E.MA European Master's Degree in
Human Rights and Democratisation

Challenges for diversity management in Norway

– The mistrust within the Somali Community towards the Child Welfare System –

Laila Elisabeth Nesheim

UNIVERSITY OF DEUSTO

E.MA- European Master's Degree in Human Rights and Democratisation

Academic Year 2012/13

Written under the supervision of Dr. Andrea Ruiz Balzola

Abstract

The objective of this thesis is to increase the understanding of some challenges contemporary Norwegian society faces in diversity management by examining the interaction and dynamics between Somalis and the child welfare system (CWS). Mistrust and tensions dominate many Somalis relationship to the institution, the root causes and consequences of this situation are still unexplored. This thesis seeks to critically review some of the possible root causes by applying a twofold approach thereby allowing for a "broad sweep" exploration on both a macro and micro level. It questions if the causes for mistrust can be found on multiple levels in society. Is there incoherence in policies on a structural level that can have implications for their implementation, and cause a possible discrepancy, posing challenges regarding the interpretation of the principle of equality and when one should recognize diversity? Will these dilemmas furthermore influence the practice of the institutions such as the CWS? It argues that the impact of integration policies on CWS is under-researched, and is possibly greater than one envisages. Secondly it questions if the mistrust can be caused by the use of a rhetoric that emphasises cultural values. The study suggests that while the cause for mistrust is multiple and complex, a combination of incoherence in diversity management on a policy level and the use of a discourse that emphasises cultural values builds boundaries creating categorisations that limit our identities and lead to exclusion and ultimately a mistrust between the actors.

Keywords:

Diversity management, immigrants, Somalis, child welfare system, integration, mistrust, culture, Norway

List of content

List of Annexes

1 Introduction

The objective of this thesis is to increase the understanding of integration processes in Norway. As a result of globalisation and new international division of labour and migration movements that has emerged over the past decades societies have faced a new level of complexity (Rodriguez-Garcia 2010, p 252). The increasing diversity in societies has become a focal point for political controversy. Migration and integration affects the receiving society in profound ways by changing the composition and raising questions of self-identification like "who are we?" and "who belongs?" As Norway has become an ever-increasing popular destination, not least due to the prosperous welfare state, debates concerning immigration, integration, national identity and policy have become evermore prominent, as in all other European societies. However the urgency of the national political issues are not reflected in debate and rhetoric at the local level. The path from benignly formulated paragraphs to practice is a long one. Many challenges emerge: How to build a healthy diverse society and at the same time create a new Norwegian "we" whilst retaining the core values of the welfare-state and a high level of social cohesion? How to stimulate interaction that promotes tolerance and inclusion between majority and minority populations? This thesis attempts to address some of the challenges that arise in this encounter, discussing particularly the interaction between the Somali community and the Child Welfare System (CWS), who are an important part of the diverse welfare state and as their responsibilities include some of the most vulnerable groups in society, and question why has this lead to tensions and a feeling of mistrust.

1.1 Empirical context

The motivation for this study was sparked by data that the background interviews revealed when posing the question: what challenges do minority groups face in the Norwegian society today? After speaking to many actors in the field it became apparent that

1

the tensions and mistrust between the CWS and Somali community were of major concern. To give a picture of the present day situation today I have selected a few extracts from the media and from informants' opinions.

Already in the autumn of 2011 the Minister of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion Audun Lysbakken highlighted the issue of lack of trust in the minority communities towards the CWS. In a speech he pointed out the need for a strengthening of the CWS cultural competence, and that this would increase respect and credibility within the minority communities. He concluded that the:

> "CWS is a security-net for the most vulnerable in society and trust in this networks ability is crucial so as to identify children and families with need for support, as many will not seek advice or assistance if there is a lack of trust" (www.regjeringen.no).

The leader of a Somali network also expressed his grave concerns regarding the situation, stating that there is no exact overview of how often children get sent from Norway due to interventions from the CWS but confirmed that this is a central issue within the Somali community. He furthermore expressed " I knows of entire families that have left Norway so as to avoid the CWS, Some have such a strong fear about the powerfulness of the CWS, that they move from Norway after having received just one protection notification" (interview, 16.Informant, 18.4.13)(interview NRK 25.02.13).

A Somali social worker said: "Somalis feel that they are not safe in Norway, neither are their children" (Interview,13.Informant29.4.13).

Another Somali informant and politician stated:

> There are many CWS cases at the moment in Norway concerning the CWS and Somalis. Great cultural collision between the actors. No respect for the Somali culture, politicians have not done a good job with the integration processes concerning Somalis (interview, 25.informat,c. 29.4.13).

1.2 Previous and ongoing research

This study attempts to contribute to the growing body of research that has been conduc-

ted regarding the interaction between the CWS and the minority population in Norway. As pointed out in a NIBR report: "a multi-cultural child welfare", research has been conducted within the field both in Scandinavia and internationally but it is fragmented and there is a need to establish a more holistic approach. (2007 Hansen et. Al.) To my knowledge there has been no investigation concerning the causes for mistrust between the Somali community and the CWS in Norway.

1.3 Theoretical foundation

In order to obtain an understanding of the integration processes in Norway and the possible impact they may have on the interaction between the CWS and the Somali community I have selected a broad conceptual framework. There is no single model for integration or accommodation processes that is valid for all cases, as it has to satisfy the certain characteristics of location, history, demography, economics, politics and culture. However it is possible to analyze different cases, find common points and highlight some principles that could be applicable beyond particular contexts (Rodriguez-Garcia 2010, pp. 254- 257). Moreover one can find significant differences in integration policies within a country such as Norway due to factors including variations in local politics and the composition of the local society. The differences in policies and practices range from assimilationist to multiculturalist models, consequently I choose to analyze the data using a broad theoretical conceptual framework that includes aspects from the whole spectrum of integration-incorporation models so as to identify the different tendencies in the policies. The interculturalist model has a central position as it has a socio-cultural approach that incorporates and reconciles cultural diversity with social cohesion (Rodriguez-Garcia 2010, pp.254- 257). Furthermore it allows for an analysis on 2 levels both macro and micro, making it possible to investigate governmental policies and the possible effect on the CWS and at the same time the interaction between the CWS and the Somalis. The interculturalist model is appropriate for the case study as it is situated in Oslo in 2012 the Council of Europe (CoE) (CoE Report, 2012)

placed Oslo second on the Intercultural Cities Index. Due to the emphasis and significance informants placed on the concept "culture", it is also a key element for understanding the case. Further I apply a minority/majority perspective to discuss the interaction between the actors and the meaning of concepts such as identity, ethnicity, and use of power.

1.4 Research questions

This thesis seeks to critically review some of the possible root causes for the mistrust that many Somalis hold towards the CWS, however as they are both multiple and complex, and due to the limited scope of this thesis I will only explore some of the potential causes. I question if the causes for mistrust can be found on many levels in society. Firstly, is there incoherence in policies on a structural level that can have implications for their implementation, and cause a possible discrepancy, posing challenges regarding the interpretation of the principle of equality and when one should recognize diversity? I argue that the impact of integration policies on child protection is under-researched, and is possibly greater than one envisages. Will these dilemmas furthermore influence the practice of the institutions such as the CWS and the challenges they face in the day-to-day meeting with the growing diverse population? As Lipsky (1980) points out: "ultimately, public policy consists of street-level bureaucrats' interpretation and implementation of laws and policies as they interact with service users"(referred to in Kriz and Skivernes 2012, p.11). Secondly I question if the mistrust between the CWS workers and the Somali community can be caused by the use of a discourse that emphasises cultural values and by doing so builds boundaries creating categorisations that limit our identities and lead to exclusion and ultimately a mistrust between the actors. To answer these issues I pose the following research questions:

"What are the root causes for the mistrust Somalis have towards the CWS and how does this arise?"

And,

"What impact do the integration policies have on the interaction between the Somali community and the CWS?"

1.5   Thesis outline

This thesis aims to answer the RQs stated above. Following on to the introduction in chapter one, chapter two presents the theoretical framework, outlining different integration-incorporation models and relevant concepts such as citizenship, identity, social capital and power. Emphasis on culture and various approaches concerning this concept will be discussed in more detail, as culture is important element for understanding the case.

Chapter three gives an account of the research design, methods for data collection and analysis and the dependability, credibility, confirmability and transferability of the study are also discussed.

Chapter four is twofold, firstly providing a brief descriptive overview of the Norwegian welfare model including the CWS, diversity management and integration polices including their aims. Moreover I give I brief account of the "Norwegian" perception of integration and immigration issues and a description of Oslo as an intercultural city. Secondly a short account of Somalis history, background and data that is relevant for their situation in Norway today.

In chapter five I present the empirical findings gained during interviews and from analysis of documents and discuss them in light of the chosen theoretical framework. Reflecting the structure and aim of the thesis, this chapter also has a twofold structure; firstly, a macro focus when analysing integration policies and their pragmatic implications, particularly for the CWS. Secondly, a micro focus when analysing the cause for mistrust from a grass roots perspective using the concepts of culture, identity, ethnicity and power in a minority/majority perspective,.

Chapter six provides a brief summary of the empirical findings in the light of the theoretical framework and I present some potential recommendations for how to build a

trustful and inclusive interaction between the CWS and the Somali community. Finally some suggestions for future research are presented.

2 Theoretical framework

Integration of minorities depends largely on the host society and its political and internal structures. Many factors play an important role in the incorporation process such as the historical pattern of nation building and the transformation of regimes within territory, the demographic, political, social and/or religious distinctions of the country. These factors are often linked with the colonial past and form the basis for citizenship policies for exclusion and inclusion. Puntham (2007, p.137) sees cultural diversity as a permanent feature of modern life, as most societies today are multicultural. This diversity rises from factors such as moral individualism and a decrease in traditional moral consensus, ethnic religious diversity, globalization and immigration. Due to the focus of this thesis I will only discuss the form of cultural diversity that comes from immigration. In simple terms two basic perspectives have been used to describe the relationship between the state and minorities: the assimilation model and the pluralist model, both are practiced in varying degree. Another common division for the integration-incorporation model is often three-fold: assimilation or republican, multiculturalism or pluralist, and segregationist or exclusion model (Rodriuez- Garcia 2010, p.256).

The following chapter will give an overview of relevant theory that can shed light on the thesis questions: "What are the root causes for the mistrust Somalis have towards the CWS and how does this arise?" and "What impact do the integration policies have on the interaction between the Somali community and the CWS?" First a definition of the terms integration, assimilation, and self-segregation is presented. Secondly, giving a brief account of multiculturalism and the critiques towards the concept, thirdly I will give a more in-depth description of the interculturalistic approach. This is the point of departure for analyzing the data in, I will and discuss the criteria's of citizenship and basis for inclusion. In the last half of the chapter I will put emphasise on theories that can elucidate the interaction between people, and discuss identity and the connection with diversity. I will put emphasis on culture, as it is a central aspect of this thesis and

present an account of various approaches and understandings of the concepts such as cultural relativism, ethnocentrism, cultural fundamentalism and parental ethno theories. I furthermore describe some elements within the concept of power. I also briefly discuss social capital and trust and the potential impact immigration can have on trust.

2.1 Integration

Before defining the term integration in the Norwegian perspective I will give a brief overview of some different understanding of the term. Integration can be understood in multiple ways, according to the context and can be seen as both a model for incorporation and as an aim in itself (as will be elaborated on in the following section). Integration is the more common approach in contemporary societies today and underlines the necessity of a common culture whilst accepting to a larger extent that immigrant's dual cultural identity and that integration can be limited to the societies common institutions (Baubock, 1996, pp. 8-10). A wide range of viewpoints exists within the integrationist perspective which vary from demanding integration on economic and political levels to extending it to moral, social and cultural arenas. However scholars have pointed out that the notion of 'integrating' immigrants and their descendants is highly problematic, as it assumes the existence of a pre-existing organically integrated and bonded society (Joppke & Morawska, 2003, in Morales 2011, p. 40). Schuck's (2009, p.170)(referred to by Morales 2011, p.11) argues "that assimilation and integration are, in essence, the same thing and that both carry the same ideological baggage of conformity to the cultural and social norms of the majority population", In fact, contemporary scholars contend that assimilation is only one type of immigrant incorporation or integration (Bean and Stevens, 2003, p.95)(referred to by Morales 2011, p.20), but it is often difficult to draw clear lines between the two terms. Hagelund moreover poses the question "why is integration considered such an irrefutable necessity? Also, critical voices in the public debate primarily attack the failure to achieve integration, hardly ever the aim itself" (Hagelund 2002, p.408). In line with this Puntham (2007, p.137) suggests that instead of focusing

on how to assimilate or integrate immigrants into society one should focus on how to achieve equal citizenship based on a sense of common belonging, and a shared collective identity, and that integration and assimilation are the means and not the end to the concept of common belonging.

2.1.1 The meaning of "Integration" in the Norwegian context

The term integration has been central in debates concerning immigrants in Norway. It has a two-fold meaning, on the one hand it has evolved as a separate policy ie. field- integration politics and on the other as an ideal for how multicultural Norway is envisaged to develop and function. Within the political sphere there is general consensus on the value of integration, however the meaning of the concept has seen changes over time, ranging from offers of protection against assimilation in the early official formulations to the duty and right to participate in social life. The definition is vague, and apart from broad formulations of equal opportunities, rights and duties, the meaning of integration is commonly referred to as what it is not i.e.: "integration is not assimilation, not segregation" (Hagelund 2002, p.406). The concept represents processes that involve challenges that both individual immigrants and the multicultural society face, as well as representing the end result of such processes. Furthermore the compromise between equality and diversity is fundamental for understanding the core concepts of Norwegian integration politics, and has been a reoccurring theme since the 1980s when multiculturalism became a reality in Norwegian society. Hagelund points out that one could avoid the more problematic debates concerning the concrete policy implications of the notion of integration if there was a common understanding of the ideal (Hagelund 2002, p.402-408).

2.2 Assimilation

Assimilation involves the notion that minorities should merge into the host society to become fully accepted as citizens by giving up their cultural origins and ties with their country of origin. It is seen that equality can only be achieved through monoculturality

where the principle of full adoption of the rules and values of the dominant society and through the avoidance of any considerations of diversity and requiring. This model is exemplified in the case of France (Rodriguez-Garzia 2010, p.254). Critiques of the assimilation approach underline the complete exclusion of cultural diversity beyond the private sphere, consequently neglecting to acknowledge the intricacy of plurality. The model also falls short in acknowledging social cohesion and equity thus marginalizing and excluding groups within the population (Rodriguez-Garzia 2010, p.255).

2.3 Self-segregation

Self-segregation typically involves minorities who choose to live in separate communities or so-called parallel societies (Cantel 2001, p. 10). Involving living residentially segregated together with people predominantly from the same ethnic group. This often effects the ethnic composition of schools and preschools and can lead to a cultural isolation of ethnic minority communities. Characteristically members from the communities can voluntarily abstain from partaking in the majority society due to fears or anxieties concerning being exposed to discrimination and prejudice and consequently have minimal interaction with the majority culture. Cantel 2001underlines that other factors such as xenophobic nationalism and radical right-wing nationalist political parties, segregated communities can pose a threat to the stability and well-being of our societies (Cantel 2001, p. 10).

2.4 Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism as a term and concept has been heavily politicized and debated over the past 25 years (Rex 2004, p.6). The fundamental principles are respect for and protection of cultural diversity within a framework of shared belonging. In pragmatic terms the application varies a "weak" approach where cultural diversity is acknowledged in the private sphere but policies of assimilation dominate in the institutional public arena to the "strong" approach which recognises ethnic-cultural differences and communities both in the public sphere and at institutional level, as in official support for the first lan-

guages of immigrants. Depending on the country, cultural pluralism places more or less emphasis on civic equality or on the separate consideration of minorities. The UK can be considered to have a weak approach integration through equal opportunities for the individual and applying legal measures preventing ethnic-racial discrimination. However assimilation predominates on a cultural level for if one is not assimilated the separation from the majority society increases. Canada practices a so-called strong model where active support is given to ethnic communities, and the mainstream is more diverse (Rodriguez-Garzia 2010, p.255).

Heller (1996, p. 25) understands multiculturalism as a general concept and culture as holistic, where open systems should be understood within their environments. She underlines the need to de-ideologiese and depolarises the term multiculturalism so as to transform it into a value concept, and that one cannot generalise issues of coexistence or relationship of cultures such as immigration, legislation, or customs. A de-ideologised form of multiculturalism does not hold cultures to be equal units because cultures cannot be compared and there is not standard to measure them by. However in a liberal democracy it is essential to recognize that another culture and lifestyle has value but not necessarily equal worth. Rights of minority groups have been central in the political-philosophical debate in connection with citizenship and immigration. Kymlika, one of the strongest and most prominent advocates for multiculturalism argues that a prerequisite for a liberal and well-functioning democratic society is the protection of group-specific rights (referred to in Heller 1996, p.27-39).

2.4.1 The "two domains of multiculturalism"

Rex 2004 points out the problem of the "two domains thesis" when applying the multiculturalism model. This concerns extending values of the public political culture into private communal spheres and per contra, the claim that the values of the private communal cultures should be extend into the public realm (Rex 2004, p.11). The perspective, on the one hand that certain values in the public sphere also apply in the private, the

11

argument is often based on a human rights argument, and goes further than a general commitment to the values of the welfare state for example that certain private family practices of immigrant communities are unacceptable. On the other hand the belief that private communal values also apply in the public domain, for example some Muslims would argue that Islam is a way of living and should not only be confined to the private sphere. Here the potential for tension is apparent, the values of the welfare state on the one side and the beliefs of an immigrant community on the other (Rex 2004, p.15).

2.4.2   From multiculturalism to "civic integration"

The transition multiculturalism to civic integration is described by Joppke (2004, p. 247) as moving from denial to affirmation of ones own culture, and can especially be seen in Britain and The Netherlands, where both countries have had a official commitment to multiculturalism. However this phenomenon has been aggravated by the rise of right-wing populism across Europe, I believe that this trend can also be detected in the Norwegian context, as I will discuss in the analysis chapter. There is a tendency that the term multiculturalism is used to describe a diverse society, rather than as a model for state policy, which is taking a more centrist civic direction Back et al. 2002 (referred to in Joppke 2004, p.17) suggests that the change in discourse to civic integration constitutes a revival of nationalism or also maybe racism, and is motivated by an effort to commit and bind immigrants to the particular host society by familiarising them with certain values and traditions. Joppke (2004) opposes this view saying that "these particularities are just different names for the universal creed of liberty and equality that marks *all* liberal societies" and argues furthermore that there is nothing particular for one nationality about the way of doing things, but common principles that immigrants are to be committed to and socialised into (Joppke 2004, p.253).

