



Am I Norwegian Yet?

*Government and Grassroots Approaches to Integration:
The Introduction Act and the Tea Time Campaign*

SVF-3901

Kristoffer Fjærestad Amundsen

*Master's Thesis in Peace and Conflict Transformation
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education
University of Tromsø
Spring 2013*

Abstract

This thesis examines different approaches and methods used for the integration of immigrants in Norway. The study compares two different cases. The first is the government's main tool of integration, the introduction program for newly arriving refugees. The second is an initiative from a civil society non-governmental organization, The Norwegian Center against Racism, call the Tea Time campaign. The objective of the research is to understand the different approaches used and how these approaches influence the outcome of the processes. To meet this objective, this study has made use of qualitative document analysis, as well as some qualitative interviews. The analytical theories used focus on the concepts of structure, agency and power.

The findings of the study suggest that the government's approach lacks an emphasis on the importance of a two-way process of integration and that actors are not directly empowered by the methods used by the government. The Tea Time campaign has a two-way integration process at the center of its approach.

Keywords: agency, power, structure, integration, immigration, peace, conflict, Muslims, Islam, discrimination, prejudice, identity, empowerment, transformation, Norway

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank some of the people that helped in this process, though I couldn't possibly thank everyone. My supervisor Marit Aure has been a great source of encouragement, criticism and advice throughout this process. The staff at the Center for Peace Studies has been a great help, particularly Percy Oware, Lodve Svare and Randolph Wallace Rhea.

My friends have been a constant source of inspiration and assistance, and not least of distraction, in particular Moustapha Babikersen, Nikolai Holm, Janvier Nzigo, Camilla Berntzen, Anne Marit Bachmann and Thorbjørn Lundsgaard. Thank you to Ira Tryndyuk for being a constant source of motivation.

Thank you to my family, especially my brother Aleks Amundsen, for all of your help over the last two years.

And thank you to Antirasistisk Senter for your cooperation in this project.

This project wouldn't be what it is today without your support, so thank you very much.

Kris Amundsen
University of Tromsø
June 1 2013

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Immigration and growing pains	1
1.2 Research Objectives	3
1.3 Research Methods	4
1.4 Theoretical Departure.....	4
1.5 The Peace Study Context	4
1.6 Structure of Study.....	5
Chapter 2: Background	6
2.1 Integration in Norway	6
2.2 Introduction Program	7
2.3 Who Does What?	8
2.4 Challenges of the Introduction Program	10
2.4.1 Organization in NAV or Elsewhere?.....	11
2.4.2 Challenges: Structure and Content	12
2.5 The Norwegian Center Against Racism.....	14
2.6 Tea Time	15
2.7 Summary	16
Chapter 3: Research Methods	18
3.1 Data Collection Techniques	18
3.1.1 Document Analysis.....	18
3.1.2 Qualitative Interviews.....	19
3.2 The Multiple Methods Approach: Macro and Micro Perspectives	19
3.2.1 Qualitative Versus Quantitative.....	20
3.3 Challenges and Reflections	20
3.3.1 Gaining Access	20
3.3.2 Ethical Considerations	21
3.3.3 Language	21
3.3.4 Cross-Gender Interviewing.....	22
3.3.5 My Position: Insider or Outsider?	22
3.4 Summary	22

Chapter 4: Theory	23
4.1 Anthony Giddens' Structuration Theory.....	23
4.1.2 Agency & Power	25
4.1.3 Bringing it All Together	27
4.1.4 Criticism of Structuration Theory.....	28
4.2 Gordon Allport's Intergroup Contact Hypothesis and its Development.....	30
4.2.1 Change Through Intergroup Contact.....	31
4.2.2 Criticism of the Contact Hypothesis.....	31
4.3 Important Concepts	33
4.3.1 Integration, Assimilation and Identity	34
4.3.2 Can Integration be Measured?	36
4.4 Summary	36
Chapter 5: Analysis.....	38
5.1 The Introduction Program	38
5.1.1 Structure.....	38
5.1.2 Agency & Power	41
5.1.3 Structuration	44
5.2 Tea Time	44
5.2.1 Structure.....	45
5.2.2 Optimal Conditions.....	45
5.2.3 Agency, Power & Transformation.....	46
5.3 Discussion & Comparison.....	47
5.4 Summary	49
Chapter 6: Discussion & Concluding Remarks	50
6.1 Am I Norwegian Yet?	50
6.2 Propositions for Further Research.....	51
6.3 Concluding Remarks	52
Literature.....	54
Internet Resources.....	58

Chapter 1: Introduction

Until rather recently, Norway has been a quite poor country. Its influence across the globe was considerably weaker than what it is today, to say the least, and it could not be considered to be a global leader in much of anything. However, the discovery of oil in 1969 changed things quite drastically, in Norway as well as abroad. The rapid technological advancements that accompanied the post-war period brought along with it an equally rapid movement of people and labor which mostly ignored Norway until after the discovery of oil. It was not until 1974 that the Norwegian government created its first official document regarding immigration and integration for this period ¹. Due to oil discovery and the subsequent economic boom, development in Norway occurred at near-record speed. Forty years after the discovery of oil, Norway is among the most modernized countries in the world. It scores highly in quality of life indices and is consistently ranked among one of the best countries in the world to live in.

Norway is now a global leader in the oil industry, a model of the social-democratic welfare state, and it holds the reputation of being a nation of peace. But as Norway developed out of the small and poor nation it had been at the close of World War II, it also became an appealing place for people from other countries. Just as in other countries, Norway has been unable to overcome some of the difficulties often associated with immigration and integration.

1.1 Immigration and growing pains

As the oil industry and general economic development brought jobs and prosperity to Norway, it also attracted immigrants looking for work. As the standard of living began to grow, refugees and asylum seekers began coming to Norway as well. Norway, being unaccustomed to immigration, has had some difficulties adjusting. Since 1970, Norway's immigrant population has exploded, now 8 times the amount it was then, and almost twice of what it was in 2000 ². In the past twenty years there have been 12 official reports and 23 different plans of action

¹ Djuve (2011)b p. 11-12

² Smestad (2012) p. 255

containing a total of 672 initiatives³. Despite this, the unemployment rate among immigrants at the end of 2012 was 6 percent, more than three times that of the rest of the population⁴. The two groups that deviate from this number were those from Asia at between 7 and 8 percent, and those from Africa, at 12.5 percent⁵.

Norway's struggles to integrate the newest members of its society are well documented. A 2009 report from the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi) about media generated fear of Islam, identified that there were nearly as many articles about Islam or Muslims as there were about Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg⁶. The same report documented that 71 percent of articles related to immigration or integration had a negative focus⁷. A study from 2012 documented that job seekers with a non-Western name are 25 percent less likely to be called into an interview than an identically qualified applicant with a Norwegian name⁸. In a study from 2012, 8 out of 10 respondents said that they believe that there are common 'Norwegian' values and 7 of 10 said that these values stand in sharp contrast to the values of immigrants from Africa, Asia, and South and Central America⁹. 36 percent of the respondents said that those values are a serious threat to the Norwegian value set¹⁰.

Many of those coming to Norway from outside of Europe are coming as refugees. The net immigration to Norway in 2010 was 42 350, of which 70 percent were Europeans, with people from Poland and the Baltic region accounting for 38 percent¹¹. Included in this number are refugees, with 6 831, a number that was down slightly in 2011 at 6 105¹². In 2004, Norway implemented a law creating a mandatory two-year introductory program for newly arriving refugees¹³. The introduction program is both required of the refugee and also their right, and all municipalities that receive refugees are required to offer the program¹⁴. The main focus of the

³ Gedde-Dahl & Stokke (2012)

⁴ SSB (2013)

⁵ Ibid

⁶ IMDi (2010) p. 9

⁷ Ibid p. 10

⁸ Midtbøen & Rogstad (2012)

⁹ IMDi (2012)b p. 6

¹⁰ Ibid p. 6

¹¹ NOU Bedre Integrering (2011) p. 44-45

¹² IMDi (2012)a p. 25

¹³ LOV 2003-07-04 nr 80

¹⁴ Ibid

introduction program is to teach the participants the Norwegian language and inform them about Norwegian culture, along with work internships and other initiatives, to give them the tools needed to prepare for participation in the Norwegian society, and make the transition to the labor market or studying ¹⁵.

Evaluations of the introduction program, now in its ninth year of existence as a law, have identified numerous problems that may contribute to the difficulties that many of the participants experience after completing the program, and they have contributed a great deal of information to this study. The next chapter will present the actors involved in the execution of the introduction program and will also identify the difficulties with the program that have been commonly pointed out.

1.2 Research Objectives

The Norwegian government had as its goal that 55 percent of participants in the introduction program will be working or studying after completing the introduction program, and that the number would rise to 70 percent one year after they have completed the program¹⁶. In 2009, only 44 percent of those finishing the program transitioned directly to the job market or started education ¹⁷. The aim of this thesis will be to analyze why the introduction program is not as successful as the government desires. The introduction program for newly arrived refugees, the government's main tool in its integration policy, will be compared with an initiative from a civil society non-governmental organization (NGO). The Norwegian Centre against Racism, or *Antirasistisk Senter* (from here referred to as ARS), had a campaign called Tea Time, in which Norwegian Muslims invite non-Muslim Norwegians into their homes for a cup of tea and to become better acquainted with one another. This study will analyze the introduction program's approach and the processes involved, to try and understand why results are not meeting the desired goals. It will also analyze the approach and processes of the Tea Time campaign, to determine if there are aspects of the campaign that may be valuable to, or missing from, the government's chief integration tool.

¹⁵ Ibid

¹⁶ Barne-, likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet (2012) p. 5

¹⁷ Rambøll (2011) p. 4

1.3 Research Methods

This thesis employs qualitative methods, drawing the majority of the information from official documents and reports. I have also conducted interviews with the administrator and coordinators of the Tea Time campaign at ARS to gain more insight into the processes, the results, as well as the background and reasoning for launching the campaign. Chapter 3 will detail the methodologies used and explore some of the methodological issues that follow these approaches and the study in general.

1.4 Theoretical Departure

The main theory to be used in this thesis will be Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. Structuration theory is Giddens' attempt to make a general social sciences theory to explain human action, power, and the reproduction of social structures. In addition, or rather, combination, it will apply Gordon Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis. Allport's ideas, later developed into a theory by Thomas Pettigrew, suggests that intergroup relations are one of the most effective methods of reducing prejudice between ethnic groups. Structuration theory is quite abstract, while the contact hypothesis is much more concrete. The theories will be explained in depth in chapter 4.

1.5 The Peace Study Context

This study uses the concepts of Johan Galtung, considered the father of modern peace studies, as a general framework. Peace is often characterized by the absence of war. Galtung has created a very different definition. He argues that there are three levels of peace, positive peace, negative peace and peace¹⁸. Galtung also gives three definitions of violence, writing that violence is either direct, structural or cultural¹⁹. Positive peace is the absence of war and injustice in society. Negative peace is the absence of war, but injustice remains, in the form of structural or cultural violence.

¹⁸ Webel & Galtung (2009) p. 30

¹⁹ Ibid p.30

1.6 Structure of Study

As already mentioned, chapter 3 will focus upon methodological issues. Chapter 4 will provide an extensive description of the theories to be applied in the study. Chapter 5 will consist of the analysis and discussion. The final chapter will reflect upon the research questions posed earlier in this chapter and engage in a broader discussion of the themes this study touches upon. The next chapter will give a background of the two research subjects of this thesis, the introduction program and the Tea Time campaign.

Chapter 2: Background

In 1974, the Norwegian parliament report number 39 (or white paper number 39) titled “About Immigration Policy”, was the government’s first official document addressing integration of immigrants²⁰. In 1970, only 1.5 percent of the population had an immigrant background²¹. The term immigrant background refers to immigrants and also children that are born in Norway to immigrant parents. At the start of 2013, 12 percent of the population had an immigrant background²². The report was mainly aimed at foreign workers that had come to Norway in recent years. Many of these workers decided to settle and bring their families with them, something that had not been anticipated. The 1970s saw several “immigration stops” in Norway, as in other parts of Western Europe, and eventually the stop became policy in 1981²³. However, the restrictions on immigration did not completely put an end to migration. Rather, it led to the third “wave”²⁴ of immigration, the arrival of refugees and asylum seekers²⁵.

