

Their “Norwegian Anchor” – Ideas of citizenship at the Norwegian Introduction programme



Bachelor thesis in political science

University of Stavanger

Oskar Kippersund Martesønn

Student number:

256134

Supervisor:

Hande Eslen Ziya

Submitted date: 12/05/2022

Word count: 8800

Abstract

In this thesis, I explore citizenship discourse among teachers at the Norwegian introduction programme. In an attempt to expand the research on citizenship, I outline an *amateur political theory* of citizenship derived from analysis, bringing nuance to previously established theories on citizenship among political elites and academics. I've conducted a semi-structured focus-group interview with two teachers affiliated with the introduction programme, and analysed the transcripts for epistemological, explanatory, and normative claims about immigrants, teachers, national culture, and citizenship. The results are discussed with regards to previous theory and research and finds some divergences. The teachers distinguish between first and second citizenships in terms of function and expression of identity, they also express scepticism towards constructions of *national culture* and *national values* and emphasise the paradoxical nature of some citizenship-requirements in the pursuit of successful integration. They favour multicultural as opposed to group-based learning spaces and express a belief in shared values across cultures. I aim to bring new perspectives to modern citizenship theory, in hopes of incentivising more research on discursive constructions of citizenship with emphasis on national minorities and migration, exploring ramifications of said constructions, contributing to the knowledge base on citizenship and integration.

Preface

I'm very grateful for the supervision of Hande Eslen Ziya, in particular for suggesting the emphasis on citizenship theory, and for demanding a higher precision on methodology. I'm also indebted to Ellen Ravndal for assisting in the notification to the Norwegian Centre for Data science. Lastly, I'd like to thank the two informants who agreed to the interview, not only for agreeing (though that was immensely helpful), but also for being very informative and open about their opinions, making for a very interesting analysis!

Contents

Introduction	2
Theory	
<i>Citizenship and the (multi)national state</i>	4
<i>Arguments for citizenship requirements</i>	7
<i>Amateur political theories</i>	9
Method	
<i>Choice of method</i>	10
<i>Selection, and informed consent</i>	11
<i>Interview, transcription and translation</i>	12
Findings	
<i>Epistemological claims</i>	13
<i>Explanatory and Normative claims</i>	19
Discussion	22
Conclusion	25
List of literature	27
Attachments	
<i>Information letter</i>	30
<i>Interview guide</i>	33

Introduction

Citizenship as an institution has seen its fair share of problems throughout European history, however given the ideas of both citizenship and nationalism displayed by recent developments internationally it is arguably again entering the forefront of conflicts in Europe. Both in issues of national sovereignty and human rights, citizenship cannot be overlooked. It is an integral entity for any political management of peoples, and contains, as Hannah Arendt put it in her criticism of the idea of human rights, an individual's only right to have rights (1951) and signifies adherence to a national state.

The war waging in Ukraine has led to new flows of migrants in Europe, also to Norway. The conflict highlights unresolved issues of national identities in relation to sovereign states. Another example of conflicts revolving around nationalities is the case of the sizeable Russian speaking minority population in Latvia, where Latvian language policy has been part of a campaign to promote Latvian culture and heritage at the expense of the purely Russian speaking minority's ability to fully participate in working life (Richard, 2021). One could assume that most post-Soviet countries suffer from similar problems. However, I contend, following observations made by Will Kymlicka (2011), that this may function as an example of what most countries in Europe (inasmuch we choose to omit the rest of the world) struggle with, namely the concept of a national state. Citizenship, or what it means to be a citizen, lies at the heart of this problem. In the post-soviet countries, the Russian minorities often identify as Russian nationals and yet their citizenship connects them to another nation state, and in Latvia this has led to the development of parallel societies with policies that further exacerbate the division of peoples (Richard, 2021). These extreme examples tell of citizenship models that fail to consider national minorities, and it is with that in mind that I would turn our gaze towards our own institutions of integration, and study what ideas of citizenship exist there.

In this thesis I will attempt to answer the question: "What is the prevailing discourse of citizenship at the Norwegian introduction programme?" This question focuses specifically on what ideas of citizenship exist among the teachers at the programme and consequently what is taught to immigrants. Immigrants between 18 and 55 with a residence permit have a right and duty to participate in the introduction programme their first time entering the country (Integreringsloven, 2021) The program includes language courses, and courses that are meant to introduce immigrants to the Norwegian society, this can include primary

school education, as well as obligatory courses on parenting and “life skills”. The assumption that teachers’ perspectives, as opposed to immigrant perspectives, constitute a prevailing discourse is based primarily on the fact that the language and knowledge of society requirements for Norwegian citizenship in large part are covered by courses at the introduction programme, and this positions teachers as a reference point, or anchor, for the immigrant.

This thesis is explorational, meaning that I attempt to inspire a critical inward gaze towards citizenship by identifying *amateur political theories* of citizenship, explicit or not, at the introduction programme, while admitting that this research’s transferability is limited I rather focus on exploring a new area of interest trying to inspire further research on the topic. The analysis is partly inductive, as even though I utilise previous models for discourse analysis, prior academic research, and theories on citizenship and integration, my chosen approach studies a new field of interest, and therefore the applicability of these theories, models and research is unknown. The reason I’ve chosen the introduction programme is that it’s in a unique position, intended to help immigrants become integrated into the Norwegian labour market, as well as being responsible for offering Norwegian and knowledge of society courses for those with the right and duty to attend these courses, primarily refugees and asylum seekers (Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet, 2022), the programme therefore could contribute to constructing new ideas of citizenship to be studied in academia.

In the next section I will discuss theories of citizenship and multinationalism, as well as introducing the concept of *leitkultur* to highlight the complexity of the relationship between nationality, culture and citizenship. Then, I move on to discussing models for discourse analysis containing ideal arguments for citizenship, along with observations made by prominent scholars on citizenship and integration in Northern Europe. Lastly, I will explain the concept of *amateur political theories* as it is integral for the study of citizenship-discourse and is the model that inspired the analysis. Under “Methods and Data; an exploratory approach”, I will argue both the strengths and weaknesses of my chosen approach of exploratory focus group interview and introduce the semi-structured interview guide. Further I will present the findings, before moving on to the discussion, where I discuss the findings in relation to previous research and theories of citizenship. Lastly, I will conclude and suggest avenues for further research.

Theory

Citizenship and the (multi)national state

Citizenship as derived from a national state is inherently a problematic concept, and in Europe this has been proved time and again when considering the impact of the first and second world war i.e., the dividing of countries and displacement of peoples that followed. Today, the issue of nationality has arguably become even more prominent, seeing the Norwegian society's willingness to receive refugees from Ukraine juxtaposed with international criticism regarding discrimination based on nationality (Svendsen & Alayobi, 2022). Criticisms show up in debates in Norwegian media outlets where it is pointed out that the Norwegian state has responded very differently to recent refugee crisis, also within Europe, privileging Ukrainians over Muslim migrants (Johansen, 2022). This critique provoked a letter to the editor of the digital newsmagazine *Subjekt* implicitly defending the unequal treatment, containing ideas of *controlling* Norway's "demographic future" (Rasmussen, 2022). This proves a willingness within society, by some, to explicitly consider culture and ethnicity to be important in the demographic composition of the state, and consequently, ought to affect who we award citizenship.

