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Abstract

The aim of this phenomenological study was to explore what role teachers at introductory programmes (SFI-schools) play in the integration of immigrants, how the teachers experience their work and what they feel about the situation in which their students, the immigrants, are. To what extent and in what way do the teachers contribute to facilitating the integration of the immigrant students? The study was conducted at two different schools, Lernia and Världens Hus (n=17), located in Malmö, Sweden. An open question was used and the self-reports were analyzed with MCA-Minerva (Meaning Construction Analysis). The result showed that teachers at both schools speak about an existing gap between the Swedish society and the immigrants and it is evident that introductory programmes can serve as a bridge connecting the two. Several interesting questions and issues about introductory programmes and integration have arisen during our study, which can lead to further research in the field of acculturation.
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Introduction

It is common nowadays that people are residents in more than just one country during their lifetime. Various causes, such as poverty, war and hopes for a better life have resulted in people moving from one culture to another. Many individuals in the world today are faced with learning to live in a new country and culture, different from what they grew up in. The receiving country is facing the decision of how to react to the new people coming to live among them. This culture contact between people from different cultures raises many important issues and questions of how to deal with the emerging change.

The purpose of our study was to explore how members of a host society, Sweden, see their role in the culture contact and the acculturation of immigrants. The study was conducted in the school-context of SFI (Swedish For Immigrants) with the teachers as study participants, representing the host society. The aim was to see what role the teachers at two different SFI-schools play in the integration of immigrants, how they experience their work and what they feel about the situation in which their participants, the immigrants, are. The intention was also to explore if there were any differences or similarities between Lernia, the official SFI-school and Världens Hus, an alternative SFI-school, which focus on native language teaching. Both schools are located in Malmö.

Acculturation

The process that individuals undergo in response to a changing cultural context is called acculturation. Acculturation can mean several different scenarios. A change of cultural context could take place in a country over time, between generations. Another example of a scenario is an environmental change, e.g. a farmer who is acculturated when moving into a big city. The acculturation, which we are focusing on in this study, is when individuals leave one country for another and meet a culture different from what they grew up in. According to Berry, Poortinga, Segall and Dasen (2002) there are some key-elements that identify acculturation: the contact or interaction between the cultures has to be continuous and first hand and the result of the contact is some change in the cultural or the psychological phenomena among the people in contact and finally, there is a long-term result of the process, which may be relatively stable.

During culture contact each culture could in theory influence the other equally, but in practice, one tends to dominate the other. This leads to a distinction between the dominant and
the non-dominant culture. But what is the actual meaning of a dominant culture? Is it only that the majority of the population belong to that culture, or is it that the dominant culture influences the other culture? How do individuals experience being part of the dominant culture? In our study we will be referring to Sweden as the host society instead of the dominant culture, as it is not clear, according to us, which culture is influencing which. However, one thing that is clear is that both cultures change in the process of acculturation. Changes in the host society can be population expansions, greater cultural diversity, attitudinal reaction and policy development. The change resulting from acculturation is very variable and depends on cultural and psychological characteristics of the host society and the minority groups.

For many decades, theory and research on acculturation of immigrants was characterised by the extent of adoption and assimilation to the culture of the host country. This linear unidirectional model of acculturation suggested that, for immigrants to gain access to the new country, they had to give up their traditional culture. During the last two decades, a new bidimensional model of acculturation has increasingly been replacing the unidirectional model. Bidimensional approaches propose that immigrants and minority group members can have either strong or weak identifications with both their original culture and the majority society and they can vary on the wish to maintain their original culture and to interact with the host population members. The bidimensional model also takes into account the acculturation strategies of the host society members (Ben-Shalom and Horenczyk, 2003).

**Acculturation strategies of the minority groups**

One of the most widely used acculturation models was developed by John Berry (Berry et al., 2002). It proposes four different acculturation strategies, which can be used by the minority group-members; assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization. Individuals from the minority group who seek to interact with the host society and at the same time wish to maintain their cultural identity are using the integration strategy. When individuals from the minority group do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and at the same time seek to interact with and adapt to the host societies culture, the assimilation strategy is defined. Separation refers to the rejection of the host societies culture and the maintaining of one’s minority identity. Finally, marginalization occurs when both the minority group members’ original culture and that of the host society is rejected.
Many research studies assessing the preferred acculturation strategies among the minority group have been conducted and in most studies, preferences for integration is expressed over the other three strategies, with marginalization being the least preferred (Berry et al., 2002).

**Acculturation attitudes of the host society**

The different acculturation strategies presented assumes that the minority groups and their individual members have the freedom to choose how they want to engage in intercultural relations. However, this is in practice not always the case. The host society might enforce certain kinds of relations, or limit the choices of the minority group members. The dimension of the powerful role played by the host society in influencing the way that mutual acculturation takes place was proposed by Berry (Berry et al., 2002). Just like members from the minority group can have acculturation strategies, so can members from the host society.

Assimilation when sought by the host society is called a melting pot. The assimilationist orientation corresponds to the concept of absorption where the host society expects immigrants to give up their cultural identity and adopt the culture of the host society. The assimilationist orientation implies that host society members will eventually consider the assimilated immigrants as members of the host society.

When separation is enforced by the host society it is called segregation. Members of the host society who prefer a segregationist orientation accept that immigrants maintain their original culture as long as they keep their distance from host majority members. They do not want immigrants to adopt or influence the host culture. Host society members who adopt this orientation disfavour cross-cultural contact with immigrants. They prefer the immigrants to remain together in separate communities and do not regard immigrants as rightful members of the host society.

When marginalization is imposed by the host society it is a form of exclusion. The exclusionist orientation is adopted by members of the host society who are both intolerant of immigrants who maintain their culture of origin and also refuse to allow immigrants to adopt characteristics of the host culture. Exclusionists deny immigrants the choice to maintain their original culture and believe that immigrants can never be incorporated culturally or socially as members of the host society.

When the goal of acculturation for the host society group is integration and when cultural diversity is an objective of the society as a whole, it is called multiculturalism. Host majority members who accept and value the maintenance of the heritage culture of immigrants and also
accept that immigrants adopt important features of the host culture support the integrationist orientation.

These four acculturation strategies are very clearly defined and separated from one another. Placing an individual from the host society in one of the acculturation strategy groups may not be as simple as Berry’s model proposes. An individual does not always have clear, stable attitudes and feelings about the acculturation process and therefore it is difficult to limit an individual to only one of the strategies. An individual can have many different selves in different contexts, what Michael Bachtin (1986) called “the dialogical self”. The acculturation attitude of an individual is also likely to change over time and is dependent on the situation in which the individual is. Therefore Berry’s four strategies are not complex enough to measure the individual’s acculturation attitudes. There is a need for a different way to explore the acculturation attitudes of individuals, a way that is suited to the complex nature of human beings.

**Interactive Acculturation Model**

Another theory, which emphasises the role played by the host society in acculturation, has been presented by Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal (1997) called the Interactive Acculturation Model, (IAM). In this model the acculturation expectations of the host society are assessed, as well as the acculturation strategies of the minority groups. The IAM was proposed to better account for relations between immigrants and host society members depending on their respective acculturation orientations. Bourhis et al. (1997) proposed that five acculturation orientations can be endorsed by host society members toward specific immigrant minorities. Except for the four acculturation strategies already presented in Berry’s model, assimilation, segregation, exclusion and integration, the IAM adds a fifth strategy called individualism. Individualism is an orientation in which host community members define themselves and others as individuals rather than as members of group categories such as immigrants or host society members. For individualists, it is the personal characteristics of individuals that are important, rather than belonging to one group or another. The individualists tend to downgrade the importance of maintaining the immigrants’ culture or adopting the culture of the host society as criteria of successful acculturation.

The IAM proposes that acculturation orientations held by host society members can influence the orientations adopted by immigrant group members. However, it can also be the opposite. The attitudes of immigrants can affect host society members in how they feel about
acculturation. This is related the discussion about which culture dominates which, is it always the host society that dominates and changes the minority groups, or can it be the opposite?

The importance of mutual influence and interaction between the host society group and the minority group is clear in the case of integration. Integration can only be chosen and successfully pursued by the minority groups when the host society is open and inclusive in its orientation toward cultural diversity. Both cultures need to accommodate for integration to be attained, involving the acceptance by both host society and minority groups of the right of all groups to live as culturally different people within the same society. The acculturation strategy of integration requires minority groups to adopt the basic values of the larger society, while at the same time the host society must be prepared to adapt national institutions such as education and labour to better meet the needs of all groups who are living together in the same society. This is the multicultural view of a plural society and the integration strategy can only be pursued in societies that are explicitly multicultural (Bourhis et al., 1997).

**Acculturation studies of the host society**

Compared to the extensive research conducted on acculturation strategies of minority group members, relatively few studies of the host society’s role in acculturation have been carried out. However, the existing studies show a distinct preference for integration in many countries and this orientation seems to have become more popular the last couple of decades (Berry et al., 2002). Recent studies measuring the acculturation attitudes of host society group-members in Germany, Switzerland and Canada found strong preferences for the integrationist and individualist orientation relative to the assimilationist orientation (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001).

The majority of acculturation studies of today have been conducted using questionnaires with multiple answers such as Berry’s Immigration Acculturation Model, IAM and the Host Community Acculturation Scale, HCAS, developed by Bourhis et al. (1997) This is the traditional way of conducting research with positivistic methods. But how much of an individual’s actual thoughts and feelings about acculturation are revealed in these tests, when it is the researcher who decides what to ask about? Is the individual’s own attitude toward acculturation really explored or is he/she only answering the researcher’s questions? One can also wonder if this theoretical result of acculturation attitudes reflects how the participants in the study act in practice toward immigrants. Is there a discrepancy between theory and practice? Do people state their real thoughts and feelings when answering the multiple answers
questions? Or is it possible that their answers do not reflect the truth, because they are perhaps affected by social desirability?

