

Solidarity Projects in Norwegian Schools

Students' Motivation and School Leaders' Rationale

Maja Rosvold Brustad



Master of Philosophy in Comparative and International Education
Institute of Educational Research

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

MAY 2014

Solidarity Projects in Norwegian Schools

Students' Motivation and School Leaders' Rationale

“If we do not ask people what motivates them, we will never know the answer”.

(Gillespie and King, 1985 in Cnaan & Goldberg- Glen, 1991:274)

© Forfatter Maja Rosvold Brustad

År 2013

Solidarity Projects in Norwegian Schools: Students' Motivation and School Leaders'
Rationale

Forfatter

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

Each year thousands of Norwegian students spend one day of their education to collect money for different aid projects. These projects aim at giving youth in developing countries the opportunity to education and are referred to as Solidarity Projects. The projects are organized by different NGO's.

The first organizations that started offering solidarity projects were Operation Day's Work. This organization was founded in 1964, and is *run for, by and with* youth. Participation in solidarity projects are based on volunteerism. There is a strong focus on that students should participate out of solidarity, not because they feel sorry for the students in a developing context or because they feel guilty.

ODW is still the main contributor of solidarity projects in Norwegian context with over 120 000 participating students each year. The later years there has, however, been a decrease in the number of participation schools doing ODW. There may be many possible reasons for this decrease. One of the main reasons is that other NGOs like e.g. PLAN Norge, Hei Verden! and other organizations offers schools to make their cause into a solidarity project. In addition, some schools choose to develop their own solidarity projects by collaborating with a local NGO in a developing context or a single school in an area.

The findings this study is based on are collected through qualitative interviews with students and school leaders at four different schools in Oslo. Two of the schools participated in ODW's project, while two schools collaborated with other organizations for their solidarity project. The purpose of the interviews was to find out about student motivation and school rationale for participation in solidarity projects.

The study applies The Volunteer Function Inventory (Clary et al, 1998) as a framework to analyze the student motivation. Motivation is compared between the different types of projects as well as across school level. In addition school leaders' justifications for participation are compared.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Birgit Brock- Utne for her constructive comments on my work, and for encouraging me to keep on going through tough times. This thesis would not have been possible without her support.

I am very grateful for the openness and willingness showed by Operation Day's Work. Without access to their database the data collection would have been a much more difficult process. I am also grateful that ODW let me present the findings from this project at their annual partner meeting. This was a very pleasing experience.

Without the participation from the schools and the students this project could never have happened. I am forever grateful that you openly shared your thoughts with me.

The process has been challenging on many levels. At times of frustration I have found great support in my dear friends and family. I would like to direct a specific gratitude to Ida J. Ulseth who helped me get admitted to this program, and Ingunn Myraunet for her practical assistance and moral support.

Last but not least I would like to direct a final gratitude to my fabulous classmates of CIE 2014, and especially to "The Computer Room Bunch". You guys have kept me going and have given me great laughs in serious times. Without you this process would have been long and lonely.

Oslo, May 2014

Maja Rosvold Brustad

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Research Questions.....	2
1.3	Short summary of the chapters	4
1.4	Limitations of the study	5
2	Contextual background	6
2.1	Historical perspective on Norwegian aid.....	6
2.1.1	Norad.....	7
2.1.2	RORG (RammeavtaleOrganisasjoner).....	8
2.2	Volunteerism and Solidarity in Norwegian context: “Dugnad”	8
2.3	Organizations providing solidarity projects for schools.....	10
2.3.1	Operation Day’s Work	10
2.3.2	Other solidarity projects	12
2.4	Education perspective.....	12
2.4.1	Development Education	13
2.4.2	International aspects of Norwegian education	14
2.5	Global Solidarity.....	15
3	Methodology	18
3.1	Social science research	18
3.2	Research design	19
3.2.1	The case study design.....	20
3.2.2	Comparative design.....	21
3.3	Research methods	22
3.3.1	Sampling.....	22
3.3.2	Data collection.....	24
3.3.3	Ethical Considerations.....	26
3.4	Data analysis.....	27
3.5	Field work.....	28
3.6	Quality assurance in qualitative research	30
3.7	Limitations to the study	32
4	Analytical framework.....	33

4.1	Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations	33
4.1.1	Intrinsic motivation	34
4.1.2	Extrinsic motivation	35
4.1.3	Distinction challenged.....	35
4.2	Motivation to volunteer	36
4.2.1	Examples of previous research on motivation to volunteer	37
4.2.2	The Volunteer Function Inventory (Clary et al, 1998).....	38
5	Findings.....	42
5.1	Hareløkka junior high school	43
5.1.1	Expressed motivation	43
5.1.2	Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project	45
5.1.3	School leaders perspective	46
5.2	Heidalen senior high school	47
5.2.1	Expressed motivation	48
5.2.2	Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project	49
5.2.3	Teacher and school leaders perspective	50
5.3	Løkkeberg junior high school.....	52
5.3.1	Expressed motivation	53
5.3.2	Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project	54
5.3.3	School leader	55
5.4	Liåsen senior high school	56
5.4.1	Expressed motivation	56
5.4.2	Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project	57
5.4.3	School leaders perspective	58
6	Discussion	59
6.1	Findings connected to framework	59
6.1.1	Hareløkka junior high school	59
6.1.2	Heidalen senior high school	61
6.1.3	Løkkeberg junior high school	63
6.1.4	Liåsen senior high school.....	64
6.2	Similarities and differences between the schools	65
6.2.1	School level comparison	66
6.3	Similarities and differences in rationale	68

7	Conclusion.....	70
7.1	Implications of the study	71
7.2	Where does it go from here?.....	72
	References	73
	Appendices	79

Abbreviations

UN	United Nations
MDG	Millenium Development Goals
ODW	Operation Days Work
NRK	Norsk RiksKringkastning
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
RORG	Rammeavtale Organisasjoner (Framework Organizations)
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

50 years ago, in 1964, Operation a Day's Work (ODW) started encouraging Norwegian students to engage in educational conditions for youth in the South. According to ODW's web page (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.a) it all started by young man entering the stage at the Student Organizations meeting and said that it was time for Norwegian students to look outside Norway's borders. I was fortunate enough to meet this young man, now a professor at Oslo University College. According to him, the story was not that dramatic. It was however true that he was one of the initiators for this student run aid organization (Eriksen, 2013). Today ODW is the largest solidarity campaign for youth in Norway engaging approximately 120 000 young students to use one day annually of their education to help youth in the south get a better chance of education (Lorentzen & Dugstad, 2011).

Solidarity is an important value that is rooted in the Norwegian culture. The Norwegian education system is also influenced by this value. The first clause of the Norwegian Education Act outlining the purpose of education states that:

“The education shall build on fundamental ideas in Christian and humanistic heritage and tradition, such as respect for human dignity and nature (...), equality and solidarity, values that also are expressed in different religions and beliefs and that are rooted in the Charter on Human Rights.” (Opplæringsloven, §1-1, 2008. My translation.)

The idea of solidarity as well as adherence to the Charter on Human Rights is important parts of the education provided to Norwegian students. This is further elaborated in chapter 2.

Solidarity in a global context has often been related to labor unions, class or race; a collective conscience that binds individuals of a society together. Wilde (2013) discusses the

consequences of the rise of neo-liberalism and the increased focus on individualism connected to solidarity. On one side a concern has arose about the decline of solidarity. On the other hand it is suggested that neo-liberalism just creates new forms and bonds that reach beyond borders to develop a transnational solidarity

In the space between educating for the idea of solidarity and giving aid for youngsters in poor countries we find the different solidarity projects directed at students at junior and senior secondary schools. The purpose of these projects is to raise awareness among the students about inequalities in the world related to issues about North/ South and to collect money for a specific cause in a developing country (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.c). The money is often raised for a cause connected to the education of youth in a developing context. Operation “a Day’s work” is one of the organizations offering this type of project to Norwegian secondary school students.

Lately ODW has experienced a decrease in the number of participating schools. When asked about this decline, the leadership of ODW had no answer, but had a suspicion that more schools are designing their own solidarity projects or are participating in projects offered by other organizations. This is what awoke my curiosity in the first place. ODW and other similar projects are based on volunteer work. The word “volunteer” implicates that one cannot be forced into participating in these projects. Why then, do Norwegian students choose use one day every year to raise money for a purpose in the developing world?

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions for this study are based on my interest in finding out why students chose to participate in volunteer work. As mentioned above ODW is just one of the organizations that offer solidarity projects for Norwegian students. A variety of other organizations also offer this type of projects. Since all of these projects are based on volunteer efforts, my interest was to find out what motivates the young students to choose to participate. Accordingly my first research question was;

1. *What motivates students to participate in solidarity projects?*

In my study I chose to interview students at four different schools about what motivated them. Two of these schools participated in ODW's solidarity projects, while the other two schools cooperated with other organizations and their solidarity projects. The reason for my choice of schools was to see if there was any difference in what motivated the students to participate in the different types of projects.

One representative from the school administration at each of the schools was interviewed to answer this question;

2. *What rationale do school leaders have for participation in solidarity projects?*

These individual interviews were carried out to get a picture of what rationale the schools have for letting their students' use one day every year to participate in these projects.

The purpose of this study, apart from answering the research questions in focus, is to shed light on the concept of volunteer work in an educational context. From my experience ODW is a natural part of the school year and have been so for many years. There seems to be little questioning about this organization in particular and solidarity projects in general in connection to school. I have made efforts to discover previous research done on the topic, but there seems to be very little. This study thus offers new knowledge on a well-known area in Norwegian context. Research (e.g. Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen, 1991; Mowen and Sujana, 2005) has, however, been done in the field of volunteer work. One of the theories from this research is applied as a framework for this study. This will be elaborated on in chapter 4.

My intention for this study is that it will offer new knowledge connected to solidarity projects and also encourage other researchers to look into this area. The qualitative perspective from the participants of these projects might also help the organizations understand what motivated the students, and might offer insight in how to better engage students.

ODW is the point of departure for this research. This is because of the long history and tradition ODW has in the Norwegian education context. It is the largest solidarity project for youth in Norway (Lorentzen & Dugstad, 2011). Other organizations that offer these types of projects are assumed to be inspired by ODW. ODW is also unique in the sense that it is run by youth, with youth as participants for youth in developing countries. In this study participants from different solidarity projects are, however, compared on equal grounds. The focus is on differences, if any, related to motivation or rationale.

1.3 Short summary of the chapters

The findings from this study are presented in the following chapters. In chapter 2 different concepts related to this research are presented and elaborated. Aid history and volunteerism in a Norwegian context is presented to offer the reader a platform of understanding. ODW's history is also described and is important to understand this organization's position in the Norwegian society. The organization is expatiated on together with a presentation of a selection of other organizations offering similar types of projects. Development Education and The Norwegian Education Act is dwelled on in order to situate the educational relevance of these projects. At the end a short presentation is made of the concept of Global Solidarity.

In chapter 3 the research method applied for this research is presented and decisions made in connection with this study are discussed. A qualitative approach has been used and qualitative interviews have been conducted to collect data necessary to answer the research questions.

The 4th chapter describes the framework applied for this research. In the first part the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is elaborated on. Secondly relevant research done on volunteer motivation is presented. Thirdly the theory that is applied as a framework for the study is presented. This framework is named The Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) and presents a set of six functions of volunteer motivation (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen & Mine, 1998). These functions are discussed in relation to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

In chapter 5 findings from the fieldwork are presented. The chapter is organized to present findings from each of the schools, both student and school leader interviews. The findings are discussed and compared in chapter 6. Each of the cases is connected to the framework and the different project approaches are compared as well as school level.

In the last chapter the major findings from this research are discussed in relation to the framework and suggestions for further research related to this topic are presented. Several findings are interesting from this research related to motivational orientation and level of motivation for the different school levels and the different project. The most interesting finding is connected to the relevance of external sources of information.

1.4 Limitations of the study

There are several limitations of this research. Firstly the amount of participants is quite small. Four schools were selected and out of these only two participated in ODW's solidarity project. The other two participated in a project offered by other organizations. To make the findings more generalizable this study would have benefited from a larger number of participants. Furthermore, the schools of inquiry are also situated in the same city. To get a wider perspective it would have been interesting to look at motivation in schools situated in different geographical locations of Norway.

Secondly, only the perspective of students and school leaders are offered in this research. Bringing in other perspectives like parents or teachers would have provided a wider description of the phenomenon. The perspectives presented here might not provide the whole picture, only the participants' perception of reality.

Thirdly, this study is done in a short period of time. It would have been interesting to make this study longitudinal to see if there are any changes in the students' motivation from year to year or compared between decades. To look at the Norwegian economy and political orientation in relation to motivation could also bring forward interesting aspects.

2 Contextual background

The purpose of this chapter is to situate solidarity projects in relevant Norwegian contexts. The projects will be situated in a Norwegian aid- history context, in the Norwegian society through education. Finally the projects will be positioned in a global context through elaboration on global solidarity.

2.1 Historical perspective on Norwegian aid

In 2013 Norway spent 1, 07% of the GDP on aid, and was by this the country that donated the most in OECD (Rønning, 2013). Norway has however not always been this fortunate. After WWII, Norway was financially broke. After the war there was an economic crisis that the country recovered from due to the Marshall aid. From 1949- 1951 Norway received 3 billion NOK in aid donations from the USA. This donation helped relieve the economic pressure that occurred after the war and helped the re- building of the country to continue as planned. This economic relief also helped gain political stability (Jagland, 1997).

From the very beginning Norway was an active partner in the UN. The Norwegian UN department was founded in 1946. This department was given the mandate to inform the public about the ideas of the organization and activities supported by the UN (Nygaard, 2002).

One point of the Truman doctrine (the Marshall aid was a part of this doctrine) was the idea of providing assistance to underdeveloped countries. As a follow up to this point Norway in 1950 created an aid campaign. The secretary of the labor party at the time, Haakon Lie, toured the country to inform the public about poverty and underdevelopment in the third world. Feedback from the public after this tour was enormous (Nygaard, 2002). Nygaard claims that the major backdrop for this broad support was Norway's history of church aid and international labor solidarity together with the positive experiences from receiving Marshall Aid (Nygaard, 1997). As a consequence of this the national fund rising "Aid to India" started in 1953. The political context was based on international solidarity and political self- interest (Nygaard, 2002). Three motives laid behind offering aid to India; firstly after being colonized

by Germany for five years during the war, Norway sympathized with former colonized developing countries. Secondly, offering aid to a developing country was also seen as a “positive defense”. By donating aid the goal was to create allies with peaceful means to weaken the communist growth. Thirdly, this was a tactic from the Labour party, the governing party at the time, to restore stability within the party. The decision of entering NATO split the party and the aid politics was a mean to re- create stability. India was chosen because it was in danger of falling into Chinas communist arms and due to its former status as a British colony (Nygaard, 1997).

2.1.1 Norad

Related to the decision of offering aid to India, the Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget) in 1952 established what was called the Fund for Help to Underdeveloped Countries (Fondet for hjelp til underutviklede land). The bilateral aid project was signed by Norway, India and the UN. During the 1960s Norwegian aid increased. The Fund for Help to Underdeveloped Countries expanded its aid to include more Asian countries and some African countries. In 1962 the Fund for Help to Underdeveloped Countries was replaced with Norwegian Development Aid. This organ was run by the state but had its own board, and was administratively situated under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Norad, n.d.).

