

Eritrean migrant youths' understanding of citizenship,
human rights and diversity in Norway

BY: SALEH ALI ETTO



MSc Thesis in Human Rights and Multiculturalism

School of business, social sciences, humanities and education

Papirbredden- Drammen

Grønland 58

3045 Drammen

NORWAY, January.31.2017

Number of Words: 25978

DECLARARION

I, Saleh Ali Etto, declare that this thesis is a result of my own research work and findings. All sources of information other than my own are duly acknowledged and references are listed as such. These sources are listed in the bibliography too. I confirm that this work has not been previously submitted to any other institution for an award of any type of academic degree. I certify that I have read and understood the college policy on plagiarism and I am well aware of its consequences.

Signature -----

date. -----

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people who contributed in making this thesis a reality by their full support, advice, encouragement and I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all of them. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Audrey Osler. Her intellectual guidance, support, critiques, encouragements and feedbacks were invaluable in the whole process of my research. I would also like to express my gratitude to all my participants who showed willingness to share their feelings and experiences with me. I thank them for their contribution they have offered by giving some of their time to this study. I also owe thanks to my fellow students, friends and all my teachers at the University College of South East Norway for their contributions. Last but not least, my special thanks goes to my beloved family, my wife and two daughters who stood out with me throughout my education years by giving me their unreserved support and encouragements.

Saleh Ali Etto

31. January. 2017

Drammen

Abstract

The goal of this thesis is to investigate Eritrean youth participants' perceptions, experiences, attitudes and feelings about citizenship, diversity, integration and human rights education that they are learning in schools and integration programs that they attend after they have settled in Norway. The thesis examines whether the informants experience multicultural classrooms that reflect and affirm their identities, and whether the institutions are inclusive and genuinely participatory. The thesis examines how these students are prepared for their citizenship roles and how do they experience the values and virtues of democracy, diversity and tolerance in their daily life. Qualitative semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight Eritrean students who are studying in two upper secondary high schools in the Oppland region of Norway from January 2016 to February 2016.

The thesis tries to examine the challenges and opportunities these informants get in Norway and the impact of that experience in their approaches, feelings and thinking toward the questions of identity, citizenship and belonging. Education has a vital role in preparing students for their future roles as citizens, but formal education alone is insufficient as students are influenced by what they see, hear and experience outside the school. The thesis findings show that all my respondents wish to be Norwegian citizens, but most of them express fear, uncertainty and anxieties about citizenship expectations as they feel that they may not be accepted as full citizens because of their appearance, religion and backgrounds. There are many reports that immigrants are often mentioned with problems like crimes and they are linked with negative behaviors in media debates. There are concerns about increasing xenophobia, islamophobia, raising support for right wing political parties, hateful speeches and racist comments toward minorities. The findings indicate that such a situation creates worries, fear, suspicion and feeling of alienation among participants'. This thesis argues that we need to re-imagine our concept of citizenship, national values and national identity.

Key words

Human rights, multiculturalism, citizenship, cosmopolitanism, integration, identity, culture, multicultural education, democracy

List of Abbreviations and synonyms

CE- citizenship education

HR- Human rights

HRE- human rights education

MC- multiculturalism

MCE- multicultural education

UDHR- Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948

Table of contents

Declaration: -----	2
Acknowledgements: -----	3
Abstract: -----	4
Abbreviations and synonyms: -----	5
1. <i>Chapter one:</i> 1.1.INTRODUCTION: -----	9
1.2Immigrant children in Norway: -----	15
1.3 Research question: -----	18
1.4definition of the key concepts-----	19
1.4.1 Citizenship and citizenship education-----	19
1.4.2human rights and human rights education-----	21
1.4.3cosmopolitanism (global citizenship) -----	22
1.4.5 Outline of the thesis-----	25
1.4.6summary of the chapter-----	25
2. CHAPTER: <i>The theories and literature review</i> ----	26
2.0 Theories: literature review-----	26
2.1 unity and diversity-----	26
2.2 citizenship and identity-----	31
2.3 citizenship education -----	36

2.4 human rights education-----	38
2.5 Cosmopolitanism -----	40
2.6 multicultural educations -----	42
CHAPTER 3- <i>Methodology</i> -----	44
3.1 Research design and methodology -----	44
3.1.1 Research design-----	45
3.2 qualitative research method-----	46
3.3sampling of my qualitative research -----	51
3.4 field work and its challenges-----	53
3.5 Positionality-----	55
3.6 research diary-----	57
3.7 Transcribing and coding -----	57
3.8 reliability and validity of the research findings -----	57
3.9 generalizations -----	59
3.10 ethical considerations -----	60
4. Chapter 4- <i>findings and discussion</i> -----	63
4.1 Integration -----	63
4.2 Identity and Cosmopolitanism -----	72
4.3 multicultural educations - -----	74
4.4 citizenship and human rights education -----	77
4.5chapter summary -----	80

Chapter 5-----	81
5.1 Conclusions and recommendations-----	81
Appendices -----	84
Appendix-1: consent form for research interview-----	84
Appendix -2: Interview questions -----	86
References (Bibliography) -----	88

Chapter- one:

1.1- Introduction

Immigration and globalization are increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistics, and religious diversities in nation states through- out the world, and such changes are challenging the existing concepts of citizenship, national identity and citizenship education as well as they are forcing both educators and policy makers to re-think existing notion of citizenship and nationality (Banks,2008:296 and Osler &Starkey 2005:2). As a result of migration democratic states face challenges like: how to ensure equal rights and dignity of all individuals while maintaining unity of the national state. Many western countries are introducing strict migration laws as immigrants are considered to pose a threat to national identity, national values, and national culture. The immigrants wish to retain their distinctive cultures, beliefs, family norms and traditions. That poses a challenge to some of the norms, institutions, principles and laws of the liberal host societies (Modood2007:8). Most immigrants are coming from historically ruled (colonized) countries that were historically perceived as inferior to the white mainstream societies of the western world. Banks (2011) says that even though the movement of people across national boundaries is as old as the nation-state itself, migration has never before in the history of the world has the movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups within and across nation states been as numerous and rapid or raised such complex and difficult questions about citizenship, human rights, democracy, and social cohesion (Banks, 2011, p. 242). Far right and anti-democracy movements, who target immigrants in general and Muslims in particularly, as the unwanted others are growing in many parts of the world (Erikson2014:168, Osler &Lybaek2014).

According to Banks (2008), Conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education around the world faces challenges from a number of historical, political, social and cultural developments. He claims that World -wide immigration, globalization, and the tenacity of nationalism have stimulated controversy and new thinking about citizenship and citizenship education (Banks, 2008).

(Biseth2012: 8) clarifies that dominant groups always create disadvantaged groups who do not feel at home in the dominant culture and not provided with equal opportunities as others. So, these immigrant groups fail to be well functioning and empowered citizens of the country.

Europeans often define themselves by common heritage of Christianity and western civilization rather than modern values of liberalism, human rights and inclusive multiculturalism (Modood2009:145). Banks (2008:297, Osler2015) argues also that Citizenship and citizenship education should be expanded to include cultural rights for citizens from diverse cultural; ethnic, racial, linguistic, and religious groups that exist in the nations, so as to enable students to acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes and commitments that are needed to become effective civic participants in their communities, nation-state, and the world. Osler & Starkey (2005:2) contends that national citizenship is inadequate and ineffective to include everyone They states that *their* citizenship education should be transformed so that it will as full citizen in our globalized and diversified community of today. So nation states need to rethink and reimagine about *traditional concepts of citizenship and national identity* (Osler, 2009:98).

Liberal assimilationist notions of citizenship assume that individuals from *different groups have to give up their home and community cultures and languages* to attain inclusion and to participate effectively in the national civic culture (Kymlicka,1995). Osler & Starkey (2010:18) explain that in today's world not all students of the school are citizens of the country in which they are learning or working. Therefore, it is no longer appropriate to establish a singular cultural, national or religious tradition in community of the school as it was before (Osler & Starkey, 2010:18). In our modern nation states, we can no longer follow our traditional notion of citizenship, so we need to introduce human rights education as citizenship education and re –define our identity (Osler & Starkey, 2010:118).

According to (Kymlicka1995:2) most politically organized communities throughout history were multi ethnic, multicultural and multilinguistic. To achieve the ideal of homogeneity, governments though out history have pursued a variety of policies that suppress minority identity (Kymlicka1995:2). (Modood2007: 18) states that the symbols and images of the country and national identity has to be revised by public debate in order to reflect the

current and future reality of the country, not only should we emphasize the past ethnic compositions of the country. He stresses that national identity, national values and laws need to be pragmatic, revisable, and readjusted: not fixed and constituted once and for all (Ibid). This means that no party should get an advantage or be disadvantage in public space. Public space should be neutral for all citizens and all parties need to identify with the rules, laws, and conventions of the land (Modood2007:53). He argues that, in practice, the public space is not neutral and it prioritizes some cultural values and behaviors over others (Ibid: 54)

(Osler& Starkey(2010: 45) state that the process of immigration and globalization has challenged the claims of nation states as providers of our primary identity. According to them globalization, immigration and modern technology have created a new situation that challenges traditional nation states model that suppress and deny diversity by claiming to the population to be homogeneous (Osler& Starkey,2010: 88, Erikson,2014:93). Modernity has helped people to recognize that diversity is the feature of all societies and even though many states deny their diversity by enforcing monolithic common narrative of national culture, that's based on national myth, national education, national symbol, language, history and national religion (Osler& Starkey, 2010:88). Diversity continues to be portrayed as a problem and a challenge to our national cohesion rather than an asset to our democratic way of life (Osler &Starkey,2010: 118). (Biseth2012:15), argues that Democracy inevitably foster diversity and we need diversity of all forms, including political diversity, cultural diversity and economic one, if we are going to be developed and flourished more . The main point here is, how can persons of diverse beliefs, races, cultures, languages and ideologies can live together without imposing their values on their fellow citizens (Modood2007).

One of the challenges to diverse democratic nation-states is to provide opportunities for different groups to maintain aspects of their community cultures while constructing a nation in which these groups are structurally included and to which they feel allegiance (kymlicka1995).A delicate balance of diversity and unity should be an essential goal of democratic nations and of teaching and learning in democratic societies (Banks et al. 2005 and Osler& Starkey 2010). Unity must be an important aim when nation-states are

responding to diversity within their populations. They can protect the rights of minorities and enable diverse groups to participate only when they are unified around a set of democratic values such as justice and equality (Guttmann, 2004). When a society is diverse, it will stay together in unity only if its citizens value diversity of all forms per se as democratic asset (Biseth2012:41). (Modood2007:22) stresses that no citizen should feel that the state represents religion, laws and an ideology of specific group, but the state should remain neutral to the concept of what is normal and abnormal. That means the state should promote individuals autonomy and it is up to each individual to decide what is good for their life (Ibid). (Kymlicka1995:108) argues that 'the state unavoidably promotes certain cultural identities, and thereby disadvantage others'. Banks(2011) states that, national states in the past have tried to create unity by forcing racial, cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious minorities to give up their community languages and cultures in order to participate in the national civic culture. Identities are very important to people and they gives meaning to their wellbeing, thus they should be respected not be disregarded in the name of national cohesion or integration (Modood2007:37).

Democratic nations around the world must deal with complex educational issues when trying to respond to the problems created by international migration in ways consistent with their ideologies and declarations (Banks2011). Banks states that Researchers have amply documented the wide gap between democratic ideals and the school experiences of minority groups in nations around the world (Banks 2009). He describe how students such as the Maori in New Zealand, Muslims in France, and Mexican Americans in the United States experience discrimination in school because of their cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, and linguistic differences. When they are marginalized within school and treated as the 'Other,' ethnic minority students – such as Turkish students in Germany, Muslim students in France, and Korean students in Japan – tend to emphasize their ethnic identity and to have weak attachments to their nation-state (Banks, 2011). We need inclusive and plural national identity that emotionally and politically meaningful to all our citizens. Banks (2008:301) states that a nation state that alienates and does not structurally include all groups into its national culture, risks of creating disharmony and fear among different groups. Self- image of being

homogeneous, Judeo-Christian culture and white society is counterproductive (Modood2007:14).

Nations in various parts of the world have responded to the citizenship and cultural rights of immigrant and minority groups in different ways (Banks, 2011). Nations throughout the world are trying to determine whether they will perceive themselves as multicultural and allow immigrants to experience multicultural citizenship or continue to embrace an assimilationist ideology (Banks, 2011). Global citizenship education has been suggested as a means of overcoming the limitations of national citizenship in an increasingly globalized world, as it offers the opportunity to explore identities and conflict in a wider context (Ulrike & Reilly (2012). According to (Bryan & Vavrus2005:185) tolerance means showing respect for different identities, cultural values, belief, sexual orientations, while intolerance can be the denigration of such differences. Intolerance according to the above mentioned authors is associated with assumptions about superiority and distinctiveness of one's own culture, race, religion and lifestyle (Bryan & Vavrus2005: 185). One must tolerate something which one disapproves or dislikes as well as he must have power to suppress it (Modood2007:63). There is nothing to tolerate if we are indifferent to or approve of the belief or behavior in question(Ibid). This will certainly have an influence on how one views and behaves toward those portrayed as "others". Tolerance and respect for minority culture and identity can be undermined by an overriding concern for preserving national heritage, national values and tradition in face of world- wide growing diversity, immigration and globalization(Osler & Lybaek2014: 559). Silence and gaps in addressing past and present inequalities, injustices, discrimination and other forms of racism, undermines our democracy and respect for human dignity (ibid).

Nations can either enable immigrants to experience multicultural citizenship that is to retain their language, culture, and enjoy full citizenship rights or be forced to be assimilated(Banks2008: 297). Unity without diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony and diversity without unity leads to balkanization of social and disintegration(ibid). This is the dilemma that we are facing in today's multicultural societies and therefore, here comes the need for balancing between these two concepts (Osler and Lybaek,2014)

Dominant groups may allow immigrant and other minority groups to practice their religion, speak their mother tongue, wear their traditional dress, but majorities may insist that minorities should do such things in private homes, not in public places like schools, working places and public offices (Modood2007:54). Immigrants with other minorities are demanding that their cultures, beliefs, values and identities be part of the structure of the public space as full members, and they are opposing privatization of their identities (Modood2007:54). In short, they are opposing marginalization, subordination and exclusion from the society. To have feelings of equal citizenship, immigrants have to be given opportunity to influence the attitudes, norms, practices and laws of the host societies as full members of the society (Modood2007:68). According to Modood2007, integration does not mean uncritical acceptance of contemporary liberal societies with all their limitations, discriminations, racism and inequalities. (Modood2007:50) says that we have to modify existing perceptions, practices, laws and institutions so as to accommodate different groups in our current society through public dialogue and debate. He emphasizes that we should guarantee the full and meaningful participation of all individuals by eliminating the barriers of participation in all affairs of the country. Migrants are often objects of debate rather than participants and subjects of the debate (Ibid).

Feeling of not being respected, discriminated, denial of equal participation and alienation can hinder sense of belonging (Modood2007:50). Thus, our national identity need to be re-imagined in our modern world by removing emotions like: non-white are not really citizens of Europe and Muslims are alien culture and religion (Modood2007:150). All women, all blacks, all Muslims, and working class do not think and act in the same way, but there is always internal diversity (Ibid: 136). Ascribed and static identities like, African, Asian, Jewish, Muslim, and other imposed identities will only leads to exclusion. Labelling has naturally a negative impact on children's sense of belonging. What kind of identity is promoted in schools and in society in general is important for minorities to feel represented or marginalized (Biseth2012:45).

1.2 Immigrant children in Norway

Now let us examine whether the children who born today from immigrant parents fully recognized as citizens, in the eyes of the majority Norwegians and whether these children consider themselves as Norwegian citizens? Why are they called immigrants, when they are born in Norway and they are legal citizens of Norway? Many European countries have difficulty viewing the foreign born and the native born second and third generation as nationals, irrespective of their legal citizenship status (Leven & Modood 2009:140). Many immigrant children fail to pass the unwritten rules of cultural membership and they remain strangers or aliens while they speak fluent Norwegian and have Norwegian citizenship (Biseth 2012). Erikson (2010) says that many Muslim children who born and live in Norway feel neither foreigners nor fully Norwegian citizens because the host society is unable or unwilling to integrate them as full citizens. In Norway, Many immigrants fail to get the job they applied for because of their foreign name, their skin color and religious belief they practice (Melentosh 2015: 310). (Erikson, 2010: 74) states that many immigrant children from Pakistan to Norway feel at home neither in Norway nor in Pakistan. Students come to school with a range of stereotypes, prejudices and negative attitudes toward those who are conceived different from them (Biseth 2012:46). Prejudice related to religion is rampant among Norwegian students in schools (Biseth 2012:48). Therefore, it is duty of the society and school to teach them about democratic attitudes and values like diversity, human rights, and promoting tolerance.

Where are you from? When are you going back your home country? These are some of the questions that are asked to many students and immigrants who speak fluent Norwegian, born in Norway and integrated well (Erikson 2010). A Black Muslim woman with a Hijab will never be considered as full Norwegian by many Norwegians and she will face problems in getting the job (Fugelli 2016). Osler (2010) argues that when a nation state redefines itself as multicultural states, the state is no longer defined as a possession of single dominant group, but rather belongs to all citizens equally (Osler & Starkey. 2010, p90). When all citizens are all equal, there is no need of hiding, apologizing for or denying of one's origins, beliefs or ethno-cultural identities and there is no need of assimilation or exclusion of minorities groups (ibid). No one chooses his race,

sex and sexual orientation and no one chooses to be born or not to be born into Muslim or Black family; thus we should not discriminate them for something they have no control over (Leven & Modood 2009:175). But, we choose politically how to live together and both new and old citizens should negotiate about all as equal citizens (ibid).

