

Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in Scandinavia

Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship
in Scandinavia

Edited by

Bo Bengtsson, Per Strömblad
and Ann-Helén Bay

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in Scandinavia,
Edited by Bo Bengtsson, Per Strömblad and Ann-Helén Bay

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Bo Bengtsson, Per Strömblad and Ann-Helén Bay and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2574-3, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2574-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	xiii
CHAPTER 1	
An Introduction to Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in Scandinavia	1
<i>Ann-Helén Bay, Per Strömblad and Bo Bengtsson</i>	
CHAPTER 2	
Dimensions of Citizenship: European Integration Policies from a Scandinavian Perspective	19
<i>Karin Borevi</i>	
CHAPTER 3	
Who is an Immigrant?	47
<i>Gunnar Myrberg</i>	
CHAPTER 4	
At the Edge of the Norwegian State? Territorial and Descent- Based Political Membership among Norwegian Sami	75
<i>Anne Julie Semb</i>	
CHAPTER 5	
Quotas or no Quotas? Including Politicians of Ethnic Minority Descent in Political Parties	105
<i>Beret Bråten</i>	
CHAPTER 6	
Including or Excluding Immigrants? The Impact of Right- Wing Populism in Denmark and Sweden	127
<i>Kristina Boréus</i>	
CHAPTER 7	
The Unrepresentative Bureaucracy: Ethnic Representativeness and Segregation in Scandinavian Public Administration	159
<i>David Karlsson and Nazem Tahvilzadeh</i>	

CHAPTER 8

- Crossing the Local Community Border: Immigrant Settlement
in Norway 187
Anton Steen

CHAPTER 9

- Making Citizens: Theories and Practices of Constructing
Citizenship Identities 215
Ylva Stubbergaard

CHAPTER 10

- Political Opportunity Structure and Ethnic Organization:
How Political, What Opportunities, Which Structures? 241
Bo Bengtsson

CHAPTER 11

- Political Integration of Minorities: Election Turnout in
Norway's Minority Communities 269
Johannes Bergh and Tor Bjørklund

CHAPTER 12

- Civil Society and Political Integration of Immigrants
in Norway 295
Ann-Helén Bay, Henning Finseraas and Anniken Hagelund

CHAPTER 13

- Ethnic Diversity and Social Trust in Denmark and Sweden 323
Henrik Lolle and Lars Torpe

CHAPTER 14

- From Naïve Newcomers to Critical Citizens? Exploring Political
Trust Among Immigrants in Scandinavia 345
Per Strömblad and Per Adman

- CONTRIBUTORS 371

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 2

Figure 2.1. Ideal-typical integration policy options	23
Figure 2.2. Ideal-typical notions of integration concerning the relation between rights and duties	28
Figure 2.3. Conditions to obtain permanent residency and citizenship	36

CHAPTER 6

Figure 6.1. Residence permits granted for different reasons in Denmark 1999–2008	130
Figure 6.2. Residence permits granted for different reasons in Sweden 1999–2008	131

CHAPTER 7

Figure 7.1. Percentage of employees with foreign background of Western and non-Western origin in Norwegian state ministries 2007	169
Figure 7.2. Percent foreign born among public employees in different professions of the Swedish public sector 2007	170
Figure 7.3. Employees with Western and non-Western foreign background in different positions and branches within the Danish public sector 2008	171
Figure 7.4. Origin of immigrants employed within local public professions in Sweden 2007	176
Figure 7.5. Representation of women and foreign born among local government professions in Sweden 2007	177

CHAPTER 8

Figure 8.1. Types of discourses	199
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 10

Figure 10.1. Four roads to political integration	247
--	-----

CHAPTER 11

Figure 11.1. Minority turnout in the 2007 elections in Oslo's municipalities, by the size of the minority population	281
---	-----

Figure 11.2. Immigrant turnout in the 2007 elections, by years of residence in Norway	283
Figure 11.3. The effect of age on turnout, by marital status and minority representation in the municipality	290
Figure 11.4. The effect of socioeconomic status on turnout, by marital status and minority representation in the municipality	291
CHAPTER 13	
Figure 13.1. The development in social trust in Sweden and Denmark, percentage saying “most can be trusted”	325
Figure 13.2. The development of percentage non-Western immigrants in Denmark and Sweden	327
Figure 13.3. Satisfaction with life in Denmark and Sweden	330
CHAPTER 14	
Figure 14.1. Political trust across different population categories (mean levels on the 0–1 scale)	354
Figures 14.2A. Regression based predicted levels of political trust (0–1) for different country of origin levels of corruption (CPI-values 0–1)	356
Figures 14.2B. Regression based predicted levels of political trust (0–1) for different country of origin levels of corruption (CPI-values 0–1)	357

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 3

Table 3.1. Ethnic hierarchy in Gothenburg 1995–2006.....	53
Table 3.2. Ethnic hierarchy in Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö 1985–2006.....	56
Table 3.3. Associations to the word “invandrare” (immigrant), mean values.....	59
Table 3.4. Associations to the word “invandrare” (immigrant), percentages.....	60
Table 3.5. Associations to the word “invandrare” (immigrant) among respondents born abroad.....	63
Table 3.6. Associations to the word “invandrare” (immigrant) among respondents born in Sweden with at least one parent born abroad.....	65
Table 3.7. Associations to the word “invandrare” (immigrant) and personal experience of ethnic discrimination, three regions of origin.....	67

