

Christina von Post

Dalarna University, Sweden

Patrik Wikström

Örebro University, Sweden

Helge Räihä

Örebro university, Sweden

Vilmantė Liubinienė

Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF NORDIC LANGUAGE TEACHERS TOWARDS SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Summary. Issues in minority education in relation to citizenship have received more attention lately, because of new requirements for language testing in several countries (Bevelander, Fernandez & Hellström, 2011, p. 101). The acquisition of citizenship is more decisive for immigrant participation in society than the duration of stay in the country (Bevelander, Fernandez & Hellström, 2011). The second language is crucial for active citizenship and integration in this perspective. Most countries in the EU (except Ireland and Sweden) have language requirements for citizenship and the use of language testing becomes increasingly common among the countries that receive migrants. The rapid development highlights the need for new international studies on the relationship between citizenship and conditions for second language learning. The goal of the recent study is to compare *premises, perspectives and scales of values* of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish language educators, related to the requirements for immigrant citizenship. Previous studies (Björklund & Liubinienė, 2004) indicate that there are major differences in value systems even between the neighbouring countries. To reach the objective of the present study, interviews were conducted with language educators in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The results have revealed two opposing patterns. The values of Swedish informants show a wide-ranging variation, while the Danish and Norwegian data on values are consistently similar. The results raise further questions about the effects caused by differences in values among language educators when comparing the countries and call for a further verification of the data in a more extended study, including Lithuania and other Baltic states.

Key words: values, second language teachers, citizenship, immigrants, integration.

Introduction

To understand cultural differences and accordingly different attitudes as well as modes of behaviour, we are to take into consideration differences in the system of universal values. Based on Inglehart's (1997) idea that the importance of

modern values is challenged by a growing importance of postmodern values in postindustrialised societies, we analyse the values and attitudes of Nordic language teachers in relation to second language education in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, all of them countries which pursue postmodern welfare state values. The L2 (second language) learners are usually immigrants, most of whom attempt to integrate (modern) achievement values, because integration into society is not restricted only to language learning, it is a complicated acculturation process which involves cultural learning and a great many other issues related to assimilation and integration into the target culture. Since the value system cannot be changed overnight, even if the learners are strongly motivated, the overall integration process is complicated, as the learners get trapped in a conflict between innate and foreign values, attitudes and belief systems.

Societal values help us understand and describe the basic aspects of human motivation and behaviour, but, as Fries et al. (2005) claim, little is known about the influence of societal values on learning, though, on the other hand, societal values validly predict various aspects of learners' behaviour in educational environments.

Cultural theory implies that a culture, as well as values, cannot be changed overnight. Furthermore, as Inglehart (1997, p. 19) asserts, when basic cultural change does occur, it will take place more rapidly among younger groups, where it does not need to overcome the resistance of inconsistent early learning, than among older ones, resulting in intergenerational differences. An awareness of the fact that deep-rooted values are not easily changed is essential to any realistic and effective program for social change. Cultural or country differences are very important, and should be taken into account. Björklund and Liubinienė (2004) show in a comparison made between Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania that there can be marked differences in national values even between neighbouring countries. But, on the other hand, all three countries have many things in common due to the shared historical past as post-Soviet countries. Such studies indicate that there might be a great variety of attitudes, based on value differences, even between the countries which culturally and geographically seem to be very close.

Based on this supposition, this study poses the following **research question** – what differences and similarities can be found in the value systems of L2 teachers involved in language education of immigrants in three Nordic countries? Thus, the current study **aims at** analysing and comparing *premises, perspectives* and *scales of values* of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish language educators, related to the requirements for immigrant citizenship.

