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Summary / Čoahkkáigeassu / Sammendrag

The use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable in studies aiming at quantitative knowledge on health and living conditions at the population level in contemporary Norway is challenged by insufficient Sámi-demographic data and blurred Sámi-ethnic boundaries. Based on the premise that the Sámi can be conceptualized as an ethnic group which is also an indigenous people, this thesis explores aspects of the operationalization, registration and (self-)reporting of Sámi ethnicity in the Norwegian part of Sápmi. The purpose was to contribute to more systematic knowledge on and understanding of factors that may affect the design, results and interpretations of population-based studies involving patterns of Sámi health and living conditions.

The thesis employs empirical data from the Sámediggi electoral roll in Norway for the period 1989–2009 (Paper I), from Norway's 1970 Census (Paper II), as well as from the SAMINOR study; a population based study of health and living conditions conducted in 2003/2004 in selected rural areas with Sámi and non-Sámi settlement in Norway (Papers II and III). The results show how Sámi ethnicity can be measured in various ways, and how both the ethnicity measures themselves and (self-)reported Sámi ethnicity based on such measures, may change over time. The choice of Sámi ethnicity measures can have a noticeable effect on study populations' size and geographical profile, but seems to have less influence on the outcomes when comparing living conditions in the Sámi population and in the remaining population in the same area. The overarching discussion emphasizes that epidemiological studies using a Sámi ethnicity variable must take into account the Sámi-internal variation and the complexity of cross-cultural research, i.e. the study of ethnically defined populations.

The thesis' main message is that it was not possible to propose an unambiguous solution regarding the operationalization of Sámi ethnicity. It is argued, however, that a key challenge is that of weighing the two measures 'Sámi linguistic connection' and 'Self-identification as Sámi'. It is also argued that using Sámi ethnicity as a variable calls for particular awareness not only about how studies are performed, but also about the purpose of each study and the research standpoint of the actors involved in the various phases of such studies. Overall, the thesis offers a systematic overview that may facilitate meaningful communication about results obtained by using Sámi ethnicity as a variable; that it becomes more transparent who we are talking about when the topic is health and living conditions in a population that is neither given nor uniform.
Čoahkkáigeassu

Geavahit sámi etnisitehta variábelin iskakademiin man ulbmil lea háhkat kvantitatiiva máhtu dearvvašvuoda ja eallindiliid birra populašuvnna dásis dála Norggas, hástaluvo váilevaš Sámi demográfäalaš dáhta ja eahpečielga sámi-etnálaš rájiid gæážil. Eavttuin ahte sápmelačcat ipmiarduvo etnikalaš joakvn mii maiddái lea eamiálbmut, dát dutkkus guorahallá iešgudet-lágan beali sámi etnisitehta operašionaliseremis/meroštallamis, registrarremis ja (ieš-)diediheamis Norgga bealde Sámis. Ulbmil lea addit eammbbo systematálaš máhtu ja ipmárdusa dakkár áššiid birra mat sáhttet váikkuhit hábmema, bohtosiid, ja dulkomiid populašuvnna dási guorahallamiin go sámiid dearvvašvuoda ja eallindiliid minstarat leat fáddán.


Dutkosa váldosáhka lea ahte ii lean vejolaš arvalit čielga čovdosa mo operašionaliseret sámi etnisitehta. Ákkastallojuvvo goitge ahte válmodhástal lea vihkkedit gaskkal mihttomeriid ‘Sámi giellačanasteapmi’ ja ‘Iešidentifiseren sápmelažžan’. Ákkastallojuvvo maid ahte go geavaha sámi etnisitehta variábelin de ferte leat dihtomielašs ii dušše mo muhtun guorahallan chádahuvvoo, muhto maiddái mii lea dánsulmial ja mii lea dutkanposišuvnna aktevrrain geat leat mielde iešgudetge fásain guorahallamis. Oktiibuto fállá dutkkus systematalaš gova mii sáhttá dagahit álkubun gulahallat jierpmálačchat bohtosiid birra mat lea vuołgán sámi etnisitehta variábelgeavahamis; ahte šaddá čielgasasabbo geaid birra mii hupmat go fádda lea dearvvašvuoha ja eallindilit muhtun populašuvnnaa mii ii leat addojuvvo ii ge oktalaš.
Sammendrag

Bruk av samisk etnisitet som variabel i studier som sikter mot kvantitativ kunnskap om helse og levekår på populasjonsnivå i dagens Norge, utfordres av mangelfulle samisk-demografiske data og utydelige samisk-etniske grenser. Basert på et premiss om at samene kan begrepsfestes som en etnisk gruppe som også er et urfolk, utforsker denne avhandlingen aspekter ved operasjonalisering, registrering og (selv)rapportering av samisk etnisitet på norsk side av Sápmi. Hensikten var å bidra til mer systematisk kunnskap om og forståelse for forhold som kan ha betydning for design, resultater og fortolkninger av populasjonsbaserte studier som involverer mønstre i samers helse og levekår.


Avhandlingens hovedbudskap er at det ikke var mulig å foreslå en entydig løsning vedrørende operasjonalisering av samisk etnisitet. Det argumenteres imidlertid for at en nøkkelutfordring er å avvike mellom målene 'Samisk språkforbindelse' og 'Selvidentifikasjon som same'. Det argumenteres også for at bruk av samisk etnisitet som variabel påkaller særskilt bevissthet ikke bare om hvordan studier utføres, men også om hva som er hensikten med hver studie og om forskningsståsted for aktører som er involvert i de ulike fasene av slike studier. I sum tilbyr avhandlingen et systematisk overblikk som kan gjøre det enklere å kommunisere meningsfullt om resultater framkommet ved bruk av samisk etnisitet som variabel; at det blir mer gjennomskuelig hvem vi snakker om når temaet er helse og levekår i en populasjon som verken er gitt eller enhetlig.
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“Nothing about ethnicity and its interplay with healthcare is simple: terminology, classification and how, when and why to collect ethnicity data all present challenges that are practical as much as they are philosophical” (Donaldson 2007.ix).

“Working with ethnicity data is complicated, but so too are the ‘real world’ processes in which ethnicity is implicated” (Kukutai 2010:163).

“Gii lea sápmelaš? Mo galgá dovdat su? Lea go varra vai vuotgga mii mearrida?" [Who is a Sámi? How can s/he be identified? By blood or by the spirit?]
(Song lyrics by Harald Gaski to a recording by Amund Johnskareng, 1980.)

1. Introduction

For a long time the knowledge of patterns of the Sámi people's health and living conditions was rather sparse (Kvernmo 1997, Sosial- og helsedepartementet 2001, Hassler & Sjölander 2005). In recent years, a growing number of studies have sought to improve the level of knowledge. The overall impression from these studies is that as a group, the Sámi are in most cases relatively well off, both in absolute terms and relative to the rest of the population in the same geographic area (Hassler, Kvernmo and Kozlov 2008, Brustad 2009, Sjölander 2011). However, it turns out that these types of studies tend to apply a variety of Sámi inclusion criteria and categories. This is not least the case in the Norwegian part of Sápmi (illustrative examples are Nystad, Melhus & Lund 2000, Lund et al. 2007, Silviken & Kvernmo 2007, Brustad et al. 2009, Bals 2010, Hansen 2011, Norum & Nieder 2012, Eliassen 2013). This practice can, on the one hand, be explained by two factors that are partly interrelated: firstly, the absence of a formalized Sámi-demographic “framework” based on regularly updated Sámi census data (Lie 2002, Pettersen 2011b), and secondly, that until recently the number of individuals who at any time are (self-)identified as Sámi, has not been given (see e.g. Jernsletten 1969, Aubert 1978, Nielsen 1986, Stordahl 1996, Andersen, S. 2003, Gaski 2008, Olsen 2010, Blix 2013). On the other hand, one consequence of such a practice is that uncertainty may arise regarding the degree of trustworthiness in the knowledge produced about patterns of Sámi health and living conditions in time and space – with reference to each study, but especially when several studies are reviewed together.

The varied use of Sámi inclusion criteria and categories in studies involving patterns of health and living conditions among the Sámi in Norway, has made some scholars argue that a key
challenge for such studies is “[...] to define the Sámi population in an appropriate way” (Brustad 2009:68, translation by the present author). This challenge is the topic of the present thesis. The purpose is to contribute to more systematic knowledge and understanding of certain factors that may affect the design, results and interpretation of studies of this kind. Based on the premise that the Sámi can be conceptualized as an ethnic group which is also an indigenous people (Makkonen 2000), the thesis explores various aspects of the monitoring, recording and (self-)reporting of Sámi ethnicity in the Norwegian part of Sápmi – as such, but especially with respect to the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable in studies aiming at quantitative knowledge on health and living conditions at the population level in contemporary Norway. The thesis thus has a social epidemiological foundation.

It is an additional ambition that the thesis will also serve as a contribution to international scholarly and ethical-political discourses, first and foremost on practices concerning the recording of information on ethnicity (see e.g. Seltzer & Anderson 2001, Peters 2011, Simon & Piché 2012, Williams & Husk 2013), but also, more specifically, on the use of ethnicity as a variable in studies of patterns of ethnically defined populations' health and living conditions (see e.g. Whaley 2003, Shim 2005, Bhopal 2009a, Kukutai 2010, Ingleby 2012).

The thesis is based on the standpoint that in Sámi and other indigenous peoples' knowledge-building about themselves (Stordahl 2008), meaningful statistical narratives also have a role to play (Prout 2012, Walter & Andersen 2013). A more specific rationale is that adequate and precise numerical data on indigenous peoples and their factual situations are a key factor for fulfilling global ambitions to level up social inequities in health (CSDH 2008), and also for the practical implementation of indigenous rights (Stavenhagen 2009). In Norway, this has relevance for, among other things, the Sámi' people's right to equivalent health services (St.meld. nr. 34 (2012-2013)), and, also for (aspects of) Sámi self-determination in health-related issues (Henriksen ed. 2010).

The thesis employs empirical data from the Sámediggi electoral roll in Norway for the period 1989–2009 (Paper I), from Norway's 1970 Census (Paper II), as well as from the so-called SAMINOR study – a population-based study of health and living conditions conducted in 2003/2004 in selected rural areas with Sámi and non-Sámi settlement in Norway (Papers II and III).
2. Concepts and contexts

The background to this thesis is the need for more systematic knowledge and understanding of various aspects of the use of ethnicity as a variable in studies of patterns in health and living conditions that involve the Sámi people in Norway. In particular, the operationalization – i.e. measurement – of Sámi ethnicity has proven to be a challenging task (Senter for samisk helseforskning 2006, Brustad 2009). Analytically and empirically, the thesis rests on three pillars. The first pillar consists of understandings of health and/as living conditions at the population level, as well as characteristics of studies that seek to obtain quantitative knowledge about such conditions. The second pillar is the concept of ethnicity and aspects of the recording of information on the ethnic affiliation of individuals, so-called ethnicity data. The third pillar is the position of the Sámi as an indigenous people and ethnic minority in the Norwegian part of Sápmi, with special emphasis on the status of Sámi ethnicity data in Norway across time and space. This chapter provides a brief presentation of each of these pillars.

2.1 Health and living conditions of populations

Originally, the term population referred to all individuals in a given geographical area, but it has gradually been applied (also) as a general designation for a given quantity of units that share at least one attribute (Krieger 2012b). Thus, human populations can be defined on the basis of practically any kind of permanent and temporary aspects of individuals, their environments and their relationships. Ethnicity is one such aspect. Knowledge on health and living conditions in specified populations can emphasize various aspects, but does typically need to rely on so-called population-based studies.

2.1.1 Health and/as living conditions

The term health is not unambiguous (Mæland 2009), and differing notions of health and how it can be achieved will have varying implications for health-related practices as well as health-related analyses. (Gjernes 2004). In the Nordic research tradition, the concept of living conditions is defined as the individuals’ access to resources that can be deployed in various arenas; living conditions are the result of an interplay between the resources that each individual can access and characteristics of the arenas in which these resources are deployed (Fyhn & Dahl 2000). The most important resources include: 1) health and access to medical
care; 2) financial resources and opportunities for consumption; 3) employment and working conditions; 4) competence and educational opportunities; 5) family and social relations; 6) housing and access to community services; 7) recreation and culture; 8) security for life and property; and 9) political resources and democratic rights (NOU 1993: 17). The concept of living conditions may thus refer to health status as well as to factors that may have an impact on health.

The nexus between health and living conditions is also prominent in that in recent years it has become (more) common to regard health as an interplay between individual biology and factors that are external to the individual (Fugelli & Ingstad 2001; Fleischer et al., 2006; Mæland 2009; Schei 2010). Such “external” factors – often referred to as social determinants of health – include individual lifestyles, social and local networks, as well as general socioeconomic, cultural and environmental conditions (Dahlgren & Whitehead 2009). Some scholars emphasize that the health of individuals must be seen in light of their entire life course (Næss & Kristensen 2009, Tong et al. 2011). Others accentuate in particular that biography, in the sense of existential conditions and experiences primarily over the individual’s own life course, but also including those of previous generations, may manifest itself as biology (Getz, Kirkengen & Ulvestad 2011). Per Fugelli (2003) has suggested that health (and illness) can be regarded as a product of biology multiplied by culture and politics, raised to the power of time and place. Social epidemiologist Nancy Krieger (2008, 2012a) has suggested a holistically oriented ecosocial theory of health patterns and distribution of illness at the population level, the core of which is that people are biological organisms and social beings that characterize as well as are characterized by a variety of contexts at multiple levels in time and space. The theory emphasizes cumulative effects and includes responsibility and accountability, power and resistance.

2.1.2 Population-based studies

The study of patterns in the health and living conditions of populations is part of the domain of epidemiology, and epidemiology’s unit of analysis is specified populations, not specific individuals (Rose 1985, Bhopal 2008). While traditional epidemiological studies typically address illness or health in defined populations and may include social factors for elucidation, studies in social epidemiology place their main focus on social or societal aspects; on whether and how these may be related to variations in health in specified populations (Oakes &
Kaufman 2006, Mæland et al. 2009). Social epidemiology therefore typically uses theoretical perspectives and empirical knowledge obtained from health-related as well as social-science disciplines. Studies in social epidemiology come in various forms (Bråthen et al. 2007, Mæland et al. 2009, O'Campo & Dunn 2012). Some are primarily descriptive, presenting conditions and prevalences. Others are (additionally) analytical; they identify associations and may suggest explanations or causes. A third type are action-oriented, in having an emphasis on solutions and interventions.

In population-based studies of health and living conditions it is essential to state explicitly to whom the results shall apply (Bhopal 2008). This is especially crucial when results from a (presumed representative) sample will be generalized to others than those who are actually included in the study. To be able to understand and explain the results of studies, as well as to assess their representativeness and potential for generalization, it is essential to know the demographic characteristics of the population(s) and the general conditions under which the members are living (Bhopal 2008, Mæland et al., 2009). Since population-based studies of health and living conditions typically use statistical measures such as proportion, average, rate and ratio, there will often be a need to quantify the population(s) at the time or times at which they are studied. Thus, it will be an advantage to have access to a formalized overview of the individuals that are included – or can be included – in the population(s) that is (are) of interest.

All population-based studies ought to have the highest possible degree of reliability and validity (see e.g. Laake, Thoresen & Veierød 2007; Svensson, Hjartåker & Laake 2007; Ringdal 2007). Reliability refers to the trustworthiness of the study’s results, i.e. that there is correspondence between the observed and “true” values, permitting the results to be replicated under equal conditions. Validity refers to whether a study has investigated what it has set out to investigate, i.e. that it has provided an answer to the research question. The value of a reliable study depends on its also having a high degree of validity. Both the data material and the analyses may have an effect on the reliability and validity of studies. Some scholars claim that the paramount form of validity is conceptual validity, i.e. that each (theoretical) concept is operationalized – rendered measurable – in a way that captures the “representation” of the concept in an intersubjective sense, so that meaningful communication about the measured phenomenon is facilitated (Jacobsen, D. 2006; Grenness 2012). Other aspects of validity include internal validity, referring to inferences drawn from statistical correlations in a data
material, and *external* validity, which denotes the extent to which the conclusions regarding those who have been studied can be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn, and possibly also to other individuals in other contexts.

It is commonly recognized that in practice no studies are perfect. *Random error* (“noise”) pulls in different directions and has no effect on the results apart from a dilution of the estimated effect – at least in large samples. *Systematic error* (bias) causes results to differ from what they would have been in the absence of such error. Common forms of systematic error include *information bias*, which occurs when the measurements are faulty, as well as *sampling bias*, which occurs when those who are studied are not representative of the population for which the study aims to draw conclusions. So-called *confounding* occurs when the assessment of an observed correlation (association) between two variables fails to take into account that a third variable co-varies (statistically) with the two former, *without* being a necessary intermediate variable in this context (see e.g. Bhopal 2008; Jacobsen, B. 2010). Confounding factors thus disrupt the clarification and interpretation of correlations.

The handling of reliability and validity will be complicated when studies involve phenomena of a high complexity and therefore will not invariably have a shared understanding or even a clear definition. The very starting point for this thesis is that *Sámi ethnicity* is such a phenomenon.

### 2.2 Ethnicity and ethnicity data

In recent years, the concept of *ethnicity* – whose etymological base *ethnos* is a Greek word for “people” – has become increasingly widespread in academic as well as everyday parlance. At the same time, it has become increasingly clear that this concept is “[…] neither simple nor precise” (Senior and Bhopal 1994:327), but rather “[…] fuzzy, flexible and contingent […]” (Ahmad 1999). On the whole, many perceive this concept as analytically “slippery” and there are continuous “[…] ontological debates over the nature of ethnicity […]” (Brown & Langer 2010:24); “[d]efining ethnicity is a minefield, as many authors have recognized” (Green 2005:2).
2.2.1 Ethnic groups

Despite the fact that ethnicity is “[…] a big concept – so big as to be meaningless” (Chandra & Wilkinson 2008:517) and therefore tends to function as an umbrella concept (Westin 2010), two aspects stand out as central (Fenton 2003). The first includes notions of origin, of having descended from the same ethnos. The second includes ideas about culture, of having shared customs, including language. Over time, various main analytical views of ethnicity as a phenomenon have developed (see e.g. Brown & Langer 2010). The primordialist view focuses on (given and unique) cultural content, regarding ethnic groups as natural results of biological differences or long historic processes. The instrumentalist view assumes that in situations of social, political and economic competition, social elites use references to ethnicity as a (strategically instrumental) resource to define group identities and regulate group boundaries, and ethnic groups are hence defined by their mutual relationships, not by their (original) cultural practices. A third view is referred to as constructivist, emphasizing in particular those (identity-forming) processes that cause ethnic groups to be created and assume social importance, and regarding ethnic groups as the result of purposive efforts by cultural entrepreneurs to construct an identity.

While primordialist views of ethnicity appear to remain widespread, constructivist views have occupied a strong position in many academic communities since 1980 (ibid.). Some constructivist positions have been criticized for throwing the baby out with the bathwater, overlooking the fact that ethnic constructions do not fall from the sky; they are based on conditions that many people regard as “their” culture, history, language and community (Karner 2007). It has been claimed that more moderate constructivist positions combine the primordialists’ views of cultural tradition as an ethnic “basis” with the instrumentalists’ views on situationally dependent construction and maintenance of ethnic groups and ethnic affiliations (Karner 2007, Brown and Langer 2010).

Nation and race

A complicating factor is that the concept of ethnicity shares its domain of meaning with two other concepts that also have origin as their pivotal point: nation and race. (Fenton 2003). Nation is partly associated with culture and partly with politics, but is used in particular to denote groups that are – or are assumed to be – based on a cultural community. Race is associated with hereditary biological characteristics, in particular visible and external
differences such as skin colour, but to some extent also physical characteristics. Today, the concept of race is highly controversial. Many want to banish this term to the scrapheap of history because it is deemed (biologically) irrelevant. Others claim that this term captures the (social) consequences of the fact that the world is not “colour blind”, and it thus remains relevant as well as necessary (see e.g. Möschel 2011; Zuberi 2011; Krieger 2010).

**Territorial/national minorities – immigrants – indigenous peoples**

Today, the term *ethnic group* is mostly used to refer to named *intra-state groups* that constitute a minority in the state in question. Distinctions are commonly drawn between a) territorial/national minorities, b) immigrants (sometimes including descendants of foreign-born ancestors) and c) indigenous peoples (Kjeldstadli 2008; Ingierd & Fossheim 2011). Among these, the concept of indigenous peoples has proven to be especially difficult to define with any degree of precision (Corntassel 2003; Barnard 2006; Friedman 2008). Over time, the indigenous peoples’ movement has shifted its focus from “essence” to “positioning” (Minde 2007:34). It is worth noting that not even the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples contains an explicit definition of “indigenous people” (United Nations 2007), but on the whole, the most prominent characteristic of ethnic groups that are also indigenous peoples is a long-standing historic affiliation with a territory at a time when colonization or modern state formation took place. It has been argued that the positions of indigenous peoples seen as a whole imply that they constitute a *people* within the meaning of international law and thus are entitled to (forms of) self-determination (Åhren, M. 2007; Anaya 2009). Conceptualizing indigenous peoples as a type of ethnic group has been criticized by some, while others have pointed out that such a conceptualization is analytically appropriate to capture the way in which indigenous peoples are understood and treated in given contexts within a state (Andersen, C. 2009; Kukutai 2010). National censuses are one such context.

### 2.2.2 Registration of information on ethnicity

In modern states, national censuses are the most common source of general demographic data. By definition, such censuses are undertaken at regular intervals and include a complete registration of all those who are resident in a defined area, undertaken by the authorities and published in a systematic form (Soltvedt 2004). As a phenomenon, censuses have been described as “a tool of statecraft” (Berdayes 2008) which are “[c]oncerned with knowing population” and which over time have become “[…] institutionalised, codified and
systematised such that myriad policies and practices of governments, international organisations, corporations and researchers rely upon censuses to a great extent” (Ruppert 2007:5).

A widespread, but not self-evident census practice is to register various forms of information on the ethnic affiliation of the citizens. A global study of the census round in the year 2000 found that such practices were applied in 63 per cent of the world’s countries (Morning 2008). A study based on the latest census forms in each of 236 countries found that 23 per cent of them made provision for specific enumeration of citizens with an affiliation to indigenous peoples (Peters 2011). Historic studies show that practices regarding ethnicity data vary not only between states, but also within states – primarily over time, but also between various parts of the state’s territory and in some cases also between various groups of citizens (Anderson 1996; Kertzer & Arel 2002; Simon 2012). Such variations must be seen in light of differences in historical-political conditions, which in turn constitute frameworks for the assessment by social actors regarding whether the collection and recording of ethnicity data is important and appropriate or superfluous and reprehensible (see e.g. Ahmad 1999; Seltzer & Anderson 2001; Morning & Sabbagh 2005; Simon & Piché 2012).