2.4.3   Critiques towards multiculturalism

Critiques' of multiculturalism (Levy 2000, Barry 2001 referred to in Joppke 2004,

p.238) agree with Heller (1996, p.25) arguing that it is not logically possible to recognise all cultures as equal by stating that "to recognise what a group values in its own culture is to accept a standard by which some other groups fail to be worthy of respect" opposes Kymlikas (1997) view by arguing that multiculturalism undermines liberal rights and divides society, the consequences resulting in less focus on economic equalities. He states that individuals can claim their rights but groups should not have this possibility. Moreover he underlines that immigrant groups cannot only be perceived as culturally different but one must also focus on their political relations (Rex 2004). Sartori (referred to in Rex 2004, p.238) focuses on the unilateral aspect of cultural recognition in the multicultural approach and highlights the obligation for the majority culture to recognize the minority groups but with less focus on the reciprocal obligation of the minority to recognize the majority customs. Parekh (2000) also points out that if there is a clash of "operative public values" with the majority society the controversial immigrant customs have to give way (Joppke 2004, p.242). Another common criticism of multiculturalism is that the focus on culture draws attention from other, maybe more pressing forms of minority discrimination, for example socio-economic inequalities (Idem, p.242). Joppke concludes that the retreat of multiculturalism is maybe a "growing sense that when in Rome do as the Romans do", " ..because the contemporary Rome's are polyglot places in which the ties that bind are increasingly procedural and universalistic" (Idem, p.255).

2.5   Interculturalisim

Interculturalism as a model for integration and management for ethno cultural diversity and can be seen as a reaction to the past 25 years of multiculturalism. It has its roots in the EU and COE, the latter produced a white paper on Intercultural Dialogue in 2008, promoting the approach as a "forward-looking model for managing cultural diversity" (COE 2008, p.3). The basic principles in interculturalism are not exclusive to the model as it incorporates fundamentals such as the need to combine official language, a legal

framework and territorial unity with symbolic elements that encourage identity, collective memory, and belonging The principle of recognition is at the core of the approach, and has this feature in common with multiculturalism. A pluralistic mindset and the practice of accommodation are also characteristics of the model, and can be found in other models such as multiculturalism. Bouchard mentions seven main characteristics of interculturalism and underlines that the model operates on two levels, the societal or macro level, defining principles for integration policy and micro level or so called interculturally, the relations in the community or neighbourhoods. In the following I will briefly describe the seven characteristics (Bouchard 2011, pp.437-443).

2.5.1 *"A majority/minority duality"*

Firstly, Interculturalisim is part of the so-called duality paradigm, one of the important aspects being the focus on minority/majority relations and the tensions associated with it. It can be exemplified by the anxiety a majority culture feels when facing cultural minorities, creating a threat in terms of rights, values, traditions, language, memory and identity, as well as security. This duality can lead to anxiety on behalf of the minority group, when it fears for its own values and culture. Insecurity and the reciprocal mistrust that can arise will accentuate the unwanted us/them duality (Idem, p.444).

2.5.2 *"A process of interaction"*

The importance of interactions, exchanges, connections and intercommunity initiatives are crucial aspects in this model, favouring negotiations and mutual adjustments as a form of interaction, albeit upholding respect for the values of the host society as inscribed by law, balance, conciliation and reciprocity are core to the interaction processes of interculturalism. This defining trait that interculturalisim advocates is termed "intergrationary" pluralism, Bouchard uses the term "integretionism" to emphasize strong integration of diverse coexisting traditions and cultures, this can be seen as contrary to multiculturalism that can lead to fragmentation (Idem, p.448).

2.5.3 *"The principle of harmonisation: a civic responsibility"*

A condition for integration is a genuine culture of interaction and mutual adjustments, making all citizens responsible for upholding intercultural relations, even when facing inevitable incompatibilities in the everyday life, both at institutional and community level. This perspective presupposes the existence of an ethic of exchange and negotiation, which is also one incentive for scepticism towards the model. Interculturalism sees it as the obligation of all citizens to contribute to mutual adjustments and accommodations and encourages creative initiatives on a micro social level. Four avenues for action are outlined, with as many categories as actors: the judicial system, the state including its subsidiaries, civil institutions/organisations and individuals/ groups implementing through both work and living environment (Idem, p.448).

2.5.4 *"Integration and identity"*

A key aspect of interculturalism is integration of diverse coexistence of traditions and cultures. Integration defined here as "the totality of mechanisms and processes of insertion (or assimilation) that constitute the social bond, which is further cemented by its symbolic and functional foundation" (Idem, p.449). Again emphasise is placed upon engaging all citizens in these processes and mechanisms, and should function on multiple levels and dimensions (individual, community, institutional, and state) and (economic, social, cultural, and so forth). The concept of integration on a cultural level is without any assimilationist associations. With this point of departure interculturalism promotes a certain type of pluralism that Bouchard defines as "integrationary", meaning a form of integration that is respectful of diversity. Integration is promoted through interaction and connection, to build down stereotypes and facilitate the process. Exclusion is therefore unacceptable on multiple levels; morally, legally, sociological and pragmatic. However, interculturalism also recognizes the right of ethno religious groups to organize themselves in small communities that are not fully integrated in the majority society, but respectful of the law (Idem, p.449).

2.5.5 *"Elements of Ad hoc precedence for the majority culture"*

A fundamental distinction of Interculturalisim allows for a so-called ad hoc approach towards the recognition of some elements of precedence for the majority culture. The ad hoc or non-formalised aspect of these elements is important however, otherwise the risk of creating a two classes society would be present. This aspect of Inteculturalism differentiates from radical republican in that it does not use the justification of universalism to grant a systematic a priori superiority to the majority or foundational culture where vulnerability to abuse of power becomes eminent. However it is important that the character and reach of ad hoc precedence is vigilantly constrained so as to avoid excesses of ethnicism while allowing for some advantages, or protections for the majority culture (Idem, p.449).

The justification of the standard can be found in a number of incentives. Firstly Bouchard highlights the concept of identity. The majority culture can legitimately maintain some contextual preceding elements of cultural and symbolic heritage that serve as the foundation of its identity and that facilitate continuity based on its seniority or history. Bouchard (2011) suggests that these elements of precedence exist in all societies, even the most liberal or civic orientated. One reason being history and custom, while the principle of cultural neutrality of nation-states is pronounced and wanted, it is not a part of the everyday reality. Bouchards (2011) points out that there is a discrepancy within academia concerning if, on the one hand, the inevitability of cultural neutrality is regrettable or on the other an advantage for legitimising the consolidation of national identity. Another argument is that the practice can be understood as a form of accommodation, where minorities seeking to harmonize through mutual adjustments accord to majorities in line with the basic principles of interculturalism, namely reciprocity. A legal argument supporting this practice is the principle of antecedence. UNESCO highlighted diversity on a global scale and by doing so supported the principle of preserving majority cultures. Lastly the argument of contextual precedence entails that all societies need a symbolic basis such as common identity, memory, belonging etc, to maintain

their equilibrium, existence and development, as the legislative structure does not ad-equately fulfil this purpose. This becomes especially evident in situations of crisis, change or conflict/tensions (Idem pp.451-460).

2.5.6 *"A common culture"*

A common culture is the sixth component of Interculturalisim and has its basis in the preceding components. A consequence of integration aims and the dynamic of interac-tions is the development of a sense of belonging and identity, which incorporates itself into initial belongings and identities, allowing for a common culture or a national cul-ture to take form. Over time both the majority and minority culture will change. How-ever, the majority culture will, as mentioned in the previous section, experience less im-pact of change (Idem, p.460).

2.5.7 *"The search for equilibrium"*

Balance and mediation between competing interest, value systems and expectations is a major goal for the Interculturalistic approach. Bouchard describes it as a "sustained ef-fort aimed at connecting majorities and minorities, continuity and diversity, identity and rights, reminders of the past and visions of the future" (Idem, p.461). He suggests that over time it is not improbable that the majority/minority dichotomy will disintegrate, either creating a unity composed of both cultures or that one culture will dissolve. This would ultimately lead to a separation from the intercultural model (Idem, p.461).

2.6 Citizenship and inclusion

Today the entry and settlement of immigrants poses questions of what constitutes the contemporary nation-state and what is understood as the preconditions for access to na-tionality and hence citizenship. The essence of citizenship is according to Marshalls (1950, p.149) classic definition, social inclusion and membership. Full membership into society includes the same access to civil, political and social rights, forming the defini-tion of citizenship. The civil rights secure persons right to liberty, such as freedom of

speech, thought and faith the right to justice and to own property and conclude contracts. The right to vote and be elected are envisaged in the political rights and the social rights are claiming the rights to an adequate standard of living that are covered by the welfare state and educational system (Idem, p. 149). Marshalls theory was developed in a culturally homogenous setting in the 1950 thus the relevance of his theory in multiethnic society such as Norway can been discussed, particularly due to the lack of recognition for cultural rights, that have become a dominant feature in academic and political debates on diversity and integration. Today three criteria's decent, birthplace and naturalization are commonly applied when deciding entitlement to nationality in the modern nation-state. Decent is the most important principle, however different priorities have been given according to different historical circumstances, i.e.: demographic-economic, military interests and perception of the national community and the definition of nationhood (Stolcke 1995, p. 20).

According to Glick Schiller (2003, pp. 576-610), the project of nation-state reached a new level of development with the emergence of the welfare states, as the primary aim is to integrate individuals in a society within a sovereign territory around a common past, shared culture, and mutual solidarity towards the society. Citizenship in this context is reflected in, the legal system, the sovereign in the political system, the nation in the cultural system, and the solidarity group in the social system. These systems are involved in reproduction of a hegemonic view in which individuals or groups are aimed to become integrated into the societies. The process of nation- building is then suggested to be the state's attempts to create an isomorphism between individuals and the nation-state (Glick Schiller 2003, pp. 576-610).

True citizenship is something beyond pro forma legal equality, the right to equal respect and access to resources and opportunities are also fundamental elements of belonging. In his article concerning "racial relations and citizenship" in the US Ibarrola-Armendariz (2010, pp.1-4) argues that there is a tendency to believe that the legal system of a

county and the political rights of citizenship are effective instruments in regulating and transform social relations, However, American history demonstrates how laws and legislation only become useful if they are accompanied by a transformation in attitudes and behaviour. Contemporary statistics show, there are by far higher proportions of Blacks and Latinos in prison, or unemployed, or homeless. This picture has implications for the understanding of citizenship, and exemplifies how structural inequality is related with race divisions and race relations (Ibarrola-Armendariz 2010, pp. 1-4).

2.7 Contact and conflict theory

The "Contact hypothesis" states that diversity fosters interethnic tolerance and social solidarity. According to Allports (1954, p.489) social psychologist hypothesis the more interaction people participate in with others of diverse racial and ethnic background the increase in trust. Ethnocentric attitudes are reduced by diversity and out-group trust and solidarity increases (Puntham 2007, p.141). However, there a certain limitations to the theory, among others is the factor that the contact needs to take place between people who perceive themselves as equal in status, appropriate conditions play an important role in the contact situation. Puntham (Idem) points out however that the majority of empirical studies show opposite results, and conflict theory supports this assumption suggesting that diversity promotes out-group distrust and in-group solidarity, one of the main causes for this being contention over limited recourses. Evidence of this is demonstrated in a large number of studies and on all levels of society ranging form land studies to local community practices, all show that in-group trust and out-group trust are negatively correlated (Puntham 2007, p.141).

2.8 Social Capital and trust

The importance of feeling trust towards others and an attachment to the community has been highlighted as vital to the integration processes in a society (Morales 2011, p7). Puntham has developed the social capital model that is valuable when determining the level of trust in the interaction with others. The central idea of social capital is that net-

works and the associated norms of reciprocity have value. Puntham (2007, p.1) defines social capital as social networks and associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness. Social networks have value for people that are in them and have demonstrated externalities creating, both public and private forms of social capital.

The concept of social capital is not homogenous and can be viewed as multidimensional, constituting of highly formal networks of multiplex forms that are densely interlaced, where reciprocity can easily be developed and interconnected, but can also be built on so-called thin forms, or informal, described as very casual social connections. Important elements in the theory are bonding and bridging. Bonding refers to connecting to people who resemble you in an essential manner and bridging is connecting to people that are unlike you in an essential manner. Bonding and bridging to not exclude the other in any way; high bonding can be compatible to high bridging or visa a versa (Puntham 2000, p.2). In contrast to both contact and conflict theories (see under) Putham finds in his prize-awarded study (2007) that diversity actually reduces both in-group and out-group solidarity, thus concluding that neither conflict nor contact theory correspond to the social reality in contemporary America (Puntham 2007, p.148). I will elaborate in more detail in the following section.

2.8.1 Does immigration decrease Social Capital?

Puntham (2007) examines the implication of immigration and ethnic diversity for social capital. In his recent work "Diversity and Community in the Twenty First Century" he demonstrated that social capital was inversely related to diversity, he finds that immigration and ethnic diversity challenge social solidarity and inhibit social capital. However he states that this is not necessarily a long-term situation but that "successful immigrant societies create new forms of social solidarity and dampen the negative effects of diversity by constructing new, more encompassing identities. Thus, the central challenge for modern, diversifying societies is to create a new, broader sense of 'we" (Puntham 2007, p.138)

2.8.2   The impact of institutional and policy framework on trust

Kesler & Blomraad (2010, p.325) study that addresses the question: "does diversity undermine the willingness of citizens to trust one another, participate in collective endeavours and to be politically engaged". They find that increased immigrant diversity does not produce declining collective-mindedness, rather, the direction and strength of the relationship depend on institutional and policy context. They define the phenomena of collective-mindedness as: social trust, civic engagement and political participation, making the concept a broader definition than that of Punthams social capital. The study demonstrates that those countries with an institutional or policy framework who endorses economic equality, recognition and accommodation of immigrant minorities experience less dramatic or no declines in collective mindedness (Kesler & Blomraad 2010, p.326). Misztal also claims "democratic systems rely on trust generated by familiarity and on trust produced by institutional structures and legal regulations"(2005, p.190). It is a fundamental component for democracy on both societal and relational levels; the basis for democracy would disappear without trust (Idem).

2.9   Diversity and identity

The sense of collective identity has changed greatly in all western societies, and Norway is no exception. The changing nature of personal identities and the different components formed by increasing diversity, such as faith, locality, ethnicity and nationality change the perception of how minority and majority groups interoperates our collective identity. Identity is closely linked with diversity, as diversity itself can be conceived in terms of socially constructed identities (Puntham 2007, p.159) moreover it has an effect on social interaction. When social distance is small, there is a perception of common identity, closeness and collective experiences. When social distance is big however, people understand and treat the other as belonging to a different category. Social distance will in turn depend on our social identity, our perception of who we are; identity in itself is socially constructed, and can be socially de-constructed and re-constructed. This form of

social change is an ongoing occurrence in all dynamic and changing societies. Thus the process of adaption towards immigration and diversity will require the reconstruction of social identities, by all citizens in this diverse society (Idem, p.156).

Sen highlights the importance of freedom of choice when selecting ones identity, and not least freedom to priorities which identity we choose to emphasize, if one prefers French, Muslim, Arab, and so fourth, or a common civil identity. He discusses how choice and freedom play an important role in determining identity from a philosophical viewpoint, and challenges "the appalling affects of the miniaturisation of people" (Sen 2006, p.16) that occurs through the classification and categorization of people. He further argues that cultural theorists that create identity through a singular connection to nationality, ethnicity, religion, culture etc present a limited perception of the distinctiveness of human beings and ignores the internal diversity of groups and the history in which human relationships have developed. Sen sees Huntingdon's theory "the clash of civilizations" (where Huntingdon argues that the post-Cold War will be marked by cultural confrontations as opposed to ideological confrontations), as exaggerated and has little to do with contemporary reality (Idem, p.43). Moreover, by only focusing on single identities when confronting tensions in society by for example making general assumptions concerning one group such as; *all* Somalis have many children, uphold inaccurate stereotypes and do not open up for different manners of connection such as common civil identity. This fixed notion of identity has been used historically to form injustice and bigotry against specific groups for political ends as Churchill's statement (1943) given as an explanation of the Bengal famine is an example of " Indians breed like rabbits" (Idem, p.106). Sen argues that conflict and violence are sustained in our society by the illusion of a unique identity, and the world is evermore divided by religion or "cultures" or civilisation" that focus little on other ways of how people perceive themselves such as through class, gender, profession, language, litterateur, science, music, morals or politics (Idem, p.38).

2.10   Culture

Promoting the coexistence of diverse cultures is also a form of promoting "multiple avenues of happiness" an underlying premise for improving the life chances of many (Heller 1996, p 28). Heller distinguishes between 3 levels or kinds of culture: culture of everyday life, high culture, and level of cultural discourse. I will focus on the latter level, as it is most relevant for my analysis. The level of cultural discourse, meaning that everything can be understood in this context; social, political, economical concepts can be seen as "culture" not primarily because the themes are maters of culture but due to discourse itself constitutes culture, problematising and creating issues through reflection (Heller 1996, p.26). Heller emphasize that understanding culture, which is essentially a holistic concept requires a contextual approach, thus culture cannot be addressed trans-contextually but understood in a specific context and furthermore not as something that is right or wrong, but different according to the different contexts (Heller 1996, p.28).

2.10.1 Culture: relativistic or ethnocentric approach?

Cultural ethnocentrism promotes the notion that one's own culture is superior all others. It is the notion that other cultures should be considered by the extent to which they live up to our cultural standards, viewing culture through the narrow lens of our own. Geertz defines ethnocentrism as being "Imprisoned in the immediacy of its own detail, it is presented as self-validating, or, worse, as validated by the supposedly developed sensitivities of the person who presents it; any attempt to cast what it says in terms other than its own is regarded as a travesty"(Geertz 1973, p24). However ethnocentrism is needed to a small extent, as a kind of bond holding society together. A group's belief in the superiority of its own way of life binds its members together and helps them to keep alive their values. Ethnocentrism prevents building bridges between cultures, however, it is maladaptive. When one culture is motivated by ethnocentrism to trespass on another, the harm done can be vast, as history has revealed. The path from this form of ethnocentrism to racism, beliefs, actions that exclude individuals or groups from equal exercise of human

rights and fundamental freedoms are short (Nanda & Warms 2007, p.17-18). Geertz highlights that modern ethnocentrism can be found in developed national political institutions, and underlines the importance that the processes of governments can advance freely without seriously threatening the cultural framework of personal identity, also that the existence of a dominating culture in the general society do not radically distort political functioning. He furthermore describes a tension in states between the need to maintain a socially ratified personal identity and the desire to construct a powerful national community (Geertz 1973, p308).

Cultural relativism refers to the concept that a people's values and customs must be understood within the culture of which they are a part, and not be evaluated according to the values of other culture. Culture is in this perspective analyzed through a reference to ones own histories and cultural traits, understood in terms of the cultural whole (Nanda & Warms 2007, p.20). Geertz claims that: "cultural relativism helps us to see that our own culture is only one design for living among the many in the history of humankind"(Geertz 1973, p.40). Every culture has a logic that makes sense to its own members, by becoming aware of cultural alternatives, we are better able to see ourselves as others see us and to use that knowledge to make constructive changes in our own society. Through looking at the "other," we come to understand ourselves (Nanda & Warms 2007, p.21). Critiques question the cultural relativist assertion, saying that despite encountering "alien cultures" no one has experienced a culture so extremely different as to be completely incomprehensible or uninterpretable to outsiders, successful integration processes are an example of this, where modification and adaption to other customs or beliefs has been successful, and that there is such a thing as a universal human nature. Another risk with applying the cultural relativistic approach is that it can overemphasise the rights of a group over the rights of individuals (Zechenter 1997, p.327).

