TRANSWEL

WP 3. Discourses of belonging affecting portability

- Design and guidelines -

Ann Runfors

Södertörn University

Ann Runfors 2015

School of History and Contemporary Studies, SÖDERTÖRN UNIVERSITY | STOCKHOLM

WP 3:
Discourses of belonging affecting portability
– Design and guidelines –

ORGANISATION, TIMEFRAME AND OUTCOME

Overall organisation

WP 3 is the first entirely qualitative part study we are performing in TRANSWEL. This will allow each team to perform qualitative analytical work of their own, with an inductive/retroductive approach to data. WP3 will be coordinated by the Swedish country team (SE CT).

The results from WP3 (on the discourses of belonging in receiving and sending countries) will, together with the WP1 results (on the logics of selectivity in the policy), be very important for describing the conditions migrants meet – and hence for interpreting and understanding the results from WP2 and WP4.

During WP3 each country team (CT) will be responsible for:
• Collecting data for their pair of countries.
• Creating texts for analysis (transcriptions of interviews)
• Performing discourse analysis on their material (by following the instructions in the guidelines presented here but also in the suggested readings below).
• Writing a paper in which their discourse analysis is presented.
• Voluntary task and an additional value: Developing the papers into journal articles. This is made possible by the format of the CT papers.

As coordinators of WP3 the SE CT, in addition to the above, will be responsible for:
• The development of criteria for sampling of material for analysis (presented in this text)
• The development of transcription guidelines for the expert interview material (presented in this text).
• The development of guidelines for the discourse analysis.
> We will provide:
> - a basic description of the theory and methods we are going to use (presented in this text).
> - a selection of literature that in the most pedagogical way available describes the chosen theory and methods (presented in this text).
> - Skype training sessions during spring 2016 (January to April), for joint discussions on the literature and on implementation of discourse analysis. (Program and instructions will be distributed separately).
> - a one-day discourse analysis workshop during our 2016 in Stockholm May meeting, where we perform discourse analysis on CT material and then compare and discuss.

• producing a comparative journal article for academic referee journal.

Outcomes

The suggested outcomes of WP3 are:

> • The CTs discourse analysis papers
> • The comparative journal article for an academic referee journal that the SE CT will develop on the basis of these CT papers.
> • Additional for those CTs who are interested: transformation of CT papers into CT journal articles.

Due to the limited WP3 timeframes (see below) we will not produce a policy brief in this WP.

Format of CT papers:

Due to the qualitative character of the analysis in WP3 and to ensure that the papers will function as basis for the comparative referee journal article the CT paper should contain:

A contextualising part:

• an introduction with CT-specifics on background etc.,
• a section on the specific material your CT used and collected (a methodological note),
• a section on the specific methods of analysis your CT used (i.e. the discourse analytical angles and discourse analytical concepts that you, due to the character of your specific material, finally chose from the theory frame presented in this text and in the recommended literature).

An analytic part

• about three sections where the analysis made by your CT is presented and argued – showing *which* discourses of belonging you could find in your material and how they manifested themselves.

Summarizing part

• a summary where the analytical sections are summed up and merged together into final results answering to the WP3 aims and questions.

The precise length of the paper is depending on the results of the CT discourse analysis (but they are expected to be at least 25 pages). The important thing is to:

• fully and thoroughly present the CT inductive discourse analysis
• to frame and contextualise the analysis to make it possible for the SE CT to produce a comparative journal article.
• as an added value: to make it possible for those CT who wants to transform their papers into an referee journal article of their own.

Timeframe

The timeframe for WP3 is very limited. WP3 is planned to start 1st of May 2016 and to be finalized 31st of October 2016. This means that there are three months less allocated to WP3 than to the other WPs. On top of this WP3 is running during the summer months, with vacation periods both for team members and for informants. This limits the actual working time even more and eventually delays work.

