



Norwegian University  
of Life Sciences

**Master's Thesis 2022 30 ECTS**

Department of International Environment and Development Studies

**Feminist perspectives on  
immigration and (re)production of  
power:  
A critical discourse analysis of  
Norwegian immigration and integration  
policy 2005 - 2021**

Sofie Olsen

Global Development Studies

The Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, has since its establishment in 1986 played a vital role in building international partnerships for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU). Noragric contributes to international development through interdisciplinary studies in the interface between assignments, research, and education (Bachelor, Master, and PhD programs).

The Master Thesis is the final assignment students submit to fulfil the Noragric Master Program requirements in “Global Development Studies,” “International Environmental Studies,” and “International Relations.”

This thesis is submitted as a final assignment for a Master’s Degree in “Global Development Studies”. The findings in this research are not necessarily a reflection of Noragric’s views. Extracts from this thesis may be reproduced after consultation with the author, provided that the source is acknowledged and referenced. For rights of reproduction or translation, contact Noragric.

© Sofie Olsen

May 2022

[Sofieolsen11@hotmail.com](mailto:Sofieolsen11@hotmail.com)

Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric

Faculty of Landscape and Society

P.O. Box 5003

N-1432 Ås Norway

Tel.: +47 67 23 00 00

Web: [www.nmbu.no/noragric](http://www.nmbu.no/noragric)

# Declaration

I, Sofie Olsen, declare that this Thesis is the result of my research and findings.  
All sources of information have been cited and a reference list has been appended. This work has not previously been submitted to any other university for award of any type of academic degree.

Date.....16.05.2022.....

Signature.....*Sofie Olsen*.....

# Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Poul Wisborg, Associate Professor at the Norwegian University of Life Science, for professional support, guidance, and feedbacks during the process of writing this thesis.

I would also direct a thank you to Andreas Gilbert, for taking up your time to help me with my grammar and thus improving the presentation of the thesis. Also, thank you Caroline, for support and motivation, and for being my best friend and study partner.

Thank you to my family and friends, who have encouraged and supported me throughout the process.

Finally, I would give a special thanks to Jonas, for your endless support, assistance, and encouragement during the study.

Any errors are mine alone.

# Abstract

The aim of the research for this thesis is to contribute to the understanding of how immigration and integration policy may (re)produce power structures that are causing discrimination and social inequality, particularly for female immigrants, in Norway. I pursue this aim by examining Norwegian immigration and integration policy as it has been formulated in political platforms prepared by four consecutive coalition governments from 2005 to 2021. By conducting a critical discourse analysis of immigration and integration policy, I critically reflect on how the policy contributes to (re)produce power relations based on nationality, ethnicity, class, and gender. Feminist perspectives provide me with discursive elements for analysing how power relations are produced and reproduced, and with theoretical perspectives for analysing the structural conditions that discourse influences and is influenced by. Tensions and synergies between Norwegian state feminism and decolonial feminism are particularly central. Through particular representations of ‘us’ as morally good, and of ‘them’ as problematic, an unequal power relation between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’ is (re)produced. I argue that representations of ‘us’ are based on a myth about Norway as a homogeneous society, and as gender equal, reflecting a state feminist perspective, and that ‘the other’ are represented as a problematic opposition, and a threat to ‘our’ assumed equality. Furthermore, immigration is shown to be discursively linked to a security discourse, by the governments making immigration policy part of the “justice and emergency preparedness policy”. A representation of ‘them’ as a threat to our security can be critiqued through decolonial feminism, which has shown how imperialist and colonial representations regard ‘the others’ as a possible threat, thus (re)producing power relations based on nationality and ethnicity. Finally, by representing immigrants as a threat to the sustainability of the welfare state, ‘them’ are continued to be represented as problematic. The political platforms represent an understanding of reality wherein the welfare state and welfare schemes are vulnerable, which then used to legitimise a strict immigration policy. Thus, representations of ‘them’ as problematic, as a threat to Norwegian security and welfare, (re)produce relations of unequal dignity and power between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’.



## Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Research aim, objectives, and questions .....	4
1.2. Outline of the thesis .....	4
<b>2. Discourse, power, and policy</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1. (Re)production of knowledge and power structures through language.....	5
2.2. Norway, a gender equal society? .....	7
2.3. The power of representing social categories and political issues .....	12
<b>3. Research method</b> .....	<b>15</b>
3.1. Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis .....	15
3.2. Data selection and analytical process .....	18
3.3. Assessing data quality and own positioning.....	20
<b>4. Feminist perspectives on Norwegian immigration and integration policy as discursive (re)production of power</b> .....	<b>21</b>
4.1. Representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ .....	22
4.2. Recontextualization of immigration.....	28
4.3. The sustainability of the welfare state .....	34
<b>5. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>6. References</b> .....	<b>44</b>

## 1. Introduction

In the years following 2015, expressions such as ‘migration flow’ and ‘refugee crises’ were widely used to describe people fleeing from conflict and war, especially from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan to various countries in Europe. At the end of November 2015, the Norwegian Parliament adopted the ‘asylum settlement’, a broad political agreement that extraordinary measures were needed to limit the number of new arrivals of refugees and asylum seekers (Eggebo and Staver, 2020, p. 128). It follows from this that the Norwegian immigration and integration policy is affected by global events, which creates the frame for my problematisation of how immigration and integration policy discursively (re)produce power relations leading to discrimination and social inequality, particularly for female immigrants, in Norway. What are the consequences of migration becoming linguistically linked to security? How does this affect equality (likeverd) and respect for immigrants who come to Norway? This thesis sheds light on how the language, or discourse, of Norwegian immigration and integration policy contributes to (re)producing power relations in Norwegian society. I have chosen to use the wording ‘(re)produce’ to indicate that policies and politics can both produce and/or reproduce power relations.

Norway is often regarded as gender equal (Berg, Flemmen and Gullikstad, 2010), although there are indeed some scholars who challenge this notion (Thun, 2012, 2020; Annfelt and Gullikstad, 2013; Kandal, 2021). Gender equality has developed into a central value and linked to what ‘being Norwegian’ means (Gullestad, 2002). It has also often been problematised in the context of integration (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019). When gender equality is represented in integration policy as a “right and duty”, it provides a limited understanding of how immigrants can be ‘integrated’. And as gender equality is considered an important Norwegian value, it is often used to measure the success of integration (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019). In this thesis, I want to contribute to the critique of the notion of equality in Norway, by placing representations of immigrants, and especially female immigrants, at the centre of the analysis.

Immigration refers to the action of coming to live permanently in a foreign country, which in this thesis refers to people moving to Norway. International migration is a global phenomenon affected by global events, and it follows that the discourse of immigration also is affected by global events. In many Western societies the immigration discourse changed after the terrorist



attacks in the USA on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, as the USA brought migration into its so called “fight against terrorism” (Farny, 2016). Thus, a migration discourse was linked to a security discourse, leading to radical changes. In Norway, a centre-right government, Bondevik II, was re-elected in October 2001. In its first White Paper on integration, one saw the beginning of questioning how much should be tolerated in terms of immigrants preserving their cultural traditions, and at the same time demands for support for “Norwegian values”, such as gender equality, the rule of law and democracy, also became more clearly formulated than in earlier policy. These changes in the immigration policy during the Bondevik II Government were clearly affected by the terrorist attacks in the USA in 2001 (Midtbøen, 2017, p. 140). This is important for my thesis because the discursive link between migration and security still exists (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Ibrahim, 2005; Farny, 2016). I discuss this topic in the context of Norwegian immigration policy in Chapter 4.2.

The main material in this thesis is political platforms prepared by four consecutive coalition governments from 2005 to 2021, namely the platforms: Soria Moria I (2005), Soria Moria II (2009), Sundvollen (2013), Granavolden (2019) and Hurdal (2021). I will provide an overview of the platforms and a detailed review of the analytical process in Chapter 3.2. Choosing a research method for this study, I found it relevant to use critical discourse analysis (CDA), because I aimed to critically reflect on how the Norwegian immigration and integration policy discursively may (re)produce power relations leading to discrimination and social inequality. CDA is a study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice, and highlights the relation between language, power, and ideology (Fairclough, 1995). I will mainly use Norman Fairclough’s analytical model, as it allows for the inclusion of different theoretical perspectives and methods for grasping the discursive dimensions of social and cultural change. Furthermore, feminist perspectives provide me with discursive elements for analysing how power relations are produced and reproduced, and with theoretical perspectives for analysing the structural conditions that discourse influences and is influenced by. Exploring tensions and synergies between Norwegian state feminism and decolonial feminism is particularly central in this thesis.

Helga Hernes’ (1988) theory of state feminism reflects the perception of Norway as a gender equal country, as she argued that women-friendly policies from above and feminist activism from below would eventually lead to the elimination of gender injustice in Scandinavian countries. Further, I have chosen to include perspectives of black feminism and decolonial feminism. Black feminism argues that black women are particularly vulnerable, as they

historically have experienced intersecting discriminating structures (hooks<sup>1</sup>, 2000). A decolonial feminist perspective argues that a lack of critical analysis of the racial genealogy of European feminists, as ‘civilisational’, ‘white’, or ‘European feminism’, has its roots in other oppressive structures than sexism, such as capitalism, racism, colonialism, and imperialism (Vergès, 2021). A decolonial feminist perspective allows me to critically reflect on several oppressive structures in my analysis of the Norwegian immigration and integration policy, and the (re)production of power relations.

By analysing the discourse of immigration and integration policy with feminist perspectives, I critically reflect on how the policy contributes to (re)producing power relations based on nationality, ethnicity, class, and gender. Through specific representations of ‘us’ as morally good, and of ‘them’ as problematic and/or as passive victims, a power relation between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’ is (re)produced. I argue that representations of ‘us’ are based on a myth about Norway as a homogeneous society, and as gender equal, and that ‘them’ are represented as a problematic ‘other’, and a threat to ‘our’ assumed equality. Further, immigration is discursively linked to the security discourse. Among other things, by two governments making immigration policy part of the “justice and emergency preparedness policy”, in their political platforms. A representation of ‘them’ as a threat to our security can be critiqued through decolonial feminism as it, in imperialist and colonial times, was common to regard ‘the others’ as a possible threat, thus a (re)production of power relations based on culture, nationality and ethnicity. Finally, by representing immigrants as a threat to the sustainability of the welfare state, there is a continued representation of ‘them’ as problematic. The political platforms represent an understanding of reality where the welfare state and schemes is vulnerable and used to legitimise a strict immigration policy. Thus, representations of ‘them’ as problematic, as a threat to both our security and our welfare state, (re)produces a power relation between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’.

The term “immigrant” will be used in this thesis as a general category including immigrants, asylum-seekers, and refugees. However, the category includes people from different countries, people seeking refuge from persecution (asylum), refugees of war and conflict, migrant workers, students, and family members of some of these groups. The reason for this simplification, is because the immigration and integration policy in political platforms currently use the same term. I will problematise this simplification in the analysis in Chapter

---

<sup>1</sup> Pseudonym of Gloria Jean Watkins. Putting the name in lowercase was an active choice she made, to focus on her message rather than herself (The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2022). I chose to keep it that way.

Four. When I use the terms ‘Norwegian’, ‘immigrants’, ‘majority’ and ‘minority’, I am aware that these terms are not unproblematic, descriptive terms, and I have chosen to use such categories in quotation marks to indicate active processes of racialisation.

### 1.1. Research aim, and questions

The aim of the research for this thesis is to contribute to the understanding of how immigration and integration policy discursively may (re)produce power structures that are causing discrimination and social inequality, particularly for female immigrants. I pursue this aim by examining Norwegian immigration and integration policy as it has been formulated in political platforms of four coalition governments from 2005 to 2021. I will conduct a critical discourse analysis of the policy statements and use feminist approaches to discuss and evaluate the (re)production of power that shapes the construction of, and policies towards, immigrants. Thus, the research aim has two aspects, first, to empirically expose the way government policy statements construct immigrants and the process of integration; and secondly, to critically discuss and evaluate the gendered power construction in the evolving policy, drawing on critical feminist theory. Hence my research questions are as follows:

- How does immigration and integration policy discourse (re)produce power relations in Norwegian society?
- How can critical feminist perspectives be used to elucidate and critique Norwegian immigration and integration discourse?

