

Governing migrants through the Norwegian Introduction Programme

Ariana Guilherme Fernandes



DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

Skriftserie för avhandlingar: 2021:3

Institutionen för socialt arbete / Departement of Social Work

Göteborgs universitet / University of Gothenburg

© 2021 Ariana Guilherme Fernandes

Cover photo: Social cut on Unsplash
Printed by Stema Specialtryck, Borås, 2021

ISBN: 978-91-88267-24-5 (PRINT)

ISBN: 978-91-88267-25-2 (PDF)

ISSN: 1401-5781

Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/68719>



Pa nha māe e pai: Es e pa bzot! Obrigada pa tud!

ABSTRACT

Title: Governing migrants through the Norwegian Introduction Programme

Author: Ariana Guilherme Fernandes

Key words: Migrants, Introduction Programme, integration, activation, governmentality, neoliberalism, ethnification, comparative social policy

ISBN: 978-91-88267-24-5 (PRINT)

ISBN: 978-91-88267-25-2 (PDF)

Internet: <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/68719>

This thesis focuses on the Norwegian Introduction Programme for newly arrived immigrants and refugees. With its implementation in 2004, the Introduction Programme represents one of the most significant policy measures initiated by the state for new migrants in Norway. The Introduction Programme combines two important official goals, namely labour market participation and immigrant integration into the receiving society.

The aim of the overall thesis is to examine how the Introduction Programme in Norway can be understood in relation to different power perspectives. One of the main perspectives is Foucault's idea of governmentality, supplemented with the concepts of neoliberalism and ethnification. Inspired by Carol Lee Bacchi's social policy analysis approach, one of the main points of departure of the thesis, is to examine what problem formulation the Introduction Programme is an answer to. The study focuses primarily on how the Norwegian Introduction Programme is justified, designed, structured and framed to facilitate the integration of new migrants in society in general, and in the labour market specifically.

The thesis is based on four studies which have all critically examined the Introduction Programme from different comparative and theoretical perspectives. Comparisons are made between different social policy measures in Norway and between seemingly 'similar' policies in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The method employed for all four studies is based on public document analysis, which falls within the broader categorization of qualitative text analysis.

The main aim of **Study I** is to provide an in-depth understanding of the underlying ideology of two Norwegian post-immigration measures; the Introduction Programme and the financial support scheme for voluntary immigrant organisations. **Study II** addresses the justifications for implementing the Introduction Programme for newly arrived immigrants and refugees in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The aim of **Study III** is to explore how policy

texts and the policy development process when establishing the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme have differently constructed the identity of their target groups. **Study IV** sets out to critically examine if and eventually how different ideas of empowerment are embedded in the design and structure of the introduction programmes in Sweden, Denmark and Norway.

In sum, it is possible to conclude that the Norwegian Introduction Programme can be viewed as an arena in which the subjectivity of new migrants is being shaped to influence their actions and beliefs in specific ways. By participating in the programme, the target group is being governed, disciplined and shaped into becoming idealized citizens, and for the state, an ideal citizen is one who is employed, active in terms of being economically and culturally assimilated. Moreover, the ideal citizen is expected to be active, self-governing and self-sufficient. In addition, the thesis also demonstrates that ethnification of the target group has implications for how the Introduction Programme has been designed and shaped.

List of Studies

This thesis is based on the following studies, referred to in the text by their Roman numerals.

- I: Fernandes, A. G. (2011). En studie av to integreringstiltak og deres underliggende ideologi (A study of two integration measures and their underlying ideology). In Puntervold Bø, B (Ed.), *Multikulturell teori og flerkulturelle praksiser – Artikler om norsk minoritetspolitikk* (pp. 46-77). Abstrakt forlag.
- II: Fernandes, A. G. (2013). Ethnification of new social risks: A comparative study of programmes for preparing newly arrived immigrants for (working) life in Sweden, Denmark and Norway'. In Harsløf, I. and R. Ulmestig (Eds). *Changing social risks and social policy adaption in the Nordic welfare states* (pp. 189-219). Palgrave Macmillan.
- III: Gubrium, E. and Fernandes, A. G. (2014). Policing Norwegian Welfare: Disciplining and Differentiating within the Bottom Rungs. *Social Inclusion*. 3(2), 5-17.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v2i3.35>
- IV: Fernandes, A. G. (2015). (Dis)Empowering new immigrants and refugees through their participation in introduction programs in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*. 13(3), 245-264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2015.1045054>

Reprints were made possible with the permission of the publishers.

Acknowledgements

What a journey! And quite a long one, I may add. The time which I have spent working on this thesis has allowed me to truly acknowledge the processes behind this kind of work and the valuable contribution and support from people around me who have helped me to complete this thesis. Without them, this thesis would not have been possible.

I need to start with my supervisors, who have been indispensable throughout this journey. When I was an undergraduate student, I had the pleasure of having Lena Sawyer as my supervisor for my bachelor thesis. At that time, I hardly knew what a PhD was. I did, however, know that I was very fortunate to have you by my side then. Luckily, our paths crossed again, and I'm deeply thankful that, through a series of coincidences, you became the main supervisor for my thesis. As then, you have been by my side, believing in me, constantly pushing me forward and making me better. Thank you for your patience, generosity, support, insights and the deep knowledge you have shared with me. You have been an inspiration, and I am forever grateful. And thank you to Ivar Lødemel, my co-supervisor, who in many ways you made this journey possible. Thank you for your support, feedback, for sharing your deep knowledge and for our conversations that have pushed me forward.

The funding for this thesis was made possible by the research project Reassessing the Nordic Welfare Model (REASSESS). A special thanks to Viggo Nordvik for his support during the initial phase. Oslo Metropolitan University has been with me throughout the whole period, where I have been employed as a PhD fellow and also as a lecturer during the final phase. Many thanks to the Department of Social Work, Child Welfare and Social Policy, former Sosialforsk, and GIV and to all my leaders and administrative staff that have offered support during this process. A special thanks to the University of Gothenburg, Department of Social Work where I have been formally enrolled in the PhD programme. Thank you for taking me in and supporting me all the way. Thanks also to Ingegerd Franzon and now Lyudmyla Khrenova for much needed administrative guidance and kind support. It would have been much more complicated without your help.

Throughout this period, people have read my work and offered valuable comments and constructive feedback, which have greatly improved the quality of the thesis. I am grateful to Dietmar Rauch and Karin Borevis for their highly constructive and valuable comments provided during my mid and final PhD seminars. My reading group, Staffan Höjer and Linda Lane, have been with me since my final seminar. Their thorough and engaged readings, followed by their highly constructive, clear and pointed feedback, have been of great help in

completing the thesis. They gave me the final push I needed, and I am deeply grateful, thanks! A special thanks to Erika Gubrium, who has been my co-author for one of the studies and who has also read through my introduction. Thank you for sharing your deep knowledge and for all the kind support. Marianne Rugkåsa has been with me since the beginning of this journey, providing encouragement, kind support and also sharing her deep knowledge. She gave me the final push to finalise the thesis. I am deeply grateful for your highly useful comments and for giving me the much-needed push in the final phase. Thanks also to Ellen Rosenfield for copy editing the manuscript and for greatly improving both language and clarity.

During this period, I have also had the privilege of receiving much needed social and scholarly support from PhD fellows and colleagues at both OsloMet and the University of Gothenburg. I have had great conversations, breaks, laughs and received understanding and support. It wouldn't have been the same without you. Thanks to all! Two, however, deserve special thanks. Monika Grønli Rosten, we had a blast during our time together as PhD fellows. The conversations, the breaks, the laughs and the food! You made it so much more fun! To Pernille Skotte, I am deeply grateful for your kind and wise support, for all our conversations, laughs and for reminding me of what is important.

To my sisters and brothers who are also my best friends: Angela, Sandra, Claudia, Ricardo, Marlene and Emanuel, thank you for standing by me. I know I can be a pain to endure in discussions, but you always bear with me. You mean the world to me! Es e pe bzot tambem. To the rest of my family and family-in-law, thanks for your support, encouragement and understanding. And to my extended family member, Ritika Dhall, thanks for being you and for believing in me.

To Eric and Adam, my two wonderful children. You both came to us during this period, which I truly believe made me gain much needed perspective about what is important. Jørgen, words are insufficient. You have always encouraged me to increase my options and you have always had solid confidence in me. You are the reason why I started this journey, and I am looking forward to those still ahead of us. Thank you!

The greatest thanks goes to my parents, Justino Guilherme Rosa and Franciska Fernandes Oliveira. Obrigada pa tud! Es e pe bzot!

Ariana Guilherme Fernandes
Oslo, August 2021

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Studies, aim and research questions.....	3
1.2 Relevance and contribution	7
1.3 Social policy as a point of departure	7
1.4 Social policy and social work.....	8
1.5 Structure of the thesis.....	10
2. Setting the stage (background and context).....	11
2.1 Immigrant integration	11
2.2 Models of immigrant incorporation.....	12
2.2.1 The assimilationist model.....	13
2.2.2 The multiculturalist model	15
2.2.3 The integration model.....	16
2.2.4 The civic integration model	18
2.3 Immigrant migration and integration in Norway.....	20
2.4 Activation.....	22
2.4.1 The dialectics of activation.....	22
2.4.2 The intensification and neoliberal turn of activation.....	24
2.4.3 Citizenship and the ideal citizen.....	25
2.4.4 Activation and the workline approach in Norway.....	27
3. Earlier studies	31
3.1 Studies of the introduction programmes from Norway, Sweden and Denmark	31
3.2 Studies from governmentality perspectives and broader Foucauldian approaches	37
3.2.1 Nordic context	37
3.2.2 Broader international context.....	42
4. Theoretical framework	45
4.1 Foucauldian perspectives	45
4.1.1 Power.....	46
4.1.2 Knowledge, truth regimes and subjectification	47
4.1.3 Technologies of power	48
4.1.4 The technology of sovereignty	49
4.1.5 The technology of discipline.....	50
4.1.6 Hierarchical observation.....	50

4.1.7 Normalizing judgement	51
4.1.8 Examination.....	52
4.1.9 The technology of governmentality	52
4.1.10 Technologies of the self.....	54
4.2 Neoliberalism	56
4.2.1 Neoliberalism and governmentality.....	57
4.3 Ethnification, race and ethnicity	59
5. Methodological approaches and empirical material.....	63
5.1 Ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions.....	63
5.2 Quality criteria in qualitative research	64
5.2.1 Self-reflexivity and pre-understanding.....	65
5.3 Empirical material.....	67
5.3.1 Specifics on the empirical material	70
5.3.2 The nature of the official documents.....	70
5.3.3 Additional empirical material	72
5.3.4 Limitations of the empirical material	73
5.4 Text analysis	74
5.4.1 Phase 1 of the analysis	75
5.4.2 Phase 2 of the analysis	75
5.4.3 Analysis of study I	76
5.4.4 Analysis of study II.....	77
5.4.5 Analysis of study III.....	78
5.4.6 Analysis of study IV.....	79
5.5 Qualitative comparative social policy approach	79
5.6 Ethical considerations	82
6. Summary of the studies.....	85
6.1 Study I.....	85
6.2 Study II.....	86
6.3 Study III.....	87
6.4 Study IV.....	88
7. The Introduction Programme as an arena for governing, disciplining and shaping migrants into ideal citizens.....	91
7.1 What was before, what was to come and why?	91
7.2 Who are targeted and thus governed?	96
7.3 To what end(s)?.....	98
7.4 By what means? How	99

7.4.1 Legislation and ‘governance’	100
7.4.2 Rights and duties vs. gratifications and punishments	103
7.4.3 Design, scope and content	105
7.4.4 NGO’s part in the content of the programme	110
7.4.5 The introduction allowance.....	111
7.4.6 The individual/integration plan: Individualisation and responsibilisation.....	114
7.4.7 Resistance.....	118
8. Concluding discussion and reflections	121
8.1 Governing, disciplining and shaping new migrants.....	121
8.2 Promoting inclusion, creating/constructing exclusion	122
8.3 Individualisation and responsibilisation – and what is lacking	123
8.4 The politicisation of immigrant integration	125
8.5 The ethnification of social policies	127
8.6 The way ahead for Norway	128
8.7 Challenges in using a governmentality perspective	129
8.8 Final remark.....	130
Summary	131
Sammanfattning på svenska	134
References	137

1. Introduction

‘Citizens are not born, they are made.’

(Cruikshank, 1999, p. 3)

One of the most politicized areas of social policy is centred on the topic of migration and integration of migrants. One illustrative example date to 2015, when Europe experienced a rapid increase in people seeking asylum within its borders, which sparked a heated debate. One of the central debates concerned the question of migrant integration and how receiving societies could receive the new migrants. In addition, political debates centred also on how many refugees each country could receive and the economic costs it would entail.

In direct connection to those political debates, we have, and still are, witnessing a rapid political climate shift which has led to an increase in restrictive refugee and immigration policies throughout Europe (Hangartner et al., 2019; Krzyżanowski et al., 2018). This has also been the case in Norway (Bygnes & Karlsen, 2017). The political shift has been made possible by, among other factors, a growing common trend where attitudes towards refugees were, and still are, becoming less tolerant. This trend is illustrated by the success of newer right-wing and populist parties (Dinas et al., 2019; Hangartner et al., 2019; Steinmayr, 2016).

This thesis deals with what happens to refugees and migrants who are successful in gaining residency. It is about the policy tools the politicians and policymakers implement in order to incorporate migrants into the society. More specifically, the focus of this thesis is on the Introduction Programme in Norway as a social policy arena to integrate new migrants.

On the 1st of September 2004 Norway implemented the Introduction Programme for new migrants and refugees. The adaption of this programme in Norway was part of a broader Western European trend where several countries during the last decades have introduced special introduction programmes¹ targeted at specified migrants with the formulated aim to facilitate the integration process in receiving societies (Borevi, 2010; Carrera, 2006a; Goodman, 2010; Jacobs & Rea, 2007; Joppke, 2007a). Common general elements of the introduction programme across countries tend to be language courses, civic instruction/social studies and labour market and vocational training (Bauböck et al., 2006; Carrera, 2006b;

¹ In this introduction I use the expression *introduction programme*. I am, however, aware of the different expressions, such as *integration programme*, *courses*, *reception* (see discussion provided by Michałowski, 2004, p. 5).

Jacobs & Rea, 2007; Michalowski, 2004; Perchinig et al., 2012). Participation in these programmes is generally mandatory for the defined target group, and non-compliance may lead to various degree of sanctions.

The implementation of the Introduction Programme represented one of the most significant policy measures initiated by the state for new migrants and refugees in Norway (Ot.prop. nr 28 (2002 - 2003). Elements of the Norwegian Programme included language training, social studies/civic instruction and measures that encourage (long-term) participation in the labour market (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2016) and programmes today still include these features. The programme is full time, ranges in length from a minimum of 3 months to 4 years and is supposed to be individualised. Further, participants receive income maintenance in the form of an introduction allowance.

Introduction programmes have two important official goals, namely, labour market participation and migrant integration into the receiving society. As such, the introduction programmes have both an activation and integration agenda (Borevi, 2010; Hagelund, 2010; Hagelund & Kavli, 2009, p. 259; Jönsson & Petersen, 2010, p. 358; Perchinig et al., 2012).

Activation measures are social policies and programmes targeted at the unemployed, who receive social welfare with the aim of promoting labour market participation (van Berkel & Borghi, 2008, p. 332). However, activation policies do not only promote labour market participation, but activation policies are also linked to a larger welfare state transformation, which is based on neoliberal state rationality (Dahlstedt, 2009; Dean, 1995).² From a neoliberal perspective, activation policies use a wide range of different techniques in order to transform people into what are perceived to be ideal citizens. These techniques involve teaching migrants important societal values, such as self-discipline, promptness and hard work (Dahlstedt, 2009a).

In this sense, the citation provided above by Barbra Cruikshank (1999, p. 3) illustrates that citizens are not simply born, but rather that citizens, through neoliberal government, are shaped into citizens who are capable of governing themselves, not only in their own self-interest, but also in the interest of others and in the interest of the state.

Throughout history, there have been groups that have been regarded as not yet ready for full citizenship in society (Dahlstedt, 2009a). For instance, ideas of an inferior morality and mentality have, according to Barry Hindess (2001), been central in state efforts to shape people into ideal citizens. Hindess uses the example of how Western welfare states, in the

² For a more in-depth definition of neoliberalism, see chapter 4.

domain of social policy, implement paternalistic and disciplinary policies and interventions for those who are perceived and defined as falling below the civilized norm and need to improve before they can be ‘freed’ to manage their own lives. Migrants are generally perceived by the majority population as different or foreign. It is in the meetings with people who are perceived to be different from the mainstream that contemporary citizen ideals become most visible and apparent (Dahlstedt, 2009a). From such encounters, migrants are then contrasted with the ideal citizen and evaluated. As a consequence, they are exposed to several governing techniques that will shape and transform them into idealized citizens (see Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009; Van Houdt, 2014).

In this introduction, I employ Michel Foucault’s perspective on governmentality and argue that the Introduction Programme in Norway is an important arena where new migrants are governed, disciplined and shaped into becoming what is perceived to be neoliberal ideal citizens. Governmentality merges the concept of ‘govern’ and ‘mentality’. The term govern refers to how people are being governed through different forms of techniques of power and domination. The term mentality, on the other hand, refers to self-governing techniques in which people come to govern themselves. As such, a governmentality perspective usually entails, one the one hand, the act of governing citizens, and on the other hand, specific techniques of self-governing. It is about the ‘conduct of conduct (Foucault, 1982, p. 789). Governmentality is also a perspective that enables an awareness of uncertainties about what kind of political problematisations take shape in a society and among individuals, and those that do not. The choice to include a governmentality perspective is part of a longer process which I further elaborate on below.

1.1 Studies, aim and research questions

The body of the thesis is based on four studies and this introduction, which includes a new updated analysis chapter. The studies all examine the introduction programme(s) from different comparative and theoretical perspectives. In the studies, comparisons are made between different social policy measures (**studies I and III**) and between seemingly ‘similar’ policies in Sweden, Denmark and Norway (**studies II and IV**). The method employed for all four studies is based on public document analysis which falls within the broader categorization of qualitative text analysis. Table 1 provides an overview of the studies and their respective aims.

Table 1: Overview of the studies and research aim and questions

Studies	Title	Research aim(s)
Study I	Fernandes, A. G. (2011). En studie av to integreringstiltak og deres underliggende ideologi (A study of two integration measures and their underlying ideology). In Puntervold Bø, B (Ed.), <i>Multikulturell teori og flerkulturelle praksiser – Artikler om norsk minoritetspolitikk</i> (pp. 46-77). Abstrakt forlag.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To provide an in-depth understanding of the underlying ideology of two Norwegian post-immigration measures; the establishment of the Introduction Programme and the implementation of financial support schemes for voluntary immigrant organisations.
Study II	Fernandes, A. G. (2013). Ethnification of new social risks: A comparative study of programmes for preparing newly arrived immigrants for (working) life in Sweden, Denmark and Norway.' In Harsløf, I. and R. Ulmestig (Eds). <i>Changing social risks and social policy adaption in the Nordic welfare states</i> (pp. 189-219). Palgrave Macmillan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To understand if and eventually how ethnification is embedded in the justifications for implementing the introductory programme and how ethnification may effect the design of the programmes.
Study III	Gubrium, E. and Fernandes, A. G. (2014). Policing Norwegian Welfare: Disciplining and Differentiating within the Bottom Rungs. <i>Social Inclusion</i> . 3(2), 5-17. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v2i3.35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To explore how policy texts and the policy development process when establishing the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme have differently constructed the identity of their target groups. ▪ To investigate how the benefits, sanctions and services availed to these two target groups have differed.
Study IV	Fernandes, A. G. (2015). (Dis)Empowering new immigrants and refugees through their participation in introduction programs in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. <i>Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies</i> . 13(3), 245-264. https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2015.1045054	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To critically examine whether and how different ideas of (radical and liberal) empowerment are embedded in policy documents and texts pertaining to the introduction programmes in Scandinavia

Unlike a monograph thesis – where all the texts can be revised until the end – an article-based thesis more readily displays scholarly development over time. As in all academic work, the

theories and perspectives outlined in a first proposal will evolve and often change as the work proceeds, an evolution which can be seen in the studies.

The studies have utilised different analytical and theoretical concepts and perspectives.

Study I employ conceptualisations of multiculturalism, immigrant integration and assimilation as the main analytical concepts. **Study II** departs from the concepts of ethnification, social risks and activation. **Study III** also has an ethnification perspective and uses Foucault's notion of institutional discipline. **Study IV** analyses the justifications, framework, structure and design of the programmes from different conceptualisations of empowerment.

One of the strengths of qualitative research is that the empirical material allows the researcher to shift focus during the analysis process (Silverman, 2005, p. 80). In this thesis, such a change can be seen in my use of the concept of governmentality. The first study was published in 2011 and the last in 2015. As the timespan of the studies shows, a substantial amount of time has passed as well in relation to the introduction. Consequently, this introduction has been written over a longer period of time, which has allowed for new perspectives to be employed and thus providing new understandings of the Introduction Programme, in addition to the published studies.

Governmentality manifested itself as a useful analytical perspective in the final stage of writing the thesis. It was not until I started on **studies III and IV** that I began to see the usefulness of applying governmentality as an overall, unifying perspective for understanding the governing and power dimensions at play in the Introduction Programme, an understanding that has resulted in a more inductive approach in terms of theorization (Silverman, 2005).

I began to understand the Introduction Programme as a policy tool, a technique of power that the state has implemented as a means to promote an understanding and definition of what they perceive to be successful integration regarding newly arrived immigrants and refugees. Just by participating, the target group is, to various degrees, complying with the expectations of the programme. That is, their conduct is being governed, disciplined and shaped in specific ways in the interest of the state, but also in their own interest. By explicitly viewing the Introduction Programme as a technique of power, I use governmentality to examine, discuss and understand the justification, structure and design of the programme.

As the overview of the studies show, the consistent component through all four studies has been the Introduction Programme in Norway. In this introduction, the focus is limited to Norway, allowing for a more in-depth examination, discussion and analysis of the programme.

The aim of the overall thesis is to:

Examine how the Norwegian Introduction Programme can be understood in relation to different power perspectives.

One of the main perspectives are governmentality, supplemented with neoliberalism and ethnification. A governmentality perspective has shaped the kinds of questions posed in this research. Instead of a focus on why something happened, I look at *how* something happened and how these occurrences differ from what preceded them. Governmentality is a particular useful perspective for examining how power operates in the policy texts that are examined and discussed in the thesis (see Rose 2006 et. al. 2006). While not explicitly using a governmentality perspective in the studies, in hindsight, it is possible to see that **studies I, II and III** depart from a wider Foucauldian perspective as they are interested in trying to understand how the introduction programmes came about and to what ends.

More specifically, the studies, to various degrees, aim to answer the question: ***What was the Introduction Programme an answer to***, though from different perspectives. This means trying to understand: ***What was before, what was to come, to whom, and by what means and to what ends?*** These are the research questions that will be analysed and discussed in chapter 7. Even though the aim and the analysis in this introduction departs mainly from a governmentality perspective, I use related and supplementary analytical concepts to understand the programme. As such, the analysis and discussion goes beyond a strict governmentality perspective.

It is also important to emphasize that the interest of the study lies at the policy formulation and programmatic level rather than on the implementation level. Even though the latter clearly is highly important, it lies beyond the scope of this thesis.³ Moreover, because the latest study was published in 2015, and since then several policy changes have been implemented in the programme, the empirical material has been supplemented with policy documents to include policy changes up to 2021, in order to provide a current examination, analysis and discussion. In addition, research that is relevant for the thesis has been updated acknowledging that substantial time has passed since the last published study in 2015.

³ In addition, it is also important to emphasise that the main focus is not on the experiences of new migrants per se.

1.2 Relevance and contribution

Because I see immigrant integration as constructed primarily by how states seek to incorporate migrants into society, it is important to examine how the states operationalise their own definition and interpretation of immigrant integration and the process of achieving it. The justification, structure and design of the Norwegian Introduction Programme say something essential about not only how society should organise the integration process of new migrants, but also what the Norwegian state sees as the end goal of migrant integration. Moreover, because the Introduction Programme in Norway is state-led and mandatory for both the municipalities to provide and for the target group to attend, the implications for how the programme is designed, shaped and governed are imperative to examine, not only for the target group, but also for practitioners and policymakers in order to understand the processes and the different power structures involved. My ambition is to contribute to a critical discussion of what kinds of subjects are created and envisioned through the policy and what kinds of power technologies and techniques that are at play in the process of transforming and creating the ideal migrant citizen.

Several studies showing how power structures operate in the field of immigrant integration and activation employ both an explicit governmentality perspective or an even broader Foucauldian perspective. Even though these studies provide important insights, to the best of my knowledge, there are no studies that have looked exclusively at the Introduction Programme from a governmentality perspective in Norway. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing research field on governmentality studies by focusing specifically on the Introduction Programme in Norway within the nexus of activation and immigrant integration policies. In addition, it contributes to the field of critical social policy and also to the field of immigrant integration, important areas for social work research and practice.

1.3 Social policy as a point of departure

One of the main points of departure for this thesis is to examine what problems the Introduction Programme is meant to address. It is well established (Andersson, 2003; Bacchi, 1999, 2009; Loseke, 2003) that how we think and perceive something will determine what we think should be done about it. Thus, ‘[...] every policy proposal contains within it an explicit or implicit diagnosis of the ‘problem’ (Bacchi, 2009, p. 2). Argumentations for and formulations of a policy inherently propose solutions to a certain problem. Describing an issue or a problem will always be an interpretation. Interpretations of this kind will invariably involve certain

choices, norms and judgements. Social policy is therefore by no means value neutral. Policy strategies categorize and thus reaffirm and construct identities for target groups.

Social policy analysis therefore offers a useful premise for research because in policy documents we can identify problem descriptions tied to proposed solutions to the problem, which again are tied to imagined identities, motivations and actions for particular target groups. As such, there is a clear power dimension in terms of who gets to define a phenomenon as a social problem (Johnson, 2010. p. 17; Loseke, 2003, p. 10). When an issue/phenomenon is first defined as a social problem, it will normally entail that the defined problem should be addressed in specific ways.

Moreover, policy documents are important empirical material for studying governmentality (Rose, 1999b, p. 4; Van Houdt, 2014, p. 56). Sociologist Nicolas Rose (1999b) writes that ‘practices of government are deliberate attempts to shape conduct in certain ways in relation to certain objectives’ (p. 4). Applied to the Introduction Programme, where the ultimate aim is successful labour market integration of new migrants and refugees, this comment from Rose suggests that the programme is a deliberate measure and attempt by the government to shape the conduct of migrants, a measure that will lead to their employment, or at the very least increase their so called ‘employability’.

Policy documents represent official discourse (see Andersson et al., 1978; de Cabo, 2018). Studying the Introduction Programme as described in policy documents, therefore, sheds light on how governments operate. The Introduction Programme is a prescription of what needs to be done from the perspective of the state in relation to new migrants and refugees. Examining policy documents which describe the design, structure and goal of the Introduction Programme, in addition to the programmatic expectations of the participants of the programme, is thus an ideal starting point for applying a governmentality perspective.

Official policy documents constitute the main empirical material for this thesis, with a focus on the Introduction Programme in Norway, with a comparative component to the introduction programmes in Sweden and Denmark. In addition, policy documents regarding the Qualification Programme and the financial support scheme for voluntary immigrant organisations have been included. In the methodology chapter (5), I present the specifics and the timeframe for the analysed official documents.

1.4 Social policy and social work

Introduction programme policies create the framework by which social workers, or ‘street level bureaucrats’ (Lipsky, 2010), operate in their daily resettlement work with

new migrants and refugees. The professionals working directly with migrants and refugees are supposed to implement the larger immigrant integration project envisioned by policymakers. In terms of practice and theory, introduction programmes falls under the wider category of what social work scholar Kathleen Valtonen (2001, p. 247) defines as ‘resettlement social work’ services and measures for that seek to relocate and integrate new migrants and refugees in society.

There is a clear connection between social work and social policy (Lødemel, 2019). Social policy is a decisive factor in determining the scope and direction of social work and how it is executed (Blomberg et al., 2016). Social policy is guided by political decisions, framings and reflects how states seeks to govern its citizens. As such, social policy has a clear normative function as it strives to uphold the values and judgements of the state.

Social work scholar Walter Lorenz (2005, p. 97) describes social work as ‘applied social policy’ and he argues that there is a need to increase awareness that social policy and social work are highly connected. If we see social policy as not value neutral, this means that neither is social work because it concretely implements policy solutions to perceived social problems.⁴ Social work scholar Kerstin Svensson (2007) writes that social work is an example of an institution that has as its ambition a striving for normality (see Fahlgren & Sawyer, 2005; Herz, 2018). Inherent in social work practice is therefore a will to normalise, that is, from the perspective of policymakers and politicians, and to address the social problem at hand (Svensson, 2007).

This aim towards normality is especially marked within the Scandinavian welfare state context. Social anthropologist and social worker Marianne Rugkåsa (2012) uses the example of Norway when arguing that in comprehensive and universal welfare states (like those in Scandinavia), the more generous they are, the more transformative the model that they will have in place for incorporating new migrants in society needs to be. Welfare states that are ambitious with many extensive services will have more pronounced markers for what is perceived to be normal. As such, the interventions and measures they have in place for transforming individuals who do not fit in to ‘the norm’ are more intrusive and intensive compared to liberal welfare states, which are not as generous and ambitious (Rugkåsa, 2012, p. 181). The Nordic welfare states have upheld a controlling and disciplinary view on those

⁴ It is important to note that this is only the case for social work practice, which is organized mainly within the state’s authority, and, to a lesser extent, other forms of social work carried out in arenas outside of the authorities’ mandate.

who do not live up to the ideals of a ‘good citizen or the good worker’ (Harsløf & Ulmestig, 2013, p. 7), thus supporting the argument put forward by Rugkåsa.

Foucault (1994) described social work as being part of a wider societal function of ‘surveillance-and-correction,’ which entails an observation of individuals and their transformation. Social work scholars Mia Arp Fallov and Kevin Turner (2013, p. 74) argue that social workers have turned into ‘judges of normality’ in welfare services as they have a key role to advise, control, investigate etc. They argue that Foucault’s perspective may help social workers to question that function, and they urge social workers to ask what role they play and what kind of citizens they construct through their practice. This is particularly true in Norway, where state generosity leads to more intrusive policies and services.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

In the following chapter, I present models of immigrant incorporation, activation and citizenship. In chapter 3, I present earlier studies of introduction programmes and immigrant integration from a broader Foucauldian perspective. Chapter 4 focuses on theoretical and analytical perspectives based on governmentality, neoliberalism and ethnification. Chapter 5 discusses methodological approaches and choices and presents the empirical material, and chapter 6 presents a summary of the four studies of this thesis. In chapter 7, the Norwegian Introduction Programme is presented more in detail and is analysed and discussed. Lastly, chapter 8 provides a concluding discussion.

2. Setting the stage (background and context)

Immigrant integration and activation programmes are closely tied to citizenship in the sense that both programmes set out, from a governmentality perspective, to create specific citizen subjects. Since the beginning of the 1990s, we have seen in Western welfare states a fundamental shift in the balance between citizens' rights and duties. This development has created a new form of social contract between the state and its citizens, where duties are increasingly overshadowing rights, and this development is clearly evident in the field of immigrant integration and activation. Because the Introduction Programme represents both a measure of immigrant integration and activation, it is important to understand the context in which the programme operates. In this chapter, I therefore present the concepts of immigrant integration and activation, their development over time, and their relationship to citizenship.

2.1 Immigrant integration

People have migrated into new societies throughout history (Triandafyllidou, 2015). Nevertheless, during recent decades, issues concerning immigrant integration have increasingly been debated in Western Europe by scholars and policymakers alike (Banting & Kymlicka, 2012; Isaakyan, 2015; Scholten et al., 2016). Existing literature in the field of migration stresses the importance and necessity of integrating new migrants into their new societies (Isaakyan, 2015). However, the notion of integration remains difficult to clearly define as there are many understandings and different meanings. Various stakeholders, such as policymakers, politicians, academics, the media, and the general public use the term *integration* in widely divergent ways (Loch, 2014; Wieviorka, 2014). Moreover, the diversity and complexity of the concept is also present within various academic disciplines, and for the purpose of this study, I restrict my attention to how the term generally is used within sociology.

According to Han Entzinger and Renske Biezeveld (2003) integration, viewed from a sociological macro perspective, refers to 'a characteristic of a social system, e.g., a society' (p. 6). The degree to which the society's constituent parts (individuals or groups), relates and connects to each other determines how integrated the society is. In other words, the whole, the foundation of a society, must successfully be able to include and incorporate its substantive parts into the whole. Defined in this way, integration can be seen from the perspective of both the individual and groups.

However, the concept of immigrant integration often implies that it is the migrants that need to integrate. Christian Joppke and Ewa Morawska (2003, p. 3) makes the important point

that the idea of integrating migrants into a society assumes that such a society is already integrated and bounded, and as such, immigration poses a threat to disintegrate and to unbind society. They write, ‘The underlying picture is that of a society composed of domestic individuals and groups (as the antipode to ‘immigrants’), which are ‘integrated’ normatively by a consensus and organizationally by a state’ (Joppke & Morawska, 2003, p. 3).

The idea of a pre-existing (before any immigration) integrated and united society is both subjective and false (see Carrera, 2006b, p. 88) as few, if any, such integrated and united societies exist. Despite this fact, integration policy is a policy field in which migrants as a target group are continuously being constructed in relation to ‘national conceptualisations of ‘who’ the migrant is’ (Scholten et al., 2016). Hence, integration policy is derived from an underlying notion of a pre-defined target group that is constructed entirely based on what they are not (see Larsson, 2015). Following this argument, migrants are thus viewed as people who need to be integrated (Anthias, 2013).

The idea of cultural diversity, or culture is central to discussions of immigrant integration. To illustrate, what is commonly referred to as cultural diversity in a society only reflects the presence of what is perceived to be cultural pluralism, that is, how many people with various cultural backgrounds are present in a given society. While the mere presence of cultural diversity does not reflect how a society should be organized, politically and normatively, policy responses do precisely that. In other words, policy responses to immigration say something essential about how a culturally diverse society should and ought to be (see Favell, 2003, p. 15; Kymlicka, 1995, 10; Parekh, 2000, p. 6).

2.2 Models of immigrant incorporation

In the existing European literature on immigrant integration, scholars have used various models to explain different national approaches to including or excluding new migrants (individuals and groups) into their new societies (Finotelli & Michalowski, 2012; Helbling, 2012; Isaakyan, 2015; Loch, 2014; Vasta, 2007). For instance, how states choose to organise their society, either by focusing on the rights of individuals, or on the rights of groups, creates a premise (often normative) for developing integration policies (Entzinger, 2000; Finotelli & Michalowski, 2012). These national approaches to integrating new migrants in practice have roughly been categorized by scholars using various models of integration/incorporation (Entzinger, 2014; Finotelli & Michalowski, 2012; Isaakyan, 2015; Vasta, 2007). These models are often described by scholars as ideal type constructions of how states actively seek

to incorporate new migrants and also mirror how the states wish to portray themselves as ideal societies (Entzinger, 2014).

However, other scholars have been critical of using such models (Joppke, 2007a, 2017). Claudia Finotelli and Ines Michalowski (2012) consider the models to be overly simplistic and static, and they argue that these models generally seem to disregard existing differences within societies. In addition, they write that models of immigrant integration have also been criticized for being normative in that they tend to rely on ideology instead of what is happening with policy at the local level. According to Gary Freeman (2004) ‘No state possesses a truly coherent incorporation regime’ (p. 946).

The world is changing fast and in the field of migration studies models previously used to describe national models of immigrant integration are losing their validity (Isaakyan, 2015). Even though I, to a large extent, agree with these criticisms, and even though the focus of this study is not on national models of immigrant integration, it is important to address some of the main models since the construction of new migrants is highly connected to how states seek to incorporate them into society. I see these models as a constellation of ideas around what a society should be and how to govern new migrants. However, my aim is not to provide a complete overview over such models, but rather to present what I perceive to be the most commonly referred to models of immigrant integration.⁵ Therefore, in the following section I focus my attention on ideas of immigrant integration associated with the models of assimilation, multiculturalism, integration and civic integration.

2.2.1 The assimilationist model

Assimilationist integration policies (or the assimilation model) are described by several scholars as being the norm in the twentieth century, primarily in the US and in Western Europe (Brochmann, 2003; Castles & Davidson, 2000; Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003; Parekh, 2000) and is somewhat more straightforward to characterize in comparison to both the concepts of integration and multiculturalism (Vasta, 2007). The goal of assimilation policies is to deliberately transform the cultural identity of minorities into the dominant societal culture, e.g., minorities absorption into mainstream society (Barry, 2001; Castles & Davidson, 2000; Parekh, 2000). This is seen in Norway, for instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, where both the Sami population and migrants were encouraged to abandon their own

⁵ Several migration scholars have evaded the discussion of national immigrant integration models as it feeds into the critic of the simplicity of models which are too static and their normativity on which they rest upon (see Finotelli & Michalowski, 2012).

cultural and societal practices in order to adopt the new norms and values of the dominant, Norwegian society (Ihle, 2017). The assumption was that after a considerable time had passed in society, minorities would be indistinguishable from the majority population. Further, in the twentieth century assimilation policies were, in many cases, associated with the use of violence, repression and other means in order to make minorities comply with national norms (Brochmann, 2003, 3; Parekh, 2000, p. 197). The oppressive history of assimilation policies directed towards minorities led many Western democracies to abandon these practices due to the negative reaction that followed (Brochmann, 2003, p. 3; Kymlicka, 1995, p. 14).

Rogers Brubaker (2001), however, highlights that the idea of assimilation has evolved and that the concept that was being used by societies and scholars in the twenty-first century was more complex and normatively defensible compared to the previous use of this concept.

In the twenty-first century, terms such as ‘thin and thick’ were introduced to distinguish between different levels of assimilation; for example ('thin') assimilation referred to equal rights, equal socio-economic opportunities etc whereas ‘thick’ assimilation referred to the idea of a complete absorption into mainstream culture. Brubaker redefines assimilation as only referring to thin assimilation, which does not require minorities to completely abandon their cultural particularity and distinctiveness as was common at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Before Brubaker, Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou (1993, 1994) introduced the notion of ‘segmented assimilation’. Portes and Zhou (1993, p. 82; 1994, pp. 21-22) write that the process of assimilation has become segmented, in the sense that there are multiple sectors of society into which specific migrant groups assimilate, and as such assimilation does not necessarily entail complete absorption into the main, dominant culture. According to Peter Schaeffer and James Bukenya (2014) contemporary usage of assimilation refers to a process that decreases differences between the majority population and migrants along multiple spheres, such as the labour market, education, language, income etc. In Norway, there are attempts to reintroduce this more nuanced idea of assimilation (Friberg & Midtbøen, 2017). Nevertheless, even though the term has become more nuanced, assimilation, especially within a Western European context, is a one-way process: migrants must integrate into the society in which they live (Modood, 2015). More specifically, migrants should strive to disturb the society as little as possible and in the process become as similar as the overall population as they can.