One could argue that this sentiment *should* provoke a response in academia through critical studies on how we view citizenship in a modern context. Kymlicka points out that citizenship theory has experienced a recent surge of interest within academia, from the 90's onward. While initially concerned with T.H. Marshall's idea of citizenship: civil rights, political rights, and social rights- for all (in recent years that is), citizenship theory has also become riddled with complex problems of identity. Marshall construed *citizenship-as-rights* also for the purpose of creating a bond between the state and its people, a proof of adherence to a political community: a national identity (2002). For a political community to stay united, its members must feel fairly treated, and regard their opinions considered reasonably, before being subject to a political majority overruling their preferred outcome (Dahl, 1989). While he was aware of this, Marshall's ideas of civil, political, and social rights do not satisfy the ideal of all citizens having a fair opportunity to lead decent lives, as Marshall's conception of citizenship did not consider the status hierarchy to much extent (Kymlicka, 2002).

As an example of the problems of status hierarchies, we can use the letter to the editor of *Subjekt*: The author stresses that there is a difference between Ukrainian refugees and refugees from Muslim countries, however not by merit of their geopolitical situation, but due to their different cultures, and therefore their perceived ease of integration (Rasmussen, 2022). While not considering the realism of this claim, it already exemplifies how there are other issues than civil, political, and social rights that affect a person's social foundation for self-respect (for an in-depth explanation on Rawls social contract theory, see Kymlicka, 2022), and their opportunity to be considered of equal status. While the idea of *controlling* the "demographic future" of a national state may be viewed as downright discriminatory, the volumes of migration global society experiences today does bear with it the establishment of sizeable ethnic minorities within national states. This, along with recognition of native peoples, does contribute to what Kymlicka calls the "multinational reality" of today (2011).

Kymlicka goes on to explain that the multinationalist critique of citizenship-as-rights postulate that the citizenship models of today do not adequately make up for the societal bias privileging the white heterosexual male "ideal" (2011). Even in countries where there is a recognition and idealisation of "the multicultural society", there may still be status hierarchies based on ethnic or cultural heritage. As an example, Fischer & Mohrman studied the opinion-shifting media coverage of Meztut Özil, a German soccer player of Turkish heritage who eventually resigned from the national team. Fischer & Mohrman argues that the resignation was in part due to the media coverage of Özil, where commentators constantly problematized his national heritage and questioned his loyalty to the German nation, and national team's, ideals. Fischer & Mohrman observes that the German conception of multiculturalism constructs a German *leitkultur* where people with migrant backgrounds are included and their cultures are seen as complementary, however also considered a detriment if they fall out of favour (2021). In Norway there have also been recent debates of "Norwegianness" in the media, and how people from migrant backgrounds may feel alienated due to not fitting in to the stereotypical conception of the Norwegian citizen (Oslodebatten, 2022).

In this thesis, I attempt to scrutinise how we conceptualise the Norwegian citizen by studying how teachers perceive immigrants in relation to the majority population through views on citizenship-requirements. Previous research has looked at elite views on

citizenship in Scandinavia and found that Norway often positions its views pragmatically between ideas of cosmopolitan citizenship and nation-centric citizenship, demonstrated by Sweden and Denmark respectively. This means that requirements for citizenship in Norway are more stringent than in Sweden, however less so than in Denmark (Brochmann & Midtbøen, 2021). Recently, research conducted on the political discourse following law changes for citizenship-requirements suggest that Norway is becoming more protective of its citizenship institution: Increasing demands for language skills; and the prime minister at the time, Erna Solberg (In office 2013-2021), expressing that the Norwegian citizenship should be hard to obtain (Carlsen & Bugge, 2021).

This way of conceptualising citizenship is reminiscent of the German *leitkultur* studied by Fischer & Mohrman. Mouritsen et al. describes *leitkultur* as a way of attempting to avoid the problems of multiculturalism by demanding loyalty to “liberal European democratic values” and the welfare state, above religious or cultural beliefs and practices. Mouritsen et al. points out that “Having modern values to start with probably eases functional integration, but changing adults’ values through policy, let alone patronising discourse, is difficult, and *leitkultur* obscures the challenge” (Mouritsen et al., 2019, p. 645). He goes on to remark that immigrants are equally or even more likely to value “Western individual liberties and democracy” (Mouritsen et al., 2019, p. 645) than the native population.

Adrian Favell distinguishes between two discourses of citizenship and migration informing the ideas of citizenship within the western liberal democracies that we see today. In his comparative study of British and French immigration and citizenship discourse he notes that Britain is concerned with “race and racism, the definition and operation of anti-discrimination laws, and the idea of multiculturalism as the best means of accommodating Britain’s distinct *ethnic minorities*” (Favell, 2001, p. 8), like the ideas recently discussed it addresses the complexity of national identity. In the French case these concerns would be considered less important, as France has a strong republican idea of citizenship that do not distinguish between nationalities, but rather consider the “culturally distinct *immigrés*” (Favell, p. 8) as individuals, who ought to be assimilated into the political community at large.

As a discursive construction, *leitkultur* traverses this terrain by calling for political assimilation, in the sense that it demands loyalty to the state, yet also recognising and

promoting distinct ethnic minorities' contributions to society at large, Fischer & Mohrman notes that when the German team won, Özil was hailed for bringing “a certain Mediterranean lightheartedness in the offence” (2021). *Leitkultur* is nevertheless a volatile construction; because it assumes that western values are neutral, unproblematic, and uniquely western, goodwill towards minorities therefore becomes contingent upon their worth as contributors to the national state's betterment, and consequently can create ill will towards a whole minority due to the “mistakes” of a few. As observed by Fischer & Mohrman; when Germany lost, Özil was blamed for not being able to conform to the “uniquely German quality of discipline” (2021). This volatility is important to consider when studying discursive constructions of citizenship, and the dynamic between national culture and minority culture.

Arguments for citizenship requirements

Carlsen & Bugge point out that when the Norwegian government decided to increase the language-requirements for citizenship in 2019, it met a massive opposition from consulting institutions. Out of 131 responses with a comment on the proposition, 121 (92%) were against increasing language-requirements, and a few institutions have also questioned the idea of having language requirements for citizenship at all (Bugge & Carlsen, 2021). While the law passed, despite the opposition, it does demonstrate that political elites may not always be in touch with public sentiments, or even sentiments among institutions working within the field at issue. Most research on political discourse on citizenship and integration, is conducted with a focus on political elites or media outlets, due to their influence. Also, in the article by Carlsen & Bugge, other actors' ideas of citizenship remain elusive.

