Constructing subject positions in the Danish integration field.

- A case study of integration projects for refugee and immigrant women.

Julie Lykke Nielsen

Master Thesis
Global Refugee Studies
Aalborg University Copenhagen

Supervisor: Marlene Spanger
October 2014

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
STUDENT REPORT

Abstract

Nowadays, integration is a well known and heavily discussed concept in Denmark. The rise of an neo-nationalistic discourse and the construction of an 'us' and 'them' dichotomy have been evident since the national elections in 2001. The focus on cultural and religious differences has created a strong political incentive for integrating 'them' into 'our' Danish society. Alongside this development the ‘field of integration‘ has been professionalized and expanded. This study use ‘the field of integration’ as the overall contextual framework, and at a micro level focuses on 'integration practices'. The aim of the thesis is to examine which *subject positions* are made available for ‘unintegrated’ refugee and immigrant women. Furthermore, the aim is to examine how political and public discourses are reflected upon in the integration practices. The thesis will use two integration projects as cases. The two projects, DIVIDA and MultiKvinder, both focus on refugee and immigrant women, and have the same holistic and affirmative approach to their target group.

This master thesis is inspired by post-structuralism, which enables a study of categorization processes, identity constructions and becomings that are present in the two integration projects that the thesis examines. These processes are examined based on semi-structured qualitative interviews with the staff and the refugee and immigrant women. The analysis is based on a varied theoretical framework. Barbara Cruikshank offers a theoretical perspective on technologies of empowerment and how these link to subjectivity processes. Nanna Mik-Meyer and Margaretha Järvinen will be used to analyze categorizations and problem identities within social work in practice. Inspired by Dorte Marie Søndergaard, Rikke Andreassen and Jacobsen and Stenvoll, this study will include an intersectional perspective since gender, ethnicity, age and class are member categories that have influenced the empirical data collection. Thus, this study includes the researcher and her subject position in the data collection and the analysis. As the analysis will show, the staff of the two integration projects present a number of available subject positions to the women. The women reflect upon these positions, when they internalize or disrupt them. The subject positions that are presented and negotiated by the staff and the women focuses on two main positions: ‘Victim subject’ and ‘Empowered subject’, which both are based on the categorization: ‘Unintegrated’. The staff portray their affirmative integration practice as a ‘best practice’ and distance the projects from the practice of the job centers and show an antipathy against the public and political discourses on integration. Thus, a new ‘us’ and ‘them’ is constituted.

Preface

This Master Thesis has been conducted at Global Refugee Studies, Department of political sciences, Aalborg University Copenhagen. The research area for the thesis is the Danish field of integration. I would like to thank the staff and the women from the two integration projects MultiKvinder and DIVIDA for their participation in the qualitative interviews I have conducted. Furthermore, I would like to thank my friend Richard for proofreading, my housemates of 'Kollektivet Rådvild' for moral support and Andreas for helpful discussions and encouragement. Last but not least, I would like to thank my supervisor, Assistant Professor Marlene Spanger for relevant inputs, constructive feedback and knowledgeable guidance.

Julie Lykke Nielsen

Aalborg University - Copenhagen

October 2014

INTRODUCTION **1**

PROBLEM AREA **1**
RESEARCH QUESTION **4**
THESIS OUTLINE **4**

CONTEXTUALISING THE FIELD OF INTEGRATION **5**

INTRODUCTION **5**
THE EMERGENCE OF NEO-NATIONALISM IN DENMARK 6
A NEGATIVE DISCOURSE ON IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES 7
CALL FOR 'BETTER INTEGRATION' 8
PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE INTEGRATION FIELD 10

PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE **13**

INTRODUCTION **13**
POST-STRUCTURALISM **13**
SUBJECTIVITY 14
UNSTABLE CATEGORIES 15
DISCOURSE AND POWER 16

METHODOLOGY **19**

INTRODUCTION **19**
CASES 19
MULTIKVINDER 21
DIVIDA 22
INTERVIEW 23
THE FORM OF THE INTERVIEW 24
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS 25

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK **27**

INTRODUCTION **27**
SUBJECTS AND EMPOWERMENT **28**
EMPOWERMENT STRATEGIES 29
BIO POWER 30
EMPOWERMENT 31
'TO CREATE A CLIENT' **32**
INSTITUTIONS AND IDENTITIES 33
INTERSECTIONALITY **35**
INTERSECTIONALITY IN GENDER RESEARCH 35
VICTIM-SUBJECT 36
REPRESENTATIONS OF MUSLIM MINORITY WOMEN 37

POSITIONING THE RESEARCHER **39**

THE RESEARCHERS POSITION IN 'THE FIELD' 39
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK 44

