This exam consists of two parts which each account for 50% of the total grade. Both parts have to be answered in order to pass the exam.

PART I: Questions

Answer 7 out of the 10 questions:

1) How can «political cleavages» be used to explain the structuring of the party alternatives in Norway?

Answer:

Here the students should start defining political cleavages - a political cleavage basically reflects broadly based and long-standing social and economic divisions within society that affect the way people tend to vote.

The serious comparative study of cleavage politics in post-industrial societies originates from the seminal work of Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan (Lipset and Rokkan 1967). They argue that political cleavages were formed in the mid 19th century when most modern democratic parties were born. Since then, five cleavages would tend to dominate electoral politics in Norway:

1. **Geography**: Centrum vs periphery. City against country-side. (Sentrale Østlandet (Oslo-regionen) vs. rest of country (two peripheries; Sør - og Vestlandet + Nord-Norge).


3. **Religion**: Religious vs. secular. Local to the bible vs. tolerant. Active vs. passive. (Valen: alcohol)

4. **Market of products**: Consumentists vs. producers (farmers).

5. **Labourmarket**: Employers vs. employees.

Lipset and Rokkan argue that—at least till the late 60s. Two new dimensions during the 1970’s is growth vs protection (environment) and migration/ethnicity.

Major parties in Norway: SV, AP, V, KrF, SP, H, FrP
Students that are able to place the different parties structured around the various cleavages should be heavily awarded

Kommunistiske Parti, Piratpartiet, PensjonistPartiet, De Kristne, Folkemakten, Rødt, Miljøpartiet De Grønne, Kystpartiet, Det Liberale Folkepartiet, Norgespartiet, Demokratene, Pensjonist-partiet i Norge are other parties in Norway that could be mentioned, but not necessary.

Especially the popularity of Miljøpartiet De Grønne would be interesting to mention + some of the others in order to discuss potential new political cleavages.

2) How are the members of parliament elected to Stortinget, and what does it mean that the Norwegian election system is proportional?

**Answer:**

The king formally selects his cabinet at will, but in practice this has not found place since 1928.

Rather members to Stortinget are elected based on party-list proportional representation in plural member constituencies. This means that representatives from different political parties are elected from each constituency. The constituencies are identical to the 19 counties of Norway. The electorate does not vote for individuals but rather for party lists, with a ranked list of candidates nominated by the party. This means that the person on top of the list will get the seat unless the voter alters the ballot.

The Sainte-Laguë method is used for allocating parliamentary seats to parties. As a result, the percentage of representatives is roughly equal to the nationwide percentage of votes – *proportional representation*.

Still, a party with a high number of votes in only one constituency can win a seat there even if the nationwide percentage is low.

Conversely, if a party's initial representation in Stortinget is proportionally less than its share of votes, the party may seat more representatives through leveling seats, provided that the nationwide percentage is above the election threshold, currently at 4%. Elections are held each four years, normally on the second Monday of September. Unlike most other parliaments, the Storting always serves its full four-year term.

3) Norway has a reputation of being ‘a peace-nation’. Why? Do you think that is a correct description? Why/ Why not?

**Answer:**

Defining peace would be good (i.e. referring to the PRIO/Uppsala armed conflict dataset with 25 battledeaths). Then mention that Peace is an important part of the national self-perception in Norway, but also to some extent the perception of others. Among the top scorers on the Global
Peace Index. Peace is also an important part of Norway's foreign policy, (The Nobel Peace Prize) and Norway has been an active participant in peacekeeping since the 1950s.

Historically as violent as any other society: Here the students might mention Civil wars and unification- The Viking period – ‘Norgesveldet, Norways decline and integration into Denmark-Norway, The Wars against Sweden, Norways participation in The Napoleonic Wars

Nevertheless, the turning-point came relatively early i.e. Successful neutrality in World War I, but followed with unsuccessful neutrality in World War II, where Norway became occupied. During the Cold War then Norway took sides. Today Norway is ahead of the curve in the decline of violence but paradoxically is increasingly involved in armed conflict. Then something about where Norway has been engaged militarily: Korea, Vietnam, Kuwait, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Libya, 2011, Syria, 2012. The students don’t have to know all of the history, but at least know the big picture in order to make a coherent evaluation of Norway as a Peace nation. Students that also remember some of the critique Norway has met as a peace nation should be particularly awarded. i.e.,

Hilde Henriksen Waage: Norway selected by PLO as most pro-Israel country, Oslo process occurred when the Palestinians were weak, most important issues excluded

Øyvind Østerud: Norway’s contribution unsuccessful

Indra de Soysa: Norway’s efforts legitimized Tamil Tigers

Realist criticism: Lack of priorities, insufficient attention to Norwegian interests

Terje Tvedt: Coalition of government, NGOs, and academics creates vested interests and prevents debate

Norway as an arms-exporting hypocrite

Biased mediation? Does victory promote peace?