### 1.2. Outline of the thesis

The thesis is divided into five chapters. In Chapter Two, I introduce the political, feminist, and discursive perspectives that constitute the theoretical approach for the thesis. Following this, Chapter Three outlines the methodology and methods used in the research. The process of research and analysis is presented, and I critically reflect on the validity and my own position in these processes. Chapter Four contains the empirical findings, analysis and discussion through which I seek to answer the research questions. Finally, in Chapter Five I conclude this thesis by emphasising and reflecting on the main analytical points.

## 2. Discourse, power, and policy

The purpose of this chapter is to present the theoretical framework through which I analyse the political platforms that provide the textual material on immigration and integration policy. Firstly, I outline the discourse theoretical perspective that forms the basis of my approach to discourse analysis. Secondly, feminist literature provides me with a theoretical lens on the larger structural conditions that language influences and is influenced by, and with discursive elements for analysing (re)production of power relations. The narrative of Norway as gender equal may be said to reflect a Norwegian state feminism, which holds that Scandinavian states are especially women friendly. However, black feminist and decolonial feminist perspectives allow me to emphasise intersecting subordination and other power structures than gender as possibly oppressive, especially for female immigrants. Finally, as my main data is comprised of political platform documents, I emphasise the special position of politicians in the (re)production of knowledge and power.

### 2.1. (Re)production of knowledge and power structures through language

I aim to identify discourses in the Norwegian immigration and integration policy and analyse how they (re)produce power. Therefore, the discourse theoretical perspective is important and will be accounted for here.

Discourse analysis cannot be separated from its methodological and theoretical perspectives, as the researcher commits herself to certain epistemological and ontological premises, guiding concrete techniques for the analysis (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999). Social constructivism and poststructuralism are important philosophical orientations that have formed the basis for discourse analysis. Although a great variety of these approaches exists, they share some premises, such as the belief that truth is constructed through social interaction (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999). Central to these philosophies is the claim that we access reality through language. Many theories of social constructivism emphasise the role of texts (language) in the construction of the social world (Fairclough, 2003, p. 8). The assumption that reality is socially constructed may be interpreted as our surroundings are malleable and interpretable indefinitely. However, the importance is to uncover how something is constructed as ‘true’, rather than analysing whether it is the case (Bratberg, 2017, p. 61).

Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language. As Michel Foucault argues, discourse is “a group of statements which provide a language for talking about, and a way of representing knowledge about a particular topic at a particular historical moment.” (Hall, 1997, p. 29). Discourses include representations of how things are and have been, as well as imaginaries, which are representations of how things might, could or should be (Fairclough, 2003, p. 207). According to Neumann (2001), discourses “produce socially constructed facts which determine how we understand the world around us. These socially constructed facts are called representations. Representations are the way things and phenomena are presented to us through language, categories etc., and is the most important collection of reality construction in which discourses rely on.” (Neumann, 2001, p. 33). Political discourse is not only shaped by politicians but are important actors in the construction of political discourse. In this thesis I look at how politicians through political platforms influence the discourse on immigration and integration, with a focus on the immigration and integration discourse, as represented through political platforms dating from the period 2005 to 2021. Other institutions or organisations may have other representations of the immigration and integration, hence contributing to the same or other discourses.

When the power of dominant groups is manifested in laws, rules, norms, and habits, it borrows from what Antonio Gramsci called *hegemony* (van Dijk, 2001, p. 355). Hegemony appears when specific representations are taken for granted and thus considered to be something ‘natural’ or ‘normal’. This hegemonic position must be maintained through constant discursive work, i.e., continuous representation and reproduction of statements and practices (Neumann, 2001). Following this view of hegemony, Marianne Gullestad (2002) argues that the official debate on immigration consists of overlapping interpretive frameworks in the form of values, ideas, and perceptions, which together form an unstable hegemony that can be summed up in the dichotomy of ‘us’ and ‘them’. “The national order is ‘we’ the numerical majority in a privileged position. The power of the majority therefore lies above all in the obvious and ‘natural’ and thus legitimate in its interpretations of the world” (Gullestad, 2002, p. 17). Such a discursive polarisation through a worldview of ‘us’ versus ‘them’, where our positive self-representation stands in contrast to the negative representation of them, is typical for political discourse (Wodak, 2001, p. 86). This is relevant as I in the analysis identify representations of ‘us Norwegians’ as the ‘normal’, and ‘them’ immigrants, especially female, as problematic.

As knowledge and power relations can be reproduced through language, we can establish that the language used to formulate policies has real-world consequences. I am especially interested in the (re)production of gendered power structures; therefore, I will now look at how feminist perspectives understand and conceptualise power.

## 2.2. Norway, a gender equal society?

Feminist perspectives contribute to the theoretical understandings of (re)production of power structures in this thesis. As Norwegian immigration and integration policy is within a Norwegian discourse, I will first look at how the perspectives of state feminism may contribute with discursive elements to the (re)production of power, in the context of immigration and integration. Further, black feminist and decolonial feminist perspectives allows me to emphasise that intersecting forms of subordination and other power structures than gender may be oppressive, especially for female immigrants.

Gender is a category used in several ways, both in everyday life, politics, and academic research. The category contains both biologically, culturally, and socially constructed identity markers (Bråten, 2013, p. 10). Commonly, sex refers to biological, and gender to the socially constructed. Furthermore, the category of gender is related to power, and feminist theories grew out of women's struggles for emancipation and equality and a realisation of the impact that gender has on social reality (Fenstermaker and West, 2002). However, it is impossible to speak of 'feminist theory' as a collective term, because different directions within feminist thinking are diverse, contradictory, and some feminist theories are even oppressive for some groups of women (Vergès, 2021, p. 5). Therefore, the following will account for various feminist theories that are relevant for this thesis. It explores how these theories account for the ways power structures is produced and reproduced, including gender relations, but also other categories and identity markers such as immigration status, nationality, and ethnicity.

In *Welfare state and woman power— essays in state feminism* (1988), Helga Hernes describes Scandinavian societies as potentially "women-friendly". She argues that the welfare state and the institutionalised gender equality policy from above in combination with feminist mobilisation from below has merged into a distinctive state feminism. Scandinavian welfare states have policies that seek to prevent women from having to make more difficult choices than men, when it comes to family, professional and social life, or unfair treatment based on gender (Hernes, 1988, p. 15). According to Hernes, policy from above and activation from

below would eventually lead to a broader elimination of injustice based on gender, without an increase in other forms of inequality. Norwegian state feminism reflects the perception of Norway as a county with gender equality (Berg, Flemmen and Gullikstad, 2010, p. 12). In addition, this perception is “confirmed” by reports that apply specific sets of criteria, ranking Norway amongst the top three countries with the highest degree of gender equality<sup>2</sup>, contributing to reproduce a narrative of Norway as gender equal. Parts of the theory of state feminism may be true in the Norwegian context, as several political measures have been introduced to promote gender equality. Further, women’s activism from below have grown to become an important element in civil society. However, it is optimistic to think that other forms of inequality do not exist and could not increase at the same time.

State feminism has been criticised for lacking recognition of complexity. In *The women-friendly policies and state feminism* (2008), Annette Borchorst and Birte Siim, suggest that Hernes’ theory about state feminism underestimates the resilience of the gendered power structures. And argue further that the term “female-friendly welfare states” are explicitly based on the political culture and institutions in the Scandinavian countries. Scandinavian countries “women friendliness” is based on the premise that women’s wage labour participation is the key to equality. Thus, Hernes’ theory primarily constructs redistribution of economy as an instrument for obtaining social justice, underestimating the centrality of recognition (Borchorst and Siim, 2008, p. 213). Birte Siim and Hege Skjeie (2008, p. 339) argues that cultural pluralism as an empirical reality, presents major challenges for Nordic state feminism when it comes to the recognition of cultural diversity and the acceptance of different models for gender equality and family forms. Due to increasing cultural diversity, differences among women have expanded, and new dimensions of gender equality have emerged:

“(…) state feminism and women friendly policies are challenged by increased diversity among women and men, not only according to gender and class but also increasingly according to ethnicity, religion, and nationality. Such diversity requires negotiations and reformulations of some of the key policies, strategies, and normative foundations.” (Borchorst and Siim, 2008, p. 222).

---

<sup>2</sup> Report ranking Norway as top three country in the world on gender equality: World Economic Forum (2021). Global Gender Gap Report. Retrieved from: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2021> (Visited April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022).

State feminism reflects a represented reality of Norway as gender equal, but it neglects the reality of Norway as a diverse country, regarding culture and national background. Despite these criticisms, state feminism still informs the main narrative of a development towards increasing gender equality in Norway. The fact that Norway is represented as gender equal has developed into a central feature in the representation of Norwegians, and as ‘our common value’. It becomes clear in the analysis how the gender equality narrative is reflected in the material, and how it contributes to a divide between representation of who ‘we’ are, and who ‘they’ are. Thus, state feminism contributes with discursive elements that seem to be activated and used by politicians, especially as assumptions and values about Norwegian society and in the construction of ‘us’ and ‘them’.

In Norwegian politics, a dominant way of using the term ‘gender equality’ is in meaning of ‘common value’ (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019, p. 199). This way of using the term may seem as both potentially inclusive and exclusive. When terms such as ‘common value’ or ‘Norwegian value’ are used in immigration and integration policy, it is implicitly stated that gender equality is a value that ‘we’ Norwegians have, and those targeted by the policy do not have. The consequence of this representation of equality is that the equality of the ‘majority’ and the inequality among the ‘minorities’ are understood as truths about cultures (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019, p. 210). Further, the traditional gender equality agenda in Norway is based on economic independence and equal political participation and influence (Siim and Skjeie, 2008, p. 325). In Chapter Four, I show how the immigration and integration policy indicates that Norway is gender equal, and the importance of economic independence to achieve this. Cecilie Thun (2012, p. 52) argues that ‘majority’ representations of feminism in Norway hold privileged or hegemonic positions because they draw on a dominant national discourse of “Norwegianness”, where ‘ethnic Norwegians’ are viewed as the norm, while ‘others’ are constructed as deviant in a Norwegian context. This means that the dominant feminism in Norway does not include all women. Hence, it becomes important to include other feminist perspectives in order to understand power relations in Norway.

In *Feminist theory- from margin to centre*, bell hooks (2000) argues that privileged feminist thoughts have marginalised the majority of women in the world. She states that black women bear the brunt of sexist, racist and classist oppression. Hence, black women should have a central role in the construction of feminist theory, as their contribution is unique and valuable. By using an example from American society, where the class structure has been shaped by racial politics of white supremacy, she shows how past feminist refusal to draw attention to



and attack racial hierarchies suppressed the link between race and class (hooks, 2000, p.3). hooks (2000, p. 19) asks if women share a common vision of what equality means, as many feminists aim to make women the social equals of men. She states that women living in poorer groups would not have defined women's liberation as gaining equal social status with men, knowing that men in their group are also exploited and oppressed and lack social, political, and economic power (hooks, 2000, p. 19). Marxism has influenced black feminism, which argues that racism, as sexism, is not a simple question of individual injustice, but a product of historical situations (Bryson, 2003, p. 221). Black feminism has its roots in imperialism and colonialism, indicating the importance of a historical context in creating the oppression of black women. This does not mean that black feminism is simply a theory of and for feminists who happen to be black. Rather, it is a self-conscious epistemological standpoint which argues that feminist struggles cannot be confined to gender issues and that "if black women's perspectives are excluded from feminist thought, then its attempt to understand even the situation of white women will be seriously flawed" (Bryson, 2003, p. 231). It follows from this that the black feminist approach provides an important recognition of the historical experiences of black women, in the context of oppression.

