Introduction

A growing body of literature indicates that immigrants can benefit and are benefiting from the services and programming offered by public libraries, as well as, making community connections during their library visits (Aabø et al., 2010; Audunson et al., 2011; Caidi and Allard, 2005; Jönsson-Lanevska, 2005; Khoir et al., 2017; Lloyd, 2015). Furthermore, libraries are responding to immigrants’ needs. Common and increasingly popular library programming for immigrants is conversation-based programming, such as language cafes and conversation circles (Frisvold, 2015).

Conversation-based programming generally aims at bringing together the members of the majority and immigrants with the aim of providing immigrants with an opportunity to practise speaking the language of the receiving country. Programme conversations are either semi-structured, which have preselected themes and topics for discussion, or unstructured, which do not have any preselected themes or topics. Conversation-based programmes that have semi-structured conversations also allow for participants and volunteers to discuss topics and themes they find interesting, which are outside of the preselected themes.

Participants and volunteers often start out in one large group while the main topic or theme for discussion is briefly introduced. Sometimes the programme organizers will introduce the topic themselves or they will have a guest speaker introduce it. Afterwards, the participants and volunteers break off into small groups and discuss the topic or theme. Programmes are generally informal and attended on a drop-in basis (Johnston, 2016b).

Previous studies and reports have indicated that conversation-based programming in public libraries supports language learning, facilitates informal information exchange related to various aspects of societal life, expands participants’ social networks and fosters integration (Atlestam and Myhre, 2014; Fisher et al., 2004; Gundersen, 2011; Hjerpe, 2014; Johnston, 2016a, 2016b; Johnston and Audunson, 2017; Ulvik, 2010).

However, in a previous article by the author (Johnston, 2016b), it was argued that, though the research is promising, the existence of a language cafe or conversation circle does not guarantee the expansion of social networks across intercultural lines. Using Gordon Allport’s (1979) Contact Theory, the article proceeded to provide a firm theoretical basis for how conversation-based programming might support fruitful interactions between immigrants and other groups.
community members – typically members of the majority – thus reducing divides in social networks that run along ethnic group lines. Yet, empirical evidence is still needed to determine if the programming elicits the outcomes theorized.

This article, again using Contact Theory as a theoretical lens, delivers results from a multi-case study on language cafes in Norway that explores how the programming might support fruitful interactions between immigrants and community members. At a time when immigration and the resettlement of refugees are salient political issues, the results of this study can serve to inform library practice, as well as provide public libraries with a way to show non-library stakeholders how libraries can be part of the solution for creating socially cohesive, sustainable communities. For students and scholars of Contact Theory, this article demonstrates the applicability of the theory to intergroup contact that takes place at language cafes and its relevance to integration.

*Library or libraries* will refer to public libraries. The term *participant(s)* will be used to refer to immigrants who attend the programmes and *volunteer(s)* will be used to refer to members of the majority who organize the programmes or facilitate programme conversations. The terms *migrant* and *immigrant* will be used to refer to:

Any person who is moving or has moved across an international border or within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence, regardless of (1) the person’s legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is. (International Organization for Migration, 2017)

The terms include, but are not limited to, the following classifications of migrants: economic immigrants, foreign spouses, refugees and international students.

**Theoretical framework**

**Contact Theory**

In order to determine if the programming elicits the outcomes theorized in the author’s previously mentioned article, the results of this study will also be viewed through the lens of Contact Theory. To begin with, Gordon Allport (1979), in his seminal work *The Nature of Prejudice*, asserts that ‘contact that brings knowledge and acquaintance is likely to engender sounder beliefs concerning minority groups, and for this reason, contribute to the reduction of prejudice’ (p. 268). Brief or superficial contact reduces the chance of obtaining information that might challenge the preconceived notions, prejudices and stereotypes that one may have of the other person. Furthermore, such encounters may actually serve to strengthen prejudices as contact only remains on a superficial level and is not substantial enough to challenge biased beliefs and attitudes. He proposes four conditions for positive outcomes from intergroup contact: equal status contact, common goals, intergroup cooperation and social sanction.

Thomas Pettigrew (1998) later suggested that contact must be between people who have friendship potential, which requires that people have extensive and repeated contact. He further theorized that four processes undergird Allport’s conditions: learning about the out-group, changing behaviour, generating affective ties and in-group reappraisal. First, learning about the out-group can correct one’s negative views of the other people or group. Second, behaviour change can lead to attitude change, which may make intergroup contact more comfortable. Third, generating affective ties can lead to feelings of empathy and positive emotions related to intergroup contact. Fourth, in-group reappraisal can lead to gaining insight into one’s norms and values and can lead to the adoption of new perspectives regarding one’s own group.

Pettigrew further theorized that these four processes may overlap and, importantly, that intergroup friendship can potentially invoke all four processes. He concluded that positive outcomes relate more closely to longer-term relationships than to initial acquaintanceship; thus, people must have extensive and repeated contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Accordingly, language cafes offer participants the opportunity to meet with other community members on a regular basis and, thereby, facilitate extensive and repeated intergroup contact. Therefore, the four above-mentioned processes and the concept of friendship potential will be used to analyse the results of the current study. As will be seen, this article places emphasis on both the participants and volunteers going through these processes; thus suggesting that the reduction of prejudice and positive outcomes from intergroup contact result from a two-way process of mutual learning and influence.

Three additional points of analysis will be taken into account regarding how contact may not always lead to positive outcomes. First, in light of a large number of studies showing that contact between groups usually leads to positive outcomes (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), some studies have shown that negative outcomes can occur if participants feel threatened and contact is involuntary (Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2011). As will be discussed, many of the participants at the language cafes are required to attend and, hence, the contact they have during the programmes with people of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds is involuntary. Therefore, the question that arises is if the cafes offer a positive social environment or an environment in which the participants feel (socially) threatened or insecure, possibly due to perceived prejudices against them.

Second, reports have shown that diversity drives down trust, yet research also shows that positive out-group contact correlates with higher levels of trust (Hewstone, 2003;
Integration

The main premise of Contact Theory is that contact which brings knowledge and acquaintance is likely to engender sounder beliefs concerning minority groups, and thereby contribute to the reduction of prejudice. It can be argued that both the members of the majority and the immigrants – not just the members of the majority as Allport’s original statement implies – need to obtain information about each other in order to reduce the prejudices they have towards each other. It cannot be assumed that immigrants do not harbour their own prejudices. Thus, the reduction of prejudice can be seen as a process of mutual exchange and influence, both immigrant and members of the majority need to learn about each other in order to correct inaccurate or prejudiced views of the other, or both.