To handle this the SE CT carefully have considered the scope of knowledge goals, material, outcomes etc. Rather than collecting a lot of material and then not having time to analyse it thoroughly, nor to fully present the results gained, we will aim at thorough analyses and result presentations on a narrowed down scope. As you will see in these guidelines we narrowed down not only the scope of the materials collected, but also the scope of the knowledge goals and – as already described above – the amount of products produced.

Besides the above we all have to prepare on forehand, see work schedule below.

WP3 Work Schedule

<u>Preparation</u>
2015
Until last of December
As the first Skype training session in discourse analysis will take place 22 January 2016, you might want to start reading suggested books and articles: Fairclough 2003 for all. Egan Sjölander & Gunnarsson Payne 2011 and Glynos, Jason et.al 2009 for those of you not familiar with different types of discourse analysis (see Theory section).

2016
1st of January to last of April.
- Team members read suggested books and articles on discourse analysis. Deadline for all literature to be read and processed is *15th of May*.
- Team members prepare for and participate in Skype discourse analysis training sessions once per month. (Program and instructions has been distributed separately).
- Optional: Team members start to transcribe interviews and to make additional expert

interviews.

WP3 starts officially
2016
1st of May to last of May
- Team members collect remaining material (make additional expert interviews).
- Team members start transcribing expert interviews and take analytical notes.
-

17 - 20 May ws in Stockholm.
Among other things we hope to be able to arrange a one-day training and sessions regarding the Logics perspective in discourse analysis.

Info on May ws:
Arrival at airport in Stockholm at latest 2pm 17 May. Departure from our hotel in Stockholm earliest 3pm 20 May.
For questions regarding transport contact Maarja, regarding accommodation and conference arrangements contact Florence, regarding ws program contact Ann.

1st of June to last of June.
- Team members transcribe remaining expert interviews, take analytical notes and starts to perform discourse analysis on the joint material.

1st of July to last of July.
- Team members continue with the discourse analysis and start writing paper following the format given.

1st of August to last of September
- Team members finalize their paper. This is sent to SE CT for feedback by 20th of September. SE CT returns the paper by 30th of September

1st of October to last of October
- CTs finalize their papers using the feedback. The final version of the paper should be sent to SE CT by 31st of October.

1st of November to last of December
- SE CT produces comparative journal article deadline 10th of December
- Internal review process 10th of December until January.

POINTS OF DEPARTURE, KNOWLEDGE GOAL AND AIMS

Discourses of belonging as defined in the application

Discourses of belonging are in the application understood as naturalized views on national membership and belonging that can include gendered, ethnicized/nationalized, age- and class-related patterns of belonging as well as cosmopolitan belonging.

Points of departure in application[1]

1) Different types of EU migrants are in different ways affected by portability regimes. Portability regimes include regulations, mobility practices as well as discourses of belonging that specify which categories of the mobile population are to be granted social rights.

2) Regulations are based on discourses of belonging, that is on naturalized views on national membership and belonging that can include gendered, ethnicized/nationalized, age- and class-related patterns of belonging as well as cosmopolitan belonging.

3) Different discourses of belonging may contain logics that excludes some and includes others.

Points of departure based on WP1

In WP1 all CTs have been mapping out how different types of regulations and different categories of portability shape *regulatory pathways of portability*. One point of departure in the conclusions from WP1 is that regulatory pathways of portability are informed by logics of selectivity, which in turn are expressed in discourses of belonging. UK CT defines the concept logics of selectivity as logics that frame the public good by expressing the borders of nation and society; by expressing what society and its economy should look like; by expressing migrants' roles in this; by expressing the relationship between society and individuals and by expressing how welfare benefits should be used and whom should be entitled. Logics of selectivity thus tell us something about whom is to be included in the national welfare system according to the discourses of belonging, on what terms, with which aims and with which effects.

Hence, logics of selectivity have an impact on the distribution of social security rights. It is these logics of selectivity and the *discourses of belonging* they create that we all want to map out in WP3.