Defining ethnic categories for use in censuses and assigning individuals to such categories can both be regarded as ways of exercising power – and where there is power, there will be resistance: “Ever since the censuses began, state efforts to pigeon-hole each individual into a single category of identity, and then conceive the whole population as divisible into these units, have faced resistance” (Kertzer & Arel 2002:27). In some cases the very idea of categorizing citizens ethnically will be controversial. One view on this is that a state should only care whether a person is a citizen or an “alien”, the latter referring to a person born outside the territory of the state. In general, it has been far less controversial to register information on the citizens’ country of birth than on their ethnicity (Blum 2002). In other cases, the controversy will concern what the relevant categories are and/or the conditions for being assigned to these (see e.g. Mateos, Singleton & Longley 2009; Aspinall 2009; Williams & Husk 2013). Key issues are: which aspects related to ethnicity will form the basis for ethnic categories? Should ethnic identification be ascribed or self-ascribed? How should affiliations to more than one group be handled?
The UN’s recommendations for the 2010 census round restricted the core topics to demographic data on gender, age and marital status, but emphasized also that “[d]ata on ethnicity provide information on the diversity of a population and can serve to identify subgroups of a population” (United Nations 2008:139f). If such data were to be collected, it was pointed out that “[t]he subjective nature of the term (not to mention increasing intermarriage among various groups in some countries, for example) requires that information on ethnicity be acquired through self-declaration of a respondent and also that respondents have the option of indicating multiple ethnic affiliations”. It was underscored that “[d]ata on ethnicity should not be derived from information on country of citizenship or country of birth”. Furthermore, the recommendations contained separate sections on the registration of religion, language and affiliation to indigenous peoples.

It is recognized that in national censuses, neither the questions, nor the categories are static phenomena. The causes of change may vary, but essential for this thesis is that ethnic categories of this type are not given a priori. Not only the implementation, but also the design of censuses is “[…] inherently a political practice” (Ruppert 2007:6, see also Rowse 2009).

Since national censuses are a main source of demographic data, the census practices will have consequences for other practices that make use of such data. However, censuses are not the only possible source of ethnicity data, since information on ethnicity also may be (more or less routinely) recorded in administrative registries, in surveys for production of official statistics, as well as in the context of research. In such contexts as well, the recording and use of ethnicity data remain a contentious area with varying practices – including in terms of legislation and ethical codes – within and between countries.

2.3 The Sámi

The Sámi are an ethnic group that also has the status of an indigenous people. Their traditional area of residence – often referred to as Sápmi – includes parts of the four states of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia (cf. the map in Appendix A). Through the ages there have been varying views of when the Sámi first arose as a distinctive group, but a long-standing Sámi presence in the Sápmi area prior to the delineation of the present national borders has been established by way of a number of sources (Aarseth 1975; Hansen and Olsen 2004). However, the Sámi have never been a homogenous group; a total of nine Sámi
11 languages/dialects have been identified historically (cf. Figure 2.1), and ways of life that were adapted to the natural environment led to the development of a diversity of main forms of Sámi material culture (Vorren & Manker 1957).

Figure 2.1 Sámi language/dialect areas


1=South Sámi, 2= Ume Sámi, 3=Pite Sámi, 4=Lule Sámi, 5=North Sámi, 6=Enare Sámi, 7=East Sámi, 8=Kildin Sámi, 9=Ter Sámi

While Sámi unity and pan-Sámi community have been emphasized in a number of contexts (Smith ed. 2005), significant differences in the position and general situation of the Sámi developed over time within each of the states that intersect the Sápmi area (Lantto 2010). These differences include different and varying polices with regard to the identification of Sámi citizens in national censuses (Aikio 1994; Lie 2002; Evjen og Hansen 2009; Axelsson 2010; Sokolovskij 2011). Despite the fact that this has resulted in partly absent and partly deficient demographic data on the Sámi population, practically all presentations of the Sámi and Sámi-related issues include more or less rough estimates of the prevailing size and geographical distribution of the Sámi people; typically in the order of 60 – 70 000 Sámi in
total, who are typically distributed with 40 000 Sámi in Norway, 20 000 in Sweden, 7 500 in Finland and 2 000 in Russia (see e.g. Galdu 2006; Hassler, Kvernmo & Kozlov 2008). The Sámi are thus – even with a reservation about low estimates – a numerically rather small indigenous people that constitutes relatively minor ethnic minority populations in each of the four countries.¹

2.3.1 **In the Norwegian part of Sápmi**

In this thesis, the empirical material and the explicit analyses are restricted to the Norwegian part of Sápmi. The primary concern of the thesis is the distinction between Sámi and non-Sámi. The thesis will only touch upon the fact that parts of the Norwegian Sápmi are populated by descendants of persons from a Finnish/Kven language background who immigrated to Northern Norway before 1945. This group is officially referred to as the *Kven* and enjoys formal status as a national minority in Norway (St.meld. nr. 15 (2000-2001); see also Niemi 2002; Ryymin & Nyyssönen 2012).

Main features of the position of the Sámi as an ethnic minority and indigenous people in Norway are presented briefly in Papers I–III. The position can be summarized in the keywords ethnic interaction, government assimilation policy, resistance and Sámi revitalization. Ethnic interaction included – and still includes – inter-ethnic marriages, although with some local variations (see e.g. Thuen 1989; Evjen 2008). Government assimilation policy – which has been related partly to the emergence of strong nation states and Norwegian concerns for security policy as well as Social Darwinist ideas of race and racial hierarchies – impacted notions of the Sámi and everything relating to them as culturally, socially and individually inferior (Eriksen & Niemi 1981; Stordahl 1997; Schanche 2002; Minde 2005). Various kinds of resistance to the assimilation policy and the so-called “Norwegianization” that followed in its wake contributed to, among other things, the adoption of the Sámi Act of 1987 and the Section 110a Constitutional Amendment of 1988, which in turn helped change the overall framework with respect to being a Sámi in Norway in general (Broderstad 1999) and produce an institutional and linguistic Sámi (re)vitalization in particular.

¹ In 2012, the population in the countries amounted to approximately 5 million in Norway, 9.5 million in Sweden, 5.4 million in Finland and 144 million in Russia (The World Bank 2013).
Development of Sámi policy and politics in Norway has partly overlapped with the development of a universalist welfare state and general processes of modernization, including centralization (Stordahl 1997; Kuhne 2006; Sørli 2010). With regard to Sámi ethnicity it has been argued that developments over the last decades have had a liberating effect for some, while they have also provided fertile ground for new conflicts and personal dilemmas (see e.g. Stordahl 1996; Johansen 1998; Agenda Utredning & Utvikling 2002; Sivertsen 2009; Olsen 2010; Høgmo 2011; Suongir 2011; Kalstad 2013). It is impossible, however, to explicitly document the impact that previous assimilation policies or more recent Sámi revitalization have had on the number of people who, at given points in time, de facto have – and in given contexts have chosen to articulate – a Sámi affiliation. The main reason for this lies in the preconditions for defining and studying the Sámi population in Norway as a demographic unit (Pettersen 2011b).

2.3.1 Sámi ethnicity data in Norway

Since the Second World War, Norway has been among those countries whose policy is not to register information on their citizens’ ethnicity in the national censuses. While all censuses undertaken from 1845 to 1930 had recorded information in various ways on Sámi or Kven affiliation in those census tracts where the authorities believed that these groups accounted for a significant slice of the population (Torp 1985; Lie 2002), this practice was in principle abandoned in 1946. It was no longer deemed “purposeful” to include questions on Sámi and Kven ethnicity – both because “[r]acial mixing has now proceeded so far that it will often be very difficult to determine the race to which large groups of the population belong” and because “[t]he concept of “race” had also become so strongly discredited due to wartime circumstances, that it surely would give rise to indignation if such a question were to be included on the enumeration forms” (Statistisk sentralbyrå 1956:20f). In addition, it was noted that “[m]oreover, a large proportion of the Sámi and Kven live exactly the same lives as the population in general and have completely adapted to Norwegian culture and tradition” (ibid.). The 1950 census, however – because of external input, but with strong doubts on the part of Statistics Norway – included questions on Sámi (and Kven) domestic language in a small number of selected villages in the three northernmost counties.
An exception: the 1970 census

Although the registration of the Sámi (and Kven) in the early census was not flawless, especially because of inconsistent criteria for ethnic categorization (Evjen and Hansen 2009), and even though the registrations of Sámi language use in the 1950 census were regarded as clearly incomplete (Statistisk sentralbyrå 1956:22; NOU 1984: 18, Ch. 3.3.3), Sámi organizations felt that a complete absence of demographic data on the Sámi population was problematic (Aubert 1978). After repeated requests from the Norwegian Sámi Council in particular (NOU 1984: 18, Ch. 10.2.2), Statistics Norway decided that the 1970 census should include four questions on Sámi affiliation. The questions – which were formulated in cooperation with the Sámi organizations and focused on various connections to the Sámi language and self-identification as Sámi – were not included in the regular census form in the way the Sámi organizations had wanted, however. It was claimed that this would be too costly (Thorsen 1972). Instead, the questions were printed on a separate form (cf. Appendix B) for distribution in 45 rural municipalities north of the Arctic Circle, whereof 24 included only census tracts with an assumed concentration of Sámi settlement (cf. Appendix C). The census tracts in which at least one Sámi form was returned had a total population equivalent to 2.9 per cent of the Norwegian total in all of the country’s 451 municipalities at that time.

As of today, the Sámi questions in the 1970 census still represent an exception in recent Norwegian census practice. Moreover, since the Norwegian census in 2000 most likely was the last so-called form-based census ever, such an exception is unlikely to occur again. The 2011 census was a so-called registry-based census, meaning that it was collated from recycled existing data by Statistics Norway, partly the agency’s own data and partly drawn from various administrative sources (Utne 2011). Consequently, since the production of national, individually based official Sámi statistics depends on systematic registration of (forms of) Sámi affiliation at the individual level, such statistics are likely to remain absent in Norway.

A Sámi electoral roll established in 1989

Over time, the Sámi organizations’ requests for registration of the Sámi for demographic and statistical purposes became interwoven with discussions regarding the establishment of a separate Sámi register for use in direct elections to a nationwide Sámi representative body. The Sámi Act of 1987 established such a register. The preparatory works of the Act nevertheless emphasized that enrollment in the roll should be a right, not a duty; this was to be a tool for use in the context of elections to the Sámediggi, not a complete “Sámi census”
The framework and numeric development of this electoral roll is the topic of Paper 1.

**Geographically based official Sámi statistics from 2006**

Since 2006, based on input from and cooperation with the Sámediggi and Sámi research institutions/representatives, Statistics Norway has produced bi-annual demographic and other statistics that are specified for those areas that are encompassed by the *Sámediggi subsidy schemes for business development*; ‘Sametingets tilskuddsordninger for næringsutvikling’ in Norwegian (Statistisk sentralbyrå 2014). In principle, this so-called STN area includes selected municipalities and local communities that are regarded as especially crucial for the preservation and development of Sámi culture and industry. This notwithstanding, subsidies can be granted to all residents in the area, irrespective of the applicant’s ethnicity. When the precursor of the current scheme, the *Sámi Development Fund*; ‘Samisk utviklingsfond’ (SUF) in Norwegian, was established in 1975, the geographical area of applicability encompassed five municipalities in Finnmark county. After several rounds of expansion, the area currently encompasses 21 municipalities and 10 sub-municipalities north of the Arctic Circle/Saltfjellet mountain range (cf. the table in Appendix D and the map in Appendix E). As of 1 January 2013, the population of the STN area accounted for 14.2 per cent of the total population north of the Arctic Circle/Saltfjellet mountain range (Statistisk sentralbyrå 2014) and 1.1 per cent of the Norwegian population as a whole.

---

2 This author was involved in this cooperation via a position as social scientist at the then Sámi Instituhtta / Nordic Sámi Institute (merged with Sámi University College in 2005).
3. Aims of the thesis

Taking the situation of deficient Sámi-demographic data and blurred Sámi-ethnic boundaries as the starting point, the *overall objective* of this thesis was to contribute to more systematic knowledge and understanding of some basic issues regarding the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable – particularly in studies aiming at quantitative knowledge on health and living conditions at the population level in contemporary Norway.

The *specific aims* were:

- To explore and critically assess actual and potential approaches to the *operationalization* of Sámi presence in Norway.

- To investigate the extent of *stability and change* in (self-reported) Sámi ethnicity over time, and assess the results in light of certain factors at various levels.

- To demonstrate some numerical consequences of using *different measures* of Sámi ethnicity when comparing living conditions in the Sámi and the remaining population in a given area.
4. Materials and methods

4.1 Overview

The thesis is based on three studies with different design and the use of partly different and partly the same material. Each study is presented in a separate paper; in the present text referred to as Paper I, Paper II and Paper III, respectively. Table 4.1 gives an overview of each study’s design, data set, the number of participants and their age, the geographical area covered, as well as the time of data collection. The subsequent sections summarize other essential aspects of each study, with an emphasis on the respective Sámi ethnicity measures.

Table 4.1. Overview of the studies’ design, data set, the number of participants and their age, the geographical area covered, and the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Paper Design</th>
<th>Data set</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>The participants’ age</th>
<th>The area covered</th>
<th>Time of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Historical-descriptive</td>
<td>The Sámediggi electoral roll*</td>
<td>5,505-13,890***</td>
<td>&gt; 18 years</td>
<td>Norway (the whole country)</td>
<td>1989—2009 (every fourth year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Time series</td>
<td>Norway’s 1970 Census **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 0 years</td>
<td>45 municipalities in Norway north of the Arctic Circle</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SAMINOR study **</td>
<td>10,541</td>
<td>36-79 years</td>
<td>17 municipalities in Norway north of the Arctic Circle</td>
<td>2003—2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Cross-sectional</td>
<td>The SAMINOR study</td>
<td>14,797</td>
<td>36-79 years</td>
<td>17 municipalities in Norway north of the Arctic Circle</td>
<td>2003—2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The study is partly based on already published data
** The study is partly based on a linkage of the two data sets
*** The increase is a topic in the study.

4.1.1 The Sámediggi electoral roll (Paper I)

The study on the Sámediggi electoral roll (see also Chapter 2.3.2) combined secondary data from various kinds of publications with primary data on the number of enrolled per municipality in 2005 and 2009; in total and by gender and age group. The Sámi ethnicity measures were implicitly determined by the Sámi Act’s criteria on the right to enrolment in the Sámediggi electoral roll:
'All persons who make a declaration to the effect that they consider themselves to be Sámi, and who either a) have Sámi as their domestic language, or b) have or have had a parent, grandparent or great-grandparent with Sámi as his or her domestic language, or c) are the child of a person who is or has been registered on the Sámi electoral roll may demand to be included on a separate register of Sámi electors in their municipality of residence' (§ 2-6).

The paragraph did not originally include the great-grandparent generation; due to input from some Sámi communities, this generation was added ahead of the third Sámediggi election in 1997 (Sametinget 2007). Those who wish to join the electoral roll must use a certain application form (cf. Appendix F). Enrolled persons might later resign from the roll.

The numerical analyses included, all in all, persons who were enrolled in the Sámediggi electoral roll at the time of each election between 1989 and 2009.

4.1.2 The SAMINOR study (Papers II and III)

Studies II and III are based on data from the so-called SAMINOR study; a population-based cross-sectional study of health and living conditions in selected rural areas in Norwegian Sápmi, where Norway's 1970 census or other relevant knowledge indicated a significant presence of both Sámi and non-Sámi populations (Lund et al. 2007). Data collection took place in 2003/2004. The study was designed as a combined living conditions and cardiovascular survey, based on questionnaires and screening. It was initiated by the Centre for Sámi Health Research at UiT The Arctic University of Norway and was carried out in collaboration with the Norwegian Institute of Public Health. The study included 24 municipalities, 18 north of and 6 south of the Arctic Circle. In 7 of the municipalities, however, only some villages were covered (cf. Figure 1 in Paper II and Figure 1 in Paper III). A total of 27,987 persons who were officially registered as resident in the selected area, and who were aged either 30 years or between 36 and 79 years, were invited to participate. Of these, 16,865 persons (60.6 per cent) returned at least one of the study's questionnaires. The response rate did, however, vary geographically, which might be due to minor adjustments to the study design along the way (Lund et al. 2007, Nystad 2010). The questionnaires were distributed in Norwegian and Northern Sámi; 1.6 per cent of the participants returned the latter.

Studies II and III include women and men aged between 36–79 years who were resident in one of the 17 wholly included municipalities north of the Arctic Circle. To account for local variations, the municipalities were grouped into five regions, based partly on cultural
variations and partly on location and population size (cf. Figure 2 in Paper II and Figure 2 in Paper III). The SAMINOR study obtained data on gender, age and municipality from the Norwegian Central Population Register. Data on ethnicity and a range of aspects of health and living conditions were obtained through the questionnaires (cf. Appendix G). Studies II and III utilized data on ethnicity and length of education. In addition, Study II utilized data on household income and self-rated health. The Sámi (and other) ethnicity questions were:

- What language do/did you, your parents and grandparents use at home?
- What is your, your father's and your mother's ethnic background?
- What do you consider yourself to be?

For all questions, one or more boxes could be ticked for the options 'Norwegian', 'Sámi', 'Kven' and 'Other, please describe'. The responses about language were to be specified for each parent and grandparent (cf. Appendix G). In this thesis, the responses are categorized as 'Yes' to Sámi when the Sámi option was ticked, either alone or combined with one or more other options.

Study III included 14,797 SAMINOR participants who fulfilled the criteria on age and home municipality and who had also answered at least one of the questions about ethnicity in the SAMINOR questionnaire (for Study II, see below).

4.1.3 Norway's 1970 Census (Paper II)

In Study II the answers about Sámi ethnicity in the SAMINOR study were compared with responses from the same persons in Norway's 1970 census (cf. Chapter 2.3.2). This was made possible by linking the data from the SAMINOR study with the answers to the questions on Sámi ethnicity in the 1970 census, and also with information about the participants' home municipality in 1970. The linking of the data was accomplished by Statistics Norway on behalf of the Centre for Sámi Health Research. The Norwegian unique personal identification number was used as linkage and then removed to anonymize the data. The Sámi ethnicity questions in the 1970 census were:

1) Was Sámi the first language spoken by the person?
2) Was Sámi the first language spoken by one of the person's parents?
3) Was Sámi the first language spoken by one of the person's grandparents?
4) Does the person consider him/herself to be a Sámi?
The answers could be 'Yes' or 'No', with 'Don't know' as an alternative in Questions 2 and 3 and 'Uncertain' or 'Do not wish to answer' in Question 4. Parents or guardians were to determine whether children under 15 should be considered as Sámi (cf. Appendix B). In Study II, four possible outcomes were defined for the comparison of the responses about Sámi ethnicity in the SAMINOR study with the answers in the 1970 census: 'Stable yes', 'Stable no', 'New yes' and 'New no'.

Study II included 10,541 SAMINOR participants who fulfilled the criteria on age and home municipality, had returned the SAMINOR questionnaire including the ethnicity questions, and, also, responded to at least one of the Sámi ethnicity questions in Norway's 1970 census.

4.2 Statistical analyses

In Study I the numerical analyses were performed using Excel. In Studies II and III the statistical analyses were performed in STATA, version 12. The analyses are described in each paper. In general, frequency tables were used for descriptive analysis, while for other analyses, logistic regression was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) with corresponding 95 per cent confidence intervals.

4.3 Ethical aspects

The SAMINOR study was approved by the Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics, Northern Norway (REK North). A Sámi consultant participated in the review of the application. Permission for retention of personal data was provided by the Norwegian Data Inspectorate. All invitees were informed of and asked to consent to subsequent linkage to various health and administrative registers, including census data (cf. Appendix G). All study participants gave their consent. The linking of SAMINOR data with the census data was approved by REK North. Beyond this, in contrast to many other indigenous peoples, the Sámi in Norway have discussed but not (yet) adopted specific guidelines or procedures for research involving Sámi participants (Porsanger 2008).

In the present thesis, some ethical aspects regarding research involving indigenous peoples is in itself a topic, especially in Chapter 6.3.
5. Summary of results

*Paper I*

- The growth of the Sámediggi electoral roll in Norway of about 150 per cent from 1989 to 2009 was distributed in ways that altered the electoral roll's geographic profile somewhat – from north to south, and from rural to urban municipalities. The two municipalities with the highest number of enrolled in both 1989 and 2009 had their total share of the electoral roll reduced from 40 to 20 per cent.

- For certain selected municipalities, calculations showed large variations in the relation between the numbers of enrolled in the Sámediggi electoral roll in 2009 and the number of persons entitled to vote in the parliamentary election the same year; from less than 1 per cent to about 70 per cent. The concept of *Sámi political density* was launched as a possible term for the calculated relation.

- Local features of the Sámediggi electoral roll related to local trends in election turnout indicate that for some persons, enrolment might serve primarily as a marking of Sámi affiliation; to enrol is to recognize and publicly show/declare Sami ancestry – one lets oneself be officially “counted in” as Sámi, but active participation in the Sámediggi elections is (apparently) of lesser importance.

- Other reasons for the increased number of enrolled might be that a) more people have a positive view of the Sámediggi as an institution, that b) fewer are sceptical towards of the recording of Sámi ethnicity in a public registry, and c) that more people self-identify as Sámi – perhaps due to d) increased openness about having a Sámi linguistic connection in their family history.

- In the absence of relevant demographic data, it is not possible to calculate the proportion of those who have actually enrolled in the Sámediggi electoral roll, relative to those who potentially meet the (current) criteria for enrolment.
The study combined replies about Sámi ethnicity given by the same individuals in Norway's 1970 census and in the population-based SAMINOR study in 2003/2004, in order to compare self-reported Sámi ethnicity at two points in time that encompass a period when the effects of a longstanding assimilation policy gradually lost ground in favour of upcoming Sámi revitalization. The results showed that self-reported Sámi ethnicity – measured as a) Sámi as home language in each of three generations and b) the respondent's self-identification as Sámi – has remained generally stable, but some changes were observed.

For the questions about Sami language, the share of 'Stable yes', 'New yes' and 'New no' replies represented about 32, 11 and 7 per cent for the grandparent language, about 27, 6, and 4 per cent for the parent language, and 19, 4 and 1 per cent for the respondent's own language, respectively.

For the question about self-identification as Sámi, the share of 'Stable yes' replies represented 17 per cent, while the 'New yes' and 'New no' represented 9 and 5 per cent, respectively. The number of 'Yes' replies in the SAMINOR study in 2003/2004 represented an increase of 34 per cent gross and 24 per cent net compared with the 1970 census data.