Within feminist research, *intersectionality* has evolved as a concept which allows one to recognise that women may be suppressed through several power asymmetries, including between women. The term originates from black feminism and was launched by Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, in an analysis of how the racial capitalist system favours the categories of white, male, heterosexual, Christian and the affluent, thus black women become marginalised within several of these categories (Berg, Flemmen and Gullikstad, 2010, p. 14). In other words, intersectionality recognises that some women may be experiencing several mechanisms of oppression, and that women may be oppressed by other women. Further, decolonial feminism offers a multidimensional approach, which responds to certain limitations of the notion of intersectionality. A concept proposed by Darren Lenard Hutchinson, to better understand how "the racist and heteronormative power not only creates precise exclusions at the intersection of domination, but shapes all social proposals and subjectivities", including among the privileged (Vergès, 2021, p. 20). It appears that the multidimensional experiences of individuals who, though subordinate, enjoy social privilege (e.g., heterosexual, upper-class, white women) (Hutchinson, 2001, p. 312). While intersectionality is focused on intersecting subordination, multidimensionality permits a more nuanced examination of the operation of privilege and subordination among oppressed social

groups. It is important to recognise that within the identity categories I refer to in this thesis, there are several nuances that affect power relations. For example, I do not include extended gender identities, sexual orientation, or religion, which are some important nuances. In this thesis, I chose to include identity markers for gender, ethnicity and nationality.

In *A decolonial feminism*, Françoise Vergès (2021) argues that feminists should not be accomplices of capitalism, racism, colonialism, and imperialism, and asks why the critical analysis of the racial genealogy of European feminism is still marginal. Western-patriarchal ideology nourishes civilisational feminism which says, in essence, to women: “You don't have freedom. You don't know your rights. We will help you reach the right level of development” (Vergès, 2021, p. 14). Decolonial feminisms are part of the long movement of scientific and philosophical reappropriation that is revising the European narrative of the world. It seeks to contest Western-patriarchal economic ideologies that turned women, black people, indigenous people and people from Asia and Africa into inferior beings marked by the absence of reason, beauty, or a mind capable of technical and scientific discovery (Vergès, 2021, p. 13). Europe is built on a racialised division of the world, hence civilisational (or white) feminism must consider the fact that it is based on the denial of the role of slavery and colonialism in its own formation (Vergès, 2021, p. 18). The objective of decolonial feminism is a deconstruction of racism, capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. Thus, decolonial feminist perspectives are built on the awareness of uneven power structures, raising awareness that feminisms too may have their roots in a privileged position. Norway is part of the Western world, historically and culturally. Therefore, it is highly relevant to scrutinise Norwegian power structures through a decolonial perspective, which is what I do in the analysis of this thesis.

Summing up, the feminist literature accounted for here provides me with a theoretical lens to the larger structural conditions that language influences and is influenced by. The comparison, tensions, and synergies between Norwegian state feminism and decolonial feminism are particularly central in this thesis. Norway's narrative of itself as egalitarian reflects the theory of state feminism, which claims that the Nordic welfare states are particularly women friendly. Decolonial feminism challenge this by critically reflecting on the construction of feminism from a privileged position, and including the importance of oppressive structures as racism, capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. From this follows that feminist perspectives provide me with discursive elements to analyse how power relations are produced and reproduced, including through language.

### 2.3. The power of representing social categories and political issues

Politicians hold a special position in the production of knowledge, as they are central to communication of knowledge, reality, and solutions to represented problems (van Dijk, 2008, p. 85). With their presentation of an issue, politicians need to convince people that their proposals for action are the right ones. Setting the agenda and framing the problems that need to be solved, is a source of political power, as the construction of what the problem ‘is’ is crucial for policy development (Djuve and Kavli, 2019, p. 29). In this thesis I focus on politicians among those who hold power in society, as my main data are political platforms, produced by politicians.

A political platform includes policy, and it defines the direction of what the government wants to accomplish within their allotted time of governance. Policy is a set of guidelines to guide decisions and achieve rational outcomes, produced by a governance body. Formulating politics is largely about arguing how society should be, based on a particular understanding of reality. Political documents take part in the shaping of society both through being management tools and by being powerful creators and communicators of an understanding of reality (Annfelt and Gullikstad, 2013, p. 10). It is important to point out that the texts analysed in this thesis are only a small sample of the discourse in a wider political field, and thus only a small part of a larger political order. I direct the focus to how politicians, through policy, represent issues, solutions and identities related to immigration and integration in Norway.

Political identities consist in a certain type of ‘we’ and ‘they’ relation, which can emerge out of diverse forms of social relations. Difference is often constructed based on hierarchy, for example between form and matter, black and white, man and woman, etc: “Once we have understood that every identity is relational and that the affirmation of a difference is a precondition for the existence of any identity, i.e., the perception of something ‘other’ which constitutes its ‘exterior’.” (Mouffe, 2005, p. 15). In social research on migration and welfare, Norway before 1970 is often depicted as a relatively homogenic society (Ånensen, 2021, p. 1). Thus, ‘we Norwegians’ are represented as a homogeneous group. Rebecca Dyer Ånensen has challenged this statement by taking a historic and geographic look at Norway. She questions why the assumption is widespread in social science, despite the importance of both migration and ethnic diversity in Norwegian history. The myth of homogeneity is also problematised in the current construction of ‘us’ and ‘them’/‘the stranger’/‘the other’, as it encapsulates and seals contradictions, and serves as a basis for thinking and action, as “the myth of homogeneity motivates a sharp distinction between ‘us’, who are homogeneous, and

‘the strangers’, who are believed to disturb this homogeneity” (Gullestad, 2002, p. 68). In this view, the importance of identifying representations of ‘us Norwegians’ and ‘them immigrants’ becomes important in understanding power relations.

Categories such as ‘immigrant’, ‘minority’ and ‘majority’ may appear descriptive and neutral but are related to power and power structures (Bråten, 2013, p. 152). The power of the ‘majority’ lies in the opportunity to define and name social categories, including define what constitutes ‘society’. When ‘immigrants’ are referred to as a category, and as a ‘minority’ in relation to the ‘majority’ population, the power relation is based on ethnicity. Further, if one includes gender, the ‘immigrant women’ become a new ‘minority’ category, related both to ‘Norwegian’ women, but also to immigrant men (Berg, Flemmen and Gullikstad, 2010, p. 22). Discourse is a key mechanism contributing to the social construction of groups within systems of power in ways that shape and sustain inequalities, for example by the mechanisms that position migrants as ‘the other’ (Huot, Bobadilla, Bailliard and Rudman, 2015, p. 131). It follows from this that political representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ are contributing to a (re)production of relations which are connected to power.

Politicians have the power to define political issues, including to define something as an issue of security. The process in which migration discourse shifts toward an emphasis on security has been referred to as the securitisation of migration (Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002; Ibrahim, 2005; Farny, 2016). Within a human security approach concerned with potential vulnerabilities and risks that threaten populations, international migration has become synonymous with environmental degradation, narcotics production, trafficking, and international terrorism (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 169). Securitisation is a result of the power of language, as statements by international organisations, politicians, academics, and journalists have normalised the view of migration as a risk to the liberal world. Hence, power is exercised through discourse by producing a truth and creating knowledge about migration (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 164).

Moreover, it is possible to understand the view of ‘migration as a threat’ as a narrative that is built upon a racist discourse (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 163). Maggie Ibrahim (2005) highlights the role of racism in securitisation by examining a shift from notions of biological superiority to exclusions based on cultural differences. She argues that securitisation is based on the host country populations view that their race and/or culture is superior, and that cultural difference leads to “social breakdown”. Therefore, linking migration to the security discourse may be viewed as “modern racism” (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 164). Securitisation becomes relevant in my

thesis as it may be evident of a discursive reproduction of racist representations, linking migrants' cultural difference to threats against the human security of the Norwegian population, thus related to (re)production of power.

Elisabeth Farny (2016) discusses the drivers behind the securitisation of migration. She states that the discourse that links migration to security was reinforced in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, where migration was brought into the discussion of the campaign against terrorism (Farny, 2016). In a Norwegian context, the construction of "Europe's refugee crisis" in 2015 was part of major changes in the discourse of immigration and integration. In the years following 2015, words such as 'migration flow' and 'refugee crises' were widely used to describe people fleeing from conflict and war, especially people from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan who had migrated to various countries in Europe (Norwegian Directorate of Immigration, n.d.). The role of the media was of course central, but political changes also show how the migration discourse was affected by a security discourse. By the end of November 2015, the Norwegian Government adopted the 'asylum settlement', a broad political agreement that extraordinary measures were needed to limit new arrivals of refugees and asylum seekers (Eggebø and Staver, 2020, p. 128). In the analysis I point out how immigration and security intersect linguistically in the political platforms, thus allowing me to assess whether it is a case of securitisation of migration in the Norwegian policy.

As my main material in this thesis is Norwegian immigration and integration policy, there are some important elements about the Norwegian context that are important to point out. Norway is open to free movement from European Economic Area countries, thus a type of immigration that is not regulated in Norwegian immigration policy (Staver, 2021, p. 183). This contrasts the otherwise strict immigration policy that Norway pursues. Anne Balke Staver (2021) has researched how states proceed to pursue conflicting goals in immigration policy, among other things by disconnecting labour immigration policy from the rest of the immigration policy. Studying political goals and outcomes is beyond the aim of this thesis, but in Chapter 4.3., I discuss how claims about a vulnerable welfare state contributes to justify both a restrictive and selective immigration policy, and how different representations of labour immigration and refugees contributes to a (re)production of power based on 'wanted' and 'unwanted' immigrants. Further, representations that indicate a 'wanted' and 'unwanted' immigration potentially (re)produce relations of unequal dignity and power between 'Norwegians' and 'immigrants' as well.

As we have seen in this subchapter, discourse is related to power, and politicians have a special position in constructing representations of social categories and political issues. Thus, politicians, through the formulation of politics, are an important contributor to discursively (re)producing power relations in society. From this it follows that discourse is important in the production and reproduction of power, and in the following chapter I will show how this in practice has been researched in this thesis.

### 3. Research method

This chapter sets out the methodological and practical steps of the research undertaken. To analyse immigration and integration policy in political platforms from 2005 to 2021, I employ critical discourse analysis (CDA), which provides me with tools to study the policy language and identify power relations in the material studied. Furthermore, by going through the analytical process and give an account of the data, I intend to create transparency and enable critical reflection. Finally, I will account for considerations of validity and research ethics, including my own position as a researcher.

#### 3.1. Fairclough's critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice, and it makes a significant and specific contribution to provide an account of the role of discourse in (re)production of power, dominance, and inequality. It differs from traditional discourse analysis in that it highlights the relation between language, power, and ideology, as it seeks to reveal how language works ideologically and contributes to (re)produce power relations (Skrede, 2017). CDA involves several related branches, and some of the best-known critical discourse analysts are Teun A. van Dijk, Ruth Wodak and Norman Fairclough. They are known for having developed different CDA approaches, all of which alternate between illuminating micro and macro conditions. I have studied texts from all three authors to gain a broad understanding of CDA, but I will mainly use Fairclough's model in my analysis. The choice to use the Fairclough's model is based on its focus on major social structures, that coincides with my interest in power relations.

In *Critical discourse analysis*, Norman Fairclough (1995) emphasises the ways we communicate as both influencing and as being influenced by the structures and forces of

contemporary social institutions. The ‘critical’ goal is to shed light on how language contribute to can naturalise social practices (Fairclough, 1995, p. 28), which may lead to oppression for some groups of people. In *Discourse, power and access*, van Dijk (2008) explores how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimised by text and talk of dominant groups or institutions: “(...) through special access to, and control over the mean of public discourse and communication, dominant groups or institutions may influence the structures of text and talk in such a way that, as a result, the knowledge, attitudes, norms, values and ideologies of recipients are more or less indirectly affected in the interest of the dominant group” (van Dijk, 2008, p. 85). Discursive practices may contribute to produce and reproduce power relations between different social categories, as social classes, between men and women, and between ethnic minorities and the majority (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999, p. 75). Politicians have special access to and control over the production of politics and policy, thus considered a dominant group, with power to (re)produce discourse. Hence, the central method of this thesis is to analyse and locate representations within the immigration and integration policy, to critically examine discursively (re)produced power relations.