In 1968 the administrative responsibility changed again. The Norwegian Development Aid was replaced by Norad (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation) as an independent government agency. Until 2004 the management of Norwegian aid was split between Norad and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 2004 the Ministry took over the responsibility for the embassies and the management of the state-to-state cooperation. Norad’s tasks were now as a professional agency to evaluate and ensure quality of Norwegian aid in cooperation with partners in Norway, developing countries and international partners. Norad supports non-governmental organizations that work with developing countries with 1 billion NOK annually (Norad, n.d.)

Today Norads task is to contribute to effective management of aid and also to ensure quality and evaluation. Norad is also responsible for communication of results of Norwegian aid and to situate debates about development questions. Different professional communities/ organizations are connected to Norad to provide knowledge about these issues (Norad, 2013).

2.1.2 RORG (RammeavtaleOrganisasjoner)

As mentioned above, NORAD cooperates and supports different non- governmental organizations. Some of these organizations claimed that the information NORAD provided to the public was not sufficient. Polls made in the 1970s on how the public attitudes were towards Norwegian aid, showed that the informational level was not sufficient. In 1975 discussions about an information collaboration started and an agreement was made with Workers Adult Education Association (Arbeidernes Opplysningsforbud- AOF) (Rorg, 2012). This organization is run by the Labour Party and its purpose is to provide education to its members on relevant topics (Store Norske Leksikon, 2006-2007). The collaboration gradually expanded and more ideal organization joined this agreement on information work concerning development aid information. In 1992 Hovdenak, who used to work for NORADs information office, published a report on how this information work was organized and how NORAD and the other organizations cooperated. The findings presented in this report are called “The Network Model” and gave a picture of how information moves from organizations into the public debate, both in aid donating and aid receiving countries (Rorg, 2013).

RORG was born in battle between Norad and a number of NGOs about what the public information should contain and how it should be organized. RORG is an acronym for Framework Organizations (Rammeavtaleorganisasjoner). Operation Day’s Work is a member or RORG. In 1990 a position was established to coordinate the framework for information about Norwegian aid provided to the public. This position was supposed to create a link between Norad and the RORG organizations. The contents of this position have often been debated, but the goal has always been to create a common framework for the information work on North/ South issues (Rorg, 2012).

2.2 Volunteerism and Solidarity in Norwegian context: “Dugnad”

A Norwegian term worth elaborating in this context is the term “Dugnad”. This term originates from the Old Norwegian term “duga” which means to master something or be good at something. The original purpose was that neighbors would help each other out in times of need. If one farmer needed help harvesting, the other farmers nearby would help him in

exchange for his services on another occasion. The word also has its origin in another Old Norwegian word; “dygd” (translated to English: virtue), with etymological connections to words like faithfulness and righteousness. Thus the term is not only reasoned practically, but also has a moral condition (Lorentzen, 2007).

The idea of volunteer work was, according to philanthropic ideas, created in the span between mandatory state taxes and volunteer funds. After 1840 a set of new collective movements arises, like the labor movement. This movement used solidarity as a weapon to become the societies leading social movement. It also entails an idea of the solidaristic man with roots from the French socialistic thought, where the individual lets self-interest's cove for the well-being of others (Lorentzen, 2007).

The “Dugnad” is still in use in different parts of the Norwegian society. Unions like e.g. Women’s Unions and other volunteer organization use “Dugnad” to mobilize workforce for a certain cause. Also sports clubs and school bands demands for a certain volunteer effort from the members. In housing cooperatives “Dugnad” is still a common feature, where people gets together to do simple work to keep the common areas of the house clean and in good condition. This is often done to save money (Lorentzen, 2007).

In the Norwegian context one also talks of “National Dugnad”. The most known national dugnad is “TV- aksjonen”. This has been an annual happening since 1974 and has the purpose of collecting money for ideal organizations. These organizations have expressed a goal for the money collected. The funds are raised in connection to a live TV show. This is a huge campaign in terms of number of volunteers and also in terms of amount of money collected. According to NRK (The National Norwegian Broadcaster) it is “*the world’s largest fundraising campaign measured in collected funds per person and number of participants*” (Lorentzen & Dugstad, 2011).

Another event that is also described as a “National Dugnad” is Operation Days work (ODW). The way ODW is organized will be elaborated on later in this chapter. ODW is categorized as a public “dugnad” because the school leaders’ allows the students to do volunteer work to raise money for a cause related to North /south issues. Like most other volunteer organizations ODW as an administrative staff that gets paid to organize the event. The organization is thus only allowed to spend 15% of its income for administrative salary (Lorentzen & Dugstad, 2011).

2.3 Organizations providing solidarity projects for schools

2.3.1 Operation Day's Work

Operation Days Work is the largest solidarity action for youth in Norway (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.a). The origin of this organization is traced back to what was called Norwegian Gymnasiums Collaboration (“Norsk Gymnasiesamband”). The first Days Work was in 1964. The organization they supported was called “Kvekerhjelpen” and was an organization that worked to free Algeria from France. Support this case and organization at the time was very controversial, as Norway and France were allied through NATO. The rationale for supporting this organization was that the focus should not be on power and alliances, but on solidarity (Eriksen, 2014).

In the beginning ODW was run by students with interests related to left winged politics. According to Tore Linné Eriksen, this has changed in line with changes in the aid politics generally. The shift has been from left towards the center (2014).

2.3.1.1 About Operation Days Work

ODW builds on four basic principles: volunteerism, solidarity, youth and education. Through their information campaign, International Week, ODW provides information to teach students about injustice in the world, with emphasis on the right to education. Students are encouraged to participate the day where they raise money, but it is highly emphasized that this participation shall be voluntarily. No one shall be forced to participate if they do not want to (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.b).

To ensure the students participate on a volunteer basis emphasis is also on providing enough information about the current project. The aim is not to make students participate because they feel sorry for the people they are raising money for or feeling guilt, but rather to work together with youth in the South to help improve their conditions and give them the same possibility to education as the students themselves are given (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.b)

Youth and education has been the main focus for ODW since the very beginning. Education is viewed as a key good. ODW's philosophy is based on the saying "*If you give a man a fish he has food one day. If you teach him how to fish he has food for the rest of his life*". By providing education to youth one creates opportunities for development (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.c).

The mantra from ODW is that the project is "For, by and with youth". As presented above, Norwegian students raise money for youth in less fortunate parts of the world. "By youth" means that the projects ODW support are chosen by the Student's Central Council ("Elevorganisasjonen"). The process of choosing a project is characterized by a high level of student participation and democracy. This council is composed of 500 students from all over Norway between the ages of 13- 19 years. The student council is ODW's steering organ. Different aid organizations apply to the student council with hope of being selected at the project ODW will raise money for the following year. The Student's Central Council forwards the approved applications to ODW's board. This board chooses 2-3 projects and forwards the projects to schools that have participated in ODW the last 2 years. These schools organize a voting among the students. The result from this voting is reported back to the central ODW committee. At last the student council debate on the different projects and vote for the project they favor (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.d).

As mentioned earlier, ODW's perspective is not only on aid, but also on providing Norwegian students with information about questions related to North/ South issues. This is connected to the issue of Development Education that will be elaborated on later. This information is provided through an information campaign called International Week. The purpose of this campaign is to inform the students about the current project in focus, to raise awareness and to emphasize the principle of solidarity.

There is a well-developed plan for how the money is spent. An aid adviser is employed by ODW to ensure that the money is spent purposefully. The money collected is not handed to the organization all in one. A plan for how the money is supposed to be spent over a period of time is developed. If the plan is not followed, the transfer of money from ODW to the organization stops (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.e).

2.3.2 Other solidarity projects

One possible answer to the decline in participants for ODW is that many NGO's are offering their own solidarity projects to schools. "Hei Verden" ("Hallo World!") is one of the organizations that offer solidarity project to Norwegian students. This organization is an political a religious independent one that, like ODW, aims at informing schools and students about North/ south issues (Hei Verden!, n.d.a). Hei Verden! has projects in different developing countries, currently (may, 2014) in Zambia, Laos and Peru. The schools choose which project they want to support and how they want to raise money for the project. The organization also offers a visit from a representative from the organization to inform the students about the project (Hei Verden!, n.d.b).

Another organization that provides schools with an option for solidarity project is Plan Norway. The schools choose how to raise the money and what cause they wish to support. Alternatively they can choose to give the money straight to a child they sponsor (Plan Norge, n.d.)

In addition to NGO's offering solidarity projects, some schools choose to organize their own solidarity projects with independent partners. This is e.g. done by establishing direct contact with a school in a developing context. An example of this is Flora Senior High school in the region Sogn og Fjordane. This school has been collaborating with a school in Malawi since 2005. The funds they collect are handled by a youth organization situated in Malawi. They also collaborate with the Norwegian NGO Fredskorpset¹ to strengthen the relationship between the partners (Clausen, 2011).

2.4 Education perspective

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter the purpose is to situate ODW in various Norwegian contexts. This section will try to situate these projects and their work in an educational context.

¹ Fredskorpset is an organization that gives young people in Norway and developing countries the opportunity to do exchange programs (Fredskorpset, 2013).

2.4.1 Development Education

Development Education is, according to Page (2008), a branch of what is called Peace Education. Development Education aims to link Peace Education to cognate social concerns. It also includes education for international understanding and human right education. Page states that Peace Education is officially accepted as an important aspect of social education. Peace Education has its origin in the enlightenment era and implies that it must be possible to contribute to a better world through education (Vriens, 1995). It has also evolved from concerns about making an educational response to the problem of war and social justice. The UN declaration outlines that the purpose of the UN is to prevent future war. It mentions Peace Education is one crucial means by which this aim can be fulfilled (Page, 2008).

Büyükdüvenci (1999) argues that Peace Education is necessary in order for people to be able to create a better world to live in. He claims that major educational challenge for the modern world is to develop a new paradigm to entail the interdependent globalized world we all live in. He states that this new paradigm should be based on solidarity and hold basic features as connectedness, interdependence and mutuality in relationships.

2.4.1.1 Development education in Norway

As mentioned earlier both NORAD and the RORG organizations work to provide knowledge about the Norwegian aid donating work. These organizations are both offering Development Education in Norway.

Development education in Norway has its origin in the establishment of UN Norway in 1946. At that time the association had mandate to inform the public about ideas, the organization and activities by the UN. This office has had a special position as development education actor in Norway. Their main target groups are primary schools. NORAD was given the main responsibility for official information on issues related to these activities as well as cooperation with and funding of the UN association and other NGOs after the establishment in 1968 (Nygaard, 2002).

Official funding for development education activities carried out by other NGOs only happened in a small scale until NORAD signed a framework agreement with AOF in 1975. This was the beginning of the “Framework Agreement Arrangement” which has encouraged

and supported a variety of NGOs engaged in development education by providing 4 year funding arrangements.

In the mid-90s the harmony around development education came to an end. There are many reasons for this, one of them being political. Without much public debate Norway had adjusted its aid policies to Structural Adjustment Programs advocated by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. This led to turbulence within NORAD concerning whether one should stimulate a critical debate around this issue or not. It was in this debate RORG was born as the main support structure for development education for NGOs (Nygaard, 2002).

The role of development education in Norway has been widely debated. There have been shifts in formal responsibilities concerning this issue from NORAD to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Nygaard concludes that the state of development education in 2005 was fragmented administratively, professionally and at the organization level (Nygaard, 2002).

2.4.2 International aspects of Norwegian education

Development education does not only concern schools and students, but is concerned with informing the public about Norwegian aid work. ODW is a part of the RORG network and is therefore an organization that is concerned with development education. ODW directs its projects and information to schools and students and is also concerned with making their projects a natural part of the curriculum.

To be able to situate solidarity projects within the Norwegian educational context I will in the following present documents concerning internationalization of education. The later years the international aspect has been an area of political interest. The Ministry of Education and Research's Government Report nr 14 (2008-2009) is a report on the current status of the internationalization of the Norwegian education system. In this report it is stated that Norwegian students should be educated to be citizens of the world and that the international perspective should be reflected in as many ways as possible through various levels of education. The purpose of this focus is to increase students' understanding for other cultures and to create solidarity for people in other parts of the world who live under worse conditions than them (Ministry of Education and Research, 2008-2009).

The general part of the Norwegian education act states that the education should

“(...) broaden the knowledge and understanding of the national cultural heritage and our common international tradition” (Opplæringsloven, §1-1, 2008. My translation.)

The Government Report nr 14 (2008-2009) also mentions this point and states that the need for knowledge about other countries' culture and language is becoming more and more important. The international perspective should be visible in all of the subjects and as a part of the general education. The education act also states that the education should:

“(...) build on basic values in Christian and humanist heritage and tradition like respect for human dignity and (...) equality and solidarity, values that are also expressed in different religions and beliefs and that are embedded in the Declaration Of Human Rights”. (Opplæringsloven, §1-1, 2008. My translation.)

The current international education policy is dominated by international co-operation and competition. The government report states that in this matter it is important to maintain the values and traditions that the Norwegian education systems are built on (Ministry of Education and Research, 2008-2009).

The Government Report also talks about internationalization through exchange programs and collaboration projects. In this context projects like Operation Days Work are mentioned as projects that are supported by the central government like The Department of Education and NORAD. These projects are viewed as a positive contribution to the internationalization of education, but it is also mentioned that the engagement and existence of these projects often lies in the hands of dedicated people. There is a concern about the lack of a holistic perspective and consistent plans for this kind of work (Ministry of Education and Research, 2008-2009).

2.5 Global Solidarity

In his book “Global Solidarity” (2013) Lawrence Wilde elaborates on the historical development of the concept of solidarity. He defines solidarity as “*A feeling of sympathy*

shared by subjects within and between groups, impelling supportive action and pursuing social inclusion”(pp 1 introduction). There seems to be a paradox of solidarity as it has a simultaneous appeal to unity and universality and at the same time has a practice of antagonism between groups.

Through the advancing of neo liberalism and individualism in the world, there seems to be a concern about the decline of solidarity. However Wilde (2013:20) states that:

“At first sight, the further development of individualism and the loosening of traditional social bonds suggest a weakening of solidarity, but we must consider the possibility that these new forms are reaching beyond borders to develop transnational solidarity, opening the way for radical transformation of global governance and advancing the goal of global solidarity”

The history of solidarity begins in France 1840 where Pierre Leroux conceived solidarity as the humanistic alternative to what he viewed as the shortcomings of the Christian charity. He claimed that rather than helping out of duty to God, people need to express concern about their fellow human beings through embracing them in mutually supportive relations. Leroux argued for that solidarity should be rooted in workplace associations that were international in scope. The solidarity term further developed through working class solidarity developed from the upheavals of 1848 to liberal solidarity. Here Emile Durkheim argues that social solidarity as the binding together of individuals in a society is a normal product of division of labor. Durkheim also contrasted the mechanical society in pre- modern societies based on likeness and the collective conscience developed around religion to the organic solidarity in modern societies. The development of complex division of labor leads to greater individualism. Although this tends to weaken the collective conscience, it does not mean that the social will be sacrificed in favor of altruism, as this is the fundamental basis of social life.