CHAPTER 4

Table 4.1. Political interest among non-Sami, unregistered Sami and registered Sami, 2006.....	90
Table 4.2. Trust in political bodies and public institutions among non-Sami, unregistered Sami and registered Sami, 2006.....	91
Table 4.3. Political self-confidence among non-Sami, unregistered Sami and registered Sami, 2006.....	93
Table 4.4. Political participation (percent participating), 2006.....	96
Table 4.5. Turnout in various elections.....	97

CHAPTER 6

Table 6.1. Proposals for exclusion of non-natives in the 1994 Danish general election campaign.....	137
Table 6.2. Negative other-presentation in the 1994 Danish general election campaign.....	139
Table 6.3. Negative other-presentation in the 2007 Danish general election campaign.....	143
Table 6.4. Proposals for exclusion of non-natives in the 1994 Swedish general election campaign.....	146

Table 6.5. Negative other-presentation in the 1994 Swedish general election campaign	148
Table 6.6. Proposals for exclusion of non-natives in the Swedish 2006 general election campaign.....	150
Table 6.7. Negative other-presentation in the Swedish 2006 general election campaign	151

CHAPTER 7

Table 7.1. Ethnic representativeness (RI values) in Scandinavian public sectors 2008, comparing countries, branches and immigrant groups	166
--	-----

CHAPTER 8

Table 8.1. The leadership's conceptions of factors restricting the settlement of refugees in their municipality in 2008, mean ranks	197
---	-----

CHAPTER 11

Table 11.1. Electoral participation in the Norwegian minority population in the local elections of 1999, 2003 and 2007, compared to participation in the entire electorate (percent voting in each category).....	273
Table 11.2. Differences in the social background composition of minorities and natives (percent belonging to each category)	275
Table 11.3. Logistic regression analysis of differences in turnout between minorities and natives.....	279
Table 11.4. Minority turnout by the existence of minority candidates in the election, and by minority representation in the municipal council (percent voting)	285
Table 11.5. Logistic regression analysis of minority turnout in the 2007 Norwegian local elections.....	286

CHAPTER 12

Table 12.1. Tetrachoric correlation coefficients, four types of organizational membership.....	309
Table 12.2. Percentage that did and did not vote in the 2003 Norwegian local election among members and non-members	310
Table 12.3. Logistic regression of voting in the 2003 local election in Norway among immigrants	312

CHAPTER 13

Table 13.1. The development of institutional trust in Denmark and Sweden 1981–1999, opinion balances	333
Table 13.2. Correlation (Pearson's r) between the identified main variables, a Denmark dummy and social trust	335
Table 13.3. Explanation of difference in social trust (0–10) between Sweden and Denmark; unstandardized regression coefficients, levels of statistical significance, and explained variance	336

CHAPTER 14

Table 14.1. Predicting political trust by corruption experience (CPI) and years in Sweden, controlling for other explanatory factors (linear regression)	361
--	-----

PREFACE

This book has three common denominators. The first is substantial: the issues of diversity, inclusion and citizenship—highly contested all over the Western world today and, consequently, given a prominent position on the political agenda. The second is geo-political: the three small countries of Scandinavia. There are good reasons to believe that migration-related “challenges to citizenship” are particularly accentuated in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, with their traditionally homogeneous populations and their political history of comprehensive welfare states and ideologies of equality. The third is disciplinary: the theoretical perspective taken is political and the contributors are, with a few exceptions, political scientists, which is not particularly common in this field of research.

Together these three common denominators give the book a specific and rather original profile, which, we believe, provides novel input to the academic and political debate on diversity, inclusion and citizenship. Moreover, the insights extend far beyond Scandinavia, and at the same time contribute to further development of theories concerning political integration in diversified democracies.

The fruitfulness of the triad of ethnic diversity, Scandinavia and political science was also the conclusion drawn at the workshop “Diversity, Inclusion and Citizenship in the Nordic Countries”, arranged by two of us, together with Karin Borevi and Maritta Soininen, at the triennial congress of the *Nordic Political Science Association (NOPSA)* in Tromsø, September 2008, where the idea of writing a book like this first came up. Several chapters have been developed from papers presented at the workshop, others are new texts written by workshop participants, and still others are written by authors specifically invited to join the book project.

The lively and open-minded academic spirit of the Tromsø workshop has left its traces on the book project as a whole. The book has been produced through a constructive dialogue, which benefited the texts as such and was rewarding for us as editors. The writing process was facilitated during a truly inspiring seminar at the Institute for Futures Studies in October 2009 in Stockholm, where a majority of the authors discussed draft versions of the chapters. We wish to take this opportunity to thank all our colleagues for their friendly co-operation and enduring efforts!

We also wish to thank Carita Ytterberg for transforming all texts into manuscripts ready to print and for carefully weeding through more or less disorderly reference lists, and Anahita Assadi for cleaning up all our

figures and tables. We are also grateful to Karen Williams for transforming our Danglish, Norwenglish and Swenglish expressions into something more like the Queen's English.

Of course, a volume such as this requires the contribution of several high-quality research environments—the authors' acknowledgements can be found after each chapter. As editors, we wish to thank our respective home institutions, Institute for Social Research, Oslo, Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Gävle and Institute for Futures Studies, Stockholm and our colleagues there for institutional, economic and scientific support.

Finally a word about the division of labour between the editors. Bo Bengtsson was the initiator of the book project and acted as informal project leader. The general framing and organization of the volume was developed in continuous deliberation between the three of us, and we also shared the burdens and joys of editing the individual chapters in dialogue with the authors.