2.2.2 The multiculturalist model

As assimilation policies (as perceived in the twentieth century) became increasingly associated with oppressive and unacceptable state-led policies, multicultural policies started to develop (Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000). In contrast to assimilation, multiculturalism is not as straightforward to define and pin down as there are multiple forms of multiculturalism that have been identified by scholars (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Again, it is not possible to present a complete overview over the different definitions and hence, the following presentation only represents some strands of multiculturalism. Here I will only highlight the main characteristics of the model, derived from various definitions.⁶

For example, Tariq Modood (2015) defines multiculturalism in the following way: ‘Multiculturalism is where processes of integration are two way and as involving groups as well as individuals. Moreover, the processes may work differently for different groups’ (p. 237). Steven Vertovec and Susanne Wessendorf (2010, p. 4) describe multiculturalism as a diverse set of approaches or methodologies that reinforce each other in terms of minorities and migrants, their incorporation and participation in society and their various religious/cultural differences.

As such, there are two main principles which creates the premise for multiculturalism. First, multiculturalist approaches are concerned with the social equality and participation of minorities and migrants. These approaches include official policy measures that promote equal rights and opportunities such as anti-discrimination, equal access to public services etc. Secondly, multiculturalist approaches are equally concerned with religious and cultural recognition of all groups of society. Examples of official policies in promoting recognition of various groups tend to include measures where cultural and religious differences are encouraged and accepted, opening public spaces where different groups are represented etc.

Since the beginning of 2000, there has been a considerable increase in public criticism of multiculturalism throughout Europe (Korteweg & Triadafilopoulos, 2015; Triadafilopoulos, 2011; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010), regardless of whether the countries in question have adopted multicultural policies or not (Vasta, 2007; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). Several current and former Western state leaders (such as Angela Merkel, Nikolas Sarkozy and David Cameron) have proclaimed that multiculturalism has failed and that there is a need for new

⁶ Focus is, for instance, not placed on the political philosophy debates on multiculturalism (see Barry, 200; . Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1992).

modes of incorporation of minorities and migrants (see Modood, 2015; Triadafilopoulos, 2011; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010).

It is argued by scholars that the so-called ‘backlash against multiculturalism’ can be tracked back to events, such as the terrorist attacks in the USA on the 11th of September in 2001. However, criticism of multiculturalism is not something that suddenly appeared in connection to events in the 2000s. We can find critiques of multiculturalism that date back to the 1970s. Critics of multiculturalism have argued that it promotes segregation, fosters environments for terrorists, reinforces what are perceived to be deplorable practices under the heading of cultural recognition, suppresses debates on immigration and minorities, denies the need for shared values and fails to acknowledge social problems associated with immigration (Korteweg & Triadafilopoulos, 2015; Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). The massive criticism against multiculturalism has led to the idea that it was a failure. Today in 2021, throughout the political spectrum, politicians tend to avoid the term altogether. For instance, Anna Korteweg and Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos (2015) write: ‘Without a doubt, political parties and actors spanning the ideological spectrum have rejected particular understandings of multiculturalism’ (p. 663).

An important point made by Steven Vertovec and Susanne Wessendorf (2010) is that even though the term multiculturalism is now often avoided by politicians and in official policy documents, measures associated with multiculturalism have not disappeared as much as one might think. They argue that the term multiculturalism has simply been replaced with the concept of integration and that there is still support for migrant and minority cultural differences, but under the heading of diversity. It is thus warranted to focus on the notion of integration as it seems to be more publicly accepted, at least mirrored against multiculturalism.

2.2.3 The integration model

Experts disagree on whether integration as a concept can be placed between assimilation and multiculturalism or whether it falls within assimilation (Vasta, 2007). According to Ellie Vasta (2007, p. 5) the concept is often used in a normative way when it implies a one-way process requiring migrants to make adjustments to the overall society and its way of life. Used in this way, it does not recognise cultural diversity in a multicultural society, hence resembling more an assimilationist approach. However, yet another usage of integration (officially) is often referred to as a two-way process, in which migrants as well as society must make reciprocal adjustments for successful integration to take place (Ahearn & Athey,

1991; Carrera, 2006a; Vasta, 2007). Within this understanding, integration allows migrants to maintain their cultural identity and simultaneously be part of the larger society. Joppke and Morawska (2003, p. 5) write that, in contrast to the old perception of assimilation, the integration model views migrants not as objects that can be manipulated and controlled, but as subjects with free will to integrate. In this model, the state only can set the stage, but not determine the outcome. Further, migrants can maintain their cultural identity, abandoning the need for migrants to conform and adhere to the substantive culture. Modood (2015) stresses that in the non-assimilative modes of integration, social interaction processes are considered as two way, where members of both migrant and minority communities, as well the majority population, must participate. Supporters of the integrationist model believe that migrants and minorities alone cannot be blamed in failing or not trying to integrate.

However, there is an increasing concern in regard to how the current notion of integration is being constructed and used in Western European countries (Joppke & Morawska, 2003). According to Carrera (2006a) the modern use of integration has changed, and several states are currently using the concept as (juridical, policy-oriented and institutional) a tool to control who is in or out of the state. Carrera illustrates this point by explaining that the political elite (mis)uses the discourse of integration to introduce restrictive immigration policies with the purpose to curb further immigration. Rather than referring to integration as a two-way process, several authors are rather describing the modern conceptualization of integration as a one-way process (Brubaker, 2001; Carrera, 2006a, 2006b; Joppke & Morawska, 2003). Instead of rights, duties are being emphasised when policy measures aimed at migrants are being developed.

Along similar lines, Bernhard Perchning et. al. (2012, p. 32) has noted a clear shift in how the understanding of integration is being used in more recent times in Western European countries. Integration is increasingly being linked to the individual duties of the migrant, which is a clear break with the previous understanding of integration, which stressed the duties of both the migrant and the society. Migrants must increasingly rely on themselves to acquire not only the necessary knowledge and skills to both participate in society at large, but also to gain and sustain an economically independent life. Willem Schinkel (2013) makes a related point when analysing Dutch integration policies: ‘It at once individualizes and de-individualizes integration: it is seen as the individual’s responsibility, while on the other hand entire cultures can be held responsible’ (p. 1155).

As briefly touched upon in the introduction, the increase of people seeking asylum, since 2015 has triggered social tensions and political conflicts (Hangartner et al., 2019). Extreme-

right parties, have, in many countries, tried to benefit from the social conflicts as they have sought to capitalise on voters' anxiety due to the rise of asylum seekers (Hangartner et al., 2019; Steinmayr, 2016). As such, these parties have tried to increase their leverage in order to enact more restrictive immigration policies. There is a growing number of recent studies in Europe which show that refugee migration is a significant factor contributing to the support and rise of extreme-right parties (see Dinas et al., 2019; Hangartner et al., 2019; Steinmayr, 2016). Post-2015 the majority of countries in Europe have introduced several restrictive measures to reduce the number of people seeking asylum, such as introducing border controls (Bygnes & Karlsen, 2017). However, measures have also included more long-term policy changes that in many cases have led to a decrease in the number of people seeking asylum and support for refugees' rights. Hence, the shifting emphasises from refugees and migrants' rights to duties as mentioned above have very much been fuelled by the 2015 developments and the increased electoral support for extreme-right parties.

Implementing mandatory language courses, introduction programmes, civic studies may be examples of a change in the political ideology, which now seeks to absorb minorities into mainstream society. As previously mentioned, many Western European countries have adopted such measures (Perchinig et al., 2012; Triadafilopoulos, 2011). These examples are part of a broader development in the growing link between civic and integration policy, creating the 'civic integration model,' which the introduction programmes are part of.

2.2.4 The civic integration model

Since the mid 1990's, participation in various forms of integration measures is increasingly being tied to requirements for attaining long-term residency or citizenship. This development links migration and integration policies more closely together, creating the so-called migration-integration nexus (Balch & Geddes, 2012). Examples of the evolving migration-integration nexus include the formation of citizenship tests and immigration pre-entry tests.

In the citizenship literature, attaching integration requirements as a condition for naturalisation is referred to as *civic integration* (Goodman, 2010; Joppke, 2007a, 2007b) or, more recently, as a 'civic turn' (Borevi et al., 2017; Midtbøen et al., 2020; Mouritsen et al., 2019). In short, civic integration policies rest on the assumption that successful integration into society should not only be based on labour market (economic) integration and civic involvement (political integration), but also on personal dedication to norms and values that (presumably) represent distinctive national citizenship ideals (Goodman, 2010). Knowing the language and gaining familiarity with both history and societal structures, as well as adopting

social and liberal values in what is perceived to be typical of the specific nation state are thus emphasised in civic integration policies.

When the term ‘civic integration’ first appeared in the literature on citizenship, the debate centred around the question of whether there was cross-national convergence towards civic integration measures in the sense of nations becoming more similar, or if a divergence was still present. In short, it was a debate on ‘convergence or national models’ (see Mouritsen et al., 2019, p. 595). Joppke (2007a, 2007b) argues that nation states that historically used to promote integration models such as multiculturalism, assimilation etc. are increasingly implementing civic integration policies and measures. While Joppke (2007a, 2007b) argues that the development of civic integration policies represents a shift and a convergence in how nation states in Western Europe seek to integrate migrants, others claim that this development does not entail a complete convergence and that there is still divergence in integration policies between nation states, and, to some extent, still keeping national models relevant (Borevi, 2014; Goodman, 2018; Jacobs & Rea, 2007). However, recent studies have critically pointed out that in order to have a meaningful assessment of convergence, there is a need to have a clear understanding what civic integration actually entails (Borevi et al., 2017; Mouritsen et al., 2019). Borevi et. al. (2017) asks ‘Is it a specific tool box of policy instruments to condition immigrants access to various legal statuses on meeting certain requirements or is it a perfectionist liberal, non-nationalistic philosophy of integration – or is it both?’ (p. 3).

Both understandings of civic integration have been employed in the debates on convergence, which can cause confusion. Consequently, Borevi et. al. (2017, p. 5) suggests that one should rather talk about a ‘civic turn’ in an attempt to avoid confusion regarding the term civic integration (see also Mouritsen et al., 2019). The concept of civic turn acknowledges that there has been an ‘ideational turn’ in terms of both ideas and policies. Per Mouritsen et. al. (2019) writes that nationalism is still present, convergence has occurred, there is still a difference in how nation states understand integration and party politics are still important. And it is important to note that, regardless of the debate on convergence or divergence, civic culture or ‘good citizenship’ as a way to integrate migrants is emphasised in nation states (Borevi et al., 2017), which leads us to the next point.

It is argued that the new policy requirements conditioning naturalisation represent a transformation from viewing integration as a two-way process, where migrants and society mutually need to make adjustments, towards regarding integration as a one-way process, where emphasis is placed on migrants’ duties and responsibilities rather than on their rights (Borevi, 2010, p. 3; Carrera, 2006b, p. 6; Joppke, 2007a, p. 14). Concern about equality

between new migrants and the overall population is therefore at stake since the idea of integration can be (mis)used as a pretence for introducing more restrictive and punitive integration measures.

In **studies II** and **III**, I argue that the introduction programmes in Norway, Denmark and Sweden, to various degrees, can be seen as representing a shift towards a more restrictive and punitive integration approach. Moreover, in this thesis, I argue that the programme in Norway can be seen as an arena for governing, shaping and disciplining new migrants and refugees into becoming new ideal citizens, in other words, a ‘good citizen’. In the next section, I provide a brief historical overview of immigrant migration and integration in Norway which have paved the way for the implementation of the Introduction Programme.

2.3 Immigrant migration and integration in Norway

Contrary to what many may think, immigration to Norway is not a recent phenomenon that started in the late 1960’s (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2014). It is possible to track immigration to Norway from the year 900 and onwards. However, 1967 was the first year in which migrants who came to Norway exceeded those who migrated out of Norway. From this year forward and up to today, this era is defined as ‘the new immigration’ period, characterised by the increased growth, scope and complexity of immigration patterns (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2014; Ihle, 2017; Midtbøen, 2017).

Compared to other countries in Western Europe at that time, Norway was a late bloomer as an immigration destination. Labour migrants, mainly men from Pakistan, Morocco and the Mediterranean countries, constituted the main migrant groups in the late 1960’s. Several other European countries had already started to restrict their immigration policies (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2014) making Norway, which then had fewer immigration restrictions, a more popular migration destination. Migrants mostly came in search of jobs as a means to support their families. Both the authorities and the labour migrants themselves saw their stay as temporary. As such, there was no principal political debate on how migrant’s adjustment to society should be facilitated.

After the second world war and during the following cold war period, some migrants came to Norway not as labour migrants but as people seeking asylum (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2010). Refugees were granted the same rights and duties as citizens, and, reflecting a more cultural assimilationist approach to immigrant integration, policymakers assumed that they would gradually adjust to the Norwegian culture. Grete Brochmann and Anniken Hagelund (2010, p. 228) have characterised the period from post-world war two up to the

1970s as a ‘no-politics’ phase because there was no official unified strategy as how to incorporate migrants into the Norwegian society.

From late 1960s to the mid-1970s, the number of migrants to Norway increased, and as a consequence, there was also a growing concern about what were perceived to be social and cultural problems in the wake of immigration (Hagelund, 2003). As other European countries continued to introduce further immigration restrictions, Norway saw the need to exert control in light of these perceived social problems, and in 1975 Norway introduced an ‘immigration stop’ primarily targeted at immigration from the Global South. This immigration stop was supposed to be temporary, just long enough to address the concerns; however, it soon became apparent to the politicians that these concerns could not easily be solved, and the stop was made permanent (Hagelund, 2003). However, the term ‘immigration stop’ was misleading as migrants continued to come to Norway as part of family reunification, as refugees and work specialists mainly from Western countries. As such, it is more precise to refer to the change in 1975 as a significant step towards a more regulated and controlled approach to immigration (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2010).

It is first in the 1970s that it is possible to identify an explicit policy approach to immigrant integration in Norway. White Paper 39 ‘On immigration politics,’ proposed an assimilation and integration strategy that described two equal options for migrants (St. meld. nr. 39 (1973-74). Migrants had the option to either assimilate as much as possible, or to participate in society whilst maintaining their cultural background. However, White Paper 74 (1979-80, p. 6) ‘On immigrants in Norway’ stated that an integration strategy was preferred, and that there was no duty for migrants to assimilate. Rather, there was an emphasis on ensuring that a migrant’s culture be maintained and preserved, clearly demonstrating a more multicultural understanding on the need for safeguarding a migrant’s cultural background. Norway was clearly inspired by the Swedish multicultural immigration policy (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2010) but was also influenced by developments in parts of Europe where multicultural approaches were gaining popularity (Ihle, 2017).

The number of refugees and other people seeking asylum started to increase beginning in the 1980s, and 1990s. Labour migrants, who earlier saw their stay as only temporarily remained and family reunifications, continued to grow in scope. The challenges that many migrants faced became more visible on a structural level, their unemployment rate was higher compared to the majority population, their living standards were lower, and many had to rely on public benefits for their income security (Hagelund, 2005; Ihle, 2017).

Since the mid-1980's, and as a direct consequence of the challenges migrants faced, immigration and integration policies started to receive both more political and public attention, leading to heated public debates (Hagelund, 2005). This development created an important backdrop and context for the justification and implementation of the Introduction Programme in 2004. Thus far, I have only briefly introduced the context and I will go into more details in the analysis chapter (7), in which I will answer the question of what the Introduction Programme was an answer to. However, it should not come as a surprise that also in Norway, there has been a shift from rights to duties where migrants are made more responsible for their own integration into society. Similar shifts can be seen within the field of activation, where we now turn our attention.

2.4 Activation

As I've already established, introduction programmes can be categorised as both an immigrant integration and an activation programme. This is partly because many politicians and policymakers operationalise migrant integration as being equivalent to labour market participation (Larsson, 2015; Rugkåsa, 2012; Wikström & Ahnlund, 2018), and also because labour market integration is a key objective in the programmes. In many European countries, activation policies have, mainly from the 1990's, been intensified as an effort to increase labour market participation among people who are unemployed, able-bodied and on (last resort) public welfare benefits. Activation has thus had a substantial impact on unemployed migrants on economic social assistance, since this public scheme have been one of the most affected by the intensification of activation (Ulmestig, 2006). Measures with the objective of increasing labour market participation among new migrants and refugees are thus part of the activation trend (Brochmann, 2004). The introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark are concrete examples of how activation, which is a labour market policy arena, is being coupled with official integration policy, which is discussed in **studies II and IV** (see also Hagelund & Kavli, 2009; Larsson, 2015).

As with the concept of integration, activation is also a broad concept with different meanings. In the following section the notion of activation is discussed.

2.4.1 The dialectics of activation

In the introduction chapter, activation was briefly defined as social policies and programmes targeted at the unemployed who receive public income support with the aim of promoting labour market participation (van Berkel & Borghi, 2008, 332). This definition links activation

directly to labour market participation, however activation as a term applies to other arenas as well. A broader definition of activation⁷ is provided by Bjørn Hvinden (1999) as:

[...] a label for a broad set of policies meant to be a cure for a range of social ills. These social ills include high levels of unemployment, extensive long-term marginalization or exclusion and fragmentation, and even dissolving civic virtues, duties and solidarities. (p. 27)

Here we see that activation is the prescribed answer to a wide range of social problems. Within the existing activation literature, the term itself refers to the need to move from a status of ‘passive’ to ‘active’ (Hvinden, 1999). Hence, the assumption underlying the term implies that those who are in the target group of activation policies have previously been passive and need to be activated in one way or another (Hvinden, 1999, p. 27). This is particularly evident when referring to policies which promote labour market participation. An example of this is the usage of the catchphrase ‘from passive to active’ which is commonly adopted by policymakers when justifying activation with the aim of labour market integration.

Hvinden (1999, p. 27) argues that the phrase ‘passive to active’ as it is used officially in social protection is misleading as it implies that people who receive public income support are generally passive. According to Hvinden, this implication is unfounded as people who are on the receiving end of public benefits are indeed active in other social arenas, but not necessarily economically active in the sense of being employed in the labour market.

Even though activation policies increased beginning in the 1990s, activation itself is not a modern phenomenon. However, what is maybe new is the intensification of activation, not only restricted to labour market policies but to other areas of social protection as well (Hvinden, 1999). It is therefore important to examine how activation policies have come to gain increasingly more ground during the recent decades.

⁷ It is important to make a distinction between the highly related terms *activation*, *active labour market policies* (ALMP) and *workfare*. ALMP’s main concern in times of economic restructuring is full employment and has both universal and selective interventions (Kildal, 2001, p. 2). Lødemel and Trickey (2001, p. 6) defines workfare as ‘programmes and schemes that require people to work in return for social assistance benefits.’ Conditionality is a marked characteristic of both activation and workfare policies.

2.4.2 The intensification and neoliberal turn of activation

Social risks are risks commonly addressed by the expanding welfare state that affect people's ability to work, such as unemployment, old age, sickness and occupational injuries. These risks were connected to the industrial labour market and its demand for a stable labour supply without social unrest (Harsløf & Ulmestig, 2013). The aim was to uphold high levels of labour participation. After the Second World War and for the following three decades, social risks in Western welfare states were more closely linked to class structures embedded in the industrial and class society and these social risks are now referred to by several as, so called, old social risks (Beck, 1997; Bonoli, 2007; Esping-Andersen, 1999; Harsløf & Ulmestig, 2013; Taylor-Gooby, 2004). By the end of 1940s and during 1950s in the Nordic welfare states women's participation in the labour force was facilitated, means-tested benefits were replaced with basic pensions, and health insurance and child benefits were introduced, to reach the aim of full employment (Harsløf & Ulmestig, 2013, p. 14).

In the same time period, active labour market policies were also implemented in the Nordic welfare states to counter these old social risks (Harsløf & Ulmestig, 2013). Active labour policies were introduced as a political instrument to meet the aim of full employment as a step in trying to ensure that everyone is entitled to a social security benefit (Johansson, 2001, p. 66). As such, one may argue that risk management was addressed mainly on a structural level, in contrast to an individual level.

However, at the beginning of the 1980s, many OECD countries started to debate how to adjust welfare provisions to the changing economy (Møller, 2013). One motivation for the ongoing transformation in how social policies were being designed and implemented was the perceived need to reduce high levels of public expenditure (van Berkel & Borghi, 2008). From primarily being concerned with income protection for people who were not able to provide for themselves, welfare states throughout the OECD-area were now putting more emphasis on labour market integration through participation in mandatory activation programmes so that able-bodied people would be able to provide for themselves and become economically independent and not be a so-called 'burden' for the public budget (Drøpping et al., 1997; van Berkel & Borghi, 2008). This approach represented a major shift in the field of employment activation.

This shift in approach in employment activation signalled a change in how policymakers viewed those receiving support where they saw a need to introduce conditions attached to economic benefits. While active labour market policies' (ALMP) main concern in times of economic restructuring is full employment and has both universal and selective interventions

(Kildal, 2001, p. 2), both activation and welfare policies are characterised by conditionality where people who receive public support must ‘actively’ participate in work related measures. As such, receiving public support is made contingent on people’s ability to participate in such measures, or they face reductions or even complete withdrawal of benefits (Lødemel & Moreira, 2014, p. 9).

There is however a distinction between activation and welfare. Ivar Lødemel and Heather Trickey (2001) define welfare as ‘programmes and schemes that require people to work in return for social assistance benefits’ (p. 6). Welfare is thus coupled with the last safety net of the welfare state. Activation on the other hand, is broader in its reach; it applies not only to people who receive social assistance but also those receiving various forms of income support benefits, for example unemployment benefits. In addition, in contrast to welfare, activation has a broader range of measures, for example, to support labour market integration such as education and training. Nevertheless, both activation and welfare clearly represent a shift towards increased and marked duties for those who, for various reasons, are unemployed.

Consequently, people in Western welfare states are increasingly becoming more dependent on the labour market for ensuring their basic needs compared to earlier when the welfare state could offer broader social protection. Similarly, people who for various reasons find themselves outside of the labour market or are otherwise marginalised, are, today in a neoliberal context, more vulnerable and exposed to social insecurity. The state’s responsibility for its citizen’s welfare has, as such, gradually shifted from having welfare state interventions with the aim to distribute social and economic resources and to even out societal cleavages, to introducing more market-oriented approaches which is part of a neoliberal turn of activation policies.

Within this neoliberal development, there is a greater focus on market solutions, decentralisation, autonomy, individual responsibility, and partnerships between state and state actors, citizens and officials, companies and organisation (Dahlstedt, 2009a, 32). Other welfare reforms in many Western welfare states introduced user fees, privatisations, decentralisation, and implementation of explicit measures of performance etc. (Dahlstedt, 2009a).

2.4.3 Citizenship and the ideal citizen

The idea of citizenship, as closely tied to duties and obligations, can be seen in the early work of Thomas Humprey Marshall. Marshall (1950) sketched the development of citizenship within the context of England and wrote his influential essay on citizenship in 1949, a time period which naturally influenced his views on citizenship. Marshall was particularly

interested in how the development of the welfare state had influenced the right/duty nexus regarding its citizens. Marshall (1992/1950) wrote the following:

Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed. There is no universal principle that determines what those rights and duties shall be, but societies in which citizenship is a developing institution create an image of an ideal citizenship against which achievement can be measured and towards which aspiration can be directed. (p. 18)

Marshall saw it as the states responsibility to ensure ‘full membership of a community’ of its citizens. For him, membership in a community can be understood as a social contract between the state and its citizens, which guarantees a set of both rights and responsibilities for its members. Marshall further categorized citizenship into three spheres of rights: civil, political and social rights. Civil rights as described by Marshall involved freedom of speech, the right to own property, the right to enter legally binding contracts and equality before the law. Political rights included the right to vote, the right to enlist as a member in a political party and the right to represent a political party or political group, e.g., the right to partake in political processes. Social rights, which Marshall devoted most of his attention to in his influential essay, were defined as being able to fully participate in a way of life, a right that was to be ensured by the state to all its citizens. This included the right to education, work, housing and so forth.

Even though Marshall made a seminal contribution to the field of citizenship studies, his work has been subjected to well-founded criticism. Marshall developed his ideas of citizenship within the context of a specific Western Europe nation state where the ideal citizen was a white male. As a result, he neglected other relevant social categories, such as gender and ethnicity (Lister, 2003; Yuval-Davis, 1991). In this thesis, I argue for the importance of examining the social constructions tied to understandings of race and ethnicity when assessing what the ideal citizen entails within the context of Norway. And as we shall see in the analysis chapter, it is also crucial to address gender in order to understand the development and framework of the Introduction Programme.

Policies toward social risk have shifted considerably in the last fifty years. In the 1950s, full employment of citizens was one of the cornerstones of social citizenship, and full

employment was assumed to include an overall good working environment, decent pay and safe and stable working conditions. The *right* to work has gradually shifted to a *duty* to work.

This is, to a larger or smaller degree, evident in activation measures. The role of the state has thus changed from top-down management to governing from a distance (Rose, 1999b). Magnus Dahlstedt (2009a) writes that with this development the meaning of citizenship has been transformed from previously being ‘a well-defined subject, with a certain set of rights, to a citizen that has become an ever-changing subject’ (p. 30, my translation). Because the individual is supposed to be in the driver’s seat in his or her own life, governing from a distance means that individuals should optimize their own potential, especially during turbulent market conditions. Hence, the goal is to become one’s own coach and expert.

This development exemplifies what Rose (2000, p. 335) refers to when stating that citizenship is made contingent on how you behave (conduct). For people who, for various reasons, find themselves outside of the labour market, one of the key issues, seen from the perspective of the state and policymakers, is what they can do to enhance their employability. From this logic we can derive that the idea of the ideal and good citizen who takes responsibility for his and her life is responsible, i.e., he and she is in the driver’s seat.

Active citizenship is as such promoted in recent welfare state policies. And we have also seen that the individualisation of responsibilities is at the core when promoting the civic integration of migrants. We are thus witnessing a clear example of where active citizenship and civic integration merge, where the conditions for creating the ideal citizen is made possible.

2.4.4 Activation and the workline approach in Norway

Norway has, to a large extent, followed the overall social policy development as outlined above; however, a brief overview of Norway’s activation history and its further development is warranted. Already from the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Norwegian government promoted the goal of participation in paid work (the ‘workline’) which turned all able-bodied adults into workers (Hatland & Steinar, 2020; Johansson & Hvinden, 2007). Norway’s development of activation policies can be tracked back historically to immediately before and after the Second World War. However, different understandings of what causes unemployment, which, to a large extent, affects how activation policies are designed in terms of rights and duties, have shifted.

Until the 1930s there was a widespread belief in society that unemployment was caused by a lack of work motivation (Hatland & Steinar, 2020). However, this view shifted during the

Great Depression, and the understanding that emerged was that unemployment was caused by a lack of demand for labour. As a result, increasing employment became a political goal.

Norway, like other Nordic welfare states, has always been characterised as a country with a strong belief in the moral virtue of work, illustrated by the idea of a strong work motivation in society. The belief in people's strong work motivation has been the cornerstone underlying welfare and employment policies (Hatland & Steinar, 2020). As we have seen earlier, the idea that citizens should contribute according to their abilities and receive welfare state support when needed was strong. It was not until in the 1980s that we began to see a shift to the perception that unemployment was due to an individual's (un)willingness and inability to work. Nevertheless, the overall trend in the 1970s and 1980s was that there were no substantial duties attached to the right to receive social security or economic social assistance benefits.

However, by the late 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, work requirements as a condition for social benefit entitlements were re-established and reinforced with an emphasis on citizens' duties to re-enter paid work, and less attention was placed on their rights.

The intensified focus on duties and activation in Norway was also influenced by developments from other OECD- countries at that time, see earlier discussion above. The change and the explicit introduction of the workline approach in Norway, at the beginning of the 1990s, represented the beginning of a major reconstruction of welfare and employment policies (Hatland & Steinar, 2020).

Throughout the 2000s, the workline approach continued to play a vital role in welfare policies (Hatland & Steinar, 2020, p. 302). The workline approach was also made more explicit for migrants (Hatland, 2020a), for example, through the implementation of the Norwegian Introduction Programme. One of the most comprehensive governance welfare reforms in modern times in Norway has been the merging of state agencies of employment and social insurance services with social assistance provisions and activation measures led by local authorities (Gubrium et al., 2014; Hatland & Steinar, 2020).

The merging of the three service providers into one entity which established the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV) was gradually implemented beginning in 2006. One of NAV's main goal was and still is to have 'more people active and at work, fewer people on benefits' (NAV, 2019), a goal that clearly reinforces the activation and also the workline approach. Further emphasising the key role of activation, the Constitution of Norway was amended in 2014, which made clear that work should be the priority for all who are able-bodied (Stjernø & Hatland, 2020).

With the development of increased and intensified activation welfare reforms, Norway has also experienced the shift from reduced rights to increased duties for people on public welfare income support. The shift from social protection to a more controlling, and at times also a more punitive role of the state, which Loïc Wacquant (2011) refers to, is thus also present in the Norwegian welfare state, here examined through the Introduction Programme (see **studies I and II**) as well in the programmes in Denmark and Sweden (see **studies III and IV**), however to different degrees. As we shall see, the controlling and disciplinary dimension of social protection is further reinforced by the merging of immigrant integration policies measures.

3. Earlier studies

Since their implementation, introduction programmes have been studied extensively in order to understand how they operate. Research on the programmes is diverse, representing a wide range of methodological approaches and theoretical perspectives.⁸ It is challenging to provide a complete overview in this thesis, and this is also not the aim. In this chapter, I provide an overview of earlier studies that I assess as relevant to the thesis at hand.

The first part presents research pertaining specifically to the introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark. I've chosen to include studies from a Swedish and Danish context because, despite important differences, the introduction programmes in these countries are similar to those in Norway. In addition, in **studies II and IV**, I compare the introduction programmes in Sweden and Denmark. In the second part of this chapter, I present a broader approach, where I include studies that move beyond the introduction programmes to focus on studies from other arenas of immigrant integration. However, in keeping with the theoretical framework in this introduction, I apply a narrower analytical focus, limited to studies from a governmentality perspective and broader Foucauldian approaches.

3.1 Studies of the introduction programmes from Norway, Sweden and Denmark

Several qualitative studies have examined how case workers experience their work in the introduction programmes. In Sweden, Erik Eriksson and Kerstin Johansson (2021) apply a qualitative approach (through in-depth interviews) when they examine employment officers' perceptions of their working conditions, coping strategies and patterns of practice in the context of the Introduction Programme. By employing Lipsky's theory of street-level bureaucracy and his discussion of coping strategies, Erikson and Johansson describe the challenging working conditions faced by the employment officers, who act as the street level bureaucrats in the introduction programmes. There is a marked tension between migrants' needs and organisational requirements, which creates a dilemma.

Two main coping strategies were adopted by the case workers to deal with the dilemma. While case workers within a client-centred pattern used discretion to address migrants' needs,

⁸ There are several studies that have measured the results and possible effects of participating in the programmes in terms of transition into the labour market and into the ordinary education system (see, for instance Hernes et. al. 2020; Qi et. al. 2021). Since the focus in this thesis is not on labour market and education outcomes, such studies are not accounted for here.

authority-centred case workers demonstrated a more rule-orientated and formal approach in their work with the participants. Anne Britt Djuve and Hanne Kavli (2015) reached a similar conclusion in Norway, where they broadly categorized case workers in the introduction programmes as either care or rule-oriented in how they worked with the participants.

Moreover, Eriksson and Johansson (2021), found that the Introduction Programme, as perceived by the employment officers, has lacked the necessary infrastructure to address the actual needs of the participants. Policy measures, supports and goals have been strictly focused on the transition to the labour market integration without providing enough support to address other social needs of the migrants, creating a mismatch. This mismatch implies that the Introduction Programme does not have the adequate support system to fully promote labour market integration. I find this to be an interesting conclusion, and in this introduction, I argue that policies aimed at migrants' integration, such as for example the Introduction Programme, must address individual, organisational and structural levels in order to fully facilitate labour market integration.

Also, from a Swedish context, Elin Ennerberg (2017, 2020) argues that the Introduction Programme's policy goal of labour market integration does not necessarily correspond with the needs of the participants. Ennerberg has examined how the two main policy goals of workfare and social investment inherent in the programme may contradict each other. Through in-depth interviews she specifically has looked at how these policy goals are perceived in practice by the employment officers and establishment guides (private actors). The findings show that the social needs of the participants get prioritised over what is perceived to be the policy goal of the work first principle.

Ennerberg (2020) argues that the disciplinary and controlling aspect of the Introduction Programme are, to a certain extent, contained by the requirement that the programme be individually tailored to each participant because the social needs of the participants have to be taken into account. Because the programmes are supposed to be individualised the employment offices have to take the social needs of the participants into account. But taking those social needs into account may contradict the states aim of only having measures and interventions in the programme that will lead to employment and hence undermining the work-first principle of the policy reform. The findings are based on the experiences of the employment officers and the establishment guides, which is important to address. Equally important is the need to examine the experiences of the participants undergoing the programme.

Also, in Sweden, Eva Wikström and Petra Ahnlund (2018) have analysed how the participants themselves experience their integration process in light of how activation is practiced within the Introduction Programme. Based on an analysis of individual action plans and interviews with participants, the study concludes that activation is the main characteristic of the Introduction Programme. Moreover, activation with conditionality features is used in the programme for accentuating labour market participation as the goal for integration. And for those who are not able to find work, the programme keeps them activated. The responsibility to integrate is thus placed on the migrants themselves, a natural consequence being that they must further develop their employability.

Djuve and Kavli (2018) have also examined how the Norwegian Introduction Programme has developed since it was first introduced and point out that the majority of policy changes have been centred towards the programme's disciplining components. However, introducing disciplining elements does not necessarily find support in research in terms of the effectiveness of activation policies. Instead, research highlights shortcomings in measures that emphasise social investment. In light of this development, Djuve and Kavli interestingly discuss 'why good ideas fail and bad ideas prevail' (p.1). The main explanation put forward is that policy changes are not based on what works, but on how politicians perceive the problem to be solved. In the case of the Introduction Programme, politicians justify the need to introduce disciplining elements based on their perception that the target groups lack motivation. All four studies in this thesis have, to various degrees, discussed how the perception of the problem - that migrants lack motivation- is partly used to justify how the programme was designed and shaped.

In Denmark the Introduction Programme seems to focus on increasing the employability of participants in the programme, and thus neglects other needs participants might have. Through qualitative interviews and policy analysis of immigration and integration policies, Kathrine Vitus and Fredrikke Jarlby (2021) have studied how local integration policy workers experience the effects of immigrant integration work targeted at young participants in the mandatory Introduction Programme. The policies are focused on increasing a refugee's employability in the pursuit of becoming economically self-reliant. However, Vitus and Jarlby argue that the policies do not consider the needs of the participants as the problematisations in the policies overlook crucial dimensions of social and cultural integration, such as social needs. Participants needs are thus not met, making individual tailoring of the programmes challenging.

There are several other studies that underline the challenges in providing tailor-made programmes to participants in the programmes. Martin Qvist (2012, 2017) has looked at the governance of local introduction programmes in Sweden with the aim of examining the influence and importance of local level governance strategies designed to increase coordination and implement interventions that prepare the target group for labour market inclusion.

The theoretical framework rests on a ‘state-centric definition of governance’. In the conclusion Qvist (2012) writes that the objective of flexible and de-standardized programmes was not met through professional network collaboration.⁹ On the contrary, collaboration led instead to processes of more homogenization (or isomorphism).

Qvist (2012) also argues that tailor-made programmes as a political construct need to receive more critical attention. On a national policy level, the Introduction Programme emphasise the individual tailoring of the programme, which is reflected through the design and structure. Case workers in the programmes develop individual plans, which are supposed to be flexible and de-standardized according to the needs of each individual participant. Although the policy goal is to individualise the programmes, on the implementation level it is difficult to live up to the policy objectives (see also Abdulla, 2017; Larsson, 2015). There are several Norwegian studies (Djuve & Kavli, 2006; Djuve & Kavli, 2015; Djuve & Kavli, 2018; Djuve et al., 2017) that also demonstrate that it is a challenge, to various degrees, to offer tailor-made introduction programmes on a local level of service provision.

In **study IV**, I make the point that even though user involvement and individual tailoring are emphasised on the design level of the programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, participants’ access to individually tailored programmes might still be restricted, which several of these studies on implementation level show. Even though there is a clear policy goal that the programmes should be tailor made for each participant, this policy goal is clearly difficult to implement fully.

In a Norwegian ethnographic study, Johanne Hansen Kobberstad (2019, 2020) also addresses the challenge of offering tailor-made programmes and takes it one step further. Kobberstad argues that the Norwegian Introduction Programme represents an activation arena where a normalising standardisation takes place. In other words, the participants are treated the same with the same needs and qualifications regardless of their different backgrounds,

⁹ Professional network collaboration refers to ‘[...] a partnership between actors from the public, private and voluntary sector’ that are supposed to provide a coordinated service structure in terms of introduction programmes (Qvist, 2012, p. 217).

goals and resources, creating a homogenisation of the participants. The participants do not have the right to define what they perceive to be a suitable path for activation according to their own needs and goals. Instead, it is the case workers and teachers, not the participants, who define the premises for what they perceive to be realistic qualification processes. In this process, the participants own goals of their qualification are perceived by the case workers as unrealistic because the case workers assume that the participants lack knowledge of the Norwegian context. Moreover, Kobberstad argues that the informal and formal competence hierarchy in Norway, which excludes the participants from ‘Norwegianess’, is due to their perceived lack of ‘Norwegian’ competence. In sum, the Introduction Programme in Norway turns refugees into a category through an othering process, constructing them as different compared to the majority population. Similar arguments of othering are formulated in **studies II, III and IV**.

There is a growing body of research on civic orientation courses, an important component in the introduction programmes. The civic orientation programme in Sweden was mainly developed to provide information about the Swedish society, as such it is supposed to have a knowledge base pertaining to what is framed to be Swedish values and a component that involves instruction work (Åberg, 2020). Instruction work refers to the work carried out by experts and managers when standardised instructions are established and the work when the instructions are subsequently employed in local practice. Linnéa Åberg (2020) studies the civic orientation programme in Sweden as a way to examine instruction work in a welfare context, where it is hard to obtain definitive knowledge. One of the first steps according to the instruction model is to undertake an analysis of what kind of measures/information the target group needs. However, the participants’ needs have not been investigated prior to designing the actual content of the programme. Rather, the provided information reflects the need to develop information that seems politically value neutral.

This has posed a challenge for the integration workers implementing the programme on the local level as the standardised information in the programme has not always been relevant for the target group. As a consequence, they have needed to adjust the information to the participants actual needs. Another challenge that Åberg (2020) highlights is that the integration workers are supposed to develop simple and clear explanations concerning Swedish values; however, this is a topic that requires in-depth knowledge, complexity and an ability to highlight contrasting perspectives in order to be as correct as possible.

In **studies II and III**, I discuss how the content of the civic (orientation) courses has been developed with the aim of teaching the participants about the majority societies, including

what is perceived to be the dominant norms and values of the societies. Åbergs study is useful as it provides in-depth knowledge of the processes involved when developing and implementing the civic course in Sweden, insights that might also be relevant for both Norway and Denmark.

Drawing on a different theoretical perspective and methodological approach, but within the same thematic field of the Swedish civic orientation programme, Kim Silow Kallenberg and Erika Sigvardsdotter (2019) draw a similar conclusion to Åberg (2020). They have analysed the narratives of Sweden, Swedishness and the idea of the Other that emerges in the learning materials in the courses. They analyse what is explicitly written and what is omitted in the materials. Silow Kallenberg and Sigvardsdotter demonstrate that the produced knowledge in the learning materials is both informative and normative, informative in the sense that the materials describe what is perceived to be ordinary conditions and behaviour in Sweden. Consequently, the learning materials clearly indicate what is perceived to be the norms and thus define what is desirable for migrants to strive for. While emphasis is placed on situations where migrants might discriminate or cause harm to others, situations where migrants themselves might experience exclusionary practises are neglected.