---

[1] References in application text on points of departure:

Beck, U. and Grande, E. (2007) 'Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis', *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (1): 67–85.

Castles, S. (2012) 'Cosmopolitanism and Freedom? Lessons of the Global Economic Crisis', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (11): 1843–1852.

Kofman, E., Phizacklea, A., Raghuram, P. and Sales, R. (2013) *Gender and International Migration in Europe: Employment, Welfare and Politics*, London/New York: Routledge.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2011) *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi/Singapore: SAGE Publications.

Knowledge goal according to application[2]

• To reveal images of 'the Other' in the newly enlarged Europe and present a comprehensive analysis of specific discourses of belonging as well as evidence of their influence with regard to migrants' portability practices.

• To provide insights into the logics of inclusion and exclusion that define which categories of mobile populations can transfer their accumulated social security benefits across borders (and which cannot), and thus to provide insights into the knowledge–power nexus.

 • To explain the practices of and limitations to portability by identifying the discourses of belonging which have an impact on the logics of inclusion and exclusion.

Aims and research questions

Aims:

•To identify [the migrants centred] gendered, ethnicized/nationalized, age- and class-related as well as cosmopolitan discourses of belonging and logics of inclusion and exclusion that are inherent in wider social and political contexts and that permeate the benefit regulations mapped out in WP1.

•To identify the relationship between the discourses on belonging, the benefit regulations and the portability practices mapped out in WP2 by showing what impact images (as for example as the other, gendered, ethnicized/nationalized, age- and class-related, skilled or unskilled, benefit or burden) may have on migrants' access to social security rights and on portability and by showing how such inherent views may create inequality.

Research questions:

[The queries below are in the application points of departure. SE CT have reformulated them into questions to examine]:

- Are the regulatory conditions mapped in WP1 shaped by discourses on belonging, inherent in wider social and political contexts?
- If so, how are these discourses on belonging inscribed in the regulations?
- What different images of mobile Europeans are incorporated in the national migration regimes and the regulations on the portability of social security rights?
- How do different discourses influence and constraint migrants' portability practices?

---

[2] References in application text on knowledge goal

Kofman, E., Phizacklea, A., Raghuram, P. and Sales, R. (2013) *Gender and International Migration in Europe: Employment, Welfare and Politics*, London/New York: Routledge.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2011) *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi/Singapore: SAGE Publications.

<u>Addition aims and research questions suggested by UK CT:</u>

• To reveal and expose *how* such discourses are inscribed in the regulations, and *with what implications* – to be able to understand the implications of subject categories and subject positions (which are evident in discourses of belonging)

• To expose the power relations that the social logics within discourse disguise, by identifying the unspoken. Which texts and voices are included and which are excluded? What significant absences are there?

Comments on aims in application

We all have thoroughly to think through which knowledge goals that are realistic – so that we can be sure to meet them. One aim in the application is to *identify discourses of belonging and exclusion that are inherent in wider social and political contexts* (that is not only in policy documents). SE CT have therefore suggested a material category that is partly already collected, expert interviews, and that we now know mirror the not only policy discourses of belonging but also discourses of belonging on a wider social and political context.

Another aim according to the application is to *identify how discourses of belonging influence and constraint migrants' portability practices*. In WP3 we will not be able to locate any *empirical relationship* between the patterns that will come out of WP2 and the discourses of belonging we detect in WP3. That is, we will not be able at this stage to empirically *show* how different discourses influence and constraint migrants' portability practices. What we all *can* do however is to make analytical *suggestions* about the relationship between the discourses of belonging we detected in WP3 and the patterns of migrants' portability practices exposed in the WP2 survey.

The final conclusions on how discourses of belonging influence and constraint migrants' portability practices will be drawn in WP 5, when we all also have the results from WP4.

EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

The SE CT has been working on identifying data that would be productive for answering our aims and for keeping our timeframes in WP3. One material category that we have identified is decision-making guidelines in receiving countries. All CTs have made inventories of available decision-making guidelines (for unemployment benefits and family-related benefits in their receiving countries). The result is though, that such guidelines are not available in Austria. If we anyway want to use decision-making guidelines, we all will have to accept different material categories as ground analysis in for in different teams, as the Austrian team will have to use a replacement material category.

Policy expert interviews have been collected for WP1. During the work with the research application it was decided to use the WP1 policy expert interviews as one data category also in WP3. Policy expert interviews are hence a material already partly gathered. It is also a material category that seems to be able to help us to identify various policy discourses of belonging as well as national discourses of belonging in the wider national social context – and hopefully also to identify intertextuality between the two.

During the work with WP2 (in contacts with diasporic entry points and migrants) the SE CT became aware that the ways in which Estonian migrants approach the Swedish welfare system might, among other things, be influenced by discourses on welfare and belonging dominating in Estonia. This transnational aspect of discourses of belonging may also be the case for other country pairs. To capture this transnational aspect, it seems important to study national discourses of belonging both in the sending and the receiving countries. Based on this SE CT suggest the use of expert interviews from both countries in the country pairs.

Expert interviews will allow all teams to work with coherent material and also to include the transnational aspect in the analysis. To be able to scientifically say anything on dominating national discourses – rather than just on individual opinions – there is a need of a body of 5-6 interviews per country (in total 10-12 interviews per team). With regards to this and to the timeframe *the suggestion is to use only expert interviews as material in WP3*. This limitation in data category scope will hopefully also allow us to do a thorough work.

Distribution of interviews

The suggestion is to do 5-6 expert interviews in sending countries and 5-6 expert interviews in receiving countries for each team and to distribute these as 4 interviews with generalist in respective country, 1 interview with unemployment benefit expert in respective country and 1 interview with unemployment benefit expert in respective country.

By generalist we aim at policy experts that have knowledge on more than just a specific policy area and who is thus expected to have an overview. It could for example be experts involved in different EU committees, persons working as senior servants in a Department (not a social agency) or in an Advisory Para organization (SOLVIT, EURES). It can also be civil servants, senior lawyers, politicians, trade union people, business policymakers or persons associated with think tanks. In SE CT we for example defined the following interviews already made as generalist interviews: An Employers Union specialist who was a member of unions free movement committee, a person in Social ministry who was expert on EU social security systems and an expert working at the Justice Department who was involved in Fresco.

As mentioned some expert interviews have already been done during WP1. For WP3 we hence only have to do some additional interviews. Following the inventories, the teams sent in, the need for additional interviews looks as follows:

The Austrian country team: 5 additional interviews distributed as follows:
3 Austrian generalist experts
1 Austrian family benefit expert
1 Bulgarian family benefit expert

The German country team: 7 additional interviews distributed as follows:
1 German generalist expert
3 Bulgarian generalist experts
1 German unemployment benefit expert,
1 Bulgarian unemployment benefit expert
1 German family benefit expert

The UK country team: 8 additional interviews distributed as follows:
2 UK generalist experts
3 Polish generalist experts
1 UK unemployment benefit expert,
1 Polish unemployment benefit expert
1 Polish family benefit expert

The Swedish country team: 5 additional interviews distributed as follows:
1 Estonian generalist expert
1 Swedish unemployment benefit expert,
1 Estonian unemployment benefit expert
1 Swedish family benefit expert

1 Estonian family benefit expert

Interview question guideline

We already have an interview question guideline developed during WP1. The SE CT will modify this question guideline and the updated version will be distributed during January/February 2016.

Transcriptions of expert interviews

To serve as a material for analysis the interviews has to be transformed into text. As discourse analysis is an inductive (retroductive) approach we will transcribe the interviews in their full length. Transcribing is an analytical act. That is, a part of the analysis is performed during the work with the transcriptions. Preferably the person who made the interview therefore also transcribes it and performs the discourse analysis on it. In *appendix 1* you can find instructions for the transcriptions.