Gävle, Stockholm and Oslo in September 2010

Bo Bengtsson Per Strömblad Ann-Helén Bay

1. AN INTRODUCTION TO DIVERSITY, INCLUSION AND CITIZENSHIP IN SCANDINAVIA

ANN-HELÉN BAY, PER STRÖMBLAD AND
BO BENGTSSON

This book is about issues of diversity, inclusion and citizenship—all highly contested throughout the Western world today and, consequently, given a prominent position on the political agenda. Our geo-political focus is on Denmark, Norway and Sweden—i.e. three Scandinavian countries with traditionally homogeneous populations and a political history of inclusive welfare states. It has been argued that, precisely for these reasons, one might expect migration-related “challenges to citizenship” to be particularly accentuated in this part of the world. Such notions of ethnic diversity and the welfare state are critically analysed in the following 13 chapters written by 19 Scandinavian authors. The contributors are mainly researchers in political science, a discipline that, thus far, has provided less input to this field of research than one might anticipate, given its particular interest in the crucial conditions of political institutions, power and democracy.

In a historical perspective, diversity in Scandinavia has primarily been seen as a question of social class. The post-war increase in the level of ambition of the welfare state notwithstanding, labour-market position tended to be decisive both in terms of socioeconomic resources and ideological standpoints. Currently, however, divisions within the population owing to national background or ethnicity are at least as imperative as socioeconomic differences. Over the past decades, Scandinavia, like the rest of Western Europe, has experienced a substantial increase in the number of immigrants. The waves of immigration have more or less followed the same pattern in the three countries: labour migration in the 60s and 70s, asylum seekers in the 80s and 90s and a new wave of labour migration in the 2000s (Brochmann and Hagelund 2010). As mentioned, some observers worry that this increasing ethnic diversity may represent a particular challenge to the Scandinavian political and social model. Denmark, Sweden and Norway are small countries that previously had comparatively homogenous populations and rather low levels of social and political conflict. Traditionally they are all

encompassing welfare states with broad and universal state programmes, and the differences in people's economic resources are moderate by any international comparison. The political party structure is rooted in the same social cleavage structure, with a historically strong mobilization of classes and counter-cultures (Klausen and Selle 1995).

Immigration sets a new agenda for national politics. In the words of Koopmans et al. (2005, 3) "... three types of political mobilization around issues of immigration and ethnic relations—*by* migrants, *against* migrants, and *on behalf of* migrants"—constitute since the early 1990s the most prominent and controversial fields of political contention in West European policies". The global political potential of seemingly local expressions of such issues became salient when, in 2005, the Danish newspaper *Jyllandsposten* published cartoons depicting the Islamic prophet Muhammad. The caricatures were soon reprinted in Norwegian newspapers, and two years later a Swedish newspaper published their own caricature. The Muhammad caricatures were followed by intense political debate in Scandinavia (as well as massive and violent protests in the Muslim world). Proponents argued for the right to freedom of speech and against self-censorship, while opponents described the caricatures as Islamophobic and racist. As we see it, this incisive confrontation illustrates the importance of research on the *long-term conditions of diversity and inclusion*: What does it take to form and sustain a democratic society built on commonly agreed upon principles and, at the same time, to uphold and protect pluralism in cultural and religious beliefs? The chapters of this book analyse and discuss how these decisive questions have been confronted in the three Scandinavian countries.

Although questions concerning diversity, inclusion and exclusion have long been on the political agenda, until recently they have not been at the forefront of political scientists' research agenda. More particularly, Scandinavian research on the integration of immigrants has largely been a topic reserved for sociologists, social geographers and anthropologists.¹ We see this book as one contribution to filling this politological lacuna in the field. All chapters deal with political aspects of immigration and integration and all are authored or co-authored by political scientists.

¹ E.g., the Norwegian Research Council concluded in an evaluation of research on immigration: "Still some of the so-called 'heavy disciplines' (like economics and political science) have related to the IMER [International Migration and Ethnic Relations] problematic only to a relatively modest degree. A stronger involvement from researchers within these disciplines should be a goal in the future development of IMER research" [our translation] (Tesli 2001).

Citizenship and inclusion

The concept of citizenship runs like a main thread explicitly or implicitly through the entire volume, an analytical approach shared with various studies of immigration and ethnic relations. Following the classic reference, T. H. Marshall ([1950] 1964), citizenship may be divided into three sets of rights: civil, political and social. Civil rights secure a person's liberty: freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to justice, to own property and conclude contracts. Political rights cover the rights to vote and to be elected as a representative to political institutions. Social rights are a person's rights to an adequate standard of living, embodied in the welfare and educational system of a society. Marshall's aim was to outline the historical development of citizenship in the United Kingdom. Civil rights came first, followed by political rights, and finally—and as a result of universal political and civil rights—came social rights. However, for an individual immigrant in a contemporary welfare state, the situation is often the opposite. Social rights are obtained before political rights. That is, while access to, for instance, decent housing is regarded as a right for refugees, the privilege to take part in national elections requires formal citizenship.

The essence of Marshall's concept of citizenship is *social inclusion and membership*. Today, his definition from 1950 would probably be seen as constructivist:

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 should 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 aspirations can be directed.
(Marshall 1964, 84.)