2.1 Integration in Norway

The phenomenon of immigration and the integration policies that follow are quite new for Norway. The policies of the 1970s were mainly related to working and living conditions. The immigration stop meant that the percentage of refugees started to grow in relation to the immigrant population as a whole. Refugees are different from other immigrant groups, such as those coming as foreign laborers for example, since they generally have very little when they come to their new host country and are often in greater need of assistance from the state²⁶. As the percentage of refugees in the immigrant population rose, so did the unemployment rate, and this became both a focus of immigration policy and a justification for continuing the immigration stop²⁷. The Norwegian parliament report number 39 “About Immigration Policy” (1987-88), underlined that equality between immigrants and Norwegians was the main principle in

²⁰ Djuve (2011)b p. 11-12

²¹ Ibid p. 3

²² SSB (2013)b

²³ Brochmann & Kjeldstadli (2008) p. 202

²⁴ Brochmann and Kjeldstadli identify the first wave as being “single male labour migrants who responded to demand in the labour market” and the second as “family members of the people of the first wave”, p. 214

²⁵ Ibid p. 214

²⁶ Djuve (2011)a p. 12-13

²⁷ Djuve (2011)b p. 12

immigration policy²⁸. This report began to focus on the importance of integration in the job market more so than its predecessors. Norwegian Parliament report number 17 “About Refugee Policy” focused on that the goal should be for individuals to be responsible for their lives and take care of themselves as soon as possible²⁹. Two years later, in report number 17 “About Immigration and the Multicultural Norway”, the workplace was for the first time pointed to as the most important arena for integration³⁰. The importance of the workplace is central to the introduction program. Djuve writes that prior to the establishment of the introduction program, Norway’s policies were based on the principle of equal treatment³¹. Integration efforts went through the same institutions that the general population used. In the 1980s and 1990s, individual municipalities were responsible for the integration process, leading to significant variation in their efforts³². This also led to significant criticism and precipitated the creation of the introduction program. This is identified as one of the three major criticisms of the previous method of integrating newly arrived refugees, the other two being that the government’s policy was unclear on how it would transmit Norwegian values and that the use of the social welfare system led to a process of clientification and forced the refugees to rely on the government³³. The most common approach was to give a few hours of Norwegian language lessons per week. This type of organization and teaching practice was used until the adoption of the Introduction Act in 2003, which presented a new form of organization and tools for integrating refugees.

2.2 Introduction Program

Today, the Norwegian government’s main integration initiative is the introduction program for newly arrived immigrants. This was a significant shift from the previous efforts at integrating refugees. The policy was aimed at increasing “the intensity and quality of the qualification efforts”³⁴. Paragraph one of the law states that the goal is to strengthen newly arrived immigrants’ opportunity for participation in occupational and social life, and their economic

²⁸ Ibid p. 13

²⁹ Ibid p. 13-14

³⁰ Ibid p. 14

³¹ Djuve (2011)a p. 12

³² Ibid p. 12

³³ Kavli et al (2007) p. 20

³⁴ Djuve (2011)a p. 15

independence³⁵. The program began as a voluntary initiative in September 2003, and became mandatory for all municipalities 1 September 2004³⁶. Any municipality which receives refugees must offer the introduction program, and are responsible for implementing the program. Asylum seekers whom have been granted residency in Norway and are between the ages of 18 and 55, have both the right and duty to take part in the introduction program³⁷. Other groups that are required to take part in the introduction program are family members of refugees that have come to Norway through family reunification. The fourth paragraph of the introduction law aims to give basic skills in the Norwegian language, basic insight into Norwegian culture, and prepare refugees for participation in the workplace. It also states that the program shall at minimum consist of language training, cultural knowledge, and initiatives that prepare the participant for further education or an association to the workplace, and that the program should be full-time year-round. The program is designed to last for two years, but can be extended to last for three. A participant may also end early, if they have been offered a job.

Paragraph six states that an individual plan shall be created for each participant, based upon their educational needs, and what initiatives may be useful to them. The plan should at minimum include the program start and the time phases, along with a description of the initiatives in the program. The plan should be created with the individual and should be reviewed periodically. Paragraph seventeen states that Norwegian language and cultural education shall together be 600 hours. Prior to 1 January 2012, the law stated that refugees had the right to and duty of 300 hours³⁸.

2.3 Who Does What?

The Norwegian state's integration efforts are a coordinated attempt by multiple ministries and agencies working in the immigration and immigration fields. The Norwegian parliament naturally makes laws, such as the Introduction Act. In the immigration sector, the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, along with the Directorate of Immigration beneath it, have the main

³⁵ Rundskriv Q-20 (2012) p. 14

³⁶ Rambøll (2011) p. 4

³⁷ LOV 2003-07-04 nr 80, paragraph 2

³⁸ Rundskriv Q-20 (2012) p. 92

responsibility for processing applications for asylum, immigration, visas, and the different types of residency permits. The integration field is the domain of the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion. Beneath it is the Norwegian Directorate of Integration and Diversity, or IMDi. IMDi's role is to cooperate with the individual municipalities and government agencies, to implement the integration policy of the government ³⁹. IMDi is also tasked with the role of being an expert in the integration field and a resource for the authorities. IMDi's main responsibilities are assisting the municipalities with settling refugees, helping the refugees to transition to work or education after completing the introduction program, working for equality in the access to public services, and working to prevent forced marriage ⁴⁰.

Two of the most important aspects of the introduction program, are Norwegian language training and Norwegian social life information. They are the responsibility of Vox, the Norwegian Agency for Lifelong Learning. Vox is an agency under the Ministry of Education and Research ⁴¹. Vox's role is to create the curriculum for these two features of the introduction program. As of January 1 2012, the 300 hours of Norwegian language and socio-cultural life education that are the right and duty of newly arrived refugees and their families was expanded to 600 hours ⁴². The curriculum consists of 50 hours of information about Norwegian society, spread across seven subjects: New immigrant in Norway; History, geography and lifestyle; Children and family; Health; Education and skills; Workplace; Democracy and the welfare society ⁴³. There are also three different paths for Norwegian language lessons ⁴⁴. The paths are specially structured to match the participant's education background. Path 1 is for those that have little or no formal education, the second for those with a fair deal of formal education, and the third for those that have a fairly comprehensive education level. Path 3 is the highest level of Norwegian language training, so it includes those that have completed higher education as well. It is important to note that Vox is responsible for creating the curriculum, but not for administering it.

³⁹ IMDi (2012)a p. 6-7

⁴⁰ Ibid p. 7

⁴¹ Ibid p. 8

⁴² Vox (2012) p. 3

⁴³ Ibid p. 4

⁴⁴ Ibid p. 22

NAV, the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration, is the public welfare agency. NAV, along with administering the introduction program in many municipalities, also is responsible for other tasks such as managing unemployment benefits and pensions for the entire Norwegian population. NAV was established in 2006 and was a reform of the previous arrangement in which the employment and social security agencies operated independently of one another.

The municipalities are undoubtedly the most important agent in the process of integrating refugees. In cooperation with IMDi, the municipalities receive and settle refugees that have been granted asylum in Norway. As discussed earlier, the implementation of the introduction program regulated the municipality's work to a much higher degree than before. The law requires municipalities that receive refugees to offer the introduction program to them. Beyond training in language and social studies, the municipalities are obliged to offer additional initiatives that help to prepare participants for life in the labor force after they have completed the introduction program. The municipalities are free to organize the introduction program as they see fit. NAV has been given the responsibility of administering the introduction program in 44 percent of the municipalities⁴⁵. The most common form of organization of the introduction program is through a separate refugee office or introduction center⁴⁶. Less common, is organization through adult education centers, accounting for 22 percent of the programs⁴⁷. The different types of organization, and the challenges that accompany those different forms, will be explained in the next section.

2.4 Challenges of the Introduction Program

This section will present a brief overview of some of the challenges associated with the implementation and execution of the introduction program. The goal is to provide an overview of the difficulties that will be examined more thoroughly in the analysis chapter. As mentioned in the first chapter, the Norwegian government had a goal that in 2012, 55 percent of the participants completing the introduction program would go directly into either work or continue their education. Additionally, the government had a goal that 70 percent of participants

⁴⁵ NOU Bedre Integreering (2011) p. 225

⁴⁶ Kavli et al (2007) p. 9

⁴⁷ Ibid p. 9

completing the program in 2012 are in work or school one year later. The percentage of participants that are in work or going to school after completing the program is how the Norwegian government measures the success of the introduction program. The government's goals for 2012 were a decrease from 2008 and 2009, when the desired goal was 65 percent, and the outcome was respectively 53 and 44 percent⁴⁸. Previous evaluations of the introduction program have identified a number of factors that can contribute to the poor results⁴⁹. These factors have led to large variations in the success rate between municipalities⁵⁰. Different forms of organization of the program can bring with it different sets of challenges. This study will distinguish between these challenges as being related to content, structure, or both.

2.4.1 Organization in NAV or Elsewhere?

An evaluation of the introduction program in 2011 found that there is generally no difference in the results in municipalities that organize the introduction program through NAV and those that do not⁵¹. There are generally two different methods of organization for the introduction program, either within the municipalities NAV offices, or outside. The most common organization of the program is in a municipality's own refugee office or introduction center⁵². Another method of organization outside of NAV is tasking the execution of the introduction program to adult education centers, which have traditionally had the role of implementing Vox's curriculum for Norwegian language and society instruction⁵³. Evaluations of the introduction program have identified a number of factors that can contribute to the lower than desired results of the program. These issues can generally be classified as being related to content, regardless of how the program is organized, or as structural difficulties, some of which are exclusive to the method of organization. Some of the challenges are rooted in both the content and the structure, as will be shown.

⁴⁸ NOU Bedre Integring (2011) p. 220

⁴⁹ Rambøll (2011) p. 5

⁵⁰ Kavli et al (2007) p. 21

⁵¹ IMDi (2011)a

⁵² Kavli et al (2007) p. 9

⁵³ Rambøll (2011) p. 48-49

2.4.2 Challenges: Structure and Content

When a participant enters into the introduction program, they are given a contact person, their program advisor. The program advisor is responsible for mapping the individual's skills and competencies, along with any qualifications that they bring with them to Norway. After this, an individual plan is created in cooperation with the participant. They determine which level of Norwegian language training is best suited for them, and whether their individual's goal is to begin working at the end of the program or if they wish to continue their education. Regardless of the direction the participant desires to go, the individual plan is tailored to the participant's needs and with goals to ensure that the participant will be qualified for whatever it is they wish to do in the future. The individual plan is a tool that should ideally be used to follow-up with the participant to make sure that they are on the right track and should be periodically updated to reflect changes in the participant's life and desires.

A problem that arises regardless of where the program is organized, is the capacity of the program advisors. Advisors can have a large case load and be responsible for many participants, thus limiting their ability for following-up as frequently or as thoroughly as may be necessary⁵⁴. Further, advisors often have additional responsibilities. This is true for program advisors within NAV and outside, but is more frequent within NAV where 67 percent have additional duties, 10 percent more than for those outside of NAV⁵⁵. Another discovery from earlier evaluations is that work with refugees can be less prioritized in NAV, because this group is quite small in comparison to the other user groups which NAV serves through its other responsibilities⁵⁶. An additional difficulty is the large amount of judgment that the program advisors possess. While the introduction program places some requirements on the municipalities, they are still quite free to implement the program as they desire. The individual plan mentioned above is an opportunity to give participants a feeling of ownership towards their work in the introduction program and to have input on what they want to do. But the program advisors and participants can have different opinions as to what is best or what is a realistic plan, and in these situations it is likely that the program advisor's opinions will be the determining factor⁵⁷. A potentially very serious problem is that of the program advisor's competency level. Within NAV, the concern is related

⁵⁴ Ibid p. 38

⁵⁵ Ibid p. 42

⁵⁶ Ibid p. 40

⁵⁷ Djuve & Kavli (2006) p. 211-212

to competency in issues of mental health of refugees, something that the advisors in refugee centers are more familiar with⁵⁸. Conversely, program advisors within NAV are also more qualified in assessing an individual's skills and work abilities⁵⁹. Advisors outside of NAV are often more specialized than those within, and particularly when the program is small because the NAV advisors are more likely to have additional duties not related to the introduction program⁶⁰. Another structural difficulty is good communication between the different actors involved, namely between the program advisors and the adult education centers⁶¹. While it would seem that organization within NAV would mean a more coordinated system, this has been shown to not always be the case, as even advisors within NAV have difficulties cooperating with their coworkers in other departments⁶². As illustrated here, different systems of organization can present different problems. And some problems are present regardless of the organization structure.