Schools have a central role to play in nurturing and promoting democracy, tolerance, commitment to cosmopolitan values, such as, human rights and social values that transcend national borders and cultures (Banks, 2011). Schools must nurture, support and affirm identities of all learners, if educators wish their students to endorse values of tolerance, mutual understanding and respect among all students. Social and educational policies need to recognize facts of diversity, not only diversities results of current immigration, but also previously hidden identities and diversities (Osler, 2010, p26). Immigrant communities often maintain psychological, cultural, and economic ties to multiple nation-states. This new reality requires that we reconsider the meaning and practice of citizenship education in light of what belonging and citizenship mean for young people growing up in today's world (Abu ElHaj, 2009). Banks 2011 states that marginalized and structurally excluded identity groups have organized and worked for their group rights, which has resulted in greater equality and social justice for all. Banks (2008) claims that marginalized groups through their movements to advance justice and equality in America, have helped the United States to come closer to actualizing the democratic ideals stated in its founding documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

In my thesis, I will discuss how Eritrean young students in Norway perceive diversity, national belonging, integration and problems they are facing with integration as African immigrants. (Osler & Lybaek 2014;553) mentions Norwegian case as follows:

“Norway, for example, established its constitution in 1814 and finally achieved independence from Sweden in 1905, after centuries of rule from Denmark and Sweden. In the subsequent policy of Norwegianization, originally conceived as a process of liberation from Swedish political and Danish cultural hegemony, schools were given a central role, becoming a powerful instrument of Norwegian nation-building. One goal was to incorporate the indigenous Sami

and Kvens people into the New Norwegian nation-state. Arguably, the intention was to include (to achieve unity), rather than to exclude. Despite this, nation-building through schooling –which continues today in an implicit form - has had an oppressive function in relation to minorities”.

Norway Yet, the Norwegian education system has been slow in meeting the entitlements of learners (both from the Sami minority and the mainstream) under article 29 (1) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which include: the development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living (Osler,2015). The task of creating the imagined Norwegian national identity, neglects past political divisions, cultural diversity, religious plurality and emphasizes on homogeneity (Osler &Lybaek2014:544).

The purpose of the paper is to promote the knowledge and skills about concepts of citizenship and contribute in attitude changes of majority toward the minorities, immigrants and develop tolerance, peaceful coexistence, and mutual understanding between different groups in society. Norwegian politician are preoccupied with immigration and integrating those who come to Norway to the societal culture as well as how to tackle extremism. There is extremism, Islam phobia and terrorist attack in Norway in opposition to the government policy of immigration (Osler and Lybæk,2014). These are the problems linked to how do young students and society at large perceive their particular identity. My goal is to advance our knowledge in that area by examining current practice and policy of citizenship education in Norway.

My research is based on a small sample of Eritrean young students who came to Norway either for family re-union or as asylum seekers with their families for their safety from persecution from repressive regime in their country. As I am an Eritrean who came to Norway as asylum seeker and I have two children who are living in Norway and going to Norwegian schools, and waiting to be Norwegian citizen in the near future, I am interested in examining their perception and experiences about Norwegian citizenship and citizenship education.

1.3 Research Question

The thesis discusses how citizenship education, cultural diversity, and human rights education that are laid down in the curriculum are implemented and practiced in Norwegian schools. The main goal of my research is to analyze and understand how societal and political principles of democracy and human rights ideals that are aspired at the policy level in the curriculum and Norwegian integration programs are implemented and practiced in Norway. I am interested in finding out the attitudes, experiences and perspectives of young Eritrean immigrant students who came to Norway as asylum seekers or for family reunion because of political unrest in their home country, Eritrea. These students are studying in Norwegian upper secondary high schools in Norwegian schools and they are learning to be citizens and they are prepared for Norwegian citizenship. I want to find out: Do these young Eritrean students feel as Norwegians and do they identify themselves with Norway? Do they feel that they have a place in Norwegian society and the country belongs to them too? If the answer is no, why and where does the problem lie? And if the answer is yes, what are the best examples of the good practices of democratic citizenship, good integration, all- inclusive and non- discriminative ways that others could learn from these positive experiences.

My research is based on a small sample of Eritrean immigrant youth who came to Norway as either asylum seekers or as part of the family re-unification program. I am interested in examining their experiences, feelings and perception about their citizenship because I am too an Eritrean immigrant who came to Norway as asylum seeker like them and I have two daughters who are learning in Norwegian schools like my informants. Both, I and my family are waiting to be Norwegian citizens. That means, I have both personal interest and experience in conducting this research. I recognize that my personal interest and experience has influenced my research topic choice, the research questions that I ask and that makes my thesis not “value free”, as all researches are influenced by personal experiences, interests, political perspectives and biases of the researcher (Banks, 1996: 79). Here are my research questions:

- How are recent Eritrean migrant students being prepared for citizenship at Norwegian schools?
- What does Norwegian education and integration policy require?
- How do the young people perceive these proceeding of schooling?
- What lessons can we learn from policy and particularly from young people about education for democracy and diversity?

After examining citizenship education and practices in Norwegian schools and its impacts on Eritrean minority children's sense of belong, I will recommend my comments for policy and practice changes for the improvements for the current situation.

The purpose of the thesis is to promote the knowledge and skills about concepts of citizenship and contribute in attitude changes of majority toward the minorities, immigrants and develop tolerance, peaceful coexistence, and mutual understanding between different groups in society. Norwegian politician are preoccupied with immigration and integrating those who come to Norway to the societal culture as well as how to tackle extremism. There is extremism, Islam- phobia and even a terrorist attack in Norway, in opposition to the government policy of immigration (Osler and Lybæk, 2014). These are the problems linked to how do young students and society at large perceive their particular identity. My goal is to advance our knowledge in that area by examining current practice and policy of citizenship education in Norway.

1.4. Definitions of key concepts

1.4.1 Citizenship and citizenship education

A citizen is an individual who lives in a nation-state and has certain rights and privileges, as well as duties to the state, such as allegiance to the government (Starkey 2012). Citizenship or membership in a political community denotes legal status with certain rights and duties toward the state as well identity linking citizens to the nation-state. Banks 2008 argues that these basic definitions are accurate but do not reveal the complexity of citizenship as the concept has developed in modernized nation-states.

According to Osler and Starkey (2005), Citizenship can be conceived as status, a feeling, and a practice. While not all students will necessarily have the status of citizen (i.e., nationality) in the country in which they are studying, but all attendants have the status of human rights. The status, feeling, and practice of citizenship are interrelated. Yet nationality is not necessarily a bar to a feeling of citizenship or sense of belonging in a community (ibid). Feelings of belonging depend on an individual's sense of security and on an atmosphere of nondiscrimination. Neither is the practice of citizenship or engagement in the life and affairs of the community dependent on citizenship status, although it is likely to be influenced by the degree to which an individual has a feeling of citizenship and belonging. Citizenship education, which focuses on status, feeling, and practice, rather than status alone, is likely to be more inclusive of a wide range of learner identities (Osler 2013, p.75). Citizenship and identities are neither fixed nor rigid, nor necessarily or naturally at the level of the nation state (Osler and Starkey 2003). Osler and Starkey (2005) argues that we have multiple allegiances and belongings. Banks (2011) states that the aim of citizenship education in most nation-states is to develop citizens who internalized national values, venerated national heroes, and accepted glorified versions of national histories (Banks 2011, p.243). Banks argues that these goals of citizenship education are obsolete today because many people have multiple national commitments, live in more than one nation, and practice flexible citizenship. Osler (2015) argues that conceptions of multicultural education which focus exclusively on the nation are insufficient in a globalized and interdependent world (Osler, 2015, p.12).

National citizenship has been described as inherently exclusive within nations, excluding those without full citizen status (e.g. children, asylum seekers), and also between nations, creating and reaffirming boundaries of belongingness, loyalty, rights and responsibility (Ulrike and Reilly 2012). (Osler 2011) puts it: 'Citizenship education typically focuses on the nation and citizens' supposed natural affinity to the nation-state' (Osler 2011, p.1) citizenship is a practice and feeling of belonging that is mastered and built over the course of life, not formal legal status (Leven & Modood 2009:20).

National citizenship could be conceived as status, a feeling and as a practice (Osler & Starkey, 2005:9). Citizenship as status is directly connected to legal entitlements like holding national passport, while citizenship as feeling depends mainly on acceptance by co-citizens as equal citizen as well as absence of discrimination (Osler & Starkey, 2010: 114). According to Osler and Starkey (2010, p.116), Citizenship as feeling does not limited to legal entitlement of goods and services that an individual gets because of his citizenship status. Citizenship could also be perceived as practice and that indicates participation

by individuals in community life equally with all others to bring change in their society(ibid).

According to Osler &Starkey (2005:11), achievement of citizenship and democracy are an ongoing struggle and long process that involves struggle for equality and justice by those who denied these basic rights. The goal of citizenship education according to Osler &Starkey (2005:12), is to promote identification with the nation state and learn about their society they live in and enable them to understand how it functions and preparing them for future role as citizens. Sometimes states and schools encourage learners to be uncritical patriots (ibid). Citizenship education according to(Osler & Starkey:2010:117), draws a line between the rightful, loyal and deserving citizens and the others who are seen as an alien threat. In such a climate of fear and suspicion certain minority groups like immigrants and asylum seeker are portrayed as less loyal and less patriots who are need of specific democratic education, which are national value rather than universal value(ibid:118). Citizenship as status, can be defined as a membership in political community with certain rights and duties. According to Banks et al.(2005),the concept of citizenship in the United States that was originally limited to white males who own property has extended through years to include different groups such as, indigenous people, women, recent immigrants and African Americans.

1.4.2. Human rights and Human rights education

Osler and Starkey(1994) state that Human rights are about the importance of individual human dignity, equality of rights and reciprocal responsibility for ensuring that the rights of others are respected. They state that Human rights education is an essential part of preparation for participation in a pluralistic democracy (Osler and Starkey1994). Jack Donnelly (2013:7) states that human rights are inalienable fundamental rights to which a person is inherently entitles to such rights because one is human being. Donnelly (2013:8) says that human rights are inalienable rights and universal, but these rights are not timeless, unchanging or absolute, but historically specific and contingent. Osler & Starkey (2010: 63) claims that human rights are not gifts bestowed by the will of governments that could be taken away from some groups and given to others. Osler and Starkey (2010) define human rights as an agenda for action and a tool for social change as well as means of empowerment (Osler and Starkey, 2010:140). This means according to them that human rights is as a framework for living together in communities characterized by diversity (Osler and Starkey, 2010, p.18). Human rights are interdependent, indivisible and

universal right that belongs to all human beings, despite our citizenship status (Osler & Starkey, 2010:16).

Human rights developed because human beings felt the need for it from their experience of gross rights violation by sovereign states (Osler & Starkey, 2010:29). Human rights are direct response to state enacted barbarity or brutality of human being against fellow humans. Donnelly (2013:11) defines human rights as “minimum set of goods, services, opportunities and protections that are widely recognized today as essential prerequisites for life of dignity” (Donnelly 2013:11). Donnelly expresses that human rights are not only aspirations but rights based on demand (Donnelly 2012: 12).

Osler and Starkey (1994) argues that “The study of human rights in schools should lead to an understanding of, and sympathy for, the concepts of justice, equality, peace, dignity, rights and democracy. Such understanding should be both cognitive and based on experience and feelings. Schools should, thus, provide opportunities for pupils to experience affective involvement in human rights ” (Osler and Starkey, 1994). Osler & Starkey (2010), explains that the goal of human rights education should be to reduce intolerance, violence, injustice and discrimination by building democratic society (Osler & Starkey 2010:141). Human rights and human rights education need to be taught and understood by everyone in society as a right is not an effective right until one learns and knows about it (Osler & Starkey 2010:16).

1.4.3. Cosmopolitanism (global citizenship)

Osler (2015) argues that we need to rethink multicultural education. In particular, we need to re-imagine the nation as cosmopolitan. Drawing on the tools of the internationally-agreed human rights project, itself a cosmopolitan endeavor, and on principles of human rights education, it is possible to develop a concept of multicultural education which supports justice and equality at all scales, from the local to the global (Osler 2015,p.12). She argues that to revitalize multicultural education in the twenty-first century, we need first to re-imagine the nation as cosmopolitan as well as multicultural (Osler, 2015, p20). She explains her point by saying that cosmopolitanism does involve conceptualizing the curriculum so that it does not promote an exclusive national identity or encourage learners (from either mainstream or minority communities) to position themselves as part of a nation whose interests are necessarily in opposition to those of other nations(Osler 2015,p.20) she

continues by saying, ‘This involves recognition that in struggles for justice and peace (local, national or international) solidarities and alliances with people in distant places are often critical, and that we are living in an interdependent world’ (Osler 2015, p20).

Globalization has been construed either as a threat to social cohesion, increasing power differentials, inequality and social injustice, or as an opportunity, uniting people across state boundaries through economic interdependence, migration, tourism, trade and the transcendence of the group interests (Vale 2004, cited by Ulrike and Reilly, 2012). Globalization indicates our interconnectedness by trade, politics, economy, culture and it creates both opportunities as well as constraints (Erikson 2014:1). No one is solely dependent on his nation for economy or human rights protection. Globalization increasingly exposes us to each other’s lives, and that leads to enhance solidarity, tolerance, sympathy with fellow humans and undermine stubborn identity politics like nationalism and Religion (Ibid:16). (Erikson 2014:15) argues that globalization challenges traditional forms of citizenship and that, in the face of increasing diversity, national identity may lose importance and globalization may promote awareness of our common humanity. He stresses that globalization threatens national, ethnic, religious and regional identities by introducing new ideas, values and practices through the modern means of communication, internet and fast transportation. But, on the other hand globalization produces new forms of diversity or differentiation: globalization makes as both more similar and more different at the same time paradoxically (Erikson 2010:30).

There is a rise in visible identity markers among both minorities and majorities nowadays (Ibid: 114). All humans wish to preserve their identities, attach to their culture, tradition and strengthen their distinctive identity (Erikson 2014:160). Couples of decades ago, hijab (headscarf) were hardly seen among Muslim immigrant women, but today young Muslim girls wear it against their parents will, says Erikson, 2014. According to (Erikson 2014: 113) 90% of Norwegians celebrate 17 May which is National day and more than half of Norwegian women wear folk dress or traditional dress, and that is new phenomenon. The reason behind such desire to preserve Norwegian identity is due to globalization and mixing, he suggests that Norwegians feel their identities are challenged or threatened (Ibid;114). When people feel that their identity is under siege, they develop strong emotional attachment to ones’ tradition, culture, and religion, says Erikson. Thus, identity becomes important when people feel that his identity is threatened. Immigrants with different skin color and religion from the majority, their full integration to the mainstream is very difficult: thus, immigrants and their children remain attached to their country of origin (Erikson, 2014: 165).

Humans naturally need secured and predictable belonging: whether religious, ethnic or national. Assertion of and identification with cultural minority groups within and beyond the nation state, as well as individual attachments to global movements, institutions and communities, may also dilute national identity. Ulrike and Reilly (2012) discuss global citizenship as follows:

Advocates of global citizenship propose that it provides a unifying identity for humanity which does not require global governance (Appiah 2006). Acknowledging that the global community may not offer the same emotional attachment as a national identity, Nussbaum (1996) argues that global citizenship should override patriotism to allow rational political decisions that do not privilege one society but are concerned with the greater good of all humanity. Young people's education in global citizenship, emphasizing responsibility to humankind, common values and respect for diversity, is therefore suggested to transcend inequalities and injustice at global, national and local levels and lends 'great power over racism, sexism, and other divisive passions that militate against cosmopolitan humanism' (Nussbaum 1997, 49). Furthermore, the development of a global identity is proposed as an essential element of education for global citizenship: 'Citizenship education should also help students to develop an identity and attachment to the global community and a human connection to people around the world (Banks,2008). Global with perceive to be different from ourselves. The challenge is to accept shared responsibility for solidarity others in our own communities, especially those others whom we is insufficient if we cannot establish a sense of solidarity our common future and for solving our common problems (Osler and Starkey 2005: 93). According to (Osler &Starkey, 2010: 113) Cosmopolitan citizenship education is an alternative to citizenship education. Human rights is a cosmopolitan project based on the assumption of entitlement of all human beings to human rights (ibid:119). Greater justice and equality cannot be achieved by current practices which focus on nationalism because nationalism fails to include all humans equally (Osler, 2015:13).

Cosmopolitan citizen according to Osler & Starkey (2005:20), is the one who views himself as a citizen of the world community. National citizenship focuses to national state belonging and encourages xenophobia as it makes distinction between citizens and foreigner while cosmopolitan citizenship can include all human beings as community (ibid). Cosmopolitanism is based on sense of feeling solidarity with fellow human beings by transcending narrow and exclusive national identity (Osler &Starkey,2005:23). Osler & Starkey (2005:22) argue that our personal identities are no longer tied to single political belonging like it assumed to be before due to globalization and immigration. This means that people can have multiple identities and hold to or more passports as many countries

allow dual citizenship rights. Osler & Starkey (2005:23), claims that cosmopolitan citizenship does not stand in tension with national citizenship, but it is a way of being citizen in many ways from national, regional to global. Cosmopolitan citizens are not born but they become cosmopolitan citizens through learning, according to Osler & Starkey (2005: 25). As we have seen above, human right is a cosmopolitan project.

1.5 outline of the thesis:

The study will consist of six chapters. Chapter one has discussed the background and introduced some basic terms and concepts the study is based upon. The chapter also has outlined the purpose of the research and the research question the study wished to find out. In chapter two I deal with the literature review and explain some key concepts and theories that I used as basis of my research and link these concepts with my research question. I focus on role of the school in identity building and perception and feeling of their identity and sense of belonging of Eritrean immigrant youths who are living and learning in Norway. In Chapter three I present research methods and steps that I followed in conducting in my empirical research. Here, I examine my positionality as a researcher and its impact in data gathering and data analysis as well as ethical questions and short comings of my research. Chapter four presents the data analysis and discussion of my findings. Chapter five gives conclusion and some recommendation about human rights and human rights education in Norway.

