

---

# WELFARE, INTEGRATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

---

A study on labour market segregation and integration policy in Norway

Master thesis in human rights, 30 credits,  
September 2013

Annika Andersson

Supervisor: Peter Johansson



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
SCHOOL OF GLOBAL STUDIES

## **Thanks!**

I would like to thank my supervisor, Peter Johansson, whose support and feedback have been of great help for me while conducting this study.

Annika Andersson

September 2, 2013

## Abstract

A fundamental principle of human rights is that of equality and non-discrimination. This should apply to every human being on an individual basis and to everyone of a Member State's territory. However, in many countries immigrants face problems with high unemployment. In Norway, immigrants' rate of unemployment is up to three times higher than that of native citizens. Unemployment rates following ethnicity might indicate discriminatory practices, and thus that everyone is not entitled to their human rights. Integration is a question of human rights and equal opportunities to participate in the society; labour market segregation affecting immigrants is thus a human rights issue. Therefore, it is of interest to look at how the labour market segregation in Norway is perceived and whether it is acknowledged in relation to human rights. This study aims to examine how, and to what extent, labour market segregation and integration are addressed from a human rights perspective in Norwegian integration policy and how this changes over time. By conducting discourse analysis, integration as a social phenomenon can be studied, as well as how labour market segregation, integration and immigrants are perceived, and what ideology is dominant in integration policy. The empirical material consists of two white papers concerning integration in Norway, released during two different time periods, both following periods of remarkably high unemployment for immigrants. The theoretical frame in this study has its starting point in human rights as a frame for integration politics in a welfare state. It also consists of integration and migration policies and theories of segregating practices, such as otherization and discrimination. Since the analyzed material is on a high political level aimed to address a nation, national discourse is also part of the theoretical structure, and multiculturalism/diversity as strategies in national policy. The results in this study reveal that labour market segregation to a great extent is recognized as a problem of discriminatory practices. Integration policies in both time periods thus aim to have a framework of human rights and equal opportunities. However, sustainment of the welfare State and profit-making are crucial, in which high employment and usage of the population's resources are of great importance. Human rights discourses are subordinated economic discourses, and are mostly articulated as a tool in achieving high employment through equal opportunities. A transformation of human rights discourses over time is visible, however, aiming to be more inclusive and to counteract otherization in the latter time period. Although, the resource discourse is still dominating, in which cultural characteristics and skills are important. The rights of the individual are thus overlooked for the economic interests of the welfare State.

## Contents

Abstract .....	2
List of abbreviations.....	6
1. Introduction .....	7
1.1. Problem formulation - Norwegian welfare and integration model.....	9
1.2. Aim .....	10
1.3. Questions .....	10
1.4. Limitations.....	10
1.5. Key terms.....	12
1.5.1. Human rights .....	12
1.5.2. Culture .....	12
1.5.3. Integration .....	13
1.5.4. Immigrant and people with immigrant background.....	13
1.6. Linguistic considerations.....	13
1.7. Disposition.....	13
2. Method and analytical framework.....	15
2.1. Discourse analysis .....	15
2.1.1. Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse theory .....	15
2.1.2. Construction of the society and identities .....	16
2.2. Operationalization .....	17
2.3. Role of the analyst .....	18
2.4. Material discussion .....	20
2.4.1. Empirical primary material .....	20
2.4.2. Secondary material; research .....	21
2.4.3. Other material.....	22
3. Theoretical framework .....	23
3.1. Human rights in a context of integration .....	23

3.1.1.	Discrimination .....	23
3.1.2.	Institutional/Structural discrimination.....	23
3.1.3.	Discrimination in the labour market.....	24
3.1.4.	Cultural racism .....	26
3.1.5.	Intersectionality .....	27
3.2.	Otherization; ‘us’ and ‘them’ .....	27
3.3.	National discourse .....	28
3.4.	Integration.....	29
3.4.1.	Migration and integration policy .....	29
3.5.	Multiculturalism and diversity.....	30
4.	Results and analysis .....	32
4.1.	Human rights frame .....	32
4.2.	Discrimination .....	34
4.2.1.	Discrimination as a recognized problem for integration .....	34
4.2.2.	Discrimination - measure .....	38
4.3.	Inclusive discourse as a measure .....	42
4.4.	‘Us’/’them’ discourse .....	45
4.4.1.	Factors: ‘us’/’them; explicitly articulated in 1997 .....	45
4.4.2.	Factors: ‘us’/’them’ – implicitly articulated in 2012, and categorization .....	46
4.4.3.	Cultural essentialism as a factor of disintegration.....	48
4.4.4.	‘Us’ and ‘them’ discourse articulated in measures .....	49
4.5.	Qualification and skills-gap discourse.....	51
4.5.1.	Factors emphasising skills-gap and diminishing discrimination.....	51
4.5.2.	Skills-gap in measures.....	54
4.6.	Resource and economic discourse .....	54
4.6.1.	Resources and discrimination – factor .....	54
4.6.2.	Work as the superior aim – through equal opportunities .....	57

4.6.3. Equality through employment.....	60
4.6.4. Profits of immigration as a measure.....	60
4.6.5. From multiculturalism to diversity.....	65
5. Conclusions .....	71
6. Final discussion .....	74
6.1. Suggestions for future research .....	75
7. References .....	76
Appendix - Translations .....	80

## List of abbreviations

CEDAW – Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women

CRC – Convention on the Rights of the Child

DIFI – Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT<sup>1</sup>

EEA – European Economic Area

EU – European Union

ICCPR – International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICERD – International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

ICESCR – International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

IMDi – Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet<sup>2</sup>

NOU – Norsk Offentlig Utredning<sup>3</sup>

OHCHR – Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights

SIED – Statement of Intent for promoting Equality and preventing Discrimination

SOU – Statlig Offentlig Utredning<sup>4</sup>

UDHR – Universal Declaration on Human Rights

---

<sup>1</sup> In English: The Directorate for Administration and IKT

<sup>2</sup> In English: The Directorate of Integration and Diversity

<sup>3</sup> In English: Norwegian Governmental Official Report

<sup>4</sup> In English: Swedish Governmental Official Report

# 1. Introduction

The human rights declarations and conventions are based on the fundamental principle of every human being's equal value in dignity and rights (Smith 2012:195). The principle consists of three fundamental characteristics: human rights are universal and apply to every human being, they are equally valid for everyone, and they are the rights of the individual. The universal human rights are thus to be enjoyed by all people on an individual basis (Freeman 2011:68, 200).

The human rights basis of equality unavoidably includes prohibition of discrimination, and is included in every human rights instrument, whether it is explicitly prohibited or generally, since non-discrimination "is the negative restatement of the principle of equality" (Smith 2012:195). Equality as a concept is to be seen as a cornerstone in human rights, and in democratic societies, and includes also the right to education and work (ibid.).

Migration of people is a consequence of the development of the nation State. After World War II, a great number of people were displaced, and migration and refugees became a concern (Smith 2012:8,376-377). Consequently, new ethnic groups were established in many countries (Castles and Miller 2009:245).

The universal human rights apply to "peoples of the Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction" (Ghandhi 2012:10). Therefore, also aliens in a state are granted rights by international law, whether they are migrant workers, refugees or migrating for reasons of family reunification<sup>5</sup> (Smith 2012:377; Ghandhi 2012:122; OHCHR Migration Papers 2005:1).

Due to industrialism and increased movement, a discussion on integration became part of the agenda of social scientists (Kamali 2006:7). Integration is commonly described as the process in which immigrants become a part of their host country, and how this process can (and should) be facilitated by the receiving State and the civil society (Castles and Miller 2009:245).

Immigrants' integration is a question of democracy and fundamental human rights. A segregated society means unequal distribution of social, political and economic resources (Södergran 2000:44). In most countries, immigrants have lower employment and activity rates,

---

<sup>5</sup> However, the right to family reunification is rather complex, since "the recognition of a specific right to family reunification seems to be in a sort of limbo between States' duty to recognize and respect the human rights of all individuals within their territory vis-à-vis States' right to freely determine –within certain limits - their immigration laws and border control policies" (OHCHR Migration Papers 2005:1).



illuminating difficulties that immigrants experience. In almost every immigration country in Europe, immigrants are more likely to be employed in temporary jobs than citizens (Zrinscak in Carmel et al 2011:198).

When there is a correlation between unemployment rates and ethnicity, sex or religion it is important to analyze what mechanisms are behind this. Kamali (2006:10) discusses a dilemma considering universal declarations on human rights and discrimination based on ethnicity, skin colour, sex, class and religion; the declarations must be valid for everyone, which is not occurring when certain ethnic groups are segregated.

The difficulties immigrants face are in some cases due to xenophobia and negative attitudes against them. However, this varies greatly from country to country and is a result of complex processes within the social, economic and political spheres (Constant, Kahane & Zimmermann 2009:6), as well as resulting from migration and integration policies, with official ideologies creating expectations and perceptions of immigrants within the majority population (Castles and Miller 2009:252). Discursive mechanisms can reproduce segregating factors by representing certain images of immigrants (Molina 2006:96, 101).

Segregation and exclusion from the labour market is thus to be seen as a human rights issue. Whether the segregation is due to xenophobia and discriminatory practices, other mechanisms, or a combination - the fact that employment is clearly ethnified, with a higher rate of unemployment for people with immigrant background, and thus less likely to be a part of the society, is a human rights issue in itself.

Previous research on integration and segregating mechanisms in Europe has largely focused on integration into the European Union (e.g. Carmel et al 2011, Mattsson 2004, Schierup et al 2006, Dahrendorf 1985), also referred to as 'the European fortress' due to the European identity that has arisen from the Union. Norway is not a part of the European Union and therefore not included in the many case studies on integration in EU-countries, but is just as well a part of the European Economic Area (EEA), which involves, equally to EU, a free market of goods and services.

There are a number of different perspectives and disciplines available to examine migration and integration patterns including historical (e.g. Amoroso 1992; Kühnhardt 2006), economical (e.g. Castles & Miller 2009), sociological (e.g. Södergran 2000; Mulinari & Neergaard 2004), or multidisciplinary (e.g. Castles and Miller 2009; Hammar et al 1997). Few studies, however,

have been conducted from a pure human rights perspective, and none in a European but non-EU country, which is why there is a need for this type of study.

The starting points in this study are human rights in relation to integration and immigration, and labour market segregation and –mechanisms, such as discrimination and otherization.

### 1.1. Problem formulation - Norwegian welfare and integration model

Norway is a welfare state, with comparatively very low unemployment. It is referred to the Norwegian welfare model, developed in the 1970's. The integration policy is based on the economic transitions from the Norwegian welfare state and the principle of equal treatment. Immigration control and selectivity are seen as an important process in Norway's ability to maintain its generous welfare state. It is also considered of great importance to integrate the immigrants, particularly into the labour market, but also into the society in general. This is because people who are outside the labour market might threaten the welfare society, and as a consequence might "challenge the togetherness and consensus" (NOU 2011:7 12).

A fundamental assumption in the Norwegian integration politics has been that social rights create integration. During the last years, however, a contradicting thought has been developed, namely that social rights become an obstacle for integration, especially when it comes to labour. Welfare is thus seen as both the solution and the problem. While it ensures a decent living and integration into society, the welfare system can be considered as too generous to be an incentive to work (NOU 2011:7 23).

In Norway, there are migrants from more than 200 countries, accounting for approximately 13 % of the population (Meld. St. 6 2012:8). The immigration rate is increasing, and as of 2011 200 000 immigrants had been settled in Norway less than 5 years, which is twice as high amount as in 2005. With an increasing amount of immigrants, a relevant integration policy is important in order to meet the immigrants' needs and make them included into the Norwegian society. An aim with the Norwegian integration policy is that it should be built on human rights' values, where access to the labour market, democracy and participation in civil society should be a reality regardless of background or sex (Meld. St. 6 2012:8).

Unemployment rates among immigrants are more than three times higher than that of native citizens. This is a rather constant number, regardless of economic situation and other aspects that might affect the labour market, and the differences in employment amongst ethnic groups have been rather constant for several years (Meld. St. 6 2012:25).

Immigrants are only partly included in the welfare society, with a clearly higher rate of unemployment than native citizens, especially for immigrants from Asia and Africa (Meld. St. 6 2012:113). Unemployment can thus be seen as following ethnicity, which could signify that everyone is not entitled to fundamental human rights, such as the right to work.

## 1.2. Aim

The aim of this study is to examine how, and to what extent, labour market segregation and integration are addressed from a human rights perspective in Norwegian integration policy and how this changes over time.

## 1.3. Questions

How are factors behind segregation, and in particular labour market segregation, discursively described in Norwegian integration policy?

How are the factors addressed: which discourses can be identified in measures against labour market segregation and which discourse gets priority?

What discursive changes on segregation and integration can be seen over time?

## 1.4. Limitations

This study will scrutinize integration policies from two different time periods, more specifically white papers. The white papers are formulated as reports, consisting of both background information of work conducted in the field it concerns, as well as suggestions of future decisions in the matter ([www.regjeringen.no](http://www.regjeringen.no)). They could therefore give an adequate picture of current discourses in the field, which is why I have chosen to analyze white papers concerning integration. Furthermore, as previously mentioned in the problem formulation in this study, policies might create segregating practices by the ideology presented and/or through discursive (re)productions of images of certain groups in society (see e.g. Molina 2006; Jørgensen Winther & Phillips 2002).

This study will focus on immigrants' segregation in the labour market. This is due to a number of reasons. The labour market is the field where the statistics show the most segregation between ethnic groups, which is why I find it important to study this phenomenon in particular. In addition, labour is often seen as a central aspect of integration: it is a way for economic independency, a possibility to support oneself and the family, and a way to participate in the society. The material of analysis in the policies has been focused on sections in the integration

policies concerning generic sayings on integration and immigration, sections concerning labour and sections concerning discrimination. The latter is analyzed in order to see, for instance, how discrimination is perceived as a possible segregating factor and how non-discrimination is seen as a measure for integration, since this is a fundamental human rights principle. The generic sayings on integration are included in order to look at how the ideology of integration on a general level is articulated. Discursive sayings, that is not related to the labour market, on groups in the society might also affect segregating practices in the labour market.

As mentioned, integration policies from two time periods are scrutinized. One of the time periods examined is 1996/1997, when a white paper of integration was released. The integration policy follows a period of a great increase in unemployment for immigrants from Asia, Africa, Latin-America and Eastern Europe between 1988-1995. Simultaneously, unemployment for Norwegian citizens decreased in the period of 1993-1996 (Meld. St. 17 1997:12). The time of 1996/1997 thus followed a period of labour segregation for certain ethnicities, which is why it is of importance to further study how the segregation is addressed in the integration policy, what factors and measures are developed in order to create an integrating practice and what discourses are dominant in this. This is the only document on integration policy released at the time, and therefore the only document analyzed for this period.

The second time period scrutinized in this study includes present time (beginning 2009) and the latest integration policies. Unemployment rates for people with immigrant background are still high and, as mentioned, for certain immigrant groups three times higher than for the majority population (Meld. St. 6 2012:25). Labour market segregation is thus still a problem, which is why I aim to study how segregation is addressed also in this policy. By this time the integration policy have been developed and includes additional statements which is why these documents have been added to the analysis. The additional documents consist of a *Statement of intent for promoting equality and preventing discrimination* (hereinafter referred to as SIED), and a *Statement of intent for integration and inclusion for the immigrant population* (hereinafter referred to as Prop. 1 S).

By making comparisons between two different time periods, the aim is to see how discourses have changed over time, what trends are visible by looking at specific times and what effects could be possible as the consequences of certain dominating discourses at a certain time.

During the first time period the single ruling party in the government was *Arbeiderpartiet* (i.e. Labour Party). In the latter time period there was a coalition government with *Arbeiderpartiet*, *Sosialistisk Venstreparti* (Socialist Left Party), and *Senterpartiet* (Center Party)<sup>6</sup>.

In this study, only factors and measures concerning labour market segregation and immigrants on a general level are included, which is why factors and measures directed exclusively towards labour migrants are not mentioned in this study. Moreover, I have not taken measures directed exclusively towards, for instance, discrimination on religious grounds into account, even though this could also be an obstacle for establishment and participation in the labour market. However, I aim to include an intersectional perspective, thus looking at how different grounds of discrimination (individually or interlinked) are related to the labour market specifically.

## 1.5. Key terms

Below follows definitions of the key terms used in this study.

### 1.5.1. Human rights

Human rights as referred to in this study is the definition stated by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights (OHCHR):

Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, whatever our nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, language, or any other status. We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination. These rights are all interrelated, interdependent and indivisible.

### 1.5.2. Culture

Culture is a recurring term in the material of analysis in this study, which is why ‘culture’ as it is stated in the white paper from 1997 will be the valid definition: “[t]he sum of knowledge that are handed over to people from previous generations through a dynamic process. The knowledge consists of values, traditions, norms, codes, symbols and expressions”<sup>7</sup> (Meld. St. 17 1997).

---

<sup>6</sup> This information is presented for the reader to bear in mind – I do not aim to further analyse ideological impacts of the government on the discourses identified in the integration policies.

<sup>7</sup> In original language: Summen av kunnskap som overleveres mennesker fra tidligere generasjoner gjennom en dynamisk prosess. Kunnskapen består av verdier, sedvaner, normer, koder, symboler og uttrykksformer.

### 1.5.3. Integration

Castles and Miller (2009:245) define integration as a process where “immigrants and their descendants can become part of receiving societies and nations”. In the integration policy from 1997, ‘integration’ is defined as “*the goal for equality through equal opportunities, rights and duties for participation for everyone, regardless of background*”<sup>8</sup> (Meld. St. 17 1997:9, italics in original. ‘Integration’ is not defined as a term in the white paper from 2012, the definition above is therefore the only definition considered). Since the analysis in this study does not aim to reveal what is true, but instead how it is perceived in the Norwegian integration policy, the definition from the white paper is most valid in this context.

### 1.5.4. Immigrant and people with immigrant background

In the Norwegian integration policy, an immigrant is defined as “people who are born abroad by two foreign-born parents and who have migrated to Norway”<sup>9</sup>. It is also referred to *Norwegian born with immigrant parents*, meaning people who are “born in Norway, but has two parents that are immigrants”<sup>10</sup>. *People with immigrant background* is a joint term of *Immigrant* and *Norwegian born with immigrant parents* (Meld. St. 6 2012:16) (the same definition is also used in the white paper from 1997).

## 1.6. Linguistic considerations

The material has been translated from Norwegian to English by myself. In order to reduce a risk of linguistic arbitrariness from my side, translations of citations are presented in an appendix. Every citation is followed by a number, indicating under which number the original citation can be found in the appendix.

## 1.7. Disposition

The initial chapter presents a problem formulation and a short background of Norwegian welfare and integration model, together with the aim and questions for this study, as well as key terms and delimitations. The following chapter describes the framework of discourse analysis and how it is used in this study. My role as an analyst in relation to this study is also presented, as well as the material used. Chapter 3 presents the theoretic framework, and the following

---

<sup>8</sup> In original language: *målet om likestilling gjennom like muligheter, rettigheter og plikter til deltakelse for alle, uansett opprinnelse.*

<sup>9</sup> In original language: personer som er født i utlandet av to utenlandsfødte foreldre og som på et tidspunkt har innvandret til Norge.

<sup>10</sup> In original language: født i Norge men har to foreldre som er innvandrere.

chapter, 4, describes the results and analysis of the study. The final chapters present conclusions, final discussion and suggestions for future research.

## 2. Method and analytical framework

### 2.1. Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is suitable for doing research on societal issues and when looking into questions of power and how this creates meaning in our world as we see it (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002:8). The short definition of discourse is “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)” (ibid. 1). It is about conducting critical research in order to “see behind” the structures on which a certain aspect, institution or phenomenon is built, as well as finding normative perspectives (ibid. 2).

#### 2.1.1. Laclau and Mouffe’s Discourse theory

Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory<sup>11</sup> (also referred to only as discourse theory) is abstract and focus on social phenomena. According to this approach, everything in the society is discursive. Therefore, discursive and non-discursive practices are not differentiated; everything can be analyzed with discourse analytical tools. The aim of discourse theory is to uncover how the reality is constructed, not to reveal the real truth, since truth is only constructed through discourses that produce meaning (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002:24-25).

Discourse theory is adequate for the type of study I aim to conduct, since I will scrutinize integration as a social phenomenon and examine what factors in relation to integration and immigrants are perceived as the true explanations. By carefully studying integration policies linguistically from different times, my aim is to reveal how groups in the society are constituted, how are individuals subjected, what paradigm can be visible in Norwegian integration policy, how are immigrants perceived as a group in relation to Norwegian citizens, etc.