The need for mutual exchange and influence also underlies theorizations of integration. A concept relevant for understanding integration is that of acculturation, which takes place ‘when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups’ (Redfield et al., 1935: 149).

However, Kathleen Valtonen (2008) notes that while acculturation is generally considered an immigrant-centred activity changes do naturally occur in the receiving society though those changes may be resisted or not perceived as such and she asserts that the concept of acculturation actually undergirds other forms of incorporation such as integration and assimilation (pp. 60–61).

Assimilation can be seen as acculturation to the fullest degree. It is the complete acculturation of one group to another with little or no change to the original culture. The process is generally characterized by the disappearance of the immigrants’ distinct cultural and ethnic differences (Park, 1928). This implies that, since immigrants must do all the acculturating and members of the majority do not, that the immigrants must learn about the majority culture and not the other way around, or at least to a very limited degree.

Integration can be seen as more balanced; a process by which both groups acculturate to each other. Thomas Stolle et al., 2008). Language cafes are diverse social environments so the trust levels between participants and volunteers would be another indicator of the programmes’ ability to foster a positive social environment.

Third, research suggests that a moderate degree of homogeneity is required for intergroup friendships to form; people with some similarities, such as educational or socio-economic backgrounds, are more likely to accept the ways in which they differ from one another (Gans, 1961). This is something that demands some reflection because, those participating in the language cafe, as will be discussed, come from very diverse and varied backgrounds.

Methodology

The findings presented in this paper are from a current study on language cafes and integration. The study includes three cases of language cafes at Norwegian public libraries including cafes in the cities of Oslo, Moss and Horten. The research design chosen for the study is case-based research (CBR), which allows for studying a few case studies in depth (Perri and Bellamy, 2012: 103–104). A particular benefit of case-based research is that it allows the researcher to draw upon different sources of information, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. This permits the data to be triangulated, which will be discussed below. The findings are considered to be more valid and trustworthy when the data from different sources converges (Greene et al., 2005; Guion et al., 2011).

Participant observation and questionnaires were selected as the methods of data collection for this current study. Data collection was divided into two phases. The first phase was comprised of participant observation. Participant observation was used to gain a general understanding of the programme and the nature of the conversations that take place within the discussion groups. Note taking was done immediately following each of the cafes. This was done because both the researcher and programme organizers believed that note taking during the programs would have caused distraction and resulted in some participants feeling uncomfortable.

The focus of the field notes was on conversation themes or topics. Each of the language cafes has pre-selected themes for discussion. Programme organizers pick a theme for each time the cafe meets. Themes often relate to culture, traditions, current issues and daily life. In general, pre-selected themes are discussed briefly by the larger group and then in smaller groups of approximately five to seven people. However, the smaller groups can choose to discuss the selected theme or anything else they are interested in talking about. This results in conversations that are multi-thematic. Both the selected themes and the participant or volunteer initiated themes were recorded in the field notes. It should be noted that a conscious effort was
made by the researcher not to introduce new themes or topics for discussion.

The researcher participated in the cafes as a participant, as she was also new to Norway at the beginning of the study. Therefore, it should be noted that the perspective carried through from the participant observation phase of the study is that of a participant. All participants and volunteers were informed of the researcher’s dual-role of participant and researcher.

The second phase of data collection was comprised of two questionnaires: a questionnaire for the participants (Appendix A) and a questionnaire for the volunteers (Appendix B). The aim of the questionnaires was to elaborate upon the data collected from the participant observation by eliciting the participants and volunteers’ perspectives and experiences of programme conversations.

The decision to administer a questionnaire rather than conducting in-depth interviews was based on lack of a common language. Many of the participants do not speak English or limited English, which is the researcher’s mother tongue. The participants are learning Norwegian, but they have varying levels of competence in the language, some very low. Therefore, conducting in-depth interviews with the participants would have required the use of translators for many different languages. There was a concern that some of the participants might feel uncomfortable talking with a translator or be reluctant to talk about negative experiences they have had, as they would not be completely anonymous.

The questionnaire for participants provided a means for asking the same questions that would have been asked during an in-depth interview. Yet, participants were able to remain completely anonymous, which may have caused them to give a more balanced account of their experiences. The questionnaire for participants was available in Norwegian, English, Arabic and Somali. Participants were allowed to work on the questionnaire alone or with other participants or volunteers. The participants could ask questions and use their mobile devices for online translation. They were able to give their response to the final question, in their preferred language.

A questionnaire was also administered to the volunteers. The two questionnaires were nearly identical, but worded differently for the participants and volunteers. The questions for both the questionnaires were based on the theoretical underpinnings of the study. The questionnaires were primarily comprised of structured questions, which included a mixture of dichotomous and interval (Likert scaling) response options. As mentioned previously, the questionnaires had one optional unstructured, open-ended question.

It should be noted that the questionnaires served the qualitative aims of the study rather than quantitative aims, as they are generally used. The questionnaires were used in place of interviews and were not intended for obtaining generalizable results to all language cafes. Rather, the aim was for analytical generalization, which is done by testing or exploring the applicability of a theory in a variety of contexts. Results that support the theory strengthen the theory and results that are contrary or do not align with the theory may indicate the limits of the theory or weaken the explanatory power of the theory.

The questionnaires were handed out at the language cafes. Participants and volunteers were told that the questionnaires were to be anonymous and that they were not obligatory to fill out. The researcher remained at the library while the questionnaires were being filled out and was available to answer questions. Questionnaires were collected once they were completed.

Sixty-four questionnaires were filled out by programme participants: 21 in Oslo, 30 in Moss and 13 in Horten. All participants in attendance at each of the language cafes agreed to fill out the survey, with the exception of four people at the Moss cafe. Thirty-one questionnaires were filled out by volunteers: 7 in Oslo, 14 in Moss, and 10 in Horten. All volunteers in attendance at each of the language cafes agreed to fill out the survey.