1.6 summary of the chapter:

In chapter one, I discussed some basic terms that could help us to understand what the role of schools in citizenship education, human rights education and multicultural education should be in our diverse and global world. As we know, Countries like Norway are becoming more diversified due to immigration and globalization and the question of identity is becoming an issue of public concern. My research question is how recent immigrant students from Eritrea are prepared for citizenship in Norwegian schools. To answer this question fully we have to understand some concepts and terms that could help in analyzing and could serve as a framework for our case. In chapter two, I will discuss some theories that I have broadly introduced in chapter one.

Chapter- two

2.0 Theories and Literature review

In this chapter I define the main concepts and theoretical frameworks which are the basis of my research questions. I examined and read literatures that are related to my research questions. I deal with human rights, human rights education, globalization, diversity, multiculturalism and the construction of national identities and its impacts on minority groups. I have chosen literatures that can help me to answer my research questions and which inform research question. I discuss particularly the question of identity and citizenship education in our modern, diverse and globalized that is concurrently showing tendencies toward nationalism. Finally, I examined how minority's culture, identity and language are perceived and treated in Norway.

2.1 unity and diversity

How to live together peacefully and without violence has been a challenge for humanity throughout history (Kymlicka, 1995: 2). We humans naturally prefer to live with our own kind rather than with those who look, dress, and worship differently than us. Human societies have developed all sorts of intricate distinctions between "insiders" and "outsiders", between those who feel themselves superior and those who are excluded as inferior and sometimes even denied their essential humanity because of these artificial distinctions (Rodolfo, 2008: 161). Peoples and communities have a right to live by their own culture: right to be different from a majority or dominant group in a nation state is fundamental human right and is a vital part of human development (Parekh 2000: 262). It is apparent that Conflicts and problems arise when societies are highly stratified along race, ethnicity, and religious lines. According to (Kymlicka 1995: 2), modern societies are multicultural throughout their histories in more than one way, for example, there are ethnic minorities, indigenous people, immigrants and religious groups in the nation state,

regardless of our political elites' efforts to homogeneity through state policies. Nation states need to be unified around a set of democratic values such as justice and equality that balances unity and diversity and protects the fundamental rights of all diverse groups (Banks,2008).

National identity construction is modern political innovation of the urban elites and nationalism stresses on the distinctive and unique cultural similarities, shared language, and history of its adherents (Erikson,2010:10). Erikson2010 claims that nationalism thereby draws boundaries between insiders and outsiders. Nationalism like all other identities are constituted in relation to others, the very idea of the nation presupposes that there are other nations and people who are different (ibid). Mutual demarcation between different groups within the nation states may also lead to dichotomization, hierarchy, conflict, stereotype, and competition for power and resources (Erikson,2010:35). Due to the above mentioned reasons, Sami ethnic group in Norway, for example, had for centuries been considered 'primitive, backward, stupid and dirty by the dominant Norwegians'' (Erikson,2010: 35). According to (Erikson2010, :36)the Sami ethnic identity was stigmatized and inferior to Norwegian, thus, it was under-communicated by many Sami ethnic group and some Sami even refused to teach their children their mother language due to self-contempt. Nations tend to be dominated by ethnic groups who divide people into perfect and imperfect citizens(Ibid).(Gutmann2003: 43) asserts that all modern democratic societies contain multiple cultures within them but the government protects the dominant culture, through the language, family law, holidays, educational system and the mass media.

The nation is and has been divided by race, ethnicity, religion, gender and class and that diversity has to be recognized and accommodated (Bank 1995: 517). Every social identity or community is exclusive in a sense that there are some who are excluded from it (Erikson,2010:73). The shared European identity, for example, would have to define itself in contrast to Muslims, Asians, Africans and so on(Ibid). The first fact of identity in general is the application of systematic distinctiveness between insiders and outsiders: between them and us(Erikson,2010:23). If such principle does not exist, there is no identity, says Erikson2010. (Osler &Lybaek2014: 555) states that the Norwegian curriculum emphasizes on a

monolithic national culture and knowledge of the Norwegian language as essential elements for Norwegian national identity building. Our national identity should have been based on our commitment to democratic ideals, not our skin color, religious belief or ethnic our background. For people to participate effectively in a democratic society as citizen, one needs to have the knowledge, skills and racial attitudes that are required to work with people from diverse background (Banks, 2008: 207).

In today's world, on the one hand, there is a tendency toward national homogenization and uniformity, and on the other hand, search for roots and keeping distance from the "others" who are sometimes perceived as threatening (Rodolfo: 2008, p163). Islam today is described as incompatible to democratic values and as anti-secularism as Catholic was in the past (Leven & Modood2009:158).Curriculum is designed to build good citizens, teach official language, instill national value and integrate minorities (Banks 1995: 17). Recognition of learners' multiple and flexible identity from the local to the global and equipping them with skills to engage in struggles against past and present injustices, inequalities and solidarity with the victims should be at the core of the national curriculum (Osler &Lybaek2014:559). Citizenship which is described as having sense of belonging to a society, needs the feeling of common fate with fellow citizens, and that is possible only when racism plus structural inequalities are removed(Modood2007:153).

There is a need for a curriculum and school system that recognizes cultural differences, prejudice free and a curriculum that reflects history, language, culture identity of all students equally (Banks el 1995:489). Banks 2011defines the need for balance between unity and diversity and he argues that Citizenship education should be transformed in the twenty-first century because of the deepening diversity in nations around the world. Citizens in a diverse democratic society should be able to maintain attachments to their cultural communities as well as participate effectively in the shared national culture (Banks 2011, p.246). Banks (2011) asserts that Unity without diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony, as was the case during the Cultural Revolution that occurred in the People's Republic of China from 1966 to 1976 and when the Communist Party dominated the Soviet Union. He argues that diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the

nation-state, as occurred during the Iraq war when sectarian conflict and violence threatened that fragile nation in the late 2000s. Diversity and unity should coexist in a delicate balance in democratic nation states (Banks2011, p.246).

Banks (2011:247) argues that Nation-states have generally failed to help students develop a delicate balance of identifications. He argue that states have rather, given priority to national identifications and have neglected the community cultures of students as well as the knowledge and skills students need to function in an interconnected global world(Banks2011,p.248).

Banks(2011) says that Students should develop a delicate balance of cultural, national, and global identifications and allegiances(ibid,p.248). Banks (1996: 12) states that students may have wrong conception, stereotype bias and partial truth about the outgroup members from their cultural knowledge. Thus, the goal of school should be, according to Banks (1996: 13), to educate to be free from cultural biases and to learn about other cultures and views to all students. Education can bring positive social changes by promoting awareness of injustice, inequality, discrimination and can help people to realize that there exist an alternative ways to current practices and beliefs. But education can also be implicated in producing inequalities, injustice, prejudices and intolerance toward the other groups (Bryan & Vavrus2005:188). So education is just like globalization, it is a double sword that can have both positive and negative effects. Education can be a tool for development and transformation but it could also serve to preserve power, influence and interests of the privileged groups of society (ibid).

According to (Murphy2012:112: Modood2007:12), there are claims that multicultural policies undermine and threaten sense of solidarity and social cohesion that binds together citizens of democratic community as stable community. Fear and suspicion of newcomer is widespread and voiced in public hearing in many parts of Europe today (Osler2009:85). Politicians in Europe renewed emphasis on importance of 'national value' and the duty of newcomers to integrate and accommodate themselves to their host society's way of life (Murphy2012:8). Immigrants are expected to be loyal to a core set of national value (Ibid). According to Parekh(2000:120), human being are in many ways the product of their cultural background and the cultural practices,

beliefs and identity add value, self-respect, well-being and meaning to the lives of individual citizens. Parekh (2000:112), asserts that our identities are shaped by recognition and respect we get from the others and refusal to recognize and accommodate minority identity could be undermining source of social cohesion and conflict in diverse community. Therefore, minorities' rights, cultures and identities need to be equally respected as that of majorities, if they are going to live together peacefully. Banks (1996:328), argues that it is not our multiculturalism that destroys or that threatens our national unity and stability but, our inability to embrace and pursue our democratic ideals of tolerance, justice, and equality. Osler (2009:90), rejects some claims made by some politicians by saying that multiculturalism has failed when they have never had an explicit multicultural policy or when they had a misguided multicultural policy. She stresses that what has not been tried cannot be declared as failed (Osler 2009:90).

(Kymlicka 1995:108), says that dominant groups control the state machinery and they support the cultural identity of the majority in their policy decisions by language, national symbol, holidays and school curriculum. When every citizen does not enjoy equal participation or if he feels discriminated because of his identity, language and religious belief, it is natural that he feels not equally valued in society. (Parekh 2000:193) claims that, if newcomers have only duties to embrace the host county's culture, law, lifestyle and identity, but have no role in influencing it or shaping it, they will feel alienated. That means that minorities do not feel sense of belonging to the county, if their culture identity and interests not taken into account. Murphy (2012: 119), asserts that integration is a reciprocal process whose success depends upon commitment of both host community and new comers. (Modood 2007) states that both the members of the host society and immigrants have to do something about integration; so the later alone cannot be blamed for failing. How to ensure unity, stability, and social cohesion within culturally diverse society is important job of every government and protection, inclusion and not portraying of minority as a threat helps in ensuring that goal. Osler & Starkey (2010:92), emphasizes that institutions founded by dominant group cultures should now promote pluralism and recognize the current reality of society.

The ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic and cultural diversity exists almost in every state now and it existed before too. The vital question that we are dealing here now is that, how nation states can provide equal opportunity of participation in their nation building to all citizens, while these groups retain vital parts of their culture, language and lifestyle(Banks2008:298). It is true that unity without diversity results in cultural repression and diversity without unity causes national disintegration, but how can states achieve a balance between these two important ideals. Banks (2008:300) says that only when nation states reflect the culture, belief and identity of all ethnic, racial and religious groups and give them equal rights, can they feel belonging and allegiance toward the states' ideals and values. States should promote democratic ideals and values that are articulated in the UDHR to create a better and just world for all rather than aggressive nationalist view of citizenship concept. Diversity and unity should coexist in a delicate balance in all democratic states(Banks2008:298).

2.2Citizenship and identity

Citizen is a member of a particular political community, while a universal community can include everyone as member as well as citizen (Osler& Starkey2010: 117).The inclusion of some people as members is also exclusion of others(ibid). A human being is defined in terms of citizenship: therefore, one's rights are protected and promoted owing to the status of being a citizen of a particular political community (Hung Ryun, 2012,p38). Hung argue that the confusion of human being with citizenship is absolutely wrong because human rights are universal rights and are inalienable rights to which all people are entitled to, regardless who they are, or where they happen to be born, while human rights is unconditional and does not depend on belonging to particular political entity(Hung2012,p.37) . This means that citizenship exclude, discriminate in-group and out-groups. Citizenship is a distinction between "politically qualified and politically unqualified" persons (Hung Ruyu,2012, p37). Hung Ryun states that this distinction implies a violation of human rights in the name of social solidarity and security. Citizens are often regarded as

equivalent to perfectly complete or full human being and the non-citizens as imperfect, deficient and unqualified human beings (Hung, 2012, p38).

(Kymlicka1995:173) states that immigrants, indigenous groups, and minorities were expected to leave their distinctive cultural heritage and assimilate completely into existing norms of the main stream culture. States try to destroy sense of separate group identity among their national minority by banning their language, culture and by suppressing their identity (Kymlicka1995: 185). Many minorities complain that they are excluded, discriminated, disadvantaged and denied equal participation with the main stream culture, despite their possession of citizenship rights(Kymlicka1995: 180). (Kymlicka1995:180), argues that providing material benefits alone will not ensure integration of minorities into main stream culture and it will not develop their sense of shared loyalty to the state. These groups are demanding inclusion, recognition and equal respect that the majority takes for granted. According to (Kymlicka1995:189), people from different national groups will share allegiance to the states only if they feel their identity and culture respected and praised rather than suppressed and despised. Citizenship is not only a legal status of certain rights and responsibilities but also feel represented and accepted by co-citizens as well.

Citizenship education could imply discrimination or exclusion, although it claims to promote solidarity and human rights according to Osler& Starkey (2014:90).Citizenship is located in a particular historical, social and cultural context where its membership is approved by political or legal system (ibid). Citizenship education aims to pass on the next generation the knowledge and attitude which are required to be good citizens (Banks 2008).Citizenship is the result of consent of present social and political realities. It changes and evolves all the time, not fixed legal status and it is under continuous construction(Osler & Starkey2010).Thus, schools should work to help students to understand this reality and challenge the existing bonds and prejudices imposed upon people(Banks1996:5). Osler 2011 states that in a globalized world, and in nation-states characterized by diversity, there have been calls for a renewed focus on forms of civic education which promote national belonging and loyalty; such calls often target, either explicitly or implicitly, students from minority or migration backgrounds (Osler2011,p.2).

Citizenship is divided into three categories: status, feeling and practice (Osler & Starkey 2010:114). Citizenship can be understood as legal status and citizenship as desirable activity (Osler, 2005, p12). Citizenship is more than just legal status and it is about feeling of belongingness to the community which one lives in. Citizenship education is used for shaping pupils into “good” citizens who are willing to take part in a public life, to support the shared identity, and to take care for and be responsible for public affairs (Hung Ryun, 2012, p38). Citizenship education aims to raise among pupil the common sense of identity and feeling of belongingness to the nation state. However, I think, there always will be people who are considered to be the “others, outsiders, strangers and foreigners” and there are discriminations in the process of citizenship education as nature of citizenship education excludes some people.

Banks 2011 asserts that the community cultures and languages of students from diverse groups were to be eradicated in the assimilationist conception of citizenship education that existed in nations such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and the UK prior to the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Banks 2011,p. 247) Banks states that One consequence of assimilationist citizenship education was that many students lost their first cultures, languages, and ethnic identities (Wong Fillmore 2005 cited by Bank2011). Some students also became alienated from their families and communities. Another consequence was that many students became socially and politically alienated within the national civic culture, as many Muslim youth in French society are today (Lemaire 2009, cited by Banks 2011).

Nationalists and assimilationists in nations throughout the world worry that if they help students develop identifications and attachments to their cultural communities they will not acquire sufficiently strong attachments and allegiance to the nation-state (Banks 2011,p248). (Banks2011:236) asserts that identity is multiple, changing, overlapping, and contextual, rather than fixed and static. Categorization of minority as internally unified, fixed and homogeneous entity with no class, gender, carrier, race and religion difference is wrong (Modood2007:116). The multicultural conception of identity is that citizens who have clarified and thoughtful attachments to their community cultures, languages, and values are more likely than citizens who are stripped of their cultural attachments to develop reflective identifications with their

nation-state (Banks 2004). Banks says that Nation-states, however, must make structural changes that reduce structural inequality and that legitimize and give voice to the hopes, dreams, and visions of their marginalized citizens in order for them to develop strong and clarified commitments to the nations and its goals (Banks2011,p.248).

Under The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR), the qualification of having rights does not depend on citizenship but to all human beings. The prominent idea of human rights is recognized in UDHR that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights (art.1). This means that having human rights is unconditional, universal and inalienable, equally applicable to citizens and aliens. Human beings are entitled to human rights because of being humans according UDHR. Therefore, in multicultural states, students must experience democratic class rooms that reflect their cultures and identities to internalize human rights values, ideals and behaviors (Bank, 2009, p100). Bank stresses that human rights ideals to be internalized for students, they must have experience of human rights in school as well as large society that validate them as human beings. The society has to affirm their cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and racial identities and empower them as citizens in school and larger society (Bank, 2009, p101). He argue that conceptualizing citizenship as shared fate has some important advantage over citizenship based on identity. The Shared fate does not limit belonging to ethnicity, religion and particular culture, but to all human beings. The problem of citizenship based on identity is our understanding of it traditionally as rigid and static national identity rather than flexible, open and as shared fate. Citizenship is always defined in terms of membership within a political community, in contrast to human rights, which is based on membership of common humanity (Zembylas Michalino: 2012, p 558).

Banks 2011 asserts that becoming a legal citizen of a nation does not necessarily mean that an individual will attain structural inclusion into the mainstream society and its institutions or will be perceived as a citizen by most members of the mainstream group within the nation (Banks 2011,p.246). He says that a citizen’s racial, cultural, linguistic, and religious characteristics often significantly influence whether he/she is viewed as a citizen within her nation.

This is what I will examine and try to explore in my Eritrean young students in Norwegian schools. (Osler & Lybaek 2014: 547) says that multicultural education in Norway is equated with Norwegian language and culture learning by the new comers: but it does not take into account other barriers like discrimination, racism and xenophobia that new comers can face. The assumption is that once immigrants learned to speak the Norwegian language, everything will go smooth (Ibid).

Osler (2015:1) states that promoting nationalism that is based on national superiority undermines peace and security by causing threat to basic human rights of minorities and immigrants. She advises that we should have to reimagine the nation state as a cosmopolitan in accordance the internationally agreed principles of human rights which are cosmopolitan in nature. School citizenship stresses on national perspectives and loyalty to the nation states rather than to our common shared human values. Osler (2015:16), argues that the process of denationalization of the curriculum is central in realizing the all-inclusive vision of the state, where the minorities are properly recognized and able to participate fully in all societal life as equal citizens. Our identities are affected and shaped by our experiences and sense of belonging. Identity is the product of social and political construction and our identities are multiple and evolving (Osler & Starkey 2005:114).

People are stereotyped and stigmatized according to their identities. Blacks, Muslims, minorities and are discriminated and workplaces or other public places. Amy Guttmann (2003:1) says that 'group identity constrains rather than liberates individuals'. She explains that when individuals are identified as blacks or whites, male or female, catholic or Muslim etc., they are stereotyped by race, ethnicity and religion and they are denied certain individuality that they have as distinctive individual character and freedom to associate as they choose (ibid). Guttmann (2003:2) claims that when people are identified according to race, religion and ethnicity, they often develop hostility toward the other groups and sense of superiority over the other groups. To ensure the group superiority, they commit crimes like the Holocaust and the like. GUTTMANN asserts that nationalism is part of the identity politics and national states are no less than any other identity groups that need to be scrutinized and controlled in democratic societies (Guttmann 2003:4). Individuals have

multiple identities and identities are flexible as we have seen above. But people are identified against their will by others by certain ascribed identities like Negro, Jewish and Arab (Ibid: 11). Visible minorities are targets of hate speech, discrimination, and they are perceived as threat to national cohesion.