Changed reporting of self-identification as Sámi was significantly associated with changed reporting of Sámi language for the parents and grandparents.

Compared to the 'Stable yes' replies there was increased odds for 'New yes' replies about self-identification as Sámi among participants with commenced college/university studies (OR 1.70, CI 1.25–2.31) and among participants with multi-ethnic self-identification (OR 5.51, CI 4.40–6.92).

As a whole, the observed intra-generational ethnic mobility in this sample indicates that stability and change of self-reported Sámi ethnicity reflect interplays between societal and individual of factors.
The study utilized Norway's Sámi Act as a starting point to define various Sámi ethnicity measures, in order to explore numerical consequences of applying different Sámi inclusion criteria in population-based studies. Four partially overlapping measures were derived, one geographically based – 'Resident in the Language area' (G1), and three individually based; –'Sámi linguistic connection' (I1), 'Self-identification as Sámi' (I2), and 'Sámi as active language' (I3). By using data from the SAMINOR study in 2003/2004 – restricted to 17 wholly included municipalities north of the Arctic Circle – the four suggested measures were used to establish four Sámi example populations.

The geographically based population constituted 38 per cent of the sample and included about 40 per cent self-reported non-Sámi.

The three individually based populations varied significantly with respect to size. About 36 per cent of the sample reported the Sámi linguistic connection, while 18 per cent reported Sami as active language. About 21 per cent reported self-identification as Sámi; numerically this population corresponded to about 60 per cent of the number reporting Sámi linguistic connection. The three populations had considerably different geographical distribution related to five regions defined for this study.

The testing of how the Sami example populations appeared relative to the respective non-Sámi ones, showed some but modest effect of inclusion criteria for the three measures education, household income and self-reported health, respectively.

Taken together, in this sample the choice of Sami inclusion criteria had a clear impact on the defined populations' size and geographical distribution, but less influence when comparing certain living conditions in the Sámi population and the remaining population in the same area.
6. Discussion

Knowledge on patterns in the health and living conditions of populations is commonly regarded as a significant factor in and for modern states and should therefore have the highest possible credibility: “Much of health policy is planned and designed on the basis of epidemiological knowledge”, and it is therefore “[...] essential that such studies have high quality and that the population has confidence in this type of research activity” (NOU 2005: 1:29). While discussing what may motivate states to produce knowledge on the health and living conditions of specified populations (see e.g. Augestad 2005; Bore 2007; Skolbekken 2010; Biruk 2012; O'Campo & Dunn 2012) will be beyond the concerns of this thesis, it is a main concern that the ambitions of high quality and confidence on the part of the population should also apply to knowledge that involves Norway’s Sámi population. In turn, this is conditioned by knowledge on and understanding of the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable.

According to Brown and Langer (2010), challenges pertaining to the use of ethnicity as a variable in general were until quite recently “[...] insufficiently acknowledged and addressed in most quantitative studies focusing on implications of ethnic diversity on different social and economic outcomes” (p. 414). According to Rughinis (2011), addressing such challenges has been more common in health-related quantitative studies (see e.g. Hahn & Stroup 1994; Senior & Bhopal 1994), but the attention appears to be increasing even here (see e.g. Ramirez et al. 2005 on social differences in health; Møllersen & Holte 2008 on psychology; Lee 2009 and Kanakamedala & Haga 2012 on biomedicine; Ford & Harawa 2010 on social epidemiology; Hunt & Megyesi 2008 and Ali-Kahn et al. 2011 on genetics). Some scholars are especially concerned with the accessibility and quality of ethnicity data (see e.g. Sandefur, Campell & Eggerling-Boeck 2004 on the health of elderly people in the USA; Fremantle et al. 2008 on the health of indigenous children in Australia; Minore, Katt & Hill 2009 on the health of indigenous peoples in Ontario; Varcoe et al. 2009 on clinical contexts in Canada; Cormack & McLeod 2010 on the health sector in Aotearoa New Zealand; Kaneshiro et al. 2011 on health research on Hawai’i; Mathur, Grundy & Smeeth 2013 on primary health in the UK).

Questioning of the relationship between the concepts of ethnicity and race is a topic in particular. According to Afshari & Bhopal (2010), ethnicity has become more common than race in health-related academic articles in recent years – especially by way of the compounding of ethnicity and race. At the same time, it has been claimed that this shift is “[...] useless unless it is accompanied by a theoretical understanding of what race and
ethnicity are as concepts related to human diversity” (Moubarac 2013:113; see also Kaufman & Cooper 2001; Duster 2006).

A main reason for this increasing attention devoted to ethnicity as a variable is most likely that a growing number of states and local communities are becoming (increasingly) more ethnically complex; increasing (trans)national migration leads to the presence of additional ethnic groups, which in turn may give rise to a greater number of ethnically mixed families that cause more people to (self-)identify with more than one ethnic group (see e.g. Snipp 2002; Callister et al. 2007; Kjeldstadli 2008). In some states, an increased focus on ethnicity may be related to the facilitation of options to select a multi-ethnic affiliation in censuses (see e.g. United Nations 2008; Gullickson & Morning 2011; Thompson 2012). More specifically, it may be significant that genetics and bioinformatics have gained a strong position in studies of human variation at the population level, and this may have caused the (potential) relationships between biology and the socially constructed categories of ethnicity and race to become a frequent – and controversial – topic on scientific as well as public agendas (see e.g. van Baren-Nawrocka 2013); not least with regard to assessments of indigenous ancestry (see e.g. Tallbear 2009; Reardon 2011; Liu 2012). Most likely, however, the attention devoted to ethnicity as affiliation with indigenous peoples has been made relevant by the fact that the rights and living conditions of indigenous peoples have become a topic on the global agenda as well as within individual states (United Nations 2004, Bartlett et al. 2007; Stavenhagen 2009). This thesis is a Sámi example from Norway in this respect.

The discussion in this chapter stems from an argument that was launched by Peter A. Senior and Raj Bhopal as early as 1994, saying that while epidemiological studies typically involve a number of factors that are not easily measurable, the phenomenon of ethnicity is unusual because “[…] it suffers from the problem of measurement error, together with heterogeneity of the measured populations, and the additional complexity of cross-cultural research” (Senior & Bhopal 1994:29, italics added). Seen as a whole, Papers I-III focus mainly on aspects of the former of these factors: measurement of Sámi ethnicity (measurement error). This chapter will also address the two other factors explicitly. The chapter starts by comparing and elaborating key results from Papers I-III. The next two sections will discuss internal Sámi variation(heterogeneity) and the study of ethnically defined populations (cross-cultural research) respectively. The fourth section discusses the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable more specifically related to studies that aim to generate quantitative knowledge about health
and living conditions at the population level in contemporary Norway. The chapter ends with some reflections on the strengths and limitations of the thesis.

6.1 Operationalization of the Sámi presence in Norway

In questions pertaining to Sámi rights it may be sufficient to refer to how a Sámi presence in an area is a historic fact: that the state of Norway is based on the territory of two peoples – Sámi and Norwegians (see e.g. Smith ed. 2005; Ravna 2012). In other contexts it will be necessary to operationalize the Sámi presence more specifically: Sámi ethnicity must be measured. Production of quantitative knowledge that includes the health and living conditions of the Sámi people is one such context.

As an ethnic group and indigenous people, the Sámi are historically associated with the so-called Sápmi area. However, Sápmi has never constituted a formalized unit with distinct borders (Niemi 1997; Eriksson 2002) and the area has also long been inhabited by people other than the Sámi (Hansen and Olsen 2004). The relationship to the Sápmi area alone can therefore not be used as a basis for operationalizing the Sámi as a distinct demographic unit. A concern in and for Papers I-III is that while the Sámi on the one hand are officially recognized as a separate ethnos whose language, culture and social life shall be protected and developed, longstanding inter-ethnic interaction combined with (the legacy of) assimilation policies have contributed to blurring Sámi ethnic boundaries at the group and individual level. This notwithstanding, the Sámi presence in Norway is de facto operationalized in some contexts – partly with the aid of individually based and partly via geographical approaches. At the same time, Norwegian policy with regard to ethnicity data provides the framework for how Sámi affiliation can be presented and explored numerically. Both these factors constitute key premises for the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable in, for example, studies of health and living conditions in Norway.

6.1.1 Individually based approaches

Individually based approaches to the Sámi presence can include objective measures (based on ancestry) of a connection to Sámi language, as well as subjective measures of self-identification as Sámi. The (current) criteria for enrollment in the Sámediggi electoral roll take into account a connection to the Sámi language through up to four generations. Sámi
ethnicity measured as ‘Connection to Sámi language’ (alternatively phrased: ‘Sámi linguistic connection’) may thus encompass a connection to a minimum of one and a maximum of fifteen Sámi speakers in a family tree. The measure of ‘Self-identification as Sámi’ may include persons for whom such an identification is self-evident as well as others for whom it is less distinct. Such identifications may also be combined with other ethnic identifications (cf. Paper II). Although the wording of the criteria for enrollment in the Sámediggi electoral roll indicates – and implies – that self-identification as Sámi will be based on a connection to Sámi language in recent family history, it remains a fact that a connection to the Sámi language does not automatically convert into self-identification as Sámi (cf. Paper III, Table I, and Paper II, Table 1).

‘Self-identification as Sámi’ stands out as the most complex and challenging measure of Sámi ethnicity. Ethnic (self-)identification is typically interwoven with individual life stories that are part of a cultural life context (Oskal 2003). For some, this can be an unproblematic or unobtrusive aspect of life, while for others this may involve serious ethical and existential issues, regarding “[...] the life one has lived and the life one wants to live, who one is and who one wants to be” (Oskal 2003:325). In democratic states that are governed by law, each individual must answer such questions; nobody can answer on someone else’s behalf, and a lack of tolerance for the answers given will “[...] represent a moralization over the answers of others” (Oskal 2003:328). A “true” answer to the question of self-identification as Sámi will thus be the answer that a person has at any one time. Whether this answer will be reported will depend on how this person perceives the conditions for answering in one way or another (cf. Paper II).

Changes over time
All individually based measures of Sámi ethnicity may capture different persons at different times. This can happen “indirectly” through a change in definitions, such as when the language criteria for enrollment in the Sámediggi electoral roll were extended from three to four generations (cf. Paper I). More commonly, however, this change takes place within the individual – either substantially or in the form in which ethnic affiliation is reported and manifests itself in various contexts. Paper I suggests that one reason for the growth in the Sámediggi electoral roll is that a growing number of persons declared themselves to be Sámi during this period. Paper II shows de facto that the number of affirmative answers to self-identification as Sámi grew by a gross percentage of 34 and a net percentage of 24 when the
responses from the SAMINOR study were compared to responses from the same persons in the 1970 census. Similar changes were found in the responses regarding language use.

**Variations in ethnic “thickness”**

While countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand have practised and partly continue to practise measurement of affiliation with indigenous peoples in the form of “proportions” or “blood quantum” (see e.g. Snipp 2002; Kukutai 2011a; Gover 2010; Tallbear 2011), this is not the case in contemporary Norway, official Sámi contexts included. Not least, it is essential that the right to be included in the Sámediggi electoral roll is not linked to total language background; having at least one person within a certain number of generations in your family history who has or has had Sámi as his/her home language is sufficient. The fact remains, however, that the individually based measures of Sámi ethnicity used in this thesis are able to capture persons with varying degrees of what can be termed ethnic “thickness”. This is not an established concept, but it is intended to indicate that this type of ethnicity measure is not unambiguous, nor can it be. The measure ‘Connection to Sámi language’ may capture persons who have a varying number of Sámi speakers in their family history as well as a varying generational proximity to an active use of the language. At the same time, the measure ‘Sámi as an active language’ may in itself have varying “thickness”; language competence may vary from fluent written and oral command to knowing “a little”. Moreover, it varies whether a given language is the only language that a person will master at different times in life. The measure ‘Self-identification as Sámi’ may capture individuals who identify with a varying number of ethnic groups and with a varying degree of (reported) ethnic stability through time and space (cf. Paper II). On the whole, persons with an identical ethnic Sámi language connection may have differing ethnic (self-)identifications, and vice versa, people who self-identify as Sámi may have widely different connections to the Sámi language.

### 6.1.2 Geographically based approaches

Geographical approaches to the Sámi presence in Norway are based on various types of knowledge on how the population in some areas traditionally has (had) an especially large proportion of people with Sámi ethnic affiliation. Thus, these areas have a high **Sámi ethnic density** (see e.g. Bécares 2009 for a general introduction to the concept of ethnic density). Differences in Sámi ethnic density have over time been used as an argument in favour of
various area-specific interventions or schemes. An early example is provided by the so-called Sámi Committee of 1956, which argued that in order for the Sámi language to have an opportunity to continue to exist, it had to be “[...] linked to a Sámi core area in which the Sámi constitute a definitive majority” (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1959:32, italics added). According to the committee, this was the case at the time in the municipalities of Kautokeino, Karasjok, Polmak (now part of Tana municipality), Tana, Nesseby and Kistrand (now part of Porsanger municipality). The proposal for a Sámi core area was not followed up, although many Sámi-related programmes and institutions have over time been located in one or more of these municipalities (NOU 2008: 5, Ch. 6.4). In addition, the concept of core area seems to have become an established term.

A later example of a geographical approach was the distribution of the separate form containing the 1970 census Sámi ethnicity questions in only 45 selected rural municipalities north of the Arctic Circle (cf. Paper II, see Appendix C for a specified overview). The administrative area for Sámi language is an even more recent example; this area originally consisted of six municipalities and currently includes ten (cf. Paper III). Another example is provided by the area encompassed by the STN scheme, which is also used as basis for geographically based Sámi statistics (originally five municipalities, today 21 municipalities and 10 sub-municipalities; cf. Chapter 2.3.2 and Appendices D and E). Moreover, when the formalized consultations between government authorities and the Sámediggi address issues that impinge on the material basis for culture – such as land-use issues, land incursions and land rights – the area of applicability is defined as the four counties of Finnmark, Troms, Nordland and Nord-Trøndelag, as well as thirteen municipalities in Sør-Trøndelag county, five in Hedmark county and two in Møre og Romsdal county (Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet 2005). The areas that are included in geographical approaches to the Sámi presence in Norway are thus far from given a priori.

When the SAMINOR study was being planned, its intention was to encompass municipalities in which at least five per cent of the population had reported to have at least one Sámi-speaking grandparent in the 1970 census (Lund et al. 2007). However, other concerns were also taken into consideration. The final area of study included parts of the South Sámi settlement area and excluded some of the 26 municipalities that were eligible on the basis of the 1970 census (ibid). Table 6 provides an overview of the 26 eligible municipalities and those that were actually included. The table presents the Sámi ethnic density of each
municipality according to the primary inclusion criterion of the SAMINOR study. In addition, the table identifies the municipalities that a) were included in the language area north of the Arctic Circle as of 2012 and 1990 when the scheme was established, and b) were included in the STN area as of 2014 and 1975 when the Sámi Development Fund was established (cf. Chapter 2.3.2). By showing the difference between two points in time, the table implicitly demonstrates that both the a) and b) areas have changed over time. In addition, the table demonstrates that both the language area and the STN area include municipalities that as of 1970 had quite markedly different Sámi ethnic densities when Sámi ethnic density is measured as having at least one Sámi-speaking grandparent.
Table 6.1 Municipalities included in various geographical approaches to Sámi ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible and included municipalities, the SAMINOR study (number of census tracts for the 1970 census if not all were included)</th>
<th>Proportion reporting to have at least one Sámi-speaking grandparent in the 1970 census</th>
<th>Region of residence in Papers II and III / County for those included in the SAMINOR study</th>
<th>Included in the language area north of the Arctic Circle as of 2012 (included as of 1990)</th>
<th>Included in the STN area as of 2014* (included in the SUF area as of 1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kautokeino</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>1 / Finnmark</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karasjok</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>1 / Finnmark</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesseby</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>2 / Finnmark</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>2 / Finnmark</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kåfjord</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>2 / Troms</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porsanger</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>2 / Finnmark</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvalsund</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>3 / Finnmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storfjord (8/9)</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>3 / Troms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebesby</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>3 / Finnmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skånland (6/15)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4 / Troms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvenangen</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3 / Troms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Måsøy</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasvik</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenes</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4 / Nordland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sørøysund **</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerfest **</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamvik</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loppa</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3 / Finnmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sør-Varanger (17/18)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlevåg</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadsø</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tysfjord (12/13)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4 / Nordland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavangen ***</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4 / Troms</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salangen (13/19)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordkapp</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyngen (16 / 19)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3 / Troms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5 / Finnmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Aubert 1978; the Sámi Act; Statistics Norway 2014

Indention and italics denote municipalities that were not included in the SAMINOR-study.

* STN = The Sámi Parliament’s subsidy scheme for industrial development, SUF = The Sámi Development Fund (cf. Appendix D).

** Hammerfest and Sørøysund were merged in 1992.

*** Lavangen and Salangen were merged in the years 1964–1976.

- - - The municipalities above this marker constituted the Sámi language area when this was established in 1990.

( ) The municipality was not included when the scheme was established.

x The whole municipality is included.

xx Parts of the municipality are included.
Different measures of Sámi ethnic density at different points in time

Norwegian policy regarding ethnicity data precludes any estimation of the Sámi ethnic density of given areas after 1970. Paper I therefore suggests that estimation of Sámi political density could be a pragmatic alternative. Figure 6.1 compares Sámi political density in 2009 for those 17 municipalities that constitute the area of study in Papers II and III to Sámi ethnic density measured in terms of grandparental language in the 1970 census, cf. Table 6.1 above. The objective is to indicate what the situation looks like today when compared to 1970; despite the fundamental difference between the two measures, they both represent complete sets of registry data, each in their own way.

Figure 6.1 Two measures of Sámi ethnic density (percentages) at two points in time in 17 municipalities north of the Arctic Circle, based on the Norwegian census of 1970* and the 1990 Sámediggi electoral roll, respectively**

![Graph showing comparison of Sámi ethnic density measures](image)

Sources: Aubert 1978; Pettersen 2010; Paper I, Table 2.
* 1970: Proportion reporting to have at least one Sámi-speaking grandparent.
( ) Proportion of census tracts included, if not all districts were included in the 1970 census.
# Lavangen was merged with Salangen during the period 1964–1976.
The figure illustrates primarily how both measures vary between the 17 municipalities, and secondly that the same municipalities are “at the top” at both times, i.e. those six that originally were defined as the Sámi language area (cf. Paper III). Their sequence varies somewhat, however. In sum, the figure illustrates that according to these two measures, no major changes have occurred with regard to which municipalities on these grounds stand out in terms of a geographical approach to the Sámi presence.

Different measures of Sámi ethnic density at the same point in time

Paper III describes how the choice of an individually based measure of Sámi ethnicity has different effects in the five regions that have been defined for this study (cf. Paper III, Table 1). Figure 6.2 illustrates how the three measures ‘Connection to Sámi language’, ‘Self-identification as Sámi’ and ‘Sami as an active language’ (labelled I1, I2 and I3 in Paper III) have a minor effect on the sample populations in Region 1 and a little more in Region 5. In the three remaining regions, the choice of measure has a material effect. The difference between Regions 1 and 2 is especially prominent, i.e. between the central and peripheral parts of the language area that was defined originally.
Changes in the geographical distribution of the Sámi population

While the Sámi data in the 1970 census encompassed only selected rural areas in the North, the Sámediggi electoral roll includes the entire country. Paper I identifies a shift in the geographical distribution of this electoral roll from 1989 to 2009; from rural to urban municipalities and from the North to the South. These shifts can partly be explained by changes in how individuals assess and report their ethnicity (cf. Paper II), but may also reflect actual changes in the areas where people with a Sámi affiliation are settled. The latter assumption is supported by the recent documentation of relatively significant long-term out-migration from rural Sámi municipalities to urban regions in the North and South (Sørlie & Broderstad 2011). Both these forms of change imply that a geographical approach to the Sámi presence may capture varying proportions of a specified Sámi population at different points in time. Table 6.2 shows two examples in this respect, on the basis of the development of the Sámediggi electoral roll.
Table 6.2 The Sámediggi electoral roll as of 1989, 2001 and 2009, nationwide, in 17 municipalities included in the SAMINOR area of study as well as in 6 municipalities that constituted the Sámi language area in 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>5,505</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,921</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13,890</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area 2003/2004 (17 mun.)</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language area as of 1990 (6 mun.)</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hætta 1992; Hætta 2002; Pettersen 2010

In 1989, approximately 73 per cent of those included in the Sámediggi electoral roll were resident in one of the 17 municipalities that constitute the area of study in Papers II and III. By 2009 this proportion had decreased to 54 per cent. Specified to regions 1 and 2 in Papers II and III, i.e. those six municipalities that constituted the original language area, the proportion of those included in the electoral roll decreased from 61 per cent in 1989 to 37 per cent in 2009. The latter observation is of particular interest, because these six municipalities are virtually identical to the area that the so-called Sámi Committee proposed as a Sámi core area (cf. above). Although such an area was never formalized, many Sámi-related schemes and institutions have been located in exactly these municipalities over the years – thus probably contributing to reinforce their profile as (the) “Sámi” municipalities (NOU 2008: 5, Ch. 6.4).

6.1.3 Approaches to Sámi ethnicity data

Papers I-III describe how Norway since the Second World War has adhered to a policy of not recording the ethnicity of its citizens in censuses (cf. also Chapters 2.2.2 and 2.3.2). Internally in Statistics Norway there is “[...] considerable opposition to ethnic mapping, and with regard to Norwegian statistics there is no legislative basis for this” (Østby 2001:6f). At the same time, information on country of birth – which is routinely registered in Norway’s central population registry – is in many cases treated as a proxy for ethnicity, not only in official statistics (Østby 2001; Dzamarija 2014), but also in public documents (Djuve, Kavli & Tronstad 2011) and also in, for example, health-related studies (Jennum 2009; Abebe 2010).

In has been claimed that Norway, which in the European context is a long, narrow and sparsely populated country, has an especially strong tradition for emphasizing geographical
dimensions; not only regional variations in general, but also distinctions between the centre and the periphery (Sørlie 2010). Combined with the fact that geography represents the “classic” approach in studies of living conditions (Melinder & Schærstrøm 2005; Bråthen et al. 2007; Sund & Jørgensen 2009), this may be one reason why the first contemporary numerically based descriptions of the living conditions of the Sámi in Norway was based on exactly this kind of approach; the geographical. The occasion was Report No. 50 (1998-1999) to the Storting – *The Equality Report. On distribution of income and living conditions in Norway (Utjânningsmeldinga. Om fordeling av inntekt og levekår i Norge* in Norwegian) and the area concerned was the then SUF area (cf. Chapter 2.3.2). At the time, such data had to be ordered specifically, but once Statistics Norway initiated regular production of geographically based Sámi statistics in 2006 (cf. Chapter 2.3.2) they became more easily available in practical as well as financial terms. Statistics Norway underscores, however, that such statistics are not “real” ethnicity data; the statistics pertain to areas, and the agency has no knowledge of which individuals are or consider themselves to be Sámi. Statistics Norway is “[...] unable to draw any conclusions regarding health or living conditions in the Sámi population as such, only for those who reside in the Sámi core areas” (Ekern 2008:19, italics added).