Issues with the content of the introduction program tend to persist in all forms of organization. A study from 2011 showed that just 7 percent of the municipalities offer a fulltime program of 37.5 hours per week as they are legally obligated to do⁶³. The size of the program is again a factor, as programs with fewer than 10 participants tend to particularly struggle with creating a fulltime program for their participants⁶⁴. The discretionary powers of the program advisors again come into play here, because they have the ability to determine what counts as a worthwhile initiative⁶⁵. Another issue relating to size, is that if there are fewer participants then there are often fewer alternatives. In regards to language training, most municipalities are able to accommodate participants with little previous education, but struggle to offer a program suited to refugees that have a background of higher education⁶⁶. Language education that is work-focused or education-focused is also subject to this problem. Programs with fewer participants also have access to fewer additional qualification initiatives, meaning that individuals will end up taking

⁵⁸ Rambøll (2011) p. 41

⁵⁹ Ibid p. 41

⁶⁰ Ibid p. 51-52

⁶¹ Ibid p. 52

⁶² Ibid p. 51

⁶³ Ibid p. 65

⁶⁴ Kavli et al (2007) p. 71

⁶⁵ Ibid p. 62

⁶⁶ Ibid p. 5

part in basically the same program as one another, despite their different plans and focuses ⁶⁷. A common qualification initiative that is used is language practice in the workplace, but again, the relevance of this varies greatly from participant to participant; an example of this comes forth in an interview from one report evaluating the introduction program, where the participant had language practice at a hotel, but spent all of their time working independently in the garden ⁶⁸. Another difficulty relating to size, could be not the size of the program but of the municipality. Smaller municipalities with few businesses and little variation in the different industries represented by those businesses would undoubtedly have problems finding positions that would be relevant for every participant. Another issue is that program advisors can sometimes have difficulties with finding businesses willing to take on refugees, or, that there is a danger of using up all of those that are willing, leaving them with no alternatives ⁶⁹. These are the main obstacles that have been highlighted by the multitude of evaluations of the introduction program and are pointed to as part of the cause for the variation in results between the municipalities.

2.5 The Norwegian Center Against Racism

The Tea Time campaign is an initiative of a small Norwegian NGO named the Norwegian Center against Racism, or *Antirasistisk Senter* (referred to as ARS from this point). The organization works to fight racism and discrimination in Norway. There are three main projects that the organization runs. The first is Agenda X, a center that brings minority youth together and enables them to plan and decide on different activities ⁷⁰. The second is Job X, a career center for minority youth between 16 and 26 years old, that assists in the job-seeking process ⁷¹. The last is a counseling office that advises individuals with minority backgrounds that need help in cases of discrimination ⁷². In addition to these activities, the organization also participates in many different campaigns, debates, and is often engages in public debates around issues of racism, discrimination, multiculturalism and human rights in the media.

⁶⁷ Ibid p. 61

⁶⁸ Ibid p. 86

⁶⁹ Rambøll (2011) p. 67

⁷⁰ Antirasistisk Senter (2011) p. 4

⁷¹ Ibid p. 4

⁷² Ibid p. 4

2.6 Tea Time

In March 2011, ARS launched the Tea Time campaign. The campaign was selected as the winner of the advertising industry's annual contest, *Reklame for Alvor* (literally translated to "Advertising for Real"), in which they are granted a free campaign. The award allows for the campaign to last for one year, but in the wake of the terrorist attacks on 22 July 2011, the Norwegian government gave an additional 700,000 Norwegian kroner to ARS to help them strengthen their work.⁷³ This allowed the campaign to operate for an additional year. The campaign was spread through advertising on television, the radio and in movie theaters. The additional funding from the government allowed for the making of a documentary. The premise of the campaign is the Norwegian Muslims invite Norwegian non-Muslims into their homes for a cup of tea and an opportunity to get to know one another. ARS' role in the campaign is to arrange meetings between Muslims that want to host and non-Muslims that want to be invited. In a documentary that aired on 21 March 2013, it was stated that over 4,000 non-Muslim Norwegians have desired to take part, that approximately 3,000 meetings have taken place and that over 500 Muslim families have opened their homes.⁷⁴ In addition to these individual meetings, ARS has traveled around Norway and held large-scale events. They have invited the Muslim population of a city or a particular mosque and invited the general public to come and participate at the events, which have been held in public places, such as shopping malls.

The Tea Time campaign came to be through an advertisement contest. The inspiration came from a Norwegian man with an Iranian neighbor. Every time the two men passed one another in the hallway, the Iranian man would invite his Norwegian neighbor in for a cup of tea. The Norwegian man was always on his way to do something or busy, but took notice of his neighbor's friendliness and wished that he had time to take him up on his offer⁷⁵. ARS' motivation for creating this campaign was due to the climate of the integration debate in Norway at the time. In their annual report for 2011 ARS cites the rising Islamophobia in Norwegian society, and the negative focus on Muslims creating a climate of suspicion⁷⁶. Debates about integration or immigration were often lacking in nuance, and Islam and Muslims became the

⁷³ Barne-, likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet (2011)

⁷⁴ NRK (21.03.2013)

⁷⁵ Personal interview, September 10 2012

⁷⁶ Antirasistisk Senter (2011) p. 5

main focus⁷⁷. Topics such as “sneak-Islamization”, “extreme Islamism” and the use of hijabs in the police force gained a great deal of media coverage⁷⁸. While there is no clear method of measuring the number of Muslims in Norway because it is a religious group, Statistics Norway (SSB) states that between 100 00 and 185 000, or respectively 2 and 4 percent of the total population of Norway, has a Muslim background, meaning that they come from a country in which Islam is the dominant religion.⁷⁹ Another method of measuring is through membership data reported by religious organizations, but this is also not fully reliable. ARS felt that the debate about immigration and integration in Norway was being dominated by a small portion of the people that the debate should be about, and that the diversity and variations in this group were not being acknowledged either.

2.7 Summary

The establishment of the introduction program was an attempt to create a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to the integration of refugees and reform a system that was characterized by significant variation between the municipalities. As shown in the chapter, through the data from various evaluations of the program, variation persists. On the whole, the introduction has been successfully implemented and its main features are in place⁸⁰. However, the quality of the offers must be improved to ensure a more meaningful program for all participants, regardless of what municipality they are living in⁸¹. As it stands today, the programs are vulnerable to individual circumstances in the municipalities, highlighted by trends in the program. For example, the municipality of Bærum is consistently a top performer with almost 9 of 10 participants from 2009 going over to work or education one year later, while Fredrikstad municipality had only 4 of 10 and is consistently one of the municipalities with a low rate of turnover⁸².

⁷⁷ IMDi (2010) p. 12

⁷⁸ Ibid p. 12

⁷⁹ SSB (2011)

⁸⁰ Kavli et al (2007) p. 82

⁸¹ Ibid p. 85

⁸² SSB (2012) p. 24

This chapter has offered a background to the introduction program, in short, how Norway got to where it is today in this arena. The next chapter will reflect on the methodological process of this thesis.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

This chapter will focus upon the research methods used in this thesis. It will focus mainly upon the choice of data collection techniques, and the justification for this selection. It will also include a reflection of my experiences during my interviews and the potential challenges associated.

3.1 Data Collection Techniques

Due to the nature of this study, two different data collection techniques were selected. This study is focused upon the methods that are employed to integrate refugees in Norway and the results of those processes. There is a large amount of literature both describing and evaluating the introduction program, so for this portion of the research, document analysis was the natural choice. In studying the Tea Time campaign, and its quite different approach to integration, qualitative interviews were used to acquire deep and rich knowledge about the motivations of ARS and the goals of the campaign.

3.1.1 Document Analysis

The introduction program is a large and complex entity. Conducting my own evaluation of the program was unrealistic, so this work has relied on the studies of others. In addition to the evaluations of the introduction program, other documents have been used, the majority of them official government reports. So the use of these documents has been both one of convenience and necessity. Necessity because of the amount of information and its value for this study⁸³. The official documents used in this study gave me access to statistics relating to integration of refugees, and not least the results of the introduction program over time.

The evaluations of the introduction program were not government produced documents, but were government commissioned. These reports allowed me to pull together recurring themes and issues to create an overview of the primary difficulties with the introduction program. It also

⁸³ Bryman (2012) p. 549

allowed me a degree of triangulation in that I could get an impression of the reality that the different reports were written from, allowing me to confirm the validity of the reports from both sides and their analyses⁸⁴.

3.1.2 Qualitative Interviews

To gather data about the Tea Time campaign, qualitative interviews were used, namely semi-structured interviews. My interviews with ARS consisted of the 3 individuals working most closely with the campaign. I made use of an interview guide and had a specific set of questions to be asked in the interviews, but the questions appeared in different orders in each interview, and new questions appeared in each interview as well, all characteristics of a semi-structured interview⁸⁵. Each interview lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. Selecting my informants was not a complex issue. My goal was to learn more about ARS' campaign means that they are who I would need to interview.

3.2 The Multiple Methods Approach: Macro and Micro Perspectives

The use of multiple methods is often used to triangulate data, as touched upon earlier⁸⁶. This study uses multiple methods for a different purpose. The document analysis allows me to compile the relevant literature on the introduction program and bring it all together to perform my analysis. The qualitative interviews are used to gather data about a very specific case, specifically, the Tea Time campaign. Together, these methods allow me to gain two different perspectives upon the integration work taking place in Norway; one perspective at the macro level, by assessing the Norwegian government's integration efforts that are taking place all across the country and with every refugee that has arrived in Norway since the Introduction Act became law in 2004. The other perspective, is at the micro level and consists of the efforts of a very small NGO working in a similar field in a very dissimilar manner.

⁸⁴ Silverman (2005) p. 212

⁸⁵ Bryman (2012) p. 471

⁸⁶ Silverman (2005) p. 121

3.2.1 Qualitative Versus Quantitative

The decision to use qualitative methods rather than quantitative was made based on the aim of this research. Rather than measuring integration, this study analyzed the approaches and processes used in the integration process. Additionally, the government already conducts quantitative studies of its own in its evaluation of the introduction program, along with having a number of quantitative indicators for measuring integration. The goal of this study was, as Silverman writes, to gain “a ‘deeper’ understanding of social phenomena”, an objective best served by qualitative methods in this case ⁸⁷.

3.3 Challenges and Reflections

The greatest challenge in the data collection process was not related to the qualitative interviews, but rather to the document analysis. The literature pertaining to the introduction program, integration in Norway, Norway’s multicultural past, present and future, and any other topic that touches on social integration in some way, is voluminous to say the least. The massive official government reports were filled with valuable information that, while at first quite useful, became somewhat repetitive. Many of the evaluations of the introduction program and much of the other literature about it has been written by some of the same authors. Keeping my data and sources straight was a challenge that made organization not just convenient, but crucial.

3.3.1 Gaining Access

Had I not been able to conduct my interviews with ARS, this research would not have been possible in its current form. Luckily, gaining access was not difficult. I sent an email to the person I considered to be the ‘gatekeeper’ ⁸⁸ of the organization and a follow-up email the following week. I received a telephone call and after a couple of short conversations, we had arranged for me to visit their offices and conduct my interviews with them.

⁸⁷ Ibid p. 10

⁸⁸ Bryman (2012) p. 85

3.3.2 Ethical Considerations

When planning my research, I had not anticipated any ethical challenges and have not had any arise through this process. My interviews were the only portion of my research which involved any kind of human interaction, the majority of the research comes from the content analysis of the relevant documents. I began each of my interviews by giving a brief background of both myself and my project. I informed them of my intentions with the interviews and they had voluntarily invited me to their offices to carry out my interviews, so I was given consent, one of the most important ethical issues in qualitative research ⁸⁹. I also informed them that their identities would not be included in this work.

In addition to making sure that my informants were willing to participate in my interviews, I signed a contract with the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD). NSD is an institution that protects personal data in research and makes sure that research follows the necessary ethical and legal guidelines ⁹⁰.