2.10.2 Parental ethnotheories

Childrearing models have been found to vary across cultures. Parental ethnotheories are cultural models that parents hold regarding children, families, and themselves as parents. The term "cultural model," has its origins from cognitive anthropology and refers to an organized set of ideas that are mutual by members of a cultural group. Similar to other cultural models related to the self, parental ethnotheories are often implicit, taken-for-granted ideas about the "natural" or "right" way to think or act. They reflect cultural beliefs about children's development and models of child rearing valued by the society, as well as being derived from the accumulated cultural experience of the community or reference group (Harkness & Super 2001, p.2-4). Acculturation can moderate the impact culture has on childrearing, it refers to the changes that occur in cultural models of parenting resulting from continuous contact with another cultural influence, as can be seen in the case of immigration. However the process of acculturation is diverse and depends on many factors, such as parents and attitudes to cultural assimilation. Studies have shown that changes in parent's childrearing beliefs and behaviours both across generations of migrant parents and within one generation, depending on the time of residence spent in the host society (Wise & Silva 2007, p. 2-5).

2.10.3 Cultural fundamentalism

Cultural differences and cleavages are conceptualised in new ways as a result of immigration and migration. A common populist statement used by both media and politicians concerning the consequences of immigration is that third world immigrants pose a threat to the national unity of the host society due to their cultural differences. Stolke (1995, p.3) argues that this threat of cultural estrangement or alienation is rhetoric of exclusion and can be moreover identified as a new form of racism that developed in the seventies where emphasises on the distinctiveness of cultural identity, traditions and heritage is underlined in the discourse. She furthermore describes how history has shaped the understanding of citizenship and belonging, but states that this is not the

cause for the continuity of the political traditions, as every period interoperates history according to its needs. She concludes that the differentiated national political agendas of the two contrasting models of integration in France and Britain have been employed to legitimate an increasing hostility towards immigrants (Stolke 1995, p.7-9).

A topic of intense discussion in the discourses of contemporary integration policies is how much space should be given to national and regional cultures and identities, as this question challenges the very core of national sovereignties. Anti-immigration sentiments and policies are often rationalised by the concepts of cultural identity and distinctiveness. Advocates such as right and centre-right politicians, media etc often lead a rhetoric that induces fear and spreads social discontent attributing crime and declining socioeconomic opportunities and poverty to immigrants. Using terms that increase the scale of the "problem" such as "immigration flood". Another argument that is commonly used refers to a ethnologist term, the territorial imperative, a alleged fact that populations, but among animals, will protect their territory against "intruders" when they exceed a specific proportion 12-25%, because otherwise acute social tensions will arise (Idem).

2.10.4 The distinction between racism and cultural fundamentalism

As racism is politically incorrect, Stolke (1995, p.7) claims as mentioned previously that cultural fundamentalism has become the new rhetoric of exclusion, where exposing boundaries and differences highlight relations between cultures. The commonalities of racism and cultural fundamentalism are described as both underlining the notion that there is a difference between humans but they do so in different ways, racism operates with race as the criterion of classification and cultural fundamentalism focuses on the way immigrants are perceived as the foreigner, stranger, and alien as opposed to the national, the citizen, the cultural "other". Moreover the distinction between racism and cultural fundamentalism is that the latter highlights the so-called "problem" of immigration as a political threat to the national identity and integrity. This due to immigrants

cultural diversity being seen as a threat to the very fundament of the nation-state that is built on a bound and distinct community that shares a mutual sense of belonging and loyalty built on common language, cultural traditions, and beliefs (Idem, p.15).

Stolke (1995) explains the power relations between extra communitarian countries as providers for the basis of cultural fundamentalism. The exploitation that "they" have undergone is an explanation for why they are the target of exclusion and not for example North Americans. Fitzpatrick agrees with Stolcke (1995) that, "not all strangers are equally strange" (Idem) and that cultural fundamentalism differ in acceptance of different cultures, nationality and citizenship are also inherent in a the common cultural heritage that the territorial state and its inhabitants are bound by, and this also is the root for the cultural fundamentalism (Idem).

2.10.5 Culture and Ethnicity

Barth (1969) (referred to in Wimmer 2008, p.982) claimed that ethnic boundaries were not created and preserved due to dissimilarity in cultural content, but that these boundaries were constructed with the aim to pursue a political or otherwise instrumental goal. It is common when applying the term ethnic that cultural characteristics are drawn on in particular when they can be used to accentuate a difference between *us* and *them*. Ethnic boundaries between groups can be considered as constructions that are situational, contextual, and changeable, rather than entities that are inherent reflections of the essence of different cultures (Idem).

2.10.6 Culture and power; the power to define what is right and wrong

On an institutional level minority cultures often suffer from unintended structural disadvantages due to a lack of status, power, resources and support from the majority. Social recognition of cultural difference and cultural recognition as an individual struggle are therefore linked to barriers in the power structures of society, where various ethnic categories and groups are unequally endowed. The immigrant can be seen as having a neg-

ative capital as the point of departure in a Norwegian society, and thus the tension can be perceived as a collective rather than an individual struggle (Alghasi et al, 2009 p.7). Foucault sees power as something that lies implicit within knowledge regimes; through the discourses that dominate in a social field we perceive what is a truth or false, right or wrong, normal or abnormal. A discourse is both a construction and constructs' social practice, forming rules for what is accepted and not. The truth in this understanding is a constructed and knowledge and power are the premises for mutual existence. This will then have consequences and implications for what one sees or does not see (Juul 2010, p. 128).

3 Methodology, research design and methods

This chapter gives an account of research design and methods of data collection, chosen constructs and population sample, adopted in order to answer the research questions. Details from the research analysis, the dependability, credibility, confirmability and transferability of the study are also discussed in the following chapter.

3.1 Limitations of the thesis

Due to both limited data and time the thesis is mainly of an exploratory nature, where the goals have been to understand and generate some ideas about the phenomena of mistrust between the CWS and Somalis, however the study also has a explanatory element as it seeks to explain within the limited framework the observed phenomena, and questions why this mistrust has arisen, it furthermore attempts to identify some casual factors of the encountered phenomenon (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.28).

3.2 Research design

The research design links the data to the initial questions of study (Yin 2003, p.25). In order to answer the RQs and conduct an interpretive analysis, a case study approach has been applied. Yin (2003, p.136) introduces five components of a research design especially important for case studies: RQs, research propositions, unit of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions and the criteria for interpreting the findings.

3.3 A case study based research design

When studying a complex social process and contemporary phenomenon such as integration processes and in particular examining the interaction and dynamics between the Somali population and child welfare system in Norway in concrete empirical situations, case studies are a suitable research strategy (Yin 2003, p.175). Interpretive case studies lay considerable emphasis on situational and often structural contexts, and allow investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life processes (Idem) so as to discover the wide variety of social, cultural, and political factors that can potentially relate to the phenomenon of mistrust (Bhattacherjee 2012, p 94). An inherent

strength with case study is that is allows for multilevel analysis, the research has both an individual and organizational perspective. I will examine both personal interactions/interpretations on a micro level and the assess policies regarding immigration and integration that are on a organizational/institutional level.

3.4   Population and sampling

An objective of the case study is to develop propositions about a specific phenomenon that can be tested in similar situations at a later stage (Idem p.65). The results of this study are related to the emerging body of research within integration processes in the Norwegian context however the propositions developed from this study can also be tested for instance in relation to other forms of new research within the field of integration, interculturalisim, diversity management and CWS in the European or Scandinavian context, thus leading to a possible generalization and theory development. As focus is given to Somalis in Norway and the mistrust to the CWS it may be possible to draw some implications for the interaction between the CWS and other immigrant groups and also the integration processes of Somalis in other Scandinavian or European countries. While the primary unit of analyses is the relationship between the CWS and Somalis in Oslo the level of analysis is integration processes at large.

Sampling is the statistical process of selecting a subset ("sample") from a population of interest so as to infer patterns of behaviour within that population. Therefore it is of great importance that one selects a sample that is truly representative of the population so as to make it possible to generalize the inference and derive it back to the population of interest. After identifying the unit of analyses to be Somalis in Oslo, which in some aspect are linked with the topic ((Idem). I sought to establish the sampling frame by locating the key actors involved in specific CWS cases mentioned in the media. After this the case studies were strategically selected, and I choose the relevant actors using non-probability sampling by selecting both expertise within the field of integration and snowball sampling (Berg 2001, p.33). The latter method can be applied independently

of the level of analyses used and was useful as some of the interviewees posed difficult to reach. Given the uncertainty in each method I combined them.

In order to gain a broader understanding of the interaction between the CWS and Somalis I choose to interview different kinds of actors such as IGOs, NGOs, academics and researchers, a Somali female lawyer, and Somali politicians. The large number of actors contributed to a large amount of data that was to be coded and interoperated, due to the limited time this posed as a challenge. See, annex 2 for list of actors that where interviewed.

3.5 Operationalisation of the research questions into constructs

To answer the RQs, they were organised into constructs that have both a unidirectional and multidimensional character. Culture became a central construct as did trust further-more elements such as ethnicity, identity, citizenship and power where taken into consideration the process of conceptualisation. Throughout the interview process the constructs where corrected and adjusted several times to capture the phenomena better. This is a valuable characteristic of interpretative research (Bhattacherjee 2012, p.96).

3.6 Data sources and collection

In the process of collecting data I applied an interpretive method employing an inductive approach and using predominantly qualitative data to generate insight into the phenomenon at hand (Bhattacherjee 2012). Sources of evidence have different strengths and weaknesses, thus the use of multiple sources enforces the evidences (Yin, 2003, p.180). As recommended when conducting research the data was collected in several ways thus triangulating the evidence (Berg 2001, p.5). The empirical material was mainly gathered through interviews and text analysis of documents. In addition information was gained through conducting one focus interview, several group interviews and observing a demonstration against the CWS in Oslo on the 8th of may 2013. A case study becomes more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information (Yin, 2003, p.186). The use of multiple sources of evidence was applied

to avoid researcher bias, and to increase the validity of the research.

3.7 Documentary sources

The literature review was an important part of the research planning and development of the interview guide. After reading relevant external and internal literature and documentation on integration processes, reports on Somalis in Norway, CWS reports and legislation, governmental strategy documents, white papers, annual reports, websites, newspaper articles, information about integration and immigration processes, actors and the controversies and barriers related to the phenomenon of mistrust were obtained. These sources furthermore provided supporting evidence and further insight to the empirical discoveries (Berg 2001, p.206).

3.8 Interviews

In total 23 interviews were conducted, in total I spoke to 27 informants. 9 interviews were background interviews. They where all semi-structured, open-ended, in-depth interviews, all but 2 where executed face-to-face and lasted between half an hour and two hours and were executed during April and May of 2013. Additionally, I conducted one group interview that I will elaborate further on in the following chapter. The interviewees were selected on the basis of their extensive knowledge about integration processes and the Somalis relationship to the welfare system at large, but also in particular the CWS. After making initial contact with Somali resource persons that I had previous knowledge of and Somalis that had been depicted in the media, I used snowball sampling to select additional respondents. During the interviews a guideline (see appendix 1) was partly used, but new information along the way resulted in new questions. Data collection never entirely ceases because coding and memoing continue to raise fresh questions. Thus, the interviews were focused, but open-ended, the respondents were asked about the facts of a matter, as well as their opinions about events. In line with Yins (2003, p.176) recommendations, some of the respondents were asked to propose own insights into certain occurrences. Their propositions were used in further

inquiries.

3.8.1 Focus group research

Can be described as a type of research that entails bringing a small group of subjects together and discussing a phenomenon of interest for a period of 60-120 minutes. The focus group consisted of 5 Somali men with diverse background; a elder leader, a politician and representative for the Somali community, a pilot and elder, a psychologist, and another Somali man, all with in-depth understanding of the relationship between the Somali community and the CWS. The participant's comments and experiences helped build a holistic understanding of the complex situation and was the basis for choosing this research design. Although this form of research has its limitations, such as no internal validity and that the findings cannot be generalized to other settings due to sample size, together with the case study this research design helps generate a deeper insight into the issue at stake. Furthermore the combination of different techniques can lead to a greater diversity of data (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.40)

3.9   Research Quality

Important in all social science is the rigor of research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) (referred to in Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110) have provided an alternative set of criteria that can be used to judge the rigor of interpretive research. I have chosen this as a basis and guideline for securing the rigor of data.

3.9.1 Dependability

The concept of dependability is similar to that of reliability in a positivist research. To ensure dependability it is important to provide adequate details about the phenomena that are being investigated, and furthermore the social context in which it arises from, so as to allow the reader to independently authenticate their interpretive inferences (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110). To overcome these challenges I have given a in-depth descriptive outline of the Somalis situation in Norway and moreover described in detail the so-

cial context that the phenomena has arisen in by giving an account for the immigration processes, diversity management and integration policies in Norway. The details are derived primarily from state reports and relevant previous studies.

3.9.2   Credibility

Credibility in interpretive research is similar to internal validity, as it emphasises causal relationship. The credibility of the inferences of the research increases when they are perceived trustworthy. To increase this certain methods can be applied, including demonstrating triangulation across subjects or data techniques, maintaining accurate data management and analytical procedures, and so fourth, allowing for an independent audit of the methodology if necessary. To meet these challenges, an outline of the thesis, time schedule, case study protocol and question guide were established in an early phase, prior to data collection. Furthermore a triangulation has been applied as described in the above chapter (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110).

3.9.3   Confirmability

Confirmability is akin to the notion of objectivity, and can be found if others independently confirm the research. To meet this demand I sent parts of the thesis to key informants for feedback so as to confirm the data that is applied (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110).

3.9.4   Transferability

Transferability refers to if the findings of the research can be generalised to other settings, similar to the concept of external validity in functionalistic research method. To improve the transferability one can provide a so-called "thick description" of elements such as structures, assumptions, and processes exposed from the data, allowing the reader to evaluate if the findings are transferable (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110). The transferability of the case studies in this thesis is enhanced by the strategic selection of cases. Case study designs are theoretical, generalizing from a study to a theory, designed to help develop, refine and test theories. They use the logic of replication. The findings

give some indication of the complexity of the integration processes and particularly related to the dynamics and interaction between the CWS and Somalis. It may shed some light on the challenges both actors face when interacting, such as the mistrust, interpretation of culture and causes for communication barriers. Moreover an impression of how to manage these challenges and similar problems that arise in integration processes can be gained (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.111).

3.10 Data coding/reduction and analysis

As the results are interpreted, the coding or reduction of data and analysis is an essential part during the research. Qualitative data needs to be reduced and transformed so as to understand and access the various themes and patterns (Berg 2001, p. 35). The data were analyzed using the interpretive method "sense- making", as it was considered the most appropriate methodology for understanding the data at hand as it is derived from complex social phenomena's. The transcripts where read through to give a sense of the whole and then to establish "units of significance" that can faithfully represent the interviewee's subjective and objective experience (Bhattacherjee. 2012, p.110). Important statements concerning the main constructs where gathered systematised and analysed, often sentence by sentence or phrase by phrase to find relevant comparison and patterns in the data (Berg 2001, p. 35).

3.11 Ethics

"Ethics is the moral distinction between right and wrong" (Bhattacherjee 2012, p.146). The principle of informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity and disclosure have been abided by and where necessary provided for in this research. The information gained during interviews and presented in this thesis has been clarified with the respondents. Due to strategic reasons not all information about the actors can be revealed. Furthermore the data collection, analysis, and interpretation procedures have been conducted in a way that is in line with the principles of science.

4 Immigration, the Norwegian welfare model, diversity management and integration policies: an overview

4.1 Norway's immigrant population: a historical overview

Norway has traditionally been considered an ethnically homogeneous country, although one has become increasingly aware of the heterogeneity that exists in society, formed by the national minorities such as the Sami, Finnish, Rom and other travellers, as well as a small Jewish population- "Kvener"; furthermore, immigrants from neighbouring countries have always been present. During the last 4 decades there has been an increase in the number of immigrants and their descendants in Norway. The flow of migration is a result of both internal processes being various societal phenomena such as labour demand due to an expanding economy, family reunification and an influx of refugees caused by war and conflict (Haagensen el. al 2010, pp. 9-10). Norway has rejected membership of European Union (EU) however it is part of the European Economic Area (EEA) making most EU regulations concerning migration and free movement of persons that are party to the EEA applicable to Norway (Østby 2013, p.7). Norway furthermore implemented the Schengen agreement in 2001 and joined the Dublin II convention in 2003.

In broad terms the migration waves to Norway over the last 50 years showed shifts in the late sixties, a steady increase in the period 1971-1985, an unstable period in 1985 -2000, followed by an unprecedented increase in immigration and net migration since 2005. This migration pattern has occurred despite the immigration ban on labour migration that was introduced in 1974, based on justification arguments voicing that present integration problems should be solved before giving access to more immigrants. The majority of immigrants from developing countries since 1970 have been refugees, asylum seekers and immigration based on family reunion (Østby 2013, p.7). At the start of 2013 14,1% of Norway's population had an immigrant background originating from 220 different countries, and making diversity the norm in Norwegian society.1, 593,300

are immigrants and 117,100 are born in Norway to immigrant parents, making a total of 710,465 persons with immigrant background. The number of immigrants and Norwegian- born to immigrant parents grew by 55 300 in 2012, the highest growth rate since records began. Polish immigrants are the largest group with a total of 77,000 persons (Østby 2013, p.7).

4.2   The Norwegian welfare model

Norway has a relatively long history as a inclusive welfare state starting already in the 1940s, based on universal rights for all residing in the county such as child allowances, pensions for old age, sickness and disability etc. (Østby 2013, p.7)(Bengtson, Stømblad, Bay 2010, p.18). Today the standard of living is higher and the socioeconomic inequalities in Norway are smaller than many. Norway has been less influenced by the financial crisis in Europe than most countries, especially concerning economic growth and unemployment, this mainly due to the economic resources created by oil income and other raw materials (Østby 2013, p.7). Social democratic regime types have traditionally dominated the political agenda forming the Norwegian welfare model that is characterised by a strong support for collective welfare in the form of inclusive health and social insurance systems, allowing for a high provision level. There is also a prevalent recognition of the political goals of social equality and full employment, as I will describe in more detail in the following chapters, making Norway a particularly inclusive welfare state.

4.3   The Norwegian child welfare system: Overview of policy and practice

Norway has in line with the social democratic welfare policies a long tradition of providing welfare services for families. This entails a wide range of family services, where most are fully subsidised by the tax system, such as public schools system from primary education to universities, health/medical services, and childcare services. Some ''welfare'' activities are partially subsidised; kindergarten, after school programs etc. The social security system also provides a broad range of family allowances i.e. single

parent benefits that are universal and independent of parental income. Additionally, means- tested social assistance is provided if needed. Traditionally there has been a low levels of poverty among children due to the distributive tax systems, however a recent study suggested that the proportion of children in Norway in relative poverty has grown from 5.1% in 2000 to 7.9% in 2006 (Kojan 2011, pp.443-446).