In the case of citizenship theory, this may be a detriment to the existing knowledge base. However, models for discourse analysis of political elite views on citizenship are still useful for studying the discourse at the introduction programme. Bech, Jensen, Mouritsen & Olsen developed a model for identifying “ideal arguments” regarding citizenship-requirements, also called “naturalisation criteria” (2017). They include five criteria based on observations of public and scientific debates on citizenship, that embody different normative grounds for citizenship policy. The first criterion is that of *democracy*, in this understanding political rights are essential for humans to be self-governing. Therefore, if a person is granted permanent residency, they must also be granted a citizenship, as anything

else would be an infringement of their basic human right (Bech et al., 2017). Hannah Arendt conceptualised this as one of the problems with the concept of human rights: there must be an institution with the authority to uphold them (1951). The next four criteria do not necessarily consider democratic participation as an intrinsic need for satisfying basic human rights and focus more on citizenship as an expression of adherence to a national and/or political community.

The *contribution* criterion says that a person should be expected to contribute to society, or at least not be a burden, before attaining citizenship (Bech et al., 2017). This criterion stresses that duties are just as important as rights, reminiscent of active citizenship, as it argues that responsible citizens are integral for the wellbeing of society at large, and that instilling duties in individuals leads to more responsible and better-informed democratic participation (Dahl, 1989; Kymlicka, 2002; Bech et al., 2017). Two other criteria that promote specific qualities of citizenship are the *competence* and *adaption* criteria.

The *competence* criterion stresses that citizens must have knowledge of the political institutions, laws, and language of a country to be able to participate in politics or exercise their rights as citizens (Bech et al., 2017), meaning that even with permanent stay, citizenship would be of little significance unless an individual acquires the necessary competence to enjoy its privileges, this is the foremost argument for language and knowledge of society requirements for citizenship. The *adaption* criterion says that citizens must have a common national identity, and applicants for citizenship should learn about the societies values and traditions before they get fully accepted into society (Bech et al., 2017). Carlsen & Bugge writes about this criterion that it also assumes that if a person grows familiar with the societal values, they will naturally adopt them (2021).

In some ways, the arguments of the *adaption* criterion can come at odds with the *competence* criterion, due to societal values being less tangible than laws and language, at least one would think that intuitively. However, Bech et al. describes the *contribution*, *competence*, and *adaption* criteria as the dominant discourse informing policy decisions in Denmark, working in tandem with explicit political ideas of what the societal values of Denmark are (2017). Mouritzen et al. describe these ideas as contributory in creating the Danish equivalent of *leitkultur* (2019). These constructions of common values, ideals and identity give way to the last criterion that Beck et al. describes, namely the *association*

criterion (translated from the Danish *foreningskriteriet*) where “the political community is like a club, of which its members determine entrance requirements” (Bech et al., 2017, p. 231), this criterion also allows for members to be kicked out of said club, should they fail to uphold the values and ideals that the majority determines to be *right*.

For Bech et al. this provokes a question of what they term *fairness*. Simply put, is it *fair* to lay higher demands on foreign applicants for citizenship, as well as subjecting them to the risk of losing said citizenship? Bech et al. finds that many Danish citizens fail to fulfil the requirements for Danish citizenship that are demanded of immigrants (2017). However, it could be argued that Danish born citizens have a birth right to their citizenship, that immigrants don't, and therefore it is *fair* to subject immigrants to a higher standard, as well as the risk of losing the citizenship if they fail to uphold them, though in some cases that might provoke a court of human rights. Another argument would be that growing up in a country instils certain qualities in a person that would satisfy the criteria of *adaption* and *competence*, though this point doesn't justify the revocation of citizenship from immigrants who have *earned* citizenship. Whatever the case, normative claims of *fairness* are an unavoidable conflict when comparing ideas of citizenship.

Bugge & Carlsen argues that these naturalisation criteria also apply to a growing extent in the Norwegian case (2021). Nevertheless, Norway is considered to be more pragmatic and less ideologically driven in its citizenship policies than Sweden and Denmark, though this is not unproblematic, as Grethe Brochmann & Idun Seland put it “The Norwegian government is strongly pressured from both sides politically on immigration matters and tends to go for vague compromises whenever possible” (2010). Brochman & Seland argue that all three countries choose their policy on grounds of functionality, where the end goal is to gain new “naturalised nationals” (2010), however, as shown, what constitutes naturalised nationals depends on the countries' construction of both nationality and citizenship, and what naturalisation criteria are emphasised.

Amateur political theories

These political constructions of nationality and citizenship can be used as examples of what Favell terms *public philosophies*. He postulates that these *public philosophies* are the result of *amateur political theories* which he defines as “ideas and justifications ... to uphold ... abstract principles, invented conceptualisations, or complex quasi-scientific

claims about the functioning or order of society” (Favell, 2001, p. 14-15). In his work, he studies the development of these theories among political elites over time. For an *amateur political theory* to be generally accepted (and thereby become a *public philosophy*) it must contain epistemological, explanatory, and normative claims that enjoys a general consensus among the majority of the public and political actors within a given country (Favell, 2001). Favell writes:

It would describe and conceptualise the basic facts and reality of the social situation it applies to (epistemological claims); it would theorise the means and application of any political intervention, and thus make assumptions about the causality of political and social processes (explanatory claims); and finally, it would embody some kind of core value or values that spell out the ideal end-goal of the policies, and what their underlying philosophical justification is (normative claims). (2001, p. 15)

Favell identifies the *public theories* of France and Britain by looking at how these claims develop over time, and what are their evolutionary dynamics.

While Favell’s comparative political study looks at two different countries, this thesis only concerns itself with one. However, I contend that there can be competing *amateur political theories* of citizenship within one country. Recall Bugge & Carlsen’s observation of the sizeable backlash from consulting institutions against the 2019 proposition for law change regarding language requirements for citizenship. The proposition for heightening requirements was aligned with the intentions stated by the government in their bill of proposal, yet still met a sizeable backlash from consulting institutions (Bugge & Carlsen, 2021). Disagreements on political matters are not uncommon, however, given the all-encompassing nature of citizenship, the implications of these disagreements on citizenship requirements can be paradigm-altering. Therefore, an in-depth study of ideas of citizenship, by identifying *empirical*, *explanatory* and *normative* claims, at the introduction programme can contribute to a more nuanced picture of what Norwegian citizenship is in a modern context.

Method

Choice of method

This study explores citizenship discourse at the introduction program, and according to Boeije “when a study has an explorative nature -for instance, a newly emerging field of interest that has not yet been extensively examined – you need methods with a maximum of explorative power” (Boeije, 2010, p. 32). Therefore, I’ve chosen to conduct a semi-structured focus group interview. Aase & Fossåskaret writes that focus group as a method reduces the impact of the researcher’s presence and allows for discussions between the interviewees (2007, p. 115). This is of particular interest for this study as ideas are produced through the consensus seeking mechanics of a discussion and informs about the discursive constructions of reality shared by the informants. According to Ringdal a focus group usually consists of 5-10 people (2001). In this project the group only consists of two people, greatly limiting the transferability of these findings. However, as this is a new field of inquiry the ambitions of the thesis only extend to that of exploration and informing further research.