Silow Kallenberg and Sigvardsdotter argue that this reflects how it is the needs and perspectives of the majority population that are addressed through the civic programme, and not the needs of the migrants. There are no explicit demands of how the migrants should act; however, by explicitly formulating Swedish ‘norms and values’, there is an expectation of how migrants should behave and how to discipline oneself in order to adhere to and follow the defined norms. Migrants are supposed to orient themselves towards Swedish society, which can be viewed as a step towards achieving Swedishness. In **study III**, we discuss how the elements of content of the civic course is steered towards what it perceived to be Norwegian values and norms.

For participants in the Swedish Introduction Programme, to orient oneself towards what is defined to be Swedish norms and values is part of what Afrah Abdulla (2017) refers to as being ‘a good’ citizen. By analysing policy documents pertaining to the programme and through observation of civic orientation courses, Abdulla (2017) argues that the introduction programmes goals and measures are, to a large extent, about transforming the participants into what is perceived to be ‘good’ citizens. A ‘good’ citizen is operationalised into three main areas: employment and economic self-sufficiency, proficiency in the Swedish language and a demonstration of democratic values. In addition, being a ‘good’ citizen is also about being independent, law abiding, honest, secular and supporting gender equality. The civic

orientation courses also teach participants about ideal child rearing practices in Sweden. Through participation in the Introduction Programme and its measures, migrants are supposed to learn how to become the ‘good’ citizen as prescribed by the authorities. Transforming, shaping and governing migrants towards an idealised end state as citizens are highlighted in several of the studies that begin with a governmentality and/or a broader Foucauldian perspective, which we now direct our attention to.

3.2 Studies from governmentality perspectives and broader Foucauldian approaches

There is a growing research literature within the field of governmentality studies that examines immigrant integration and activation policies and measures targeted at migrants. Even though the field is growing, it is primarily within migration studies that we find the majority of studies that are written from a Foucauldian governmentality perspective (Rajas, 2012). In this section, I present studies from governmentality perspectives and also studies within broader Foucauldian approaches. The section starts with a presentation of relevant studies within a Nordic context, which is then followed by a wider international orientation.

3.2.1 Nordic context

In the following, emphasis is placed on lifting studies that place emphasis on measures that aims specifically to incorporate migrants into the labour market and society in general, as these goals are compatible with those of the Introduction Programme.

Viktor Vesterberg (2016a) has conducted several studies which have an explicit governmentality perspective in analysing labour market projects that seek to increase the employability of specific target groups with migrant backgrounds. From a Swedish context Vesterberg (2015) has investigated how unemployed migrants are socially constructed as learning subjects in labour market projects co-funded by the European Social Fund. One of the main findings shows that there is a discourse of individualisation, which constructs migrants as responsible for their unemployment. More specifically, Roma and Somali people are two groups that stand out in the project descriptions as particularly problematic and are constructed through ethnicity. For example, Roma and Somali people are perceived as being less socially competent and having a poor understanding of gender equality. The rhetoric of the individualisation of unemployment among migrants is similar to the findings in **studies II, III and IV**.

The focus on the individualisation and responsibilisation of migrants’ unemployment is also found in other relevant studies. Jennie Larsson (2015) has analysed the Swedish the

Establishment Reform, which includes the Introduction Programme. The Establishment Reform in 2010 moved the responsibility for refugee reception from municipalities to the national Swedish Employment Service in order to increase labour market participation of new migrants. Larsson references Nikolas Rose and argues that the Swedish Establishment Reform can be viewed as being part of a neoliberal development where individualisation and responsibilisation of individuals and their freedom of choice are emphasised. Because the responsibility for successful integration into the labour market is thus solely placed on the individual migrant, structural barriers that affect exclusion or inclusion in the labour market are not addressed.

In **studies II and IV**, I draw a similar conclusion, arguing that structural barriers in the labour market are not addressed when justifying the need for introduction programmes. Moreover, Larsson (2015) argues that participants who were able to live up to the expectations and requirements of the programmes¹⁰ were those who were considered to be successful by the private actors and employment service officials. In other words, the Establishment Reform was designed for those few who were able to govern themselves.

Larsson (2015, p. 300) argues that the advanced liberalism which Rose refers to can be understood as the ideological foundation on which the Establishment Reform was based. The discussion that Larsson raises in regard to the self-governance of the participants is highly relevant for this thesis as I consider the Introduction Programme as a specific technique of power.

In another but related study, Vesterberg (2013) examines the intersection of ethnicity and employability through a governmentality analysis. The study analyses how ethnicized un/employability of Others has been problematised through a specific Swedish European Social Fund co-founded project targeted at unemployed Somalis. Through a discourse of otherness, the unemployed Somalis in the projects are portrayed as ‘different’ regarding ethnicity. In order to increase ‘their’ employability or direct their behaviour towards ‘advanced liberal subjects’, different techniques were implemented such as guidance, individual action plans, job interview training and CV writing. Several of these techniques are also taught through the Introduction Programmes, which are analysed more in depth in chapter 7.

Moreover, in **studies II and III**, constructions of ethnicity are analysed in connection to the target group of the programmes. In line with Vesterberg, one of the conclusions in these

¹⁰ Those who were able to actively choose a private actor, made independent choices, worked on their employability by participating in activities and education.

two studies is that there is a process of ethnification present in the analysed policy documents, which portray the target group in the introduction programmes as ‘others’ who are in the need of transformation.

In a similar study Vesterberg (2016b) analyses how Roma in Sweden are discursively problematised and positioned as subjects by the learning materials used in European Social Fund co-founded labour market projects. A central finding shows that unemployed Roma are viewed as a problem through mainly four misery discourses; socioeconomic, educational, gendered and embodied and medicalized miseries. These discursive miseries are all part of how unemployed Roma are constructed into specific subjects that require necessary instruction in becoming both employable and educable.

Departing from his earlier studies (2013, 2015) on labour market projects aimed at unemployed migrants, Vesterberg (2017) introduces the term ‘exclusionary inclusion’. The concept of exclusionary inclusion refers to the following paradox: Although the projects aim to achieve social inclusion of unemployed migrants, they are at the same time constructing and identifying the target subjects as ‘Others’ through an exclusionary discourse.

Vesterberg demonstrates that unemployed migrants in the projects first need to be constructed as being deviant and excluded, so that they can subsequently be included and hence normalised. It follows that it is a normality that requires that you first deviate from the norm. In other words, targeted subjects are governed through games of truth between project leaders and the participants. Within such games of truth, it is possible for the participants to reject the truths from project employees by opposing and performing counter-conduct, and hence refusing to live up to the constructions of employability and to be included on the premises determined by project leaders. Vesterberg makes a valuable contribution as he demonstrates one of Foucault’s important points, which is that power is always relational, and as such power resistance through counter-conduct is possible.

Employing Foucault’s notion of power combined with a hermeneutic phenomenological perspective Ali Osman (2006) has investigated Swedish measures targeted at people with migrant backgrounds that aim to facilitate their integration into society at large and into the labour market specifically. Osman shows that integrating practices function as an arena for normalisation and disciplining of the unemployed target group (Osman, 2006). Integrating practices seek to govern and shape the subjectivity of migrants and is a strategy to normalise and free them from what is perceived to be a less civilized culture. The aim is thus to normalise, discipline and alter their behaviour so that they can successfully enter the labour market, however not necessarily according to their level of competence.

In a more recent study, Magnus Dahlstedt and Viktor Vesterberg (2017) reach a similar conclusion while mainly employing a Foucauldian approach. They analyse the process of acquiring citizenship in Sweden for unemployed and racialised migrants in the labour market. More specifically, they have analysed under what conditions and how unemployed people with migrant backgrounds are included in society at large, through interventions that seek to enhance their employability. The authors argue that in order to take part in the social community, migrants must acquire values and norms that are perceived to be Swedish, an approach that creates a ‘racialised citizenship,’ a form of citizenship that makes it possible to both include and exclude certain subjects, under certain circumstances. On the one hand, you have the formal dimensions of citizenship that must be met; on the other hand, you have the informal dimensions of citizenship that require access to social rights.

Success in the labour market is conditioned by the degree of one’s commitment to certain values which are illustrative of being the ideal Swedish citizen, that is being free, employed, independent and demonstrating the ability to make choices. Again, we see that the responsibility to integrate is placed on the individual migrant who must adhere to specific norms in order to be deemed an integration success. **Studies II, III and IV** include examinations and discussions of constructing migrants as deviating from dominating norms.

While employing a governmentality perspective when analysing the expectations of immigration administration and public authorities of migrant associations in Finland Mikka, Pyykkönen (2007, p. 217) shows that there is a clear presence of a governmental and a political dimension of integration in migrant associations. More specifically, there is a certain productive power in place in order to shape and direct the behaviours of migrants in realizing the larger integration project into the Finnish society.

In many Western European countries, successful integration of migrant women is conditioned by their ability to live up to gender equality norms (Farris, 2017; Perchinig et al., 2012; Vuori, 2009), this is also the case in Norway (Gressgård, 2005; Gressgård & Jacobsen, 2002; Midtbøen & Teigen, 2013; Rugkåsa, 2012). From a governmentality framework, Jarmila Rajas (2012) investigates the dimension of gender in Finnish integration policies, with special attention directed at how migrant women are problematised in light of an idealised employed Finnish women. Within the context of state feminism governmentality, migrant cultures are viewed as oppressive and patriarchal. These cultures are viewed as undermining gender equality and as direct consequence, hindering migrant women’s participation in the labour market. There is a wish to emancipate and empower migrant women through various integration policy tools as means to reach the ideal of the working migrant women. **Studies I,**

II and **III** address and discuss understandings of how the successful integration of migrant women is tied to the idea of gender equality.

Expanding on the notion of empowerment of migrant women, Tabitha Wright Nielsen (2009) has examined how empowerment is constructed within an integration project in Sweden aimed at women with migrant and refugee background. The analysis is guided by Foucault's conceptualisations of power as well with particular attention to Foucault's understanding of subjectification, disciplining and self-disciplining. Wright Nielsen writes that empowerment is to be understood as a form of power that sets out to create specific subjects that are in accordance with the aim of the construction of empowerment. Consequently, it does not set out to liberate as the method proclaims. More specifically, Wright Nielsen shows that the will to liberate is conditioned by the liberation from the women's cultural background. By extension, the women are thus constructed and positioned as not adhering to the prescribed Swedish norms. Hence, within the discourse of empowerment women or groups are created in such a way that exclude other important factors that might explain their vulnerable position.

Investigating a labour market project targeted at migrant women against the backdrop of a white governmentality perspective, Anna Lundstedt's (2005) shows that there is a clear dividing line between the subject positions migrant women are ascribed compared to how the subjectivity of White womanhood is constructed. Stereotypical beliefs and conceptions of the 'Other' materialised in the demarcation of the target group, and in the design of the activities and methods of the project.

In a study focused on labour market-oriented integration training carried out by Ameera Masoud et. al. (2019) in Finland from a governmentality and discursive practice perspective, the authors demonstrate how integration practices work through governing. They argue that integration policies need to construct migrants in a certain way, as problematic and in danger of being excluded, hence creating the space for introducing integration measures that will reduce the risk of social exclusion. While integration training interventions create an arena for inclusion, it is still the individual migrant who is ultimately responsible for finding a job and thus freeing himself/herself from being dependent on welfare services and integration measures. Following this line of argumentation, migrants find themselves trapped in an 'exclusionary inclusion process' (Masoud et al., 2019), showing similarities to Vesterberg's (2017) concept of exclusionary inclusion. Depicting migrants and refugees in a problematic way thus creates the space for integration measures. This issue is analysed and discussed in **studies II and III**.

Another study by Ameera Masoud et. al. (2020) examines integration policies, practices and the discourse of employability. The authors are particularly interested in the construction of ‘employable refugee subjectivity’. The empirical material, which include participant observation, interviews with refugees undergoing the programmes and practitioners is based on ethnographic data from vocational integration programmes for migrants in Finland. The empirical material also includes official policy documents pertaining to integration practices and employability. In their analysis, inspired by Foucault’s discursive approach, the authors argue that the construction of employable refugee subjectivity is based on a reverse process of skilling. Refugees’ subjectivity is constantly being remade in the pursuit of becoming ‘employable,’ which involves a process of ‘de-skilling, re-skilling and skilling’. First there is a need for de-skilling, where refugees are portrayed as not yet skilled because they are unemployed. Portraying refugees as unskilled opens up various forms of integration training and practices: the re-skilling and skilling are allowed to take place, and migrants must learn to manage their own integration process.

The review of the abovementioned literature reveals a clear trend where the emphasis is placed on the migrant’s responsibility to successfully integrate, mainly through labour market participation. The problem construction of unemployment among migrants is individualised, constructing them as responsible for their unemployment. Connected to the responsibilisation of their unemployment, they are further constructed as racialised others and in need of governing and transformation. Constructing migrants as being in need of integration creates the space for implementing corrective measures with the aim to integrate. Integration measures and arenas represent sites where normalisation, governing and disciplining of migrants can take place. Migrant women’s perceived lack of gender equality is of particular concern where the formulated goal is to increase their agency, and by extension strengthening their integration process.

3.2.2 Broader international context

Civic integration policies and measures can be understood as a technique of power. Several scholars, who suggest that civic integration measures should be analysed as illustrations of power, have argued for the usefulness of applying Foucault’s ideas to the area of migration and citizenship, more specifically in the field of civic integration policies and measures (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009; van Houdt et al., 2011). Studies that have critically analysed citizenship tests and requirements from a governmentality perspective provide important

knowledge on how power operates and describe the processes prospective citizens are subjected to in terms of being governed, disciplined and shaped into becoming ideal citizens.

Oded Löwenheim and Orit Gazit (2009) illustrate how citizenship tests are a practice embedded in disciplinary power. The tests are constructed in a way to make people conform to certain behaviours and pressure them to subscribe to specific norms and values. Failure to conform to such requirements, e.g., not passing the citizenship test, results in denial of citizenship or, in some cases even, deportation. The threat of punishment is thus very much in place. In constructing the tests in such a way that disciplines, punishes but also rewards (by granting citizenship), the state seeks to construct citizen-subjects of migrant examinees that are self-governed according to the social norms that the state has specified as ideal. As such, Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) argue that citizenship tests can then be viewed as ‘a technology of disciplinary power and a means to produce individuals who govern themselves’ (p.158).

Citizenship is a reward that migrants must prove themselves to be worthy of.

The power relations between the migrant and the state within such a context are constructed as asymmetrical, in the sense that migrants have to prove that they have earned the right to citizenship. Framed in such a way, the state is working on the subjectivity of the migrant examinee.

Strongly connected, is the process of responsibilisation of the migrant examinee through citizenship tests (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009). Responsibilisation is a characteristic of neoliberal governmentality, which shifts the state responsibility in regard to certain areas of political, social and economic life to private communities, the market and not least, individuals. The state makes it explicit, through the citizenship tests, that they have given the necessary tools (civic, cultural and linguistic knowledge) to the migrants for them to integrate, and hence participate in society. The citizenship test is in this regard an official examination of immigrants’ ability to attain the required knowledge. As such, migrants who fail the test are to blame, and not the state. As Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) points out, placing the blame on the unwillingness and apathy of migrants distracts attention from larger societal and structural mechanisms that contribute to keeping migrants in poverty and social exclusion.

Friso Van Houdt et. al. (2011) who have analysed citizenship criteria in the Netherlands, the UK and France, draw a similar conclusion. They argue that citizenship is a significant technique in the management of the population according to formulated national political programmes (van Houdt et al., 2011, p. 423). Migrants must show that they are worthy of their citizenship, illustrated by a neoliberal rhetoric of responsibilisation. The authors point to three processes to exemplify their point: (1) new social contracts between migrants and the

state, (2) ‘sacralisation of the nation’ (norms and values) (3) the idea that migrants must earn their citizenship. These three examples are part of a new government strategy the authors refer to as ‘neoliberal communitarianism.’ It is a way to govern through individual responsibility as well as through a sense of community.

Marc De Leeuw and Sonja van Wichelen (2012) have also analysed Dutch citizenship and conclude, in accordance with both Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) and van Houdt et. al. (2011), that the exam (citizenship test) is a technique of governmentality applied on new citizenship candidates. This particular technique ‘normalizes secular liberalism’ and makes migrants who are categorized as the ‘Other’ conform to the social values and norms of the nation state, especially those pertaining to culture and religion (de Leeuw & van Wichelen, 2012, p. 195).

Citizenship tests and requirements for permanent residency are thus the final policy tools that serve as the ultimate demonstration of whether prospective migrants are evaluated as worthy or not of being formal citizens or long-term members of society. However, other policy tools and measures used by both national and local authorities to shape and direct the behaviour of migrants precede these citizenship tests. It is important to examine how citizenship tests and requirements operate, but also how policy tools and measures, such as introduction programmes, functions before citizenship test becomes actualised.

4. Theoretical framework

Governmentality, supplemented with the perspectives of neoliberalism and ethnification creates the theoretical framework of the thesis. In line with Rose et. al. (2006), I perceive governmentality not as a concept or a single theory, but more as a critical analytical perspective (see also Rose, 1999b, p. 21) and as ‘a style of thought’ (Lemke, 2013, p. 51). Governmentality is a perspective that opens up for understanding how power operates within the framework of the Norwegian Introduction Programme. The analytical tools developed within governmentality studies are characterised by flexibility and an open-ended approach, which is useful for analysing the programme. A governmentality perspective works well with several other methods. Above all, the creativity embedded in the approach is particularly appealing (Rose et al., 2006). Indeed, the fact that the governmentality perspective is not hard-wired to any particular political perspective allows the researcher to focus ‘on how things happen’ – to be critical but not to critique. To have a fuller understanding of governmentality, it is important to address other conceptualisations developed by Foucault. I start by accounting for the Foucauldian perspectives and then move on to present the perspective of neoliberalism, which is highly connected to governmentality. This chapter ends with a presentation of the concept of ethnification, which, I argue, is needed in this thesis to supplement and contextualise the analytical tools of governmentality and neoliberalism.

4.1 Foucauldian perspectives

Foucault’s perspective of governmentality was developed in the last stage of his work and is not as developed (Foucault, 2007, pp. 135-36; Rose, 1999b, p. 3) as several of his other concepts, methodological approaches and theoretical ideas (Nilsson, 2008, p. 120). However, the development of governmentality is highly related to and based on his earlier work. In the following presentation of Foucauldian perspectives, I therefore introduce them in roughly chronological order in an attempt to show how his earlier work influenced his understanding of governmentality. I start with what has been referred to as Foucault’s ‘genealogical period’ at the beginning of the 1970’s, when he mainly focussed on his ideas of power and knowledge, including his ideas of truth regimes and subjectification (Nilsson, 2008). I then continue to elaborate on his different ideas of distinctive systems of power starting with sovereign power, then followed by discipline power and its underlying conceptualisations. This section ends with what has been referred to as Foucault’s ‘governmentality and ethics period’.

4.1.1 Power

In many cases we understand power as an entity that some people possess and others do not, be it an individual, group, institution or other entity. Foucault rejected this idea of power as a possession (Foucault, 2007) and proposed a more complex and dynamic understanding of power. This reasoning breaks with our traditional understanding of how citizens are governed in a society, that is top down from the state to the individual citizens.

One of the premises in Foucault's ideas of power is that we must leave our conventional notions of 'state' power behind. Instead of asking who holds power and where it originates, we should rather focus on asking 'a how-question of power' (Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013; Rose et al., 2006). Starting an analysis with a how question of power allows us to examine how power is exercised, under what conditions, to what effects and means, e.g., the process under which power is exercised (Foucault, 1982, pp. 785-6). Following this reasoning, power does not operate from one 'power centre', rather, power is everywhere, it is relational, and it circulates. As such, we should understand the dynamics of power, not as static but constantly developing and changing in character. We should rather treat power as a verb, an activity and as an ongoing dynamic process.

Because of the changing dynamics of power, it is also difficult to provide a universal definition of it. Power is part of all social relations and influences all our other actions (Nilsson, 2008). Moreover, Foucault makes the important point that power is productive, in the sense that it constructs, but it is also limiting (Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2012, p. 75). Power is productive in the sense that it produces and constructs knowledge about society and its subjects. More specifically, power is productive as it both works on – and encourages individuals into turning themselves into specific subjects (Mik-Meyer & Villadsen, 2013).

This understanding of power may be abstract, making it difficult to fully grasp. Because if power is omnipresent, then everything is about power (see for instance McKee, 2009; Wright Nielsen, 2009). However, in this thesis the appeal of employing Foucault's idea of power as an analytical tool is particularly useful as it opens up for understanding *how* power takes form and it requires that we critically assess how certain things are constructed as given. It is what Foucault refers to as the microphysics of power, the small, subtle exercise of power that does not necessarily take on remarkable forms in correcting behaviour (Nilsson, 2008). This micropower is often to be found in different techniques, for instance in disciplining and training. Examination of the structure and design of the Norwegian Introduction Programme where disciplining and training of new migrants takes place is thus fruitful for analysing how systems of power operate within the programme.

In **study IV**, I critically analysed the way in which recent reconceptualizations of empowerment in social work have marginalised its earlier radical ideals. I was critical of the idea that power is something that can be transferred from professionals who hold power to service users who have less power, which is precisely a conceptualisation of power that Foucault's warns against, in the sense that power is treated as an entity that easily can be transferred to others. By adding Foucault's understanding of power, we get an important analytical dimension. Barbara Cruikshank (1999) inspired by Foucault, views empowerment as a particular system of power that works on the subjectivity of people. In the quest of altering the power relationship, the professionals are constituting the subjectivity of the service users, constructing and directing their behaviours to specific ends. Through their professional expertise, rather than liberating service users, professionals are regulating their behaviour who have little control or influence.

4.1.2 Knowledge, truth regimes and subjectification

Truth and knowledge are highly connected to Foucault's ideas of power. Foucault (1980) claims that 'truth isn't outside of power, or lacking in power [...] each society has its own regime of truths' (p. 131), which are in a constant battle to decide what is considered to be true or false, good or bad etc. It is a process where regimes of truths and rationalities are constantly being defined and redefined (Withworth & Carter, 2014). What is considered valid knowledge is dependent on which truth regimes are at play in a given society and at a specific time.

It is crucial to question how truth regimes come to be and to explore how something is seen as natural, self-evident and thus accepted instead of seeing it as a partial construct of specific power relations present at a given time and place (Withworth & Carter, 2014).

Regimes of truths that gain legitimacy reward those who speak that specific truth (Vesterberg, 2016a).

Subjectification is strongly related to power, knowledge and regime of truths. When individuals are constructed based on what is considered as normative truths, it is part of a subjectification process where the individual is shaped into a specific subject with specific characteristics (Nilsson, 2008; Wright Nielsen, 2009). According to Foucault (1982) we should not regard subjectivity as something that is true and pure in an individual, in other words subjectivity is something that is neither free nor independent of power. Hence, the subject is not something that is given and that you are, rather a subject is constituted and ascribed (Otto, 2003, p. 2; Rose, 1999b, p. 3). Foucault (1982) described this as:

[...] a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to. (p. 781)

It is important to note that the process of subjectification includes all forms in which people, collectively or individually, are subjectified (Otto, 2003, p. 2; Rose, 1999b, p. 3). Consequently, different categories of groups are also constructed, and not only individuals. The specific subject positions with certain characteristics one are ascribed to, in a continuum from normal to deviant, is decisive for what kind of correction activities that the subject is exposed to in order to change according to current societal norms and values (Nilsson, 2008). By creating specific subjects, it is thus also possible to control them through the subjectification process. In this thesis, the concept of subjectification is helpful as it makes visible the process involved in the creation of specific subjects. Specifically, I am examining how target groups of the Introduction Programme are subjectified in policy texts.

4.1.3 Technologies of power

Foucault understands power as a triangle of rule consisting of sovereignty, discipline and government (governmentality), in which different forms of power operate (Bacchi, 2009, p. 28; Dean, 2010, p. 24; Foucault, 1991, p. 102; Rose, 1999b, p. 23). These are referred to as 'technologies of power', representing systems of power.

It is important to differentiate between 'technologies of power' and 'techniques of power'. Whereas the term *technologies of power* refer to systems of power and is more general in nature, the term *techniques of power* are specific and is concerned with concrete interventions and activities directed at given populations, such as techniques of power used with prisoners (Van Houdt, 2014, p. 49), or in the case of this thesis, the technique of the Introduction Programme.

Foucault (2007, pp. 107-08) emphasised that there is a strong link between all three forms of power systems. One should thus not regard one form of power of the triangle as separate, but ideally see how they relate to each other. Thomas Lemke (2013) emphasises that governmentality studies need to incorporate 'a plurality of rationalities and technologies' (p.

41). As such, it is important to examine different systems of power separately and how they also connect.

In the following, I provide an overview of the three technologies of power: sovereignty, discipline and, governmentality.

4.1.4 The technology of sovereignty

The form of power related to the technology of sovereignty is often linked to institutions such as the legal system and the state bureaucracy (Nilsson, 2008, p. 86). As such, the law is one of the most central tools within this system of power, where the use of injunctions and punishment are implemented (Nilsson, 2008, p. 94). The power of sovereignty is based on a model of political hierarchy where power is concentrated in the king and where the mode of rule is highly linked to law and order.

The concept of the technology of sovereignty is an idea of power based on monarchical relations evident in 1600-1700 Europe.¹¹ In Foucault's (1995) book 'Discipline and Punish' he described how public corporal punishment and execution were used as tools to illustrate the harsh consequences for those who opposed the authority of those in power in the sovereign period. For example, the state used torture to control the population and in connection, to show who held power in society.

However, this form of power depended not only on the sovereign to insert fear in the population to prevent them from breaking the law but was also dependent on the obedience of the people themselves because they had to agree with the verdicts made and not oppose them. In other words, the people had to submit to this method of control to ensure that the methods worked effectively. Foucault (1995, p. 61) shows how this system of control, based on corporal punishment and executions, started to lose its legitimacy from the late eighteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the lower strata of the population in particular, increasingly started to question and oppose the power of the sovereign and its penal system. Thus, the penal system of corporal punishment and execution started to change character, from harsher models of punishment to 'gentler' means of control (Foucault, 1995,

¹¹ It is important to stress that each technology of power and their conceptualisation emerged in a specific time and context. That is, the technology of sovereignty in 1600-1700 Europe, gradually being replaced by the technology of discipline in the end of the 18th century up to 1825 followed by the technology of governmentality. Even though these conceptualizations of power came about in historically different contexts, it would be a mistake to say they replaced each other, rather they are interrelated and connected, never fully replacing each other, thus the triangle of rule.

pp. 81-82).¹² And it is here another form of power emerges, the power of discipline and hence the technology of discipline, which is central to our understanding of some of the main techniques embedded in the Introduction Programme.

4.1.5 The technology of discipline

The power of sovereignty, with its focus on corporal punishment, was gradually replaced by the power of discipline, a change that began at the end of the eighteenth century and continued up to 1825 (Foucault, 1980, pp. 104-105; 1991, p. 37). This power of discipline is perhaps not as direct as the power of sovereignty but aims to be more efficient in its method. Foucault (1995) wrote that the objective of the new form of disciplining was '[...] not to punish less, but to punish better; to punish with an attenuated severity perhaps, but in order to punish with more universality and necessity; to insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body' (p. 82).

Hence, the aim was not to use corporal punishment as a way to make people conform, but to use the power of discipline to make the population govern themselves. After all, self-governing is a more effective way of exercising power. The power dimension embedded in the technology of discipline, however, is less visible in its form and methods, but far more effective, in terms of creating obedient and more compliant subjects, compared to earlier methods.

The main objective within this power system is to correct, cure and in the end create perfect individuals (Foucault, 2007, p. 44). In a disciplinary society, there are three main techniques of control: hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination (Foucault 1995).

4.1.6 Hierarchical observation

Through observation of people, institutions can gain power and control over them. In an ideal observation system, it would be possible for a supervisor to have a complete overview of the whole situation and context. This is, however, difficult to fully achieve because there are a few situations in daily life where supervisors have a complete overview over those who are supervised. Because a full overview is not always possible, one must instead depend on a

¹² It is however important to emphasise that even though Foucault is more attentive to other forms of power, he is still very much concerned with how modern forms of government is still influenced with the problem of sovereignty (Foucault, 2007, p. 107; see also van Houdt, 2014, p. 50).

hierarchical set of observers who are strategically placed at lower to higher levels to pass on observed information.

The metaphor of the Benthamite Panopticon was used by Foucault (1995, p. 200) as an example of a disciplinary technique to illustrate that discipline was a mode of governance (Foucault, 1995, p. 195). The main premise behind the Panopticon was that prisoners could never be certain whether they were being observed by the guards and were thus constantly reminded of the potential of being under surveillance. Foucault's use of the metaphor of the Panopticon was to highlight the significance of observation as a technique of control and policing in modern societies in order to discipline citizens and direct them towards desired behaviours.

4.1.7 Normalizing judgement

Hierarchical observation leads to a normalising judgment. By the term 'normalising judgment,' Foucault (1995) means that people's behaviour is being evaluated and judged according to specific standards or norms of a society. In modern disciplinary systems, those who fail to meet the required norms and standards are supposed to alter their deviant behaviour, in contrast to earlier where the goal was to punish deviants from the norm physically in order to make them change. Consequently, those who do not live up to the norms were thus exposed to a disciplinary process of normalization, where the goal is to make them adhere to the prescribed norms, standards and values of society. The disciplinary process is made possible through the activities in institutions where people are observed, evaluated and judged based on those who are deemed normal, and those who are not.

The evaluating process was made more accessible and possible by the emergence of the modern academic disciplines which study humans, such as medicine, psychology and psychiatrics etc. Knowledge of humans as a category or species is accumulated and it has become an established practice to gather, document and archive a wide range of information. Information on every individual citizen is thus increasingly being collected and documented.

I find the concept of normalization to be central for understanding what processes participants in introduction programmes can be subjected to. Normalisation as a scientific concept and reference is created primarily by contrasting it to what is established as abnormal, such as a deviation, madness, sickness etc. As such, the form of power executed within the technology of discipline is generally found within institutions such as prisons, schools, psychiatric hospitals, military apparatus etc. (Nilsson, 2008, p. 86), all institutions who seek to normalise behaviours.

Placing and contrasting groups in opposition to each other is a process Foucault (1982, p. 28) referred to as ‘dividing practices’ and is closely connected to normalisation. Foucault (1982) provides the examples of ‘the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, the criminals and the ‘good boys’ (p. 778). Within a contemporary activation rhetoric, dividing practices are illustrated by, for instance, contrasting the employed as the ideal with the antipole of the unemployed, the active versus the passive, the self-reliant versus the dependent and so forth. A consequence of such dividing practices may in many cases result in constructing targeted groups as responsible for their own problems (Bacchi, 2009, p. 17). Self-reliance is the ideal for neoliberal citizens, whereas the ‘lazy’ welfare recipient is constructed as the negative opposite (Pratt & Valverde, 2002, p. 139). I find the concept of dividing practices to be relevant and useful when examining how the target group of the Introduction Programme is positioned in policy texts in regard to other groups.

4.1.8 Examination

The examination is the final stage of in the disciplinary system. It tests the knowledge gained through the hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment (Foucault, 1995). This examination is twofold. First, it is important to know what those who are being observed know and to what extent they live up to societal norms. The second aim, if they have failed on both counts, is to take charge and take control of their behaviour and make them follow a prescribed course of action in terms of transformation and reform. Here, one can easily argue that the target group of the Introduction Programme has already been examined in the sense that they meet the formal requirements for participation, and that the programme in itself is necessary in order for them to learn and live up to the societal norms of society. Hence, they are in need of transformation and reform through their participation in the programme.

Study III makes explicit use of the concept of discipline to explore how distinctions are made by welfare authorities when policing welfare recipients (participants in the Introduction and the Qualification programme) may depend on normative understandings of deservingness and ideas of ethnicity and culture.

4.1.9 The technology of governmentality

It was during Foucault’s later lectures that he developed his understanding of governmentality (Dean, 2010; Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013; Nilsson, 2008; Otto, 2003; Rose, 1999b; Van Houdt,

2014).¹³ It is particularly during the lecture courses he held at the *Collège de France* in 1978 and 1979, where he devoted time to introducing and explaining what he referred to as governmentality (Dean, 2010; Lemke, 2001, 2002; Rose, 1999b; Van Houdt, 2014). Foucault started to focus on the idea that the system of power represented by the state is used as a means of control and domination (Nilsson, 2008, p. 121). Foucault perceived the idea of ‘state’ in a broad sense, including institutions, procedures, techniques, calculations and knowledge production that together created a form of governance. Even though it is the activities of the state that generally are under examination within a governmentality perspective, the use of the same techniques can also be found under other institutions.

Foucault (1997) formulated that governmentality was understood in a broad sense as techniques and procedures for directing human behaviour. Government of children, government of souls and consciences, government of a household, of a state, or oneself (Foucault, 1997, p. 81). Phrased differently, governmentality deals with how the population as a whole, as well as the individual citizen, is governed and engages in self-government (Fejes, 2008, p. 654). As Foucault (1982) phrased it, it is about the ‘conduct of conduct’ (p. 789).

Governmentality is a perspective that enables an awareness of uncertainties about those kinds of political problematisations take shape in a society and among individuals, and those that do not. This perspective leads to the following question: ‘What are the new fields of problems that the governmental strategy feels obliged to find solutions for?’ (Otto, 2003, p. 2). Thus, there is a strong connection between problematisation and governmentality (Bacchi, 1999, p. 47), which I will return to later. This understanding has strongly influenced Bacchi (1999, 2009) to develop the methodological approach of ‘What’s the problem represented to be (WTP?) which guided the analysis in **study II**.

Inherent in the idea of governmentality is that we must be cautious not to simplify the concept of government and to reduce its meaning to only referring to the ‘government’ of the state. Government is to be understood and analysed in such a way that it takes into account the complexity of modern systems, which also include the government of others, ourselves, but also the state (Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013, pp. 8-9). It is a way to understand how systems of control operate (Bacchi, 1999, p. 47). Rose (1999a) writes it’s: ‘[...] the strategies that seek to govern us, and the ethics according to which we have come to govern ourselves’ (p. 9).

¹³ It should be noted that Foucault himself did not use the governmentality perspective in any of his academic writings that can be found in his studies or books, but he gave lectures and interviews about governmentality (Dean, 2010; Foucault, 2007; Lemke, 2001; Nilsson, 2008; Otto, 2003; Rose, 1999b). His lectures and a selection of his interviews have since then been published and translated.

As already mentioned, Foucault mainly analysed two different kinds of technologies: technologies of power and domination and technologies of the self (Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2013, p. 75; Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013, p. 10; Foucault, 1988a, p. 18). While technologies of power and domination are exposed (externally) to subjects, technologies of the self are power mechanisms which subjects expose themselves to (internally). Technologies of power and domination are techniques that seek to control, regulate and shape individual conduct and make them subordinate to various goals or different forms of domination (Foucault, 1988a, p. 18). On the other hand, technologies of the self are techniques that individuals employ to control themselves, and, by isolating these aspects of themselves, they allow themselves to be controlled, changed and directed to specific ends.

These two types of technologies, technologies of power and domination and technologies of the self, rarely operate on their own. Rather, it is in the intersection between these technologies that Foucault (1988a, pp. 18-19) referred to as governmentality. Thus, there is always a relationship between political governance and the governance of the self, even though they operate on different levels (Nilsson, 2008, p. 120).

A governmentality perspective directs attention to technologies and techniques that are used in different contexts, (Villadsen, 2002, p. 78), e.g., governance is operationalised through the technologies and techniques needed to reach its goal, what is perceived to be the creation of the ideal citizen (Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013, p. 9). Technologies of the self are highly sophisticated in their operationalization ‘of self-control through discourses of autonomy’ (Bacchi, 1999, p. 47). Here, it is important to examine how Foucault tied ethics to politics to illustrate how we govern ourselves. I will now move on to focus on how this is only made possible by our perception of people as free and autonomous individuals.

4.1.10 Technologies of the self

Governmentality differs from sovereignty power, where an individual’s ability to act is constrained, and disciplinary power, where people are objectified by surveillance techniques, which limit the ability to act. In contrast, governmentality acknowledges subjects and their freedom to act (Otto, 2003, p. 3).

Foucault (1982, p. 782) emphasised that the modern state’s power is both totalizing and individualising at the same time. It is totalizing in its power in the sense that the state is concerned with the population as a whole. Foucault (1982) refers to this combination of power as ‘a tricky combination in the same political structures of individualisation techniques

and of totalization procedures' (p. 782). Illustrations of the state's totalizing power include the state's implementation of health programs, the introduction of mandatory school systems, and taxes, and the categorizing of the population such as unemployed, sick, retired etc. (Villadsen, 2007, p. 158). In contrast, the state's individualising power is exemplified through its concern with the individual's self-perception and personality. According to Foucault, the individualising power of the modern state was made possible because of an old power technique which used pastoral (spiritual) power, and which was first developed within Christian/Jewish institutions (Foucault, 2007, p. 127).

Pastoral power was historically practiced by priests and pastors, with the aim of ensuring people their salvation in their afterlives. Salvation was made possible if people exposed 'their inner secrets', e.g., their souls, especially those secrets that were characterised as sinful and amoral. Their inner secrets are expressed mainly through a confession (Foucault, 1988b, pp. 61-62). It is important to note the sophistication of this form of power, which is grounded on both salvation and individualisation – 'it produces the truth about the individual' (Fejes, 2008, p. 654). Pastoral power is exercised so that each individual speaks truthfully of who they are. As such, the individual is held responsible for what they have said. Lastly, and most importantly, this form of power aims to force individuals to work on their own salvation (Nilsson, 2008, p. 136), based on the insights that the confession has brought about of their true selves (Foucault, 2007, p. 128).

In modern society, it is those in the professions who are most closely linked to the welfare state and its practices such as psychologists, doctors, nurses, social workers, advisors, therapists etc. and they are the ones who exercise pastoral power. Governing in advanced liberal societies is dependent on what Rose (1999a, p. 149) defines as experts of various forms, who rely on their authority and the expertise that was acquired through their training and claims to truth. They exercise power in the sense that they seek to govern citizens towards specific ends of what is framed to be in the individual's self-interest (Nilsson, 2008, p. 137), even though the target group themselves may have other interests. This governance is based on the idea that individuals must express who they truly are. These actions are thus a first step for them to internalise the goals of the professionals as their own and hence an effective way to govern citizens (Rose, 1999a, p. 149). As shown in **study IV**, the professionals working directly with the participants in the Introduction Programme, are, interestingly enough, defined as programme advisors, a point I will return to later in chapter 7.

4.2 Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is a contested concept that means different things depending on your perspective (Ong, 2006, p. 1). In general terms, however, neoliberalism is described as an economic ideology in regards to how the market and the state relate to each other (Harvey, 2005). More specifically, David Harvey (2005) refers to neoliberalism as:

[...] a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. (p.2)

Iver Hornemann Møller (2013) writes that the neoliberalism ideology seeks subordination to the ‘free market,’ where the private sector is emphasised at the expense of the public sector. Neoliberalism promotes downsizing of the state and its proponents’ belief is that the private sector can produce a healthier economy and a more efficient government.