The CWS, which is a family- and welfare-oriented system, is based on the principles of support, prevention, equality of opportunities, and early intervention (Kojan 2011, p.444). It is ''need based'', entailing that all reports of concerns are assessed by front-line staff in the municipalities. The central legislative framework for the provision of CWS is the Child Welfare Act (CWA) of 1992, whose functions are to protect children from abuse and neglect, and improve opportunities for children with poor living conditions (sections 1-1 and 4-4). The CWA is applicable to children aged 0-18 years; but can be extended until 23 years. In 2003 the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) was incorporated into the CWA, formally emphasising the right of children's participation on matters that concern their welfare (Idem). In contrast to Anglo-American approach that typically focuses on abuse, neglect and harm as preconditions to receive services, the CWS in Norway is often referred to as ''family oriented'' with a strong focus on preventive efforts. There is a wide definition of who precisely is a ''needy child'' and the notion of equality is essential in the CWA (section 4-4), reflecting the social democratic framework of the child and family policies in Norway (Idem).

Responsibility for provision of services occurs on two levels; the municipalities and the central authorities. Although the CWS is enacted legislatively on a national level, the daily activities operate on a local level. The Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth, and Family Affairs (Bufetat) is a centralised authority, responsible for the recruitment and provision of out-of-home care, i.e. foster homes and institutions. The local CWS (municipalities) are responsible for guidance, accepting and evaluating referrals, investigating children's situations and operate as organisers, coordinators and providers of

most of the direct services (Idem).

Each municipality has a high level of political autonomy in both organising services and professional discretion in decision- making regarding responses to needs or behaviour resulting in great variation in organisation and provision of services across Norway. Thus making it difficult to conclude on the general practice of CWS. The County Social Welfare Board (Fylkesnemnda) is a quasi-court administrative body where the executive controlling organs of the municipalities are the County Governors (Fylkesmannen) that take the final decision if children should be removed from their homes as the local municipality suggests. Removals can be either made with the parents' consent or by CWS taking custody of the child by court order (Idem).

A range of avenues, such as, parents, social workers, teachers etc provide reports of concern to the local CWS if detecting a child with potential needs. When/if a formal referral is received by CWS, municipalities have a week to establish if further action is necessary. In cases of investigation, CWS gather additional information about the child and its immediate environment. An investigations typically result in one of the following options: (a) decision to intervene, either with (section 4-4 of CWA) or without (sections 4-12 and 4-24 of CWA); the approval of children (b) the child or the parents are referred to other services (i.e. family counselling, psychiatric services); or, (c) closing the case. A resolution may involve various forms of action, often combining services to both children and parents (Idem).

4.3.1   Statistics concerning immigrant children receiving measures the CWS

In 2009 there were 1426300 children/youth 0-22 years old in Norway, 11% had immigrant background. In all 46487 (3,3%) children received measures from the CWS, 2,9% had no immigrant background, 6,7% where immigrants and 5,1% decedents. The over representation receiving measures was greatest among first-generation immigrants, and concerns especially 13-17 year olds. The number of immigrants and Norwegian- born children to immigrant parents has increased from 16 % of all children with measures in

39

2004 to 21 % in 2009. 6307 children with Somali-background received measures from the CWS making them the third largest group. Regarding the Norwegian-born to Somali parents the percentage is lower 8% with 383 children receiving measures. In sum the report shows that Somalis are the third largest group receiving measures from the CWS in 2009 In 2009 the use of removal as an intervention was applied 2,6 times more often for children with minority than not. Somalis are among one of the 3 groups that experienced this most often (Kalve & Dyrhaug 2011, p.5-11).

The main reasons for interventions in minority families is physical abuse, 5,3% compared to families with no minority background at 1,2 % (Kalve & Dyrhaug 2011, p.5-11), furthermore the child's behaviour is more commonly referred to as a reason for intervention than with Norwegian children (IMDI 2012).

4.4   Immigration and integration aims and policies

The labour government (in power since 2005) has underlined inclusion and equality as central values in the integration policies. One key objective in all policies is to ensure a high participation in the labour market, the most important aim being to ensure that all Norway's residence are "able to utilize their resources and participate in the community" (NOU 2012, p.5). The white paper on integration further concludes that the overall integration of immigrants into Norwegian society is relatively good with exception of the lack of participation in the labour marked (NOU 2011,p.14). Further, reports by OECD (2009) and Holmøy and Strøm (2012) underline the integration of decedents in the labour market being better than can be found for comparable groups in most countries. According to the current Norwegian integration polices integration in concrete pragmatic terms means training, education, work/labour, living conditions and social mobility. Norwegian integration policies have consequently stated that their aim is giving those immigrants that received residence permit decent living conditions. A important factor in creating good living conditions is access to the labour marked, but due to lack of formal skills and language competence a number of measures have been put

in place. These measures have changed with time and with accordance to the composition of the immigrant groups and the needs of the labour market. The main policy responsibilities for immigrants are shared between central government and municipalities. Integration concepts such as diversity and multiculturalism have been heavily debated the past 30 years and the attitude towards them has been more in favour on a policy level than within the population at large. Policies have focuses on opening up for diversity but still prioritizing integration into education and the labour market. In 2011 the Norwegian integration policy was ranked as number 7 of 31 European countries in The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), where Sweden received top score. The MIPEX is formed of 7 policy areas: labour market mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination. In sum there are 148 policy indicators in the mentioned areas giving a score of 0,50 or 100, equal treatment was awarded the highest score. Norway received top score for political participation, otherwise receiving on average for anti-discrimination, access to nationality and long-term residence. The other indicators received between 4-8 (Østby 2013, p.14).

4.4.1 The "Norwegian" perception of immigration and integration issues

A common perceptions found in the Norwegian society regarding immigration is that it could strain the welfare state, this based on two assumptions: firstly that the contract of solidarity that is the basis of the welfare state would not be acknowledged by the native Norwegians because large number of immigrants would receive welfare rights despite not contributing to the financial basis of the welfare state. Secondly because a general impression is that the net welfare cost of immigration is to high and would destroy the basis for the welfare state (Østby 2013, p.14). Erikson claims (2013, p.5) that due to Norway being successful in maintaining a high level of welfare, security and employment, despite the economic crisis can also be a factor that has contributed to an increase of xenophobia. The perception that Norway is vulnerable due to prosperous stability in

an otherwise unstable context can be seen as an incentive to restrict the flow of immigration. A COE report (2012) underline that a common perception in all sectors of Norwegian society is that "Norway/Oslo's <u>awareness</u> of itself as a richly and irredeemably multi-ethnic place was still seriously low", and a common concern is that the realisation and acknowledgement of this fact is an obstacle to a sustainable integration process (COE, 2012. P.13).

Across the political spectrum one can also find anti-immigrant sentiments; these are especially associated with the right-wing populist Progress Part (PP). Erikson (2013, p.2) states that the Norwegian society is divided by those who defend diversity and those that fear the encroachment of Norwegian culture by immigrants, particularly Muslims, they are seen to represent values that are incompatible with the liberal individualistic and democratic ideals that are highly esteemed by the majority. The atrocities of 22nd July 2011 also uncovered a strong militant anti-immigrant (and especially anti-Muslim) fringe that regards the Norwegian pluralism as treacherous. Despite only one-third of immigrants in Norway coming from predominant Muslim countries, they are the targets for the most extreme social and political debates concerning integration. An opinion poll found that 25% of the population believes that "there are to many Muslims in the country", in Oslo where half the Muslims live the poll showed 16%. A general claim in the aftermath of 22nd July 2011 is that the Norwegian society has been unsuccessful in confronting the feelings and implications it may have for the future of a multicultural society. Throughout the trial the focus was that Breivik was mentally ill rather than extremist xenophobic and islamifobic, taking the focus from the publics own conscience, some argue the reason for this being that by suppressing contentious issues rather than a facilitating a open discussion it is easier to build social harmony (COE 2012, p 13).

4.5   Oslo as an intercultural city

Oslo is a diverse and cosmopolitan city and the fastest growing in Europe with a population of 624,000 inhabitants in 2013. Due to strong and stable economic growth and an

open labour market, Oslo is, according to COE rapport 2012 "on the way to being one of Europe's most diverse cities" (COE 2012, p.3). For the past 40 years there has been a significant body of immigrants coming to Oslo which has resulted in 30,4% of the total population (189,400 persons) having origins outside Norway and half of children and adolescents having minority identity through their own or their own parents immigration history. As of 1.1.12 Somalis are the third largest group of minorities in Oslo, constituting 12,779 1st and 2nd generation inhabitants (COE 2012, p.12). In 2012 a policy directive "city Government Decision 152/12- Diversity Opportunities" was introduced focusing on the intercultural ambitions and commitments of the city, this was a follow-up of the programme OXLO Oslo Extra Large initiative showing the city governments expression of values and political commitment for an inclusive city (Idem).

4.5.1 Civil society in Oslo

There is a large and active civil society that is concerned with diversity in Oslo plays a crucial role in diminishing racism and discrimination. Organisations highlight among other things the negative focus from the media towards minority youth as a challenge creating " an identity of low self-esteem and alienation" (COE 2012, p. 13). A NGO that is mentioned as especially interesting from an intercultural perspective in the COE report is OMOD (organisation against Institutional Discrimination), serving as an ombudsman, with a strong intercultural perspective they challenge society and key institutions including the CWS with a comprehensive reappraisal of how services should be designed and delivered. They scrutinize the central/local government polices and legislation and implementation relationship to immigrants (see analysis for details on OMODS critical review of the CWS). NGOs engaging with arts and youth have also precedence in Oslo's intercultural strategy with the aim to build down prejudice of minority youth in general, but also in arts and media as these fields are considered as being most segregated in Norwegian society (Idem).

4.6 Somalis: history and background

Somalia has a rich and diverse history and background. Due to space restrictions the following account will be limited. There are approximately 10 million Somalis living in and around Somalia, many in the neighbouring countries Kenya, Ethiopia and Djibouti. 85 % are ethnic Somalis and have historically inhabited the northern area, the remaining are minority groups living largely in the south. The northern region is dominated by semi desert consequently the main source of income is generated by nomadism and trade, due to the coastline and some small farming. The south is dominated by farming and nomadism. Today the main source of income is derived from the Somalia diaspora. Khat is also an important part of the Somali national economy that the militia is partially financed by. Somali is the common language and many speak Arabic that is the other official language, furthermore English is spoken by some in the north and Italian in the south Most Somalis are Sunni Muslims, however the role religion has played in society has undergone changes, under Siyads regime religious influence on society was minimal, today the importance of religion varies in the different regions (Ahmed, et.al. 2006, p.10).

In the late 1800 the colonial powers governed Somalia, the British in the north and Italian in the south, these differences in rule became one of the challenges that the country faced during the reunification process. After independence and the reunification of the two regions a government was democratically elected and a parliamentary system introduced. Although the idea of a Pan Somalia was strong, rivalry between clans and the different regions created tensions and growing unrest lead to a coop by Siad Barre and his supporters in 1969 (Engebretsen & Farstad 2004, p.10). Barre introduced a one party government based on scientific socialism; a model that attempted to incorporate Somali tradition and Marxism, where the clan system was forbidden. He focused on building infrastructure, enhancing education and giving women greater rights. However the many positive aspects of Barres rule did not achieve bridge building between north and south, and in the 80s his regime grew increasingly restrictive and totalitarian. Tensions

grew and the regime weakened eventually leading to the outbreak of civil war. In 1991 resistance groups overtook Mogadishu and Hargeisa, many were killed and 360,000 fled. Somaliland was declared independent, a status that is still not recognized by the international community today (Idem).

The past 20 years in Somalia have been largely dominated by chaos, war, unrest, hunger and famine, and approximately 1/3 of the population are refugees. Despite repeated attempts supported by the international community to negotiate peace and establish a functioning government the situation in Somalia still remains unstable. However through the post-transition roadmap, a political process led to the establishment of permanent democratic institutions and the new constitution was passed in august 2012 followed by the inauguration of the Federal Parliament of Somalia, the first permanent central government in the country since the start of the civil war. Despite the many challenges Somalia faces, including conflict, violence, terror, piracy, the new government brings hope for the future (Idem).

4.6.1 The Clan system (Reer)

An important part of the political organizational system in Somalia, before and now, is the clan-system, based on descent through the fathers lineage (patrilineal descent) and kinship, whereby both men and women are an integral part of their clan from birth to death and have rights and obligations tied to this commitment. The clan system has traditionally been a political, financial and social security network, and was steered by Somali traditional value system (Xeer) regulating society based on norms and rules as well as on the Koran. It also played a central role in negotiating conflicts of a different nature for example the political role the clan system has played has varied throughout history. In colonial times the clan system was abused by the colonial powers as a political tool to create status differences between groups, under Barres regime it was partly forbidden, but it has seen a revival during the last decades (Ahmed, et.al. 2006, p.10).

For newly arrived immigrants in Norway the clan system is an important network and

resource for information, however the importance of the clan seems to diminish with time of residence (Ahmed, et.al. 2006, p.10). Many Somali organizations are clan based and from a Norwegian perspective it can be difficult to ascertain if the organization represents Somalis in general or the particular clan. Many Somalis do not wish to highlight their clan allegiance due to the active role they played as political and possibly violent actors in the civil war. The Somalis I spoke to confirmed the importance of clan belonging also in exile, claiming that the group structures in Oslo today where dominated by clan-belonging, stating that they often hold greater legitimacy than state institutions in Norway (interview, 20.Informant, 22.4.13).

4.7 Somalis in Norway, today's situation: Data and factors that affect integration processes

4.7.1 Statistics and data

Most Somali came to Norway as refugees and asylum seekers after 1987 due to the unrest in the northern states in 1988. The first refugees that came to Norway where therefore from Somaliland in the North. Later the escalation of conflict spread to the south and forced president Barre into exile in 1991. More than 1 mill people fled Somalia during that year, however the number of refugees has increased since 1996. For the period 1990-2009, 19,600 Somali immigrants came to Norway; today most do so through family reunification. Somalis are the largest group of non-western immigrant groups in Norway and are in total 24000 persons. The number of Norwegian-born to Somali parents was the second largest group at 9,100, only the Pakistani had a higher birth- rate with 15,200 Norwegian-born. This also reflects the young age structure (SSB 2013. http://www.ssb.no/en/innvbef).

4.7.2 Duration of residence

Somalis are one of the newest immigrant groups, meaning they have shortest duration of residence. This can be an explanation for low scores and influences the rates and indicators that are considered significant for estimating the level of integration (Blom &

Henriksen 2009, p.12). According to a newly published SSB report (Østby 2013, p.20) the negative scores seemingly better over time, especially for descendants and younger immigrants. The duration of residence is also often mentioned as explanatory for low level of participation in society in the interviews I conducted (interview, 22.informant, 25.4.13) (interview, 12.informant, a&b 29.4.13).

4.7.3 Emigration and return

In the period 2004- 2008 the immigration rate for Somalis is higher than most immigrant groups, also in terms of age standardization showing that a significant number are moving but not necessarily returning to Somalia. Data from a survey in 2005-2006 show that almost 6 of 10 Somalis asked stated that they "didn't know" if they would return to their country of origin, this despite the political and social situation at the time being extremely unstable. This can indicate that many do not establish permanent bonds to Norway as was confirmed in interviews (interview, 25.informant, & 24.informant, 29.4.13) and is interesting in regards to integration processes that will be discussed in the analyses (Østby 2013, p.28).

4.7.4 Family situation

As mentioned previously the Somali population in Norway is much younger compared to the other immigrant population, nearly 50% are under the age of 20. Moreover they are the group with the highest birth-rate (4,4,), which can be explained by high immigration and high fertility. Statistics show that with increased duration of stay fertility also generally declines. Traditionally, families live in larger units, and often many generations together. Among Somalis from urban areas love marriages is common whereas in rural areas arranged marriage is the norm, forced marriage is not widely spread. Differences in integration are often measured by marital patterns illustrated by the partner's country background, as it can give some indication of the relations between immigrants and natives. More than 90 % of Somalis marry a person with Somali decent. Some state

(Østby 2013, p.20) that divorce is traditionally widespread in Somali society as both men and women hold equal rights based on different criteria to demand divorce. Traditions allow women to keep their rights and status within their father's clan thereby being lessening their dependence on the husband and his family. Others (Ahmed, et.al. 2006, p.10) disagree claiming it to be a phenomena that has began in Norway where approximately 30% of the Somali population live in single-parent households (Østby 2013, p.20).

4.7.5   Education
Almost 11% of the Somali population have no completed education, being the second largest group after Afghans with 12 %. Gender differences however are unusual compared with other data: females under 19 have higher educational enrolment than male, however above 19 years of age males are dominant in education rates. Education and good performance in the educational system is often considered as a prerequisite for successful integration in the labour marked giving increased work options and thereby also income (Idem p.21).

4.7.6   Participation in the labour market
Somalis have the lowest participation in the labour market, the consequences being that the main source of income for a large percentage of Somalis is state support. Women have an employment rate almost 60 % below the average in Norway, and men 40 %, the rates are lower than for any other immigrant group. This can also be partly attributed to their recent arrival. For the age group 16-24 the employment rate was only 35% lower than the national level, but the descendant's rates lie above the immigrant level, and at 50% participation the Somali descendants do almost as well as other immigrant descendants. Also the inactivity rates for Somalis were higher than for any other group and more women than men are inactive. Studies show that previous work experience and the general competence that Somali immigrants bring with them to Norway has not been

useful or relevant for the Norwegian labour market The high unemployment rates also offer challenges to integration policies, as will be discussed in the analyses (Shala, Eide 2012, p.13).

4.7.7 Living conditions

Immigrants and refugees arriving in Norway are placed in residence by the municipality, however after a certain period they are able to move and many, especially Somalis, move to Oslo and the surrounding region. 65 % of Somalis live in small flats, due to limited resources and problems accessing the rental market, this is especially challenging in the Oslo region. Many have reported that they have experienced discrimination when searching for housing, more than 4 of 10 where sure that they had been refused rent or purchase due to there ethnic origin (Henriksen 2010, p.221).

4.7.8 Poverty

The statistics indicate that a large percent of Somali families are without income earned from employed persons, resulting in varying degrees of poverty, an average Somali single parent family has a much lower income than other comparable families, despite having on average more children. Moreover in 2006-2007 almost 4 out of 10 stated that they sent money to Somalia every month (Østby 2013, p.47). Taking into account that most Somalis send money to their families in Somalia it is important to be aware of the impact that such low income can have on the family's wellbeing and the children's upbringing environment (Engebretsen & Farstad 2004, p.10).

4.8   Challenges and conflict areas for Somalis in Norway

4.8.1 Previous research

As the previous chapter indicates Somalis score lowest on many ratings compared to other immigrant groups. An report from SSB (2013) concerning results following participation in the introduction program find that Somalis have lowest rating in accessing work or education/training, whereas participants from other African countries (Eritrea,

Ethiopia and Congo) have better results each year (Normann& Egge-Hoveide 2013). Various studies show that Somalis as a group have a lack of knowledge and understanding of the Norwegian society and systems, especially the welfare system. Research conducted in other western countries has shown similar outcomes (Danso 2002; Griffiths 2002). Typically, both in Norway and other countries in W. Europe, long-term unemployment, bad living conditions, illiteracy, and a high rate of single mothers has led to problems in adapting to the available social and educational programmes. Somalis in Norway experience obstacles and problems in many situations when in contact with the majority society, particularly when interacting with public institutions (Shala, Eide 2012, p.15). Issues such as female circumcision, living conditions, use of hijab at school and workplaces, receipt of social security, high unemployment, and criminal offence have put Somalis in a negative focus in the public eye.