The difference between geographically based and individually based approaches to the Sámi presence in Norway is underscored by the fact that the Personal Information Act (*personopplysningsloven* in Norwegian) defines information on “racial or ethnic background” as sensitive (Section 2-8a). Since information on ethnic affiliation – including language preferences – is not routinely registered in health-related administrative systems, this in turn entails consequences for institutional and official statistics as well as for access to data in health-related research.

In light of Norwegian policy on ethnicity data, the Sámediggi electoral roll represents an exception. It is worth noting that even though the Sámi questions in the 1970 census (Paper II) as well as the establishment of the Sámediggi and its electoral roll (Paper I) came as a result of the efforts of Sámi organizations, there has also been Sámi resistance against and ambivalence with regard to the registration of Sámi ethnic affiliation. Not all Sámi individuals and organizations were in favour of the idea of a separate electoral roll, and some Sámi have been suspicious of statistics enumerating those who are Sámi or Sámi-speaking because it is
remains burdensome to “[…] be assigned to a group that for centuries has been branded and gradually also perceived as a cultural and economic low-status group” (Magga 2003:235).

In 2001, the Sámediggi electoral roll was incorporated into Norway’s central population registry. Technically it is thus fairly simple to link the electoral roll to other national collections of data, including Norway’s numerous health registries (Folkehelseinstituttet 2009). However, this and other types of access to the electoral roll can only be granted to researchers for scientific purposes and with the consent of the Sámi Parliament. (cf. Section 81 of the Regulations for elections to the Sámi Parliament).

Since its establishment in 2001, The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues has emphasized that in order to document and fully understand the actual and relative situation of indigenous peoples, there must be access to adequate and quality-assured statistical data (United Nations 2004; United Nations 2009). Internationally, however, the situation remains that “[s]urprisingly, in most countries such information is lacking”; it is “[…] amazing how little information about the actual situation and condition of indigenous populations public officials in many countries possess” (Stavenhagen 2009:361f). Seen as a whole, the latter statement seems to be descriptive of Norway as well.

### 6.1.4 An analytical framework

An operationalization of the Sámi presence in Norway with the use of the connection to Sámi language as an ethnic “basis” can be summarized in an analytical framework for ethnically defined Sámi populations (Figure 6.3). The figure has been developed from the schematic populations in Figure 1, Paper I, and can also be related to the sample populations in Figure 3, Paper III.
By using the outermost of the solid circles as a starting point, the figure illustrates the following situation: in Norway there are a number of individuals who de facto have at least one connection to Sámi language in their family tree. These individuals constitute the theoretical population P0. In the population P0, there is at any time a proportion who know that they have a connection to Sámi language. This proportion constitutes population P1, here restricted to four generations in conformity with the prevailing language criterion for enrollment in the Sámediggi electoral roll – symbolized by the four rectangles s1–s4.

Membership in population P1 can thus be based on a connection to at a minimum of one and a maximum of fifteen persons with Sámi as their home language – the person him-/herself (s1), two parents (s2), four grandparents (s3) and eight great-grandparents (s4), which indicates a potentially large variation in Sámi ethnic “thickness” when this is defined as various combinations of connections to Sámi language (cf. above). Among the persons in the figure’s population P1, there will at any time be a certain number who define themselves as Sámi; these account for population P2. The innermost circle, P3, encompasses those who are at least
18 years old and have chosen to register in the Sámediggi electoral roll. Each of the individually based populations P0, P1, P2 and P4 can theoretically be specified for the entire country or for a selected geographical area.

The dotted outermost oval (Pg) symbolizes different geographically based Sámi populations. Membership in such a population follows from being resident in a given area X that a given actor/institution at a specific time and in a specific context has defined or categorized as Sámi. The areas encompassed will vary, and the areas can be widely different in terms of so-called Sámi ethnic density – to the extent that this is measurable (cf. Chapter 6.1.2).

The situation with regard to Sámi ethnicity data in Norway implies that the Sámediggi electoral roll (P3) is the only individually based Sámi population that remains formally identifiable and quantifiable at all times. As demonstrated in Papers I-II, (reported) affiliations to individually based Sámi populations may vary over time. With regard to geographically based Sámi populations (Pg), their membership and population size can be inferred from address data in Norway’s central population registry. Such populations change through demographic events such as migration, births and deaths.

### 6.2 Internal Sámi variation

The approaches to Sámi presence presented above share the feature that they are all concerned with external relationships, with the ethnic boundary between the Sámi and the non-Sámi. Senior and Bhopal (1994) are not alone in pointing out that studies that involve ethnic groups may be challenged by and have a tendency to disregard internal variation. For example, Kennedy and Hall (2006:124) have argued that “[o]ften, ethnic groupings used for research and policy formulation are very broad and fail to take into account within-group differences”.

The ability of studies that use ethnicity as a variable to address intra-ethnic heterogeneity could be of particular importance for groups that often experience partly essentialization and stereotypes and partly stigmatization. These include indigenous peoples that are often exposed to external – and occasionally internal – expectations and conformist demands of “[...] being an indigenous people in a pre-determined way” (Oskal 2003:335, see also Paradies 2006;

---

3 It is recognized that persons may self-identify as Sámi without fulfilling the language criterion in the Sámediggi electoral roll, but this issue is not a topic here.

Paper I emphasizes that the establishment of the Sámediggi as a representative Sámi body was (also) an institutionalization of the right to individual differentness and internal disagreement as Sámi. While Sámi unity and pan-Sámi community are emphasized (Smith 2006), drawing attention to exactly this internal Sámi variation has also become more common – in Norway often referred to as Sámi diversity (St.meld. nr. 28 (2007-2008); Solbakk & Solbakk 2013). This term refers in particular to the various Sámi language areas, but the distinction between coastal and inland areas also appears to be attracting more attention (Eyþórsson 2008; NOU 2008:5; Nilsen 2009). The same applies to Sámi who are resident in urban areas, who occasionally are referred to as “city Sámi” (Dankertsen 2006; Gjerpe 2013; Pedersen & Nyseth 2013). Whether the Sámi who are resident to the south of the Sápmi area should be understood as a separate group is not self-evident, but their proportion in the Sámediggi electoral roll has increased (cf. Paper I) and in several elections to the Sámediggi there have been lists entered on the basis of this geographical dimension (Pettersen 2011a). The latter observation indicates a Sámi community of interest in this respect.

Combined with the various forms and degrees of “thickness” in Sámi ethnicity as it has been described above, the Sámi diversity implies a considerable potential for variation in the experiences of individuals qua Sámi. At the same time, such experiences will necessarily vary because of general demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and ways of life, including individual life histories and lifestyles. Not least, considerable generational differences have been documented with regard to attitudes to how to “be” Sámi (see e.g. Stordahl 1997; Sivertsen 2009; Høgmo 2011; Blix, Hamran & Normann 2012). At the individual level, (potential) Sámi may have a wide range of experiences and preferences, and at the collective level, groups of (potential) Sámi may have different – and sometimes contradictory – interests. The extent to which and the contexts and ways in which the ethnic dimension has importance for the life of each individual must be investigated empirically, not assumed a priori (Stordahl 1998). Taking this internal Sámi variation into account means recognizing that “[...] there is no single Sámi way of being, nor is the challenge to identify a Sámi way of being which is the Sámi way of being” (Oskal 2003:333). According to Oskal (2003:335), approaches based on “[i]deas of a ranking list for Sámi-ness” that implicitly presume an idea of “The Genuine Sámi” may conceal rather than provide insight into empirical conditions.
6.2.1 Intersectionality

In recent years it has become increasingly common to emphasize the importance of simultaneous affiliations of individuals to social categories that may be unequally privileged; so-called categories of difference. Ethnicity/race is one such category, gender and social position are others. The main point is that to regard, for example, the category of Sámi and the category of women separately may result in a marginalization of experiences that stem from being both at the same time, i.e. from being a Sámi woman. Inspired by feminist research it has become more and more common in recent years to use the concept of intersectionality about understandings that emphasize the interwoven nature and mutual interaction between social categories (see e.g. Hancock 2007; see Gressgård 2013 and Gullikstad 2013 for informative, updated summaries in Norwegian). The increasing popularity of this concept – almost a buzzword some claim (Davis 2008) – has led some scholars to point out, firstly, a risk of an implicit essentialization of each single category, secondly that the concept may challenge traditional identity politics, and thirdly that there is nothing new in recognizing that affiliations are interwoven. What could be a point, however, is to operationalize this recognition in a way that helps provide new (change-oriented) insight (see e.g. McCall 2005; Veenstra 2011; Hancock 2012; Anthias 2013).

6.3 Studying ethnically defined populations

The point made by Senior and Bhopal (1994) that researchers who use ethnicity as a variable in their studies need to be aware of complexity related to “cross-cultural research” is based on the recognition that so-called ethnocentrism – i.e. using one’s own ethnic group (unconsciously) as a standard for assessment of all ethnic groups – may have an effect on all aspects of research. Paying attention to this may prevent the researchers’ own values from resulting in investigation of, for example, the (negative) deviations of a minority from a “neutral” majority, instead of focusing on issues that represent the most widespread health problems of the minority. A method for avoiding ethnocentrism is for the researcher to reflect on and give grounds for why and how a study is implemented (Senior & Bhopal 1994; Bhopal 2009a).

While ethnocentrism as a phenomenon can be related to how classification of the surroundings is a fundamental human practice (Bowker & Star 1999), so-called eurocentrism is linked to power structures and how the global position of Europe and the West emerged historically (Hjelde 2006). A particular aspect of this emergence is that practices involving
classification of people into official categories of ethnicity or race originated in the context of conquest, colonialism and the invention of the nation-state; the ethnics were “objects” about whom the power-holders needed to obtain knowledge in order to turn them into a governable population – they were “the Other” (see e.g. Anderson 1996; Kertzer & Arel 2002; Hacking 2007). Historically this has inflicted experiences of “the supremacy of the white race” on many ethnic groups, of being treated as a subordinate minority as well as of having the status of a research object.

6.3.1 Research objects and subject positions

Negative experiences of being a research object have – not least among indigenous peoples – led to widespread scepticism of research on the one hand, but also, on the other hand, to proactive resistance in the form of alternative decolonizing methodologies and separate codes of research ethics (see e.g. Castellano 2004; Smith, L. 2005; Kuokkanen 2008; Ball & Janyst 2010; Kendall et al. 2011; Ingierd & Fossheim 2011; Tuck & Yang 2012; Graeme 2013). The aspects being emphasized include the researcher’s position in relation to the (local) community being studied and the importance of the research capacity of the indigenous peoples themselves. A main message in this context is that during the entire research process, respect and willingness for accountability must be combined with critical reflection on the part of the researcher on his or her positioning (see e.g. Nicholls 2009; Jones et al. 2013; Putt 2013). This message shares many features with the focus on situated knowledge and responsible knowledge production among feminist-oriented scholars (Haraway 1995; Rustad 1998; Kramvig 2007). At the same time, these scholars emphasize that while it is an illusion to have a view from nowhere – to be “neutral” – such partial perspectives remain of exactly such a partial nature: they are views from somewhere.

In Sámi research – which in itself is not an unambiguous term (Bull 2002) – the position of the researcher as a Sámi ethnic insider or outsider has occasionally represented a contentious issue, partly as a topic, but also as a specific conflict in research projects and at the institutional and individual level (see e.g. Otnes 2006; Kuokkanen 2008; Stordahl 2008; Evjen 2009).
6.3.2 Methodological awareness

Methodology is concerned with how research can – or should – be undertaken. According to Gobo (2011), most of the contemporary methodological knowledge is characterized by having its origin in Europe and by being embedded in Anglo-American culture. According to Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva (2008), statistical methods were originally developed by “elite white men” for purposes of numerical analysis of human differences in the form of deviations or deficiencies in “the Other”, in an era when “the West” was associated with colonial power, slavery, white supremacy and the male citizen as its norm. They argue that research using race as a variable continues to be influenced by an inherent logic that views race as an unalterable characteristic of an individual, failing to recognize that “[t]he real issue is the way the society responds to an individual's racial identification” (p. 7). Their message is that even though statistical methods today are presented as neutral and objective, it remains a fact that the social contexts of the users of these methods assist determine what statistical correlations will be explored and thus provide frameworks for interpretations of empirical issues. Bhopal (2007) has summarized that through the ages, also health-related research has partly been based on and partly promoted ethnic stigmatization and racism, demonstrating that ethnicity and race are variables that show “[…] dramatically and unequivocally, the importance of historical, political and social awareness among health researchers” (p. 19).

While the main message in de-colonizing methodologies has gained more general acceptance, some indigenous scholars have pointed out that with regard to research on indigenous peoples, these methodologies may have a restricting effect in giving pre-eminence to qualitative methods as well as in placing excessive emphasis on the degree of difference from what is defined as “Western”: on dichotomies and a pre-colonial past (see e.g. Barnes 2006; Hokowhitu 2009; Nakata 2013). The philosopher Nils Oskal (2008:344) has argued this it is impossible “[…] to justify a distinctive methodology that is supposed to guarantee an a priori tenability […]” and warns against establishment of new orthodoxies. In a recent book, Maggie Walter and Chris Andersen (2013) have argued that indigenous peoples that are embedded in the everyday life of modern nation-states must have a capacity for using the entire range of research tools to collect and analyse data that have an effect on how their social world is designed. Walter and Andersen underscore that all knowledge production – including forms based on quantitative methods – remains culturally and socially positioned. They propose a quantitative research methodology that recognizes the fact that research positions invariably
remain important and that provides an opportunity for statistical portraits of indigenous peoples, not only in order to dichotomize, aggregate and search for their deficiencies, but also to draw attention to local variations and differences within indigenous populations.

With reference to epidemiological research, Simmonds (2010) discusses and demonstrates in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand how a so-called Kaupapa Maori approach to the use of quantitative methods can provide knowledge that emphasizes the experiences and priorities of the Maori. Canada-based Cameron et al. (2010) present a framework for what they refer to as “culturally safe epidemiology”, that recognizes that rigorous epidemiological research based on quantitative methods may be necessary to draw attention to serious health issues in local indigenous communities, but seeks to avoid designs in which the “external” researchers are collectors of information and the indigenous people being investigated are regarded as mere sources of data.

6.3.3 Populations as analytical units

Bhopal (2009b) claims that despite the elementary epidemiological insight that human populations are varied and variable, and that results thereby cannot necessarily be generalized “[…] between populations, within subgroups of the same population, or within the same population at different times” (p. 6), it remains a common mistake to place insufficient emphasis on the definition of the populations to be studied and on understanding them in their proper context. Krieger (2012b) argues that when considering the key role played by populations as analytic units in the demographic sciences, surprisingly little critical thinking has been devoted to the idea of a population. Who is being studied and why? Who constitutes meaningful populations in health-related studies? Krieger argues that rather than understanding populations as statistical aggregates of the inherent characteristics of individuals, emphasis should be placed on how populations and their members are being formed by dynamic internal and external relationships. For studies to result in meaningful population averages and valid conclusions regarding causes respectively, the selection of study participants must take place “[…] in relation to the range of exposures experienced (or not) in the real-world societies” (p. 660), and must take into account that experiences are located in “[…] the real-world societies, that is, meaningful populations, of which they are a part” (p. 666). Critical thinking on populations as analytic units in epidemiological studies bears witness to a modification of the conventional distinction between internal and external validity.
Krieger’s point on populations as statistical versus substantial units is akin to the sociologist Richard Jenkins’ (2008) idea of a distinction between categories and social groups. *Social groups* are made up of persons who have such an amount of (direct or indirect) contact and in some cases also a (more or less explicit) shared goal as to provide them with a *collective identity* (although it remains an open question whether the group or the (self-)identification with it will be the first to arise). *Categories* are primarily instrumental constructions that do not presume that those who are being assigned to a category maintain social relations or share an identity (see also Eriksen, T.H. 2010). On the basis of discourses related to indigenous peoples and social justice in Australia, Tim Rowse (2012) presents a tension between the concepts of people and population. *People* is a political concept that refers to a social, collective entity: an actor endowed with rights consisting of citizens endowed with rights. *Population* is primarily a technical concept that refers to an administrative category of individuals and households in state statistics (cf. also Chapter 2.1). Rowse suggests that the concept of ‘people’ invites an emphasis on relationships and mutual responsibility between two political collectives: between indigenous peoples and states. The concept of ‘population’ opens for regarding the indigenous people primarily as a statistical entity that – in the Australian context – occasionally appears to be defined by its degree of difference, or by the size of the “gap”. Such ideas may invite an understanding that if the gap disappears, the indigenous people will disappear: assimilation has taken place (see also Kowal 2008).

According to Rowse, both people and population nevertheless remain appropriate concepts if the distinction between them is taken into account.

### 6.4 Sámi ethnicity and/in studies of patterns in health and living conditions

Papers I-III demonstrate that, and how, Sámi ethnicity is defined, understood and handled in different ways in Norway. The absence of unambiguous Sámi ethnic boundaries in time and space is in conformity with moderately constructivist understandings of ethnicity as a phenomenon (cf. Chapter 2.2.1). Cultural heritage in the form of a connection to Sámi language via the family tree constitutes a formal “ethnic base”, although establishment/maintenance of a (reported) individual Sámi affiliation measured as self-identification as Sámi may be situationally dependent. A connection to Sámi language will not necessarily be converted into self-identification as Sámi, and the likelihood for this to happen will vary in time and space and between different Sámi individuals. Furthermore, both formal definitions and individual
reporting of individually and geographically based measures of Sámi ethnicity may vary according to the context and change over time. A variation in the (reported) connection to Sámi language implies a variation in the Sámi ethnic “thickness” at the individual level and in Sámi ethnic density at the geographical level. These variations are supplemented by internal Sámi variation along ethnic as well as general dimensions (cf. Chapter 6.2).

On the one hand, some scholars argue that constructivist understandings have the consequence that ethnic affiliation becomes a matter to be explained, rather than being used for purposes of explanation (Brubaker 2002, quoted in Lynnebakke and Fangen 2011): since it is not given what ethnicity “refers to”, ethnicity is hardly suitable as an explanatory variable in studies of specific outcomes. On the other hand, it remains a general and fundamental challenge that to be able to produce any form of (quantitative) knowledge about de facto named ethnic groups and their situation, ethnicity necessarily needs to serve as a classificatory variable (see e.g. Brown and Langer 2010). The pragmatic position is that whether and how ethnicity has a potential as a variable is not given a priori, but will depend on the context and objective of each study, as well as on how each researcher throughout the stages of study – from the design to the interpretations – describes and critically assesses the selected measures of ethnicity (Bhopal 2009a). Credible epidemiological knowledge combines high scientific quality with trust on the part of those whom this knowledge concerns and describes. With regard to studies involving the Sámi population in Norway, their trustworthiness may depend on the position from which a study is undertaken (cf. Chapter 6.3), on the objective of the study as well as on an assessment of the studied population(s) as meaningful and representative.

6.4.1 Objectives

One type of objective for the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable in studies of health and living conditions is to obtain quantitative knowledge on the situation regarding health and living conditions of the Sámi – either per se or relatively in the form of similarities and dissimilarities when compared to other ethnically defined populations. Knowledge about the situation of the Sámi per se is necessary for designing policies and services for the Sámi population. Such knowledge is relevant for the authorities (St.meld. nr. 34 (2012-2013)), for the Sámi themselves with regard to (forms of) self-determination (Stavenhagen 2009; Henriksen ed. 2010) and not least for both parties in the formalized consultations between government
authorities and the Sámi Parliament, one of the purposes of which is to develop a shared understanding of the situation and development needs of Sámi communities (Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet 2005). Knowledge on the relative situation of the Sámi is also relevant for both parties, including with regard to any existing ethnically related social differences in health (St.meld. nr. 20 (2006-2007); CSDH 2008). At the same time, knowledge on the situation of the Sámi per se may be concerned with equality and equity as well as internal Sámi variation, including a possible internal Sámi health gradient (CSDH 2008; Sund & Eikemo 2011), and if so, the dimensions along which this gradient runs (see Shepherd, Li & Zubrick 2012 for a study of Australian aborigines in this respect).4

Another type of objective for using Sámi ethnicity as a variable could be to gain knowledge about a specific health/living conditions phenomenon, such as a given health issue or an (assumed) health determinant as it appears in a multi-ethnic population. In such studies, ethnicity will typically be a so-called exposure variable, often specified as a risk factor or a protective factor, which is tested by using multivariate analysis to reveal associations that can help provide an understanding or possibly explain the phenomenon being studied (Bhopal 2008).

Objectives for using ethnicity as a variable have – along with the research position – an effect on the choice of approach in epidemiological studies. According to Bhopal (2009a), a key principle should be that studies of ethnically defined populations give pre-eminence to the so-called absolute risk approach, meaning to report and compare the number of cases and ratios per population included. This is essential in order to obtain knowledge about the health and living conditions of populations per se – including, for example, their need for health services. This approach calls for data that are as representative of the population(s) as possible and thus sensitive to selection bias. It is consequently essential to avoid attrition among (invited) participants along dimensions that have a bearing on the results (Bhopal 2007). When more
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4 An aspect which is recognized but not discussed in this thesis includes issues pertaining to the use of universal/standardized versus population-specific measures of health and living conditions (see e.g. Larsen, Schweitzer & Fondahl eds. 2010; Prout 2012; Cram 2014). The same applies to the relationship between social inequality and injustice and (ethnicity-related) differences in preference, respectively (Braveman & Gruskin 2003; Herbert, Sisk & Howell 2008; Bhopal 2009a; Kowal & Paradies 2010).
than one ethnically defined population is involved, the participation per group must be sufficient to lend strength to the statistical analyses.

The so-called relative risk approach estimates the relationship between the (likelihood of) incidence of a specific phenomenon in various populations with the aid of statistical measures such as odds ratios and standardized mortality ratios. This approach – which according to Bhopal (2009a) has long remained (too) dominant in comparisons of patterns in two or more populations – calls for distinctive categories and is sensitive to information bias (Bhopal 2007). When using categorical variables – that are conditional on mutually exclusive categories – it is essential that individuals be assigned to the correct category in accordance with the research question of the study, including that identical cases are classified identically in time and space. In studies that involve ethnically defined populations it is thus crucial that systematic mis-classification is kept to a minimum.