Fairclough has developed a three-dimensional model to unite different analytical traditions into an approach of CDA: (1) reading of text, including linguistic analysis, (2) interpretive traditions which see social practice as something people actively produce, and (3) the macro-sociological tradition, where social practice is analysed in relation to social structures (Skrede, 2017, p. 32). The first dimension of Fairclough’s CDA model consists of a detailed text analysis within linguistic discipline, which is referred to as *social events*. The second dimension in the model, called *social practice*, includes an analysis of the process around the text production, distribution, and consumption. At this stage, it is still a linguistic focus on the text, however, one seeks to identify what discourses the texts draws on. The third dimension of Fairclough’s analytical model, *social structure*, aims to uncover the connection between discourse, power, and ideology. To answer my research questions, I have used Fairclough’s model in CDA to approach the data material. Therefore, the following will give an account of the analytical tools used to analyse immigration and integration policy.

‘Modality’ is a text analytical tool that can identify the speaker’ way of expressing facts and attitudes. “Modality means the speaker’s judgement of the probabilities, or the obligations, involved in what he is saying.” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 165). Fairclough divides modality into two categories of speech functions; the exchange of knowledge (epistemic modality) and the exchange of activity (deontic modality). ‘Statements’ and ‘questions’ are the speech function

associated with ‘knowledge exchange’, while ‘demand’ and ‘offers’ are associated with ‘activity exchange’. When analysing political rhetoric, modality can provide insight into the worldview that is promoted, which knowledge that is postulated as true and valid (epistemic), and how we should act considering the social circumstances described (deontic) (Skrede, 2017, p. 51). An example of epistemic modality is: “The number of migrants worldwide has increased significantly since the turn of the millennium, and migration flows are very unpredictable.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 24). As the quote is a statement, it represents an exchange of knowledge as true. Followed by how we should act considering the social circumstance described (deontic): “Norway must therefore have a high level of preparedness for rapid shifts.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 24). Politics is to a large extent about presenting social issues, and solutions to solve them. In other words, there are many markers of modality in the political platforms, which reveals represented worldviews and suggested solutions in the context of immigration and integration.

‘Nominalisation’ is a grammatic metaphor that presents processes in society as things or entities instead of processes, resulting in a shading of actors, and responsibility of the process (Fairclough, 2003, p. 132). An example from a political platform is the nominalised word ‘migration flow’, which emphasise migration as a ‘thing’ rather than a complex processes, and regardless of the events and political decisions that have led to the situation. The individuals who flee and their situation are hidden, and ‘our’ responsibility to help is disguised, by presenting migration as a noun.

‘Intertextuality’ is the study of the relation between a text, and other texts. The primary goal is to uncover how ideological interests may be represented by the intertextuality (Skrede, 2017, p. 51). For example, the Sundvollen platform (2013) contains intertextuality between the immigration policy and the Immigration Act, as parts of the law is reproduced in the political platform. This will be further evaluated in the analysis. ‘Interdiscursivity’ concentrates on how authors of texts draw on already existing discourses and genres to produce a text, and how text receivers also use already existing discourses and genres in consumption and interpretation of the text (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999, p. 81). Due to the content that is reproduced from the Immigration Act in the Sundvollen platform (2013), which is policy on when a foreigner may be arrested or imprisoned, one can also consider whether it is a case of interdiscursivity between a migration discourse and security discourse. When a discursive field begins to incorporate other discourses, it indicates a change. This change can lead to



‘recontextualization’, in that a social practice is subjected to a new logic. Often, when intertextual and interdiscursive links are reproduced frequently, they may end up being recontextualized (Skrede, 2017, p. 55). I will, especially in Chapter 4.2., show how intertextuality and interdiscursivity are evident in the immigration and integration policy, furthermore, evaluate a possible recontextualization of migration.

As members of a community, ‘we’ depend on certain collective assumptions, because social communication or interaction depend on shared meanings, a ‘common ground’, which can be taken as given (Skrede, 2017, p. 55). Assumptions about what exists (existential assumption) and assumptions of what is good or desirable (value assumptions) are two different ways of communicating a ‘common ground’, an example of these are evident in the Soria Moria II platform: “The Norwegian welfare state is based on solidarity, and on a willingness to give and share. Trust in society’s institutions and between the inhabitants is a necessary prerequisite for a society like this.” (Soria Moria II, p. 2009, p. 72). In the political platforms, reference is made what exists and what is desirable in the context of immigration and integration.

In the third dimension of Fairclough’s model, it opens to include different theoretical perspectives and methods for grasping the discursive dimensions of social and cultural change (Skrede, 2017, p. 32), which allows me to include feminist perspectives in my analysis of immigration and integration policy’s discursive (re)production of power in Norway.

### 3.2. Data selection and analytical process

Qualitative research uses many forms of data, including text, interviews, participant observation, audio recording and video. In this thesis, the main data is political platforms produced by coalition governments, hence my main data is text. I chose to analyse political platforms as they contain a broad set of policy statements within the selected political fields. Political platforms are the result of negotiations and compromises in political coalitions, aimed to create a basis for governing. Political platforms place restrictions and provide opportunities on a wide variety of topics, described in a text divided into chapters and subchapters. Immigration and integration policy concern people who move to Norway, with a view to settle, or to work. The immigration policy shall regulate entry, residence, and settlement in Norway. While integration policy aims to contribute to enabling immigrants and their children to use their resources and contribute to the community (The Directorate of

Immigration and Diversity, n.d.). It turns out that the different political coalitions place both immigration and integration policy under different main chapters and sub-chapters. These are also interesting observations to be included in the analysis Chapter 4.2. When I started the research process, I had an expectation that it would be possible to identify a major difference in the discourse before and after the ‘migration crisis’ in 2015, the time perspective of the study was therefore limited from 2005 until 2021. However, as I did not find the major changes, I left this focus, but kept the time limit as I found other interesting observations. The political platforms which constitute the material for my analysis are the Soria Moria I, Soria Moria II, Sundvollen, Granavolden and Hurdal platforms (see Table 1).

**TABLE 1: OVERVIEW OF THE POLICY PLATFORMS USED AS DATA SOURCES**

<b>Platform</b>	<b>Production year</b>	<b>Coalition parties</b>	<b>Governments</b>
Soria Moria I	2005	Labour Party, Socialist Party, Centre Party	Stoltenberg I
Soria Moria II	2009	Labour Party, Socialist Party, Centre Party	Stoltenberg II
Sundvollen	2013	Conservative Party, Progress Party	Solberg I
Granavolden	2019	Conservative Party, Progress Party, Liberal Party, Christian Democratic Party	Solberg II
Hurdal	2021	Labour Party, Centre Party	Støre

*Sources: The governments of Stoltenberg I and II, Solberg I and II, Støre (See references)*

In order to strengthen the credibility of my analysis and interpretations, I sought to approach the material systematically, while acknowledging that it is impossible to entirely avoid subjectivity in the interpretations. I started the analytical process by reading through the political platforms, in chronological order. Next, I printed all the parts from the platforms that

addressed immigration and integration policy. On these, I first marked text-analytic characteristics from the first step in Fairclough's analytical model. Second, I did a more thorough read-through, to categorise the main representations and common tendencies in the political platforms. I thematised the findings into a table, to get an overview of these and to identify possible differences. The table was useful for a while, but then the material began to merge into a uniform text material for me. I continued to take notes, however, not dividing them into a table. I pondered for a while whether the analysis should be structured chronologically but found that it made more sense to structure it thematically, as the point of the analysis is not to compare the platforms, but rather to be able to identify any changes through a comprehensive discourse analysis of the immigration and integration policy in the five platforms. The analysis is thematically structured, and relevant quotes and points are taken from the various platforms, analysed as discourse, and examined and discussed through state feminist and decolonial feminist perspectives.

### 3.3. Assessing data quality and own positioning

An essential part of social research is to provide transparency and facilitate critical examination of one's research, to ensure the trustworthiness of our findings. The first thing to note is that the political platforms are written in Norwegian, and I have had to translate quotes retrieved from the platforms. I am aware that the translation may have caused the meaning to change or nuances to be lost. Nevertheless, because Norwegian is my native language, I conducted the analysis in Norwegian, before I translated. Thus, the translation should not have significantly affected the analysis and concluding remarks.

A discourse analyst would never attempt to find 'the true purpose' of a statement, as it is impossible to go behind discourses and inside of people's heads (Neumann 2001, p. 38). Instead, "the analyst has to work with what has actually been said or written, exploring patterns in and across the statements and identifying the social consequences of different discursive representations of reality" (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999, p. 21). To provide a level of internal validity, conclusions must follow from logical arguments and evidence the researcher provide. It is challenging, and impossible to achieve full objectivity in qualitative research, but the criterion relates to whether it can be assessed that the researcher acted in 'good faith,' meaning that personal values, attitudes, and perceptions has not intentionally influenced the research results (Bryman, 2016).

Moreover, I must consider that I, as a researcher, am situated within certain national and international discourses, which affect my analysis and conclusions. As Dunn and Neumann argues: “(...) researchers are not neutral observers, but often are intimately related to the power hierarchies at play” (2016, p. 58). Hence, the importance of reflecting on how one’s position as a researcher is situated within different discourses and contexts, and how this may impact the research process. As I only use secondary data, I have not had the opportunity to directly influence the data, which is the case with for example qualitative interviews.

Although, the data is not influenced by me, it does not mean that the study is without my influence. I have decided the range of documents to be examined and have selected several quotes, and the selection would have been made differently by another researcher. I have also interpreted the selected quotes, which is influenced by me and my background. However, the reader of this thesis has the opportunity to be critical of the interpretations, findings and results of the research, as the process is made transparent through my descriptions of the process.

Following from the above, I recognise that my personal political views have influenced my attitudes and expectations related to immigration and integration issues, and therefore this research process. Furthermore, Françoise Vergès (2021, p. 25) argues the difficulty of making white women recognise that they are white. Hence, it is important for me to reflect on the fact that I am a white woman, born in Norway. I may never be able to fully recognise and understand oppression based on race, ethnicity, and class. By being aware of and reflect on my own position as a researcher throughout the process has been important in order to reduce biases, trying to reduce the role of unacknowledged preconceptions in influencing the collection and analysis of data, i.e., trying to increase the internal validity.

#### 4. Feminist perspectives on Norwegian immigration and integration policy as discursive (re)production of power

In this chapter, I discuss three trends in the representation of Norwegian immigration and integration policy between 2005 and 2021, contextualised within certain aspects of the (re)production of power relations within Norwegian society. I draw attention to the discursive construction of social categories, and the importance of creating a homogenous ‘we’ group with similar values and desires, to define ‘them’ as a different and problematic ‘other’. Furthermore, I emphasise how political platforms represent immigration and integration

policy and how it is used to create an image of the immigrant as a threat, and as a potential burden on the state. I use black feminist and decolonial feminist perspectives to critique and discuss the (re)production of power relations between women and men, and between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’, in the context of immigration and integration policy.

#### 4.1. Representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’

Politicians have the power to represent and define social categories, such as ‘us’ and ‘them’. Within the five Norwegian political platforms, different ways are used to refer to ‘us’, which may be seen as the acting ‘we’ in the context of immigration and integration. With some phrasings ‘we’ refers specifically to the Government, for example: “The Government will pursue an active integration policy towards all immigrants.” (Soria Moria I, 2005, p. 72). However, when the political platforms refer to ‘us’, ‘all’, or ‘Norway’, it indicates a broader definition of the acting ‘we’, which may include the entire population or possibly citizens. Here, ‘Norway’ equals the acting ‘we’:

“Norway has taken on a great deal of responsibility over a long period of time, and the responsibility for displaced people must be shared between several countries.

Therefore, the Government basically supports plans for a binding European quota system that provides a permanent distribution mechanism between all European countries. To address the causes of migration, the Government will step up its efforts to promote development and democracy.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 25).

