. What she pointed out during the interview could summarize her mental attitude and her positivism toward life. It is worth to remind what she said:

People come and move to Norway for different reasons she said. There are people who were willing, others who were forced because they did not have a choice. However, whatever the reason why they come to Norway, they have to make an effort to adapt themselves.

Several researches sustain the difficulties refugees can face while acculturating in a new country. In NOU (2007) for instance, it is stated that it can be more challenging for refugees to economically and socially adapt themselves and therefore be *fully integrated* to the life in Norway because they are not meant to come and fill a special place in the Norwegian economy and labor market. Daugstad (2008) in NOU (2010) found out in addition that immigrants from Asiatic countries including Turkey, Africa, South and Central America and

Eastern Europe are mostly people living in households with low income, and they are mostly dependent on public welfare programs, if compared with population living in Norway in general. Unemployment can be up to three times higher among those immigrants (NOU 2010). Hofstede (2001) claims that: economic status and education can be related to each other. The fact, however, is that, educational and work experience back-home are often devaluated when immigrants move to a new country. My three informants however got their first job opportunities when moving to Norway. According to Aycan and Berry (1996) in Berry (1997), *a common experience for migrants is a combination of status loss and the limited status of mobility. One's departure status is frequently higher than one's entry status.* That is to say immigrants can often feel distress because of status when moving to a new country. Julia, Sheila and Swang however have successfully adopted themselves economically and do not respond to the qualifications mentioned above. All three women are active workers and two of them could afford to buy houses. Despite the fact that Sheila and Swang came as refugees in Norway, it did not prevent them from adapting themselves economically.

Economic adaptation (Aycan and Berry 1996, in Berry 1997) which refers to *the degree, to which work is obtained, is satisfying and effective in the new culture*, psychological adaptation which refers to *good mental health and personal satisfaction in the new environment* and *sociocultural adaptation* which refers to *the ability to cope with daily issues* have proved to be successful for my informants. They can be said to be enjoying themselves and thrive in the Norwegian society by the moment the interview has been conducted. At last, not at least, despite different period of residence in Norway, it has been surprisingly positive to note that Julia and Sheila share the same points of view about different themes and are adopting the same acculturation strategy while living in Norway. Daugstad (2008 in NOU 2010), claims however that period of residence can have an impact on how well immigrants, can or wish to integrate or not in a new country of settlement. In the present study, it has been proved that the period of residence in Norway has not been necessarily a key factor for a worse or better adaptation to the informants' new life; if we take into account that the informants have respectively been living three, seven and twelve years in Norway.

5.2 Prior-acculturation factors and acculturative strategies

Prior-acculturation factors like gender, age, education and social status before the arrival at the new country of settlement can, according to Berry (1997), influence the quality of the acculturation process or adaptation to the new culture. Acculturation strategies rely on two essential aspects: cultural maintenance which suggests the fact of rejecting or preserving one's native or minority culture, and contact and participation which means the fact of opting to adopt or to reject the host-country's culture. Berry (1997) stresses out in addition that the quality of the acculturation process may differ depending on the reason for residence at the country of settlement and the acculturation strategy chosen by the immigrants. As mentioned earlier, Julia and Sheila came to Norway thanks to a family reunification: the one as a refugee and the other one as a worker. However, the two women share the same vision when it comes to their children's upbringing-style: learning all about the Norwegian culture at the barnehage, and try to master their mother-tongue and traditions at home. Based upon Berry (1997)'s acculturative assumption, Julia and Sheila's approach can be interpreted from two different perspectives: combining their attitude toward their children when it comes to teaching them about their native-culture and native-language with the fact that they allow them to get in touch and learn about the Norwegian language and culture, may suggest that Julia and Sheila's children can be integrated in the Norwegian society in general. In other words, the two mothers have chosen to adopt the integrative acculturation strategy in that perspective: they teach their children both how to preserve their native-culture and how not to reject the Norwegian culture and language at the same time.