A discourse means that there is a fixation of meaning, and it consists of different *signs* that are understood in a certain way in certain discourses. A discourse is totally established when every sign has its fixed meaning interrelated to other signs, i.e. it is a *moment*. This is performed by *exclusion* of all other meanings that the signs could possibly have. A discourse is thus about fixating the signs to the extent that no other sign could have that meaning. In a discourse there

---

<sup>11</sup> Every approach within discourse analysis have a basis in social constructionism, consisting of four fundamental premises: 1) the reality can only be viewed as created through categories, and is our interpretation of the world. 2) The way we produce reality is determined by our historically and culturally specific understanding. It is also contingent, meaning that it can change over time. 3) Knowledge is created in social processes, in which we compete about what we should consider true or false, and construct what is seen as common truth. 4) We perform social actions within a particular worldview, in which some actions are considered natural and others are controversial. It is a continuation of the previous premise, and the social construction of truth has consequences for how we act in social life (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002:5-6)



are certain signs that are more important than others. These are called *nodal points*, other signs are ordered around the nodal point and get their meaning in relation to it. In a national discourse, for example, a nodal point is ‘the people’ (Jørgensen Winther & Phillips 2002:26).

When signs are put in relation to each other in order to create a meaning, it is called *articulation*. However, since a discourse is always contingent and related to signs outside, the fixed meaning of the discourse is at risk of being disordered by other signs fixating the meaning in another way. *Elements* are relevant in this aspect, as they are signs that have not been given a fixed meaning yet. They are therefore *poly-semantic* and contain multiple meanings. In a discourse, the attempt is to fixate the meaning of elements by reducing the multiple possible meanings into one (ibid.). There are some elements that are especially open to be ascribed different meanings, these are called *floating signifiers*. When there is a fixation of the signs, it is a *closure* of the discourse. However, there can never be a permanent closure of meaning, since “the transition from the ‘elements’ to the ‘moments’ is never entirely fulfilled” (Laclau and Mouffe cited in Jørgesen Winther & Phillips 2002:28); i.e. the discourse is always changeable. Therefore, a key term within discourse analysis is *discursive struggle*, meaning that different discourses are in constant struggle of closing the discourse in a particular way and struggling to achieve *hegemony* (ibid. 13). A hegemonic discourse is the dominating discourse that have created a temporarily fixation of the signs (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:55). This makes the discourse hard to penetrate since its existence is not questioned but seen as the truth (Mattsson 2005:146).

Another discourse theoretical concept used in this study is *chains of equivalence*. By linking significant with each other, it is possible to see which moments are equivalent in the discourse, i.e. to see what meanings the discourse is linked with and what meanings are left out (Jørgensen Winther & Phillips 2000:50).

### 2.1.2. Construction of the society and identities

There are also floating signifiers that refers to a totality, which in discourse theory is called *myth*. A term such as ‘the society’ is produced as if it exists objectively, by being ascribed a total structure. One of the aims with discourse analysis is to define and analyze the myths that are seen as natural and by which actors it is articulated (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002:40).

Identity, whether it is individual or collective, is being ascribed to us, as well as being negotiated discursively. We could have different identities at different given times and/or contexts, and it is changeable. Creation of group identity is thus created the same way, i.e. by discursively

ascribing meaning to the identity that excludes other possible meanings. 'The other' is being excluded in the discursively created group, and so are possible differences *within* the group and alternative ways of formulating the group (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:51-52). A group can be said to exist when it is formulated in words, since it does not exist socially until discursively created, i.e. when it is represented and being addressed as a group. However, the constitution of a group means a differentiating towards other groups and is thus part of giving meaning to the society. Different myths of the society could also constitute groups differently.

However, not every individual has an equally great possibility to articulate discourses and create change. Actors are referred to as *subject positions* in discourse theory, meaning that individuals are ascribed different positions in different discourses, such as 'mother' in a family discourse and 'feminist' in a political discourse. Different subject positions consequently have unequally possibilities to articulate a change that is recognized. Limitations to certain subject positions might follow social categories such as sex, ethnicity and class, thus being conditional on structural power relations (Winther Jørgensen and Phillips 2000:54, 63). The discourses that are mapped in this study are articulated from a top political level, where the actors possess subject positions that only a few people can have access to and who have power to formulate political change and consequently new discourses.

Some of the linguistic tools presented above are only used in the process of analysis and not further presented in the result. The tools presented in the analysis in this study are articulation, closure, discursive struggle, hegemony, subject position, myth and chains of equivalence.

## 2.2. Operationalization

Initially in the analysis process, I penetrated the two integration policies that are the main sources of analysis in this study. I categorized the material in problems/factors and measures, more specifically factors and measures that could be said to be of a general character and those specifically aimed at the labour market. When identical excerpts were found, only one of them were used in the study.

What is defined as factor/problem and measure in relation to immigration segregation in general and in relation to labour market segregation for people with immigrant background in particular, is partly done by me, partly outlined in the documents analyzed. In the white paper from 1997, the document is clearly divided into background/factors and measures. There is no such distinction in the white paper from 2012, which is why the consideration of what is said to be factor and what is said to be measure is done by me. Shortly, the definition of factor is, the way

it is used in this study, descriptions or problematizations of *why* certain groups experience higher unemployment rates/are not participating in the society to as great extent as the majority or *how* immigration is said to give effect on the society. Measures, as used in this study, are formulated goals of the integration policy that, as mentioned, are either of a generic nature or specifically directed towards the labour market.

A fundamental tool in discourse analysis that I have been using is deconstruction. By deconstructing it is possible to demonstrate that the discourse is contingent and could have been articulated differently; the aim is to deconstruct the structures that are seen as the “truth”. In this study I am deconstructing by showing discursive struggle and thus alternative ways of articulating the discourse. By looking at how discourses of the Norwegian integration policy change over time one way is to look at historical discourses in order to reveal alternative formulations (the historical context is also a way of distancing oneself from the naturalized understandings, which is further described in 2.3.). The deconstruction facilitates the work of determining what signs are nodal points around which the moments are (temporarily) fixed and if a closure of the discourse is done by excluding alternative meanings. By looking at what discourses that are articulated in both time periods, it has also been possible to see what discourses appear to be hegemonic.

Chains of equivalence is used when I have assessed that it eases the understanding of the discourse and discursive change for the reader.

As discussed above, the study must be related to a background structure in order to be able to find a meaning in the discourse; one study analysis cannot reveal if the discursive sayings are creating change or reproduction since there is always a limited number of discursive sayings (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002:140). As mentioned, the focus in this study lies in factors of segregating practices and measures of integration and how this is related to human rights discourses. The theoretical structure in this study has its starting point in human rights as a frame for integration politics in a welfare state. It also consists of integration and migration policies and theories of segregating practices through hegemonic discourses of otherness. Since the analyzed material is on a high political level aimed to address a nation, national discourse is also part of the theoretical structure.

### 2.3. Role of the analyst

Since everything is discourse according to Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory, so is the result from a discourse analysis. Therefore, the analyst must carefully consider his/her own role in

creating a discourse when producing an interpretation of discourses. Since the premise is that there is no truth besides the one that is discursively produced, then how should the analyst relate to the truth that is produced from the discourse analysis he/she conducts (Jørgensen Winther & Phillips 2002:21f).

The researcher can relate to the problem in different ways, and the different approaches within discourse analysis also take different solutions in this matter. Discourse analysis does not use the traditional objectivist's research demands of reliability and validity. However, validity is not completely overlooked. Within discourse analysis, validity is foremost about whether the reader will accept the analysis. There are several ways to do this. One is to focus on *coherence* in the analysis. If some aspects are not in line it is less likely that the analysis will be accepted. Another way, that Winther Jørgensen and Phillips (2002:125) mention is to look for the *fruitfulness* of the analysis, which means to evaluate the "explanatory potential of the analytical framework including its ability to provide new explanations" (ibid.). In order for the study to be valid it is important that the study is made transparent so that the reader can follow the process and consider whether the assumptions made and the results in the study are consistent and acceptable. Therefore, my aim is to produce a transparent result by showing discourses with citations<sup>12</sup> and by closely explaining the identified discourses. However, as a researcher, I can never produce knowledge that is completely transparent, because it is always context-influenced (ibid. 22). I must distance myself from my naturalized understandings in order to be able to see the knowledge that is taken for granted from the periphery, to the extent possible (Jørgensen Winther & Phillips 2002:189f). This can be done by looking at historical understandings of what one aims to study in order to see how it has developed and taken another form today. One can also distance oneself physically by moving away from the centre (ibid. 193). Since this study aims to scrutinize change over time, studying the past is inevitably a way of distancing myself from the naturalized understandings (even though "the past" in this study is only 20 years away and societal discourses have probably not changed dramatically).

When initiating this study, and partly while conducting it, I was living in Norway, thus being an immigrant myself since my nationality is Swedish. Conducting a study on integration policy in Norway in this context, my role as a researcher in this study is both in the centre and the periphery, to refer to above terms. I am in the periphery of the Norwegian cultural context and

---

<sup>12</sup> The level of transparency with citations is obviously reduced when the citations are translated by the author, as has been done in this study. I aim to counteract that by showing the full citations in original language in an appendix.

the national identity of Norwegians, and partly in the center of the Norwegian integration politics since I am one of the targeted groups, although not one of the groups of focus in this study. Not being fostered into Norwegian culture and political discourse is an advantage in my role as a researcher, when scrutinizing and analyzing the Norwegian context, thus being distanced from what I am about to study. However, being a resident in Norway, I am unavoidably a part of, and affected by, Norwegian politics, thus complicating the distance-making. However, I aimed to distance myself from the naturalized understandings by entering the analysis with an understanding of what I am about to analyze from previous research and theory and with analytical tools.

The fact that I am schooled within mainly social sciences and that the approach used in this study is human rights will naturally also mirror the results in this study.

## 2.4. Material discussion

The material in this study mainly consists of two different types; material produced by the Norwegian government, of which integration policies from 1996/1997 and 2012/2013 are the primary material and the ground for the discourse analysis, and secondary material consists of material produced in purpose of research. I have also used Norwegian Governmental Official Reports as a source for background information of Norwegian integration policy.

### 2.4.1. Empirical primary material

The empirical material in this study mainly consists of two *Stortingsmeldinger*, i.e. white papers, and are

drawn up when the Government wishes to present matters to the Storting<sup>13</sup> that do not require a decision. White papers tend to be in the form of a report to the Storting on the work carried out in a particular field and future policy. These documents, and the subsequent discussion of them in the Storting, often form the basis of a draft resolution or bill at a later stage ([www.regjeringen.no](http://www.regjeringen.no)).

The two white papers analysed in this study, published in 1997 and 2012 respectively, consist of descriptions of the current situation of immigration and integration and presents a number of measures in the field. Throughout the study, the white paper from 1996/1997; *About immigration and the multicultural Norway*<sup>14</sup>, is referred to as Meld. St. 17 (Stortingsmelding

---

<sup>13</sup> i.e. the Parliament

<sup>14</sup> Original title: *Om innvandring og det flerkulturelle Norge*

17), and the white paper from 2012/2013; *A comprehensive integration policy – diversity and community*<sup>1516</sup> is referred to as Meld. St. 6 (Stortingsmelding 6).

As a complement to the white paper from 2012 a statement of intent has been developed, focusing on measures of discrimination and equality. *The Statement of Intent for Promoting Equality and Preventing Discrimination*<sup>17</sup> (hereinafter referred to as SIED) consists of measures aiming to promote equality and prevent discrimination of immigrants and their children, Samis and national minorities, and is valid for the time period between 2009-2012 (SIED 2009:2). This statement of intent is to be seen as a complement to the white paper from 2012/2013. The *Statement of Intent (...)* and the white paper from 2012 are to some extent over-lapping, which is why the statement of intent has mostly been used as a complement also in this study. Other statements of intent have been developed from 2005 as a complement for the integration policy, with the goal “to ensure that every immigrant as quickly as possible shall be able to use their resources” (regjeringen.no, pressemelding no 20, 2005). The latest published *Statement of intent for integration and inclusion of the immigrant population*<sup>18</sup>, (also referred to as Prop. 1 S) for the time period of 2009-2010, have also been used in this study as complementary material of analysis, also being part of integration policy documents.

#### 2.4.2. Secondary material; research

The secondary material in this study consists of research material. Initially the starting point in the secondary material was a SOU, *Statlig Offentlig Utredning*, conducted with the aim to study mechanisms behind segregation and institutional discrimination in Sweden<sup>19</sup> (Kamali 2006:3). Since the aim of the report is similar to what I aim to study, I proceeded from theories and researchers referred to in that study, mostly consisting of research and theory of structural/institutional discrimination, otherization, categorization, cultural racism, integrating/segregating processes, and intersectionality. I have further used research material that aim to put integration in relation to human rights, national discourse, migration and integration policy and multiculturalism.

---

<sup>15</sup> Original title: *En helhetlig integreringspolitikk – mangfold og fellesskap*

<sup>16</sup> The English title is taken from a short version of the *Stortingsmelding* written in English.

<sup>17</sup> Original title: *Handlingsplan for å fremme likestilling og hindre etnisk diskriminering*

<sup>18</sup> Original title: *Handlingsplan for integrering og inkludering av innvandrerbefolkningen*

<sup>19</sup> Kamali, who was the editor and main researcher in the Swedish Governmental Public Report – *The Segregating Integration*, from 2006, has been described as “controversial” (Dagens Nyheter 2007-03-08), and received critique for the report, from the government and the minister of integration, as well as from international and Swedish researchers, claiming that his conclusions lacked empirical foundation and were not falsifiable (Dagens Nyheter 2006-07-28).

Regarding structural/institutional discrimination in general and in relation to the labour market, I have mostly used theories described in the SOU (2006), primarily de los Reyes. Even though the report received critique and the conclusions were questioned, the statements and theories that I use in this study are confirmed also by other researchers (Jensen in Alsmark et al 2007; Miles 1993; Neergaard and Mulinari 2004; Mattsson 2004; Schierup and Ålund 1990).

Otherization, categorization and cultural racism are somewhat related to each other, and quite an immense amount of research has been done in the area, particularly in relation to integration. I have mostly looked at Mattsson (2005), Kamali (2006), de los Reyes (2006), Miles (1993) and Schierup and Ålund (1990). De los Reyes has also conducted a great deal of research on intersectionality, both individually (2006) and with Mulinari (2010).

Regarding migration and integration policy, I have to a great extent looked into *Migration and Welfare in the new Europe*, edited by Emma Carmel (2011).

National discourse has its base in this study, in Winther Jörgensen and Phillips (2002), Miles (1993), and Mattsson (2005).

Schierup and Ålund (1990) has conducted research on the paradox of multiculturalism, which is why they are the foundation for the section *Multiculturalism and diversity*, along with Martinsson (2006), who have raised a paradox of diversity.

#### 2.4.3. Other material

NOU, *Norsk Offentlig Utredning*, in English *Norwegian Governmental Official Report*, is an investigation on different conditions in the society appointed by the government ([www.regjeringen.no](http://www.regjeringen.no)), and has in this study been referred to when presenting Norwegian welfare and integration model.

## 3. Theoretical framework

### 3.1. Human rights in a context of integration

The concept of a universal society and citizenship, as proclaimed in fundamental human rights, is based on the idea that all human beings are equal. However, the idea of equality between citizens does not automatically imply equal economic advantages, lack of social marginalization or participation in political institutions. Immigrants that have legally been a member of a new state are entitled to civil, political and social rights but run the risk of not having them fulfilled due to racism, poverty or discrimination. A wide range of research has shown that migrants experience a blockage of their participation in society because of discriminatory practices in national institutions. The risk is also that these practices are being upheld by (unintentionally) discriminatory rules (Schierup, Hansen & Castles 2006:50).

Immigrants' integration is a question of democracy and fundamental human rights. A segregated society means unequal distributions of social, political and economic resources (Södergran 2000:44). Marginalization is against fundamental human rights of democracy and equality (Södergran 1997:18).

#### 3.1.1. Discrimination

The right not to be discriminated is a principle within the concept of human rights, and part of the goal of equality. Within the instruments of human rights, discrimination is prohibited on a number of grounds, such as race, sex, language and religion. Human rights shall be valid for everyone without distinction, as formulated in the Vienna Declaration, “[r]espect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms without distinction of any kind is a fundamental rule of international human rights law” (Smith 2012:196).

#### 3.1.2. Institutional/Structural discrimination

The differences between the terms structural and institutional discrimination are not crystal clear, and researchers do not always define them the same way. Kamali (2006:31-32) describes institutional discrimination as the discriminatory practices on subordinated groups through dominating institutions and their policies and praxis. It also refers to the people who practice these policies.

Structural discrimination is described as the discriminatory actions that take place in the society and its institutional order. It is often subtle and indirect (e.g. formulated in norms, ideologies and forms of organization) and thus unintentionally discriminates and excludes groups, often



of other ethnic background than the majority, and also makes these actions legitimate (Kamali 2006:32).

What the two discriminatory concepts have in common is that they both create an order that normalizes discrimination and makes it an every-day-practice, i.e. something that is not reflected over. It *appears* to be ethnically neutral but is in reality differentiating against subordinate groups and benefits the superior group(s) in society. Because of its normalized practice it is constantly reproduced. It is however difficult to make a clear distinction between the two concepts and many researchers claim that both terms should be used combined (ibid.), which is how they will be used in this study. Although it is called structural, the role of the individual is not to be forgotten; individuals with institutional power have the possibility to reproduce the institutional discrimination. Therefore individual discrimination cannot be totally distinct from institutional/structural discrimination (Kamali 2005:35).

When analyzing institutional discrimination, the focus is not on racist values or the purpose of the discriminatory actions, but on the result. The discriminatory practices can often be due to unreflected actions that happen on routine, due to internalized ideas of 'the other'. Presumptions of 'the other' are therefore important to relate to discriminatory mechanisms (de los Reyes 2006:16).

### 3.1.3. Discrimination in the labour market

The labour market is often seen as central in the welfare state and a key to integration. It is through the labour that the welfare can be maintained and resources can grow and benefit the members of the society (de los Reyes 2006:9). In order for everyone to be able to contribute to the welfare through labour, a premise is that everyone has the same possibility to get access to the labour market (ibid. 3). Immigrants are often ascribed collective characteristics and associated with unemployment, exclusion and welfare dependency. These associations sustain ethnic power relations in the labour market (ibid. 10-11). Immigrants have lower employment and activity rates in most countries, revealing difficulties that immigrants face in integration processes (Zrinscak in Carmel et al 2011:198).

Mattsson (2004:117-118) means that 'benefit dependency' has been a code word for immigrants, since the amount of the benefits is compared with living standards in the home countries which would thus be a reason to voluntarily stand outside the labour market. This is a discourse grounded in culture and an image of immigrants as less willing to work.

There is a risk of underestimating discrimination in the labour market when work is seen as the key to integration; discrimination is thus mainly problematized in relation to the people outside the labour market, since the labour market per se often is thought of as creating equal opportunities (de los Reyes 2006:11).

When there is an ‘otherization’ and focus on immigrants’ cultural differences from ‘us’ (which will be further described in 3.2) they might be seen as ‘diversity agents’ in the working life, with focus on their ‘cultural skills’ (de los Reyes 2006:4). Diversity presumes ethnic, cultural and gendered differences, which is problematic, since it at the same time ignores hierarchic relations in the labour market as a result from the symbolic meaning of diversity. There is a risk of sustained inequality regarding power and influence when diversity is characterized as a variety of ethnic and cultural differences. When it comes to discriminatory actions and attitudes, one premise is the idea of dissimilarity, and how this mirrors people’s actions and characteristics (de los Reyes 2006:12, 15).

Immigrants often have to “buy” their jobs by starting their own business (de los Reyes 2006:4). Schierup (2006:41) refers to ‘ethnic entrepreneurs’, as a consequence of segregating mechanisms where immigrants often are forced to unsecure labour markets, with worse working conditions. Ethnic niche economies occur due to a closed ordinary labour market, and as a last resort some immigrants choose a market with low establishment costs and easy accessibility, such as retailing, restoration branch and other service markets such as taxi driving and cleaning (Jensen in Alsmark et al 2007:415). Miles (1993:51), means that if immigrants to a great extent occupy semi- and unskilled jobs, it might be due to exclusionary and racist practices.

Labour market segregation at an initial stage in the migration process does however not necessarily indicate discrimination, but could be a “natural” step to enter the labour market through a low level when the language proficiency is low and there is a lack of local knowledge and networks. The problem is a fact if the low level is sustained without a chance of mobility upwards (Castles and Miller 2009:254).

Neergaard and Mulinari (2004:252) talks about the term of ability as relevant in a processes of exclusion. Mattsson (2004:110) coins a similar term, namely ‘skills-gap discourse’<sup>20</sup>. It is developed from a presumption that there are essential differences between ethnicities; a

---

<sup>20</sup> In original language: *kompetensbristdiskursen*.

“racialized vision on people’s characteristics” as Mattsson describes it. The ethnified labour markets, i.e. that immigrants are overrepresented in certain branches, are a consequence from a perception of cultural differences. It is an imagined lack of skills and competence and also an absence of the national characteristics of the host country that signify this perspective, in an attempt to identify what immigrants lack. This is something that also Schierup (2006:49) claims, meaning that this follows a general trend in every ‘North-Atlantic welfare state’, leading to a redefinition of “full employment” into “full employability”, where unemployment is firstly blamed on a supposedly lack of skills of the individual. The trend is part of a transformation from the ‘national welfare state’ towards a ‘post-national welfare regime’. The aim of the latter would be a maximization of local or regional advantages (in a post-national/international context) through a differentiated business with mobile humane capital.