It was perceived to be the shortcomings of Keynesian economy theory coupled with the economic recession in the 1970s that neoliberal ideas started to get a stronger political hold (Møller, 2013). There was a marked shift away from Keynesian to monetarism (see also Dean, 2010; Hall, 1993), and it is possible to refer to a global neoliberal turn in the 1970s (Oksala, 2013b). In the Keynesian model, social expenditure played a key role in stimulating economic growth (Kamali & Jönsson, 2018). Neoliberal proponents argued that low economic growth and high unemployment were a result of labour market barriers caused by the interventions of the state in the market. They claimed that interventions, such as high minimum wages, strong job protection and generous unemployment benefits had led to economic growth problems. Rather than promoting social and political stability and encouraging economic growth, neoliberal ideologists argued that welfare policies and expenditures were costly and were the root cause of the economic problems at that time (Kamali & Jönsson, 2018). The economic ideology of neoliberalism was portrayed by its advocates as the only possible way forward to ensure future economic success (see also Dean, 2010; Kamali & Jönsson, 2018). As one of the most well-known advocates for neoliberalism, Margaret Thatcher used as her slogan ‘There is no alternative’ (Oksala, 2013b, p. 61). Proponents of neoliberalism also critiqued the welfare state for protecting against social risks at the expense of the responsibility of each individual citizen (Schinkel & Van Houdt, 2010). It was argued that through the organization of financial redistribution from taxpayers to welfare recipients, the welfare state was reducing freedom,

undermining the work ethic and making recipients dependent (Pratt & Valverde, 2002). This understanding paved the way for a relocation of risks, which placed greater emphasis on the responsibilisation of the individual, as well as making each person, together with the private sector and community, increasingly responsible for what used to be considered as public tasks (Schinkel & Van Houdt, 2010, p. 698).

Consequently, neoliberalist ideas translated into social policy entail that as many social problems as possible should be solved by the market. As such, economic incentives to support the market should guide social policy legislation and administration. According to neo-liberalistic thinking, a free market is capable of absorbing everyone. The shrinking of social protection was a consequence of neoliberalism (Møller, 2013; Wacquant, 2011). As we shall see below, the downsizing of social protection is tied to the creation of a specific citizen subject that is not in need of such protection.

4.2.1 Neoliberalism and governmentality

Governmentality scholars, such as Dean (2010), Rose (1999b) and Burchell et. al. (1991), have developed Foucault's idea of governmentality, proposing that neoliberalism is an expansion of liberalism's method of governing populations, both by the state but also by the individuals themselves (Schinkel & Van Houdt, 2010, p. 698). Neoliberalism is thus not purely an economic ideology (Pratt & Valverde, 2002); it is also a specific way to govern through specific neoliberal economic rationality (Oksala, 2013b). In the governmental game of truth, neoliberal economic arguments have won as the only way to ensure the biopolitical value of life (Oksala, 2013b). Within such an understanding, the goal of good governance is to increase the material wellbeing of the population as much as possible, an aim that can only be ensured through economic growth. To be able to deliver higher standards of living for the whole population and thereby safeguarding the care of life, productivity must be maximized.

Neoliberal governmentality works on the production of a particular subjectivity that aims to create an economic and competitive subject (Oksala, 2013b). As a consequence, neoliberalism promotes techniques that create subject-citizens which are free, independent and perhaps most importantly, responsible (Pratt & Valverde, 2002; Rose, 1999b). In other words, you have the freedom to behave in a responsible way that is beneficial for both yourself and society at large (Øvreliid, 2007, pp. 52-53). The ideal neoliberal citizen-subject is one who is both able and compelled to become an 'entrepreneur' of herself and himself, and as such is not making any demands on the state. Rose (1999b) makes the important point that neoliberalism is a way of 'governing through freedom' in advanced liberal democracies, a

way which ‘does not seek to govern through ‘society’, but through the regulated choices of individual citizens, now constructed as subjects of choices and aspirations to self-actualization and self-fulfilment (Rose, 1996, p. 41).

It is acknowledged that neoliberalism has led to a shrinkage of the state’s (social) responsibilities, but at the same time, there has been an expansion of different techniques to recreate social and citizen subjects (Oksala, 2013b; Ong, 2006). Consequently, one essential precondition for neoliberal governmentality is based on techniques of both discipline and sanctions for ‘bad’ behaviour, as well as gratification for ‘good’ behaviour. The key term here is responsibilisation, making individuals understand that they are free to make choices and influence the course of their lives based on their individual preferences (Johansson & Hvinden, 2008, p. 47).

As Anna Pratt and Mariana Valverde (2002, p. 139) point out, endorsing neoliberal techniques to address and punish ‘dependency’ is generally seen as a right-wing ideology. However, within a governmentality perspective, neoliberalism is not perceived as being tied to any political parties. Indeed, governmentality scholars argue that neoliberal rationalizations are gaining ground throughout the world irrespective of local specific political ideologies (Pratt & Valverde, 2002; Rose, 1999b). Neoliberalism is not just as any political programme; it is more complex and much deeper than just an economic doctrine (Oksala, 2013b). It has become difficult to counter proponents of neoliberalism who argue that there are no alternatives (Oksala, 2013b). In other words, neoliberalism has become a distinct form of governance.

As briefly mentioned earlier, governmentality and problematisation are strongly connected. According to Foucault one of the main reasons for inaugurating neoliberal rationality was based on problematisation, that is, on constructing problems in a specific way so that individual responsibility would naturally follow, but under the idea of ‘autonomy’ (Bacchi, 1999, p. 47), a term which has had a great impact on how social policies have been justified, designed and structured.

One of the key questions that have been addressed in studies **I**, **II**, and **III** is whether we can understand the justifications for introducing introduction programmes. From a governmentality perspective, the programme serves as an important illustration of a technique and an arena for the creation of the ideal citizen by working on the subjectivity, that is, the shaping of the behaviour of the target group through neoliberal rationalities. Moreover, neoliberal governmentality is useful for analysing the economic rationalities underlying the programme to understand the shift from protective welfare, where social provisions were

granted categorically as a right, towards disciplinary social policy and corrective welfare, activation and active labour market policies (Lødemel & Trickey, 2001; Wacquant, 2011). The neoliberal state has adopted a new and strong penalty role towards the weakest at the bottom, which warrants a deeper examination of the Introduction Programme in light of a neoliberal governmentality perspective.

4.3 Ethnification, race and ethnicity

Wacquant (2011) suggests that processes of ethnification and racialisation are important to understanding the punitive side of the welfare state. Wacquant (2011) argues that ‘[...] rigid racial separation accelerates and intensifies the turn to punitive policies by aiming them at a tainted and isolated population with which the rest of the citizenry does not identify’ (p.13). In societies where there are distinct ethnic divisions, ethnification creates a space for the state to implement and maintain the repressive side of the welfare state. Thus, ethnic and racial division impacts the state’s punitive role. Wacquant argues that minorities have a higher probability of being poor (class) and are *also* exposed to the effects of belonging to a group that has gone through a process of ethnification and have been made into an ‘Other’ (Wacquant, 2011). Both processes make it more probable that certain groups will face social inequalities.

A substantial critique of a governmentality perspective is that it has a tendency of neglecting social inequalities (McKee, 2009, p. 475). Within the field of feminist and critical race studies, scholars have pointed out that there seems to be an assumption in governmentality studies that power is equally distributed among people; however, the question of how power is distributed and used is much more complex. As such, there is a need to acknowledge that power is connected to social stratifications, which again are further contingent upon social categories such as race, ethnicity, class, gender etc.

The categories of newly arrived migrants and refugees are important in this thesis as they represent the target group of the introduction programmes. Consequently, it is warranted to address how ideas of race and ethnicity related to the target group might impact the justification, structure and the design of the programme. In achieving this, governmentality and neoliberalism are thus supplemented with the conceptualisation of ethnification.

In **study II**, I used the following definition: ‘Ethnification aims to highlight both the ways understandings of ‘race’ are a part of contemporary usages of ethnicity and culture in Europe, as well as how these categories are socially constructed and must be understood in relation to hierarchy and the uneven division of power and resources’ (Fernandes, 2013, p. 193). In the

following, I elaborate on the reasoning underlying this definition and the concepts related to it.

Both historically and in modern society, the idea of both race and ethnicity has, in different places and contexts, been socially constructed to categorise people in terms of privilege and subordination (Miles, 1993; Miles & Brown, 2003; Williams & Johnson, 2010). As concepts, race and ethnicity are highly related, and it is challenging to provide clear distinctions between them. Nevertheless, a common widespread differentiation marker is that race is often associated with biological and genetic origin and ethnicity with cultural and/or religious origin (Denton & Deane, 2010; Gunaratnam, 2003; Hall, 2000). Another way to distinguish between race and ethnicity is that race is often a category that is ascribed externally, whereas ethnicity is more connected to a group's or an individual's identification (Wikström, 2009). However, these distinctions are disputed and are being rethought (Gunaratnam, 2003). Stuart Hall (2000) makes the important point that biological racism emphasises features such as skin-color; however, markers are also used to suggest cultural and social differences. Hall (2000) convincingly argues:

The more ethnicity matters, the more its characteristics are represented as relatively fixed, inherent within a group, transmitted from generation to generation, not just by culture and education, but by biological inheritance, stabilized above all by kinship and endogamous marriage rules that ensure that the ethnic group remains genetically, and therefore culturally 'pure'. (p. 223)

Based on this reasoning, Hall refers to two systems of racism, one based on the process of biological differentiation through the category of race, and one based on cultural differentiation through the category of ethnicity (see also Gunaratnam, 2003). Instead of viewing race and ethnicity as two distinct categories, one should instead focus on their similarities. Because the social consequences of the categorisations of race and ethnicity are comparable, within a postcolonial perspective it is argued that we should focus on their similarities (Wikström, 2009). The argument behind this reasoning, which resembles Halls, is that racism and discrimination do not differentiate between ethnic/cultural or racial affiliation; however, the consequences and effects of these categorisations are comparable in people's lives. The postcolonial stand rejects the essentialist meanings ascribed to race and ethnicity but views them rather as a reason for constructing differences and hierarchisation among people (Wikström, 2009). In line with the postcolonial view and with Gunaratnam (2003), I

perceive the distinctions between race and ethnicity to be blurred and not straightforward. The two concepts are similar in the sense that they undergo similar processes of categorisations where differences are created.

I use the concept of ethnification to demonstrate how the categories of race and ethnicity are intertwined and socially constructed in specific contexts at specific times for specific ends. I use the terms ethnification and racialisation interchangeably as they show to the similar processes just described above. However, in this thesis, in terms of consistency, I employ *ethnification* as I did in both **studies II and III**.

I used *ethnification* in those studies to understand how migrants are constructed in regard to specific problematisations. However, **study I** also shows the process of ‘othering’ immigrants in relation to their ethnicity and culture. Even though I did not use ethnification, ‘othering’ of migrants is clearly related. As such, **studies I, II and III**, demonstrate how migrants are constructed as the deviant ‘other’ through specific categorisations of race, ethnicity and culture. The rhetoric in the policy texts works on the subjectivity of the target group and positions them as passive welfare dependents in need of transformation so that they can become the ideal neoliberal-subject, one who is independent, employed and takes responsibility. It is clear that the target group is being governed through a neoliberal rationality, where there is an individualisation of social risks. This is a point that I return to in the chapter 7.

5. Methodological approaches and empirical material

In this chapter, I provide an overview and discussion of the methodological approaches and the empirical material of the studies. However, such a presentation and discussion are highly linked to the ontological and epistemological foundations of the dissertation, as they create the base for the methodological choices made throughout the whole research process. As such, I also position the thesis, ontologically and epistemologically.

5.1 Ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions

One of the main premises behind this study is the understanding that officially defined social problems, problematisations, and hence policy solutions can be embedded in different understandings and interpretations. This point of departure is very much in line with a social constructionist position and tradition, where the starting point is based on the idea that society can be viewed as a product created by humans (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2005). Thus, the social world consists of phenomena that are socially constructed (Hacking, 1999). As such, how one perceives the social world is contextually situated in specific historical and cultural perspectives. The focal point is thus on the unstable and ‘always contestable nature of social reality’ (Bacchi, 2009, p. 34; Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2005, p. 13).

The understanding that the social world is socially constructed rejects the ‘rational approach to policy’ which embraces the standard positions¹⁴ epistemology (cf. Bacchi, 1999). The underlying philosophical assumption behind ‘the rational approach to policy’ is that knowledge about the world that is objective and true, and that the truth is attainable. The ontological belief within this view is that nature is what it is, e.g., there exists only one world that is not dependent on how people perceive it to be. The epistemology is that one can obtain true and objective knowledge about the world that is value free. Those who support the ‘rational approach to policy’ therefore assume that there is a real world out there which is accessible to a neutral description and analysis.

While I reject the standard rational view of ontology and epistemology, this is not to say that we cannot know *anything* about reality. Nevertheless, one of the main and most severe critiques of studying problem representations as manifested in texts, as I have done, is the claim that if everything is a construction of reality, then which representation and construction

¹⁴ I use the concept ‘standard research position’ to represent what is generally defined as ‘positivism’ or ‘realism,’ where science is based on strict rules and procedures (see Mjøset, 2009). Furthermore, science is mainly deductive, from abstract theory to testing of hypothesis and so forth. Moreover, reality is perceived as something ‘out there’ (see Sarantakos 1998, ch. 2).

are more real than others? (Bacchi, 1999; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 1999).¹⁵ This is a critique often associated with strict constructionism and that there is a risk of getting trapped in the texts, and hence language.

In line with Bacchi (1999, pp. 32-39), I do not concur that this critique leaves us at a dead end. Rather, interpretations and problem representations in social policy are directly linked to interventions. Nancy Fraser (1989, p. 166) writes that interpretations are not only representations but also interventions and acts. This is particularly the case when it is the government which defines the problem because the government's understanding has a direct impact, as its version of the problem is translated into policy regulated through legislation, which has the technology to govern (Loseke, 2003, p. 123). The Introduction Programme is an example of how certain problem interpretations and representations have been translated into a concrete intervention/measure that is implemented on the local level with direct material consequences for the target group undergoing the programme. As Loseke (2003) phrases it: 'When successful social problem claims lead to public policy, they change our world in very real ways' (p. 123).

The ontological and epistemological basis of this thesis lies the premise for how to make use of quality criteria that are relevant for this particular research process. In the following, I therefore present the quality criteria that are emphasised in this thesis.

5.2 Quality criteria in qualitative research

There is an ongoing discussion about which quality criteria that should be employed to evaluate qualitative research. Such a discussion is inevitably a normative one, in the sense that it provides guidelines of what constitutes as 'good' or 'less good' qualitative research (Justesen & Mik-Meyer, 2012, p. 35). Various research traditions and positions utilise distinct quality criteria, and even though the seemingly same criteria are used, they are understood and used differently. Whereas validity ('truth, correctness and strength') and reliability ('consistency and trustworthiness') are commonly employed in quantitative research as quality criteria, in qualitative research, the use of these same criteria is more readily debated and problematised, and in many cases, interpreted and used in different ways (see also Justesen & Mik-Meyer, 2012; Kvæle et al., 2015; Madill et al., 2000). Researchers taking a social constructionist position tend to reject the notions of both validity and reliability. They see these concepts as irrelevant because these concepts have been primarily developed within

¹⁵ This critique is often associated with the relativism position (see Bacchi, 1999).

the standard/realist position, which sees truth as something that is objectively attainable (Justesen & Mik-Meyer, 2012; Madill et al., 2000).

Researchers using a social constructionist perspective emphasise various qualitative criteria. In this thesis, I specifically want to draw attention to the criteria of reflexivity, transparency and ethical considerations as I perceive them as essential in ‘doing’ research. In short, reflexivity is related to transparency as it refers to the need for the researcher to openly reflect over the methodological choices made throughout the research process, in addition to reflecting over the researcher’s own position and relevant experiences. In the next section, I will discuss reflexivity and aspects of my own background which have influenced the choices I have made in this thesis. This discussion will be followed by a description of the empirical material, method and the analysis process. I will also present the qualitative comparative social policy approach. Throughout these sections, I will also address potential strengths and limitations of the thesis. At the end of this chapter, relevant ethical considerations are discussed.

5.2.1 Self-reflexivity and pre-understanding

Social constructionist positions emphasise the need for researchers to be self-reflexive, underscoring the point that research is neither ‘objective’ nor value neutral; hence, a researcher’s position and reflexivity plays an essential role in the research process. Roni Berger (2015) defines reflexivity ‘[...] as a process of continual internal dialogue and critical self-evaluation of the researcher’s positionality as well as active acknowledgement and explicit recognition that this position may affect the research process and outcome’ (p. 220). In qualitative research, there is an increasing recognition that reflexivity is a crucial undertaking in the process of producing knowledge (Berger, 2015).

While I already have positioned myself and this study in terms of how I perceive knowledge, there is still a need to make certain parts of my background explicit as it has influenced my overall positioning within the field and how I have approached it. My professional background, here under my education and work experience, combined with my background as a migrant, have contributed to my engagement and commitment towards this field of study. These experiences have influenced how I have developed the research project at hand.

My interest in introduction programmes began in 1999 when I was an under-graduate social worker student in Sweden. I had my first internship in Norway in one of the municipalities chosen as a pilot (among several others) to the proposed Introduction

Programme. In 2003, I was part of a team in a borough in an Oslo municipality which was preparing for the establishment and implementation of the programme in the same borough. In 2004, I started to work in the programme as a case worker and I eventually (2005) became the unit leader of the programme in the same borough (up to 2009). This overview illustrates that I have accumulated work experience with, and knowledge of, the programme since 1999. As such, I have experienced both the possibilities and challenges embedded within the framework of the programme, but, most importantly, I know how the programme is implemented on the ground level, or, more precisely, how one borough during a specific time period has operationalised the programme.

My familiarity with and knowledge and experience of the programme on an implementation level has greatly influenced how I developed the project, that is, within a critical social policy approach. I became interested in how the programme, on a policy design level, had come to be, what the programme was an answer to and so forth. As such, it is apparent that my professional engagement with the programme has had a direct impact on how I have framed the aims and research questions. Overall, I perceive my familiarity with the programme to be a strength, in so far as it has guided me to ask relevant questions. At the same time, it can be argued that it is precisely my familiarity with the programme that can be seen as a challenge because it means that that I have approached the research field with pre-understandings and assumptions.

Moreover, my background as a migrant has also influenced me as a researcher. There is an ongoing debate in the academic literature in migration studies about whether an insider vs. an outsider perspective of researchers hinders or facilitates the research process (Berger, 2015; Carling et al., 2014). While Berger (2015) argues that researchers with a migrant background in migration studies might benefit from an insider perspective, and also reduce potential hindrances, Carling et. al. (2014) urges for a more nuanced stance where the research approach is more dynamic in relation to the insider/outsider division.

My own positionality in terms of my background regarding this project is multifaceted. First, my project is on the policy design level, and it does not engage in direct contact with human subjects with migrant backgrounds. However, it deals with, among other things, on how new migrants and refugees are constructed in policy texts. As such, I am personally engaged in the researched policy field in the sense that I am interested in how policies targeted at integrating migrants are framed and designed so they take into account the complexity of the issues that migrants face, on multiple levels, when subjected to various forms of integrating measures and interventions.

In sum, I am both professionally and personally invested in how society at large seeks to incorporate migrants. I make no claims of ‘neutrality’, but my research positioning also argues that a neutral, objective position is impossible to fully attain, as in all research. However, being committed and invested in a field of research does not relieve researchers from any responsibilities regarding empirical, methodological and theoretical foundations of a study (Grue, 2012, p. 26). Therefore, it is imperative that I account for the whole research process in detail, ensuring that it is as transparent as possible, thus allowing readers to critically examine and scrutinize the scientific foundation on which the research stands on.

5.3 Empirical material

The empirical material which creates the basis for the analysis in all four studies consists of official policy documents pertaining to the Introduction Programme in Norway (**studies I, II, III and IV**), Sweden and Denmark (**studies II and IV**) and to the financial support scheme for voluntary immigrant organisations in Norway (**study I**) and the Qualification Programme in Norway (**study III**). The studies rely on analysis of specific documents presented in the overview in Table 2.

Table 2: Overview of analysed official documents in the studies

Document	Study I	Study II	Study III	Study IV
St.meld.nr. 27 (1996-97) The states relationship towards voluntary organisations (Om statens forhold til frivillige organisasjoner) NO	X			
St.meld.nr. 39 (2006-2007) Voluntarism for everyone (Frivillighet for alle) NO	X			
Rundskriv 3/2009 IMDi Funding to voluntary activities in the local community that contributes to participation, dialogue and cooperation in the local community that contributes to participation, dialogue and cooperation (Tilskudd til frivillig virksomhet i lokalsamfunn som bidrar til deltakelse, dialog og samhandling). NO	X			
Rundskriv 4/2011 IMDi Funding to voluntary activities in the local community that contributes to participation, dialogue and cooperation in the local community that contributes to participation, dialogue and cooperation (Tilskudd til frivillig virksomhet i lokalsamfunn som bidrar til deltakelse, dialog og samhandling). NO	X			

St.meld.nr. 17 (1996-97) Immigration and the multicultural Norway (Om innvandring og det flerkulturelle Norge) NO	X			
St.meld.nr. 49 (2003/2004) Diversity through inclusion and participation: Responsibility and freedom (Mangfold gjennom inkludering og deltagelse) NO	X	X		
NOU 2001:20 The Introduction Act for newly arrived immigrants (Lov om introduksjonsordning for nyankomne innvandrere — (Introduksjonsloven) NO	X	X	X	X
Ot.prop.nr. 28 (2002-2003) The Introduction Act for newly arrived immigrants (Om lov om introduksjonsordning for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven) (NO)	X	X	X	X
Rundskriv H-20/05 The introductory and Norwegian language training act for newly arrived immigrants (Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven) (NO)	X			
Rundskriv Q-20/2012 The introductory and Norwegian language training act for newly arrived immigrants (Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven) NO		X	X	X
Integrationsloven 2000 (The Integration Act) DEN		X		X
Prop. 2009/10: 60 Newly arrived immigrants labour market establishment – self responsibility with professional support (Nyanlända invandrare arbetsmarknadsetablering – egenansvar med professionellt stöd) SWE		X		X
Regeringen, 2003: 63 The government's vision and strategies for better integration (Regeringens vision og strategier for bedre integration, (Den)		X		
Better integration – a joint action plan 2000 (Bedre Integration – en samlet handlingsplan) DEN		X		
Prop. 1989/90: 105 Coordinated refugee reception and a new system for reimbursement for the municipalities etc. (Om samordnat flyktingmottagande och nytt system för ersättning till kommunerna, m. m.) SWE		X		X
New in Denmark 2010 (Ny i Danmark) DEN		X		

Prop. 2008/09: 156 SFI-bonus – trial activities for stimulating newly arrived immigrants to learn Swedish quicker (Sfi-bonus – försöksverksamhet för att stimulera nyanlända invandrare att snabbare lära sig svenska) SWE		X		
Betänkning nr. 1337 1997 Integration (Integration) DEN		X		X
SOU 2008: 58 Self-responsibility with professional support (Egenansvar – med professionellt stöd) SWE		X		X
SOU 2003: 75 Establishement in Sweden – possibilities for the individual and society (Etablering i Sverige - möjligheter för individ och samhälle) SWE		X		
St. meld. Nr. 6 2002 – 2003 Action plan against poverty (Tiltaksplan mot fattigdom) NO			X	
St. meld. Nr. 9 2006 – 2007 Work, welfare and inclusion (Arbeid, velferd og inkludering) NO			X	
St. meld. Nr. 50 1998 – 1999 White paper on equalization (Utjamningsmeldinga) NO			X	
Forskrift 2012 Curriculum ordinance for Norwegian and civic studies for adults (Læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne VOX) NO			X	
Forskrift 2005 Curriculum ordinance in Norwegian and civic studies for adult immigrants (Forskrift om læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne innvandrere). NO			X	
Ot. Prop. Nr. 70 2006 – 2007 Changes in the social services act and certain other acts (Om lov om endringer i sosialtjenesteloven og i enkelte andre lover) NO			X	
Innstilling St. nr. 148 2006 – 2007 Recommendation from the work- and social committee on work, welfare and inclusion (Innstilling fra arbeids- og sosialkomiteen om arbeid, velferd og inkludering) NO			X	
Specifications to the enactment 2009 Act regulating the Introduction Programme (Vejledning om introduksjonsprogrammet m.v. etter integrationsloven (DEN)				X

The timeframe of the analysed documents, overall, for all four studies in the dissertation, ranges from 1989 (Prop. 1989/90: 105) up to 2012 (Rundskriv Q-20/2012). However, the time periods analysed in the studies vary, depending on what measures and in which countries the

documents that have been analysed and compared originate. For more specific information see each individual article. In chapter 7 (analysis chapter), I include policy changes in the Norwegian Introduction Programme, up to 2021.

5.3.1 Specifics on the empirical material

The search for relevant official documents to analyse was mainly based on a manual search of the governments webpages pertaining to each specific policy and measure under examination. In **studies I and III**, this was a rather straightforward process as the policy documents could all be found within the same Norwegian official webpage. I used key words such as *new migrants*, *refugees*, *Introduction Programme*, and *integration* for each policy and measure and was able to identify the key official documents relevant for the studies.

In contrast, the search for relevant official documents pertaining to the introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark for **studies II and IV** was more challenging. Sweden and Norway have a longer tradition in governmental documenting and writing, compared to Denmark (Breidahl, 2012, p. 18). In Sweden and Norway, searching for and identifying relevant and central documents for the introduction programmes was a rather straightforward process. In Denmark, at the time I was searching for relevant documents, there were no official governmental search engine where I could search for policy documents. In the searching process in Denmark, I had to go to the responsible ministry for the Introduction Programme to locate key, official documents. From these documents, I was able to locate other relevant documents. Finally, in Denmark, I made use of academic work which had addressed the programme in order to identify further relevant official documents. Even though I was able to identify key, official policy documents pertaining to the programme in Denmark, I cannot be sure that I was able to identify all relevant documents which is a limitation in the case of Denmark.

5.3.2 The nature of the official documents

Even though all the analysed documents are official texts, they have different functions. In the following, I provide a description of the nature of the official documents that have been analysed in Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

Green papers (in Norwegian NOU Norsk Offentlige Utredninger and in Swedish SOU Svensk Offentliga Utredningar) in both Norway and Sweden, are commission reports on a particular issue/theme. These papers are developed by a government appointed working group or an expert committee and can also include politicians and public officials (Government

Offices of Sweden, 2015; Regjeringen, 2020). The issues examined by government commissions are within areas that often are more complex and require extensive analysis. The commissions are independent from the government; however, the commission's inquiry is based on a mandate, a set of instructions which the commission is required to follow. The mandate is to 'identify the area or issue to be investigated, define the problems to be addressed [...]’ (Government Offices of Sweden, 2015). Green papers address what are perceived to be social problems and the commission’s job is to suggest long-term solutions for those problems (Andersson et al., 1978, 53; see also de Cabo, 2018). Both Green papers and White papers (see below) are thus ideal starting points in terms of identifying and analyzing problem presentations (see Bacchi, 2009; de Cabo, 2018).

White papers (Stortingsmeldinger (St.meld.nr) are used in Norway when the government wishes to present an issue to the Parliament (Stortinget) but doesn't require a decision from the Parliament. White papers often present an overview of earlier and present policies within a field or suggest future directions for policies and measures (Hagelund, 2003, p. 56). White papers thus create a basis for parliamentary debates which may lead to more concrete policy proposals.

Even though White papers represent the current government's political will, they are not necessarily written by the political leadership. The majority of the work that lies behind a White paper, researching and articulating the actual report, is carried out by civil servants in responsible ministries (Hagelund, 2003, p. 56). Nevertheless, it is the current political leadership in the ministries that approves the final content of the papers, and as such sets out the main premises for both current and further policy development. White papers are thus also an ideal starting point for analysing problem representation and proposed solutions within a policy field. However, it is important to stress that both Green and White papers and their proposals might not always lead to concrete policy changes. Suggested policy changes are dependent on majority support in the Parliament.

In Norway there are several steps in the legislation process before new laws and regulations are implemented. These formal steps are attached to specific official documents. Odelstingsproposisjoner (Ot. Prp.) are refined proposals that are to become laws. Instillinger til Stortinget (Instill. St.) are the Parliamentary response to government proposals, the resulting enacted laws (Regjeringen, 2020). *Ordinances* (Forskrift) are developed by the government and are more detailed specifications of regulated laws. Rundskriv are subsequent circulars to enacted laws providing further specifications in interpretations of regulations and laws (Regjeringen, 2020).

In Sweden, governments submit proposals for new legislation and amendments to already existing acts to the parliament through propositions (Prop.). These propositions to the parliament can also include ordinances which specify the enacted legislations in more detail (Regeringskansliet, 2021).

In Denmark, parliament committees develop reports, deliberations, within a specific area of focus with specific proposals to be enacted by the Parliament. These reports are called a ‘Betænkninger’. The reports present an overview of former policy and measures and aims for future policy direction. In these reports, the members of the committee are able to formulate their opinions on the proposals and submit their recommendations to the Folketinget (Folketingstidene, 2021). As with both Green and White papers, ‘Betænkninger’ focus on politically prioritised problems and solutions. As such, these papers also provide an ideal starting point for policy analysis.

5.3.3 Additional empirical material

In addition to the abovementioned policy documents, other forms of officially attained information regarding the content of the programmes were included. In the following, I provide a brief overview of the specific materials that were included for each study and the justification for including them.

In **study II**, the document *Information from New to Denmark*, published by the Danish Immigration Service and the Danish Agency for International Recruitment and Integration, was included as part of the empirical material. It is an official document and was included because the information elaborated on the importance of learning the Danish language. As such, it provided more contextual information regarding this formulated goal. In addition, the Danish government’s joint action plan for ‘Better integration’ from 2000 was also analysed because it was directly connected to the measures and interventions in the Danish Introduction programme.

In **study III** the document *Information from the Norwegian civic course* was analysed, and the information was retrieved from Skills Norway (VOX), which is the Norwegian agency for lifelong learning. The document is official and was part of the empirical material because it discussed the need for a civic course, which is now part of the Introduction Programme, and is key for our understanding what kind of norms and values the state perceives as essential knowledge for the target group. Further, comments of key public political figures as reported in *Aftenposten* and *Dagbladet*, two of Norway’s national newspapers with a leading readership, were also analysed. These were included in order to

understand the strategies underlying the reforms to the Introduction Programme and the Qualification programme, and also to understand how key actors framed and discussed the need for the reforms. However, this was only a small part of the empirical material and was used only for the Qualification Programme.

Study IV also made use of scholarly works pertaining to the implementation of the introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark and was used to briefly discuss how some parts of the programmes had been implemented in light of empowerment, participation and user involvement. Nevertheless, the main empirical data in **study IV** came from policy and official documents.

5.3.4 Limitations of the empirical material

The choice of what text material to include and exclude is mainly determined by the focus of a study. It could for instance be argued that it is a limitation that I have mainly examined and analysed official policy documents, and have not included political documents, parliamentary debates and media coverage which addresses the studied measures, and in particular the introduction programmes. However, it has not been my aim to analyse the process of policy making per se.¹⁶ On the contrary, my focus has been to analyse the policy and measure/intervention designs that already have been passed and implemented by Parliament. As already argued, what is of interest are the policy intervention measures as outlined in policy documents. As such, the selection of the empirical material for the text analysis has been driven by the specific aims and research questions of each individual study (see Phillips & Schröder, 2005, p. 285). Nevertheless, this focus has limited the amount of empirical material to include. At the same time this has also enabled me to gain more in-depth knowledge and understanding of the selected empirical material, and hence also the examined policy measures/interventions.

It should also be pointed out that the size of the text corpus is not decisive, but what is crucial is whether it is possible to answer the research questions through an analysis of the selected texts (see Phillips & Schröder, 2005, p. 286). Emphasis should be placed on the quality of the analysis, rather on the amount of the material (Silverman, 2005, p. 55). Consequently, in order to make a detailed textual analysis, David Silverman (2005) argues

¹⁶ However, in **study III**, the focus is, among other things, also on the strategies underlying the reform process of the Introduction and Qualification Programme. These strategies are evident from the empirical material in this article, which includes statements from social actors and key public political figures in two prominent daily newspapers in Norway.

that it is crucial to limit the text corpus in an effort to ensure quality and feasibility. Moreover, focusing on selected policy intervention measures has allowed me to examine and analyse from different theoretical perspectives, enabling a so-called theoretical triangulation, a method involving the use of several theoretical approaches when studying a certain phenomenon (Denzin, 1970; Drie & Dekker, 2013).

5.4 Text analysis

Göran Bergström and Kristina Boréus (2005) write that there are multiple ways to analyse texts. I have employed various forms of textual analysis in the studies. In **study I**, an idea- and ideology analysis (see Boréus & Bergström, 2005) is employed combined with content analysis (see Boréus & Bergström, 2005). The analysis in **study II** is inspired by Carol Lee Bacchi's (1999, 2009) 'What's the problem?' approach (WPA). **Study III** bases the text analysis on a combination of social policy justifications and is specifically oriented towards how target groups are socially constructed and framed to serve policy objectives. Idea- and ideology analysis are employed again in **study IV**.

Even though these are various forms of conducting text analysis, they are similar in the sense that they are, to various degrees, interested in representations and justifications of framed problem solutions. The justification for choosing different textual analysis methods is based on the aim and research question of each individual article. In the studies I have elaborated on these various forms of text analysis and justified the rationales behind the analysis method employed. However, due to logistics within the study format (space limitations), I was not able to sufficiently account for the whole specific analysis process in the studies, which I therefore intend to do in the following sections.

The first two phases of the analyses were the same for all four studies and are therefore presented jointly. The subsequent phases are more specific to each study and are thus presented separately. It is, however, important to underline that even though I present the analysis process in different phases and subsequent steps, this does not mean that working with the analysis has been a linear process. Rather, the analysis process has been characterised by its dynamic nature, moving back and forth between the empirical material and the theoretical framework, taking one step forward, and then moving back, sometimes leaping ahead, and sometimes starting from scratch again. Nevertheless, the phases represent a rough description of how I proceeded and is an attempt to systematically describe the overall analysis process.

5.4.1 Phase 1 of the analysis

The first phase of analysis was very much in line with what Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke (2006) define as the first phase of thematic analysis, namely, gaining familiarity with the data. Even though I have conducted specific forms of text analysis, and not a thematic analysis per se, it was imperative in the analytical process that I not only get acquainted with the data but immerse myself in the data. Immersion entails that you read through the data repeated times when searching for meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87). In my initial reading of the texts, I scanned all the documents to get an initial overview of the material. I started to read the documents chronologically according to each measure and country under study. In **study III** where I have a co-author, we divided up the initial reading of the empirical materials. Even though phase 1 of the analysis was primarily to gain familiarity with the empirical material, I nonetheless started to mark text passages that immediately seemed relevant and interesting with initial preliminary notes and comments.

5.4.2 Phase 2 of the analysis

When I had gained familiarity with the texts, I moved on to phase two of the analysis process, which refers to the production of initial codes derived from the data material (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 88). In this phase, I described what was being articulated through the text. I conducted my coding manually, which specifically entailed that I wrote my notes directly in the text. I also highlighted and categorized different potential themes and/or patterns. The coding process was carried out in light of the overall research aim/question and analytical questions. As such, my coding was mainly theory driven (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 89) and demonstrated a more deductive analysis approach in the sense that I approached the documents and the analysis with specific analytical questions and concepts derived from the theoretical framework of each individual article.

As a prerequisite for others to assess the legitimacy of the interpretations I made, it was essential that the theoretical foundations be made available as they have both implicit and explicit effects on the analysis process (see Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fangen, 2010). In the subsequent sections, I therefore present the further analysis phases for each article, as the remaining phases are strongly connected to the theoretical perspectives employed in each article.

5.4.3 Analysis of study I

In phase 3, I made explicit use of the sub-research- and analytical questions I was ‘asking’ the documents/texts. **Study I** is mainly based on an idea- and ideology analysis (Boréus & Bergström, 2012), I therefore developed research sub-questions that were used as a framework in analysing the ideological argumentation of the texts. The sub-questions posed were:

1. What are the justifications put forward for introducing the measures and policies under examination?
2. Is a hierarchy of the argumentations presented and are the arguments contradictory?
3. What importance is given to justifications?
4. To what extent do the official texts have possible underlying meanings?

Qualitative content analysis, which means that one focuses on the most apparent and evident meaning of the text (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) was also used in **study I**. Here I posed the following questions:

1. To what extent is maintenance of cultural heritage and characteristics of the minorities emphasised?
2. To what extent is adjustment to Norwegian society and culture emphasised?
3. What is the relationship between maintenance of minority heritage and adjustment to Norwegian society?
4. What is the relationship between rights and obligations for immigrants?

These questions are based on the theoretical foundation of the study which focuses on selected conceptualisations of multiculturalism, immigrant integration and assimilation as the main analytical concepts. As such, the conceptualisations and analytical questions were, in a sense, the lenses I had when I started to sharpen the analysis. In this phase (3) of the analysis I took several steps. In the first step I analysed the text corpus in relation to the Introduction Programme in light of the specific questions posed. This enabled me to search for and identify themes, not only in relation to the analytical questions, but also in relation to what seemed relevant for the overall analysis. In step 2, I repeated the same process with the text corpus in relation to the voluntary immigrant organisations. Step 3 of the analysis was focused on comparing and reviewing the preliminary themes/categories that were highlighted’. The 4th and last step in phase 3 was to identify similarities and differences found in the texts

pertaining to the measures in focus.

Phase 4 of the analysis was going back and forth between the empirical material and the theoretical foundation and revising, either to strengthen or reject initial analyses made. The 5th and last phase of the analysis involved synthetizing the analysis and writing the full article.

5.4.4 Analysis of study II

Study II, focused on the introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Since I was already more familiar with the empirical material from Norway, I spent more time getting familiar with the data corpus for Sweden and Denmark. Even though I already was familiar with the Norwegian material, I chose to analyse Norway last in an effort to approach the material with the same analytical focus as with Sweden and Denmark. In phase two, I followed the procedure as explained above as with **study I**.

In **study II**, the analysis is inspired by What's the problem (WTP) approach to policy analysis developed by Bacchi (Bacchi, 1999, 2009). The WTP approach was chosen because the study was focused on the justifications and problem representations that paved the way for implementing the introduction programmes.

Bacchi (2009) has developed 6 analytical questions that can be applied to various policy problem representations. The analysis was guided by the following four questions:

1. What is the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy?
2. What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?
3. What is left unproblematic in this ‘problem presentation’? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be thought about differently?
4. What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’?

As with **study I**, phase three also had several steps. In the first step, I analysed the material in order to answer the analytical questions posed for each country under examination.

Ethnification as a theoretical perspective was also central to the analysis considering the research aim of the article. In addition, my analysis was conducted in light of the concepts of social risks, activation and the social construction of social problems. I followed the same order as I had in phase 1 and 2, that is, I started with Sweden, continued with Denmark and ended with Norway. I created a table for each document for each country under study as a way to get a better overview. Step 2 in phase 3 was then to compare the countries and the themes/categories that had been highlighted in my initial readings.