The influence of integration policies

The Interactive Acculturation Model proposes that the acculturation orientations of host society members are influenced by the integration policies adopted by the state government of the host country. Through its influence on the educational system, public administration, and the mass media, the state can influence public attitudes concerning immigration and integration issues. An example of this can be seen in the study mentioned above, conducted by Bourhis et al. (1997), where the mainly integrationist and individualist orientations endorsed by Canadians are said to reflect the mainly pluralist integration policies adopted by the Canadian government.

A country’s integration policies can range from multicultural and pluralistic to having goals as assimilating or segregating immigrants. Some societies seek diversity and are accepting of the cultural pluralism resulting from immigration, they support the continuation of cultural diversity as a shared communal resource. It is proposed by IAM that these state integration policies adopted at the national, provincial, and regional levels create an official integration climate that can influence the acculturation orientations of host society, which in turn have an impact on the acculturation orientations of the immigrants (Bourhis et al., 1997).

But not only is it possible for the integration policies of the state to influence its members, but also vice versa; integration policies can be influenced by the acculturation orientation found to be most common among members of the host society. The general attitude of the population can have an impact on what kind of integration policy the government develops.

Integration policies

Most European countries used to favour an assimilationist orientation, however this policy did not work well in most countries and it gradually changed. In many parts of the world today the multicultural society is becoming more and more favoured (Berry et al., 2002).

At an integration conference in Groningen, Holland, in November 2004, all the ministers responsible for integration from the EU-countries and the EU applicant countries, came together to discuss integration issues. In the conclusions of the conference it was stated:
Key points highlighted by the ministers included that integration must be a two-way process that fully involves both immigrants and the host society (EU Integration Policy Conference, 2004).

This is in accordance with the integration approach to acculturation, which means that both the host society culture and the minority culture must be active in the process.

As mentioned above, the integration policies of a country are thought to influence the acculturation orientations of its members and vice versa. Our study was conducted in Sweden, an explicit multicultural country. Berry et al. (2002) mention Sweden when talking about multicultural societies and quote the three goals that were included in the multicultural policy, which was adopted by the Swedish government in 1975; equality, freedom of choice and partnership.

The goal of freedom of choice implies that public initiatives are to be taken to assure members of ethnic and linguistic minorities domiciled in Sweden a genuine choice between retaining and developing their cultural identity and assuming a Swedish cultural identity (Berry et al. 2002).

In a more recent statement from the Swedish government it is stated that:

The rights and equality of the individuals also includes the right to be different. Hence the society should facilitate the individual’s integration of old and new patterns of live and life stiles in any way the individual wishes1 (Proposition of the Government, 1997/98:16).

In theory, Sweden is a perfect scene for the integration of immigrants. But how does it work in practice? Does the Swedish population reflect the country’s integration policy? Does a country’s integration policy correspond to how the country actually acts toward immigrants?

The role of introductory programmes for immigrants

---

1 Individens rätt och lika värde innehåller även rätten att vara olik. Samhället bör därför underlätta för individen att integrera gamla och nya livsmönster och livsstilar på det sätt hon själv önskar.
In many receiving countries newly arrived adult immigrants are offered courses in the host country’s language and these courses are a combination of language learning and introduction to the host country. For many immigrants this is their first contact with the host society and its members.

At the EU integration conference in Holland in November 2004, one of the main issues discussed was the role of introductory programmes for immigrants. The introductory programmes are thought to be an essential first step in integration of immigrants.

*Introductory programmes should be directed towards economic and social self-sufficiency and the promotion of shared citizenship – a focus on ties that bind us, and on solid respect for difference. The needs and concerns of both the newcomer and of the host society must be addressed in attempts to foster shared citizenship in diverse societies* (EU Integration Policy Conference, 2004).

In Sweden, the introductory programmes go under the name of SFI, Swedish For Immigrants. Each and every municipality in Sweden is obliged to offer introductory courses to all newly arrived adult immigrants. Newly-arrived in this context means immigrants who have been in Sweden less than two years. The official goals of the introductory courses, Swedish For Immigrants (SFI), are described by the Board of education:

*The education also aims at knowledge and understanding of the organisation of the society and its basic values, to facilitate the student’s integration, active participation in and contribution to the development of society, work and culture in Sweden* (SKOLFS 1994:28).

These goals of SFI reflect the importance of introductory programmes in facilitating the integration of immigrants in the Swedish society. Several questions arise about the meaning of these goals of the introductory courses. What do concepts like the organisation of a society and its basic values mean? Do the concepts mean the same regardless of the group one belongs to, if one is a Swedish citizen or a Swedish immigrant? And what does it mean to participate

---

2 Utbildningen syftar även till kunskap om och förståelse av samhällets organisation och dess grundläggande värderingar för att underlätta den elevens integration, aktiva medverkan i och bidrag till utvecklingen av samhällsliv, arbetsliv och kultur i Sverige.
actively in a society? When does one become passive? Does the activity indicate a mental participation in the society, such being politically active or airing one’s opinions, or does the activity only mean that one has to show up at the introductory courses and listen to what the teachers say?

For many immigrants this is their first contact and with the Swedish society. How important is this contact and introduction for the acculturation and integration of immigrants? In the process of an individual’s socialisation a society’s education system is probably the most important institution through teaching and reinforcing the country’s cultural values. Socialisation is the process by which members of a culture learn and internalise the rules and patterns of behaviour that exist in their culture. The process involves learning cultural norms, attitudes, values and belief systems. Is the role played by the host society’s education system for adult immigrants as important in acculturation and integration as the role of education system in a child’s socialisation?

The role of teachers at introductory programmes in the integration of immigrants has not been explored in any study before, known to us, despite the emphasis on these programmes by many European state integration policies.

**Purpose of study**

In our study we wanted to explore how teachers in the introductory programmes for immigrants look at their work and what role they play in the integration of immigrants. Do the teachers at SFI reflect the multicultural integration policy adopted by the Swedish government? To what extent and in what way do the teachers contribute to facilitating the integration of the immigrant students? Our study was conducted at two different schools, Lernia and Världens Hus, located in Malmö, Sweden and the intention was also to explore if there were any differences or similarities between these two schools in how the teachers experience their work. In our study we made the distinction between the teachers and the introductory programmes, where the teachers work. We focused only on the teachers’ role in the integration of immigrants, the official role of introductory programmes have not been explored by us.

**Approach of study**

In our study of acculturation we decided to use a phenomenological approach to research, as opposed to a positivistic one. We chose the phenomenological approach to explore how the
teachers in the SFI-context experience their situation, what their situation means to them and how they construct their life world. Since we feel that individuals and their thoughts about acculturation are more complex than what Berry’s and the IAM’s acculturation strategies suggest, we chose to use a phenomenological research method instead. We did not feel that we would have explored the phenomenon itself if we chose to use multiple answer questions for our study. This would have, according to us, limited the result, as we would have been the ones deciding what to ask about. Only by using this phenomenological approach in our study are we able to truly explore the attitudes of the teachers toward their participants, the immigrants, in the SFI-context. The phenomenological approach to science will later be described in detail.

Description of schools

We decided to conduct our study in two different SFI-schools in Malmö. Lernia is the official SFI-school where immigrants are placed upon their arrival in Sweden. Världens Hus is an alternative school for immigrants who have not been able to complete the official SFI-school. The schools use different ways of teaching. We wanted to explore how teachers at these two schools experience their work and what they think and feel about the situation in which their participants are.

Lernia

The official SFI-school, which the city of Malmö assigned to offer new immigrants courses in the Swedish language and an introduction to the Swedish society, is called Lernia and it is located in Valdemsarsro, Malmö. Just like Malmö, every main city in Sweden has a municipally run SFI-school, and these schools are designed according to the guidelines stated by the Board of education. The SFI-courses include language courses combined with introductory courses to the Swedish society, and vocational training concentrating on a certain occupation. The immigrants are put into different classes based on their previous education and work experiences. At Lernia the courses usually last for two years, but can be extended for an extra year depending on the student’s needs. Most of the teachers are of Swedish origin and the majority of the classes are held in Swedish.

Lernia is a large school with approximately 100 employees and more then 1200 students. There are 3 target groups, target group one is available for 300 students, those who lack comprehensive school when they arrived to Sweden, target group two is available for 500 students, those who have completed comprehensive school and target group three is available
for 300 students, those who have an academic education. The remaining students who are not included in the target groups are for different reasons placed in special-need classes. The newly arrived immigrants are not to wait more than three months for an education at Lernia; the school does admissions of students all year around.

*Världens Hus*

The other school, which uses native language teaching, is called Världens Hus and was started by the district of Hyllie in Malmö, which quickly came to cooperate with Hyllie Park folk high school. The school is located in Kroksbäck, Malmö. The regional office in Hyllie felt that there was a need for an alternative school for all the immigrants who, at the official school of SFI, Lernia, did not manage to learn enough Swedish or did not complete the courses for some reason. Världens Hus offers these students a new chance to learn Swedish in their own pace with a native language teacher, a teacher who speaks their language. The native language teachers at Världens Hus speak Arabic, Pashto and Albanian. There is also a small number of teachers at Världens Hus who are not native language teacher but most of these teachers do however have some knowledge in the participants’ native languages.

Världens Hus is a rather small school with approximately 100 students and 10 teachers. One class consists of 20 students and the majority of them are women. There are five different grades, one grade is estimated to require one year but there is no time limit, the students are able to stay as long as needed in each grade. Since most of the students are illiterate when they arrive at Världens Hus, they are first taught to read and write in their native language before learning Swedish. They do not only learn the Swedish language; they have lessons in social science, mathematic, computer skills, arts and craft, etc.