The changes in the working life are said to be built around an idea of the modern working life, as opposed to industrialism with monotonous work, which has now evolved to a white collar society. Ideas of non-western immigrants who do not match the competence requirement in the ‘modern working life’ are built on the image of ‘the others’, and ‘cultural distance’ (Mattsson 2004:111-112). Schierup and Ålund (1990:4-5) have a similar theory, in which the liberal multicultural ideology creates a label of “foreign cultures as a problem”, that does not fit into the modern society.

#### 3.1.4. Cultural racism

Racism is complex and changeable, and adaptable to global and historical changes. New forms of racism have evolved, and researchers have articulated ‘the racism without races’; a cultural racism that differentiates due to culture. People, as carriers of different cultures, are thus seen as unable to work and/or live together because of cultural conflicts and social inequality is explained through cultural differences. This also affects immigrants’ children that have been born and raised in the ‘new’ country but still seen as carriers of cultural and traditional values, according to the cultural racism, which hinders them from adapting to the country specific labour market (de los Reyes 2008:10).

Cultural racism is about differentiating other cultures, referring to an essential cultural difference, which seems to be closely linked to ethnocentrism where the ‘problem’ is being culturalized rather than structural power relations being problematized (Schierup & Ålund 1990:10-11). Discourses on cultural distance are at risk of reproducing ideas of ‘race’, nation

and culture and thus also hierarchies of similarity and difference (Neergaard & Mulinari 2004:251).

Culture is often seen as a common denominator for ethnicities, but often only seen as an attribute of minorities, although everyone belongs to an ethnic group. Where ethnic minorities are perceived as ‘unwanted’ they are often described as an economic threat or putting the national identity at risk (Castles and Miller 2009:40).

### 3.1.5. Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a theoretic perspective arisen from the feminist movement, through criticism of hegemonic ‘white feminism’. It is thus originally a visualization of power structures over gender and ethnicity simultaneously, but has later developed to include power structures over other multiple identities, such as sex, race and class. This means that an intersectional perspective does not see categories as isolated dichotomies<sup>21</sup> but as simultaneously interrelating categories that affects each other (de los Reyes & Mulinari 2010:14, 25).

De los Reyes and Mulinari (2010:21) talks about the “feminization of migration”, referring to a greater number of women migrating, while being more exposed to harsh working conditions, a problem that is increased by a discourse that sees migration from outside Europe as a threat. Power relations created in labour markets need to be analyzed through an intersectional perspective, since the globalization of labour is organized around positions of sex, class and ethnicity. Research has shown that racist discrimination in the labour market is gendered and also effected by other aspects such as age and class. Therefore, an intersectional perspective is important when analyzing discrimination in order to enlighten the complexity and what different forms of oppression that are interrelated (de los Reyes 2008:7).

## 3.2. Otherization; ‘us’ and ‘them’

‘Otherization’ refers to some groups being perceived as ‘the others’ that are subordinated ‘us’. Historically, it has been systemized through one group’s control over socio-economic resources and power positions. This might lead to an ethnic hierarchy in the society where different ethnic groups have different positions (Kamali 2006:9-10). ‘The national’ becomes a tool of power in which a number of distinctions are made to separate ‘us’ from ‘them’ and to know who belongs

---

<sup>21</sup> Examples that are raised by the author are man/woman, immigrant/native citizen, young/old, heterosexual/homosexual.

to what, by highlighting the differences of the immigrants (e.g. cultural aspects, religion, values, etc.) (Mattsson 2005:151).

Discourses about race have been reformulated into other discourses, such as the discourse of 'the Other' which often consist of assumptions and claims about specific groups, articulated and shared by the ones who take part in the discourse (Miles 1993:84). Physical characteristics, real or false, have historically been used to distinguish groups and ascribe traits, and still are. Also, cultural differences are being used in this regard (ibid. 87).

A dilemma is visible in European integration policy, according to Kamali (2006:10): the universal declarations of every human beings' equal value are being counteracted by institutional discrimination imbedded in practices in the society that creates a categorization<sup>22</sup> of human beings which in turn ascribes them different values and violates equal rights (Kamali 2006:10).

In order to analyze exclusion one needs to look at discursive, material and symbolic distinctions between the ones on 'the inside' and the ones on 'the outside' (de los Reyes 2006:14). Inclusion exists co-dependently of exclusion, and the boundaries of inclusion could be articulated differently, and not necessarily in an open racist ideology, but might as well be articulated in 'the nation' as a boundary that works exclusively towards an identified 'Other' (Miles 1993:79. Mattsson 2005:151).

### 3.3. National discourse

Since this study aims to examine processes and discourses that occur on a national basis and of national measures one way to discover this is by looking at national discourses. Theoretically, two major distinctions of the nation as a term have been made: political and cultural. The political theory consists of the idea that which nation one belongs to is only concerning whether

---

<sup>22</sup> Important to raise in this context is the aspect of categorization in relation to human rights. Categorization might create stigmatization by labelling people. However, categorization is also a fundament in human rights in order to protect certain groups that are more vulnerable for violation of their rights – perhaps due to categorization and stigmatization. Even though the universal human rights shall apply to every human being “without distinction of any kind” the recognition of women, children and migrant workers as particular groups is being made. Using categories or labels for separating groups reproduces the aspect of categorization, as well as emphasising distinctions between groups. However, categorizing is necessary to reveal differences between specific groups that are due to structural discrimination. By making distinctions between men and women, for instance, in relation to employment, salary, etc., inequalities can be revealed. It becomes a paradox; categorization creates stigmatization and might lead to discriminatory actions towards a specific group, while categories are necessary to reveal discriminatory practices on a structural level.

you live within that territory and confess yourself to belong to that nation. It has thus been referred to as subjective because of the active choice that the members of the nation can make. The cultural theory is referred to as objective, since the “membership” of the nation in this theory is not made by choice, but by belonging to the culture and speaking the language that is spoken in the nation. The latter is the theory that to the greatest extent has been adopted (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:157-158).

In nationalist discourses the nation is often referred to as a natural unit, characterized by specific cultural traits that are more or less stable (Miles 1993:100, Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:167). There are several dimensions of nationality that are somewhat fluent and flexible, i.e. it is due to the context whether someone is considered to belong to a nationality, to partly belong to the nationality or being just an immigrant. It is thus a flexibility of exclusion and criteria of categorization of people that are in a constant change as well as out of reach for the people. Flexibility in the limits of nationality is important in a discriminatory practice since it creates a variety of foundations upon which the violations can occur (Mattsson 2005:152).

### 3.4. Integration

Integration as a social process can, according to Papadopoulus (in Carmel et al 2011:37), be seen as various discourses of migrant integration, articulated through power dynamics, where some immigrants are recognized institutionally as members of the society in the destination country, and are either integrated by multiculturalism, i.e. perceived as equal to us but different, or by assimilation, i.e. perceived as equal and similar.

Jensen (in Alsmark et al 2007:407) refers to individually centered integration discourse, where immigrants are described and analyzed from the native population as an average norm. Individually centered discourse describes immigrants as different compared to the native population.

If different migrant groups have an unequal position in the labour market this might be evidence of differential inclusion (Kaiser in Carmel et al 2011:133). Differential integration refers to different migrant groups being differently affected due to aspects of access to the labour market, social benefits, political and cultural rights and education (Carmel et al 2011:6).

#### 3.4.1. Migration and integration policy

Migration and integration policies are often a result of complex processes of decisions that in turn shape attitudes of the citizens and could create new social borders (Carmel et al 2011:9,

Castles and Miller 2009:252). National integration political models and frames of welfare and institutions affect the social orders and possible exclusion mechanisms for immigrants in the society (Schierup 2006:50; Castles and Miller 2009:252).

Policies of migration and integration that refers to 'our' rights, 'our' culture, 'our' territory or 'our' nation, constitutes a problematic exclusion and social boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. It has been referred to as 'banal nationalism', and is visible in migration policies, consequently affecting the differential integration (Carmel et al 2011:9).

Immigrants are sometimes described as economic, social and cultural resources in policies, and it is referred to cultural conflicts and cultural heritage as explanations of social problems (Schierup & Ålund 1990:14).

### 3.5. Multiculturalism and diversity

Castles and Miller (2009:247) define multiculturalism, saying

that immigrants should be able to participate as equals in all spheres of society, without being expected to give up their own culture, religion and language, although usually with an expectation of conformity to certain key values.

Multiculturalism became an integrated aspect in European politics in the 1990'ies. In some cases, it was perceived as a 'multicultural utopia' in which ethnic groups are culturally acknowledged. It was a result of a culturalization of the political rhetoric and a politicization of 'culture' (Schierup & Ålund 1990:2). In the late 1990'ies, however, 'multiculturalism' as a term to a great extent became replaced with 'diversity' in relation to integration praxis (Schierup 2006:56).

Multiculturalism and diversity are being used as strategies in welfare societies (Schierup & Ålund 1990:2; Martinsson 2006:151). Furthermore, a rhetoric of diversity often refers to economic incentive, where dissimilarity is perceived to increase growth. Diversity is part of a transformation towards a post-modern society (Martinsson 2006:151). However, both Schierup and Ålund (1990:83) and Martinsson (2006:151) relate multiculturalism and diversity with a paradox: Schierup and Ålund claim that "pluralism is culturalized into a diversity of cultural differences and at the same time is ethnocentrically related to the majority culture's prescribed normality". Martinsson refers to another paradox, meaning that 'diversity' consists of a wish of perceiving differences as changeable and unexpected, while the term in itself reproduces and stigmatizes categories.





## 4. Results and analysis

Below follows results, consisting of citations from the integration policies from the two time periods, and analysis of these. The results are sorted in discursive groupings. Under each identified discourse it is further divided into factors/problematizations, (i.e. how the disintegration is described and what factors or problems are perceived to be underlying), and measures, (i.e. the perception of how the factors and/or problems are being solved). However, some results are defined as consisting of more than one discourse, the separation of the discourses is therefore not completely distinct.

Measures can be described as consisting of two different types throughout the policies; ‘legal’ and ‘other’. The ‘legal’ measures are measures that will be legally bound and written in the Criminal Law. More correctly they are *suggestions* of legal measures. ‘Other’ measures are of various types but aims to increase integration, by actions directed towards immigrants or the remaining population.

Where the citations from the white papers are in italic, that is how it is originally phrased.

### 4.1. Human rights frame

In the white paper from 1997 integration is (p. 9) described as “*the goal* for equality through equal opportunities, rights and duties for participation for everyone, regardless of background” [1]. In the integration policy from 2012 it is stated that “[t]he integration policy should enable everyone’s equal rights, opportunities and duties” [2] (Meld. St. 6 2012:9).

In both time periods it is thus a framework of human rights as a concept in the integration policy, where everyone’s equal rights, opportunities and duties are central (compare with Schierup, Hansen & Castles 2006).

It is further acknowledged in the white paper from 1997 that:

Internationally there is a considerable work regarding regulation on migration between countries and concerning migrants’ situation. The collaboration has in certain areas resulted in international treaties where the countries are obligated to respect closely defined norms and principles (Meld. St. 17 1997:21). [3]

A number of conventions are brought up that have been ratified by Norway, such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). For the former the right to work and decent working conditions, the right to strike and acceptable living standard are mentioned (Meld. St. 17 1996:22). Conventions that are mentioned as relevant for immigrants and integration are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), ICESCR, ICCPR, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention for Refugees.

An important human right principle for a functioning integration policy is considered the absence of racial discrimination, and “the starting point for the understanding of such discrimination is the ICERD” [4] (Meld. St. 17 1997:45). In general, the international humanitarian duties through international conventions are brought up, and

Humanitarian consideration is put great weight on in the Norwegian immigration policy. Immigration to Norway during the last years to a great degree consisted of people in need of protection and close family to people that are already in the country. Our international humanitarian duties suggests that this will be the case also in the future, even if it means economic expenses for the Norwegian society in a short term (Meld. St. 17 1997:35). [5]

Racism and discrimination are contrary to superior goals and principles in Norwegian politics. Norway has ratified international conventions on human rights, and we are therefore obligated to counteract discrimination and racism and work for equal opportunities for everyone (Meld. St. 17 1997:45). [6]

Human rights are referred to as “their international humanitarian duties”, and they are “therefore obligated to counteract discrimination”. The principle of human rights is seen as an international principle that Norway is obligated to follow, rather than a fundamental part of Norwegian law. Its implementation is put in relation to the economic expenses that are also part of an economic discourse in relation to human rights (which will be further developed below, see 4.6). However, absence of discrimination is emphasised in above excerpt, revealing a focus on a human rights principle (compare with Smith 2012).

It is further expressed that:

[w]ithin the frame of Norwegian law and fundamental human rights every resident have, regardless of background, right to claim their values, follow cultural traditions and practice their faith (Meld. St. 17 1997:7). [7]

Norwegian law *and* fundamental human rights are thus expressed to be separate, in opposition to how it is expressed in the white paper from 12/13 (p. 8), where human rights are articulated as a fundamental part of the Norwegian State, rather than a duty that must be followed:

Human rights and the principles of democracy are the foundations in the Norwegian state of law.<sup>23</sup> This is valid also in a more diverse society than before (Meld. St. 6 2012:8). [8]

Human rights as well as democracy are perceived as foundations of the Norwegian state of law, but is according to theory also a fundament in achieving immigrants' integration (Södergran 2000).

Both policies thus have a frame of human rights, although articulated differently. There is a greater focus on international conventions and the duties these imply for the Norwegian state in the policy from 96/97, that has evolved into being a fundamental frame of Norwegian law in 2012. The rhetoric of human rights and how it should be seen in relation to the State can thus be seen as transformed into having a more natural role in the latter time period.

## 4.2. Discrimination

### 4.2.1. Discrimination as a recognized problem for integration

Discrimination is recognized as a segregating factor, both in a general context and in the labour market in the white paper from 1997:

Many people with immigrant- or other minority background have lesser opportunities than the remaining population to participate in the Norwegian society. This could be blamed discrimination, but also other forms of exclusion where the effects is enhanced for people with immigrant background (Meld. St. 6 1997:46). [9]

Discrimination as a factor for lesser opportunities is explicitly articulated:

---

<sup>23</sup> See also Meld. St. 6 2012:104.

Amongst certain groups, especially with refugee background, the income is remarkably lower, unemployment rates higher and the living standards generally lower. The causes are complex. Differences can also be blamed power inequality, exclusion, racism and discrimination (Meld. St. 17 1997:7). [10]

A human rights articulation is visible in above excerpt, linking the higher unemployment rates with inequality, exclusion, racism and discrimination, acknowledging difficulties that immigrants might have for participation in the society (compare with Zrinscak in Carmel et al 2011), that can be linked with differential integration (Carmel et al 2011). Discrimination is seen as a possible factor for differences within several aspects, both in recruitment (unemployment), in the labour market (lower income), and in the society (lower living standards) (compare with de los Reyes 2006).

Research has shown that

Immigrants with higher education from Asia, Africa and Latin America have distinctly lower opportunities to get employment compared to Norwegians with equivalent education and experiences. Distinct perceptions are tied to immigrants as a group, for instance perceptions on problems related to practice of religion in the work place and expectations on adaptation difficulties in the company. Immigrants are to a greater degree than Norwegians valued by prejudices on characteristics rather than valuation on characteristics (Meld. St. 17 1997:59). [11]

Lower opportunities to get employment are linked with perceptions and expectations against immigrants as a group, leading to difficulties in the labour market. It is also a problematization of prejudice towards a certain group by the majority population, revealing awareness of discriminatory practices (compare with e.g. de los Reyes 2006; Zrinscak in Carmel et al 2011; Kamali 2006).

Awareness of structural discrimination is also to be seen (Meld. St. 17 1997:46):

Bias are central aspects within discrimination (...). If majority has a repellent or hostile attitude towards people with immigrant background and possibly other minorities, it creates a culture of attitude in the society which might give a ground for racism and legitimisation of discrimination. In addition, such atmosphere could be interpreted as a signal from the society that people with immigrant – or other minority background are unwanted as equally valued participants in the community.

This might lead to that many people do not wish, or avoid to participate in important areas of the society. [12]

Above shows, as mentioned, on awareness and recognition of structural discrimination, and an arguing against a possible cultural attitude legitimizing discrimination (compare with Mattson 2004), and that it might lead to differential integration (compare with Carmel et al 2011). It is formulated from a human rights discourse, referring to equal value (Smith 2012).

It is further expressed in the white paper from 96/97 (p. 47) that “[t]here is little doubt that these phenomenon [racism and discrimination] occur in Norway” [13], and in the white paper from 2012/2013 (p. 36) it is stated that according to research, “discrimination occur in the labour market, especially in the recruitment process of immigrants. Many immigrants experience worse working conditions than the remaining population”. [14]

Discrimination is said to occur in both integration policies, on a general level in the white paper from 1997 and specifically referred to the labour market and recruitment in 2012, although it is stated that many immigrants also experience worse working conditions.

Structural discrimination is recognized also in the white paper from 2012 (p. 115):

Structural relations and widespread attitudes are often discriminating which employers are not necessarily aware of and which employees might have difficulties identifying as concrete discrimination. [15]

In the *Statement of Intent for Promoting Equality and Preventing Discrimination* (2009:26), discrimination is articulated as a possible explanation for high unemployment:

People with immigrant background are underrepresented in the working life. When the unemployment amongst immigrants is three times higher than for people with Norwegian background, a near explanation for part of the anomaly is discrimination (...). Discrimination does not only occur at recruitment, but can also hinder further career development and a sufficient use of skills. [16]

Discrimination is explained as a possibility for the high unemployment for certain groups (compare with Kamali 2006), stating that it is occurring not only at recruitment but also in working life. It is focused both on problems concerning recruitment and on problems in the working life for immigrants and using their skills (compare with de los Reyes 2006). The latter will be further developed in 4.6.

Another paragraph in the white paper from 2012 (p. 7) is however articulating that there are no distinct economic and social differences between groups:

In Norway, the living standards are higher and differ less [between groups] than in other countries (...). Norway shall not develop a society where immigrants have lower standards of living and are not a part of society to the same extent as natives. Norway should remain a society of justice without distinct economic and social differences. That is how a safe society is prevailed. [17]

It is articulated that it is unacceptable that Norway develops into a society where immigrants have a lower living standard, which is already a fact according to the statistics where the economic and social differences are distinct (see for example NOU 2011:14). Previous research has also shown that discrimination occurs in both labour market and social life. The possibility of being called to a job interview reduces by 25 % if you have a foreign surname, and more than half of the respondents from Asia and Africa in a research on discrimination had experienced discrimination on public transport, from the police and in social settings. Discrimination was especially common for visible minorities (Meld. St. 6 2012:113). The discourse articulated above is however a closure, saying that Norway *is* a safe society of justice without distinct economic and social differences. It thus goes hand in hand with the values upon which the Norwegian society is said to be built; human rights and social values where equality is a corner stone (Meld. St. 6 2012:8). There is an obvious risk when the national identity is dominant in the type of statements above, proclaiming that the reality is coherent with how it is desired to be. The discourse thus implies that there is a lesser need for measures against discrimination since Norway can simply “remain a society (...) without distinct economic and social differences”.

Racism and discrimination are acknowledged as factors for segregation in both policies. Discourses and rhetoric are thus similar in both time periods. Structural discrimination is also described and perceived as a possible factor for exclusion of immigrants, as well as difficulties that immigrants might experience in integration. Even though labour is seen as a key for integration (see 4.6.2) discriminatory practices also in the working life are acknowledged. The right to work and the right to equal opportunities in the working life are implicitly recognized in the two time periods. However, a discursive struggle is visible in 2012, proclaiming that differences between groups are not distinct.

#### 4.2.1.1. *Intersectional perspective - factor*<sup>24</sup>

An intersectional perspective in relation to discrimination is acknowledged in both time periods:

Discrimination can occur on many different grounds – sex, sexual orientation, language or age. Such forms of discrimination can obviously also affect people with immigrant background. People with immigrant or other minority background might in addition be affected by discrimination due to their skin colour, belief or national or ethnic origin (Meld. St. 17 1997:45). [18]

And in the white paper from 2012:

Discrimination is prejudice differential treatment. It creates barriers for participation in working life and in society. People with immigrant background might meet different forms of discrimination, for instance as a Muslim, as a homosexual or as a woman (Meld. St. 6 2012:11). [19]

Both policies thus include possibilities of discrimination on several grounds simultaneously (compare with de los Reyes and Mulinari 2011). It is further described as a possible discriminatory mechanism in many areas in the society, although working is explicitly mentioned in a way in which it was not in the white paper from 1997.