3.3.3 Language

I had originally intended on conducting my interviews in English since the work that would follow it, this document, was also to be done in English. In my communications with ARS, I was told that this would be fine, but that one of my potential informants did not speak much English. I ended up conducting all of the interviews in Norwegian, something that in hindsight was strategically advantageous. Speaking a language that my informants were more at ease with may have helped to make them more comfortable and reduce any preconceived notions that they may have had of me ⁹¹.

Another reflection related to language is that the majority of the documents that I have analyzed have been in Norwegian. However, as I am fluent in Norwegian, I wouldn't consider this to have been a particular challenge. Rather, it has given me the ability to have access to information about a subject that would be difficult to research solely in English.

⁸⁹ Silverman (2005) p. 257, Walliman (2011) p. 47

⁹⁰ For more information on NSD and its guidelines see <http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern>

⁹¹ Miller & Brewer (2003) p. 170

3.3.4 Cross-Gender Interviewing

Each of my informants was female, making all of my interviews a cross-gender interview. This was not something that I considered before my interviews or at that time, only as an afterthought. I can't say whether this had any impact on my informants, but I do not believe that it did. Gender can change the way in which different people perceive you, as with other characteristics like age, race, ethnicity ⁹².

3.3.5 My Position: Insider or Outsider?

The membership role of the researcher is often important to consider when reflecting upon data that has been acquired through interviews. This is also something that can affect the informant's views of the researcher. When giving information about my background to one of my interviewees, I informed her that I was both American and Norwegian but that I had grown up in the United States for the most part. She immediately asked me which society I felt more connected to and I replied that I identify with both, but not entirely. Her answer was that then I know how it feels. I believe that this shared connection of being both an insider and an outsider simultaneously allowed me to build a good rapport and overcome any potential issues related to either cross-gender interviewing or any other perceptions that she may have had ⁹³.

3.4 Summary

This chapter has focused upon issues and potential issues related to the methodology of this study. The combination of qualitative interviews and document analysis has been chosen to be able to present a micro and macro level analysis of integration process in Norway. Both methods are the primary data collection method for their respective cases, specifically the Norwegian introduction program for newly arrived refugees and the Norwegian Center Against Racism's Tea Time campaign. The next chapter will present the different theories that will be applied to the data analysis.

⁹² Ibid p. 170

⁹³ For more on membership roles see Adler & Adler (1987)

Chapter 4: Theory

This chapter will provide an explanation of the theories that will be used to analyze the methods the introduction program and Tea Time campaign use in their integration efforts. It will begin with discussing the main components of Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. Then, it will explore the contact hypothesis of Gordon Allport. Each section will include some of the subsequent criticisms the theories have received. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of some of the concepts and their definitions that will be important to the following chapter, the analysis of the introduction program and Tea Time campaign's methods of integration.

4.1 Anthony Giddens' Structuration Theory

Social science theory generally distinguishes itself into two separate groups, those theories that are specialized and constructed towards a particular field, and those that attempt to address the social sciences more holistically. Anthony Giddens' structuration theory is of the latter variety. Giddens was unsatisfied with theories that kept human agency subordinate to the role of structure and wanted to "provide an account of action which does not obliterate the role of either structure or agency"⁹⁴. Structuration theory is Giddens' attempt at creating a general theory that "addresses a wide range of human activity and is only indirectly associated with any particular social setting. Instead it provides theoretical concepts that sensitize the researcher to particular categories and views of human action and social structure"⁹⁵.

This chapter will examine the main elements of Giddens' theory: structure, agency and power. It will then combine them to explain his theory of structuration. But first, I will present a rough description of the theory before expanding on it. Discuss the individual features is difficult as they are interconnected, so perhaps a bit of context beforehand will be helpful. Structuration theory states that we have structure, system and the process of structuration. Structure is the norms and rules which govern social action. System is the practice of these rules, the actual

⁹⁴ Baber (1991) p. 219

⁹⁵ Chiasson & Saunders (2005) p. 750

interactions that take place between actors. Structuration is the outcome of these two features put together. Hopefully that will suffice for understanding the following sections.

4.1.1 Structure

Structure, in Giddens' theory and most social theory, is the rules and norms that govern social action. What sets Giddens' use of structure apart from other theories, is the 'duality of structure' which is central to structuration theory. Giddens differentiates between structure and system. Social systems constitute the interactions that take place between actors and the structure is the rules that the actors draw upon in those interactions. The structure is what allows "for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space and which lend them to 'systemic' form"⁹⁶. So for Giddens' theory, structure is the group of rules that actors draw upon in the creation of social system. Structure reproduces that action, yet by drawing upon those rules, actors are also reproducing the structure. This is what Giddens refers to as the duality of structure "that the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction"⁹⁷.

Giddens also identifies three different types of structure, or different classifications for the norms and rules. They are the structures of signification, domination and legitimation. They "are not separable but three different aspects of practice"⁹⁸. These three structures have modalities by which they can be identified. The structure of signification refers to the production of meaning and the interpretation of that meaning. The structure of domination refers to "the structuring effects on interaction of inequalities of resources"⁹⁹. Resources can be separated into two types, authoritative resources, or the command over people, and allocative resources, command over materials¹⁰⁰. This translates into the power that agents have in their interactions. Finally, the structure of legitimation "concerns not what acts mean, but whether or not they are appropriate

⁹⁶ Giddens (1984) p. 17

⁹⁷ Ibid p. 19

⁹⁸ Mingers (1996) p. 475

⁹⁹ Ibid p. 475

¹⁰⁰ Giddens (1984) p. 33

or acceptable or performed in satisfactory ways”¹⁰¹. It is concerned with the proper application of the norms and rules of structure and the sanctions that may follow if not satisfactorily used.

In Giddens’ structuration theory, the norms and rules that govern interactions are used by actors when engaging in social systems, and therefore, are also contributing to that structure by reproducing those rules. The introduction program will be the structure of this study. In order to prevent this chapter from becoming more abstract than necessary, the different features of the introduction program that make up the three different types of structure will be explained in the next chapter. The next section will look more closely at the role that agents play in structuration theory.

4.1.2 Agency & Power

Giddens’ concepts of agency and power are perhaps too intertwined to address separately. This is because the ability to act is in itself, a use of power. I will first give some of the characteristics of Giddens’ agent, and then describe how it functions within the model.

Just as structure is reflexive in Giddens’ theory, so is his agent. Giddens states that actors continuously monitor their own actions, as well as those of others. “It is the specifically reflexive form of the knowledgeability of human agents that is most deeply involved in the recursive ordering of social practices. Continuity of practices presumes reflexivity, but reflexivity in turn is possible only because of the continuity of practices that makes them distinctly ‘the same’ across space and time”¹⁰². So because agents monitor actions that take place, this becomes part of their basis for acting themselves, as these actions are producing and reproducing the structure.

Another important feature of Giddens’ agent is that they are knowledgeable. “As social actors, all human beings are highly ‘learned’ in respect of knowledge which they possess and apply, in the production and reproduction of day-to-day social encounters”¹⁰³. The structure of

¹⁰¹ Mingers (1996) p. 475

¹⁰² Giddens (1984) p. 3

¹⁰³ Ibid p. 22

legitimation is a manifestation of this fact, as actors draw upon mutual knowledge in their interaction. We can also see the knowledgeable aspects of the agent in the structure of legitimation, where “in the production of interaction, all normative elements have to be treated as a series of claims whose realization is contingent upon the successful actualization of obligations through the medium of responses of other participants”¹⁰⁴. The ‘knowledgeability’ of Giddens’ agent leads us to the discussion of agency and power. Knowledge means that agents act with intent and this is a display of power, as we shall see in the next section.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, structuration theory is Giddens’ attempt to show that agents are not controlled by structure, but have influence of their own. Central to this, is the ability of the agent to act, and more importantly, act otherwise. “Agency concerns events of which an individual is the perpetrator, in the sense that the individual could, at any phase in a given sequence of conduct, have acted differently. Whatever happened would not have happened if that individual had not intervened”¹⁰⁵. It is the ability of a person to act differently that ties agency and power together so intimately. This is how the agent contributes to the duality of structure. While the structure gives the agent the rules of interaction in the social system, the agent has the ability to act differently. Because each interaction is both a production and reproduction of the social system, when the agent chooses to act differently, they are producing something new and contributing to a transformation of the system. This is what Giddens means when he writes that structure is both constraining and enabling. Actors are constrained by the rules of the structure, but are able to act otherwise.

Another connection between agency and power is found in the structure of domination. As mentioned earlier the structure of domination refers to the command over resources, either in the form of people or materials. The command over resources is power. Giddens has given all agents power in the sense that they can act differently and transform the structure. But this does not mean that all agents are equally powerful. This is where the structure of domination comes into play. “The use of power in interaction can be understood in terms of resources or facilities which participants bring to and mobilize as elements of its production, thereby directing its

¹⁰⁴ Cassell (1993) p. 107

¹⁰⁵ Giddens (1984) p. 9

course”¹⁰⁶. Actors with disproportionate access to resources, have disproportionate levels of power. Resources can be understood as anything “which a participant is capable of bringing to bear so as to influence or control the conduct of others who are parties to that interaction, including the possession of ‘authority’ and the threat or ‘use of force’”¹⁰⁷. Unequal power means that agents have varying abilities of influencing the outcome of interactions that take place. “The transformational character of resources is logically equivalent to, as well as inherently bound up with the instantiation of, that of codes and normative sanctions”¹⁰⁸. Power is directly related to the ability to shape social reproduction. And social reproduction is directly related to social integration, as we shall see in the next section. The two main actors, and their power, that will be analyzed in the next chapter will be the participants in the introduction program and the program advisors and other administrators of the program.

4.1.3 Bringing it All Together

Giddens’ structuration theory presents a model in which actors shape the world through their actions and the outcomes of their interactions. Power will invariably be dispersed unequally between agents, thus granting those with the most power an advantage over the outcome of their interactions. Yet, all agents are powerful in that they are knowledgeable and can purposefully act otherwise, against what the structure, and thus the outcome of previous interactions, compels them to do. But how does this relate to social integration? Giddens states that agents are positioned in relation to the structure. “Social positions are constituted structurally as specific intersections of signification, domination and legitimation which relates to the typification of agents. A social position involves the specification of a definite ‘identity’ with a network of social relations, that identity, however, being a ‘category’ to which a particular range of normative sanctions is relevant”¹⁰⁹. So positioning is how agents categorize one another, and defines how they interact with one another. Giddens writes that “social interaction refers to encounters in which individuals engage in situations of co-presence, and hence to social integration as a level of the ‘building blocks’ whereby the institutions of social systems are articulated”, and continues to say that “interaction depends upon the ‘positioning’ of

¹⁰⁶ Cassell (1993) p. 111

¹⁰⁷ Ibid p. 111

¹⁰⁸ Giddens (1984) p. 33

¹⁰⁹ Ibid p. 83

individuals”¹¹⁰. Giddens’ definition of social integration is “reciprocity between actors in contexts of co-presence”, or when they are interacting face to face¹¹¹. Additionally, he defines what he calls system integration as “reciprocity between actors of collectives across extended time-space”¹¹². What he is referring to here is connections between actors that are not present. Social integration, for Giddens, is the micro level, while system integration is the macro. For there to be system integration, first the building blocks need to be in place, meaning that there must be social integration at the micro level. Just as everything in structuration theory, the individual interactions of agents in the social system and their outcomes contribute to building that social system.

Giddens’ ideas of social and system integration are important to consider. Is it possible for an individual, say a Somali refugee, to be integrated in Norway if Somali refugees in general are not integrated? Giddens argues that for there to be system integration, social must be in place first. We will come back to this idea later in the chapter when we discuss the relevant concepts in more depth. Next we will look at some of the criticism that structuration theory has received.

4.1.4 Criticism of Structuration Theory

Structuration theory was Giddens’ attempt at creating a theory that could balance the power of structure and agency in a field that was overrun with theories emphasizing the importance of structure. He has received a great deal of criticism that he has given agents far too much power. For Giddens, it is the agent’s ability to act otherwise that is their source of power. Loyal argues that “this power might be equally well used to intervene in a situation that would otherwise change in order to maintain it. Hence what Giddens call ‘transformative capacity’ could equally well be called ‘stabilising capacity’. It covertly implies connection between activity and change, and, correspondingly, between passivity and stability”¹¹³. Loyal also criticizes Giddens, saying that, “these social relationships are both expressed through, and orchestrated within, a broader social and cultural environment which involves unequal power”¹¹⁴. Loyal, and others

¹¹⁰ Ibid p. 89

¹¹¹ Ibid p. 28

¹¹² Ibid p. 28

¹¹³ Loyal (2003) p. 67

¹¹⁴ Ibid p. 142

supporting this position, seem to have misread Giddens in this instance. The transformative capacity that Loyal refers to here is about an agent's ability to act differently from what the structure compels the actor to do. Giddens openly acknowledges the disproportional power that different agents bring with them into interactions, this is shown through the structure of domination. But the ability of an agent to act otherwise is how agents can attempt to counter the imbalance of power and contribute to a transformation of the structure.