Data analysis

Content analysis was performed on the field notes generated from participant observation. Analysing the themes or topics discussed made it possible to determine if both Norwegians and immigrants are able to share their perspectives and understandings, which is necessary for intergroup learning to take place. The coding of the field notes generated from the participant observation was facilitated by NVivo 11 qualitative data analysis software. The coding scheme for this study (Appendix C) was based upon the coding scheme from a preliminary study and was further developed by the theoretical framework and ad hoc refining of categories.

The software SPSS was used to analyse the results of the surveys. Frequency distribution was used to describe participants and volunteers’ distribution and variation on the variables that the questionnaire aimed at measuring. Descriptive statistics were deemed sufficient for analysing the results because the study did not aim at giving causal inferences, as it is a relatively small-scale study.

Due to the informality of the programmes, such as participants attending on a drop-in basis, there is no fixed population. The number of people who attend the programmes is very fluid. Some people attend on a very regular basis and some attend a few cafes and then never again. In Oslo, many of the participants attend language cafes at multiple libraries. The reason participants stop attending is not entirely known – some obtain employment or their work schedules change, some move (within Norway or leave the country), and others may find that
they are using Norwegian enough in their daily lives that they do not need to attend a language cafe. On any given session of a language cafe there might be some people who would like to attend, but cannot due to illness or do not get into the programme because it is full. In which case, they might go to another library in Oslo and attend their language cafe and, therefore, are a participant of the other library’s language cafe on that night. Some people are required to attend the language cafes, as will be discussed below; however, it is a requirement of the language programmes they attend and not the programme organizers of the language cafes. Volunteers are more consistent in their attendance; however, their schedules also fluctuate and some may stop attending for a while or quit entirely. Therefore, the participants and volunteers attending a language cafe on any given day must be considered the population, rather than a sample as it is not possible to determine who might return or who has or will quit.

The data from the two questionnaires, including comments made in the open-ended question, and field notes were triangulated. For example, the participants and volunteers were asked in the questionnaires if they had learned about other cultures from participating in the language cafes. Their responses to the question were then compared to the conversations topics and themes documented in the field notes. Have they talked about each other’s cultures or have they only talked about Norwegian culture? If participants and volunteers learned about other cultures then the conversations would have had to reflect a sharing of cultures. Comparing participants and volunteers’ self-reported experiences and perceptions against observations made by the researcher helps to increase the validity of the findings. This triangulated approach can be seen in the reporting of the results.

Potential bias and limitations of the study

In consideration of potential biases, only including people in the study who attend the language cafes might result in a more positive reflection of the programmes and outcomes than if people who stopped attending or chose not to attend were included. However, as will be discussed, a portion of the language cafes’ participants are enrolled in the state-run introductory programme and, as part of the programme, they are required to attend the language cafes. Therefore, it is possible that a portion of those participants would not voluntarily choose to attend the cafes. Furthermore, questions on the questionnaire were also designed for both positive and negative responses. Participants’ required attendance and the design of the questionnaires, along with their ability to remain completely anonymous, should limit any potential bias for overly positive outcomes. This will be discussed further in the discussion section.

As this study explores how the programming might support fruitful interactions between immigrants and community members within the context of a language cafe, the study does not address any possible differences between immigrants or Norwegians who attend the language cafes and those who do not (non-users). Likewise, the study does not provide any insights as to how the people who attend the language cafes are or are not reflective of the wider population. Lastly, the study is researching the potential of language cafes to support integration and, therefore, will have little to say about why a language cafe might fail in supporting integration or not be successful in any other way.

Profiles of the cases and attendees

The following is an overview of the language cafes and then detailed profiles of the participants and volunteers attending each of the cafes, which is important for understanding how the programmes can reduce social divides between the various cultural and ethnic groups and support integration.

Overview of the language cafes

Three language cafes were selected for the study, each in a separate community (e.g. neighborhood or town). The first language cafe is located in Oslo, the capital of Norway. The library selected for the study is the Toyen branch of the Deichman library system. The branch is located in the Gamle Oslo neighbourhood of the city, of which 20,305 (39.5%) residents are immigrants or Norwegian-born children with immigrant parents (Ordemann, 2016, personal communication). During the time of the participant observation, the language cafe met every Wednesday from 5p.m. to 7p.m. The dates attended were from 18 March 2015 to 27 May 2015. The total number of visits was seven. For simplicity, this cafe will be referred to as the cafe in Oslo or the Oslo cafe. The cafe has the capacity for 25 people to attend, in addition to the volunteers. The programme was often full and around 6 to 8 volunteers attended each session. Participants started lining up about 30 minutes before each cafe to ensure that they can attend the programme that night.

The second language cafe is located in Moss, a town approximately 45 minutes to the southeast of Oslo. The total population is 32,182, of which the immigrant and Norwegian-born children with immigrant parents is 6,409 (20%) (Ordemann, 2016, personal communication). During the time of the participant observation, the language cafe met every Wednesday from 1p.m. to 3p.m. and, on average, about 30 to 40 participants attended each cafe and about 10 to 12 volunteers. The dates attended were from 11 March 2015 to 3 June 2015. The last visit comprised of an organized visit to the Norwegian Parliamentary Building (Stortinget). The total number of visits was ten.
The third language cafe is located in Horten, a town approximately 1 hour 40 minutes to the southwest of Oslo. The total population is 27,178, of which the immigrant and Norwegian-born children with immigrant parents is 4065 (15%) (Ordemann, 2016, personal communication). During the time of the participant observation, the library’s language cafe met every other Tuesday from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and, on average, about 15 to 25 people attended each cafe and about 10 to 12 volunteers. The dates attended were from 24 February 2015 to 5 May 2015. The total number of visits was five. Since the completion of the research, the language cafe has started meeting every week and the average number of participants has increased to over 50 and even up to 100 on some occasions.

The language cafes in Oslo and Moss are collaborative efforts with the volunteer centre, whereas, the library in Horten has the sole responsibility for the language cafe. Participants and volunteers are generally recruited through library advertising, such as on the library’s website or in the library, through volunteer centres, and through Norwegian language courses. Many participants (and some volunteers) hear about the language cafes through word-of-mouth and it is common that they will attend the first few times with a friend who is already attending the cafe. This is especially common for people living at the asylum reception centres, which are the living accommodations provided for people who have applied for asylum and are waiting for their applications to be processed. Some asylum seekers even attend the language cafes before they start formal language classes.