THEORY'S AND METHODS FOR ANALYSIS

Every CT will perform a discourse analysis of their material – in accordance with the instructions in the text below and in the suggested readings. This analysis will be fully presented in a paper from each CT. These CT working papers will be the base for the SE CT to write a comparative journal article for a peer-reviewed journal.

Discourse analysis in general

There are several different theories within discourse analysis. One major approach is *Critical Discourse Analysis, CDA* – developed by among others Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun van Dijk. Another is *Political Discourse Theory (PDT)* developed by Ernesto LaClau and Chantal Mouffe.

All discourse analysis leans on constructivism (more or less) and focus on language and language use. Common points of departure are:
•The ways people perceive of the surrounding world varies due to time and place.
•The ways people perceive of the surrounding world is expressed in language, e.g. in the ways people categorize.
•The ways people interpret, use language and categorize has consequences for concrete individuals.

Whereas in "ordinary text analysis" the focus is often on outspoken elements in the material analysed, we, by performing discourse analysis, also are trying to get access to the tacit and

untold levels of texts.

<u>Retroductive analysis</u>

In discourse analysis it is often advisable to work in a retroductive mode, that is to not only work inductive, but to *move back and forth between the text and the theory* in order to detect which concepts that are most useful for opening up the text, analysing it and lifting up your interpretations of it. The choice of specific concepts should hence be adjusted to each specific country case empirical material. That is, exactly which concepts from the suggested approaches below that will be of use of in the discourse analysis of your team is depending on your specific material. These choices will be a part of each CTs analytical work.

<u>Suggested readings for team members that are not familiar with discourse analysis:</u>

Egan Sjölander, Annika & Gunnarsson Payne, Jenny (red.). 2011. *Tracking discourses: politics, identity and social change*, Lund: Nordic Academic Press. (Outlines and compares various approaches within discourse theory, with very useful examples on how to apply them and combine them).

Glynos, Jason et.al 2009. Discourse Analysis: Varieties and Methods. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods, pp. 5-13, 17-20.

Available at: http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/796/1/discourse_analysis_NCRM_014.pdf

Critical Discourse Analysis as the methodology for the WP3 analysis

Most discourse analytical perspectives contain a "package" where theory and method are closely integrated. The basic package suggested for the WP3 discourse analysis is Critical Discourse Analysis, CDA. As discussed later on, this approach is one that is easy to understand and also easy to apply.

CDA is problem driven and interested in the social and performative dimension of language. It views language in a structural perspective and both builds on and develops Michel Foucault's previous works on discourse. The theoretical key-points of CDA are:

• Discourses are constituted by social practices but also constitute social practices.

• Discourses contribute in constituting subject positions (and thus social identities), relationships between people and groups and systems of knowledge and belief.

• Discourses must be understood in their historical and political context.

• Discourses can be changed over time, for example by social actors.

• Discourses contribute to the creation and reproduction of unequal societal power relations.

The term *critical* in Critical Discourse Analysis points to the aim within CDA, namely to uncover unequal societal power relations – and thereby contribute in counteracting

inequality. The critique in question is an immanent form of critique – that is a critique from within that unveils inherent inconsistencies and contradictions and has the goal to uncover problems, the cause of problems and the effects of the problems.

The application departs from a view where policy documents as well as expert interviews are viewed as discursive practices. It thus locates discourses to written text and to talk. The portability practices of the mobile people we are investigating in WP2 and WP4 thus in the application are viewed of as non-discursive practices. The application hence views discursive practices as a special category separated from non-discursive social practices. This way of viewing discourse is in line with the ontology of CDA, which – as will be commented on below – makes a distinction between discursive practices and non-discursive social practices and locates discourses to communicative events such as written text and to talk.[3]

The CDA Fairclough approach

Within CDA we will in WP3 use of the text/talk-orientated CDA approach advocated by Norman Fairclough. This approach is concerned with the categories of empirical material we will analyse (i.e. text and talk) and offers concrete and hands on concepts for the analysis of such data. It is concerned with what language and other discursive practices *do*, that is with the *effects* of language and discursive practice. It views language/ discursive practices as intertwined with structures of subordination. This goes well together with our aim to identify naturalized views on national membership and belonging as well as to identify their effects.