This is why citizenship “requires a bond of a different kind, a direct sense of community membership based on loyalty to a civilization which is a common possession” (Marshall 1964, 92). In Marshall's community-related interpretation, full membership includes the same access to civil, political and social rights as other members. What is necessary for an individual to see him- or herself as a full member of a certain political community, and to be seen as one by others, cannot be determined with any precision, and it obviously varies across countries and periods of time. So, in contrast to the generally well-defined rules of legal or “nominal”

(Bauböck 1994) citizenship, Marshall's concept is socially defined (cf. also Borevi 2002).

Marshall's theory was developed in a culturally homogeneous setting, and it has been discussed to what extent it would be of relevance in the multiethnic European (and Scandinavian) nations of today. In particular it has been claimed that a fourth type of *cultural rights* should also be included (e.g., Kymlicka and Norman 1994). In recent years, the role of cultural rights in a multiethnic welfare state has been a dominant subject in academic and political debates on diversity and integration.

The conceptual division between civil, political and social citizenship opens the door to a variety of politological approaches to the inclusion of community members with a foreign background, as illustrated in the contributions of this volume. Some contributions focus on formal aspects and on the discourse about and attitudes towards the rights of immigrants. Some study immigrants' actual use of their civil, political or social rights, while others focus on the implementation of political decisions and their effects on immigrants' situation. The contemporary debate on diversity and inclusion reflects the social and political development as well as the current academic discourse. This book is no exception. We briefly discuss three topics that are central in the debate and that recur throughout the volume: 1) retreat from multiculturalism, 2) integration and the welfare state, and 3) social and political capital.

Retreat from multiculturalism

In the political-philosophical debate related to citizenship and immigration, there has long been a battle over the rights of minority groups. One of the most ardent advocates of multiculturalism, Will Kymlicka (1995), argues that group-specific rights for minorities are not only consistent with liberalism, but on certain occasions a prerequisite for a well-functioning, diverse, liberal democracy. Brian Barry (2001), a strong opponent, believes that multiculturalism undermines liberal rights (as, he would argue, individuals have rights but groups do not), fragments society, and steers attention away from economic inequalities. The theoretical debate has stimulated empirical research on the extension of multiculturalism and its effects (see Koopmans et al. 2005, 7 for a review). An analysis of the research on current policies reveals a general retreat from multiculturalism in Europe (Brubaker 2001; Joppke 2004; Entzinger 2003; Koopmans et al. 2005), as policies increasingly tend to emphasize immigrants' obligation to adapt to their new country (Wright 2008). Koopmans (2010) has investigated how integration policies and welfare-state regimes have affected the socio-economic integration of immigrants

in eight European countries. He concludes that a combination of generous welfare state and multicultural policies has hampered integration in the labour market and promoted segregation, arguing that multicultural policies in a welfare state context lead to welfare dependency and thereby to social and economic marginalization.

Integration and welfare state

Koopman's study is part of an extensive academic debate about the relationship between immigration, integration policies and the welfare state (Banting and Kymlicka 2006). As most welfare states have had relatively homogenous populations, some predict that growing diversity will undermine support for welfare programmes. For instance, Alesina and Glaeser (2004) contend that religious and racial divisions essentially explain the gap in welfare spending between the United States and Europe. Following these scholars, the divisions in the United States have made it difficult to forge a common class-based identity, and consequent class coalitions with the political strength to push through social redistributive programmes. According to Brochmann and Hagelund (2010), such a challenge should be especially strong in the Scandinavian welfare states, owing to their universal welfare programmes. In this perspective, increased diversity may lead either to a more selective welfare state in general or to a divided welfare state in which the majority is entitled to universal programmes and the minority population to selective programmes (Joppke 1999). However, Banting (2000) concludes that extensive welfare states have managed to incorporate immigrants without eroding the legitimacy of the welfare state. His explanation is that even though immigrants in principle receive formal social rights in line with the rest of the population, these rights have to be earned through employment. They are based on deservingness for both members of the majority and the minority. Banting et al. (2006, 83) have investigated a connected hypothesis which maintains that the adoption of multiculturalism policies will undermine the welfare state. They find no systematic correlation between strong multiculturalism policies and welfare state retrenchment.

Social and political capital

Contemporary debates about social and political integration are strongly influenced by the literature on social capital. According to Putnam's (2000, 19) definition, social capital refers to "social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them". In a controversial and often-cited study, Putnam (2007; see also Jonas 2007)

concludes that ethnic diversity correlates with low social capital. In ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, residents of all ethnicities tend to “hunker down”. The inhabitants have less trust, fewer networks and participate less in voluntary organizations. According to Putnam, however, the negative effect of diversity on social capital should be expected to be temporary. “In the long run societies have overcome such fragmentation by creating new encompassing identities that dampen the negative effects of diversity” (Putnam 2007, 138–139).

The literature on social capital has also stimulated research on the social and political integration of immigrants. Putnam (2000) makes a distinction between “bonding” and “bridging” organizations. Bonding social capital is made up of social ties between people who are similar along important dimensions; such capital works to strengthen exclusive identities and homogenous group constellations, and may in its extreme be harmful to society. Bridging capital, on the other hand, is constituted by ties across social distinctions, between people who are different to one another. Bonding organizations are, according to Putnam’s definition, “inward looking”, while bridging organizations are “outward looking”. With such a conception, it is hardly surprising that organizations based on ethnicity have recently been regarded with some suspicion, among scholars as well as policy-makers (cf. also Morales and Giugni 2011 on social capital, political participation and migration in several European cities, including Stockholm and Oslo). The reader will find that various standpoints and arguments related to the Putnam-inspired discourse on group homogeneity are discussed and scrutinized in detail in this volume.