The research **objectives** could be defined as follows: to discuss the problem of language acquisition in minority groups in relation to citizenship and cultural assimilation; to outline the diversity of national attitudes relating to immigrants' citizenship in these three Nordic countries and to provide illustrations based on case studies of the values and attitudes of L2 teachers in relation to language education and citizenship acquisition of immigrants in Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

In order to reveal the vast range of user experiences, case studies were chosen as the most appropriate **research method**, supplemented by the survey, using semi-structured interviews. Qualitative analysis was used with the goal to identify three analytical focuses, namely the construction of *premises, perspectives* and *value scales*. The convenience sample was drawn from language educators in three Nordic countries; therefore, the research findings do not strive to reflect the general tendencies for the whole population. This study reflects only the initial findings and is a pilot study for a larger survey of teacher values in countries around the Baltic Sea area.

The structure of the paper develops along the following lines: first, the problems of citizenship, second language education, assimilation and minorities are discussed; next, the issue of national regulations and attitudes relating to immigrants' citizenship in Nordic countries is presented; and finally, the findings of the case studies are analysed and discussed, followed by conclusions.

Discussion of Second Language Education in Relation to Citizenship and Language Policy

Citizenship can be seen as both a goal and means to an end in democratic societies. This double function of citizenship is especially true for the integration of immigrants. The acquisition of citizenship is more decisive for immigrant

participation in society than the duration of stay in the country (Bevelander, Fernandez, & Hellström, 2011). Second language education is crucial for active citizenship and integration in this perspective. Most countries in the EU (except Ireland and Sweden) have language requirements for citizenship, and language testing is increasingly common among the countries that receive migrants. The rapid development highlights the need for new international studies on the relationship between citizenship and conditions for second language learning.

The major social institution facilitating L2 learning is public schooling. A social stimulus for adults, which can contribute markedly to L2 learning is acquisition of citizenship, which is associated with inclusion, belonging, integration, as well as accessing equal political, social and economic rights.

Swedish education policy can be seen as an example of this kind of support for immigrants' learning and languages as a resource for second language learning. International studies show that if immigrants keep and develop their first language (L1) and at the same time add the new language (L2) to their previous, the second L2 language learning is enhanced (see Wayne & Collier, 1997, p. 53, Wayne & Collier, 2001, pp. 7–8, Cummins & Genzuk, 1991, p. 1, Torres-Guzmán, 2002, p. 12). Immigrants' language and culture are seen as a prerequisite for integration and additive cultural learning resulting in sustainable multilingualism. The opposite to this view is assimilation seen as subtractive obstacle for effective cultural learning and for two-way integration. The official Swedish view is in favor of the additive view of integration, but the regulations construct a language hierarchy with Swedish as a national language at the top, the national minority languages in the middle and immigrant languages at the bottom. Swedish language legislation states that the public sector has a particular responsibility for the use and development of the Swedish language and also a particular responsibility to protect and promote the national minority languages (SFS, 2009, p. 600). This particular responsibility is not mentioned in the case of other languages. So there is a gap between the ideology in favor of all languages being equal and the regulations making them unequal. The gap between official rhetoric in favor of equality and the actual law is, in the case of minority languages, filled with arguments for the need of 100 years of unbroken cultural and biological lineage of the speakers for the language to become a national minority language (Lainio, 1999, p. 175). The problem is that these

arguments are not valid, neither from the equity point of view nor from the scientific point of view when it comes to minority languages and effective second language learning. This Swedish dilemma is becoming acute. One example of this is the Arabic language being one of the three biggest languages in Sweden while still lacking status as a minority language⁴⁹. This is an example of the dilemmas having to do with values on the national level, indicating the complexity of these questions on the international level.

The major incentives to learn the second language, according to Paulston (1986), are as follows: economic advantage, primarily in the form of source of income and social prestige. Without rewards, language learning is not salient. One must invariably look at social conditions to understand the attitudes and values that accompany language learning. This has implications for training programs for immigrants designed to promote integration.