On the other hand however, if we take into account the fact that, Julia and Sheila do not feel the need that the barnehage staff talk about their respective native-culture to their children's classmates, which implies that their children only get in touch with the Norwegian culture and language at the barnehage, then the acculturation strategy adopted by the two mothers is assimilation. Julia and Sheila may be said to struggle between two different worlds: barnehage and family-life, in their everyday life. As Hofstede (2001, p 430) points out that first generation immigrant family can experience standard dilemma. *They are marginal people between two worlds, and they alternate daily between one and the other.* At work or public offices for instance, those immigrants have to interact with the local people, they can be at the same time looked ahead to learn the host-culture, and values. At home, however they may try to preserve their native customs and values. Bhugra and Gupta (2011) agree with

Hofstede (2001) and claim that women who moved to a new country thanks to a family reunification can be more likely to experience stress and pressure due to the fact that their native-culture expect them to transmit the traditional values to their children, but at the same time, they can be expected to have more up-to-date views. Sheila and Julia's daily-lives can be reflected in what Hofstede (2001) claims. Sheila and Julia may be expected to behave differently inside and outside the family-home that they can be said to unconsciously transmit their value and attitude to their children. Sheila and Julia's respective children are entitled to learn and speak only the Norwegian culture and language at the barnehage, and at home they can be "constrained" to behave according to their native-culture and speak their native-language exclusively. If what may happen inside and outside the family-home is analyzed separately, then assimilation may be said to be the acculturative strategy adopted by the two mothers regarding their children's life at the barnehage.

All three women are married to a man from their respective home-country and can be considered to be first generation immigrants because with their respective husbands, they are the first family members to move to Norway. Despite having young children, all three are active women: they are all working and can help provide for their respective families' expenses. Swang pointed out during the interview that most immigrant mothers in Norway still act and live like they were used to in their home-country. In other words: they may stay at home to take care of their family and do not have social contact with the outside world. As a result, the children most of the time may not be sent to the local barnehage but stay at home until they reach 6 years old: the age for compulsory education in Norway. Hofstede (2001) argues that *mothers from the first generation are virtually prisoner in the home, locked up when the father has gone to work. She does not learn the language and can remain entirely dependent on her children and husband.* For the three women in this paper however, it has never been an issue to choose to go to work. They feel the need to be active and social. Sheila asserts during the interview that the first action she decided to do when she first moved to Norway has been to learn the Norwegian language because it is a part of the integration process according to her. My two other informants, even if they do not yet master the Norwegian language, felt the same need. For them as well, learning to speak the Norwegian language can be one key factor to a better integration and in Norwegian society.

Beiser et al (1988) in Berry (1997) asserts that education can appear to be a factor associated with positive adaptation. Education can be a key-success for better adaptability to a new

culture. Blom and Henriksen (2008) in NOU (2010) agree with the same assertion and claim that the higher education an immigrant has, the better is her or his chance for successful life in the country of settlement and at the same time it can provide opportunities for well-paid work. Hofstede (2001) agrees with the same assumption and argues that for individualistic-oriented cultures, education has the main goal to preparing individual to face life. In other words: *learning to cope with new, unknown and unexpected situations (Hofstede, 2001 p.235)*. In collectivist-oriented society, however, education can be a key-factor for better social status. Sheila, through her educational experience at a Norwegian University, could get both better social status and a satisfactory work. Despite coming from a collectivistic-oriented culture, Sheila adopted as well a more individualistic-oriented attitude described by Hofstede (2001) when settling down in Norway. Haagensen et al. (1990)'s statement can describe the "integrative strategy" adopted by Sheila. The word integration can be explained as a *measurement* and as a *means* or as a *strategy* in immigrant research. As an individual strategy, an immigrant can reach and attain equality with the majority population by acquiring the skills that give members of the majority group higher social status: acquiring the local language or studying at the local institutions or universities can be examples of such strategy. The first decision Sheila took when moving to Norway was to learn the Norwegian language and study at a Norwegian University. As an outcome she got a satisfactory work at a Norwegian company. Education and work have therefore been an integrative strategy for Sheila.