Phases 4 and 5 were the same as in **study I**, that is, going back and forth between the data and theoretical framework to strengthen or reject parts of the analysis, and then writing up the article.

5.4.5 Analysis of study III

Study III is co-authored, and the analysis process reflects the fact that the initial reading of the empirical material was divided between me and the co-author. I focused mainly on the Introduction Programme and my co-author on the Qualification Programme. In phase 1, gaining familiarity with the data corpus was not as time consuming as it was for **studies I** and **II**, as I already had gained familiarity with the empirical material regarding the Introduction Programme. After the initial readings of the empirical material, we did the remaining preliminary and main analysis work together.

As with the previous studies, phase 3 in this study is also characterised by several steps. The analysis in **study III** is based on a combination of social policy justifications and is specifically oriented towards how target groups are socially constructed and framed to serve policy objectives. Because we were comparing two different measures, the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme, one of the analytical perspectives we used was contrasting the two target groups to examine how they were construed in the policy documents and by policymakers. In addition, we had thematic categories that formed the basis for our analysis. The theme for this study was reflections on the ideologies shaping the programmes – for example, the normative rationales behind the work approach or social inclusion. Categories also reflected the meanings – concerning, for example, the welfare state, social assistance recipients, what it is to be Norwegian – that are discursively produced through the shape of the policies themselves (Gergen, 1994).¹⁷ In this article, we also used Foucault's notion of institutional discipline, which was a central element to our analysis. Step one in phase 3 was therefore reading and analysing the data corpus in light of the analytical focus described above for each measure. We started with the Introduction Programme as this was the first one to be implemented and we then continued with the Qualification Programme. The last step in this phase was then contrasting the programmes.

¹⁷ It should be noted that we did not conduct a discourse analysis per se. In the study we use a wide definition of discourse that is linked to specific perspectives or views (Böréus & Bergström, 2012). In other words, we did not carry out a discourse analysis which is bounded to a particular theoretical and methodological whole, creating a unifying analytical package Jørgensen & Philips, 2002, p. 4).

Phase 4 was also characterised by moving back and forth between the empirical material and the analysis in order to revise and adjust. In phase 5 we wrote out the whole article, including making the final adjustments to the analysis.

5.4.6 Analysis of study IV

When I came to **study IV**, I was rather familiar with the empirical material, not only for Norway, but also for Sweden and Denmark. However, I had to read the material once again with new theoretical and analytical perspectives.

As in **study I**, the analysis approach was mainly inspired by ‘idea and ideology analysis.’ The analytical focus was on the ideas and ideology of radical and liberal empowerment in the introduction programmes as they are formulated in policy documents.

In phase 2 of the analysis, I searched for themes pertaining to empowerment. In phase three, I used 3 analytical questions in order to examine and identify various ideas and ideologies of empowerment in data material. The analytical questions posed were:

1. At what level does intervention for change take place: at the individual level, the structural level, or both (aims of the programmes)?
2. What is the balance between rights and duties for the target group of the programmes?
3. What tools (instruments) are used to enhance participation and user involvement, and how are they designed?

These questions served as an entry point for the analysis. This phase also had several steps. The first step was to analyse the material separately for each country. I began with Sweden, followed by Denmark and finally Norway. The second step was to compare the countries.

In phase 4, I started to systematically assess whether to revise, adjust, strengthen or reject my preliminary analysis made in phase three. And of course, writing out the study and the whole analysis was finalised in phase 5.

5.5 Qualitative comparative social policy approach

There are many ways in which comparative research approaches can take form. In a broad sense, comparative research is essentially comparing different phenomena with each other and searching for commonalities and/or differences between them (Kjeldstadli, 1988, p. 437). In a narrower sense, comparative research in social sciences tends to refer to comparisons across space, such as nations, states, countries, regions and so forth (Allardt, 1990; Clasen, 2013;

Denk, 2002). However, comparisons can also be made across time (Allardt, 1990; Mangen, 2013).

Most of the methods employed within the comparative approach have been outlined by researchers within the standard/positivist position (Wad, 2000; Yanow, 2014), who have as a premise that there exists a real social world that can be studied objectively. In contrast, the constructionist-interpretivist comparative approach has as its starting point that social reality is socially constructed and embedded in a specific historic and cultural context (Yanow, 2014). The comparative approach employed in this dissertation falls within the latter. Research designs within a constructionist-interpretivist approach build on the adaptability of the research process and emphasise the cumulative learning process of the researcher as the research develops (Yanow, 2014). The thesis at hand demonstrates a development over time, which, of course, has had a direct impact on how the research process has proceeded.

In the studies, comparisons are made not only between different social policy measures in the same country (**studies I and III**) but also between countries (**studies II and IV**). As such, I have conducted comparative critical social policy analyses in line with a social constructionist ontology and epistemology.

Jürgen Kocka (1996) highlights that in all comparative research: ‘It should become clear why what is being compared with what, in what respect and with what aim’ (p. 198). These three questions have been answered in the respective studies. However, employing a qualitative comparative social policy research design has several strengths as well as limitations, traits that are commonplace for most research approaches. In the studies there was not enough space to properly address some of the advantages and challenges. Hence, in the following sections, I discuss them as well as elaborate on the comparative logic underpinning the studies.

In **study I**, where the Introduction Programme is compared to the financial support scheme for voluntary immigrant organisations, comparisons are made between these two measures. Here, the goal was not to compare similar measures, but instead to contrast two measures that are indeed different in terms of aims. The analysis was focused on the justifications for introducing the measures.

Contrasting different social policy measures is not in itself problematic, and this is an approach that is commonly employed in social policy analysis (Clasen, 2013). However, one point that should have been made in the study was that the analysis was not only based on contrasting the two measures but was also a comparison across time as the measures were implemented at different time periods. This analysis and the development over time showed

an overall political tendency in Norway towards thin assimilation policies. This clarification is important as this might have nuanced and supplemented the conclusion.

Study III is also a comparison between two different measures, however, two measures that are highly similar. The comparative research design employed was a direct result of the findings and conclusion derived from **study II**. In **study II** one of the main conclusions suggests that the stronger the ethnification process articulated through the justifications as illustrated in the description and framing of the social problem that needs to be addressed, the more punitive the introduction programmes will be. In retrospect, it was clear that such a conclusion could not stand alone. In order to critically assess the conclusion, it was important to contrast the introduction programme with a similar measure targeted towards marginalised groups in the overall population to examine and analyse whether this was indeed the case. In Norway, the Qualification Programme, which has been modelled after the Introduction Programme, served as an ideal contrasting measure because the measures are very similar. However, the differences between the programmes serve as an ideal starting point to analyse the programmes not only against the backdrop of ethnification but also through Foucault's concept of discipline. Hence, the comparative research design in **study III** is therefore a reflection of a greater awareness of the limitations of one of the main conclusions made in **study II** and a means of addressing this limitation.

Studies II and IV are both situated within a focused comparative cross-national social policy study, focused in the sense that the number of countries that are being compared is restricted to three (Denk, 2002). One central challenge in comparative (cross-national) studies is ensuring that you are comparing what is comparable (Frendries, 1983; Puskás, 2009). The introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark are similar, but they also exhibit important differences. The three countries have very similar policies, but there are important differences in the justification and organisation of the programmes.

Even though there are well grounded reasons for comparing the introduction programmes in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, it is important to underscore that such a comparison only represents a certain viewpoint and perspective. Noemi Lendvai and David Bainton (2013) write, 'Comparing is placing a mirror to national social policies and looking at them from the point of view of the other national social policies' (p. 126). I would have seen different things and drawn different conclusions if I had compared the Introduction Programme in Norway with the Introduction Programme in, for example, the Netherlands. Even though this might seem obvious, it is still important to make the point that selection criteria are important as

they have direct implications for what reflections we make depending on what is being compared (Lendvai & Bainton, 2013).

In cross-national policy comparison, it is not unusual for researchers to be more familiar with one country than another country, or countries under study, which is a limitation. This has been the case for me since I am most familiar with the Norwegian case given that my overall, professional (social) work experience is derived from Norway. Moreover, much of my work experience is connected to the Introduction Programme, on multiple governance levels, hence increasing my familiarity with the programme in Norway. I do not have first-hand experience with programmes in Sweden and Denmark, and the knowledge I have attained has been through my research project.

One important concern in cross-national comparative studies is the issue of language (Mangen, 2013, p. 246). Proficiency in the languages in which the documents have been written has been pivotal. Whereas my language skills in Swedish and Norwegian have been an asset, this has not been the case for Danish. I am the least familiar with Danish and this has sometimes created minor challenges during the analysis process. In such cases, I have been careful to use language tools to help me ensure that I have understood certain text passages correctly. However, because Scandinavian languages share many similarities, language issues have overall been a minor limitation. Further, considering that English is not my first language, my translation of Norwegian, Swedish and Danish policy texts to English might also be a limitation as I cannot be certain that I have always been able to provide the most precise translation.

5.6 Ethical considerations

While there is a clear expectation and obligation for researchers to reflect on ethical considerations on research that engages in direct or indirect contact with human subjects, such as conducting interviews, observations and so forth, there seem to be less focus on ethical issues and dilemmas pertaining to research that does not involve such contact. Although this thesis falls in the latter category, it does not relieve me as a researcher of the need to discuss potential ethical dilemmas embedded in this study.

At first glance, it might not seem obvious that the study is embedded in larger ethical dilemmas, as the focus is on the Introduction Programme. However, a large part of the analysis, has, to various degrees, focused on the categories of newly arrived immigrants and refugees, a group that is considered to be in a vulnerable position and is often stigmatised in

society. As such, constructions and understandings of ethnicity have been an analytical focal point.

Yasmin Gunaratnam (2003) articulates that one of the main ethical concerns when researching ‘race’ and ethnicity is that we run the risk of re-producing hegemonic understandings of these conceptions. As Paul Gordon (1992) writes, ‘Race’, racial groups and categories ‘[...] are not things that are given – objective facts waiting to be used – but concepts that have to be constructed’ (p. 18).

In this analysis, I have focused mainly on the social construction of the concepts of newly arrived immigrants and refugees as categories. Treating categorisations as social constructions has allowed me to critically analyse how target groups are socially constructed in public documents (see Bacchi, 1999, 2009; Schneider & Ingram, 1993). At the same time, since they are often presented as static in policy documents, I have made efforts through my theoretical approach/usage of target group constructions and ethnification to also show these as social constructions. As such, I have tried to avoid reproducing the categorizations of newly arrived immigrants and refugees as something given and static.

In addition, the category of migrants overlooks important and crucial differences between various groups and people. Policies often ignore how heterogenous the category of migrants is. Even though I am aware of these differences, for the sake of terminological consistency, in this thesis, I use the term newly arrived immigrants and refugees and new migrants interchangeably to refer to the target group of the introduction programmes.

Finally, and already briefly touched upon, it is imperative that I disclose the methodological choices made throughout the thesis, which I have attempted to do throughout this chapter to increase the transparency and trustworthiness of the thesis. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that other researchers with a different approach and analytical toolbox may have reached different conclusions. Ultimately, it is up to the reader to assess the quality of the thesis at hand.

6. Summary of the studies

6.1 Study I

Fernandes, A. G. (2011). En studie av to integreringstiltak og deres underliggende ideologi (A study of two integration measures and their underlying ideology). In Puntervold Bø, B (Ed.), *Multikulturell teori og flerkulturelle praksiser – Artikler om norsk minoritetspolitikk* (pp. 46-77). Abstrakt forlag.

The main aim of **study I** is to provide an in-depth understanding of the underlying ideology of two Norwegian post-immigration measures; the establishment of the Introduction Programme and the implementation of financial support schemes for voluntary immigrant organisations.

The study discussed and analysed the measures in terms of how Norwegian authorities justify and argue for their implementation in public policy documents. The theoretical perspectives underlying the analytical framework for this analysis are based on conceptualisations of immigrant integration, assimilation and multiculturalism. I've studied the empirical data, which consists of official policy statements, using a qualitative text analysis (mainly content and idea- and ideology analysis), and my analysis is based on the textual descriptions of these official policy statements.

My analysis suggests that the justifications for implementing the Introduction Programme do not view integration as a two-way process, and instead focus on immigrants' adaptation and absorption into Norwegian society. This focus does not reflect the usual theoretical definition of integration as a two-way process adjustment of both migrants and the society at large.

Support for multiculturalism is also evident in the policy statement's arguments for introducing public funds to voluntary organisations. However, the government fails to incorporate the ideas of multiculturalism in the actual financial support scheme. Consequently, I find the use of the term integration as an objective of the Introduction Programme and the use of multiculturalist rhetoric for voluntary immigrant organisation to be somewhat misleading. The findings suggest that the political ideology underlying these policies is *thin assimilation*, not *integration*.

6.2 Study II

Fernandes, A. G. (2013). Ethnification of new social risks: A comparative study of programmes for preparing newly arrived immigrants for (working) life in Sweden, Denmark and Norway'. In Harsløf, I. and R. Ulmestig (Eds). *Changing social risks and social policy adaption in the Nordic welfare states* (pp. 189-219). Palgrave Macmillan.

Study II addresses the justifications for implementing the introduction programmes for newly arrived immigrants and refugees in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The aim of the study is to if and eventually how ethnification is embedded in the justifications for implementing the introductory programme and how ethnification may effect the design of the programmes.

Furthermore, the study proposes that ethnicity is a new social risk, and the strategies to handle the risk through introduction programmes are anchored in different perceptions of the problem. How the problem is framed/anchored is connected to an ethnification process, which in turn may have consequences for which strategies and policies are adopted in each country. Immigrants are subjected to specific ethnification processes, which are examined and analysed.

I used a combination of theoretical perspectives to analyse this article. Inspired by writings on ethnification/racialisation (Eriksson, 2006; Miles, 1993; Miles & Brown, 2003; Williams & Johnson, 2010), which show how 'race' has been socially constructed and used in different contexts and time periods to group and place people into relations of subordination and privilege with each other. I use the term ethnification to refer to both the ways understandings of 'race' are a part of contemporary usages of ethnicity and culture in Europe, as well as how these categories are socially constructed and must be understood in relation to hierarchy and the uneven division of power and resources. The study also makes use of ideas from social risks and activation.

I use a comparative social policy approach, mainly inspired by Carol Bacchi's (1999, 2009) method of social policy analysis, What's the problem? The empirical material for this study consists of official national policy documents which address the Introduction Act. More specifically I analyse official (political) documents from the time period when the introduction programme was first addressed in each country to its implementation.

Ethnification as a process is shown to be part of the justifications for implementing the programmes in all countries. I argue that the way the immigrant unemployment problem is perceived and described in policy documents affects the kind of measures that are implemented for this target group. My analysis suggests that the stronger the ethnification process is in the description of the problem, the more punitive the introduction programme will be. The risk of

ethnification is particularly strong in Denmark; however, both Norway and Sweden use justifications that are ethnified.

6.3 Study III

Gubrium, E. and Fernandes, A. G. (2014). Policing Norwegian Welfare: Disciplining and Differentiating within the Bottom Rungs. *Social Inclusion*. 3(2), 5-17.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v2i3.35>

The aim of **study III** is to explore how policy texts and the policy development process when establishing the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme have differed constructed the identity of their target groups. We also investigate how the benefits, sanctions and services available to these two target groups have differed.

As in **study II**, we use the term ethnification, however here in combination with Foucault's notion of the discipline of the self. Policing is a disciplining means for using welfare services to govern welfare recipients towards a desired behaviour or goal. In the study we apply Foucault's definition of institutional discipline as a means for exploring how the distinctions made by state and local welfare authorities in Norway when policing recipients may take shape according to normative perceptions of ethnicity and deservingness. More particularly, we explore the regulating understandings and activities linked to the inclusion and exclusion of eligibility to welfare benefits and services and the form of the services offered.

Our focus lies at the point of entry, moving from the lowest tier of Norwegian welfare benefits (social assistance) to two semi-parallel and higher tiers promising more (higher benefits, better services). The tiers represent programmes that share aims yet differ in reach.

While both programmes have been premised on the need to transform participants from a status of passive welfare benefit recipients to active participants in qualifying measures and society, the target groups vary, and it is this contrast that is our point of focus. We contrast the two policies at two 'moments' in the policy cycle: 1) policy framing (public and policymaker understandings/assumptions concerning the target group, the location of accountability for the marginal position of the policy recipient and the policy's political/social goals); and 2) the shaping and formative structure of these policies (how the relevant policies came into existence and what they look like).

We used qualitative text analysis in our study. We analysed primary policy documents pertaining to the Introduction Programme and Qualification Programme, respectively, with a

focus on strategies underlying the reform process, the use of framing and discourse by social actors involved in this process, and the objectives tied to these processes.

The Introduction Programme and Qualification Programme have been framed and shaped as a solution to the problems of worklessness and low social integration. The focus on divisions between those lying inside versus those lying outside work life has shifted focus to individualized problems and solutions. The individualized and ethnified casting of the ‘problem’ leaves us with a policy problem description that moves attention away from recognition of broader socio-structural problems.

However, the two programmes differ in terms of how the programs are described. In contrast to the Qualification Programme, the Introduction Programme has cast the problem of being ‘outside’ the Introduction Programme target group as a matter of cultural difference. The Qualification Programme, on the other hand, is framed around an individual assessment tool, yet the assessment of deservingness is overwhelmingly based on work ability, not cultural differences. The Introduction Programme is also based on work ability, yet rather than individualized, its rights-based eligibility protocol adheres to an essentialized notion of outsiderness, with the inherent goal of cultural assimilation for the entire target group. In the last decade, activation and conditionality have indeed introduced ‘softer’ forms of discipline. Yet additional distinctions along ethnic lines within the Introduction Programme also illustrate movement back to slightly harder forms of control.

6.4 Study IV

Fernandes, A. G. (2015). (Dis)Empowering new immigrants and refugees through their participation in introduction programs in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*. 13(3), 245-264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2015.1045054>

Study IV sets out to critically examine if and eventually how different ideas of empowerment are embedded in the design and structure of the introduction programmes in Sweden, Denmark and Norway.

The theoretical framework is based on different conceptualisations of empowerment. According to Robert Adams (1996) empowerment is fundamental to social work practice and theory. Fundamental to the concept of empowerment are understandings of participation,

user-involvement, individualisation, power, influence and self-realization. However, there are many different ideas and ideologies of what empowerment is.

I analyse primary and secondary policy documents of the introduction programmes in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway using textual analysis. This method of analysis is inspired by an approach within idea- and ideology analysis as described by Bergström and Boréus (2012, 146), which is based on the intention to analyse the presence of ideas and ideologies in specific policy fields, in debates or in general.

My analysis has demonstrated that the aims of the programmes fail to live up to the ideals within a radical empowerment ideology because they seek to transform the individual without taking into consideration the structural barriers in society that exclude immigrants from entering the labour market. Moreover, the aims and the means for achieving them (content of the programme), have a clear assimilationist undertone. This is especially evident in the case of Denmark. The programmes in all three countries have several elements in the program that have the potential of being empowering, when viewed from both a radical and liberal empowerment ideology. However, the liberal empowerment ideology is more present in the programmes, to various degrees, compared to the radical empowerment ideology, which is more difficult, if not impossible, to live up to within the framework of all three programmes.

7. The Introduction Programme as an arena for governing, disciplining and shaping migrants into ideal citizens

In this chapter, I discuss and analyse the Introduction Programme in Norway, mainly from a governmentality perspective and from perspectives on neoliberalism and ethnification, as outlined in chapter 4. In addition, this chapter offers a broader discussion of the connections and links to the four studies.

The structure of this chapter is organised around the 6 analysis/research questions. To understand the following questions through an understanding of governmentality, I will analyse and discuss: ***what was before, what was to come and why, to whom, to what ends and by what means?***

Section one of this chapter focuses on the first three questions (what was before, what was to come and why) as it deals with the justifications and problematisations underlying the Introduction Programme. In short, this section of the chapter answers the question of what the programme was an answer to, which was my focus in **studies I, II and III**.

In this section, I broaden the analysis and discussion by also including secondary material addressing the need for a reform within the integration field, thus broadening the outlook in light of a governmentality perspective. The timeframe analysed here begins mainly in 2001, when the Introduction Programme was first officially proposed (NOU 2001:20) up to January 2021, when the latest policy changes came into effect.

The **second section** looks at question 4, the ‘whom’ question, that is: Who is targeted for participating in the programme and what does the demarcation of the target group reflect? In **section three**, I examine the fifth question, ‘to what end(s)’, looking specifically at the aims of the programme and the sixth question, ‘by what means’ which is a ‘how question’ (see Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013, p. 7-8). Because of the high numbers of both required and optional measures in the program, this part of the discussion and analysis is more extensive compared to other sections.

7.1 What was before, what was to come and why?

A fruitful point of departure for starting a governmentality analysis is to examine what kinds of problematisations the state feels required to respond to (Bacchi, 1999; see also Bacchi, 2009; Otto, 2003). To paraphrase Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller (1992, pp. 181-83) what are the ills the government seeks to cure, e.g., what is the diagnosis and hence the prescription? As such, to govern is an activity intrinsically connected to problematisations.

Because problematisations do not exist in a vacuum, it is important to examine problem constructions as contextualised in relation to place and time and within specific professional and institutional environments (Vesterberg, 2016b). Political rationalities also manifest moral aspects as they attempt to put forward claims of truth about who we are and what we ought to be, and these political goals presuppose that it is possible to steer human behaviour towards a desired end (Rose, 1999b). Following this reasoning, it is vital to know what was before the implementation of the Introduction Programme. What measures were in place? And by extension, what was implicitly and explicitly not working, according to whom and why was the Introduction Programme proposed as the solution to the perceived ‘problem’?¹⁸ In short, what were the political rationales underpinning the creation and implementation of the Introduction Programme? In the subsequent sections, I address these questions.

One of the main problematisations seen in the analysed policy texts was centred around the notion of welfare dependency among newly arrived migrants and refugees. The policy documents refer to the targeted group’s high unemployment rate and the high number ‘passive’ social assistance benefits recipients as the motivations for instituting a national integration measure. The desire to reduce welfare dependency in the targeted groups led in combination with an activation agenda led to the development of the Introduction Programme as the solution (see Perchinig et al., 2012).

In the secondary literature, Djuve, addressing the transition to the Introduction Programme (Djuve et al., 2001) writes that in regards to income support (before the implementation of the programme), newly arrived immigrants and refugees were entitled to social security benefits, which more specifically entailed that many of them had to more frequently resort to economic social assistance, since they lacked the right to claim unemployment benefits. While social assistance was described as being a ‘help to self-help’ and as a way to further the recipients’ process towards self-reliance, it was argued by both politicians and scholars that this had, in many cases, led to a clientification, i.e., a significant number of migrants had become dependent upon social benefits (Djuve et al., 2001). This was a concern among policymakers and one prominent labour politician, Rune Gerhardsen (1991) sparked a debate concerning ‘a misguided kindness’.¹⁹ He argued that it was necessary to make demands on people who were dependent on public welfare, including migrants.

¹⁸ Due to space limitations, focus is only placed on integration and qualification measures, which were replaced by the Introduction Programme.

¹⁹ In Norwegian, ‘snillisme’.

Gerhardsen (1991, p. 21) also revived the historical Nordic union slogan ‘Perform your duty. Demand your right’²⁰ which reflects a responsibilisation of each individual.

Within the academic field of social sciences, the critique of welfare dependency among migrants was particularly voiced by a Norwegian anthropologist, Unni Wikan (1995, p. 160). However, the critique was already formulated in a Green paper in 1986 (NOU 1986:8, 1986). A mandatory Introduction Programme which requires the target group to attend and participate in various measures to prepare for labour market integration was thus framed as the solution to ‘the problem’. A higher standardised benefit, the introduction allowance, was coupled with participation in the programme as an economic incentive to motivate participation within the target group.

The rhetoric of welfare dependency and the reliance on what is described as passive benefits are strongly connected to the political rationale underpinning the move toward intensified activation programmes at the beginning of the 1990s (Dahlstedt, 2009a; Hvinden, 1999; Johansson, 2001; Lødemel & Moreira, 2014). Viewed from a governmentality perspective, this intensification meant that new migrants and refugees were made responsible for their unemployment status and what is perceived, as formulated in the policy texts, as their passivity. Such a problematisation opens up the space for introducing interventions that seek to enhance the employability and increase the activity level of the targeted group (Dean, 1995; Rose, 2000). This intensification of activation programmes was thus transmitted to the field of immigrant integration (Perchinig et al., 2012). As several authors have already argued, integration was now, in the late 1990s defined in terms of migrants’ responsibilities and duties, in contrast to their rights (Borevi, 2010; Perchinig et al., 2012; Schinkel & Van Houdt, 2010).

The responsibilisation and individualisation of risks, such as unemployment, as described in the background chapter (2), are pivotal for understanding our modern form of neoliberal governance. I argue that responsibilisation and individualisation of risks in terms of migrants can also be seen in the analysed policy documents. As articulated in **study II**, newly arrived immigrants and refugees were constructed as being regarded as being at particular risk of becoming unemployed based on, for instance, their ethnicity, language etc. (see also Mik-Meyer & Villadsen, 2013, p. 24). Within the context of the Introduction Programme, it is in the interest of the target group to optimize their potential, to be active. And if they are not yet employable, they should take the necessary steps in becoming employable. Here, this means

²⁰ In Norwegian, ‘Gjør din plikt. Krev din rett’.

to take an active part in the Introduction Programme, which seeks to increase the target group's employability. This is in line with other relevant studies that have looked at activation measures targeted at the unemployed (Dahlstedt, 2009a; Dean, 1995; Masoud et al., 2019; Vesterberg, 2016a).

Another problematisation, identified in **studies II** and **III**, which paved the way for the Introduction Programme was an articulated need to introduce and improve measures targeted at new migrants and refugees. Prior to the implementation of the Introduction Programme in Norway in 2004 Djuve (2010)²¹ writes that there was no national coherent qualification regime to integrate newly arrived immigrants and refugees. The main rule was that the state funded integration measures, but the measures per se were developed and implemented by the municipalities. As a result, measures varied in terms of content, duration and intensity, which made policymakers, researchers and politicians question the quality of the various measures, which was expressed as being concern for them (Djuve, 2010).

Free Norwegian language training to newly arrived immigrants and refugees was made available from 1975 and onwards and participation was voluntary (Djuve, 2010). However, it was also perceived as a concern that the quality of Norwegian language training was not meeting the needs of each individual. The language courses were not differentiated enough according to everyone's needs, hence reducing the quality of the courses. The solution to this problematisation was thus to offer a tailored programme to meet the needs of each individual and to increased follow-up of each participant of the programme emphasising the need for user involvement.

A third problematisation relates to values and norms specifically tied to gender equality. Politicians and policymakers perceived gender equality to be a problem. They hypothesized that earlier measures had not clearly communicated what was defined to be the basic 'Norwegian' values to new immigrants and refugees (Djuve, 2011; Djuve, 2010). This concern was mainly framed around issues pertaining to the cultural and religious rights of migrants generally, but more specifically concern about gender equality was linked to a specific understanding of Muslims (Djuve, 2011; Djuve, 2010). This concern was also found in the analysed policy texts, where gender inequality and migrant women are portrayed as lacking agency, which was of particular concern. The prescribed solution to these problematisations was to institute an individual introduction allowance and establish civic courses.

²¹ It should however be noted that there is little literature in Norway that looks at qualification measures of new immigrants and refugees (Djuve & Pettersen, 1997, p. 85).

First, one of the articulated reasons for introducing a standardized individual introduction allowance without any additional child benefit was to promote participation in the programme by both caretakers in a family and to actively encourage gender equality (Ot.prop. nr 28 (2002 - 2003), pp. 70-71). As I argued in **studies I, II and III**, the idea of non-Western migrant women as repressed and lacking agency has had a direct impact on the design of the introduction allowance, which is based on an ethnified and essentialised understanding of the target group. The idea underlying this rationale is that a child benefit would jeopardize women's active participation in the programme and create a disincentive, as child benefits would stimulate women to have more children, rather than participating in the programme. Secondly, participating in civics course emphasising Norwegian 'values', with special emphasis on gender equality was a direct response to the problematisation of non-western women as non-equal.

Second, the prescribed solution to these problematisations was to design an Introduction Programme that would also emphasise interventions that would transfer an understanding of Norwegian values to participants, a goal which was, among other things, to be achieved by attending a civic course. The main content of the course was formulated to 'provide basic understanding of Norwegian society life' (Barne- likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet, 2012, p. 23). As we described in **study III**, this also meant gaining an understanding of perceived Norwegian values, human rights, child rearing, the problem with forced marriages, gender equality and so forth. As such, successful integration into Norwegian society was also framed as being equivalent with gender equality (Annfelt & Gullikstad, 2013; Gressgård, 2005; Gressgård & Jacobsen, 2002, 2003; Rugkåsa, 2010).

Tying gender relations with integration is not only a Norwegian phenomenon. Existing international literature show the same tendencies in several European countries (Perchinig et al., 2012; Vesterberg, 2016a; Wright Nielsen, 2009). Perchinig et. al. (2012, p. 32) make an illustrative point in regards to the focus on gender and refer to the term 'repressive emancipation' in terms of state promotion promoting gender equality through coercion. Sara R. Farris (2017) introduced the concept of femonationalism which is short for 'feminist and femocratic nationalism' to explain how neoliberals and western European right-wing parties promote racist politics by urging for gender equality. Femonationalism also highlights the role that recognised feminists play in the framing of Islam as a fundamentally sexist religion and culture. Farris uses the example of civic integration programmes to show how women's rights and gender equality are framed as one of the most crucial values that migrants are expected to learn and conform to. She also makes the important point that these policies operate at a

neoliberal economic level, where non-Western migrant women's possibilities in the labour market are often limited to low paid work, and where the risk for exploitation is high. This intensification of neoliberal governmentality has also transformed women into neoliberal subjects, where they are free to make choices based on economical rationales (Oksala, 2013a).

To sum up, the concerns and problems that the Introduction Programme address were 1) clientification, or welfare dependency of new immigrants and refugees 2) the differences in content, quality and intensity of previous measures and 3) the need to highlight basic 'Norwegian values', specifically tied to gender equality.

7.2 Who are targeted and thus governed?

Governmentality as an analytical perspective also addresses the process of subjectification in which individuals or groups are constructed as certain subjects in which they are made governable (Otto, 2003; Rose, 1999b). Subjectivity does not reflect a 'real and pure' individual. On the contrary, it is something that is ascribed. Power is therefore naturally embedded in subjectification processes. Simply naming groups creates an embedded power dimension (Yanow, 2003). To be sure, identifying and categorising target groups who are to be governed is an important ingredient in terms of governing (see Vesterberg, 2015, p. 306). But the discussion of target groups is closely related and intertwined with problematisations, rationalities and the social construction of target groups. In the following, I discuss and analyse who is targeted for participation in the Introduction Programme and why.

Demarcation of the target group, and hence eligibility for participation in the Introduction Programme are newly arrived refugees and immigrants who have been granted residency on the main following grounds: political asylum, humanitarian (subsidiary) grounds, collective residence permits, quota refugees and those who come in family reunification to these groups. Only those between the ages of 18 and 55 are eligible for residency.

According to the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi) there were 13 803 participants attending the Introduction Programme in 2020 (Directorate of Integration and Diversity, 2021c). Participants in the programme are highly heterogenous with different backgrounds in regard to country of origin, language, level of education, work experience, and family situation etc (Djuve & Kavli, 2015). Even though participants are referred to as newly arrived immigrants and refugees in the legislation, in practice, how long they have been in Norway before starting the programme varies. Some have come as quota refugees and start the programme within three months after they are

settled in a municipality, but the great majority of the participants have come to Norway as people seeking asylum and may have spent several years in reception centres before being settled in a municipality and starting a programme (Lillevik & Tyldum, 2018).

Studies I, II and III discuss the target group delineation in the introduction programmes. In **study II** attention was directed to how the target groups were constructed based on a perception that non-Western migrants, which make up the majority of the target group, are in a greater need of qualification and integration measures. I argued that this understanding is based on an ethnification process which is based on a marked hierarchy and subordination contingent on ideas of race. By portraying the target group as welfare dependent with a reduced level of employability, insufficient cultural understanding and a need for gender equality, the target group is constructed as the problem, and hence in need of a measure on an individual level. Thus, the Introduction Programme is expected to remedy these problems.

The construction of the individual as self-manageable promotes the idea that each individual is responsible for the problems he/she faces, hence can be understood as an opening up of space for state interventions that allow for the utilisation of ‘techniques of individualisation and classification’ (Rose, 1999b, p. 133). To illustrate, if you find yourself outside of the labour market, you must be willing to work on yourself and what is perceived as your shortcomings, e.g., language skills, in order to enhance your employability. The problem is thus individualised.

It is important to note that those who are not included in the target group are labour migrants, EU-migrants, and those who come in family reunification with persons who have citizenship. Norway has opened for other categories of new migrants to participate in the programme, but this is an offer the municipalities may provide, and is not formulated as a legal right (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2016). In practice, as participation in the programme is costly for the municipalities to provide, few migrants who are not in the direct target group are offered the programme (see Directorate of Integration and Diversity, 2021c).

In **study III** the point of excluding migrants from mainly Western countries from the target group is discussed as signalling ‘that the needs, norms and cultural background [...] are more ‘normal’ according to prevailing Norwegian standards and that they are distinctly different’ (Gubrium & Fernandes, 2014, p. 11) from those targeted. De Leeuw and van Wichelen (2012) put forward a similar point in their analysis of the Dutch integration exam. In the Netherlands, some migrants are exempted from taking the exam if they come from countries that are described by the authorities to be ‘socially, economically and politically comparable to

European countries' (de Leeuw & van Wichelen, 2012, p. 203).²² As shown both in **study III** and by de Leeuw and van Wichelen (2012), by not targeting Western migrants to the programme with the justification that they are portrayed to be 'more similar' to the majority population, a normalising judgement is being made by the state. Non-Western migrants are thus evaluated as more 'abnormal' in comparison to Western migrants, hence initializing a normalization state governed process (participation in the programme) where governing, shaping and discipline occurs. The state is thus involved in the institutional activity of evaluating and defining who is in need of normalizing and disciplining processes and those who are not (Foucault, 1995).

7.3 To what end(s)?

Within a governmentality perspective it is vital to direct attention towards the function of technologies and techniques by which the perfect ideal citizen is shaped and created (see Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013; Foucault, 2007). One pressing question that arises is 'What constitutes an ideal citizen?' Regarding the Introduction Programme, it is rather straightforward to consult the main aims of the programme by answering: 'What should the participants ideally achieve by participating and successfully completing the programme?'

The aim of the programme has, to various degrees, been analysed in all four studies, however not from a governmentality perspective. Until 2021, the main aim of the programme was to incorporate new migrants into society and help them reach economic self-sufficiency through participation in ordinary working life (Introduction Act Introduksjonsloven, 2003, article1). In addition, Norwegian language skills and civic knowledge were formulated as important objectives. In the new legislation of 2021, the formulation of the main aim has been revised to the following: '[...] immigrants should be integrated early into the Norwegian society and become economically independent. The law also mandates that immigrants acquire good Norwegian skills, knowledge of the Norwegian society, formal qualifications and a persistent labour market attachment' (Integration Act, article 1, my translation).

Several minor, but significant changes have been made. In contrast to earlier legislation, a time aspect has been introduced in the sense that it is emphasised that migrants should integrate early. It is also important to note the word choice 'integrate', which is also new. In

²² People who are exempted from taking the exam come from the European Union (EU), the European Economic Community (EEC), Australia, Canada, Japan, Monaco, New Zealand, South Korea, Switzerland, and the USA.

addition, formal qualifications and persistent attachment to the labour market are now emphasised.

Foucault's notion of dividing practises (Foucault, 1982) is useful when analysing the formulated aims. If we contrast these aims with their opposites, it is possible to pin down what it entails to be an ideal citizen. For example, success in the program means being employed and economically independent, thus not being 'dependent' on public welfare. Success also means mastering the Norwegian language, acquiring knowledge of Norwegian society and taking an active part in society. Hence, if we look at the implied opposites: if you are unemployed, dependent on public welfare, do not know the language, have limited Norwegian language skills, and are perceived to be 'passive' in terms of participation in society, you are deemed as abnormal, deviant and in need of correction. The prescribed cure is thus participation in the programme, where the target groups are exposed to various techniques that will govern them, discipline them and shape them into becoming ideal citizens. Through their participation in the programme, they will be able to acquire the necessary skills that they apparently do not currently possess.

The successful citizen is thus one that is economically and otherwise self-reliant, independent, active and responsible for their own lives, key characteristics that align with neoliberal governing in advanced liberal societies (see Pratt & Valverde, 2002; Rose, 1999b). The change in the reformulation in the aim stressing that migrants should integrate early is justified with the argument that the earlier the qualification process starts, the sooner the participant will be able to enter the labour market or start in ordinary education. This again will make the participants become economic independent sooner (Prop 89 L (2019-2020), p. 33).

It is further argued that early participation in the programme is in the interest of not only the society at large, but also for each individual participant in order to avoid long periods of passive waiting time after their arrival to Norway. Rather than altering the neoliberal project of creating the ideal neoliberal citizen-subject, the change has further reinforced it. In other words, there is no time to lose in securing the economic independence and employment for the target group. And to be sure, the attachment to the labour market is expected to persist over time.

7.4 By what means? How

Having examined what is construed as an ideal citizen, yet another question that is pressing is by what means is such a citizen created? In the following, attention is thus directed towards the

‘how’ question, e.g., how are the formulated aims of the programme to be operationalised? This entails a focus on what kind of technologies and techniques (forms of interventions) are embedded in the programme as tools for pursuing the goals of the programme. Governmentality operates with two main technologies, the technology of power and domination, and technology of the self. The discussion and analysis will be structured around these two technologies and their underlying techniques can be understood to be embedded in the Introduction Programme.

7.4.1 Legislation and ‘governance’

On July 4, 2003, the Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget) passed the Act of the Introduction Scheme and Norwegian language training for newly arrived immigrants and refugees (Introduksjonsloven, 2003), a law which regulates the Introduction Programme. Beginning September 1, 2003, the municipalities could freely choose whether they wanted to introduce the scheme, and thereby the programme. By September 1, 2004, however, the Introduction Scheme became mandatory for all municipalities. The revised and current legislation from 2021, which was passed on November 6, 2020, is now called ‘The Act on integration through training, education and work (Integreringsloven), 2020). While the revised legislation targets new participants receiving their first residence permit from the 1st of January 2021 and onwards, participants already in the programme and those who have received residence permit prior to 2021, will follow the earlier legislation. Depending on when the last participants started and will start in the programme according the former legislation, there will be a transitional period until only the new Integration Act is in force.

It is the state that regulates the programme through the national legislation which demonstrates that the state can be understood as having intensified and expanded its control and influence of the integration process (Emilsson, 2015; see also Gebhardt, 2016). The Act can thus be viewed as an illustrative example of the triangle of rule through which different technologies of power operate (Foucault, 2007). The technology of sovereignty is related to a form of power that is usually connected to the legal system. In this system of power, the law is one of the main tools for implementing legal directives and corrections (punishment) (Nilsson, 2008). It is through the sovereign technique of the law that all other techniques, embedded in the programme, are put into work, e.g., are operationalised. In the system of disciplinary power, gratification and punishment have a determinable role in the process of correction and training (Foucault, 1995). The technology of discipline is thus also present in the legislation as it formulates and regulates the duties and rights of both the municipalities and the participants.