The following chapters

The chapters that follow rest upon theory-informed in-depth analyses of different political aspects of citizenship in a Scandinavian context. They all present new and original empirical findings, and several also make specific theoretical contributions to social science discourses on diversity, inclusion and citizenship. We believe that, taken together, they will shed considerable light both on current, common trends in the integration policies of the Scandinavian welfare states and on the more general issues of citizenship and integration.

Opening the contributions to this volume, *Karin Borevi* analyses the “retreat from multiculturalism” thesis in relation to a theoretical model of *integration policy options*, combining the general understanding of national identity (“ethnos” vs “demos”) with the state’s approach to ethnic minorities. As stated above, the political response to what has been inter-

puted by many as an unsuccessful route to integration—the previous more “soft line” multicultural approach—recently seems to be reflected in a general trend of “restrictiveness”. However, Borevi argues that it should pay off for scholars (and policy-makers alike) to distinguish between the passive and active recognition of ethno-cultural diversity, on the one hand, and the overall conception of national identity, on the other. Starting from this distinction, Borevi presents an empirically informed analysis of the development in Sweden, thus showing that Sweden actually was a pioneer in the policy-change from official multiculturalism to civic integration. Importantly, however, this does not cover the full story. Comparing actual policies of civic integration, Borevi draws on Marshall’s conception of citizenship in terms of the relative statuses of rights and duties. Thus, she is able to demonstrate interesting cross-country variations in Scandinavia. Although in general, Denmark, Norway and Sweden all conform to the ideal of civic integration, the countries are clearly distinguished in terms of their official requirements for immigrants. Only in the case of Sweden do rights clearly come before duties, as in Marshall’s theory. Actual policies of civic integration may—at least from the immigrant’s point of view—take very different shapes also in highly similar countries.

Intuitively, one would expect overall conditions in a given country to vary across members of different ethnic groups regardless of their officially recognized rights (or duties). Scattered observations in previous research also suggest that “a foreign background” may in fact involve highly different outcomes, depending on which specific background is in question. Utilizing detailed survey data on how people of both Swedish and foreign background interpret the word immigrant (“invandrare”, in Swedish), *Gunnar Myrberg* presents a study on *ethnic hierarchies* and their consequences. Myrberg tests the validity of previous anecdotal evidence for the claim that the label “immigrant”, at least in a Scandinavian context, has more to do with ethnically defined otherness than with actual migration experiences. Thus, people who in terms of culture, religion or skin colour are generally considered more distant from the majority population would be regarded as immigrants to a higher extent. Empirically testing this claim, Myrberg demonstrates significant consistency in such perceptions. Regardless of background, survey respondents report highly similar interpretations of what it means to be an immigrant in Swedish society. Hence, migrants from third-world countries are much more likely to be associated with the label than are migrants from, e.g., Western Europe. Furthermore, Myrberg shows that the ethnic hierarchy reflected in people’s mind-sets also is strongly associated with socioeconomic conditions in general and with experiences of

discrimination. Being an “immigrant” in the popular conception of the word thus tends to reduce benefits from (formal) equality of opportunity. Considering the long tradition of multicultural policies in Sweden, a “multicultural frame of mind” is obviously hard to promote in practice. To politicians, journalists and researchers, Myrberg’s findings should serve as a reminder not to use the term “immigrant” in its lexical meaning without bearing in mind its labelling function in the popular discourse.

Also bringing forth within-country differences between ethnic groups, the contribution of *Anne Julie Semb* focuses on the political conditions of the indigenous Sami minority in northern Scandinavia. Her theoretical points of departure are Kymlicka’s idea of “overlapping political communities” (Kymlicka 1995) and Alan Cairns’ notion of minority-based “nations within” (Cairns 2002). From this perspective, Semb analyses the special form of *dual citizenship* accessible for members of the Sami population in Norway (as well as in Sweden and Finland). Norwegian Sami may register themselves, on a voluntary basis, as voters for elections to the Sami parliament, thus receiving membership in an additional political system, this one based on descent rather than on formal Norwegian citizenship. An important question is whether the institutional duality will engender political isolation, either in word or deed, such that active Sami tend to develop a sense of reduced affiliation with the majority culture political institutions, thus also refraining from attempts to participate politically in other arenas than the one specifically designed for their own group. To test several hypotheses formulated along these lines, Semb draws on data from a unique survey administered in the northern Finnmark region of Norway, where the Sami population is significant. Her study clearly suggests that no signs of political alienation are observable among the Sami minority. On the contrary, when asked about their relation to the ordinary political community, registered Sami report at least as high levels of interest, trust and participation as do other Norwegian citizens. Hence, the extra opportunities for influencing Sami matters do not engender any mental segregation from the polity of the entire citizenry for a minority equipped with an additional political institution, and thus engagement in public affairs does not have to be a zero-sum game. Concluding this, however, Semb also finds that the integration is not really symmetric. Non-Sami, and even non-registered Sami, tend to express less interest and confidence in the Sami parliament, an observation that may indicate a legitimacy problem for a system of dual political membership. Again, actual multicultural recognition is not a clear-cut route to mutual trust and understanding.