There was a positive support given the socialist parties After World War I . This seemed to be a decisive moment in the unravelling of international socialist solidarity. The national solidarity was strong through the 20th century. The term solidarity was damaged and abused by the Russian communists, but reclaimed under its right terms by the Polish workers movement led by Lech Walesa (Wilde, 2013).

In the mid-20th century most of the countries in Western Europe, North America and Australasia had developed welfare states that emphasized social protection and free education. The pressure on the state to take responsibility for the welfare of its citizens came both from the organized labor movement and from elements of the middle class adopting a social-liberal outlook. From the mid-1980s there was according to Bob Jessop, a move from welfare to workfare societies (Wilde, 2013). Here public money is seen as an investment in competitiveness by moving people into productive work.

In the later years issues related to poverty has led to the emergence of a global society who aims at reaching the UN MDGs. Wilde (2013:66) states that: “(...) *but most activists realize that aid alone is not the answer to development problems. Only when a more humane form of governance is established will it be possible to see a way forward to global solidarity*”.

3 Methodology

This chapter will discuss the methodology for this study. The first part will give an introduction of the main characteristics of qualitative and quantitative research within social science research. The second part will elaborate on qualitative research and how it is used in this specific project. The aim of this chapter is to explain how this research was planned and carried out

3.1 Social science research

There are two main approaches to social science research, qualitative and quantitative. The two approaches are viewed to be fundamentally contrasting by most of social science researchers. However, lately some social science researcher sees this distinction as no longer valid or even “false”. (Layder 1993:110 in Bryman, 2012:35; Hammersly 1992:39 in Brock-Utne 1996:613). Østerud (1995, in Brock- Utne, 1996:613) argues that this dichotomy can be broken down and that a project can be situated on a scale from extremely quantitative design to extremely qualitative design. There is also a third approach to social science research; Mixed Methods. Here one combines at least one quantitative part and one qualitative part in different ways (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

The distinction between the two main approaches is still a common feature in social science research, and according to Bryman there is little evidence to suggest that this is changing. Thus this paper will be based on the assumption that this distinction still persists.

One distinction between quantitative and qualitative research is the relationship between theory and research. The quantitative approach has a deductive orientation towards the role of theory, which means that the research is derived from a hypothesis created from a theory that will be tested. According to Bryman, this is the most common way to view the nature of the relationship between theory and research. On the other hand, qualitative research is inductive by nature. This means that unlike deductive approach in quantitative research a theory will be an outcome of the research (Bryman, 2012).

Secondly the two approaches differ in what is regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline, epistemological assumptions (Bryman, 2012). Quantitative research is regarded as positivist. A positivist seeks to explain and predict what happens in the social world by searching for regularities. This approach is traditionally used in natural science research (Burrell and Morgan, 1992). The qualitative approach takes an interpretivist position and claims that the social sciences are fundamentally different from natural sciences. The main difference between these strands is the emphases on positivists aim to explain human behavior, versus the interpretivist need to understand human behavior (Bryman, 2012).

Thirdly, their ways of capturing reality is different. The ontological position of the quantitative approach is in Bryman's (2012) book referred to as objectivism. Burrell and Morgan (1992) call this position realism. Even though the names are different, the meaning remains the same. In this understanding of reality it is claimed that the social world is made of structures external to the individual and has an existence that is independent from actors (Burrell and Morgan, 1992; Bryman 2012). The contrasting ontological position often adopted by qualitative researchers is by Burrell and Morgan (1992) named nominalism, but referred to as constructionism by Bryman (2012). This position claims that social phenomena and their meaning are in a constant state of revision and are continually being changed by social actors. The social world around the individual is made up by names and concepts to be able to structure reality. The understanding and meaning of social phenomena are formed through the social actors and their subjective views (Burrell and Morgan 1992; Bryman, 2012; Cresswell, 2011).

The aim of this study to try to understand why schools and students participate in different solidarity projects. The focus is especially on getting the students own perception of their motivation. From what is outlined above I will argue that the philosophical assumptions for qualitative research fit this project well.

3.2 Research design

The choice between qualitative and quantitative research is a choice of *research strategy*. Choosing a *research design* is the next step in narrowing down the research. A research design is by Bryman (2012) defined as a framework for how to collect and analyze data.

There is a jungle of different research designs to choose from and the distinctions between these are not always cut in stone (Yin, 2009). What design to choose is according to Patton (2002) based on different considerations like the purpose of the study, the scholarly or evaluation audience, what funds are available, the political context and also the interests and biases of the researcher.

3.2.1 The case study design

A case study is, according to Yin (2009:4), a research design that “*allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristic of real- life events*”. He also says that this type of design is relevant if you want an in depth description of a social phenomenon.

Looking at this description the case study seems to be a suitable design for this project.

Firstly the research problem this study is based on is *why* schools and students choose to participate in solidarity projects. Asking *why* questions are also a characteristic that is descriptive for this type of research design (Yin, 2009). Secondly, the aim of the study is to get in depth description of the rationales both from the schools and the students. Since the aim also is on getting a holistic characteristic of this case, I will argue that the case study design is suited for this project. This does not mean that this is the only design that could be useful for this research problem. It would e.g be interesting to do a longitudinal study by following the students for a longer period of time, but because of the limited time and resources, the case study design seems to be the most suitable one.

The case focused on in this study is the phenomenon of solidarity projects in Norwegian schools. It is considered a brick of social reality (Bryman, 2012) situated between or in the middle of the institutions of schools and different aid organization. The focus is not on the school or the organization, but rather at the case represented by a solidarity project.

There are multiple ways of doing a case study. In his book, Bryman distinguishes between five different types of cases. In the *critical case* the case is chosen to get a better understanding of circumstances according to a well-developed theory. The *extreme* or *unique case* is concerned with a unique topic that stands out from others. The objective of the *representative* or *typical case* is to capture the circumstances and conditions of an everyday situation. This type of case allows the researcher to examine key social processes. The *revelatory case* is when a researcher is able to observe a phenomenon previously inaccessible.

The *longitudinal case* offers the opportunity to do investigations over a longer period of time (Bryman, 2012).

Bryman (2012:71) says that “*any case can involve a combination of these elements, which can best be viewed as rationale for choosing particular cases*”. Looking at the description of the different cases I find that my research is a representative or typical case. The objective in this kind of case is to capture the circumstances of an everyday situation (Yin, 2009 in Bryman 2012:70). Even though these solidarity projects lasts for a short period of time, and in that way may not qualify as an ‘everyday situation’ I will argue that the phenomenon of solidarity projects is such a common thing in Norwegian schools and well known in the Norwegian society, that it cannot be defined as any of the other types of cases.

Another rationale for choosing a representative case is that it allows the researcher to look at key social processes (Bryman, 2012). These projects are ongoing processes, but do only happen once a year for the students. I will argue that it is a social process for Norwegian students. One of the teachers I interviewed put it like this:

“It is sort of an introduction to Norwegian culture, that you support countries that are poor” (Social teacher, Heidalen Senior High School, November 7, 2013).

As for any type of research design there are also some criticism made of case studies. Yin (2009) has mentioned some of the criticism made in his book. Firstly he claims that many of the researchers that have done case studies often have been too sloppy and that the study lacks rigor. Secondly there are worries about the case study not being able to provide scientific generalizations. Yin (2009) argues that the goal is to make analytical generalizations to help expand and generalize theories, not to make statistical generalizations. Thirdly he states that it is hard to know if an investigator is good at doing case studies, because there are little ways of screening for investigators abilities to conduct a good case study (Yin, 2009). All these considerations are things I needed to be aware of while conducting this project.

3.2.2 Comparative design

Bryman (2012) mentions another kind of design that is relevant for this research; comparative design. This entails studying two different cases with a relatively identical method. This design can be used in both quantitative and qualitative research. The logic behind doing a comparative research is that one can better understand a social phenomenon when two (or

more) similar cases are compared (Bryman, 2012). This being a thesis in “Comparative and International Education”, the comparative aspect is a given part of the research. There are two comparative elements in this research- one is between schools that have different projects. The other one is between the different school levels- junior high school and senior high school. There will also be made a comparison between the different school leaders rationale for participating, connected to the second research question. The comparisons are made to see what similarities and differences exist concerning motivation to participate in solidarity projects.

3.3 Research methods

Different theorists define the term research method in various ways. For this research I have chosen to adapt Bryman’s(2012) definition; “*A research method is simply a technique for collecting data*”. This section will describe the process of collecting data for my research.

3.3.1 Sampling

The logic of sampling in qualitative research is different from in quantitative. In qualitative research the goal is to collect information- rich cases where one can get as much information as possible about the issues related to the inquiry (Patton, 2002). When doing a case study one needs to sample the case before sampling units and/or participants (Bryman, 2012).

There are multiple ways of sampling within qualitative research; *purposive sampling* is when the researcher seeks to sample participants in a strategic way so that the samples are relevant for the research questions. *Theoretical sampling* is convenient when the aim of the research is to generating a new theory. The process of collecting data is controlled by the emerging theory (Bryman, 2012). For this project I chose to do what Bryman refers to as *generic purposive sampling*. Here the researcher creates criteria concerning the types of cases needed to be able to answer the research questions. This is similar to what Patton calls Criterion sampling (2002). For this project it was important to create some criterions for choosing participants.

The major criterion was that the schools needed to be a part of some kind of solidarity project. Secondly I wanted the students I met with to be a representative sample of the student group

at that particular school. The criterion of having a solidarity project was not one that could be sacrificed. The students who were chosen were not necessarily a representative sample. At most of the schools the students selected to be interviewed were perceived as more engaged or knowledgeable than the average students. When selecting schools criterion sampling was used. Students were selected by what is called snowball sampling, or even convenience is sampling. Snowball sampling happens when the researcher first samples a small group of participants, and these participants recommend other participants. Convenience sampling happens when the participants are available by chance to the researcher (Bryman, 2012). Patton says that this strategy is probably the most common one amongst qualitative researchers and also the least desirable one because the choice of participants is not thought through (Patton, 2002).

I started the process of sampling for this project by establishing contact with the central Operation Days Work- committee. They offered me access to their database where I could find information about which schools had participated the previous year. They also offered information about schools that the ODW committee had been in touch with, that had decided on another solidarity project.

From their database I chose a variety of schools that were currently participating in ODW and schools that had their own projects. In all I contacted between 25- 30 schools by e- mail. I got positive feedback from five of these schools, and out of these five, four was chosen as participants. All of the four schools chosen fulfilled the criterion of having a solidarity project. The selection of participants might have been different if more schools had responded positively to my e- mail.

After establishing contact with the schools in focus, I explained to the school leaders or teachers at the various schools what type of students I would like to interview. The selection of students was thus out of my hands. In that matter the sampling of students can be described as snowball sampling (Bryman, 2012).

Sample size in qualitative research is hard to determine before the research starts.

Onwuegbuzie and Collins sum it up like this:

“In general, sample sizes in qualitative research should not be so small as to make it difficult to achieve data saturation, theoretical saturation, or informational redundancy. At the same time, the sample should not be so large that it is difficult to

undertake a deep, case- oriented analysis“(Onwuegbuzie and Collins 2007:289, in Bryman, 2012:425).

After deciding on the topic for my project, I also had to decide on a comparative perspective. Through conversations with ODW I decided that it would be interesting to compare schools with ODW and schools with other solidarity projects, to see if there are any differences or similarities in motivation among the students that participated in different projects. A second comparison in this research will be made between the two education levels; junior high school and senior high school. For the research to be valid I needed at least one junior high school and one senior high school that participated in ODW and the same for other solidarity projects. The sample size is for this reason at four schools. To make it manageable in terms of time I decided to do group interviews at the different schools. This type of interview will be elaborated on under *Data collection*. The samples for this project are argued to be information- rich samples. The sample size is limited to these four schools as this seemed to be manageable in terms of time and resources.

3.3.2 Data collection

To collect the information needed from the different participants, various types of interviews were conducted. In qualitative research there are two main categories of interviews; unstructured and semi- structured interviews. In contrast to quantitative interviewing, where the interviewees are asked questions from a strict interview guide, the emphasis for qualitative interviews is to get a flexible structure to get as rich and detailed descriptions as possible from the participants (Bryman, 2012).

As mentioned earlier, four different schools participated in this research. At each of the schools I interviewed a group of four to five students. I also interviewed one school leader; either the principal, the vice- principal or another person from the leader group.

Student interviews were designed to be semi- structured. For these types of interviews the researcher prepares a list of questions related to the topic of investigation. The emphasis is not on the order of the questions, but rather the list serves as a tool for the researcher to see that all of the topics that are relevant for the research are covered in each of the interviews (Bryman, 2012). Before the interviews an interview guide was prepared (See appendix I). Bryman (2012) says that an interview guide for semi- structured interviews contains a series

of questions that are more general than questions in quantitative interviewing. This leaves the researcher with the possibility to ask further questions in response to replies from interviewees. The interviews with students were group interviews with 4- 5 students in each group. This type of interview is sometimes confused with the focus group interview. The main distinction is that the conductor of focus groups is concerned with how individuals discuss a certain matters as individuals of a group. The distinctions between the two are not clear cut, and are sometimes used for the same purpose (Bryman, 2012). The purpose for doing a group interview in this case was both to save time, but also to get good, reflective answers from the students. The idea was that by interviewing in groups the students would be more likely to pay less attention to the researcher and more freely discuss the topic in focus.

As Kvale (1996) mentions, there are several things one needs to be aware of when doing qualitative interviews. As part of the preparation for the interviews I tried to imagine how it would be to retrieve perspectives from 15- 19 year olds. My experience as a teacher certainly gave me a benefit in terms of how to communicate with youth. In his book Kvale gives 10 qualification criteria for a good interviewer. He says that the researcher must be clear in the way she is asking the questions, gentle and sensitive when listening to the respondents, and critical in terms of being able to question what is being said. The last criteria mentioned is how the interviewer manages to interpret and clarify meanings from the interviewees (Kvale, 1996). This was probably the most challenging part of doing the interviews, as the answers given were not always straight forward. Me usually being a talkative and opinionated human being, not stating my opinions was sometimes very challenging. Taking time to reflect on my role as a researcher and being aware of what that role entails was helpful. Patton (2002) offers the term “empathic neutrality” as a tool for qualitative researchers. Here he states that there is no universal prescription can capture the researcher’s cognitive and emotional stance towards the people of inquiry. Empathic neutrality suggests that there is a middle ground between getting too much involved and remaining too distant.

School leaders interviews were conducted individually and semi structured. An interview guide had been prepared before the interviews (See appendix II). The challenges of these interviews were different from the student interviews. The interview situation and dynamic was clearly different from the student interviews because it was adults with certain responsibilities being interviewed. The interview setting with one participant and one researcher was also different from the student group interviews. In most cases the school

leader interviews were conducted straight after the student interviews. Interviewing different types of participants this close in time was sometimes challenging. My growing awareness of this issue made it easier from one interview to the next.

In order to get a deeper understanding of the background for these solidarity projects, I was fortunate to be given time to talk to one of the founders of ODW, presently Professor at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Tore Linné Eriksen. This interview took the form as an unstructured interview where the topic was ODWs history and also ODWs current place in society.

The main source for this thesis is made up of information retrieved from the interviews conducted. In addition I also engaged in informal conversations with different people employed centrally at ODW. I was also given the opportunity to present findings from my research at ODWs annual partner meeting in January 2014. The presentation of these findings was the subject for debate during the meeting.