The project of Världens Hus and their concentration on native language teaching have attracted attention in Malmö for its accomplishments in educating illiterate immigrants (Mörnerud, 2004). Mörnerud describes other schools, for example in Niger, which have had more success with bilingual teaching compared to monolingual teaching. In Sweden the use of native language teaching in SFI-schools is almost non-existing. Mörnerud emphasizes the importance of the native language as language of instruction for basic understanding and learning in the school context. Today the new coming immigrants in Sweden who have none or little education are greater than before and consequently the need for native language teaching schools, which teach from the bases, is increasing (Mörnerud, 2004).
Method

Procedure and Participants

Since we decided to conduct a study about the acculturation process we contacted the migration office in Malmö, to speak with them about possible areas of our study. We met with Britta Ström, responsible for integration issues, and Gunilla Håkansson, principle of SFI in Malmö and reached a mutual agreement to carry out our study in the SFI-context.

The first school we contacted was Världens Hus. At our first visit there we attended a class with 20 students and three native language teachers. We did not hand out our question at that time; instead we observed how things worked at the school and how the students and the teachers reacted to our presence. We wanted to see how a normal class was constructed and organized at Världens Hus. We spoke with some of the teachers who expressed their willingness to participate in our study and who offered their disposal if we needed help or information. In general we received a very positive response from both the teachers and the students. A couple of weeks later we returned to Världens Hus and handed out our question to all eight teachers available at the school that day. We introduced our study, handed out our description of project (see appendix A) and gave them instructions about the question and informed them about when it had to be completed. Four days later we returned to pick up the completed questions. We were pleased to see that all eight teachers had answered our question. The eight study participants included six women and two men, five or them are native language teacher and three are SFI-teachers and their age varies between 36 to 53. At the second school we contacted, Lernia, we experienced difficulties. It seemed to us that all the employees had a very hectic schedule and did not have time to meet with us and help us to get in contact with participants for our study. Eventually we managed to meet with Hilding Åkerman, head of the educational unit, who told us about the arrangement and gave us general information about the school. Our first attempt to collect participants to our study was through the use of email but it was without success as none of the teachers replied to our question despite several requests. Therefore we decided to come to the school in person and ask teachers on the spot. We handed out our question, as well as the description of project (see appendix A), to nine teachers and
waited for them to answer it. While waiting we spoke to several teachers about their work and their situation as well as with some students. The nine study participants included five women and four men, five of them are SFI-teachers and four are vocational trainers and their age varies between 30 and 42.

In our study we used one open question, (see appendix B for the complete version of the question), where the participants wrote down their thoughts about their teaching role and what they thought was important to them. The question was:

*Please tell us about all your thoughts, feelings and views about your working role, regarding your relation with the students and the situation in which they are (to live in a new culture)*.

We decided to use an open question in order not to give them any guidance and to enable them to write what was important to them. This is in accordance to the phenomenological approach where the researcher is not supposed to influence the answers of the participants. The aim of an open question is to enable us to see how an individual constructs his/her own life world. By analyzing a text produced by the individual we focus on understanding how the individual constitutes meaning in his/her work and life based on his/her own subjective experiences as well as acknowledging the individual as a source of information (Sages, 2003).

The participants at both schools were anonymous; they were only asked if they were a man or a woman, how old they were, what background they had and what kind of teacher they were, native language teacher, SFI-teacher or vocational training. All the instructions were included in the question form, but if they had any further questions we were at place for their disposal.

**Phenomenology**

In our study of acculturation we wanted to know how the individuals in the school context experience their situation, what their situation means to them and how they construct their life world. To explore this we decided to use a phenomenological research method. The phenomenological approach to research was introduced by Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) in the late 19th century, around the same time when psychology as a science was born. Husserl developed phenomenology as an alternative approach to the research method of nature science
that was dominating psychology at the time. His main criticism of the positivistic contemporary science was that it had not explored or questioned the life world of humans, the existence we all share (Karlsson, 1995). Husserl described the life world as a place and time where the meaning(s) of everything has its origin. The life world is constructed by the individual’s experiences of the context he/she is in and how the individual constitutes his or her existence. This originates in and through the daily activity of the individual (Sages & Dahl, 1999). The life world is intersubjective, it is partly shared by individuals who are in the same context. To share a life world means that individuals participate in common forms of daily activities but the construction of the life world is always individual (Sages, 2003). It is assumed that the human mind is intentional; it is always directed toward something, which can be both internal and external. The phenomenological approach aims at a critical examination of the experience and in order to do so a reduction has to be made by the researcher. The phenomenological reduction is the task of describing a textual language just as one sees it, to look and describe, not only in terms of the external object but also the internal act of consciousness, the experience and the relationship between phenomenon and self. Husserl meant that it is important to bring things that are not obvious into the light (Karlsson, 1995). The natural attitude and the beliefs that we have of all things in the world inhibit us from realizing the possibility to question the experience of the world. The reduction breaks with our natural attitude and acceptance of our experiences. What the reduction does is that it opens up the consciousness and the subjective role of giving meaning to the world (Karlsson, 1995).

One needs to understand the meaning that things have for the person being studied. To find the meaning one needs to look at the individual’s own terms and expressions about the object of interest. In our study this is done by looking closely at the words of the participants through MCA (Meaning constitution analysis) – Minerva, which will soon be explained.

The phenomenological researcher tries to understand a situation as it is constructed by the participants and how and what people interpret the world, rather then why. The aim is not, as in positivistic research, to explain or find correlations, but rather to explore and describe a phenomenon. The intention is to discover patterns, which emerge after close observation, careful documentation and thoughtful analysis of the research topic. These patterns are always contextual findings at first. Only a careful analysis of meaning as it is constituted by the individual subject can give indications for eventual generalisations and formulations of typologies and classifications above the individual level (Sages, 2003). The research can be described as inductive as opposed to the positivistic research of deduction.
**Indwelling**

A phenomenological researcher assumes the posture of *indwelling* while conducting research; the researcher interacts in the investigation and tries to experience the world in a similar way with the study participants, while at the same time removing himself/herself from the situation to rethink the meanings of the experiences (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

We have attempted to assume the posture of indwelling in our study by visiting the schools where the participants in our study work and trying to take in the general atmosphere of the situation. We spoke to the study participants at both schools prior and after the actual study and tried to understand their experience of their work and get a general feeling of what it is like to do the work they do.

**Emergent design**

In our study we have used an *emergent design*, which implies that the aims and ways of the study are modifiable and open for change in the ongoing process of the investigation. Phenomenological research does not have a pre-set script to follow in detail, like the positivistic research. The perspective is open-ended and not clearly focused in its initial stages. An important quality of the researcher is tolerance for ambiguity, the ability to hold two or more different interpretations of an event, activity, or a person in mind, while waiting to see which interpretation is merited by the data which one is in the process of collecting (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). An emergent design has been implemented in our study by being open to change of focus in the study and by modifying our main question to suit the study as it developed, as well as being open for different interpretations of the data.

**Validity**

In the science of psychology the validity is a central concept and the problems of validity have up to now been formulated from a traditional positivistic conception of science. In the traditional positivistic approach the concept of validity refers to the extent of truth in the research, the fact that the scientist is measuring the things he/she is suppose to (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, 2003). It is characterized by an atomistic ontology of reality, which means that it
is believed that entities exist independent from each other. This implies that the knower is
independent from what is known, that the researcher is independent from his/her research and
that a person consists of different variables, which can be studied independently and objectively.

Phenomenological research relies on different ontological principles. The mainstream
thinking with its atomistic view of an individual, which can be studied independently of any
cultural context and time, is contrary to the phenomenological view. Phenomenology has a
holistic view of the individual, which is why an individual can only be studied as a whole and
in a context. This is the reason why we are not using questionnaires in our study of
acculturation. When using questionnaires the researcher is studying variables independent from
the individual, removing the research topic from its original source, the individual.
Knowledge, whether produced, communicated or understood always originates in a situated
subject, having his or her understanding process anchored in his/her life world experience
(Sages, 2003). This is the reason why an individual can never be studied without taking his/her
context into consideration.

The researcher is always directed somewhere, with his/her intentionality, and in a specific
c context. A researcher can never be independent of his/her study, nor can he/she ever exist
outside the research. This is why research always is a subjective process, which is, contrary to
what is often stated in the positivistic approach, something that makes the research more valid.
It is the only way to attain knowledge about individuals as a whole and in a context.

An outcome of high validity is a result that does not exclude any possibilities of
interpretation of the data and which constantly changes its understanding of the participant. The
researcher should criticise his/her own interpretations and negotiate with several different
options and avoid taking anything for granted, which is a great risk for the researcher in
qualitative research methods. To validate is equivalent to the possibility for the reader, on the
grounds of his or her own life world experiences, of reactivating the original noetical processes
having resulted in the knowledge written down in the research report (Sages, 2003). This
means that if the result has a high validity, the reader will be able to understand the process
though which the researcher has come to his/her conclusions in the result. The validity also
refers to the transparency of the research process and the reaching of results, which means that
the reader must be able to see clearly why and how the researcher has come certain conclusions
in the result.

In our study of acculturation we have applied the concept of validity when presenting and
interpreting the results by trying to propose every different possibility of interpretations of the
data. The reaching of our conclusions has been presented as clearly as possible, to enable the reader to follow the process in which we have reached the result. We have attempted to be as open-minded as possible when looking at the results and not to be limited by our own preconceptions and subjectivity. The use of an open question in our study assures the ecological validity, since the individuals are able to express whatever they think is important and that they are being studied in their own context.