Scholars have pointed out the necessity of being aware of how the use of absolute and relative approaches respectively under certain conditions may lead to diverging conclusions (see e.g. Elstad 2005; Sund & Eikemo 2011). When ethnically defined populations are involved, it is important to note that absolute approaches are suitable for elucidating health and living conditions within specific populations, while relative approaches are designed to elucidate differences between populations. A poorly considered use of the latter approach may cause certain challenges to attract attention because they represent “deviations”, or even worse: because they are “exotic” in the eyes of (ethnocentric) researchers (Bhopal 2007).

6.4.2 Meaningful study populations

The complexity of ethnicity as a phenomenon, including the fact that there are different kinds of ethnic groups (cf. Chapter 2.2), makes it especially challenging to critically assess what and who constitute meaningful study populations when these are defined on the basis of ethnicity. A particular aspect is that while the ethnic categorization should be as optimal as possible with regard to the topic of a given study, it should also remain as consistent as possible through time and space. The latter is especially important, since studies that estimate ethnic ratios and proportions ought to be based on approximately the same denominator of a given ethnic group within a given geographic area (see e.g. Cormack & McLoud 2010).
According to Krieger (2008; 2012b), population-based epidemiological studies should in general be based on the view that people are biological organisms as well as social beings. At the same time, it is far from given what role should be assigned to socially relevant categories – such as gender, ethnicity/race and to some extent pre-defined age groups – in this respect, despite the widespread use of such categories in some countries in particular (see e.g. Shim 2002; Epstein 2007; Bhopal 2007; Mir et al. 2012; see also the references in the introduction to this chapter). As far as ethnicity is concerned, it appears to be more common to regard this as a relevant variable for the study of situations regarding health and living conditions than for the study of health and living conditions phenomena. This discrepancy is most likely related to a general uncertainty as to whether ethnicity fundamentally speaking is suitable for purposes of explanation – not least given the more or less explicit combination of biological and social factors in epidemiology (Galea & Link 2013). This uncertainty can be reinforced by the fact that studies calling for a relative risk approach are especially sensitive to classification error.

Ethnic mis-classification nevertheless remains a challenge for all epidemiological studies that involve ethnically defined study populations – not least indigenous peoples, given the history of marginalization and (enforced) assimilation endured by these peoples (see e.g. Simmonds 2010; Haozous et al. 2013). Moreover, although ethnicity typically is treated as a categorical variable, there is an increasing acceptance for permitting reporting of multi-ethnic affiliation in censuses and research data (cf. Chapter 2.2.2). What would be a “true” or a false classification in such cases is not given a priori, especially if multiple ethnic affiliations are involved, or even various combinations of these. Several scholars have pointed out that (reported) multi-ethnicity is gradually becoming a problematic aspect not only for classification and statistical analysis, but also for interpretation of results (Snipp 2002; Liebler 2010; Kaneshiro et al. 2011). The potential for mis-classification increases further since the very definitions of ethnic boundaries do not invariably remain stable, and since (reported) ethnic (self-)identification may change over time – so-called ethnic mobility (cf. Paper II; see e.g. Carter et al. 2009; Brown et al. 2010; Robitaille, Guimond and Boucher 2010).

6.4.3 Representativeness

In order to have high data quality in population-based studies, the data need to be representative of those from whom they have been collected. To prepare for and assess
representativeness requires access to information on how the population(s) is (are) composed with regard to criteria that are relevant for the research questions (cf. Chapter 2.1.2). A study that includes all information relevant for the study about all individuals in the relevant population(s) is of a representative nature. For example, this could be the case for studies that are based on complete registry data. Most population-based studies, however, are based on a sample drawn from the population(s) for which the study sets out to draw conclusions. Representative samples are established by following certain rules and procedures for selection of participants. Drawing conclusions that are valid for others than only those who have actually been studied (statistical generalization) requires a sample in which all units have the same likelihood of being selected, so-called probability sampling (Ringdal 2007). The larger the sample, the more representative the data may become.

Because regularly updated Sámi demographic data are mainly absent in contemporary Norway, it largely remains an illusion to prepare for and assess Sámi ethnic representativeness in individually based populations. The Sámediggi electoral roll represents a partial exception, since it may serve as a specific Sámi study population as well as a technical basis for drawing samples that are de facto Sámi samples. At the same time, it remains essential that Sámi representativeness in this case refers to the Sámi population that at any time is enrolled, and not to the population that at any time is qualified for such enrolment according to the objective and the subjective criteria. As a phenomenon, Sámi representativeness is further complicated by the fact that (reported) affiliation to various Sámi populations may vary over time (cf. Papers I and II). A given Sámi sample may of course be representative with regard to a selected measure of ethnicity, especially in areas that have a high Sámi ethnic density along this dimension (cf. Chapter 6.1.2).

In this thesis, the study of the Sámediggi electoral roll (Paper I) is representative in a formal sense, since it is a registry study. The SAMINOR study (Papers II and III) was based on a sample and had a total response rate of 60 per cent, which is usually deemed acceptable for studies of this type (Lund et al. 2007). Whether this study is ethnically representative or is subject to selection bias in this respect cannot be formally assessed. The SAMINOR study was partly conducted as a survey (ibid.). In some cases, such studies may have an acceptable response rate when seen as a whole, but nevertheless fail to be representative in all their sub-analyses. The reason is that partial systematic attrition may occur if certain categories of participants fail to respond to certain questions (Elstad 2010). For example, the “tangled”
history of ethnicity as a phenomenon in society and research (cf. Chapter 6.3) may have caused some to perceive questions about ethnicity as so sensitive – or even provocative – that they have chosen not to respond to them. If so, a systematic attrition of persons who might have reported a Sámi ethnicity could lead to an ethnic selection bias. At the same time, it is conceivable that questions about ethnicity could constitute an incentive for (full) participation by persons who have an especially explicit and active relationship to Sámi issues in general and their own Sámi affiliation in particular. Attrition as well as “enthusiasm” may both be influenced by the local context, meaning that the participation could be more ethnically representative in some areas than in others.

More generally, some participants may choose not to respond to certain questions because the questions are (too) numerous or perceived as not very meaningful (ibid.). In ethnic minorities, (full) participation may be influenced by whether the study is not focused exclusively on risk factors and deviations from an assumedly “standard” population, but also on the strengths and capabilities of the minority (Cameron et al. 2010, Walter 2010). In a Sámi context, for example, the accentuation of externally inflicted, collective traumas, the so-called Sámi pain (Nergård 2011), can be counterbalanced by focusing on factors that promote resilience, such as the widespread Sámi idea of self-preservation; “birget” in Northern Sámi (Andersen, K. 2010; Bals et al. 2011). Participation can also be influenced by whether some topics are perceived as sensitive with regard to (cultural) norms. For example, a recent study suggests that some Sámi communities have a culture of not speaking directly about matters of health and illness (Bongo 2013). Provision of a questionnaire in multiple languages may help boost participation, but this effect will depend on the level of mother-tongue reading and writing skills. The latter are often deficient among Sámi speakers (Solstad et al. 2012).

Studies of ethnically defined populations may also be subject to a selection bias that is unrelated (directly) to ethnicity. In the SAMINOR study, the non-participants tended to be men, unmarried and among the youngest in the age segment included (Nystad 2010). In general, non-participation in survey-based studies tends to be socially biased (Elstad 2010). Scholars have therefore recommended that “[…] all types of health and medical research employ strategies to increase the representation of socially disadvantaged groups” (Bovenkamp et al. 2014).
6.5 The strengths and limitations of this thesis

While a number of studies during recent decades have used qualitative methods to explore contemporary Sámi ethnicity as a phenomenon, this thesis is the first study to address Sámi ethnicity as a variable for use in quantitative studies in contemporary Norway. By relating the qualitative phenomenon of Sámi ethnicity to the use of quantitative methodologies, the thesis elucidates, in a new way and in a Sámi context, “[...] the complex dynamics between concepts, instruments and phenomena” (Frønes 2010:44), and more specifically that “[...] questionnaires are primarily also a method for collection of qualitative data (Jacobsen, D. 2006:126). It is regarded as a strength that the thesis partly has assessed and partly used all of the three major Norwegian data sets that contain individually based Sámi ethnicity data of a relatively recent origin (cf. Table 4.1).

Some limitations of the different studies are presented in each paper. With regard to the thesis as whole, it can be regarded as a limitation that it explicitly discusses multi-ethnic origins and self-identifications to a fairly minor extent (Snipp & Lott 2009; Kukutai & Callister 2009). Paper III does not take into account that a significant proportion of the participants in the SAMINOR study reported multiple ethnic affiliations. Also, the category of ‘Kven’ could have been more widely discussed in Papers I-III. It was assumed, however, that this would have entailed quite lengthy descriptions that would not have provided any material contributions to the elucidation of the main topic in each paper.

The study could have touched on the fact that although ethnic self-identification has become (ethically) preferable in many contexts (cf. Paper III), some studies have demonstrated firstly that there is not always a correspondence between self-ascribed and socially ascribed ethnicity/race, and secondly that this distinction may have relevance for the life experiences of individuals (Jones et al. 2008; Harris, Cormack & Stanley 2013). In a Sámi context, features such as oral language characteristics (Sollid 2009; Bull 2011), place of birth or residence (Eidheim 1971; Thuen 2003) and certain external characteristics (Schanche 2002) become associated with an ethnic affiliation that does not necessarily accord with the self-ascribed ethnicity of the individual in question. More generally, one may ask whether the thesis fails to communicate fully how commonplace discourses on Sámi ethnic affiliation may be considerably more complex than is indicated by the use of connections to Sámi language as an ethnic “basis”. Given the scope of various types of internal Sámi variation, it would have
required too much space to enter into a discussion of the relationship between ethnic boundaries and cultural meaning: “the cultural stuff”, to use Barth’s terminology (Vassenden 2011).

Some may have wished to see a systematic presentation of the different Sámi inclusion criteria and categories that can be observed in the literature. However, informative overviews can be found in Brustad 2009 and Sjölander 2011.

Finally, the independent variables ‘Years of education’ (Papers II and III), ‘Self-reported household income’ and ‘Self-reported health’ (Paper III) are presented only in passing. As socioeconomic measures these variables represent certain inherent challenges (Arntzen 2002; Schou, Krokstad & Westin 2006; Strand & Naess 2009), and there is also reason to be aware of the specific issues that may play a role when ethnicity is involved (see e.g. Chandola & Jenkinson 2000). The observation that all the Sámi populations in Paper III scored significantly lower than the non-Sámi on the measure ‘Self-reported household income’ could also have been explicitly addressed. However, a substantial assessment of outcomes related to health and living conditions was not a concern for this thesis.
7. Concluding comments

The objective of this thesis was to contribute to more systematic knowledge and understanding of certain fundamental issues pertaining to the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable, primarily in population-based studies of health and living conditions in Norway. The thesis has presented and demonstrated issues that in various ways may have a bearing on the ability of such studies to provide optimally trustworthy quantitative knowledge on patterns in the health and living conditions of the Sámi across time and space.

7.1 Main messages

The main message of this thesis is that it was not feasible to propose an unambiguous solution to the challenge of “[...] being able to define the Sámi population in any appropriate way” (Brustad 2009:68). However, the thesis provides a contextual and systematic overview of a) fundamental aspects of this challenge and b) responsible alternatives and their opportunities and limitations. In itself, this may help facilitate meaningful communication regarding results produced using Sámi ethnicity as a variable, i.e. that it will be clearer who we are talking about when the topic includes health and living conditions in a population that is neither given, nor homogenous. Main messages in this regard are the following:

- **Productive use** of Sámi ethnicity as a variable in population-based studies is conditional on handling of analytical challenges pertaining to the construction of and ascription to Sámi ethnic categories, as well as of ethical and political challenges regarding whether and how the implementation of such studies should be facilitated. Special caution is required with regard to the objectives of each study and the actors that will be involved at various stages of the study, as well as how it will be conducted.

- **A key challenge** pertaining to the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable consists in choosing between the two measures ‘Connection to Sámi language’ and ‘Self-identification as Sámi’ (populations P1 and P2 in the analytical framework in Chapter 6.1.4). On the one hand, ethnic self-identification appears to have become the (ethically) preferred measure of ethnicity in many (most?) contexts (United Nations 2008). On the other hand, with reference to how some scholars argue that the health of individuals must be seen in light of their entire life course (Næss & Kristensen 2009, Tong et al. 2011), there may
nevertheless be a reason to select a more inclusive measure, in this case ‘Connection to Sámi language’. The reason is that this may capture a larger number of persons whose life experiences may be related to their Sámi connections, even though their ethnic self-identification at the moment is non-Sámi (cf. Paper II on ethnic mobility). Another, although related argument says that those who choose not to identify themselves as Sámi because of the effects that assimilation policy has inflicted on them and their families nevertheless have a “right” to be regarded as part of the Sámi people (see Rowse for a discussion related to indigenous Australians in this regard). Given the situation of Sámi ethnicity data and that the reporting of language connections and ethnic self-identifications proves to vary over time, use of the two measures must primarily be based on updated survey data that by their nature will have unknown representativeness.

- **The Sámediggi electoral roll** (population P3 in the analytical framework in Chapter 6.1.4) occupies a special position in being a de facto identifiable and quantifiable Sámi population, although it remains impossible to determine its representativeness for Norway’s unknown (potential) Sámi population as a whole (population P0) or for all those who identify themselves as Sámi (population P2). Because the electoral roll is updated at regular intervals and covers the entire country, it is technically speaking well suited as a sampling frame for (primarily descriptive) population-based studies. Even though the Sámediggi may permit such use pursuant to the regulations under the Sámi Act, this is not without its problems, and practices have so far remained restrictive (Jonassen 2010). Similarly, because the Sámediggi electoral roll is integrated in Norway’s central population registry, it can easily be linked to other (public) registries and used for registry-based studies of the health and living conditions of the Sámi. One advantage of such studies is their ability to include precise data on, for example, socioeconomic variables such as education and (household) income. Another advantage is that registry-based studies may to some extent reduce the scope of research questions applied to Norway’s Sámi population, which accounts for a relatively small number by any measure. Relevant actors should occasionally assess whether facilitation of well-founded and responsible registry studies based on the Sámediggi electoral roll could constitute an alternative under specified conditions.

- Populations based on the measure ‘Sámi as an active language’ can be regarded as sub-populations of those specified in the analytical framework in Chapter 6.1.4. As a main
rule, use of this measure must be based on self-reported data. In population-based studies of health and living conditions, such a measure has special relevance with regard to aspects of the health and welfare services (Nystad 2006) although other aspects may also be relevant. This measure may also be used to establish study populations consisting of (self-identified) Sámi who are not active users of the language – a group that for this reason may have special challenges entailing consequences for their quality of life and thereby also for their living conditions (Andersen, A. 2011).

- Use of **geographically based measures of ethnicity** (cf. ‘Pg’ in the analytical framework in Chapter 6.1.4) may represent a practical as well as pragmatic solution. At the same time, such measures are somewhat ambiguous with regard to the area included and to Sámi ethnic density. In Paper III, the measure ‘Resident in the language area’ resulted in a population of which 40 per cent returned a response other than Sámi to all the explicit questions on ethnicity. Figure 6.1 illustrates the large variations in Sámi ethnic density, both inside the municipalities in the language area as well as outside. Scholars have suggested that the ethnic density of an ethnically defined population in a given area may have an effect on aspects of the health and living conditions of this population (see Bécares, Cormack & Harris 2013 for a study of ethnic density related to the health of the Maori). Studies of such aspects in a Sámi context should therefore use measures of ethnicity that are sufficiently fine-tuned to capture the fairly substantial variations in Sámi ethnic density in different areas.

- Giving priority to **small-scale approaches** in population-based studies of health and living conditions may permit taking into account that geographical areas differ from each other in a great many respects other that just Sámi ethnic density. According to Krieger (2012b:666), all population-based health-related studies should emphasize that experiences are located in “[…] the real-world societies, that is, meaningful populations, of which they are a part” (cf. Chapter. 6.3.3). Using more fine-tuned geographic measures may help provide more nuanced statistical images of the internal situation in “the Sámi community” and thereby also implicitly provide more nuances to the dichotomy Sámi/non-Sámi (see Walter 2008 for an example from indigenous Australia in this respect). A further point is that localized experiences do not necessarily need be related to ethnicity; other aspects of local affiliations and communities may also be (equally) relevant and material.
• Quantitative knowledge on patterns in the health and living conditions of the Sámi may be concerned with *external relations* in the form of similarities and dissimilarities between Sámi and non-Sámi populations as well as with *internal Sámi issues*. Given that there are only few and small “gaps” between the living conditions of the Sámi and those of other groups in given geographic areas, it nevertheless remains relevant to search for (more) knowledge on the situation *within* all or parts of the Sámi population in Norway. This includes potential (social) inequalities in health, as well as the dimensions and shape of a possible intra-Sámi health gradient. A focus on internal Sámi variation may help ensure that studies are based on real needs in actual communities (Kuokkanen 2008), rather than on the interests of (ethnocentric) researchers with regard to (exotic) ethnic “deviations” (Senior & Bhopal 1994; Bhopal 2007). Care should be taken not to base differentiations on dimensions that can be perceived as “ranking lists” of Sámi-ness (cf. Chapter 6.3). According to Lofters and O’Campo (2012), all action-oriented studies of health and living conditions should emphasize experiences and conditions that can be assumed to have relevance for the issues being studied and that also constitute “[…] actionable sources of heterogeneity […]” (p.106, italics added).

• Emphasizing *differentiated approaches* to Sámi experiences and needs related to health and living conditions corresponds with the main message in a recent study of policy documents that are relevant for the provision of health and welfare services to the Sámi (Blix, Hamran & Normann 2013). This study’s proposal for a new and knowledge-based, updated public study of this field deserves support.

• Despite the fact that the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable remains a challenge, well-founded and well-justified use ought to continue – not least since it is generally recognized that “[…] from a policy context, statistical results will almost always count for more than qualitatively obtained evidence” (Walter & Andersen 2013). At the same time, it is worth noting how several scholars have pointed out that demographic statistics and population-based studies not only reveal the actual situation of populations; they may also contribute to construct and produce populations, categories and identities (see e.g. Ruppert 2007; Rowse 2009; Walter 2010; Biruk 2012; Kukutai & Taylor 2012). Such aspects of the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable should also be included in future research.
7.2 Closing statement

The Norwegian state is based on the territory of two peoples – Norwegians and Sámi – and is also home to other ethnic groups of different kinds. Longstanding inter-ethnic interaction combined with (the legacy of) assimilation policies have contributed to blurring Sámi ethnic boundaries at the group and individual levels, in time and space. When Statistics Norway after the Second World War abandoned the practice of recording Sámi (and Kven) ethnicity in Norwegian censuses, this implicitly contributed to render the Sámi invisible in statistical narratives about the Norwegian state, as well as explicitly complicate certain types of numerically based, Sámi-related knowledge building. In sum, this creates a situation in which issues pertaining to operationalization of Sámi ethnicity in general and (self-)identification as Sámi in particular are complex, demanding and often controversial.

Against a global historic backdrop where (even) health-related research has partly been based on, and partly contributed to promote ethnic stigmatization and racism (Bhopal 2007, 2009a), it has been argued that the only ethically acceptable justification for using ethnicity as a variable in studies of health and living conditions is to do so with a view to benefiting and not harming the ethnic group(s) involved. In this perspective it is essential for relevant actors to reflect on and justify whether, why and how studies that use ethnicity as a variable can and should be implemented.

At the same time, as an ethnic group that is also an indigenous people, the Sámi in Norway have – like other peoples in modern states – a general need for “[...] meaningful statistical narratives about themselves” (Prout 2012:333) and “[...] a robust and relevant statistical evidence base with which to make informed decisions” (Kukutai 2011b:60). One precondition for meeting this need is to have systematic knowledge and understanding of various aspects pertaining to the use of Sámi ethnicity as a variable. This thesis may serve as a contribution to this effect.
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A) Examples of maps of Sápmi

Source: www.galdu.org/govat/doc/eng_sami.pdf

Source: www.nordiskamuseet.se/sites/default/files/public/amnen/sapmi/sapmi-karta-03-05-2013_1920px.jpg
B) The additional form containing the questions about Sámi ethnicity in Norway's 1970 census (in Norwegian and in Northern Sámi)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was someone born in the first generation step in the person's family? (Check box in the red box for the answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was someone born in the first generation step in the person's family? (Check box for the answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was someone born in the first generation step in the person's family? (Check box for the answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the person's surname the same as the name? (Check box)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aubert 1978:129
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gårdsgevärd och nr. döpte ärmanakti namns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personliga namn</td>
<td>Kommunala namn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lei gi sångotella vuotes giella mäid posayar iis särdfag? (Särge x dau ruvvi mi bo vuoteg várdsámis áválháldun)
   Mánit hærá ni dautet bo vats po hovdó, nála aválháls ruvote gá ruvvá áválháls sáfrát. Lei ni novda de sárj-
   juvva x ciie áválháls ruvote)
   1 [ ] Lei
   2 [ ] Li

2. Lei gi sångotella vuotes giella mäid uoimunatt húna posasury vijamunni sårdfag? (Särge x)
   1 [ ] Lei
   2 [ ] Li
   3 [ ] In diefe

3. Lei gi sångotella vuotes giella mäid uoimunatt húna posasury sårdfag ja akkum sårdfag? (Särge x).
   1 [ ] Lei
   2 [ ] Li
   3 [ ] In diefe

4. Adua gi posasury jetsa sårdfagutá Presents angående resultatet av undersökningen, mieridit galga tó nati vooll mädu ra kjuvut sårdfagutá.
   1 [ ] Lei
   2 [ ] Li
   3 [ ] Li bot visesa
   4 [ ] In diefe valetik
C) The municipalities where the additional form in Norway's 1970 census was distributed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERSIKT OVER KRETSER A LIST OF THE CENSUS TRACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841 Fauske 1921 Solangen 1940 Kåfjord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Fredere Vatnman 2 Løkse/Løkseb...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842 Sjøerudod 2 Moeby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Milser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Skjervvikbotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mørsvikbotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ramøy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strømnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sagvannna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Utsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Løberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 Tyssedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Spannedalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853 Eresnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Tyssedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854 Ballangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nordstrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Røda/Arnas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ballangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bjørkåsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Stor-Ballangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ballangenmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Østreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kjeldebotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855 Axnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Transbybotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856 Strøm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bryggenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 Snøe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Trefald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ventrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nordre Våg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 Kongsbakk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kongsbakk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Langsetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802 Tromøy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Østreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bøvisteidet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Brøvisteidet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ramasjordbotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Andersdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Laksfjordbotn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Sjursnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Raiervik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Brovisteidet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 Køfjord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Vik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Søndre Oteren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Løberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grastangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fjelldal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Elvønes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Løberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Aubert 1978:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D) The municipalities included in the geographical scope of the Sámediggi subsidy schemes for business development (STN) / the Sámi Development Fund (SUF) between 1975 and 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 kommuner</td>
<td>13 kommuner</td>
<td>15 kommuner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Kautokeino</td>
<td>2017 Kvibstad</td>
<td>2018 Måsøy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Porsanger</td>
<td>2022 Lebesby*</td>
<td>1943 Kvenangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Karasjok</td>
<td>2023 Gamvik*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 Tam</td>
<td>1913 Skånland*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027 Nesseby</td>
<td>1920 Lavangen*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 nye)</td>
<td>(8 nye)</td>
<td>(2 nye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hele kommuner</td>
<td>6 hele kommuner + 7 delområder</td>
<td>7 hele kommuner + 8 delområder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstall 1.1.1976:</td>
<td>14 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 kommuner</td>
<td>26 kommuner</td>
<td>26 kommuner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Alta*</td>
<td>2012 Alta (u)</td>
<td>2023 Gamvik (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Måsøy (u)</td>
<td>2014 Loppa</td>
<td>1919 Græangen (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Lebesby (u)</td>
<td>2018 Måsøy (u)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 Tromsø*</td>
<td>2019 Nordkapp*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919 Græangen*</td>
<td>2023 Gamvik (u)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Storfjord</td>
<td>2030 Sør-Varanger*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 Kåfjord (H)</td>
<td>1913 Skånland (H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805 Narvik*</td>
<td>1919 Græangen (u)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 nye, 3 andre)</td>
<td>(6 nye, 8 andre)</td>
<td>(2 andre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hele kommuner + 11 delområder</td>
<td>14 hele kommuner + 12 delområder</td>
<td>16 hele kommuner + 10 delområder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 800</td>
<td>37 500</td>
<td>38 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 kommuner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 Salangen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 Balsfjord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 Kvalsøy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 Skjerjos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 Nordreisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 nye)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 hele kommuner + 10 delområder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstall 1.1.2013:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deler av kommunen ble inkludert

(u) Utvidet område av kommunen ble inkludert

(H) Kommunen gikk fra å være delvis til helt inkludert

Source: Statistisk sentralbyrå 2012:14
E) Map of the municipalities included in the geographical scope of the Sámediggi subsidy schemes for business development (STN) per 2014

*Kilder: Statistisk sentralbyrå 2014:18*
Application form for enrolment in the Sámediggi electoral roll per 2014 (in Northern Sámi and Norwegian)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Navn</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal code / Poststed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A)** If the language is Saami, I speak the language. I am a Sami speaker.