Because of the study being conducted in Norway and me as a researcher being Norwegian, it was most naturally to do the interviews in Norwegian. In terms of creating an environment where the interviewees felt comfortable, this surely was a benefit.

3.3.3 Ethical Considerations

When doing research of and with human beings there are many ethical perspectives one should consider. Diener and Crandall(1978) have outlined four important principles. The first principle is whether there is any harm done to participants. Harm can entail a number of facets like physical harm, harm to development, loss of self- esteem and stress (Diener and Crandall,1978 in Bryman, 2012:135). In this research the subject of inquiry was less sensible and the risk of doing damage to the participants was limited.

Secondly, Diener and Crandall talk about the lack of informed consent. In some types of qualitative research like covert participant observation the researchers identity is not known and it is therefore impossible to get an informed consent (Diener and Crandall,1978 in Bryman, 2012:138). This research did not include situations where the researcher needed to remain anonymous. An informed consent form was sent to the participants before the interviews took place and collected before the interviews started. Students under the age of 18 had to get the form signed by their parents.

The third ethical principle mentioned by Diener and Crandall is the invasion of privacy. This is linked to the notion of informed consent, as this gives the participants knowledge about what information the researcher seeks to retrieve. It is also linked to the issue of anonymity and confidentiality- if the findings are presented in a way that makes it impossible to trace the interviewee (Diener and Crandall 1978, in Bryman, 2012:135). The informed consent handed to the participants before the interviews gave a clear picture of what theme the interviews would evolve around. In this letter it was also ensured that findings would be presented in a manner that would make it impossible to trace. All of the names of participants and schools in the chapter about findings are pseudonyms.

Lastly mentioned is deception;

“Deception occurs when researchers represent their work as something else than what it is” (Bryman, 2012).

The main arguments for avoiding deception are that it challenges the reputation of social science research and also the researcher’s professional self-interest (SRA Guidelines in Bryman, 2012:143). There was a high level of transparency in this research in terms of information given to the participants. The challenge for the researcher is then to present information collected in a trustworthy manner so that it gives a true picture of the participants’ perception of the subject of inquiry.

3.4 Data analysis

“In this complex and multi- faceted analytical integration of disciplined science, creative artistry, and personal reflexivity, we mold interviews, observations, documents and field notes into findings” (Patton, 2002:432).

The aim of qualitative data analysis is to transform data into findings (Patton, 2002). There are few well established and widely accepted rules for how to analyze the data in qualitative research. Many have tried to draw on guidelines but currently there exists no formula or recipe (Patton, 2002; Bryman, 2012).

In his book Bryman mentions some basic operations in qualitative analysis. Transcribing the interviews is seen as valuable. After transcribing the interviews it is common to code the findings (Bryman, 2012). Kvale (1996) calls this part of the analyzing process *meaning categorization* – where long statements are reduced to simple categories. These categories can be developed in advance or can arise ad hoc during the analysis.

After conducting the interviews they were all transcribed deductively. This means that only data closely related to the research questions were transcribed (Abate, 2013). The interviewees mostly kept to the topic so very little of the recorded interviews were left out. After transcribing all of the interviews, the process of categorizing started. Some categories were made from the interview questions before the interviews. These were viewed as guidelines more than definite categories. After the transcription the interviews were separated into smaller themes. These themes were the backdrop for the larger categories that were created after thematizing all of the interviews. Three large categories emerged. These categories will be elaborated in the Findings chapter. Kvale (1996) says that to categorize is to decontextualize statements from the participants. After categorizing the process of interpreting the findings start. He says that this stage is about recontextualizing the statements within a broader frame of reference. This interpretation and recontextualization will be presented in the discussion chapter where findings will be linked and discussed with previous research and literature.

3.5 Field work

According to Patton (2002) going into fieldwork is the most usual way of collecting data in qualitative research. Fieldwork is when the researcher goes into the field and spends time in the setting under study. “Going into the field” means having direct and personal contact with the people under study in their own environments. In the field the researcher can make first hand observations, talk with people about their experiences and perceptions about the case of inquiry or make conduct more formal individual or group interviews. To do research based on qualitative inquiry means entering the real social world of programs, organizations and getting close enough to the people and their circumstances to apprehend what is really happening (Patton, 2002).

The fieldwork for this research took place in my current city of residence; Oslo. There are many reasons for this being a suitable place to do fieldwork for this study. Firstly, this is where the central ODW committee has its office. This meant that the meetings I had with them could be flexible and could take place when there was a need for it. Secondly, I will argue that the ecological validity of the research is higher when the cases are situated in an area with similar characteristics. Ecological validity will be elaborated upon in the *Quality assurance in qualitative research* part. Thirdly, the practical considerations also mattered. This study is limited both in time and resources, so to be able to do research in a nearby environment was beneficial. At last, my experience and knowledge about the Norwegian education system as a teacher, and my experience with ODW as a student gave me some advantages in terms of understanding the case of inquiry.

Through my time in the field I established direct contact with different contributors to the case of inquiry. I had regular contact with the central ODW committee, met with one of the founders of ODW, and talked with students and school leaders. There were little problems entering the field. ODW was positive to be a part of this study, and was of great help providing information about possible participating schools. Getting in touch with the schools proved to be somewhat challenging. I sent out around 30 e-mails and got 5 responses. Fortunately, the ones that responded did fit the project.

Even though I have experience both from the Norwegian school and from ODW I will argue that I took on an outsider perspective for this research. This means that the researcher enters a partly unknown field to get knowledge about it (Patton, 2002). This field was not completely unknown for me, but the situation the students were in both at point in time and in place was unknown. Seeing ODW from the inside was also a new experience. In this way I will claim that I did have an outsider perspective.

The duration of my research was short. I spent a few hours at each of the schools getting their view on a single element (Patton, 2002). My aim was to get their perspective on motivation and rational for participating. This was done through conducting group interviews and individual interviews.

3.6 Quality assurance in qualitative research

Quality assurance in qualitative research is a confusing field. In quantitative research reliability and validity are important criteria for establishing and assessing quality. For qualitative researchers on the other hand, there are many ways suggested to assure quality of the research (Bryman, 2012). There seems to be an agreement among qualitative researcher that the concepts of validity used in quantitative research is inappropriate for qualitative researchers. Rethinking validity for qualitative use has led to many new terms like eg. successor validity, catalytic validity and situated validity (Kleven, 2007). Kleven(2007) argues that what needs to be valid in qualitative research is not the test or assessment as such, but the interpretation of the findings.

LeCompte and Goetz (1982 in Bryman, 2012:390) adapt the terms validity and reliability, but gives them a somewhat different meaning than in quantitative research. *External reliability* is about to what degree the study can be replicated. This is hard to do in qualitative research, since freezing a social situation is impossible. As a solution they suggest that the replicator tries to adapt the same role as a researcher as the original research. *Internal reliability* is concerned with if there is more than one researcher, do they agree about what they see and hear? *Internal validity* talks about whether there is a good match between the researchers' observations and the theoretical ideas they develop. *External validity* is concerned with to what degree the findings can be generalized across social settings. This might offer a challenge for qualitative research as it often is small in samples.

Guba and Linclon (1994 in Bryman, 2012: 390-394) has developed alternative criteria for assessing quality assurance in qualitative research. They propose two primary criteria. *Trustworthiness* consists of four criteria; firstly mentioned is *credibility*. This is concerned with ensuring that research is carried out according to cannons of good practice. Also important is respondent validation where the participants validate the findings. Secondly they talk about *transferability*. Here they argue that by making thick descriptions the qualitative researcher provides others with a database for making judgment about the possible transferability of findings to other milieu. The *dependability* criterion they say that to establish the merit of research in terms of trustworthiness the researcher should adopt an auditing approach. This means keeping all of the information and sharing it with other

researcher to ensure that the findings are valid. This approach has not become popular as it is demanding for both parties involved. The *confirmability* criterion says that even though complete objectivity is not possible, the researcher has to act in good faith.

The second primary criterion is *Authenticity*. This is concerned with the wider political impact of the research. This is a controversial criterion and has not been influential in terms of quality insurance (Bryman, 2012).

Ecological validity is a component that is often discussed in terms of external validity. This is concerned with the extent to which behavior observed in one context can be generalized to another (Brock- Utne, 1996). It is concerned with the question of whether social research produces findings that might be technically valid, but have little to do with what happens in people's everyday life (Bryman, 2012). In order to ensure high ecological validity it is necessary to present as many characteristics as possible from the case in focus (Brock- Utne, 1996).

Throughout my research different criteria of quality assurance has at been kept in the back of my mind. Referring to Guba and Lincoln's criterion of confirmability, the research has at all time been done with objectivity in mind. Many times I have reflected on my own biases and trying to see if the findings could have been interpreted another way. I have also tried to provide thick description from the situations to ensure that the research is presented properly. Respondent validation was attempted done during and at the end of all interviews. All if the interviews ended with me summing up what I had heard and how I understood what had been said. The participants then got the chance to correct my interpretation. In terms of ecological validity I have tried to present as many characteristics as possible from the cases observed. There is a fine line between presenting enough characteristics to ensure high ecological validity and not compromising the participants' anonymity. In the findings chapter I have thus described the cases as thorough as I could, but provided all of the participants and their schools with pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity. The interviews were as mentioned, conducted in Norwegian. All of the interviews are translated by the researcher.

To ensure that this research was carried out legally, it was reported to NSD, the Norwegian Data Protection Official (Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste). This was done to ensure anonymity of the project and to protect the participants. This study was however not relevant for NSD.

3.7 Limitations to the study

As most qualitative research this study is limited in terms of generalizability. The study offers findings from one case; Solidarity Projects. To get an even thicker description it would have been interesting to include more participants. This could be either more schools from the same area, different areas or more students from the chosen schools. It would also have been interesting to include the perspective of e.g. teachers or parents to get an even more thorough description of the case. In terms of time it could also be interesting to do the same research over a longer period of time. This could have been done over several years to see if the motivation or rational changes.

4 Analytical framework

In this chapter the analytical framework for this study is developed. Theories of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are presented and discussed to get an overview of how motivation is viewed. First I will elaborate on the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Secondly a selection of previous research on motivation to do volunteer work is presented. Lastly The Volunteer Function Inventory by Clary et al (1998) is elaborated on, and applied as a framework for this study.

4.1 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations

Cnaan and Goldberg- Glen (1991) wisely state that “*Motivation is a difficult concept in general, because, to a large extent it is subconsciously constructed*”. Despite of this difficulty, the subject seems to stimulate researchers’ curiosity. The subject is widely studied and has been influential in various settings, like educational and developmental practices (Deci and Ryan, 2000).

Many have tried to define and categorize motivation (e.g. Kleinginna and Kleinginna, 1981; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). A simple and understandable definition is made by Ryan and Deci, who say that *motivation means to be moved to do something* (2000). Traditionally motivation has been divided into two main categories; intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2000). The major operational definition of intrinsic motivation is *the freely chosen continuation of an activity in “free time”, measured in seconds*. Enjoyment or fun derived from an activity is for many authors central for the phenomena (Lindenberg, 2001; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). The contrast is referred to as extrinsic motivation which is doing an activity with a feeling of being pressured; there may be tension or anxiety, just in order to get a desired result (Lindenberg, 2001). Extrinsic motivation is supposed to lead to a separable outcome (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Ryan and Deci (2000) refer to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as motivational orientation. These authors also argue that motivation not only varies in orientation, but also in level; motivation is a unitary phenomenon that varies from very little motivation to act to a great deal of it.

4.1.1 Intrinsic motivation

As mentioned above, intrinsic motivation is defined as the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfaction rather than for some separable outcome (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation is inherent in the human being and from birth onwards children are playful, curious and active creatures, driven by a will to learn and discover (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Many researchers have tried to define and classify intrinsic motivation in a variety of ways.

Intrinsic motivation theories emerged as a critique of the dominant behavioral theories from the 1940s to the 1960s. Operant theory (Skinner, 1953 in Ryan and Deci, 2000) claimed that all behaviors are motivated by rewards. The reward for intrinsically motivated behaviors is supposed to be in the activity itself.

Ryan and Deci (2000) argue that intrinsic motivation in one way exists within the individual, but in another sense it also exists in the relation between individuals and activities. What and when someone is intrinsically motivated depends on the individuals' interest for a certain activity. Some researchers define intrinsic motivation in terms of the task while others define it in terms of the personal satisfaction one gains from doing a task.

There have been several attempts to operationally define intrinsic motivations, but two measures are most frequently used; the free choice measure and self-reports of interest and enjoyment for an activity (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Csikszentmihalyi (1988 in Eccles and Wigfield, 2002) defined intrinsically motivated behaviors in terms of the instant subjective experience one gets from engaging in an activity. He created "Flow theory" where the activity and the participant merge into a unit and all the attention is directed at the task.

Eccles and Wigfield (2002) also talk about *Individual difference theories of intrinsic motivation*. Here they argue that the primary interest in intrinsic motivation has been focused on conditions, components, and consequences without making a distinction between intrinsic motivations as a state versus as a trait-like characteristic. They claim that the interest in the trait-like characteristics is increasing especially within educational psychology.

4.1.2 Extrinsic motivation

Most activities after early childhood are not intrinsically motivated. Social demands and roles call for responsibility and tasks that are not necessarily intrinsically motivated. Ryan and Deci (2000) say that:

“Extrinsic motivation is a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome”.

In contrast to intrinsic motivation the activity is done for an instrumental value rather than for the joy of the activity.

Ryan and Deci created the Self- Determination Theory (SDT) to distinguish between the different types of motivation. They argue that extrinsic motivation can vary in the degree to which it is autonomous. A sub theory of SDT, Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) details the different types of extrinsic motivation; *Amotivation* is the state of lacking an intention to act; *External regulation* is when an activity is carried out to satisfy an external demand; *introjected regulation* is when a certain feeling of pressure is present to avoid guilt or anxiety; *identification* is when one has identified with the personal importance of a behavior; *integrated regulation* occurs when identified regulations have been fully assimilated to the self (Ryan and Deci 2000). The authors argue that:

“The more one internalizes the reasons for an action and assimilated them to the self, the more one’s extrinsically motivated actions become self- determined” .

4.1.3 Distinction challenged

The motivational distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations has the later years been challenged (e.g. Lindenberg, 2001; Covington and Müeller, 2001). Covington and Müeller(2001) argue that there is a widely held assumption that extrinsic and intrinsic motivations are not just separable processes, but even incompatible. Lindenberg (2001) supports this, and claims that the repetitiveness of this distinction has led to signs of exhaustion within the research paradigm. These authors have tried to redefine the motivation paradigm in different ways.

For this research the intrinsic/ extrinsic distinction will be used, as it is seen relevant for the findings. It is not to say, however, that the results support this distinction. As it will appear in

the following chapters, students sometimes seemed to be both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated. Eccels and Wigfield (2002) conclude in their article, that to understand students' motivation it is crucial to understand the context. This also became quite visible in this research.

4.2 Motivation to volunteer

A great amount of research has been done to try to understand what motivates people to do work in without getting paid for it (e.g. Finkelstein, 2009; Mowen and Sujan, 2005; Clary et al, 1998; Cnaan and Goldberg- Glen, 1991).