Selection, and informed consent

I’ve selected two teachers affiliated with the introduction programme, because they, as mentioned in the introduction, are integral in creating a discursive construction of citizenship at the introduction programme. Both teachers work with immigrants, and both have been affiliated with the introduction programme for over ten years, they know each other and therefore display a friendly rapport with each other throughout the interview, this also affects some of the reflections as they sometimes assume, rightly, that the other teacher “knows what they are getting at”. Due to the sensitive nature of some of the data involved I’ve chosen not to divulge the exact age, location or gender of the participants involved as I’ve considered it to be irrelevant towards the interpretation of the empirical material gathered. However, information on the citizenship-status of one of the informants where divulged to which I’ve gained explicit consent to publish.

The informants were selected by contacting several learning centres, where the first teachers who responded to the request where interviewed. When asking teachers whether they would like to be interviewed for this project, some of the teachers expressed worries that they lacked the necessary knowledge to discuss citizenship exemplifying why it’s important for any

interviewer to be aware of the Hawthorne effect. Aase & Fossåskaret describe this effect as the tendency for informants to act differently due to the awareness of being observed (2007). In the case of an interview, this can lead to informants self-censoring or attempting to say “the right thing”. To counteract this, I first made sure to explain the intention of the study, as well as walking through the information letter in person, before establishing a more relaxed setting for conducting the interview.

Due to the nature of the data gathered in the interview I had to send a notification form to the Norwegian Centre for Research Data and get an assessment before contacting potential informants, as this project concerns itself with the political opinions of informants and therefore involves gathering sensitive categories of personal data. This also meant gathering explicit consent, I made sure to inform the interviewees both before the interview and after, that they could at any time withdraw their consent, and that they could upon request get access to any material gathered about them, including transcripts of the interview. I gathered physical signatures from them with explicit consent to participating in the focus group interview (the information letter, as well as the interview guide, can be found attached to this document).

Interview, transcription, and translation

The interview guide is comprised of fourteen questions. Four of which are preliminary questions, intended to ease informants into the interview by demanding a low degree of reflection, with questions like “how long have you taught at the introduction programme?” or asking for reflections on the courses as well as the experience of being a teacher at the programme. The next ten questions are more in depth and incentivises a higher degree of reflection, examples include: “do you think Norwegian values are an important part of the courses?”, “To what extent do you think the political situation in Norway affects your teaching?”, and “What do you think should be expected of one who shall obtain citizenship in a country that they have moved to?”. Other questions were intentionally vague, like “what do *you* think citizenship is?” or “How would you describe the diversity of opinions in class?”. When conducting the interview, the questions were asked in the order that fit best with the discussions, leading to a few adjustments in the order of questions asked. The interview opened for concluding remarks, resulting in a twelve-minute unstructured discussion at the end.

The interview was recorded using the “Diktafon” app, lasted for 43 minutes and 13 seconds, and was transcribed for the purposes of analysis. It’s important to note that the interview was conducted in Norwegian, therefore statements from informants are translated, by me, into English when quoted from the transcripts (which are written in Norwegian). Due to the many similarities between the languages in terms of sentence structure and expressions, the process of translation was not very challenging. However, I should address the translation of *bøyg*, a slightly diffuse term meaning impossible or very challenging hindrance. Due to not being particularly impactful the term has been translated to “hindrance”. Another term that proved slightly more problematic is that of *holdepunkt*, meaning “thought you can support yourself on”, “basis” or “foundation”, as a function I’ve found it translates best to “anchor”, however the reader must beware of this translation.

The analysis involved studying transcripts from the interview, looking for epistemological, explanatory, and normative claims regarding ideas of citizenship, inspired by Adrian Favell’s model. The findings are not presented in chronological order, but rather in accordance with what sort of claims emerge. These claims are then discussed in regard to Beck et al.’s five “naturalisation criteria”, *fairness*, and Favell’s two discourses of citizenship from his analysis of France and Britain.

Findings

One important thing to note about the interview is that the informants (that I will refer to as the teachers for the remainder of this thesis) actively position their views aware of current policies of citizenship. Therefore, many of the explanatory and normative claims are formulated as either for or against current policy. However, when considering the epistemological claims made throughout the interview, it’s apparent that both the explanatory and normative claims, or lack thereof, are constructed from an entirely different foundation, or understanding of reality, than what has been found by previous research mentioned in this paper. I will now present the findings in two parts, the *epistemological* claims, and the *explanatory* and *normative* claims.

Epistemological claims

Several entities are described and given functions or responsibilities throughout the interview; the entities I will focus on are *the immigrant*, *the teacher*, *Norwegian values*, and *citizenship*. According to the teachers, immigrants are a mixed group of people, some

of whom have experienced traumas, some of whom are illiterates, and some of whom have university degrees. Immigrants come from varying family constellations, cultures, and economic backgrounds. All these factors affect how they interact with others and with the introduction programme, as well as their opportunity to get a citizenship. As an example, consider these excerpts from the transcribed interview:

{1}

Speaker 1:

I experienced many who have become... who are very passive, and who've just thought: "Yes, but I have my family here, I have... I don't really need to speak Norwegian, I don't need to be outside". I know several who have said that "no, we shall... we shall never work" and they are considerably younger than me, right?

Speaker 2:

And it's women often then, or?

Speaker 1:

Yes, women often

{2}

Interviewer:

Is it your experience that there's a difference between different groups with regards to how easy it is to get a citizenship? {...}

Speaker 1:

I think it is {...} Depends on what school-background and the language group they adhere to; it will affect how hard it is to learn Norwegian and {...}

Speaker 2:

And the citizenship test you must take in Norwegian.

Speaker 1:

True, you must. {...} To get permanent residence there are some income requirements, right? And for many that is... will naturally become a hindrance, to

say it like that, right? {...} it isn't just language requirements. {...} you must contribute to the Norwegian society economically as well.

Speaker 2:

And I've had participants who've had to quit the Norwegian course... that {they} need to achieve these requirements, because {they} need to work to get the income, so that {they} can get permanent residence to save {their} daughter. To get... I mean, to get {their} daughter for family reunion here, and is left standing in this pressured situation. So, if {they} doesn't get {their} daughter here quickly, she gets married as a teenage bride, right? So, some experience these hard conflicts.

These two excerpts also illustrate some of the problems the teachers identify in relation to the *immigrant*. Excerpt 1 shows the problem of social integration, where the development of parallel societies hinders active participation in society at large. Excerpt 2 show how the teachers state that language-requirements for citizenship can be considered a hindrance for immigrants' ability to integrate into society, they also describe what I will refer to as the *requirement paradox*: where the attempt to fulfil one requirement can hinder the fulfilment of another, leading to compromises which may worsen the situation of every entity involved. In the case from excerpt 2 the income requirement supersedes the language requirement due to the urgency of getting permanent residency, even though the language requirement is widely considered to be more important for successful integration (Bugge & Carlsen, 2021). This implies that the *requirement paradox* is in part to blame for the development of parallel societies and failed integration. Throughout the interview the teachers also problematise the generalised conceptions of immigrants, yet they also express the need for some form of generalisation to create functional policies. Further, they criticise the dividing of responsibility between the introduction programme and the municipality, creating problems for participants attempting to gain work experience as well as inconsistencies between municipalities regarding what constitutes valid documents for exemption from language requirements (I.e., doctors' statements and so forth).