As previously mentioned Somalis rates and indicators are strongly influenced by their duration of residence. Østby 2013, (1999- 2009) However the study also shows that the situation seems to improve over time, although not as fast or consistently as with Iraqis, the most "comparable" immigrant group. Other important reasons for low scores in integration are lack of experience with properly functioning public institutions- this common factor has been described as distinctive for the background of many Somalis and that this "culture" furthermore has lead to a general mistrust for the public apparatus (Engebretsen & Farstad 2004, p.10). It is also probable that many other aspects of Somali background will effect the quality of their lives in the host country, such as social status in Somalia, parents social status, klan origin, whether they chose to migrate to Norway or fled due to conflict, if they belong to the ethnic majority or a minority group and whether the person grew up in the countryside or a city. All these factors and more have an impact on the integration process in Norway and consequently the adaption to the Norwegian society will naturally take time.

4.8.2 The media's role

The COE emphasizes in a report (2012, p.5) that the media is a distant but extremely influential phenomenon in Norway, despite the clear separation between media and politics, the media coverage has been characterized as negative and creating a bad reputation for diversity and immigrants in Norway. Negative focus in the media regarding Somalis as a group, highlighting low scores on living condition indexes as well as other issues can have a negative effect on individuals with Somali background The negative media attention is experienced as an extra factor in an already challenging situation (Ahmed et al 2006, p.20).

5 Analyses

5.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to critically review some of the possible root causes for the mistrust that many Somalis hold towards the CWS, however they are both multiple and complex, and due to the limited scope of this thesis I will only explore some of the potential causes. I question if the causes for mistrust can be found on many levels in society. The following chapter is therefore two-fold; the first has a macro focus discussing mainly integration policies possible impact for integration and social practice within the CWS. Examining particularly the cornerstone principle of equality and how this can pose to be a dilemma for recognizing diversity. The chapters second half will attempt to analyses the cause for mistrust through understanding the meaning of culture in the practice of the CWS and for the Somali community. Further discussing the interaction between the actors form a minority/majority perspective and examining the meaning of concepts such as identity, ethnicity, use of power.

5.2 An overview of the case

Integrerings og Mangfoldsdirektoratet (The Directorate of Integration and Diversity) (IMDI 2012) produced a report 26.9.12 with the aim to distinguish and collect feedback from the minority population regarding expectations towards public institutions concerning the need for knowledge and information. Somali among other minority groups where represented as well as the CWS and other welfare institutions. The outcome showed a variety of opinions; lack of communication, information, dialog and cultural sensitivity was underlined as the major challenges the CWS face in their present work. There was also concern about poor communication methods and lack of dialog with the immigrant population and a lack of a framework to evaluate feedback from the immigrant community. Furthermore there is no holistic approach to resolving the challenges although some individual efforts exist however lacking an overall focus. CWS representatives had differing opinions concerning the cause for mistrust and discontent with

the CWS, stating that the source of discontent expressed by minorities where physical upbringing is common was due to their (CWS) increased focus on violence in family relations. Another representative disagreed with the description of the CWS as lacking cultural sensitivity, claiming that the CWS has shown positive development in this area. Bufetat claimed that the organizational structure spreading responsibility between the state and municipalities has resulted in a lack of an overall plan for working with minorities in the CWS (Barvik & Kleven 2012, p.2).

The child ombudsman has also detected a widespread anxiety among minority parents caused by a fear of the CWS intervening in their private family matters, and fear of removal of children from their homes. They see that the CWS also has challenges finding appropriate foster-care for minority children. The situation jeopardises minority children's possibilities for receiving the care they are entitled to. The Ombud claims that there is a need to strengthen the CWS efforts to create trust and credibility with minority communities (Barneombudet 2009, p.16). Minority organizations also declare the need to build trust, stating that this would require a broad approach and with a long-term focus, by establishing cooperation between the actors on multiple levels structural/policy and with the municipalities creating channels and methods for communication (pp.1 - 10). Dyrhaug & Kvale (2011, p.10) confirm what many sources are reporting, that there is a real mistrust within certain minority communities and that a major cause for this according to minority parents is lack of cultural understanding. The CWS claim on their part that they need increased competence regarding multicultural understanding and that differentiating perspectives regarding upbringing and use of violence make it difficult for do understand the minority parents situation (Barvik & Kleven 2012, p.2).

Bashe Muse, leader of Somali network expressed grave concerns regarding the situation, stating that and (NRK 25.02.13) there is no exact overview of how often children get sent from Norway due to intervention with the CWS but confirmed that this is a central issue within the Somali community. According to representatives in the child

welfare system, more that 6 children "disappear" every year from the most immigrant-populated areas in Oslo (interview, 16.informant, 18.4.13). However, the actual number remains unknown, as there have been no accredited studies on the mater. The concerns of Musse where also expressed and confirmed repeatedly by all my Somali informants. One Somali informant said:

> There is a fear, or I would rather call it a phobia. I know many well-educated, resourceful Somalis that also experience this fear. The main reason is ignorance on behalf of Somalis. Somalis say that when u come to Norway, your children aren't yours any longer, they are owned by the state, everything is controlled by the state, this is how the Somali community experience it (interview19.informant 22.4.13).

Another expert informant claimed:

> Somalis very afraid of the CWS, I know of a boarding school near the border of Ethiopia and Somalia where children from all over Europe are sent due to the growing fear of the child welfare system. I meet with teenagers that have told me that their parents have forced them to live in Somalia due to a fear for the CWS" (interview, 20.informant, 29.4.13).

Yet another expert expressed her concerns:

> There is no doubt that there is mistrust between the CWS and Somalis. But I question why is there mistrust towards Somalis? When did this mistrust develop? Somalis have been in Norway since 1980s. Why now and not before? A question to ask the CWS, why are they focusing on Somalis now and not previously? What groups are experiencing this mistrust? Somalis are a diverse and large group. What is the root causes to these issues? What are the common denominator in the cases where children are taken, neglect, violence, and abuse? What are the common factors in the cases? Why do Somalis not use the CWS as a help measure (interview, 21.informant, 29.4.13)?

5.3   Trust and sense of belonging

"A key aim for the government is a equal CWS for all children, and a CWS that is trus-

ted in the population, trust is moreover not only crucial among the people, but also on a cases-basis"(Meld. St. 6. 2012, p. 77). Trust and a sense of belonging are according to the Governments integration policies fundamental requirements for an inclusive community, and peaceful coexistence requires a common framework based on democratic principle and Norwegian law (Erikson 2013, p.10). A crucial element in all democracies is that citizens feel confident that political systems and its institutions are efficient. Political confidence implies that citizens are sure that institutions will complete their obligations although they are not being controlled. Confidence in institutions entails "a general judgement regarding their level of credibility, fairness or competence, merits that would make them trustworthy". If distrust and a lack of confidence are restricted to a fragment of the population with certain characteristics such as a low level of socio-economic resources, as is the case for the Somali population in Norway, it can lead to greater political exclusion and a further fortification of pre-existing social inequalities (Morales 2011, p.199-200). It is also considered especially disturbing if state institutions that are often regarded as the basic pillars of society experience a decrease in authority and lack of confidence within the population as these cannot be replaced, as is the case with political leaders and parties. In addition, if there is distrust in public authorities or representative institutions, the legitimacy of these institutions is at risk (Morales 2011 p.200). Smith (2001) claims that British social work currently substitutes confidence for trust, arguing that a broad and comprehensive regulatory framework does not allow for much negotiable space where trust is possible. He also highlights that trust is a "relational concept" meaning that it entails a certain amount of risk-taking, however there is little space for uncertainties in social work practice and particularly CWS practice (Smith referred to in Johansen 2013, p. 537). Johansson found in her study that "reciprocal and trustful relationships in combination with attention to the special needs of migrant families are a powerful vehicle for inclusion" (2011, p. 535). The previous minister, of "The Ministry for Children, Equality and Social Inclusion" Audun Lysbakken un-

derlined in a speech ("CWS in a inclusive society", addressing CWS workers on 23.09.11) the importance of increasing trust within minority communities, "if there exits whole groups within society that do not trust the institution, then this is a problem".

The concept of contact theory also suggests that a meaningful engagement with others enables us to change our attitude and behaviours towards the "other", implying that greater contact between the two actors could narrow the boundaries. Conflict theory opposes that notion, outlining that increased physical interaction with others of a different race or ethnic background will lead to decreased trust in the "other" and a tendency to group with our "own" (Puntham 2007, p.141). However living in "plural monoculturalisim" meaning alongside each other, but in separate units where cultures "pass each other like ships in the night" is also not adequate. In such a society, as is the case in many western democracies and can be found in Norway, a sense of shared society with common values and a understanding of each others need and attributes will have little chance to develop. Rather, an increase of prejudices and stereotypes can grow and irrational fears can develop with the risk that one can demonize the "other" (ICOCo 2012, p.8).

5.3.1   The connection between State institutions and trust

A very plausible explanation that can be one of several causes contributing to a general mistrust within Somali community towards public state institutions is the lack of experience with properly functioning public institutions, often described as a unique feature of Somalia and the society. However throughout Barres regime the situation was the opposite, meaning that the population had to relate to institutions that where both manipulative and suppressing (see description in chapter 4). These contradicting experiences are what many Somalis bring with them in their meeting with the Norwegian welfare system, and have been described as a cause for a general mistrust towards the public apparatus (Engebrigtsen & Farstad 2004, p.15) , this was also confirmed by several of my informants (interview, 18.informant, 23.4.13).

saying:

> As a point of departure many Somalis are sceptical to the state institutions, they lack of basic understanding of the Norwegian Society, and need a support network that has competence, not the clan system as they can create rumours about how things work. For example a Somali women spent all her money on buying clothes prior to a visit for the CWS as she thought this was what they where there to would evaluate.

Another possible explanation for lack of trust towards state institutions is demonstrated in Kesler & Blomraads (2010, p.322) study described in chapter 2. They establish that countries with an institutional or policy framework that support economic equality, recognition and accommodation of immigrant minorities encounter none or little decline in collective mindedness, any link between immigration and collective-mindedness is caused by state policies and institutional structures (ibid). The findings of this study are interesting in the case of Somali community's mistrust towards the CWS. Firstly the CWS are not only a professional in their field but an agent of the municipality and in so also a representative for the state. With this point of departure it is important to have faith in the integrity of the professional and trust in the society that the professional represents (Johansson 2011, p.537). Secondly the study demonstrates how state institution arrangements and policies have implications for the collective mindedness and social trust of citizens, highlighting how crucial it is that government institutions adapt and facilitate to a new sense of belonging otherwise a consequences can be a mistrust in a community/ group or society (Kesler & Blomraad 2010, p.336). The question is if this could be the case for the CWS. Firstly are today's policies not fitted to the new composition of diversity in the contemporary society? Secondly, is there an incoherence in the line of policies that makes the implementation complex? Furthermore both these factors could create a gap between policies and practice. I will attempt to address these questions in the following.

5.4   Does the principle of equality meet the needs of the diversity?

The Norwegian model is characterized by the principle of equality that the main body of

policies towards immigrants is also built upon. In Norwegian language this can in some cases be understood as assimilation. A reason for this could be linguistically based as the same word "likhet" means both "equality" and "similarity" making no terminological distinction between equal rights and cultural similarity. Equality in the Norwegian context is furthermore associated with cultural homogeneity, and to claim the right to equality is a creditable action, whereas claiming the right to difference is in ideological terms more problematic. The reason for this can be found in the history of Norwegian nationalism and as an indirect result of the labour welfare model (Erikson 2013, p.2). A danger with focusing on equality to such an extent can make individuals indistinguishable at all levels, however equality on a structural level (rights and obligations of citizens) does not necessarily lead to the elimination of differences as they can coexist in the public sphere, yet this demands for a process of diversity management that recognizes a form of mutual accommodation, such as the interculturalisim model promotes. Within the ongoing debate of integration the understanding of equality has advanced from "being alike" to "equal opportunities" to "adapted opportunities to be able to reach similar results if desired". Recent trends show emphasise on equality understood as the equal value of people with diverse backgrounds, however there is still a incoherence in policies if minorities should be able to claim the *same* rights, the necessary *possibilities* for achieving satisfactory results or the same results as ethnic Norwegian (Søholt, Wessel 2010, p. 43-52). The equality principle is also deeply rooted in the CWS, I will briefly look at the main effects of this for the CWS practice and interaction with the minority population.

5.4.1 Possible implications of the equality principle in integration policies on the CWS practice

The principle of equality is also deeply rooted in the CWS value base, and is a fundamental principle for Bufetats services, one of the central aims of the Management Reform implemented in 2004 was to offer equal services to all clients that need CWS

measures despite the complexity in the sector (Rambøll 2012, p.20). However as the evaluation of the management-reform concluded the definition of the principle of equality is complex, as the utilisation and practice varies according to different actors in the CWS system: "..Lack of a common definition and understanding of the term has lead to difficulties in the application of structured measures that contribute to increased equality..". It furthermore states that equality also encompasses the dimensions of differentiation and dimensioning, meaning equal access to differentiated services for all so as to meet the diverse needs of children that have a right to CWS (Idem). They found that the CWS care-institutions where not adequately differentiated for children with multifaceted challenges, however due to the lack of utilisation of what equal services and differentiating entail, it limited the possibilities to conduct a comprehensive evaluation (Idem p.16). This exemplifies the complexity of the equality principle on an institutional level when applying the policies in practice. I will later in this chapter discuss the dilemma that the principle of equality can lead to in the process of interventions.

5.4.2 *Is there incoherence in Norwegian integration policies: multiculturalism, assimilation or interculturalisim?*

While the Norwegian governments have for the past 20 years successfully developed policies that cultivate equal opportunities for its growing diverse population, the policies are not necessarily coherent making it problematic for state institutions to implement them in practice which would potentially also allow for social institutions and their workers to develop their own "approach" based for example on personal opinions or the ideological inclinations in society. The possible incoherence can be detected in several areas of society, not only in the CWS. I will give an account for some examples of this practice and discuss integration policies in the framework of the different integration-incorporation models, described in the theoretical framework chapter (Erikson 2013, pp.2-4).

One can detect an incoherence in policies concerning minorities claim to right of differ-

ence that are not in line with the equality principle yet they can be seen as an attempt to a bidirectional adaption or intercultural model. The dilemma is if the Norwegian society should support ethnic *communities* or *individuals?* Mainstream policies have focused largely on the right of an individual with a minority background to select ones lifestyle, career and so fourth, implying that family and ethnic traditions and practices in immigrant communities/families should not take priority over the individuals right to choose ones own life (Søholt, Wessel 2010, p. 43-52). Another example of incoherence is that many religious organizations automatically receive substantial state support where other NGOs do not here the state can indirectly be seen to encourage immigrants to promote their religious identity as well as showing support for communities and not individuals (Erikson 2013, p.2).Furthermore there exists no national policy concerning instruction in minority language versus Norwegian in primary schools; the decisions here are at municipal level. There is a tendency to see that policies concerning equality are more coherent whereas policies regarding equality and diversity are less accomplished, this Erikson (Idem) claims is partly due to the history of the welfare state, where cultural diversity was traditionally not a concern (Idem).

There are also a number of policies that can be understood as even more multiculturalistic, and thus not in line with the equality notion. These policies encompass two main traits: official recognition of group differences and of the fact that minority groups have specific distinctive identities, beliefs and practices, and the accommodation of social institution and practices to the cultural needs of the minority groups (Kymlicka 2000, Parekh 2000). In Norwegian policies these traits are for example seen in favouring special treatment for Muslims such as Halal food in prisons and hospitals, exception from gym class for girls at schools, and the choice for women to be examined by female doctors. Despite the existence of these polities the findings of Banting et.al (2006) (in Kesler & Blomraad 2010, p.330) conclude that Norway ranks as "weak" on multicultural policies compared with 19 other countries. The study shows that Norway has not im-

plemented the multicultural model formally, but rather has a number of components that have a strong multicultural nature (Idem).

The incoherence of on the one hand a strong focus on equality for all but on the other a recognition of minorities in some areas and on some levels of society can be sufficient to raise dilemmas for bureaucrats and practitioners (such as CWS workers as will be discussed in depth in the following chapters). One dilemma being that the acknowledgement of special rights for minority groups to maintain their culture may very well clash with their opportunities to participate on equal terms in the majority society. This is termed the multicultural paradox, and has lead to a decrease in the use of the term multiculturalism in the Norwegian public discourse, as there is a perception that it connotes segregation and mistaken tolerance. Diversity is the "new" term used in the contemporary discourse, as it presupposes equal participation in institutions such as the educational system, and labour market (Erikson 2002, p.13).

5.5   Imposed obligations and assimilation

Søholt and Wessel (2010, pp. 43-52) point to a dilemma in Norwegian integration policies questioning if the ambition of integration and inclusion is assimilation or integration? The policies can be understood as a combination of diversity in everyday life and a claim for assimilation to core values as a way to maintain the welfare state and strengthen social cohesion across ethnic backgrounds. The repercussions of 9/11 lead to an estrangement of the Muslim population, and a generalisation of "all" immigrants as Muslims, this further lead to a focus from the media and general public pressurising to motivate visible minorities to assimilate to core values and lifestyles in the Norwegian society (Idem). Certain aspects of Norwegian integration policies can therefore be seen as a revival of assimilation tendencies, yet as scholars have highlighted, integration and assimilation can be perceived akin as they both ideologically represent conformity to cultural and social norms of the majority population (Idem).

5.5.1 Exclusion of minorities based on "the progressive dilemma"

The solidarity principle is seen as a cornerstone of the Norwegian welfare system building on the notion that mutual reciprocity is only sustainable if all members of society perform according to their means (Søholt & Wessel 2010, p.64). However when the shared aims are not experienced as reciprocated by some in society as described in chapter 2 this can create a motivation for exclusion. Also studies such as Koopmans (2010, p.2) underline and potentially accentuate the "problem". He describes the link between a strong welfare system and multicultural recognition, termed the " The progressive dilemma" showing that the socio-economic integration of immigrants in 8 European countries is affected by the combination of a generous welfare state and multicultural policies. He concludes that this combination has compromised integration processes in the labour marked and promoted segregation, arguing that these factors in turn lead to welfare dependency and furthermore to social and economic marginalization. Some argue that the growing challenge of ethnic segregation in Oslo is an example of this form of marginalization. Statistic show that Somalis exhibit a traditional location pattern, with a high concentration in Oslo inner east, a explanatory reason for this is that many live in municipal housing, which are highly concentrated in this area (Søholt & Wessel 2010, p.64). However scholars claim that segregation can also be induced by fears and anxiety for being exposed to discrimination and prejudice, and lead to a so-called self-segregation, where minorities voluntarily choose to live in parallel societies, where residential isolation can lead to little interaction with the majority society and cultural isolation (Idem).