Volunteerism is defined in different ways by different authors. Omoto and Snyder says that “*Volunteerism [is] an ongoing activity aimed at improving the well- being of others*” (Omoto and Snyder, 1995 in Mowen and Sujan, 2005:170). Penner defines it as “*(...) ongoing, planned and discretionary prosocial behavior that benefits non- intimate others and offers little or no tangible reward*” (Penner, 2002 in Finkelstein, 2009:653). Mowen and Sujan on the other hand compares volunteerism with charitable giving, and says that “*(...)volunteerism is similar [to charitable giving] because it involves the gift of time to a nonprofit organization*” (Mowen and Sujan, 2005:171).

As we see from these definitions, volunteerism is about doing something for others, not necessarily with a personal relation to the volunteer, without getting rewarded materially. The two first definitions state that volunteerism is something that takes place over time. This study is based on solidarity projects that are based on volunteerism in the sense that students do work that benefit non- intimate others without getting material reward for it. The duration of the work is limited to one day per year, but the process of informing the students may go on the whole year. Even though the days of volunteer work might be less frequent than what authors mentioned above had in mind, I will argue that the work done for these projects can be defined as volunteer work, because of the time students donate to the organizations.

4.2.1 Examples of previous research on motivation to volunteer

This part will present three examples of research done on volunteer motivation. All of these researches have tried to identify what motivates people through applying different theories of motivation and behavior.

“Measuring Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services”

This research was conducted to try to understand what motivates people to volunteer in human services. The research is based on previous research that suggests that volunteer motivation is a two- or three-dimensional phenomenon. Some researchers claim that motivation is based on altruistic or egoistic motives, while others claim that there are three dimensions; altruistic, social and material. From a literature review they created a table with 28 frequent motives to volunteer.

The result of this research does not coincide with either the two- or three- dimensional models on volunteer behavior. Rather they found that the motives are not distinct but overlapping. They also found that volunteers do not act from a single motive, but from a combination of motives that can be described as a “rewarding experience” (Cnaan and Goldberg- Glen, 1991).

“Volunteer Behavior: A Hierarchical Model Approach for Investigating Its Trait and Functional Motive Antecedents”

The research this article was conducted to identify individual difference variable predictive of a set of volunteer behaviors. It explores the relation between a functional motive approach (by Clary et al, 1998) and a trait approach for predicting volunteer behavior. The research tested the predictive ability of 5 traits; volunteer orientation, need for activity, need for learning, and present time orientation. As a hierarchical model of personality the 3M model (Meta – theoretical Model of Motivation by Mowen) was used to provide a structure for identifying a motivational network of traits that influences behavior (Mowen and Sujan, 2005).

“Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process”

In this study the construct of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations was used to investigate dispositional factor that can contribute to volunteering. To do so the researchers applied

functional analysis developed by Clary et al. A part of the functional analysis is The Volunteer Function Inventory that identifies six motivational functions served by volunteering; values motives, career motives, social motives, understanding, protective motives, and enhancement motives. In addition the study applied The Role Identity Theory by Piliavin and colleagues. They viewed the self as comprising of multiple identities that emerge from ongoing social interactions and others' expectations.

The study linked aspects of functional analysis to role identity theory and constructs fundamental to the volunteer process were systematically linked to intrinsic and extrinsic tendencies. They found among other that with high intrinsic motivation came evidence of prosocial behavior, internal motives, and the establishment of a volunteer role identity (Finkelstein 2009).

4.2.2 The Volunteer Function Inventory (Clary et al, 1998)

For my study The Volunteer Function Inventory (VFI) developed by Clary et al (1998) will be applied as a framework. The six VFI categories were hypothesized through functionalist theory and potentially served as functions that motivated volunteers. The functional analysis is an approach that is explicitly concerned with the reasons and purposes, plans and goals that underlie and generate psychological phenomena (Snyder, 1993 in Clary et al 1998). A central principle of functionalist theorizing is that people can and do perform the same actions with different psychological functions. In their article Clary et al (1998) state that:

“The core propositions of a functional analysis of volunteerism are that the acts of volunteerism that appear to be quite similar on the surface may reflect markedly different underlying motivational processes and that the functions served by volunteerism manifest themselves in the unfolding dynamics of this form of helpfulness, influencing critical events associated with the initiation and maintenance of voluntary helping behavior”.

From this we can see that the reasons for volunteering, even though they may appear the same, might be induced by different factors for different individuals.

The authors developed a set of six functions served by volunteerism by looking at previous functional theorizing, with emphasis on the classic theories of attitudes by Katz (1960) and Smith et al (1956). Several functions are common for these researchers when looking at

motivational foundations of volunteerism; some attitudes are thought to serve knowledge, some serve a value expressive function while others serve an ego defensive function. Clary et al then propose that the diverse functions identified in such functional theorizing have their counterparts in volunteers' motivation. The result is a set of motivational functions served by volunteerism.

Clary et al's article does not connect these functions to previous theorizing on motivation connected to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In the following the six motivational functions will be presented and an attempt will be made to connect these functions to intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Clary et al, 1998).

4.2.2.1 Six motivational functions served by volunteerism

The first function Clary et al mention is *values*. Here they claim that involvement in volunteer services might offer opportunities to express values related to altruistic or humanitarian concern for others. This concern is often a characteristic of those who volunteer (Anderson and Moore, 1978, in Clary et al 1998) and distinguishes volunteers from nonvolunteers (Allen and Rushton, 1983 in Clary et al 1998). The altruistic or humanitarian concern for others I will argue is an intrinsic motivation. To be able to express values connected to this concern will possibly lead to an inherent satisfaction (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Secondly they mention *understanding* as a function. This involves the opportunity to experience new learning experiences and offers the chance to exercise knowledge, skills and abilities that might otherwise go unpracticed (Clary et al, 1998). This function can not be as easily defined in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. If a person engages in volunteer activity to gain new knowledge or to be able to experience new learning experience, the function might be viewed as extrinsic. In that way the activity has an instrumental value (Ryan and Deci, 2000). If there is an unexpected outcome from doing volunteer work in terms of new learning experiences and knowledge, the function can be viewed as intrinsic. In that way the learning can become an inherent satisfaction (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Thirdly the *social* function is brought up. This function reflects motivation concerning relationship with others. Volunteering might offer opportunities to be with people one favors or engage in an activity viewed as important by significant others (Clary et al, 2000). This function I will argue is clearly related to extrinsic motivation, as the outcome from engaging

in a volunteer activity is related to a separable outcome in terms of socializing (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The fourth function is concerned with *career*. Here they state that engaging in volunteer work might be lead to career- related benefits or gives an opportunity to gain career relevant skills (Clary et al, 1998). This function is also connected to a separable outcome and not to the joy of doing the volunteer work (Ryan and Deci, 2000). It will thus be argued to be an extrinsic function.

The fifth function is labeled *protective*. It traces its roots to functional theorizing's traditional concerns with motivations involving processes associated with the functioning of the ego. These motivations focuses on protecting the ego from negative features of the self and may serve to reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others (Clary et al, 1998). Even though this function focuses on the ego and internal processes of guilt, I will argue that it can be applied into the extrinsic part of motivation. The focus is on a separable outcome, here in terms of protecting the ego from negative reviews or reducing a feeling of guilt (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The last function is named *enhancement*. This function derives from indications that there may be more to the ego and especially to the ego's relation to affect, than the protective processes outlined under the *protective* function. In contrast to the protective functions concern with eliminating negative aspects surrounding the ego, the enhancement function involves a motivational process that focuses on a positive growth and development of the ego (Clary et al, 1998). To label this function is more of a challenge. If participating in a volunteer activity with the purpose to gain positive growth of the ego, this function might be viewed as extrinsic. However, I will argue that to develop the ego is not something that is easily planned, and might thus be an outcome of doing volunteer work. This outcome might again lead to being more intrinsically motivated (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Clary et al realize that proposing six functions for volunteering might not be the optimal number of functions, but argue that their building on previous theorizing can defend it. They also state that the essential message is that it encourages considering a wide range of personal and social motivations that promote volunteer behavior. It is also stated that by doing so the functional approach advances the interactionist position, as it argues that important

consequences follow from matching the motivations characteristic of individuals to the opportunities afforded by their environments (Clary et al, 1998).

5 Findings

In this chapter findings from the data collection done in connection with this study will be presented. As presented in the methodology chapter, the data was collected through qualitative interviews with participants from four schools situated in Oslo, Norway. The chapter is organized to address the research questions presented in chapter 1. The findings will be presented in sequences of four different cases and will be categorized in line with the interview questions.

During the fieldwork period I visited 4 schools that all are situated in the capital of Norway, Oslo. Two junior high schools, grade 8 to 10 (13-16 year olds) and senior high schools, grade 1-3 (16-19 year olds). At each of the schools two set of interviews were conducted; one group interview with 4 students and one individual interview with a school leader.

As mentioned earlier, the comparative element for this study is between schools that participate in ODW and schools that participate in other solidarity projects and school level comparison. To be able to make this comparison I chose to visit one junior high school and one senior high school with ODW and the same for schools that attends other solidarity projects.

In connection to what was presented as *ecological validity* in the methodology chapter, I will describe the schools as detailed as possible without compromising the anonymity of the participants. The description will not include references as this would reveal the identity of the schools. All of the participants are given pseudonyms for the same reason. Each of the cases is divided into three sub chapters. This is to done to shed light to the two research questions this paper is based on.

After analyzing the student interviews, two large categories emerged; *Expressed Motivation* and *Attitude towards present project and feelings about changing project*. The first category will present what the students stated as their main motivation factors. The second category will give a picture of the motivation being for the specific project or if it is more of a general motivation. The second research question asks about the schools rationale for participation in a solidarity project. To answer this I have interviewed school leaders at every school. Findings from these interviews will be presented under the third subchapter in all of the cases.

It is to be mentioned that all of the interviews were conducted in Norwegian. The quotes presented are translated by the researcher.

5.1 Hareløkka junior high school

The first school I went to visit was a junior high school situated in the eastern part of Oslo. This part of the city is close to Grorudalen, which is a part of the city with a population enriched by many nationalities. Hareløkka junior high school has 320 students, where between 50- 60% of the students come from a minority background. The students are between 13- 16 years old.

The students I met with were, according to the assisting head master, a representative selection when it came to the students' background. I met with three boys and one girl, three with immigrant background and one ethnic Norwegian. Looking at the amount of commitment and engagement these students had, their level of knowledge and reflection about the topic was perceived as above average for their age.

5.1.1 Expressed motivation

“(...) we get motivated when we have this International week, then we get to see like videos and stuff of other kids, we see that we are quite fortunate when it comes to school and stuff. If we look at other kids that have to walk long ways around to get to school, because they are afraid of many different things, we get more motivated to work, and the school is kind of good to, every time we do something, give us a reason for why we do it” (Paul, 10th grade).

One of the first things that came up when I asked the students about their motivation was the International Week. This is, as mentioned in the background chapter, a project week in connection with the ODW project. The aim of this week is to give students information about the project they will be collecting money for and to raise awareness for the situation in the country where the project is situated. (Operasjon Dagsverk, n.d.c). For the students at Harløkka this obviously motivated them in different ways; getting insight in the project,

raised awareness for the situation children their age in other parts of the world are caught in and awareness about how fortunate they are to live in a country like Norway. Their perception of the project and its goal seemed to be clear to the students. A short movie about the project and the conditions of the people the money is collected for is shown during this week. This was mentioned as the one external factor that triggered motivation.

I asked the students if they thought their opinion reflected the other students' opinions. After thinking a while one of the students replied:

“It is many, I think, that work at ODW because it would look weird if they didn't do it” (Svein, 9th grade, my translation).

From this quote it also shows that the tradition of doing ODW among the students is quite solid at this school. It also shows that other students' participation motivates peers by attending the project.

The impression I got from the students, and also by talking to the vice principal was that the flow of information was good. The students also stressed the importance of the information from ODW and how important it was that the teachers had knowledge and interest in the project.

“And when it is the teacher that tells us what ODW has said, and talks about all the arguments, ODW has very good arguments and nice Power Points and movies and everything, so it is kind of a double effect because of that” (Svein, 9th grade).

What ODW says obviously matters, but equally important seems to be the trust the students have in their teacher. When I asked the students to try to rank the different sources of motivation, information from the organization was a clear number one followed by teachers and fellow students.

Extrinsic motivation like information from the organization and influence from teachers and students was discussed along with an intrinsic factor of motivation, “The good feeling”. My impression was that the feeling of doing something meaningful to help people that are not as fortunate as they are also affected the students significantly. As mentioned earlier the students I spoke with seemed to be more mature than most students their age. This might have affected their reflection on this topic. Their meanings on the subject were none the less thought through:

“It’s kind of like when you do a good deed, everyone gets that good feeling, you know. It is what you think when you are done with Operation Days Work, that you have contributed, you have done a good deed, then you get the feeling inside, that; Reasonable day” (Paul, 10th grade).

5.1.2 Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project

“It is kind of important that we think that we don’t have many opportunities to contribute to help poor people. ODW gives us this opportunity. (...) when the school and ODW gives us time to do it, that we can show interest and help people, I feel like that’s a good thing. (Paul, 10th grade).

As stated above, Paul sees this day as one of the few opportunities youth have to make a difference and contributing to changing things they feel is unfair.

Through the conversation it became clear that it was important for the students to get the possibility to contribute. These students seemed to be very motivated by external factors like International Week and the movie from ODW. These two factors had clearly affected their urge to make a difference. Trust in ODW as an organization also appeared as strong among these students. I asked if they trust in ODW:

Ole: “Yes, they have a very good project, or routine to give out money and the money are...”

Paul: “...given where they should kind of. They don’t really take anything themselves. Like Ole said, for youth to youth. That’s what’s so great. ”

The students’ attitude towards the organization and the way it is organized also emerged in a conversation about the ethical perspective of using you own savings instead of working this day. They agreed that it didn’t really matter for the ones receiving the money how it was collected, but the whole point of ODW was to do a Day’s Work.

"It doesn't really matter technically for them if the money comes from your parents because you worked or if you just relaxed (...). The thing with ODW is that it should be volunteer work. You are supposed to use a part of your education to give others education. You kind of undermine the whole concept of ODW." (Svein, 10th grade)

The attitude towards ODW as an organization shows in the quote above where Svein says that the arguments the teacher presents is viewed as good because they stems from ODW.

The temperature rose when I asked how they would feel if the school had decided that they would not do ODW next year. They thought that many students would complain to the student council. The attitude to changing project was the same; there would be reactions in the student group. One of the students even wanted to get help from the ODW District Committee to get help and support to maintain their cooperation with ODW. This attitude was not homogeneous, but the conversation was concluded that:

"But the point about ODW is that it is by youth for youths education!" (Ole, 9th grade)

5.1.3 School leaders perspective

According to vice principal at Hareløkka doing ODW has a long tradition at this school. One of their rationales for participating is that the student engagement is great when it comes to this project. The students had also expressed that they would like to continue doing ODW in the future. The school had participated in all of her five years as assisting principal and in her opinion the tradition is strong.

Their participation and the project are evaluated annually together with the school committee. Here they discuss and agree how successful they think the project has been. The students' commitment is also visual through their participation: only two to three students in each class do not participate, mostly because they have not been able to find work.