In this quote, deontic modalities are used in making commitments to truth, and then moves to commitments of what is the case, predictions, and moral statements. The Government claims that Norway has taken a lot of responsibility for people migrating, claims that are postulated as true and valid knowledge. In this understanding of reality, Norway, in an international context, takes responsibility for people migrating, portraying ‘us’ as morally good. Further, the last sentence indicates that the Government will work to stop the causes of migration. In all the platforms, except Sundvollen, it is indicated that the Government will increase its efforts to combat the reasons why people migrate, or increase its efforts to help migrants internally, i.e., in the region, near their home countries. This may seem like an attempt to divert attention from immigration policy, by placing importance of combating the causes of migration. In debates, the argument is used to defend development assistance for a larger

amount of people. From a text analytical perspective, it shows a representation of reality, and how ‘we’ should act in the given situation. It furthers a representation of ‘us’ as morally good, in that ‘we’ want to help as many refugees as possible.

As discussed previously, members of a community depend on certain collective assumptions to create a ‘common ground’. This requires some form of common understanding, for example of what is the reality, and what is important and desirable (Skrede, 2017, p. 55). The audience of political platforms are the Norwegian population; thus, value assumptions are represented as values of the Norwegian population, representations of ‘us’, of how ‘our’ reality is and what ‘we’ want:

“The Government wants to preserve a welfare society based on trust, unity, small differences and opportunities for all. The tendencies of increasing inequality along economic, social, geographical, and cultural divides must be counteracted.”  
(Granavolden, 2019, p. 79).

In the first sentence, a reality about Norway and Norwegians is presented, with both existential and value assumptions. It is assumed that Norway is a society built on trust, unity, small differences and opportunities for all. Further, the value assumption indicates that it is desirable to preserve this reality. The second sentence indicates that there are “increasing tendencies of inequality, (...) which must be counteracted”. We can read from this quote that immigration is linked with the threat of cultural division, as an undesired development that must be counteracted. It is assumed that the “increasing tendencies of inequality” threatens the ‘desired’ homogeneity. From a discourse analytical viewpoint, assumptions play a part in constructing what is reality and what is desired in the Norwegian society. By affirming that cultural diversity must be counteracted, it constructs an uneven power relation between those who are part of the Norwegian ‘desired’ culture, and those with other ‘undesirable’ cultures.

Furthermore, value statements in the first Soria Moria (2005) platform by the Stoltenberg I Government create a notion that the Norwegian population has a collective, shared aspiration for what is good and desirable:

“The Government will work for a tolerant, multicultural society, and against racism. Everyone shall have the same rights, duties, and opportunities regardless of ethnic background, gender, religion, sexual orientation, or ability. (...) Diversity makes Norway a richer society. Equality (likeverd), solidarity, justice and a good distribution

policy are the basic values for creating such a society. An inclusive society presupposes equality between the genders. The Government will oppose discrimination, prejudice, and racism in order to give everyone the best foundation for participating in society. At the same time, we must clearly convey that it is assumed that all citizens are obliged to participate actively and to support the laws and democratic values of society.” (Soria Moria I, 2005, p. 72).

The first two sentences indicate that “a tolerant, multicultural society, and against racism” is collectively desired. These are inclusive values, which indicate a desire for openness to differences, and it follows that diversity is good and positive. The quote continues with a listing of what are believed to be common values for ‘us’, followed by the fact that these values must be clearly communicated to ‘them’. This indicates that the writer assumes that ‘they’ do not already have these values, representing an assumption about a basic opposition between ‘our’ and ‘their’ norms and values. Integration policy is represented in terms of the dissemination of values held by the taken-for-granted equal ‘majority’ to the presumed unequal immigrants, who are either uneducated about the values or antagonistic to them. Consequently, this leads to a (re)production of power between values and cultures.

Moreover, gender equality is often referred to as a core value in the Nordic countries, and therefore closely linked to the building of a Norwegian identity. As gender equality is seen as a Norwegian value and marker of “Norwegianness”, it further becomes a marker for integration (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019). In the statements on integration policy, it is implied that Norway is a gender equal society: “An inclusive society presupposes equality between the genders” (Soria Moria I, p. 72). This way of representing gender equality has the consequence that the equality of the ‘majority’ and the inequality of the ‘minorities’ are understood as ‘truths’ about cultures. This may reproduce a division between ‘us’ and ‘them’, where the Norwegian population appears as equal and the immigration population as unequal, confirming findings in earlier research (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019, pp. 205-210). These representations may further contribute to a notion of male immigrants as hostile to women, and the female immigrant as passive victims. In contrast, ‘we’ are implicitly morally good, meaning that ‘we’ oppose these unequal relations and related practices.

Importantly, the creation of ‘we’ that can be traced in the political platforms, also entails the construction of the ‘other’. In immigration and integration policy, ‘them’ are the ones targeted by the policy, namely, immigrants. In a quote from the Granavolden platform, one may see

how ‘we’ and ‘them’ are made two distinct and separate categories: “Priority must be given to measures that promote common meeting places between immigrants and the Norwegian population.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 80). However, ‘immigrants’ are an extremely diverse category, with regard to nationality, the reason for migrating, lived experiences and life situation. Sometimes, the political platforms distinguish between asylum seekers, refugees, quota refugees, women, or migrant workers, but mainly the term ‘immigrant(s)’ is used in both immigration and integration policy. Just as ‘we’ are represented as a homogenous group, ‘them’ are too, placing the emphasis on differences between the two categories rather than within the diversity of groups.

Whenever women are explicitly mentioned in the statements on immigration and integration policy, it is with a negative connotation. Within the five platforms analysed, the following quotes are the places where ‘women’ are made a category:

“The Government will protect foreign women from being exposed to violence in marriages with resident men and provide support measures to those affected.” (Soria Moria I, 2005, p. 71).

“The Government will implement new and targeted measures to ensure that women with a minority background are treated as independent persons with their own rights to information, language training, education, and work.” (Soria Moria I, 2005, p. 72).

“It is especially important that more women with an immigrant background have the opportunity to participate through paid employment.” (Soria Moria II, 2009, p. 72).

“It is also a problem, both for society and the individual, that there is too low occupational participation among immigrant women.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 14).

“The Government will increase the proportion of minority women who participate in working life.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 15).

“The Government will consider restrictions on family establishments to combat polygamy.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 26). (“Flerkoneri”, indicating women, the wife(s)).

“The main challenge in integration is that the level of employment is too low, especially among refugees and women.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 79).



“The Government will prioritise vulnerable groups such as women and children among quota refugees from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.” (Hurdal, 2021, p. 73).

These quotes construct a view of the female immigrants as passive victims, indicating that female immigrants are not able to determine and to acquire what is best for themselves. The Government promotes assumptions that immigrant women are restricted in several arenas in their lives, as being exposed to domestic violence, oppression, and that they are not being treated as independent persons in their social contexts.

The representation of the female immigrants as somewhat ‘lacking’, contrasts to the ‘common knowledge’ and representation of Norway as a country with high gender equality and with a large proportion of women employed. A representation of immigrant women as a deviation from the ‘normal’, underpins a stereotypical account of the ‘immigrant woman’ as resource-poor (Berg and Kristiansen, 2010, p. 243). A quote from Vergès states how the Western-patriarchal economic ideology has provided a civilisational feminism, which in essence tells women: “You don’t have freedom. You don’t know your rights. We will help you reach the right level of development.” (Vergès, 2021, p. 14). The quotes from the political platforms categorising women confirm a decolonial feminist critique, as they tell women what they have, and what they lack, and that ‘we’ can help ‘them’ develop.

Practices such as forced marriage, polygamy, female genital mutilation, and honour violence are problems often related to integration. By promoting ‘minority’ women’s problems as different from ‘Norwegian’ women’s problems, a distinction is made between groups of women. The political platforms express assumptions about the female immigrants, which indicate a communication about what is true, thus a perception of reality:

“The Government wants to establish that forced marriage and female genital mutilation are punishable in Norway.” (Soria Moria, 2005, p. 72).

“The Government wants to introduce a 24-year age limit for family reunion policy, with liberal discretionary assessments, the purpose of the change being to combat forced marriage and ensure that the couple can support themselves.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 22).

“The Government wants to fight forced marriage and polygamy and prevent the rules on family immigration from being undermined through exploitation.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 25).

“Assess whether forced marriage and honour control across national borders under given circumstances can be regarded as organized crime and/or human trafficking.” (Hurdal, 2021, p. 74).

In these quotes, the female immigrant is repeatedly represented as a victim, and implicitly it is the immigrant man who is the violator, which contributes to the construction of ‘the other’ as morally bad. Thun (2012, p. 51) argues that when violence is understood as cultural and different, for example by the term “honour violence”, the discursive effect is that it is constructed as ‘their’ problem, not a general women’s issue, hence, overshadowing a potential common feminist agenda of opposing violence against women. Further, the way ‘they’ may be forced to marry, contrasts with ‘our’ values of autonomy and freedom of choice, creating a difference between ‘us Norwegian women’ and ‘them immigrant women’. In the ‘majority’ representation of feminism in Norway, female immigrants appear to deviate from the norm, as their interests are seen as different interests: “immigrant women are minoritized and racialised in the sense that they are assumed to be a homogeneous category and excluded from the category “women” because of their assumed “otherness” in a Norwegian context.” (Thun, 2012, p. 42). Thus, the Norwegian integration policy (re)produce relations of unequal dignity and power between ‘Norwegian women’ and immigrant women.

The integration policy in Norway places great emphasis on equal rights, opportunities, and requirements for everyone who is to be part of Norwegian society. The equality in this case, is culturally conditioned on certain values and practices (Bjartnes and Sørensen, 2019, p. 210). The integration policy in the political platforms largely asserts that to become part of the Norwegian society (‘integrated’), equality is an important value, as the opposite must be avoided: “Tendencies of increasing inequality along economic, social, geographical and cultural divides must be counteracted” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 79). The integration policy indicates that all forms of inequality must be counteracted, even cultural differences. Which further indicates a power relation between cultures.

Based on the observations in this subchapter, certain representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in the context of immigration have been established. The Norwegian immigration and integration policy are representing ‘us Norwegians’ as a homogeneous group, with similar values and

desires. Further, the representation of 'Norwegians' is linked to moral goodness, meaning 'we' want to oppose violating practices that 'we' assume the female immigrant is experiencing. The female immigrants are represented as passive victims, of issues such as forced marriage and honour violence, which implicitly indicates the male immigrants as oppressors. This confirms a decolonial feminist critique, which argues that "saving racialised women from 'obscurantism' remains one of the main principles of civilisational feminisms" (Vergès, 2021, p. 19). These representations of 'us' and 'them' discursively (re)produce power structures within the Norwegian society, between men and women, between 'Norwegians' and 'immigrants'. In the next section, I direct attention to a recontextualization of immigration that represents 'them', the immigrants, as potentially dangerous.

#### 4.2. Recontextualization of immigration

Another way to represent something and someone, is by suggesting that it, or 'they', are a threat to 'us' or something that is 'ours'. This gives representation a new dimension, namely fear. When something is represented as dangerous or a threat, the political decision or action is established as something we should avoid (Wodak, 2001, p. 75). By representing immigration or immigrants as potential threats, contributes to legitimise a restrictive policy.

'Refugee crisis' and 'migration flow' were widely used words when talking about the substantial number of people migrating to Europe in 2015. These are nominalised words, appearing as something unpredictable and without responsible actors. In the Granavolden platform (2019, p. 24), statements like: "the number of migrants has increased significantly", "the migration flows are very unpredictable" and "Norway must have a high preparedness for rapid shifts", are quotes that represent change and an unpredictable environment. The latter quote is an example of deontic modality, as it is promoted as the 'only way' to act within the given situation. Hence, the unpredictability is used both as an explanation of reality, and a legitimisation of the immigration policy as part of the preparedness policy, which I will come back to later.