Note that in the excerpt 1, Speaker 1 positions themselves as a purveyor of the immigrant perspective, this happens several times throughout the interview, it may be in part because they construe the *teacher* as the *immigrant's* "Norwegian anchor" (translated from *holdepunkt*, for an explanation see *interview, transcription, and translation* in the methods

section). The teachers view themselves as mediators of *National culture*, as we can observe in the following excerpt, the teachers appear conflicted over the meaning of Norwegian values, critiquing traditional conceptions of Norwegian culture and expressing a pragmatic idea of values among immigrants.

{3}

Interviewer:

Is it your experience that Norwegian values are an important part of the Norwegian and knowledge of society courses?

Speaker 2:

Yes, uh... yes?

Speaker 1:

A bit? They at least seem to permeate, like, books, and where it carries a sort of... these Norwegian values that they think are so extremely Norwegian, and that might not necessarily be that. {...} there's lots of "voluntary work" stuff {laughter} suddenly, in the books, that we think like "yeah, yeah, ok", we think we're big on, very much...

Speaker 2:

Yeah, it gets presented like it's a uniquely Norwegian thing, and it's actually not.

Speaker 1:

That everyone participates in it, all the time, right? With pleasure, but I think about all the times when you don't {sighs}.

Speaker 2:

Yeah, yeah, but then we have to nuance it a bit.

Speaker 1:

And the thing with Norwegian val... yeah, but the more one talks to people, the more one understands that values are often shared... you share the same values. It's just that you call it something else or talk about it in a different way. But we're so

incredibly preoccupied here with trying to promote the Norwegian, right? The Norwegian values, as if they are unique.

Assumably due to their closeness to the subject in question, the teachers consistently express a dynamic understanding of immigrant identities, with a notable exception when talking about the three major migrant-groups from Somalia, Syria, and Ukraine. When prodded on their attitudes toward culture versus education as a determiner for relative ease of integration, the teachers described attitudes towards specific immigrant groups from the perspective of the introduction programme as an institution: initially, during the wave of immigration from Somalia in the late 90's/early 2000's, Somalians were seen as hard to integrate due to lack of education. Later, Syrian immigrants adopted that identity, due to having a similar background in terms of education and demographic composition, according to the teachers. When asked about the diversity of opinions in class, Speaker 1 noted that "Now, we're in a new situation, where we suddenly may get many Ukrainian refugees, for example {...} if one then considers starting up purely Ukrainian classes, then it will be a completely different way of working". Referring to a recent proposition discussed in government. The teachers termed this difference in treatment of the major immigrant groups as "special treatment", a statement to which I will return when discussing normative claims. Now, we will look at the *citizenship*-entity.

The teachers construct *citizenship* as having three functions: (1) as a means to an end, (2) as a contract, and (3) as an *ambivalent* expression of identity. The first function primarily states that a citizenship offers safety, and the opportunity to travel to countries which you cannot otherwise. Notably, the teachers mention rights, but do not specify voting-, or political participation-rights, but rather rights in a broader sense, presumably alluding to the status and protection that rights grant in general. Relatedly, the teachers consider themselves less "romantic" about citizenship than others and stresses its instrumental value, the idea of shared values and virtues seem quite peripheral in the teacher's conception of citizenship. However, they do not entirely discount a citizenship's effect on identity, and they compare it to a contract, not necessarily with stipulations, but rather as a statement of adherence to the nation, quite closely linked with the third function, as an identity. I've chosen to refer to the third function's expression of identity as ambivalent because the nature of, or degree to which, identity is considered as a part of the citizenship depends on an individual's life situation, according to the teachers. Initially when talking

about citizenship, the teachers considered it purely as an instrumental entity which functioned primarily as a hurdle for an individual get past before gaining control over their own life. However, when later referring to a classroom discussion, Speaker 1 began to reflect around the idea of *having* a citizenship:

We talk... yes, we talk a lot about identity, right? {...} I'm not a Norwegian citizen myself, and when I say that it's a bit like: "yes but...", right? "Aren't you... don't you feel Norwegian?" {...} And that I do, I am born and raised here. That's not what that citizenship is about, it's left over. It's something that's left over after my parents time, right? "oh, right, but why won't you now apply for Norwegian?" and then I think, yeah... or, I will, maybe, now that I have an opportunity.

The opportunity Speaker 1 refers to is the recent law change that allows for two citizenships. Later in the interview the teachers note that it seems many who hadn't before, now apply for citizenship as they get to keep both. The teachers distinguish between the meaning of identity of first and second citizenships. Whereas the first often harbours your nationality or connections to your past, and your heritage, the second varies more in that regard, where some deem it purely as an instrument, and others view it as a marker of having been integrated or being/becoming a national. This distinction is foreign to the theories of citizenship referred to in this paper, yet important, as it affects both the explanatory and normative claims in this paper.

So far I've found that the teachers: (1) have a broad conception of immigrants, yet can also generalise when referring to the major groups of Somalians, Syrians and Ukrainians, (2) consider themselves as mediators of culture as the immigrants Norwegian anchor, (3) express a pragmatic view of national culture, emphasising similarities and differences while distancing themselves from what they deem traditional ideas of Norwegian values, and (4) consider citizenship as both an instrument, and as a contract containing an ambivalent expression of identity, distinguishing between first and second citizenships in the latter regard. I've also identified a few problems: (1) the development of parallel societies, (2) the *requirement paradox*, (3) citizenship requirements as a hindrance, and (4) dividing of responsibilities for integration among institutions and inconsistencies between municipalities.

Explanatory and Normative claims

The explanatory claims made by the teachers are few and far in between, primarily the claims revolve around whether they believe new law changes and policies will work. The teachers often tailor their formulations of problems to fit in with what they perceive as the ruling political paradigm. However, interestingly most of their statements involve outright rejections of basic assumptions among the political elite. As an example, we can study this excerpt:

{4}

Interviewer:

We've actually gone through all the questions, {...} Something you would like to comment?

Speaker 2:

I'm just thinking about... when we had this project of B1 and citizenship and...
{name of professor}

Speaker 1:

Yes! {...}

Speaker 2:

Then we talked about these new requirements and, and that... this view of that making it a bit harder to gain citizenship will motivate and will make {people} more integrated. {...} I have no faith in that...

Speaker 1 {in agreement}:

No, no, you see, there is no... immediate correlation with... yeah

Speaker 2:

No, I'd rather believe the opposite in that event... that it will be harder to get them to feel integrated, in a sense. Because if they don't attain this citizenship, it will only create more exclusion.