MCA-Minerva

To explore the life worlds of the participants in our study we chose to use the text analysis programme called MCA (Meaning Construction Analysis)-Minerva, which has been developed by Roger Sages, associate professor at Lund University (Sages & Dahl, 1999; Sages, 2003). According to this method of analysis the first step is for the researcher to assume an attitude toward the research called *epoche* (Sages & Dahl, 1999). Epoche is a significant concept in the phenomenological research and the aim is to as much as possible get rid of all previous knowledge and attitudes about the studied topic. The researcher is supposed to clear his/her mind of all his/her presumptions and expectations of the phenomenon being studied. This is done to reduce the risk of the researcher influencing the results and outcomes of the study. In the MCA-analysis the researcher should be as objective as possible and this is done by dividing the text into very small meaning units. This reduction decreases the risk for personal and subjective interpretations of the text. And it also facilitates for other researchers to compare the analysis step by step to other analysis and to identify differences and possible mistakes.

Minerva aims to create a view of the participant’s life world and how it is constituted by that person. This is done by looking closely at a text, created by the participant about a certain topic of interest to the researcher, what the meaning of the text is and in what way it is written. The final results of the analysis are horizons, which together create a person’s life world. Horizons are results of complete noemas and these consist of partial entities and modalities. The modalities describe how the person expresses himself/herself in the text. The person might for example express himself/herself in present time and with a negative affect. A core noema consists of only partial intentions. The partial intentions are made up from entities and predicates. An entity is what appears as something that exists for the individual and the entities can be expressed through one or several predicates.

MCA-analysis in our study
The 17 protocols were first analyzed separately with MCA with modalities and partial intentions, including entities and predicates. The 6 modalities used are belief, function, time, affect, will and subject.

The result will be presented using complete noemas in two themes of entities, with belonging predicates. The two themes of entities are teachers and participants. We chose these entities as they relate to our study question and because they are the most occurring entities. Only the predicates, which are relevant to our study question, have been included. In the theme teacher we have included related words such as educator and native language teacher and in the theme participants we have also included the entity of students.

Using only certain entities may lead to that relevant and important parts of the protocols will not be included in the result. Someone might for example be talking about participants but using the word immigrants, or talking about teachers using the word people, and then these entities will not be included in the result. But there is a reason why we are presenting the result in this way. Only by using the same entities are we able to compare the individuals and the two schools, it enables us to look at the differences and similarities between the teachers and between the schools when they speak about the same entity.

The different predicates to the entities each have the six different modalities, which will be presented in charts and tables. We decided to present two of these in the presentation of the themes; affect and time. The reason why we chose to include only two modalities in the presentation of entities was to enable a deeper and more integrated interpretation and to clarify the relation between entities and modalities. The modality of affect was chosen because everything is always expressed with an affect, positive, negative or neutral. We chose time as the second modality since everything one says is always in a temporal context, it is always situated somewhere in time. The times used are past, present, future, present->past, present->future, always-recurrent, empty.

*Structure of presenting the MCA-analysis*

The result will begin with a presentation of all six modalities in charts depicting comparisons within and between the two schools. The comparisons between the schools regarding the modalities and its categories will also be presented with the use of statistical tests to see if any differences are significant. To explore this we chose to use the parametrical test of Independent samples T-test. The result from the T-tests for each modality will be presented below each chart. The use of quantitative means and statistical tests in our study does not contradict our method of research. It is important to keep in mind that phenomenological psychology does not
take an all or none position on the issue of quantitative or qualitative methods, contrary to what is usually believed (Sages, 2003).

Further the result will continue with a presentation of entities in the theme teacher at Världens Hus and then Lernia and each school contains a summary at the end. The theme participant will be presented in the same way as the theme teacher, separately for the two schools and with a summary after each. The entities and predicates are presented separately for each person and after every person there is a comment on the content of the predicates. Only the teachers who mention the different entities in their protocols will be presented.

According to the phenomenological approach to research a certain amount of interpretation can be included in the presenting of the result, therefore the comments to the entities will include discussions based on our understanding of the result.

The findings presented in our results are only contextual and based on the entities and predicates, which have been selected by us for the presentation of the result. We do not claim that our results have an external validity, nor do we want to generalize our results to all teachers within the SFI-context. Our findings are based on a small part of the 17 protocols and are only valid for the entities and predicates included in the result.

Result

*Presentation of modalities*

*Modality: Function*
Figure 1. The modality of function, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus

The modality function states in what way something is expressed in the meaning unit. The modality is divided into three categories: perceptive, signitive and imaginative. Perceptive means that something is expressed in concrete and specific terms, it expresses fact, not interpretation. Signitive indicates that the meaning unit expresses an interpretation and this is expressed with abstract terms. When the meaning unit contains a speculation about something, when something that does not exist is imagined, then the function is imaginative. In the table above it is seen that at both schools signitive is more widely used than perceptive and imaginative, with Lernia using it in 64.46% of the time and Världens Hus in 53.96%. Perceptive is used 31.48% at Lernia and 42.93% at Världens Hus. Imaginative is the category least used with 4.06% at Lernia and 3.11% at Världens Hus. The difference between signitive and perceptive is more salient at Lernia than at Världens Hus.

Table 1.1
The means and standard deviation of the modality of function for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality Function</th>
<th>Lernia Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Världens Hus Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signitive</td>
<td>64.47</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>53.97</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>42.93</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modality: Time

![Time Modality Chart]

*Figure 2.* The modality of time, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus.

The categories in the modality time are: present, past, future, always-recurrent, present->past and present->future. The modality refers to in what time a meaning unit is expressed. In the modality of time, the most widely used category is present for both schools, Lernia uses it in 45.50% and Världens Hus in 41.43%, this means that in almost half of the meaning units the teachers at the two schools speak about things in present time. Future is used 0.45% at Lernia and not at all at Världens Hus, past is used in 7.44% at Lernia and 7.84% at Världens Hus, present->future is used at Lernia in 4.52% and at Världens Hus in 2.45%, present->past are rarely used with a percentage of 1.21% at Lernia and 0.20% at Världens Hus.

Table 1.2

*The means and standard deviation of the modality of time for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lernia</th>
<th>Världens Hus</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always-recur.</td>
<td>15,79</td>
<td>16,2</td>
<td>24,39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future 0,44 1,33 0 0 0,35
Present 45,2 11,88 41,52 26,31 0,72
Pres->past 1,2 1,48 0,2 0,58 0,09
Pres->fut 4,49 4,63 2,45 3,63 0,33
Past 7,39 16,21 7,86 12,49 0,95
Empty 24,81 17,82 23,79 12,99 0,90

*Modality: Affect*

![Affect](image-url)

*Figure 3.* The modality of affect, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus.

The modality states with what affect, negative, positive or neutral, a meaning unit is expressed. In the modality affect the categories of positive and negative are not used very often, but approximately to the same extent at both schools. The category of positive it is used 11,96% at Lernia and 13,56% at Världens Hus. Negative is used 13,58% at Lernia and 8,97% at Världens Hus. Neutral is the dominating category in the modality of affect, which is used 74,54% at Lernia and 77,47% at Världens Hus.

*Table 1.3*

The means and standard deviation of the modality of affect for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)
Negative 13,63 12,43 8,16 4,06 0,24  
Positive 11,96 12,56 12,34 10,15 0,95  
Neutral 74,46 20,06 70,5 27,8 0,74  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lernia</th>
<th>Världens Hus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>13,63</td>
<td>12,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>11,96</td>
<td>12,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>74,46</td>
<td>20,06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modality: Belief**

![Belief Diagram]

*Figure 4.* The modality of belief, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus.

The modality of belief refers to the extent of certainty a meaning unit is expressed with. Doxa-affirmation means that the person speaking is certain of what he/she says and that it can not be questioned. Doxa-negation is used when the person states insecurity, that he/she does not know something. Possibility, probability and question all refer to the common meaning of the words. In the table above it is seen that doxa-affirmation is used in 96,23 % at Lernia and in 99,35 % at Världens Hus. The remaining categories are all used in less than 3 % of the meaning units. Possibility is used in 0,67 % at Lernia and in 0,65 % at Världens Hus, probability is used in 0,24 % and 0,00 % and question is used by Lernia in 2,86 % and by Världens Hus in 0,00%.

**Table 1.4**  
*The means and standard deviation of the modality of belief for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lernia</th>
<th>Världens Hus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1.5

The means and standard deviation of the modality of subject for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doxa-affirm.</td>
<td>96,23</td>
<td>7,92</td>
<td>99,35</td>
<td>1,33</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0,24</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>7,95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modality: Subject

Figure 5. The modality of subject, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus.

The modality of subject states who the subject in the meaning unit is. The modality is divided into five different categories: I, one-all, they, unspecified and we. At both schools the category most used is unspecified, teachers at Lernia use it in 58,70 % of the meaning units and Världens Hus in 59,63 %. The category used second most at Lernia is I with 18,37 %, whereas at Världens Hus it is the third most used category with 14,51 %. At Världens Hus the categories of they is the most common category after unspecified with 14,98 %. Lernia uses they in 13,77 % of the meaning units. The categories of we and one-all are all used in around 5 %, with one-all being used by Lernia in 4,43 % and by Världens Hus in 4,95 %. We is used in 4,73 % by Lernia and in 5,93 % by Världens Hus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lernia</th>
<th>Världens Hus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18,37</td>
<td>14,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-all</td>
<td>4,43</td>
<td>6,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>13,77</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>4,73</td>
<td>5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>58,68</td>
<td>11,56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modality: will**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{aspiration} \\
\text{engagement} \\
\text{none} \\
\text{unengagement} \\
\text{wish-positive}
\end{array}
\]

![Figure 6](image)

\textit{Figure 6.} The modality of will, the black bars represent Lernia and the white bars represent Världens Hus.