#### 4.2.2. Discrimination - measure

Measures against discrimination in the white paper from 1997 include a legislative proposition against ethnic discrimination in working life, which will include a prohibition against “different treatment of job applicants on the basis of race, skin colour or national or ethnic background” [20] (Meld. St. 17 1997:47). Absence of discrimination and racism is expressed to be necessary to reach equal opportunities for immigrants (Meld. St. 17 1997:12):

*In order to reach the goal of equal opportunities, it is necessary with an active contribution to fight racism and discrimination. There is a need to strengthen the protection against discrimination and improve the opportunities for legal aid to people who have experienced discrimination.* [21]

Above is an articulation of the human rights principle of equality in which non-discrimination and non-racism shall be an “active contribution”, thus following both the described factors of

---

<sup>24</sup> Where an intersectional perspective is visible (or absent) in measures it is analysed in other sections in this study, since intersectionality is rarely the only discourse articulated.

discrimination mentioned above and theorized principles of human rights (compare with Smith 2012). The measure is both preventive and repressive.

A similar articulation is found in the white paper from 2012 (p. 9):

No one shall be discriminated or excluded due to immigrant background. Integration policy shall facilitate for everyone living in Norway to experience a belonging and participation in the Norwegian community [22]

Non-discrimination is articulated in above excerpt, and within both time periods a human rights principle of equality and discrimination is expressed. There is however a greater focus on the individual in the excerpt from 2012, expressing that everyone shall experience participation and belonging, compared with 1997 where non-discrimination is articulated on a more general level. Although, a goal of equal opportunities is explicitly articulated in the excerpt from 1997, which is not visible in the latter excerpt..

It is further expressed that:

[t]he aim with the order [of strengthened protection against discrimination] will be to give legal professional guidance to individuals exposed to discrimination on the basis of skin colour, belief or national or ethnic origin (Meld. St. 17 1997:47). [23]

Only discrimination on ethnic basis (and skin colour) or religion is recognized, thus being an absence of an intersectional perspective (compare with de los Reyes and Mulinari 2011).

Legal measures against discrimination are visible also in the white paper from 2012 (p. 115):

For that reason [structural relations and widespread attitudes] a complaint based law system is not sufficient to counteract discrimination. The law of discrimination therefore imposes employers and public authorities a duty for active equality work (the activity and report duty). The aim of the activity and report duty is to create awareness through continuous activity in business and thereby discriminating practises and organizational structures. [24]

The law is valid for employers with more than 50 employees and the discriminatory grounds that needs to be recognized are “ethnicity, religion, spirituality, etc.”. Above shows an awareness of structural discrimination and an aim to eliminate this. An intersectional perspective is not clearly stated, however, with the “etc.” not being defined. The responsibility



lies on employers and public authorities and it is thus a measure directed towards a structural level (compare with Kamali 2006).

Measures towards leaders in the working life can be seen also in the white paper from 1997:

Leaders and others should have knowledge about the barriers in the recruitment process that immigrants face, and take an active approach towards recruitment of people with immigrant background. Such recruitment should be introduced in the training of leaders and training of interview technique and recruitment. There might also be a need to arrange own courses to ensure that leaders and human resources personnel have knowledge on barriers and different exclusionary practices (Meld. St. 17 1997:59). [25]

Above articulates a measure directed towards employers, similar as to the above-mentioned measure from 2012. It is related to the *approach* towards people with immigrant background, thus aiming to reduce what was recognized as a factor, namely culture of attitude and prejudice against people with immigrant background. It was similarly an aim to create *awareness* in the measure from 2012. The focus in the excerpt from 1997 is however on recruitment practices only, whereas the excerpt from 2012 focuses on equal opportunities for people with immigrant people that are already employed, thus revealing awareness on the fact that discriminatory practices are likely to occur also in the working life and not only at recruitment (compare with de los Reyes 2006).

Non-legal measures against discrimination are visible in both time periods. In 1997 (p. 47), a development of a *Statement of Intent against Racism and Discrimination* is one of them, which will deal with three goals:

1) measures against discrimination in the working life, including a follow-up of the proposal put forward to the Parliament during the spring in 1997, 2) training and competence development of publicly employed in first line positions in every business, basic education, supplementary training and internal training, 3) measures against racist motivated violence and harassment, including improved documentation. [26]

At least one of the goals, the initial one, in the statement of intent focused on discrimination in working life, revealing the importance of absence of discrimination in the working life, as well as revealing lack of other specified areas apart from the working life, such as the housing

market or school, thus implying that labour is seen as the key to integration (compare with de los Reyes 2006). It is not further explained what the training for publicly employed will concern, and if this is also regarding discrimination in the working life. It could be an expression of reducing structural discrimination, directing the measure towards first line employees in public institutions. The remaining goal aims to deal with violence and harassment on racial grounds, thus being directed towards “visible” discrimination rather than discrimination on a structural basis.

Measures to eliminate racism and discrimination are described (Meld. St. 17 1997:45):

The Norwegian society is to a great extent characterized of fair distribution and equal opportunities for everyone. It is therefore an important task to spread the knowledge that some people are being discriminated and experience harassment due to skin colour, belief or descent. It is not until we recognize the problem that we can do something about it (...). A solid welfare policy that includes *every* group, and that is supported by the population, will also be a part in counteracting racism and discrimination. [27]

Above articulation is also similar to the discourse described in *factors* above from 2012, where social injustice was described as non-existing. It is articulated that Norway to a great extent is “characterized of (...) equal opportunities for everyone”, revealing a national discourse and their fundamental values (compare with Jørgensen Winther and Phillips 2000; Miles 1993). The difference is, however, that the occurrence of discrimination and harassment is acknowledged. In addition, an inclusive rhetoric is visible, referring to, and emphasising that, *every* group shall be involved in the welfare policy. It is also a measure on a higher level, referring to the welfare policy.

Knowledge on the extent and nature of discrimination is articulated as measures in both time periods, although the measure from 2012 is focusing on *experienced* discrimination from immigrants’ themselves, while the white paper from 1997 is focused on documentation:

Today there is no system to register the nature and extent of discrimination and racist motivated actions in the society. Such a system will improve the possibilities to evaluate the politics and develop efficient measures against discrimination. (...)  
[T]he legal department will (...) improve existing registration measures (criminal

statistics, the criminal record), and collect documentation of art and nature of racist motivated actions and discrimination (Meld. St. 17 1997:48). [28]

In order to implement accurate measures there is a need for sufficient knowledge on the nature, extent and the reasons for discrimination (...). As part of the generated knowledge in the field of integration, the government will perform mapping of experienced discrimination. The mapping will (...) enlighten experience of affinity, barriers for participation and trust in the population. Also children's and youth's experiences from discrimination will be enlightened. (Meld. St. 6 2012:116). [29]

The measure above from 2012 is the single measure that has focus on hearing the group affected by discrimination. The development from 1997 to 2012 could in this regard be seen as an increased focus on the individual.

The measures against discrimination are rather similar in both time periods, both consisting of legal and non-legal measures, directed towards a societal level as well as employers and their approach and awareness. However, measures explicitly aiming to counteract structural discrimination are more visible in the white paper from 2012, perhaps revealing a developed mind-set of structural discrimination as a factor for the sustained unemployment amongst certain groups. The white paper from 2012 also includes measures where people with immigrant background are heard, which can also be seen as a development from 1997.

#### 4.3. Inclusive discourse as a measure

Following above articulations of human rights principles of equality and non-discrimination, it is proclaimed in the white paper from 1997 (p. 8), that:

Everyone, regardless of background, shall have equal opportunities, rights and duties to participate in society and use their resources. (...) There are many ways of being Norwegian. By actively exaggerating everyone's equally great right to bring his/her values and traditions into the community, the togetherness is strengthened. [30]

Above can be described as an inclusive discourse, with an aim to widen the term of 'Norwegian' to include other values and traditions. As mentioned in the theory, a 'people' is mostly delimited by claiming a common culture with shared values (Winther Jörgensen & Phillips 2002, Castles & Miller 2009), and above articulation is following that theory, although making an attempt of

defining the 'Norwegian people' heterogeneously. In below excerpt, an attempt of counteracting an 'us' and 'them'-rhetoric is visible, emphasising that immigrants as a group has great variations and therefore it is little to gain by referring to them homogeneously:

The immigrant term includes people with very different backgrounds with regard to their country of origin, reason for migration, time of residence in Norway etc. Due to great variations in living conditions between different groups of immigrants it will often be little meaning in describing immigrants as one group (Meld. St. 6 1997:37). [31]

In the white paper (2012:9) it is proclaimed that:

No person can be described according to only one dimension, since all of us have many characteristics and identities. You may be a woman or a man, immigrant or born in Norway, young or old, employed or unemployed, religious or atheist, homosexual or heterosexual, or have a disability. Categories and labels attached to individuals or groups may have a stigmatising effect and contribute to exclusion from the community. It may put individuals into a category which may create and reinforce differences which lead us to think in terms of 'us' and 'them'. Language must be inclusive. There must be acceptance for the fact that there are many ways of being Norwegian. Differences within the group 'immigrants' will usually be greater than differences between immigrants and the rest of the population.<sup>25</sup>

And further described that:

It is not which God you believe in, what clothes you wear or what food you eat who define you as Norwegian. The Norwegian community is defined by everyone who lives in this country (Meld. St. 6 2012:8). [32]

Above excerpts are deconstructing Norwegian-ness, articulating it as an inclusive term defined by the people living in Norway, not defined by predetermined cultural or national characteristics or values. It is still an attempt of counteracting an 'us' and 'them'-rhetoric, although explicitly articulated compared to the one from 1997. This is also visible in the excerpt below:

---

<sup>25</sup> This paragraph is not translated from Norwegian by me but is a citation from a short English version of the white paper from 2012/2013.

In the debate on values, it can at times be perceived as if immigrants as a group have values that are in opposition to the fundamental values of the Norwegian society. (...). The dividing line, related to commitment to the values, does not cross between immigrants and the remaining population. Among the (...) immigrants in Norway there are a number of different beliefs, experiences and traditions, and with that different interpretations and practices of these values. The rest of the population is neither homogenous concerning ways of living, traditions and values. (...). It is unlucky that many people take for granted that there are great conflicts of interest and value between immigrants as a group and the remaining population (Meld. St. 6 2012:104). [33]

Above excerpts are similar to the one from 1997, aiming to counteract an ‘us’/‘them’-rhetoric, although emphasising that Norwegian-born people are heterogeneous as well, rather than emphasising the heterogeneousness as a consequence of *brought* values and traditions, as in the white paper from 1997. The original (international) delimitation of a ‘people’ through culture and shared values (Castles & Miller 2009) is not visible in the white paper from 2012. It becomes an expression of political theory of the nation rather than cultural theory (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2002). However, the headline of the *Statement of intent for integration and inclusion of the immigrant population*, being a part of the integration policy from the latter time period, is articulating an integration discourse that is limited to a certain group; namely the *immigrant population*. A discursive struggle is thus visible in the meaning of integration - on the one hand including<sup>26</sup>, aiming to not differentiate ‘us’ and ‘them’, on the other hand an otherization, where the immigrants are referred to as a separate population.

Both policies contain an inclusive rhetoric, meaning that it is articulated that *being Norwegian* shall be an inclusive and open term in order to hinder exclusionary practices due to an ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse in the society. It is however more explicitly articulated in the white paper from 2012, and a development of inclusion as a term is visible. Where it is only referred to ‘immigrants’ as being heterogeneous in the white paper from 1997, the articulation in 2012 refers to the majority population as well, and an attempt of defining the nationals from a political

---

<sup>26</sup> A development of the terminology in the latter time period is visible also with the term ‘comprehensive’ that is being used in achieving a goal of high employment, meaning that it is “a process that includes both the people who already live here, and the ones who move to this country. New residents must adapt to the society they come to and take part in working life and the society. The population who already lives in Norway must acknowledge and relate to the fact that the population is changing and becoming more diverse” (Meld. St. 6 2012:9). [34]

theory rather than cultural can be revealed, even though immigrants are actually referred to as a separate population in the statement of intent. However, the problem of categorization and ‘us’ and ‘them’-rhetoric remain in articulations of immigrants and Norwegians in the integration policies in both time periods. Factors and measures articulating an ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse will be described below.

#### 4.4. ‘Us’/‘them’ discourse

##### 4.4.1. Factors: ‘us’/‘them’; explicitly articulated in 1997

An ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse is visible in the white paper from 1997 (p. 31):

Effects of immigration on the total occupation for the origin population can go both positive and negative ways. Higher demand pulls for higher employment. On the other hand immigrants could fill positions that would otherwise be possessed with people without immigrant background. [35]

It is referred to the “effects of immigration” as positive or negative for the origin population, thus articulating a clear ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse; ‘they’ take ‘our’ jobs. It is however a discursive struggle with the excerpt below:

Several researchers deal with these questions [of immigration and labour]. One reason for the great interest in this question is that there are statements in many countries that immigrants “occupy working places” for the origin population. *The research mainly conclude that immigration has a small effect on wage development and occupation for the originate population* (Meld. St. 17 1997:31-32). [36]

It is on the one hand articulated that immigration might have a negative effect on the employment opportunities for the native population, and on the other it is referred to empirical studies showing that this is not the case. Below excerpt is also relating to negative and positive aspects of having immigrants in the Norwegian labour market:

Immigration could also have the effect that it increases the occupation for the remaining population in the longer term by being a buffer function. With a high rate of immigrants in conjuncture sensitive business this might be the group that is most affected in periods of low demand and high unemployment (Meld St. 17 1997:31). [37]

It is described as positive for ‘the remaining population’, thus implicitly ‘us’, if a buffer of immigrants could ‘take the hit’ in a recession and save ‘us’ from unemployment. There is an obvious risk in relating positive and negative effects to immigration and employment for the ‘ordinary’ citizens, since it differentiates the labour market into concerning ‘immigrants’ and ‘the remaining population’, which might create negative perceptions on immigrants, their abilities and a perception of immigrants as a threat towards the remaining population. The dilemma that Kamali (2006) refers to – the principle of equality within human rights being counteracted by categorizations and thus creating institutional discrimination, is a likely consequence from the way immigrants are being categorized above. It can also be referred to social boundaries, raised by Carmel et al (2011), and ‘banal nationalism’ which might lead to differential integration. In addition, the right to work for every person is clearly absent in above articulation, and the discussion refers to a higher, structural level, where the individual is not visible. Above is a discursive struggle with discourses previously mentioned, where it on the one hand is articulated that people’s attitude towards immigrants might create racism and legitimization of discrimination (see 4.2.1.), while an articulation of the beneficial for ‘us’ due to a buffer of immigrants, and ‘them’ as a possible threat, might in itself create a hostile attitude amongst the majority. It can be referred to ‘dimensions of nationality’ (Mattsson 2005); the context determines the belonging to the nationality, and immigrants’ are perceived differently. In an economic and socialistic context, where the importance lies in economic contribution and equal share, the otherization is clear and ‘immigrants’ are not perceived as belonging to the Norwegian society but either a positive or negative effect for the labour market.

#### 4.4.2. Factors: ‘us’/‘them’ – implicitly articulated in 2012, and categorization

The clear ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse from 1997 has changed in the integration policy from 2012/2013, and the discourse is not explicitly referring to ‘us’ and ‘them’ linguistically, but rather implicitly articulating an ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse that can be revealed analytically.

There is an expressed goal of an inclusive society in the integration policy from the latter time period where everyone has equal rights and equal opportunities to contribute and take part in the society. In order to achieve this goal, the Norwegian government has developed a number of statements of intent; Statement of intent against poverty, statement of intent against forced marriage, against circumcision, for promoting equality and preventing ethnic discrimination. There is also a newly released statement of intent for prevention of criminality, and two statements that are to come, also in relation to integration politics, namely against radicalisation and violent extremism (Prop. 1 S 2010:1). The integration policy is thus connected with a

number of areas that are assumed to be linked with immigration. The discourse articulated through this is that immigration and integration should be seen in regard with female oppression, criminality and violent extremism. By including these measures in integration politics, a cluster of meanings is created that are to be seen with immigrants, since this is the target group. This way, a categorization of immigrants is created that includes female oppression, criminality etc., instead of having measures for female oppression under, for instance, measures of gender equality, and statements of intent on criminality within legal measures. To take the discussion further; someone who executes forced marriage might as well have been living in Norway for a number of years, being a Norwegian citizen although still practising a culture that allows forced marriage. The aspect of self-identification of nationality is thus ignored since it is assumed that *immigrants* are the ones practicing this, not *Norwegian citizens*. It might therefore be a permanent stamp of being an immigrant. It becomes an ‘us’ and ‘them’ discourse, where ‘they’ are referred to the ones practising female oppression, criminality and extremism. As Kamali (2006) claims, ‘otherization’ might lead to an ethnic hierarchy. There are distinctions made between immigrants and the majority population in above, thus highlighting differences of the immigrants (Mattsson 2005).

Women tend to be categorized in the white paper from 2012:

More women than men discontinue the introduction program. One important explanation to women’s discontinuation is that they take a greater part of the baby care at birth and during the first years (Meld. St. 6 2012:33). [38]

Above is a closure of the discourse, where the only possibility mentioned is that women take care of the babies. It is a discursive absence of discrimination and intersectionality; discrimination is not mentioned as a possibility, and the aspect of discriminatory practices due to both ethnicity and gender is overlooked (compare with de los Reyes and Mulinari 2010). Both the excerpt above and the one below are categorizing women:

There are many reasons why women in some immigrant groups participate in working life to a lower extent. Some reasons are qualifications and level of education. Part of the reasons for lower participation in labour could also be reluctance towards mothers with small children being in paid work (Meld. St. 6 2012:80). [39]



Above is partly a 'skills-gap discourse' (Mattsson 2004), partly a homogenous image of immigrant women. The possibility of immigrant women being excluded from the labour market due to discrimination for being immigrant women is not raised and the discourse is closed for other meanings.

The 'us' and 'them' discourse articulated in the white paper from 1997 was explicitly referring to 'us' and 'them'. The articulation has changed in the latter time period, more implicitly articulating an 'us' and 'them' discourse. Similarly as to how 'inclusive' developed from 1997 to 2012, above might reveal a conscious attempt of removing a distinct differentiation of 'us' and 'them' in the latter time period in order to have an integration policy and ideology in line with the articulated inclusive discourse.

#### 4.4.3. Cultural essentialism as a factor of disintegration

In both time periods it is articulated that different cultures living together lead to conflicts.

In Meld. St. 17 (1997:48) it is proclaimed that “[p]roblems can often occur when people with different cultures work and live together. These problems can lead to greater conflicts if they are not solved in an early stage”. [40]

In Meld. St. 6 (2012:7) it is articulated that “Norway is part of a more globalized world (...). Immigration leads to a more diverse society, which gives opportunities but also more conflicts”. [41]

Above discourses are articulating that different cultures lead to conflicts, not a lack of understanding of other cultures, for instance. It is an expression of cultural essentialism since cultures in themselves are described as leading to conflict, thus implying that people are carriers of culture, and that culture equalizes certain values (compare with de los Reyes 2006, Mattsson 2005). When people of different cultures are thought of unable to live together it is an expression of cultural racism, differentiating on the basis of culture (de los Reyes 2008, Schierup & Ålund 1990).

It becomes a discursive struggle with the inclusive discourses, where it is articulated that diversity occurs as much within groups as it does between them. Another discursive struggle with above is to be found in the white paper from 1997 (p. 7) where it is stated that:

[s]ometimes differences in values, traditions and way of living create conflict between majority and minority. Such conflicts will be characterized by power

differences in the society (...). Conflicts of value are not firstly created by immigration. [42]

Above excerpt thus reveals a problematization of structural power differences, leading to conflicts of value, and must be seen as a possible framework for the proclamation of cultures leading to conflict mentioned above, hence diminishing the discourse on cultural characteristics. Although the structural relations are problematized in above excerpt from 1997, the culture is problematized (compare with Schierup & Ålund 1990) in the excerpt from 2012.

Immigrants described as differentiated in relation to the remaining population, is also visible in the white paper from 1997:

Immigration, specifically during the last ten years, has led to a greater span in the view of life, traditions and perceptions of the good life than before (Meld.St. 17 1997:7). [43]

There is a great variation in background, way of living and perceptions amongst immigrants and their descendants. (...) [F]rom generation to generation there are changes in the different groups, whether it concerns the relation between women and men, view of life or living. Cultural relations are in a constant change (Meld.St. 17 1997:7). [44]

Discourses are articulated as if only immigrants' culture and way of living is of great variation and changing, thus referring to Norwegian culture as something neutral and fixed (compare with Castles & Miller 2009; Miles 1993), thus being a paradox of multiculturalism, as raised by Schierup and Ålund (1990).

The rhetoric and discourse of cultural characteristics and essentialism are visible in both time periods, although they differ slightly. There is a greater understanding of structural relations effect on cultural conflicts in the white paper from 1997, compared with the white paper from 2012. Although, there is a greater focus on immigrants' cultures as something different in 1997.