Berry (1997) claims that it cannot be taken for granted that minorities should be able to *successfully integrate* in a new society by themselves. Integration can only take place when *the dominant society is open and inclusive in its orientation towards cultural diversity*. Researchers have proved that integration, based upon the Migration Education perspective (Sand, 2008), which is equal to *integrerende sosialisering (integrative socialization)* is the most effective acculturating strategy (Engen 1989 in Sand 1996). Sheila argues immigrant people in Norway should make an effort to adapt themselves to the life in Norway by participating actively in the social and labor life in Norway. She claims, whatever the reason they came here, they should give a try to adopt themselves. The findings in the present study assume that all three informants think they all adopt an integrative acculturating strategy. The reason is mainly because they all let their children preserve their native-culture and teach them to master their native-language. At the same time, their respective children are sent to the barnehave in order to learn the Norwegian language and culture. However, two of them do

not claim or expect that the barnehage introduces or talk about their native-culture to the other children at the barnehage. In fact, Julia and Sheila adopt the assimilative acculturating strategy both inside and outside the family-home: at home, they only focus on their native-culture patterns, and outside the family-home that is at the barnehage: they want their children to adopt only the Norwegian culture and language.

5.3 Cultural or linguistic shock?

For Sheila, culture is about her native-language speaking, but most of all emotional heritages. Swang claims however that for her culture includes tradition, her native-language speaking, religion and food. The three informants point out that they did not experience culture-shock while moving to Norway. Julia and Sheila claim it was the unknown Norwegian language which has been a shock for them, not the culture itself. The two women share the common interest that language-learning is crucial. Swang however asserts that it was the unknown social and educational systems in Norway which differ from her native-culture. Common interest relates here to the usefulness of an acquired knowledge in the future life of a person. Julia claims that the fact of going to the barnehage can be one way to keep her children away from cultural and linguistic shocks later at school. Having experienced linguistic shock, the mother became aware of the importance of Norwegian language learning. Sheila shares the same vision. For her, the fact of going to a barnehage *can ease the transition from barnehage to school*. Being immigrant children growing up in Norway, it is crucial for the children to master the Norwegian language, to get in touch with the locals and get to know the culture of the host-country as soon as possible according to the three mothers. That is to say, while they are still young children. As Berry (1997) points out: those pre-school children, unlike adults, are more prone to a successful acculturation because they have not yet acquired *a full enculturation into one's parents' culture (...) early childhood is a period for maximal flexibility and adaptability* Berry (1997, p.21). Berry (1997) points out that, one method to avoid culture-shock is for an immigrant to learn to get to know the people of the country of settlement. This, however, cannot be achieved without knowing the local language (Berry, 1997). My informants agree with the fact that language can be a key for better adaptation in the new country of settlement and one key-success to avoid culture-shock. The barnehage curriculum asserts and sustains the statement that language is among one's cultural heritages and that one's mother-tongue constructs one's identity.

5.4 Value, interests and socialization

All three informants share the common value that sending their children to a barnehage will allow them to acquire the Norwegian language and the Norwegian culture. All three claim that sending their children to a barnehage can prove to be an effective measure to avoid challenges in everyday life. Sheila and Swang pointed out and share the common value that some immigrant parents should change their attitude when moving to Norway. They claimed it is mostly valid when it comes to the fact that immigrant children are not sent to the barnehage but stay at home with their mothers. It is a well-spread attitude both among mothers back-home and most immigrant mothers in Norway according to Sheila and Swang. Berry (1997) talks about behavioral shift: that is the fact of learning new manners and behaviors which can fit in the new culture. The immigrants are here expected to unlearn some behaviors which can no longer be appropriate for his or her life in the host country. All three women interviewed in this study have succeeded to fulfill a behavioral shift suggested by Berry (1997) when it comes to the fact of sending their children to the barnehage and be social active, not just staying home and keeping their children with them at the same time. According to Hoem (1978) in Sand (1996) socialization occurs:

When an individual grows into a social system (...), that is when a person lives in a process in which he can influence and can be influenced of his environment (...) in this process, values and social norms are transmitted, skills are developed and identity is shaped.

Sand (1996) points out in addition that immigrant children need to *develop bicultural* identities in their daily lives, that is to say they need to cope with their native-culture and have to get to know the culture of the host-country at the same time. How do the immigrant children in the present study manage to cope with this challenge on a daily basis? All three mothers use their native-language actively with their respective children at home or whenever they are together. They all agree that in addition of mastering the Norwegian language, their children should be able to speak their mother-tongue fluently as well. All three women share the opinion that speaking their native-language with their children can be one key factor for preserving their root and identity. Julia for instance sends her daughter to a private school once a week so that this latter can learn to be able to speak her mother-tongue properly.