When people organize together around a certain social markers on the basis of their own mutual identifications of race, ethnicity, religion, culture and gender, they are called identity groups (Gutmann2003:11). According to Guttmann (2003:13), group identity provides mutual support, opportunity to develop their interests and better secure sense of social belong. Group identity propels women and disadvantaged minorities to fight against inherited negative stereotypes and develop better self- image of their group (ibid). Identity construction, whether gender identity, racial identity or religious identity, according to Bryan &Vavrus(2005:185), is a relational process in which individuals or groups define themselves in opposition to others. Even though all human being engage in this process of distinguishing oneself from others and maintain coherent sense of self, there are occasions where this process of exclusion and differentiation leads to dehumanization, objectification and de-legitimization of those who portrayed as different (ibid).

2.3Citizenship education

Schools in many countries do not affirm the cultural identity of students from diverse groups, but marginalize students from racial, ethnic, religious and linguistic minority groups (Banks1996:3).Minority language, culture, life style and faith is considered as inferior and not worth of recognition in many parts of the world (Kymlicka1995: 13).Banks (2009)states that during massive immigration to the USA in 1800-1900 migrants were taught shame and hope. Groups such as Jewish Americans, Polish Americans, Irish Americans, were taught to be ashamed of their language, culture, and family backgrounds (Bank, 2009, p101). However, they were given hope for structural inclusion into American society, if they became culturally assimilated (ibid). Western European states are also engaged in assimilationist ideology which expects the minorities who made up national states to forsake their original culture, language, lifestyle and identity to become good citizens. The aim of this idea is to maintain the majority culture, language and hegemony of dominant group(

Murphy2012: 56). Such assimilationist notion of citizenship is becoming ineffective due to deepening diversity throughout the world and the quest of marginalized groups for recognition of their rights increased (Bank: 2009,p107). Thus, citizenship education should be reformed so that it will provide students with civic equality, cultural recognition and validation as these conditions are vital for students to internalize human rights values, ideals and behaviors (ibid). Banks (2008) believe that citizenship education should help students to develop tolerance to other views, other cultures and have to challenge traditional views that are taken for granted. Students should learn human rights based on solidarity, compassion and shared values rather than narrow nationalistic one (Banks2008). Young people in school need to learn to challenge by questioning the arguments based on binary dichotomy like, we/they, allies/ enemy and good/evil (Zembylas2012, p560). Parekh puts it: "Citizens cannot be committed to their political community unless it is also committed to them, and they cannot belong to it unless it accepts them as belonging to it" (Parekh 2000, 342).

Educational systems generally have strong tendency toward legitimizing the existing social and political order (Banks et al.2005). Banks (1996:5) asserts that the knowledge that exists in society and taught in schools is not full and perfect as it may reflect particular values, ideologies, interests ,positionality, biases and perspectives. He says that students should learn to be critical thinkers as well as to understand that knowledge is not neutral but biased. Banks (1996:125) stresses on the idea that knowledge is a social construction and knowledge is not created in a vacuum. Thus, he argues that national citizenship education should be more inclusive and multidimensional that reflects diversity in society. Citizenship education is national in nature and promotes national identification of individuals with that single specific national state and develop sense of duty toward its members (Osler &Starkey2005:20). Citizenship education excludes to some groups of like, immigrants and refugees(ibid:2). Narrowly defined identities need to be critically considered in any citizenship education in democratic societies, argues Osler& Starkey(2005:84). According to the above argument, learning citizenship education must focus on promoting skills for living together in a diverse society that shares common values.

The task of education is to teach diversity of human race and raise the awareness of the similarities as well as interdependence of all humans (Michelinis: 2012,p560). Schools should help students to develop how national, regional and global identification are interrelated and evolving (Bank: 2009, p108). Each identity has to be respected, valued and recognized publicly. I think, there is a need for balancing between these different competing identities from our above discussions. Nation states that follow assimilationist policies and alienate or do not structurally include all cultural groups; run the risk of creating division and discrimination. Students must acquire the knowledge, skills and views that enable them to work, live and interact with diverse culture, religion and life style and national school system must reflect and give voice to all diverse ethnic, racial and religion of the students (Banks2011). Osler 2009 states that Issues of diversity, democracy, patriotism and citizenship are given a new emphasis in response to the threat of global terrorism and to a perceived need to integrate Muslim citizens (Osler 2009:95). According to (Kymlicka1995:189), shared identity derives from communality of history, language, religion and culture and these things are not shared by all citizens in our modern multicultural society. In citizenship education, students both need to learn to think critically and to distinguish fact from opinion and propaganda (Banks 1996:267). Banks (2008:299) states that some minority groups(blacks in USA) are denied structural inclusion and full participation into the main stream culture even when they acquire the language skills and adopted well the cultural norms of the dominant group due to their race.

2.4 Human rights education

Human rights education also requires that students examine perspectives other than their own: recognize that human rights problems occur not only in foreign lands but also within their own country and community (Shimon David: 1999, p 56). David believes that the role of education should be to help students to develop critical thinking of their tradition, culture, religion, political system and identity. If the goal of human rights education is to cultivate the idea that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights as stated in UDHR, thus rights of all human beings have to be protected and promoted, not only of

citizen argue he(David1999,p57). This takes us to the idea that every human being is entitled to human rights regardless of his nationality, cultural background, religion and ethnicity. I think, Citizenship education is introduced because there is diversity and conflicts of values in society. Students should be given opportunity to learn about different cultures, views, the ways of life and beliefs, so as to live effectively in a multicultural society. There is a need for multicultural literacy, human rights literacy beside traditional academic literacy (Banks et al.2005). I believe that it is important to examine, how schools are preparing students for global world life. I argue that we need to avoid focus on strengthening one culture, one religion, one view and better focus on our common human shared values as many scholars are argued for. Students have to acquire the skills and knowledge that are necessary to handle differences and respect each- others culture, history and religion.

Increasing diversity and increased recognition of it throughout the world requires to re-examination of the ends and means of traditional concepts of citizenship education (Banks, 2008). Osler (2008) states that, In response to real and perceived threats to social cohesion resulting from migration, changing demography and globalization, states introduced citizenship education in their school systems to enable students to peaceful co-existence(Osler 2008,p21). Migration on a global scale brings peoples with different world views, social practices, religious beliefs and races. This diversity creates intolerance, discrimination, populist parties as well as parallel societies, extremism and violent tensions between different groups (Starkey 2012, p23). Many schools across the world follow exclusive national identity by explicit curriculum, content of text books, symbols and daily practices, thus exclude and discriminate some members of society. The goal of education is according to (Osler & Starkey (2010:124), is to teach and to enable students to understand the barriers to citizenship like, discrimination, racism, intolerance and equip them with skills to challenge such barriers. Citizenship education needs to be conceptualized in the new reality of globalization and current developments.

Globalization according to (Philippe Legrain2002:4), is about how our lives are becoming increasingly intertwined with those of distant peoples' and places around the globe: economically, politically, culturally and technologically.

Philippe states that 'globalization is not a choice but it is a reality' (Philippe 2002:7). Globalization is compressing the world, and is bringing us closer together for better or for worse (Erikson, 2014).

Human rights education is a transformative education because it is based on critical approach to knowledge and authority (Osler & Starkey 2010:131). Human rights education is crucial for building democratic citizens who show respect and tolerance to differences of culture, political and religious practices. In the multicultural and globalized world of today students need to learn to develop critically thinking and independent thinking. Critical thinking according to Nussbaum (2006:387), means the capacity to examine and question ones culture, belief, political ideology, tradition and family values. This means according to her not to accept any belief or practice as authoritative only because it is handed down by our tradition or habit but challenge any idea and ask for reasons (Nussbaum 2006:391). Human rights education helps learners not to think themselves as homogeneous group of nation but state made up of different groups who all deserve equal respect and dignity. Young people can work, live and participate effectively in multicultural world, only if they learned to critically examine their own values and beliefs (Nussbaum 2006:389). Our democratic society needs citizens who can think logically and resolve difference peacefully by respecting different view. All these can be achieved by human rights education as it is based on cosmopolitan principles.

This is also Norwegian reality as elsewhere in the globe. Thus, the paper will examine how the Norwegian schools are dealing with their citizenship and human rights education? What is the teachers' perception about such issues and how they are passing on it to the youth, is focus of the paper. I will examine the theories and practices of citizenship and human rights education in Norwegian schools. I think that if human rights ideals to be internalized and become meaningful for children and youth, these ideals must address students' own experiences, hopes, dreams, open new opportunities and the schools must reflect their identities, and empower them all equally as citizens.

2.5 Cosmopolitanism

Since cosmopolitan citizenship is based on feelings of solidarity with human beings wherever they are situated and acceptance of diversity, it necessarily

challenges ethno-nationalist and other exclusive definitions of the nation:

'Education for cosmopolitan citizenship ... implies a broader understanding of national identity; it requires recognition that British identity, for example, may be experienced differently by different people' (Osler and Vincent 2002: 124).

Cosmopolitan citizenship does not deny the validity and importance of national perspectives, but it focuses more on our common humanity rather than on narrow cultural and geographic differences (Osler &Starky2005:21).

Cosmopolitanism requires us to live, work and to learn with strangers whom we have never met before. Human rights are set of principles designed for living together in multicultural modern society, and it is cosmopolitan in nature argues Osler & Starkey(2010). Cosmopolitan perspective entails looking beyond national borders and local cultural identities.

Cosmopolitan citizenship education helps people to develop perspectives that people can see themselves not only citizens of some local groups but also to see themselves as human beings linked to all other humans due to our shared common destiny(Naussbaum2006:389). Nussbaum (2006:390)argues that we need to think and transcend beyond narrow national attitudes, if we want to get a common solution to our common global problems, like environmental problems terrorism and eradication of poverty. To overcome fear and prejudice, students need to learn multicultural education and education that teaches our interdependent. It is education about culture, religion, history and laws of other groups. Cosmopolitans believe in human rights and human dignity of all human being as all human beings are equals. (Appiah2010:622) claim that cosmopolitans value the diversity of human culture, belief and lifestyles and do not force homogeneity. This means according to Appiah(2010), that cosmopolitans love their village, their community, their country and their world as well. Cosmopolitan citizens defend the rights of others to live in a democratic state with multiple identities and cultural practices according their free and autonomous choices (Appiah2010:627). Banks (2008: 301) argues for at students should be encouraged to develop a delicate balance of community cultural, national and global identification and allegiance. To be cosmopolitan citizen does not mean to forsake your national or community culture but it is only expanding your thoughtful and clarified identity (Banks2008:302). Banks adds to his idea by saying that one who does

not respect his own identity and culture, cannot respect values, culture and beliefs of that of others too(Banks2008:302).

2.6 Multicultural education

Multicultural citizenship education is essential for today's global world as national citizenship is ineffective because of deepening diversity and globalization (Kymlicka1995). As globalization and immigration are challenging traditional concept of citizenship, it is necessary that states to reimagine and rethink about their citizenship programs that fits with current realities. Multiculturalism demands that society should not be based on only one set of values, beliefs, and culture, but should accommodate and recognize that variety of values, traditions, and interests exist in every society (Modood,2007:175). According to (Erikson2014:156) Culture is 'synonymous with the way of life and world view the members of particular group or community have in common, which distinguishes them from other groups'. But, there are different ways of life and world views: the rich differs from the poor, women from men, the highly educated from the illiterate and the urban from the rural(Erikson,2014:156). Culture is something that is dynamic and it changes continuously because of internal and external factors.

Multicultural education according to Banks (1996:3) is the type of knowledge, skills and abilities that helps to identify the creator of the knowledge and their interests. This means to be able to examine the knowledge from different angles critically rather than accepting it at face value and to challenge institutionalized main stream knowledge which could be biased (ibid). Banks (2008: 298) says that citizens do not only need writing and reading literacy but also multicultural literacy. He states his argument by saying: "the world's greatest problems do not result from people being unable to read and write, but they result from people in the world- from different culture, races, religions and nations unable to get along and work together to solve the world's intractable problems such as global warming, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, poverty, racism, sexism and war"(Ibid;298). The goal of Multicultural education is to help students to develop faith in their ability to make changes in society and make it more democratic society (Banks1996:131). Multiculturalism according to (Modood2007:64) involves active support for cultural differences, or

recognition of existence of different cultures, languages and histories in our society. Multiculturalism involves tolerance to other cultures and remaking of the public sphere in order to fully include all marginalized identities. It recognizes and promotes understanding that there exists cultural, religious, and ethnic diversity in society. Multiculturalism is in short that 'new set of challenges are posed to society and new political agenda (policy) is necessary' ((Modood,2007:5). Multiculturalism is a liberal modern idea or political philosophy that is caused by globalization, liberalism and post-colonialism (ibid).

Multiculturalism according to Parekh (2000: 13) is mutual accommodation that needs sacrifices and adaptation on the part of minority and majority groups alike. Multiculturalism is a policy that seeks to accommodate the culturally different values, identities, beliefs and practices of both minorities and dominant cultural groups in the culturally diverse society. In other words, it is about treating individuals with equal respect, getting equal opportunity and consideration in multicultural society. Culture is defined by Parekh (2000:2) as " a body of beliefs and practices in terms of which a group of people understand themselves and the world and organize their individual and collective lives". Culture is not static, fixed and immutable, but culture is a dynamic and fluid that came into being for certain purposes by human beings and it changes continuously. Banks (1996:124), defines culture as all behavior learned by the individuals within their group. Culture provides the context which individual's exercise their freedom and opportunities and so the range of our choices are affected by our cultural upbringing (Gutmann2003.4).

Chapter three

3.0 Methodology

In this chapter, I will discuss in detail what research strategies, research methods and research methodology I followed. I will explain the appropriateness of my research methods and methodology that I selected to adopt for my research. Here, I will elaborate my research design, my research topic, sampling process, data collection and data analysis process as well as challenges and limitations of my research and ethical considerations that I considered relevant for my research. Thus, this chapter tries to give my readers a better understanding of my findings and conclusions. Methodology according to Silverman (2006), is a choice we make about the cases we study, methods of data collection, analyzing, planning and executing the research in general. On the other hand methods are specific research technics, like interviews or observations; we follow to do our research (Ibid).

My research question in this thesis is to explore the experiences, feelings and understandings of Eritrean immigrant students who are learning in Norway about their citizenship, identity and sense of belonging. I will also discuss issues of their integration into the greater society and their view and understanding about the Norwegian integration policies. My interview questions are prepared based on literatures about citizenship, human rights educations, integration and multicultural education. The topic is interesting and challenging as it involves a wide range of issues like citizenship, integration, human rights education and multicultural education. These are issues that are widely discussed in today's multicultural societies and many minorities face identity dilemmas. My study finding is based on a small sample of Eritrean migrant students who are attending Norwegian schools in central region of Norway, thus my study does not claim to represent experiences and perceptions of all Eritrean students in Norway. My study only gives insight to and addresses to

the individual perception, feeling, dreams attitude and narrative of my informants about their citizenship, identity, cosmopolitanism and democratic citizenship. There are both similarities and differences among my informants about their understanding about citizenship, human rights, identity and belonging. The study is based on semi structured interview that is done with eight young Eritrean students. In this chapter, I will discuss the research strategy that I followed and different research approaches I adopted for my thesis. I will explain the process of my fieldwork with all its challenges and limitation. Finally, I will discuss ethical considerations that I took into consideration while conducting my research.

3.1 Research design and methodology

In this chapter in order to illuminate my research questions, I will investigate both theoretical and empirical sides of the human rights and citizenship education in Norway. To get better insight of the questions, I have examined the Norwegian school curriculum, integration policy document, Norwegian white paper and I also observed school practice as well as I conducted semi structured interview with eight Eritrean students who are learning in Norwegian schools. I have examined if there is a gap between policy and actual practice. I also looked at previously done researches in the area that I am studying now. The research has adopted qualitative research method as it focuses on the meaning people gives to their experiences and to uncover deeply their personal understanding and experiences(Silverman 2006:29). For my empirical case, I have interviewed young Eritrean students who are going to Norwegian schools as I have mentioned it above. For effective management of time, I have time table which shows time allocation for each stage of my research plan, with consultation with my supervisor. To ensure access to the site of research and access to my respondents, I have started contacts with them as early as November 2015. I recruited eight Eritrean students in central part of Norway for my interview.

3.1.1 Research design

Here I will present my research design overview to my reader.

First of all I needed to have full and deep knowledge of the area I wish to study. Therefore, I read about concepts like: citizenship education, human rights education, multiculturalism, integration and cosmopolitanism in general and in Norwegian context particularly.

- . The schools are both in rural area in Oppland. I contacted personally my participants and I gave them copy of my consented form for signature and I fixed date with them. I went to two chosen schools to contact my potential respondents personally and arranged time with them on their convenience.
- Semi structured interview has been conducted with eight Eritrean immigrant students.
- Responses of my participants are recorded as they agreed to it.
- I will transcribe, analyze and finally, present my findings as conclusion.