Some students might also tap into the debate of Norway being part of the liberal peace thesis: democratic, member of IGO’s and trading-state. This is also fine, but then they have to explain the liberal peace argument (Trade, IGO and Democracy leads to peace) and its realist critique (only military power matters, states remain peaceful when it is in their interest to do so – i.e. smaller states, relying on alliances)

4) Which factors explain health-inequality in Norway?

**Answer:**

The students should first give a definition of health-inequality as ‘differences in health within the population’ – i.e. KOLS, Diabetes, etc. and differentiate between absolute and relative health inequalities. Norway score low in absolute health-inequalities, but still have some relative health-inequalities.

Factors that Hujit and Eikemo mentions as reasons are:

**Caution:**
First, it may be the case that adversity is especially damaging when living in a prosperous society, which also claims to be egalitarian and meritocratic. People with a lower socioeconomic position do not only perceive their personal situation as potentially being worse compared with other
groups, but they may also feel that there is little chance of improvement, since they have apparently failed to make good use of the possibilities that have been offered to them.

Secondly, even in case of no mobility, mortality and morbidity are decreasing more pronouncedly among high status groups compared with low status groups in the Nordic countries; everyone benefits (in an absolute sense) from egalitarianism, but higher social groups are more able to do so than lower social groups, for instance by making better use of the medical system.

Thirdly, health differences between social groups may be relatively large in the Nordic countries because of mortality selection. This implies that whereas the frailest part of the population dies during childhood in other European regions, the quality of the medical system in the Nordic countries allows these people to survive. However, they generally do so in poor health. Since these people may be overrepresented in lower as compared with higher social groups, social health inequalities would become larger when frailer people survive.

**Social selectivity:**

First, the socioeconomic gradient in smoking prevalence is much steeper in the Nordic countries as compared with countries in the South. It may be more culturally and normatively accepted to smoke among higher social groups, whereas this may be less true for the Nordic countries. As a result, smokers are a more socially selective group in the Nordic countries as compared with other societies.

Secondly, in a related way, like most other countries in Western Europe, the Nordic countries are faced with a relatively large influx of immigrants. In general, these immigrants (especially those from non-Western societies) often have a low socioeconomic position and also encounter problems in obtaining access to health services.

Additionally, knowledge on healthy lifestyles is less widespread among immigrants, and immigrants are generally less healthy than the native population. Given that both the average health and socioeconomic position are relatively high in the Nordic countries, immigrants in these societies form a socially more selective group as compared with other countries. As a result, the impact of the immigrant population on socioeconomic inequalities in health may be stronger in the Nordic countries, leading to a relatively steep social gradient in health.

**Statistical artefact:**

First, it has been argued that variations in health inequalities can be explained by a mathematical rule rather than by substantial interpretations. However, it should be confirmed by other cross-national studies whether or not it would be an overestimation to entirely attribute cross-national health differences to this type of artefact.

Secondly, it has been argued that variations between countries in the level of self-assessed social health inequalities may be due to cross-cultural variations in the self-report of health. However, little is known at this stage about the extent to which cross-cultural variation in reporting styles also affects cross-national differences in social health inequalities.

5) What two reforms of care policy did Norway introduce in the 1990s and how has this affected both family-life and work life?

**Answer:**
Brandt & Kvande (2006):

1) The fathers quota in 1993 – where a proportion of maternity-leave was transferred to the father

2) Cash for care scheme in 1998 – parents with children from one to three receive cash payment around 400 euros a month if the children is not in public childcare.

While the first reform was focused around the dual-income/earner family model, the second reform was concerned mostly with a family-model, strengthening the family as the care provider.

The first reform ensured mothers the opportunity to combine giving birth to a child, with participating in the job-market, and fathers were given more responsibility and rights as care-givers.

The second reform was aimed at making one of the family-members (either mum or dad) able to stay home beyond the parental leave-period. Evaluations of the reform has shown though that although several people have received cash for care, the amount of people that actually have reduced their working hours is minimal.

Both in families and in working life has there been a reduction of ‘industrial time regime), moving towards flexible time-regimes – not necessarily meaning that there is more time to family, but that the boundaries between the two gets blurred and unpaid overtime is increasing.

Gender patterns still present – women are mostly responsible for the child-caring, and many Norwegian women are working only part-time.

6) Why is abundance of resources also known as a resource curse?