#### 4.4.4. 'Us' and 'them' discourse articulated in measures

Below excerpt reveals an 'us' and 'them' discourse in the white paper from 1997:

Immigration gives access to a remarkably more varied basis of experiences and knowledge than exist in more closed, homogenous societies. In order for us to get full use of this basis, every resident, regardless of background, shall have the

opportunity to active participation in the society, and there must be contact and interaction between different populations (Meld. St. 17 1997:7). [45]

It is articulated that there exist an ‘us’ that needs to get full use of the immigrants’ varied basis of knowledge, thus creating a ‘them’. This can be related to the banal nationalism previously referred to, coined by Carmel et al (2011). It is also an implicit articulation of human rights and non-discrimination, articulating that “every resident, regardless of background, shall have the opportunity” to participate. This is however a tool in achieving “full use” of the “remarkably more varied basis of experiences and knowledge” (similar discourses will be further described in 4.6.). The articulation that immigrants make the society more heterogeneous is however also in line with the inclusive articulation in factors in the white paper from 1997.

An ‘us’ and ‘them’ articulation is found in measures for increasing recruitment of people with immigrant background from the latter time period:

Several measures are being implemented in order to increase the recruitment of people with immigrant background. (...) [T]he government [introduced] testing with moderate affirmative actions with immigrants from Africa and Asia etc. (...). The purpose of the testing is to give corporates experience, skills and awareness on recruitment of applicants with immigrant background (Meld. St. 6 2012:39). [46]

Recruitment of people with immigrant background is articulated to be something different or special compared to recruitment of people with Norwegian background, that they need experience and skills to handle, which reveals a ‘cultural characteristics discourse’ (compare with Schierup & Ålund 1990, de los Reyes 2006; Miles 1993). The testing were conducted on immigrants from Africa and Asia etc., with the purpose of getting experience of applicants with ‘immigrant background’ thus linking ‘immigrant background’ in this context to immigrants from Asia and Africa. It could therefore as the experience of applicants with immigrant background is referring to non-Western immigrants, supposedly more different than Western immigrants (compare with Mattsson 2004), which is why the corporates need experience of this particular group.

The articulations above thus follows what was revealed in factors; that ‘us’ and ‘them’ is explicitly articulated in 1997 and implicitly in 2012. Articulation of ‘us’ and ‘them’, whether implicit or explicit, might create social borders (Castles & Miller 2009) and differential integration (Castles & Miller 2009), as well as exclusionary practices (Miles 1993).

## 4.5. Qualification and skills-gap discourse

### 4.5.1. Factors emphasising skills-gap and diminishing discrimination

Explanations deviating from a discourse of discrimination and ‘us’ and ‘them’ can be revealed in the integration policies, focusing on immigrants’ qualifications and a skills-gap discourse:

Today it is visible (...) that employment amongst immigrants is lower and the registered unemployment is far higher than for the rest of the population. This is especially concerning groups from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe (...). Two of the main reasons for this are lack of qualifications and exclusion (Meld. St. 17 1997:56). [47]

It is acknowledged that full-time employed from Africa, Asia and Latin-America with university education earn 20 % less than others with similar education (Meld. St. 17 1997:39). This is however not problematized with above, thus defining above-mentioned group as low-skilled, since the lack of qualifications is mentioned as one of the main reasons for the high rate of unemployment amongst immigrants (compare with de los Reyes 2006). It is thus a skills-gap discourse where the high unemployment rates of immigrants are partly blamed their (potentially) low education (compare with Mattsson 2004). It does not explain the exclusion that occur in low-skilled jobs or the fact that immigrants are over-qualified to a greater extent than native citizens (see Meld. St. 17 1997:35-36). It is however acknowledged that exclusion is a main factor, although discrimination and/or racism are not explicitly mentioned in this articulation, thus making the phenomenon milder.

Change in Western labour markets is articulated as a possible factor for lower employment amongst non-Western immigrants:

It is not only recession that is the cause of weaker connection to the labour market for immigrants. The last decades large changes have occurred in Western countries, business has grown, and the industrial labour market has stagnated. Higher education, language skills and knowledge of country specific aspects are needed, such as laws. Several studies show that Western immigrants are better off on the labour market in Western countries than non-Western immigrants. There can be different reasons for this, such as differences in level of education, that work experience from other Western countries are easier to transform or that immigrants

from non-Western countries experience discrimination on the labour market (Meld. St. 17 1997:32) [48]

Above can be referred to the theory of the ‘modern working life’ (Mattsson 2004), where non-Western qualification cannot match the high demands, thus creating an ‘otherness’ and ‘cultural distance’. ‘Immigrants’ are initially referred to as one group, when explaining “the cause of weaker connection to the labour market”, implicitly being linked to a lack of higher education, language skills and country specific knowledge. This is linked with *Western countries*, thus implicitly referring to non-Western immigrants also when initially referring to immigrants’ “weaker connection to the labour market”. However, in the articulation above discrimination is mentioned as a possible factor as well, the discourse is thus not closed to a skills-gap discourse. The focus lies in skills needed for the transformed labour market in the West.

It is further described that:

An exclusion of immigrants from working life could reflect a general development where employees with low skills, short education and little work experience are more exposed to unemployment (Meld. St. 17 1997:60-61). [49]

Immigrants are again being linked with low skills, short education and little work experience (compare with de los Reyes 2006). It is not problematized by raising statistics of discrimination, but linked with “a general development”, thus articulating exclusion as something that naturally occurs due to a societal development. When immigrants are being associated with low skills and unemployment, there is a risk of sustained power inequalities in the labour market (de los Reyes 2006).

A closed skills-gap discourse can be revealed in the white paper from 2012/2013 (p. 42), where it is referred to a report, stating that “[g]ood use of immigrants skills and workforce requires that immigrants participate in working life up until retirement age, in line with the rest of the population”. [51] For that reason, research was conducted on a group of immigrants from Pakistan, India, Turkey and Morocco, migrating to Norway in the late 60’s and early 70’s, whose participation in the labour market drastically decreased after a number of years in employment and to a greater extent than for the rest of the population with similar age, sex and education. It is further described that:

The report lifts a number of possible reasons to this development. Bad work environment, insecure jobs, lack of reassignment skills, tough physical jobs, and/or

long working days. In addition, it is emphasized that many in this group had little to gain financially by being in paid work. Many were in low-paid employment and could, if they were qualified for it, get higher income through different benefits. This especially applies if they had many children (ibid.). [52]

The development of decreased participation in working life for immigrants before retirement age is linked to a number of factors, but a possibility of discrimination is excluded. “Lack of reassignment skills” is one factor, implying a skills-gap discourse. It is also a discourse of ‘benefit dependency’ (Mattsson 2004), implying that receiving benefits is a greater incentive than working. Statistics has, as mentioned, revealed that immigrants to a greater degree are in low-paid employment with worse working conditions which could be explained with discriminatory practices. The reasons mentioned above could be indicating that this is the case in above example, mentioning “bad work environment”, “tough physical jobs”, etc. without problematizing this with underlying factors. Discrimination is not articulated as a factor in above context, thus revealing a discursive absence of discrimination.<sup>27</sup>

Discrimination as a factor is excluded also in below excerpt, describing why the rate of establishments amongst immigrants is higher than their rate of employment (17 % and 11 % respectively):

‘Livelihood establishers’, which the most establishments consist of, want to establish their own business in order to support themselves and their family. Immigrant establishers in this group might have a strong driving force related to creating something of their own and to realize their potential. For some, unemployment and weak opportunities to mobilization in the labour market, might be additional factors and a motivation to start their own business (Meld. St. 6 2012:41). [53]

Above articulation could be related to “buying their own job”, as theorized by de los Reyes (2006), and ethnic entrepreneurs (Schierup 2006). It is only recognized to some extent that this would be a possibility, although articulated in difficulties at the labour market in general, not difficulties in the labour market due to discrimination, despite the fact that discrimination against people with immigrant background in recruitment processes occur (Meld. St. 6

---

<sup>27</sup> Important to note is the fact that the discourse articulated in the report first and foremost mirrors the perceptions of the author of mentioned report. However, the results referred to are not further problematized or questioned in the white paper.

2012:113). Furthermore, unemployment and weak opportunities are described as additional factors, implying that it is rather a question of a personal driving force, diminishing possible discriminatory factors.

A skills-gap discourse is visible in both time periods where discrimination as a possible factor is diminished, thus deviating from discourses of human rights and non-discrimination. However, articulations differ between the two time periods. The ‘modern working life’ and categorization of Western and non-Western employees are articulated in relation to a skills-gap discourse in the white paper from 1997, and also an articulation of higher unemployment for low-skilled workers as a general development. In the white paper from 2012 the articulation were benefit dependency and ethnic entrepreneurs in relation to a skills-gap discourse. Similar for both time periods, is that immigrants’ unemployment, lower participation, and higher rate of being entrepreneur were not being problematized, thus diminishing discrimination as a possible factor.

#### 4.5.2. Skills-gap in measures

Measures articulating a skills-gap discourse is only one, regarding integration in municipalities in the white paper from 2012 (p: 28):

In 2013 the government will implement a new subsidy with development funds to the municipalities. The aim is to increase the quality and improve the results in the integration work of the municipalities. Particular weight will be put on tuition in the Norwegian language and social sciences. [55]

Discrimination is not mentioned as a possibility to unsuccessful integration, but the immigrants’ lack of skills in Norwegian and social sciences (compare with Mattsson 2004). It is a focus on the individual rather than structural measures, and a one-dimensional approach where the measure does not take several aspects into account, such as removal of discriminatory barriers *and* Norwegian tuition.

#### 4.6. Resource and economic discourse

##### 4.6.1. Resources and discrimination – factor

In the white paper from 1997, a few studies have been conducted on economic effects from immigration. One of them aims is to reveal “how the GDP is distributed between immigrants and the remaining population” [56] and another on “what effects immigration has on public budgets” [57] (Meld. St. 17 1997:33-34). A categorization between Western immigrants and

non-western immigrants is made, and a conclusion is that Western immigrants contribute to the value in the society to an equal amount as non-immigrants, whereas non-Western immigrants contribute only 40-60 % of Western- and non-immigrants. It is also proclaimed that:

Western immigrants are to a higher degree than others occupied in business that is high-waged and contributes more to the GDP per employed. Non-western immigrants are to a higher degree occupied in business such as renovation and cleaning, education and social services (...). Differences in contribution to GDP between immigrants and non-immigrants is foremost due to the number of people without paid work (ibid.). [58]

It is thus a border-making of Western and non-Western immigrants. It is described how different groups give different values to the society, which thus preserves a categorization of the population into two, rather homogenous, groups. It might be stigmatizing to identify which groups give which value to the community without going deeper into possible underlying factors, and contextualize the people behind the numbers (compare with de los Reyes 2006). The fact that non-Western immigrants to a higher degree are “occupied in business such as renovation and cleaning (...)” as opposed to the high-waged Western immigrants, which can be seen as an ethnified labour market (Jensen in Alsmark et al 2007) is not problematized. As Miles (1993) claims; when a certain group in the society possess low-skilled jobs it might show excluding and racist practices. It is indicating that the groups who are not creating enough value is not actively contributing enough which might create discrimination from other groups in a socialistic welfare society where an idea of equal share is dominant, which could be related to ‘economic threat’ raised by Castles and Miller (2009). It also creates a discourse where different groups have different economic value in relation to the community.

Above articulations can also be identified as an ‘employment discourse’, i.e. what matters is that as many as possible are employed, regardless if their qualifications have been met, since what matters for the contribution to the GDP is whether one is engaged in paid work. This is visible also where it is described that “potential of contributions to the common economy that can be realized if the labour activity among immigrants increases” [59] (Meld. St. 17 1997:35).

The economic situation in Norway due to the number of refugees is brought up:

Immigration to Norway has in the latest years been dominated by people with refugee background and family reunited people (...). The economic situation will



probably be different in Norway than other countries that have based their immigration politics on recruiting people with special qualifications (Meld. St. 17 1997:32). [60]

It is further expressed that expenses for refugees are different for the ones of “regular” immigrants (Meld. St. 17 1996:34).

Above could be related to an economic contribution discourse where different groups are related to different economic values. ‘Refugees’ are compared with immigrants with “special qualifications” on an economical basis. However, counting on costs and benefits of immigration is seen as controversial (Castles and Miller 2009). Above might create a “culture of attitude”, as mentioned in the white paper from 1997, as well as social borders (compare with Carmel et al 2011; Castles & Miller 2009), where refugees and family reunited immigrants are perceived as an economic disadvantage for the Norwegian society.

It is recognized that immigrants from non-Western countries have a higher rate of unemployment, are more often employed in part-time jobs than others, that many are overqualified for their work and that the factors for this might be discrimination (Meld. St. 17 1997:35-36). This is not problematized in relation to above discourse of economic contribution.

In the white paper from 2012 the economic discourse has changed, and it is instead referred to immigrants as resources rather than economic figures:

Discrimination hinders immigrants from equally participating in the society and hinders the society from using the population’s resources and talents (Meld. St. 6 2012:8). [61]

It can be said to be an economic welfare discourse, where discrimination is seen as a hinder for the good of society, where immigrants’ resources cannot be used.

Discrimination makes the Norwegian society to a worse society. Working life misses out on skills and workforce (Meld. St. 6 2012:38). [62]

It is thus articulated that a ‘worse society’ is a society where skills and workforce is lost. It is an absence of a human rights discourse, in both excerpts above, since lack of equal opportunities, unequal political and social rights etc., are not mentioned. A perspective of the *individual’s* rights is also absent. This is visible also below:

Norway has a potential of improvement when it comes to usage of immigrants' skills. This particularly concerns immigrants from countries in Asia and Africa. Studies show that the extent of over-qualification is greater among immigrants than the rest of the population (Meld. St. 6 2012:36). [63]

Over-qualification is not seen as a problem due to possible discriminatory factors, but because this means that Norway cannot use the immigrants' skills. The human rights discourse is absent also in this articulation, since the individual's right not to be discriminated, or right to equal opportunities are not articulated.

To summarize, an economic discourse can be revealed in the policy from 96-97, where the implementation of international conventions, and unemployment are put in relation to economic costs. In the latter policy another type of discourse is articulated, but similar to a discourse of economic terms, namely that discrimination is costly for the society due to lost workforce – the focus lies on resources rather than economic cost. Discrimination is thus not equivalent to a human rights discourse but rather to a resource discourse.

#### 4.6.2. Work as the superior aim – through equal opportunities

The Norwegian welfare policy is dependent on high creation of value and high employment, and it is expressed that “[m]easures that give people with immigrant background a better starting point for participation in working life shall be prioritized” [64] (Meld. St. 17 1997:11).

It is further stated that:

High value and high employment are necessary fundamentals for the welfare policy of Norway. Statistics show that immigrants experience problems getting into the labour market. *The government sees it as an important challenge to ease immigrants' opportunities to get into employment. Language tuition, qualification and approval of qualifications are important focus areas in this context. At the same time, the approach of the employer is important for the immigrants to have the same opportunities to be employed as other qualified candidates.* (Meld. St. 17 1997:35). [65]

High value in employment is described as a fundament for welfare politics, which is why immigrants' opportunities to get into employment shall be facilitated, and measures for “participation in working life shall be prioritized”. The “*important focus areas*” for achieving this are language tuition and qualifications, thus revealing a skills-gap discourse, indicating that

increasing immigrants' skills is the most important measure when they "experience problems" in the labour market. Equal opportunities, as articulated above, is not firstly a question of human rights, but rather a question of high value and a sustainment of the welfare. Articulation of human rights and discrimination is implicit, where immigrants' "to have the same opportunities" as others is dependent on the "approach of the employer". The employers' duty not to discriminate or treat differently is not mentioned, only that their approach matters for immigrants' possibility to equal opportunities.

Similar rhetoric is found in the white paper from 2012, although the articulation of discrimination differs:

Development of orders and measures in the integration policy shall take the superior aim of high employment into consideration. It shall be facilitated that immigrants get necessary skills for the Norwegian working life and that immigrants' skills and work force are used. Recruitment of immigrants shall be strengthened at every level in working life, and obstacles such as discrimination shall be removed (Meld. St. 6 2012:27). [66]

Employment is the superior aim of integration policy measures, and measures are thus a way of reaching the goal of high employment. Immigrants' skills are again initially mentioned, indicating that this is seen as the most important measure in this context. Discrimination is explicitly articulated, and it is expressed that such obstacles shall be removed. Human rights are articulated similarly as in 1997; they are not described as the fundament of the politics but as a facilitation for achieving high employment and usage of resources.

Since high employment is seen as a necessary fundament in Norwegian welfare policy in the former time period, and as a superior aim in the latter, measures on training and education are seen as important in both time periods:

*Better Norwegian tuition for children, youths and adults is crucial for increased participation. Active recruitment and specifically aimed means are necessary to achieve equal opportunities* (Meld. St. 17 1997:8). [68]

In the white paper it is stated that "[b]etter Norwegian tuition and a more targeted qualification for the Norwegian working life are important tools to succeed [in getting more immigrants into the labour market]." [69] (Meld. St. 6 2012:8).

Both excerpts put focus on tuition and training as important measures. In the former excerpt, measures against discrimination are implicitly mentioned as “specifically aimed means” that “are necessary to achieve equal opportunities”. Discrimination as a factor is thus reduced in both time periods since measures against discrimination are not part of the “focus areas” or “important tools” for increased participation in the labour market.

Loss of resources for the society due to discrimination is described also within measures in the white paper from 1997:

*Unemployment is a problem for the affected. It is also a problem for society – not the least because the society loses resources that lie in human work force. In order to increase labour participation and reduce unemployment amongst immigrants, measures that can increase the individuals’ qualifications for the Norwegian labour market, and measures that can reduce the barriers for immigrants’ participation in working life must be prioritized. Language proficiency has a great importance for immigrants’ participation in working life and other areas in the Norwegian society. Participation is also conditioned on efficient orders of approval in order to use the resources that immigrants bring to this country, and that discrimination does not occur (Meld. St. 17 1997:54). [70]*

Above excerpt is in line with previous articulations where increasing immigrants’ skills are prioritized. Discrimination is explicitly articulated although it is described as an additional measure, less emphasised than qualifications and orders of approval. Above is also part of the resource discourse, articulating the loss of resources for the society due to unemployment, which will be further developed in 4.6.4.

In the white paper 2012/2013 (p. 38) it is stated that:

Work contributes to strong individuals, safe families and a well-functioning society. It is through work that also immigrants find their place in society. A well-functioning, safe and fair society requires equal opportunities for every citizen to contribute and participate in the labour market. [71]

Work is articulated as being an overall solution – giving strong individuals, safe families and a functioning society. ‘Work’, in this articulation, is formulated as a wide term. It is a closure of the discourse, not giving room for problematizations of work as the key to integration. Research and statistics presented showed that immigrants are to a greater extent employed in low-wage

jobs, temporary employment and are over-qualified. A temporary, low-waged job where one cannot use their skills and with low opportunities for mobility does not necessarily lead to a strong individual and a safe family. As de los Reyes (2006) theorized, when labour is seen as the key to integration the tendency is that worse working conditions is not being problematized. Work, however, is achieved through equal opportunities. Consequently, what could be related to human rights is only a tool in reaching the higher aim of employment.

Work is described as the superior or fundamental aim in both time periods, in which human rights become secondary and a tool for using immigrants' resources. Qualifications and training are thus seen as important measures, in which discrimination as a factor is being reduced. In addition, in the latter time period, a problematization of the higher rate of immigrants represented in low-wage jobs is absent, thus revealing an employment discourse.

#### 4.6.3. Equality through employment

Following above resource discourse and work as a superior aim, equality is considered to be important in both time periods in order to have as many people as possible in paid work:

Equality, participation and integration is a prerequisite in order for the society to get full use of immigrants' resources and experiences (Meld. St. 17 1997:11). [72]

Economic independency is a requirement for real equality. The welfare state is dependent on most possible participants in working life. It is therefore a goal that both women and men in a family as far as possible are tied to the labour market and have their own income (Meld. St. 6 2012:80). [73]

Equality is not articulated from a human rights discourse, and every human being's right not to be discriminated on the basis of sex; but from a resource and economic contribution discourse. Equality is a tool in sustainment of the welfare state. In line with the resource discourse previously mentioned, it is referred to the State "to get full use of (...) resources" and "most possible participants in working life".