Lastly, the technology of governmentality is very much in place as the Act regulates the programme, which in turn entails a governance of conduct, regulating the behaviour of the municipalities through different forms of governance, through the program advisors and other professionals with a mandate within the programme (see Herz, 2018, p. 36). And lastly it regulates the participants through their own internalized self-regulations. It is interesting to note that the new name of the legislation is precise in its description of what takes place within the programme, that is, training and education that in the end will lead to work. In other words, the name of the Act (integration through training, work and education) emphasises the programme as an arena for governing and shaping.

In the following sections, I provide an overview of the most essential regulations of the Act which are in place and which provide the tools for successfully governing both the participants and the municipalities. As such, the main focus will be placed on regulations pertaining to rights and duties, scope and content, the introduction allowance, the individual/integration plan and the integration contract.

In terms of the municipalities, there are several techniques of power at play in which the state aims to regulate how the municipalities govern the locally led introduction programmes. According to Djuve et. al. (2017, p. 161) there are mainly four governing tools directed to the municipalities which are: (1) regulations, both in terms of the Act itself and instructions, (2) economic support and economic incentives, (3) dialogue, knowledge dissemination (conferences, seminars etc.), local anchoring and (4) auditing, monitoring and praise ‘naming and shaming’, and awards.

These governing tools can all, to various degrees, be viewed from a governmentality perspective as techniques that aim to govern the municipalities both directly and more at a distance (see Pyykkönen, 2007, p. 213). The first technique, the Act itself and the instructions, as already mentioned and discussed, create the foundation for governing in which many of the other techniques in the programme are embedded. Here, emphasis will be given to the fourth technique as the discipline and governing is more directly overt.

The fourth governing tool, auditing, monitoring and praise ‘naming and shaming’ are techniques employed by the state as they try to govern both directly and more at a distance. For example, when the Introduction Programme was first introduced in 2004, there was no system in place to audit and monitor how the municipalities implemented and enforced the programme. However, in 2012 through the Introduction Act article 23 the state made the County Governor (Statsforvalteren) in charge of auditing and monitoring municipalities to make sure the programmes were fulfilling their duties according to the law. The new

legislation required that auditing ensure the quality and dependability of the programmes (Integration Act (Introduksjonsloven), 2020, article 48). Ultimately, it is a question of quickly securing the transition to work or education and ensuring that participants become economically independent as soon as possible, consequently making sure that the ideal citizen is rapidly in the making. Municipalities that fail to live up to specific requirements of the law receive an order from the County Governor to correct the breach. Auditing and monitoring through the County Governor can be viewed as a more direct form for governing. It is also important to note that the County Governor also serves as the appellate administrative body for participants that file formal complaints regarding their programme.

Beginning in 2012, the municipalities were responsible for auditing and monitoring their own work within the framework of the Introduction Act, as directed in article 24. In the new Integration Act this regulation has been removed; however, the duty to the need for municipalities to audit the introduction programmes is still intact in the Municipality Act article 25 (the Municipality Act (Kommuneloven), 2018). It was argued that this change was strictly based on administration reasons as the municipalities have to audit and monitor anything they are responsible for, including the Introduction Programme (Prop 89 L (2019-2020), p. 163). This can be viewed as a governing technique that governs more at distance as it requires municipalities to perform their own audits and monitoring over time, making it possible for the municipalities to govern themselves. Hence, the County Governors auditing combined with the municipalities self-auditing, can be understood as an illustration of governmentality at its best, governing directly and indirectly.

Finally, in terms of praising, the state utilises several means that are meant to encourage the municipalities to aim for a high level of participants transitioning to work and education after their termination in the programme. The government has operationalised this goal in setting as a target that at least 70 % of all participants should be in ordinary work and education one year after their completion of the programme (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).²³ Municipalities are required to monitor and register their own results in a national database in a national introduction register (NIR), which enables both them and the state to monitor and evaluate their results (Directorate of Integration and Diversity, 2021a). In this sense self-monitoring and evaluation can be seen as a technique of control in terms of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgement (Foucault, 1995).

²³ This target is for 2020.

Once a year, the figures are made public which entail yet another technique of control, namely the examination (Foucault, 1995). Municipalities who can reach high targets, receive recognition and positive acknowledgement from state authorities. A concrete example of this is the implementation of the annual establishment reward (*bosettingspriset*) that was introduced in 2008 by the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (2021b). Several municipalities are nominated for their work and results with the Introduction Programme, which also provides recognition, and in the end one municipality receives the final award at a ceremony during an annual integration conference. However, municipalities that, for various reasons, don't do as well are publicly shamed, part of a process of disciplining and controlling them. Introducing specified targets that determine which municipalities have been most successful is a classic example of a technique of control employed in a neoliberal society (see for instance Herz, 2018).

7.4.2 Rights and duties vs. gratifications and punishments

Two important premises in the process of correction and training within the system of disciplinary power are, on the one hand, to make use of positive reinforcement, or 'gratifications', and at the same time to also utilise punishments (Foucault, 1995). Translated to a social policy context, we can view gratifications as being rights and punishments as being sanctions. As pointed out by Lydia Morris (2002, p. 146) welfare rights can also be understood as a means of maintaining surveillance and exerting control. As already established, participation in various forms of introduction programmes is normally coupled with an obligation to participate. In several cases, attaining, for example, long term residency and/or citizenship in society is made contingent upon participation in such programmes (Borevi et al., 2017; Mouritzen et al., 2019).

However, in some cases, participation in programmes is also connected to an extension of certain rights as well. This is the case for Norway. The Introduction Act article 2 regulated both the rights and duties for the participants and the municipalities and is now regulated in article 8 in the new Integration Act. Here, focus is on the participants. The right vs. duty to participate in the programme for the target group is analysed and discussed, from different perspectives, in all four studies.

As we already have seen, the Introduction Programme was partly an answer to what was perceived as a lack of a coherent national integration measures that could ensure the same quality, content and intensity. The Introduction Programme provides a right to free comprehensive training tied to an economic allowance, the introduction allowance. In terms of

providing rights, the Introduction Programme did indeed represent a substantial extension of rights for the target group which compared to earlier was not guaranteed (see A. Djuve & H. C. Kavli, 2015; Djuve et al., 2017). At the same time, with the rights came also the duties, just as illustrated by Foucault (1995). Even though it is easily argued that having access to free and comprehensive training in many cases is beneficial, it is not a free choice for the target group to attend, as they are required to participate. Not attending the programme has both economic and legal repercussions. In terms of economic sanctions, you lose the right to the allowance as it is contingent on participation in the programme. In addition, you can lose the right to economic social assistance support, which is the last economic safety net in Norway.

Since the implementation of the programme in 2004, several new elements and measures in the programme have been introduced. These measures extend both rights and duties, but there has been an increased focus on duties and obligations. In 2005 a Norwegian language course of 250 hours and 50 hours of civic instruction (in a language you understand) were introduced. As a requirement to gain long-term residence and/or citizenship, one had to complete the courses, but one did not have to pass a test. However, in 2012, the hours for the Norwegian language class increased from 250 to 550 hours (Regjeringen, 2012). One year later, in 2013, final mandatory exams were introduced in both the Norwegian language and in the civics course, but participants were only required to take the test, not to pass it.

This rule changed, however, and in 2017, to gain permanent residency, participants now had to receive a passing grade on the civics test (in a language one understands) and pass an oral Norwegian test level A1²⁴. To gain both citizenship and permanent residency participants must pass an oral test in Norwegian level A2²⁵ and a citizenship test or, as an alternative, pass the civic course test in Norwegian (The Citizenship Act (Statsborgerloven), 2005; Utlendingsforskriften, 2009). The requirements changed again when Parliament passed in October 2020 new requirements (Prop. 98 L (2019-2020). Now the requirement is that one must pass an oral language test at the B1 level. The new requirements have yet to be implemented.

As the above outline clearly illustrates, there has been a considerable increase in what migrants are required to learn. They also have to document the learning process and, in the end, pass several tests demonstrating that they have reached a level that is deemed good

²⁴ Level A1 is described as elementary in the current curriculum for Norwegian and Civic studies (Forskrift om læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne innvandrere, 2012).

²⁵ A2 is described in the current curriculum as a basic understanding of Norwegian and Civic studies (Forskrift om læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap, 2012)

enough to gain permanent residency or citizenship. It is also interesting to note that the most stringent requirements are tied to gaining citizenship. As earlier studies on citizenship and governmentality (de Leeuw & van Wichelen, 2012; Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009; van Houdt et al., 2011) have shown us, implementing language requirements and citizenship tests is embedded in a technology of disciplinary power where the state seeks to construct specific citizen-subjects of migrants that conform to specific ideals of what constitute the ideal citizen. Not living up to the ideals (civic, cultural and linguistic) and hence not passing the tests will result in the denial of permanent residency and citizenship. Ultimately, it is in the hand of the migrants to demonstrate that they are worthy of citizenship and if they don't live up to the requirements, they themselves are to blame. In this sense we can see that responsibilisation, a key feature of neoliberal governmentality, is clearly in place (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009).

Even though citizenship tests and requirements are important final policy tools in the governing, disciplining and shaping of prospective new citizens, it is also important to look more closely at how these policy tools and measures operate prior to the final language and citizenship test. In the next section we therefore turn our attention to what constitutes the design, scope and content of the Introduction Programme and how the programme can be understood as a means to govern, discipline and shape the target group before they reach the final stage of citizenship or permanent residency.

7.4.3 Design, scope and content

Since the Introduction Programme was instituted partly a response to the problematisation of new migrants, who are framed as welfare dependent, part of the solution to that problem is reflected in the design and structure of the programme. The programme is full time, 37,5 hours a week, all year and resembles, to a great extent, the same working conditions of an ideal wage worker in Norway. One step in becoming employable is thus being subjected to a structure that resembles the conditions in the ordinary working life, which has as an underlying assumption that the target group is not acquainted with such conditions, and hence needs to learn them. That migrants are required to be full time participants already informs us that they are being exposed to a structure that is supposed to work on their subjectivity in terms of increasing their employability.

Up to 2020, the participants had a formulated right to two years in the programme but could be granted an extra year based on an individual assessment of their further needs for qualification. In 2018, the opportunities for being granted a third year, were specified and emphasised in the legislation (Prop 45 (2017-2018). Beginning in 2021, the time period in the

programme for each participant has become more differentiated and this change is rather substantial compared to earlier regulations. According to the new law, the end goal and the duration of the programme is based on the level of education and age of each individual participant. The target group is categorised into three sub-groups. The first subgroup consists of those with minimum upper secondary education (videregående). For them, the end goal of the programme is higher education or work, and the duration of the programme is a minimum of 3 months and up to 6 months (can be extended for additional 6 months). Compared to earlier, this change represents an actual decrease in rights in the sense that the time period they are entitled to participate in the programme has been considerably reduced.

The second subgroup includes participants below the age of 25 who do not have education above upper secondary. Here, the end goal of the program, as a main rule, is to complete upper secondary education. Participants have from 3 months up to 2 years to accomplish this goal, with the possibility of a one-year extension. For this subgroup, this shift represents an extension of rights in terms of the duration of the programme.

The third and last subgroup are all the remaining participants. The end goal is either to transition to employment or to complete parts, or the whole, of primary and lower secondary school (grunnskole) or upper secondary. The time period is then set from three months to up to two years and can be extended up to one year. However, if the end goal is to complete upper secondary, then participants may have up to three years. For those who wish to complete upper secondary, this change also represents an extension of time allocated in comparison to earlier. However, for those with the first end goal, to find employment, the duration of the programme is similar to earlier.

The amount of time available to the state to exert control over the lives of the participants is thus relatively limited. This is especially true when compared to the amount of time the state usually has available in shaping citizens that are born in the country, from when they are born (cradle) to the very end (grave), through providing welfare state and primarily through the education system. Even though depending on the goals, the duration of the programme is now differentiated, from 3 months to up to potentially four years, the programme, is quite intensive. Even though the process of normalisation and transformation is most likely to continue in other social arenas after they have completed the programme, the clear goal is to optimise as much as possible within the available time frame to exert control, shape, govern, discipline and transform the participants.

Pykkonen (2007) refers to ‘work-related techniques, including employment, work practice, work training, education and so forth’ all of which are to promote and enhance the

employability of the individual participant (p.215). In the case of the Introduction Programme, these work-related techniques are all present. The Integration Act regulates requirements of the minimum requirements, which, since implementation of the Act, have always consisted of language training, civic instruction and work training/preparation courses, which all aim at increasing the skills of the participants and hence strengthening their employability (Barne-likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet, 2012).²⁶ Starting 2021 two new minimum components have been added to the programme: a course in life coping skills (livsmestring) and if participants have children below 18 years, a course in parenting (Integration Act, 2020, article14).

As earlier discussed, one of the problematisations which also paved the way for the programme was the need to have in place measures that would convey an understanding of so-called Norwegian values. The arenas where this can take place within the programme are primarily in the Norwegian language course and in the civic course. The language training course tends to be the largest element in programme. As a rule, participants start the programme by attending a language course followed by or combined with practical language training (språkpraksis). Language training is emphasised and the metaphor of ‘language being the key’ to society is commonly used in official policy documents addressing integration. The importance of language is reflected not only by the amount of time dedicated to the activity in the programme, but also by the fact that it is directly tied to gaining long term residency or citizenship. Interestingly enough, the importance of language skills is emphasised officially, but the number of target groups who have access to free language courses is rather small. This point is elaborated in **study II**.

The civic instructions course (50 hours) provides knowledge of society. The civic instruction course will always to a certain degree be embedded in the core values that a society is built upon (Brochmann & Djuve, 2013, p. 235). The curriculum for the civics course states that the students are supposed to learn about gender equality and different perspectives of child rearing, topics that all point to the idea that migrants need to gain more awareness of such issues, a point also made in **study III**. The consequences of such an understanding are that migrants need to be governed and shaped by learning values that will guide them to act more in line with the idea of what it is to be a Norwegian.

²⁶ These are the minimum requirements, however the programme may offer various other activities, such as training and treatment. Because what is possible to include in the programmes varies across municipalities, the discussion provided in this section describes what the programme minimum should be in all programmes.

This is not exclusive to Norway and there are several international studies that demonstrate how civic instruction is an arena for instructing migrants to learn, adhere to and possibly internalise what is prescribed to be core values of the nation (Abdulla, 2017; Silow Kallenberg & Sigvardsdotter, 2019).

Interesting enough, Åberg (2020) demonstrates how the civic courses in the Introduction Programme in Sweden have been developed without any consideration of what kind of information and measures the target groups need. Consequently, the information passed to the participants must be adjusted by workers on the local level of implementation to better fit the needs of the participants. Also, from a Swedish context, Vesterberg's (2015, p. 310) study of labour markets projects targeting unemployed migrants in Sweden makes the point that such approaches, that is, tying the perceived lack of gender equality to migrants 'produces hierarchical differences and ethnicized 'Otherness', which creates a space for migrants in learning to be Swedish, and in this case, learning to be Norwegian. This process of contrasting groups against each other, where one group's behaviour is constructed as 'good' while other groups are deemed 'bad' and in the need for correction, is an illustration of what Foucault referred to as 'dividing practices' (1982, p. 28). The civics course is a clear illustration of an individualising technique that seeks to govern and shape the participants' behaviour. This example of a 'dividing practice' works on their subjectivity in getting migrants to adhere to and internalise ideas of what it means to be Norwegian.

Participants can access both primary and secondary education within the framework of the programme. In 2016 a policy change made it possible for upper secondary education to be a full-time activity (Meld. St. 16 (2015-2016)). Moreover, in 2021 it was explicitly regulated that the starting point for participants below age 25 should be to complete upper secondary level, and if they pursue this goal, participants can get up to three years to complete their goals. This is also the case for other participants that wish to complete upper secondary. This represents an extension of participants' formal rights and opportunities, which fall under the category of gratifications.

Within the activation literature the right to formal education is described as a social investment because it leads to an increase of human capital (Djuve & Kavli, 2018). It is also important to note the reformulation of the overall aim of the programme, where the word choice of 'persistent' labour market attachment acknowledges the need to increase formal qualification paths. Hence, in the new integration Act there is an explicit emphasis on better qualifications processes and, to a larger extent, securing formal education within the scope of the programme (Prop 89 L (2019-2020)). However, as several studies show, few participants

have made use of these opportunities because the formal requirements to gain access to them are high and not easily attainable (Djuve & Kavli, 2018; Djuve et al., 2017). It is, however, too early to assess the most recent 2021 policy change.

Work training/preparation courses are, under normal circumstances, employed during the last phase of the programme. These courses are designed to make the participants take part in training and job-preparation activities, which include techniques like resume writing, work practice, job training etc. (Vesterberg, 2013, p. 752). It is through these courses the participants are supposed to learn the final requirements before the ultimately find employment. As Vesterberg (2013) points out, such techniques can viewed as shaping the direction of ‘the mindset, aspirations and behaviour of the target to become more aligned with the norms of advanced liberal societies’ (p. 752).

Both the new elements of the life coping skills course and the parenting programme represent techniques that operate through the technology of power and domination and through the technology of the self. The life coping skills course lasts 25 hours and is divided into the following themes: migration, health, and diversity and career competence, including knowledge about education and work. It is recommended that the course be given at the beginning of the programme. The Ordinance for the Integration Act (Integreringsforskriften, 2020) describes the aim of the course in life coping skills in article 4: ‘[...] shall strengthen participants’ motivation and coping strategies in meeting the expectations of a new society. The course shall contribute to the participant’s ability to identify and use his own competence and resources’ (my translation).

This aim is a perfect illustration of how the participants through their acquired increased self-knowledge are supposed to work on their motivation and skills in order to reach their full and true potential as defined by the state. To be clear, the underlying assumption of the aim is that the participants need to become ‘more motivated’ as they are not yet motivated enough. Further, the participants do not yet have the necessary coping skills needed to meet the expectations of the new society. Expectations in this sense are about being able to live up to the ideal of the neoliberal citizen subject. Framed in this way, the life coping skills course is the solution to dealing with unmotivated participants who must work on themselves to remedy what they lack.

The parenting programme also works on the subjectivity of the participants. The scope of the parenting programme is differentiated depending on need. It can either be provided in groups for 8 – 12 hours, or it can be given individually from 5 – 8 guidance hours. As with the

life coping skills course, the parenting programme should be taken during the early phase of the starting the Introduction Programme.

The aim of the parenting programme ‘[...] is to give information and guidance about the parenting role in a Norwegian context and to create safe parents that are able to bring up their children well, and hence facilitate integration in Norway’ (Integreringsforskriften, 2020, article 3). Also, here, the underlying assumption is that the targeted parents don’t know how to raise their children. From the aim, it seems that parents need to be educated within a specific Norwegian context where they shall be ‘created’ as safe parents with the indirect understanding that they are not safe parents yet. Hence, they need to be created and transformed through the parental programme where they will be shaped into becoming ‘good’ parents, who are able to provide for ‘a good’ upbringing for their children. As such, the targeted parents do not yet live up to the norms to what is perceived to be good parenting in Norway.

We see the same patterns and processes observed elsewhere in the programme, here manifested that participants, who also are parents, become the ‘Other’ that need to be fixed (see also Dahlstedt, 2009b). However, a new dimension is added here, namely the creation and shaping of the ideal parent. Hence, we are moving into the field of parental governmentality (Dahlstedt, 2009b) where ideas of culture and ethnicity play a crucial role in terms of migrant parents.

It should, however, be remarked that parental governmentality is not only directed at migrant parents but is a power technology that is directed towards the overall population as well. It has long been established that the government has measures that seek to promote and accommodate parents’ will and their ability to act as ‘good’ parents to ensure children’s wellbeing (Madsen, 2016). An illustrative example of such measures is the clinic health centre for children (*helsestasjon*) in Norway. Even though the services offered to parents at the clinic health centres for children are mainly voluntary, it is an offer that is difficult to refuse (Madsen, 2016). Through the clinic health centres, migrant parents already have access to the same services as the overall population but will now in addition have to attend a mandatory parenting programme through the Introduction Programme, which is an offer they can’t refuse, at least, not without facing both economical and judicial consequences.

7.4.4 NGO’s part in the content of the programme

Interventions and measures that can be part of the programme are not limited to activities employed by official authorities. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) offer a vast array of measures that can be included in the programmes. Examples of such organisations are civil-

society organisations, such as migrant associations, and private organisations. Opening up to various non-governmental actors creates the space for civil society to actively take part in the governing of new migrants (cf. Pyykkönen, 2007; Rose, 1999b; Vesterberg, 2015). In terms of migrant associations these non-official associations represent a technique of governance as they seek to instruct their members and the target groups of their interventions on how to become and act civilly in their new society (Pyykkönen, 2007, p. 210). Again, to become and act civilly illustrates the dividing practices Foucault (1982, p. 778) refers to. In this case, migrants are constructed as not yet being civil (in opposition to the majority citizens) and civility is something they will learn through the normalisation processes initiated by the state. Becoming more normal, here more civil, is made possible through several techniques of governance in place to govern the associations, and these techniques are discussed below.

For example, one central technique of governance operates through the public funding of associations and their measures (Pyykkönen, 2007).²⁷ Because associations are, in many cases, dependent on public funding when implementing activities, funding their functions is a way of ‘governing at a distance’ (Pyykkönen, 2007, p. 212). Associations that receive public funding must adhere to the aims and premises funded by the authorities. In terms of new migrants’ integration, immigrant associations are viewed by governmental authorities as useful because they can facilitate the integration process as the state understands and defines it. In **study I**, I make a similar point that the government’s main justification for introducing a financial support scheme for local voluntary immigrant associations was, and still is, that they can facilitate migrants’ adaption into Norwegian society. By using not only immigrant associations but also the civic society in general as providers of activities for the Introduction Programme, the reach of technology of power, and hence the techniques of governance and control increases, in addition to those already embedded in the structure of the programmes. With this, the governance of new migrants and refugees is made even more powerful, and thus more effective.

7.4.5 The introduction allowance

Participants in the Introduction Programme are entitled to an introduction allowance. Norway have designed the introduction allowance to be more generous than what is received at the social assistance level. As described earlier, failure to comply with participation requirements of the programme leads to economic sanctions. For example, an unexcused absence from the

²⁷ Other techniques of governance identified by Pyykkönen (2007), in addition to those two mentioned above, are registration of associations, auditing and evaluation, integration law and related local programmes.

programme will lead to reductions in the introduction allowance, and, as such, the allowance is designed to be an economic incentive. Norway uses the allowance both as a sanctioning tool and as a positive economic incentive. As such, it is not only the threat of sanctions, but also the possibility of a higher allowance that creates the overall incentive to participate in the programme.

There are several ways of understanding why Norway has implemented a relatively generous introduction allowance (which I addressed in all four studies). One way to understand it is that the state is using the benefit as an economic incentive, in the sense that the allowance resembles a work salary in an ordinary labour market, thus, promoting a normalisation process for entering the labour market. The higher allowance can then be understood as an ‘economic nudge’ (Øverbye 2013). In terms of using positive incentives, Foucault (1995) writes:

In discipline, punishment is only one element of a double system: gratification-punishment. And it is this system that operates in the process of training and correction. The teacher ‘must avoid, as far as possible, the use of punishment; on the contrary, he must endeavour to make rewards more frequent than penalties [...] (p. 180).

In setting the allowance at a higher level, the aim is to reward, give a gratification to the participants that follow the regulations, norms and rules of the program, hence complying with the requirements of the programme. Because the introduction allowance is higher compared to basic economic social assistance, it makes the reward of the allowance more powerful. In other words, if you fully follow the programme according to the rules, the reward is not only frequent, but constant and as such, punishment and sanctions are not needed. However, failure to comply leads to economical punishment. Simplified: If you comply you will be rewarded, if you do not, you will be punished. Reward and punishment are given according to participants’ willingness and ability to conform to the values, norms and behaviour in accordance with programmatic expectations (see Foucault, 1995).

The attendance register is a record that each individual participant keeps throughout the month to document their attendance and participation in the programme. Those in charge of each activity or intervention, such as a teacher in a Norwegian language class, are responsible for signing the register after completion of each session/day, hence controlling the attendance of participants. Unexcused absences lead to a deduction of the introduction allowance according to the amount of time they have been absent. The attendance register is a way to exert disciplinary power over the participants merely by observing, but also by rewarding them (no reductions of the allowance) and sanctioning them (reducing the allowance)

(Foucault, 1995).²⁸ Surveillance is made possible through a hierarchical chain of observers passing on information which monitors the participants' compliance with the regulations embedded in the Introduction Programme.

The attendance register teaches participants to obey and follow the 'law, norms and rules' of the programme, and by extension the regulations that are present in mainstream working life (cf. Pyykkönen, 2007). The underlying assumption is that the participants have limited knowledge of working life in Norway when they first arrive and must be taught this through their participation in the programme. The function of this government technique is to micromanage the behaviour of the participants in specific ways. It is a technique of discipline and control as it observes, monitors and sanctions the participants in case they do not live up to the requirements as defined in the law and regulations of the programme. This is part of the normalizing judgement (Foucault, 1995) which takes place within the programme (institution) and this function is carried out by observers, such as both the teachers (on the lower level of observation) and by the case workers (at a higher level of observation) as they impose the norms and values and evaluates the behaviour of the participants (at the lowest level of them all). That is, those who adhere to the law, regulations and rules are rewarded through the introduction allowance, and those who do not, are thus sanctioned and disciplined through the same allowance.

This government technique of control can be understood as an illustration of how the modern state operates in directing the behaviours of the participants in the programme towards a certain behaviour, in this case living up to 'the normative expectation of full employment', a point made in **study III**. It is an illustration of a disciplinary and an individualising technique that seeks to produce the 'good and employed' citizen.

Moreover, the attendance register can be seen as an illustration of a modern Panopticon in the sense that the participants are under constant surveillance within the framework of the programme. It is also an example of the use of a sovereign power technique anchored in the legislation regulating the programme, in this case the introduction allowance. This technique gives the case worker the legal foundation for regulating and sanctioning the participants through the allowance.

Moreover, the procedure for keeping and maintaining the attendance register both for those attending and for those signing/confirming, can be understood as a monthly ritual, or in the

²⁸ See also Hagelund (2007, p. 678), who identifies the function of the attendance register as a way to discipline the participants, as the register monitors their presence in the programme, and non-valid absence leads to economic sanctions.

vocabulary of Foucault, an examination. It is an examination in the sense that the participants' behaviour and performance are evaluated through the hierarchical observation and normalising judgement exercised by the teacher/others and ultimately by the caseworker.

Hagelund (2007, p. 678) argues that teachers, and by extension others who validate the register, demonstrate that they are in fact exercising their controlling role. This is also true for the case workers who are also exercising control but at a higher level, an example of Foucault's 'hierarchical observation.'

In disciplinary processes, documentation plays an essential role, and the attendance register is a tool of documentation. It is a tool to classify, categorise, compare and normalise individuals (Foucault, 1995). Throughout their attendance in the programme, the participants are being documented, categorised and ultimately evaluated and judged.

In summary, the technique of the introduction allowance is the epitome of a disciplinary power technique as it includes all strategies for achieving successful discipline, that is hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and finally, the examination (Foucault, 1995).

7.4.6 The individual/integration plan: Individualisation and responsibilisation

Prior to 2021, it was an explicit formulated goal that the programme be individually tailored in order to meet the particular needs of each participant, and that this aspect of the programme would be ensured by an individual plan (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet, 2016). Starting this year, 2021, the individual plan has been replaced with an integration plan (Integration Act Integreringsloven, 2020, article 15). Even though the plan has changed names, in its structure and design it is, in essence, highly similar to the earlier individual plan. Still, there are new elements²⁹ that have been introduced. The new integration plan is formulated in the following way in the legislation (Integration Act, 2020, article 15):

The plan is to be developed with the participant and constructed based on completed competence mapping, career counselling and an assessment of what elements the participant might utilize. [...] (my translation).

²⁹ According to recent legislation, the new elements in the integration plan are that the plan should be developed based on a competence mapping and on career counselling. There has always been a detailed mapping of a participant's background; however, the mapping process has been developed and revised further and is now referred to as a competence mapping and is regulated as a right and duty in the legislation. Even though career counselling, to various degrees, has been part of the programme, it is now formulated as a right and duty and should be based on the competence mapping. The career counselling must take place within 3 months of a participant's arrival in a municipality.

At a minimum, the integration plan must contain the end goal of the participant and Norwegian goal [...]. The program should state the scope of the Norwegian language training³⁰ civic instruction, the duration of the programme, the elements of the programme and the opportunities to appeal (my translation).

Hence, it is in the integration plan where the specific aims (main and intermediate), measures (hence content) and time-period are formulated. A close examination of the individual/integration plan reveals explicitly what the programme sets out to do on an individual level. In other words, it explains *how* the individual participant is supposed to reach his/her specific goal. Viewed from a governmentality perspective the individual plan serves as an epitome of how power operates.

The plan is an individualising technique that works on the subjectivity of the participants. The plan is also a technique of the self in which the participants come to govern themselves. As such, it is important to examine how the individual/integration plan is created, developed, revised and maintained. In addition, it is important to investigate how ‘ownership’ of the plan is construed.

According to the legislation, the plan is supposed to be developed in cooperation between the programme advisor (case worker) and the participant, where they both act as experts in formulating and developing the plan, however from highly different premises. The programme advisor acts in the role of an expert, who works on behalf of the municipality and the state. Moreover, the programme advisor is supposed know about the opportunities available and restrictions within the framework of the programme, e.g., what resources are available for reaching specific goals. In the role of an expert, the programme advisor exemplifies the pastoral power in the sense that through the dialogue that takes place to negotiate and determinate the goal(s) and the contents of the plan, they seek to guide the participant towards specific goals. This is, however, framed in an individualising way, so the participants internalise the belief that they are acting in their own self-interest. To be sure, by involving the participants in the formulation and creation of the plan and offering them choices about which measures to incorporate in the programme, the plan illustrates how a technology of the self operates in the sense that the participants are made responsible and self-regulated (see Born & Jensen, 2010). Even though the overall aim (in the long term) for all participants is to become economically independent, the plan is developed on an individual

³⁰ Previously, the participants had one individual plan for the Norwegian language training and one for the introduction programme. In the new legislation the two plans have been merged into one integration plan.

level, hence each participant internalises the goal individually. In this way, individualisation and responsibilisation are at the centre stage of the plan.

As I mentioned above, the plan is designed based on the wishes and qualifications of the participant, who acts as an expert on himself/herself. Hence, in order to develop the plan, the qualifications, capabilities, needs and aspirations of the participants have to be mapped by the programme advisor. This pastoral technique requires a self-examination and self-flexibility on the part of the participant (see Foucault, 2000, p. 310; Van Houdt, 2014, p. 56). In dialogue with the programme advisor, the participant is encouraged to express and assess his/her qualifications or lack thereof, in order to determine the content and measures of the programme.

The process of creating, negotiating, developing and maintaining the individual/integration plan is thus based on a dialogue, a dialogue between the programme advisor and the participant, with clear references to Foucault's (1988b, 2000) notion of the technique of confessing. The participants are confessing their 'inner truths' and the programme advisors are showing the 'right' path forward (see also Villadsen, 2007, p. 158). As Foucault (1988a) writes: 'confession permits the master to know because of his greater experience and wisdom and therefore to give better advice (p. 47).' This is a vital point as in the example of the Introduction Programme, the programme advisor will, more often than not, claim to have more knowledge and expertise in how the labour market is organised and what measures are available to increase the participants' employability. The participants must thus rely on the expertise of their programme advisors to give them the advice and guidance necessary to increase their chances of reaching the formulated goals (see also Kobberstad 2020, 2019). Within the pastoral power, the experts acts on what they perceive and assume to be in the best interest of the participants, but also in the best interest of society (Nilsson, 2008, pp. 52-52).

Einar Øverbye (2013, pp. 108-109) uses the term *communicative steering* to describe what happens when welfare professionals, here understood as the programme advisors, are able to successfully convince participants that labour market participation is for their own good. The hope is that the recipients will internalise the goal (labour market attainment) as their own. According to Øverbye (2013) the participants will act on their own behalf, hence these participants don't need additional rewards or punishments to make them comply to the requirements of the state. It is a way to direct the behaviour of the participants in a direction that aligns with the interests of the state. The technique of the individual/integration plan, or more precisely, in the dialogue where the individual plan is negotiated, is an example of how

‘the conduct of conduct’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 789) is at work, that is directing, guiding and leading people or encouraging them in a certain way so they may govern themselves.

It is important to note that the programme advisors are also being governed in a way that increases the advisors’ own motivation as to activate their participants. Instead of playing the role of expert, these advisors now act more as facilitators or coaches. As facilitator, the aim is to place the participants at the centre stage, where they are encouraged to define their own goals (Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2012, p. 18). A facilitator is not supposed to solve the problems of their clients. Instead, the clients are supposed to solve their own problems, but with the help of the facilitator. Rose (1999a, p. xxiii) describes the professionals as guides so that the participants themselves can be self-regulating.

From the perspective of the state, the ideal starting point for developing the plan is thus anchored in how the participants themselves perceive their situation, making sure the participant understands why the programme is needed, and also making sure that he/she has internalized the goals of the programme and the means for reaching these goals. As such, developing an individual/integration plan with specific content and short term and end goals reflects the participant’s development process. In a way, they are ‘in the making,’ reflecting a transformation process from which any deviation will result in not being employed. They will ‘become’ ideal citizens by being both employed and by extension integrating in society as long as they follow their plans. The problem to be solved is thus an individual problem, and the solution is an individually tailored programme that will fix the problem.

The plan can thus be viewed as both a technique of power and domination in which the programme advisor seeks to control the participant, and at the same time as a self-technology in which the participants regulate oneself. From a governmentality perspective the mapping and the development of the individual/integration plan might also be understood as a technique of power in which the programme advisor is shaping the refugee in order to make them ‘employable, normal and adjustable’ to society. The participants must confess what they want to improve to live up to the aims of the plan, both the short- and the end plan. Migrants are created as subjects that needs to be governed, disciplined, shaped and at the end transformed. The integration plan is as such a particularly efficient technique of power and displays how power operates within the framework of the programme.

In contrast to the integration plan, which is mainly a continuation of the earlier individual plan, the implementation of an integration contract (Integration Act, article16) is a new policy tool representing a marked shift. The new legislation states that the participant and the

municipality shall enter a contract at the same time as they develop the integration plan. The justification for introducing the integration contract is grounded in that it shall serve as a means of displaying the duties of the municipality and to clarify both the rights and the duties of each participants (Prop. 89 (2019-2020), 102). The argumentation is not straightforward considering that the duties and rights of both the municipality and the participants are clearly regulated in the legislation. As such, the contract in itself does not seem to be legally binding, and it is unclear what the consequences are if the contract is breeched. This is a point that the state also seems to acknowledge, however they emphasise that the contract is to make visible the right and duties even further (Prop. 89 (2019-2020), p.102).

In a way, the contract therefore becomes a symbolic act. However, symbolic acts also have an important role to play in the governing of the municipalities and in the disciplining, governing and shaping of the participants. The implementation of the integration contract therefore represents an additional technique of power and domination and, as a self-governing technique, reinforces the other techniques that already are in place.

7.4.7 Resistance

Foucault (1995) makes the point that resistance to various forms of power techniques are always plausible and even to be expected. One of Foucault's (1978) well-known articulations is 'Where there is power there is resistance (p. 95).' Applying this view, participants can be understood to be resisting the governing attempts of the programme advisors if they decide not to cooperate in facilitating the individual/integration plan and if they object to both the formulated goals and the contents of the programme (see Holmes, 2002).

In the end however, it is the programme advisor who has the ultimate power to make the final decision regarding the contents of the plan. Participants may exercise their right and power to file a complaint to the county commissioner office regarding the content of individual plan and by extension the programme. Nevertheless, the county commissioner office can only overrule the municipality if the decision is obviously unreasonable. The complaint system is thus also a reflection of the asymmetrical power relations at play between the participant and the authorities, favouring the state apparatus.

One last resort to exercise power and resistance by the participants is that they can ultimately choose not to attend parts of the programme and may even withdraw completely from the programme. Although the participant is economically sanctioned (introduction

allowance is withdrawn and not being eligible for economic social assistance) and may in the long run face having its citizenship request declined, the participant is still exercising his/her power. By resisting and not complying to the system and state and hence not being a ‘docile body(ies)’ which underlines Foucault’s (1980) important point that power is indeed everywhere. It should, however, be noted that studying power resistance and counter-conduct solely by analysing official documents does not capture how resistance might unfold in everyday activities carried out by participants (see Vesterberg, 2016a, p. 42).

And even though the participant may object to the content of the plan, and hence the actual content of the programme, it is ultimately the municipality, represented by the programme advisor that has the ultimate say in the matter, thus reflecting the asymmetrical power relations at play.

8. Concluding discussion and reflections

In the following, I summarize and discuss the key findings and contributions of this thesis and its connection to similar relevant studies. I also discuss potential implications in terms of social policy and possibilities for future research.

8.1 Governing, disciplining and shaping new migrants

The aim of this thesis was to examine how the Norwegian Introduction Programme can be understood in relation to different power perspectives. I posed 6 research questions that have been analysed and discussed in the preceding chapter, which were: What was before, what was to come and why, to whom, to what ends and by what means? In summarizing the key findings from the analysis and discussion, I will briefly go through these questions, however, not in the same order.

The answer to the question of what was before is that prior to 2004, on a concrete and practical level, there wasn't a national, coherent integration measure which was viewed as a problem. Instead, there were a variety of measures throughout Norway that differed in their content, approach, intensity and quality.

Another identified problem in the policy texts was that unemployment of the target groups was explicitly linked to welfare dependency. The target group of the programme was portrayed in the examined policy texts as passive recipients of public benefits. In addition, and connected to the above, there was the idea that the target groups did not have the necessary skill set to readily be employed, and, therefore, needed to improve their employability. The policy texts suggested that they needed to understand and acquire basic 'Norwegian values', specifically tied to gender equality. Non-Western migrants, in particular, were portrayed as not having enough awareness surrounding such issues.

What was to come and with what means was thus a direct response to the way the problem was perceived, that is, of what was lacking and thus needed. The solution to the problem was a national mandatory activation and integration measure, which required the exposure of the target group to various techniques by which they were to be governed, disciplined and shaped into ideal citizens. To what ends? Well, the programme goal was to turn participants into successful citizens. Participants would become citizens who were economically and otherwise self-reliant, independent, active and responsible for their own lives. The lives lived by migrants would align with and reflect a Norwegian way of being, conveying Norwegian values and norms.

In sum, by applying a governmentality perspective, I've concluded that the Introduction Programme in Norway can be viewed as an arena in which the subjectivity of new migrants is being shaped in specific ways. Through the target group's participation in the programme, they are being governed, disciplined and shaped into becoming idealized citizens, which means, as perceived by the state, that they are employed, active in terms of being economically and culturally assimilated.

Moreover, this is an ideal citizen who lives up to the state's expectations that they be active and self-governing and administers oneself. This finding, that the Introduction Programme sets out to create specific subjects, is very much in line with conclusions reached in several other relevant studies that have examined integration measures from a Foucauldian perspective (see Osman, 2006; Vesterberg, 2013; Wright Nielsen, 2009). While the referred studies above have all examined local integration measures, the Introduction Programme represents a larger, national mandatory measure (see Emilsson, 2015) in which all three power technologies are at play, sovereign/legal, disciplinary and governmentality making the Introduction Programme a clear illustration of how power operates to rule, discipline, govern, regulate and shape the participants. The framework in which the programme is embedded, and it has the policy tools to effectively discipline, punish and sanction with greater consequences if the target group members do not comply, such as losing the opportunity to become naturalized citizens.