Moving along, the volume also includes studies on how political parties, as organizations, response to the challenges of ethnic diversity in Scandinavia. *Beret Bråten* highlights the inclusionary potential of established parties in Norwegian politics, thus observing different strategies concerning recruitment as well as overall goals. Drawing on Will Kymlicka's and Tariq Modood's discussion of *group representation and influence* (Kymlicka 1995; Modood 2007) as well as on Anne Phillips' "politics of presence" (Phillips 1995), Bråten discusses the problem of poor ethnic minority representation in light of previous measures to increase the proportion of women in elected assemblies. While gender quotas have been voluntarily introduced in most parties represented in the Norwegian parliament, since the 1970s and onwards, an analogous measure for ethnic groups rarely seems to have been adopted. Bråten offers an empirical study aiming to illustrate politicians' conceptions and strategies of ethnic inclusiveness, based on interviews with leading representatives of Norwegian parties covering the left-right spectrum. Although the established parties, as expected, all embrace the general need for increased minority representation, they come to different conclusions concerning the appropriateness of ethnically based quotas. Interestingly, however, they may argue in favour as well as against such quotas by referring to the priority of individuals' rights. While for example a left-wing party may argue that quotas safeguard the rights of individuals with a foreign background, representatives of a conservative party may contend that they refrain from quotas, of any kind, for the very same reason. While a consensus on this matter seems remote, Bråten suggests that the state of affairs could change swiftly with increasingly strong public claims for more political representatives of ethnic minority decent.

In the following contribution, *Kristina Boréus* focuses on how political parties may respond to each others' rhetoric regarding immigration and immigrant politics. Specifically, she evaluates how "mainstream parties" have responded to the rhetoric regarding immigration and immigrants by *right-wing populist (RWP) parties*. Such parties typically take a highly critical stance on immigration and express critical views on—or even hostility towards—immigrants or ethnic minorities. In response, other parties may choose different rhetorical strategies. Boréus presents a comparative study based on detailed content analyses of election campaigns in Denmark and Sweden. Although an RWP party was present in two campaigns in the 1990s in Sweden, this kind of political movement has without a doubt been more successful in Denmark, most notably after the late 1990s. Studying transcripts from televised interviews and debates, as well as printed election material, Boréus traces anti-immigration and

anti-immigrant stances in the campaigns, the latter being operationalized as (1) policy proposals that are exclusionary of immigrants living in the countries and (2) negative other-representation of immigrants. Applying a modified model of mainstream party response developed by Meguid (2005), she finds that the presence of RWP parties has had an effect on the rhetorical strategies of mainstream parties in the case of *anti-immigration* stances. In the case of right-wing parties, this impact has been in the direction of agreement with RWP stances on immigration policies, while the Social Democrats in both countries have chosen strategies of dismissal, i.e. trying to avoid the topics as much as possible. The impact of RWP parties in regard to *anti-immigrant* stances is less clear. Such positions are expressed in all the analysed election campaigns, and the presence of an RWP party in an election campaign does not necessarily mean that anti-immigrant rhetoric is more pronounced.

Moving on from strategies of political parties, the next chapter concerns multicultural recognition within the realm of welfare state agencies in Scandinavia. In light of theoretical arguments for a *representative bureaucracy* (e.g., Kingsley 1944), the study by David Karlsson and Nazem Tahvilzadeh involves mapping the extent to which citizens with a foreign background have entered the publicly financed workforce in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Presenting comprehensive analyses of differences in ethnic diversity between the countries, as well as between various occupational categories, Karlsson and Tahvilzadeh find that although immigrants are generally underrepresented in the public workforce, there is conspicuous variation associated with the relative status of professions and levels of government. Hence, immigrants working in the public sector are much more likely to be found in “blue-collar” jobs involving welfare service production than in high-salary positions of government bureaucracies. Moreover, echoing Myrberg’s conclusion concerning ethnic hierarchies, immigrants from non-Western countries seem to have significantly fewer opportunities than do immigrants from more “Scandinavian-like” countries—the status variation of public sector positions being clearly reflected in unequal access for different categories of immigrants. Hence, the authors suspect that structural barriers of discrimination at least to some extent prevail also in those parts of the labour market where prospects, if anywhere, ought to be favourable. The public sector’s officially recognized responsibility to act as a role model in an ethnically diversified society leaves a great deal to be desired in practice. An ambitious welfare state is no guarantee for ethnic diversity in the institutions responsible for the implementation of public policies.

Although professionals in the public sector influence the actual output to a high extent—when citizens encounter public policies, e.g. in terms of welfare services—the level of polity relations concerning integration policies should also be explored. Taking on such an assignment, *Anton Steen* offers a study on *local responsiveness to national steering*, and more particularly on Norwegian municipalities' readiness to conform to central government requests concerning reception of refugees. In the Scandinavian welfare states, as underscored by Steen, ambitiously formulated state commitments to provide asylum could hardly be realized without reasonably cooperative political decision-makers at the local level. However, politicians in the municipalities also have a local public opinion to take into consideration—not to mention other demands regarding welfare obligations in their respective settings. Interestingly, Steen observes that even in the presence of obvious scepticism toward refugee settlement in the municipality populations, local leaders habitually agree to receive refugees as a result of central authority requests. Studying elite survey data, as well as statements and arguments delivered by political leaders in local mass media, Steen concludes that in the local discourses instrumental aspects are more prominent than symbolic ones. The local decision-making process more easily results in what are considered positive outcomes from the central government's vantage point, due to the incentive structure provided by quite generous state grants. Local politicians may argue that refugee reception is best calculated as a "welfare gain", as the resources provided may spill over and provide better opportunities for the community at large. Though Steen also argues that the current system may be vulnerable to economic imbalances, it clearly seems to have facilitated local leaders' efforts to appease xenophobic opinions. This supports the general thesis of Joppke (2005) and Freeman (2006) that elites play a decisive role in sensitive immigrant issues and explains why liberal immigration policies may defy the wishes of a negative public.