Diversity of National Regulations and Attitudes Relating to Immigrants' Citizenship in Nordic Countries

The three Nordic countries Denmark, Norway, and Sweden have been popular destinations for many refugees for a long time. One of the main reasons for this, according to Tobias Etzold (2016, p. 1), is that "the Nordic countries – despite recent cuts – continue to have comprehensive and generous social welfare systems". However, in terms of migration and refugee policy, the Nordic countries do not have uniform models. In some cases, the differences are greater than it might seem at first sight. At the same time, the Nordic countries are closely related not only as neighbours but they also have open borders between the countries. The open border policy includes former immigrants with citizenship in one of these countries. Bauder (2012, p. 191) advocates for open borders as a general goal for the future immigration policy. The border policy in the Nordic countries can be seen as a step in this direction but with the reservation that this policy only applies to citizens in these five countries. The Nordic countries are also interesting since there are at the same time marked differences between national regulations and attitudes relating to immigrants' citizenship. Previous research

⁴⁹ <http://spraktidningen.se/comment/1668>.

has also revealed differences in the perception of immigrants in the Nordic countries. Among 27 European countries examined, Sweden was the most willing to allow immigrants, whose ethnicity differed from the majority, to settle in the country. Norway came in as number 6 and Denmark as 11 (Bloom, 2010, p. 153). A clear example of the differences between the countries is the perception of a suitability test of immigrants seeking citizenship. Currently Sweden is the only Nordic country that does not use language tests in connection with the application for acquiring citizenship (Rooth & Strömblad, 2008, p. 28). This shows that there can be considerable differences even between neighbouring countries and despite things like open borders and similarities in language and culture, it is easy for citizens to travel, stay and live in the country they choose.

Premises, Perspectives and Value Scales

Laws and regulations for citizenship vary in relation to traditional principles for determination of nationality. Two traditional and competing principles are *jus sanguinis* (heritage) and *jus soli* (territory) (Fangen, Lynnebakke, & Paasche, 2014, p. 4). A somewhat later developed policy is *jus domicile* (stay). Most national regulations are a mixture of the three principles, but often with an emphasis on one of them (Levanon & Lewin-Epstein, 2009, p. 421). These three principles can also be related to three types of approaches to the regulation of citizenship, namely *pluralism* with an emphasis on *jus soli*, (Canada), *assimilation* using both *jus domicile* and *jus sanguinis* (France) and *exclusion* with an emphasis on *jus sanguinis* (Sweden in the past history). However, it is important to note that there is no direct link between principles and regulations on the one hand, and the specific rules for citizenship on the other. Contemporary Sweden embodies the system of such divergent principles. The principles are however used as general starting points in understanding a political debate surrounding citizenship (Levanon & Lewin-Epstein, 2009, p. 422) as well as theoretical points of departure for discussing issues of citizenship (see Bauder, 2012). Also the concepts of *integration*, *assimilation* and *exclusion* are used in this paper (see Berlin, 2015; Berry, 2005, Zenou, 2008). The concepts are reconstructed from the interviews with second language teachers. The concept *assimilation* defines obligatory “one way only” adaption of the immigrants to the new culture. This

view emphasizes that the adaption is solely the responsibility of individual immigrants. From this perspective, societies are seen as homogenous and stable entities and immigrants are expected to leave their former language and culture in favor of the new language and culture. The concept of *integration* defines a two-way adaption of both the immigrants and society. The emphasis is on multicultural society where cultural differences are seen as resources for both individuals and societies. Immigrants are expected to keep and develop their language and culture while learning the dominant language and culture in the new country. The concept of *exclusion* defines obligation to assimilate but without access to full participation in society. The participation is restricted by general demands that some groups of immigrants are not able to live up to and that lead to social sanctions. Societies defined in terms of exclusion are seen as homogenous and unchangeable.

Research methodology, materials and methods

Based on the discussion of premises, perspectives and value scales, we refer to these principles as *premises* in our survey. To these established premises, we add a fourth hypothetical premise, namely the individual's capability for achievement, for example, language skills demonstrated in language tests. The selection of this premise is based on current political debates in the Nordic countries. We call our fourth hypothetical premise *achievement*.

In addition to the premises, the analysis of interview responses is also based on five perspectives, the *social* (identity, integration), *political* (legitimacy), *economic* (money), *legal* (legality) and *moral* (morality and ethics) perspectives. These perspectives are influenced by Habermas' (1986) notion of different forms of rationality and validity claims.