ANALYSIS PART I - 'THE STAFF' **47**

INTRODUCTION **47**
'SOFT EMPOWERMENT' 47
'THE DEVELOPMENT STORY' 51
'AN INTEGRATION SPACE' 56
VICTIM POSITION 59
EMPLOYMENT = INTEGRATION 63
SUMMING UP 70

ANALYSIS PART II - 'THE WOMEN' **72**

INTEGRATION OBJECT 72
VICTIM POSITION 75
SUMMING UP 79

DISCUSSION **81**

CONCLUSION **85**

FUTURE STUDIES **87**

REFERENCES **88**

BOOKS **88**
ARTICLES & RESEARCH PAPERS **89**
WEBSITES **90**

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE – THE STAFF **91**

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE – THE WOMEN **92**

Introduction

The status of refugees and immigrants in Denmark has been of interest to me for many years. I have engaged in different projects related to the political and social situations of refugees and immigrants as an activist, volunteer, intern and employee. Since I entered the 'professional' field of integration, I have wanted to conduct research on the practices of integration in the social area. I was especially interested in the processes of categorization and how this creates specific subject positions for people.

In the fall of 2014, I interviewed the staff and the users from two integration projects for refugee and immigrant women in Copenhagen. These interviews gave me unexpected perspectives on the field of integration. This master's thesis is based on a personal interest in 'the integration field' and thus will be the starting point for this document.

Problem area

From a post-structural point of view, communities and societies can be seen as constructed spaces where cultural ideas and norms are challenged, contested and changed. These specific changes can be investigated at a more empirical level, where the notion of society and identity are constructed and negotiated. The questions of inclusion and exclusion of specific groups are central to this construction (Hvenegaard Lassen, 2007).

Within the integration field, many different actors and stakeholders try to affect the political and public discourse on 'integration'. Nowadays, integration is a well known and heavily discussed concept in Denmark. Whereas 'integration' in the past had many different meanings, today it is almost only associated with integration of refugees and immigrants (Olwig and Paerregaard, 2011). Many politicians, experts and citizens take part in daily debates and discussion on 'good' and 'bad' integration, thus integration is often a topic in the daily media. Although, conflicting opinions are present in the political sphere, a movement towards the right, with stricter immigrant and asylum policies, has been evident (Hervik, 2006). Alongside with the political change towards a more immigration critical discourse, there are stories

highlighting immigrants and integration in the media. In this way, negative and stereotypical representations of refugees and immigrants occupies a significant number of articles and TV-news reports (Andreassen, 2007). Immigrants from non-western countries, particularly Muslims, have been portrayed as a threat to danish values, and have been the focus of the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy presented by right-winged politicians (Hervik, 2006). Stereotypical images of immigrant and refugee women, based on intersections between gender, ethnicity and religion, are produced and reproduced in the media as well as in the political discourse. A generalized image is that of Muslim women being oppressed, specifically victims of male oppression, within their ethnic/religious communities. This is primarily due to the traditional and patriarchal mindset that the refugees and immigrants bring with them from their countries of origin (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010).

Refugees, immigrants and their descendants are often seen as opposed to 'danish' values, such as freedom of speech, women rights, democracy and values of the welfare state. The question of how to integrate refugees and immigrants and make 'them' true members of the danish society, who adhere to the 'welfare state values', have become an important issue in danish politics (Olwig and Paerregaard, 2011). This has led to a ministry in charge of 'integration', several social-policies regarding 'integration', academic and ethnic experts on 'integration' with several actors, institutions, strategies and policies. A Number of initiatives and integration projects are being funded by the government and the municipalities, all trying to include the marginalized ‘unintegrated’ people into danish society. Social-policies are transformed into integration *practices* found in integration projects at the local level, where the aim regarding the group of 'unintegrated ethnic minority women' is to 'develop' them into self-sufficient, active, participatory and productive citizens (Cruikshank, 1999). Within these projects, power relations exist and are negotiated through daily practices. Different subject positions are presented for, and interpreted by, the ethnic minority women, based on intersecting categories of gender, ethnicity and religion (Søndergaard, 1996). These categories overlap in the practices found in the integration projects.

This project will rely on a theoretical understanding of integration as a process where the

minorities own culture is maintained, while simultaneously including the minorities in a common national culture. Neither the groups own culture or the common culture are static but are developed in a dialogue. Thus, the concept of integration is constructed as a contradiction to the concept of assimilation and segregation, both of which are linked with a more static approach towards culture (Larsen, 2006).