**B)** I speak the language, and I have a majority of years of education in the language.

**C)** I have been a Sami for at least 30 years. I am a member of the Sami community.

---

**Valg**

The election is held on 30th June. I am a member of the Saami community.

---

Source: [http://www.samediggi.no/Samediggevalga/Caliheapmi-jienastuslohkui](http://www.samediggi.no/Samediggevalga/Caliheapmi-jienastuslohkui)
G) The SAMINOR study: Information pamphlet, letter of invitation, informed consent statement, questionnaires (in Norwegian and in Northern Sámi)
Helseundersøkelsen har tre formål:
- Du som deltar i helseundersøkelsen får sjekket om du har bestemte sykdommer, eller om det er fare for at du kan få dem.
- Å få ny kunnskap om helse, sykdom og levekår i områder med samisk og norsk bosetting.
- Å lage en oversikt over folks helse – en «helseprofil» for folket. Dette er viktig for å gi fylket og de enkelte kommunene et bedre grunnlag for å planlegge helsetjenesten i framtida.

Hvem kan delta?

Hvordan får du time til helseundersøkelsen?

Dearvsvuodaiskkadeami die duin feat golbma ulbmila:
- Dus gi searvvat iskkadeapmái iskat leatgo dus dihto dávddat, dahje leago dus várra dait oázzut.
- Oázzut odda máhiu dearvsvuoda, dávddaid ja eallindili birra sámi ja dáža ássanguolvluin.
- Rähkadit várdosa oibmuid dearvsvuodas – yllka «dearvsvuodaprofiilla». Dát lea dehálaš vai yllkas ja juohke gielldas lea buoret vuoddu pláñet boahittevaś dearvsvuodoreálvalusa.

Gii såhttá searvvat?
Juohkehaš rieğádan 1925–1967 ja 1973 guolvluin goś ásset sápmelačćat ja dážat. 9 giellda Finnmárrkku, 6 Tromssás, 4 Nordlánddas ja 2 Davvi-Trøndelagas leat iskkadeamis miede.

Mo oáčcut diimmu dearvsvuodaiskkadeapmái?
**Hvordan foregår helseundersøkelsen?**

Omtrent fire uker etter helseundersøkelsen får du et brev i posten med opplysninger om ditt kolesterol, blodtrykk og blodsukker, og hvordan du ligger an i forhold til anbefalte verdier. De som har særlig høy risiko for å få hjerte- og kar sykdommer og suksksyke, vil bli bedt om å ta kontakt med sin egen lege for videre oppfølgning.

Alle som møter fram til helseundersøkelsen, får et tilleggsskjema, med spørsmål om blant annet kosthold og levevård.

**Vi trenger din tillatelse**
Når du møter fram til helseundersøkelsen, ber vi deg om å undertegne et samtykke der du sier deg enig i et eller flere av de fire punktene nedenfor. (Du vil få kopi av samtykke erklæringen).

1) At du kan bli kontaktet med anbefaling om oppfølgning, behandling eller for å forebygge sykdom.

2) At opplysningene dine kan brukes til medisinsk forskning etter vurdering og tilrådende fra Regional komité for medisinsk forskningsetikk i Nord-Norge og Datatilsynet.

3) At resultatene dine (etter godkjenning fra Datatilsynet) kan settes sammen

**Mo iskojuvrot?**

Sulli njeallle vahku manñil dearvass vuodaiskkadeami oacçut poasttas reitve iežat kolestrola, varradeattu ja varrasohkkara bira, ja mo dat leat râvejuv-von meriidi ekuti. Bivít sin geain lea hui alla váibmo- ja suonadávdávărra ja sohkardávda, válidt oktuuođa iežäset doaktärin joatkka čuovvolæpmái.

Juohkehaš gii boahťa iskkadeapmái, oazžu lassiskoví, gâzaldagaggin ee. biepmu ja eallindili bira.

**Mii dårbbashaat du lobi**
Go boaadát iskkadeapmái, de bivdit du ñallit vuolláei miehtama, mas logat iežat leat ovttamielas ovttta dahje moatti dán njeallle čuoggás vuolbealde (Miehtamis oacçut màngosa).

1) Ahtè dunna sahtta válidt oktuuođa go áigu râvvet čuovvolæami, dálkkodi dit dahje eastrarit dávvdaid.

2) Ahtè visot du diedit sahttet adnot medissinnaalàs duutkamii Regional ko-mite for medisinsk forskningsetikk i Nord-Norge ja Datatilsynet árvoostal-lama ja râvvaga mielde.

3) Ahtè du bohtosis (Datatilsynet dohk-keheami mielde) sahtta čohkket die-duguinu du birra ėarâ registarin dut-kandoaimmaide nugo Kreftregisträt,
med opplysninger om deg i andre registre for forskningsformål slik som Kreftregisteret, Dødsårssaksregisteret og folketellingene. I alle disse tilfellene vil navn og personnummer bli fjernet. Forsikringsselskaper får ikke tilgang til dataene.

4) At blodprøven din kan lagres og brukes til medisinsk forskning og genetiske analyser for å finne årsak til sykdom. All bruk av denne prøven vil bare skje i samsvar med godkjennelse fra Datatilsynet og etter at Regional komité for medisinsk forskningsetikk i Nord-Norge har vurdert og tilrådet prosjektet.


Vi ønsker å følge alle som møter til helseundersøkelsen i lang tid framover med hensyn til hjerteinfarkt, hjerneslag og andre aktuelle sykdommer. Derfor ønsker vi å lagre opplysningene du har gitt, frem til fylte 100 år, for å sammenholde disse med opplysninger fra sentrale registre slik som Kreftregisteret og Dødsårssaksregisteret.

Dødsårssaksregisteret ja olmøshlokkamat. Visot dáid oktavuodain sikhko namma ja personnummar. Dâhkâdufs fitnodagat eai beasa dáid dieduid oaidnit.

4) Ahîte du varraiskkus sáhtá ráddjot ja adnot medisinnalaš dutkamii ja genetalaš analyseaide gavnhai hátt dâddaid átttaid. Dán iskosa juohke geavvá heapmi geavvá dušxe Datatilfsynet dohkkeheami miele ja mannj go Regional komité for medisinsk forskningsetikk i Nord-Norge lea árvoštallan ja ráven prošeavta.

Vaikke dása dál miedat, de sáhtát mannj molsut oavila ja bivdit sikhko iskkaeemis diedílaalktá mákkárga ákka dasa. Dán dagat cállalačšat institutt for samfunnsmedisin; Institutt for samfunnsmedisin, UiT, 9037 Tromsø. Du varraiskkus dále bálkestuvvo.

Mii dâhtoš beammet guhkit ággik cůovvut juhhekačča gii boštá dearvassvuodaiskkadeaméi váibmodohppohaga, vuoinjašgádlänvigi ja éará vejolaš dáddaid hárái. Danne dâhtoš beammet râdjat du adádd dieduid, gita devdon 100 jahkái, vaïcái beásá sulastahtit guovddáš regiss tariidd dieduíguin, nugo Kreftregisteret ja Dødsårssaksregisteret.

Bures boahtin dearvassvuodaiskkadeaméi
Vaikkve leatge aiddo leamaš doåktára luhtte dahje dovdad iežat dearvasin, de sáhtát liikká sevarat iskkadeaméi. Dalle veahkehat min oazzu eaneń mahtu ja riektasat dieduid du gielda ja fylka dearvassvuodas.

Velkommen til helseundersøkelsen
Selv om du nettopp har vært hos lege eller selv om du føler deg frisk, kan du likevel delta i undersøkelsen. Da hjelper du oss til bedre kunnskap og riktigere oversikt over helsen i kommunen og fylket ditt.
Helse- og levekårssundersøkelse  
— et forskningsprosjekt


Helse- og levekårssundersøkelsen er nærmere beskrevet i brosjyren, som ligger vedlagt. Dersom du er i tvil om noe, kan du kontakte oss på tlf. 78 46 89 04 eller på e-post: helseus@fagmed.uio.no

Du kan delta på følgende måter: (kryss av ønsket på spørreskjema under «samtykke til deltakelse»)

A Dersom du ønsker å delta i helseundersøkelsen og forskningsprosjektet, krysser du av punkt A, fyller ut spørreskjemaet og returnerer det til oss via vedlagte konvolutt. Du vil senere få et brev med tid og sted for fremmøte sammen med et nytt spørreskema.

B Dersom du bare ønsker å delta i en enledende del av forskningsprosjektet uten helseundersøkelse, krysser du av punkt B , fyller ut spørreskjemaet og returnerer det til oss via vedlagte konvolutt.

C Du kan unngå purring fra oss ved å kryss av punkt C og returnere spørreskjemaet til oss. Purring vil skje skriftlig.

Datatilsynet har gitt konsesjon for lagring av opplysninger fra undersøkelsen og forskningsprosjektet til høvdingen av Regional kontrakt for medisinsk forskningssetikk i Nord-Norge.

For forskningen sin del vil det være av stor interesse at vi får inn så mange opplysninger som mulig. Du deltar frivillig og kan, etter å ha sagt ja til deltakelse, senere trekke deg uten å begrunne hvorfor og uten at det vil ha noen konsekvenser for deg. Det samme gjelder dersom man i utgangspunktet ikke ønsker å delta. Opplysninger du har gitt kan du be om å få slettet.

Resultatene vil bli publisert i massemedia, og det utformes en rapport fra helse- og levekårssundersøkelsen når den er avsluttet.

De som fullfører hele helse- og levekårssundersøkelsen vil være med i trekningen av 3 reiseavgivelsel til en verdi av kr. 10 000. Vi regner med en deltagelse på ca. 15000 personer.

Med hilsen

Anne Kirsten Anti  
Senter for samisk helseforskning  
Karajok

Eivin Lund  
Institutt for samfunnsmedisin  
Tromsø

Per G. Lund-Larsen  
Nasjonalt folkehelseinstitutt  
Oslo
INFORMERT SAMTYKKE

Jeg har lest informasjonen om undersøkelsen og samtykker i at (stryk det / de avsnitt du reserverer deg mot):

1. Jeg kan bli kontaktet med anbefaling om oppfølging, behandling eller for å forebygge sykdom.

2. Opplysningene mine kan brukes i medisinsk forskning til å kartlegge og finne årsaker til helse, sykdom og livskår. All bruk av opplysningene i eventuell framtidig medisinsk forskning vil bare bli brukt dersom Regional komité for medisinsk forskningsetikk og Datatilsynet ikke har noen innvendinger mot dette.


4. Blodprøven min kan lagres og brukes til medisinsk forskning og genetiske analyser for å finne årsak til sykdom. All bruk av denne prøven vil bare skje i samsvar med godkjenning fra Datatilsynet og etter at Regional komité for medisinsk forskningsetikk i Nord-Norge har vurdert de etiske sidene ved gjennomføring av prosjektet.

.......................................................... ..........................................................
sted og dato underskrift
Dearvvasvuoda ja eallindilleiskkadeapmi
– dutkanprošeakta

Dearvvasvuodadepartmenta lea min bivdän iskat dearvvasvuoda- ja eallindillä
juokhekačas riegādan 1925–1967 ja 1973 dihto gieldeisų sami ja dāžā asammi
Davvi-Norggas ja Davvi-Trendelāgas. Ulbmilin lea viežat diedid vaišmo- ja
suonadāvaidad, borsadāvaid, allergiaid, bākčaid ja eara gillamuśa id ja lākohis-
vuodaid birra vai dair sāktāi eastačit. Dāosto lea ulbmilin diedit ollmīd oarvula
dearvvasvuodabāvalusa birra, sin eallinuvgi nugo bioju ja borguheimi, eallin-
dili ja gulevušvuoda birra. Geat hālaidat searvat, leat miele dutkanprošeavattas mas
leat gāžadānskovit ja dearvvasvuodaiskkadeapmi. Ikkadeami visot dieud tmeanu-
duvojot čiegusvuodas.

Dearvvasvuoda- ja eallindilleiskkadeapmi lea dārkilat vāldakahallon gihppagis mi
čuovvu mele. Jus eahpordan mādege, sāktāg gahalhali mėngiin tlf. 78 46 89 04
dabe e-poosta: helseus@lagmed.uib.no

Dan lāhka sāktā searvat: (russe bajimuččas gāžadānskovis «miedan searvami»)
buohta)

A. Jus hālaidat searvat dearvvasvuodaiskkadeapmi ja dutkanprošeikti, des russet C ĉuoggā, deavvāt gāžadānskovit ja māhcaha dan midjadi čuovvu konalhitas.

B. Jus hālaidat searvat dušte dutkanprošeavatta algoasais almnna dearvvasvuoda-
iskkadeami haga, des russet B ĉuoggā, deavvāt gāžadānskovit ja māhcaha dan
midjadi čuovvu konalhitas.

C. Ėat rāsa jus russet C ĉuoggā ja māhcaha gāžadānskovit midjadi. Rāssan lea
gālaččat.

Dataikusnet lea addān sierralobi rādat iskkadeami diedid ja dutkanprošeavatta lea
dāvven Regional komite ior medisinsk forskningsetik i Nord-Norge.

Dutkama dāfus lea hui miellagidevaš ahte oaužtun nul diedid go vejolaš. Don
searvat sakkodāhulaččat ja sāktāt, manjil go leat mielehan searvami, guošāšit
vuodāškahtit ja durtje čuozakeshtit. Seamma gueskā jus aļgus juo il hālait sear-
vat. Diediid midat almnna hāltit bivdät sihkut.

Bohtosid almnna medidan, ja čilos raporta dearvvasvuoda- ja eallindilleiskka-
deapmi go dat lea loahpahuvwon.

Si goat čadaht olles dearvvasvuoda- ja eallindilleiskkadeami leat mielek vuorða-
deamen 3 mātneskeanjakoartin man ārva lea 10 000,- ru. gudogse. Doraviit ahte
su. 15000 ollo sovet.

Dearvvasvuodaiguanin

Anne Kirsten Antti
Sami dearvvasvuodaiguanin

Elliv Lund
Instrum for samfunnsmadiin
Romea

Per G. Lund-Larsen
Nasjonalt Folkhalsokatediin
Oslo
DIEDIHUVVON MEHTAN

Lean lohkan dieđuid iskkadeami birra ja mieđan ahte (sihko dan / daid osiid maidda várašat):

1. Sáhttá muinna várđit oktavuođa go áigu rávvet čuovvoleami, dálkkodit dahje eastadit dávdmaid.


báikki ja beaivi

vuolláičála
Helse- og levekårssundersøkelsen

Personlig innbydelse
### 6. BRUK AV MEDISINER

Med medisiner mener vi de medisiner kjøpt på apotek, kosttilskudd og vitaminer regnes ikke med her.

**Bruker du?**
- Nå
- Fort, men ikke nå
- Aldri bruakt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medisin</th>
<th>Hast blodtrykk</th>
<th>Kolesterol/tilskudd</th>
<th>Insulin</th>
<th>Tabletter over 70 år</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hvor ofte har du i løpet av de siste 4 ukene brukt følgende medisiner? (Sett en kryss pr høyre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ikke brukt</th>
<th>Slik uten respekt</th>
<th>Slik på respekt</th>
<th>Aldri brukt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smertestillinge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smertestillinge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovemedisin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berølgende medicin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medisiner mot depressjon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annen medisin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For de medisinene du har krysset av for de to punktene ovenfor og som du har brukt i løpet av de siste 4 ukene:**

Angi navnet og hvilken grunn det er til at du tar/har tatt disse (sykdom eller symptomatikus, kys av for hvor lenge du har brukt medisinen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navn på medisinen</th>
<th>Hvor lenge du brukte</th>
<th>Antall</th>
<th>Antall</th>
<th>Antall</th>
<th>Antall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 mån.</td>
<td>3-6 mån.</td>
<td>6-12 mån.</td>
<td>Over 1 år</td>
<td>Aldri brukt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pr. dag</td>
<td>pr. uke</td>
<td>pr. mån.</td>
<td>pr. året</td>
<td>pr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dersom det ikke er ant. pluss her, kan du kryss på ene sol, som du kigger ved.

### 7. MAT OG DRIKKE

**Hvor ofte spiser du vanligvis disse matvarene?** (Sett en kryss pr linje)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spisning</th>
<th>1 g</th>
<th>1-3 g</th>
<th>3-6 g</th>
<th>6-12 g</th>
<th>3 g. ol. pr. dag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frukter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bær</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ost (alle typer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poteter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolte grønnsaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rå grønnsaker/salat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hva slags lett bruker du oftest? (Sett ett kryss pr linje)**
- Bruker ikke
- 1 g
- 3 g
- 1-3 g
- 3-6 g
- 6-12 g
- Over 1 år

**Bruker du følgende kosttilskudd:**
- Ja
daglig
- Elsket
- Nei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinket, trykksal</th>
<th>Fiskeolje/olje</th>
<th>Vitamintilskudd</th>
<th>Annen kost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hvor mye drikker du vanligvis av følgende?** (Sett en kryss pr linje)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-6 g glass pr. dag</th>
<th>1-6 glass pr. dag</th>
<th>2-3 glass pr. dag</th>
<th>4-6 glass pr. dag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mætroser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruk/Cola med sukker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruk/Cola uten sukker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hvor mange kopper kaffe og te drikker du daglig?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filterkaffe</th>
<th>Kokekaffe/brygge</th>
<th>Annen kaffe</th>
<th>Te</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Omtrent hvor ofte har du i løpet av det siste året drukket alkohol? (Sett et kryss på for kolonne, om regnes ikke med)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Har aldri</th>
<th>Har ikke</th>
<th>Omtrent 1 g drikket</th>
<th>Omtrent 2-3 g drikket</th>
<th>Omtrent 4-6 g drikket</th>
<th>Omtrent 7 g og over drikket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siste år:</td>
<td>Siste år:</td>
<td>Siste år:</td>
<td>Siste år:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hvert</td>
<td>1 gang</td>
<td>2-3 ganger</td>
<td>4 ganger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pr. måned</td>
<td>pr. måned</td>
<td>pr. måned</td>
<td>pr. måned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Til dem som har drikket siste år:
| Når du har drukket, hvor mange glass eller drinkeyt du vanligvis drikket? | Antall |
| Omtrent hvor mange ganger det siste året har du drikket så mye som minst | Antall |
| Når du drikker, drukker du da vanligvis: (Sett en kryss pr all)
| Ol | Vin | Brennevin |

Omtrent hvor ofte har du i løpet av det siste året drikket alkohol (lettid og alkoholitet of regnes ikke med)
BRUK AV HELSETJENESTER

Hvor mange ganger de siste 12 månedene har du selv brukt: (sett et kryss for hver linje)

- Kommunelege/fastlege
- Spesialist
- Legevalgt
- Sykehus inngjølge
- Hjemmesykepleie
- Kommunal hjemmehjelp
- Fysioterapeut
- Kiropraktor
- Tannlege
- Alternativ behandler

Ingen 1-3 ganger 4 eller flere

Hvor mange leger har du selv vært hos de siste 12 månedene?  

(sangi antall)

Har du fått tildelt navngitt fastlege? Ja Nei

Når du er til undersøkelse, hvilket språk kommuniserer du og legen på? (sett et eller flere kryss)

- Norsk
- Samisk
- Bruker folk
- Annet språk

Tror du det skjer noen gang at du og legen misforstår hverandre, g.e. språklige problemer?

- Aldri
- Sjelden
- Av og til
- Ofte
- Usikker

Dersom det er behov for folk, synes du at legen er fink nok til å be om det?

- Ja, alltid
- Ja, som regel
- Nei, ikke alltid
- Nei, aldri
- Jeg liker ikke å bruke folk

Hvor fornøyd eller misfornøyd er du med følgende sider ved den kommunale legetjenesten i den bostedsområdet? (sett et kryss for hver linje)

Austand til legen
Legens tilgjengelighet på telefon
Venterid på legetidene
Tid inne hos legen
Mulighetene for å få ferdig om dine plager
Legens forståelse av din kulturelle bakgrunn
Legens informasjon om dine helsetilstander, undersøkelse og behandlingsopplegg

Beskriv forholdet til kommunehelse, helse- og sosialtjenesten:

- Meget fornøyd
- Fornøyd
- Misfornøyd
- Meget misfornøyd
- Vet ikke

Legens språkbeherskelse (samisk eller norsk)

Totalt sett, hvor fornøyd eller misfornøyd er du med den kommunale legetjenesten?