The analysis of responses is also based on dichotomous *scales* emerging from the interview responses. These scales are reconstructed from the material and based on respondents' emphases or reiterations.

The case study was chosen as the most appropriate **research method**, supplemented by the survey, using semi-structured interviews. Qualitative analysis was used with the goal to identify three analytical focuses, namely the construction of *premises*, *perspectives* and *value scales*. The convenience sample

was drawn from language educators in three Nordic countries: two respondents from Norway, two from Denmark and three from Sweden. The Danish interviews were conducted through Skype while the other interviews were held at the teachers' workplace.

The material under analysis consists of 4 hours of recorded semi-structured interviews with the respondents. Transcriptions of relevant sequences are made in simple standard orthography. The selection of transcriptions is based on interpretations of the content in the recordings. Three of these examples are used for illustrative purposes in this paper. The initial question used for elicitation is formulated as follows: *What do you think about immigrants becoming citizens?* The method used is qualitative analysis of the transcribed examples with three analytical focuses, namely the construction of *premises*, *perspectives* and *value scales*.

Values and Attitudes of L2 Teachers Relating to Language Education and Citizenship of Immigrants in Norway, Sweden and Denmark

Analysis of the research findings is based on three case studies - one from each Nordic country. Materials under analysis consist of three transcriptions made in standard orthography without added punctuation and translated into English from Swedish. The embedded examples are italicized. *Premises*, *perspectives* and *scales* are illustrated by the quotes taken from the interview material.

Norwegian respondent (N1)

I think there are only very few requirements really for the first generation / I must say they unfortunately / yes I say that some ethnic groups people here they take those things granted in relation to society / then they get no public attention which allows them to slow down the pace / take it easy and perhaps after five years six years they seek social welfare / where there are / yes revenues and yes do no more, so maybe avoiding the control systems smoothly as many do.

Interpretation

This answer constructs a situation where *there are very few requirements for the first generation*. The premise is achievement, in the form of more demands. Using the word *really* underlines the lack of requirements. N1 also adds a comment *I must say*, suggesting a necessity to say this despite possible objections underlined by a concluding negative stance *unfortunately* at the end of the clause. The deontic modality *must* also highlights the strong need to describe things as they really are. N1 then constructs a category of which this has to be said, namely *some ethnic groups*. Ethnic groups are described with attributes like *they take those things given* (very few requirements), *slow down the pace, take it easy, seek social welfare, avoiding the control systems smoothly*. All of this *unfortunately* needs to be said. There is a moral perspective, *seek social welfare*, which also includes an economic perspective. N1 points out achievement as a premise for citizenship in the evaluation, *very little requirements*. The perspective is also social, *avoiding the control systems smoothly*. The duration of stay also figures as a premise, *after five years, six years*. The premise also includes heritage *first generation* and the length of stay. The value scales that can be constructed are individual-society in terms of responsibility where the individual has responsibility, passive-active scales on initiatives and actions in which the individual is expected to be active and rights-obligations scale where the citizen has many obligations.

The general interpretation is that for the moment it is too easy to become a citizen in Norway and more requirements are needed to motivate the first generation of immigrants to distance themselves from their ethnic perspectives in order to foster assimilation to Norwegian values. These values are implied as counteractive to the first generation immigrant cultural values. The overall goal is then a faster assimilation of these groups of immigrants by posing more requirements. The approach to immigrant citizenship is assimilation.

Swedish respondent (S2)

...citizenship is one thing and becoming a Swedish citizen that is another matter / but the question you should ask yourself is if those who come to Sweden get a

chance to learn Swedish at one point or another / there are a lot of older people who come and they need to learn to talk / they need to learn the oral language or they will never get a job on the labour market / but then absolutely it is voluntary / but not like this if you don't pass this course then you can go back home to your own country / nah not so / perhaps you should try to reach out to these old ladies and gentlemen who become quite isolated because they do not have access to the community / it's really a shame for them and it is also a shame for their children/ those who may become interpreters for their parents...