Public policy concerning issues of multicultural diversity may take many different shapes. But previous research arguably does not offer much insight into the perceptions of policy among those who are primarily affected. Contributing in this vein, *Ylva Stubbergaard* explores the experiences and perceptions of immigrated women participating in labour-market projects in Sweden, and reflects upon how citizenship could be understood not merely as a set of formal regulations, but also as a *construction of identity*. She takes her starting-point in concepts derived mainly from Chantal Mouffe's dynamic perspective on citizenship and Barbara Cruikshank's notion of government policies aimed at "making

citizens” (Mouffe 1992; Cruikshank 1999). With a critical eye on the inherent power relations between suppliers and subjects of policies intended to facilitate integration processes, Stubbergaard interprets messages from the interviewees in the two dimensions of inclusion-exclusion and emancipating-disciplining. The interviews provide multifaceted accounts of how women, sharing the experience of struggling to be included in the labour-market in Sweden, interpret the difficulties of integration in Swedish society. As participants in projects of this kind, the women have to comply with certain regulations and organizing principles. In so doing, they develop their own conceptions of the real-life differences between formal citizenship and the identity of being fully accepted as a Swedish citizen. At the same time, though, participation in the projects in many cases seems to provide important intangible assets, such as self-esteem, greater respect from families and friends, and beneficial civic skills.

In Stubbergaard’s study, the welfare state programmes may be possible resources for participants’ inclusion in society. Potential responses and strategies related to institutional, or even more general structural, conditions are also scrutinized in the chapter by *Bo Bengtsson*. He takes his point of departure in the increasingly popular theory of *political opportunity structure* (POS), discussing its potential usefulness for the study of political integration. Specifically, he analyses the role of the ethnically oriented civil society in this regard. Bengtsson’s overall question concerns to what extent POS theory may be useful when analysing the possibilities of ethnic organizations to contribute to political integration in a Marshallian inspired perspective. Carefully reviewing the insights of leading scholars’ seminal work (e.g., Tarrow 1994; McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1996), and comparing this with results from POS-inspired empirical studies of ethnically oriented associational life, he concludes that fruitful applications of POS theory demand inclusive definitions of “political” as well as “opportunity” and “structure”. The activities of, typically multifunctional, ethnic organizations would in several regards be expected to differ from the archetypical social movements on which the theory originally was formed. For instance, an ethnic organization may have a social agenda (i.e., providing room for cultural activities for the benefit of its members) that is at least as important as its possible political aims in the narrow sense. Importantly though, even an ostensibly “non-political” ethnic organization will often provide a “structure” in which members gain politically valuable resources. Providing a road-map of general mechanisms, according to which the political integration of immigrants could be promoted

collectively as well as individually—and within both ethnic and non-ethnic voluntary associations—Bengtsson offers a comprehensive check-list for future empirical efforts. Ideally, researchers following this would be able to focus both on general institutional aspects of associational life and on the contextual conditions for immigrants or groups of immigrants in a given geographic or historical setting.

A volume on ethnic diversity and political integration would be incomplete if it failed to analyse these issues in terms of *political participation* (cf. Leighley 2001). In the next two chapters, thus, efforts are made to explain differences in voting—arguably the most common, yet fundamental, mode of political participation. Studying turnout in Norwegian local elections, Johannes Bergh and Tor Bjørklund initially observe that “minority voting”, as repeatedly found in various studies across established democracies, is generally low in comparison with the majority population’s contribution to electoral turnout. Importantly, however, when using detailed data on turnout in different ethnic categories (defined by country of origin), the authors also find significant variations; thus, a considerably larger proportion of the members of some immigrant groups use their right (when entitled) to take part in the election of political representatives. Formulating a comprehensive set of hypotheses, based on earlier scholarly efforts, these variations are systematically scrutinized. Aside from reasonably expected influences of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of a given ethnic group, Bergh and Bjørklund conclude that what Hanna Pitkin has labelled “descriptive representation” (Pitkin 1967) is a strong explanatory factor. Their analyses reveal that turnout is considerably higher in minority groups that previously have succeeded in getting a representative from their own group onto the municipal council. While the empirical analyses may not completely account for inter-group differences in turnout, Bergh and Bjørklund’s study suggests that there is an element of ethnic politics also in the Scandinavian democracies. In light of a desired inclusion in a civic rather than ethnic demos, this finding should clearly be taken into account, not least when political parties review their agendas.

Combining Bengtsson’s interest in ethnic organization and Bergh and Bjørklund’s in electoral participation, *Ann-Helén Bay*, *Henning Finseraas* and *Anniken Hagelund* focus their contribution on the importance of *social capital* for turnout among immigrants. The authors note an increasing interest in Norway for immigrants’ participation in voluntary associations (a core element in the popular movement interpretation of democracy, in Norway as well as in the rest of Scandinavia). At the same time, though, possible effects of organizational engagement on participation in political