**Answer:**

Having a lot of natural resources – e.g. oil, diamonds, minerals, etc. has paradoxically enough been a curse to many countries either in terms of leading to conflict or by leading to weak states.

In the lecture and the readings we have talked about 7 mechanisms: Students who know about these should be heavily awarded, in particular if they also know the rationale behind each of these.

*Dutch disease* (as countries discover oil and put emphasis on exporting oil and gas, export of other products than i.e. oil loses out in competition to other countries leading to a recession in the economy known as the Dutch disease)

*Rentier state/taxation* (In countries whose economies are dominated by natural resources, rulers don't need to tax their citizens because they have a guaranteed source of income from natural resources. Because the country's citizens aren't being taxed, they have less incentive to be watchful with how government spends its money. In addition, those benefiting from mineral resource wealth may perceive an effective and watchful civil service and civil society as a threat to the benefits that they enjoy, and they may take steps to thwart them.)
**Internal conflict:** First, resource curse effects can undermine the quality of governance and economic performances, thereby increasing the vulnerability of countries to conflicts (the 'resource curse' argument). Second, conflicts can occur over the control and exploitation of resources and the allocation of their revenues (the 'resource war' argument). Third, access to resource revenues by belligerents can prolong conflicts (the 'conflict resource' argument).

**International war and conflict:** (petroaggression – oilstates often involved in conflict, disputes, wars i.e. Iraq’s invasion of Iran and Kuwait; Libya’s repeated incursions into Chad in the 1970s and 1980s; Iran’s long-standing suspicion of Western powers.

**Revenue volatility:** (prices for natural resources oftentimes volatile- making countries that rely heavily on export of natural resources potentially also volatile in terms of their economic situation)

**Excessive borrowing:** (Discoveries of oil and other high-value resources has oftentimes lead to too optimistic scenarios regarding the economic future of the country, leaving many countries heavily indebted.)

**Corruption:** (In resource-rich countries, it is often easier to maintain authority through allocating resources to favoured constituents than through growth-oriented economic policies and a level, well-regulated playing field. Huge flows of money from natural resources fuel this political corruption).

7) Why did Norway escape the resource-curse?

**Answer:**

Defining the resource curse is necessary. If this is already done under question 6 then they should refer to it here. A few words about when Norway found oil is also fine, but focus should be on six factors mentioned in Matsen & Torvik (2006) as important factors for avoiding the curse

(i) saving of resource income: Norway is saving a lot of money coming from oil and gas-export in the Pensionfund.

(ii) presidentialism versus parliamentarism: Norway - being a parliamentarian country means more distribution of power, and possibly reduces the risk og despotism and corruption.

(iii) institutional quality: In countries – such as Norway - with good protection of property rights and little corruption, natural resources may contribute to growth. More natural resources provide private agents with productive investment opportunities, in turn creating positive externalities for other agents. On the other hand, with poor protection of property rights and much corruption, more natural resources may hinder growth. In such countries more natural resources may stimulate predation, rent-seeking, and other destructive and/or non-productive activities, in turn creating negative externalities for the rest of the economy.

(iv) type of resources: oil less lootable than diamonds, gems, drugs, minerals

(v) offshore versus onshore oil: countries with offshore oil fare better than countries with onshore oil due to being more difficult to loot, and the need of more technical equipment
(vi) early versus late industrialization: Norway already a strong state when the discoveries was made, emphasis on state-ownership of the resources (Statoil and the ten oil commandments), the level og trust in Government and Norwegian state high.

8) According to Hylland Eriksen (2013) the Norwegian Government not been entirely successful in their goal towards integration of immigrants. What do the two concepts assimilation and integration mean?

**Answer:**

(Hylland-Eriksen (2013:7))

Assimilation = entails the eventual disappearance of any differences between groups, leading to one group swallowing another

Integration = refers to the maintenance of a distinctive cultural identity while simultaneously participating as equals in greater society.

9) What role does mass-sport have in Norway?

**Answer:**

Mass-sports in Norway is very important and popular, as there is a lot of emphasis on the positive effects of exercise for health. Children start at an early age and it is to a large extent organized around the idea that participation is more important than talent. In this sense there is a potential conflict between mass-sport and elite-sport in Norway (Helle-Valle 2009). Nevertheless, through mass-sport there has also been recruited a lot of sporttalents, so it would be unfair to say that mass-sport come at the cost of elite-sport in Norway. (It is also true that elite-talents often function as ambassadors of their sport thus recruiting people to mass-sport.)

10) What forms of welfare arrangements do you find in the Norwegian labour market?