Koopmans study also reflects the current debate about the relationship between immigration, integration and the welfare state. The prediction that growing diversity will undermine support for the welfare programs is a rhetoric often used in the public discourse. It has been argued (Dagbladet 21.6.08) that the causes for Somalis scoring low on integration barometers can be a result of clientifing and passivity caused by the welfare state and integration policies that have created a dependency (Thorshaug et.al 2010,

p.21-22). Erikson (2008) also describes "stories" regarding Somalis that dominate the broader public sphere as greatly simplified in contrast with academic studies. There is a focus on the inability of society to integrate minorities, and instead of placing clear demands on immigrants, they are treated with tolerant kindness, and it is tacitly accepted that they cannot be fully "integrated" into Norwegian society (Hylland-Erikson 2008). This narrative appeals to the sense of justice and fairness in the receiving society, first: the moral being that welfare state ought not to facilitate people unconditionally, second: all humans do not have the same value, although they should. Both narratives are connected to strong metaphors and pictures making meaning of the world in a specific way (Idem). To conclude, one can question if this attitude actually leads to a greater probability for neglect from the society at large or if this results in increased negative focus from the state institutions such as CWS, leading to a problematising of Somalis as a group that is motivated by the general opinion in society (Thorshaug et.al 2010, p.21-22)(interview, 1.informant, 18.4.13).

5.6   Can diversity lead to exclusion from citizenship?

As established in chapter 2. true citizenship is more than a pro forma legal equality, the right to equal respect and access to resources and opportunities are also fundamental elements of belonging. Shiller (2003, p.583) claims that the welfare state models primary aim is to integrate individuals in a society within a sovereign territory around a common past, shared culture, and mutual solidarity towards the society. Citizenship is in this approach a combination of legal, political, social and cultural elements. These elements are involved in the reproduction of a hegemonic perspective that individuals or groups are aimed to become integrated into. Immigration challenges this form of citizenship on many levels. Firstly, by posing as a threat to the welfare model as discussed in the above section, secondly due to the perception that they challenge political boundaries as they can be see to threat the states sovereignty as is often reflected in political debates. Thirdly, the threat can be experienced due to the cultural differences for ex-

ample the notion that the Somali culture can gain position over the Norwegian. As Stolcke points out (chapter 2), although the essential prerequisite for access to citizenship rights is formal political equality, she suggests that in many western societies today this presupposes cultural identity and so also cultural sameness, a point that will be discussed further in the following chapter. These reasoning's can and have been used by opponents of immigration when objecting to giving immigrants the basic social and political rights intrinsic in citizenship.

The findings of this first section point to that policies possibly are not meeting the reality on ground level, as Erikson pointed out there is a need to be update so as to fit the new map. From this brief analysis it is problematic to establish any casual effect the integration policies may have on the practice of the CWS and how they furthermore relate to the interaction and relationship with the Somali population, however there is a possible incoherence both regarding the form of integration approach and the emphasises that is given to equality versus diversity. I will discuss the implications of this incoherence in greater depth in the next section.

5.7 Culture

5.7.1 The understanding of culture in the Norwegian context

As established in the previous chapters immigrants in Norway have to a great extent been understood through a cultural framework, not only in the CWS, as I will discuss in the following, but in the general debate in society and academia in Norwegian society. The causes for this can be multiple, maybe the less visible class-differences and the strong focus on equality in the Norwegian society on both community and policy level have contributed to enhancing the cultural perspective (Østby 2008). Also the data from the interviews emphasize culture and the important role it plays in understanding and interacting, it has furthermore often been used as a central explanation for the mistrust and barriers between the actors, however the interpretation of culture as a concept has varied greatly. Some extracts from interviews with informants show the different use of culture

as a term:

> I experienced the distance between Somalia and Norway as great: food, culture, clothes, lifestyle, was all so different and difficult. The difference in childrearing was also big (interview, 21.informant, 29.4.13).

> The mistrust has nothing to do with culture; we are individuals that belong and form our culture. We underline the importance of culture, culture is not important, but mistrust has to do with lack of understanding for a child's development, the basis for life is different (interview, 24.informant, 29.4.13).

There are cultural differences, in parenthood models, in Norway children are in the centre, and are given independence from a very early age, to much maybe, we can learn both ways. We have a basic common understanding that we love our children, but we use different methods due to different cultures (interview, 12.informant a, 29.4.13).

The great variation in how culture is perceived is problematic as the definition and perception of culture is key for overcoming and understanding the challenges the CWS and Somalis face in their interaction. In the following I will discuss some of the many different ways culture can be understood.

Culturalism can on the one hand be seen as not a country-specific phenomenon through which discourses and practices are defined, yet on the other hand it also becomes clear that the *forms* of reproduction of culturalism are quite country-specific (Alghasi et al,2009 p.7). Bourdieu (1996) applies the term "doxa" when referring to the common assumptions and understandings that becomes the norm and that we take for granted. This tendency can be seen with both CWS workers and the Somali informants, and can possibly determine their interaction forming a relationship based on what they assume as neutral or normal, however these doxa are often not neutral, but created by the society they are produced in by the dominant ideologies (Referred to in Østby 2008, p.58). However culture can be seen as an important element of building and legitimizing a national identity, and can on the one hand lead to a common we, or on the other serve as a tool for discrimination. Heller (1996) underlines the importance of not seeing culture as

something right or wrong, but different according to different contexts (Heller 1996, p.26) as a danger when giving one perspective the right of way, either it be culture, class, ethnicity, is that the complexity disappears and a simplification of the person's position occurs (Sen 2006). This will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

5.7.2   The role of culture in the CWS

5.7.2.1   Previous research

Kriz and Skivernes (2012) demonstrate how important the concept of culture is for the CWS. The study shows that Norwegian CWS workers identified cultural differences as the major challenge for working both with marginalized minority parents and for the parents themselves. Issues including lack of language proficiency, lack of understanding of society, state systems, values, and differing perception of the child's position and status. CWS workers where also of the opinion that the challenges minority parents experienced were related to integration, social isolation, and parents lack of participation in the children's life in Norwegian society. The study further emphasized the multi-facetted cultural dimension of the challenges minority parents face in raising their children how the complexity of cultural values occur when raising children (Kriz and Skivernes 2012, p.11).

The report "Barnevern i et minoritetsperspective" (CWS in a minority perspective) (Thorshaug et.al 2010, p.164) confirms this perspective and finds that the role of culture is crucial in the CWS interaction with minority families on multiple levels both implicit explicit. Culture plays a role when regarding communication and work methods, for example "Cultural misunderstandings", and different perceptions and interpretations of what represents " a good upbringing". Culture also has implications for different perspectives on gender, age, family and the relation between the private and public sphere. In sum culture is frequently applied as a universal explanation for "everything" that one had problems understanding.

The research showed that the CWS lack knowledge of minorities living conditions, in-

tegration policies and the effect they have on minorities daily life, racism and discrimination, awareness concerning power, as well as multicultural competence (Bø 2008; Rugkåsa 2008 in Thorshaug et al.2010, p.170). This demonstrates on the one hand, the importance that the CWS has knowledge of culture, both their own and others, and recognise that Norwegian or western values are only one of many perspectives for understand childrearing, on the other hand the importance of avoiding the dominant use of culture as a social explanatory factor for poverty, marginalisation and so fourth. A challenge is therefore finding the balance between cultural and societal or integration factors (Thorshaug et.al 2010). Johansson discusses in her study (2011) whether ethnic background is under-communicated in CWS in Sweden and if this affects the well-being of marginalised immigrant families, finding that it was not helpful to address problems with ethnical connotation, as this approach includes the notion of Western theories and methods being universally valid, and that "this attitude is destructive for both the adults and the children as none of them gets appropriate help"(Johansson 2010, p.546). She finds that "a reciprocal and trustful relationship in combination with attention to special needs of migrant families is a powerful vehicle for inclusion "(Idem p.546).

5.8   What is in the best interest of the child? The balancing between equality and recognition of diversity

The CWS defines the present well being and future opportunities of the child in a way that values an equal (same or similar) childhood and equal (same or similar) opportunities for all children (Kriz&Skivernes 2012, p.14). The definition of well-being can exclude the conceptualization of a childhood that incorporates cultural difference. Finding the compromise between equality and diversity is an evident dilemma in the work of the CWS as discussed previously. The dilemma of how on the one side creating common premises for equal treatment of minority families and their children but at the same time recognising the diversity when assessing whether or not there is a need for interventions. The decision should be, according to the CWA, based on a recognition and respect for cultural diversity at the same time upholding the value of equal treatment for all, the

67

ultimate aim being to prevent neglect and abuse, protecting the best interests of the child.

The Meld. St. 6. 2012, (p. 78) underlines that "minority children" shall not be evaluated or treated in another category than Norwegian children, neglect and maltreatment can and shall never be explained by referencing to cultural difference". The CRC is incorporated in the CWA and "the best interest of the child" is the guiding principle in all CWS work. This term is problematic in several ways; firstly there is no common understanding of what is in the best interest of the child, according to Lysbakken (Minister of Ministry for Children, Equality and Social Inclusion) "it is our traditions and cultural values that form this opinion", if this is so and forms the underlying basis for assessment of a case then the question is who's culture is in the child's best interest? And what perspective should be applied, should the point of departure for the CWS be relativistic or ethnocentric? Secondly, the issue of power plays a central role as pointed out by several informants (interview, 18.informant, 26.4.13) questioning on what basis the CWS has the understanding concerning their choice of childrearing to manage the power to make the "right" decision regarding their child? Particularly if the CWS applies an ethnocentric approach as the basis for the assessment of the need for an intervention, is the CWS managing the power of decision in the right way? In sum how should they mange and balance the power so as not to misuse it? I will discuss these questions in the following sections.

An essential question for the CWS is to what extent should variations of the interpretation of "in the child's best interest" be accepted? The danger of falling into the "two domains thesis" becomes a concern in these circumstances, as it can be difficult to judge what is in the child's best interest and the risk of extending the values of the public realm into the private become great. Moreover if these values go beyond the basic values of the welfare state, such as equality and solidarity, and rather take on a populist and excluding tone the principle of equality will take a negative form and could potentially

be the cause for mistrust. The two domains thesis also claims that minority values can be extended to the public realm, entailing legitimizing the childrearing methods of Somalis. This could become problematic as some of the Somalis have a more "physical method" as several of the informants stated and a CWS worker claimed are not in line with the Norwegian CWA.

> Some Somali families have a more physical way of bringing up their children, they believe that a slap is not harmful, I can agree with this in many ways, but in Norway it is not allowed to hit children, and where is the border between a hit and a slap, and how do children experiences being slapped throughout the whole upbringing? How can one give good advice, and try to advise them how to give children borders in a better way. Some appreciate it and others deny that it has happened (interview, 12.informant, 29.4.13).

5.9   The problematic interpretation of culture in the CWS

Research shows and experts highlight the need for a "cultural sensitive CWS", but what is culture? Culture can be understood in many perspectives, in this setting it is most relevant to analyse through a relativistic, ethnocentric and essentialist lens.

5.9.1   Relativistic

Where the relativistic perspective sees culture as being connected to our roots and destiny, and is part of our past. If this perspective is integrated in the CWS approach, emphasizes will often be placed on the cultural heritage of the minority family, and details that are connected to his homeland culture. The interaction will thereby be based on this fundament; this can however overshadow other socio-economic factors as class, income, gender, age and educational background. as exemplified in this informants A CWS workers stated:

> There are cultural differences, in parenthood models, in Norway children are in the centre, and are given independence from a very early age. To much maybe, we can learn both ways. We have a basic common understanding that we love our children, but we use different methods. As the boy in CWS care said , "its not strange that mum hits, because she was also hit when she was younger"(interview, 12.informant a, 29.4.13).

5.9.2 Ethnocentric

I see this statement as an example of ethnocentric approach, provided by a CWS worker when asked how to improve the relationship with the Somali community this informant from the CWS replied:

> There have been information meetings, and there is a need for more, need to find common arenas to demystify the CWS. Need for mandatory attendance in parenthood courses. This should be a criterion for receiving social aid. I hear the FRP (Progress Party) voice inside me which I don't like, but I think this could be a great preventive measures, not because they are bad (dårlig) people but so as to learn what we expect of parents in a Norwegian society, this is a honest approach saying this is what we expect, this is how we do it here, when it comes to for example how to prepare school lunches ("matpakke") etc (interview, 12.informant a, 29.4.13).

It can be interpreted from the statement that she believes the Norwegian childrearing is the natural or "right" way to think or act as this is the way valued by society. As established in the theoretical framework an ethnocentric approach can prevent bonding between cultures, and the danger of applying this approach, as the informant pointed out herself by referring to PP politics, is the potential for exclusion and prejudice.

The essentialist perspective suggests that culture can be explained as a phenomenon that is in our present, and is the basis for communication and mutual understanding. With this point of departure the understanding of culture will affect impulses and choices and minority cases will be assessed by their specific challenges in daily life and not because of their background. In sum, how one defines culture is of extreme importance as the approach and understanding will reflect on this and be consequential for how the CWS workers in the system define problems and identify solutions.

5.9.3 Neutrality

Bouchard (2011) points out that the principle of cultural neutrality of a state and its institutions is both pronounced and wanted, however as the case in question demonstrates

it is not part of everyday reality. Several informants also said they experienced an exaggerated focus from the CWS on Culture:

> To much focus on culture or religion, using religion to explain that the father is strict due to his Muslim religion. CWS is not neutral when meeting families. It is crucial to receive constructive assistance in a early stage of intervention…..Attitude in the investigation fase is a reason for mistrust. One often experience prejudice regarding for example the number of children one has (interview, 17.informant, 23.4.13).

Another informant accentuated: "Culture is the problem between the 2 actors, there is a need to combine the 2 different cultures" (interview, 23.informant a, 29.4.13).

Acculturation is the theoretical term that refers to the process of change that occurs in parental models when in continuous contact with another cultures (Wise & Silva 2007, p. 2-5). The interculturalistic model recommends this approach and highlights reciprocity, seeking to harmonise through mutual adjustments (Bouchard 2011, p.451-460). Research also recommends normalising the strong focus on the importance of culture underlining that all CWS work should be based on individual accommodation, dialog and respect for different opinions and approaches, and that this should be the point of departure for a multicultural CWS. Furthermore highlighting cultural adapted interventions or a relativistic approach prior to a regular approach can lead to CWS workers underestimating their own competence, as research has shown that social workers become unnecessarily insecure and therefore less action orientated when interacting with minority groups. Multicultural understanding and competence is essential, however as important is a general knowledge of the CWS and the values that it is built on (Thorshaug et.al 2010, p.164).

5.10 Majority/minority perspective, us/them and how these roles affect the relationship between the CWS and Somalis.

5.10.1 Majority/minority duality paradigm

Mistrust can be understood within Bouchards (2011, p.451-460) majority/minority duality paradigm. The focus on majority-minority relations and the tensions connected to

these relations could serve as an explanation for the mistrust that has arisen between the CWS and Somali community. Both majority and minority groups experience anxiety when facing cultural differences; the majority culture will experience a threat concerning rights, values, traditions, language, memory and identity. This can be exemplified through the Norwegian approach to assimilation politics when highlighting cultural equality as discussed in the previous chapters. The minority culture on the other hand can also experiences an anxiety as a reaction to this ideology and fear for its own values and culture. A consequence of this fear is according to the duality paradigm insecurity and reciprocal mistrust that increases when the unwanted us/them duality increases (Bouchard, p. 444).

5.10.2 Can cultural fundamentalisim be a cause for mistrust?

Many Somalis I spoke to stated that culture was a main cause for the tensions and mistrust between them and in society in general, moreover it seemed that culture was applied as an explanation for the differences and division between the actors, many underlined in particular the lack of understanding for the "others" culture, and how this was a key reason for the mistrust. Stolke claims that cultural fundamentalism has become the new rhetoric of exclusion, where exposing boundaries and differences highlight relations between cultures (Stolcke 1995, p.15). One informant said:

> I experience that the CWS lacks knowledge of the Somali culture, they don't understand our way.. Newly arrived immigrants are told through the "grapevine" within the Somali milieu that the CWS can take away their children (interview, 21.informant, 29.4.13).

Another said:

> The many CWS cases at present concern the CWS and Somalis, this due to great cultural collision between the actors. No respect for the Somali culture. Politicians have not done a good job with integration processes concerning Somalis. A example of this is a case where the motives for the CWS to remove the child because he eats with his hands and the mother does not have eye-contact with her child, this is cultural behaviour not a crime (interview, 25.informant c, 29.4.13).

An informant from the CWS stated:

> Women who have a clear stance in regards their own culture or way of
> living, for example saying that they don't want more children, and that don't
> want to be wife number 2 are also often those that are positive to receiving
> help and to the Norwegian society in general. The culture or lifestyle that
> many women live in is maybe difficult for them to detach themselves from,
> I don't know if that is what they want, but this is a cause for many problems.
> Another issue is a lot of secrets. The parents are divorced on paper but not in
> reality, the children must keep secret that the father lives there. This is a
> common part of the culture, this is also a outspoken fact (interview,
> 12.informant b, 29.4.13).

Culture is here used in a very broad term, where the cause for a difficult interaction is explained by the Somali culture. In my understanding there is an underlying assumption that if she became less Somali (having fewer children and not being wife number 2), it would be easier for her to become part of Norwegian society. Stolke describes the "problem" as being "them", not "us", "we" are the measure of a good life which "they" threaten to undermine, this because they are foreigners and culturally different. Emphasis on culture could lead to a simplification of a person's situation, leading to, in the worst-case scenario, racism. The commonalities of racism and cultural fundamentalism are described as both underlining the view that there is a difference between humans, racism operates with race as a classification and cultural fundamentalism focuses on the way immigrants are perceived as the foreigner, stranger, and alien as opposed to the national, the citizen, the cultural "other".

Making a general assumption regarding all Somalis the informant focuses on one identity, in this way upholding inaccurate stereotypes, thus not open for establishing different forms of bonds. This is particularly dangerous, as many scholars have stated, when it is combined with power, as will be discussed in more depth in the following. However in my understanding the CWS worker conveyed the best intentions for Somalis throughout the interview, despite a unconscious attitude that was expressed often through the use of cultural terms.

Also a Somali informant expressed that becoming "Norwegian" and integrating into the

Norwegian culture was not wished for, she moreover applied the term culture to describe the negative aspects of what was not wanted by becoming like the "other":

> Within the Somali community there is a widespread fear that the CWS can take your children, this due to fear of the children being influenced by Norwegian culture, and forget their Muslim values and identity and become "uta gallodi", (meaning in Somali: to become nonreligious) and a fear of becoming "Norwegian". This is a threat in itself, a big threat; to become Norwegian is a threat….(interview, 21.informant 29.4.13).

To sum up, a one-sided focus on cultural understanding and competence in the CWS can contribute to enhancing stereotypes and us/them dichotomy. A alternative Qureshi (2008) (refered to in Østby 2008, p.59) suggests would be to have a greater focus on ones own attitudes and values and a critical approach to the prevailing attitudes and power relations in society.