#### 4.6.4. Profits of immigration as a measure

The skills (...) that immigrants bring, are valuable in Norwegian working life and society. It is a resource that an increasing amount of people are bi- or multilingual. The Norwegian society does not manage to fully take advantage of these resources today (Meld. St. 17 1997:55). [74]

Above is an acknowledgement that immigrants' abilities and qualifications should be better taken into use, although it is a focus on their cultural or foreign skills, such as language. It is thus a differentiation of 'them' who come from abroad and speak exotic languages (compare with de los Reyes 2006). It is a discourse of what is best for the welfare state, and how immigration creates economic value for the society. The question of their self-fulfilment or their right to not be discriminated is absent. A similar discourse is seen in the white paper from 2012:

Profits from immigration are dependent on how the labour market, the authorities and the society facilitate immigrants' use of their skills and workforce. This will positively contribute to the future sustainability of the welfare. Profits of increased diversity require a working life that values people with different qualifications and background. In addition to the authorities' work it is therefore of great importance that companies are concerned with how immigrants' skills can be better used. (Meld. St. 6. 2012:36). [75]

It is good for Norway that people with ties to other countries live here. To have background from and knowledge of other countries and cultures is a resource, for the individual and the society, and it is important to acknowledge and use different experiences and abilities (Meld. St. 6 2012:104). [76]

Above articulations are similar to the one from 1997; a welfare discourse where the profit is prioritized. It could be related to a utility maximization discourse where their use is the most important, which is in line with the theory raised by Schierup (2006) of a post-national welfare regime where the focus lies in maximization of local advantages. In this context the advantage is the immigrants' "different qualifications". Above is also implying an essential cultural characteristic, when referring to valuing different qualifications and backgrounds (compare with de los Reyes 2008, Schierup & Ålund 1990; Mattsson 2004), expressing a discursive struggle with the inclusive discourse previously mentioned. It is referred to 'profits' in economic terms since it is linked to working life and work force, and thus an articulation of diversity as economic incentive (compare with Martinsson 2006).

A resource discourse is visible in both time periods, although the perspective differs. The individuals' 'right' to use *their* resources is absent in 1997, the focus being more often on the usage *of* immigrants' resources for the good of the society:

*The government wants to prioritize measures who give people with immigrant background better starting point for participation in the labour market, and measures that contributes to usage of every knowledge resource (Meld. St. 17 1997:8). [77]*

*Integration, equality and participation in a multicultural Norway is a condition for the society to get part of immigrants' resources and experience<sup>28</sup>. (St. Meld. 17 1997:7). [78]*

*There are considerate resources of value to be made by using the potential labour market resources of the immigrants to a greater extent than today (Meld. St. 17 1997:34). [79]*

The resource discourse in 1997 is thus for the good of the society, not for individuals' equal opportunities to use their resources, even though the goal of integration is described to be that of everyone's equal opportunities.

In the white paper from 2012 (p. 7) it is proclaimed that:

All inhabitants in Norway have rights and obligations and should have the opportunity to participate in and contribute to working and social life. Therefore, the most important goal for the Government's integration policy is to ensure that all people who live in Norway are able to utilize their resources and participate in the community. [80]

The resource discourse is in above excerpt related to a human rights discourse, linking it with rights and everyone's opportunity to participate, and to use their resources.

Absence of the individual's opportunity to use his/her resources is visible in below paragraph from 2012:

Immigration to Norway is a resource. (...). Immigration creates opportunities for development of the Norwegian society. At the same time, immigration means challenges. These must be dealt with, both on a national and local level, in order to be able to make profit from the immigrants' resources (Meld. St. 6 2012:25). [81]

---

<sup>28</sup> See also Meld. St. 17 1997:11.

It is further stated that:

The greatest resource in Norway are the people who live here. This is the starting point in the integration policy – that everyone shall be able to use their resources. Work is the key to participation and economic independency. The government will therefore strengthen the effort to get more immigrants, women and men into work (...). A better use of immigrants' qualifications is necessary (Meld. St. 6 2012:7-8). [82]

The former excerpt emphasizes the society's profit-making of immigrants' resources, not in their individual right in having equal opportunities to do so. The latter excerpt is initially referring to everyone's equal ability to use their resources, although it is later referred to "use of immigrants' qualifications", thus not articulating the individual's rights. Above should be seen in relation to the statement previously mentioned, proclaiming that "[t]he integration policy should enable everyone's equal rights, opportunities and duties" (Meld. St. 6 2012:9). The articulations above thus deviates from what is stated to be a framework of the integration policy, where a human rights discourse is articulated.

In below excerpt from 2012 (p. 25), better use of immigrants' qualifications is a measure for increased employment:

The government's work to increase employment amongst immigrants is based on two cornerstones. Firstly, fundamental qualifications shall be strengthened through improved Norwegian tuition (...). Secondly, immigrants' qualifications shall be better used. That requires a more comprehensive achievement to increase the recruitment of immigrants to working life, facilitation for establishment of business for immigrants and better orders of approval for qualifications from abroad. This also includes eliminating hindrances such as discrimination, bad work environments and social dumping. [83]

"Better use ..." is thus achieved through a comprehensive achievement together with increased recruitment of immigrants, facilitation of establishment for immigrants, improved approval of qualifications and elimination of discrimination. Both cornerstones expressed above are primarily regarding "better use of immigrants' qualifications", since strengthened "fundamental qualifications" falls under this category as well. Human rights become secondary, and usage of immigrants' skills is dominant in both cornerstones. The human rights measures are part of the



resource discourse and one of other factors in achieving a high employment. The perspective of the individual's rights is absent.

Better use of immigrants' skills, and improvement for qualification for low-skilled immigrants can be put in relation to below excerpt from 1997, also revealing a resource discourse:

The most important group is foreigners that get allowance to work as experts, i.e. they possess skills that are not covered by the domestic labour market. The background to this is consideration for the labour market (Meld. St. 17 1997:29). [84]

It is a value of immigrants in relation to what they can contribute., and experts are perceived as more important than other migrants. It is thus part of the economic contribution discourse, as well as categorizing people due to economic contribution, which could be related to social border-making (compare with Carmel et al 2011; Castles and Miller 2009).

Multilingualism as a resource is also described as a fundamental value:

Diversity, equality, equal worth, tolerance, freedom of speech, solidarity, economic and social equality, protection of children's rights, freedom of religion and belief and multilingualism as a resource are other fundamental values upon which the government builds its politics. These are the central values ensuring that the Norwegian society gives room for diversity in a safe community (Meld. St. 6 2012:103). [85]

Multilingualism as a resource is described as one of the fundamental values, which is part of the resource discourse; a central value is to use the immigrants' resources, and their linguistic knowledge in particular. It is a focus on their 'cultural skills' (compare with de los Reyes 2006), creating an otherization based on cultural characteristics (Miles 1993; Mattsson 2005).

However, a discursive struggle is articulated in the *Statement of intent for promoting equality and preventing discrimination* (2009:26):

Globalization and internationalization are central aspects in today's working life. There are continuously new demands of ability for public and private working life. The recruitment must therefore be as wide as possible to secure that the best qualified is being recruited. It is important to use the skills and qualifications that

the individual possesses independent of sex, age, disability, ethnicity, religion etc.

[86]

Above is a different discourse on skills in a globalized world, where it is not referred to as immigrants' useful skills due to bi-/multilingualism but that everyone should be equally valued as applicants, thus articulating human rights discourse (compare with Smith 2012). It is also stated that characteristics such as sex, age, ethnicity, etc., should not matter, thus articulating an intersectional discourse (de los Reyes and Mulinari 2010). However, it is articulated that it is "important to use the skills", thus being directed towards a structural level, not taking the individual's equal opportunities into consideration.

In both time periods, immigrants' 'different', i.e. cultural, qualifications are seen as resources that create profit for the welfare State, and should thus be taken into use. The difference between the two time periods is mainly that the perspective of the individual is absent in the white paper from 1997, whereas it can be seen in the latter time period, thus including a human rights discourse. In addition, the statement of intent from the latter time period did not emphasize resources on a cultural basis, but from an individual perspective, thus deviating from the discourse articulated in the white papers.

Immigrants' skills and immigration/immigrants as a resource go hand in hand, whether it is immigrants' individual opportunities to use their skills or the society's usage of skills that is in focus. It is part of an economic discourse, where specific skills equalize resources and economic value for the labour market and the welfare, thus also being a resource discourse (these discourses are interlinked and difficult to separate completely, since resources are often referred to economic terms).

#### 4.6.5. From multiculturalism to diversity

Labour is, as mentioned, seen as an important factor to integrate immigrants. Discourses mentioned above have also been concerning usage of immigrants' resources in the working life. In the integration policy from 1996/1997 (p. 59), one measure in order to get usage of immigrants resources is to

[R]eserve [economic capital] in order to develop good, multicultural working places. The funds will be used to get knowledge of how such working places function today, what can be done to recruit more people with immigrant

background, what can be done to create a better working environment for everyone, regardless of background, how immigrants brought qualifications are used. [87]

The discourse of multiculturalism would in an equivalence chain be arranged as follows:  
Multicultural – people with immigrant background

Above articulation can be seen as a continuation of above discourses on how immigrants' qualifications shall be used. Multicultural working places are seen as an important factor to get usage of immigrants skills by "recruiting more people with immigrant background". The measure imposes a one-dimensional, cultural perspective; the articulation of multicultural working places are directed towards immigrants, with a supposedly different culture than native Norwegians, and multicultural working places are thus supposedly different towards working places with a native Norwegian personnel. It is a discourse of cultural essentialism, where individuals with 'immigrant background' are seen as carriers of their culture (compare with de los Reyes 2006; Mattsson 2005), having special needs in the labour market due to their background even though they might have been born in Norway. The differentiation is visible also in the fact that the measure is directed towards immigrants as one group. Needs and preferences might differ greatly within 'immigrants' as a group depending on sex, age, education, religion etc. By not taking other differences than culture/ethnicity into account the only factor for being 'the other' is having another ethnicity and/or culture than Norwegians. When culture is the only dimension regarded in recruitment of 'people with immigrant background' it is also a homogenization of immigrants (and their descendants) and intersectional perspectives are excluded (compare with de los Reyes and Mulinari 2010).

In the latter time period, the term of multiculturalism has been widened, and cross-cultural is not mentioned. Instead, it is referred to 'diversity' which is defined in the SIED (2009:9):

A diversity perspective can be understood as a general perspective, referring to a number of human characteristics such as sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion etc. The diversity of the population must be acknowledged and showed respect, by reflecting the different needs of the population in the frame of public services and the common systems. In addition, it requires for us to expand our understanding of what it means to be Norwegian. [88]

It is thus a broadening not only from referring to different cultures, to referring to many other possible categories affecting people's different needs, such as sex, age, etc., but also an

inclusive perspective of ‘being Norwegian’, similar to the *inclusive discourse*. To ease the understanding of diversity for the reader and how it is discursively produced (and later discursively changed) I will show this with a chain of equivalence; diversity – sex – age – disability – sexual orientation – ethnicity – religion – the population.

The development from multiculturalism is seen also in the headlines of the two policies, the white paper from 1997 headlined *About immigration and the multicultural Norway*, and the white paper published in 2012 headlined *A comprehensive integration policy – diversity and community*. It is also a focus on integration in the white paper from 2012, compared to immigration in the white paper from 1997, perhaps revealing the attempt to introduce an integration policy that does not focus on immigration per se, but on a reciprocal integration practice, which ‘comprehensive integration’, aims to achieve.

Diversity is however mostly referring to cultural differences only. A strategy in the integration policy for the labour market is to work closely with enterprises and hold lectures on how to achieve and manage diversity in a company. The aim is to increase recruitment of people with immigrant background, and to get a “lift of diversity”<sup>29</sup>. In order to achieve this, an internet portal is created by the Directorate of integration and diversity. In addition, local projects are initiated in specific areas with higher rate of immigration (Prop. 1 S 2010:8).

The portal contains a number of tools for so called diversity recruitment:

On the diversity portal are good examples, articles, presentations, films, and online courses within recruitment, inclusive work environment and management in a multicultural work place (...). The aim is to facilitate that more employers get use of the multicultural skills that immigrants in Norway possess (SIED 2009:29). [89]

Above equivalence chain of diversity is not reproduced, but changed into: diversity – multicultural – immigrants

Diversity has thus changed from being a term referring to a number of characteristics that applies to ‘the population’, into being a term referring to ‘multicultural’ applying to ‘immigrants’. It is again a differentiation with culture as the only dimension of ‘otherness’, since diversity is being equivalent to multiculturalism, and an articulation of multicultural working places as differentiating towards working places with only Norwegians. Immigrants’

---

<sup>29</sup> In original language: *mangfoldsløft*

skills are also referred to as ‘multicultural skills’, as opposed to skills of native Norwegians that would thus be culturally neutral (compare with Miles 1993; Schierup & Ålund 1990). This can be related to ‘immigrants as diversity agents’, raised by de los Reyes (2006), leading to an otherization with focus on the cultural differences and supposedly different skills. The perceptions of dissimilarities might lead to discriminatory practices (Kamali 2006). The native Norwegian becomes the cultural norm. When immigrants are perceived as different from the native population, it reveals an individually centred integration discourse (Jensen in Alsmark et al 2007; Schierup & Ålund 1990).

Similarly as to “develop multicultural working places” from 96/97, integration policy from 2012/2013 aims to improve leadership of “culturally diverse working places”:

The Directorate for Administration and IKT (DIFI) offers a course for leaders that includes leadership of culturally diverse working places. DIFI has developed a set of tools that leaders and governmental departments can use to practice diversity (...). The departments submit yearly reports to IMDi regarding status on the recruitment of people with immigrant background, and regarding activities and measures for an inclusive recruitment practice (...), and (...) work for diversity carried out in the department (Meld. St. 6 2012:39). [94]

A new term is introduced above, namely cultural diversity, thus linking diversity, in above context, to refer to cultural differences only. The equivalence chain to be made out of above paragraph is similar to above equivalence chain on diversity, equalizing diversity with multiculturalism and ‘people with immigrant background’, and would thus be combined as: Diversity – cultural – people with immigrant background.

With the *Diversity price* the government wishes to show good examples of inclusion of people with immigrant background in working life, and to spread knowledge and inspiration of achievements leading to increased diversity in the work place. The diversity price is yearly handed out to an enterprise that has stood out regarding ethnic diversity at the work place. Recruitment of women with immigrant background shall be an important criteria when evaluating candidates (ibid.). [95]

Also in above paragraph is diversity linked to people with immigrant background, which in a chain of equivalence would simply be:

Diversity – people with immigrant background

It is thus a reproduction of ‘multicultural’ as articulated in the white paper from 1997 rather than a reproduction of ‘diversity’ as a wider perspective as defined in the Statement of intent (2009:9). It is a one-dimensional aspect of diversity, where ethnicity becomes the only characteristic for being diverse. It thus becomes a greater focus on what is different, as in the policy from 1997, namely ‘the others’, who do not possess the same culture (and cultural background) as native Norwegians. It becomes a cultural distance which might lead to cultural racism (compare with Scierup & Ålund 1990) which might anchor perceptions of similarity and difference (Neergaard & Mulinari 2004).

Diversity is also linked with an economic discourse:

Diversity in the Norwegian working life will strengthen the competitiveness of Norway in a more global world (Meld. St. 6 2012:35-36). [97]

Diversity is linked with competitiveness, thus articulating an economic discourse. It can be related to the theory raised by Schierup (2006), previously mentioned, and the post-national welfare regime, with a development towards maximization of differentiation, and Martinsson (2006), meaning that diversity is often related to economic incentives.

Above discourses on multiculturalism and diversity are a discursive struggle with the inclusive discourse previously mentioned, where people are described as not necessarily different due to ethnicity, while at the same time, diversity is only described through parameters of Norwegians and people with immigrant background. Values and preferences are thus described as bound by ethnicity. It can be related to the paradox of diversity, raised by Martinsson (2006). The internalized idea (compare with de los Reyes 2006) of immigrants’ in this aspect is their cultural differences compared to native Norwegians.

To refer to the theory raised by Papadopoulos (in Carmel et al 2011), the integration policies in both time periods are articulating ‘integration by multiculturalism’, where immigrants are perceived as equal to the majority population but different, even though the aim is to deconstruct, at least in the latter time period, categories and not emphasize differences between groups.

Schierup (2006) means that the welfare frame and political models affect exclusionary practices and social orders. Articulated above is an economic welfare frame where the political model includes utility maximization in which different (cultural) skills become important.

## 5. Conclusions

This study aimed to examine how, and to what extent, labour market segregation and integration are addressed from a human rights perspective in Norwegian integration policy and how this changes over time.

Results revealed that discrimination is to a great extent seen as a possible factor for immigrants' problems in the Norwegian society in both time periods, both concerning employment, career possibilities and participation in other areas. Also, structural discrimination is brought up as a possible factor, as well as general approaches towards people with immigrant background amongst the majority population, thus arguing against discrimination due to categorizations in the society.

Responding to the articulation of discrimination in factors, the framework for measures in the integration policies from both time periods is that of human rights and democracy. The articulation differs however, and it is described as a duty that must be followed in 1997 and a fundamental part of the Norwegian state in 2012, thus revealing a development of the human rights discourse. Non-discrimination is also emphasized in both time periods, in order to reach the goal of equal opportunities. A goal in both policies is also to have inclusive rhetoric and a wide, heterogeneous term of being 'Norwegian'. However, this is also developed in the latter time period, defining the nationals from a political theory instead of cultural, and explicitly wishing to counteract an 'us' and 'them'-rhetoric.

However, the welfare State is central in the Norwegian integration policies, and in order to sustain the welfare, resources are crucial – both economic and human. The Welfare State is the myth, in discourse analytical terms, that constitutes the residents as resources. In this, high employment becomes the superior aim in which a resource discourse is prioritized. Therefore, measures are mainly targeted towards using immigrants' skills and resources, multicultural/diverse resources in particular – 'different' skills are an advantage in sustainment of a welfare state with priority in economic profit. However, a transformation in the resource discourse is visible, having more focus on economic resources in the white paper from 1997, to referring to mostly cultural resources in the latter time period.

In order to increase employment – and profits – training, education and orders of approval are put great focus on, in which equal opportunities become a tool in achieving high employment. Human rights discourses are thus secondary in the primary goal of high employment. This



deviates with what was proclaimed as the fundamental frame in Norwegian politics; namely human rights and equal opportunities. The fundamental frame, as articulated in the integration policy, are high employment and resource use, in which equal opportunities is an implement.

When the discourse of an economic welfare, and the residents' different resources, is superior, an 'us' and 'them' discourse is created in the attempt of creating utility maximization. Non-discrimination is thus counteracted in the integration policies by articulating people with immigrant background in a categorizing manner. Different skills that immigrants possess, such as cultural knowledge and foreign language proficiency, become a tool in making profit.

The categorization of 'us' and 'them' is explicit in the white paper from 1997, and implicit in the latter white paper, perhaps revealing an attempt of developing the integration policy in the latter time period, which is also visible in the terminology, with 'inclusive' and 'comprehensive' being added into the integration policy in 2012. In addition, a political theory of nationality rather than cultural theory is being articulated in the white paper from 2012. However, despite explicit statements of a wish to widen the term 'Norwegian', although to different extent in the two time periods, the resource and economic contribution discourse for the good of the society is still prioritized, and an 'us' and 'them' discourse is hence still visible. The 'immigrants' are distanced from the majority population, being linked with a number of meanings as well as categorizing people with immigrant background, women in particular. The articulations of 'people with immigrant background' are to a great extent contradicting the initial articulations of discrimination and argumentation against prejudice and bias leading to hostile approaches amongst majority population.

Following the development of inclusiveness as a term and a more implicit articulation of 'us' and 'them' in the latter time period, the development of multiculturalism into diversity is an attempt to be more inclusive. However, the term deviates from the definition and takes on the same meaning as multiculturalism, thus putting emphasis on differences in ethnicity and culture.

Otherization is also seen in the skills-gap discourse that is visible in both time periods, by equalizing 'immigrants' with lower education and lack of certain skills, and skills needed for a 'modern working life'. The skills-gap is either closed for other meanings, or, when discrimination is mentioned as a possible explanation, the skills-gap discourse gets priority. The otherization is visible also in discourses of cultural characteristics and essentialism, where culture is perceived as leading to conflicts and problems.

The general development in the white paper in 2012 is thus that the approach aims to be more humane and inclusive, although the attempt is insufficient, when human rights and categorizations are subordinated the Welfare State in which high employment is essential. However, conclusions on change over time in a greater perspective is difficult to make by only looking at two time periods; the identified development might be a temporary trend or a deviation from previous years. What the study does reveal, though, is that a changed terminology does not necessarily imply factual change. The dominating political model in both time periods, and the prioritized discourse, is that of economic welfare. Human rights become of less importance in this model in Norwegian integration policy. This approach is what needs to change if the fundamental frame of human rights is to be implemented.

## 6. Final discussion

Human rights shall apply to everyone within a State, thus also including immigrants legally residing within a territory. Integration is a question of human rights, and should enable that every resident is equally entitled to human rights. Human rights are part of the national political agenda in Norway, and, as seen in this study, part of the framework in integration policy.