Interpretation

S2 is making a distinction between being a citizen and different ways to become a citizen, *citizenship is one thing, becoming a Swedish citizen that is another matter*. S2 suggests that there is no necessary relation between how you acquire citizenship and how you act as a citizen. (This is an opposite view compared to the view of N1 arguing for more requirements for obtaining citizenship in order to produce good citizens.) S2 takes a practical stance when talking about citizenship education and pointing out the *need to learn an oral language or they will never get a job on the labour market*. But it should be voluntary, *but absolutely it is voluntary*. The voluntary and equality perspective also permeates the view on obligations. All of us as part of the same society must ensure that *they* (immigrants) get a chance to learn Swedish, particularly the older immigrants, *older people who come and they need to learn to talk*. The values of equity and voluntary participation are seen as ways to achieve integration. It is a social obligation (for members of a society) to create opportunities to learn Swedish since *they need to learn to talk, they need to learn to get an oral language*. There is also the problem of the elderly immigrants who are unable to take advantage of the freedom to choose, *these old ladies that are sitting at home, they do not have access to the community*. The solution here is outreach services for the elderly, *you should try to reach out to these old ladies that are sitting at home*, and give them, *access to the community*. The premise is stay, *but not like this if you don't pass this course then you can go back home to your own country nah not so*, and also, *a chance to learn Swedish at one point or another*. The perspective is social, *reach out to these old ladies and gentlemen who become*

quite isolated, and moral it's really a shame for them and it is also a shame for their children. The value scales that can be constructed are individual-society in terms of responsibility where the society has responsibility, passive-active scales on initiatives and actions in which the individual is expected to be active and rights-obligations scale where the citizen has both rights and obligations. In general terms, S2 advocates for integration by voluntary means and for providing equal opportunities to different groups of immigrants. It is also the responsibility of society to provide ways and means to integration and citizenship. This approach to immigrant citizenship underlines integration.

Danish respondent (D3)

To be a citizen of Denmark you must be able to speak the language / it is not possible to live in a country where you don't know what is going on around you / so yes it is the first condition / and you also have to be able to be integrated / yes you have to know that the most important thing is that you can read / and reach the level in Danish / and have knowledge of the institutions / and why you vote in elections and what the law says.

Interpretation

Danish citizenship requires good language skills so prospective citizens *must be able to speak the language*. It is up to the immigrants to accept the requirements. In terms of language skills, it is important that one *can read*. It is not possible to stay in Denmark if you do not know the language since you *don't know what's going on around you*. The knowledge of this is the *first requirement* in the integration process. One can't be a citizen if one does not *have some knowledge of the institutions and why you vote in elections and what the law says*. D3 also says that *you also have to be able to be integrated*. The process is one-sided and relies entirely on the individuals' ability to get integrated. (This is in sharp contrast to the view of S2). It is also the immigrants' own responsibility to be integrated (This is also in a sharp contrast to S2). D3 uses the term integration in a way that in fact resembles the concepts of assimilation and exclusion. There are many obligations put on the immigrant by society, but

society has no obligations to adapt to the immigrant's needs. This is a demand for assimilation and there are several "one way only" demands. These unambiguous requests for one-sided assimilation also lead to the conclusion that otherwise *it is not possible to live in a country*. There is in other words no place in Danish society for someone who cannot meet these requirements (also in sharp contrast to S2). In this case, the perspective of D3 is exclusion of those who cannot meet the requirements, certainly some of the elderly immigrants. The premise is achievement, *must be able to speak the language, know what is going on around you, read a little, have some knowledge of the institutions and why you vote and what the law says*. The perspective is social, *be able to be integrated, know what is going on around you* and moral, *you have to know this*. Immigrants have a responsibility to become integrated. The value scales that can be constructed are individual-society in terms of responsibility where the individual has responsibility, passive-active scales on initiatives and actions in which the individual is expected to be active and rights-obligations scales where the citizen has many obligations. Speaking in general terms the individual immigrant has a duty to adapt to the general requirements for citizenship without consideration of his or her abilities. The approach to immigrant citizenship is then assimilation and exclusion.