5.10.3 Identity, diversity and inclusion

The Norwegian governments reaction to the increased diversity has as described in the above been ambivalent. Hagelund (2002) questions if it is possible to construct a new identity as a diverse society on the same foundations of the Norwegian ideology of equality and if it is possible to preserve a notion of nationally bounded equality both in forms of an identity-defining trait and normative ideal (Hagelund 2002, p.402). Bouchard suggests that it is legitimate for the majority culture to uphold some past symbolic cultural heritage as a basis for continuity of a national identity but harmonize through mutual adjustment and reciprocity. As a nation-state Norway is evolving through a process of redefining itself from a homogeneous and egalitarian society to being multicultural and diverse as the COE report indicated there exists a very low level of awareness in the county concerning its self-image as a multicultural and diverse society, reflecting that the common Norwegian national identity is not in line with the contemporary reality. Erikson also points to the challenge, claiming that there is a discrepancy between the premises the Norwegian society was founded on, namely ethnic homogeneity and to a great extent cultural homogeneity, while today's Norway is increasingly di-

verse (Erikson 2013, p.17).

Several informants expressed experience of exclusion and not feeling part of the Norwegian society, saying that there is no room or recognition for the Somali culture, one held:

> There is no respect for us and our way, Norwegians think their way is the
> only right way to do things, there is no respect for weaker groups in society..
> (interview, 26.informant d, 29.4.13).

Another said:

> Most Somalis wish to establish a life in Norway and partake in society, but
> especially the immigrants that arrived recently see no future in staying
> partly due to the situation with the CWS (interview, 28.informant, 26.4.13).

Both views express a feeling of exclusion, Puntham claims that the feeling of exclusion and not belonging has an impact on our identities and furthermore effects social interactions. As short social distance leads to mutual understanding of identity, familiarity and collectiveness, in the opposite situation, as experience by the informants, people will treat the "other" as if they belong to another category (Puntham 2007, p.159). In view of the interculturalistic model diverse coexistence of culture and traditions is vital for forming shared connections, however the concept of cultural integration should be void of assimilated association (Bouchard 2011, p.449).

It was also apparent from many interviews with Somali that protecting ones "own" identity was important, one expressed (also mentioned previously):

> Within the Somali community there is a widespread fear that the CWS can
> take your children, this due to fear of the children being influenced by
> Norwegian culture, and forget their Muslim values and identity and become
> "uta gallodi", (meaning in Somali: to become nonreligious) and a fear of
> becoming "Norwegian". This is a threat in itself, a big threat; to become
> Norwegian is a threat. When children misbehave the parents use threats as
> part of childrearing. Children grow up with threat and being afraid it is a
> normal part of their upbringing and one of the threats are that the CWS will
> come or "those Norwegians" will come and take you away" (interview,
> 21.informant, 29.4.13).

The significance of preserving the Muslim values and Somali "culture" was expressed

by many informants particularly through their concern that the CWS does not draw upon the resources Somali or Muslim families have when placing children in foster-care. Bouchard explains the anxiety a minority experience in meeting a majority by tensions caused by a reaction to feeling ones culture and values are threatened. This was a evident concern with many informants, one informant who has spent the last 30 years working with Somalis in Norway expressed that many believe the CWS have a underlying agenda to make all children "Norwegian", loosing their Somali identity by using primarily Norwegian foster-care (interview, 22.informant, 25.4.13).Bouchard 2011, p.444). (Representatives from the CWS stated that the reason for not using Somali or Muslim care was only due to a lack of families with Muslim background).

Sen (2000) underlines that freedom and the choice to select ones identity is a important measure as it allows for open and multifaceted identities that promote thinking and living beyond a cultural sphere (Sen 2000). Moreover one should avoid categorisation that creates identity through a singular connection, by doing so one limits the internal diversity of a group and upholds inaccurate stereotypes. Another informant expressed "Many identify themselves as Somali in Norway and not Norwegian", this can be explained by the dependency social distance has on how we perceive ourselves- our social identity, and underlines the distance this informant experiences towards the Norwegian identity and society. Diversity therefore demands a de-construction and reconstruction of social identities so as to allow society to adapt towards immigration and diversity. Another informant expressed:

> Somali women identify themselves as mothers and have often no other central focus in their lives. To take away the children from a Somali women affects her psychological balance and identity, she has to re-orientate herself. I would compare this experience to being as traumatic as suddenly becoming disabled. Is the CWS aware of this (interview, 18.informant, 26.4.13)?

she further stated:

> Many experience that they are treated as "aliens" by the CWS when

children are placed in foster care, despite laws saying that parents can partake in deciding what kind of upbringing the foster families should provide concerning factors such as religion, education, etc. This is very difficult for parents to experience. And this affects many in the Somali community (interview, 18.informant, 26.4.13).

This report reflects how being a mother is such a vital part of many Somali women's identity and thus the great impact removing a child has on the identity for Somali women. If seen in light of Sens (2000) hypothesis identity can be explained as a product of a social construct created in a contextual society, the "typical Somali family values" may differ form "the typical Norwegian", and therefore a dynamic interaction between the actors can create a social bond and understanding and in a long-term perspective a new sense of belonging leading to a incorporation into the original belongings and identity.

To conclude the opinions of the informants point to that implicit in the argumentation of not recognizing the "others" culture also lies a fear of losing ones identity. The lack of a common identity can lead to a fragmentation in society and be a root cause for mistrust. A key aspect concerning identity is that it is a living, multifaceted and an un-fixed process and should be perceived in these terms. Constricting identity processes to so-called fixed categories disables the possibility for living beyond a cultural sphere, however an important point in a intercultural perspective is that those who chose to live a traditional or seclude life should not be forced to partake in active interaction.

5.10.4 Discrimination on the basis of culture and ethnicity

One often talks of trait-explanation hegemony overriding situational explanations, where stereotypes, and simplistic group generalisations are the fundaments for the interpretation instead of seeing the issue in its natural context. Use of generalised explanations can be a cause for undermining the legitimacy and creating mistrust in the Somali Community. Somalis fear that the CWS cannot see beyond "the other" label, at the same time studies show that many immigrant families experience that their approach to child

upbringing and gender roles are disqualified by social workers (Bø 2008 referred to in Hansen et.al 2007, p. 380). Despite ethnic discrimination being illegal and the great focus of equal treatment, prejudice still exists in many areas of society, also housing market, labour market and in education (Erikson 2013, p.12).

5.10.5 The case of female circumcision

OMOD (2008) recently raised concerns on the subject of discrimination and lack of knowledge regarding diversity in the CWS, referring to a recent case where the CWS was found to have breached the discrimination act due to unrightfully demanding a gentile investigation of a Norwegian-Somali child. The trait-explanation hegemony overriding situational explanations can clearly be seen in the case as the suspicions of the CWS where solely based on her Somali decent, the parents moreover where not believed when they claimed they where against female circumcision (http://www.omod.no/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/LDN-vedtak-omskjæring.pdf see case for more details). OMOD (2008) registered that ethnicity and culture where and are used as the basis for accusation of a prohibited act, without legitimate findings and concrete data to verify the allegation (idem).

The case described above can be an unwanted implication or repercussion of the strong focus on the ethnicity-orientated campaign against female circumcision in the Norwegian integration policies in recent years. Maybe the policies have lead to a practice that has exaggerated focused on ethnicity and thus not considering the individual within the larger picture. The case also in particular exemplifies how the concepts of ethnicity and culture are used as the basis for discrimination, or in Stolkes terms, cultural fundamentalism in (1995). The CWS assumption was founded exclusively on ethnicity and cultural heritage demonstrating the power of cultural criterion and how culture as a classification can become fundamentalist and possess similar mannerisms to that of racism (Stolke 1995). Moreover ethnicity is a characteristic for racial attitudes and can often be drawn upon when pursing an instrumental goal.

The case reflects one discourse concerning the view of immigrants in Norwegian society that can be found on both macro and micro level. There is a strong understanding that diversity is connected to national or ethnic groups and their culture and not individuals; people are treated as Tamils, Somalis, etc and not in accordance to their individuality. A consequence of strong cultural focus is that it draws attention from minority discrimination and other social-economic inequities as often highlighted as a main critique of the multiculturalistic approach.

5.10.6 Medias negative effect on discriminatory attitudes

As discussed in the previous sections the use of concepts such as ethnicity and culture have lead to boundaries between the actors. The result of the often stigmatizing and derogatory media exposure of Somalis can also have implications for the level of trust between the state institutions and the Somali community. Erikson (2008, no page no.) describes for example how a health worker expressed the view that the work of the health services had, in effect, become increasingly challenging as several years of building a good relationship with the minorities was undermined, because trust that had been developed over a long period turned into suspicion due to the strong negative focus in the media (Idem). One can imagine that this could be similar the case of the CWS. Klepp (2008) (referred to in Fangen 2008, p.503) found that 88% of net-newspapers reporting about Somalis in 2008 had a negative focus. The Somalis I spoke to also acknowledged a negative focus attributed to their ethnic group by media, politicians and by the majority population in general, an example in the media being "child care cases over-represented by Somalis" (Fangen 2008, p.502).

One informant said:

> We can not hide the fact that there is discrimination, I have experienced it
> myself, when 2 actors don't listen and understand who I am there is a lack
> of communication and they build accusations that don't exist, this is
> absolutely discrimination. There is no respect for the weak groups in
> society, Norway thinks their way is the only right way (interview,

25.informant c, 29.4.13).

Another mentioned:

> Somalis as a minority group experience that they are victims of
> discrimination in the labour marked, housing, media and FRP (PP) have
> stigmatized Somalis (interview, 16.informant, 18.4.13).

Stolke describes this perception of the "other" as cultural fundamentalism, focusing on
the way immigrants are perceived as the foreigners and alien as opposed to the national,
the citizen. The "problem" of immigration is seen as a political threat to the national
identity and integrity due to cultural diversity being seen as a threat to the basis of the
nation-state as a bound and distinct community sharing a common sense of belonging
and loyalty built on language, cultural traditions, and beliefs (Stolcke 1995, p.15). One
Somali expressed how he thought the CWS perceived his community:

> Why does the CWS operate as they do? Different reasons: To create
> workplaces, no respect for other cultures, they think the Norwegian way is
> the best; the Somalis are looked upon as the worst. None are as the Somalis.
> The Roma are the only group that can be compared (interview, 26.informant
> d, 29.4.13).

5.11 Balancing power in the CWS- "the best interest of the child" in whose perspective?

Dumbrills study (2005) investigates the ways in which parents experience and negotiate
CWS interventions. He finds that the way in which the CWS workers managed power
formed the opinions that parents held of interventions and also was decisive for their re-
actions to the interventions. The results of this study underline the importance for both
practitioners and policy-makers to be aware of the impact power has on the worker-par-
ent interaction. (p. 27-28). An informant working within the CWS also confirmed this:

> If the Somali community do not trust that the CWS can make the right
> decisions, and are not capable to decide what is best for your child then the
> system lacks legitimacy and there is a great basis for mistrust (interview,
> 11.informant, 29.4.13).

She furthermore stated:

> The role of the CWS as controller and helper, involves a duality that places

80

them in complex situation (interview, 11.informant, 29.4.13).

The power the CWS holds is both coercive and normative, including elements such as expertise, interpersonal skills and legitimate power, as well as resources and services (Johannson 2013 p.537). One informant stated how he experienced the relationship with the CWS:

> The problem is that when one tries to have a dialog with the CWS they have the power and they fabricate situations that don't exist. They have recourses, money strong legal measures that Somalis don't have. Somalis are the losers (interview, 27.informant e, 29.4.13).

Kojans study demonstrates that the CWS aim is to redress inequality by enabling families to participate in society, and the CWA specifically underlines the socially equalizing function of the CWS (section 4-4). A large number of the services provided are affirmative that can be understood as aiming at redressing inequality. The CWS holds the power to determine in which situations a minority group should be treated equally and when their diversity should be recognized, this can potentially prevent CWS worker from recognizing the need of the families in challenging circumstances (Johannson 2011, p.537). Ericsson (referred to in Kojan 2011, p.453) argues that: "child welfare may be pictured as a tool that is used by the authorities to ensure that family life does not deviate too markedly from the norms it considers should be followed if the family is to fulfil its role as the cornerstone of an economically, physically and morally healthy society". Kojan also argues that "CWS as a cultural institution passes on the values of the majority: the dominant middle class these values and practices might not be shared by the lower socioeconomic groups", as can be seen by this informants statement:

> The CWS has power and support from the municipalities, just because there is a cultural collision it is not enough reason to take the children (interview, 25.informant c, 29.4.13).

In sum, the challenge of balancing the power of decision to on the one hand provide equal treatment for all families and on the other hand recognising the needs of Somali

families, but still with the best interest of the child as a landmark is highly demanding practice for the CWS. With this point of departure one can also question the practicality and feasibility of the dual role the CWS holds as both controller and helper, and if this should be separated through differential response systems (Dumbrill 2005, p. 27-28). Furthermore this again underlines the problematic balancing of the values incorporated in the integration policies, and if they prevent the CWS of recognizing the needs of minority groups (Johannson 2013 p.537).

6 Conclusion

6.1 Towards some conclusions

In this thesis I have studied some of the challenges contemporary Norwegian society faces in diversity management. In investigating the root causes for mistrust between the Somali community and the CWS, I have chosen a twofold approach thereby allowing for a "broad sweep" exploration on both a macro and micro level. While data reveals that the cause for mistrust is multiple and complex, a combination of incoherence in diversity management on a policy level and the use of a discourse that emphasises cultural values, creates boundaries and promotes exclusion that also contribute as possible sources of mistrust.

6.2 A brief account of the study, methods and scope

Conducting an extensive number of interviews with a wide range of actors and reviewing relevant document sources provided me with a large body of empirical information upon which to build the thesis. The choice of the theoretical framework was based on the key concepts and constructs that arose when analysing policy documents and through the process of sense-making of data derived from the interviews. The intercultaralistic model was appropriate due to the setting of the case as described previously, and the broad conceptual framework of integration-incorporation models was selected to fit the Norwegian context. The concept of culture, identity, citizenship and power were also applied to match the empirical data. Analysing the collected data in a broad conceptual framework gave a range of different perspectives. The choice of analysing the case on two levels has both advantages and limitations, giving a wide-ranging perspective that highlights the complexity of the case but also limiting the possibilities for an in-depth analysis of either the interaction between the actors or the implications of policy documents. Moreover the scope of this thesis does not include other important dimensions that can affect the interaction and ultimately the mistrust between the actors including: sosio-economic, political, educational factors, transnational ties, social and

communication skills, use and quality of interpreter and the effect of other interventions.

6.3 Main discoveries

The findings show that there exists a level of tension and mistrust within the Somali community towards the CWS. From the data retrieved through interviews, media and other relevant sources I was able to establish this fact, and although the study cannot be indicative of the general opinion in such a diverse community, the data was adequate to confirm that this holds good for a significant number of families. The findings corresponding to the first RQ will be addressed in the following:

"*What impact do integration policies have on the interaction between the Somali community and the CWS?*"

Though analyzing diversity management documents I discovered a possible incoherence in the line of integration-incorporation policies due to a wide rage of different approaches which potentially contribute to uncertainties and difficulties for both bureaucrats and practitioners. For example, the acknowledgement of special rights for minorities may diminish their opportunities to participate on equal terms in the majority society. Balancing the cornerstone principle of equality with recognizing and meeting the needs of diversity is another apparent dilemma found in integration policies both on a structural and institutional level. The lack of a clear understanding of the notion equality and how to put it into practice could have implications for CWS workers in their interaction with the Somali community. In sum these findings demonstrate the need for a revision of diversity management policies and an assessment of their appropriateness for meeting the needs of the new composition of diversity in Norwegian society. The findings point to two crucial factors: Firstly, incoherence in policies on a structural and institutional level can lead to a discrepancy between policy and practice, causing uncertainties and complexities in interpretation and implementation that can affect the work of the CWS and lead to interaction that can, amongst other factors, be a starting point for mistrust. Secondly, diversity management possibly fails to recognize the equal valid-

ity and legitimacy of difference; this could lead to a rhetoric of exclusion and general tension between the majority/minority population.

"*What are the root causes for the mistrust Somalis have towards the CWS?*"

6.3.1 Culture

The data from the interviews demonstrated that "culture" was a key term used by the majority of informants as an explanation for the misconceptions and differences on the part of both actors creating tension and mistrust. The findings demonstrated that, in line with the general understanding in Norway, immigrants are perceived through a cultural framework. Theory highlights how dominance of culturalistic discourse accentuates the negative elements and perceived cultural difference leaves little room for cultural recognition or for a renewal of the understanding of commonality. The interviews reflected that, instead of resolving the issues, focus on culture seemed to contribute to a growing gap between the CWS and the Somali families. The notion of cultural differences was seen to be a problem creating a feeling of vulnerability and fear, which can become a motivation for both actors to defend their own culture and regroup within their ethnic boundaries. Feelings of social anxiety and a lack of recognition tend to promote radicalization both for majorities and minorities. I found that this experienced threat could further lead to a tendency of cultural fundamentalism where exposing boundaries and differences between cultures create the basis for us/them dichotomy and mistrust between the actors. The role of culture also played an important role in defining what is in the best interests of the child, as previous research also confirms. The findings showed that in the attempt to balance the principle of equality and recognise diversity there was a clear emphasis on the part of the CWS to accentuate an ethnocentric approach. However, the CWS representative also had a relativistic perspective when underlining the cultural differences as a problem that could lead to the need for interventions. To conclude, I found that the use of culture as a discourse enhanced stereotypes and could be a key cause for creating mistrust between actors.

6.3.2 Identity

The empirical findings indicate that implicit in the argumentation of not recognizing the "others" culture there lies an inherent fear of losing ones identity. An absence of a common identity in society can lead to fragmentation and be a root cause for mistrust. Identity should be considered as a living, versatile and un-fixed process, if it is constricted into so-called fixed categories it hinders the possibility for living beyond a cultural sphere. The COE report indicated that there is also a low multicultural self- perception in the Norwegian society in general, this can be due to the ethnic and cultural homogenic values upon which the Norwegian society was founded and the lack of awareness of the increasingly diverse society and has changed Norwegian identity. The emphasis on the social distance between the Somali and Norwegian culture could also add to exclusion of the "others" identity. In sum the findings show that the lack of a common experience of identity most probably enhances a feeling of mistrust.

6.3.3 Power

The findings also suggested that the experience of an imbalance of power was a central issue that lead informants to doubt the CWS' capabilities. A lack of trust in the management of power in the system creates grounds within the Somali community for questioning the decision-making legitimacy of CWS eg. in making life-changing decisions concerning ones children. Furthermore the question of the hegemony of decision that the CWS possess in determining who is a "good parent" poses challenges and leads to a discussion concerning what is in the best interests of the child.

6.4 The way forward: Possible recommendations

How can the CWS create trust and increase their legitimacy in the interaction with the Somali community?