The modality states the engagement with which a meaning unit is expressed. Engagement means that the person has an engagement in or behind the meaning unit. Unengagement means that the person is not engaged. Aspiration indicates that the meaning unit is expressed with a demand. Wish-positive is when the person expresses a wish for something to happen and wish-negative is a wish for something to not happen. None is used when none of the categories described above are expressed. Engagement is the category, which is used in most of the meaning units at both schools. Lernia uses it in 56,11 % and Världens Hus in 60,23 %. None is used almost as often as engagement with Lernia using it in 43,55 % and Världens Hus in 37,05 %. Aspiration, unengagement and wish-positive are all below 1 % at both schools. Lernia does not use aspiration or unengagement at all, but wish-positive is used in 0,34 % of the meaning.
units. Världens Hus uses aspiration in 0.77 %, unengagement in 0.76 % and wish-positive in 0.34 % of the time.

Table 1.6

*The means and standard deviation of the modality of will for Lernia and Världens Hus and the probability value of the differences (n=17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lernia</th>
<th>Världens Hus</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish-positive</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>55.91</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unengagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Presentation of the entity themes*

**Theme: Teacher at Världens Hus**

Person 4, 5, 7, and 8 do not have teacher/native language teacher/educator as an entity.

Table 2.1.

*Entity: teacher and native language teacher of person 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Who became a link between Sweden and the participants’ native countries</th>
<th>Neutral/past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native language teacher</td>
<td>Who means contact with the new society</td>
<td>Neutral/empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who can understand the participants’ culture and tradition</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who can explain to the participants about the new culture in an easy way</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks only in a neutral affect about teacher and native language teacher. In past the teacher became a link between Sweden and the native countries. This implies that such a bridge is needed; that there is a gap between Sweden and the countries of the immigrants that one has
to overcome. The contact between the cultures requires a middleman and the native language
teacher means contact with the new society. It also implies that the participants themselves can,
because of an unknown reason, not overcome this gap between the cultures. A third party is
apparently needed for this.

The teacher is someone who can understand the participants’ culture and tradition. This
implies that the participants’ have a different culture that one needs to understand and that the
teachers at Världens Hus are able to do this, probably because they have the same culture and
language as the participants. It is implicitly said that there are some people who, as opposed to
the native language teachers, do not understand the culture and tradition of the participants. The
teacher is also someone who can explain to the participants about the new culture in an easy
way. This might imply that there is also a difficult way of explaining about the new culture to
the participants and that this might have happened in the past, maybe at the first SFI-school the
participants went to. This need for explanation about the “new” culture also implies that a gap
exist between the old and the new culture, that they are separate from each other.

Table 2.2

*Entity: teacher and native language teacher of person 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native language teacher</th>
<th>With whom the teaching becomes easier</th>
<th>Positive/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Who respects the participants</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a positive affect it is stated that the teaching becomes easier with a native language
teacher. It is not said why it becomes easier, but one can guess that it is because the teacher
speaks the same language as the participants and this facilitates the communication. The
sentence implies that the teaching has been difficult before, but it is not stated when, why or
with whom. It could be at the previous school where the participants attended, the official SFI-
school, Lernia at Valdemarso. The teacher is someone who respects the participants. Since this
is brought up, it might mean that there are people who do not respect the participants, but this is
not mentioned. That the teacher respect the participants could maybe imply that they are equal
people who are on the same level, no one is above the other.

Table 2.3

*Entity: native language teacher of person 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native language teacher</th>
<th>Who works like a bridge between the two cultures</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This person implies, just as person 1, that there is a need for a bridge or a link between the Swedish culture and the participants’ cultures and this need is filled by the native language teacher. The use of the word bridge implies that the cultures are not even connected, but away from each other and that something needs to bring them together. The native language teacher is someone who knows about the new culture as well as about the participants’ native cultures and connects the two.

Table .4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: native language teacher of person 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native language teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The native language teacher is someone who can mediate the contact, however it is not stated between who the contact is and why it is needed. The thing that is clear though is that a contact is needed and the native language teacher can work as a mediator of contact.

Summary of theme: Teacher at Världens Hus. Person 4, 5, 7 and 8 do not use the entity of teacher, native language teacher or educator in their texts. One an average, person 1, 2, 3 and 6 speak of teacher/native language teacher with a mainly neutral affect and in present time. One teacher speaks in past time and one speaks in always-recurrent. None of the respondents states anything with a negative affect when talking about teacher/native language teacher. One general theme of the respondents at Världens Hus is that they speak of teachers mediating contact between the Swedish and the participants’ culture. Both person 1 and 2 mention the teacher being a bridge/link between the cultures, the Swedish one and the participants’ cultures. They seem to speak about very similar things, a gap between the cultures, which is connected by the native language teacher. Person 1 and 6 both speak about native language teacher meaning contact, contact with the Swedish society and contact with something not stated. Person 1 states that a native language teacher understands the participants’ culture and can at the same time explain to them about the new culture in an easy way. This is part of the thought of teachers/native language teachers being a contact with the new society. Person 1 speaks about the understanding that the teachers have for the participants’ situation, that they can relate to them and person 2 speaks of the respect that the teachers have for the participants. Both these statements imply that the teachers think of the participants and teachers as being on
an equal level, nothing separates the two. The teachers seem to look at the participants as equal people who they can understand and respect.

Theme: Teacher at Lernia

Person 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9 do not have teacher/native language teacher/educator as an entity.

Table 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: educator of person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks in a negative affect about the feeling of no power. The person feels that he has no power to influence the students, give them guiding or help the students with learning disabilities. The students need to overcome the problem of language disability before the teacher can gain the power to help them and this seems to create feelings of helplessness and of frustration. The person is not able to reach the students when they do not know the language. Until the students gain sufficient knowledge in the Swedish language, the teacher feels that there is a gap between them, that they are on different levels.

Table 1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: educator of person 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person says that, for the students, all educators are representing the people who rule this country. Since he feels that he is a representative he implies that the Swedish society needs to be represented, that the students need a face and closeness to the people who make the decisions in the country that they live in. The person feels that there is a need for a link between the students and the ones that rule and he takes on that role. The fact that he uses the word becomes implies that it is only in his teaching role that he is a representative. What role
The person feels that the educators have an advantage towards the students. The way he says it, he implies that the Swedish people have an advantage toward the immigrants when it comes to language skills, economy and law. It is not stated if these are external circumstances, which the participants cannot control, or if the disadvantage is due to the immigrants’ internal factors. He implies that the educators and the students are on different levels and he talks about this with a neutral affect and in present time. Even though the person feels that he has the advantage towards his students he point out that this advantage must be handled with caution and responsibility. He implies that it is important that the students do not perceive the advantage as he does, because then they might feel inferior to the teachers. The question of language advantage is important when it comes to how the cultures differ. The Swedish people have the linguistic advantage, whereas knowledge of the language is often an obstacle that prevents the immigrants to enter the new society. The language is what separates the cultures.

**Summary of theme: Teacher at Lernia.** Person 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9 do not use the entity of teacher, native language teacher or educator in their texts. The three people who do mention the entity speak mostly in present time. The three teachers speak about three different things, about feeling powerless to help the students, the feeling of being a representative of the people who rule, and of feelings about the advantage that educators have towards the students. Even though the topics are different, all three imply that the educators and the students are on different levels. Person number 4 who speaks about the language disabilities and the feeling of no power to help the students with their problems at occasions, implying as long as the students do not have sufficient knowledge in Swedish, he cannot reach them. The language separates the teacher and the students and puts them on different levels. Person 6 feels that he is a link between the ones that rule and the students, that there is a need for a representative for the ones
that rule. The person implies that he is more connected and closer to the people who rule than the students are and this puts them on two different levels. Person number 8 feels that the educators have an advantage at many areas; language skills, economy and law, and he sees a difference in these areas between the Swedish people and the immigrants, that they are not on equal levels. The first person speaks with a negative affect in present time, that it is negative that he sometimes feels a lack of power, the two remaining persons speak in neutral effect about being a representative and about the advantage that the teachers have. The three persons at Lernia who use the entity of teacher/educator have one thing in common; they speak about the lack of equality between teachers and participants.

*Theme: Participants at Världens Hus*

**Table 3.1**

*Entity: participants of person 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who were illiterate</th>
<th>Neutral/past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who many have lived a long time in Sweden without the language</td>
<td>Neutral/past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who could express themselves freely</td>
<td>Positive/past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about participants in past time and neutral affect how they were illiterate and how many of them had lived a long time in Sweden without knowing the language. These are stated as circumstances that are not due to the participants themselves but to external factors. Then the person changes to a positive affect when saying that the participants could express themselves freely, implying that they had not been able to do so before. The predicate is mentioned when the person in her text speaks about how fantastic it was for the students to have a teacher at Världens Hus, who could speak the same language as the participants. So the reason that the participants could express themselves freely is that the teacher can speak their language.

**Table 3.2**

*Entity: students of person 2*

| Students | Who could not get an education when they were children | Negative/past |
When speaking about the students in past time, the person uses a negative affect. The students could not get an education when they were children and they had a hard time communicating with the Swedish teacher. These are both due to external factors causing difficult circumstances for the students. The students are according to person 2 not be blamed for this. In present time and with neutral affect the person states that many students are illiterate and that they therefore learn both languages at the school, their own native language and then the Swedish language. Finally the person says that the participants have a wish, they want something, and they are directed towards something with engagement.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: participants of person 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement that participants have so much more to say implies that they are not able to say everything that they want, that they have so much more inside them. What they have to say more about is however not elaborated in the text. But it is clear that something is holding the participants back. What is it that limits the participants from saying everything they want? Is it the language that is causing it?

Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: students of person 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The person speaks with neutral affect and mainly without any time about what the participants should feel and know and how they should be treated. The person seems to speak about how things should be when it comes to immigrants, instead of expressing her own feelings and thoughts about the issue. The person expresses herself with demands. She states that students should know the Swedish language and she speaks of the students being responsible and independent, implying that the students are responsible for their own actions and their lives in the new country. This also implies that the person looks at the students as people who should be treated as humans and who are on the same level as everyone else. They have rights and responsibilities just like every other citizen. They should be informed of this and they should be treated with respect and consideration.

Table 3.5

Entity: participants and students of person 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who are motivated</th>
<th>Positive/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Who has a baggage with them</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who get to strengthen and keep their culture</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks of participants and students in present time. In a positive affect it is stated that the participants are motivated. They are directed towards something with a wish and an engagement. In a neutral affect the person speaks of the students having a baggage with them, bringing with them things from their native country. The person also says that the students get to strengthen and keep their culture, implying that the person thinks it is important that the students keep their original culture and traditions and that this is allowed.

Table 3.6

Entity: participants of person 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who become persons to me</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who notice that I understand their culture</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who have a short education</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who sometimes do not know any other languages</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The person speaks of participants as people who he understands and who become persons to him. The person obviously looks at the participants as people he can understand and relate to and as individuals who he becomes close to. The person also speaks about the participants having a short education and sometimes not knowing any other languages. These are external circumstances stated in neutral affect.

Table 3.7

Entity: participants of person 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who have a perspective</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The person states that the participants have a perspective, implying that the Swedish perspective is not the only one, but things can also be seen from the participants’ perspective. Different perspectives exist and things are always seen from one’s own perspective. The fact that the participants’ perspective is pointed out implies that it is different from the Swedish perspective.

Table 3.8

Entity: students of person 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Who should not feel that they need help</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The person does not want the students to feel that they need help. This implies that the person thinks that the students actually need help but the person does not want this to be the case. The statement implies that the person wants the students to feel independent, to not have to rely on someone else.

Summary of theme: Participants at Världens Hus. On an average the teachers at Världens Hus express themselves with a neutral affect and in present time. The teachers all speak about different things relating to the participants, however some issues are brought up by more than one teacher. Three teachers, person 1, 2 and 6, bring up the fact that many of the students are illiterate and did not get the chance to educate themselves in their native country. These are expressed as external circumstances, which are causing difficulties for the participants. But the statements of the teachers imply that the participants themselves are not responsible for these
circumstances. The difficulties the participants are experiencing are attributed to external factors.

Something that is emphasized by two teachers, person 4 and 8, is that the participants need to be independent. They should, as person 8 says, not feel that they are in the need of help. Person 4 emphasizes the importance for the students to feel responsibility and to be independent. This implies that the participants should be seen as any other citizen, independent and responsible for his/her own actions. The participants are seen as equal to the teachers, as people they can relate to. Person 6 says that the participants become persons to him, which implies that he sees the participants as individuals, equal to himself.

Person 2 states that the participants have a wish and person 5 says that the participants are motivated. These statements imply that the participants are directed towards something with a wish and with engagement. The participants are seen as active players in their own lives. This differs from how the teachers speak of the participants regarding their education in their native countries and the participants being illiterate. In that context the participants are seen as passive actors in their lives with external factors affecting them.

Theme: Participants at Lernia

Person 5 and 6 do not have participants/students as an entity.

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity: participants of person 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about the participants and their lack of willpower in a negative affect and in present time. The person thinks that the participants sometimes lack the willpower to learn and that the person is struggling with how he will reach them. He speaks in future/present about how he will reach them, he cannot reach them now, it is something he has to do in the future. The lack of willpower is a negative internal factor that the person applies to the participants. Even if the participants sometimes do not have any willpower, they have expectations about the school and the education. The person speaks about the conversations that he has with the participants. At the same time he has conversations with them, he still feels that he has
difficulties reaching the participants. There is clearly a gap between the teacher and the participants, which the person is trying to overcome.

Table 3.10

*Entity: participants and students of person 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Who might not dare to express how they really feel</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who are afraid to be too critical</td>
<td>Neutral/empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who instead extol Sweden</td>
<td>Neutral/empty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who many of them are aware of Swedish phenomenon</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who many say it is a good country to live in</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who have brought something from their native country</td>
<td>Neutral/Pres-&gt;past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about the feelings of the participants towards the new situation in the new culture. She speaks about their fear to express themselves in the new situation and to be critical towards the new country; instead they extol the Swedish society. The person states that the participants think that Sweden is a good country to live in and at the same time she says that she thinks the participants might not dare to say what they really think. The person seems to believe that the participants do not consider Sweden a good country to live in, but they say so anyway. Does this mean that the person herself does not think Sweden is a good country to live in? The person speaks about how the participants are aware of the Swedish society, but at the same time they brought something with them from their native country. That they will keep what they brought, but at the same time embrace the Swedish culture. The person speaks in neutral effect and mostly in present time.

Table 3.11

*Entity: students of person 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Who arrive here</th>
<th>Neutral/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who wants to learn a new language</td>
<td>Neutral/Always-recurrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is not supposed to experience coming here as a hopeless hell</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The person speaks about how the students arrive in the new culture and that the students want to learn a new language so the situation will be easier in the new culture. The person speaks about her fear that the students are going to experience the situation as a hopeless hell. She says that the students want to learn the new language, implying that they are directed towards something with engagement. They are active players in their lives. The person speaks in neutral affect and mostly in present time, except when she speaks about how the students want to learn a new language, then she uses always-recurrent.

Table 3.12

*Entity: students of person 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Who have been treated badly because of their lack of language</th>
<th>Negative/past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who show contempt and mistrust for the Swedish society</td>
<td>Negative/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who have their own ideas</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who do not want to accept anything else</td>
<td>Negative/present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who are obligated to learn Swedish</td>
<td>Neutral/empty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about the participants in negative affect in three out of five occasions. She speaks about how they have been treated badly because of their lack of language. This is an external circumstance causes difficulties for the students. She speaks about the feelings that some of the students have about the Swedish society, that some of the students show contempt and mistrust and that they favour their own ideas and that they do not want to accept the new ones. The person seems to think that the students have a very negative attitude toward the new country. The person thinks that the students are obligated to learn Swedish. This is a demand that the students have to face. The person speaks about how the students have been treated with negative affect and in past time. She implies that when the students will know the new language, the bad treatment will decrease. This means that if immigrants want to be treated in a nice way, there are certain conditions, such as speaking the language, that need to be completed.

Table 3.13

*Entity: participants of person 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who show a sensitive side</th>
<th>Positive/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The person speaks of the participants’ sensitive side with a positive affect and in present time. Showing a sensitive side can imply different things. It could mean that the participants are weak and vulnerable but it can also imply that the person sees the participants as human beings who can show their sensitive side. The person also speaks about the range that there is among the participants, how different they are. The statement refers to the different levels of ambitions that the participants have when it comes to learning the language.

Table 3.14

*Entity: participants of person 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Who are in an exposed situation</th>
<th>Negative/present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who do not have much to oppose</td>
<td>Negative/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about the situation of the participants, all in negative affect. He speaks about their situation, which is exposed. If something happens, the students do not have much to oppose, they are exposed and vulnerable. The person implies that the participants are in a situation where the external circumstances are negative, something that the participants cannot control. The participants cannot oppose to the situation that they cannot control. They are, according to the person, not able to change their situation in an active way.

Table 3.15

*Entity: participants and students of person 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Who have different levels of ambitions</th>
<th>Neutral/empty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Who in some degree could take the custom of where they come</td>
<td>Neutral/always-recurrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should not give up their own traditions</td>
<td>Neutral/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person speaks about two different things when it comes to the participants, that they have different levels of ambition and the participant’s culture. He speaks in neutral affect in all predicates. The person notices in his teaching role that the students have different levels of ambition, that they have different levels of willpower to learn and to be educated. He implies
that the participants could in some degree take the custom where they come and adapt more to
the Swedish society. Still, he thinks that at the same time as they in some degree adapt, they
still should keep their own traditions. However, the person thinks that the participants are not
contributing enough to the integration process. He seems torn between two different attitudes
concerning the integration of immigrants.

Summary of theme: Participants at Lernia. Overall the teachers speak in neutral affect, and
in present time. Two of the teachers at Lernia, person 5 and 6, do not mention students or
participants at all. The teachers speak about the participants in very different ways, but some of
the topics are brought up by several teachers. Four teachers, person 2, 3, 4 and 9, speak about
the participants’ relation to the Swedish society. Person 2 wonders if the participants express
what they really think when they say that Sweden is a good country to live in. Person 3 speaks
about the feelings of a hopeless hell to face another culture and how she does not want the
participants to experience that. Person 4 says that the participants show contempt and mistrust
toward the new society. Person 4 also speaks of adaptation to the Swedish society when saying
that the participants are obligated to learn the Swedish language, she also speaks about how the
participants have their own ideas and that they do not want to accept anything else. Person 9
does not think that the participants are contributing enough to their integration, he want them to
adapt more to the Swedish customs. At the same time he speaks about the importance of
keeping their cultural heritage.

All the teachers at Lernia, except for one, speak of the participants as people unrelated to
themselves. Only person 1 mentions himself when speaking about the participants. Does this
imply that the teachers’ relationship with the students is on a purely professional level, and no
personal relationships involved? Person 1 speaks about trying to reach the participants and that
implies that a gap exists between him and the participants that has be overcome.

Two teachers, person 7 and 8, talk about the participants being sensitive and in an exposed
situation. Person 8 does not think that the participants have anything to oppose.

Person 1, 7 and 9 all speak of the participants’ ambition to learn the new language and that
it varies very much.