Discussion of Research Findings

First, the relations between three types of approaches for the regulation of citizenship, namely *integration*, *assimilation* and *exclusion*, are going to be discussed.




Fig. 1. The relations between three types of approaches for the regulation of citizenship

Figure 1 illustrates that the Swedish respondents are placed farther away from the other two countries, Denmark and Norway. The Swedish respondents express more pluralistic values consistent with integration, while the Norwegian and Danish respondents express values which involve more assimilation and exclusion in relation to Sweden. The Swedish respondents also express more heterogeneous values and larger differences are observed within the Swedish group. It should also be mentioned that the Danish respondents showed a marked hesitancy on issues concerning their personal opinions about immigrants' citizenship while this was not the case with Swedish and Norwegian respondents. One of the Danish respondents also questioned the relevance of personal opinions about immigrants' citizenship. One hypothetical interpretation of this hesitancy could be that citizenship is seen as an objective relationship between the state and the citizen and therefore not affected by the third person opinion. This interpretation can, however, be contested since there are plenty of value statements in the Danish material. Another hypothesis is that opinions about immigrants' citizenship are delicate in a political sense in Denmark. This latter interpretation is supported by the fact that one of the Danish teachers checked some official facts with a colleague first before discussing the subject. This interpretation is also supported by earlier international comparisons showing that the difference between official statements and informal statements is bigger in Denmark, as compared to other countries. In a comparison with 10 countries Denmark showed the biggest difference between official and informal statements (Levanon & Lewin-Epstein, 2009, p. 425). Teachers' different value priorities in our study are consistent with the results reported by Bloom (2010). Sweden appears to be more pluralistic than Denmark while Norway is placed between Denmark and Sweden.

The next issue to be discussed is related to perspectives, i.e. social, political, economic, legal and moral.




Fig. 2. Attitudes towards social, political, economic, legal and moral perspectives (D = Denmark, N = Norway, S = Sweden, bold underlined = more prominent)

Most obvious in Figure 2 is that the social perspective dominates together with the moral. The political perspective also occurs but not to the same extent. What also becomes obvious is the moral perspective of the Norwegian respondents. The Norwegian respondents construct citizenship as an individual commitment. The economic perspectives are missing almost entirely and the same applies to the legal perspectives. Immigrants' citizenship seems to be primarily a moral question for the Norwegian respondents while it is mostly a social issue in the other countries.

Next, the relations between the premises *ancestry* (jus sanguinis), *territory* (jus soli), *stay/time* (jus domicili) and *achievement* are going to be discussed.




Fig. 3. The relations between premises ancestry, territory, stay/time and achievement (D = Denmark, N = Norway, S = Sweden)

Figure 3 displays a clear difference in the basic premises of the right to citizenship in the three Nordic countries. Regardless of the differences between the Swedish respondents, there is a clear consensus that achievement does not belong to the premises for citizenship while both Danish and Norwegian respondents see performance as the most important premise. The Swedish respondents' answers show thereby both diffusion and conformity. This is in line with earlier studies. Our study also shows a consistency with previous surveys regarding the Danish respondents. The Norwegian respondents are most similar and consistent with each other in their answers and in their support for the individual achievement as premise. When we summarize the overall findings so far, as illustrated in Figures 1–3, there is a consistency between the Danish and Norwegian respondents' attitudes to the citizenship of immigrants. The Swedish respondents appear as a contrast to the other two.

The similar positions persist after the analysis of distribution of rights and obligations.

	Individual		Society	
Rights	S		D N	
Obligations	D N		S	

Fig. 4. Rights and obligations (D = Denmark, N = Norway, S = Sweden)

Citizenship is seen as the responsibility of the immigrants themselves by Danish and Norwegian respondents. The immigrants are responsible for their own adaptation and cultural reorientation and change. Society, in the case of Norwegian respondents, and the state, in the case of Danish respondents, emerge as entities which do not change. Assimilation is seen as a necessary condition for immutable values. Stable values and a moral obligation to assimilation are, in other words, both conditions for and consequences of each other, according to Danish and Norwegian respondents. Society and the state require change and adaptation of the citizens to maintain stability.