Profile of participants and volunteers

The participants come from very diverse backgrounds and have come to Norway for a variety of reasons. A little less than half the participants are female and a little over half are male. The majority of the participants are in their late 20s or 30s and about a third are in their 40s or early 50s.

In Oslo, the majority of participants come from European countries and have come to Norway for work. In Moss, the majority come from African countries and have come to Norway as asylum seekers or refugees. In Horten, there is a greater mixture of people coming from European, African and Asian countries and more varied reasons for coming to Norway. The average length of time participants have lived in Norway is two-and-a-half years; however, participants reported having lived in Norway anywhere from as little as two weeks up to 30 years.

Participants’ level of education varies from having completed only a portion of their primary schooling to having completed graduate degrees. However, the majority have either finished secondary school or some form of higher education (vocational school, university, etc.). The majority of participants in Moss and Horten are not employed, whereas the majority of participants in Oslo are employed. This may partly be due to the times the cafes are held. The Moss and Horten cafes are held during the day whereas the cafe in Oslo is held in the evening after normal working hours.

Around half of the participants are required to attend the programmes and around half attend voluntarily. The Norwegian Government offers immigrants language classes and requires refugees to attend a two-year introductory programme, which includes language classes and coursework about Norwegian society. Many of the participants who attend the Government’s introductory or language programmes are required to attend the language cafes. The inclusion of participants who are required to attend helps counter a possible positive bias. This is because immigrants who might not normally attend the programmes are included and not just the highly motivated, more outgoing immigrants.

The vast majority of volunteers at the Horten and Moss cafes are women, over the age of 56 and retired. However, around half of the volunteers at the Oslo cafe are men and almost all of volunteers are under the age of 56 and employed. Across the three language cafes, the vast majority of volunteers have attended some college or received a university degree. Two of the volunteers are immigrants who have achieved a high level of fluency in the language.

Less than half of the volunteers in Oslo and the vast majority of volunteers in Moss are not originally from the community where the language cafes are held whereas the vast majority of volunteers in Horten cafe are originally from the community. However, it should be noted that the many of the volunteers in Oslo and Moss have lived in the community for many years.

The profiles of the participants and volunteers are important because they show the diversity of people attending the language cafes. This diversity is of particular importance when considering the programmes’ ability to foster bridging social capital and increased communication between publics.

Results

The following are the results from the participant observation and field notes and the questionnaires. The results are presented as they pertain to the four processes and friendship potential theorized by Pettigrew. Consideration is also given the possibility of higher rates of negative outcomes for participants who are required to attend the programming, as well as trust and homogeneity.

Learning about the out-group

The first process proposed by Pettigrew is in line with Allport’s original hypothesis that learning about the out-group can correct negative views of the group and, thereby, reduce prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998: 70). Accordingly, the
vast majority of participants indicated that they found the conversations at the language cafe to be informative regarding Norwegian culture and traditions and the vast majority of volunteers indicated that they found the conversations at the language cafe to be informative regarding other cultures and traditions. This was evident in the conversations. The following are three excerpts from the field notes. Conversations documented in the field notes were coded under ‘Norwegian’, ‘non-Norwegian’ or ‘comparative’ themes. The first excerpt can be seen as a ‘Norwegian’ theme:

The theme for the day was May 17, Norway’s national day. To begin with, one of the volunteers spoke a bit about how Norwegians celebrate May 17 – processions, clothing (bunad), music, food, and changes in the tradition. She showed a few pictures of May 17 activities. Participants and volunteers were able to discuss a bit about their 17th of May experiences.

The second excerpt can be seen as a ‘non-Norwegian’ theme:

During the cafe, the Somali women’s use of henna on the ends of their fingers and on their hair was discussed. Volunteers also asked about how men used it – noting that some Somali men that they have seen have very red beards. The women discussed it and talked how they make the henna paste. They also spoke about how they decorate their hands with henna for weddings and for the upcoming celebration of Eid.

The third excerpt can be seen as a comparative theme

The group began by going around the circle and talking about each participant’s wedding. We heard about traditions from Sri Lanka (Hindu and Catholic), Somali, Eritrea, Uganda, and Sudan. Participants talked about the clothing, times, rings (or other jewelry exchanged), dowries, and gifts to families and/or to the bride (cars, camels, property, and money).

As these excerpts demonstrate, volunteers and participants were able to share their cultures and experiences as well as ask others questions about their cultures. This shows how the programme conversations support intergroup exchange of ideas and experiences. Interestingly, in the coding of the field notes, seventeen conversations were labelled as only pertaining to Norwegian-related topics or themes, whereas 29 conversations were labelled as pertaining to non-Norwegian topics or themes and 37 were labelled as comparative. These results from the field notes show that there is a considerable degree of give and take of Norwegian topics and topics pertaining to other cultures and nationalities.

Volunteers and participants also appear to be changing their preconceived notions of each other because of programme conversations. One volunteer wrote that one of the benefits of attending the programme was ‘to see that Muslim men are not as bad as you hear [and] to learn about other cultures’. Similarly, a participant wrote

the Norwegians who come and teach us Norwegian are very helpful and thanks to them I am convinced that you shouldn’t have prejudice, that Norwegians are very sincere and open towards people from other countries

thus countering the perception that Norwegians dislike immigrants. These comments show how learning about the out-group has corrected the negative views held by the volunteer and participant respectively – or at least misinformation that they had received – and thereby reduced their negative stereotypes or prejudices.

Interestingly, the interactions also appear to allow for learning about within-group variations. A participant wrote that a benefit of the language cafe is that ‘one can talk with different Norwegians (not just, for example, with their spouse). One can get to know more about Norway and Norwegians (their culture, interests, etc.)’. Acquainting oneself with the range of perspectives and experiences within a group also reduces prejudice and stereotypes – realizing that everyone in a group does not think and act in the same way.

Changing behaviour

The second process is based on the premise that behavior change is often the precursor of attitude change (Pettigrew, 1998: 71). While attitude change might occur before one’s behaviour changes, research shows that the changes appear to be less strong than when there is direct contact. The basis for this comes from studies on people with ingroup friends who have out-group friends (Pettigrew, 2011). Moreover, research shows that the repetition of positive intergroup encounters causes the encounters to increasingly feel ‘comfortable and right’ (Zajonc, 1968). Repetitive intergroup contact is precisely what the language cafes offer.