This study will use the 'integration practices' as the empirical field of research, in which meanings are constructed and discourses[1] reaffirmed or disrupted in different ways. The field of integration will not be used as a field of observation with all ready known problems to be analyzed, since this will remain open towards new perspectives found during the empirical data collection (Hvenegård-Lassen, 2007). The integration field is the framework that constitutes the research of *subject positions* and discourses on integration that takes place within integrations practices. The thesis will use two integration projects as the empirical data material; DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. Both projects have a focus on marginalized women who have come to Denmark as refugees, immigrants or via family reunification. Women who are defined as 'excluded' have a very limited knowledge and contact with danish language and society. The two cases were chosen because of their similarities in target group and methods, since this study is not comparative. Both projects have a holistic methodology towards the target group, and use an approach built on recognition. As the analysis will show, 'the staff' of the two integration projects present a number of available subject positions to 'the women', who are the users of the projects. The women reflect upon these positions, which reaffirms or disrupts them. These subject positions are focused around two main categories: 'Victim subject' and 'Empowered subject', which both are based on the client position: 'Unintegrated objects'. This position is the basis for intervention by the social workers who's aim it is to clarify, categorize and make possible solutions to the 'problem identity' to which the person is connected (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003). This is based on the openness to the clients inner self and a willingness to cooperate and develop. The 'development' of people *self* is linked to technologies of biopower, where the aim is to teach people how to manage and control their own life

[1] I follow the Foucauldian understanding of 'Discourse' which is based on an idea that meanings and norms are not given. They are constructed, negotiated, reaffirmed and disrupted. A discourse is formed when specific themes are

(Foucault, 1976). On an every day level, technologies of biopower can be found in the integration projects that this study will base its analysis on.

Research Question

Based on the forgoing problem area I would like to raise the following research question:

"Which subject positions for refugee and immigrant women are presented and negotiated by the social workers and the women in the integration projects DIVIDA and MultiKvinder, and how does the staff portray their integration practices in relation to general public/political discourses on integration?"

Thesis outline

The structure of the thesis is as follows. In the first chapter I will introduce and present the the aim of the thesis as well as research area within which my research questions lies . I will moreover present the contextual framework for the field of integration, the political and public development regarding immigration and integration. Conclusively it describes the increased focus on integration work and the professionalization of the field. Chapter 2 concerns my philosophy of science and methodology. I am inspired by post structuralism, and this chapter will provide the reader with the aspect of post structuralism relevant for this study. Furthermore, I will present my chosen method and the two integration projects that I will use as cases. Chapter 3 deals with the theoretical framework where technologies of empowerment, categorization of clients and intersectionality are elaborated upon. Chapter 4 leads up to the analysis with a 'pre analysis' of the researcher's position in the field. Inspired by post-structuralist ideas I will reflect upon the positions that I am placed in by the interviewees and how I myself categorize the interviewees. Finally, this chapter presents an analytical framework. Chapter 5 is the analysis, which i divided into two parts: one part that deals with the perspectives of the staff, and one part that deals with the perspectives of the refugee and immigrants women from the projects. In chapter 6 I will discuss my findings in order to answer my research question in the conclusion, which is chapter 6. I will end the project with suggestions for future research.

Contextualising the field of integration

This section will provide the reader with a contextual framework since it places the integration practices in a wider context. It will focus on two different 'developments' connected to refugees and immigrants for the last fifteen years. Firstly, I will describe the development of a critical discourse on immigration and integration in the media and in the political sphere. This constitutes one perspective towards refugees and immigrants which have implied a stricter asylum and immigration law with purpose of Denmark receiving as few foreigners as possible. The critique of a failed integration policy lead to a new focus on those refugees and immigrants that were already in Denmark, who needed to become more integrated into the Danish society. Thus, I will present the development of a professional field of integration that already existed prior to the focus on 'failed integration', but developed and professionalized in relation to the 'new' clients in social work: refugees and immigrants. The chapter aims at presenting some of the discourses that I believe to be important to outline in this thesis. Thus, I will not explain all the different contradicting discourses that the field of integration contains.

Introduction

Immigration throughout history is a well know phenomenon. For economic reasons, political asylum and other reasons for refuge, people have come to Denmark to start up a new life in a new setting. The response from the national governments to immigration has been to try to integrate or assimilate the immigrant into the Danish cultural values and social norms. This is rooted in a perception of Denmark as being a country based on democratic, modern and liberal values contradicting the widely accepted perception of 'the foreigners' as backwards and oppressive (Olwig & Paerregaard, 2011: 2). A discourse, which will be discussed further below in this chapter.