life have rarely been thoroughly studied. Of particular interest in this regard is the idea of differences between “bridging” and “bonding” associations (Putnam 2000). If immigrant organizations are generally characterized as belonging to the latter, they would primarily tend to provide room for withdrawal from the majority society. Thus, even though their members indeed may produce a beneficial social capital for the particular group as such, associational activism would not stimulate interest in the host society’s political life. Studying Norwegian policy documents from the 1970s and onwards, the authors observe a clear shift towards a fear for such a negative scenario. Whereas policy-makers previously considered immigrant organizations as instruments to protect immigrants against assimilation, such organizations are more recently expected to accept a role as cross-cultural bridges. Accordingly, the demand for increased inclusiveness—and thus more diversity—in overall associational life is also more pronounced in contemporary policy documents. Contrasting policy-makers’ worries about bonding associations with empirical individual-level relationships, Bay, Finseraas and Hagelund move on to compare the participatory effects of different kinds of organizational involvement. Their analysis reveals that, among immigrants in Norway, membership in a voluntary association generally seems to promote electoral participation. Although the specific positive effect of membership in (presumably more bonding) immigrant organizations clearly is weaker than the corresponding effects of (presumably more bridging) sports clubs or trade unions, there are no signs of any negative effects, regardless of organizational type. Hence, in contrast to policy-makers’ fear for isolation, the results in this chapter support a more optimistic view of immigrant organizations’ capabilities to stimulate political integration into Norwegian society.

As several scholars remind us, the basic mechanism of social capital is *trust* (cf. Rothstein 2005). Hence, social scientists have found good reasons to focus on the level and distribution of citizens’ trust—both their “horizontal” mutual trust in each other and their “vertical” overall confidence in societal institutions. Intuitively, trust in a society is probably not developed independent of the ethnic composition of the population, and thus multiethnic diversity may well have some bearing in this respect too (Alesina and La Ferrara 2002; Hooghe 2008). Our volume closes with two chapters devoted to exploring this theme. In the first of these, *Henrik Lolte* and *Lars Torpe* investigate differences in the development of “social” (i.e., inter-citizen) trust between Denmark and Sweden by taking advantage of the cross-country European Social Survey. Apparently, from a point in time not long ago, when the level of social trust clearly was

higher in Sweden than in Denmark (though both countries were, and still are, found in the top position in an international comparison), during the past decade the situation has become the reverse. Lolle and Torpe raise the question of how important the continually increasing ethnic heterogeneity in Sweden is—at least partly as a consequence of the more restrictive immigration policy in Denmark, its northern neighbour has become more ethnically diversified. In contrast to what may be expected from theories on likely adversarial effects of ethnic heterogeneity on social trust, however, Lolle and Torpe show that the higher proportion of non-Western immigrants in Sweden cannot explain the lower level of trust there. Moreover, their study interestingly reveals that immigration is more often regarded as a threat among Danes than among Swedes. As this factor, fully in line with expectations, is associated with less social trust, the authors conclude that trust differences would have been even higher had the Swedes feared immigration to the same degree as the Danes.

Whereas Lolle and Torpe present evidence of an important difference between Denmark and Sweden when it comes to trust in political institutions, the last chapter in this volume exclusively focuses on variations among immigrants in this particular kind of trust. In their contribution, *Per Strömblad* and *Per Adman* explore how the legacy of experiences from political institutions in other countries may influence confidence in Scandinavian politicians and civil servants. In view of the prominent heterogeneity in the immigrant populations of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Strömblad and Adman utilize information on the level of corruption in immigrants' countries of origin. Matching this kind of country information to individual-level data, their analyses suggest that immigrants from highly corrupt countries in the world have the strongest confidence in Scandinavian political institutions. However, further investigation reveals that this high level of "political trust" tends to decrease over time. Hence, after a number of years spent in the host country, immigrants from more corrupt countries would be positioned more on a par with the rest of the population. Analysing possible reasons underlying the time factor in this respect, the authors contend that experiences of discrimination do not provide a sufficient explanation. Instead they argue that if immigrants from less trust-worthy political regimes initially have a very bright view of the system performance of stable democracies, such as the Scandinavian countries, their experience and knowledge acquired over time will generally engender a more critical, but supposedly also a more realistic, outlook.

Together, the book chapters, all based on politological analyses in a Scandinavian context, serve to provide novel input into the academic and

political debate on diversity, inclusion and citizenship. Moreover, we contend that the insights extend far beyond Scandinavia, and at the same time contribute to the further development of theories concerning political integration in diversified democracies. True, there are many dilemmas to cope with in a world of crossed borders. But efforts to understand how politics and policies could make a difference in this respect will probably provide some keys to achieving the integrated society.

References

- Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting poverty in the US and Europe: A world of difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alesina, Alberto, and Elianna La Ferrara. 2002. Who trust others? *Journal of Public Economics* 85: 207–234.
- Banting, Keith. 2000. Looking in three directions. Migration and the European welfare state in comparative perspective. In Michale Bommes, and Andrew Geddes, eds. *Immigration and welfare. Challenging borders of the welfare state*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Banting, Keith, and Will Kymlicka. 2006. *Multiculturalism and the welfare state. Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Banting, Keith, Will Kymlicka, Richard Johnston, and Stuart Soroka. 2006. Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state? An empirical analysis. In Keith Banting, and Will Kymlicka, eds. *Multiculturalism and the welfare state: Recognition and redistribution in advanced democracies*, 49–91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barry, Brian. 2001. *Culture and equality. An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauböck, Rainer. 1994. *Transnational citizenship: Membership and rights in international migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Borevi, Karin. 2002. *Välfärdsstaten i det mångkulturella samhället* [The welfare state in a multicultural society]. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Brochmann, Grete, and Anniken Hagelund. 2010. *Velferdens grenser: Innvandring og velferdsstat i Skandinavia 1945–2010* [Boundaries of welfare: Migration and the welfare state in Scandinavia 1945–2010]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2001. The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24: 531–548.