However, despite the fact of attending the native-language courses, the child still struggles mastering the native-language and even refuses to speak her native-language with her parents. Assimilative socialization has occurred in that case. The child's resocialization process may have led to this assimilative socialization. It is worth to remind that resocialization is based on the combination of value conflict and common interest. The immigrant child is here expected to acquire new cultural identity but at the same time the child may be at risk of losing his native-culture. In the present case, the education at the barnehage has led to an unexpected and unconscious outcome for the parents: assimilative socialization. Assimilative socialization here can mean the immigrant child has lost her native cultural features and identity and focuses only on the cultural features, such as language and behaviors, of the host country. Due to the fact that the child spends most of her time, nine hours a day more precisely, at the barnehage, and that she is consequently in constant contact with other Norwegian-speaking and Norwegian-born classmates, the immigrant child unconsciously rejects her native-language. The common interest shared by the barnehage staff and two of my informants: Julia and Sheila however is that teaching their native-language or their native-culture to the other children at the barnehage, is useless because their respective native-language are not meant to be used during all kinds of activities at the barnehage for instance.

When it comes to Sheila and Swang's children, they speak their mother-tongue actively with their parents. They all answer in their respective mother-tongue when their parents talk to them. However, when Sheila's children are playing together, they speak in Norwegian. Sheila tries to convince her daughters not to do so, while the pedagogues at the barnehage claim that the Norwegian language is in that case the girls' *lekespråk* (play language) and that the parents should allow the children to speak the Norwegian language. Sheila pinpointed that her husband and she, despite the pedagogue's recommendation, still encourage their daughters to speak their native-language whenever they play together. Value conflict is valid in this case. Sand (1996) argues that when immigrant parents and the barnehage staff do not share the same value about the child's education, we can talk about value conflict. In the present case, Sheila and her husband disagree with the pedagogue at the barnehage when it comes to Norwegian language speaking while playing at home. Interest conflict can be illustrated here by the fact of speaking the Norwegian language at home can be seen as useless by Sheila and her husband. The parents and the barnehage however, share the common interest that mastering the Norwegian language can be useful for the children's future life.

Cultural differences were the main focus studied in the present paper. It is worth to pinpoint that what the culture may mean for the immigrant parents and what it refers to in the barnehage curriculum may differ. As mentioned earlier in the barnehage law § 2, 3rd paragraph, the main concern of culture learning at the barnehage is about promoting children's creativity, their social competence and establishing common norms and values for all children and adults at the barnehage. It is in addition about transmitting old traditions to younger generation and at the same time stimulating the children to create their own cultural features through interaction, games and play. Play and interaction are intended to promote cross-cultural communication and at the same time the fact of learning about other's culture will help the children to understand other's point of views. The Norwegian barnehage main task, as mentioned earlier, is therefore to develop children's *cultural identity* (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2011). What about the informants 'point of view based upon the previous definition? To Julia, native-language speaking is the cultural feature that is most important to her. To Sheila, culture is mostly about native-language speaking and emotions. And to Swang, culture is all about native-language speaking, tradition, religion food and social competence learning.

Common values shared by the barnehage curriculum and my informants, when it comes to the definition of culture, are: culture is about transmitting old traditions and does to younger generations, like: language teaching, promoting social competence like regulating feelings and collaborating with others, which can encourage cross-cultural communication and understanding. A common interest that is to say when the barnehage curriculum is viewed as engaging and useful by both the barnehage and the parents, shared by all three immigrant women in this paper and the barnehage staff may be the fact that the Norwegian language can be the one and only language that should prevail at the barnehage. Sand (2008) refers to this fact as integrative socialization, based upon the Special Educational Needs perspective. That is to say: integration can here be opposed to segregation and can be viewed more as integrative assimilation. The immigrant children in this paper were only granted native-language assistance only the first year, or even less, when they began at the barnehage. They can be expected to have acquired enough Norwegian language skills during that period.