According to the teachers, having higher citizenship requirements can actually hinder integration, they also state in the interview that language testing hinders language learning due to creating a precedent of studying for the purpose of passing the test, rather than for the purpose of learning the language, and consider this “the danger” of relying heavily on testing. They also express some normative claims regarding testing, excerpt 5 show how they responded when asked what they would expect from someone who apply for Norwegian citizenship:

{5}

Speaker 2:

They should understand how the Norwegian society functions, but we shouldn't expect that they understand it better than Norwegians in general though.

Speaker 1:

No, {...} having higher requirements for them than for others, I also think is wrong.

Speaker 2:

And... the citizenship test, that they must know what percentage of the country forest and mountains is. {...} or what is the average age of first-time mothers?

Speaker 1:

Yeah, that's hard to... yeah, how many more get separated?... Right?

Speaker 2:

Is that important to know?

Speaker 1:

Yeah, is that important to know?

Speaker 2:

{...} yeah, I don't think so

In addition to the scepticism towards testing, the teachers apparently express a strong position on *fairness*, stating that applicants for citizenship should not have to know more about society than the average Norwegian. The teachers hold a similar position on treatment of different immigrant groups, for example when discussing policies on the treatment of Ukrainian immigrants, they oppose ideas of putting Ukrainians in their own separate classes, both normatively and explanatory. Normatively they oppose it on grounds of equal treatment, alluding to the government “not caring” about other migrant groups. While their explanatory claim centres around a multicultural idea of integration.

Speaker 1 postulates that it’s “very positive to have people from so many cultures”, and later in the interview Speaker 2 adds to this claim by questioning whether putting Ukrainians in their own separate class, might be doing them a disservice, in the event that they have to stay in Norway. The former statement is notable, due to its matter-of-factness despite the teachers later lamenting that Norway is “not as multicultural as we think”. This suggest that the teachers also may view the introduction program as a basis for the betterment of the nation state, an assertion that might be strengthened by an observation from the end of the interview, were speaker 1 notes that “we’re a young nation”, and goes on to characterise Norway as a country that “knows how it is to be invaded by others” invoking ideas of a new nation state with an emphasis on sovereignty yet with “room to grow”.

This sudden personification of Norway intuitively seems to come at odds with the previous distancing manoeuvre from the traditional conception of Norwegian values, as nation branding processes reminiscent of this often are used with the intent of formulating a common narrative of national history and identity (For an example on nation branding, see Loftsdóttir, 2015). However, I would argue that it’s rather an expression of hope to counteract the otherwise quite bleak descriptions of the integration system in Norway, framing the introduction programme as a contributor to a better society. Another expression of hope is apparent when the teachers refer to the new integration law, notably expressing that the new law will be “integral” in directing focus towards the problem of division of responsibilities for integration between the introduction programme and the municipality.

Summary of findings

This *amateur political theory* can be characterised as having many epistemological claims, notably the distinction between first and second citizenships and the pragmatic view of national culture. As for explanatory claims it emphasises multiculturalist ideas of integration and stresses the merits of diverse societies and is critical of difficult citizenship-requirements due to their many negative or counterintuitive effects (see, *requirement paradox*). As for Normative claims, the theory is not particularly concerned with *national values*, pointing out that they are rarely exclusive to the nation, and therefore become rather platonic, however it has a strong claim of *fairness* stating that citizenship requirements should not, in any case, exceed what an average native citizen could be expected to know.

Discussion

Comparing the *amateur political theory* from the two teachers in the introduction programme with Favell's findings, I would confidently state that it is closer to the British discourse on citizenship and integration due to the emphasis on multiculturalism. However, it does not seem that the teachers relish the idea of group-based rights, and they do not necessarily divide immigrants by their nationality, in fact education and economic background seems a way more appropriate way of grouping immigrant groups, according to the teachers. The only diversion from this norm is when they speak of Syrians, Somalians, and Ukrainians, however they still emphasise prior education as a determining factor. In the way they conceptualise the *immigrant* they come closer to the French discourse seeing immigrants as individuals, not distinguished by nationality. They also primarily view the nation state as a political community, putting little emphasis on its *unique national culture*, bringing us to the next point, about *leitkultur*.

When initiating this project, I did expect to encounter some ideas of *leitkultur*, because Bech et al., Mouritzen et al., and Carlsen & Bugge all find a clear concept of what the national state represents culturally and in terms of values within both Denmark and Norway (2017; 2019; 2021). Mouritzen et al. finds that Denmark has its own concept of *leitkultur* (2019), and both Carlsen & Bugge and Brochman & Midtbøen compare the Norwegian discourse to the Danish, claiming that the two discourses are growing closer (2021; 2021). However, this thesis, in turning its gaze towards the introduction programme, is unable to reproduce the same results. The teachers position themselves in stark opposition to the idea of *unique national values*, and postulate that these values are

similar across most cultures, however assuming different forms and formulations. It is unclear what these exact values are however, and if I were to pressure them on an answer, they might have conjured up some sort of leading cultural ideal, nevertheless it is notable that the explicit *amateur political theory* produced places little to no emphasis on common national values.

One could argue that these values are expressed through laws and societal structure, however the teachers do not consider this to be an expression of unique values, but rather of a functioning system. In short, *leitkultur* finds little ground within this *amateur political theory* and thus far it seems this lack of *leitkultur* hasn't impeded the functioning of "multicultural" classrooms, at least according to the teachers. If one were to speculate, it could be due to the lack of the *patronising* discourse, as problematised by Mouritzen et al.(2019), that common values among participants at the introduction programme are able to present themselves. However, it could also be that the teachers' function as a "Norwegian anchor", may be a replacement for *leitkultur*, in that the teachers' position of authority creates dynamic that implicitly dominates other cultures. Meaning that the teachers may enter the classroom with unconscious ideas of values that they seek to confirm in the students, and the students adopting these values in an attempt to please the teacher. The latter point the teachers are highly aware of, however they would probably not attribute the common values that they find in the classroom to implicit cultural dominance. We arrive at a paradox here, either multiculturalism is blind to its own unique values that it attempts to confirm in others, or *leitkultur* claims to instil values in people that already have them. In an attempt to position this *amateur political theory* of citizenship in a public political context, we can see how it interacts with the five naturalisation criteria, some of which also have an implicit conception of *leitkultur*, notably the *adaption* criterion.

Comparing this theory with the naturalisation criteria from Beck et al., we can observe a few interesting distinctions. The teachers formulate many of their opinions in ways that make it hard to position their views within the criteria-model, due to their emphasis on the immigrant perspective. It is intuitively reasonable to assume that they would agree with the *democracy*, *competence*, and *contribution* criteria. However, on closer inspection they may not, at least not without major revisions. As an example, we can look at the teachers' emphasis on *competence* and *contribution* for the betterment of the immigrant's position in society rather than for *qualifying* them to participate politically, not to mention that these

two criteria, when formulated as citizenship requirements, can create the *requirement paradox*; significantly worsening the situation for the immigrant, and serving little purpose for the betterment of society.