Fairclough suggests that communicative events (like interviews) should be analysed in three dimensions to explore how they work within socio cultural practice:
• as *text* – the specific text in question, where the linguistic properties of the text should be *described*. In this dimension one can e.g. analyse wordings in the text and *nominalization* (see above).
• as *discursive practice* should be *interpreted*. In this dimension one can e.g. analyse how texts talk to other text and discourses and the processes related to the production and consumption of the text and (such as coherence, intertextuality, interdiscursivity).
• as *socio cultural practice* that should be *explained*- In this dimension one should relate the text in question to the surrounding wider none discursive context and take into

---

[3] The application mentions a knowledge-based discourse analysis which should involves three steps:
1) identification of the corpus of data;
2) identification of central elements which constitute the relevant discourse;
3) and reconstruction of the meaningful relationships between discourse elements.
See
Foucault, M. (2002) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. by Sheridan Smith, London/New York: Routledge. 2002

consideration the circumstances of the texts as well as the constitutive effects of discourse.

CDA concepts and dimensions for analysis

One can say that the definition of discourse within an approach also defines the object of study. In Fairclough's approach *discourse* is defined as situated text and talk – as language use in speech and writing. Discourses are, according to CDA, particular macro ways of representing aspects of the world around us, that are also used in micro level talk and writing. This definition goes well with our categories of data: (transcribed) interviews.

Besides *discourse,* other concepts offered in Fairclough's CDA are for example *Text, Genre*, *Intertextuality* (the later denotes that all texts talk to other texts. Texts lean against, respond to, reproduce and rework previous texts – outspoken or without stating it), *Interdiscursivity* (points to the use of other discourses or of discursive elements in the creation of a discourse, to how utterances lean against discourses and how macro level discourses are unconsciously used in micro level discursive practice. Is viewed as a prerequisite for all utterances and all creation of meaning), *Assumptions* (linked to interdiscursivity and denotes the unstated background of a statement), *Nominalization* (denotes terms that become verbs excluding handling actors – such as change, globalization for example).

More concepts and more concrete instructions on how to perform a discourse analysis with the use of Critical Discourse Analysis can be found in Fairclough, 2003 (see below)

Readings for all CTs – as a shared ground for the analysis

Fairclough, Norman 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London
     & New York: Routledge.
 This book can be downloaded from the Internet and is also uploaded to the BSCW. You may want to buy it, as it will be our "bible".

The logics perspective as an overall theoretical framework

Taking the whole TRANSWEL project into consideration we so far have begun to locate different welfare system logics. In WP3 we will try to trace logics of inclusion and exclusion, or as termed in WP1; the logics of selectivity. Due to the focus on different logics one suggestion is to frame the above-mentioned analysis by using *the Logics approach* developed by Jason Glynos and David Howart.

The Logics approach is an offshoot to Political Discourse Theory (PDT) and a very new development that tries to make PDT more transparent and easier to use in analyses of empirical material. As an offshoot to PDT is does not view discourse merely as language, text

and communication, but rather as the frames through which we see the world. It follows the PDT stance that everything is discursive, i.e. that everything is mediated through discourse. Hence, the Logics approach thus does not solely concentrate on texts and the social and performative dimension of language. Rather the principal object of analysis is *practice* and, especially *regimes of practices*. Regimes of practices are defined as dominant but temporary clusters of discursive arrangements – arrangements that both structure the system of social practices and are being structured by it.