The criticisms of structuration theory generally follow the argument of Loyal. The debate consists of whether we should prioritize structure or agency. Giddens, in my own estimation, succeeds at not prioritizing either of the two, contrary to the beliefs of his critics. This will be shown in the case studies in the next chapter. Rather than contributing to the voluminous literature on this point, we will move to the other critique that accounts for the rest of the debate over structuration theory. This criticism has to do with the epistemological and ontological groundings of Giddens' theory. Giddens borrows extensively from various sociological theorists and philosophers, particularly in his model of agency¹¹⁵. In creating the consciousness of his agent, he compiles the ideas of Freud, Wittgenstein and Habermas. Loyal criticizes Giddens for this, writing that rather than creating a cohesive mix of these ideas, what he has does is created "a conception of personality that both lacks depth and is highly formalistic in its characterisation of the relation between the three spheres of consciousness" partly due to "his decontextualised use of these concepts from the broader theory within which they take on meaning and explanatory force"¹¹⁶. Giddens, in response to the criticism he had received on this points since his *Central Problems in Social Theory* was released in 1979, writes in the introduction to *The Constitution of Society* that we must distinguish between the goals of social science theory and philosophy. He argues that the goal of social science theory is to provide an account of "the nature of human social activity and of the human agent which can be placed in the service of empirical work" while philosophical debates do no contribute anything to this goal¹¹⁷. He continues to say that "I think it wrong to slant social theory too unequivocally towards abstract

¹¹⁵ Ibid p. 60

¹¹⁶ Ibid p. 60-61

¹¹⁷ Giddens (1984) p. xvii

and highly generalized questions of epistemology, as if any significant developments in social science had to await a clear-cut solutions to these”¹¹⁸.

Giddens’ structuration theory is quite complex but this description will do for the purposes of the reader understanding how the theory will be applied to the cases in this study. The following section will give a short introduction to Gordon Allport’s intergroup contact theory which will be used in the analysis of the Tea Time campaign, in conjunction with structuration theory.

4.2 Gordon Allport’s Intergroup Contact Hypothesis and its Development

Allport presented his intergroup contact hypothesis in his book *The Nature of Prejudice* in 1954. The book gives the hypothesis that individuals from different groups that have contact with one another, are less likely to have negative stereotypes about the other group. Allport identifies some key factors relating to the context of the interaction, yet stops short of formulating a theory of intergroup contact. His work has been developed by other social scientists, and Thomas Pettigrew has done the most to create a intergroup contact theory¹¹⁹. Allport’s hypothesis was that “to be maximally effective, contact and acquaintance programs should lead to a sense of equality in social status, should occur in ordinary purposeful pursuits, avoid artificiality, and if possible enjoy the sanction of the community in which they occur”¹²⁰. Pettigrew’s work has also stressed the elements of equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation and the support of the authorities, law, or customs¹²¹. Pettigrew refers to these as the optimal conditions for intergroup contact.

There is a vast literature of empirical evidence which supports the intergroup contact theory of Allport and Pettigrew. From desegregation of the Merchant Marines¹²², to desegregation of public housing¹²³, many studies report a decrease in prejudice between groups that have contact, or individuals from groups that have those contacts. However, there are also some problems with intergroup contact, as we shall see. First, we will look at the processes that lead to change.

¹¹⁸ Ibid p. xviii

¹¹⁹ Dovidio et al (2003) p. 6

¹²⁰ Allport (1954)

¹²¹ Pettigrew (1998)

¹²² Brophy (1946)

¹²³ Deutsch & Collins (1951), Wilner et al (1955)

4.2.1 Change Through Intergroup Contact

Pettigrew identifies four processes that influence intergroup contact. The first is learning about the outgroup. What he means by this is that when an individual learns something about the outgroup that corrects a negative stereotype they previously held about that group, it will lead them to change their attitude and reduce prejudice towards that group ¹²⁴. The second is a change in behavior, which he cites as a precursor to attitude change ¹²⁵. He argues that this happens when individuals conform to new expectations in new situations. He also points to repeated contact with the group, preferably in different settings as a source of behavior change. The third process is the generation of affective ties. Positive emotions and positive exchanges reduce the anxiety that is often present when encountering the outgroup, whether an individual is prejudiced toward the other group or not ¹²⁶. The final process is ingroup reappraisal. A positive exchange with the outgroup leads to new information about that group and their values. This causes an individual to reevaluate their own values when they see that there are other perspectives, and can “reshape your view of your ingroup and lead to a less provincial view of out groups in general (‘deprovincialization’)” ¹²⁷.

These four processes are important, but they presuppose Pettigrew’s optimal conditions for contact. These prerequisites are not always possible, and the research literature reflects this. Many studies have reported positive effects, even when the optimal conditions are not in place ¹²⁸. In some of the studies without the optimal conditions in place, intergroup contact has even had negative effects. The next section will address the difficulties that the contact theory potentially faces.

4.2.2 Criticism of the Contact Hypothesis

Pettigrew, despite being the decidedly most influential researcher in the development of the intergroup contact theory, points out several potential challenges. The first of these is the ‘causal sequence problem’. This is particularly relevant in studies that try to validate the theory. He

¹²⁴ Pettigrew (1998) p. 70

¹²⁵ Ibid p. 71

¹²⁶ Ibid p. 71

¹²⁷ Ibid p. 72

¹²⁸ Ibid p. 68

suggests that selection bias can limit the validity of a study. Or, that prejudiced people may simply choose to avoid interacting with the outgroup¹²⁹. To address this, he proposes studying situations in which the participants have little choice in whether they participate or not.

The second problem Pettigrew identifies is too much deviation from Allport's original hypothesis. He states that too many studies have pointed out additional variables needed to facilitate the optimal conditions for contact and writes that the hypothesis "risks being an open-ended laundry list of conditions - ever expandable and thus eluding falsification"¹³⁰. He also points out that giving the theory too many variables will make it difficult to apply to intergroup encounters.

The final two problems that Pettigrew highlights are interrelated and have to do with generalization. He states that the original contact hypothesis of Allport does not identify the processes involved in the intergroup interaction the way Pettigrew has in his theory. The danger is that rather than showing how change can be possible, it only points to when it can happen¹³¹. His final criticism is that there is no description of the changes and whether they can be generalized across different situations, other individuals in the group and to different groups. Pettigrew addresses these issues with his four processes of change, yet as we shall see in the next section, there is also criticism beyond just Pettigrew.

Much of the criticism that the contact hypothesis receives comes from researchers that believe that intergroup contact leads to conflict, not to a reduction in prejudice¹³². However, the literature referred in earlier sections of this chapter has disproven this quite competently. One of the critiques of Allport's hypothesis is that stereotypes are not resistant to social changes in society and that prejudice can be transformed in that way¹³³. Another criticism is that the optimal conditions that Pettigrew points to are unlikely to occur naturally in social encounters¹³⁴. This is hard to disagree with, but as the theory will be applied to the Tea Time campaign,

¹²⁹ Ibid p. 69

¹³⁰ Ibid p. 69

¹³¹ Ibid p. 70

¹³² Pettigrew & Tropp (2005) p. 262

¹³³ Eagly & Diekmann (2005) p. 31

¹³⁴ Forbes (2004) p. 74

this critique loses some of its relevance to this study. Responding to more criticism from Forbes, Pettigrew defends that the contact theory can be applied to the population at the macro scale because an individual will conduct a group analysis if there is an attitude change and it will extend further than the individuals of the outgroup that are immediately involved in the encounter ¹³⁵. Another source of critical comments has come individuals that have witnessed extreme ethnic conflicts, such as in Northern Ireland and South Africa for example ¹³⁶. Pettigrew argues against their case for separation with the numerous examples of where isolation and segregation have failed ¹³⁷. The next section will explore some of the concepts important to the analysis of the Tea Time campaign and the Norwegian government's approaches to integration of refugees in Norway.

4.3 Important Concepts

One of the questions this study attempts to answer is why the introduction program is not working as well as the government desires. The government measures the success of the introduction program by the number of participants that successfully make the transition from the program to the workplace or continue their education after completion. Are refugees integrated in Norwegian society after they have learned the language and have gotten a job? Is it possible to go to school or go to work and not be integrated? How long does one have to hold a job before the integration process is complete? Integration is one of the more difficult terms to define. Inside the word are ideas about sameness and difference, inclusion and exclusion. The United Nations defines social inclusion as “a society for all, in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play” ¹³⁸. This is not a very precise definition either. In the context of Norway, Cora Alexa Døving writes that integration has become a metaphysical concept; that when something good happens, it is due to successful integration, and failed integration is the reason for the bad things that happen ¹³⁹. The following sections will look at some of the relevant concepts and attempt to create a more concrete definition of integration that will be used in the analysis in the next chapter.

¹³⁵ Pettigrew et al (2011) p. 277

¹³⁶ Ibid p. 277

¹³⁷ Ibid p. 278

¹³⁸ United Nations (1995)

¹³⁹ Døving (2009) p. 7

4.3.1 Integration, Assimilation and Identity

Before settling on a definition of integration, we should define what it is not. Integration and assimilation are quite different. Assimilation tends to have a negative connotation and is understood as making the newcomers similar to the majority population¹⁴⁰. But it can also have a positive side, “assimilation means that the newcomers are welcome to become full members of their host community”¹⁴¹. This should be the goal of any integration initiative. “What gives rightly a bad name to assimilation of immigrants and more frequently of ‘minorities’ is forced assimilation. This means the eradication by force of differences and the imposition by force of language, culture, values, customs and world views”¹⁴². Things like language, culture and values are parts of our identity, and as Hieronymi points out, a constructed identity cannot be successfully forced upon people¹⁴³. He identifies the Soviet Union in particular in this claim. He continues to state that identity is of particular importance in relation to refugees, saying that “refugees are people who were deprived of the protection of their governments, who were persecuted by those who were supposed to protect them because of a particular aspect of their identity. But refugees are also those who are willing to sacrifice aspects of their identity linking them to their country, culture, language and community of origin and willing to seek and accept a new identity in their country of asylum”¹⁴⁴.

So how can we define integration? Integration policies should not be about destroying an individual’s identity so they can adopt a new one, but instead, adapting their current identity. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines integration as “a two-way process that involves mutual adaptation of migrants and the host society, as well as equality of rights and obligations. It involves acceptance by the host society and adjustment by the migrant. It is not something that happens once in a static manner. Integration is a dynamic relations between two communities”¹⁴⁵. The European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) defines integration similarly, as does the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and they all largely draw their definitions from the 1951 Refugee Convention¹⁴⁶. However, ‘a dynamic two-

¹⁴⁰ Schneider & Crul (2010) p. 1144

¹⁴¹ Hieronymi (2005) p. 137

¹⁴² Ibid p. 138

¹⁴³ Ibid p. 136

¹⁴⁴ Ibid p. 139-140

¹⁴⁵ IOM (2006) p. 2

¹⁴⁶ UNHCR (2009) p. 10

way process' is still quite abstract. A definition that is a good step towards concretization of the term is "the minority's simultaneous participation in the shared institutions of society and its reproduction of group identity"¹⁴⁷. This definition introduces a new concept, identity.

Hieronymi points that identity can be used as both a tool of oppression and liberation¹⁴⁸. He also notes that identity, like integration, is not static but dynamic. He writes that "identity is not a constant for anyone - nor is it the same or perceived the same way by everyone...Our identity evolves, changes under the impact of individual or collective, external or internal, personal factors"¹⁴⁹. The power and importance of identity clearly makes it a necessary part of defining integration. The UNHCR's definition points to three specific features of integration: Equal rights in relation to the general population, the ability to become financially self-reliant, and the adaptation by both the refugee population and the host society¹⁵⁰. The IOM also highlights the importance of identity, stating that "policies and strategies to support the social, economic and cultural inclusion of migrants in their new environment in countries of destination and to educate receiving communities on the diverse contributions of newcomers can reinforce the positive effect of migration"¹⁵¹. The UN defines integration as "a society for all, in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play"¹⁵².