Accordingly, attending the programmes and interacting with people from different cultural groups appears to be a behaviour change for many volunteers as well as participants. Almost half of the volunteers had little or no contact with immigrants before attending the language cafe. Moreover, some of the Norwegian volunteers do not find opportunities to talk with immigrants elsewhere. A third of the volunteers indicated that they have few or no opportunities to talk to immigrants outside of the language cafe. Therefore, engaging in weekly conversations with immigrants constitutes a behaviour change for many volunteers.

A little over half of the participants also indicated that they lack opportunities to speak with Norwegians outside of the language cafe. Therefore, engaging in conversation with Norwegians can also be seen as a behaviour change on the part of these participants. For some of the participants, the change in behaviour is done voluntarily, but of
course, the change in behaviour is involuntary for the participants who are required to attend.

Interestingly, in Horten, the smallest town with the smallest percentage of immigrants, only a quarter of the participants reported that they have few or no opportunities to have discussions with Norwegians outside of the language cafe, whereas well over half of the volunteers have few or no opportunities to have discussions with immigrants outside of the language cafe. Curiously, the opposite was reported in Oslo, the largest city with the highest percentage of immigrants. In Oslo, well over half of the participants have few or no opportunities to have discussions with Norwegians outside of the language cafe, yet less than a quarter of volunteers indicated that they have few or no opportunities to talk to immigrants outside of the language cafe. This suggests that the size of the town or the relative size of the immigrant population can influence immigrants’ ability to engage with the members of the majority. This finding merits further research.

One might question whether attending a language cafe constitutes a behavior change, as volunteers and participants might simply be more open to having contact with each other. In other words, they may not have been avoiding contact with each other. This may be true, but the change might not be so extreme as to go from avoiding contact to initiating contact. The simple fact that many have had little or no contact previously and now they do is a change in behaviour.

In addition to constituting a behaviour change for many, the interactions at the language cafes appear to have resulted in attitude changes, or causing the encounters to feel comfortable and right for some of the volunteers. Two-thirds of volunteers said that they feel more comfortable talking to immigrants outside of the language cafe than they did previously. Similarly, the vast majority of volunteers said they feel somewhat or a lot more comfortable talking to people of different cultural backgrounds. One volunteer noted that they ‘have met many nice people from different countries’ and that it is a ‘joy to come to the language cafe every time’.

For participants, attending the language cafes also appears to have led to attitude changes, with the vast majority of participants indicating that they feel somewhat or a lot more comfortable talking to people of different cultural backgrounds after attending the cafes, which may include both Norwegians and other participants. One participant reflected on how she feels more comfortable talking to Norwegians now:

at the beginning when I came to Norway, I felt very shy and lonely – to start a conversation or just to ask in Norwegian. Now after my experience at the language cafe and Norwegian course I feel very comfortable.

Clearly, the positive encounters have made the interactions feel more ‘comfortable and right’ for this participant.

Generating affective ties

The third process relates to the generation of feelings of empathy and positive emotions associated with intergroup contact, which results when contact feels comfortable and right. Accordingly, trust might be considered an indicator of affective ties in that any previously held scepticism and distrust gives way to higher levels of trust as people become more acquainted with each other. This relates to the previously mentioned research showing that positive out-group contact in diverse neighborhoods correlates with higher levels of trust (Hewstone, 2003; Stolle, et al., 2008).

Well over half the participants in Oslo and Horten and the vast majority in Moss indicated that, in general, people in their towns can be trusted somewhat or a lot. These results are interesting when we consider that the majority of participants in Moss are asylum seekers or refugees who have fled from their countries due to war, civil unrest and other tragic situations. One might assume that they would have lower trust levels, but this does not appear to be the case. This finding merits further research as to what factors have resulted in their relatively higher levels of trust.

In comparison with the previous finding, almost all of the participants indicated that they trust the volunteers somewhat or a lot at the respective language cafes. This corroborates findings in Norway that refugees and immigrants feel more comfortable interacting with and are more trusting of non-immigrant patrons in the context of the library, but less so elsewhere (Audunson et al., 2011; Vårheim, 2014). Moreover, it supports the previous assertion that trust might be considered an indicator of affective ties in that any previously held scepticism and distrust gives way to higher levels of trust as people become more acquainted with each other.

Overall, volunteers reported high levels of trust, both in general and in respect to the participants at the language cafes. Almost all of volunteers indicated that they believe somewhat or a lot that people in their towns can generally be trusted and all of the volunteers indicated that they trust the participants somewhat or a lot. These findings suggest that the volunteers’ trust did not diminish in the face of diversity.

Feelings of belonging might also be considered an indicator of affective ties. The vast majority of participants indicated that they feel a greater sense of being part of the Norwegian community from attending the language cafe. Similarly, the vast majority of volunteers indicated that they feel a greater sense of being part of the multicultural Norwegian society from attending the language cafe.

A comment by a volunteer gives the sense that intergroup contact has led to the formation of affective ties stating that she has benefited from attending the language cafe by:
be of help to other people. We are all born on the same planet and we must try to take care of each other.

Another comment by a volunteer suggests a greater feeling of belonging when she commented that it is ‘good to be integrated with our new countrymen’.

**In-group reappraisal**

This process results from gaining insight into one’s norms and customs that can lead to the adoption of new perspectives regarding one’s own group – insight that one’s own norms and customs ‘are not the only ways to manage the social world’(Pettigrew, 1998, p. 72). Accordingly, over a third of volunteers indicated that they have found the programme conversation to be informative regarding Norwegian culture and society. Furthermore, well over half the volunteers indicated that they have gained new perspectives or understandings of Norwegian culture and society from the discussions at the language cafes. Similarly, well over half of participants also indicated that they have gained new perspectives or understandings of their own culture and society from the discussions at the language cafes.

Some volunteers and participants indicated that they felt these were rather strange questions regarding if they had learned about or gained new perspectives on Norwegian culture. A few volunteers felt that their role was that of a teacher rather than student, thus imparting Norwegian language and culture rather than learning about and reflecting on their own culture. Likewise, a few participants felt that they were there to learn about Norwegian culture rather than reflect on their own. This suggests that how volunteers and participants perceive their role or relationships within the programmes – such as a student-teacher relationship rather than that of co-participants – may influence the outcome of this process.