As discussed in Egan Sjölander & Gunnarsson Payne (2011) the Logics approach can be used together with other approaches in analyses of empirical material – despite the mentioned ontological differences between PDT and CDA. The more theoretically oriented so-called Logics approach could function as our overall theoretical framework, while CDA could be characterized as our methodology for discourse analysis, offering hands on instruments for analysis.[4] This goes well with our aim to choose concepts that help us to identify discourses of belonging in the specific material we are analysing.

The main analytical concepts in the Logics approach are social logics, political logics and fantasmatic logics. *Social logics* are logics that has become naturalised, that are no longer questioned or even discussed. Today Liberal democracy and females' right to vote are for example social logics. The concept of Social logics thus has similarities with Faircloughs concept *assumptions.* Social logics can actually be seen as consisting of a set of assumptions and the concept assumption can therefore help us detect to social logics*.*

Political logics in turn are logics that are questioned. Even if Liberal democracy and females' right to vote are today unquestioned, they were highly so as in earlier days. Hence in earlier days liberal democracy and females right to vote where political logics. When there seem to be an implicit opponent to a standpoint and one has to argue in detail for it the standpoint rests on a political logic. When people realise that thing that seems totally natural can actually be changed a social logic can turn into a political logic.

Fantasmatic logics relate to affect and explains why social actors are invested in certain phenomena – why they so to speak are captured by certain practices. Affects that are related to an expected scenario can for example be a fantasmatic logics, a logic that explains

---

[4] Fairclough himself argues (in the introduction to Analysing Discourse recommended above) that the methodological devices he suggests can easily be combined with other discourse theories. Glynos and Howart in turn support a stance where the methods and the choices of concepts are adjusted to the empirical case in question.

standpoints of social actors.

The above concepts and the focus on logics seem to fit well with the TRANSWEL approach. Furthermore, the interest in *regimes of* practices is in the line with the overall knowledge goal of TRANSWEL, i.e. to identify *portablity regimes,* regimes that include both discursive and non-discursive practices, benefit and portability regulations, mobility practices *and* the discourses that specify which categories of the mobile population are to be granted social rights.

Readings for all team members:

West, Karen 2011. Articulating discursive and materialist conceptions of practice in the logics approach to critical policy analysis, *Critical Policy Studies*, 5:4.

Howarth David & Glynos, Jason 2008. Interpretations, Mechanisms, and Logics. Unpublished conference paper from 1st IDA World Conference, Roskilde University, Denmark, 8-10 September 2008. (31 p.)

http://magenta.ruc.dk/upload/application/pdf/f51d6748/Glynos_Howarth.pdf.

Discourse analysis training sessions

The Swedish team will provide Discourse analysis training sessions once a month during spring 2016 (four sessions on Skype in January – April and one IRL during the May ws). The aim is to arrive at a joint understanding of our chosen discourse theory and method and to practice discourse analysis on data.

Team members prepare before each training session by reading suggested literature and by writing a short pm where they implement methodological concepts on an empirical text that is common for all: an expert interview performed and transcribed in English. This text will be provided well in advance of the first training session. Instructions on the Discourse analysis training-sessions has already been distributed. Contact person: Florence.

APPENDIX 1:

Instruction for transcriptions of policy expert interviews

Transcriptions are when recordings of interviews are transformed into written form. Transcriptions are necessary if interviews are to be studied in a detailed and qualitative way. A transcript is a representation of the recording and thus also an interpretation. This means that transcribing is an interpretive act, rather than simply a technical procedure. The close observation transcribing entails make you notice unanticipated phenomena. Hence, the person who made the interview preferably also transcribes it and performs the discourse analysis on it. As you will see later on in this text we besides, making the transcription, suggest you to write down all the interpretative insights you get during the transcription work in a separate analytical note, to use in your further discourse analysis.