Dersom du noen gang har benyttet alternative behandlere, hvilke har du brukt? (sett et eller flere kryss)

- Helsegivers, lese, blase, håndarbeidere
- Healer
- Akupunktør
- Soneterapeut, homeopat, kinesiolog osv.

Hvor lenge er det siden du har benyttet en alternativ behandlere, hvor lenge er det siden sist? ( angi i hele tall)

(dåer) (månedes)

Tenk deg at du i dag skulle få behov for hjelp/bistand fra den kommunale helse- og sosialtjenesten (hjemmesykepleie, hjemmehjelp, sosiale tjenester, fysioterapi osv.)

Vet du hvor du skal henvende deg?

Ja Nei Usikker

Er du trygg på at du får hjelp hvis du trenger det?

Ja Nei Usikker

Dersom du i dag får hjelp fra den kommunale helse- og sosialtjenesten, er du fornøyd med tilsynet?

Ja Nei Usikker

SKADER/ULYKKER

Har du vært utsatt for noen ulykker som medførte behandling hos lege og/eller sykehusinleggelser?

- Lege
- Sykehus inleggelser

Hvor mange ganger?

(sangi antall)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKADER/ULYKKER (fortsettelser)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hvis ja, hva slags ulykke(r) er du blitt behandlet for? (sett ett eller flere kryss på linje)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorsykkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snøscooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehydrscooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traktor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallulykke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurttakse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har ulykken(e) fort til nedsatt arbeidsevne?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Helt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILIE OG SPRÅKBAKGRUNN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Nord-Norge bor det folk med ulike etniske bakgrunn. Det vil si at de snakker ulike språk og har forskjellige kulturer. Eksempler på etniske bakgrunn, eller etnisk gruppe er norsk, samisk og kvensk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hvilket hjemmespråk har/hadde du, dine foreldre og beste-familie? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morfar:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farfar:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeg selv:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hva er din, din fars og din mors etniske bakgrunn? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min etniske bakgrunn er:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fars etniske bakgrunn er:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mors etniske bakgrunn er:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hva regner du deg selv som? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norsk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARBEIDSLIV/ØKONOMI (fortsettelser)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARBEIDSLIV/ØKONOMI (fortsettelser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNNE DU TENKE Deg å flytte fra din hovedkommune derfor du slik tilbud om arbeid et annet sted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dersom du er arbeidsløs, angis hvor lenge du har vært arbeidsløsaste (angis i hele tall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ (år)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dersom du er selvstendig næringsdrivende, hvilken type næring jobber du? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Reindrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Forretningsvirksomhet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hvor mange personer bor det i din husstand?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ (antal personer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hvor stor er familien/husstandens bruttoinntekt per år?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Under kr. 15 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Kr. 30 1 000–45 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Kr. 60 1 000–75 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hvor ofte spiller du på ulike pengespill slik som lotto, tipping, spilleautomater og lignende?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Aldrissyssel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ I gang i uka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hvor mye spiller du for ukentlig i gjennomsnitt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Under kr. 100 i uka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Kr. 501–1000 i uka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOBBING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Med mobbing mener vi når en eller flere personer gjentar ganger sier eller gjør vondt ting mot deg, og du har vanskeligheter med å forstå deres handlinger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hva regner du deg selv som? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Ja, de siste 12 mån.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DERSOM DU HAR VÆRT UTSAAT FOR MOBBING, HVILKEN TYPE MOBBING ER DU BLITT UTSAAT FOR? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Baksmakking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAN DU ANGLE VARET GJENNOMFØRE-TREFOREKLAGT? (sett ett eller flere kryss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ På skolen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. ROYKING OG BRUK AV SNUS

Hvor lenge er du vanligvis daglig i røykklyft rom? Antall hele timer

Røykte noen av de voksne hjemme da du vokste opp?

Bor du, eller har du bodd sammen med noen dagligrøykere etter at du fylte 20 år?

Har du røykt/royker du daglig?

Hvis du røyker daglig nå, røyker du:

Vil du avhengig av grunn lagre vonet snus?

Vil du avhengig av grunn lagre vonet snus?

Vil du avhengig av grunn lagre vonet snus?

Hvis du har røykt daglig tidligere, hvor lenge er det siden du sluttet?

Hvis du røyker daglig nå, eller har røykt tidligere:

Hvor mange sigaretter/royker du/roykte du vanligvis daglig?

Hvor gammel var du da du begynte å røyke daglig?

Hvor mange år til sammen har du røykt daglig?

Har du brukt/bruker du snus daglig?

Hvis du bruker/bruker snus daglig, hvor mange år til sammen har du brukt snus?

9. MOSJON OG FYSISK AKTIVITET

Hvorvanlig er fysisk aktivitet i din tid? (Tenk deg et ukentlig gjennomsnitt for året. Arbeidstid regnes som fritid. Besvar begge spørsmålene)

Lett aktivitet

Ingen

Under 1

1-2

3 og mer

Timer pr. uke:

(Endt kryss i den ruta som piker best)

ISR

Hard fysisk aktivitet

Til arbeidsplassen

 chica

Angi bevegelse og kropplig anstrengelse i din tid!

Leser, ser på fjernsyn eller annen

Stillstilende beskjøftigelse

Spaserer, sykler eller beveger deg på annen måte minst 2 timer i uke?

(Tegn også rundt gang eller sykling til arbeidsplassen, søndagsturier m.m.)

Driver mosjonsidrett, tenger hagårbeid e.l.?

(Tekn å aktiviteten skal være minst 4 timer i uke)

Tener hardt eller driver konkurranseidrett regelmessig og flere ganger i uke?

10. UTDANNING OG ARBEID

Hvor mange års skolegang har du gjennomført?

(i så med alle år du har gått på skole eller studeret)

Hvordan trives du i din jobb?

Mener du at du står i fare for å miste ditt nåværende arbeid eller inntekt de nærmeste 2 årene?

Mottar du noen av følgende ytelsler?

Sykepenger

Attestering

Socialhjelp/stønad

Overgangstbonsend for enslige foreldre

11. RESTEN AV SKJEMAET SKAL BARE BESVARE AV KVINNEN

Hvor gammel var du da du fikk menstruasjon allerede forste gang?

Hvis du ikke lenger får menstruasjon, hvor gammel var du da den sluttet?

Er du gravid nå?

Hvor mange barn har du født?

Hvis du har født barn, fyll ut hvert barns fødselsår, og hvor mange måneder du ammet etter fødselen

(Hvis du ikke ammet, skriv 0)

Barn:

Fødselsår:

Antall med.

1. barn

2. barn

3. barn

4. barn

5. barn

Bruker du, eller har du brukt?

(Best å kryss for hvor lange)

P-pille/minipil/p-sprøyte

Hormonsprøyte (ikke vanlig spirall)

Ostrogen (tablett eller plaster)

Ostrogen (krem eller stickpiller)

Hvis du bruker/bruker mest Finalsiktig estrogen:

Hvor lenge har du brukt dette?

Antall år

Hvis du bruker p-pille, minipille, p-sprøyte, hormonsprøyte eller estrogen; hvilket merke bruker du?

Spesifiser:

Ikke skriv her
### 1. SYMPTOMER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoster du omtrent daglig i perioder av året?</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>NEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Har du hatt slik hos du lenge som i en 3 måneds periode i begge de to siste årene?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hender det at du er plaget av savnlashet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hvis ja, når er du mest plaget av savnlashet? (Sett en av disse kryss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hele året</td>
<td>Vår</td>
<td>Sommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har du det siste året vært plaget av savnlashet slik at du har gått ut over arbeidstid?</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>NEI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Er du stort sett fornøyd med tilværelsen?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meget fornøyd</td>
<td>Ganske fornøyd</td>
<td>Litt misfornøyd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hender det at du i lengre perioder - i minst 3 dager - er trist og nedfor? | JA | NEI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Har du i de siste 14 dager følt deg ute av stand til å take dine vanskeligheter?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nei</td>
<td>Av og til</td>
<td>Ofte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hender det at du føler deg ensom?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nei</td>
<td>Av og til</td>
<td>Ofte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. KOSTHOLD NÅ


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hvor mange ganger du ikke pleier å spise middagen?</th>
<th>Antall ganger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Hvor ofte spiser du fiskepulleg?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1-2 pr. uke</th>
<th>3-4 pr. uke</th>
<th>5 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spekesalat/fiske ...</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Røkt fisk ...............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malterol i tomatsås ....</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedlagt sild .............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaviar ..................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annet fiskepulleg .......</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor mange ganger pr. år spiser du fiskekornet?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiskekornet ..............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogn ....................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor ofte spiser du følgende retter?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5 pr. år</th>
<th>6-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
<th>2-1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pizza ..................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spagetti, pastaetter .</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger i brod ......</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjøttakser/karbohydrater</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisker ..................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grynret ................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor ofte spiser du rent kjøtt til middag (f.eks. koteletter, steak, grynretflett, biff, fløde)?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-5 pr. år</th>
<th>6-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
<th>2-1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kylling ...............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svin ....................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsebrønse .............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sau/lam ................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg .....................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hval ...................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor mange egg fra sjøfugl spiser du pr. år?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antall egg</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor ofte spiser du kjøtt av rein?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
<th>2-1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kjøtt reinkjøtt ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stekt reinkjøtt ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjøtt reinkjøtt ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tørket reinkjøtt ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor ofte spiser du andre matvarer av rein?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5 pr. år</th>
<th>6-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blodmat av rein ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangbein ................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reינmunge .................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinlever .................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvor ofte spiser du bær?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-5 pr. år</th>
<th>6-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
<th>2-1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molle .................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske, frosne, røntet ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kol/Kjøtt syltetøy ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyttebær ...............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske, frosne, røntet ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kol/Kjøtt syltetøy ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaat ..................</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krokelær ...............</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hvordan pleier du/ditt hushold å skaffe følgende råvarer til eget bruk? (Sæt et eller flere kryss)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiser</th>
<th>Sjøfugl</th>
<th>Helt</th>
<th>Snakk</th>
<th>Korper</th>
<th>Korperl</th>
<th>Ryter</th>
<th>Såtter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kjøtt:  

| Rein ........... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Sau ............ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Egg ............ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Fisk:  

| Ferskvann .......... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Saltvann .......... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Bær:  

| Molle .......... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Tyttebær .......... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Hvor ofte pleier du å jakte, fiske og plukke bær?  

| Jakte rent/fiske ... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Jakte reinfugl .......... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Hvor ofte har du spist et hovedmål fra ditt husholds jakte/fiske siste år?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-5 pr. år</th>
<th>6-11 pr. år</th>
<th>1 pr. mand</th>
<th>2-3 pr. måned</th>
<th>1 pr. uke</th>
<th>2-1 pr. uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hovedmål (jakt) ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovedmål (fiske) ..........</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. KOSTHOLD I OPPVEKSTEN

Tenk på maten du fikk hjemme før du flytta for deg selv. Hvis du bodde mesteparten av året på skoleinternat, tenk på maten du fikk der.

**Bodde du på internat (statsinternat eller privat) da du gikk på barne- og ungdomsskolen?**
- Ja, ungdomsskolen
- Ja, barneskolen
- Ja, både barne- og ungdomsskolen
- Nei, ingen av delene

**Hvis ja, hvor mange klasserinn?**

**Hvor lenge var du på internat i snitt for hvert klasserinn?**
- 1-3 mnd.
- 4-6 mnd.
- 7-9 mnd.

**Hvor ofte spiste du fisk og reinkjøtt i oppveksten?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivitet</th>
<th>Aldri</th>
<th>1-11</th>
<th>År</th>
<th>1-2 pr. år</th>
<th>2-3 pr. år</th>
<th>3-4 pr. år</th>
<th>5-6 pr. år</th>
<th>7-8 pr. år</th>
<th>Uke</th>
<th>Uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koløysteit fisk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinkjøtt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hvor ofte spiste du andre matvarer i oppveksten?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivitet</th>
<th>Aldri</th>
<th>1-11</th>
<th>År</th>
<th>1-2 pr. år</th>
<th>2-3 pr. år</th>
<th>3-4 pr. år</th>
<th>5-6 pr. år</th>
<th>7-8 pr. år</th>
<th>Uke</th>
<th>Uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blandmat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauskjerter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjøttboller, perker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiskemat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiskeölaver og rapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grønt, pannekaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fikk du medisinsk tran i oppveksten?**
- JA
- NEI

**Fikk du servert tran til for eksempel fisk?**
- JA
- NEI

**Hvor ofte spiste du ville bær og planter i oppveksten?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivitet</th>
<th>Aldri</th>
<th>1-11</th>
<th>År</th>
<th>1-2 pr. år</th>
<th>2-3 pr. år</th>
<th>3-4 pr. år</th>
<th>5-6 pr. år</th>
<th>7-8 pr. år</th>
<th>Uke</th>
<th>Uke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ville bær</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syregress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Er maten du spiser nå, forskjellig fra det du fikk i oppveksten?**
- Nei
- Litt forskjellig
- Ganske forskjellig
- Veldig forskjellig

### 4. NATTPISING

Våken du ofte opp for å spise etter at du har lagt deg om kvelden?
- JA
- NEI

**Hvis ja, hvor mange spåsmålene:**

**Når har du oftest plaggene? (Sei et eller flere kryss)***
- Morgen året
- Vår
- Sommer
- Høst
- Vinter

**Hva spiser du om natten? (Sei et eller flere kryss)***
- Kjøtt
- Blandmat
- Godter
- Annet

**Spiser du mer enn halvparten av dagens matmengde etter kl. 20 om kvelden?***
- JA
- NEI

**Er andre i familien plagg med nattpisning?***
- JA
- NEI

**Har du skiftarbeid, nattarbeid eller går volker?***
- JA
- NEI

### 5. OPPVEKST, FAMILIE OG VENNER

I hvilken kommune har du bodde lengre enn ett år?

1. Fødested: fra 0 år til

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>År</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Fødested: fra år til

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>År</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Fødested: fra år til

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>År</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Fødested: fra år til

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>År</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Fødested: fra år til

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>År</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ØNSKES du har bodde i flere kommuner, husk og egne ikke.**

**Bor du sammen med ektefelle/samboeren?**
- JA
- NEI

**Har du datter eller daglig omsorg for barn?**
- JA
- NEI

**Foredelen/andren?**

**Hvor mange gode venner har du?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antall venner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antall venner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Er du tilsynlig noen av de følgende menigheter/trossamfunn? (Sei et eller flere kryss):***
- Medlem i statskirkje
- Den Læslandsskikes menighet
- Arntens menighet
- Ikke medlem av noen menighet

**Felter du at du kan påvirke det som skjer i lokalsamfunnet der du bor? (Sei et eller flere kryss):***
- JA, i stor grad
- JA, i liten grad
- NEI

**Har du ikke forsøkt**
6. VERDITILKNYTNING:

TIL ALLE:

Er det viktig for deg å ha kontakt med naturen?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Er utnyttelsen av naturen gjennom fiske, jakt og høvplukking viktig for deg?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Er bevaring av slekts- og familiehistorier viktig for deg?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Hvor opplevelse du er blitt møtt med eller diskriminert på grunn av din etniske bakgrunn (norsk, kvensk, russisk, russisk, russisk, norsk, etc.) bakgrunn?
- Særlig mange ganger ✗
- Noen ganger
- En sjelden gang
- Aldri ✗

Tror du at diskriminering av etniske minoriteter kan ha negative helsesøkonomiske konsekvenser?
- I stor grad ✗
- I noen grad
- I liten grad
- Absolutt ikke

Fører du deg presset ut av næringen din?
- I stor grad ✗
- I noen grad
- I liten grad
- Absolutt ikke

7. TIL DEM MED SAMISK BAKGRUNN:

Er samiske kledeser riktige for deg?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Hvilkien betydning har duodjja for deg?
- Meget stor ✗
- Stor
- Liten
- Ingen betydning

Hva betyr bevaring og utvikling av det samiske språket for deg?
- Meget stor ✗
- Stor
- Liten
- Ingen betydning

Er den viktig for deg å ha i et lokalsamfunn der du daglig kan møte andre samer?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Syner du at bevaring av typiske samiske næringer er viktig?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Er utviklingen av det moderne samiske skoleverket viktig for deg?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Er det viktig for deg at samiske lokalavdannelser bør få et større innslag av moderne arbeidsplasser?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Hva betyr samiske media (radio, TV, aviser, bøker) for deg?
- Meget stor betydning ✗
- Stor betydning
- Liten betydning
- Ingen betydning

Hva betyr moderne samisk kunst (billedkunst, musikk, film og teater) for deg?
- Meget stor ✗
- Stor
- Liten
- Ingen betydning

Hvordan ser du på at samisk samfunn og kultur med årene har fått en sterkere internasjonal kontakt?
- Meget viktig ✗
- Viktig ✗
- Lite viktig
- Helt uviktig

Hva betyr Sametinget for deg?
- Meget stor ✗
- Stor
- Liten
- Ingen betydning

Opplever du forurensering av eller ingrep i naturen som en trussel mot din samiske tilværelse?
- I stor grad ✗
- I noen grad
- I liten grad
- Absolutt ikke

Fører du til moderne utviklingen fortresher den samiske kulturen?
- I stor grad ✗
- I noen grad
- I liten grad
- Absolutt ikke

TAKK FOR HJÆLPEN!
HUSK Å POSTLEGGJE SKJEMAET I DAG!
DEARVASVUODA -
JA EALLINDILE-
ISKKADEAMPNI

Bovdehus
1. DU DEARVVASVUOHTA

Mo lea du dearvvasvuohda dul? (Russe jetke ootat)

- Heittot
- Li nu buorre
- Buorre
- Hirbmat buorre

Leago dus, dahje leago dus leamai?

Ahti vacatas geande?  T  JUO II

Asta

Bistevea bronkhiitas/emfysema/KOLS

Diabetes (sohkarbdavd)

Fibromyalgia/bistevea bëveçassyndroma

Psikalaš vattut maidda leat ijaran veelka

Vëimodohpehát (vëimohóvvl)

Angina pectoris (vëimómgasath)

Vœingågjldnanvihlik/vœingågjldvan

Multipel skolese (MS)

Uleconis kolli

Bavcçapagsto dahje unohastago ratti gec.

Goarapit millilt, raahpd dahe ve vacat jednit dtuhohagás?

Sáhttogo ná bavççastit valkkie it lliht?

2. DEAHIKE- JA DAKTERIGEGIVSSIT

Leagó manimus jigi vaasusuvan haksasiugín ja dahje stirdum deháilgun ja laddaishuim niki lea bista uchimuas 3 manu okilačat?

Leago dus goossige leamai?

Doddjion pëhitadadas/pëhitadiergiss?

Doddjion norai?

JUO IN

3. ČOAVIE- JA CAOLLEDÅVEALREARKKAAT

Leago dus leamai gëhceceloogagan,

cottbaahooladahat dahje adddehalddahat
masi beviaalcaacat uchimuus vahik?

Leagó dus goossige leamai čoavjís haksasat

dahje varka mi lea bista uchimuus 2 vahik?

JUS JUO, pokko čoavjís dovdisit haksatasi?

Russe ootit

Bajit oasis

Vuulit oasis

Miehto čoavjís

Dovdoljito haksasat dahje varka jëmamit?

Russe ootit

Bistä aín vuohkuid

Cjat aín manuñik

Giksaatvarat gavisi haggaami,

cjovisjoarramii

dahje hirbmat buoskuulëmiin?

Leago dus baika dâbalacat?

Russe ootit dahje modfil

Dahalat

Njartat

Garas ja gëjirlagan

Vuulhagid garas ja njartat

Gaddnsa

Balckâgo soames aigígíd golmma dahje eanet
gearde beavíata?

Leagó giksaatuvan oovijíjin/coljígin go
mielkki jugat?

Leago eariin berraaxis smeema dâvdamearkkaat?

Eatinis

Ahti

Oappá/vielja

Márdin

Ii ovettage

JUO IN

4. EARA GIVSIT

Vulubeadle lea isti isegudet välttuvudain. Leagó manimus

vahte daim ovttage dovdan (otnais râdijai)?

Russe jetke gëvحل boodhau?

Fâhka balu akka haga

Dovdan balu dahje iseguda

Skurvas dahje oovejporan

Dovdan isaat caugen dahje huitas

Aiki isaat sivahallat

Caddimvättivuodat

Henrusas, lossamiella

Dovdan leat ávkemashaatin,

Dovdan ahte visot lea lossat

Dovdan ehhpeosivu

Jurdsân leohpahl eallima

5. BEARRAISIS DÄVDIAD

Leago ovttage dahje mingaisis du vëhmëniin
dahje oappain/vieljaish leamai vëimôm-
dohpbehat dahje angina pectoris?

Russe daid fuulkiid bruhtit geajm lea dahje lea leamai muh-
tun däid dâvdilain ja almmet sin agi goa ožjó dâvdilaid.

(fox cmat oappai/vielja, Cille sú ji jëh aramius eallëmis dän oozčul)

Eatinis

Ahti

Vëimôm-dohpbehat ovdal

60-jagi ahi

Vëimôm-
dohpbehat

manjil 60-jagi

Diabetes

Vœingåg-
gpõmlanvihlik

Asta

Gassakaolledavorardváda

Čižzëkorâda

Mannerâksa-
borasâda

Galle oappai/vielja leat dus?  Vielja  Oappá
6. DÄLKASID GEAVAHEAPMI

Dälkasidgin olevaidat dus apotekas oston dälkasid. Biehmolasahusiga ja vitamiinidat eet lohikos dus mingule.

Geavahatgo?
Dälkas a II varrudeldiui ... Dväld. muggi is ud. In goassege:
Kolesteroglesdosaedidj
dälkas ... ... ...
Imuillinna ... ...
Tabletaid ... ...

Man dävia leat marjimus 4 vahkus geavahan däid dälkasid:
(Rusio auki jaoks haigla)

Mäkk vuoja anät däyjmimsut (rusio auki jaoks haigla)

Läbibi alde ...
Borramusa-
rähkadeamis ...
Geavahatgo däid biehmolasahusid:
Ta, tränablehtid ...
Kuuluvuojaablehtid (omega 3) ...
Vitamiinid ... ...

Man olu jugat dälkalačdat däin:
(Rusio auki jaoks haigla)

Bäöčassuojehaadidj
resetptu haig...
Bäöčassuojehaadidj
resetptain ...
Oordendälkassid ...
Räöhändälkassid ...
Dälkassid harvsi voostät ...
Eärä dälkassid resetptain ...