**Friendship potential**

Many of the participants indicated that they have expanded their social networks. One participant in particular said that they have benefited from attending the language cafe because they have ‘got a [social] network and gotten to know many people’. Many other participants made similar comments. Indeed, attending the language cafes appears to have been a positive social experience for the vast majority of participants at all the language cafes. Almost all of the participants and volunteers indicated that attending their respective language cafes has been a positive social experience. Moreover, well over half of the participants and volunteers indicated that they have made some or many friends or acquaintances at the language cafes.

Interestingly, Oslo has the greatest difference between the number of participants and the number of volunteers who indicated that they made friends and acquaintances. Yet, the similarities in age, gender and educational background are the most similar between participants and volunteers at this cafe. This suggests that even though a moderate degree of homogeneity exists between participants and volunteers there are other factors influencing – or preventing – the formation of intergroup friendships between participants and volunteers. This finding in combination with the previous finding that participants in Oslo have the fewest opportunities to speak with Norwegians outside of the language cafe suggests that other factors make it more challenging for the participants to connect with the non-immigrant community in Oslo. These findings merit further research.

With these findings in mind, one might ask, what is friendship? Friendship is difficult to define and can be defined and conceived of differently by different people and in different cultures. The responses therefore can be seen as indicators that the interactions were positive and as evidence that contacts were established, to varying degrees. However, there is additional evidence that the relationships formed transcend mere acquaintanceships. The most salient example is a couple of the participants at one of the language cafes who began dating. They became known as the ‘language cafe couple’.

The language cafes also appear to serve as a springboard to other activities; thus increasing the opportunities for extensive and repeat contact. In Horten, many of the women who attend the language cafe also meet on a regular basis to dance; they dance traditional dances from the women’s home countries. On a few occasions, as was experienced by the researcher on the first visit to the language cafe, the women invite other women who are new to the language cafe to join them.

Social media also play a role. It is common that participants connect with one another on social media – something also experienced by the researcher. For the most part this appeared to be between participants. However, it was also observed on a couple occasions, that volunteers connected with participants on social media. Furthermore, the language cafe organizers in Moss and Oslo have Facebook pages that the participants can follow. It is possible that further connections are made via the Facebook pages as those who follow the page can see who else follows it.

Some participants and volunteers have met before attending the language cafe or through other activities. For example, in Moss the programme volunteers come from the local volunteer centre, which has many activities that involve the language cafes’ participants and volunteers. In these cases, the language cafe may not be the place where these participants and volunteers meet, but would instead serve as another point of contact, thus increasing the likelihood for extensive and repeated contact amongst participants and volunteers.

**Possible outcome differences**

What about the participants who are required to attend? Has their experience also been a positive one? It appears
that it has been a positive social experience for the vast majority. Combining the results from all three cafes, all of the participants who attend voluntarily indicated that they feel attending the language cafe has been a somewhat or very positive social experience. The response was equally positive from the participants who are required to attend the language cafes; nearly all indicated that attending the language cafe has been a somewhat or very positive social experience. In addition, the vast majority of the participants across all three language cafes who attend voluntarily and those who are required to attend indicated that they believe they have benefited somewhat or a lot from attending the language cafe. These findings suggest that the programme is just as positive for those who are required to attend as for those who attend voluntarily.

Discussion

How might conversation-based programming support meaningful interactions between immigrants and members of the majority in ways that reduce social divides that run along ethnic group lines and, thereby, foster integration? Conversations at the language cafes appear to support the four processes as theorized by Pettigrew that undergird Contact Theory, which include learning about the out-group, changing behaviour, generating affective ties, in-group reappraisal, as well as friendship potential. The four processes will be discussed in turn.

The analysis of the programme conversations shows that both Norwegian and non-Norwegian topics are discussed, which is necessary for all involved to learn about the other groups (out-groups). Accordingly, both participants and volunteers found the conversations to be informative about the others’ cultures, which indicates that they are learning about each other. Moreover, the information is changing the way they think about each other. Volunteer and participant comments indicated that they were moving past prejudices and stereotypes and on to more informed understandings of each other.

Many volunteers and participants have little or no previous contact with each other or have few opportunities to interact with each other outside of the programme, or both. Attending the programmes and engaging in conversation with each other represents a change in behaviour, which also appears to be followed by a change in attitudes. Participants and volunteers indicated that they feel more comfortable interacting with people of different cultural backgrounds.

Elevated levels of trust between participants and volunteers, as well as increased feelings of belonging to each other suggests the formation of affective ties between the volunteers and participants. The volunteers report greater feelings of belonging to the multicultural Norwegian community and the immigrants report greater feelings of belonging to the Norwegian community. Trust between the immigrants and Norwegians within the context of the programmes is very high; thus suggesting that the programmes offer a safe and nonthreatening environment for contact between the groups to proceed.

Both volunteers and participants report gaining new perspectives and understandings of their own culture, which indicates that a degree of in-group reappraisal is happening. The number of participants and volunteers who indicated this was a bit lower on average than the responses pertaining to the other processes. This process may take a little longer as it requires people to reflect on the conversations, something that may happen immediately or even years later. As mentioned previously, it may also be influenced by how participants and volunteers perceive their role or relationships to each other within the programmes.

The friendship potential at the language cafes appears to be quite high. The vast majority report that they have found attending the cafes to be a somewhat or very positive social experience and many have made friends or acquaintances. Moreover, many of the participants specifically stated that a benefit of attending the language cafe has been the formation of a social network. While there might be an occasional person who has a less than favourable experience, the vast majority find the programmes to be a positive social experience, regardless if they are required to attend or attend voluntarily. The cafes also appear to act as springboards to other social activities, as well as providing opportunities for repeat contact for those who have met elsewhere; thus expanding upon the programmes’ friendship potential.

The results regarding the friendship potential might have a slight positive bias; however, other factors reduce the possibility of the results being overly positive. The volunteers and participants who attend the language cafes might be favourably disposed to meeting and becoming acquainted with people of other cultural backgrounds and ethnicities. Some may be; however, it cannot be assumed it is the case for all. Before attending the language cafes, some of the volunteers were involved in other activities with immigrants and clearly had an interest in having contact with immigrants; however, other volunteers were simply looking for opportunities to become involved in their communities and based on a variety of factors, including their availability and backgrounds, were offered to volunteer at the language cafes. They might have initially attended the language cafe to help with the so-called ‘immigration crisis’ and not out of an interest in befriending immigrants and refugees. For immigrants, they might have initially attended the language cafe out of a need to learn the language or because they were required to rather than out of an interest in meeting and interacting Norwegian people. Furthermore, as the findings indicate, the contact appears to have led to the reduction of prejudice, at least for some of the volunteers and participants. This suggests
that the friendships and acquaintanceships cannot be expected outcomes of the interactions.