When I asked how the school justified spending time on a project like this she primarily mentioned the students engagement. The trust in ODW as an organization from the school leader's perspective was also strong;

“And since ODW is an organization that works well, and where they actually also are a part of choosing the project every year makes them feel like they own some of it. That’s why they are proud to participate in ODW. “

The vice principal had also participated in a course given by the ODW and also knew the content of their web pages well. These factors had strengthened her impression of ODW as a trustworthy organization with well-developed routines.

On question about expected learning outcome for the students she expressed that it was expected that the students would get the possibility to develop their empathic feelings, and also improve their perspective outside their closest relations. She also anticipated that the students would improve their skills in orienting in news as well as appreciating their fortune and opportunities they have related to where they live. It was also mentioned that there is a lot of learning related to school subjects connected to ODW;

“Yes, we are very concerned with the learning form this. ODW are very professional and have learning goals connected to a teaching program. We can almost just pick a program and put it into our teaching plans and use it in e.g. social science, religion, Norwegian, yes most of the subjects. So its not like we miss out on something when we have International Week. “

5.2 Heidalen senior high school

Heidalen is a senior high school situated in Nordstrand district, in the southern part of Oslo. According to one of the teachers I spoke with, the composition of students at this school is considered multicultural. Most of the students come from national minorities. There are about 480 students at this school aged 15- 19 years old.

This school offers mainly vocational training with the exception of one course that offers an additional year with general subjects (Studieforbredende) for the students to be able to apply for further studies.

This school had also chosen to do ODW as a solidarity project for their students. The student I met here were all a part of the student council. This council also had the role of being school committee for ODW. The students study background varied, three of them did their second year of a program called Child and care- worker (Barne- og Omsorgsarbeider) and the fourth did an additional year after finishing her education

5.2.1 Expressed motivation

“For me it is basically because I don’t have to go to school and at the same time can do something good for others” (Caroline, 18 yrs)

“For me it is like, I get to try to live the working life. Get to see how that is. In addition to give money to support others” (Suhaib, 18yrs).

The excerpt presented above paints a good picture of how their motivation preferences are. The first thing mentioned by all of the students was that they were able to do something else than regular school activities for a day. It is valued as an experience that can relate to their work life after school. They see the possibilities of getting experience in applying for jobs, going to interviews and doing a Day’s Work as a great opportunity. The fact that the rationale for this day’s work is to collect money for a charitable purpose seems to be second priority.

When I asked who affected their decision to attend this day the most, the answers were split. One felt that his family had a great role in affecting his decision, and if he did not participate his family would question it.

On question about their peers influence, they first denied that fellow student had anything to do with their participation. Through the conversation it appeared that in one of the classes the attitude toward ODW was quite negative. It appeared that the negative spirit of one or more student definitely affected other students’ choice of participation. I further asked if they felt like they had to participate this day and they replied that the alternative at school was less attractive than doing a day’s work.

Researcher: “How about teachers? Do they have any influence?”

Caroline: “noooo, not from my experience. My teachers are for sure not engaged”.

Silya: "It sort of seems like they don't really know what ODW is. It is kind of a day where the students are not there, that's how it feels."

From the conversation it seemed like the teachers have little effect on their motivation. Their impression is that their teachers do not care much about this day or the students' participation. The negative effect of the teachers' lack of engagement can be seen as relevant if one compares the level of engagement at this school compared to Hareløkka. It is also known that the teachers lead by example, and by not being engaged or not showing that they care about this project it will possibly affect the students negatively. One teacher at Heidalen is an exception in terms of engaged teachers. Apart from being a social teacher, he is also in charge of the student council and leads ODW. Through his work the students get information about the project and tasks to fulfill related to it. The students did not see his work as specifically motivating, but as an outsider I could see that if it was not for him they would have a lot less knowledge of the project.

Experience from Hareløkka lead me to ask if the students had seen the film made by ODW about this year's project. One of the students had seen it, and her experience was very positive. She seemed to have a deeper understanding of what the money was for and how the ODW was organized. This school did not have International Week, even though ODW stresses the importance of this to secure the students understanding.

My curiosity on intrinsic motivation made me ask if compassion or solidarity was a motivational factor. The girl who had seen the movie expressed that this had made her feel compassion and had motivated her differently than the other external factors like fellow students and teachers.

Through the conversation it also emerged a problem concerning the flow of information from Student Organization (Elevorganisasjonen) to the student council and out to the classes, lack of time being an excuse for this.

5.2.2 Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project

"ODW is very like common for everyone and you kind of feel like you don't give money to something you are passionate about" (Silya, 17yrs.).

Like mentioned earlier, and as one can see from the student's motivation towards participating, their attitude about this project was fragmented. The quote above is retrieved from a conversation about changing projects. Here the student states that she is not passionate about ODW because it is someone everyone does. It is not something that is unique for this school and therefore she expresses that she thinks it is too mainstream.

Through this conversation it also became clear that all of the students were positive towards changing project, and was eager to make a school project; a project where the school collects money for a specific school or area in the developing world. The argument being that it might be more fun for everyone. Another student agreed to this and also pointed at the level of affiliation might be higher if one did a school project compared to ODW. This student had experience from this kind of project from her junior high school, and it was a positive experience. She talked about how the process of getting information about the project was very different; they had regular school meetings about the project and a project committee from her school also visited the project. That way the students got first hand information about how the project was progressing. The conversation led me to ask if they felt like they got any information about the progress of the projects ODW supported. Two of the students did not know anything about it, but a third one stated that ODW's web page and brochure explains how the money travels. None of them knew where they could find information on how the money was spent.

Rounding up the conversation with the students, Suhaib made a comment that sums up their impression about ODW and attitudes towards ODW:

“It is actually good, ODW is really good, but if we get more information about it, more people will participate, I think” (Suhaib, 18yrs).

5.2.3 Teacher and school leaders perspective

After confirming Heidalen schools participation in this project, it became clear that the schools social teacher, Morten, had more knowledge about the justification for participating and about the students' perspective than the principal. I therefore interviewed both the social teacher and the principal.

4.2.3.1 Social teacher

“(...) ODW has a double pro by helping others, but it also is sort of a student practice in international solidarity and empathy (...) it is an introduction to Norwegian culture that support other countries”

As mentioned in the introduction, the students at Heidalen School have various national and cultural backgrounds. Morten, the social teacher uttered that he was surprised about the reluctant attitude amongst the students when it came to participation in ODW. His assumption before the project was that the empathic motivation would be stronger among students that might have experiences injustice in a similar way as the people one would be collecting money for. In reality the students were not motivated and failed to understand why they should collect money for people in Latin- America when the situation in their country of origin is challenging. He then presented a theory that one of his colleagues had presented for him; that solidarity in some cultures is connected to family.

Through the conversation it became clear that conducting ODW at this school was not easy. Like mentioned, the students lack of engagement and solidarity was one obstacle. Another one seemed to be the communication between the different sections at the school. Being a school with vocational education, the different sectors are mostly separated and maybe not used to work cross sectional. This presented a great challenge.

I asked him about his impression about how the students felt about this project. He replied that most of the students viewed it as something mandatory, something they were required to do. Even though the ODW stresses that participation should be voluntary, Morten confirmed that they in reality do not have much of a choice.

When it came to the question of changing projects he was very positive. His hope was that by changing projects one could force the students to engage more and also create a greater feeling of ownership. The downside of arranging a school project or another individual project is that it demands a lot more resources. ODW delivers a “package” ready to use with a project and a plan for how to collect the money and how to spend them. Deciding to create an individual project means that the school would have to do all of these things themselves, and this demands for resources. He pointed out that if he had initiated a project like this the school leaders would most likely let him.

I asked if he knew if the school had any explicit goal by participating in ODW he said that he thought it would look bad if the school did not participate. He summed up the conversation by saying that his impression of ODW as an organization was good, but for a school with many other challenges, doing a solidarity project is demanding.

4.2.3.2 Principal

Due to the exhaustive conversation I had with Morten, the social teacher, my talk with the principal mostly concerned the schools goal by participating.

It came across that the decision to participate practically fell on the student council. If they wanted to participate in ODW the school leader supported this. She said that ODW always has a clear purpose and that the school was behind that purpose.

Some of the students had asked to do another project. Her attitude was initially positive, but since her trust in ODW as an organization was so high, she demanded to hear a presentation about this project and how it was organized. The students never came back with this presentation.

5.3 Løkkeberg junior high school

Løkkeberg is a junior high school situated in Grünerløkka district in the central part of Oslo. It has about 500 students with various national backgrounds. The students are between 12- 15 years old.

Løkkeberg junior high school is one of the cases that had chosen another project than ODW. As mentioned, this school is quite new and I got the impression from the very modern building and the way classes was organized that this school wanted to be innovative. The students could, for a few hours a week choose an optional subject (Valgfag). One of these was International Cooperation. This class is responsible for the schools solidarity project by arranging a day to collect money and by communicating with the organization that provides their chosen project.

Løkkeberg had chosen a project provided by a smaller organization. This organization builds schools and improves conditions for deaf children in a country situated in the eastern part of

African. In contrast to ODW, they did not have a day where the students had to work to collect money. Instead they have a day with different activities where the students participate and get money from sponsors they had to find before this day. One of the activities was running laps on a court where they got 10 kroner for each lap.

5.3.1 Expressed motivation

“(...) and then they showed how a boy named Arnold, he was 4 years and lived in the slum in Kenya, and... I have a younger brother that is 4 years... and I just thought that if that was my little brother, I don't know what I have done, I wouldn't manage it. And that meant so much to me, I even started crying” (Isra, 9th grade).

The quote above is derived from a conversation with the students about motivation. A representative from the cooperating organization had visited Løkkeberg to give a presentation about the organization and what they work with. Included in the presentation was a video of some kids that are a part of their project. This video had a huge impact on the students and their motivation. It was evident that it had made an impression not only for their motivation regarding this project, but also on their feeling of injustice in the world in general. This visual presentation came forward as the one most important factor in terms of motivation and also appeared as a trigger for further reflection amongst the students.

“So now we are collecting money for a school and they get to learn how to communicate and feel more accepted in the community. And I want to kid of... because the young kids and youth they kind of, they should get the opportunity to get a better life.” (Isra, 9th grade)

They further mentioned that the thought of being able to help people that are less fortunate was motivating. When I asked what they felt motivated them the most, they all agreed that it was “the good feeling” they got my doing something to help these people they had seen on

the video to get a better life. As mentioned, this project was about helping deaf children in an area where being deaf leads to being more or less excluded from the society. Through the conversation it became clear that the students were very disturbed by the fact that a disability of that kind had such dramatic effects and their motivation was clearly connected to this injustice.

These students were all in the International Cooperation class. The information they got about the project and the situation through this class also appeared as a motivating factor. Going in depth with this subject and having direct connection to the organization gave them a feeling of ownership to both the project and the organization.

5.3.2 Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project

“ I would be disappointed and sad because ODW, you help people there as well, but you don't really know... It is in many places, but our project, it's like you help children to get a school and they can learn (...)” (Roaida, 9th grade)

Looking at the quote above one can see that the students have a close relation to the current project. This quote is a response to the question of how they would react if the school leader had decided that they would do ODW instead of their current project. From the quote one can see that they see ODW as too general since the focus changes from year to year. It seems to be valued as positive that they are a part of the same project over time. In that way they are able to follow the progress their contribution offers.

By being a part of the class International Cooperation the students get the possibility to get in touch directly with the organization they are cooperating with. The direct contact and also being able to get in touch with the children they are helping via letters seemed to be very important for their feeling of ownership.

I also asked how they would react if their school decided to not have a solidarity project at all. They responded that they would be upset and disappointed with such a decision. Some of the students said that if that were the case they would try to do solidarity work outside the school.

One of my questions was if and why they viewed this kind of project as important. They all agreed that it was of importance. The main argument was that it helped them see how lucky they are to live in Norway and to have the possibility to get an education. Understanding their fortune also led them to wanting to give something back by helping kids that are less fortunate.

5.3.3 School leader

The vice principal at Løkkeberg was unfortunately very busy during my stay and did not have time to be interviewed. She instead answered my questions by e-mail.

In her e-mail she confirmed that the school was a part of a project that aims to help deaf children in an African country. As mentioned, this school is a relatively new school so their history with the project only goes back one year. This year is the second one with the project.

The reason for doing this specific project was based on a visit and lecture from the organization. The school leader liked the concept of contributing to building a school for deaf children in a slum area.

“We have a group of students where many fall outside the successful Norwegian template and do not have a lot of resources. Many have roots in Africa and/ or have a story as refugees or have parents who are illiterate. IT is incredibly important for this group of students to feel like they can contribute even though their own life is not easy”

From this quote one can see that the school's rationale for participating in this specific project is partly based on the students' background. Further she also states that her impression is that this type of project is important to the students. Her impression is that they like to feel like they can help build a better life for youth in a less fortunate part of the world.

As mentioned in the introduction, Løkkeberg school does not have a day where the students work to collect money. Instead they have an activity day where the students can raise money in other ways. The reason for this is to make it possible for all of the students to participate and contribute.

5.4 Liåsen senior high school

Liåsen senior high school is situated in Nordstrand district, Oslo. It has about 830 students and offers general studies that prepare the students for further. The students are between 15-19 years old.

This school has also chosen to do a different project than ODW. This is an initiative that is local at this school. Their project focuses on a part of the world with many political and cultural conflicts, and is thus considered a brave cause to support. Even though it is a local initiative, they collaborate with an NGO to ensure that the money is spent well. A student group who also is in charge of the project choose which NGO the school is cooperating with. Some students are given the opportunity to visit the project to see how the money is spent.

5.4.1 Expressed motivation

“It is many who gets a bad conscious and feels like they are skipping school. So maybe I’ll just do some work at home and get paid for that. They feel guilty and just have to do something, kind of. Even if they don’t care too much about the case” (Nils, 18 yrs)

The group of students I met at Liåsen was a split group in terms of defining what motivated them. One of the girls was leader of the project group and was therefore very engaged in the case and the project. Her family also had a history of being dedicated to this cause, so in her case the family and the knowledge she had about the case was her biggest influence. One of the boys was also very dedicated to the case and showed a strong engagement. His interest in the situation in the area they support was his greatest motivational factor.

The other three students were more laid back and less interested in the case and the project. They all participated, but it seemed like it was more because they “had to”. As one can see from the quote above Nils states that his consciousness and feeling of guilt if he does not contribute was what drove him. During the conversation more examples like this became evident. The fact that they got registered absence by not participating seemed to push the students into participating. Apart from these two almost contradictory ways of being motivated, a third feeling came forward;

Jens: "I really don't have any connection to the case (...)So I'm like, what does it hurt if I contribute a bit to the schools project. It can't hurt."

Trine: "Yeah, I think it is many who think "Why not?". It's not like "So now I'm really motivated and am going to save the world". It's more like "ok, so we have this day and sure I can contribute, kind of".

These two students give a picture of what I would call an apathetic feeling towards the project. It seems like they have not really given it too much thought and participates in a kind of unconscious way. The way they present it makes it sound like there are not any extrinsic or intrinsic factors that have motivated them, they just "go with the flow".

5.4.2 Attitudes towards the project and feelings about changing project

As mentioned earlier the project at Liåsen is based on cooperation with larger organization that has projects in the country in focus. The students were left with the impression that the current cooperating organization was well organized in terms of how the money travels and also how their project was organized.

Information about the project to the rest of the students is the project group's responsibility. There was some dissatisfaction about the information given previous year. The composition of this group changes every year, and there was hope of better distribution of information with the new group.