The Swedish respondents' approach is more heterogeneous and divergent in comparison with Denmark and Norway. The societal values are considered by Swedish teachers as negotiable in relation to immigrants' citizenship. Opportunities for citizenship ought to be provided by society without

requirements of assimilation. The moral aspects of the individual's responsibilities are clearly reduced in Swedish answers in comparison with the Danish and Norwegian ones.

The Norwegian respondents show a clear-cut pattern. The individual immigrant alone is responsible for fulfilling society's requirements which are not negotiable. All scales — individual-group, passive-active and rights-obligations — point to the individual.

There is, however, a slight division between Norwegian and Danish respondents. The Norwegian respondents see society as the main authority while the Danish respondents talk more about the government as a source of authority which is also in accordance with the Danish second language teachers' careful considerations of the official rules for immigration when discussing immigrants' citizenship.

Conclusion

To conclude, the research findings have revealed clear differences between the countries. Danish and Norwegian second language teachers show more similarities with each other while Swedish respondents have a divergent opinion. Those differences between the countries should be taken into consideration when designing common efforts for the integration of immigrants in Europe. There is a need for comparative research dealing with attitudes and national values in relation to immigration, citizenship, language learning, and integration in different countries. The preliminary results raise further questions about the effects caused by differences in values among language educators when comparing the countries and call for a further verification of the data in a more extended study, including Lithuania and other Baltic states.

References

- Bauder, H. (2014). Domicile citizenship, human mobility and territoriality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(1), 91–106.
- Berlin, J. (2015). *Assimilated individuals and segregated communities: a comparative study of housing and living related well-being of Finnish*

- roma and housed gypsies and travellers in England* (Doctoral dissertation). Publications of the University of Eastern Finland, dissertations in social sciences and business studies (101).
- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 697–712
- Bevelander, P., Fernandez, C., & Hellström, A. (2011). *Vägar till medborgarskap*. Lund: Arkiv förlag.
- Björklund, F., & Liubinienė, V. (2004). *Value change related to the process of democratisation in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia*. Södertörns högskola: research reports.
- Bloom, S. (2010). *Comparison of attitudes in Norway and other European countries*. Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/a/english/publikasjoner/pdf/sa122/comparison.pdf>.
- Cummins, J., & Genzuk, M. (1991). Analysis of final report longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy. Early exit and late exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children. *California Association for Bilingual Education Newsletter*, 13(5).
- Etzold, T. (2016). Refugee policy in Scandinavia: Paradigm shift in liberal Sweden? *The Green Political Foundation* 201 6.06.22. Retrieved from <https://www.boell.de/en/2016/06/22/refugee-policy-scandinavia-paradigm-shift-liberal-sweden>.
- Fangen, K., Lynnebakke, B., & Paasche, E. (2014). *Citizenship regimes: Consequences for inclusion and exclusion of young adult immigrants in Europe*. Retrieved from <https://www.sv.uio.no/iss/english/research/projects/eumargins/policy-briefs/documents/2nd-policy-brief-citizenship-november-3rd-2010-final.pdf>.
- Fries, S., Schmid, S., Dietz, F., & Hofer, M. (2005). Conflicting values and their impact on learning. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(3), 259–273.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Här är 20 största språken i Sverige. In *Språktidningen* (2016). Nr 3. Retrieved from <http://spraktidningen.se/comment/1668>.