The Norwegian government's goal of the introduction program is to strengthen newly arrived immigrants' possibility of participation in the workplace and society, as well as their economic self-sufficiency¹⁵³. This goal leaves out the aspect of identity but quite clearly draws upon the other definitions, focusing upon giving newcomers the ability to take care of themselves and to participate in their new country. To try and concretize the definition even further, we will look at how integration is measured.

¹⁴⁷ Hylland Eriksen (2010) p. 151

¹⁴⁸ Hieronymi (2005) p. 143

¹⁴⁹ Ibid p. 143

¹⁵⁰ UNHCR (2009) p. 24

¹⁵¹ IOM (2006) p. 1

¹⁵² UN (1995) para. 66

¹⁵³ LOV 2003-07-04 nr 80

4.3.2 Can Integration be Measured?

A central question to be asked before beginning, is if it is even possible to measure integration. Governments often attempt to do so because “immigration and integration are loaded issues. The public debate and policy formation in relation to these issues often arouse strong emotions”¹⁵⁴. There are several indicators that are used to try and quantify the level of immigrants’ integration. “The approach to integration is predominantly a segmented one, in which differing levels of ‘success’ can be achieved in different areas of life. Migrants can for example be successful in terms of their participation in the labour market but still be at a disadvantage on the housing market. Even then, opinions differ on what ‘successful’ means; many countries implicitly assume that integration is successful if migrants achieve equal scores on what are considered to be relevant domains of society”¹⁵⁵. When measuring the success of integration, this is done from the perspective of the government, not that of the immigrant. The indicators that are often used “focus mainly upon the ‘hard’ sectors of society such as the labour market and education system”, as well as acquisition of the language of the country, and less consideration is given to “socio-cultural integration, for example in the form of social participation, contacts between migrants and host population, personal perceptions of migrants as to whether they feel at home and accepted, or mutual trust between different populations groups, as well as in form of experiences of discrimination”¹⁵⁶. Norway, however, is quite good at measuring the social indicators, though it is still seems that being in work or education is the driving force for defining integration.

4.4 Summary

Compiling these various definitions of and indicators used for measuring integration, we ought to be able to create a solid definition of integration. We should understand integration as a two-way process, in which both newcomers and the host population adapt, in an environment of inclusion, with equal rights and opportunities to participate in all areas of society. Integration is not a static state and does not consist of a checklist of goals to be reached. Socio-economic participation (having a job or going to school) is not a substitute for socio-cultural participation,

¹⁵⁴ The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (2012) p. 31

¹⁵⁵ Ibid p. 37

¹⁵⁶ Ibid p. 37

and integration cannot be reached without these two criterion and all of the aspects that each one entails.

With this definition in mind, we will move onto the analysis chapter. The chapter will apply Giddens' structuration theory to both the government's introduction program and ARS' Tea Time campaign. Additionally, Allport and Pettigrew's intergroup contact theory will be used. The goal will be to understand how they approach the issue of integration and what their goals are.

Chapter 5: Analysis

This chapter will apply the theoretical ideas presented in the previous chapter to the two different cases this study focuses upon. It will analyze the approaches and methods used by the Norwegian government in the introduction program for newly arriving immigrants and the Tea Time campaign. The conclusions drawn from the analyses will be used to try and explain why the introduction program's results are not as successful as the government desires, meaning that the number of participants that transition to work or education after completing the program does not meet the government's target, and how aspects of the Tea Time campaign may contribute to the government's efforts, if at all. The chapter will first analyze the approach and methods of the introduction program before focusing upon the Tea Time campaign in order to compare the approaches and methods used by the two.

5.1 The Introduction Program

This section will draw upon the information about the Norwegian government's introduction program given in the background chapter and Giddens' structuration theory discussed in previous chapter. As explained earlier, structure is the rules and norms that agents draw upon in their interactions. These interactions constitute the social system, and the outcome of these interactions is the structuration process. For this analysis, the agents interacting within the social system will be the participants and the administrators of the introduction program. First, we will establish what the structure is in this context and look at the three types of structure, signification, domination and legitimation.

5.1.1 Structure

For this analysis in the context of the introduction program, the structure will be the program itself. This means that the rules and practices within the program are what is drawn upon. As was acknowledged in the background section, there is substantial variation in the results of the introduction program. This is because there are so many different versions of the program being carried out across Norway. In the research phase of this project, official government reports and analyses conducted by various research institutions have been the most important source of

information about the introduction program. However, I have been unable to determine exactly how many municipalities receive refugees and therefore offer the introduction program. Many of the analyses focus only on municipalities that have participants that are completing the program in a given year, meaning that they do not include all of the municipalities that offer the introduction program. Official statistics and reports from IMDi and SSB also fail to give a conclusive answer to this question. Information about the settlement of refugees is broken down to the level of the individual counties, but not the municipalities. Specific information and analyses at the municipal level is given through case studies, usually limited to a comparison of a handful of municipalities. However, I have been able to create an estimation with the help of a few different documents. IMDi conducts a survey of different leadership positions within municipalities regarding the settling and integrating of refugees in their municipality. In the 2012 version of the report, 404 different municipalities are represented in the report ¹⁵⁷. However, this number could include municipalities that no longer receive refugees, and may not be accurate. IMDi's annual report for settling of refugees states that in 2012, 343 municipalities were encouraged to take refugees, of which 66 took as many as requested and 203 took fewer, a total of 269 municipalities ¹⁵⁸. In 2013, IMDi has encouraged 360 municipalities to receive and settle refugees ¹⁵⁹, and as of March 8 2013, 268 have decided to do so ¹⁶⁰. In questioning the quality of the educational portion of the introduction program, one report notes that the Norwegian training involves 420 municipalities and even more adult education centers ¹⁶¹. After reading through several thousands of pages without finding a definitive answer to this question, I have determined that this is as close to a conclusion that we can come. At the least, there are 269 municipalities receiving refugees and implementing the introduction program and perhaps as many as 420 of Norway's 428 municipalities.

Turning back to structure now, we will see why this is important. The variations within the introduction program are understandable in light of the inherent differences in interpretations, resources, and capabilities in each municipality. The analysis will be general as it cannot address all of these municipalities, however many it is that offer the introduction program, but it is

¹⁵⁷ IMDi (2012)c p. 4

¹⁵⁸ IMDi (2012)d p. 11

¹⁵⁹ IMDi (2013)b p. 1

¹⁶⁰ IMDi (2013)a p. 1

¹⁶¹ NOU Bedre Integrening (2011) p. 230

important to keep in mind the differences that will be found from one municipality to the next. Now we will identify the three different types of structure, starting with signification.

The structure of signification refers to the production of meaning, the social rules that determine what constitutes meaning, and how it is interpreted in communication. Interpretation is accomplished through the use of social norms. Giddens defines social norms as “the rules of behaviour which reflect or embody a culture’s values”¹⁶². In the context of the introduction program, signification is the content of the program. The education portion of the introduction program gives participants an introduction to their new society as well as the language. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the socio-cultural lessons consist of seven subjects: New immigrant in Norway; History, geography and lifestyle; Children and family; Health; Education and skills; Workplace; Democracy and the welfare society. These things, along with language, provide the foundation of social norms in Norway. Giddens states that the “structures of signification always have to be grasped in connection with domination and legitimation”¹⁶³. Before reflecting on signification, we will look at the other two types of structure, beginning with legitimation.

The structure of legitimation refers to the rules that actors draw upon when monitoring their and other actors’ actions. These rules take the form of norms, but also laws and obligations. In this study, the structure of legitimation is the norms as referenced in relation to the structure of signification. Deviating from the social norms can result in sanctions, depending upon how other actors perceive those violations. Another feature of the structure of legitimation, is the legal right and duty of newly arriving refugees to participate in the introduction program. The Introduction Act requires that all newly arriving refugees go through the program, and also mandates that all municipalities that receive refugees offer the program. So in addition to the potential normative sanctions, there is also a legal framework. Once again, before discussing the structure of legitimation, we will look at the structure of domination and reflect on the structure holistically.

¹⁶² Giddens (2004) p. 22

¹⁶³ Giddens (1984) p. 31

Lastly we come to the structure of domination, explained in the previous chapter as resource inequality. These resources are command over people, over materials, or anything that an actor can use to influence others or influence the outcome of an interaction. Within the context of the introduction program, the structure of domination is illustrated by the power of the participants and the power of the administrators of the program, whether it be program advisors, teachers or NAV employees.

The three types of structure are distinct, yet too interconnected to discuss independent of one another. The structure of signification contains the norms, derived from the educational content of the introduction program. These norms, along with the academic content, are legitimated by the legal aspects of the Introduction Act which obliges participants to take part. The program advisors and other administrators working with the introduction program reinforce the norms and content through their roles and the power that is inherent in the positions that they hold. This is significant. The program advisors and other administrators have the ability to determine what is meaningful and what is not. The educational portion of the program is arguably the most important aspect, and clearly the foundational one, so the power to create meaning is a substantial capacity. The aim of the introduction program is to give the participants the knowledge needed to gain employment and participate in Norwegian society. So the production of knowledge and subsequent reproduction of knowledge can be understood as the outcome of the introduction program, in theory.

We will now move on to the themes of agency and power. As in the previous chapter, they will be addressed simultaneously due to difficulty of disentangling them from one another. We will bring along the three types of structure, particularly the structure of domination, in the discussion of agency and power.

5.1.2 Agency & Power

One of the highlights of agency in structuration theory is the ability of agents to act differently from how the structure advises them to act. This is what gives them so much power. But as shown by the structure of domination, this does not mean that power is balanced. The interaction

that is particularly interesting to look at in the context of agency and power is that of the participant and their program advisor. At the start of the program, the participant's previous competencies are mapped to determine which language path is best suited for them, and also whether the program should be tailored towards education or the workplace. This is the participant's main opportunity to influence the content of their individual plan. But the impact of their influence is contingent upon how willing the advisor is to make use of it. The Introduction Act created the framework for the integration work that the municipalities conduct, but there is still a substantial amount of discretion given to them in their work, something documented by Djuve and Kavli ¹⁶⁴. They write that when the participant and the advisor are in disagreement it is most often the advisor's point of view that is determining, and that their reasoning will often be done upon their own values ¹⁶⁵. The large degree of discretion given to the program advisors is by design. Integration is a difficult subject, as we have discussed, and it can hardly be achieved through a cookie-cutter system designed for everyone. Different participants will have different needs, the freedom is there to allow for the advisors to be able to meet those needs. But that freedom leads to a significant power imbalance between the participants and advisors. The program advisors have a large amount of control of the participants' daily life, and can intervene if their actions are perceived as illegitimate ¹⁶⁶.

Another issue with the large degree of discretion in the introduction program is how success is defined. Djuve points out, and the discussion in the previous chapter highlights this, that what is deemed to be successful and failed integration can also be a question of judgment ¹⁶⁷. For example, is it satisfactory that a refugee with a master's degree in physics has learned the language and is driving a bus for a living two years after arriving in Norway? Or that a municipality has 80 percent of their participants go over to work after completing the introduction program, but 50 percent are only working part-time and are still receiving benefits from NAV? From the perspective of a program advisor, this might be acceptable, but perhaps not from the perspective of the individual. Again, the imbalance of power and the discretion of the advisor will be decisive.

¹⁶⁴ Djuve (2011)b, Djuve & Kavli (2006)

¹⁶⁵ Djuve & Kavli (2006) p. 211

¹⁶⁶ Ibid p. 213-214

¹⁶⁷ Djuve (2011)b p. 30

The method that the municipality chooses to organize the introduction program can have implications of the participants' agency and power. Programs that are organized within NAV can make it easier for participant's to build a relationship with their program advisor and not have to focus upon several different actors. But on the other side, this kind of organization gives the program advisor more power over that participant, minimizing their agency. As discussed in Chapter 2, the competency of the advisors also varies depending upon whether the program is organized in the municipality's own refugee center or in NAV. When operating in areas that are outside or beyond their competency levels, it is more likely for those advisors to use their own norms and values to guide their judgments, as pointed out by Djuve and Kavli. Another important consideration, though outside of the direct focus of this study, is the agency and power relations between those working with the introduction program. This could be between the program advisors and the teachers at the adult education centers, the advisors and their superiors, or the advisors and their NAV-colleagues that have access to the work placement and internships that the advisors rely on in creating a worthwhile program for the participants.