Further, if we are to look at the *democracy* criterion, while it's highly likely that the teachers would agree with the implications that lacking citizenship threatens human rights, they do not emphasise the right to democratic participation, but rather the necessity of free movement and work. As a conceptual exercise one could construct a sixth criterion that emphasises immigrants' opportunity or inherent value as contributors to society at large, and term it as a *multiculturalist/multinational* criterion. However, more research is needed to see if that is a viable addition.

The teachers would however come at odds with the last two criteria, given their position on *fairness*. Regarding the *adaption* criterion, they would not accept the assumption that national culture is distinguishable enough to warrant particular emphasis, yet they would probably rather include it in the *competence* criterion as a part of societal knowledge, considering the prior discussion on *leitkultur*. As for the *association* criterion, the teachers position on equal treatment is inconsolable with this criterion, unless it were to apply equally to all citizens, both "native" and foreign, a proposition that is arguably ludicrous.

When comparing the different facets of the *amateur political theory* arrived at in the analysis, it appears to consistently err on the side of previous theories, by consistently attempting to formulate ideas of citizenship that centre the interest of the immigrant, going as far as to distinguish between first and second citizenships. This distinction challenges the notion that citizenship is a neutral entity composed of static elements that can be arrived at through informed discussions, meaning that Kymlicka's presentation of citizenship as an entity to which the political conflict between liberalism and communitarianism can be mediated, sells the contents of the citizenship as a political tool a bit short. And the assertion that one can instil a national identity, however inclusive it may be, by awarding citizenships would fail to consider the intrinsic difference in first and second citizenships.

Conclusion

There is a risk that this thesis has left the reader with more questions than answers. However, in an attempt at answering the question: “what is the prevailing discourse of citizenship at the Norwegian introduction programme?” I will summarize what I’ve found. I will also be making a case for why ideas of citizenship outside of political debates and policies needs to be studied further.

According to my findings, there exists divergences from the ideas that inform policymakers decisions on citizenship policy within the introduction programme in Norway. While the transferability of these findings is limited, the exploratory nature of the study has allowed for the identification of possible ideas of citizenship that exists within the discourse among teachers at the introduction programme. They include a rejection of the assumption that citizenship-requirements contribute to “better integration” and come at odds with some of the implications of these requirements normatively, due to the uncertainty of whether the average Norwegian would be able to fulfil them. Further, the findings suggest that citizenship requirements might come at odds with one another and create problems for individuals in pressured situations (i.e. *requirement paradox*). The teachers interviewed expressed scepticism towards the traditional conception of Norwegian values, and rather considered values to be common among people of differing backgrounds, however potentially differing slightly in formulations. This value-pragmatism also informed their emphasis on the merits of multicultural spaces for learning, arguably viewing the introduction programme as a valuable contributor in a more multicultural society. They also expressed wishes for integration to be considered a common task, arguing that municipalities needed to take more responsibility with measures of work integration.

In relation to previous literature on citizenship these finding show differences between elite views on citizenship and views among teachers at the introduction programme, where teachers emphasise immigrant perspectives and interests, and relatedly identify differences between first and second citizenships, a distinction that may inform a modern view of citizenship in times of high numbers of migration. When comparing the five naturalisation criteria from Bech et al. with the findings from the analysis, I found that they did not entirely coincide, due to differing emphasis on what constituted justifications for citizenship-requirements, and the value of multicultural identities. The findings suggest the

adage of a sixth criterion, that argues for the opportunities and merits of multiculturalism/multinationalism.

Due to this being an explorative study, it is meant partly to incentivise further research. One avenue for further research would be studying discursive constructions of citizenship in society and observing ramifications of these constructions by seeing how they inform attitudes towards minority groups. Another field of study would be to further scrutinise these findings and explore the distinction between first and second citizenship. The findings from this study suggest that citizenship-research focusing on foreign applicants for citizenship might give valuable insights for policymakers and theorists and contribute to a better system of integration and a higher degree of inclusion in society.

List of literature:

Aase, T. H. & Fossåskaret, E. (2007). *Skapte Virkeligheter: om produksjon of tolkning av kvalitative data* (2nd edition). Universitetsforlaget

Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (2nd edition). Schochen Books

Bech, E., Jensen, K., Mouritsen, P. & Olsen, T. (2017). Hvem er folket? *Politica*, 39(3): 227–248.

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Brochmann, G. & Midtbøen, A. H. (2021). Philosophies of integration? Elite views on citizenship policies in Scandinavia. *Ethnicities*, 21(1), 146-164.
doi:10.1177/1468796820950453

Brochmann, G. & Seland, I. (2010) Citizenship policies and ideas of nationhood in Scandinavia, *Citizenship Studies*, 14:4, 429-443, DOI: [10.1080/13621025.2010.490037](https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.490037)

Bugge, E. & Carlsen, C. H. (2021). Språkkrav for statsborgerskap og hvordan de begrunnes. I M. Monsen & V. Pájaró (Red.), *Andrespråklæring hos voksne. Vitenskapelige innsikter og didaktiske refleksjoner* (s. 191-215). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. Yale University Press

Favell, A. (2001) *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain* (2nd edition). Palgrave.

Fischer, M. & Mohrman, K. (2021) Multicultural integration in Germany: Race, religion, and the Mesut Özil controversy, *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 14:3, 202-220, DOI: [10.1080/17513057.2020.1782453](https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2020.1782453)

Integreringsloven. (2021). *Lov om Integrering gjennom opplæring, utdanning og arbeid* (LOV-1997-02-28-19). Lovdata. <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2020-11-06-127>

Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet (2022, February 3rd). *Målgruppe for opplæring I Norsk og samfunnskunnskap*, <https://www.imdi.no/kvalifisering/regelverk/norsk-og-samfunnskunnskap/malgruppe-for-opplaring-i-norsk-og-samfunnskunnskap/>

Johansen, I. G. (2022, March 14th). En populistisk flyktningpolitikk. *Subjekt*. <https://subjekt.no/2022/03/14/en-populistisk-flyktningpolitikk/>

Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary Political Philosophy; an Introduction* (2nd Edition). Oxford.

Kymlicka W. (2011) Multicultural citizenship within multination states. *Ethnicities*. 2011;11(3):281-302. doi:[10.1177/1468796811407813](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407813)

Loftsdóttir, K. (2015). *The Exotic North: Gender, Nation Branding and Post-colonialism in Iceland*. NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 23:4, 246-260, DOI: [10.1080/08038740.2015.1086814](https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2015.1086814)

Mouritsen, P., Faas, D., Meer, N. & de Witte, N. (2019). Leitkultur debates as civic integration in North-Western Europe: The nationalism of ‘values’ and ‘good citizenship’, *SAGE journals*, 19(4), 632-653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819843538>

Oslodebatten. (n.d.). *Norsk eller ikke norsk*. Oslodebatten. Retrieved May 2nd 2022. <https://www.oslodebatten.no/tag/norsk-eller-ikke-norsk>

Rasmussen, T. (2022, March 17th). Ikke alle flykninger er likeverdige. *Subjekt*. <https://subjekt.no/2022/03/17/ikke-alle-flykninger-er-likeverdige/>

Richard, H. (2021, December), Latvia, small and ever more divided. *Le Monde, diplomatique*. <https://mondediplo.com/2021/12/09latvia-divided>

Ringdal, K. (2001), *Enhet og Mangfold: Samfunnsvitenskapelig forskning og kvantitativ metode* (4th edition). Fagbokforlaget

Svendsen, C. & Alayobi, M. (2022, February 2nd). FN-ekspert hardt ut mot Norge: Mener det er nesten latterlig at fire barn ikke er hentet fra Syria. *NRK*.

https://www.nrk.no/norge/fn-ekspert-hardt-ut-mot-norge_-mener-det-er-nesten-latterlig-at-fire-barn-ikke-er-hentet-fra-syria-1.15836718?# =

Attachments:

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet

Ideas of Norwegian citizenship?