8.2 Promoting inclusion, creating/constructing exclusion

Despite its goal of inclusion, the Introduction Programme has both the legal and economic means to exclude members of the target group that the programme is supposed to include. This finding is highly connected to Vesterberg's (2017) concept of exclusionary inclusion and Masoud, Holm and Brunila's (2019) term, the exclusionary inclusion process. The Norwegian Introduction Programme is based on a line of reasoning that the target group is lacking in key individual characteristics, thereby constructing exclusion and hence creating a space and arena for inclusion through their participation in the programme.

Moreover, as I have argued in the previous chapter, the programme has means that can further enhance exclusion in that the programme relies on sovereign, discipline and governmentality power technologies through which techniques of control, discipline and self-governing operate. For example, the introduction allowance executes control through rewards and sanctions. Moreover, the individual/integration plan and integration contract can be seen as new welfare contracts where the aims and interventions of the programme are constantly

being negotiated. The participants are included as long as they adhere to the plan, excluded if they do not. Aiming for inclusion through means of exclusion might seem like a paradox; however, the rhetoric of inclusion is in itself the first step in creating specific subjects to be governed.

8.3 Individualisation and responsibilisation – and what is lacking

A point I want to make is how the Introduction Programme is mainly about new migrants and refugees' adjustment to the dominant society, rather than how society also could make necessary adjustments. It seems reasonable to talk about the adjustment process as an assimilationist one. This point was made in **study I** and in retrospect, in light of the governmentality perspective, this point also represents the responsibilisation and individualisation of the target group in terms of integration. Even though the state and municipalities have a responsibility to finance and provide the programme, it is first and foremost the migrants who must attend the programme and take responsibility for their own integration process. When responsibilisation is first and foremost placed on migrants, Carrera (2006b) puts forward the argument that 'integration becomes the non-territorial border dividing the 'inside' and the 'outside', who is in and who is out, who has rights and who has only obligations' (p. 89). So, while it is true that the programme represented an extension of rights, it is also true that the duties embedded in the programme have increased and tightened. An important illustration is the requirements and duties linked to naturalisation.

Another point I want to stress, which is related to the point above, is the failure to address structural perspectives when justifying the need for the programmes, a point which was emphasised in **studies II, III and IV**. The problem presentation is mainly centred on new migrants and their alleged shortcomings and how they might be remedied. Tied to this was also a concern, in the policy texts, that earlier integration policies failed to qualify and activate migrants sufficiently. As Nanna Mik-Meyer and Kaspar Villadsen (2013, p. 27) describe, focus is thus placed on creating a responsible jobseeker, in direct opposition to a passive recipient.

As such, earlier concerns relating to socio-economic differences and fighting inequality are no longer the first priority. Rather, the priority is to prevent migrants from becoming long-term dependents, and unemployed. A consequence is that the social problem being described is not connected to structural mechanisms that might account for migrants' exclusion from the labour market and society at large. One possible explanation for this is that the Introduction

Programme is seen as a selective measure, and selective measures can have stigmatising effects since these measures are being applied to only certain segments of the population.

It can further be argued that there are other policy areas which address structural mechanisms in society that exclude migrants from the labour market, such as anti-discrimination regulations. For example, Norway has had anti-discrimination legislation since 2005, which includes legal protection against ethnic discrimination. Arnfinn Midtbøen (2015, p. 24) argues that even though Norway offers legal protection against ethnic discrimination, it is possible to identify a remarkable silence and lack of attention directed towards discrimination mechanisms in welfare- and integration debates in Norway. When explaining low labour market integration among migrants, explanations tend to dwell on combinations of lack of will and qualifications and on integration policies that fail to activate and qualify migrants (Midtbøen, 2015, p. 24). It is also important to note, that in studies that have identified discriminatory practices among employers towards migrants, there is a tendency for employers to choose skill enhancing measures addressed at the migrants, rather than suggesting policies and interventions aimed at reducing and preventing discriminatory practices within the working place (Midtbøen, 2014).

The Introduction Programme represents one of many integration policies that emphasise the responsiblisation and individualistion of a social problem. Despite numerous individual-oriented interventions and measures that are supposed to increase migrants' employability, former and current statistics are still showing that migrants are three times more likely to be outside of the labour market compared to the majority population (Statistics Norway, 2019). It is high time that necessary, and more focus is also directed at the labour market, which for various reasons is relatively closed for many of the new migrants that have undergone such measures (see Djuve & Kavli, 2018; Djuve et al., 2017). Something is clearly not working. Policies such as the Introduction Programme will not be able to 'remedy' migrants' exclusion from the labour market and society in general, if the 'solution' doesn't acknowledge the need to include all levels: individual, organisational and structural.

There is a need for more research to examine all levels and critically assess how they intersect in creating opportunities and well as hindrances to migrant's integration in the labour market. And even though further research is warranted, it is important to also consider the overall political context where immigrant integration and policy tools are debated, an important dimension I have yet to address and discuss.

8.4 The politicisation of immigrant integration

Examining and discussing how the political environment impacts integrationist measures has not been the focus of this thesis and has therefore not received much attention. However, in this concluding discussion it is important to take a broader view and to reflect upon the political context in which the introduction programmes have been discussed, implemented and within which they currently operate.

As we have seen, there has been a development, since the implementation of the programme, to impose more duties on the participants. These duties have become more pronounced, especially those that are tied to the requirements of naturalisation. The most recent policy change, which was passed in the fall of 2020, represents a further tightening of citizenship requirements in citizenship legislation. In **study II**, where I compared the justifications for introducing the programme with those in Denmark and Sweden, I categorized Denmark as having the most punitive programme, whereas Norway was placed in the middle and Sweden at the other more liberal end. Such a categorisation when analysing the Scandinavian variations in integration approaches have been fairly consistent (see Borevi, 2010; Borevi et al., 2017; Brochmann & Hagelund, 2010; Hernes, 2018).

One factor for understanding the different approaches is to look at the influence that anti-immigration parties have had in policy formation. Fekete (2006) argues that the inclusion of extreme right-wing parties' governmental coalitions results in the implementation of the most severe integrationist measures, which the finding in **study II** supports. Fekete uses the case of Denmark to demonstrate that the most 'aggressive integrationism' was introduced when the Liberal Party (Venstre) allied itself with both the Conservative People's Party (Det Konservative Folkeparti) and the populist and anti-immigration Danish People's Party (Dansk Folkeparti), the latter's presence being the most decisive factor for turning more restrictive and repressive in its integration approach. In 2001, the Danish People's Party became a supporting party for the centre-right government, which has led to their substantial influence in the migrant and integration policy field (Holm, 2006). This political collaboration lasted until 2013. The political influence exercised by the Danish People's Party is often highlighted when explaining Denmark's general restrictive immigration and integration policies (Green-Pedersen & Odalmalm, 2008; Jønsson & Petersen, 2010).

In Norway, the Progress Party (Fremskrittspartiet), defined as an anti-immigration party in the academic literature (see for instance Ivarsflaten, 2008), has received considerable support in elections, and they have been represented in parliament longer than the Danish People's Party in Denmark. However, until 2013, the Progress Party had very little formal

influence on any government because it wasn't coalition party for any of the ruling governments. However, as one of the traditionally top largest political parties in Norway, it is important not to downplay its influence on policymaking in the immigration and integration field, even though its formal influence has not been strong. According to Simonnes (2013), in the period of 2005-2009, both the Labour party (Arbeiderpartiet) and the Conservative party (Høyre) in Norway approached the Progress party on policy, particularly within the field of refugee and asylum policies and immigrant integration. On a rhetorical level, however, differences remained between the parties. With the election of 2013, the Progress Party went into government with the Conservative party but withdrew in January 2020.

Aksel Hatland (2020b) argues that the Progress Party as a member of government was not able to gain support for its alternative views on immigrant and integration issues but had to comply with the political agenda that the majority in Parliament wished to implement. Nevertheless, during the last years, Norway has moved in a more restrictive direction as naturalisation requirements have been tightened (Brochmann & Midtbøen, 2020). Several of these restrictions for naturalisation were introduced in 2016 with very little political or public debate (Eggebø & Staver, 2020).

Prior to the electoral success and introduction of the Swedish Democrats (Sverigedemokrater) in national and local parliament in 2010 (Dahlström & Esaiasson, 2011) it is argued that the immigration and integration debate in Sweden had been characterised by few political disagreements across political parties (Dahlström, 2004). Carl Dahlström and Peter Esaiasson (2011, p. 359) write that, in an effort to curb anti-immigration parties, the established parties in Sweden have traditionally chosen 'a dismissive issue strategy' to avoid putting migrant issues at the centre of political debate. However, with the Swedish Democrat's electoral success during this decade, the politicisation of migrant issues has changed considerably in Sweden. Nevertheless, compared to both Denmark and Norway, Sweden has had fewer anti-immigration parties in parliament.

In light of the current political climate and as the support for anti-immigration parties have increased substantially (see background chapter), all three countries have implemented restrictive integration policies with the goal of limiting future asylum seekers (Hernes, 2018). Nevertheless, we still see persistent cross-national differences between Denmark, Norway and Sweden in their approaches to immigrant integration, still leaving Denmark at the restrictive end, Norway in the middle and Sweden at the opposite end (see Brochmann & Midtbøen, 2020; Hernes, 2018). Much more can be said about the politicisation of immigrant integration and this is an area where there is a need for continuing knowledge expansion. It is however

clear that for migrants, there is a decrease in rights and an increase in duties, a change which leads us to a discussion of the ethnification of social policies.

8.5 The ethnification of social policies

It is important to address the issue of the ethnification of social policy through the example of the Introduction Programme. In the US it has been argued for a longer period that welfare state systems not only reflect racial classifications, but also reproduce inequalities along ethnic and racial lines (Schram et al., 2009). Similar arguments have been formulated within the context of Europe. These political disagreements about immigration and the reorganisation of welfare appear to have actuated some sort of ‘racialisation and ethnification’ of social citizenship (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Hemerijck et al., 2013).

Anton Hemerijck et. al. (2013) writes that ‘the new divide is rapidly becoming one of the ‘undeserving’ migrants and minorities pitted against “deserving” nationals, who are bearing the brunt of welfare retrenchment under the pressures of globalisation’ (p. 5). Supporting such a statement are studies that show that migrants are constantly viewed, by the population at large, as the least deserving compared to majority populations (van Oorschot, 2006). Following this line of argumentation, Georg Menz (2006) writes, ’Migrants are much more likely to be on the receiving end of the ‘sticks’ [...]’ demonstrated by ‘tighter eligibility, lower absolute levels of transfer payments, more pressure and demands on the individual recipients’ (p. 400).

Social policies that, to various degrees, have been developed based on an ethnification process that are grounded on negative stereotypes of migrants should, for obvious reasons, be prevented. Both **studies II** and **III** demonstrate that ethnification of the target group has implications for how the introduction programmes have been designed and shaped. **Study III** goes one step further and shows how harsher disciplinary tools of control are more pronounced and explicit when the target group consists of migrants. Fiona Williams (1987, p. 27) makes the persuasive point that welfare theory and strategy must both recognize that the state deals with different people differently and that this might lead to severe consequences. Such consequences might be fewer effective rights of migrants across welfare states and the emergence of new patterns of stratification in social rights.

As such, there is a need for a de-ethnification of social policies. The welfare state needs to apply a de-ethnification process to ensure that all citizens’ actual needs are met. The state should not construct ideas of what their problems are which again are connected to stereotyped and racialised/ethnified ideas of targets groups. Policymakers and welfare state

professionals specifically, and society at large, need to have an understanding of how target groups are constructed along ethnic lines and how such constructions may have an impact on policies targeting them. There is no denying that in most cases new migrants and refugees will have to learn the language, hence the need for targeted measures. However, measures that are based on an understanding of migrants as fundamentally different from the majority population run the risk of reproducing social inequalities in society along ethnic lines. If policymakers understand migrants as a category of people who primarily are lacking in something vital in order to integrate (Eastmond, 2010; Forsander, 2004), then the path to the solution is already given, hence what should be added and remedied. Such approaches will not be able to successfully meet the needs of the target group.

There is a need to highlight the complexity of the situation that new migrants and refugees face. A specific targeted policy, such as the Introduction Programme, which mainly only addresses the target group's alleged shortcomings by providing measures to increase their 'employability' is doomed to fail if the labour market, for various reasons, remain closed for them. There is a growing field of studies that examines how racialisation/ethnification impacts policies specifically aimed at migrants; however, this is a field that requires continuing research.

8.6 The way ahead for Norway

Norway's official approach to immigrant integration has undergone major changes since the new migration phase took place at the end of 1960s. The approach has shifted from 'no-politics' to an official multicultural and integration strategy where migrants' rights were emphasised. But the idea of multiculturalism received widespread public criticism, and by the end of the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s, the government initiated comprehensive immigrant integration reform. These reforms paved the way for the Introduction Programme, and also introduced the civic integration era in Norway, a phase that has been characterized by both introducing more established rights, but at the same time inserting more duties and sanctions.

As we have seen, the Introduction Programme has gradually undergone several changes that have reinforced the disciplinary and controlling elements of the programme. This development is very much aligned with rest of Europe, not only in terms of more restrictive civic integration policies, but also in agreement with harsher activation demands for the unemployed, all of which fitting well within a strong advanced neoliberal development.

An important point made by Djuve and Kavli (2018), as mentioned earlier, is that, since its implementation, the main policy changes in the Introduction Programme have been directed towards reinforcing the disciplining features of the programme even though such elements do not support effective activation measures (transition into work). The political changes are justified not on the basis of what works, but rather on how policymakers perceive the problem. According to the policymakers, unemployment is caused by a lack of motivation and, therefore, migrants need to be disciplined in order to enhance their chances for employment.

Applying a governmentality perspective has allowed me to examine, among other things, how problematisations are constructed based on the ideas of migrants' perceived lack of motivation and their 'otherness'. Overall, this thesis offers new understandings of how new migrants and refugees are being governed through their participation in the programme. Nevertheless, it is also important to acknowledge the possible limitations that might follow from applying a governmentality perspective.

8.7 Challenges in using a governmentality perspective

This study has carried out a critical social policy analysis of official policy documents and other documents pertaining to the Introduction Programme. In this thesis a governmentality perspective has been utilised to further understand the power dynamics embedded in the design, structure and outline of the Introduction Programme. It could be argued that such an analysis invites a rather dogmatic understanding of government, e.g., it is always about discipline, control and dominating power structures with little space to manoeuvre (see McKee, 2009; Rose et al., 2006). However, applying a governmentality perspective opens up a broader understanding of how policy comes to be and how target groups are subjectified in specific ways. My goal has been to understand this process better, and it has triggered new questions to explore. For instance, do we wish to be governed in ways that negatively construct differences between people? Do we wish to be governed in ways that only have one understanding of what 'the ideal and good' citizen life looks like? And perhaps most importantly, which groups are excluded from such ideals?

Governmentality studies are also often criticised for their dismissive attitude toward the messiness of realpolitik and implementation processes. It has never been my intention to analyse what takes place on implementation level, although this analysis is clearly also important.

In the analysis, I demonstrate the opportunities within the framework of the programme for participants to show resistance and the space they have for counter-conducts. However, these opportunities are what we can see by analysing policy formulation texts. It is still an open question whether participants can make use of such resistance and in what ways. Further research examining how participants experience their participation and how they perceive the power relations embedded in the programme would allow for a deeper and fuller understanding from the target group's perspective. Even though there exist a few studies on how participants evaluate their participation in the programmes (see for instance Lillevik & Tyldum, 2018), there is still a need to explore issues of power as they unfold in the everyday, hands-on execution in the programme. For example, when studying introduction programmes, there is important knowledge to gain by using what Kim McKee (2009) defines as a 'realist governmentality approach,' which employs an ethnographic approach to examine how power unfolds 'in situ'.

8.8 Final remark

I began the thesis with a citation from Barbara Cruikshank and I want to end it with another quote from her. 'The will to empower others and oneself is neither a bad or a good thing. It is political; the will to empower contains the twin possibilities of domination and freedom' (Cruikshank, 1999, p. 2).

Within the framework of the Introduction Programme (legislation, structure, design and programmatic expectations) there is the potential for doing great good, great harm and everything in between. It is therefore of the upmost importance that politicians, policymakers and practitioners have an awareness and understanding of the processes involved 'in the shaping and making' of new and future citizens in advanced liberal societies. And yes, it is political.

Summary

This thesis focuses on the Norwegian Introduction Programme for newly arrived immigrants and refugees. With its implementation in 2004, the Introduction Programme represents one of the most significant policy measures initiated by the state for new migrants in Norway. The Introduction Programme combine two important official goals, namely labour market participation and immigrant integration into the receiving society.

The aim of the overall thesis is to examine how the Introduction Programme in Norway can be understood in relation to different power perspectives. One of the main perspectives is Foucault's idea of governmentality, supplemented with the perspectives of neoliberalism and ethnification. Inspired by Carol Lee Bacchi's social policy analysis approach, one of the main points of departure of the thesis, is to examine what problem formulation the Introduction Programme is an answer to.

Argumentations for and formulations of a policy inherently propose solutions to a certain problem. As such, the main interest of the study lies at the policy formulation level. The study focuses primarily on how the Norwegian Introduction Programme is justified, designed, structured and framed to facilitate the integration of new migrants in society in general, and in the labour market specifically.

The thesis is based on four studies which have all critically examined the Introduction Programme from different comparative and theoretical perspectives. Comparisons are made between different social policy measures in Norway and between seemingly 'similar' policies in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The method employed for all four studies is based on public document analysis, which falls within the broader categorization of qualitative text analysis.

The main aim of **Study I** is to provide an in-depth understanding of the underlying ideology of two Norwegian post-immigration measures; the Introduction Programme and the financial support scheme for voluntary immigrant organisations. The theoretical perspectives which created the analytical framework for the analysis is based on conceptualisations of immigrant integration, assimilation and multiculturalism. The analysis suggests that the justifications for implementing the introduction programme do not address integration as a two-way process, and instead focus on migrants' adaptation and absorption into Norwegian society. The government fails to incorporate the ideas of multiculturalism in the actual financial support scheme. Consequently, the use of the term integration as an objective of the introduction scheme and the use of multiculturalist rhetoric for voluntary immigrant

organisation are therefore somewhat misleading. The findings suggest that one may instead refer to ‘thin assimilation’ in describing arguments and underlying political ideology.

Study II addresses the justifications for implementing the introduction programmes for new migrants and refugees in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The aim of the study is to understand if and eventually how ethnification is embedded in the justifications for implementing the introductory programme and how ethnification may effect the design of the programmes. Study II begins with the concepts of ethnification, social risks and activation. Ethnification as a process is shown to be one of the justifications for implementing the programmes in all countries. The study argues that the way the immigrant unemployment problem is perceived and described in policy documents affects the kind of measures that are implemented for this target group. The risk of ethnification is particularly strong in Denmark, however both Norway and Sweden also use justifications that are ethnified.

The aim of **Study III** is to explore how policy texts and the policy development process when establishing the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme have differently constructed the identity of their target groups. We also investigate how the benefits, sanctions and services availed to these two target groups have differed. As in study II, this study also makes use of ethnification; however, here it is in combination with Foucault’s notion of institutional discipline. The findings show that both the Introduction Programme and the Qualification Programme have been framed and shaped as a solution to the problems of worklessness and low social integration. However, there are some important differences. The problem of being outside worklife for the Introduction Programme target group is also cast as a matter of cultural difference. In the last decade, activation and conditionality have introduced ‘softer’ forms of discipline. Yet additional distinctions along ethnic lines within the Introduction Programme also illustrate movement back to slightly harder forms of control.

Study IV sets out to critically examine if and eventually how different ideas of empowerment are embedded in the design and structure of the introduction programmes in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The theoretical framework is based on different conceptualisations of empowerment. All three countries have several elements in the program that have the potential of being empowering, viewed from both a radical and liberal empowerment ideology. However, liberal empowerment ideology is more present in the programs, to various degrees, compared to radical empowerment ideology, which is more difficult, if not impossible, to live up to within the framework of all three programmes.

In sum, it is possible to conclude that the Norwegian Introduction Programme can be viewed as an arena in which the subjectivity of new migrants is being shaped to influence their actions and beliefs in specific ways. By participating in the programme, the target group is being governed, disciplined and shaped into becoming idealized citizens, and for the state, an ideal citizen is one who is employed, active in terms of being economically and culturally assimilated. Moreover, the ideal citizen is expected to be active, self-governing and self-sufficient.

The Introduction Programme represents a larger, national mandatory measure in which all three power technologies are at play, sovereign/legal, disciplinary and governmentality, making the Introduction Programme a clear illustration of how power operates to rule, discipline, govern, regulate and shape the participants.

The thesis also demonstrates that ethnification of the target group has implications for how the Introduction Programme has been designed and shaped. I argue that there is a particular need for a de-ethnification of the programme, but also for a broader de-ethnification of social policies in general. It is important to highlight the complexity of the situation new migrants face. A specific targeted policy, such as the Introduction Programme, which addresses only the target group's alleged shortcomings by providing measures to increase their 'employability,' is doomed to fail if the labour market, for various reasons, remains closed for them.

It is of the outmost importance that politicians, policymakers and practitioners have an awareness and understanding of the processes involved 'in the shaping and making' of new and future citizens in advanced liberal societies.

Sammanfattning på svenska

Att styra invandrare genom det norska introduktionsprogrammet

I avhandlingen studeras frågor om det norska introduktionsprogrammet för nyanlända invandrare och flyktingar. Introduktionsprogrammet introducerades 2004 och är en av de viktigaste policyåtgärderna som den norska staten genomfört för nyanlända.

Introduktionsprogrammet kombinerar två viktiga officiella mål, nämligen deltagande på arbetsmarknaden och integration av invandrare i samhället.

Det övergripande syftet med avhandlingen är att undersöka hur introduktionsprogrammet i Norge kan tolkas i relation till olika maktperspektiv. Avhandlingen har flera centrala perspektiv, varav ett är Foucaults perspektiv om governmentality, som suppleras med neoliberalism och ethnification. En viktig utgångspunkt för avhandlingen är att med stöd av Carol Lee Bacchis sociala policyanalys undersöka vilka problemställningar som introduktionsprogrammet är ett svar på. Argumentation för och utformning av en policyåtgärd innehåller i sig förslag på lösningar på ett särskilt problem. Studiens huvudsakliga fokus ligger följaktligen på policy nivå. Avhandlingen fokuserar först och främst på hur det norska introduktionsprogrammet motiveras, utformas, struktureras och inramas för att underlätta integration av nyanlända i samhället i allmänhet och på arbetsmarknaden i synnerhet.

Avhandlingen består av fyra artiklar som kritiskt har undersökt introduktionsprogrammet i olika komparativa och teoretiska perspektiv. Jämförelser har gjorts mellan sociala policyåtgärder i Norge och till synes ”liknande” policyåtgärder i Sverige, Danmark och Norge. Den metod som använts för dessa fyra studier bygger på analys av offentliga policy-dokumenter vilket faller inom ramen för kvalitativ textanalys.

Syftet med **studie I** är att ge mer kunskap om den underliggande ideologin för två norska postinvandringsåtgärder; introduktionsprogrammet och ekonomisk stöd till frivilliga invandrarorganisationer. Studiens teoretiska och analytiska perspektiv bygger på konceptualisering av integration och assimilering av invandrare, samt multikulturalism. Analysen indikerar att motiven för implementering av introduktionsprogrammet inte utgår från integration som en tvåvägsprocess, utan i stället fokuserar enbart invandrarens anpassning och inkorporering i det norska samhället. Regeringen lever heller inte upp till multikulturalismens idéer genom det ekonomiska stödprogrammet. Det innehåller att användningen av termen integration som ett mål för introduktionsprogrammet och användningen av multikulturalistisk retorik för frivilliga invandrarorganisationer är något

vilseledande. Resultaten pekar i stället på att en mer beskrivande argument och att den underliggande politiska ideologin heller är 'tunn' assimilering.

Studie II undersöker och jämför motiven för implementering av introduktionsprogrammet för nyanlända invandrare och flyktingar i Sverige, Danmark och Norge. Syftet med studien är att undersöka om och eventuellt hur etnifiering är införlivad i motiven för införande av introduktionsprogrammet och hur etnifierande argument används i den politiska retoriken som legitimerar och bestämmer utformningen av programmen i Sverige, Danmark och Norge. Studie II utgår från begreppen etnifiering, sociala risker och aktivering. Etnifieringen som process utgör en del av skälen för införandet av programmen i alla tre länderna. Studien visar att förståelsen av hur arbetslösheitsproblemet bland invandrare uppfattas och beskrivs i policydokument påverkar vilka slags åtgärder som införs för denna målgrupp. Risken för etnifiering är särskilt stark i Danmark, men även i Norge och Sverige används etnifierade argument.

Syftet med **Studie III** är att undersöka hur policydokument och processen för policyutveckling vid införande av introduktionsprogrammet och kvalifiseringsprogrammet har konstruerat olika identiteter för respektive målgrupp. Vi undersöker också hur skillnaderna i förmåner, sanktioner och stöd till dessa två målgrupper utformas. Liksom för studie II, använder också denna studie etnifiering men här i en kombination med Foucaults begrepp om institutionell disciplinering. Det framkommer att både introduktionsprogrammet och kvalifiseringsprogrammet har inramats och utformats som en lösning på problemen med arbetslöshet och bristande social integration, även om det finns några viktiga skillnader. Utmaningen att stå utanför arbetsmarknaden för introduktionsprogrammets målgrupp ramas också in som en fråga som kan förklaras med kulturella skillnader. Under det senaste årtiondet har aktivering och konditionalitet introducerat "mildare" former av disciplin. Introduktionsprogrammet har ytterligare distinktioner som grundas i etniska dimensjoner vilket också är ett tecken på en utveckling mot ett något striktare former av kontroll.

Studie IV undersöker kritiskt om och eventuellt hur olika idéer om empowerment är en del av utformningen och strukturen av introduktionsprogram i Sverige, Norge och Danmark. Det teoretiska ramverket bygger på olika konceptualiseringar av empowerment. I samtliga tre länder finns flera element i programmen som har möjlighet att verka myndigörande, betraktat både ur en radikal och liberal empoermentsideologi. Den liberala empowermentsideologin är mer närvanande i programmen – i olika omfattning – jämfört med den radikala empoermentsideologin, vilken är svårare, om inte omöjlig att leva upp till inom ramen för alla tre program.

Sammanfattningsvis visar resultaten i avhandlingen att det norska introduksjonsprogrammet kan ses som en arena i vilken nya migranteras subjektivitet formas för att påverka deras handlingar och beteende på specifika sätt. Genom målgruppens deltagande i programmet, styrs, disciplineras och formas de till att bli den idealmedborgare som staten eftersträvar för att en ska vara anställningsbar och aktiv, samt ekonomiskt och kulturellt assimilerad. Dessutom är detta en idealmedborgare som lever upp till förväntningarna på att vara aktiv, självstyrande och ekonomiskt oberoende. Introduktionsprogrammet är en nationell obligatorisk åtgärd där alla tre maktteknologier är verksam (sovereignty, disciplinary och governmentality) vilket gör introduktionsprogrammet till en tydlig illustration av hur makt operationaliseras för att leda, disciplinera, styra, reglera och forma deltagarna.

Avhandlingen visar också att etnifiering av målgruppen har påverkat utformningen av introduktionsprogrammet. Jag argumenterar för att det finns ett särskilt behov av en avetnifiering av programmet, men även för en bredare avetnifiering av socialpolitiska åtgärder i allmänhet. Det är viktigt att belysa komplexiteten i den situation som nya migranter befinner sig i. Specifika åtgärder, som exempelvis introduktionsprogrammet, vilket i huvudsak endast ser på målgruppernas påstådda tillkortakommanden genom att erbjuda insatser i syfte att öka deras ”anställningsbarhet” är dömda att misslyckas om dörren till arbetsmarknaden, av flera orsaker, förblir stängd.

Det är viktigt att politiker, policyutvecklare och utövare är medvetna om processerna vid ”formandet och skapandet” av nya och framtida medborgare i avancerade liberala samhällen.

References

- Abdulla, A. (2017). *Readiness or resistance? Newly arrived adult migrants' experiences, meaning making, and learning in Sweden* [PhD. thesis]. Linköping University.
- Adams, R. (1996). *Social work and empowerment*. Macmillan.
- Ahearn, F. L., & Athey, J. L. (1991). *Refugee children-theory, research and services*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Allardt, E. (1990). Challenges for comparative social research. *Acta Sociologica*, 33(3), 183-193.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000169939003300302>
- Andersson, J. (2003). *Mellan tillväxt och trygghet: Idéer om produktiv socialpolitik i socialdemokratisk socialpolitisk ideologi under efterkrigstiden* [PhD. thesis]. Uppsala University.
- Andersson, S., Mellbourn, A., & Skogö, I. (1978). *Myndigheten i samhället. Problem och utvecklingslinjer i statsförvaltningen*. Liber förlag.
- Annfelt, T., & Gullikstad, B. (2013). Kjønnslikestilling i inkluderings tjeneste? *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning*, 37(3), 309-328.
- Anthias, F. (2013). Moving beyond the Janus face of integration and diversity discourses: Towards an intersectional framing. *Sociological Review*, 61(2), 323-343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12001>
- Arp Fallov, M., & Turner, K. (2013). Foucault og socialt arbejde. In S. Juul Hansen (Ed.), *Sociologi i socialrådgivning og socialt arbejde* (pp. 72-91). Hans Reitzels forlag.
- Bacchi, C. L. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems*. Sage Publications.
- Bacchi, C. L. (2009). *Analyzing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Pearson Education.
- Balch, A., & Geddes, A. (2012). *Connections between admission policies and integration policies at EU level and linkages with national policy making*. (PROSINT WP 1). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/ariafe/Downloads/Connections%20between%20admission%20policies%20and%20integration%20policies%20at%20the%20EU%20level%20and%20given%20linkages%20

- 0with%20national%20policy%20making.%20PROSINT%20Comparative%20Reports%20WP1%20(1).pdf
- Banting, K. G., & Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Is there really a backlash against multiculturalism policies? New evidence from the multiculturalism policy index.* (SULCIS Working Paper 2012:4). Retrieved from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:821657/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Barne- likestillings- og inkluderingsdepartementet. (2012). *Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven).* (Q-20/2012). Regjeringen Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/static/RDEP/q-2012-0020.pdf>
- Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism.* Polity.
- Bauböck, R., Ersbøll, E., Groenendijk, K., & Waldrauch. (2006). *Acquisition and loss of nationality: policies and trends in 15 European states, Volume 2: Country analyses.* (IMISCOE Research). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press Retrieved from <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/35189/340146.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Beck, U. (1997). *Risikosamfundet: På vej mod en ny modernitet.* Hans Reitzel.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* Anchor Books.
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 15*(2), 219-234.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/1468794112468475>
- Blomberg, S., Hultquist, S., & Petersson, J. (2016). Socialpolitik och socialt arbete. In A. Meeuwisse, S. Sunesson, H. Swärd, & M. Knutagård (Eds.), *Socialt arbete: En grundbok* (3 ed., pp. 215-233). Natur och kultur.
- Bonoli, G. (2007). Time matters. Postindustrialisation, new social risks, and welfare state adaption in advanced industrial democracies. *Comparative Political Studies, 40*(5), 495-520.
- Boréus, K., & Bergström, G. (2005). *Textens mening och makt: Metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys.* Studentlitteratur.

- Boréus, K., & Bergström, G. (2012). *Textens mening och makt: Metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys* (2 ed.). Studentlitteratur.
- Borevi, K. (2010, September 30 - October 2). *Dimensions of citizenship. European integration policies from a Scandinavian perspective* [Conference paper]. Swedish Political Association Conference, Gothenburg.
- Borevi, K. (2014). Multiculturalism and welfare state integration: Swedish model path dependency. *Identities*, 21(6), 708-723. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.868351>
- Borevi, K., Jensen, K. K., & Mouritsen, P. (2017). The civic turn of immigrant integration policies in the Scandinavian welfare states. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 5(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-017-0052-4>
- Born, A. W., & Jensen, P. H. (2010). Dialogued-based activation – A new “dispositif”? *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 30(5/6), 326-336. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1108/01443331011054271>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Breidahl, K. (2012). *Når staten lærer. En historisk og komparativ analyse af statslig policy lræring og betydningen heraf for udviklingen i den arbejdsmarkedrettede del af invandrerpolitikken i Sverige, Norge og danmark fra 1970 til 2011* [PhD. thesis]. Aalborg University.
- Brochmann, G. (Ed.). (2003). *The Multicultural Challenge – Comparative Social Research*. (Vol. Volume 22). Elsevier.
- Brochmann, G. (2004). Velferdsstatens utålmodighet i det flerkulturelle Norge. *Nytt norsk Tidsskrift*, 03(04), 348-360.
- Brochmann, G., & Djuve, A. B. (2013). Multiculturalism or assimilation? The Norwegian welfare state approach. In P. Kivistö & Ö. Wahlbeck (Eds.), *Debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states* (pp. 219-245). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brochmann, G., & Hagelund, A. (2010). *Velferdens grenser: Innvandringspolitikk og velferdsstat i Skandinavia 1945-2010*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Brochmann, G., & Kjeldstadli, K. (2014). *Innvandringen til Norge: 900-2010*. Pax.

- Brochmann, G., & Midtbøen, A. H. (2020). Philosophies of integration? Elite views on citizenship policies in Scandinavia. *Ethnicities*, 21(1), 146-164
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796820950453>
- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 531-548.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870120049770>
- Bygnes, S., & Karlsen, M.-A. (2017). Krise og kontinuitet i mottak av flyktninger i Norden. *Tidsskrift for Velferdsforskning*, 20(4), 260-267. <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2464-3076-2017-04-01>
- Carling, J., Erdal, M. B., & Ezzati, R. (2014). Beyond the insider-outsider divide in migration research. *Migration Studies*, 2(1), 36-54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnt022>
- Carrera, S. (2006a). *A comparison of integration programmes in the EU: Trends and weaknesses*. (Challenge Papers No. 1). Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/6773/1/1310_01.pdf
- Carrera, S. (2006b). Integration of immigrants versus social inclusion: A typology of integration programmes in the EU. In T. Balzacq & S. Carrera (Eds.), *Security versus Freedom? A Challenge for Europe's Future* (pp. 87-114). Routledge.
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. Macmillan.
- Clasen, J. (2013). Defining comparative social policy. In P. Kennett (Ed.), *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy* (2 ed., pp. 71-83). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The will to empower: Democratic citizens and other subjects*. Cornell University Press.
- Dahlstedt, M. (2009a). *Aktiveringens politik: Demokrati och medborgarskap för ett nytt millennium*. Liber.
- Dahlstedt, M. (2009b). Parental governmentality: Involving ‘immigrant parents’ in Swedish schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(2), 193-205.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690802700289>

- Dahlstedt, M., & Hertzberg, F. (2012). Governmentality og entreprenørskap. In A. E. Rønbeck & S. Germeten (Eds.), *Inspirert av Foucault: Diskusjoner om nyere pedagogisk empiri* (pp. 74-93). Fagbokforlaget.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Hertzberg, F. (2013). In the Name of Liberation. *European Education*, 45(4), 26-43. <https://doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934450403>
- Dahlstedt, M., & Vesterberg, V. (2017). Citizens in the Making: The Inclusion of Racialized Subjects in Labour Market Projects in Sweden. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 40(2), 228-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12084>
- Dahlström, C. (2004). *Nästan välkomna. Invandrarpolitikens retorik och praktik* [PhD. thesis]. University of Gothenburg.
- Dahlström, C., & Esaiasson, P. (2011). The immigration issue and anti-immigrant party success in Sweden 1970-2006: A deviant case analysis. *Party Politics*, 19(2), 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068811407600>
- de Cabo, A. Y. M. (2018). *Brott eller passion? Myndighetsdiskurser om manlig sexhandel från 1930-till 2000-tal* [PhD. thesis]. University of Gothenburg.
- de Leeuw, M., & van Wichelen, S. (2012). Civilizing migrants: Integration, culture and citizenship. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(2), 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549411432029>
- Dean, M. (1995). Governing the unemployed self in an active society. *Economy and Society*, 24(4), 559-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085149500000025>
- Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage.
- Denk, T. (2002). *Komparativ metod - Forståelse genom jämförelse*. Studentlitteratur.
- Denton, N. A., & Deane, G. D. (2010). Researching race and ethnicity: Methodological issues. In P. H. Collins & J. Solomos (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of race and ethnic studies* (pp. 67-89). Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Aldine Publishing.