Another issue related to discretion is the content of the program. Aside from the education aspects of the program, there should be additional initiatives that help to prepare the refugees to start working or going to school and participating in Norwegian society after completing the program. Evaluations of the introduction program have found that this is one of the areas where quality varies the most. The variation is particularly pronounced between the municipalities with many participants and those with few, as those with few are likely to have less options¹⁶⁸. This situation goes into both legitimation and domination. The Introduction Act obliges the municipalities to offer refugees a full-time program. The result is that in smaller municipalities, the program advisors have to stretch the meaning of qualifying initiatives to be able to reach this goal, offering activities such as choir practice¹⁶⁹. Participants lose their power and agency when a municipality lacks a broad range of qualification initiatives and they are forced to go through the same program as the other participants, regardless of their previous qualifications and individual plans.

¹⁶⁸ Kavli et al (2007) p. 61

¹⁶⁹ Ibid p. 62

5.1.3 Structuration

The previous section focused upon the structure of the introduction program, and how the different features of structure are reflected in the program. This section will focus upon structuration. Structuration is the process whereby actors draw upon social rules in their interactions, reproducing the system. However, because Giddens' actors are knowledgeable and have the ability to act otherwise, they are able to act differently and can produce change. This is the duality of structure, in which the rules are both constraining and enabling the agent's behavior. In the context of the introduction program, participants find themselves in a system with a very asymmetric balance of power. The ability to act otherwise within the introduction program would seem to indicate quitting the program as the participant's options are quite limited in this area. The law opens for this if the participant has found themselves a job or been accepted to school, but if they drop out without having done so, they are subject to losing their financial benefits¹⁷⁰. The ability of participants to influence the program is limited by the structure, while the power of the administrators is maximized by the structure. The outcome of interactions that create the structure, and the production and reproduction of the structure solidify the practices and the institution¹⁷¹. The analysis chapter will focus upon how the three types of structure combine to enable and limit the actions, and thus power, of the participants in the introduction program, and how this is related to the results of the program. The results of this analysis will be compared with those of the Tea Time campaign in the next chapter.

5.2 Tea Time

This section will focus upon analyzing the Tea Time initiative. The analysis of structure will not go as deep as in the previous section, but will rather focus on a specific feature of structuration, that of transformation. This is how the theories of Giddens and Allport will be linked together. It will then go on to a discussion of agency and power, before comparing the approaches of the Norwegian state and the Tea Time campaign.

¹⁷⁰ Kavli et al (2007) p. 85

¹⁷¹ Giddens (1984) p. 23-24

5.2.1 Structure

We can identify Allport and Pettigrew's intergroup contact theory within Giddens' structuration theory. The aim of intergroup contact is to decrease and remove prejudice. This goal involves a transformation. It means that an actor changes their attitudes and knowledgeably chooses to act differently, contributing to changing the structure. Giddens acknowledges that actors "may operate with false theories, descriptions or accounts both of the contexts of their own action and of the characteristics of more encompassing social systems"¹⁷². The concern here is with changing this, and giving the actor new knowledge, something that is part of the four processes that Pettigrew identifies. The change is where the analysis will be focused upon in this discussion.

Giddens writes that "in many contexts of social life there occur processes of selective 'information filtering' whereby strategically placed actors seek reflexively to regulate the overall conditions of system reproduction either to keep things as they are or to change them"¹⁷³. This is precisely what ARS has done through the Tea Time campaign. The campaign seems to almost be an operationalization of the contact theory. The next section will show this by going through Pettigrew's optimal conditions.

5.2.2 Optimal Conditions

The optimal conditions for intergroup contact are equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation and institutional support. The setting for the interactions has generally been in Norwegian Muslims' homes, in the living room, a place that Norwegians are comfortable with. Because the exchanges take place in the homes of the Norwegian Muslims, both groups have equal status, something that may not be guaranteed in another setting. The common goal of the interactions is quite clear, simply to get to know one another. Many of those that participated in the Tea Time campaign had very little knowledge about Islam and Muslims in Norway and asked many questions, ranging from terrorism to the role of women¹⁷⁴. The institutional support was something that was initially missing. But as mentioned in Chapter 2, ARS received additional funding from the government, through IMDi, to continue their work with the Tea

¹⁷² Ibid p. 92

¹⁷³ Ibid p. 27-28

¹⁷⁴ Personal interview, September 10 2012

Time campaign. The final condition for optimal intergroup contact is intergroup cooperation. This is something that is lacking from the campaign. Both parties in the Tea Time exchanges contribute to the interaction by asking and answering each other's questions, but there is no formal goal that has been established such as in the jigsaw technique¹⁷⁵. The Tea Time campaign is not an exact replica of Allport and Pettigrew's model, but it is quite close. As noted in Chapter 4, there are many studies that have reported the positive effects of intergroup contact even while all of the optimal conditions were not in place.

5.2.3 Agency, Power & Transformation

In structuration theory, an actor's power translates to their ability to transform, or maintain, the structure. In the context of the Tea Time campaign it is the Norwegian Muslim hosts that have the power advantage, or at the very least, have equal power to their counterparts in the exchanges. The structure of domination would suggest that due to the setting in the host's homes, they would have more power. And because of the design of the campaign, they would seem to have more power. Giddens writes that all actors are positioned in interactions, where they are assigned a role or identity based on this position and the "expected modes of conduct" in a given interaction¹⁷⁶. As hosts, they are granted a certain amount of power from their counterparts, rather than being given the identity of Muslim, or immigrant or something similar that they might be prescribed in the context of sitting on a bus or standing in line at the store. This increase in power, combined with positioning of the two groups in an interaction that is enabling to transformation, gives these agents a great deal of power to influence a transformation.

As stated in Chapter 4, Pettigrew argues that individuals conform to new expectations in new situations. This is the second process of change through intergroup contact. The first is when the outgroup learns something new about the outgroup, something that quite clearly happens in the Team Time exchanges. The third, is the generation of affective ties. Whether this can happen in a single, limited exchange with a member of the outgroup is debatable, but a part of this is having a positive exchange. Based on the feedback that ARS has received, this has

¹⁷⁵ For more about the jigsaw technique, see Aronson's *The Jigsaw Classroom* (1978)

¹⁷⁶ Giddens (1984) p. 85-86

overwhelmingly been the case. The final process is ingroup reappraisal, based on a positive experience and new information about the outgroup. This also seems to be the case with the Tea Time exchanges, but is difficult to measure precisely and know for sure.

Whether the Tea Time campaign has been successful or not is difficult to know, but we can draw some conclusions. The campaign has been very visible in the media, and as one of my informants put it, “journalists don’t write about toothpaste campaigns”¹⁷⁷. There was also a rise in requests to participate in the campaign following the terror attacks of July 22 2011¹⁷⁸. From the perspective of ARS, the campaign has been successful on two main points. The first, that they have seen a greater degree of nuance in the media in items relating to immigration and integration. The second, that they have managed to reach their target group of people that had generally positive attitudes towards immigration but that were negative or skeptical to Muslims as a group¹⁷⁹.

5.3 Discussion & Comparison

The Norwegian government’s introduction program and ARS’ Tea Time campaign are clearly two very different initiatives, this was obvious even before the analysis. They address different issues and are targeted at different groups, but this does not mean that they are entirely incomparable. From the perspective of Giddens’ structuration theory, the introduction program imposes a quite strict framework upon participants. Their power and influence is quite limited in comparison to that which the program advisors and other administrators wield, minimizing their capability to act as knowledgeable agents. This stands in stark contrast to the Tea Time campaign which through its design, seeks to maximize the power of agents. Of course, the two initiatives are operating in somewhat different fields and with different goals. The goal of the introduction program is to prepare refugees for participating in Norwegian society. The Tea Time campaign focuses upon reducing prejudice towards Norwegian Muslims. The Tea Time campaign is targeted towards native-Norwegians and obviously emphasizes the ‘two-way process’ aspect of integration.

¹⁷⁷ Personal interview, September 10 2012

¹⁷⁸ Ibid

¹⁷⁹ Ibid

The Norwegian government emphasizes the importance of integration being a two-way process, but the introduction program does not necessarily reflect that position. The introduction program shares some of the features described by Paulo Freire in his influential book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Freire distinguishes between two methods of education, the ‘banking method’ and ‘problem-posing’. The banking method is when education “becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat”¹⁸⁰. The relationship between teachers and students has a very asymmetric balance of power in which students are passive receivers of information from the teachers. Does this mean that the introduction program is an inherently oppressive structure? No, but it does provide another indicator that the program can be a hindrance to agency and empowerment.

The importance of integration being a two-way process was highlighted by the definitions explored towards the end of Chapter 4. The introduction program does not necessarily exclude initiatives or measures that involve a two-way process, but it is not one of the built-in features of the program either. The tools that the introduction program offers to refugees are unquestionably essential to the integration process and help to enable participation in Norwegian society, yet they are not sufficient for countering the kind of prejudice that the Tea Time campaign tries to transform. However, because of the voluntary nature of the Tea Time initiative, even its impact in this area is limited. When the interactions are organized on a larger scale, such as in shopping centers as mentioned in Chapter 2, it has the potential to expand the audience to a larger group than those who actively seek to participate in the exchanges. This is of course positive, but the public location may also alter the balance of power some, perhaps reducing the transformative capacity of the interaction.

¹⁸⁰ Freire (2003) p. 72

5.4 Summary

This chapter has analyzed the approaches and processes of the government's introduction program and the Tea Time campaign using the structuration and intergroup contact theories and discussed the conclusions of these analyses. The next and final chapter will summarize the findings of this study, as well as engage in a wider discussion of the themes presented in this thesis.

Chapter 6: Discussion & Concluding Remarks

This final chapter, will summarize the findings of this study. It will first reflect back to the questions posed at the beginning of this thesis and determine whether any answers have been found or if this work has just raised even more questions. It will then offer suggestions for additional research into the introduction program and end with a more broad discussion, encompassing some of the subjects of this thesis and others that not have been mentioned.

6.1 Am I Norwegian Yet?

The previous chapter attempted to find an answer to the research question “why is the introduction program not as successful as the government desires”. Through the use of Giddens’ structuration theory we have arrived at our answer, that the introduction program does not empower participants at the level needed for them to be successful and that there is not enough focus upon integration being a two-way process. This is, however, just one answer to this question and there are surely others. The introduction program seems to be focused upon preparing participants to participate in Norwegian society after they have completed the program. It may be an assumption on the part of the government that the two-way process will begin once refugees have found work and start participating in society. As for the Tea Time campaign, the structure of the initiative quite clearly focuses upon empowerment of individuals and tries to position them in the best possible way to make a transformation. The campaign is aimed towards the host society, and thus focuses on a two-way process of integration. This leads to the third question of this study, whether the Tea Time campaign can offer anything to the government’s approach. The answer is clearly, yes. The Tea Time campaign should be seen as having been successful, despite its perhaps limited and targeted reach. While the government may have other initiatives that emphasize the two-way aspect of integration, it is not a part of the introduction program, their largest integration tool. The Tea Time campaign held its final exchange on June 4 2013. This research has shown the value of an initiative such as the Tea Time campaign and the government’s efforts at integrating newly arriving refugees would be supported by creating something similar and incorporating it into the introduction program.

IMDi has published a report measuring the population's opinions on integration issues six times since 2005. The report from 2012, documents that those that have frequent contact with immigrants are also those that tend to have the most positive opinions about the amount of immigrants in Norway, how the integration process is going and are more tolerant of differences and diversity¹⁸¹. 78 percent of respondents believe that immigrants have the main responsibility of integrating, and this matches up with that about 80 percent say that the integration problems in Norway are due to a lack of effort from the immigrant population¹⁸². Additionally, 41 percent of the respondents are skeptical towards Muslims in Norway, though in 2010, this number was 52 percent¹⁸³. Perhaps the Tea Time campaign has played a role in decreasing this number in the last two years. The report focuses particularly on the period from 2005 to 2012, and the change in some of the statistics. Two positive trends are that in 2005, 28 percent of respondents said that they have no contact with immigrants and in 2012, that number had fallen 15 points to 13 percent¹⁸⁴. Answering the question 'how has your contact influenced your opinion of immigrants?', the majority responded that their contact had both a negative and a positive impact on their views¹⁸⁵. But only 4 percent responded that it had given them a more negative opinion, while about a third of respondents said that it had been positive¹⁸⁶.