A barnehage which sustains this integrative socialization (Engen, 1989 in Sand, 2008) based upon the Special Educational Needs perspective would try to transform the immigrant children to be as identical as possible the Norwegian children. It can be done by ignoring the

immigrant child's native language. The Norwegian language would be in that case the only language spoken at the barnehage. None of the three informants however have an objection when it comes to the active use of the Norwegian language at the barnehage. Two of them, however, share the common interest that talking about their native-language or teaching specific features of their native-culture at the barnehage, can be useless. Can it be interpreted as a way of preserving one's culture according to the two mother's attitude? That is to say would it mean that only people from a same cultural background should share the same cultural features? However, seen from another perspective, can transmitting one's a cultural feature to others be one way of safeguarding one's native-culture? That is to say it can keep the culture alive, even in a multicultural society. Julia asserted that children at the barnehage are still too young to understand cultural differences. Sheila on the other hand claimed it is each immigrant parents' task to teach or not their children about their native-culture. Sheila and Julia claimed they do not expect or demand that the barnehage staff will talk or teach about their native-culture to the children at the barnehage.

Swang however claimed that teaching the other children about her native-culture is important for her and her family. At the barnehage where her children are going, they promote inter-cultural communication by having a special day when they talk about one specific country, other children are taught songs and words in the native-language and when the children from that specific country bring typical food. According to Swang, it can be an effective way to make the children aware of cultural differences and stimulate at the same time friendships. Barnehager which promote such cultural event may agree with the integrative socialization (Engen, 1989 in Sand 2008) based upon the Migration Education perspective. In that perspective, integration can be viewed as the opposite of integrative assimilation mentioned earlier. The immigrant children can be in that case given the opportunity to maintain some of his or her native-culture and a part of his or her mother-tongue heritage through songs and words. The diversity can be seen as a *pedagogic resource* (Sand, 2008 and Fandrem, 2011). As Sand (2008) claims it, when integration is understood as *gruppepluralism* (group-pluralism) preserving the minorities 'language and culture is crucial.

The barnehage curriculum asserts that barnehage should take into account every child's social, ethnical and cultural background. According to Kunnskapsdepartementet (2011) or Ministry of Education, the barnehage should promote that minority children express themselves in their mother-tongue. The barnehage should in addition ensure that all children socialize in a

multicultural community. The curriculum argues that being conscious about one's cultural heritage and getting to know others' culture will promote children's understanding of others' perspective and behavior. All these are clearly stated in the barnehage curriculum. Nevertheless, Sheila and Julia claimed they do not expect or claim the barnehage staffs to talk about their native-culture to other children at the barnehage. They do not feel the need that their native-culture can be in focus once in a while at the barnehage despite the fact that the Norwegian authority makes an effort to help them preserve their cultural heritage at the barnehage. On the other hand, there can be barnehager which, despite what is stated in the barnehage curriculum, do not promote multiculturalism at the barnehage.

5.4.1 Sheila and the Collectivistic-oriented values

All three informants in the present study come from a collectivistic-oriented culture. And all three women claim they did not experience culture-shock when moving to Norway because their native-culture and the Norwegian one are very alike. Nevertheless, it was only Sheila who pointed out that even if her native-culture has much in common with the Norwegian culture; the emotional heritage her native-culture has to offer to her children is *unique*. Tight family-ties are one of the most significant characteristics of a collectivistic-oriented culture (Hofstede, 2001). Yeh et.al (2006) and Hofstede (2001) agree on the fact that the family represents the main source for identity construal of a collectivistic person. Hofstede (2001) claims that *people in collectivist societies are integrated horizontally (...)*. That is to say: family-ties can be so strong that family members can stay in close contact with their parents, grand-parents and other elders so long they are alive. Younger generations in a collectivistic-oriented culture can be expected to perpetuate that tradition Sheila asserts she talks on the phone with her parents, who live abroad, every single day. The long distance does not prevent them from having tight and warm relationships. For Sheila, it is crucial to transmit this close family ties, she inherited from her parents, to her children.