3.2 using a Qualitative research method

The purpose of my research is to find out how Eritrean minority students in Norwegian schools feel about citizenship education and integration in Norwegian society. I want to investigate their perceptions, feelings, emotions and personal experiences and individual understanding and their own definition of terms like citizenship, diversity and human rights education in their schools. I adopted qualitative research approach as that method suits better in obtaining into peoples' world views, feeling, understanding and perceptions from the subjects' point of view (Silverman2010).. The use of Qualitative research strategy better suits in answering my research questions because according to Bryman (2004), "qualitative research emphasizes words rather than quantifications and views the way in which individuals interpret their social world"(p. 380). In qualitative research we deal with human feelings, personal experiences, opinions and individual understanding of social world which is impossible to get from reading books, articles or other documents

according to Bryman (2004). In order to understand better how the social world is functioning, you need to contact firsthand participants (Silverman2006).The above explanation is in line with my research question objectives, which are to explore my Eritrean student's views, feeling, perception, hopes and experiences about their citizenship education, human rights ideals and issues of identities. According to (Silverman, 2006;86), the strength of qualitative research is its ability to investigate closely what is happening in the world directly. In qualitative research, the researcher examines what people say and do actually in their daily life directly by observation and interview (Silverman2010). The above explanation is in agreement with my research plan, which is to investigate my Eritrean students' views, experiences and feelings about their citizenship. Through face to face interview, I want to find out what my informants' think meaningful and important to them from their own word rather than predetermined or fixed categories. Silverman (2006:56) argues that a qualitative research provides deeper and better understanding of social phenomenon than what would be obtained from purely quantitative figures. According to Bryman (2004) a qualitative research emphasizes words rather than quantifications and views the way in which individuals interpret their social world. It is a strategy that is well suited if the researcher's goal is to probe beneath the surface appearance.

I conducted semi structured interview for my primary data collection and for the purpose of getting an answer to my research questions. This method has helped me to obtain a depth understanding my informants' personal views, attitudes and perception about human rights, citizenship education and their identities understanding. Bryman (2004), argues that qualitative interviews helps to obtain complex and depth knowledge that we cannot get from other methods, like survey based approaches. Qualitative research suits better to obtain peoples' world views, narrative of informants about different issues and their individual understanding(Bryman2004: 401). If a researcher wants to understand how the social world is functioning, a researcher needs therefore to contact firsthand participations (Silverman2006). This means that the closeness to the people being investigated is considered as important in order to be able to see the world with their eyes. My goal is to understand my subjects' personal perceptions and experiences about citizenship, integration and human rights education in Norwegian schools and that plan can be better

achieved by contacting them personally. So I chose qualitative research method for answering my research question.

Bryman (2004) emphasizes that an epistemological position on qualitative research focuses on the understanding of social world through the interpretation of the world by its participants (p. 380). The data collection in my qualitative research has been done in a natural setting, in school building, coffee shops and student's living room according to informants' choice and preferences. In my qualitative research, my respondent had an opportunity to express their own position regarding integration and adopting Norwegian values as African immigrants who are in unprivileged position in society. Appropriateness of qualitative approach is its ability to gain access to data and gives voice to the voiceless (Silverman 2010). In my case, my respondents are Eritrean immigrants who are learning Norwegian language, culture and way of life. There is general criticism toward immigrants that claims that they are unwilling to integrate into society in Norway. In my research, I could see and understand my informants' interpretation and meaning they give to their world experiences directly from the semi-structured in depth face to face interviews that I conducted with them.

In qualitative research you do not know what you will find out until you conduct your correspondence with your respondents. I was not sure about the perceptions, feelings and views of each Eritrean student about citizenship education, diversity and human rights until I approached them. It is important to examine the world from the respondents' angle (Bryman2004). Thus, I listened to them and tried to understand and investigate how do they interpret and understand the issues of human rights education, citizenship, and integration. According to Bryman (2004), " in qualitative research, the perspectives of those being studied—what they see as important and significant—provides the point of orientation" (p.408). So, I listened carefully to the voices of my Eritrean students to know how they interpret citizenship education, issues of identity, and human rights. To get firsthand information and better understanding of the case I am investigating, I need to talk to concerned people and how they see the world from their angle. Written materials like books and articles do-not provide us with deeper feelings, perceptions and understandings of social world as first hand respondents can

do. Therefore, it was clear to me that I had to conduct field work to gain an insight to my interviewees' views and experiences.

My findings in the thesis are drawn from a semi structured, face to face interview with eight Eritrean students who are going to Norwegian schools. I conducting a semi structured interview with eight students (six males and two females) was done in their schools room, coffee shops and student living rooms between January 2016 and February 2016. The Interviews was conducted in a natural setting and it was in settings convenient and comfortable to respondents. The interview was conducted in Tigrigna language without any interpreter. The interviews lasted around half an-hour with each interviewee. The meeting places were arranged in agreement with each interviewee according interviewee's convenience and preference on individual basis. All my informants voluntarily signed the consent form that I prepared for signature for them after I gave them all necessary explanation about the confidentiality, research ethical questions involved like their privacy and the purpose of my research. As part of my observation, I went to their schools, to their sport activity halls and I observed them in their free time hours twice and I attended class-rooms once, so as to observe their relation with other students and see their participation, understanding and situation.

All my informants were tape recorded and I used pseudonyms so as not to reveal their identities. My informants are Eritrean students who are studying with ethnic Norwegians and came to Norway before 3-4 years ago for family reunion. I only used names they chose to be called for themselves during the interview. I have not mentioned their school, their address or commune they live in and family related information so that to protect their identity.

Conducting interview helped me to get depth understanding of my respondents' feelings, perceptions and their personal views on citizenship education, human rights issue they learn at school and how they think about it. Bryman (2004) explains that: ".....the qualitative researcher seeks close involvement with the people being investigated, so that he or she can genuinely understand the world through their eyes" (p. 408). From direct face to face contact with my interviewees, I was able to better see their understanding and I can ask them some follow up questions in case there arises a need for that. I asked for more elaboration in some answers if that was

needed and that is an advantage of it. Interviewing enabled me to observe the hidden and silenced expressions, emotions and actions of my respondents which is not possible to get by other methods. Qualitative interviewing as a method of data collection helps a researcher who wishes to investigate the views, experiences and voices which believed to be ignored, misrepresented or suppressed in the past (Silverman2006:114). Interview with my immigrant students helped me to know in depth their individual views and experiences about integration and citizenship issues. I chose interview as my primary data collection method because it enable researcher to understand the world from the subject's point of view. In addition to interviews, I also read many books, articles and legal papers which are related to my research questions. Such reading helped me to have broader and in depth knowledge of the topic that I am studying and able to link such theories to my empirical findings.

Qualitative research helps to understand and observe closely what people do, claim, feel, perceive and give meaning to the world around them individually, and that is why I chose qualitative method for my research. But, qualitative research has limitations and shortcomings too. Face to Face Interviews can be more reactive to personalities, moods, and interpersonal dynamics between the interviewer and the interviewee (Bryman2004). Additionally it is time consuming in interviewing, data analysis and data interpretation process. A research strategy is not a purely a neutral instrument that is independent of the researcher's epistemological background. It is closely related to how do the researcher thinks social reality should be studied. According to Bryman (2004), qualitative research focuses on how the people involved understand their experience, give meaning to their world and interpret their reality. In my case, I wanted to get depth understanding and to investigate how do my Eritrean youth perceive and understand citizenship education in Norway. From my interviews I could see that my informants were aware of the mainstream political debates about asylum seekers and negative stereotypes toward them.

Qualitative interviewing as a method of data collection is appropriate in investigating some voices that were ignored, misrepresented or suppressed in the past (Bryman2004, Silverman2006). My interview helped me to better understand their personal experiences and thoughts Vis a Vis the ongoing debates about integration problems of asylum seekers. Qualitative research

interview helps to uncover and explore the individual's self-definition, singularity and personal view points (Bryman2004) .My choice of personal, face to face interview enabled me to listen my respondents voices as well as to observe how they reply to my questions, follow their hidden feelings, their silences and their actions. In other words, I could see the hidden and silenced data that was impossible to come across by other means of data collection.

There is a potential for bias in qualitative researches both in interviewing and in data analysis process (Bryman2004).The respondents may falsify their claim either to please the interviewer or to project the version of the person they wish to be (Bryman2004). The researcher also could fall into the bias through the projecting of his personal views and thoughts to the interviewees. I was cautious of these shortcomings and I was careful not to ask leading questions and not to influence my respondent as much as I could.

3.3 Sampling of qualitative research

Based on my research questions, it is important get access to the right sites and the right respondents who are capable to answer my questions. Therefore, I used purposive sampling strategy and that is non probability form of sampling, as explained the concept by Bryman (2004, p. 418). According to Bryman (2004), in purposive sampling sites and participants are selected because of their relevance to the research questions that are being posed (p. 418).In purposive sampling selection of participants is done by predetermined criteria deliberately according their ability to answer research questions. In my case, to investigate similarities and differences among my interviewees about their perception of Norwegian citizenship and human rights education, I conducted my interview in two remote, rural and small commune school with eight Eritrean minority students who are learning in upper secondary high school. My sample size is eight respondents .The reason for that is to get close involvement with my participants. I know I cannot generalize based on the

information I get from these eight participants but it is adequate for my purpose of current research.

My research question is to investigate how minority students feel about their sense of belonging in Norwegian citizenship education and to know the role of the school in this identity building process. Therefore, by interviewing minority students, I am intending to get the information I wanted to find out. Bryman (2004) explains that: in purposive sampling the researcher samples with his/her research goals in mind (p. 419). The most important issue here is, to get the right people who can answer my research questions. I also used snow ball sample method for my research. I used Snow ball sampling as I already knew some students who go to the school I was conducting my research and I could get other respondents from my first informants' network(Brymann2004). By taking the sample from minority students who are learning to be citizens, I will get opportunity to understand the feeling, hopes and views of Eritrean students. I will also examine the right documents that help me to answer my research question. I will look at school curriculum, integration policy documents and other laws on citizenship.

The following reasons have been taken into account in choosing my informants. I wanted to have participants from both genders (boys and girls) equally, but as I could not get many girls who can participate in the research, I chose six boys and two girls in my research sample. Secondly I focused in their religious affiliations. Eritreans are 50% Muslims and 50% Christians, but there are few Muslims in Norway. So I could not get equal number of both religions and many girls. Two of my respondents are Muslims and the rest six are Christians. Though Eritrea is country of nine different groups, all my respondents are from one ethnic group which is Tigriana ethnic group. That is the majority of immigrants from Eritrea in Norway are from one ethnic group. I could not get from minority groups of Eritrea in my sample. I would like to have participants from all ethnic, religion and regions of Eritrea, but that could not be realized. Maybe that could have made a difference in my research. My third choosing factor was, how long did they live in Norway. My interviewees have lived in Norway from 3-5 years. After I contacted them and I explained the goal of my research to them, all my respondents were positive and willing to participate. Thus, I had no problem in recruiting.

Table1: table of participants.

NO.	NAME	SEX	AGE	NO. OF YEARS IN NORWAY	Religious affiliation
1.	Hadish	M	19 Years	3	Christian
2.	Halima	F	18	4	Muslim
3.	Iyassu	M	22	3	Christian
4.	Futsum	M	18	4	Christian
5.	Mussie	M	21	4	Christian
6.	Fiori	F	21	5	Christian
7.	Omer	M	20	3	Muslim
8.	Gideon	M	21	4	Christian

3.4 Fieldwork and its challenges

Fieldwork process generally involves many unexpected occurrences and challenges that cause the researcher to redraw his schedule. That is my experience and I will discuss it later. First of all, Fieldwork is coming into contact personally with informants and attempting to understand their views, their experiences and trying to understand the world from the subjects' point of view (Bryman2004). In October 2015, I went back to my family in in central region of Norway and I started my contacts immediately with my respondent. I had contacts with some of my informants before and that helped me to have contact with the rest too. My continuous contact with my respondents helped me to build confidence with them. Such confidence and trust that I created with the informants have helped them to share their experiences and feelings with me without inhibition and to express themselves freely. My participants were willing to participate and they were enthusiastic about my project after I explained them the purpose of my research. As we developed good contacts, they were more open and not restricted to share their feeling with me. I scheduled interview date and place according to their convenience. It took me about one week to guarantee the consent of all participants. In January2016, I

conducted five interviews. But three of my respondents were busy with other personal plans. So they told me that it was not convenient for them the interview in as I wanted. So I redrew my schedule with them for February 2016 and I conducted my interview with three of them in February 2016.

There are a number of challenges that any researcher is likely to face in conducting any research. The problems could be concerning validity and trustworthiness of the findings of the research, financial problems, gaining access to the site and respondents, ethical dilemmas, language barriers and other practical challenges. In my research, I also expected a number of challenges and I addressed some.

How respondents behave and answer research questions could be influenced by presence of interviewer(s) (Bryman 2004). Interviewees can give an answer they believe that the researcher wants to hear rather than what they really think. The presence of the researcher may affect how the informants behave and respond. This means that participants may give an answer that they believe that the researcher wants to hear in order to be perceived in a good light (Bryman 2004). Here could some opinions can be over communicated while the other remain under communicated. Some of my informants were emphasizing on our African social life and values over the Norwegian culture of individualism. As I am an Eritrean immigrant like them and have similar experiences and situation, they were expecting that I know what they mean and they were assuming that I agree with their explanation. To minimize this problem, I took much care not to influence responses of my respondents and I was trying to be neutral as researcher. According Bryman (2004), researcher should avoid indicating agreement or disagreement with interviewee answers as well as not to ask leading questions (p.473). I tried to avoid influencing the answers of participants and I minimized my personal biases and expectations. I was trying to be humble with my informants and tried to show them that I was genuinely interested in each of their unique individual experience and history. It is not only personal bias but also the age, gender, race, cultural background of the researcher and personal interests of the researcher has an impact on research (Bryman, 2004: p.474). I am myself are from Eritrea and I live in Norway and I have children who are going to Norwegian schools. I am interested in their future in Norway and their identity building education in

schools. My research could be affected by my personal interests in the area that I am studying. My personal interest in the case I am investigating has influence on how I frame my research question and my theoretical preconception. Bryman (2004) stresses that research should be free from researcher's personal opinions, feeling and personality if it is to be trustworthy and objective (p. 393). I have do all my best to keep critical distance from my personal bias and minimize it, though it is impossible to be 100%bias free in qualitative research, or indeed in any research. Anyway, I tried to avoid expressing my empathy toward my minority participants. As a researcher, I did not allow overtly my personal values; inclinations and biases dominate my research findings. The question of generalization is also another problem that I will take into consideration. I admit that my finding from small group of semi structured interview could not be valid for all school in Norway. The personal feeling and experience of my respondents may or may not be repeated in future.

3.5 positionality

Positionality refers to the researcher's position or place in relation toward his cases he is conducting a research on. It affects how a researcher frames the questions, how he collects the data, how he analyses the data and how he writes his conclusions (Bryman2004, Silverman2006). As I have mentioned above, I am an Eritrean who is living in Norway with his family and studying Eritrean students' experiences, feeling and identity questions in Norwegian schools. That means that I am an insider researcher who shares with my respondents the status of minority belonging as we are all immigrants who share the same social status in Norwegian society. Many of my informants know me well and we share the same experience, culture, language and socio-political standing as Eritrean immigrants in Norway. Therefore, I admit that my interests in this research are not only academic but also emotional one. Such attachment has influence on my choice of the topic, literature review, framing of my questions and overall processes of the research. But I was always been cautious to keep down my personal views, ideals and beliefs in all stages of the research. (Silvermann2000:201) stresses that knowledge is not neutral and

objective but knowledge reflects the values, interests and experiences of its creators or producers. I am well aware of Silverman's description of knowledge construction, and I was cautious of my personal biases in my research.

As an insider researcher, I had got a better position of confidence building with my informants who share the same language, culture and social status as me. So, it was easy for them to take me as one of them who shares the same experience like them in Norway. That helped me to get their trust and they could share their feelings, experiences and attitudes openly without any reservations. Some of my informants expressed their frustrations and uncertainty about their futurity in Norway openly and without any reservations due to the trust they put on me and because they accepted me as one of them who shares similar fate and experience. That was the positive side of my research as it enriched my data because my informants were expressing themselves openly. My positionality as an insider researcher helped me to understand their body language, communication codes and to realize the underlying meaning of many communications of my respondents.

On the other hand, being an insider researcher has its limitations and weaknesses. One of the shortcomings of insider researcher is that the researcher remains suspended or with incomplete information in many occasions (Bryman2004). For example, many of my respondents were saying "as know", "as you heard" or "as you see" several times, when they were answering my questions because they took me as one of them. They assumed that I knew and shared their experience and feeling as Eritrean immigrant who is living like them in Norway. This assumption leaves many important data hanging or incomplete. Had I not been considered as insider, this assumption could not have arisen. To minimize such problem, I was insisting my informants to give me further explanation in detail about what they say, feel and think. I was insisting them to explain me by their own words, and pushing them for details, whenever they left me in suspense in any incomplete statements. Being part of the group (insider researcher), creates problem of being biased and show sympathy toward one's group. To avoid my personal bias, I was trying to be objective in all my questions to my interviewees and I was trying to avoid asking any leading questions.

3.6 Research Dairy

I kept records of my daily research process as I wanted to have a better evaluation and review of my daily research processes. Keeping the dairy helped me to make timely assessments of my interviews with my informants and what improvements to do for the next interview. I was learning continuously from my previous challenges I came across. I was jotting down all my experiences, feeling, thoughts and challenges as the research process continues. Keeping the dairy supported me to reconcile my own opinions that I have from my theoretical ideals which the research is based on with the findings I get on the ground. Making the dairy helped me to improve and learn from each interview I made.

3.7 Transcribing and coding

After I have finished my field work, I started to transcribe the interviewees I collected into written text by translating the interview from Tigrigna into English. That was time consuming but it was helpful in obtaining better insight into the data and it helped me to be more familiar with the data I gathered. I listened into my recorded data over and over several times. This is the process whereby the researcher immerses oneself in the data.

After I transcribed the interviews, I printed them out and coded them manually so as to get potential themes. I used different colored pens to highlight the quotations from my respondents. I did that in order not to lose sense of my data and to be able easily locate it again.