Daid dälkashidlud maid leat russen bajaleal guovitii cüggas ja maíd leat atman marjimus 4 vahku:
Biia namu ja manne däid geavahateat geavahan (dävid dähe dävdamarka): (Rusio data man gõhka leat dälkas geavahan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mäkk vuoja anät däyjmimsut (rusio auki jaoks haigla)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läbibi alde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. BORRAMUS JA JUHKAMUS

Man dävia borat dälkalačdat däid borramusaid:
(Rusio auki jaoks haigla)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galle gohpa gafe dahi deaja jugat beavil? (Rusio 0 sticki täpsud maid in juga beavilacat)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filtar täike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sulli man dävia leat marjimus jagi juhkan alkoholat?
(Geavahatgo ja alkoholadis voelus ja lekk)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In goassege</th>
<th>In juhkan</th>
<th>Hau mottij</th>
<th>Sulli okii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 g</td>
<td>4-6 g</td>
<td>1-2 g</td>
<td>3 g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siffčide geet leat juhkan marjimus jagi:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go leat juhkan, galle glasas dahi drikka leat dälkalačdat juhkan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sulli galli marjimus jagi leat juhkan nu olu go ühcinsum 5 glasas dahi drikka jändoris?

| Go jugat, jugatgo dälkalačdat? (Rusio auki dale moduk)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vuola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEARVASVUODABÄIVALUSAIID GEAVAHEAPMI

Gallii leat manijumis 12 mänu is geavahan:
(russe oküü fuohke limfïs)

Gii loaktara luhite leat is leamax manijumis 12 mänu? (aimmut galle)

Leatgo oõzõon namahuvot istadookatara? [jo] [in]

Go leat ikweedamis, makkar gallii guhahallabehti doaktariin?
(russe oküü daihe màngi)

[ ] Dârogillii
[ ] Sâmegillii
[ ] Gevahan dulika
[ ] Eärâ gallii

Jõhikto abe dooi doaktariin eabppi adèhala giella-
vättisvõudaid geazii?

[ ] Ean goassige
[ ] Hârve
[ ] Duollet dalle
[ ] Dâvâj
[ ] Eahpiisikkar

Jus dârbhâsunvo dulika, leapo doavtit du mielas doavâi
eahppi dan bivit?

[ ] Joo, aloohii
[ ] Joo, dâbaââchät
[ ] li aloohii
[ ] li goassige
[ ] In liikü dulika geavahit

Man duhtavâi daihe duhtameahhünt leot don gieldia
duavter-balvalusa çuovvoiš belii du âsangelldas?
(russe oküü fuohke limfïs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiinemt</th>
<th>Duhtamt</th>
<th>Duhtamt</th>
<th>Hiinemt</th>
<th>Imesamit</th>
<th>Imesamit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joo</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Joo</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jus goassige leat geavahan mossaavtolaâ dâlkkoodebaddii, goaâd leat geavahan? (russe oküü daihe màndii)

[ ] Guvllâra (bohhi, bohso, gielladâlkkoodebaddii)
[ ] Heollâra
[ ] Akupunktüra
[ ] Sonnetarpetàta, homsepata, kinesisoloja njo.

Jus leat geavahan mossaavtolaâ dâlkkoodebaddii, goaâs lei
manijum? (aimmut olles logain)

[ ] (jagi)
[ ] (mânu)

Jurddis mat abe dâi dârbhâsât veahki giellïa deavvas-
võoda- ja sosialbalvalusa (nuovttubõhcoovittus, nuovtt-
uveaho, sosïlia balvalusa, iîshtoolopas njo.)

Diedâgoto geaminna gâcâcât válid oktauvoa?

[ ] Joo
[ ] In
[ ] Eahpiisikkar

Leatgo oodjebas abe oacçût veahki jus dan dârbbâsât?

[ ] Joo
[ ] In
[ ] Eahpiisikkar

Jus dîl oacçût veahki giellïa deavvasvõoda- ja sosialbal-
valusa, leatgo duhtavâa dainna?

[ ] Joo
[ ] In
[ ] Eahpiisikkar

VAHÂGAT/LIHKOHISVUOBAT

Leat go leamax lihkohisvõoda man geazil ferteij doaktara
luosa ja/daïhe buoheccvisi bhîlluvot?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doaktara lusa</th>
<th>Joo</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Gallii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buoheccvisi bhîlluvot</td>
<td>Joo</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Gallii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VAHAGAT/LIHKOHISVUODAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jus joo, de makkar lihkohisvuodat(idde) leat dälkdovudvon?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(russe okti dahej moddii juhike fronjäf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Birja)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohirosikkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muutoaskohter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njeajjevullatsikkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traktor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geihčani lihkohisvuodat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čuohpadanavahagat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earä</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leatigo lihkohisvuotadat gešhpédan bargonävecaid?
- [ ] Čibbas
- [ ] Belohahkii
- [ ] lifi/ei oppanassige

### BARGOEALLIN/RIHTADILLI (jotlaka)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sähtäisõõ jurddäät färret assingieddastat jus fällo duhtiε barga earä balikstä</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Jus leat bargainsehpamne, mütäl man gukä leat bargu ohčam: ammut olles loguim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jagi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jus leat iesebirgejeadji ealalhusoall, makkar ealalhusas barggatt</th>
<th>(russe okti dahej moddii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boazodilis</td>
<td>Cuoldsteinmis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanadoalus</td>
<td>Vuovidelsalus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cäwpedaammas</td>
<td>Earä (ëfíge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gallis asset du bearägottsit?
- [ ] (galle olbmo)

### BEARAS JA GISSLADUOOGAS

Davvi-Norgasa asset mangga čearridduoogat olbmo. Déi mearkkaša ahçe hallei mängalagan giela ja leat iegudel kulturrat. Èvålamearkkat čearriddala duogágii, dahe čerdii leat daća, sémni ja kvenna.

Makkär ruovttugia lea/lei duus, du väh memių ja åhuin/adjain? (russe okti dahej mänga)
- [ ] Dánuoggia
- [ ] Samäregia
- [ ] Kveŋarregia
- [ ] Earä, čilge

### GISSLIDEAPMI

Givssidiemii aivividat go okta dahej moattis dutjnje baháđi manggii dasdj leat dâhje åslikk, ja dus lea váttis ieżat healušit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leatgo guassige givsiduvon?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Jus leat givsiduvon, de mo leat givsiduvon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BARGOEALLIN/RIHTADILLI

Makkär bargu/callibirgejapmi lea duus? (russe okti dahej moddii)
- [ ] Fästabalë, ollesäi
- [ ] Fästabalë, oaseäi
- [ ] Aiğodatbargu
- [ ] Isebirgejeadji ealalhusoall
- [ ] Bargunsehpamne
- [ ] Raouvttus
- [ ] Bargunavčahi nešomarhuk
- [ ] Earä (ëfíge)
8. BORGGUHEAPMI JA SNUVSEN

Man guhka leat beavil dábalačat
suovvalanjas?

Galle olles dimmu

Borgguhigo oktage rávisimmo ruovttus
go bajássadett

Juo IN

Aštgo, dahe leatgo assan, ovttas beavilas
borgguhadeedjigiiin aamaj go devdet 20 jalg?

Juo IN

Leatgo borgguhan/borgguhagto beavilachat?

Galle hago IN

Jus borgguhagob beavilachat dál, borgguhagto?

Galle hago IN

Sigarehaitad?

Galle hago IN

Sigráadi/sigareh/bilipu?

Galle hago IN

Geassunduhpaharullingu?

Galle hago IN

Jus beavilachat leat borgguhan ov达尔, man guhka lea dassa go heette?

Galle hago IN

Jus borgguhagob beavilachat dál, dahe leat borgguhan ov达尔?

Galle hago IN

Man boaris ledjet go vuovtas gearde
ôozet mímmodađvidad?

Galle hago IN

Leatgo dál aphecheapmet?

Galle hago IN

Jus ov达尔 ov达尔, galle hago

Leatgo suovey/suoveyseet beavilachat?

Galle hago IN

Jus suovey/leat suovey, galle hago

Galle hago IN

Leatgo suovey/suoveyseet beavilachat?

Galle hago IN

9. LASMOHALLAN JA RUMASLAS LIHKADEAPMI

Mo lea du rumaslas lihekadeapmi astaajigis leamis manimus
jagil (jundis gaskameeri valkus jahlat, Násti bagari lohko
astaajin. Vásti gaskameeri gaslađakad)

Dilmuun vahkku:

Galle hago IN

Gelppes lihekadeapmi

Galle hago IN

Galle hago IN

Garra rumaslas bagu

Galle hago IN

Almut lihekadeami ja rumaslas rahnamsuad du astaajigis.
Jus lea hui mängagalän lihekadem om, gaskal grasi ja
dalvi, de bija gaskameeri. Gaskalda usaaki dússe manimus
jahkii. (Russse ruvitit mi booramais heive)

Logat, gahgat tu dahe eará
jaskačočik boldoluxi

Galle hago IN

Vácxii, vóadaču dahe lihekad eendáškki
algaan 4 taimu vahkku:

Galle hago IN

Lišumomuči, barang saat beavileharggja ja?

Galle hago IN

Härejhalat garasit dahe gilvočalat
jeavvalačchat ja mängji vahkku?

Galle hago IN

10. OAHPPU JA BARGU

Galle jagi leat skuullaid vázzant? (jagel go leat skuullaid vázzant dálhe stadev)

Juo IN

Mo loottái bargus?

Juo IN

Hirbat bures

Juo IN

Bures

Juo IN

Hirbat heitteg

Juo IN

Oavvildatgo ahte orut massim deiá bargut
dahl hujasad laganus 2 jálg?

Juo IN

Oavvildatgo ahte orut massim deiá bargut
dahl hujasad laganus 2 jálg?

Juo IN

Budhcekceruda

Juo IN

Bagoomi-abahmardaggera

Juo IN

Sosíl vesahkii-bađaíjga

Juo IN

Gaskabodosadárjagga ovttaskas
fuolohedjide

Juo IN

11. DÚŞE NISSONOBMOJ GALCET VÁSTHOIĐ DÁS RÁJES SKOVIS

Man boaris ledjet go vuovtas gearde
ôozet mímmodađvidad?

Galle hago IN

Jus eai čat leat mímmodađvidad, man boaris
ledjet go dat nohke?

Galle hago IN

Leatgo dál aphecheapmet?

Galle hago IN

Jus suovey/suoveyseet beavilachat?

Galle hago IN

Jus suovey/leat suovey, galle hago

Galle hago IN

Galle mán leat riegardáhtin?

Galle hago IN

Jus leat mán riegardáhtin, deaväle juokhe mán leat riegardáhtin?

Galle hago IN

(jus leat amahan, cas o)

Galle mán

Mán

1. mán

2. mán

3. mán

4. mán

5. mán

(jus caso máñi, Gàle amaha Lhali)

Gavehagatu, dahe leatgo geavahan?

Skow-eleki jokhe lóinkj

Galle hago IN

Dál Ov达尔/leatgo in

Geavahan

P-pilla/minipill/p-cirganaasa

Galle hago IN

Hormonspírálá in dalvik speírlia

Galle hago IN

Östrogena tabukhái jokhe Platzol

Galle hago IN

Östrogena hóomála sajajhe oogcospilli

Galle hago IN

Jus geavahan/leat geavahan resephtegatnegas

Östrogena: Man guhka leat dan geavahan?

Galle hago IN

Jus geavahan p-pilla, miniipilla, p-cirganaasa, hormonspírálá
dahlie östrogena: mahkár meara geavahan?

Galle hago IN

Almut:

Galle hago IN
1. DÄVDAMEARKAT

Gosatgo masi beivivalačat soames aëggid jagst? JUO IN

Leatgo ná gossan nu gubrá go 3 mánu guolke manjins jag? JUO IN

Danphauluvago ahte giksaivat nagirgeahetsuvauds? JUO IN

Jus juo, goas giksaivat eamemus nagirgeahetsuvauds?
(Ruse oki ot difo mooku)

Miehtä jarj Giddat Geasit

Calkeát Dálvit

Leatgo manjins jagi giksaivon nagirgeahetsuvauds nu ahte lea caucahan bragasavecaler?

Leatgo eana duhtaças leat eallindillin?

Hirbat duhtaça
Vehas duhameahtun

Geavágo ahte gubakti siggi – ainjuo 14 bavivi – leat vávisi ja šuンドas?

Leatgo manjins 14 bavivi dován ahte i nake čeçavit vattisvooludat?

Mactá nó muhtumin Dávja Masí oppa šiège

Dovdalgau gosange ižat okto?

Mactá nó muhtumin Dávja

2. BORRAMUS DÁL


Gallii vahkus låvet mällasiid borrar?

T

LASSIGAŽÁLDA GAT DEARVASVUODA: JÀ EALLIN-DILEISKADEPMAI

Giltu go bohtiet dearvassvoodiskadeapmi. Dân láhkai leat vaishekan láhkai odda diedid dearvassvooda ja eallindiji birna gowällun gos ijet saipmačat ja dáat, iskadeami valeculuïmil lea leamet láhkai odda diedid vâlmoorraroromadörédjaid birna, vai tâj saîstii easta-
dit. Iskaedamini gëltet dusa lassin saîstii màhtu eara dávédjaid ja gressi birna, nu ahte saîstii olbrumid dearvas
svoodas fyllkas bidjat vàrdisa. Dânne bòvdit du vàstidit soames gãshâldago gillin mat saîniet leat màvsoolačat rësid ja eara dávédjaid.

Devdon skovsi sâddjejave ñuovvu vàstidankunfândluhtas. Porto lea màkson. Giltu ovedâlgihtii vaisheki ovedâst!

Ustritl dearvassvoodaugin
Sâmi dearvassvoodaugi guovddi ja
Nåsjanåhfolkehekeinstituutt

Man dâvja lea mällasiin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 g. guolke</th>
<th>2 g. guolke</th>
<th>3 g. guolke</th>
<th>4 g. guolke</th>
<th>5 g. guolke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guoli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biergu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Man dâvja borat vošon dönki ja sâddi mällasiidda?

Dönskoi árvv varas, veit hoojovvia, suvos, bitoote

Sâddi (varas, varas, varas)

Man dâvja borat eara vošon goli mällasiidda?

Buurodes guolesortait (árvv, suvos, bitoote, duumvaniqou, šuov, gañjai)

Buurodes guolesortait (árvv, suvos, bitoote, duumvaniqou, šuov, gañjai)

Man dâvja borat bošton goli mällasiidda?

Buurodes guolesortait (árvv, suvos, bitoote, duumvaniqou, šuov, gañjai)
2. BORRAMUS DÂL (joatkka)

Man davja borat guolleborramusa mallíasiddu?

Grollegåhhkiud/ bulláid/dearnna
Guollegàtiinn/ guolleputeru
Guolleskkiid/ skâvahuvun guli

Man davja borat guollesunlii?

Spîhke/- sâllegauli
Suovasguali
Maknaalla tomâhtas
Salliituvli
Meoddenjuuviddas
Eará guollesuvli

Galle geardde jagis borat guollesiskkiudid?

Grollevarivoasa
Meoddemidd

Man davja borat ĉuvvoaš borramusâid?

Pizza
Spgełetti, pastaborramusaid
Hamburgera lâbbis
Bieregâhkiud/ karbonâdidd
Mûfflii
Ruitoborramusâ

Man davja borat obba bierrgu mallisiddu (omd.: ĉelgeškâsviit, ĉevarbaal, riútobierggu, bila, deahkkiit)

Vuoncââvggu
Spinni
Vuoksâšibbiu
Sâvzzâåáâhcâ
Ealggga
Fälla

Man davja borat bohcohoierggu?

Vaâšon bohcho- hoierggu/lîema
Barston bohcho- hoierggu
Gilles, câpppm, liettmâpuvun
Suovasbierrgu
Goiâkbierrgu

Man davja borat eara borrhamausa bohcos?

Bohccovvary- borrhamausa
Addamîid
BohconjuukČama
Bohccovuovasa

Galle mearraloddemani borat jahlii? 0 1-3 4-6 7-9 10+

Galle mani

Man davja borat murjîid?

Oktî vášida 1 láievašhas murvjememastuin, jopâid 1 mišëlëhëtäi, 1 bajêíëhëtäi, 1 ãšsa máhîlii, dohje ovto mëxlkis goas boror vanas murjîid.

Luuopmâlnid:

Varas, galmihuvun, fîrmovuvun
Vuâšon/oston meastu

Jopâid:

Varas, galmihuvun, fîrmovuvun
Vuâšon/oston meastu

Sarriddid:

Varas, galmihuvun, fîrmovuvun
Vuâšon/oston meastu
Máhîli

Čâhpeesmûrjiid:

Varas, galmihuvun
Máhîli

Moi livet dont/âse du dałlodoalli hâkhk atouvoaš
nuoddo/nuoňnasid ńeʒâ/ńežas atmûr (tëmmu dâl dalçi muoñid)

Bierggu
Bohco
Sâvzzâ
Ealggga
Ožotgo medīsiemalas trāna bājasaddamis?

Ožotgo trāna omd. guolksi (eara vuola sādālt)?

Man dāvja borret meabcemurjiid ak sattuid bājasaddamis?

Leago borromus maid dao borat earālāgan go maid borret bājasaddamis?

3. BORRAMUS BAJASSADDAMIS

Jurddās nuotu borromusa birr a ovdal go sārrej sierra. Jus āset eamā oasī jāgs internāhtas, de jurddās borromusa birr doppe.

Āsetgo internāhtas (stāhtintemāntas dāhje privāhta) go vārzes mānāid- ak nuoraidskuvillas?

Ju goappāge

Jus juo, galle luokha?

Man guhūd lejet internāhitas gaskamearālačat luokhe luokhā?

Man dāvja borret guoli ak bohcciberiugu bājasaddamis?

Man dāvja borret eara borromuslaids bājasaddamis?

4. IDJABORRAN

Manihatgo dāvja boradi mānjp go eahkeds leat veledan?

Jus 'juo', višt boahiite 4 gāzaldaga:

Goa leat dus dāvijumusat givsīt?

Maid borat ihkku?

Boratgo eane go beali jāndora borromusas mānjp di 20 eahkedas?

Givsidvuojetgo earat bearāas idjaborramis?

Maid borat ihkku?

Leago dus hargvouorm, idjabargu dāhe vuourd vacatl?

5. BAJASSADDAN, BEARAS JA USTIBAT

Man gieldds leat āssan guhikigo ovstt jaq?

Gieldda:
1. Rievikahākā:

2. .

3. .

4. .

5. 

Åstgo ovstt naitosguimmi elastraddim?

Leago dus beavīlās dāhe jukkkon foolahus:

Vāhniimmidaearāides?

Galle buori ustiba leat dus?

Geaigūn sāhīt eacjebasat hāallat ja geat sāhīt du vēakhej jus dan darbhabat. Ale loga sin geaigūn ovstas āsat, muiho eara fūlkkiad gali
Colatgo otväge disid searvegottiide/oskkuide?
(Roome ohki dyhe moddii)
□ Stahtangiku mielluhut
□ Lestadiñaala searvegoddai
□ Eerá searvegoddai
□ In mielluhut otväge searvegottiis

Dovddatgo ahle sahtät väikhuut dan mi dánhpuhuv hääke-
gottis goos äsat? (Roome důre ohki)
□ Joo, hui olu □ Joo, muhtun muddii
□ Joo, unnnán □ In □ In leat geahččalan

6. ÁRVOČATNAŠUPMI

BUOHKAIDE:
Leago dutnje dehalaš leat luondus?
Hirbart dehalaš Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leago luonddu akvástllall nugo guolahšepami, bivdu ja mürjon dutnje dehalaš?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leatgo sotka- ja bearašarbeverut dutnje dehalačč bishuht?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leatgo vāshahan ahle leat givsíhuvon dahe vealahuovun du čeardšalas duogaza (samí, kveona, russia, tamila, dazá jna.) geazínt?
Hui mängii Muhtumün Hārve In oppanassilge
□ □ □ □ □
Jahkšto ahle čeardšalas umnitlogiid vealahuapmi sǎhhita dearyvsvuhtti čuothat hōjas gvisiit?
Hui olu Muhtun lähkai Unnnán li oppanassilge
□ □ □ □ □
Dovddatgo ahle eaalhuasusit leat duvdujnuvomin eret?
Hui olu Muhtun lähkai Unnnán li oppanassilge
□ □ □ □ □

7. SIDJHIDE GEAIN LEA SÁMI DUOGÁS:

Leatgo sámi bivťavsvierut dutnje dehalaččat?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Maid meerkaša dutnje duodji?
Hirbart stuorra Stuorra Unnnán li makkärge mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi
□ □ □ □ □
Maid meerkaša dutnje sámegiela seealhuheapmi ja ovdidi-
deapmi?
Hirbart stuorra Stuorra Unnnán li makkärge mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi
□ □ □ □ □
Leago dutnje dehalaš ässat hääkegottis goos beavjulččat sahtät deavvoladit eara simingiini?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leago du míasas dehalaš ahle hułilmis sámí eslahusat bishuuvvojí?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leago dehalaš dutnje ahle ovdíluuvgo oddaäiğasa sámí skoví?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Leago dutnje dehalaš ahle sámí hääkegottis beresí aazžut eanet oddaäiğasa bargosesjí?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Maid meerkašas dutnje sami mediat (TV, avivsát, girjíjíjí)?
Hirbart stuorra Stuorra Unnnán li makkärge mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi
□ □ □ □ □
Maid meerkaša dutnje odda sámí dáidda (govváidaa, musihkka, tibhna ja tehter)?
Hirbart stuorra Stuorra Unnnán li makkärge mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi
□ □ □ □ □
Mo du míasas lea go sámí servodat ja kultuvra jagijid mielde lea ozón lagat niikaidgasasas oktavuuładí?
Hirbart Unnnán Áibbas
dehalaš dehalaš dehalaš deattoheapme
□ □ □ □ □
Maid meerkaša dutnje Samedigíjí?
Hirbart stuorra Stuorra Unnnán li makkärge mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi mearkšatupmi
□ □ □ □ □
Dovddatgo ahle nuukskideapmi luundus dahe sisahkken lundui äitä du sâmí eallma?
Hui olu Muhtun lähkai Unnnán li oppanassilge
□ □ □ □ □
Dovddatgo ahle oddaäiğasa ovḍaneapmi duvdu eret sámí kultuvra?
Hui olu Muhtun lähkai Unnnán li oppanassilge
□ □ □ □ □

GIITU VEHKI OVDDAS!
MUITTE SKOVI OTNE POSTET!