Their current partner organization is religiously based and there had been some complains about this previous year. Thus they considered changing partners to a bigger well-known international organization that also has a humanitarian project in that area. Their hope was that this change combined with better information to all of the students would lead to more students participating.

When I asked how they would feel if the school decided to change to ODW the apathetic feeling became prominent again.

"I think some would like it and some would not, but the majority would be like... I have to work anyway" (Trine, 18yrs)

5.4.3 School leaders perspective

The vice principal at Liåsen had only been employed there for one semester. It should be taken into consideration that her opinions are based on her time at the school.

She did however confirm that Liåsen did engage in a solidarity project and had been a part of this one for two years. Before they started this project they did ODW, but due to one teacher's engagement in this specific case. The reason for this engagement did not emerge from the interview.

The rationale for doing this project was to give the students the possibility to get a greater understanding for a conflict situation in a certain area. It was also a goal that the students should be able to tell about the situation to others after. Another goal by doing this specific project was to create greater engagement in the student group and also to give them a sense of ownership to the project.

It was also confirmed that the project was run by a group of students whose composition changed from year to year. This was to give more students the opportunity to get closer to the project and be able to spread information amongst the other students. As a part of the project some of the students got to visit the place they have been raising money for on a solidarity trip, to see how the money are spent.

“They have had travels so that someone has been in the area and they can tell about with compassion (...). In that way the engagement is raised and might lead to greater participation.” (Vice Principal, Liåsen).

6 Discussion

To get a deeper understanding of the findings related to the research questions and to relate these findings to a theoretical background, this chapter tries to connect the findings presented in chapter 5 to the analytical framework outlined in chapter 4. In the first part an attempt is made to connect factors from VFI (Volunteer Function Inventory) to the separate cases from the findings chapter. The next part discusses the similarities and differences between the school levels. In the last part the schools rationales will be discussed.

6.1 Findings connected to framework

Here the findings from each of the cases presented in chapter 5 will be discussed separately in relations to the framework presented in chapter 4.

6.1.1 Hareløkka junior high school

In the first quote presented in chapter 5 one of the students says that

“(...) we see that we are quite fortunate when it comes to school and stuff [compared to children from other parts of the world]” (Paul, 10th grade).

To engage in an activity because one feels more fortunate than others might reflect a feeling of guilt related to this fortune. This assumption is reinforced when Paul continues by saying that the film they have watched connected to the project showed children who had to take long detours to school because they were afraid to go the shortest path because of violence. This motivated him to work to collect money. This feeling of guilt for being more fortunate than others I argue fits well with Clary et al`s (1998) *protective* function, where they claim that a person will try to protect its ego from negative features of the self and reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others. It could also be argued to fit within the *values* function because of this student`s humanitarian concern for others.

These suggestions are also supported by the students' appreciation for the international week where they get information about the project they are supporting. Raising their awareness of how the situation is for children in other parts of the world led them to realize how fortunate they are to live in Norway. As a part of the international week the students got to see a movie about the project in focus. This movie obviously affected the students greatly and was also a contributing factor to their motivation. Being informed through ODW's information campaign, International Week, and watching the movie are both concrete external factors that affected the students' motivations significantly. These external factors do not directly apply to any of Clary et al's functions, but did lead the students to get motivated.

I asked if their perception of how they got motivated did fit other students' motivations. The answer to this was that many students participate because it would "look weird" if they did not participate. Look weird to whom, might be a relevant question to ask in this context. Both the students I interviewed and the assisting principal confirmed that most of the student at their school did participate in ODW. To not participate would be to deviate from the norm, to do something different than what "everyone else" is doing. My assumption is therefore that the students that participate because it would "look weird" if they did not participate are afraid that their peers and teachers would react to it. Looking at it this way I will argue that this motivation might fit with Clary et al's *social* function where volunteering offers an opportunity to do something that is viewed as important by significant others.

Through conversations with the students and the vice principal I got the impression that the flow of information was well established at this school. ODW's arguments were repeated by teachers that the students trusted. One of the students claimed that when ODW's arguments were delivered to them by a teacher they trusted, it had a "double effect". To get this information delivered in such a good way might in the end lead to Clary et al's *understanding* function. It will become a new learning experience and the students will be able to develop knowledge and understandings that they would otherwise not have access to (Clary et al, 1998).

A returning term throughout the conversation was "The Good Feeling"; the feeling they got when they did something meaningful, something that might make a difference for others. There was a strong agreement among the students that this is a positive feeling that clearly motivates them to participate. This "Good Feeling" might be argued to fit into the *protective* function, as it might be a feeling of satisfaction over reducing the feeling of guilt. It can also

be argued to be connected to the *enhancement* function if this good feeling helps enhance the ego's growth and develops positive strivings of the ego (Clary et al, 1998).

The school's cooperation with ODW and their long tradition of participating in this project seemed to have a positive influence on the students' motivations. The benefits of this participation are, among others, that the students develop a greater understanding for the situation of children in other parts of the world. This might in the end lead them to altruistic and humanitarian concern for others. This again fits into Clary et al's (1998) *values* function.

Through my conversation with the school leader I tried to get an impression of what rationale the school leadership had for participating in ODW. She stated that the main reason was the student engagement for this project. She also talked about a wanted learning outcome in terms of development of empathic feelings and seeing how fortunate they are to grow up in Norway. These statements links well to Clary et al's *understanding* function, as well as the *enhancement* function (1998).

One observation I made was that the flow of information seemed to be well developed at Hareløkka. There was a close cooperation between ODW, the school, teachers and the students. I will argue that this flow is very relevant seen in relation with students' motivation to participate. It seemed highly important that the students got the information they needed and that the information came from someone they trust, like their teachers or the organization.

6.1.2 Heidalen senior high school

Already from the first quote from Heidalen, one can see that the motivational factors for the students vary greatly. Caroline says that she participates for two reasons; because she doesn't have to go to school that day, and because she gets the opportunity to do something good for others. Her first argument is extrinsically motivated because of her satisfaction of not having to do school related work this day. Her second argument can be related to Clary et al's *values* function as she expresses her concern for others. It can also be seen in relation to the *protective* function to protect her ego from negative features.

Suhaib also gives two reasons for participating; to get experience with "working life" and also be able to collect money to support others. Here he presents two motives in one sentence; altruistic and extrinsic. His first argument is related to the *career function*, where volunteering

may give career- related benefits. He also sees the opportunity to help others as a motivation, which also can be related to the *protective* function.

Some of the other students also expressed that participating in ODW might give them experiences that could lead to benefits when entering the working world. Focus on the *career* function was thus present through getting experience in writing job applications, participating in interview situations and getting work experience.

Another one of the students said that he participated because of his family's reactions if he did not. This statement can be related to Clary et al's *social* function, where one engages in an activity because of its importance to significant others (1998).

Whether the response of their peers had any influence on their participation was at first dismissed by the students. Through the conversation it came forward that there was some dissatisfaction with the project in one of the classes. This dissatisfaction might have led to a lack of engagement or a negative feeling towards the other students in the class, so I will claim that the peers did have an influence on the students' motivation, but maybe in a negative manner. One might argue that this also can relate to the *social* function (Clary et al, 1998).

One of the students had seen the movie from ODW about the current project. Watching this movie seemed to have given her a deeper understanding of the project and also provided a more intrinsic motivation. She seemed to be more worried about the situation of the children in the movie and showed a different kind of compassion about the subject than the other students. Her motivation to participate seemed more connected to the *protective* function than for the other students (Clary et al, 1998).

The social teacher at Heidalen said that the goal of participating in ODW was to be able to help others but also to raise the students' awareness for international solidarity and develop their empathic feelings. This relates to both the *understanding* and *enhancement* function (Clary et al, 1998). Morten was clearly positive towards changing to another project than ODW, but was worried about the amount of work this would demand. His main concern was the structural factor of cooperation among the teachers. This already seemed to be a challenge. The students at Heidalen were also positive to changing projects. They would prefer an individual project where they could feel more ownership to the project and the case in focus.

From my observation the main challenge for Heidalen was the structural issues. The flow of information was poorer than at Hareløkka. When seen in relation to the students' motivation, this seems to be a crucial factor. If the students do not get access to relevant information about the project they also miss the tools they might need to get motivated.

6.1.3 Løkkeberg junior high school

As mentioned in the findings chapter, Løkkeberg junior high school had chosen to participate in another solidarity project than ODW. The students I talked with here were all well informed and seemed very motivated to participate in their chosen project. If we look at the first quote presented from this case, we can see that the student is clearly affected by the conditions of the children they are raising money for. These considerations and affections are clearly linked to Clary et al's *values* functions. Her humanitarian concern and altruistic motives become evident through her statement.

A representative from the cooperating organization came to inform the schools teachers and students about the project in focus and had also shown a movie about the case. The lecture and especially the movie seemed to have influenced the students significantly. Through the conversation the students reflected upon their feeling of injustice and also on their fortune of living in Norway at several occasions. Their motivation as a consequence of this can be related to the *protective* function (Clary et al, 1998). This seemed to be unanimously the most visual feature among the students and was reflected on several times during the conversation.

The term "The Good Feeling" came forward as a prominent feature also at this school. The term was mentioned in connection to the feeling they got when they had done something that might benefit the children they were raising money for.

All of the students I talked to were well informed because of their participation in the International Cooperation class. Through this class they also developed a close relationship with the organization. The information provided through this class seemed to be a catalyst for their further motivation. It is hard to say if the motivational factors that were evident among these students would apply for the rest of the students at Løkkeberg. It is however clear that all of the students at this school did participate at the lecture from the organization and did watch the movie.

The vice principal at Løkkeberg also supported what I had seen in the students. She said that for these kids it was especially meaningful to be able to contribute to someone else's wellbeing, bearing in mind that some of the students come from difficult backgrounds as immigrants. This background might lead them to feel even worse than ethnic Norwegian children when seeing the horrible state the children they are helping are in. This also supports the strong relation to the *protective* function. Through this I will also claim that there is a visual connection to the *values* function as well, as the students emphasized a humanitarian and clearly altruistic concern for the children in focus (Clary et al, 1998).

The structure of the day for raising money was different from the schools that participated in ODW. The high level of participating students at Løkkeberg was because of the activities of this day.

In the two other cases I saw flow of information as an important finding connected to the students' motivation. The students at Løkkeberg were, as mentioned, all a part of the International Cooperation class, and therefore had firsthand information about the project. How the information is delivered to the rest of the students at this school did not come forward through the interviews.

6.1.4 Liåsen senior high school

Liåsen had also chosen to participate in another project than ODW. This project was a local initiative run by a student group that cooperated with an organization. Before visiting this school I gained knowledge about their project and what cause they raised money for. Because of the nature of the case in focus, my pre assumption was that the engagement and motivation among the students at Liåsen would be present and visual. I was therefore surprised to find that a recurring theme was "because I have to".

In the first quote from Liåsen it is clearly stated that the reason Nils is participating in this project is not because of his affection about the case, but rather because of his feeling of guilt if he skips school. This lack of engagement about the project was valid for many of the other students at the school. Trying to connect this to Clary et al's functions, I would claim that it relates to the *social* function. The main reason why Nils is participating is because of his

feeling of guilt. Guilty to whom? Probably because most of his peers participate and because his teachers expect him to participate; all significant others.

Not all of the students I talked to participated because of their conscience. The family of one of the students had a history of being engaged in this case and her motivation was clearly affected by this. She showed a lot more reflection around the project and her engagement can be related both to the *values* and the *protective* function (Clary et al, 1998).

The main finding derived from this conversation was that surprisingly many of the students did not reflect too much around why they participated in the project; it was just “something that everyone does without thinking too much about it”. This, as mentioned earlier, surprised me, as I imagined that having an individual project would foster more consciousness among the students.

The school’s rationale for participating in this project was to raise awareness among the students for a certain situation. It was clear that the vice principal expected a certain learning outcome from this, clearly related to Clary et al’s *understanding* function.

When it came to the flow of information, this was the student group’s responsibility. There had been some dissatisfaction among the student about the amount of information this group had offered in the past. Again one can see that the importance of a good system for handing over information is crucial for the students’ ability to get motivated.

6.2 Similarities and differences between the schools

Summing up the findings from Hareløkka junior high school, there seemed to be a unison understanding for the project the students were raising money for. The reasons for participating in the project varied somehow from student to student, but there seemed to be more focus on intrinsic motivations. Ryan and Deci (2000) also talk about level of motivation. Here the level of motivation seemed to be relatively high for all of the students.

Heidalen senior high school also participated in ODW, but here the motivational orientation varied more than at Hareløkka. The level of motivation also varied to some extent, but my impression was that it was generally lower than at Hareløkka.

Løkkeberg junior high school was one of the schools that had an independent solidarity project. The intrinsic motivational orientation among the students here was relatively unanimous. The *protective* function (Clary et al, 1998) came forward as important for all of the students. Also the motivational level among these students was relatively high.

The second school to do an independent project was Liåsen senior high school. Here the gap in motivational orientation as well as motivational level varied greatly. The gap spread from high level of motivation with altruistic motives to an apathetic attitude to the project. There seemed to be little consistency around the understanding of the projects purpose.

6.2.1 School level comparison

When comparing the cases I found that there were a lot of similarities between the two junior high schools. The students at both of the schools showed high level of motivation. There was also some consistency when we look at the motivational factors from these two schools; the protective function was repeated as important at both of these schools. “The Good Feeling” was also mentioned by the students as an important motivational factor.

Another important finding that was similar at both the junior high schools was that the flow of information seemed to be excellent. The information from the organization in focus was delivered to the students by people whom they trusted. There also seemed to be a great trust in the way the cooperating organization handled the money. This trust and support especially from their teachers (and school leaders) also seemed to have a great effect on the students motivation.

Both of these schools did get information about the projects they raised money for from the organization; ODW informed Hareløkka through International Week and through a movie about the project, and at Løkkeberg a representative from the cooperating organization came to give a lecture and show a movie about the project. As mentioned in the methodology chapter I have chosen not to reveal the names of the cooperating organization apart from ODW not to compromise the anonymity of the school. The students at both of the schools at

more than one occasion brought up the movie as an important motivation, or a catalyst for motivation.

There were also some clear similarities between the senior high schools. At both of the schools there was great variation in terms of how motivated the students claimed that they were. Both places I talked to students who were very motivated and engaged and students that had a more apathetic attitude towards the project. The focus of motivation also varied greatly at these schools. There was a focus on the *career* function at both of the senior high schools. This was not mentioned among the junior high school students. There might be several reasons for this. The senior level students are closer to working life and seek experiences that might benefit them when entering the working world. The junior level students at Hareløkka said that it was hard for them to get a job for this day because of their young age. Instead they raised money in other ways, like selling cake and coffee at the sub way station.

Another observation was that the flow of information about the project to the students was poorer at senior level than at junior level. This might be due to several reasons, but my assumption is that the students are more responsible for their own learning and less connected to a class teacher at senior level. The trust relationship that the students at junior level expressed was less visible at senior level. Both at Liåsen and at Heidalen a student group was responsible for passing on information about the project.

Neither Liåsen nor Heidalen had visits from any external informants from the organizations. Nor had they seen movies from the projects (with the exception of one girl at Heidalen). Seen in relation to how important the junior level students valued these external factors, this might be one of the reasons for the low level of motivation in the senior level students.