Discussion
The aim of our study was to see what role the teachers at SFI-schools play in the integration of immigrants, how they experience their work and what they feel about the situation in which their students, the immigrants, are.

The result presented above will be discussed in relation to our research question and the acculturation theories described. First the modality charts will be looked at more closely. Further, similarities and differences between the two schools, Världens Hus and Lernia, will be considered from the two themes; teachers and participants. Comparisons between men and women, vocational, native language and SFI-teachers or different countries of origin will not be made due to the low number of entities and predicates included in the result. We feel that the presented result is not big enough to enable us to compare anything beyond the two schools. A critical examination of the research method used, MCA-Minerva, and its validity will be presented. The discussion will end with a final note where the most significant and important findings of the study will be made.

Discussion of the modality charts

The T-test showed no significant differences between Lernia and Världens Hus regarding the modalities. We did see some small differences in the modality of function and if the sample would have been more extensive we might have reached a level of significance. However, this was not the case. Given that the teachers at the schools in general speak in the same way when it comes to the modalities, we think it is of importance to see how they speak, meaning the differences between the categories within the two schools.

Modality: Function

In the modality of function, both schools speak mostly in signitive, which means that the teachers express themselves in abstract terms. Perceptive is used second most at both schools, but the difference between signitive and perceptive is bigger at Lernia than at Världens Hus, meaning that Lernia uses signitive more often than Världens hus relative to the other categories. Do teachers in general speak in an abstract way? And why do teachers at Lernia speak more in an abstract way relative to perceptive compared to Världens Hus. The category of imaginative is used very little at both schools. This implies that the teachers do not speculate or hypothesize about anything. Why is this? Do people in general use imaginative more than what the teachers at the schools do?
Modality: Time
Teachers at both schools focus on present time when speaking. The dominating categories, after present, are empty and always-recurrent. The categories of future and past are rarely used. What implications does the focus on present time have in the teaching? Does this mean that the teachers are only interested in what is happening right now, and that they do not take into consideration the past and the future of their working role and the immigrants? Is focusing on the present necessary when being an SFI-teacher? The fact that the teachers use empty and always-recurrent to the extent they do, implies that they often speak of things independent of time.

Modality: Affect
In the modality of affect, the category most widely used at both schools is neutral. Why do the teachers rarely use the categories of positive and negative? Do they not want to express their affect towards the things they write about? Or do they not have affects about those things? Teachers at Världens Hus speak slightly more in positive than in negative, whereas the teachers at Lernia use positive and negative in almost the same amount. Does this indicate that the teachers at Världens Hus focus more on the positive things about their work and the immigrants than what the teachers at Lernia do?

Modality: Belief
In the modality of belief, the teachers at Lernia and Världens Hus use doxa-affirmation in almost all meaning units. Doxa-affirmation indicates that the person is certain about what he/she says, that it cannot be questioned. Why is it that the teachers at the schools speak with such certainty? Are the teachers really this certain about everything they say, or could their use of doxa-affirmation imply a need for confidence when working as a teacher? Possibility and probability are at both schools used in less than 1 % of the meaning units. This implies that the teachers do not speculate about things or are unsure about what they say; instead they express things clearly and without doubt. This relates to the modality of function, where it is seen that the teachers rarely use imaginative, meaning that they do not use their imagination when expressing themselves. Only teachers at Lernia use the category of question, teachers at Världens Hus do not use it at all. This reflects the frequent use of doxa-affirmation and the infrequent use of imaginative, which indicates that the teachers speak in a confident and convinced way. The low use of questions reinforces the teachers’ certainty in their speaking.
**Modality: Subject**

The most widely used category among the teachers at both schools in the modality of subject is unspecified. Is there a reason why the teachers use specified subjects so rarely and instead speak in a more general way when expressing themselves? The category of I is used second most at Lernia and third most at Världens Hus. At Lernia I is used in approximately 5% more than they, whereas at Världens Hus there is almost no difference between the two. Can this imply that the teachers at Lernia focus more on themselves and their teaching than their participants, which are often referred to as they, whereas at Världens Hus the teachers focus equally on both? The categories of we and one-all are used in the least amount but equally often at both schools. Can the infrequent use of we imply that the teachers do not so often identify themselves with other people? And what can the low amount of one-all in the teachers’ texts indicate?

**Modality: Will**

The teachers at Lernia and Världens Hus use the category of engagement in more meaning units than the other categories in the modality of will. This implies that the teachers are personally engaged when speaking about their work and their participants. However, the category of none is also widely used by both schools. This contradicts the category of engagement, implying that the teachers are not personally engaged in their work. It is therefore interesting to look at the different contexts in which the teachers use engagement and none. The category of wish-positive is used in less than 1% of the meaning units at both schools, implying that the teachers do not express any wishes for things to happen. Why is that? Only at Världens Hus is unengagement used, with 0,77%. Even aspiration is only used at Världens Hus and then in just 0,77% of the meaning units. This indicates that the teachers at the two schools barely express any demands.

**Summary of modalities.** Overall the teachers at Lernia and Världens Hus express themselves in a similar way. They mainly use abstract terms when speaking and rarely speculate or hypothesize. They speak with a certainty and express things clearly and without doubt. What is the reason behind this conviction and certainty with which the teachers speak? Teachers at both schools focus on present time and the categories of future and past are rarely used. What implications can this concentration on present time have in the teaching? In the modality of affect, the category most widely used at both schools is neutral and they tend to speak with an unspecified subject. Is the teachers’ speaking without specific affect or subject
intentional or do they always speak in a general way? The teachers at Lernia and Världens Hus use the category of engagement in more meaning units than the other categories in the modality of will, which implies that they are personally engaged when speaking about their work and their participants. They do however frequently use the category of none, which implies the opposite, that the teachers are *not* personally engaged when speaking. Are the teachers torn between being personally engaged in their work and trying to keep a professional distance?

_Similarities and differences between Världens Hus and Lernia_

**Theme: Teacher**

The persons at Världens Hus use a neutral or positive affect when speaking about teachers, whereas the persons at Lernia use a neutral or negative affect. This difference in the modality of affect can also be seen in the modality charts presented in the result. The time they speak in does not differ much between the two schools, both express themselves mostly in present time. In the entities and predicates included in the result we found some similarities and differences between Lernia and Världens Hus.

_A gap between the cultures._ The persons at Världens Hus speak of the teachers being a bridge over the gap that exists between the Swedish culture and the participants’ native countries. The native language teachers are also said to be mediators with the new society, helping the participants to get in contact with the new country they live in. They seem to think that their job as SFI teachers is important in the acculturation of immigrants. This reflects the general attitude at the integration conference in Holland, November 2004, where the importance of introductory programmes in the integration of immigrants was emphasized. The teachers at Världens Hus see themselves as mediators between the immigrants and the host society, facilitating the contact between the two. The native language teachers are able to explain to the participants how things are done in the new country and thereby make the culture change easier for the immigrants. One person at Lernia also implies that there is a gap between the Swedish society and the participants but instead of being a link between the two, which the persons at Världens Hus speak about, he sees himself as a representative for the Swedish society, the people who rule. The teachers at Världens Hus seem to look at themselves as being between the cultures and facilitating the contact between them, whereas one teacher at Lernia puts himself only on one side, in one of cultures, as a representative of the Swedish society. The teacher at Lernia seems to make the distinction between “us” and “them”. The teachers at
Världens Hus also make a distinction between the cultures, but they feel that they are part of both cultures and do not separate “us” from “them”.

A dominant culture? One general thing that the persons at Lernia imply is that the teachers and students are on different levels. They speak of themselves as superior to the participants, being the ones with the advantage and the representatives of the people who rule, defining themselves as the dominant culture. Instead of speaking about host society and minority cultures, which we refer to in our study, the teachers make the distinction between a dominant and a non-dominant culture and identify themselves with the dominant culture. What implication does this attitude have in the teachers’ interaction with the participants? In what way does it affect the teaching?

Separation due to language? There is clearly a separation between the teachers and the participants at Lernia. One person states that he cannot reach the participants as long as they do not have sufficient knowledge of the Swedish language, implying that there is a gap between the teachers and the participants that needs to be overcome. The reason for this gap that separates the teachers and the participants seems to be due to the language. The language is in general what tends to separate the host society and the immigrants.

The opposite seems to be the case at Världens Hus. The language is not something that separates the teachers and the participants since they share the same language. The language is one of the things that makes the teachers and the participants understand and relate to each other and it is what makes the teaching easier. Native language teaching is according to Mörnerud (2004) essential in the teaching of illiterate immigrants. She emphasizes the importance of the native language as the language of instruction for basic understanding and learning in the school context.

The teachers at Världens Hus seem to look at the participants as equal to themselves, as people they respect and relate to. One person says that the participants become persons to him. There seems to be a feeling of closeness between the teacher and the participants and in contrast to the teacher at Lernia, there does not seem to be a gap between the teacher and the participant. Could this have to do with the teacher and participants speaking the same language? Saying that the participants become persons to him, the person is also implying that he sees the participants as individuals rather than belonging to specific culture. This attitude relates to the fifth acculturation strategy proposes by the Interactive Acculturation Model (Bourhis et al., 1997) individualism. Individualists define themselves and others as individuals
rather than as members of group categories such as immigrants or host members and it is the personal characteristics of individuals that are important.

*Theme: Participants*

On both schools most of the teachers speak about the entity participants or students in neutral effect, however, in 6 out of 25 predicates the teachers at Lernia speak in negative effect, whereas at Världens Hus only 2 out of 23 predicates are expressed in negative affect. This difference goes in line with the general difference between the schools regarding the modality of affect, which can be seen in the modality charts presented in the result. The teachers speak mainly in present or empty time. In the entities and predicates included in the result they all speak about different things relating to the participants. However, there are some general differences and similarities between the schools.