The immigration policy in the various platforms represents interdiscursivity, in that they draw on other discourses. The Soria Moria I, Soria Moria II and Hurdal platforms have a chapter with the heading 'Immigration and integration', thus, linking the two topics together. On the one hand, these topics are closely linked together, as it at some point applies to the same people, namely people who are born in another country and for some reason now lives, or wants to live, in Norway. On the other hand, there is an important distinction between the

topics. By linking immigration and integration, one mixes questions about people who already are part of the Norwegian population, together with questions about who will be allowed to enter the country in the future. Linking these topics may lead to people living in Norway being maintained as a foreigner (Gullestad, 2002, p. 19). This may contribute to maintaining the distance both discursively and in reality, between ‘us’ Norwegians and ‘them’ foreigners. Further, by continuously mentioning children of immigrants as second-generation immigrants, may be seen as a continuation of this division. The term, second-generation immigrant is not used in the analysed political platforms, but often in statistics, academic research, and media. This categorisation indicates that even if you are born in Norway, the ‘immigrant’ categorisation will remain with you. This is not necessarily negative or problematic, however, when immigrants are discursively linked to security issues and the sustainability of the welfare state, it can become problematic. How we talk about immigration and immigrants (discourse), can have negative consequences for people who want to create their lives in Norway, also for people born in Norway.

In the Sundvollen (2013) and Granavolden (2019) platforms, the topics of immigration and integration are separated and placed under different head chapters. In both platforms, the topic of immigration is part of the ‘Justice, preparedness and immigration’ chapter. Preparedness, i.e., how the government is to ensure the safety of its society and citizens. Other subchapters here are about fighting crime and violence, and politics for the police, punishment, and imprisonment. The juxtaposition of immigration with these topics gives the impression that immigration is an issue of security, linking the immigration and security discourse. Justice means the same as the administration of justice, i.e., the enforcement of law and justice through the courts. Immigration and justice are linguistically interconnected in the Sundvollen platform by a reproduction of the Immigration Act, § 106 ‘Conditions for arrest and detention’. These were laws that the government was to consider passing in a speed court. Parts reproduced her:

“A foreigner can be arrested and imprisoned when:

(...) the foreigner does not co-operate in clarifying his identity in accordance with section 21 or section 83 of the Immigration Act, or there are specific grounds for assuming that the foreigner states an incorrect identity,

(...) there are concrete grounds for assuming that the foreigner will evade the implementation of a decision which entails that the foreigner is obliged to leave the realm,

(...) the foreigner constitutes a threat to fundamental national interests, and this is established in a decision in the foreigners' case or in an instruction from the ministry, and measures are taken against the foreigner with a view to deportation.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 21)

The fact that the authors of the platform have chosen to reproduce this particular part of the Immigration Act indicates the linkage to immigration as a security issue, and on immigrants as a potential threat. The first sentence is about documentation of identity, where the immigrant is portrayed as unwilling to cooperate in clarifying his or her identity. In addition, this concern about fake ID papers is used as a justification of efforts to make sure that only those who “actually need protection” get it. The use of fake IDs is presented as cheating and as a planned and desired move from the immigrants' side to fool the system. The second sentence further indicates unwillingness to cooperate, and in the last sentence it is indicated that an immigrant may constitute a threat to fundamental national interests, without specifying these interests. Furthermore, there is a strong focus on “efficient case processing and faster return of persons without legal residence and criminals”:

“Reduce the level of punishment required for the expulsion of foreigners who have been sentenced or subjected to a special reaction in the home country for circumstances which according to Norwegian law can lead to a prison sentence of five years or more. Today's rule is ten years or more. (...)

Create a quick file for asylum seekers who are caught for carrying out criminal acts (such as possession and sale of drugs), where the application is processed quickly, and the applicant is returned to the country of origin in case of rejection.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 21).

These two quotes are about making it easier and more efficient to return immigrants that can be related to crimes, whether committed in their country of birth and/or in Norway. The quotes indicate deontic modality, in that they are represented as a solution to the social circumstances. It promotes an assumption that immigrants to a substantial extent may be linked to criminal actions, hence the social circumstances implicitly being high level of criminal activity of immigrants. It further indicates an assumption about the relevance and

importance of these laws, to prevent foreign criminals from staying in Norway. The linguistic interconnection of an immigration discourse and security discourse is clear in the Sundvollen platform (2013), with among other things the direct citation from the Immigration Act. To conclude the above quotations, I would say that the problem is not (necessarily) the laws themselves, the problem is that they are reproduced in Norway's immigration policy. As it contributes to discursively link immigrants to cheating, unwillingness to cooperate and criminal activity. In other words, it is not the immigration process that is represented as a threat, but immigrants at the individual level. A decolonial feminist perspective critiques how the rhetoric and practice of the colonial civilising mission are still used to legitimise politics of theft (Vergès, 2021, p. 13), which is the case in this part of immigration politics. Rhetoric about criminal acts is used to legitimise stricter immigration policies, thus (re)producing attitudes that are based on power relations between ethnicities and cultures.

The Granavolden platform (2019) also has a comprehensive immigration policy, and includes linguistic points that indicate immigration as an issue of security:

“The number of migrants worldwide has increased significantly since the turn of the millennium, and migration flows are very unpredictable. Norway must therefore have a high level of preparedness for rapid shifts. Population growth, long-term conflict and unrest, poverty and climate change will present major challenges concerning migration, also in the years ahead (...)

The Government will ensure an offer with reinforced receptions that ensure safety and security for the surroundings (...)

The Government will maintain temporary border control for as long as the security policy situation requires.” (Granavolden, 2019, pp. 24-27).

In the first quote, the complex process of migration is made into a noun (“folkeforflytninger”), that shames the entire process and presents it as a single thing and deprives the focus on the process's diverse individuals and multiple causes and dimensions. The individuals who flee, and their situation, are hidden, and the responsibility to help is disguised. Further, the word is used in a sentence which points out something negative, namely that it “puts the Norwegian society to the test.” This is stated as a fact, which reveals the worldview promoted, (i.e., migrants is a threat), and the knowledge is postulated as true and valid (that migrants propose a threat to Norwegian society). This is continued in the next sentence, by claiming that we should have reinforced reception centres, to ensure the safety of

the surroundings, thus indicated that immigrants living in reception centres may pose a threat to the surrounding environment. The last statement implicitly states that immigrants is an issue of security, hence the need for border control. This is the only quote that directly shows a change after 2015, as the reference is made to when it was decided to close the borders. As it in 2015 was decided to provide border control of everyone who arrived in the country. The quotes above show how the policy contributes to representing a reality where immigration and immigrants in several ways contribute to an increased threat in Norway.

All five platforms agree on the need for a strict, consistent, and fair immigration policy. Although it may seem that 'fair' is used as a legitimization for a substantially stricter policy. It is indicated that some immigrants "sneaks into the queue" and lurks for protection, at the expense of those who 'really' need protection:

“(...) The government will also actively implement measures to limit the number of people staying illegally in Norway.” (Soria Moria II, 2009, p. 70).

“The Asylum Institute is a very important tool for providing protection to people who are genuinely threatened, and it must not be abused in any form.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 19).

“It is important to pursue an asylum policy that keeps the number of asylum seekers without protection needs as low as possible, in order to spend the resources on asylum seekers with protection needs and quota refugees.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 25).

The importance of maintaining trust and the legitimacy of the asylum system is something that is repeated in all five platforms. This provides an assumption that the asylum system is being misused, especially that immigrants are using false identities and documents. In the last sentence of the presented quotes, the policy is trying to legitimise a tightening of immigration policy by indicating that people who do not need protection are draining our resources to help those who “actually need protection.” However, such a discourse and tightening of immigration policy may affect the ability of people in need of protection to obtain residence and citizenship in Norway.

Representing migration as a security issue, and immigrants as potentially dishonest and criminal, creates a negative image, which discursively reinforces the divide between ‘us’ Norwegians and ‘them’ foreigners, that I emphasised in Chapter 4.1. When ‘them’ immigrants are represented as a threatening element (or potential element) in the Norwegian society, it is

used as a justifying tool for a stricter immigration and integration policy. The interdiscursivity in the Conservative platforms between immigration and security discourse is clear, thus a process towards recontextualization of migration (securitisation). However, one might not say that the immigration discourse has been fully recontextualized, as the Hurdal platform (2021) returned to placing the topic of immigration together with integration, indicating that the recontextualization as a security issue is not stable. However, the actual policy in some areas dictates otherwise. There is a quote in the policy, stating: “Broad political settlements are to be reached.” (Hurdal, 2021, p. 72), a quote that was recognised and discussed in media soon after the Hurdal platform was published: “This may mean that the Government will apply to the Right-wing side in immigration and asylum policy” (Sørenes, 2021). When the Conservatives governed, there were major restrictions in immigration policy, which were briefly summarised as stricter control over who has the right to reside, freer reins for the police and restrictions on the privacy of asylum seekers, as well as some changes in integration policy (Olsen, Barstad and Byhring, 2017). This may indicate that a broad political agreement has developed in the field of immigration and integration, thus an unstable recontextualization of immigration within the security discourse.

The relation between securitisation and racism requires reflection. Discursively linking immigration to security by representing the immigrant as a threat does not mean that everyone will feel threatened by immigration and immigrants, but it maintains a balance of power in that ‘we’ define ‘them’ as potentially dangerous. And as Ibrahim (2005, p. 165) argues: “fear of the ‘other’ is at the core of new racism.” Negative attitudes towards migrants should be understood as racism (Ibrahim, 2005). Securitisation of migration can be detrimental to the adaptation and belonging of immigrants in a new society, as the creation of a truth of the immigrant as a threat to security may control actions and attitudes of host-country citizens towards immigrants (Farny, 2016).

We have seen evidence of recontextualization of the immigration discourse within a security discourse, especially in Sundvollen (2013) and Granavolden (2019) platforms. Primarily, this is because immigration policy is placed under a heading with justice and emergency policy, but also through certain representations of immigration as something unpredictable and threatening. Statements in the Norwegian immigration and integration policy contributes to reproducing a securitisation of the immigration discourse, which also contributes to negative attitudes towards immigrants which should be understood as racism.



As we shall see in the following subchapter, the importance of legitimising immigration and integration policy by representing immigrants as a threat continues, also in an economic dimension. This reveals how the immigration and integration policy is legitimised by representing ‘them’ as a threat to ‘our’ welfare.

#### 4.3. The sustainability of the welfare state

From the mid-2000s, Norwegian research on immigration started to evolve around questions about the welfare state. In 2010, Grete Brochmann and Anniken Hage Lund published the book *Velferdens grenser*, focused on the development of the increasing immigration and ethnic diversity in Scandinavian countries, placed within the framework of societies and institutions that have been based on ideas about equality (Midtbøen, 2017, p. 142). The Brochmann Committee was appointed by the Stoltenberg II Government with the task of mapping the consequences of increased migration and international mobility for the Norwegian welfare model: “The first Brochmann Committee’s report on welfare and migration (NOU 2011: 7) is largely based on Brochmann’s own research and perspectives, interspersed with solid doses of insights from economics, and has become a standard reference in political debate.” (Midtbøen, 2017, p. 142). This led to a change in the immigration and integration policy discourse, where one began to focus on economic consequences and especially the consequences for the sustainability of the welfare state. The Stoltenberg II Government published their political platform, Soria Moria II, after they had been re-elected in 2009 and before the Norwegian official report, NOU 2011:7 had been published. ‘Sustainability’ is not mentioned in the immigration and integration policy in Soria Moria II; however, it is referred to as being addressed in the forthcoming official report: “The Government will assess changes in integration policy based on the official committee that is looking into the connection between immigration and emigration and the development of our welfare schemes.” (Soria Moria II, 2009, p. 73). The quote indicates that it is primarily the integration policy that is to be changed based on the findings in the report. However, as we will see, the argument about a vulnerable welfare state has rather been used to legitimise a restrictive immigration policy. The introduction of the focus on the consequences of immigration on the welfare state, led to a change in the immigration and integration discourse, as immigration now became linked to the sustainability of the welfare state.