- Dinas, E., Matakos, K., Xeferis, D., & Hangartner, D. (2019). Waking up the golden dawn: Does exposure to the refugee crisis increase support for extreme-right parties? *Political Analysis*, 27(2), 244-254. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2018.48>
- Direktoratet for Integrasjon og Diversitet. (2021a, March 26). *Formålet med NIR*.
<https://www.imdi.no/nir-og-bosetting/nasjonalt-introduksjonsregister-nir/dette-brukes-nir-til/>
- Direktoratet for Integrasjon og Diversitet. (2021b, March 14). *Sunndal kommune er vinner av bosettings- og integreringsprisen 2020*. <https://www.imdi.no/arkiv/arkiverte-nyheter/sunndal-kommune-er-vinner-av-bosettings--og-integreringsprisen-2020/>
- Direktoratet for Integrasjon og Diversitet. (2021c, March 22). *Årsrapport IMDi 2020*.
<https://www.imdi.no/om-imdi/rapporter/2021/arsrapport-for-imdi-2020/>
- Djuve, A. (2011). Introductory programs for immigrants. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 1(3), 113-125. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10202-011-0014-0>
- Djuve, A., & Kavli, H. C. (2015). *Ti års erfaringer. En kunnskapsstatus om introduksjonsprogram og norskopplæring for innvandrere*. (Fafo-rapport 215:26). Retrieved from
<https://www.fafo.no/images/pub/2015/20431.pdf>
- Djuve, A. B. (2010). Empowerment or intrusion? The input and output legitimacy of Introductory Programmes for recent immigrants. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'intégration et de la migration internationale*, 11, 403-422.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-010-0156-2>
- Djuve, A. B., & Kavli, H. C. (2006). Velferdsstatens skreddere. Skjønn og brukermedvirkning i flyktningetjenesten. *Tidsskrift for Velferdsforskning*, 9(4), 210-222.
- Djuve, A. B., & Kavli, H. C. (2015). Facilitating user involvement in activation programmes: When carers and clerks meet pawns and queens. *Journal of Social Policy*, 44(2), 235-254.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279414000804>
- Djuve, A. B., & Kavli, H. C. (2018). Refugee integration policy the Norwegian way – why good ideas fail and bad ideas prevail. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 25(1), 25-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1024258918807135>

- Djuve, A. B., Kavli, H. C., Braanen Sterri, E., & Bråten, B. (2017). *Introduksjonsprogram og norskopplæring. Hva virker – for hvem?* (Fafo-rapport 2017:31). Retrieved from <https://www.fafo.no/images/pub/2017/20639.pdf>
- Djuve, A. B., Kavli, H. C., Lund, M., & Østberg, T. (2001). *Fra sosialhjelp til lønnet kvalifisering: resultater fra forsøk med heldags introduksjonsprogram for flyktninger.* (Fafo-rapport 364). Retrieved from https://www.fafo.no/media/com_netsukii/364.pdf
- Djuve, A. B., & Pettersen, H. C. (1997). *Virker tvang? Erfaringer med bruk av økonomiske sanksjoner i integreringsprogrammer for flyktninger.* (Fafo-rapport 234). Retrieved from https://www.fafo.no/media/com_netsukii/234.pdf
- Drie, J., & Dekker, R. (2013). Theoretical triangulation as an approach for revealing the complexity of a classroom discussion. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 338-360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.652069>
- Drøpping, J. A., Hvinden, B., & Vik, K. (1997). *Activation policies in the Nordic countries.* Routledge.
- Eastmond, M. (2010). Egalitarian Ambitions, Constructions of Difference: The Paradoxes of Refugee Integration in Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(2), 277-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2010.521323>
- Eggebø, H., & Staver, A. B. (2020). Mer midlertidighet. *Nytt norsk Tidsskrift*, 37(2), 125-136. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1504-3053-2020-02-04_ER
- Emilsson, H. (2015). A national turn of local integration policy: Multi-level governance dynamics in Denmark and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 3(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-015-0008-5>
- Ennerberg, E. (2017). *Destination employment? Contradictions and ambiguities in Swedish labour market policy for newly arrived migrants* [PhD. thesis]. Lund University.
- Ennerberg, E. (2020). Unemployment services for newly arrived migrants in Sweden: The privatization and rebureaucratization of the introduction programme. *Social Policy & Administration*, 54(5), 719-732. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12571>

- Entzinger, H. (2000). The Dynamics of Intergration Policies: A Multidimensional Model. In R. Koopmans & P. Statham (Eds.), *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics* (pp. 97-119). Oxford University Press.
- Entzinger, H. (2014). The growing gap between facts and discourse on immigrant integration in the Netherlands. *Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 21(6), 693-707.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.828616>
- Entzinger, H., & Biezeveld, R. (2003). *Benchmarking in immigrant integration*. (ERCOMER). Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Eriksson, E., & Johansson, K. (2021). Street-level bureaucrat in the introduction programme – client-centred and authority-centred strategies to handle challenging working conditions. *Nordic Social Work Research*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2156857X.2020.1869063>
- Eriksson, M. (2006). Avvikande eller osynlig – Rasifierande praktiker i familjerättssekreterares hantering av fäders våld. In *SOU 2006:37 Om välfärdens gränser och det villkorade medborgarskapet* (pp. 183-216).
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford University Press.
- Fahlgren, S., & Sawyer, L. (2005). Maktrelationer och normaliseringssprocesser i välfärdsstaten. *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift*, 2(3), 95-106.
- Fangen, K. (2010). *Deltagende observasjon* (2 ed.). Fagbokforlaget.
- Farris, S. F. (2017). *In the name of women's rights. The rise of femonationalism*. Duke University Press.
- Favell, A. (2003). Integration Nations. The nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. In G. Brochmann (Ed.), *The multicultural challenge - Comparative social research* (pp. 13-43). (Vol. Volume 22). Elsevier.
- Fejes, A. (2008). To be one's own confessor: Educational guidance and governmentality. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 653-664.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690802423320>
- Fejes, A., & Dahlstedt, M. (2013). *The confessing society: Foucault, confession and practices of lifelong learning*. Routledge.

- Fekete, L. (2006). Enlightened fundamentalism? Immigration, feminism and the Right. *Race & Class*, 48(2), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396806069519>
- Fernandes, A. G. (2013). Ethnification of new social risks: Programmes for preparing newly arrived immigrants for (working) life in Sweden, Denmark and Norway. In I. Harsløf & R. Ulmestig (Eds.), *Changing Social Risks and Social Policy Responses in the Nordic Welfare States* (pp. 189-219). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Finotelli, C., & Michalowski, I. (2012). The heuristic potential of models of citizenship and immigrant integration reviewed. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 10(3), 231-240.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2012.693033>
- Folketingstidene. (2021). *Om indholdet i tillæg A-H*. Folketinget. Retrieved 2021 June 28 from <https://www.folketingstidende.dk/da/guide-til-dokumenter/om-indholdet-i-till%C3%A6g-a-h>
- Forsander, A. (2004). Social capital in the context of immigration and diversity: Economic participation in the Nordic welfare states. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale*, 5(2), 207-227.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-004-1010-1>
- Forskrift til integreringsloven, (2020). <https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2020-12-15-2912>
- Forskrift om læreplan i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne innvandrere, (2012).
<https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2012-04-19-358>
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality. Volume 1: An introduction*. Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings. 1972-1977. Michel Foucault*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M. (Ed.). (1988a). *Technologies of the self*. The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988b). *The will to Knowledge. The history of sexuality: 1*. Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In C. Gordon, G. Burchell, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 87-104). Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *Dits et Ecrits 1954 - 88. Edited by Daniel Defert and Francois Ewald*. Gallimard.

- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Power. Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984*. Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (2007). Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78. In M. Senellart, F. Ewald, & A. Fontana (Eds.), *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices: Power, discourse and gender in contemporary social theory*. Polity Press.
- Freeman, G. P. (2004). Immigrant incorporation in Western democracies1. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 945-969. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00225.x>
- Frendries, J. P. (1983). Explanation of variation and detection of covariation. *Comparative Political Studies*, 16(2), 255-272. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/0010414083016002006>
- Friberg, J. H., & Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Innvandrernes etterkommere: Teoretiske og komparative perspektiver. *Norsk sosiologisk tidsskrift*, 1(1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2535-2512-2017-01-01>
- Gebhardt, D. (2016). When the state takes over: Civic integration programmes and the role of cities in immigrant integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(5), 742-758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1111132>
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Harvard University Press.
- Gerhardsen, R. (1991). *Snillisme på norsk*. Schibsted.
- Goodman, S. W. (2010). Integration requirements for integration's sake? Identifying, categorising and comparing civic integration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5), 753-772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691831003764300>
- Goodman, S. W. (2018). The civic integration turn. In A. Weinard, S. Bonjour, & L. Zhyznomirska (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Politics of Migration in Europe* (pp.167-178). Routledge.

- Gordon, P. (1992). 'The racialization of statistics'. In R. Skellington & P. Morris (Eds.), *'Race' in Britain today* (pp. 20-43). Sage Publication.
- Government Offices of Sweden. (2015). *How Sweden is governed. Committees*. The Government of Sweden. <https://www.government.se/how-sweden-is-governed/committees/>
- Green-Pedersen, C., & Odmalm, P. (2008). Going different ways? Right-wing parties and the immigrant issue in Denmark and Sweden. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(3), 367-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760701847564>
- Gressgård, R. (2005). Sideblikk. Hva mener regjeringen med flerkulturell mangfold? *Nytt norsk Tidsskrift*, 1, 72-79.
- Gressgård, R., & Jacobsen, C. (2002). En kvinne er ikke bare en kvinne: Kjønnsproblematik i et flerkulturelt samfunn. In C. Holst (Ed.), *Kjønnsrettferdighet: Utfordringer for feministisk politikk* (pp. 189-230). Gyldendal akademisk.
- Gressgård, R., & Jacobsen, C. (2003). Questions of gender in a multicultural society. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 11(2), 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740310002923>
- Grue, J. (2012). *Interdependent discourses of disability. A critical analysis of the social/medical model dichotomy* [PhD. thesis]. University of Oslo.
- Gubrium, E., & Fernandes, A. G. (2014). Policing Norwegian welfare: Disciplining and differentiating within the bottom rungs. *Social Inclusion*, 2(3), 5-17. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v2i3.35>
- Gubrium, E., Harsløf, I., & Lødemel, I. (2014). Norwegian activation reform on a wave of wider welfare state change. In I. Lødemel & A. Moreira (Eds.), *Activation or welfare? Governance and the neo-liberal convergence* (pp. 19-46). Oxford University Press.
- Gunaratnam, Y. (2003). *Researching race and ethnicity: Methods, knowledge and power*. Sage.
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Harvard University Press.
- Hagelund, A. (2003). *The importance of being decent: Political discourse on immigration in Norway 1970-2002* [PhD. thesis]. University of Oslo.

- Hagelund, A. (2005). Why It Is bad to be kind. Educating refugees to life in the welfare state: A case study from Norway. *Social Policy & Administration*, 39(6), 669-683.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2005.00463.x>
- Hagelund, A. (2007). Byråkratiske møter med sårbarhet. Snillhetskontroll i arbeid med flyktninger. *Sosiologi idag*, 37(3-4), 143-165.
- Hagelund, A. (2010). Dealing with the Dilemmas: Integration at the Street-level in Norway. *International Migration*, 48(2), 79-102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2008.00497.x>
- Hagelund, A., & Kavli, H. (2009). If work is out of sight. Activation and citizenship for new refugees. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 19(3), 259-270.
<http://ejournals.ebsco.com/direct.asp?ArticleID=48DFB88EA1309CE05FC3>
- Hall, P. A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275-296.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/422246>
- Hall, S. (2000). Conclusion: The multi-cultural question. In B. Hesse (Ed.), *Un/settled multiculturalisms: Diasporas, entanglements, transruptions* (pp. 209-241). Zed Books.
- Hangartner, D., Dinas, E., Marbach, M., Matakos, K., & Xeferis, D. (2019). Does exposure to the refugee crisis make natives more hostile? *American Political Science Review*, 113(2), 442-455. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000813>
- Harsløf, I., & Ulmestig, R. (2013). *Changing social risks and social policy responses in the Nordic welfare states*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hatland, A. (2020a). Et steg mot assimilering av innvandrere. In A. L. Ellingsæter, A. Hatland, P. Haave, & S. Stjernø (Eds.), *Den nye velferdsstatens historie: Ekspansjon og omdanning etter 1966* (1 ed., pp. 251-254). Gyldendal.
- Hatland, A. (2020b). Flyktningekrise og innstramminsforsøk. In A. L. Ellingsæter, A. Hatland, P. Haave, & S. Stjernø (Eds.), *Den nye velferdsstatens historie: Ekspansjon og omdanning etter 1966* (1 ed., pp. 316-322). Gyldendal.

- Hatland, A., & Steinar, S. (2020). Abeidslinja - velferdspolitikkens nye mantra. In A. L. Ellingsæter, A. Hatland, P. Haave, & S. Stjernø (Eds.), *Den nye velferdsstatens historie: Ekspansjon og omdanning etter 1966* (1 ed., pp. 175-185). Gyldendal.
- Helbling, M. (2012). Public debates, integration models, and transnationalism in Western Europe. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 10(3), 241-259.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2012.693035>
- Hemerijck, A. C., Palm, T., Entenmann, E., & van Hooren, J. (2013). *Changing European welfare states and the evolution of migrant incorporation regimes. Background paper reviewing welfare state structures and reform dynamics in a comparative perspective* (IMPACIM). Retrieved from https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/PR-2013-IMPACIM_Background_Welfare_States.pdf
- Hernes, V. (2018). Cross-national convergence in times of crisis? Integration policies before, during and after the refugee crisis. *West European Politics*, 41(6), 1305-1329.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2018.1429748>
- Hernes, V., Arendt, J., Andersson Joona, P., & Tronstad, K. (2020). Rapid or long-term employment? A Scandinavian comparative study of refugee integration policies and employment outcomes. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2020.1824011>
- Herz, M. (2018). Det sociala arbetets kontrollmaskineri. In M. Dahlstedt & P. Lalander (Eds.), *Manifest : för ett socialt arbete i tiden* (pp. 33-44). Studentlitteratur.
- Hindess, B. (2001). The liberal government of unfreedom. *Alternatives*, 26(2), 93 - 111.
- Holm, L. (2006). *Folketinget og Udlændingepolitikken – Diskurser om naturaliserede, indvandrere og flygtninge 1973-2002*. [PhD. thesis]. Aalborg University.
- Holmes, D. (2002). Police and pastoral power: Governmentality and correctional forensic psychiatric nursing. *Nursing Inquiry*, 9(2), 84-92. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1800.2002.00134.x>
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Hvinden, B. (1999). Activation: A Nordic perspective. In M. Heikkilä (Ed.), *Linking welfare and work* (pp. 27-42). European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Ihle, R. (2017). Integrering – samfunnsfellesskapets opptakskrav? *Plan*, 49(1), 10-17.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1504-3045-2017-01-04>

Lov om integrering gjennom opplæring, utdanning og arbeid (integreringsloven), (2020).

<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2020-11-06-127>

Lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere, (2003).

<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLO/lov/2003-07-04-80>

Isaakyan, I. (2015). Integration paradigms in Europe and North America. In A. Triandafyllidou (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Immigration and Refugee Studies* (pp. 169-179). Taylor and Francis.

Ivarsflaten, E. (2008). What unites right-wing populists in Western Europe?: Re-examining grievance mobilization models in seven successful cases. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(1), 3-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414006294168>

Jacobs, D., & Rea, A. (2007). The end of national models? Integration courses and citizenship trajectories in Europe. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 9(2), 264-283.

Johansson, H. (2001). Activation policies in the Nordic countries: Social democratic universalism under pressure. *Journal of European Area Studies*, 9(1), 63-77.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14608460120061957>

Johansson, H., & Hvinden, B. (2007). Re-activating the Nordic welfare states: Do we find a distinct universalistic model? *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 27(7/8), 334-346.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330710773908>

Johansson, H., & Hvinden, B. (2008). What do we mean by active citizenship? In B. Hvinden & H. Johansson (Eds.), *Citizenship in Nordic welfare states: Dynamics of choice, duties and participation in a changing Europe* (pp. 32-51). Routledge.

Johnson, B. (2010). *Kampen om sjukfrånvaron*. Arkiv.

Joppke, C. (2007a). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 1-22.

Joppke, C. (2007b). Transformation of immigrant integration: Civic integration and antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany. *World Politics*, 59(02), 243-273.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1353/wp.2007.0022>

- Joppke, C. (2017). Civic integration in Western Europe: Three debates. *West European Politics*, 40(6), 1153-1176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2017.1303252>
- Joppke, C., & Morawska, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Justesen, L., & Mik-Meyer, N. (2012). *Qualitative research methods in organisation studies*. Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet. (2016). *Rundskriv til til lov om introduksjonsordning og norskopplæring for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven)*. (G-01/2016) [Rundskriv]. Regjeringen Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/4b44b3ea29554b4aa1e9169829b75b78/g-01-2016.pdf>
- Järvinen, M., & Mik-Meyer, N. (2005). *Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv : Interview, observationer og dokumenter*. Reitzel.
- Järvinen, M., & Mik-Meyer, N. (2012). *At skabe en professionel: Ansvar og autonomi i velfærdsstaten*. Hans Reitzels forlag.
- Jönsson, H. V., & Petersen, K. (2010). Danmark: Den nationale velfærdsstat møder verden. In G. Brochmann & A. Hagelund (Eds.), *Velferdens grenser: Innvandringspolitikk og velfærdsstat i Skandinavia 1945-2010* (pp. 131-210). Universitetsforlaget.
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.
- Kamali, M., & Jönsson, J. H. (2018). Introduction: Neoliberalism and social work in the Nordic welfare states. In M. Kamali & J. H. Jönsson (Eds.), *Neoliberalism, Nordic welfare states and social work: Current and future challenges* (pp. 1-22). Routledge.
- Kildal, N. (2001). *Workfare tendencies in Scandinavia welfare policies*. (ILO). Retrieved from <https://d1wqxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/34221426/workfare-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1627981797&Signature=HlQJpbWMsBdDHbo8Ronz86T~Bz2MLEX~Yx4xUiMVvwUOdEIh0A7jJr6m6zkgKs3GxTtuTrFro5vIv9t2UQtL1Q~qAS-EPu4lEohDqKd1XibQrsrvWuA29rZd--kfBEptKEyZ13ZvqnOIUSLUazpMBne3~ydwUPiaBAXM1YiltaObXEYjiz8pm~htsEDkGoK>

F7Osx~JXZByA1Xq0oW-mP8N17BZZPGR8mr3~TCWkF8~edR353qumJuYf9yYZF-YU0fdN9bWiXDMSkefrKnf0t95rTcncVYnmrbrycL5QoIkXmTNlNFqrkIfFnXxiw1SYL1B7f0KOIyGPvcsrZNh0~A__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA

- Kjeldstadli, K. (1988). Nyten av å sammenlikne. *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, 29(5), 435-448.
- Kobberstad, J. H. (2019). *Å passe inn. Kvalifiserte flyktningers møter og sammenstøt med "det norske gjennom introduksjonsprogrammet*. [PhD. thesis]. Nord University.
- Kobberstad, J. H. (2020). Høyt utdanna flyktningers tilnærming til kvalifisering og arbeid. *Søkelys på arbeidslivet*, 37(1-02), 92-108. <https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1504-7989-2020-01-02-06>
- Kocka, J. (1996). The uses of comparative history. In R. Torstendahl, R. Björk, & K. Molin (Eds.), *Societies made up of history : Essays in historiography, intellectual history, professionalisation, historical social theory & proto-industrialisation* (pp. 197-209).
- Akademityck.
- Kommuneloven. (2018) Lov om kommuner og fylkeskommuner (LOV-2018-06-22-83). Lovdata.
<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2018-06-22-83?q=kommuneloven>
- Korteweg, A. C., & Triadafilopoulos, T. (2015). Is multiculturalism dead? Groups, governments and the ‘real work of integration’. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(5), 663-680.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2014.907925>
- Krzyżanowski, M., Triandafyllidou, A., & Wodak, R. (2018). The mediatization and the politicization of the “Refugee Crisis” in Europe. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1-2), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1353189>
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2019). *Tildelingsbrev til Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet for 2020*. Kunnskapsdepartement.
- <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/5be5c97123954550a313256d8bad54e8/tildelingsbre-v-til-imdi-for-2020-1686749.pdf>
- Kvale, S., Brinkmann, S., Anderssen, T. M., & Rygge, J. (2015). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju* (3 ed.). Gyldendal akademisk.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.

- Larsson, J. K. (2015). *Integrationen och arbetets marknad: Hur jämställdhet, arbete och annat "svenskt" görs av arbetsförmedlare och privata aktörer* [PhD. thesis] Atlas Akademi.
<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:874817/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Lemke, T. (2001). 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 30(2), 190-207.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140120042271>
- Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, 14(3), 49-64.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/089356902101242288>
- Lemke, T. (2013). Foucault, politics and failure. In J. Nilsson & S.-O. Wallenstein (Eds.), *Foucault, biopolitics and governmentality* (pp. 35-52). Södertörn University.
- Lendvai, N., & Bainton, D. (2013). Translation: Towards a critical comparative social policy agenda In P. Kennett (Ed.), *A handbook of comparative social policy* (2 ed., pp. 115-134). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lillevik, R., & Tyldum, G. (2018). *En mulighet for kvalifisering. Brukerundersøkelse blant deltagere i introduksjonsprogrammet*. (Fafo-rapport 2018:35). Retrieved from
<https://www.fafo.no/images/pub/2018/20684.pdf>
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary expanded ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives* (2 ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Loch, D. (2014). Integration as a sociological concept and national model for immigrants: Scope and limits. *Identities*, 21(6), 623-632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2014.908776>
- Lorenz, W. (2005). Social work and a new social order – Challenging Neo-liberalism's erosion of solidarity. *Social Work & Society*, 3(1), 93-101.
- Loseke, D. R. (2003). *Thinking about social problems: An introduction to constructionist perspectives*. Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lundstedt, A. (2005). *Vit governmentalitet: 'Invandrarkvinnor' och textilhantverk - en diskursanalys* [PhD. thesis]. University of Gothenburg.
- Lydia, M. (2002). *Managing migration: Civic stratification and migrants rights*. Taylor and Francis.

- Lødemel, I. (2019). Sosialt arbeid og sosialpolitikk: Ei familiekrønike. In H. Aamodt, E. Dahl, E. Gubrium, M. Haldar, & Å. Hermansen (Eds.), *Sosialt arbeid og sosialpolitikk i samhandling. Et svar på velferdsstatens utfordringer?* (pp. 29-55). Fagbokforlaget.
- Lødemel, I., & Moreira, A. (2014). *Activation or welfare: Governance and the neo-liberal convergence*. Oxford University Press.
- Lødemel, I., & Trickey, H. (2001). *An Offer you can't refuse: Welfare in international perspective*. Policy Press.
- Löwenheim, O., & Gazit, O. (2009). Power and Examination: A Critique of Citizenship Tests. *Security Dialogue*, 40(2), 145-167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010609103074>
- Madill, A., Jordan, A., & Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist and radical constructionist epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712600161646>
- Madsen, O. J. (2016). Psykologiens innflytelse i velferdsstaten. In R. Kroken & O. J. Madsen (Eds.), *Forvaltning av makt og moral i velferdsstaten: Fra sosialt arbeid til "arbeid med deg selv"*? (pp. 86-111). Gyldendal akademisk.
- Mangen, S. (2013). Cross-national qualitative research methods: Innovations in the new millennium. In P. Kennett (Ed.), *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy* (2 ed., pp. 243-263). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992/1950). *Citizenship and social class*. Pluto Press (originally published in Sociology at the crossroads and other essays. London: Heineman).
- Masoud, A., Holm, G., & Brunila, K. (2019). Becoming integrateable: Hidden realities of integration policies and training in Finland. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1678725>
- Masoud, A., Kurki, T., & Brunila, K. (2020). 'Learn skills and get employed' - Constituting the employable refugee subjectivity through integration policies and training practices. In L. Lundahl & K. Brunila (Eds.), *Youth on the move: Tendencies and tensions in youth policies and practices*. (pp. 102-123). Helsinki University Press.

- McKee, K. (2009). Post-Foucauldian governmentality: What does it offer critical social policy analysis? *Critical Social Policy*, 29(3), 465-486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018309105180>
- Meld. St. 16 (2015-2016). *Fra utenforskning til ny sjanse. Samordnet innsats for voksnes læring.* Retrieved from
<https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/daaabc96b3c44c4bbce21a1ee9d3c206/no/pdfs/stm201520160016000dddpdfs.pdf>
- Menz, G. (2006). ‘Useful’ Gastarbeiter, burdensome asylum seekers, and the second wave of welfare retrenchment: Exploring the nexus between migration and the welfare state. In C. A. Parsons & T. M. Smeeding (Eds.), *Immigration and the Transformation of Europe*, (pp. 393-418). Cambridge University Press.
- Michałowski, I. (2004). *An overview on introduction programmes for immigrants in seven European member states*. (De ACVZ). Retrieved from
https://www.ludenet.org/archives/qeceran/projects/Overview_of_Introduction_programmes.pdf
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2014). The Invisible Second Generation? Statistical Discrimination and Immigrant Stereotypes in Employment Processes in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(10), 1657-1675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.847784>
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2015). Etnisk diskriminering i arbeidsmarkedet. *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, 56(01), 4-30. http://www.idunn.no/tfs/2015/01/etnisk_diskriminering_iarbeidsmarkedet
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Innvandringshistorie som faghistorie: Kontroverser i norsk migrasjonsforskning. *Nytt norsk Tidsskrift*, 34(2), 130-149.
<https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1504-3053-2017-02-03>
- Midtbøen, A. H., Brochmann, G., Erdal, M. B., Kruse, M., Jensen, K. K., Bevelander, P., Mouritsen, P., & Bech, E. C. (2020). Assessments of citizenship criteria: Are immigrants more liberal? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46 (13), 2615-16461.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1756762>
- Midtbøen, A. H., & Teigen, M. (2013). Sosial investering i kjønnslikestilling?; Flerdimensjonale perspektiver på norsk aktiveringspolitikk. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning*, 37(3-4), 294-308.

- Mik-Meyer, N., & Villadsen, K. (2013). *Power and welfare: Understanding citizens' encounters with state welfare*. Routledge.
- Miles, R. (1993). *Racism after Race Relations*. Routledge.
- Miles, R., & Brown, M. (2003). *Racism* (2 ed.). Routledge.
- Modood, T. (2015). Integration and Multiculturalism: Focus on Western Europe. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2 ed., pp. 235-242). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.64013-8>
- Mouritsen, P., Kriegbaum Jensen, K., & Larin, S. J. (2019). Introduction: Theorizing the civic turn in European integration policies. *Ethnicities*, 19(4), 595-613.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819843532>
- Møller, I. H. (2013). A liberalistic handling of new social risks - Danish experiences from three decades of social policy reforms. In I. Harsløf & R. Ulmestig (Eds.), *Changing social risks and social policy responses in the nordic welfare states* (pp. 245-265). Palgrave Macmillan.
- NAV. (2019, 2020 October 8). *What is NAV?* Norwegian Labour and Welfare Service.
<https://www.nav.no/en/home/about-nav/what-is-nav>
- Nilsson, R. (2008). *Michel Foucault: En introduktion*. Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- NOU 1986:8. (1986). *Flyktningers tilpasning til det norske samfunn* Sosialdepartementet.
<https://www.nb.no/statsmaktene/nb/677fcb2ba5951c509fe224e81bfa6381?lang=no#3>
- NOU 2001:20. *Lov om Introduksjonsordning for nyankomna innvandrere (Introduksjonsloven)*. Oslo:
Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2001-20/id143913/>
- Oksala, J. (2013a). Feminism and Neoliberal Governmentality. *Foucault Studies*, 16, 32-53.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i16.4116>
- Oksala, J. (2013b). Neoliberalism and biopolitical governmentality. In J. Nilsson & S.-O. Wallenstein (Eds.), *Foucault, biopolitics and governmentality* (pp. 53-72). Södertörn University.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Duke University Press.

- Osman, A. (2006). Integrerande "praktiker" som arena för normalisering och disciplinering av utlandsfödda. In E. Gunnarsson, A. Neergaard, & A. Nilsson (Eds.), *Kors & tvärs: Intersektionalitet och makt i storstadens arbetsliv* (pp. 206-221). Normal förlag.
- Ot.prop. nr 28 (2002 - 2003). *Om lov om introduksjonsordning for nyankomne innvandrere (introduksjonsloven)*. Oslo: Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/otprp-nr-28-2002-2003-/id171771/?ch=1>
- Otto, L. (2003). *Foucaults "governmentalitetsteori" Styringsteknologi og subjektivitet*. (Working Paper). Retrieved from <http://etnologi.ku.dk/upload/application/pdf/f51d6748/Governmentality.pdf>
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Macmillan.
- Perchinig, B., Hollomey, C., Kraler, A., Wöger, A., Babickà, K., Güell, B., Davis, R., Jubany, O., Mutilva, N., Scholten, P. W. A., Entzinger, H., Saharso, S., Suter, B., Qvist, M., Vacceli, E., Kofman, E., D'Angelo, A., Lewis, H., Borkert (...) and Zincone, G. (2012). *The national policy frames for the integration of newcomers*. (PROSINT WP 2). Retrieved from <https://www.icmpd.org/file/download/48292/file/The%2520national%2520policy%2520frames%2520for%2520the%2520integration%2520of%2520newcomers.%2520Comparative%2520report.%2520PROSINT%2520Comparative%2520Reports%2520WP2.pdf>
- Phillips, L., & Schröder, K. (2005). Diskursanalytisk tekstanalyse. In M. Järvinen & N. Mik-Meyer (Eds.), *Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv. Interview, observationer og dokumenter* (pp. 275-202). Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 74-96. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stable/1047678>
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1994). Should immigrants assimilate? In Kivistö P. & G. Rundblad (eds.), *Multiculturalism in the United States. Current issues, contemporary voices* (pp. 317-328). Pine Forge Press.

- Pratt, A., & Valverde, M. (2002). From Deserving Victims to 'Masters of Confusion': Redefining refugees in the 1990s. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 27(2), 135-161. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3341708>
- Prop 45 (2017-2018). *Endringer i introduksjonsloven (opplæring i mottak og behandling av personopplysninger mv.)*. Kunnskapsdepartementet. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/prop.-45-l-20172018/id2593537/>
- Prop 89 L (2019-2020). *Lov om integrering gjennom opplæring, utdanning og arbeid (integreringsloven)*. Kunnskapsdepartement. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/prop.-89-l-20192020/id2699012/>
- Prop. 98 L (2019-2020). *Endringer i statsborgerloven (krav om ferdigheter i norsk muntlig)*. Kunnskapsdepartementet. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/prop.-98-l-20192020/id2699960/>
- Puskás, T. (2009). "We belong to them": Narratives of belonging, homeland and nationhood in territorial and non-territorial minority settings [PhD. thesis]. P. Lang.
- Pyykkönen, M. (2007). Integrating governmentality: Administrative expectations for immigrant associations in Finland. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 32(2), 197-224.
- Qi, H., Irastorza, N., Emilsson, H., & Bevelander, P. (2021). Integration policy and refugees' economic performance: Evidence from Sweden's 2010 reform of the introduction programme. *International Migration*, 59, 42-58. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12813>
- Qvist, M. (2012). *Styrning av lokala integrationsprogram. Institutioner, nätverk och professionella normer inom det svenska flyktingmottagandet* [PhD. thesis]. Linköping University. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:562430/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Qvist, M. (2017). Meta-governance and network formation in collaborative spaces of uncertainty: The case of Swedish refugee integration policy. *Public Administration*, 95(2), 498-511. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12310>
- Rajas, J. (2012). Assemblage of pastoral power and sameness; A governmentality of integrating immigrant women. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 2(1), 5-15. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.2478/v10202-011-0022-0>

- Regeringskansliet. (2021). *Rättsliga dokument. Proposition*. Retrieved 2021 June 28 from
<https://www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/proposition/>
- Regjeringen. (2012 January 1). *Opplæring i norsk og samfunnskunnskap for voksne innvandrere*.
Regjeringen. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/q-352011-iverksetting-av-rett-og-plikt-t/id667997/>
- Regjeringen. (2020, September 15). *Oversikt over dokumenttyper*. Regjeringen
<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokument/oversikt-over-dokumenttyper/id2341785/>
- Rose, N. (1996). *Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies*. Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1999a). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self*. Free Association Books.
- Rose, N. (1999b). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (2000). Government and control. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(2), 321-339.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.2.321>
- Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 173-205. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591464>
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2, 83-104.
- Rugkåsa, M. (2010). *Transformasjon og integrasjon: Kvalifisering av minoritetsetniske kvinner til arbeid og deltagelse i den norske velferdsstaten* (Vol. no. 242). Unipub.
- Rugkåsa, M. (2012). *Likhetens dilemma: Om sivilisering og integrasjon i den velferdsambisiøse norske stat*. Gyldendal akademisk.
- Schaeffer, P. V., & Bukenya, J. O. (2014). Assimilation of Foreigners in Former West Germany. *International Migration*, 52(4), 157-174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00617.x>
- Schinkel, W. (2013). The imagination of 'society' in measurements of immigrant integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1142-1161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783709>
- Schinkel, W., & Van Houdt, F. (2010). The double helix of cultural assimilationism and neo-liberalism: citizenship in contemporary governmentality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 696-715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01337.x>

- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of aarget populations: Implications for politics and policy. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334-347.
- <https://doi.org/10.2307/2939044>
- Scholten, P., Collett, E., & Petrovic, M. (2016). Mainstreaming migrant integration? A critical analysis of a new trend in integration governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2), 283-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852315612902>
- Schram, S. F., Soss, J., Fording, R. C., & Houser, L. (2009). Deciding to discipline: Race, choice, and punishment at the frontlines of welfare reform. *American Sociological Review*, 74(3), 398-422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400304>
- Silow Kallenberg, K., & Sigvardsdotter, E. (2019). Om Sverige, svenskhet och de Andra i samhällsorientering för nyanlända. *Arkiv - tidskrift för samhällsanalys*, 11, 71-96.
- <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.13068/2000-6217>
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research* (2 ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Simonne, K. (2013). I stjålne klær? – En analyse av endringer i Høyres, Arbeiderpartiets og Fremskrittspartiets innvandrings- og integreringspolitikk. *Norsk statsvitenskapelig tidsskrift*, 29(2), 144-158. http://www.idunn.no/nst/2013/02/i_stjaalne_klaer_-_en_analyse_av_endringer_i_hoeyres_arbeide
- St. meld. nr. 39 (1973-74). *Om innvandring*. Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet.
- St. meld. nr. 74 (1979-80). *Om innvandrere i Norge*. Kommunal- og arbeidsdepartementet.
- Statistics Norway. (2019, 2021 February 11). *Registrerte arbeidsledige blant innvandrere* Statistics Norway. <https://www.ssb.no/arbeid-og-lonn/statistikker/innvarbl>
- Lov om norsk statsborgerskap (2005). <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2005-06-10-51>
- Steinmayr, A. (2016). *Exposure to refugees and voting for the farright: (Unexpected) Results from Austria*. (IZA Discussion Papers No. 9790). Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp9790.pdf>
- Stjernø, S., & Hatland, A. (2020). Omorganisering og nye stønadsreformer i arbeidslinjas tegn. In A. L. Ellingsæter, A. Hatland, P. Haave, & S. Stjernø (Eds.), *Den nye velferdsstatens historie: Ekspansjon og omdanning etter 1966* (1 ed., pp. 302-315). Gyldendal.

- Svensson, K. (2007). Normer, normalitet och normalisering. In K. Svensson, K. Hollertz, A. Kristiansen, K. Lenz, U. M. Emilsson, L. B. Ohlsson, & D. Tops (Eds.), *Normer och normalitet i socialt arbete* (pp. 17-34). Studentlitteratur.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (2004). *New risks, new welfare: The transformation of the European welfare state*. Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1992). The politics of recognition In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism. Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25-73). Princeton University Press.
- Triadafilopoulos, T. (2011). Illiberal means to liberal ends? Understanding recent immigrant integration policies in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(6), 861-880.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.576189>
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2015). *Routledge Handbook of Immigration and Refugee Studies*. Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.no/books?id=xAGpCgAAQBAJ>
- Ulmestig, R. (2006). *Kommunal arbetsmarknadspolitik i ett integrationspolitiskt perspektiv*. (Integrationsverket). Integrationsverket Retrieved from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:227877/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Forskrift om utlendingers adgang til riket og deres opphold her, (2009).
<https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2009-10-15-1286?q>
- Valtonen, K. (2001). Immigrant integration in the welfare state: Social work's growing arena. *European Journal of Social Work*, 4(3), 247-262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714889976>
- van Berkel, R., & Borghi, V. (2008). The governance of activation. *Social Policy & Society*, 7(3), 331-340.
- Van Houdt, F. (2014). *Governing citizens. The government of citizenship, crime and migration in the Netherlands* [PhD. thesis]. Erasmus University of Rotterdam. hdl.handle.net/1765/51303
- van Houdt, F., Suvarierol, S., & Schinkel, W. (2011). Neoliberal communitarian citizenship: Current trends towards 'earned citizenship' in the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. *International Sociology*, 26(3), 408-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580910393041>

- van Oorschot, W. (2006). Making the difference in social Europe: Deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(1), 23-42.
- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928706059829>
- Vasta, E. (2007). *Accomading diversity: Why current critiques of multiculturalism miss the point*. (COMPAS WP-07-53). University of Oxford Retrieved from
https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/WP-2007-053-Vasta_Accomodating_Diversity.pdf
- Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (2010). *Multiculturalism Backlash*. Taylor and Francis.
- Vesterberg, V. (2013). Ethnicized un/employability: Problematized others and the shaping of advanced liberal subjects. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization*, 13(4), 737-757.
- Vesterberg, V. (2015). Learning to be Swedish: Governing migrants in labour-market projects. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 37(3), 302-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2015.1043987>
- Vesterberg, V. (2016a). *Etnicizing Employability. Governing the unemployed in labour market projects in Sweden* [PhD. thesis]. Linköping University. <http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:922827/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Vesterberg, V. (2016b). Exploring misery discourses: Problematized Roma in labour market projects. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 7(1), 25-40.
<https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela9071>
- Vesterberg, V. (2017). Rationalities of exclusionary inclusion: Constructing others while combating social exclusion. In A. ÅLund, C.-U. Schierup, & A. Neergaard (Eds.), *Reimagineering the nation. Essays on Twenty-First century Sweden* (pp. 141-163). Peter Lang.
- Villadsen, K. (2002). Michel Foucault og kritiske perspektiver på liberalismen. Governmentality eller genealogi som analysestrategi. *Dansk Sociologi*, 13(3), 77-97.
- Villadsen, K. (2007). Magt og selv-teknologi. Foucaults aktualitet for velfærdsforskningen. *Tidsskrift for Velferdsforskning*, 10(3), 156.
- Vitus, K., & Jarlby, F. (2021). Between integration and repatriation – Frontline experiences of how conflicting immigrant integration policies hamper the integration of young refugees in

- Denmark. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2021.1873112>
- Vuori, J. (2009). Guiding migrants to the realm of gender equality. In S. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S. Irni, & D. Mulinari (Eds.), *Complying with colonialism: Gender, race and ethnicity in the Nordic region* (pp. 207-224). Ashgate.
- Wacquant, L. (2011). The wedding of workfare and prisonfare revisited. *Social Justice*, 38 (1-2), 203-222.
- Wad, P. (2000). Komparation i kritisk realistisk perspektiv. *Dansk Sociologi*, 11(2), 7-28.
- Wiewiorka, M. (2014). A critique of integration. *Identities*, 21(6), 633-641.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.828615>
- Wiktorin, U. (1995). *Mot en ny norsk underklasse: Innvandrere, kultur og integrasjon*. Gyldendal.
- Wikström, E., & Ahnlund, P. (2018). Making refugees work? Individualized work strategies in the Swedish refugee settlement program. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 8(S4), 47-65.
<https://doi.org/10.18291/njwls.v8iS4.111157>
- Wikström, H. (2009). *Etnisitet*. Liber.
- Williams, C., & Johnson, M. (2010). *Race and ethnicity in a welfare society*. Open University Press.
- Williams, F. (1987). Racism and the discipline of social policy: A critique of welfare theory. *Critical Social Policy*, 7(20), 4-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026101838700702001>
- Winther Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (1999). *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Roskilde Universitetsforl. Samfundsletteratur.
- Withworth, A., & Carter, E. (2014). Welfare-to-work reform, power and inequality: From governance to governmentalities. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 22(2), 104-117.
- Wright Nielsen, T. (2009). *Viljen til at frigøre. En undersøgelse af empowerment i praksis* [PhD thesis]. Lund University.
- Yanow, D. (2003). *Constructing "race" and "ethnicity" in America. Category-making in public policy and administration*. M.E. Sharpe.

- Yanow, D. (2014). Interpretative analysis and comparative research. In I. Engeli & C. Rothmayr Allison (Eds.), *Comparative Policy Studies: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges* (pp. 131-159). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1991). The citizenship debate: Women, ethnic processes and the state. *Feminist Review* (39), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1395439>
- Øverbye, E. (2013). Velferdsprofesjonene i aktiveringsstaten: En studie av ambivalente relasjoner. In A. Molander & J.-C. Smeby (Eds.), *Profesjonsstudier 2* (pp. 107-121). Universitetsforlaget.
- Øvrelid, B. (2007). Empowerment är svaret, men vad var frågan? In O. P. Askheim & B. Starrin (Eds.), *Empowerment: I teori och praktik* (pp. 48-61). Gleerups.
- Åberg, L. (2020). *Standardiseringars arbetets kollektiva praktik. En studie om att kvalitetssäkra integrationssatsningen Samhällsorientering för nyanlända* [PhD. thesis]. University of Gothenburg. https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/63230/2/gupea_2077_63230_2.pdf