**Answer:**

Dølvik et al. (1997) mentions several welfare-arrangements – the students ought to remember most of them to get full score

Parental quota : 47 weeks 100% salary, 57 weeks 80% (including the fathers 12weeks)

Sick-payment: among the most generous in the world: 100% og salary for a year (90 % in Denmark and 75% in Sweden). Self-declaration and and absence to care for children up to four weeks.

Unemployment benefits (65% of salary) for three years
Disability pension – similar to old age pension

old age pension – usually at age 67 2/3 of salary, can retire at age 62.

PART II: Essay

Answer one of the following questions:

Question 1: How has the mediatization of Norway influenced the relationship between media and politics? How is Norway different and similar to other countries in this respect?

Answer:

This is a broad question, it is therefore important for the candidate to keep a clear structure.

A term that the essay need to mention, is medialization/ mediatization.

The hypothesis “the mediatizations of politics» is about how the actors and institutions in the political sphere has had to adjust themselves to the logic of the media and the way they work. In the hypotheses the media has increased their power, at the expense of the political actors and institutions. The adjustment has therefor been one sided. As a consequence, both institutions and whole societies, has become dependent on the media.

The essay should discuss how the media’s influence has change and developed over time in Norway: media as a channel, media as an arena, media as an actor and media as a director. The role of the TV is important for the last phase.

The other part of the question asks about Norway compared to other countries:

When it comes to Television, the Norwegian broadcasting system and structure is quite similar to a lot of other European countries. But Norway was among the last European countries to establish a national TV-broadcaster. What is most specific for the Norwegian case, is our Newspaper structure. Particularly, the amount of different newspaper can be mentioned, as Norway’s amount is increasing in contrast to other countries. In general, news reading is declining throughout Europe. In Norway, where large parts of the population reads newspapers, not being “tuned into” news reading, could lead to stigma. In contrast to Greece for example, where low interest in news is more common. Norway could be placed in a Democratic Corporatist Model in the media system classification, together with several other Nordic countries, Germany, the Netherlands and Australia, for example. This means there is a strong state intervention in the media system. But as Hallin and Mancini point out, there is a tendency towards more commercialization.
Those who are able to discuss the connection between the mediatization of politics and democracy should be honoured. Social life and community integration are key words here. Especially the citizens’ ability to have knowledge about politics is important, as it motivates political participation. In Norway there has been a weakening of the parliamentary chain, and one of the suggested reasons is that the media has become more important and independent.

Question 2: The Norwegian decision to resume Commercial whaling has been very controversial outside of Norway. Why is this decision controversial? (Consider both the actions of the International Whaling Commission as well as various critics). What is Norway's reason for deciding to resume Commercial whaling?

Answer:

The International Whaling Commission adopted what it calls a “moratorium” on all commercial whaling in 1982. It took effect in 1986. By the terms of this moratorium, all members of the IWC were to stop taking all whales for commercial purposes unless they formally objected to this measure. (Technically, the quotas for all whales were set at “zero”. This did not include whales taken by aboriginal peoples and “scientific whaling”). Norway, along with four other countries, did make a formal objection. Norway, however, temporarily and voluntarily, halted its commercial whaling and conducted research (which involved taking whales for research purposes) until it was satisfied that there was sufficient basis for establishing that the stock of Minke whales that Norwegian whalers were taking could tolerate the practice. Norway resumed commercial whaling in 1993.

This is controversial because Norway is taking whales without a quota from the IWC, which is the organization that has been given international authority to manage whales and whaling. Many object that this action is against the spirit of the IWC, that it weakens the organization, that whaling is never sustainable in the long run, that there are real problems in controlling whaling at the international level, that whaling is inherently cruel, that whale watching is increasingly important (and thus a way for coastal communities to use their resources without killing), that whaling is not necessary and that whales should not be taken because they are under pressure for other reasons (environmental) and can’t tolerate it.

Norway counters with the following: it’s position is legal under international law because Norway is acting in accordance with the terms of the IWC convention, that the minke whale stock from which it is taking whales is large and in absolutely no danger of being over-exploited, that the moratorium was in any case not necessary since many safeguards were already in place by 1982, that a total moratorium was unscientific because it did not take into consideration the condition of the various whale stocks, that international management norms had already developed to control whaling (and other marine resources), Norwegian whaling is very different than the type of whaling most people have in mind (because it is carried out by small boats relatively close to Norway and the product is meat rather than whale oil), that the Norwegian whaling is not cruel (and is more humane than other meat industries and types of whaling), and that the IWC has lost legitimacy as the
international organization with the right to manage whaling because it is no longer being run for the
benefit of the whaling industry and on scientific principles, because whaling is an important economic
activity in Northern areas, and finally, that whales constitute an important resource that should be –
and can be – used responsibly.