6.2 Propositions for Further Research

One of the most interesting findings in this study was that integration in Norway is going quite well when compared to international results¹⁸⁷. Norway is ranked number 8 of the 31 western countries that are evaluated in the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), which evaluates a number of integration indicators in conjunction with government policies¹⁸⁸. The InterCultural Cities Index, a joint project between the Council of Europe and the European Commission, ranks Oslo second of twelve large cities in Europe¹⁸⁹. This is in stark contrast to the often negatively

¹⁸¹ IMDi (2012)b p. 4

¹⁸² Ibid p. 21

¹⁸³ Ibid p. 6

¹⁸⁴ Ibid p. 25

¹⁸⁵ Ibid p. 26

¹⁸⁶ Ibid p. 26

¹⁸⁷ OECD (2009) p. 68

¹⁸⁸ MIPEX (2013)

¹⁸⁹ Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (2012)

focused debate about integration in Norway. Further research should be directed towards the media's role in framing the integration debate in Norway, and the actors that portray the integration process as a failure in Norway.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

This section will focus on some general issues relating to integration in Norway. The reports and evaluations of the introduction program that have contributed to this study have identified multiple factors that influence the results, from poor work training initiatives¹⁹⁰, different interpretations of what good results are¹⁹¹, to poorly planned settlement procedures¹⁹². This section will not focus on the introduction program's obstacles and solutions to these, as they are already well documented. Instead, it will offer some thoughts on integration in general in Norway and IMDi's role.

Pettigrew writes that "situations are embedded in social institutions and societies. Thus, institutional and societal norms structure the form and effects of contact situations"¹⁹³. He continues, citing Russell's study of South Africa under apartheid, that "societal norms of discrimination poison intergroup contact"¹⁹⁴. From our understanding of structuration theory, it seems that Giddens would likely be in agreement here. One of IMDi's core responsibilities is to raise the knowledge level of the general public about their role and the status of integration in Norway¹⁹⁵. This is an area where their effort has been extremely poor. Just 40 percent of the population have heard of IMDi and only half of those are familiar with what IMDi does¹⁹⁶. In the absence of contact or when there is just a minimal degree of contact with the outgroup, media gains more influence in the formation of opinions¹⁹⁷. The fact that there are almost twice as many Polish immigrants as Somali immigrants in Norway, yet three times as many articles in the

¹⁹⁰ Djuve (2011)b p. 33

¹⁹¹ Rambøll (2011) p. 5

¹⁹² Kavli et al (2007) p. 15

¹⁹³ Pettigrew (1998) p. 78

¹⁹⁴ Ibid p. 78

¹⁹⁵ IMDi (2012)c p. 4

¹⁹⁶ IMDi (2012)b p. 5

¹⁹⁷ Ibid p. 31

news about Somalis, illustrates how the media can present a distorted view of reality¹⁹⁸. In a debate on Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation ahead of the 2009 elections, the program leader began the show by saying that “we will try and find out why integration is not working in Norway”¹⁹⁹. The debate on integration in Norway focuses the majority of its attention on Islam, while only a maximum of 5 percent of the population can be characterized as Muslim. Islam is presented as a religion that leads to negative behavior and that the mere presence of Muslims is a threat to society²⁰⁰. Looking at the state of the debate in Norway, though better now than a few years ago, the two-way process is practically nowhere to be seen. IMDi has failed at challenging the negative stereotypes perpetuated in the media and by different organizations and individuals. If they are unable to counter the generalizations and allow the ideas of a tsunami of immigrants and failed integration that are already commonplace in many European countries²⁰¹, they will not be able to prevent the institutionalization of discrimination that Pettigrew warns of.

¹⁹⁸ IMDi (2010) p. 18

¹⁹⁹ Ibid p. 10

²⁰⁰ NOU Bedre Integrering (2011) p. 341

²⁰¹ The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (2012) p. 31

Literature

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Antirasistisk senter (2011). *Årsrapport 2011*. Oslo, Norge.
- Baber, Z. (1991). Beyond the Structure/Agency Dualism: An Evaluation of Giddens' Theory of Structuration. *Sociological Inquiry*, 61(2), 219-230.
- Barne-, Likestillings- og Inkluderingsdepartementet (2003). *LOV 2003-07-04 nr 80: Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven)*.
- Barne-, Likestillings- og Inkluderingsdepartementet (2012). *Rundskriv Q-20/2012: Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven)*.
- Barne-, Likestillings- og Inkluderingsdepartementet (2012). *Tildelingsbrev til Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet*.
- Barne-, Likestillings-, og inkluderingsdepartementet (2012). *Stortingsmelding 6: En helhetlig integreringspolitikk: Mangfold og fellesskap*.
- Brochmann, G., & Kjeldstadli, K. (2008). *A history of immigration: The case of Norway 900-2000*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cassell, P. (1993). *The Giddens reader*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Chiasson, M., & Saunders, C. (2005). Reconciling diverse approaches to opportunity research using the structuration theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 747-767.
- Djuve, A. B., & Kavli, H. C. (2006). Velferdsstatens skreddere: Skjønn og brukervedvirkning i flyktningtjenesten. *Tidsskrift for velferdsforskning*, 2006(4).
- Djuve, A. B. (2005). Hvem inkluderer innvandrere?. In H. Torp (Ed.), *Nytt arbeidsliv: Medvirkning, inkludering og belønning*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Djuve, A. B. (2010). Empowerment or Intrusion? The Input and Output Legitimacy of Introductory Programs for Recent Immigrants. *International Migration and Integration*, 11, 403-422.
- Djuve, A. B. (2011). a. Introductory programmes for immigrants - liberalism revisited, or changing ideas of citizenship?. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 1(3), 113-125.
- Djuve, A. B. (2011). b. *Introduksjonsordningen for nyankomne innvandrere* Ø Et integreringspolitisk paradigmeskifte (19). Fafo.

- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 5-21.
- Døving, C. A. (2009). *Integrering: Teori og empiri*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Eagley, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an Attitude-in-Context. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Ed.), *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years After Allport*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Enes, A. W., & Henriksen, K. (2012). *Monitor for introduksjonsordningen 2011* (1). Statistisk Sentralbyrå.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Samfunn*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Forbes, H. (2004). Ethnic Conflict and the Contact Hypothesis. In Y. T. Lee, C. McAuley, F. Moghaddam, & S. Worchel (Ed.), *The psychology of ethnic and cultural conflict* (pp. 69-88). Westport, Conn: Praeger.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Giddens, A., & Birdsall, K. (2001). *Sociology* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Handbook on integration for policy-makers and practitioners*. (2009). Brussels: European Commission, Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security.
- Hieronymi, O. (2005). Identity, Integration and Assimilation: Factors of Success and Failure of Migration. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(4), 132-150. doi:10.1093/rsq/hdi095
- IMDi (2008). *Deltakelse og måloppnåelse: Resultatrapportering fra introduksjonsordningen 2007* (7).
- IMDi (2009). *Hvem gjør hva? Direktoratenes arbeid for integrering og mangfold*.
- IMDi (2010). *Innvandrere i norske medier: Medieskapt islamfrykt og usynlig hverdagsliv. Årsrapport 2009*.
- IMDi (2008). *Integrert, men diskriminert: en undersøkelse blant innvandrere fra Afrika, Asia, Øst-Europa og Sør- og Mellom-Amerika* (9).

- IMDi (2012). *a. Fact booklet about immigrants and integration.*
- IMDi (2012). *b. Integreringsbarometeret 2012: Holdninger til innvandring, integrering og mangfold.*
- IMDi (2011). *b. Virksomhets- og regnskapsrapport ofr IMDi per 31.12.11.*
- IMDi (2013). *c. Kommunelederundersøkelsen.*
- IMDi (2013). *d. Årsrapport for busetting.*
- Kavli, H., Hagelund, A., & Bråthen, M. (2007). *Med rett til å lære og plikt til å delta: En evaluering av introduksjonsordningen for nyankomne flyktninger og innvandrere* (34). Fafo.
- Loyal, S. (2003). *The sociology of Anthony Giddens.* London: Pluto Press.
- Midtbøen, A. H., & Rogstad, J. (2012). *Diskrimineringsens omfang og årsaker* (1). Institutt for samfunnsforskning.
- Mingers, J. (1996). A Comparison of Maturana's Autopoietic Social Theory and Giddens' Theory of Structuration. *Systems Research, 13*(4), 469-482.
- The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (2012). *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe: Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries.* The Hague.
- NOU (2011). *Bedre integrering: Mål, strategier, tiltak* (14). Oslo.
- NOU (2011). *Velferd og migrasjon* (7). Oslo.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Christ, O., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup contact effects on prejudice: A normative interpretation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*, 411-425.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Fredrickson, G. M., Glazer, N., Knobel, D. T., & Ueda, R. (1982). *Prejudice.* Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271-280.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). INTERGROUP CONTACT THEORY. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.
- Rambøll (2011). *Analyse of resultatoppnåelse i introduksjonsordningen.* IMDi.
- Schneider, J., & Crul, M. (2010). New insights into assimilation and integration theory: introduction to the special issue. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 33*(7), 1143-1148.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research.* London: SAGE.

- Smestad, M. L. (2012). Monitoring integration in Norway. In *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe: Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries*. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP.
- UNHCR (2009). *Mapping Integration: UNHCR's Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming Project on Refugee Integration in Ireland - 2008/2009*.
- Vox (2012). *Læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne innvandrere*.
- Walliman, N. (2011). *Research methods: The basics*. London: Routledge.
- Webel, C., & Galtung, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.

Internet Resources

- Barne-, Likestillings- og Inkluderingsdepartementet (2011, August 17). *700 000 kroner til Antirasistisk senter - regjeringen.no*. Retrieved from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/bld/aktuelt/nyheter/2011/700-000-kroner-til-antirasistisk-senter.html?id=652492>
- Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (2013), Intercultural Cities Charts, Retrieved from <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/intercultural-cities-charts.php>
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles (2013). *Integration*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecre.org/topics/areas-of-work/integration.html>
- Gedde-Dahl, S., & Stokke, O. (2012, December). *Hadde flaks og fikk jobb i Fredrikstad - Aftenposten*. Retrieved from <http://www.aftenposten.no/nyheter/iriks/Hadde-flaks-og-fikk-jobb-i-Fredrikstad-7059314.html#.UaotA5wZBsI>
- IMDi (2013). *a. Fakta om bosetting og kvalifisering av flyktninger og asylsøkere som har fått oppholdstillatelse*. Retrieved from <http://www.imdi.no/no/Fakta-og-statistikk/Fakta-om-bosetting-og-kvalifisering-av-flyktninger-og-asylsokere/>
- IMDi (2013). *b. Flere kommuner mener de må ta imot for mange*. Retrieved from <http://www.imdi.no/no/Nyheter/2013/Kommunelederundersokelsen-2012/>
- International Organization for Migration (2013). *Migrant Integration*. Retrieved from <http://www.iom.int/cms/en/sites/iom/home/what-we-do/migrant-integration.html>
- International Organization for Migration (2006). *IOM and Migrant Integration*. Retrieved from http://publications.iom.int/bookstore/free/iom_and_migrant_integration.pdf
- NRK (2013, March 21). *NRK TV - Tea Time - bli kjent med naboen*. Retrieved from <http://tv.nrk.no/program/koid75005612/tea-time-bli-kjent-med-naboen>
- Migrant Integration Policy Index (2013), Retrieved from www.mipex.eu/norway
- Statistisk Sentralbyrå (2011). *Muslimsk flertall?*. Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/muslimsk-flertall-i-norge-i-fremtiden>
- Statistisk Sentralbyrå (2013). *a. Flyktninger og arbeidsmarkedet, 4. kvartal 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/arbeid-og-lonn/artikler-og-publikasjoner/flyktninger-og-arbeidsmarkedet-4.kvartal-2011>

Statistisk Sentralbyrå (2013). *b. Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre, 1. januar 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.ssb.no/innvbef/>

United Nations (n.d.). *Social Integration - Social Policy and Development Division*. Retrieved from <http://social.un.org/index/SocialIntegration.aspx>