- Habermas, J. (1986). *Kommunikativt handlande. Texter om språk rationalitet och samhälle*. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos.
- Lainio, J. (1999). Språk, genetik och geografi – om kontinuitetsproblematiken och debatten om finska som minoritetsspråk. In K. Hyltenstam (Ed.), *Sveriges sju inhemska språk*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Levanon, A., & Lewin-Epstein, N. (2010). Grounds for citizenship: Public attitudes in comparative perspective. *Social Science Research*, 39(3), 419–431. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.12.001.
- Paulston, C. B. (1986). Social factors in language maintenance and language shift. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *The Fergusonian Impact*, 2. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, New York, Amsterdam.
- Rooth, D. O & Strömblad, P. (2008). Språk, krav och medborgarskap. Underlagsrapport nr 14 till Globaliseringsrådet.
- Svensk författningssamling nr: 2009:600. Språklag. Kulturdepartementet.
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (2002). Dual language programs: Key features Directions. *Language and Education*, 14.
- Wayne, T., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Retrieved from http://www.thomasandcollier.com/assets/1997_thomas-collier97-1.pdf
- Wayne, T., & Collier, V. (2001). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students. Long-term academic achievement*. Retrieved from <http://cmmr.usc.edu//CollierThomasExReport.pdf>.
- Zenou, Y. (2008). How common is integration policy in Europe? *Stockholm University and Research Institute of Industrial Economics* (IFN). Retrieved from <http://www.parisschoolofeconomics.eu/IMG/pdf/ArticleZenou3.pdf>.

Christina von Post

Dalarna University, Sweden; cvp@du.se

Patrik Wikström

Örebro University, Sweden; patrikwikstrom71@hotmail.com

Helge Räihä

Örebro University, Sweden; helge.raiha@oru.se

Vilmantė Liubiniėnė

Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania; vilmante.liubiniene@ktu.lt

ŠIAURĖS EUROPOS KALBŲ DĖSTYTOJŲ VERTYBĖS IR JŲ POŽIŪRIS Į ANTROSIOS KALBOS STUDIJAS

Santrauka. Kalbos mokymasis imigrantams, siekiantiems gauti šalies pilietybę, tampa vis labiau aktualus pastaruoju metu, nes kai kuriose šalyse yra privalomi testai, kalbos įsisavinimo lygiui nustatyti, kuriems, beje, yra keliami nauji reikalavimai (Bevelander, Fernandez & Hellström, 2011, p. 101). Pilietybės įgijimas yra daugiau lemiantis veiksnys siekiant integruoti imigrantus į dalyvavimą visuomenės gyvenime, nei jų buvimo toje šalyje trukmė (Bevelander, Fernandez & Hellström, 2011). Antrosios kalbos žinios yra svarbus rodiklis, užtikrinantis integraciją ir aktyvų įsitraukimą į pilietinę visuomenę. Dauguma ES šalių (išskyrus Airiją ir Švediją) taiko kalbos testavimą pilietybei gauti, ir tai tampa vis labiau įprastu reiškiniu imigrantus priimančiose šalyse. Problemos aktualumas rodo naujų tarptautinių tyrimų poreikį, kurių tikslas būtų išsiaiškinti pilietybės suteikimo ir antrosios kalbos mokymosi sąlygų sudarymo imigrantams santykį. Šio straipsnio tikslas yra palyginti Danijos, Norvegijos ir Švedijos kalbų dėstytojų vertybines nuostatas ir ištirti prielaidas ir perspektyvas, susijusias su reikalavimais, keliamais imigrantams, kurie ketina įgyti tos šalies pilietybę. Ankstesnės studijos (Björklund & Liubiniėnė, 2004) rodo, kad egzistuoja dideli kultūriniai vertybiniai skirtumai netgi tarp kaimyninių šalių. Įgyvendinant tyrimo tikslus, buvo apklausti kalbų dėstytojai Danijoje, Norvegijoje ir Švedijoje. Rezultatai atskleidė du, vienas kitam priešingus, modelius. Švedų vertybinės nuostatos iš esmės skiriasi nuo danų ir norvegų, kurių nuostatos yra panašios. Tyrimų rezultatai kelia eilę klausimų išsamesnėms studijoms ateityje, įtraukiant platesnį respondentų ratą ir praplečiant tiriamųjų imtį Lietuvoje ir kitose Baltijos šalyse.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: vertybės, antrosios kalbos dėstytojai, pilietybė, imigrantai, integracija.