However, the framework of human rights is contradicted and becomes secondary when high employment is the greatest aim, in which human rights and equality are implements in achieving this. The terminology aiming to be inclusive and to hinder discrimination has little meaning when it is not implemented in the very document promoting it. In this context, it is of importance to raise the question of the relevance of integration policies per se, and what impact they have on the population, since this affects the generality of the study. However, the impact of integration policies in Norway and of the ruling government would be a study in itself. Nonetheless, it is a problem of a more general character, since there is a risk that this is a recurring problem – it is one thing promoting norm criticism and inclusive societies, another implementing it. Immigrants are a vulnerable group in this regard, easily being pointed out as ‘the Other’. The national discourse and the perception of the world in nations (or intra-national unions), is hegemonic and with it perceptions of what makes a nation and how its nationals are defined. Castles and Miller (2009:43) express it as “how can a nation be defined, if not in terms of a shared (and single) ethnic identity? How are core values and behavioural norms to be laid down, if there is a plurality of cultures and traditions?”

Which categorizations get discursive priority is context-bound and changeable. The focus on ethnic categorization is strong in many societies, perhaps particularly in an integration discourse where the articulation of the nationals and the nation are being challenged. The importance of ethnicity as a category is visible in this study, and it appears to be dominant. ‘Immigrants’ are rather constantly linked with ethnicity and culture, especially in relation to the labour market. This might get consequences, such as exaggerated focus on ethnicity as a characteristic before individual characteristics. In this regard, *the government* is the actor articulating the discourses of categories and human rights related measures in the integration policy, not the people who are being categorized; the subject positions articulating the discourses are top political, with power to formulate and change discourses. An important question to raise in this context, is: how are human rights implemented when economic welfare is superior of individual’s rights? And how are human rights implemented when the welfare State is perceived to be sustained by

ethnic dissimilarity and utility maximization, in which otherization is a premise? This is what might create the dilemma that Kamali (2006) refers to, where universal human rights are not valid for everyone due to ethnic segregation.

However, implementation of human rights are dependent on economic resources in a state. Therefore, high employment and economic resources are necessary for implementing human rights in a State. Human rights and welfare, both in economic and social terms, are thus interdependent. However, in the integration policies analysed in this study, welfare is expressed to be dependent on human rights, in particular equal opportunities for participation in the society, and the labour market in particular. Human rights become contradicted in the welfare discourse; the economic welfare is not motivated with implementation of human rights, but for the good of the society – the rights of the individual are thus not in focus but how the individual can be used in sustainment of the welfare.

When categorization precedes the individual, the risk is also that the right of the individual is overlooked. In addition, when belonging to a category that is being valued, as in this study when different cultures are described as resources or economic figures, the question of the individuals' equal value might be overshadowed.

### 6.1. Suggestions for future research

This study looked into labour market segregation and integration, and how this is addressed from a human rights perspective in Norwegian integration policy. However, discourses articulated in policies might not reflect what 'the reality' looks like. Therefore, a suggestion for future research is to look at how immigrants' human rights are ensured in the integration process in the working places, i.e. examine how the integration policy is being implemented and whether structural discrimination occurs.

Furthermore, this study is limited to looking at the labour market. Therefore, it would be of importance to look at integration and segregating practices in other areas than the labour market. Since work is often seen as a key to integration, then how are other areas, and thus other groups of people, perceived in the integration process? For example, how are schools included in an integration process and to what extent are children's rights fulfilled in this aspect?

## 7. References

- Alsmark, Gunnar; Kallehave, Tina; Moldenhawer, Molette (ed.) (2007). *Migration och tillhörighet : inklusions- och exklusionsprocesser i Skandinavien*. Makadam Publishing in cooperation with Centrum för Danmarksstudier vid Lunds universitet, Lund.
- Carmel, Emma; Cerami, Alfio; Papadopoulos, Theodoros (ed.) (2011). *Migration and Welfare in the New Europe – Social protection and the challenges of integration*. The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Castles, Stephen; Miller, Mark. J (2009). *The Age of Migration – International Population Movements in the Modern World* (fourth edition). Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire
- Constant, Amelie F.; Kahanee, Martin; Zimmermann, Klaus F. (2009). "Attitudes towards immigrants, other integration barriers, and their veracity", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 30 Iss: 1 pp. 5 – 14.
- Dagens Nyheter 2007-03-08 <http://www.dn.se/nyheter/politik/50-ar-pa-fredagen-och-partiledare-nasta-vecka/> (downloaded 2013-08-08)
- Dagens Nyheter 2006-07-28 <http://www.dn.se/ledare/signerat/ministerns-forlangda-arm/> (downloaded 2013-08-08)
- De los Reyes, Paulina; Mulinari, Diana (2009). *Intersektionalitet : kritiska reflektioner över (o)jämlighetens landskap*. Liber, Malmö.
- De los Reyes, Paulina in SOU 2006:59. *Arbetslivets (o)synliga murar – Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering*. ”Arbetslivets (o)synliga murar – diskriminering i arbetslivet”. Edita Sverige, Stockholm.
- De los Reyes, Paulina; Kamali, Masoud in SOU 2005:41. *Bortom Vi och Dom: Teoretiska reflektioner om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering: Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering*. Edita Sverige, Stockholm.
- De los Reyes, Paulina (2008). *Etnisk diskriminering I arbetslivet – kunskapsläge och kunskapsbehov*. En rapport för Landskapsorganisationen i Sverige. LO-distributionen.
- Freeman, Michael (2011). *Human Rights – An Interdisciplinary Approach*, (second edition). Polity Press, Cambridge.

Ghandhi, Sandy (2012). *International Human Rights Documents* (eighth edition). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Handlingsplan (2009). *Handlingsplan for å fremme likestilling og hinder diskriminering*. Barne- og likestillingsdepartementet.

Jørgensen Winther, Marianne; Phillips, Louise (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage, London.

Jørgensen Winther, Marianne; Phillips, Louise (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Kamali, Masoud in SOU 2006:73. *Den segregerte integrationen: Om social samanhållning og dess hinder: Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration og strukturell diskriminering*. Edita Sverige, Stockholm.

Mattsson, Katarina (ed.) (2004). *Rasism i Europa: arbeidsmarknadens fleksible fortryck: rapport frå forskarseminariet 5 oktober 2004*. Agora, Stockholm.

Mattsson, Katarina in SOU 2005:41. *Bortom Vi og Dom: Teoretiske refleksjoner om makt, integration og strukturell diskriminering: Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration og strukturell diskriminering*. "Diskriminerings andre ansikte – svenskhet og "det vita västerländska". Edita Sverige, Stockholm.

Martinson, Lena in SOU 2006:59 *Arbetslivets (o)synlige murar – Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration og strukturell diskriminering*. "Strategisamhälle – Om, värdegrund og diskriminerende frigjørelse". Edita Sverige, Stockholm.

Miles, Robert (1993). *Racism after "race relations"*. Routledge, London.

Molina, Irene in SOU 2006:73. *Den segregerte integrationen: Om social samanhållning og dess hinder: Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration og strukturell diskriminering*. "Mångkulturelle fororter eller belagte rum?" Edita Sverige, Stockholm.

Mulinari, Diana; Neergaard, Anders (2004). *Den Nye Svenske Arbetarklassen – rasiferte arbeidernes kamp inom facket*. Boréa Bokforlag, Umeå.

NOU, Norges offentlige utredninger. Brochmann, Grete (ed.) (2011). *Velferd og migrasjon – den norske modellens framtid*. 07 Oslo AS, Oslo.

Proposisjon 1 S (2010). *Handlingsplan for integrering of inkludering av innvandrerbefolkningen*. Arbeidsdepartementet.

Regjeringen.no, (2010) ”Proposisjoner og meldinger”  
<http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dok/regpubl.html?id=1751> (downloaded 2013-08-23).

Regjeringen.no, (2005) “Pressemelding no. 20.”  
<http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ad/presSESenter/pressemeldinger/2005/handlingsplan-for-integrering-og-inklud.html?id=103476> (downloaded 2013-08-31).

Regjeringen.no, (2011) “Thorbjørn Jaglands regjering”  
[http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/om\\_regjeringen/tidligere/oversikt/ministerier\\_regjeringer/nyere\\_tid/regjeringer/thorbjorn-jaglands-regjering-1996-1997.html?id=438732#](http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/om_regjeringen/tidligere/oversikt/ministerier_regjeringer/nyere_tid/regjeringer/thorbjorn-jaglands-regjering-1996-1997.html?id=438732#) (downloaded 2013-09-18).

Regjeringen.no, (2013) “Jens Stoltenbergs andre regjering”  
[http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/om\\_regjeringen/tidligere/oversikt/ministerier\\_regjeringer/nyere\\_tid/regjeringer/jens-stoltenbergs-andre-regjering.html?id=449424](http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/om_regjeringen/tidligere/oversikt/ministerier_regjeringer/nyere_tid/regjeringer/jens-stoltenbergs-andre-regjering.html?id=449424) (downloaded 2013-09-18).

Smith, Rhona K.M. (2012). *Textbook on International Human Rights* (fifth edition). Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik; Ålund, Aleksandra (1990). *Paradoxes on multiculturalism – Essays on Swedish Society*, Avebury Academic Publishing Group, Hants.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik; Hansen, Peo; Castles, Stephen (2006). *Migration, citizenship and the welfare state*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik in SOU 2006:59. *Arbetslivets (o)synliga murar – Rapport av utredningen om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering*. ”Den sociala exkluderingen i Sverige – Migration arbetsmarknad och välfärdsstat i förändring”. Edita Sverige, Stockholm.

Short version of Meld. St. 6 (2012). *A comprehensive integration policy – diversity and community*. Norwegian ministry of Children, Equality and Social inclusion.

Stortingsmelding 17 (1997). *Om innvandring og det flerkulturelle Norge*. Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet

Stortingsmelding 6 (2012). *En helhetlig integreringspolitikk – mangfold og fellesskap* Det kongelige Barne- likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet, Regeringen Stoltenberg II

Södergran, Lena (1997). *Invandrar- och flyktingpolitik I praktiken*. Umeå universitetstryckeri, Umeå

Södergran, Lena (2000). *Svensk Invandrar- och Integrationspolitikk – En fråga om jämlikhet, demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter*. Umeå universitetstryckeri, Umeå.

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights. (2013) “What are human rights?”. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Pages/WhatareHumanRights.aspx> (downloaded 2013-08-25).

OHCHR Migration Papers. (2005). “Family Reunification”. <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:7wRFRUMILPAJ:www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/migration/taskforce/docs/familyreunification.pdf+&cd=1&hl=sv&ct=clnk&gl=se>. (downloaded 2013-09-01).



## Appendix - Translations

### 4.1.

[1] *målet* om likestilling gjennom like muligheter, rettigheter og plikter til deltakelse for alle, uansett opprinnelse.

[2] [i]ntegreringspolitikken skal bidra til at alle har like muligheter, rettigheter og plikter.

[3] Internasjonalt pågår det et betydelig samarbeid om reguleringen av migrasjon landene imellom og om migranternes situasjon. Samarbeidet har på enkelte områder resultert i internasjonale avtaler der landene forplikter seg til å respektere nærmere angitte normer og prinsipper (...). Det er i så måte basert på forestillingen om universelle menneskerettigheter. Likeverdighetsprinsippet står sentralt.

[4] Utgangspunktet for meldingens forståelse av slik diskriminering bygger på definisjonen i FN:s rasediskrimineringskonvensjon.

[5] Humanitære hensyn er tillagt stor vekt i den norske innvandringspolitikken. Innvandringen til Norge har de siste årene i stor grad bestått av personer som trenger beskyttelse og nær familie til personer som allerede er i landet. Våre internasjonale humanitære forpliktelser tilsier at dette også vil være situasjonen i framtida, selv om det på kort sikt skulle innebære utgifter for det norske samfunn.

[6] Rasisme og diskriminering er i strid med overordnede mål og prinsipper i norsk politikk. Norge har ratifisert internasjonale menneskerettighetskonvensjoner, og vi er derfor forpliktet til å motarbeide rasisme og diskriminering og arbeide for like muligheter for alle.

[7] Innenfor rammen av norsk lov og grunnleggende menneskerettigheter har alle innbyggere, uansett opprinnelse, rett til å hevde sine verdier, følge kulturelle tradisjoner og praktisere sin tro.

### 4.2.1

[8] Menneskerettighetene og demokratiske prinsipper utgjør fundamentet i den norske rettsstaten. Dette ligger fast, også i et samfunn med en mer sammensatt og mangfoldig befolkning enn tidligere.

[9] Mange personer med innvandrers- eller annen minoritetsbakgrunn har dårligere muligheter enn den øvrige befolkningen til å delta i det norske samfunnet. Dette kan skyldes diskriminering, men også andre former for utestenging hvor virkningen forsterkes for personer med innvandrerbakgrunn.

[10] Blant enkelte grupper, særlig med flyktningbakgrunn, er inntektene markert lavere, arbeidsledigheten høyere og levekårene generelt dårligere. Årsaksforholdene er sammensatte. Ulikhet kan også skyldes maktforskjeller, utestenging, rasisme og diskriminering.

[11] Innvandrere med høyere utdanning fra Asia, Afrika og Latin Amerika har klart dårligere muligheter for å bli ansatt enn nordmenn med tilsvarende utdannings- og erfaringsbakgrunn. Det knyttes særegne forestillinger til innvandrere som gruppe, f.eks. forestillinger om problemer knyttet til religionsutøvelse på arbeidsplassen og forventninger om tilpassningsproblemer i bedriften. Innvandrere blir i større grad enn nordmenn vurdert etter forestillinger om egenskaper snarere enn vurdering av egenskaper.

[12] Fordommer er sentrale aspekter ved diskriminering (...). Hvis majoriteten har en avvisende eller fiendtlig holdning til personer med innvandrerbakgrunn og eventuelt andre minoriteter, skaper det et holdningsklima i samfunnet som kan gi grobunn for rasisme og legitimering av diskriminering. I tillegg kan et slikt klima tolkes som et signal fra storsamfunnet om at personer med innvandrers- eller annen minoritetsbakgrunn er uønskede som likeverdige deltakere i fellesskapet. Dette kan føre til at mange ikke ønsker eller unnlater å delta på viktige samfunnsområder.

[13] Det er imidlertid liten tvil om at disse fenomenene [rasisme og diskriminering] forekommer i Norge.

[14] diskriminering på arbeidsmarkedet forekommer, særlig ved rekruttering av innvandrere. Mange innvandrere opplever dårligere arbeidsforhold enn befolkningen for øvrig.

[15] strukturelle forhold og utbredte holdninger ha diskriminerende virkning som arbeidsgivere ikke nødvendigvis er seg bevisst, og som kan være vanskelig for arbeidstakere å identifisere som en konkret diskrimineringssak.

[16] Personer med minoritetsbakgrunn er underrepresentert i arbeidslivet. Når arbeidsledigheten blant innvandrere er tre ganger høyere enn for personer med norsk bakgrunn, er det nærliggende å forklare noe av misforholdet med diskriminering (...). Diskriminering skjer

ikke bare ved rekruttering, men kan også hindre videre kar- riereutvikling og en god utnyttelse av kompetanse,

[17] I Norge er levestandarden høyere og forskjellene i levekår mindre [mellom grupper] enn i de fleste andre land (...). Norge skal ikke utvikle seg til et samfunn hvor personer med innvandrerbakgrunn har dårligere levekår og deltar i mindre grad i samfunnsfellesskapet enn resten av befolkningen. Norge skal fremdeles være et rettferdig samfunn uten store sosiale og økonomiske forskjeller. Slik bevares et trygt samfunn.

#### 4.2.1.1.

[18] Diskriminering kan skje på mange ulike grunnlag – kjønn, seksuell legning, språk eller alder. Slike former for diskriminering kan selvsagt også ramme personer med innvandrerbakgrunn. Personer med innvandrer- eller annen minoritetsbakgrunn kan i tillegg utsettes for diskriminering på grunn av sin hudfarge, trosbekjennelse, avstamning eller nasjonale eller etniske opprinnelse.

[19] Diskriminering er usaklig forskjellsbehandling. Det skaper barrierer for deltakelse i arbeids- og samfunnsliv, og har konsekvenser for enkeltindividet. Personer med innvandrerbakgrunn kan møte ulike former for diskriminering, for eksempel som muslim, som homofil eller som kvinne.

#### 4.2.2.

[20] forskjellsbehandle arbeidssøkere på grunn av rase, hudfarge, eller nasjonal eller etnisk opprinnelse.

[21] *For å nå målsettingen om like muligheter, er det nødvendig med en aktiv innsats for å bekjempe rasisme og diskriminering. Det er behov for å styrke vernet mot diskriminering og forbedre mulighetene for juridisk bistånd til personer som opplever at de har blitt diskriminert.*

[22] Ingen skal bli diskriminert eller stengt ute fordi de har innvandrerbakgrunn. Integreringspolitikken skal legge til rette for at alle som bor i Norge, opplever å høre til og tar del i det norske fellesskapet.

[23] Hensikten med ordningen [styrket vern mot diskriminering] vil være å gi profesjonell juridisk veiledning til enkeltpersoner som utsettes for diskriminering på grunnlag av hudfarge, trosbekjennelse, eller nasjonal eller etnisk opprinnelse.

[24] Diskrimineringsloven pålegger derfor arbeidsgivere og offentlige myndigheter en plikt til aktivt likestillingsarbeid (aktivitets- og rapporteringsplikten). Formålet med aktivitets- og rapporteringsplikten er å skape bevisstgjøring gjennom løpende egenaktivitet i virksomheter og dermed forebygge diskriminerende praksiser og organisasjonsstrukturer.

[25] Ledere og andre personalansvarlige bør ha kunnskap om de barrierer i rekrutteringsprosessen innvandrere står overfor, og ha en aktiv holdning til rekrutteringen av personer med innvandrerbakgrunn. Slik rekruttering bør tas opp i lederopplæring og som en integrert del av intervjueteknikk- og rekrutteringsopplæringen. Det kan også være behov for å arrangere egne kurs for å sikre at ledere og personalansvarlige har kunnskap om barrierer og ulike utestengningsmekanismer.

[26] 1) tiltak mot diskriminering I arbeidslivet, inkludert oppfølging av forslaget om endring av arbeidsmiljøloven som vil bli lagt fram for Stortinget under løpet av våren 1997, 2) opplæring og kompetenseheving av offentlige ansatte i førstelinjetjenesten i alle etater – grunnutdanning, videreutdanning, internopplæring, 3) tiltak mot rasistisk motivert vold og trakassering, inkludert bedre dokumentasjon.

[27] Det norske samfunnet er I stor grad preget av rettferdig fordeling og like muligheter for alle. Det er derfor en viktig oppgave å spre kunnskap om at enkelte faktisk blir diskriminert og opplever trakassering på grunn av sin hudfarge, trosbekjennelse eller opprinnelse. Det er først når vi erkjenner problemet som vi kan gjøre noe med det (...). En god velferdspolitik som omfatter *alle* grupper, og som har støtte i befolkningen, vil også være en del av innsatsen mot rasisme og diskriminering.

[28] Idag er det ikke utviklet et system som kan registrere art og omfang av diskriminering og rasistisk motiverte handlinger i samfunnet. Et slikt system vil forbedre mulighetene for å evaluere politikken og utvikle effektive tiltak mot diskriminering (...). [J]ustisdepartementet vil (...) forbedre eksisterende registreringsrutiner (kriminalstatistikk, straffesakregistret), og innhente dokumentasjon om art og omfang av rasistisk motiverte handlinger og diskriminering.

[29] For å kunne sette i verk treffsikre tiltak er det behov for god kunnskap om art, omfang og årsaker til diskriminering (...). Som en del av kunnskapsarbeidet på integreringsfeltet vil

regjeringen gjennomføre kartlegging av opplevd diskriminering. Kartleggingen (...) vil belyse opplevelse av tilhørighet, barrierer for deltakelse og tillit i befolkningen. Også barn og unges opplevelse av diskriminering vil bli belyst.

#### 4.3.

[30] Alle, uansett bakgrunn, skal ha like muligheter, rettigheter og plikter til å delta i samfunnet og bruke deres ressurser. (...) Det er mange måter å være norsk på. Ved aktivt å frambringe at alle har like stor rett til å bringe med seg sine verdier og tradisjoner inn i fellesskapet, styrkes samhörigheten.

[31] Innvandrerbegrepet omfatter personer med svært ulik bakgrunn med hensyn till opprinnelse land, bakgrunn for innvandringen, botid i Norge mv. På grunn av stor spredning i levekårene mellom ulike grupper innvandrere, vil det ofte være liten meningsfylt å beskrive innvandrere som én samlet gruppe.

[32] Det er ikke hvilken gud du tror på, hvilken mat du spiser eller hvilke klær du går med som definerer om du er norsk. Det norske fellesskapet utgjøres av alle som bor i landet.

[33] I debatten om verdier kan det til tider se ut som om det råder en oppfatning av at innvandrere som gruppe har verdier som står i motsetning til det norske samfunnets grunnverdier (...). Skillelinjene, når det gjelder oppslutning om verdiene, går ikke mellom innvandrere og den øvrige befolkningen. Blant (...) innbyggerne i Norge som har innvandret eller som er født av innvandrede foreldre, finnes det en rekke ulike oppfatninger, erfaringer og tradisjoner, og med det, ulike tolkninger og praktiseringer av de samme verdiene. Den øvrige befolkningen er heller ikke enhetlig med tanke på levemåter, tradisjoner og verdier (...). Det er uheldig dersom mange tar for gitt at det er store interesse motsetninger og verdikonflikter mellom innvandrere som gruppe og resten av befolkningen.