In the right-wing political platforms from 2013 (Sundvollen) and 2019 (Granavolden), the quote “sustainability of the welfare state” is used to legitimise the regulation of immigration: “Immigration puts the Norwegian society to the test, no matter what the cause is. This applies not least to the sustainability of the Norwegian welfare state. It is therefore necessary to regulate immigration.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 19). The first sentence claims as a fact that immigration challenges the Norwegian society, and especially the welfare state. It is indicated that immigration is a challenge for several reasons, but “not least to the welfare state.” The vulnerability of the welfare state is represented as true and valid knowledge, and to regulate immigration is presented as the only solution. Following this, the immigration policy represents a reality where immigration threatens the welfare state, thus the link between immigration and the sustainability of the welfare state is established.

Moreover, the 2019 Granavolden platform uses ‘A sustainable immigration policy’ as a chapter headline, lifting the importance of the statement even more. Further, the platform has the exact same sentence as Sundvollen, followed by slightly more explanation of why immigration causes challenges for the welfare state:

“Migration moves puts the Norwegian society to the test, for whatever reason. This applies not least to the sustainability of the Norwegian welfare state. The Norwegian welfare state is facing a period of an increasing share of elderly people and less financial room for manoeuvre. High immigration will be an additional challenge in this picture. It is therefore necessary to regulate immigration.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 24).

In this quote, an assumption is made about immigration as an existential challenge to the sustainability of the welfare state. Indicating a threat to the welfare state is a threat to something very basic and important in the Norwegian society. The word ‘sustainability’ equals ‘durability’ and is thus used to legitimise the regulation of immigration to preserve the welfare schemes. Again, the immigrant is made a symbol of something threatening, first to security, and now to the welfare state. This may affect attitudes towards immigrants and contribute to sustaining a power structure where ‘we’, ‘the Norwegians’, have a welfare that is threatened by ‘them’, the ‘immigrants’. The immigration and integration policy discursively (re)produce a power relation between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’, by assuming that ‘them’ constitutes something that threatens what is ‘ours’.

The Norwegian immigration policy appears to have become more restrictive during the past decade, but Staver (2021) argues that the immigration policy has become increasingly selective. Representing the welfare state as vulnerable justifies a sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit selectivity of a wanted labour immigration and unwanted refugee and asylum immigration. While there have been extensive restrictions on asylum and family immigration, labour immigration from outside the European Economic Area is being facilitated, by new measures in the legislation that distinguish labour immigrants from other immigrants, through active use of detailed regulations, and with the actual case process organised so that the “desired” immigrants meet a different first line than other immigrants (Staver, 2021, p. 187). As mentioned earlier, diversity within the ‘group of immigrants’ are not always confirmed. However, when ‘labour immigrants’ are made a separate category within the political platforms, it is always with a positive sign: “It is a good thing that labour immigrants want to create a future in Norway.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 19), and “Immigration has provided society with important skills and helped to cover labour shortages in several sectors.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 24). The policy claims that labour immigration is exclusively positive, thus, established as a truth.

The positive formulation of labour immigration and the negative or problem-focused formulation about refugees and asylum seekers is further evident in this quote from the Granavolden platform:

“Population growth, long-term conflict, unrest, poverty and climate change will present major challenges from migration in the years to come. At the same time, it is a positive development that more and more people want to take advantage of the increased opportunities to travel, study and work legally in other countries.”  
(Granavolden, 2019, p. 24).

In this quote, the ‘group’ of immigrants are divided into categories. Those migrating because of long-term conflict, unrest, poverty, and climate change are not high skilled engineers or global development students applying to study at universities in Norway, but refugees or asylum seekers, in need of protection. It is stated explicitly that this category of migration is challenging, further, it becomes the opposite of the “positive development” that is stated in the second part of the sentence. The last sentence specifies that people who travel, study and work, are welcomed, as they provide an advantage to the Norwegian society. As tourists, exchange students to universities, experts to companies and labour for those jobs that do not get filled by Norwegians, are positive for the development of the Norwegian society, thus, for

the welfare state. In other words, it becomes a categorisation that creates a selectivity and a (re)production of power, based on who is wanted and who is not.

Many Western countries have used rationales about economy and security to restrict immigration, taking economic priorities while disregarding the need for family reunification and other humanitarian concerns:

“This trend has been associated with a discursive bifurcation of migrants according to economic potential; prioritizing migrants who are constructed as desirable (i.e., skilled economic/labour migrants) above those portrayed as undesirable (i.e., unskilled, and economically unproductive migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers).” (Huot, Bobadilla, Bailliard and Rudman, 2016, p. 132).

The selective immigration policy is based on a value assumption that economic growth is a desired priority in decision-making within all policy areas, as it is about getting the ‘right type’ of migrants to match the specific needs of the labour market. This kind of ‘migration management’ as a set of discourses and policies, is consistent with neoliberalism, as it is about achieving economic profit through market transactions, on the one hand, and to limit access for those who may lead to a burden on the scaled-down welfare state, on the other (Samers and Collyer, 2017, p. 167). For many, economic growth is an undisputed good. Fairclough (2003, p. 57) argues that the focus on growth, assumes that growth can take place indefinitely. Norwegian immigration and integration policy seems to be based on an understanding that economic growth is desirable, regardless of whether this takes place within the framework of power structures that lead to discrimination and social inequality. Without having enough evidence to confirm that there is a neoliberal ideology behind this policy, it can be said that the categorisation of people as ‘wanted’ and ‘unwanted’ based on economic outcomes is in line with a neoliberal way of thinking, thus leading to a (re)production of power relations.

In the Norwegian integration policy, employment is represented as being crucial for immigrants to become integrated in the Norwegian society, with benefits for both the individual and for the welfare state (Soria Moria I, 2005; Soria Moria II, 2009; Sundvollen, 2013; Granavolden, 2019; Hurdal, 2021). Anne Britt Djuve (2011, p. 113) argues that there is a broad consensus in the literature that the welfare state has been undergoing a process of activation. Activation policy aims to promote active and self-reliant citizens, with workfare policy as one of the cornerstones (Hagelund and Kavli, 2009). Unemployment is said to be the main challenge for a successful integration, and a high expectation of self-effort is placed on

immigrants. Therefore, the discourse that refugees endanger the welfare state is also used to legitimise a labour focused integration policy.

The reality created in the integration policy is that immigrants are poorly represented in working life, especially women, and that this has negative ripple effects. It justifies a focus on quick decisions, fast case processing, and fast integration into working life as key factors to provide a successful integration. Immigrants must participate as quickly as possible with their resources, so that they do not become a burden on welfare schemes:

“The government will pursue an active integration policy towards all immigrants, in order to ensure that they can contribute with their resources in Norwegian work life and society in general, as quickly as possible.” (Soria Moria I, 2005, p. 72).

“Work gives the individual financial independence and is the most important tool for counteracting poverty, for equalising social inequalities and for achieving equality between women and men.” (Soria Moria II, 2009, p. 72).

“It is a challenge that many who have education and competence with them from their home country to a small extent get the competence approved and used. It is also a problem, both for society and the individual, that there is too low labour participation among immigrant women. (...) Participation in working life and good Norwegian skills are the keys to inclusion in Norwegian society. Work provides belonging, community, networking, and the opportunity for self-help. Earned income also provides an opportunity to enter the housing market.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 14).

“We must succeed better with integration into working life. This is absolutely central both for the individual and for the sustainability of our welfare systems.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 24).

“Integration requires a significant effort from the individual immigrant, who must learn Norwegian and acquire knowledge about Norwegian society. Immigrants must, as far as possible, support themselves and their families, and contribute actively to working life and society. (...) The main challenge in integration is too low employment, especially among refugees and women. This also leads to exclusion and poverty, which particularly affects children.” (Granavolden, 2019, p. 79).

“Those who are granted residence in Norway must be integrated quickly. Settlement, work, and education is crucial to get into the Norwegian society as quickly as possible,

learn the language and participate on an equal footing with everyone else.” (Hurdal, 2021, p. 74).

As we see from the presented quotes, there are almost no limits to what benefits employment will entail, ranging from combating child poverty to achieving equality between women and men. A lot of responsibility is placed on the immigrants themselves, both implicitly and explicitly.

The quotes in the previous section show in different ways how ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’ discourse is interdiscursively mixed with ‘economic’ and ‘labour’ discourse. As especially evident in this quote: “Participation in working life and good Norwegian skills are the keys to inclusion in Norwegian society.” (Sundvollen, 2013, p. 14). While the discourse of ‘inclusion’ is a fundamental moral and humane discourse oriented towards people who have a sense of belonging to a community, people are made into productive forces that stand together with others, in a contribution to economic growth. Fairclough (2003, p. 128) argues that social cohesion discursively can be used as a strategy to legitimise a neoliberal discourse. In the political platforms, economy and employment are used as decisive factors for inclusion and integration, by emphasising the importance of labour for belonging and inclusion in Norway. In this case, ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’ are reduced to being about work and human capital, which is further evidence of a neoliberal discourse in the political platforms. Neoliberal ideology confirms a decolonial feminist critique, in which women’s rights are included in an ideology of assimilation and integration into the neoliberal order, that “reduces women’s revolutionary aspirations to an equal share of the privileges granted to white men by white supremacy” (Vergès, 2021, p. 12). In the context of Norwegian integration policy, this is evident with the great emphasis labour as key to integration. Thus, already existing power structures in Norwegian society and working life is not recognised, leading to (re)production of power relations, especially in disadvantage of immigrant women.

Moreover, in a decolonial feminist perspective, the notion of individual freedom is contested. When women’s rights are reduced to a defence of individual freedom, this happens without questioning the content of this freedom, and without questioning the genealogy of this notion in European modernity (Vergès, 2021, p. 17). Equal rights are proposed without assessing which historical roots have shaped these rights and without acknowledging which power structures these desired ‘equalities’ should take place under. The same goes for employment, as the capitalist labour market consists of power structures which have been created in line with an increasingly globalised economy. This one-sided focus on economy as crucial to

equality reflects a state feminist understanding, in that economic redistribution is crucial to achieving equality between the genders.

As we have seen, immigration continues to be represented as something threatening, also to the sustainability of the welfare state. A shift towards economic and welfare state legitimization of the immigration and integration policy in Norway, became common after the Brochmann Committee analysed the impact of immigration on the welfare state. For immigration policy, the discursive change towards a focus on the sustainability of the welfare state has led to a more restrictive and selective policy. In the political platforms, it is discursively evident in that some ‘groups’ of immigrants are represented as wanted, and others as unwanted, by representing a reality where labour immigration contributes to economic growth, while ‘immigration’ (refugee, asylum) contributes to challenge the welfare state. Hence, those who contribute to economic growth are the desired, and those who contribute to more expenses are unwanted. This testifies to a neoliberal way of thinking, where people are degraded by being reduced to the role of economic contributors, thus a kind of dehumanisation, which is contributing to (re)producing relations of unequal dignity and power between the ‘Norwegians’ and the ‘immigrants’.

## 5. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to understand how immigration and integration policy may (re)produce power relations leading to discrimination and social inequality, particularly for female immigrants. I asked: “How does immigration and integration policy discourse (re)produce power relations in Norwegian society?” and “How can critical feminist perspectives be used to elucidate and critique Norwegian immigration and integration discourse?” The research questions have been operationalised by conducting a critical discourse analysis of Norwegian immigration and integration policy as formulated in five political platforms from 2005 to 2021. The thesis does not analyse social inequality in practice but provides material and analytical perspectives enabling me to reflect on how the language in political platforms contributes in (re)producing power relations that may lead to social inequality, equality (likeverd) and respect of people, in the context of immigration and integration in Norway. I have problematised the equality narrative in Norway, placing representations of immigrants and especially female immigrants at the centre of my analysis. By taking a critical feminist stance, I recognise that female immigrants may be subjected to

intersecting oppressive structures, based on gender, ethnicity, and immigrant status in Norway.

Based on the observations from the analysis, certain representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in the context of immigration have been established. The Norwegian immigration and integration policy are representing ‘us Norwegians’ as a homogeneous group, with similar values and desires. Further, the representation of ‘Norwegians’ is linked to moral goodness, meaning ‘we’ want to oppose violating practices that ‘we’ assume the female immigrant is experiencing. Female immigrants are represented as passive victims of such abusive practices as forced marriage and honour violence, which implicitly indicates the male immigrants as oppressors. Through certain representations of ‘us’ as morally good, and of ‘them’ as problematic, a power relation between ‘Norwegians’ and ‘immigrants’ is (re)produced.