3.8 Reliability and validity of the research finding

One of the criticisms that qualitative research faces is the subjective nature of the data gathered in that study, which can be a challenge to its reliability and validity. Reliability is concerned about the question of whether the results of the research can be reproduced if the research conducted at another time by

other researchers (Bryman2004). Reliability is about repeatability or question of generalization beyond that specific context of the research according to Bryman (2004: 46). In other words reliability is concerned with the question of measure in qualitative research as stable and constant or something that fluctuates over time. Reliability is closely linked to issue of replicability according to Bryman (2004:47). This means that the research findings should not be biased and influenced by personal opinions, feelings and beliefs of the researcher. In my case, the goal of my research was not to replicate and I do not claim my findings from small sample of Eritrean students represent whole population of Eritreans in Norway. My research goal was to investigate my informants' experiences, feeling, attitude and understanding about their learning of citizenship education in Norwegian schools. Thus my research may not be generalizes beyond this specific context. Being aware of my personal biases, I was keeping critical distance from my interviewees' and I made great efforts to be neutral as much as I could. Validity is accessed by different means and related to reliability. Reliability hinges on whether an informed person (for example, some- one from the same background or some-one who has conducted similar research in a parallel context) is able to find research results convincing.

A researcher has to be transparent, consistent and open-minded both in data collection and data analysis. I was trying to keep distance from my own personal biases throughout the whole research process, though it is impossible for a researcher to be totally neutral in any research. As an immigrant I share some of the integration experiences with my respondents. In my analysis, I used my respondents own words so as to limit my biases. My findings are based on the integration of the Eritrean students and their perception about citizenship as likely future citizens of Norway. But at finally, this is my thesis, so I need to take responsibility for the final product. It is my interpretation of the meanings which respondents give to their feelings and experiences.

In a research, the data must be properly collected and analyzed so as to reflect the real world that was studied. To ensure the reliability and validity of my finding, I collected my data both from primary sources namely, in-depth face to face interviews with Eritrean students and secondary data. By conducting the interviews, I tried to get an answer to my research questions by relating the

responses of my informants with my theoretical frameworks. I read different policy documents like Norwegian education curriculum, Norwegian integration law and I also read a lot of literatures related to my study. I did that to ensure reliability and validity of my research and to generate a holistic knowledge. I did my best to be consistent, transparent and objective through-out my research process.

The interviews were conducted in Tigrigna language, which is one of Eritrea's official languages and the language that my informants felt at ease to express themselves with. The translation of the interviews has been done later by me. It was an advantage that my informants used the language they are most fluent in, (their mother tongue) as that facilitated to express themselves openly and comfortably without language barriers. That made my research more reliable and richer in meaning as they were sharing their individual experiences in their language without interpreter. My respondents expressed their unique and individual feeling, experience and perception that are diverse attitude about citizenship and integration issues in Norwegian society. These diverse and different opinions of my informants made my research to be valid. I was conscious about the issue of reliability in my research and to ensure validity of my research, I explained the purpose of my research to my informants clearly and they consented to share their experiences, perceptions and feelings freely. That was important to ensure validity of my research.

3.9 Generalization

According to Bryman (2004), a research is considered to have high degree of generalization if the findings of the research can be transferred to other external contexts or can be repeated by other researcher in the future time. I do not claim that my research can be transferred to wider population of Eritrean youth who are studying all Norwegian schools, but rather I tried to get a depth understanding, views and feelings of limited number of informants. Thus, the views, experience and perceptions I got from my respondents reflects their unique and personal understanding. It may or may not be repeated in

later researches. As Bryman (2004) explains, it is impossible to 'freeze' social setting and circumstances of initial research so as to replicate it in later one. What my subjects feel, perceive and experience about Norwegian citizenship now could be different if the situation changed tomorrow.

3.10 Ethical considerations

It is very important to be aware of the ethical principles that are involved between researchers and participants in all stages of the research process. A researcher should balance between the pursuit of truth and his participant's rights and interests (Bryman2004). My research is based on the experience and views of my participants about their integration and citizenship. As I am an Eritrean immigrant like them and know many of them personally, I had to be neutral on issues that I discuss with them and I remained as neutral as possible. This was important ethical issue for me. Bryman (2004) stresses on four key ethical issues that a researcher must keep in mind when conducting research -- and they are : 1)not to harm your participants 2)lack of informed consent 3)invasion of privacy and 4)deception (Bryman2004:151). Silverman (2006:316) stresses for the need to respect informants and to be cautious about things that may cause all forms of harm to them. In case of harm to respondents, I was so cautious from all activities that may cause what so ever harm to my participants. Bryman (2004) defines harm to participants " harm could be physical, psychological, loss of self- esteem, stress, or inducing subjects to perform reprehensible acts" (p. 135). I did all my best from not harming or avoid harm to my participants and I prioritized the interests of my participants foremost. I upheld the confidentiality of my participants' information. To ensure confidentiality and privacy of my informants, I used pseudonyms and everything was anonymous, including their names. Complete anonymity is difficulty as most Eritreans who live in the small communities and schools know each other as they are few in number. I did not mention the names of my participants and not revealed their addresses and their institution. This is to maintain their interests and not harm them in anyway and I have done everything in my power to protect confidentiality and privacy of my informants. I assured my informants that the information that they give me

will not affect them or their family in any negative way. I explained to them that their answers and views about integration and identity will not pose them a threat but could help them to raise their voices publicly on issues that affect their life. Thus, to ensure protection of their privacy, their identities will not be made public. I have also informed them clearly that they have not to answer all my research questions if they do not want. They had an opportunity to ask me any question about the research.

To ensure the freedom of voluntary participation and rights of withdrawal of my informants from participating at any stage of the research for whatever reason, my respondents signed the consent form willingly. Before signing the consent form, I gave them full and detailed information about the goal of my research and content of the interview and I explained to them in details for what purpose the information they gave me to be used. Respondent were given a chance to ask questions about the goal of the research and effects of it to them, both positive and negative influence. I gave them all necessary information about the purpose of my research and I explained to them, how and for what purpose the information they gave me will be used.

Bryman (2004) stresses that participants need to have full information about the research and need voluntary consent to participate in it (p. 138). I was honest with my participants about my research goal and I explained to them explicitly and clearly. I did my utmost to protect privacy and confidentiality of my participants. If respondents do not wish to answer some of my questions due to their personal reason, they were free to do so. Bryman (2004) explains deception to participants as: "deception occurs when researchers represent their work something other than what it is"(p. 147). This is not to tell the participants the truth about your goals, and tell those who funded your research and what are you going to use the research for. I was honest to my participants and I did not try to deceive them. I took all necessary and sufficient measures not to harm or damage in anyway my respondents and I worked hard to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of my informants in all levels of the research. The participants' strong interest in the subject (mentioned above) is an indicator of their voluntary participation.

Generally, my ethics consideration can be summed up as: 1) I will take care not to harm my participants ,2) I will get voluntary and informed consent from my

participants 3) protect their privacy 4)and I will be honest with them about my research purposes by giving them full and sincere clarification. That means not to deceive them in any way. I understand my responsibility to protect interests and rights of participants in conducting my research. I will be grateful for and show respect for my respondents' for their precious time I take up. I will thank them for their invaluable information and contribution by giving them all gift card.

3.11 chapter summary

In this chapter, i have discussed the research methods I followed, ethical questions I faced, and research process I used in conducting my empirical data collection. The next chapter, I will link my finding with my theoretical framework, and I will try to answer my research questions by analyzing the findings.

Chapter- 4

4.0 Findings and discussion

This chapter discusses the integration experiences and citizenship education in Norwegian schools, and I explore and investigate the Eritrean immigrant students' integration experiences, feelings and perceptions about integration and citizenship education in Norway. The students are learning in Norwegian upper high schools in Oppland Norway after they came to Norway either as asylum seekers or for family re-unification program.

4.1 Integration:

Integration is generally understood as a process of migrants' adaptation to their host society's way of life, culture, and values. That means that the new comers have to undergo some changes in their customs, traditions and attitudes so as to adjust to their new society's way of life. Many scholars also conceptualize integration as the process of both immigrants' and host societies' negotiation and re-adjustment of their way of life, customs and laws for mutual accommodation of both minority and majority (Modood,2007 and Erikson2014). Integration as the process of migrant adaptation to their country of settlement is perceived and implemented differently in different countries, and its success too depends on how integration policy is formulated and implemented in each country. Banks (1996:76) asserts that many from the main stream think that immigrants have entered into our country, therefore, they have to adopt our way of life, culture and they have to speak our language. According to (Osler &Starkey2010), the shift from mono-cultural to multicultural nation state needs to be accompanied by institutional and policy reforms that recognizes and accommodates minorities as well as sees diversity as strength rather than as source of conflict and division. (Modood2009:147) asserts that many democratic countries have no official multicultural policies, as a result, there are many immigrant who are caught between their old cultures they have left behind and their new western societies, which are unable or unwilling to integrate them as full and equal citizens. The purpose of

my thesis is to investigate the experiences of Eritrean immigrant students' in Norway and the impact of integration process which prepares them for Norwegian citizenship.

Integration involves negotiation and debate between majorities and minorities about the terms and conditions of integration: thus, it is two way process (Modood,2007:48). (Modood2007: 47) asserts that the new and old citizens should negotiate about all as equal and dignified citizens and there is no absolute, fixed and non-negotiable national values . (Parekh2000) claims that it is the white majority who decides which policy to follow toward the minority groups' integration, and majority blames only the minority for the failure of integration. Modood2009 asserts that liberalism is not a package to be accepted or rejected, but it is subject to different interpretations and negotiations. He argues that there is nothing absolute and non-negotiable value, and minorities' views, attitudes, and perspectives have to be included to influence the discourses. Principles of living together in liberal democratic societies require agreement on norms of co-existence by all groups. This is basic point several of my informants emphasized on. One of my respondents, Hadish, speaks of his integration experience as follows:

“They want us to be like them in everything, if we want to be successful. They do not recognize that we have our own good culture of helping our family, respect for the elderly and the sick as well as we observe our religion strictly. Norway was like us not long ago, but, now they have become non- religious. Norwegians also have many good cultures which I personally appreciate: like democracy and freedom of speech, but I do not agree fully with their attitudes toward religion----but it's them who have power to decide because it is their country. They also think that we know nothing and they think that we always need their guidance. It is true that I speak poor Norwegian language: but I have problems in Norwegian language does not mean that I am poor in all subjects and other things as they assume--- and they are surprised when we show them what we can and know” (Hadish, 10.01.2016).

My respondent, Hadish, perceives his Norwegian integration as changing one's culture, custom and lifestyle completely to look like the Norwegians by leaving his cultural heritage. Statistics from Norway indicate that half of the population agree that immigrants should “strive to become like Norwegians as much as possible”(St. Meld.nr.49, 2003-2004 cited by Stokke2012:33). Norwegian integration policy has been criticized for falling short of genuine multicultural dialogue and minorities are invited for dialogue so long as their presence

legitimizes government policy that is predefined notion of integration (Gessgård2010). Immigrants are seen as threat to national identity, national values and there is strong opposition to diversity (Ibid; 1). As Hadish does not speak fluent Norwegian, he feels that Norwegians think that he lacks knowledge in many other things too. Many of my participants claimed that because they lack Norwegian language skills, people think that they also lack other skills too. (Osler & Lybaek2014: 548), asserts that the new comers in Norway are considered as if they lack knowledge about core principles of human rights, democracy, gender equality and they are in need of learning these universal values from Norwegians who are presumed to be carriers of these universal human rights norms. They also note research that suggests that teachers also have low expectations of minority students. The disapproval, rejection, hostilities, stereotypes, low expectation and indifference minorities sense from the mainstream as identified by Hadish above, leads them to isolation and low self-esteem (Banks et al, 1995:316). Minorities participate in integration policy debates on predetermined notion of integration that assumes majority values, practices and interpretations as universal (Stokke2012;253).

Stokke (2012) defines this kind of integration as Norwegian monologue, where goals are defined in advance by the majority: thus, integration can be seen as ‘a form of assimilation’ (Stokke2012: 250) My interviewee, Hadish, claims that Norwegians think that he lacks competence in many things too because he does not speak fluent Norwegian and they judge him only by his language skills. Minorities do not reject liberal values like democracy, human rights and individual freedoms, but they demand negotiation in interpretation of these principles (Parekh2000). Hadish and all my participants assert that they appreciate values like democracy and individual liberties that they enjoy in Norway but they are dissatisfied with Norwegian interpretations of religious freedom. (Erikson2010:173) states that it is the majority who have the power to decide when should the minorities be like the majority, and when should the minorities be excluded or defined as different. Erikson 2010 illustrates how the minority identities are activated from the outside through the acts of exclusion, stereotype and categorization. Many people think and worry that, if immigrants are allowed to retain their identities, culture and tradition, they will not acquire strong attachments to their country of residence and that are

wrong (Banks2008). In reality, diversity of culture, religion, race, and language is natural human phenomenon, and it should be accepted as such as democracy itself means diversity. Norwegian identity is based upon myth of ancient ancestry, national culture, Norwegian shared national values, and the country is assumed as homogeneous society with high degree of equality and many Norwegians perceive diversity as something new(Biseth2012: 41). On the other hand, immigrants are blamed for poor integration, defined as abusers of the welfare system, linked with crimes and claimed that they cannot adhere to Norwegian democratic values of gender equality(Ibid;57).

The Norwegian integration policy document,(St. Meld. nr.49:2003-2004) emphasizes loyalty to fundamental Norwegian social values like democracy, human rights and gender equality, but it recognizes that these values are not static and fixed but subject to interpretations and emphasizes on dialogue with interpretations of the shared political values through political and civil process. The document also recognizes that complex identities and there are different ways of being Norwegian (Ibid.33).(Stokke2012:50) claims that the Norwegian approach can be characterized as ‘pseudo- open’ monologue, which continues to dominate the ‘other’ through assimilation acculturation rather than genuine and open dialogue which allows dominant norms and interpretations as only one among different understanding of the shared values interpretation. Norway’s relative homogeneity has prevented the development of an explicit multicultural policy and despite a shift toward understanding integration as a mutual process of accommodation, the idea that ‘Norwegian’s is superior to other ways of life, values and practice is still there(Engebrigtsen2010:71, cited by Stokke2012:51). My respondent is dissatisfied with Norwegian way of religious rights interpretation and he feels powerless to change Norwegian attitude. My respondent says that it is the Norwegians who have power to decide as it is their country. This indicates his feeling of powerlessness which is reflected in other respondents too.

There is increased hostility toward immigrants which is reflected in strict immigrations laws and stronger will to control and regulate their conduct (Gressgård2010: 36). Genuine dialogue is difficult and it’s only means to an end in the planned pluralism in Norway (Gressgård2010; 1). According to Gressgård2010, western conventional norms are universalized and linked with

equality, freedom, and human progress, while the minorities are depicted as uncivilized, traditional and collectives (Gressgård2010:36). These are examples of hierarchical opposites, such as pure-impure, individual- group, and normal-deviant tendencies that insinuate that immigrants need liberation from traditional practices and cultural boundaries (Ibid;34). (Gressgård2010:39) asserts that the extent that immigrants fail to perform equally well with majority is seen as the result of their inferiority and their cultural backwardness. Here is the tendency to take the majority as aggregate of autonomous free and equal individuals while the minority are collective group who lacks personal autonomy (Habermas1996; 512).

Minorities are often tolerated rather than accepted and seen as equal citizens in a genuine dialogue which is mutual learning, and Modern liberal values, such as, democracy, human rights, gender equality which are neither exclusively western nor eastern, but ,these values are claimed as part of national culture in some European countries(Modood2007). (Modood2007:65) describes integration as a mutual learning process and dialogue, but not uncritical acceptance of any value or practice, as values are not static, but constantly reinterpreted and reformed, so, there comes the need for mutual evaluation- the national values need to be discussed, negotiated, and re-imagined so as to reflect the nation's contemporary diverse reality .(Modood2007) stresses on that the mark of a democratic society is, equal opportunity, equal treatment and whether everyone is included or not. He advises that minorities should enjoy equal participation right in defining, interpretation and negotiating the common shared national value of their society. Another respondent, Halima, explains her integration in Norway;

“I tried to learn Norwegian language very quickly as I could and I made a good progress. At the beginning, we were told and I believed it too that the knowledge of Norwegian language, culture and history of Norway as a key for getting the job and integration in Norway. As new comers we do not know the laws and the system, so, we only had to follow what we were told and thanked them for the opportunities we got. But, as I see it now, I have many problems to go through in getting the job and be accepted as Norwegian: the problems that I personally face are, my skin color, my name as well as my cultural background, as I am an African Muslim girl with Hijab. I think it is unfair that they blame us for not wishing to work and fail to be integrated. They think that we came to live on the social security, while they do not want to hire people like me and my elder sister. I am not sure of my job opportunities

even after I have finished my school, but, I have no choice except working hard with my studies and try to exceed them and do the jobs they left ". (Halima,07.01.2016).

My respondent, Halima, worries about her future job opportunities not because she does not want to work, and be part of the society, but due to existing problems of her background. According to Osler & Lybakaek (2014;547), the Norwegian authorities assume that once immigrants mastered to speak the Norwegian language, everything will be smooth for them, but other barriers like racism, discrimination and structural exclusions are not dealt well in Norway. These challenges of integration are not anticipated or stressed as it should be, and minorities are blamed for problems of integration rather than the main stream (Ibid). There are discriminations, stereotypes, prejudices and hateful speech against those people who perceived to be culturally, religiously and racially different, and they are being judged by an essentialized image of the group (Sen, 2006:33). (Osler 2015), states that there is an absolute avoidance of race and racism discussion in Norwegian school system. She claims that the problem is magnified when race is silenced in all social studies in Norway, and the teachers lack the pedagogical tools to deal with cultural racism. (Stokke 2012:27), illustrates that Muslims are expected to be assimilated into the main culture, but at the same time Muslims are considered as 'unassimilable' because their religion supposedly hinders them from integrating : thus, whatever a Muslim does for successful integration, he will always be suspected of not being integrated 'enough'. Certain kind of people are always stereotyped, stigmatized, excluded and unfit to become citizens even though they embrace the constitution, and lifestyle of the mainstream: you have to go back where you belong as you cannot be good and honest citizen (Banks et al--1995:299). My respondent, Halima and other respondents too have expressed fear and anxiety of not getting the job they applied for due to their background. Halima's fear of not getting the job and social acceptance even after she finished her school illustrates that, it is not her failure to integrate, but society's failure to uphold its own ideals of equal opportunity to participate, non-discrimination and justice as the integration policy document declares (see St.Meld.nr.49; 2003-2004).(Stokke 2012: 43) states that the visible markers of foreign ancestry, such as non- Norwegian appearance and foreign sounding names are taken as indication that a person does not share basic Norwegian values.