Looking at the findings, there seems to be little similarities between the two schools that participated in ODW and the two schools that had independent projects. As mentioned earlier I expected to see a higher level of motivation at the schools that did independent projects, because of their conscious choice of a project. I find it especially surprising that the level of motivation was that low at Liåsen, given the focus of their project.

To sum up the findings, there seems to be some major observations that affect the students' ability to get motivated more than others. The first one is the structural factor of information flow from the organizations to the students. A visual deposition in form of a movie seems to

be a simple way to get the students motivated. Something external like a movie seems crucial to give the students the information they need to be able to get motivated.

The good structural factors and the visual presentation might be part of the answer to why the junior level students seemed to be more motivated than the senior level students. Another assumption is that for the junior level students participating in a solidarity project might be the first experience they get in terms of world injustice. This might be an emotional experience that gives them an urge to contribute.

Rounding up, the most important observation I made during these interviews was that motivation is very much based on the individual. Most of the students also gave more than one answer to the question “what motivates you to participate. This is comparable to what Cnaan and Goldberg- Glen (1991:281) found, where they state that; “*Motives for volunteering are not distinct, but overlapping*”

It should be noted that the sampling of students was done by one of their teachers. The result might thus have been different with other participants. The findings from this research can therefore not be generalized. Still they may be viewed as an important contribution to the field of research on volunteer motivation.

6.3 Similarities and differences in rationale

The second research question for this research focuses on the schools rationale for participating in solidarity projects. Looking at the response from the school leaders and teachers I interviewed about this subject, the reason for participation was similar at all of the schools. All of the school leaders wanted their students to gain some kind of new knowledge or a deeper understanding for a certain situation. There was a clear focus on developing intrinsic values for the students and a hope that the students would get intrinsically motivated to continue caring about the project and work for international solidarity. Seen in comparison with what the students stated as their motivation, the student motivation and the teacher expectations were not compatible for some of the cases. There seemed to be a more realistic expectation from the school leaders at the junior high schools than at the senior high schools.

It is difficult to explain why this is the case, but my assumption is that the teacher- student relationship seems to be closer at junior high school level. The teachers might thus have more realistic expectations for their students.

7 Conclusion

This study has aimed to find out the reasons to participate in solidarity projects during school hours for students and school leaders. The study has included four different cases where students and representatives from the school leadership have been interviewed about their motivation and rationale for participation. Major findings from this research are centred on similarities and differences connected to the students motivations for the different projects as well as the different school levels. School leaders' justifications and rationales are discussed related to allowing the students to participate in these projects.

The findings from the fieldwork have been discussed in light of with theories of motivation and specifically in relation to the theory applied as framework; The Volunteer Function Inventory (Clary et al, 1998). Different findings have been discussed in terms of motivation and school level. The major findings are connected to student motivation connected to school level. Junior high school students were found to have higher levels of motivation and their motivational orientations were more intrinsically focused. "The good feeling" connected to doing these projects were used as an argument at several occasions. There seems to be little connection to students' motivations in relation to type of project.

The study has also investigated the school leaders rational for allowing students to participate in these projects. All of the school leaders' unison agreed that the main purpose of these projects was to provide the students with new knowledge and engagement connected to the project the organizations offered, and develop the students' idea of solidarity. This is in line with the thoughts on Development Education presented in chapter 2 where it is stated that one of the main purposes of Development Education is to educate for an international understanding and also a understanding of the Human Rights.

The findings are as mentioned discussed in relations with theories on motivation and motivation related to volunteer work. The theories applied for this study matched the findings to a certain degree. The findings lay outside these theories are the most interesting ones. It became evident that external sources of information, like presentations made by representatives from the organizations, movies about the project or tasks related to the project done in advance are the most significant catalysts for student motivation. The importance of these external visual factors appears in the findings chapter and becomes clearly evident in the

comparison with schools that does not use these external tools. The students at junior high school level were significantly more motivated than the students at senior high school level. It is an interesting observation that both of the junior high schools had used some of these external means while none of the two senior high schools had. It might have been a coincidence that it was the junior high schools I visited that had used these tools. The findings can thus not be generalized to say that junior high school students are generally more motivated for participation in solidarity projects than senior high school students.

My assumption before conducting the interviews was that students at schools that participated in independent projects might be more motivated because of the project being more personal than at schools participating in ODW. This was however not the case. For further studies it would be interesting to see if this also is relevant for students at other schools that carried out independent projects.

7.1 Implications of the study

Some theoretical implications are worth mentioning from this study. The theory used as a framework for this research was to some extent applicable. The Volunteer Functions Inventory was however developed from research on people volunteering in their own time and for a longer period of time (Clary et al, 1998). These solidarity projects are more concentrated in time and takes place during school hours. All of the six functions were used to explain the findings, but as mentioned above, the most interesting findings are outside these functions. This study offers new knowledge connected to a specific area connected to both participant motivation and development education.

There are also some practical implications from this research. Firstly, the findings of the importance of external sources of information might be helpful for the organizations providing solidarity projects. The effect of movies or lectures made by representatives from the organizations is almost invaluable.

Secondly, the importance of good flow of information might also help the schools motivate their students for participating and getting them more engaged in the topic. It seems like the projects are well organized from the organization, the key seems to be good flow of

information from the teachers or school leaders to the students. Some of the schools would have benefited from a clearer information structure.

Thirdly, this research implicates that solidarity projects are of importance. Solidarity projects offer an alternative way of learning about injustice in the world and also give the students the opportunity to actively engage with such matters. It gives the students the possibility to feel like they are making a difference. In relation to the fear of decrease in solidarity in relation to the growth of neo-liberalism (Wilde, 2013), solidarity projects offer an arena for thoughts of global solidarity to be developed and reflected upon by students.

7.2 Where does it go from here?

In the methodology chapter limitations for this study is outlined. It would be interesting for further research to do a quantitative research of student motivation to see if findings can be generalized to a greater extent. It would also be interesting to see other people's perspective on these projects, like parents or teachers or to see how teacher or parents affects students' attitudes to these projects. Several other comparative elements would have been interesting; is there any difference in motivation geographically? This study has focused on schools in Oslo. A national perspective would maybe give another perspective. Several of the schools that participated in this project had students from various cultures. A possible comparison would be motivational level and orientation in relation to ethnical background. This study has been limited in time. A comparative research on student motivation from year to year or between decades would offer a valuable perspective.

References

- Abate, T. (2013). *Applied Research Methods Part II* [Power Point Slides]. Unpublished manuscript, EDU4252, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- Brock-Utne, B. (1996): *Reliability and validity in qualitative research within education in Africa*. 1996. *International Review of Education* 42 (6).605-621. Retrieved 28 January 2014. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF00601405>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods (4th ed)*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Burrell, G. & Morgan G. (1992). *Social Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Ashgate
- Büyükdüvenci (1999). Solidarity thorough Peace Education. In J. Calleja & A. Perucca (Eds.), *Peace Education Context and Values*. Italy: UNESCO
- Clausen, K.C. (editor)(2011). *Internasjonalisering (Internationalization)*. Flora Videregående Skole (Flora Senior High School). Retrieved 20 may 2014. Retrieved from [http://www.flora.vgs.no/cms/flora/cms.nsf/\\$all/AB68D33AC4E569FFC1257504007372AC?open&qm=wcm_1,12,0,0](http://www.flora.vgs.no/cms/flora/cms.nsf/$all/AB68D33AC4E569FFC1257504007372AC?open&qm=wcm_1,12,0,0)
- Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J. & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach . *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-1530. Doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516

- Cnaan, R. A., and Goldberg- Glen, R. S. (1991) Measuring Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27 (3), 269-284. Doi: 10.1177/0021886391273003
- Covington M.V., Müller, K.J. (2001). Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Motivation: An Approach/Avoidance Reformulation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(2), 157-176. Doi: 10.1023/A:1009009219144
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (2nd ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational Beliefs, Values and Goals. *Annual review of Psychology*, 53, 109- 132. Doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153
- Eriksen, T.L. (2014). Conversation with Tore Linnè Eriksen about Operation Day's Work, 13.01.2014
- Finkelstein, M.A (2009). Intrinsic vs extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process. *Personality and Individual Differences* 46(5-6), 653-658. Doi: 0.1016/j.paid.2009.01.010
- Fredskorpset (2013). *About us*. Retrieved 24 May 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.fredskorpset.no/en/about-us/>
- Hei Verden (n.d.a). Kort om Hei Verden (Short about Hello World). Retrieved 20 may 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.heiverden.no/newsread/dokument.aspx?nodeid=5233>
- Hei Verden (n.d.b). Slik kan din skole bli med! (How your school can join!). Retrieved 20 may 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.heiverden.no/newsread/dokument.aspx?nodeid=5222>

Jagland, T. (1997). *50- års jubilèet for Marshallhjelpen*. (Speech to the Nobel Institute). The Office of the Prime Minister. Retrieved 20 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumentarkiv/Regjeringen-Jagland/smk/Taler-og-artikler-arkivert-individuelt/1997/50-arsjubileet_for_marshallhjelpen.html?id=262206

Kleinginna, P.R. Jr., & Kleinginna A. M. (1981). A Categorized list of Motivation Definitions, with a Suggestion for a Consensual Definition. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5(3). 263- 291. Doi: 10.1007/BF00993889

Kleven, T.A. (2007). Validity and validation in qualitative and quantitative research. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 28(3), 219-233. Retrieved 22 May 2014. Retrieved from http://www.idunn.no/ts/np/2008/03/validity_and_validation_in_qualitative_and_quantitative_research

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews. An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. United States of America: Sage Publications

Lindenberg, S. (2001). Intrinsic Motivation in a New Light. *International Review for Social Sciences (Kyklos)*, 54(2-3), 317- 342. Doi: 10.1111/1467-6435.00156

Lorentzen, H. (2007). *Moraldannende kretsløp. Stat, samfunn og sivilt engasjement (Circles of Moral: State, society and civil engagement)*. Oslo. Abstrakt Forlag

Lorentzen, H. & Dugstad, L.(2011). *Den norske dugnaden: Historie, kultur og fellesskap (The Norwegian Dugnad: History, culture and community)*. Oslo. Høyskoleforlaget (Norwegian Academic Press)

Ministry of Education and Research (2008- 2009). *Internasjonalisering av utdanning*. St.mld. nr. 14 (*Internationalization of the Education*. Government report nr. 14). Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research

Mowen, J.C., Sujan, H. (2005). Volunteer Behavior: A Hierarchical Model Approach for Investigating Its Traits and Functional Motive Antecedents. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 15(2), 170- 182. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1502_9

Norad (n.d.). 50 år med Norad. Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.norad.no/no/om-norad/historie>

Norad (2013). Slik er norsk bistand organisert (This is how Norwegian aid is organized). Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.norad.no/no/om-bistand/slik-er-norsk-bistand-organisert>

Nygaard, A. (1997). *Norsk u- hjelps første landvalg: India er Allright, sa Lange (Norwegian Aid's first choice of country: India is allright, Lange said)*. Retrieved 22 May 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/1253.html>

Nygaard, A. (2002). Development Education in Norway. *The Development Education Journal*, vol.8(3).Trentham Books. Retrieved 13 march 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/782.html>

Operasjon Dagsverk (n.d.a). OD's historie (Operation Day's Work history). Retrived 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.od.no/Om_OD/ODs_historie/index.html

Operasjon Dagsverk (n.d.b). Grunnprinsipper og statuetter (Basic principles). Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.od.no/Om_OD/Grunnprinsipper_og_statutter/index.html

Operasjon Dagsverk (n.d.c). Hva er Operasjon Dagsverk? (What is Operation Day's Work?). Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.od.no/Om_OD/Hva_er_Operasjon_Dagsverk_/index.html

Operasjon Dagsverk (n.d.d). OD- systemet (The ODW system). Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.od.no/Om_OD/OD_systemet/index.html

Operasjon Dagsverk (n.d.e). Hvordan brukes pengene? (How is the money spent?). Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://www.od.no/Om_OD/Hvordan_brukes_pengene_/index.html

Opplæringsloven (2008). *Lov om grunnskolen og den vidaregåande opplæringa* (Law about primary school and further education). Oslo: Parliament. Retrieved 21 May 2014. Retrieved from http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61#KAPITTEL_1

Page, J. (2008). *Peace Education. Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*. United States of America: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*(3rd ed). United States of America: Sage Publications

Plan Norge (n.d.) Lag din egen innsamlingsaksjon (Create your own fundraising campaign). Retrieved 20 may 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.plan-norge.no/ungdom/innsamlingsaksjon>

Rorg (2012). Bakgrunn. Norads informasjonssamarbeid med organisasjonene. Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/2629.html>

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L.(2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25(1), 54–67. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Rønning (2013). 800 Milliarder til Bistand (800 billion for aid). *Bistandsaktuelt*. Retrieved 22 May 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter-og-reportasjer/arkiv-nyheter-og-reportasjer/800-milliarder-til-bistand-i-2013>

Store Norske Leksikon (2005- 2007). Arbeidernes Opplysningsforbund i Norge. Retrieved 21 may 2014. Retrieved from http://snl.no/Arbeidernes_Opplysningsforbund_i_Norge

Vriens, L. (1995). Peace Education in History. In H. Löfgren, (Ed.), *Peace Education and Human Development* (pp.409-429). Malmö: University of Lund

Wilde, L. (2013). *Global Solidarity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*(4th ed). United States of America: Sage Publications

Appendices

Appendix I: Interview guides school leaders

Interview guide I: School leader at schools participating in Operation Days Work

1. Does your school participate in a solidarity project?
2. What project are you participating in?
3. How many years have this school participated in this project?
4. How many students are participating this year? More or less than before?
5. Why did you choose to participate in this project?
6. Why not another solidarity project?
7. Do you think it is important for the school to be a part of a project like this?
8. Do you think the students find it important?
9. What purpose does the school have for participating?
10. What learning outcome do you expect from attending this project?
11. Are there many students at your school that doesn't participate in this project? If yes; why?
12. Does your school have an ODW committee?
 - a. If yes; how do you characterize the students that are a part of this committee?
 - b. If no; why not?

Interview guide II: School leader at schools participating in independent project

1. Is your school participating in a solidarity project?
2. What project are you participating in?
3. How many years have this school participated in this project?
4. How many students are participating this year? More or less than before?
5. Why did you choose to participate in this project?
6. Has your school at any point been a part of another solidarity project, e.g. ODW?
 - a. If yes; why did you decide to do another project?
 - b. If no; elaborate.
7. Do you think it is important for the school to be a part of a project like this?

8. Do you think the students find it important?
9. What purpose does the school have for participating?
10. What learning outcome do you expect from attending this project?
11. Are there many students at your school that doesn't participate in this project? If yes; why?
12. Does your school have a student project committee?
 - a. If yes; how do you characterize the students that are a part of this committee?
 - b. If no; why not?

Appendix II

Interview guide student interviews

1. Will/ did you participate in your schools solidarity project this year?
2. What influenced you participate in this project? (Teachers, fellow students, the organization?)
3. Who do you think influenced you more; teachers, parents, students or others?
4. Have you participated in this project before? If yes;
 - a. How has your previous experience influenced your participation?
5. What outcome do you expect from participating?
6. Do you think you want to participate again next year?