Even if there is a bias, the acquaintanceships and friendships cannot be discounted or devalued, as they are genuine and the formation of out-group contacts is most likely going to be initiated (no matter the location or context) by individuals who are more open to people of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Individuals who make the initial contact with members of another group might be seen as ‘connectors’ in that they form the preliminary connections between groups, which can then be built up as other members of the groups connect and form relationships.

Importantly, Pettigrew et al. (2011) report that research shows there can be indirect contact effects. They note that the research demonstrates that having in-group friends who have an out-group friend relates to diminished prejudice. This is thought to occur because seeing one’s friend have contact with an out-group person makes it normatively acceptable. However, they note that the new attitudes from indirect contact may not be held with the same degree of certainty as with those resulting from direct contact. Yet, this may serve to prepare people experiencing indirect contact for later direct contact (Pettigrew et al., 2011: 277). As conversation-based programming is held in public libraries, the indirect contact effects could possibly apply to other library users who are not directly involved in the language cafe, but observe their fellow nationals engaging in conversation with immigrants.

As theorized, a moderate degree of homogeneity may be needed for intergroup friendships to form. However, those participating in the programs represent a very heterogeneous group in that many come from different social, cultural, educational and economic backgrounds. They have varied reasons for coming to Norway, and are at different points in their lives. Furthermore, the amount of time participants have lived in Norway varies greatly. While the volunteers represent more of a homogenous group in terms of age and ethnic background, they also differ in social, economic and educational backgrounds as well as in age. Possibly the conversations provide participants and volunteers with enough time to discover their similarities and, hopefully, be more tolerant and even accepting of each other’s differences – this includes interactions between volunteers and participants, as well as participants and their co-participants.

Importantly, the findings from the study show that the programmes are beneficial for participants in different contexts and from diverse backgrounds and life situations. Overwhelmingly the programmes have been a positive social experience for men and women of varying ages, educational levels, and immigration and employment statuses. Interestingly, the programmes are relevant for people who have just arrived in Norway, as well as those who have been in the country for many years – for those who are just learning the language and about the culture to those who are conversationally fluent and have a lot of experience with the culture. While, the existence of a language cafe does not guarantee the expansion of social networks across intercultural lines, the ability of this type of programming to support the expansion of social networks and foster intergroup friendships is very strong. A programme participant sums it up well when s/he wrote that the language cafe is a ‘good opportunity to practice [speaking Norwegian], I made new friends, I got information about other cultures, I got a lot of information about Norway’.

Contact Theory is useful for explaining the social processes that contribute to the commonly reported outcome that participants expand their social networks. The theory also provides a way to account for the experiences of the volunteers, which is necessary for understanding how these programmes might support integration. Learning about one another, changing of behaviour, forming affective ties, and re-evaluating one’s ways of doing and thinking about things is, as this study shows, a process of mutual influence.

Furthermore, Contact Theory implies that the acquisition of information is of central importance in reducing prejudice and, as previously discussed, in facilitating integration. The provision and dissemination of information is a core library function. In the case of language cafes and other conversation-based programmes, the information may come from the interaction with another person rather than a book or digital document. Regardless of the format, the outcome is a greater awareness of and better understanding of our fellow humans. Therefore, the use of libraries as meeting places must be acknowledged as contributing to information dissemination and as an important addition to print and digital collections.

The findings of this study also help to strengthen the applicability of Contact Theory in different contexts. This article also provides theoretical links regarding how the theory relates to integration. Understanding these links can help develop both our understandings of Contact Theory, as well as, integration and other forms of immigrant incorporation.

In summary, conversation-based programming in public libraries clearly has the potential to facilitate fruitful interactions between immigrants and members of the majority. This contact is necessary if integration is to proceed. Macro level, top-down integration policies, though they are important in many ways, can only do so much. Integration must take place on the micro level – person to person (Hewstone, 2003). Immigrants and members of the majority must have opportunities to meet and interact. There is no other way around it. Conversation-based programming in public libraries should be considered a viable intervention for facilitating integration; it is a complementary (and necessary) bottom-up approach to top-down integration policies and initiatives.
Moreover, public libraries have some additional advantages in this regard. First, they are able to welcome people of all backgrounds and provide a neutral, friendly place for contact to proceed. No other government offices or other public institutions are able to welcome people in the same manner. Second, public libraries are found in most towns or neighbourhoods, which makes them relatively easy to access. Furthermore, conversation-based programmes are relatively inexpensive; libraries of all sizes and budgets can implement such programmes. Public libraries have the potential to support integration on a wide scale and, as a result, be a key player in the larger effort to achieving socially cohesive communities. Lastly, the findings of this study provide with empirical evidence that can be used to justify libraries’ continued use of resources and staff time for conversation-based programming.

Conclusion

Based on this multi-case study of language cafes in public libraries, the programming shows great potential for facilitating the four processes undergirding Contact Theory: learning about the out-group, changing behaviour, generating affective ties and in-group reappraisal, as well as friendship potential. In simpler terms, the programming shows much potential for reducing prejudices and fostering intergroup friendship and acquaintanceships, which are necessary for integration to proceed. Thus, the programming needs to be considered a viable intervention for facilitating integration and for fostering greater social cohesion in diverse societies.
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**Appendix A. Questionnaire for participants**
Thank you for filling out this survey! It is 27 questions long and should take around 20 minutes to complete. The aim is to generate knowledge that can help improve language cafes. All answers are confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you can quit the survey at any time. Any identifying information will not be included in the final report.