When young people who lost much of their culture, language, and custom are not accepted in the society as equals and face discrimination because of their background, it breeds sense of alienation, resentment and resistance (Modood 2009:140). Halima's statement clearly shows that she has to work hard to exceed her classmates so as to get acceptance now and for the future job market. Immigrants are portrayed as abusers of Norwegian welfare system, breaches of law and Norwegian values. Banks A. (1995:37) states that integration program focuses generally on teaching to students who are different from the main stream the cognitive skills like: language skills and national values that are required to function in the existing system, but it fails to teach about racism, stereotype reduction, cultural awareness, tolerance, acceptance and appreciation among diverse groups who live together. Another respondent, Iyasu illustrates his integration experience in similar way:

"The first time I came to Norway, I was so happy and ambitious about everything, but as time went, I began to see and feel things that I did not expect and thought about before my close contacts with the Norwegian society. Now, I have so few real friends, and I have so few things to talk about and share with my class and outside of it, so I feel lonely and isolated. I am also worried about the negative attitudes that I hear and see on TV and newspapers about immigrants. People think that we are all the same; and they judge us from something wrong done by few individuals. I am not so hopeful of my future opportunities; but, it is too early to say much" (Iyasu, 09.01.2016).

Norwegians of African descent often face institutional and everyday life racism, anxiety of belonging and illusion of the notion multiculturalism (Melntosh 2015:310). Non-western Immigrants are portrayed by national media and political discourses as anonymous members of their cultural group, whereas western immigrants, alongside the majority population are treated as individuals (Gressgård 2010:10). My respondent, Iyasu, feels that there is generalization, and stereotype toward immigrants by the mainstream society. He is wishing to be seen individually for his achievements and his weakness personally without being judged by the mainstream by his immigrant group identity. Like all other groups, minorities are not homogeneous, but they have different views, priorities, and values. Each individual is different and unique. The stereotypical negative portrayal of immigrants by media plays major role in contribution to majority prejudice, and that depicts them as the 'others' (Gressgård 2010:47). Banks (2008) explains that all immigrants whose identities

perceived to be threat to the mainstream values and unity have faced hostile and negative stereotypes like discrimination and stigmatization through-out history : the Jewish, Catholics, African Americans and Chinese immigrants all were perceived as a threat in the USA before and the same is happening to Muslims, blacks, and asylum seekers now.

Iyasu says that he feels isolation and he has few things to share with his classmates and outside society. That is shared by other respondents too. That may lead to self- rejection and feeling of alienation. (Banks2008:302) affirms that self-acceptance is a prerequisite for the acceptance and valuing values of others. Students from cultural, racial, and religious minorities who experience discrimination, social rejection, and other forms of marginalization often have difficulty to accept and valuing one's own identity. The one who does not have a clarified, reflective and positive personal, cultural and national identities, cannot have positive opinion of other culture, race, and ethnic groups (Ibid:303). Some websites in Norway use hateful speeches against immigrants and portray them as danger to national culture, values, laws, and threat to national identity (Erikson2011). People who feel threatened by existence of the 'others' turn to intolerance, prejudice and negative stereotyping against those who perceived the 'others' (Gressgård2010:113). Generally, integration is presented on the assumption that minorities need to learn how 'we' do things and they have to understand "our" way of life. Osler2011 illustrates that the immigrants are linked with social instability and other negative portrayals like extremism both by the media and the government, but the governments fail to address concrete measures against racial injustice, and social inequalities. (Sen2006:160) opposes the idea of defining a person's identity by his community and religion by overlooking all other affiliations a person has, such as his class, profession and political ideology. That's what my respondent is opposing and rejecting to be defined collectively as member of particular group (asylum seeker), but not be seen as individual person with his priorities. The assumption that all members of the group shares common identity (they are homogeneous) is misleading and individuals can choose whether or not to identify from vast array of identities that are available.

Cultures are internally diverse and targeting anyone by his background is injustice. From the above discussion, we have seen that claims of western

nations that they have national “core values” that is exclusively belongs to their culture and minority groups need to learn these universal principles of democracy, equality, justice and human rights complicates the integration. Minorities are not rejecting liberal values, but they are demanding negotiations in the interpretations of these values. Feelings of fear and rejection of those who are different culture, religion, and race is hindrance to feeling of belongingness and integration as we have followed above. As (Gressgård2010:137) states, dominant cultures should recognize that their interpretations, values and perceptions are not the only and universal one, but one among different interpretations. Erikson2010 argues that the main stream culture views diversity as deviance and difference as deficit. But, what we need in our Multicultural Norway is equal opportunity, secure and respectable place for all, as diversity is vital element of democracy. (Habermas1996: 500) states that multicultural societies are ruled mainly by constitutions that can bind them together, not by national culture, language, religion or ethnic background. The shared public institutions, national values, norms and laws need to be revised and more inclusive, so as to fit the current realities of our global world (Habermas1996:305). Our perception of the nation needs to be changed due to increasing diversity, and state should be responsive to the needs of all groups. My respondents support that promotion and celebration of cultural diversity as a value itself so long the identities are freely chosen, but it would be dangerous to categorize people by their identities, like inherited religion and country of birth. As (Sen2006: 171) illustrates, to see a person exclusively of only one of his many identities and priorities by downplaying all other affiliations is misleading.

4.2 Identity & Cosmopolitanism

Identities are voluntary and personal matter, and we do not have only one single, fixed, choice less primary identity in exclusion to all other identities, but we have multiple, and changing identities (Sen2006:45). (Sen2006:36) stresses that our identities need not only obtained through where we find ourselves (ascribed identity), but they can also be acquired and earned. Identity is multiple, changing, overlapping, and contextual, but not rigidly fixed, predetermined and static (Ibid). Our identities are mostly social constructions, so even if it is difficult, it is not impossible to change these ascribed identities like nationality, religion and ethnicity.

Human rights according to (Osler2015:241) is a cosmopolitan project which is based on the principles of human rights: principles of equal dignity of all human beings, solidarity with our fellow humans, and recognition of the global community as an interdependent and interconnected. (Osler2015: 246) argues for education for cosmopolitan citizenship as it invites learners' to reimagine the nations Cosmopolitans and that education helps learners to claim their rights and defend rights of others. Cosmopolitans do not take sides in concepts of what 'good life' means and believes in existence of different values, ideas and identities (Appiah2010: 620). Cosmopolitans are open to other cultural values, preach tolerance and diversity. Cosmopolitan citizen see oneself as having links with the world community and it provides an alternative way to nationalism. Cosmopolitan In the global world what matters most is connection and sentiments, thus, there is no reason to limit one's affinity to one specific place and group (Ibid:622). Cosmopolitan love one's home countries, states they live in as well as they are loyal to our humanity (Nussbaum2006). My respondent, Futsum, outlines his identity as follow:

"Here in Norway, I have friends who love me and accept me as well as people who reject me. The same was true in my home country. In my country, we have different ethnic groups with different cultures, language and beliefs, and that is true here too. I feel that I can live anywhere so long I follow the law of the land. I see my future here in Norway as I see better opportunities here, but that does not mean I will forget my home country and my roots. We have a number of practices and customs that I disapprove in our culture, like forced marriages. I do not accept all Norwegian practices too. The first time I came to Norway, I had problems to accept and understand some of the Norwegian practices and attitudes, like the

same sex marriages, but now, I changed in many ways and I got adapted to these new ideas through school learning and other sources. I am happy to live like a Norwegian as well as an Eritrean. For me, everything depends on adaptation" (Futsum:05.02.16).

Futsum sees him-self both as Norwegian and Eritrean and he asserts that he can live with anybody so long he obeys the law. (Appiah2010:620) says that In our multicultural society, we do not need citizens who are committed to shared culture, but we need citizens who are committed to our shared institutions, political culture and laws which are vital for our shared life. As there is no single shared culture, belief, political idea and practice that is shared by all members of any society, it is important that citizens have shared political culture and respect of the law, while they choose freely their own views and identities (ibid).

Futsum does not imagine culture as homogeneous and fixed but he sees it as multiple and dynamic. His view on identity confirms that young peoples' identity is flexible, diverse and shifting, not rigidly fixed. Futsum confirms that diversity is natural; he indicates that we have different religion, ethnicity, class and other diversities in every society and he recognizes this as natural phenomenon. Identities are not inheritances or preservations, but they are ongoing social constructions, that emerge out of interactions with different social, political, and cultural groups (Banks et al 1995:319). Futsum claims that he internalized some new values that he was skeptical to at his first encounter. He learned these values from the school and the society that he is living in. Futsum, critically examines his native cultural practices of forced marriage and he rejects some attitudes of the Norwegian ideas of religion. He is not obeying them blindly as authoritative because they are traditions or national values. The teachers' role is to help learners to develop critical thinking, and ensure that identities of all are reflected in the class. Futsum's perception of identity is shared and reflected by other respondents too.

(Nussbaum2006:388) asserts that democracy needs citizens who think critically and challenge any existing idea for more explanation and justification. For young people to imagine alternative solutions and challenge existing social structures, they need to be trained in critical thinking skills (ibid:390). The task of education according to (Nussbaum2006:393) is to help students to think critically, challenge the existing social order, and question conventional

wisdoms like Futsum does. Futsum rejects forced marriage which is cultural practice in Eritrea and he critically adopts new values. Blind loyalty to the state rather than our shared humanity prevents people from critical and reflective thinking. Cosmopolitan citizens see different cultural practices critically, and recognize our common humanity. Cosmopolitans do not have primary and exclusive affiliation to their fellow nationals, but think themselves as global citizens (Appiah2010). Futsum says that he wants to be both Norwegian and Eritrean, i.e. Cosmopolitan citizens do not deny local, regional and global identities and they defend rights of others everywhere (ibid). To fight injustice whoever happens to be the victim on the basis of our shared humanity rather than to specific group is the principle of cosmopolitan (Gutmann2003:133). Effectively, Futsum represents himself as a developing Cosmopolitan citizen.

4.3. multicultural education

Multicultural education (MCE) is an education for functioning effectively in culturally diverse societies, and its purpose is restructuring the schools and teaching institutions so that to give all learners an equal opportunity of learning (Banks et al1995: 516). The goal of MCE according to(Banks1996:5) is to bring structural change in the school system, the curriculum, and attitude change of both teachers and students so as to create an equal educational opportunity for students from diverse ethnic, cultural, and racial students who think critically and have the skills, the knowledge, the attitudes, and the commitments needed to participate in the democratic actions that helps the nation to close the gap between its ideals and its realities. MCE works toward prejudice reduction, social justice, promote intercultural understanding by empowerment of all students and attitude improvement toward those who are different from us and create sense of community: as these goals were not achieved in the past when different cultures, languages and religions were excluded, ignored and denied in the schools (Banks el at1995:516). My respondent, Mussie, explains his feelings and attitudes about MCE:

“In school we learn about UN, HRs, and history about Sami minority ethnic group that were oppressed in Norway. In theory everyone knows from school about discrimination, and racism but the problem is in practice in general. No one says anything to me directly but they

do not want to have deep contact with me and that's the worst for me. They say, Hello to me and I respond the same, but we do not go beyond that often with many. In my home country, I had friends, family and I miss that social life... I have never thought of my color or identity before. Here, it is new culture, language and environment. Sometimes, I go out of the class in my thoughts as I feel bored and lonely. My parents do not have a work and it's stressful at home both to them and to me. My Parents remind me of my religion and family helping Many of the things the teachers teach, I have problems to follow due to language problems and sometimes it does not give me any sense what they are talking about "(Mussie, 17. 01. 2016).

Racism and discrimination are rarely considered in academic and political discourses as a serious problem, although, they are significant for minority students' learning (Erikson2010, Biseth2012). Mussie feels being ignored, alienated and excluded as other students keep their distance. The social distance he experiences and feels makes him to focus and perceive his distinctive identity. Family, friends and job are important for feeling of belonging and lack of these makes him to remember nostalgically his home country. There is a wide gap between democratic ideals of equality opportunity and daily experience of students who face discrimination, racism and exclusion due to their culture, language, religion and skin color (Banks2008). In absence of viable social life individuals like Mussie develop weak sense of belong. Similar feeling was expressed by Halima and Hadish during the interview. These students who are treated as the "others" develop weak attachments to the nation state and emphasize on clinging to their old identities(Erikson2010).(Banks1996) stresses that minority student's cultural knowledge conflicts with school knowledge which is more consistent with cultural experiences of the middle class white student. This means that the knowledge that exists in society and taught in schools are not objective and neutral but reflects values, and suits more to mainstream. Mussie, with many other participants said that they have problems both in school and society because their social interaction is limited.

According to Mussie, he gets bored by and loses interest in the school as he does not understand the subject matter the teacher is talking about. That could be he is not motivated to follow the teaching as it does not reflect to his experience and irrelevant to him.(Banks1993:12), states that teaching MCE to students can help them to be critical consumers of knowledge, and knowledge producers. Mussie affirms that everyone knows in theory about non -

discrimination and stereotypes, and he say that the problem exists on the ground. Students are learning the past history of the Norwegian oppression of Sami ethnic group, but they need also to learn present discrimination, injustice, inequality, structural and institutional discrimination that exists in society. In school students learn about solidarity, our interdependence, shared humanity and HRS, but if students do not experience these values in practice in their daily life, these values will have little meaning to them. Here, Mussie understands and criticizes the gap between theory and practice about inclusion and exclusion. Learners need to be taught to examine how racism, discrimination and xenophobia undermine democracy and they have to learn that diversity is a prerequisite for democracy (Osler & Lybaek 2014). The political and pedagogical discourses stress mainly on the immigrants' language learning, but they do not focus on structural and institutional problems that face minorities (Ibid:560). The school needs to use appropriate and culturally inclusive methods and materials to meet the needs of all learners in the class (Osler 2015:70). Knowledge that stems from mono-cultural base cannot be effective for a MC and plural society, so schools must teach students MCE that helps them to reform and reshape society for better (Banks 1996). The role of MCE is not only to teach students to fit into the existing work force, social order, and keep the status quo, but to transform and reimagine society (Ibid:98). Immigrant students face conflicting expectation, challenges and dilemmas of the meaning of family values, God, morality, gender roles and expectations of both their parents and mainstream society (Banks et al 1995,317). Mussie looks uncertain about his families' insistence and wanting him not to forget his culture, heritage, identity, and his class mates' expectation to conform to existing norms. Both school and family have power to influence students' views and learning developments. One of my respondents, Fiori, described her Norwegian experience as positive and she says:

“I am living in a better and open society that gave me a chance to practice my religion freely as I wish. I get the same rights like everyone else: I go to the same activity, school, clinic and I live like Norwegians live. Most Norwegians are friendly and kind but there are of course very few who hate others too, but, I don't judge the whole by the acts of the few. Understanding will come when they know who really we are. People are suspicious of us now due to what they hear from media and other sources .i know that my identity is both how others define me as well as how I see myself , but I don't care how others define me, most important is

what I see myself. This is what I learned and I believe. I love Norway and I consider Norway as my home” (Fiori 17.02. 16).

The goal of MCE according to Banks,1993, is to empower all students and help them to be knowledge carrying active citizens who have positive racial and ethnic attitude. Fiori asserts that she has positive experience in Norway, and she describes Norwegian as friendly and she explains that she is hopeful about the future. Acts of few Norwegians does not represent the whole Norway, says Fiori. MCE is compatible with HRs as it focuses on equality, justice, and coexistence. Fiori, defines herself as Norwegian because she experiences no negative attitudes toward her and she knows that she is living in a democratic and egalitarian Norwegian society that gave her equal opportunities. Her feeling of living in a better open, democratic society that values her identity and treats her justly and equally made her to be active citizen who loves to engage and works with others for betterment of her community and country.

Fiori experiences friendly classroom and just society that gave her equal opportunities and freedoms with all citizens. This encouraged her to consider Norway as home for her and her future family. The opportunity of inclusion as equal and dignified member of a society helps people to identify with values of their country and defend its values (Banks2015).

4.4. Citizenship and human rights

Citizenship is defined as a membership in particular political community, and it entails certain legal rights, duties and loyalty towards the state. Citizenship is not only ownership of passport, but it can be conceived as status, feeling and practice (Osler & Hugh, 2005). Citizenship is nationalistic, thus, it has both inclusive and exclusive nature: inclusion of some people as members is exclusion of the others. One’s feeling of belong depends on sense of security and on atmosphere of non- discrimination (ibid:75). Those who have no legal status of citizenship (immigrants, stateless and refugees)do not enjoy bundle of rights, such as political, social and civil rights that is given to citizens(Osler2015:75). Human rights are inalienable rights that one gets because one is human being and it believes that all human beings born free, equal in dignity and rights(Art.2 UDHR). The goal of HRE is to cultivate the idea

that all human beings are equal and born free: thus, learners rights should not be subject to political loyalty to specific entity (Hugh2012).(Osler2015:71) stresses that citizenship education which reinforces sense of national identity is ineffective and inadequate for living in our diverse and interdependent modern world: thus we need to re-imagine citizenship and we have to introduce MCE which promotes HRs, tolerance and democratic principles. Omer, speaks of his citizenship as follows:

“I see my future her in Norway and I want to be both Norwegian and Eritrean. My family reminds me not to forget my identity, but I think that I can live and work anywhere in the world today. Norwegians do-not talk about their national identity as we do in Eritrea. They marry from Asia, Africa and other places more than we do. I know that I cannot be accepted as Norwegian by many because anyone sees that I am a black. People will ask me where I came from. This is normal, if Norwegians came to Eritrea, we would do the same. I have friend and other activities I do. I have better opportunities here than in my home country and I want benefit that opportunity. Most important for me is to have education and work, as I can live anywhere if I have money and profession”(Omer,23.01.16).