*Active/passive players in external circumstances.* At Världens Hus three teachers bring up the fact that the students did not get a chance to educate themselves in their native country. At Lernia none of the teachers mention the skills that the participants possessed or did not possess before they arrived to the new culture. However, at both schools teachers point out that the participants are passive players in a context where external factors are affecting them. One teacher at Lernia speaks about how the participants are in an exposed situation and that the participants have nothing to oppose. Several teachers at Världens Hus speak of the participants being illiterate and that they did not get the chance to education in their native country. These are all external circumstances that, according to the teachers, the participants are passive players in. The participants have not been able to control not receiving an education as a child or being in an exposed situation. The difficulties the participants are experiencing are attributed to external factors.

However, the teachers at Världens Hus also speak about the participants being active players in their own lives, that they are motivated and that they are directed toward something with engagement, but at the same time affected by external circumstances that they cannot control. The same is said at Lernia, the participants are in a situation, which they cannot always control, but at the same time they have their own feelings of what they want and what they think.

*Independence as an aim.* Some teachers at Världens Hus speak about the importance of being independent, and that the participants should not feel that they are in a need of help. They
should be independent and feel responsibility, just like any other Swedish citizen. At an European Union integration conference in November 2004 the importance of introductory programmes leading to independence was emphasized: *Introductory programmes should be directed towards economic and social self-sufficiency* (EU Integration Policy Conference, 2004). The teachers at Världens Hus seem to agree with this aim, that the introductory programmes should encourage the independence and self-sufficiency of the participants. The persons at Lernia do not mention the importance of being independent.

**Different acculturation strategies.** Teachers at both schools mention that the participants have to/are obligated to learn the Swedish language, this is of great importance in the integration in the Swedish society. Another teacher at Lernia speaks of adaptation to the Swedish society; he thinks that the participants should adapt to the Swedish customs more. These statements go in line with one of Berry’s acculturation strategies, namely assimilation, also known as “melting pot”. The person at Lernia also mentions in this context that the participants should not give up their own traditions, which could indicate that he is in favour of either integration or segregation. It could be that the person is torn between several different acculturation strategies. However, it could also indicate that he is in favour of the integration strategy, that acculturation is a two-way process. At the same time as he wants the participants to adapt more to the Swedish customs he also states that they do not have to change.

None of the teachers at Världens Hus mention anything about assimilating to the new culture. Instead they speak of the participants’ perspective and of understanding of their culture. The participants are able to keep and strengthen their original culture. Teachers at Världens Hus seem to acknowledge the participants’ culture and the right to keep it. This is in accordance with a statement from the Swedish government in 1997/98 where it is stated that *the rights and equality of the individuals also includes the right to be different*. The fact that the teachers think that it is important for the participants to not loose their original culture could imply that they are in favour of the integration strategy of acculturation. But it could also be in accordance with the segregation strategy, if the teachers want the participants to keep their original culture and at the same time reject the new one. However, this seems not to be the case among the teachers at Världens Hus.

According to the IAM the country’s integration policy reflects the acculturation orientations of the host society members. Do the teachers at Lernia and Världens Hus reflect Sweden’s multicultural integration policy? Statements by teachers at both schools imply that they are in favour of the integration strategy, in accordance with the Swedish government.
However, some of these statements could also imply that the teachers are in favour of other acculturation orientations, the statements are ambiguous. As we mentioned in the introduction, we feel that Berry’s and the IAM’s acculturation strategies are too simplistic for the complex nature of individuals. Our reasons for rejecting these acculturation strategies have been reinforced by the result that we have obtained, the statements of the teachers about acculturation are too complex and ambiguous to enable us to define their acculturation orientation.

*Attitudes toward the new country.* Only at Lernia do the teachers mention that the participants have a negative attitude toward the Swedish society. One person speaks about the participants’ contempt and mistrust toward the new country, and another person implies that the participants are not telling the truth when saying that Sweden is a good country to live in. Why is it that this person thinks that the participants are lying when they say positive things about the Swedish society? Does it have to do with the person’s own opinions of the society? What implications do the teachers’ own attitudes have in the teaching? And how important is the relationship between the teachers and the participants?

The teachers’ own attitudes and opinions might affect the participants’ attitudes and feelings toward the new country. Especially when the teachers are seen as representatives of the Swedish society. What is clear is that there exists a two-way process with a mutual influence between the teachers and the participants and what the two think of each other becomes very important in the school context. According to the IAM, the mutual influence and interaction between the host society group and the minority group is of great significance when it comes to the acculturation of immigrants and their feelings toward the new country.

*Discussion of method and validity*

In our study of acculturation we used the text analysis program called MCA-Minerva, which is based on the phenomenological approach to research. We experienced a few difficulties since it was the first time we used this programme. It was difficult to receive clear instructions in the use of MCA since different people tend to use it in different ways. To learn MCA seems to be a subjective process where one needs to find one’s own way of using the program. However, the subjectivity when using MCA does not necessarily have negative implications. As long as one is consistent when using the program the subjectivity does not cause any problems. Only when
it comes to comparing results from MCA, analyzed by different people using the program in different ways, the subjectivity could create difficulties.

Since our data was very extensive, it was difficult to include everything in the result. We had to focus on only a small part of the result to be able to analyze it deeply and look over all possibilities of interpretations. This led to that a lot of interesting data was not included in the result and important finding might have been lost. But if a deep analysis of the result was going to be made, reducing the result was a necessary step in the process.

An outcome of high validity in phenomenological research is a result that does not exclude any possibilities of interpretation of the data. The researcher should criticise his/her own interpretations and negotiate with several different options and avoid taking anything for granted, which is a great risk for the researcher in qualitative research methods. In the interpretation of the result we attempted to be objective by looking at all possible understandings of the words in the text. We have refrained from including our own preconceptions in the interpretation of how the teachers have expressed themselves. We have avoided taking anything for granted and tried to illustrate all the existing options. In the MCA-analysis we divided the text into as small meaning units as possible to decrease the risk of making subjective interpretations of the text.

Conclusions

We feel that we have accomplished the aim of our study, to get an understanding of how teachers at SFI-schools experience their work and what attitude they have toward their students, the immigrants and their integration into the Swedish society. The most significant finding in our study is the fact that many teachers at both schools speak of a gap between the Swedish society and the immigrants’ native culture. The teachers at Världens Hus see themselves as a bridge or a link between the cultures, mediating the contact between the immigrants and the new society. Native language teachers seem to be important people in the acculturation process of immigrants, facilitating the integration into the Swedish society. The teachers at Lernia also imply that there is a gap between the cultures but instead of being the ones who connect the cultures they put themselves on one side of the gap, as representatives of the Swedish society. The separation between the teachers and the participants at Lernia seems to be due to a language barrier. However, at Världens Hus the language issue does not cause any difficulties since the teachers and the students speak the same language.
Clearly, there exists a need for someone who builds a bridge over the gap between the cultures. The teachers at Världens Hus have taken on this role in their teaching and implemented the attitude of being mediators between the Swedish society and the participants. However, the teachers at Lernia seem to have another attitude toward the existing gap between the participants and the host society members. Instead of being in between the cultures, they place themselves on only one side of the gap, as representatives of the host society.

It is evident that the introductory programmes play an important role in the integration of immigrants, as the bridge that connects the cultures and the SFI-teachers need to act as mediators between the Swedish society and the immigrants to facilitate the acculturation process.

The findings in this study are only contextual and based on the entities and modalities, which have been included in the result and the study was conducted with a small amount of people. The aim of this study was not to generalize our result to include all teachers at SFI-schools. What we wanted to do was to describe in detail a small number of participants’ feelings and thoughts about acculturation and thereby generate more questions about the research area of integration to encourage more studies of acculturation within introductory programmes. A few patterns have emerged in the result of our study and these give indications of interesting areas of future research.
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Appendix A

Projektbeskrivning

Bakgrund
Vi är två studenter vid Lunds universitets institution för psykologi som står inför kandidatuppsatsen (41-60 poängs-nivå). Tidigare har vi bland annat läst 20 poäng interkulturell psykologi, varav tio med fokus på utvecklingspsykologi.
Vi är väldigt intresserade av acculturation, processen som uppstår då en människa ställs inför en kultur olik från den hon är uppvuxen i. Vi vill konkretisera frågan i en studie av människor inom SFI –utbildningen (Svenska För Invandrare) som har olika kulturella bakgrunder.

Metod

Planering
Vi vill gärna höra era åsikter och tankar kring vår undersökning och vi är öppna för eventuella förslag till förändringar av vår studie.
Självklart kan vi redovisa vårt resultat av undersökningen för er om ni är intresserade.

Louise Häkansson & Maja Warnstam

Louise Häkansson 070-366 09 84
Eriksfälgatan 16 B 040-96 64 51
214 32 Malmö

Maja Warnstam 046-211 48 70
Magistratsvägen 55 K422 070-205 73 79
226 44 Lund

Handledare:
Roger Sages 046-2228756
Berätta gärna om alla dina tankar, känslor och funderingar omkring din arbetsroll, gärna utifrån din relation med eleverna och den situation de befinner sig i (att leva i en ny kultur).

Du behöver inte tänka på att skriva på korrekt svenska eller att stava rätt, det viktigaste är att vi förstår vad du menar.

Var god ange följande information om dig själv:

Kön: Kvinnan □  Född i land: _____________

Man □  Om inte i Sverige, hur många år har du bott här? _____________

Ålder: ________

Föräldrar födda i land: __________

Modersmål: _____________

Är du SFI-lärare, Yrkesutbildare eller Modersmålsläsare? ________________

Vilken målgrupp undervisar du? ____________

Tack för din medverkan!