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er en bacheloroppgave i statsvitenskap ved Universitetet i Stavanger. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Prosjektet er en bacheloroppgave som skal undersøke idéer innenfor introduksjonsprogrammet om hva norsk statsborgerskap er, og hva det innebærer. Oppgaven retter søkelyset mot idéer om statsborgerskap blant lærere i norsk og samfunnskunnskap.

Oppgaven skrives på engelsk og forskningsspørsmålet lyder slik: «What is the prevailing discourse of citizenship at the Norwegian introduction programme?»

Hensikten med oppgaven er altså å finne ut av hva slags idé om statsborgerskap som preger introduksjonsprogrammet.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Universitetet i Stavanger, Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet, Institutt for medie- og samfunnsfag er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Du får spørsmål om å delta fordi du er lærer i Norsk og/eller samfunnskunnskap for nyankomne innvandrere, og derfor har en særskilt kompetanse til både å kunne uttale deg om forhold som gjelder opplæring av nyankomne innvandrere, samt meddele observasjoner fra læringssituasjoner.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at du tar del i et gruppeintervju sammen med kollegaer ved læringssenteret. Det vil ta cirka en time. Under intervjuet vil dere få spørsmål om hva dere mener om norsk og samfunnskunnskapsopplæringen sånn den er i dag, hva dere mener om statsborgerskap og/eller hva det betyr for dere, og til hvilken grad dere synes den politiske situasjonen i Norge får en påvirkning på undervisningen deres. Dette gruppeintervjuet blir registrert med lydopptak og deretter transkribert.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykke tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om deg vil da bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Ved Universitetet i Stavanger er det kun meg og min veileder og eventuelt prosjektansvarlig ved instituttet som vil ha tilgang til informasjonen. Ingen uvedkommende får tilgang til personopplysningene dine. Ditt navn og dine kontaktopplysninger vil jeg erstatte med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data. Alle data blir lagret innelåst eller i en kryptert fil.

Du vil ikke kunne bli gjenkjent i publikasjonen, informasjon som blir publisert innebærer bare yrke, hvor lenge du har jobbet, og størrelse på gruppen som er intervjuet.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 30.06.22. Personopplysninger og eventuelle lydopptak skal slettes ved prosjektslutt.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Universitetet i Stavanger har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med

Universitetet i Stavanger, ved en av disse adressene:

- Student: Oskar Kippersund Martesønn,
- Prosjektets veileder: Hande Eslen Ziya,
- Prosjektansvarlig ved instituttet: Ellen Ravndal,
- Vårt personvernombud ved: Rolf Jegervatn,
- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Prosjektansvarlig
(Forsker/veileder)

Eventuelt student

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet *Ideas of Norwegian Citizenship*, og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

å delta i *gruppeintervju*

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. 30.06.22

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

Interview guide

For semi-structured focus-group interview

The following questions are intended to aid in uncovering attitudes among teachers, at the introduction programme, towards the citizenship-institution of the Norwegian nation-state; what it represents as well as what should be demanded of applicants for citizenship. Further, the questions will aim in uncovering the perceived importance of citizenship at the introduction programme as a whole. The interview will be conducted in Norwegian. In the event that an informant be quoted, I will translate their response and inform that I did so in the thesis.

Questions in Norwegian:

Introduserende spørsmål:

1. Hvor lenge har dere undervist på introduksjonsprogrammet?
2. Hvordan vil dere beskrive det å være lærer her?
3. Hva synes dere er bra med introduksjonsprogrammet? Hva synes dere ikke er bra?
4. Hvordan opplever dere de nye lovendringene angående introduksjonsprogrammet og Norsk- og samfunnskunnskapsopplæringen? (er det rotete? Lett å skjønne? Bra/dårlig? Får dere informasjon? Forandrer det mye for dere? Forandrer det mye for deltakerne?)

Dybde:

5. Opplever dere at Norske verdier er en viktig del av norsk og samfunnskunnskapsopplæringen?

hvorfor? hvilke verdier er disse? hvorfor ikke?

6. Hvordan vil dere beskrive meningsmangfoldet i klasserommet?

Kulturforskjeller, grupperinger, selvstendighet

7. Hvor sannsynlig tror dere det er at deltakere på introduksjonsprogrammet får norsk statsborgerskap?
 - i. Opplever dere at introduksjonsprogrammet bidrar I denne prosessen?

Hvordan? Og hva er det viktigste elementet? Hvorfor ikke? Hva mangler?

8. hva tenker *dere* statsborgerskap er?
9. hva mener dere bør forventes av en som skal få statsborgerskap i et land han eller hun har flyttet til?
10. opplever dere at det er forskjell på ulike grupper med hensyn til hvor lett det er å få norsk statsborgerskap?

11. Snakker dere om statsborgerskap i timene? Er det viktig for deltakere?
12. Til hvilken grad mener dere at den politiske situasjonen i Norge påvirker undervisningen din?
13. Opplever dere at deltakere ønsker å være aktive i samfunnet?
14. Føler dere at dere har et ansvar for at deltakere får mulighet til å bli bidragsyttere i samfunnet?

Hvorfor? Hvorfor ikke? Er statsborgerskap viktig i den prosessen?

Translation of questions without guiding notes

Introducing questions:

1. How long have you taught at the introduction programme?
2. How would you describe being a teacher here?
3. What do you like about the introduction programme? What do you not like?
4. What are your experiences with the recent law-changes regarding the introduction programme and the Norwegian and knowledge of society courses?

In Depth:

5. Do you think Norwegian values are an important part of Norwegian and knowledge of society courses?
6. How would you describe the diversity of opinions in class?
7. How probable do you think it is that participants at the introduction programme obtains a Norwegian citizenship?
 - i. Do you experience that the introduction programme contributes in that regard?
8. What do *you* think citizenship is?
9. What do you think should be expected of one who shall obtain citizenship in a country that they have moved to?
10. Do you experience differences between distinct groups regarding how difficult it is to obtain a Norwegian citizenship?
11. Do you talk about citizenship during classes? Is it important for participants?
12. To what extent do you think the political situation in Norway affects your teaching?

13. Do you experience that participants wish to be active in society?
14. Do you feel a responsibility that participants get an opportunity to be contributors in society?