Students need to be taught the skills, knowledge and attitudes that will enable them to function in diverse and global society (Banks2008:137). Omer, believes that he can live and work anywhere in the world so long he has the knowledge and money. He does not limit his scope to one place and culture as citizens of particular community. National boundaries are eroding as many people live in several countries and have multiple citizenships due to immigration, globalization, and modernity: thus, the concepts of educating students to prepare them to work and live in one state is becoming impractical. Goal of CE in most countries according to Bank2008 is to produce citizens who internalize national values, glorify national hero, and that goal is becoming difficult in global world of today. People need to learn and experience human rights norms and principles in their life, if they are going internalize it.

(Banks2009:101), illustrates that it is important that children experience human rights in school and larger society that validate their identities and give them opportunities to participate in life of society as equal and dignified individuals, if they are going to internalize principles of human rights. Another respondent, Gideon, discusses his expectation of Norwegian citizenship as follows;

“I can-not compare my situation in Eritrea and here. In my country I had never thought of who I was, and I was happy. Here, I don't feel at all like I was in Eritrea .When you learned and have high income, people will hate you and do not recognize your achievements. If you have no work, they will blame you. They want you to work in lower positions.....I may get the papers but I will not be accepted as full Norwegian. People will ask me where I am from as they see that I am a black. So, I have to focus only in my work and studies---it is their country and they gave us protection. The papers they gave us can they withdraw at any time as we see immigration laws are changing----I don't know what will come next. They are saying a problem that we exist here, it is clear signal that I do not well come here. It is not easy to live outside one's culture and society. So, I am Eritrean first and then Norwegian. The worst is for those who born here and do not know any other country and culture except Norway as home. I worry for my children for these kind of situation.”(Gideon,19.02. 16).

According to (Banks, 2015: 151) people, who feel structurally excluded and experience marginalization, do not internalize values, symbols and norms of the nation state and they have ambivalent feelings toward the state as well as they have low level of political efficacy and low level of allegiance to the state. Gideon believes that he can get the papers, but he does not believe that others will recognize him as full Norwegian. In the above Omer also mentioned that he will not be accepted as full citizens because everyone sees that he is black. This leads Gideon to consider him -self mainly as Eritrean, but he wishes to be Norwegian as it gives him certain privileges. He conceptualizes Norway for ethnic Norwegians. He prefers to focus on his work and study, not to engage in society as he does not think his voice and action can bring changes (Modood2009). Omer and others also said that their main focus is making money, get the job and indifferent about the rest. Sign of “Failed citizenship” is that those who feel structurally excluded alienate themselves' from the society as they have no belief that they can influence political, economic, and social decisions that affect their lives by participating in it and make a difference(Banks2015:153). Gideon and many other respondents in my research do not feel and believe that they are integral of Norwegian society, so do not view themselves as full Norwegian citizens because of their background. They express fear, anxiety, and uncertainty toward their future citizenship roles. Naturally, one feels belonging when one feels not threatened because of one's background: when you have a job , income and feel respected and accepted as equal.

Minorities who experience exclusion, rejection and discrimination choose isolation to retain their traditions, and they reproduce their boundaries and identities (Erikson2010:150). Gideon, Omer and several of my participants expressed their fear of the future and they are uncertain about it. Gideon says that Norwegians can take back the papers they gave him. He feels and senses his unique identity that he never thought about before, and which may be is a hindrance to his inclusion, participation and belong. This kind of people have problems to identify themselves as citizens and feel loyalty toward the state, its values and they have ambivalent feeling toward it(ibid:131). Gideon like many other informants states that he wish to focus on his private matters like the job and study, but not really motivated to engage in political life as full and dignified citizens. He thinks that he will not be accepted as full Norwegian by many due to his background. “The failed citizens” according to Banks2015, develop weak national identities and they focus mainly in their particular issues rather that broad national interest as they do not see their future with the interests of the society they are living in. This is the reality, feeling and experience of many of my informants.

4.5 chapter summary

This chapter examined the Eritrean students’ feelings, perceptions and experiences on citizenship, identity, and integration process in Norway. I explored their thoughts toward their future citizenship roles and expectations. Chapter five below marks the conclusion of the thesis and forwards some policy recommendations.

Chapter 5

Conclusion.

Education for national citizenship in our modern multicultural societies are facing problems of constructing of a national state that reflects, includes, accommodates, and recognizes the identities of all its citizens. State must have a shared values, civic culture and ideals that all citizens internalize. As we have followed above, for minorities to internalize the concepts of human rights, democracy, freedom, and equal opportunity, they have to experience these concepts in their daily life and they need to experience a more inclusive and tolerant society that recognizes and respects their identity. The challenges of living together in a democratic and diverse society like Norway can only be met if we can construct more inclusive new Norwegian identity (Osler & Lybaek, 2014). Emphasis on exclusive vision of the nation rather than on our shared humanity undermines us all: thus, we need to reimagine the nation state as a cosmopolitan (Osler 2015). Schools alone cannot create a cohesive and united society that strength our national values as there are xenophobia, discrimination, islamophobia, fear and hateful speeches toward immigrants in general and Muslims in particular (Osler & Lybaek 2014). Hate speech, stereotypes, Calling people idiots, and terrorists is not going to change peoples' minds and hearts: so let's create more inclusive society (Erikson, 2010: 165). Education can play both positive and negative role: schools can teach HRs norms, promote democracy and tolerance to learners or impose values, and interests of the dominant to minorities (Modood 2007).

The curriculum, books, and teachers must reflect history, images, cultures, dreams and identities of all groups, not only values, myths, and views of the dominant (Banks 1993: 23). Norwegian curriculum does not reflect the changes in demography in contemporary society (Osler & Lybaek 2014). The shared common civic culture of the country should be culture of all groups and not

culture of single group (Banks1993). In Norway, the authorities had envisioned consolidation of a homogeneous white national identity, rather than official MC definition of the national identity (Erikson2010:144). Therefore, we have to reimagine and rethink the nation state as MC. Majority is unwilling to give up its dominant status, and many far right, and extremists groups oppose and reject multiculturalism out of fear or ignorance (Banks1996:323)

In the western societies there is belief in democracy, HRs and justice on one hand, and the practice of racism, discrimination, and hateful speeches toward minorities on the other hand(Banks2015). My research finds out that all my informants wish to be Norwegian citizens, but many expressed fear, anxiety and uncertainty toward their future citizenship roles. Many expressed worry and fear about job market and equal opportunity in practice. Their experience of integration and later years of school made them feel uncertain about their Norwegian identity because Norwegian identity is rooted in Norwegian culture, myth of ancestry, and focus on Christian and humanistic values. Identity depends partly on how others see and define you. Majority of the informants failed to identify themselves as full Norwegian citizens who engage in all sides of national life because they felt that they will not be accepted by many as Norwegians due to their backgrounds of race, religion and culture. Those who are in power positions have special responsibility to take care what kind of signal and message they are conveying by their acts and rhetoric's in creating fear and division in society.

We have followed that diversity is a basic characteristic of any democratic society and there is no fixed, rigid and non- disputable national value that is instituted once and for all. In a multicultural and secular society like Norway, it is high time to define Norwegian national values as human rights values and norms rather than emphasis on “ Christian and humanist value” as Norwegian national value. All my informants expressed their wish to be Norwegian citizens, but they felt unsure of full membership because Norwegian means European white, for many. Who is real Norwegian is vital question that needs examination. King Harald of Norway said that Norwegians are Muslims, Christians, Atheists, Homosexuals, heterosexuals and country of all races. Therefore, we need Norway which includes all races, minorities, faiths, sexual orientation and cultures in our daily life experience. Our perception of the

nation and national identity needs to be reimagined to include all groups. Diversity in itself should be taken as a value if we wish strong and democratic Norway, and not only formal inclusiveness but genuine inclusiveness that is based on mutual integration and dialogue on our basic values. I think, only then can everyone feel full belonging and identify with the national values as he feels that the country equally belongs to him too. Everyone can accept the responsibility of citizenship to defend our national values of democracy, rule of law and human rights only if we ensure fair, just and all-inclusive society that we all wish.

In Europe, there is a conflict between universalistic principles of democracy, on the one hand, and particular claims to preserve established form of life, culture, national identity and homogeneity on the other (Habermas 1996: 492). In my research, I observed many young immigrants students who are hesitant to identify themselves with their country of residence and want to focus on their private limited interests like making money, get a job, pursue education and isolate oneself from participating in community life, because they do not feel that they have a place in the system. In our current trends toward “nationalism”, fear of the others, the rise of far right populist movements, and the uncertain future made majority of my respondents to lean toward social distance, fear, and ambivalence toward active citizenship duties. These are the main obstacle to feelings of belonging. A place man calls home is a place where man feels included, respected as equal citizen and feel that he has a shared future with all others in that society. As this is not true with many of my respondents due to the above discussed reasons, I recommend that we need to fight the threats of our democratic principles, like hatred, intolerance, xenophobia, inequality, discrimination, bigotry and racism.

Appendices.

APPENDIX-1

1. CONSENT FORM FOR THE RESEARCH INTERVIEW

Name of the College: University College of South-East Norway, School of Business and Faculty of Social Sciences and Faculty of Humanities and Education.

Name of the program: MSc Human Rights and Multiculturalism

Name of the candidate: Saleh Ali Etto

Supervisor: Prof. Audrey Osler

I am student of master in human rights and multiculturalism at the above mentioned college, and I am conducting research on the issue of citizenship and citizenship education in Norwegian schools. The purpose of my research is to examine how young Eritrean immigrants feel about their identity education in schools.

You were selected as a possible participant in this project because, as an Eritrean, I believe that your views and position in relation to the question of identity and sense of belonging is important. You have to read the information below, and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.

Your participation in this study will consist of an interview with an estimated length of one hour. You will be asked a series of questions about your standpoints regarding citizenship and your experience, feeling and understanding about identity. Our discussion will be audio taped if you are willing to help me accurately document your insights in your own words.

Your responses will remain confidential and will be used for reference while proceeding with this research. Though direct quotes from you may be used in the paper, your name and other identifying information will be kept anonymous. All interview recordings will be stored in a secure work space until April, 2015. The tapes will then be destroyed. This interview is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw your consent as long as the project is in progress, and to stop the interview at any time or for any reason.

If you have any questions or concern, please contact me at any time at the e-**mail address:** etto1970@yahoo.com or you can also contact to my supervisor, Prof. Audrey Osler on email A.H.osler@leeds.ac.uk.

I have read the above information and understood its content. I have therefore, voluntarily, consented to participate in the research project.

Participant Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix.2

Interview schedule

NB. The questions were asked in Tigrigna, the national language of Eritrea.

1. Please, How will you introduce your- self or how will you define your identity?
- b. What is your dream job and what will studying?
2. What were your expectations about Norway before your arrival B) and what are your feeling now? C) Does your immigrant background affect your social, cultural and world view?
3. Do you enjoy your school b) do you have friends?
4. How do you feel in school here in Norway and in your home country, Eritrea? Is there any difference to you?
- B. Do you feel that your classmates and teachers respect your religion, language and identity? C) Have you ever felt unfairly treated because of your background? D) Do you think you will get equal job opportunity as Norwegians?
5. What are your hopes about Norwegian citizenship?
- 6 .How do you feel in your school as African immigrant student ?
7. How do the Norwegian students see you? B) Do you feel accepted when you give different opinion than the rest? C) Do you feel encouraged to preserve your language, religion, and culture in school and society?
8. What do you learn about citizenship, Human Rights, and diversity at school?
9. How do you feel when immigrants are negatively represented in the media and (political debates)?
10. In your opinion, how is the integration process in Norway? What does your teacher expect from in introductions program?
- b) Do you feel your differences recognized publicly? In schools, media, work....?

11. What activities do you participate in your local community?
12. Do you want to be Norwegian citizen? WHY and why not?
13. How are your teachers teaching you to be Norwegian?
14. Are there any problems that you face about your identity?
15. What does your family say about your culture, language, religion and your identity general? Do they worry about not losing your identity?
16. What does it mean to you to have Norwegian citizenship? Is it important and are you proud of it?
17. Do you feel fear of being marginalized, or discriminated in your work, profession and other opportunities in Norway because of your background?
18. In your opinion, what is the best way to deal with Norwegian multicultural and diverse group identities?
19. Now, there is a lot regulation and debate about immigrants in Norway, how do you feel?
20. Are you proud of your parents' identity? Will you think of changing your identity? B) What is your concept of identity, is it unique or multiple and changing?

References

- Abu Elhaj(2009) .becoming citizens in an era of globalization and transnational migration: re-imagining citizenship as critical practice: theory into practice,48:4,274-282
- Appiah A. Kwame (2010). Cosmopolitan Patriots. Chicago journals, vol.23, no.3, pp.617-739
- Banks James A.(1993). The canon debate knowledge construction and Multicultural education researcher, Review of Research in Education. Vol22, NO.5, 4-14
- Banks (el at.1995) Handbook of Research on Multiculturalism. Macmillan
- Banks James A.(1996). Multicultural education: transformative knowledge action, history and contemporary perspectives. Teachers College Press, NY, Columbia University.
- Bank James A.(2009). Diversity And Citizenship Education. The Educational Forum, vol.73: 2, p100-110
- Bank James A. (2008). Diversity, group identity and citizenship education in global age. New York and Abingdon. Routledge .pp.129-139
- Banks James A.(2011). Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global perspectives. San Francisco, 17-48.
- Banks James A.(2015). Failed Citizenship, Civic engagements, and Education. Kappa Delta,51(4), pp. 151-154
- Biseth Heidi(2012). Educators as custodians of democracy: A comparative investigation of democracy in multicultural school environment in Scandinavian capitals,(University of Oslo, 2012). Doctoral thesis.
- Bryan Audrey & Vavrus Frances (2005). Globalisation, societies and education: the promise and peril of education, the teaching of intolerance in an era of globalization. Educational Review, 3:2, pp.183-202.

- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University press.
- Donnelly Jack (2013). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Cornell university press.
- Erikson, Thomas Hylland 2010. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Pluto Press
- Erikson, Thomas Hylland 2014. *Globalization: the lay concepts*. Blomberg Publishing PLC.
- Gressgård Randi (2010). *Multicultural dialogue, dilemma, paradoxes, and conflicts*. Berghahn Books.
- Guttmann Ammy (2003). *Identity in Democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Habermas Jurgen (1996). *Between facts and norms: contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Hung Ruyu (2012). *Being human or being citizen?* Cambridge journal of education, vol42: 1, p37-51
- Ignatieff Michael (2001). *Human rights as politics and idolatry*. Princeton University Press.
- Kymlicka Will (1995). *Multicultural citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Legrain Philippe (2002): *open world: the truth about globalization*. Abacus.
- Lindquist H. & Osler A. (2015). *Navigating race and ethnicity research: reflection on working with Norwegian schools: race equality teaching*, 31(1)
- Melntosh Laure (2015). *Impossible presence: race, nation, and cultural politics of "being Norwegian"*. *Ethics and racial studies*, 38:2, 309-325
- Modood Tariq (2007): *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Polity Press, USA.
- Modood T. & Levy Geoffrey 2009. *Secularism, Religion, and Multicultural Citizenship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy Michael (2012). *Multiculturalism: a critical introduction*. Routledge

Nussbaum Martha C.(2006). Education and democratic citizenship: capabilities and quality education. *Journal of human development*,vol.7, no.3, pp.385.

Osler Audrey (1994). Fundamental issues in teacher education for human rights: A European perspective. *Journal of moral education*, vol.23, issue3, p.349-359

Osler Audrey(2008). Citizenship education and the Ajebo report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation. *London review of education*, vol.6,no.1,pp.11-25

Osler Audrey(2009). Patriotism, Multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and teaching of history. *Educational review*, 61:1, pp.85-100

Osler Audrey &Starkey Hugh(2010). *Teachers and Human Rights Education*. Institute of education press, London.

Osler Audrey(2011). Teacher interpretation of citizenship education: national identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of curriculum studies*,43:1, p1-24.

Osler Audrey(2013). Bringing human rights home: Learning from 'superman' and addressing political issues at school. *Social studies*(2013), 104.pp.67-76

Osler Audrey & Lena Lybaek(2014). Educating ' the new Norwegian we': an examination of national and cosmopolitan education policy discourse in the context of extremism and islamophobia. *Oxford review of education*, 40:5,543-566

Osler Audrey(2015). The stories we tell: exploring narrative in education for justice and equality in multicultural context. *Multicultural education review*, Vol.7, issue2,p12

Sen A.(2006). *Identity and violence, the illusion of destiny*. New York

Shimon David: March 1999. Routledge, *Holocaust, human rights and democratic citizen*, vol.90,21, p53-63

Silverman, D.(2000). *Doing qualitative research. A practical hand book*. London: Sage publication Ltd.

Silverman D.(2006).*interpreting qualitative data*. Oxford: sage publications Ltd.

Starkey Hugh(March, 2012). Human rights, Cosmopolitanism and utopia. Cambridge journal of education, vol42, issue 1, p21-35

Statistic Norway (2015). [http:// www.ssb](http://www.ssb).

Stavenhagen Rodolfo: (2008). Building intercultural citizen through education, European journal of education, vol43,2, p161-179

Stokke Christian(2012). A multicultural society in the making; how Norwegian Muslims challenge a white nation. Doctor thesis at NTNU, Trondi

Ulrike Niens & Jacqueline Reilly(2012). Education for global citizenship in a divided society: young peoples' views and experiences. School of education, vol.48, no.1,p103-118.

Young Marion Iris(1989). Polity and group difference: A critic of the ideal of universal citizenship. Chicago journals, vol.99,no.2,pp.250-274

Zembylos Michelano(2012). Citizenship, shared fate and affective relations. The educational forum, vol31,6, p553-567