The construction of the female immigrant in Norwegian immigration and integration policy confirms a decolonial feminist critique, as the policy reflects some elements that Vergès’ (2021) identify in her problematisation of ‘white feminism’, which aims to save ‘black women’ from ‘obscurantism’ and expresses the need to tell women what they have and what they lack, and that ‘we’ can help ‘them’ develop. Norwegian immigration and integration policy states what female immigrants in Norway do not have, first of all that “they do not have a job.”

An important focus in Norwegian integration policy is employment. Consequently, an important finding is that integration policies represent female immigrants as particularly problematic, for example by stressing the low employment rate among female immigrants. This contributes to a construction of female immigrants as less integrated, in contrast to immigrant men. In addition, female immigrants are represented in contrast to the narrative of Norway as gender equal, especially considering the ‘well known’ high rate of employment among ‘Norwegian’ women. Thus, female immigrants are exposed to intersecting power relations by both male immigrants and ‘Norwegian’ women.

Securitisation becomes relevant in my thesis as it may be evident of a discursive reproduction of racist representations, linking migrants’ cultural difference to threats against the human security of the Norwegian population. The discourse analysis in this thesis show that elements of intertextuality and interdiscursivity play an important part in the recontextualization of an immigration discourse to a security discourse, hence a securitisation of immigration. As I have shown in the analysis, especially statements and representations from the Sundvollen



(2013) and Granavolden (2019) platforms make this clear. This is primarily, through locating immigration policy under a heading together with justice and emergency policy but also through certain representations of immigration and immigrants as something unpredictable and threatening (for ‘us’).

A recent human crisis in Europe clearly shows a discursive change in the Norwegian immigration discourse, namely the Russian invasion of Ukraine. The ongoing war has forced millions of people to flee. Norway and other European countries have not closed their borders (as in 2015), but instead it is communicated more openness and willingness, both from politicians and individuals, to help the Ukrainian refugees. Some have argued that this is because Ukraine is in ‘our region’, and therefore it is our duty to help. However, this shows a limited recognition of human rights in Norwegian immigration policy when major distinctions are made between the situation in Ukraine now versus in Syria in 2015.

Based on the findings in Chapter 4.3, statements of the sustainability of the welfare state contributes to justify a restrictive and selective immigration policy. It is established as true and valid knowledge that immigration poses a threat to the sustainability of the welfare state and that regulation of immigration is the ‘only solution’ to this problem. This can be linked to power, as ‘they’ are represented as threatening something that is ‘ours’. Further, links to a neoliberal ideology in Norwegian immigration and integration policy is also an interesting finding. As the analysis showed, it is especially evident where discourses on integration and inclusion were interdiscursively mixed with economic and labour discourse. Neoliberal ideology confirms a decolonial feminist critique, in which women’s rights are included in an ideology of assimilation and integration into the neoliberal order, which is also an oppressive power structure for many women. Consequently, a structure that decolonial feminists seeks to destroy.

Norwegian immigration and integration policy contributes to discursively reproducing representations of realities where ‘Norwegian women’ are employed and gender equal, while female immigrants are represented as unemployed and as victims of women-oppressing practices. Integration policy usually represents female immigrants with a negative impression. That they are poorly represented in working life is presented as a major problem with ripple effects on child poverty and gender equality. Discursively this is (re)producing power relations based on ethnic and cultural differences between ‘Norwegian women’ and female immigrants. It is often stated as common knowledge that Norway is a gender equal country, which reflects discursive elements from state feminist theory. As a large proportion of

'Norwegian women' is employed, female immigrants are represented as a contradiction to this represented reality. In addition, it is assumed that female immigrants are exposed to honour violence, forced marriage and female genital mutilation, which makes 'them' victims of male immigrants. It is especially problematic that female immigrants are represented as passive victims in Norwegian immigration and integration policy, primarily because women's self-determination about what is desirable for themselves is not recognised.

My concluding remarks in this thesis is based on my knowledge and understanding of what respect for other people entails, and others may disagree. Further research could have conducted qualitative interviews with different 'categories' of immigrants, in order to explore and understand whether immigrants also perceive that Norwegian immigration and integration policy fails to represent immigrants as equals (*likeverdige*). Through the analysis of Norwegian immigration and integration policy in this thesis, Norwegian state feminism contributes with discursive elements which reflects the representation from the political platforms of 'us Norwegians' as gender equal, and the role of economic participation to achieve gender equality. However, if critical feminist perspectives are included, one can argue that Norway is not necessarily gender equal. Through certain representations of 'us' and 'them' in the Norwegian immigration and integration policy, power is discursively (re)produced, to the disadvantage of immigrants, and especially female immigrants. The policy represents ways of thinking that prevent immigrants from being respected as worthy, Norwegian citizens.

## 6. References

- Annfelt, T., & Gullikstad, B. (2013). Kjønnlikestilling i inkluderings tjeneste? *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning*, 37(3-04), pp. 308-329.
- Berg, A.-J., Flemmen, A. B., & Gullikstad, B. (2010). *Likestilte norskheter: om etnisitet og kjønn*. Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Bjartnes, K. S., & Sørensen, S. Ø. (2019). Likestillingsproblemer i integreringspolitikken. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning*, 43(3), 198-212.
- Borchorst, A., & Siim, B. (2008). Woman-friendly policies and state feminism: Theorizing Scandinavian gender equality. *Feminist Theory*, 9(2), 207-224.
- Bratberg, Ø. (2019). *Tekstanalyse for samfunnsvitere*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryson, V. (2003). *Feminist political theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bråten, B. (2013). Partier og politikk: Den flerdimensjonale likestillingspolitikken hvem, hva og hvorfor. In B. Bråten, & C. Thun, *Krysningspunkter: Likestillingspolitikk i et flerkulturelt Norge* (pp. 151-176). Oslo: Akademika forlag.
- Ceyhan, A., & Tsoukala, A. (2002). The securitization of migration in western societies: Ambivalent discourses and policies. *Alternatives*, 27, 21-39.
- Djuve, A. B. (2011). Introductory programs for immigrants: Liberalism revisited, or changing ideas of citizenship? *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 1(3), 113-125.
- Djuve, A. B., & Kavli, H. C. (2019). 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.
- Dunn, K. C., & Neumann, I. B. (2016). *Undertaking discourse analysis for social research*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.
- Eggebo, H., & Staver, A. B. (2020). Mer midlertidighet: innvandringspolitikken etter asylforliket. *Nytt norsk tidsskrift*, 37(2), 125-136.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Farny, E. (2016, January 29). *E-International Relations*. Retrieved January 14, 2022, from Implications of the Securitization of Migration: <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/01/29/implications-of-the-securitisation-of-migration/>
- Fenstermaker, S., & West, C. (2002). "Doing difference" Revisited: problems, prospects, and the dialogue in feminist theory. In S. Fenstermaker, & C. West, *Doing gender, doing difference: Inequality, power and institutional change* (pp. 205-216). New York: Routledge.
- Gullestad, M. (2002). *Det norske sett med nye øyne*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- 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.

- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall, *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13-74). London : SAGE Publications.
- Hernes, H. M. (1988). *Welfare state and woman power: Essays in state feminism* (1 ed.). Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. London: Pluto Press.
- Huot, S., Bobadilla, A., Billiard, A., & Rudman, D. L. (2016). Constructing undesirables: A critical discourse analysis of 'othering' within the Protecting Canada's Immigration System Act. *International Migration*, 54(2), 131-143.
- Hutchinson, D. L. (2001). Identity crisis: "Intersectionality", "multidimensionality", and the development of an adequate theory of subordination. *Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, 6(2), 285-317.
- Ibrahim, M. (2005). The securization of migration: A radical discourse. *International Migration*, 43(5), 163-187.
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. (1999). *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Kandal, H. (2021, May 25). *CORE- Center for Research on Gender Equality*. Retrieved March 10, 2022, from 5 facts about gender equality in Norway: <https://www.samfunnsforskning.no/core/english/news/2021/5-facts-about-gender-equality-in-norway.html>
- Midtbøen, A. H. (2017). Innvandringshistorie som faghistorie: Kontroverser i norsk migrasjonsforskning. *Nytt norsk tidsskrift*, 34(2), 130-149.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the Political*. London: Routledge.
- Neumann, I. B. (2001). *Mening, materialitet, makt: En innføring i diskursanalyse*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Norwegian Directorate of Immigration. (n.d.). *UDI*. Retrieved January 27, 2022, from Statistikk om innvandring: [https://www.udi.no/globalassets/global/aarsrapporter\\_i/tall-og-fakta-2015.pdf](https://www.udi.no/globalassets/global/aarsrapporter_i/tall-og-fakta-2015.pdf)
- Olsen, T., Barstad, S., & Byhring, P. (2017, September 1). Sylvi Listhaug: 70 prosent innstrammingsminister- 17 prosent integreringsminister. *Aftenposten*. Retrieved March 23, 2022, from <https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/OMkmb/sylvi-listhaug-70-prosent-innstrammingsminister-17-prosent-integreringsminister>
- Samers, M., & Collyer, M. (2017). *Migration* (2 ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Siim, B., & Skjeie, H. (2008). Tracks, intersections and dead ends- Multicultural challenges to state feminism in Denmark and Norway. *Ethnicities*, 8(3), 322-344.  
doi:10.1177/1468796808092446
- Skrede, J. (2017). *Kritisk diskursanalyse*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Solberg II Regjeringen. (2019). Politisk plattform: for en regjering utgått av Høyre, Framskrittspartiet, Venstre og Kristelig Folkeparti. *Granavolden*.
- Solberg Regjeringen. (2013). Politisk plattform: for en regjering utgått av Høyre og Fremskrittspartiet. *Sundvollen*.

- Staver, A. B. (2021). Restriktiv eller selektiv- Innvandringspolitikkenes ulike ansikter. *Nytt norsk tidsskrift*, 38(3), 183-194.
- Stoltenberg II Regjeringen. (2009). Politisk plattform for flertallsregjeringen: utgått av Arbeiderpartiet, Sosialistisk Venstreparti og Senterpartiet. *Soria Moria II*.
- Stoltenberg Regjeringen. (2005). Plattform for regjeringssamarbeidet mellom Arebdiserpartiet, Sosialistisk Venstreparti og Senterpartiet. *Soria Moria* .
- Støre Regjeringen. (2021). Hurdalsplattformen: for en regjering utgått av Arbeiderpartiet og Senterpartiet. *Hurdal*.
- Sørenes, K. M. (2021, November 8). AP og SP vil invitere Listhaug med på å lage ny asylpolitikk. *Aftenposten*. Retrieved February 3, 2022, from <https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/politikk/i/9K8Wgd/ap-og-sp-vil-invitere-listhaug-med-paa-aa-lage-ny-asylpolitikk>
- The Directorate of Integration and Diversity. (n.d.). *IMDi*. Retrieved February 20, 2022, from Tall og fakta: <https://www.imdi.no/om-integrering-i-norge>
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2022, February 11). *Britannica*. Retrieved April 3, 2022, from bell hooks: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/bell-hooks>
- Thun, C. (2012). "Norwegian women got gender equality through their mother's milk, but anti-racism is another story"- An analysis of power and resistance in Norwegian feminist discourse. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 20(1), 37-56.
- Thun, C. (2020). Excellent and gender equal? Academic motherhood and 'gender blindness' in Norwegian academia. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 27(2), 166-180.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), pp. 249-283.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton, *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse, power and access. In T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and power* (pp. 84-104). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vergès, F. (2021). *A decolonial feminism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: SAGE Publications.
- Ånensen, R. D. (2021). Myter om det homogene Norge. *Norwegian Journal of Sociology*, 5(6), 1-8.





**Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet**  
Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet  
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003  
NO-1432 Ås  
Norway