Thank you! Jamie Johnston, PhD Candidate, Oslo University College, Email: jamie.johnston@hioa.no Phone 45223458

1. **What is your gender?**
   - Male □
   - Female □

2. **How old are you?**
   - 25 or under □
   - 26-40 □
   - 41-55 □
   - 56 or older □

3. **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**
   - Some primary school □
   - Primary school □
   - Secondary school □
   - Vocational/technical school □
   - Some college □
   - Bachelor’s degree □
   - Master’s degree □
   - Doctoral degree or professional degree (MD, JD, etc.) □
   - Other (Please specify) ___________________________
4. Why did you come to Norway? (Mark all that apply)

- Work
- Family reunification
- Spouse / Partner
- Education
- Asylum/Refugee
- Other (Please specify) _________________

5. Where do you come from?

- Europe
- North America
- Latin America
- Asia
- Africa
- Oceania

6. How long have you lived in Norway? _________________________________

7. What do you do?

- Working
- Unemployed
- Retired / Pensioner
- Permanently Disabled
- Homemaker / Stay at home parent
- Student
- Participant in Introductory Programming (NAV)
- Interim period at an asylum reception center
- Other (Please specify) _________________

8. Are you required to attend the language cafe (as part of the introductory programming)?

- Yes
- No
- Other (Please specify) _________________

9. How long have you attended the language cafe (approx.)? _________________________________

10. Do you attend Norwegian language courses?

- Yes
- No
- Other (Please specify) _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding language learning at the language cafe:</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you think that attending the language cafe has improved your language skills?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you have other opportunities outside of the language cafe have discussions (in Norwegian) with Norwegians?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Have you found the conversations at the language cafe to be informative regarding the following topics:  
(Mark all that apply)

- Work or jobs □
- Education □
- Political or civic (e.g., local or national issues) □
- International issues □
- Recreational opportunities (hobbies, sports, cultural activities, travel advice, etc.) □
- Norwegian culture and traditions □
- Other cultures and traditions □
- Housing (e.g., finding, renting, furnishing, etc.) □
- Health / Health Care □
- Other (Please specify) _________________

Regarding the program conversations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you think that the Norwegian volunteers value your opinion on the topics and issues discussed?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Have you developed new understandings or perspectives on the topics and issues discussed?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you think the participants and volunteers are able to debate or disagree in a respectful manner?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are there issues that you feel more strongly about now than you did before attending the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Have you gained new perspectives or understandings of your own culture and society from the discussions at the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding feelings of trust at the language cafe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. In general, do you think that most people in Oslo can be trusted</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In general, do you trust the Norwegian volunteers at the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. In general, do you believe the Norwegian volunteers trust you?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the social aspects of the language cafe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you feel that attending the language cafe has been a positive social experience?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Do you feel a greater sense of being part of the Norwegian community from attending the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do you feel more comfortable talking with people of different cultural backgrounds than your own from attending the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Have you made any friends or acquaintances at the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Overall, do you believe that you have benefited from attending the language cafe?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Why do you believe that you have benefited or not benefited from attending the language cafe (optional)?
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

Appendix B. Questionnaire for volunteers
[Translated from Norwegian]
Thank you for filling out this survey! It is 26 questions long and should take around 20 minutes to complete. The aim is to generate knowledge that can help improve language cafes. All answers are confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you can quit the survey at any time. Any identifying information will not be included in the final report.

Thank you! Jamie Johnston, PhD Candidate, Oslo University College, Email: jamie.johnston@hioa.no Phone 45223458

1. What is your gender?
   Male □
   Female □

2. How old are you?
   25 or under □
   26-40 □
   41-55 □
   56 or older □

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Some primary school □
   Primary school □
   Secondary school □
   Vocational/technical school □
   Some college □
   Bachelor’s degree □
   Master’s degree □
   Doctoral degree or professional degree (MD, JD, etc.) □
   Other (Please specify) _________________

4. Are you originally from Oslo/Moss/Horten? (Mark all that apply)
   Work □
   Family reunification □
   Spouse / Partner □
   Education □
   Asylum/Refugee □
   Other (Please specify) _________________

5. If not, how many years have you lived in Oslo/Moss/Horten (or surrounding areas)?_______________
6. What do you do?

Working □
Unemployed □
Retired / Pensioner □
Permanently Disabled □
Homemaker / Stay at home parent □
Student □
Participant in Introductory Programming (NAV) □
Interim period at an asylum reception center □
Other (Please specify) _____________________

7. How long have you attended the language cafe (approx.)? ______________________________________

8. What is the main reason you attend the language café?

Work (library staff, language instructor, etc.) □
To socialize □
Community involvement □
Career development □
Other ____________

9. Did you have much contact with immigrants before attending the language cafe?

Regarding contact with immigrants: Not at all / None A little / Few Somewhat / Some A lot Not sure

10. Do you feel more comfortable speaking to immigrants outside of the language café than you did before attending the language cafe?

11. Do you have other opportunities to speak with immigrants outside of the language cafe?

12. Have you found the conversations at the language cafe to be informative regarding the following topics:
(Mark all that apply)

Work or jobs □
Education □
Political or civic (e.g., local or national issues) □
International issues □
Recreational opportunities (hobbies, sports, cultural activities, travel advice, etc.) □
Norwegian culture and traditions □
Other cultures and traditions □
Housing (e.g., finding, renting, furnishing, etc.) □
Health / Health Care □
Other (Please specify) _________________

13. Do you think that the participants value your opinion on the topics and issues discussed?

Regarding the program conversations: Not at all / None A little / Few Somewhat / Some A lot Not sure

14. Have you developed new understandings or perspectives on the topics and issues discussed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding the program conversations:</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you think the participants and volunteers are able to debate or disagree in a respectful manner?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are there issues that you feel more strongly about now than you did before attending the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have you gained new perspectives or understandings of Norwegian culture and society from the discussions at the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding feelings of trust at the language café:</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. In general, do you think that most people in Oslo/Moss/Horten can be trusted</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In general, do you trust the participants at the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In general, do you believe the participants trust you?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding the social aspects of the language café:</th>
<th>Not at all / None</th>
<th>A little / Few</th>
<th>Somewhat / Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you feel that attending the language café has been a positive social experience?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you feel a greater sense of being part of the multicultural Norwegian community from attending the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Do you feel more comfortable talking with people of different cultural backgrounds than your own from attending the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Have you made any friends or acquaintances at the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Overall, do you believe that you have benefited from attending the language café?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Why do you believe that you have benefited or not benefited from attending the language café (optional)?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C. Coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Scheme</th>
<th>Subcategories/Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics of Conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Communicative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses and Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction &amp; Active Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media &amp; Informative Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings of Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification with Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Successes in Norwegian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Political &amp; Civic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics and Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights and Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualifiers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food and Food Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview &amp; Workplace Etiquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs &amp; Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges and Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>