Sheila argued that Norwegian people are *cold* emotionally. She told about an anecdote which occurred when her parents came to visit her, to illustrate her meaning. As mentioned in the findings in this paper, Sheila was astonished by her colleagues' reactions when they knew Sheila's parents are staying at her place for three weeks. As a member of a collectivistic-oriented culture, Sheila found it "shocking" the colleagues dared ask where her parents are

staying during their vacation and that cohabitating during three weeks can be challenging. For her it was “natural” and “normal” her parents are staying at her place. Hofstede (2001 p.228) states that *people in individualist societies lack not only horizontal but also vertical integration*. As a “normal result” of the individualistic upbringing-style, younger generations are not expected to keep close contact with their parents after they have moved from the family-home. Sheila maintains that the family ties and emotions are the most important cultural features she wants to convey to her children. Sheila claims, it is only her husband and her or other close family members who are capable of transmitting that emotional heritage to her children, nobody else can.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 Main findings

Integration or Assimilation: Do Norwegian Barnehager preserve Immigrant children's Native-Culture according To their parents? The answers to the research question according to the findings in the present paper suggest that: two of the three immigrant mothers asked in the present research feel that it is not the barnehage's duty to convey their native-culture or make the barnehage staff and their own children conscious about their typical cultural patterns. They wish to have this duty or responsibility alone. Sheila claims for instance that it is her husband and her duty to convey their cultural heritage to their children and do not wish others than themselves to do so. For Julia, in addition to her husband and her, other national fellows at the private school, where their daughter learns her mother-tongue, may take part in the native-culture education of their daughter. Sheila and Julia feel and wish that only those who are involved directly in the culture itself should be those who convey the cultural heritage to the children. That is to say: the barnehage has the duty to transmit the Norwegian culture to the children at the barnehage, whereas the immigrant-parents have the role to transfer or not their cultural heritage to their respective children. . Sheila claims furthermore that too many nationalities are represented at the barnehage, that in practice, it can be challenging to convey about all the different countries' culture to young children. In other words: the two mothers practice an assimilative integration not integration when it comes to the education of their children at the barnehage. That can be how "integration" works for them. They combine the fact that their children get to know and practice the Norwegian culture at the barnehage, and at the same time, they inherit their native-culture at home.

As far as Swang is concerned, she is enthusiastic about the fact that the barnehage care about her native-culture and is willing to take part when the barnehage organizes special multicultural festivities. It can be a positive way to make other children aware about cultural differences according to her. Swang is pleased about the fact that her sons are well-integrated at the barnehage but at the same time she fears they will no longer master their native-language when they get older. This is because they are in permanent touch with the Norwegian culture and society.

Discovering what integration meant for the mothers interviewed during the research process and how they put “their integration process” in practice have been one of the crucial findings in the present paper. The immigrant parents’ perspective about integration can be understood from two different standpoints: upbringing-style inside the family-home and social adaptation at the barnehage. The mothers can be said to struggle with *bicultural identity* (Sand, 2006). Due to “social pressure”, they need to adopt themselves to two different ways of life: they do their best so that their children get involved and be acquainted with both the Norwegian and their native-culture, but at the same time they put a limit to what their children are “permitted” to do inside and outside the family-home. Two of the mothers in the present paper seem to be more concerned about their upbringing-style at home and what they can do to preserve their native-culture at home, rather than to “demand” or wish that the barnehage staff, when it is possible, introduce or talk about their native-culture with the other children at the barnehage.

6.2 Methodological reflection

Analyzing the present research question, as explained earlier in the present study, has been a personal choice. However, the theme, the method and the barnehage where the informants have been selected have been a “project package” preselected by the Senter for Atferdsforskning (Center for Behavioral Research) at the University of Stavanger. The number of informants I could choose has therefore been limited because only those related to the project could be interviewed. In addition, there were only few children whose both parents are immigrants. Another method, like Theory Review could have been another option. However, due to the fact that only few researchers have written about the present theme, in a Norwegian context, it has been challenging to find solid theoretical background I could use for my Thesis. Interview has been then the method chosen for the present study. Possible challenges I feared I could face during the interview process have been described in the methodological part of this thesis. However what has been most demanding and time-consuming was the fact of waiting for feed-back from some barnehage board of staff and the fact of facing negative response about participating in the interview. As mentioned earlier, it took two and a half months to find informants. Nevertheless, the number of informants is not the only decisive key factor in such research, that despite challenges during the research process, I am grateful to have found door-openers and three informants who have been willing and enthusiastic to take part in the present study. These challenges regarding recruiting

informants for the present thesis may be a starting point for new research: why is it difficult to recruit immigrant parents for a research interview?