The overall findings of this thesis indicate that the root challenges facing the CWS and Somalis in their interaction must be understood through a definition of culture which is relevant and useful. In the given circumstances. Moreover there is a need to agree upon

to what extent one should emphasise culture, as over emphasis can lead to cultural fundamentalism whereas the opposite could ultimately lead to a lack of recognition of the needs of a diverse population. A possible solution could be to focus on a holistic approach, where culture is best understood as a frame of reference for societal behaviour patterns and ways of thinking, rather than decisive for how one behaves and thinks. Moreover building down of stereotypes and preconceptions could be facilitated by a focus on cultural self-awareness. Lastly there is a need to create an awareness concerning the power of culture as a discourse for strengthening ones position and identity both as a minority and majority group.

The terms that are applied in the political, institutional and community-level discourse such as equality and diversity and the true implications of these for minorities in the day to day practice of state institutions such as CWS must be understood more fully. A one-sided emphasis on the individual workers approach to the client will not solve the overall challenge of changing the attitudes and practices of an institution but a more collective approach could be achieved were a greater emphasis placed on an understanding of the minorities situation in the context of institutional and structural situations. This could also create more equality and lessen the differences between "us" and "them".

Lastly many of the actors involved (IMDI, Bufdir, representatives from the Somali community) highlighted the importance of the need for dialog between the actors at a grass roots level. A common critique to this approach in the light of the intercultural framework is that it allows the actors to avoid structural issues such as racism, poverty and power. Governments and policy makers can thereby attribute the lack of willingness of individuals to interact and dysfunctional cultural groups to the growth of social divisions rather than addressing the core issues at a political, social and economic level. Another danger of intercultural dialogue on community level as a way to build trust is that focus is derived from complex mechanisms that are often the root causes for inequalities and instead offers temporary displacements.

6.5   Further research

During the process of working with this thesis, several important and relevant topics for further research where identified. Many Somalis questioned why the CWS intervened in their family matters, not understanding the reasons for such measures. It would be interesting to know the outcomes and long-term effects of the interventions for minority children and their families. Few Norwegian studies have focused on this field. Also what are the objectives for providing CWS, are they in order to equalise the opportunities for disadvantaged children or are they a tool for integration processes? It would be important to establish how many Somali families send their children away from Norway due to fear of interventions from the CWS, especially as the data from the interviews indicate that this is a substantial number. Additionally, there is a need for studies related to the role diversity management policies play in the day to day practice of the CWS and the consequences of their impact; to what extent do they affect the practice of the CWS or is the interaction between decisive aspect in the outcome of the connection between the actors? This could elucidate the direct role of policy on practice and fill a gap in this research area. In an international perspective it would be of interest to explore the need for a general adaptation of the approach of CWS towards minority communities in order that it could better meet the needs of the growing diversity in western societies.

Annex

Annex 1.

Interview guide (translated from Norwegian)

Basic data:

Background of respondent

- Name
- Work-title (when relevant)
- Area of work and position (when relevant)

The organisation/workplace (when relevant)

- Size
- Area of work

Questions to all respondents

- Can you tell me about your role/engagement/involvement in the case of the interaction with the Somali community and the CWS? And your understanding/perception of the situation?
- Can you tell me about the relationship between the Somali community and the CWS in your opinion?
- What is the reason for mistrust/ tension/ conflict that has been depicted in the media recently?
- Do you experience that the Somalis have different perception/understanding of their legal rights in CWS cases/interventions?
- How do you experience that the CWS meet the Somali community and diversity in general?
- Is there a difference between the Somali and Norwegian child upbringing?
- Is there a difference in core values in the Norwegian/Somali culture?

- How do you experience the CWS cultural competence?
- How is the communication between the CWS and Somalis?
- Is the CWA adapted to the diverse society? And are the criteria's for intervention adapted to diversity?
- Has the relationship between the CWS and Somalis changed over time?
- What in your opinion can be done to better the present situation of mistrust?
- How can the CWS/Somalis cooperate better?
- Do you have additional thoughts/ opinions regarding the case that you would like to add?
- Can you recommend other people I can talk to?

Annex 2

Pseudonym/ number of informants	Workplace/ Organisation	Title/ role	City	Date
1.Informant: Said Ahmed	Oslo prison	Prison warden	Oslo	18.4.13
2.Informant: Anja Wedde Sveen	KIM (Kontakt utvalget mellom invandrerbefolkningen og myndighetene (umbrella org. for minority NGOs)	Consultant	Oslo	17.4.13
3. Informant: Ali Jama	By Missonen (NGO)	Consultant	Officer	24.4.13
4.Informant: Rowena B. Teodocio	EMI (Unit for Diversity and Integration)	Executive Officer	Oslo	26.4.13
5.Informant: Ana Lopez taylor	INLO	Manager	Oslo	12.4.13
6.Informant: Kari Helena Partapoli	Anti Rasistik senter (NGO)	Executive Manager	Oslo	16.4.13
7.Informant: Linda Alzaghari	Minotenk (NGO with focus on minority issues)	Executive Manager	Oslo	16.4.13
8.Informant: anonymous	PAC Norway (Pakistani NGO)	Executive Manager	Oslo	16.4.13
9.Informant: Norunn Grande	Nansen Freds Center (NGO)	Senior advisor	Oslo	19.4.13
10.Informant : Roger	Police, Prevention Center	Division	Oslo	18.4.13

Broaken		Officer		
11.Informant : Sissel Marie Neumayer	Bufdir	Officer/Senior advisor	Oslo	25.4.13
12.Informant a &b: anonymous	Gamle Oslo Barnevern (Oslo Municipality CWS)	Executive Officer & CWS worker	Oslo	29.4.13
13.Informant : Anfa H. Hashi	Grunerløka Barnevern (Oslo Municipality CWS)	"Go-between" for Somali fam-ilies	Oslo	29.4.13
14.Informant : Thomas Hylland Eriksen	University in Oslo (UIO)	Professor	Oslo	16.4.13
15.Informant : Cindy Horst	Peace Research Institute (PRIO)	Senior Researcher	Oslo	25.4.13
16.Informant : Bashe Musse	Oslo City Council	Politian	Oslo	18.4.13
17.Informant : Hassan Ali Omar	NorSom (Somali NGO)	Activist	Oslo	23.4.13
18.Informant : Marinne Hussein	Tawiiq Moske (Somali Moske Oslo)	Counsellor, and member of help-group for Somali women	Oslo	26.4.13
19.Informant : Ilham Hassan		Lawyer	Oslo	22.4.13
20.Informant :Ingeborg Wardøen	Expert in the field	Somali Expert	Oslo	22.4.13

21.Informant : Safia	Amatea (Counselling Center for women)	Councillor for minority girls	Oslo	29.4.13
22.Informant : Ali Jama	By Missonen (NGO)	Officer	Oslo	25.4.12
Group interview			Oslo	
23.Informant , a: anonymous	Community leader	Imam	Oslo	29.4.13
24. Informant, b: Shahar Abdi Farah	Community leader	Pilot	Oslo	29.4.13
25.Informant , c: Ahmed Wais	Community leader	Politian, member of the Labour Party	Oslo	29.4.13
26.Informant , d	Community leader	Elder/Leader in the Somali Commmunity	Oslo	29.4.13
27.Informant , e	Community leader		Oslo	29.4.13
28. Informant: Naima	Mother, and involved in a CWS case		Oslo	26.4.13

Bibliography

Books/Articles:

Adem S, Eide, K. 2012. "Somalieres mote med Nav", pp.11-12 *Tidsskrift for velferdsforskning*, Vol 15, nr.1, 2012

Ahmed A. Siyad, Camilla Bildsten og Christian Hellevang Informasjon, samarbeid, dialog. "Somaliere I Norge, Noen erfaringer". *Somalisk Utviklingforum, Mølla Kompetansesenter, Leieboerforeningen.* 2006 http://www.imdi.no/Documents/Somaliere%20i%20Norge%202opplag%2007.pdf

Alghasi, S., Eriksen, T.H., Ghorashi H. *Paradoxes of Cultural Recognition Perspectives from Northern Europe*, Ashgate Publishing Limited 2009

Allport, G.W., *The nature of prejudice,* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley. 1954.

Barry, B. "Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism". Cambridge: Polity Press, P. 416. 1999.

Bauböck, R. "Social and cultural integration in a civil society". pp.67-133 In R. Bauböck, A. *The Challenge of Diversity: Integration and Pluralism in Societies of Immigration,* European Center Vienna, 1996.

Begtsson, B. Strømblad, P. and Bay, A. *Diversity, inclusion and citizenship in Scandinavia.* Cambridge scholars publishing 2010

Berg, Bruce, L. *Qualatative Research methods for Social Science,* fourth Edition. Allyn and Bacon 2001

Bhattacherjee, Anol, *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practice* USF Tampa Bay Open Access Textbooks Collection. Book 3. 2012. http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa_textbooks/3

Bouchard, G. "What is Interculturalism?" McGill Law Journal- Revue de droit de McGill

Cantel, Ted, pp. 435-468, 2001.

Dumbrill Gary C. "Parental experience of child protection intervention: A qualitative study", Child Abuse & Neglect 30, pp.27–37 2006

Geertz, Clifford *The interpretation of Cultures: Selected essays,* Basic Books, Inc. USA 1973

Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. *Parents cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions and consequences.* (Eds.) New York: Guilford. 1996.

Heller, & A. Zolberg *The challenge of diversity: Integration and pluralism in societies of immigration* pp. 67–133. Eds. Vienna: Avebury. 1996

Hylland-Eriksen, T. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*

London and Sterling: Pluto Press 2002

Ibarrola-Armendariz, Aitor Racial "Relations and Citizenship in the United States" pp.244-52In *Citizenships and Identities: Inclusion, Exclusion, Participation*. Ed. by Ann K. Isaacs. Pisa: Plus-Pisa University Press. , 2010

Joppke, Christian, "The retreat of the multiculturalisim in the liberal state: theory and policy" The British Journal of Sociology.Volume 55 Issue 2, 2004

Juul, Randi, "Barnevernets undersøkelser av bekymringsmeldinger: dikursive praksis-former og barneperspektiver, og konsekvenser I forhold til barna". Avhandling for graden philosophiae doctor, NTNU, Doktoravhandlinger ved NTNU, 2010

Kesler, C., Bloemraad, I. "Does Immigration Erode Social Capital?The Conditional Effects of Immigration-Generated Diversity on Trust, Membership, and Participation across 19 Countries, 1981-2000". Canadian Journal of Political Science 43(2) pp.319-347, 2010

Kymlicka, W. *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights.* Oxford: Clarendon. 1995

Kriz, Katrin and Skivenes, Marit "Challenges for marginalized minority parents in different welfare systems: Child welfare workers' perspectives", International Social Work published online 17 October 2012
http://isw.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/10/17/0020872812456052

Levy, J. *The Multiculturalism of fear*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000

Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco, *Migration Minorities and Citizenship, social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe: making multicultural democracy Work,* PALGRAVE MACMILLAN. 2011

Marshall, T.H. "Citizenship and social class", (first published 1950), published in Inequality and Society, edited by Jeff Manza and Michael Sauder, W. W. Norton and Co.: New York, 2009

Malcom, J. *Interculturalisim: Theory and Policy,* The Baring Foundation 2007

Nanda, Serena & Warms, Richard, *Cultural Anthropology, Nith Edition* Thomson Learning, Inc. 2007

Nasar Meer & Tariq Modood "How does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism?", Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33:2, pp.175-196, 2012 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2011.618266

Norges Offentlig Utredninger (NOU) 2011:14, *Bedre Integrering, Mål, strategier, tiltak.* Departementenes servicesenter Informasjonsforvaltning, Oslo 2011

Parekh, B. *Rethinking Multiculturalisim,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2000

Parekh, B. *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory.* London: Macmillan Press. 2006

Puntham, R. "Social Capital: Measurement and Consequences", pp. 1-32, 2000. http://www.oecd.org/edu/country-studies/1825848.pdf

Putnam, *R. E "*Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century", The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. Scandinavian Political Studies, 30(2), pp.137–174. 2007

Rex, John, "Multiculturalism and Political Integration in the Modern Nation State" Serie: Dinámicas interculturales Número 1. Multiculturalism and Political Integration in the Modern Nation State Edita: CIDOB edicions pp. 5-24, 2004.

Rodríguez-García, Dan, "Beyond Assimilation and Multiculturalism: A Critical Review of the Debate on Managing Diversity Int. Migration & Integration" 11:251–271, 2010

Shala Adem, Eide, Ketil. "Somalieres mote med Nav". Tidsskrift for Velferdsforskning, Fagbokforlaget. vol 15, nr. 1, pp.11-22, 2012

Schiller, Nina Glick and Andreas Wimmer, "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical

Epistemology". International Migration Review 37 (3): pp. 576–610, 2003

Sen, A. *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny.* London: Allen Lane. 2006

Stolcke, V. "Talking culture: new boundaries, new rhetoric's of exclusion in Europe". Current Anthropology, 36 (1), pp.1–24,1995

Taylor, C. *The politics of recognition.* pp. 25–73. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition,* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1994

Tharmalingam, S. 2011 "Towards integration in Norway: Dynamics of cultural incorporation in the context of Transnationalization". Int. Migration & Integration 14: pp. 1-18, 2013

Wimmer Andreas, "The making of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory". American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 113, 4 pp. 970-1022, 2008

Wimmer A. and Schiller N. Glick "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration. An Essay in Historical Epistemology", International Migration Review 37 (3) pp. 576–610, 2003

Wise, Sarah & Silva, da Lisa., "Differential parenting of children from cultural backgrounds attending child care", Research paper NO. 39, Australian Institute of Family Studies 2007

Yin, Robert K. *Applications of case study research,* 2nd ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 34, 2003

Zechenter, M. Elisabeth, "In the name of culture: Cultural Relativism and Abuse of the Individual", Journal of Anthropological Research, Vol. 53, Universal Human Rights versus Cultural relativity, pp. 319-347, 2000

Østby, L, "Rasisme eller kultur: Perspektiver I utdanning av sosialarbeidere I Norge og England", FONTENE Forskning 1/08, pp. 49-61, 2004

Homepages:

Arbeids og Inkluderingsdepartementet. "Somaliere I Norge, en arbeidsgrupperapport" 2009
http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/AID/publikasjoner/rapporter_og_planer/2009/R_somaliere_i_Norge.pdf

Audun Lysbakken, Speech/article, "CWS in a inclusive society", by addressing CWS workers Minister of Ministry for Children, Equality and Social Inclusion on 23.09.2011,

http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/bld/aktuelt/taler_artikler/ministeren/taler-og-artikler-av-barne--likestilling/2011/barnevern-i-et-inkluderende-samfunn.html?id=655244

Barneombudet, Supplerende Rapport til FNs Komite for barns rettigheter, 2009www.barneombudet.no

Barvik, G. & Kleven R. Kunnskap om offentlige tjenester i innvandrerbefolkningen – bestilling Oppsummering pr. oktober 2012 IMDI www.imdi.no

Blom, S. og Henriksen, K. Levekår blant innvandrere i Norge 2005/2006. SSB. Rapporter 2008/5 2008.

Stattistisk for the largesy immigrant group in Norway: SSB 2013. http://www.ssb.no/a/publikasjoner/pdf/rapp_200805/rapp_200805.pdf

Community Cohesion: A report of the independent Review team, Institute of Community Cohesion 2012 http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Publications/Documents/Document/Default.aspx?recordId=96

Dyrhaug, T. & Kvale, T. Barn og unge med innvandrerbakgrunn i barnevernet 2009, SSB Rapport 39/2011 http://www.ssb.no/a/publikasjoner/pdf/rapp_201139/rapp_201139.pdf

Engebrigtsen, Ada & Farstad, Gunhild R. Somaliere i eksil i Norge, en kartlegging av erfaringer fra fem kommuner og ate bydeler I Oslo, Norsk institutt for forskning og aldring NOVA Skriftserie 1/2004 Fafo 2004, http://unpos.unmissions.org/

Fangen, Katrine Humiliation as experienced by Somali Refugees in Norway, Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo 2004 http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/FangenSomalia.pdf

Haagensen, E., Thorud, E., Jølstad, Ola Finn. International Migration SOPEMI- report for Norway 2009-2010 http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/AD/publikasjoner/rapporter/2011/SOPEMI_Report_2010.pdf

Henriksen, Kristen, Levekår og kjønnsforskjeller blant innvandrere fra ti land. SSB Rapporter 6/2010 http://www.ssb.no/a/publikasjoner/pdf/rapp_201006/rapp_201006.pdf

Holm-Hansen, Jørn, Thomas Haaland og Trine Monica Myrvold (2007). Flerkulturelt barnevern. En kunnskapsoversikt. NIBR-rapport 10/2007. http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/BLD/Barnevern/2011/Barnevern_i_et_minoritetsperspektiv_evaluering.pdf

Holmøy, E. and B. Strøm: Makroøkonomi og offentlige finanser i ulike scenarioer for innvandring (Macroeconomic aspects of different scenarios for immigration). Report 2012/15, Statistics Norway, Oslo-Kongsvinger 2012. http://www.ssb.no/emner/09/90/rapp_201215/

Hylland-Eriksen, T. H. Immigration and National identity, Migration Policy Institute, 2013 http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/TCM-Norwaycasestudy.pdf

Hylland-Eriksen, Stories about Somalies" 2008 published on http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/Somalis.html

IMDi, Offentlige tjenester for alle? Gjennomgang av minoritetsperspektivet i 10 statlige etater. Rapport 7/2006. http://www.imdi.no/no/Kunnskapsbasen/Innholdstyper/Rapporter/2006/IMDi-Rapport-72006-Offentlige-tjenester-for-alle/

IMDi, Bruk av tolk i barnevernet. Rapport 5/2008. http://www.imdi.no/no/Kunnskapsbasen/Innholdstyper/Rapporter/20052/IMDi-rapport-5-2008-Bruk-av-tolk-i-barnevernet/

Institute of Community Cohesion. Cohesion, integration and openness: from "Multi" to "Inter"Culturalisim 2012 http://www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Resources/Publications

Meld. St. 6 Melding til Stortinget, En helhetlig integreringspolitikk, Mangfold og Felleskap. Det konglige Barne -, Likestillings-og inkluderingsdepartement 2012-2013 http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/38098840/PDFS/STM201220130006000DDDPDFS.pdf

OMOD, 2008 http://www.omod.no/?p=1545

Oslo as an intercultural city. Council of Europe, COE, 2012. www.coe.int/intercultural-cities

Søholt, S. & Wessel, T. Contextualizing ethnic residential segregation in Norway: welfare, housing and integration policies. NORFACE Research Program on Migration 2010. http://blogs.helsinki.fi/nodesproject/files/2010/12/Norway.pdf

Østby, L Norway's population groups of developing countries' origin

Change and integration Statistisk sentralbyrå, Statistics Norway Oslo–Kongsvinger 2013.http://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/_attachment/103718?_ts=13d6d5b6cc

Case

Sak nr. 49/2011, Vedtak 29.juni 2012 found at 2.5.13 Likestillings- og diskriminerings-nemda http://www.omod.no/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/LDN-vedtak-om-skjæring.pdf

Interviews

See Annex 2 for list of interviews.