In a project one needs to decide which level of transcription detail is required, that is how data are to be represented in the written form. Different transcription conventions are used for different aims and methodological approaches. Different levels of detail in the transcription in turn produce different representations of data. Different transcription modes hence also affect the analysis made.

We are in WP3 manly interested of *the ways in which meaning is being made in the interview and how the meaning is being framed*. By closely analysing the language in the interview narrative we will be performing content-based analysis of the meaning communicated. Much of the literature on transcription and discourse analysis recommend very detailed transcription modes, to try to represent as many levels of the communicative event going on in the interview as possible – verbal as well as non-verbal. Due to our interest in meaning in combination with our limited timeframe we however suggest a more simple, down to earth and less time-consuming transcription mode.

Transcription mode
(You can find an example of a transcript in the suggested mode below)

•Firstly, we suggest the use of grammar and spelling conventions of standard *written* language (rather then to transcribe the dialects etc.)

Secondly, we suggest a represent of the conversation as a *dialog* in the genre of a play: That is:

INT: xxxx
IP: xxxx

INT = interviewer,
IP = interviewed person.

Thirdly, we suggest to *first hand* represent the *verbal* conversation – and thus not to try to capture *all* non-verbal features of interaction in the transcript. But as you see below we however recommend to represent both verbal features that are not speech and important non verbal communication *that*

communicate meaning we are interested i).

Fourthly, in line with the above, we suggest to represent such *verbal features that are not speech* but that communicate meaning with the help of clarifying brackets, e.g.: [nervous laughter] [embarrassed coughing] and also with the help special signs indicating for example emphasis and raised voice communicating meaning (see sign guideline at the end of this text).

Fiftly, also in line with the above, we suggest including also information on <u>important</u> *non-verbal features,* that is such non-verbal features that communicate meaning we are interested in. Here you can use clarifying brackets, e.g.: [pause], [long pause], [raised eyebrows (and other facial expressions communicating meaning)].

Lastly we suggest including information on *contextual information* that you perceive of as important, also within brackets*,* e.g. [Interview persons phone rings. The interview is interrupted for 5 minutes], [sentence impossible to hear].

Sign guideline:
CAPITAL = in a loud voice.
Italics = emphasis
CAPITAL AND ITALICS = extra emphasis.
 (…) = Omitted part.
 [verbal, non-verbal features and contextual information].

Excerpt of a transcript made in the suggested mode
INT: How would you describe the Swedish welfare system, its main strengths and weaknesses today?

IP: I think that *at least*, the perception of the Swedish welfare system across Sweden is that the system is *very* solid and *very* generous. The system is changing […] it is not changing as fast as the world around it. We think WE are […] As long as you *are in the system*, you are well care of. I think we have to deal with getting people *IN* the system. I do understand that not *everyone* can be *IN* the system [seeks words] *for political reason*. But we have to deal with people that are outside the system and don't get into it. And I think that it is problematic [someone knock at the door and enter in the room].

INT: What would you describe as the main issues surrounding EU migration in Sweden over recent years?

IP: I think I will take the opportunity to get back to the personal identity number. From my perspective that is the *main single issue*. (…) The PIN is problematic for *two* reasons [embarrassed coughing]: the fact that you have to prove that you want to be here for *more* than one year, which is *difficult* if you get part time contract or if you have a contract for 9 months, or a contract for two hours a day for instance [the informant speaks very quickly]. And the fact, that if you are *not employed* or *self-employed* that you have to prove that you have a comprehensive sickness insurance. And this is in *line* with EU law. You should have one if you are in Sweden for more *than three months*.

Suggestion for separate analytical note:
As transcription is an analytic act it may be very helpful for your further discourse analysis if you – in a separate document – write down all the analytical insights and thoughts you get during the

interview transcription work. In the analytical note you may for example write down your interpretations of the meaning communicated in words but also your interpretations of the meaning communicated by for example raised voice, nervous laughter, embarrassed coughing, long pauses or raised eyebrows etc, etc.