6.3 Need for further research

The findings from the present study gave us evident answer to the research question; however the research process can as well suggest a new starting point for further research. One big question that aroused my curiosity was: what made people so reluctant to take part in the research interview? Two barnehage boards of staff were unenthusiastic to talk about my project to the immigrant parents I wanted to interview. One of them informed me it is a long and demanding process to contact and talk to the immigrant parents about the project that she has no time to help me. Can this reflect relationship and communicative challenges faced by some barnehage staff while dealing with communication with some immigrant parents? This can be an interesting topic for further research. Some immigrant parents as well have been unwilling to be interviewed. I did not have the opportunity to ask them directly. It was the responsible at the barnehage which have been my door-openers. Can it as well reflect culture-differences or challenges between two cultures? Can it be that immigrant parents from a collectivistic-oriented culture may not be used to talk about feelings or their private life to “strangers” that it can be uncomfortable to be interviewed? Here we can refer to the theoretical part of this paper, when it comes to people from collectivistic-oriented culture way of thinking: *in collectivistic-oriented culture, the family can constitute the main source for identity construal of a collectivistic person. At the same time, it can provide help, care and support for the members within the family circle (Yeh et. al, 2006)*. People from a collectivistic-oriented culture most of the time seek advice and help only from other members of his or her family. Can it suppose that they obviously do not want to talk about their private life and feelings to someone they are not related to?

6.4 Practical implications

This paper can help newly graduate pre-school students, professionals and not least pre-school teachers get up-to-dated information about today’s immigrant parents feelings, thoughts and experience about their children’s’ life at a barnehage. This thesis can as well highlight how important their native culture is for immigrant parents, whether it is inside or outside the

family-home. This knowledge can help professionals make positive differences in the immigrant children's life. This paper can as well provide essential background information for evaluating if what is written in the barnehage curriculum about cultural differences and the rights for immigrant children to preserve their identity are factual in practice and if the immigrant parents agree with that fact. The immigrants parents' points of view in this study are not meant to represent the entire immigrant population living in Norway. They are personal experiences the parents interviewed have shared to let us have a glimpse in their life.

Writing the present paper has been an enjoyable and exciting process. Thanks to specific theoretical background about cultural differences and acculturation discussed in the present paper, I could get explanation to the emotions and feelings I felt while coming alone to Norway and at the same time, discover and understand why I behaved in particular ways. As Kvale (1997) claims: *research interview can be similar to the therapeutic interview* because both the informant and the researcher can be influenced by the new knowledge and findings and may behave according to these new perspectives. Furthermore, being an immigrant parent sending my children to a barnehage, it has been a positive and enriching process to be able to analyze other immigrant parents' upbringing-style, their experience and expectations about the lives of their children at a barnehage .

References

- Berry, J. W. (1997). Lead Article: Immigration, Acculturation and adaptation. . *Applied Psychology: An international Review* 46, 5-29.
- Bhugra, D., & Gupta, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Migration and Mental Health*: Cambridge University Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (1994). *Kulturelle veikryss: essays om kreolisering*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Fandrem, H. (2011). *Mangfold og mestring i barnehage og skole: migrasjon som risikofaktor og ressurs*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforl.
- Gilje, N., & Grimen, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Samfunns-Vitenskapenes Forutsetninger*: Universitetsforlaget.
- Haagensen, E., Kvisler, L., & Birkeland, T. (Eds.). (1990). *Innvandrere: Gjester eller Bofaste? En Innføring i Norsk Innvandringspolitikk* (second edition ed.): Gyldendal Norsk Forlag
- Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2011). *Doing Case Study Research. A practical Guide for Beginning Researchers Vol. second edition*.
- Hoem, A. (1978). *Socialisering, en teoretisk og empirisk modellutvikling*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

- Høydahl, E. (2007). Begrepet vestlig er nyttig til statistisk bruk. Retrieved from <http://www.utrop.no/12762>
- Johannessen, A., Tufte, P., & Christoffersen (Eds.). (2010). *Introduksjon til Samfunnsvitenskapelig Metode* (4th Edition ed.): Abstract Forlag AS.

- Klepp, K.-I., & Aarø, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Ungdom, Livsstil og Helsefremmende Arbeid*: Universitetsforlaget.

- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2011). *Rammeplan for barnehagens innhold og oppgaver*. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Barnehager/Rammeplan_2011/KD_bokmal_Rammeplan_2011_web.pdf.

- Kvale, S. (1997). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju*. Oslo: Ad notam Gyldendal.

- Nielsen, k., Brinkmann, S., Elmholdt, C., Tanggaard, L., Musaeus, P., & Kraft, G. (Eds.). (2008). *A Qualitative Stance. Essays in honor of Steinar Kvale* Aarhus University Press.

- Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste. (2012). Is my research project subject to notification? Retrieved 14.03.2012, 2012, from <http://www.nsd.uib.no/nsd/english/pvo.html>

- NOU 2010: 7. (2010). *Mangfold og mestring: Norge som innvandringsland*. (7). regjering Retrieved from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/nouer/2010/NOU-2010-7/4.html?id=606164>.

- Oberg, K. (Ed.). (1960). *Cultural shock: adjustment to new cultural environments*. (1960 ed.): Pract Anthropol

- Ogden, T. (Ed.). (2009). *Sosial kompetanse og problematferd i skolen* (Vol. 2): Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.

- Sand, S. (1996). *Integrering eller assimilering?: flyktningeforeldrenes syn på det pedagogiske tilbudet i barnehagen og grunnskolen*. Oplandske bokforl., [Vallset].

- Sand, S. (Ed.). (2008). *Ulikhet og Fellesskap: Flerkulturell pedagogikk i barnehage*: Oplandske Bokforlag, 2330 Vallset.

- Silverman, D. (Ed.). (2001). *What is Qualitative Research? I D. Silvermann. Interpreting Qualitative Date. Chap 1 (p. 25-42)* London: Sage.

- Statistisk Sentralbyrå. (2008). Innvandrerebegreper i statistikken. Vestlig og ikke-vestlig – ord som ble for store og gikk ut på dato Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/ssp/utg/200804/15/>

- Strøm, B., & Holmøy, E. (2012). Gjør innvandring det lettere å finansiere velferdsstaten på lang sikt? [Offentlig økonomi]. *Statistisk Sentralbyrå*.

- Yeh, C. J., Aurora, A.K , Wu, K.A (2006). A new theoretical model of collectivistic coping. *Handbook of multicultural perspectives in stress and coping*. Chap 3. Retrieved from <https://springerlink3.metapress.com/content/x4p4k51j58h44473/resource-secured/?target=fulltext.pdf&sid=h43hqyktfhdkqfb20zhaka3c&sh=www.springerlink.com> doi:10.1007/0-387-26238-5_3

Appendix

Appendix 1: Interview-guide

- 1 - Can you tell me about yourself and your family?
- 2 - When and why did you and your family move to Norway?
- 3- Why do you send your children to a barnehage?
- 4 - What does culture mean for you?
- 5- Which aspect(s) of your culture do you want your children to keep?
- 6 - Can your children speak your native language?
- 7 - Do you use your mother-tongue actively with your children?
- 8- Are they good at speaking both Norwegian and your native-language?
- 9 - Do they respond in Norwegian or in your mother-tongue when you talk to them? Do you think it is positive or negative?
- 10 - Can you describe your first meeting with the Norwegian society? Did you experience culture shock?
- 11 - Based on your experience with the barnehage so far, are there daily activities you mostly agreed or disagreed with, because of your cultural background?
- 12 - Which aspects of the Norwegian culture differ most from your culture?
- 13-What does integration mean to you?
- 14- What does it mean to be integrated into the Norwegian society? Can you give some

examples?

15 - Are your children integrated at the barnehage?

16 - What should bilingual children do to be well integrated at the barnehage and in the Norwegian society in general?

17- Would you love that the pre-school teachers tell about your culture to other children at the barnehage?

18 - What would you particularly recommend?

19- Today there are still many immigrant parents who do not send their children to barnehage. What could be the reasons do you think?

20 - Would you recommend other immigrant parents to send their children to a barnehage?

21- What should the barnehage staff do to encourage immigrant parents to send their children to a barnehage?

22- What do you think of this research and this interview? Do you want to add something?

23- To sum up, which words would you use to describe your experience with the barnehage?