#### 4.4.1.

[34] [e]n prosess som omfatter både de som bor her fra før, og de som flytter til landet. Nye innbyggere må tilpasse seg samfunnet de kommer til og ta del i arbeids- og samfunns livet. De som allerede bor i Norge, må anerkjenne og forholde seg til at befolkningen endres og blir mer mangfoldig.

[35] Virkningen av innvandring på den samlede sysselsettingen for den opprinnelige befolkningen kan gå både i positiv og negativ retning. Økt etterspørsel trekker mot høyere

sysselsetting. På den andre side kan innvandrere fylle arbeidsplasser som ellers ville vært besatt av personer uten innvandrerbakgrunn.

[36] Flere av undersøkelsene tar for seg disse problemstillingene [innvandring of sysselsettingsgrad]. En årsak til at det har vært stor interesse omkring dette spørsmålet er at det i mange land har blitt framsatt påstander om at innvandrere "tar arbeidsplasser" fra den opprinnelige befolkningen. *Undersøkelsene konkluderer i all hovedsak med at innvandring har hatt liten innvirkning på lønnsutviklingen og sysselsettingen til den opprinnelige befolkningen.*

[37] Innvandring kan også ha den effekten at den høyner sysselsettingsgrad i den øvrige befolkningen på lengre sikt ved å inneha en form for bufferfunksjon i økonomien. Med en høy andel innvandrere i konjunkturfølsomme næringer kan det være denne gruppen som rammes hardest i perioder med lav etterspørsel og høy arbeidsledighet.

#### 4.4.2.

[38] Flere kvinner enn menn avbryter introduksjonsprogrammet. En viktig forklaring på kvinnenenes avbrudd er at de tar en større del av omsorgspermisjonen ved fødsel og omsorgen for barnet i det første leveåret.

[39] Det er mange årsaker til at kvinner i noen innvandrergrupper deltar i mindre grad i yrkeslivet. Noe skyldes kvalifikasjoner og utdanningsnivå. En del av årsaken til lavere yrkesaktivitet kan også være motforestillinger mot at kvinner med små barn skal være i lønnet arbeid.

#### 4.4.3.

[40] Problemer kan ofte oppstå når personer med ulik kulturell bakgrunn og lever sammen. Disse problemene kan lede til større konflikter hvis de ikke blir løst på et tidlig stadium.

[41] Norge er en del av en stadig mer globalisert verden (...).Innvandringen medfører et mer mangfoldig samfunn. Det innebærer langt flere muligheter, men også flere konflikter.

[42] Noen ganger kan forskjeller i verdier, tradisjoner eller levemåter skape konflikt mellom minoritet og majoritet. Slike konflikter vil være preget av maktforskjellene i samfunnet (...). Verdiekonflikter er ikke i første rekke skapt av innvandring.

[43] Innvandring, særlig di siste tiårene, har ført til større spennvidde i livssyn, tradisjoner og oppfatninger av det gode livet enn før.

[44] Det er stor variasjon i bakgrunn, levekår og oppfatninger blant innvandrere og deres etterkommere. (...) [F]rån generasjon til generasjon skjer det betydelige endringer i de ulike gruppene, det være seg forhold mellom kvinner og menn, livssyn eller levevis. Kulturelle forhold er stadig i forendring.

#### 4.4.4.

[45] Innvandring gir tilgang til et vesentlig mer variert erfarings- og kunnskapsgrunnlag enn det som finnes i mer lukkede, ensartete samfunn. For at vi skall kunne få full nytte av dette grunnlaget, må alle innbyggere, uansett bakgrunn, ha mulighet til å delta aktivt i samfunnslivet, og det må være kontakt og samhandling mellom ulike befolkningsgrupper.

[46] Flere tiltak er blitt iverksatt for å øke rekrutteringen av personer med innvandrerbakgrunn i arbeidslivet. (...) [R]egjeringen [innførte] en forsøksordning med moderat kvotering av innvandrere fra land i Asia, Afrika mv. i 12 statlige virksomheter (...). Formålet med forsøket er å gi virksomhetene erfaring, kompetanse og bevissthet om rekruttering av søkere med innvandrerbakgrunn]

#### 4.5.1.

[47] Idag ser vi (...) at yrkesdeltakelsen blant innvandrere er lavere og den registrerte arbeidsledigheten er langt høyere blant innvandrere enn i befolkningen for øvrig. Dette gjelder spesielt innvandrere fra Afrika, Asia, Latin Amerika og Øst Europa (...). To av de viktigste årsakerne er mangelfull kvalifisering og utestengning.

[48] Det er ikke bare nedgangskonjunkturer som er årsak til at innvandrere har svakere tilknytning til arbeidsmarkedet. De siste tiårene har det skjedd store endringer i næringsstrukturen i de fleste industrialiserte land. De tjenesteytende næringer har vokst, samtidig som industrinæringen har stagnert. Forandringene har skapt nye krav til kompetanse. Det kreves høyere utdanning, språkkunnskaper og kjennskap til forhold som er spesifikke for det enkelte land, for eksempel bestemmelser og lover. Flere studier viser at innvandrere fra vestlige land klarer seg bedre på arbeidsmarkedet i vestlige land enn innvandrere fra ikke-vestlige land. Det kan være ulike grunner til dette, som at det er forskjeller i utdanningsnivå, at

yrkeserfaring tilegent i vestlige land er lettere å overføre eller at innvandrere fra ikke-vestlige land opplever diskriminering i arbeidslivet.

[49] En utstøting av innvandrere i arbeidslivet kan avspeile en generell utvikling der arbeidstakere med svake kvalifikasjoner, kort utdanning og liten yrkeserfaring blir mer utsatt for arbeidsledighet enn tidligere.

[50] Den generelle økonomiske utviklingen og forholdene i arbeidsmarkedet de siste tiårene har redusert innvandrernes yrkesdeltaking i mange land.

[51] God bruk av innvandreres kompetanse og arbeidskraft forutsetter at innvandrere deltar i arbeidslivet fram til pensjonsalderen, på linje med befolkningen for øvrig.

[52] Rapporten trekker fram flere mulige årsaker til denne utviklingen. Dårlige arbeidsvilkår, usikre jobber, manglende omstillingskompetanse, harde fysiske jobber, og/eller lange arbeidsdager. I tillegg pekes det på at mange i denne gruppen hadde lite å hente rent økonomisk på å ha betalt arbeid. Mange var i lavtlønnsyrker og kunne, hvis de var kvalifisert for det, få høyere samlet inntekt gjennom ulike trygdeytelser. Det gjaldt særlig hvis de hadde mange barn.

[53] Etablerere av «levebrødsbedrifter», som det er flest av, vil etablere egen bedrift for å forsørge seg selv og familien. Innvandreretablerere i denne gruppen kan ha en sterk drivkraft knyttet til det å skape noe eget og å realisere eget potensial. For noen kan samtidig arbeidsledighet og svake utsikter til mobilitet på arbeidsmarkedet, være tilleggsfaktorer og en motivasjon for å starte for seg selv.

[54] Personer med innvandrerbakgrunn likevel i mindre grad enn resten av befolkningen representert i politiske prosesser og organer. Det er også en tendens til at jo nærmere den utøvende makten man kommer, jo mindre speiles mangfoldet i befolkningen (...). Personer med innvandrerbakgrunn som gruppe har med andre<sup>87</sup> ord mindre makt og innflytelse enn andre grupper i samfunnet. Økt deltakelse i arbeidsmarkedet og i utdanning gir økt deltakelse og innflytelse på andre arenaer. Som oftest må grunnleggende behov være på plass, som blant annet økonomisk trygghet for seg og sin familie, før man søker innflytelse gjennom deltakelse på formelle arenaer. (...) [F]or å motvirke skjev maktfordeling i samfunnet, er å øke underrepresenterte gruppers tilknytning til arbeidsmarkedet.



[55] I 2013 innfører regjeringen en ny tilskuddsordning med utviklingsmidler til kommunene. Målet er å øke kvaliteten og bedre resultatene i kommunenes integreringsarbeid. Det skal legges særlig vekt på opplæring i norsk og samfunnskunnskap.

#### 4.6.1.

[56] Hvor BNP er fordelt på innvandrere og den ørige befolkningen.

[57] Hvilken innvirkning innvandring har på offentlige budsjetter.

[58] Vestlige innvandrere er i større grad enn andre sysselsatt i næringer som gir høy avlønning og tilsvarende høye BNP-bidrag pr ansatt. Ikke-vestlige innvandrere er i større grad representert i næringer som renovasjon og renhold, undervisning og helse- og sosialtjenester (...). Forskjellene i BNP-bidrag mellom innvandrere og ikke-innvandrere skyldes med andre ord først og fremst forskjellen i andel personer som er utan betalt arbeid.

[59] Potensialet for bidrag til den offentlige økonomi som kan realiseres dersom yrkesaktiviteten bland innvanderne øker.

[60] Innvandringen til Norge har i de siste årene i stor grad bestått av personer med flyktingbakgrunn og familjegenforente (...).Det økonomiske situasjonsbildet i Norge vil sannsynligvis være et annet enn i land som har basert sin innvandringspolitikk på å rekruttere personer med særskilte kvalifikasjoner.

[61] Diskriminering hindrer innvandrere i å delta i samfunnslivet på like fot, og hindrer samfunnet i å bruke befolkningens ressurser og talenter.

[62] Diskriminering gjør det norske samfunn til et dårligere samfunn. Arbeidslivet går glipp av kompetanse og arbeidskraft.

[63] Norge har et forbedringspotensial når det gjelder bruk av innvanderes kompetanse. Dette gjelder særlig for innvandrere fra land i Asia og Afrika. Undersøkelser viser blant annet at omfanget av overkvalifisering er større blant innvandrere enn i befolkningen for øvrig.

#### 4.6.2.

[64] Tiltak som gir personer med innvandrerbakgrunn et bedre utgangspunkt for deltakelse i arbeidslivet, skal prioriteres.

[65] Høy verdiskapning og høy sysselsetting er et nødvendig fundament for norsk velferdspolitik. Statistikken viser at mange innvandrere har problemer med å komme in i arbeidslivet. *Regjeringen ser det som en viktig utfordring å lette innvandreres muligheter til å komme i arbeid. Språkopplæring, kvalifisering og godkjenning av kompetanse er viktige satsningsområder i denne sammenheng. Samtidig vil arbeidsgiveres holdninger være viktig for att personer med innvandrerbakgrunn skal ha de samme mulighetene til å bli ansatt som kvalifiserte søkere.*

[66] Utforming av ordninger og tiltak i integreringspolitikken skal ta hensyn til det overordnede målet om høy sysselsetting. Det skal legges til rette for at innvandrere som trenger det, skaffer seg nødvendig kompetanse for norsk arbeidsliv og at innvandreres kompetanse og arbeidskraft blir brukt. Rekruttering av innvandrere skal styrkes på alle nivåer i arbeidslivet, og hindringer som diskriminering skal fjernes.

[67] Regjeringen legger til rette for høy sysselsetting gjennom den generelle økonomiske politikken og gjennom et bredt sett av virkemidler i arbeids- og velferdspolitikken. Integreringspolitikken skal utfylle denne strategien gjennom tiltak som bidrar til at innvandrere har like muligheter til å delta i arbeidslivet som befolkningen for øvrig.

[68] *Bedre norskopplæring for barn, unge og voksne er avgjørende for økt deltakelse. Aktiv rekruttering og enkelte særtiltak er nødvendig for å oppnå like muligheter.*

[69] [b]edre norskopplæring og mer målrettet kvalifisering til arbeidsmarkedet er viktige virkemidler for å lykkes med dette [å få enda flere innvandrere i arbeid]

[70] *Arbeidsledighet er et problem for den som rammes. Det er også et samfunnsproblem – ikke minst fordi samfunnet mister de ressurser som ligger i den menneskelige arbeidskraft. For å øke yrkesdeltakelsen og redusere arbeidsledigheten blant innvandrere vil virkemidler som kan øke den enkeltes kompetanse for norsk arbeidsliv, og virkemidler som kan redusere barrierene for innvandrernes deltakelse i arbeidslivet, bli prioritert. Språkferdigheter har stor betydning for innvandrernes deltakelse i arbeidslivet og på andre arenaer i det norske samfunnet. Deltakelse er også betinget av effektive godkjenningsordninger for å utnytte de ressursene innvandrere bringer med seg hit ti landet, og av at det ikke forekommer diskriminering.*

[71] Arbeid bidrar til sterke individer, trygge familier og til et velfungerende samfunn. Det er gjennom arbeid at også innvandrere finner sin plass i samfunnet. Et velfungerende, trygt og

rettferdig samfunn forutsetter like muligheter for alle innbyggere til å bidra og delta i arbeidslivet

#### 4.6.3

[72] Likestilling, deltakelse og integrering er en forutsetning for at samfunnet skal få full nytte av innvandreres ressurser og erfaringer.

[73] Økonomisk selvstendighet er en forutsetning for reell likestilling. Velferdssamfunnet er avhengig av at flest mulig deltar i yrkeslivet. Det er derfor et mål at både kvinner og menn i en familie så langt som mulig er tilknyttet arbeidslivet og har egen inntekt.

#### 4.6.4.

[74] Den kompetanse (...) innvandrere og flyktinger bringer med seg, er verdifulle i norsk arbeids- og samfunnsliv. Det er en ressurs for det norske samfunnet at stadig flere innbyggere er to- eller flerspråklige. Disse ressurser klarer ikke det norske samfunnet å nytte fullt ut idag.

[75] Gevinstene ved innvandring er avhengig av hvorvidt arbeidslivet, myndighetene og samfunnet for øvrig legger til rette for at innvandrere får brukt sin kompetanse og arbeidskraft. Dette vil kunne bidra positivt til den framtidige bærekraften til velferdsstaten. Gevinstene ved økt mangfold forutsetter et arbeidsliv som vet å verdsette personer med ulik kompetanse og bakgrunn. I tillegg til myndighetenes arbeid er det derfor av stor betydning at bedrifter og fagforeninger er opptatt av hvordan innvandreres kompetanse kan brukes på en bedre måte.

[76] Det er bra for Norge at det bor mennesker her med tilknytning til andre land. Det å ha bakgrunn fra og kjennskap til andre land og kulturer er en ressurs, for den enkelte og for samfunnet, og det er viktig å anerkjenne og ta i bruk ulike erfaringer og kompetanse.

[77] *regjeringen vil prioritere tiltak som gir personer med innvandrerbakgrunn et bedre utgangspunkt for deltakelse i arbeidslivet, og tiltak som bidrar til at alle kunnskapsressurser blir brukt.*

[78] *Integrering, likestilling og deltakelse I et flerkulturelt Norge er en forutsetning for at samfunnet skal få del i innvandreres ressurser og erfaringer.*

[79] *Det er betydelige verdiskapningsressurser å hente ved å utnytte innvandrernes potensielle arbeidskraftressurser i større grad enn idag.*

[80] Alle innbyggere i Norge har plikter og rettigheter. Alle skal ha muligheter til å delta og bidra i arbeids- og samfunnsliv. Et rettferdig samfunn med et trygt fellesskap forutsetter små sosiale og økonomiske forskjeller og likestilling mellom kvinner og menn. Derfor er det viktigste målet i regjeringens integreringspolitikk å sørge for at alle som bor i Norge får brukt ressursene sine og tar del i fellesskapet.

[81] Innvandring til Norge er en ressurs (...). Innvandring skaper muligheter for utvikling av det norske samfunnet. Samtidig medfører innvandring også utfordringer. Disse må håndteres, både på nasjonalt og lokalt nivå, for å kunne dra nytte av innvandreres ressurser.

[82] Norges største ressurs er menneskene som bor her. Dette er utgangspunktet for integreringspolitikken – at alle skal kunne benytte sine ressurser. Arbeid er nøkkelen til deltakelse og økonomisk selvstendighet. Regjeringen vil derfor styrke innsatsen for å få enda flere innvandrere, kvinner og menn i arbeid (...). Bedre bruk av innvandreres kompetanse er nødvendig.

[83] Regjeringens arbeid for å øke sysselsettingen blant innvandrere bygger på to hovedpilarer. Den ene pilaren er å styrke grunnleggende kvalifisering gjennom blant annet bedre norskopplæring (...). Den andre pilaren er å bidra til bedre bruk av innvandreres kompetanse i arbeidslivet. Det innebærer en mer helhetlig innsats for å øke innvandreres rekruttering til arbeidslivet, tilrettelegge for innvandreres etablering av bedrifter, forbedre godkjenningsordninger for utenlandsk medbrakt kompetanse og for å redusere og fjerne hindringer, slik som diskriminering, dårlige arbeidsforhold og sosial dumping such as discrimination, bad work environments and social dumping.

[84] Den viktigste gruppen er utlendinger som får tillatelse til å arbeid som spesialiseter, dvs at de innehar en kompetanse som ikke dekkes av det innenlandske arbeidsmarkedet.

[85] Mangfold, likestilling, likeverd, toleranse, ytringsfrihet, solidaritet, økonomisk og sosial likhet, vern om barns rettigheter, tros- og livssynsfrihet og flerspråklighet som ressurs er andre grunnleggende verdier som regjeringen bygger sin politikk på. Det er disse sentrale verdiene som sikrer at det norske samfunnet gir rom for mangfold i et trygt fellesskap.

[86] Globalisering og internasjonalisering er sentrale aspekter ved dagens arbeidsliv. Det stilles stadig nye kompetanse- krav til offentlig og privat arbeidsliv. Rekrutteringen må derfor være bredest mulig for å sikre at de best kvalifiserte tilsettes. Det er viktig å benytte den kompetanse

og de kvalifikasjoner den enkelte er i besittelse av uavhengig av kjønn, alder, funksjonsevne, etnisitet, religion mv.

#### 4.6.5.

[87] Avsatt [1,5 millioner kroner] for å utvikle gode, flerkulturelle arbeidsplasser. Midlene skal brukes til å få kunnskap om hvordan slike arbeidsplasser fungerer idag, hva som kan gjøres for å rekruttere flere personer med innvandrerbakgrunn, hva som kan gjøres for å skape et bedre arbeidsmiljø for alle, uansett bakgrunn, hvordan innvandrene medbrakte kompetanse brukes.

[88] Et mangfoldsperspektiv kan forstås som et generelt perspektiv som viser til en rekke kjennetegn ved mennesket som kjønn, alder, funksjonsevne, seksuell orientering, etnisitet, religion mv. Det handler om at mangfoldet i befolkningen må anerkjennes og vises respekt, ved at ulike behov i befolkningen blir avspeilet i utformingen av offentlige tjenester og samfunnets felles ordninger. Det krever også at vi utvider vår forståelse av hva det vil si å være norsk.

[89] På [www.mangfoldsportalen.no](http://www.mangfoldsportalen.no) finnes gode eksempler, artikler, presentasjoner, filmer og nettkurs innen rekruttering, inkluderende arbeidsmiljø og ledelse på en flerkulturell arbeidsplass (...). Målet er å legge til rette for at flere arbeidsgivere drar nytte av den flerkulturelle kompetansen som finnes blant innvandrere i Norge

[90] Direktoratet for forvaltning og IKT (DIFI) tilbyr kurs for statlige ledere som inkluderer ledelse av kulturelt mangfoldige arbeidsplasser. DIFI har også utviklet et sett av verktøy som ledere og virksomheter i staten kan benytte for å trene på mangfold (...). Virksomhetene har årlig rapportert til IMDi om status på rekruttering av personer med innvandrerbakgrunn, samt om aktiviteter og tiltak for en inkluderende rekrutteringspraksis (...), samt (...) arbeid for mangfold.

[91] Med *Mangfoldsprisen* ønsker regjeringen å vise fram gode eksempler på inkludering av personer med innvandrerbakgrunn i arbeidslivet, og å spre kunnskap og inspirasjon om innsats som bidrar til økt mangfold på arbeidsplassen. Mangfoldsprisen deles ut årlig til en virksomhet som utmerker seg i forhold til etnisk mangfold på arbeidsplassen. Rekruttering av kvinner med innvandrerbakgrunn skal være et viktig kriterium ved vurdering av kandidater til prisen.

[92] Innvandring gir også muligheter for å ha en arbeidsstyrke med kunnskaper om et marked som i økende grad består av et mangfold av forbrukere med ulike preferanser og kulturer. Mange av Norges fremste bedrifter er aktive i markeder flere steder i verden. Møtet mellom

mennesker med ulik bakgrunn og livserfaring på arbeidsplassen gir større muligheter for at det utvikler seg nye tanker, ideer og skaperkraft.

[93] Mangfold I det norske arbeidslivet vil kunne styrke Norges konkurrenceevne I en globalisert verden.