During the 1960's and the 1970's, Denmark received a number of labour migrants from the Turkey, Pakistan and North Africa. When Denmark experienced an economic recession and unemployment increased, many of the immigrants had obtained permanent visas and, subsequently, decided to stay. From the mid-seventies up until 1990's, labor immigration

ceased and at the same time Denmark began to receive refugees from Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Iraq, the Balkans, Iran, Lebanon and Somalia (Olwig & Paerregaard, 2011: 3). To many Danes, what began as the arrival of a few thousands labor immigrants, that Denmark had invited themselves, developed into an influx of people from distant parts of the world. They came with entirely different cultural and social norms, something which was perceive as a new development seen in a historical context. Although the influx of immigrants and refugees have been modest compared to other parts of the world, it is nevertheless a common notion that, whereas Denmark used to be a culturally homogeneous country, this is no longer the case because of the settlement of immigrants and refugees in Denmark (Olwig & Paerregaard, 2011: 4). It is at the stance of this perception that neo-nationalism have gained a foothold in Danish society.

The emergence of neo-nationalism in Denmark

According to Hervik (2006), a rise of neo-nationalism emerged in the Danish political and public sphere since around the beginning of 1990's, which peaked in 2001 where the national election campaign was centered on issues of immigration and asylum policies. Although nationalistic tendencies and statements had been present before 2001, it was during the election campaign in 2001 and the following years that neo-nationalism cemented in Danish political discourse and became widely accepted by many Danish citizens, whom in 2001 voted for parties that campaigned for a much more strict immigration and asylum policy.

Questions about the legal and social position of different immigrant or refugee groups have been brought up in the political agenda from the beginning of the 1990's. Bosnian refugees were discussed politically and in the media in the years of 1992-1995, where Denmark received around 17.000 refugees. Left and right ended up agreeing on a temporary solution where Bosnian camps were placed outside normal integration procedures. Since the Balkan wars did not end within the period of two years, the temporary residence permit lasted, it was agreed that the Bosnian refugees had the possibility of applying for permanent residency (Hervik, 2006: 96).

Another group of people who were discussed in the public was the Somali refugees, who were

the topic in a number of critical articles launched in 1996 and 1997 by the tabloid newspaper ‘Ekstra Bladet’ and a provincial newspaper, ‘Aarhus Stifttidende’. During these series of articles, the newly established party, Dansk Folkeparti (Danish People's Party) had a major role in the media and political discourse on immigration and refugee policies. In the months of 1997, many scores of articles and statements were put forth with the messages that Somali refugee could not be integrated. Their traditional, nomadic lifestyle was simply too different from the 'Danish culture'. With the focus on the ”backwardness” of their culture, neo-racist features were present as well. Whereas, the Bosnian refugees were the dominant 'other' in the first half of the 1990's, the Somalia refugees took over as the 'scapegoat' (Hervik, 2011: 69).

A negative discourse on immigrants and refugees

In 2001, many of the campaigning parties, from The Social Democrats, to the Liberal Party Venstre, followed a negative discourse on immigrants and refugees. The running minister candidate for the Liberal Party ‘Venstre’, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, stated that the former government had failed in their immigration policies as well as their integration policies:

”After nine years with Nyrup [the former prime minister] refugee and immigrant problems are bigger than ever. More than every second immigrant is without work. The number of people under the family reunification law is increasing an increasing. Danish values have come under pressure from fundamentalist groups...Second-generation immigrants are responsible for a disproportionate share of crime and violence in Danish society” (Anders Fogh Rasmussen in Hervik, 2006: 93).

The nationalistic politics and rhetoric were decisive for the outcome of the election and the right-wing won the election by an overwhelmingly majority. This allowed the Liberals and the Conservatives (‘Venstre’ and ‘Det Konservative Folkeparti’) to form a coalition with the nationalistic party Danish People's Party (‘Dansk Folkeparti’), a party with extreme statements on immigrants and their descendant, particularly Muslims (Ibid.). An enemy image of Muslims became evident in the discourse on immigrants, refugees and their descendants, and neo-nationalism constituted the 'them' and 'us' dichotomy. These immigrants, refugees and their descendants were able to bring spouses from outside Europe to Denmark. Something which was seen as a non-integrating behavior, and according to member of the Liberal party ‘Venstre’,

ought to be stopped: *"We need to prevent immigrants and their descendants from finding their spouses in Turkey, Pakistan and Somalia"* (Birthe Rønn Hornbech in Hervik, 2006: 92). Since the election of 2001 were focused on stricter immigration policies, these types of statement were not unusual. Very extreme statements also joined the debate and made the standard nationalistic statements seem 'normal'. Member of The Progress Party ('Fremskridtspartiet'), nowadays a member of Danish Peoples Party('Dansk Folkeparti'), stated that: *"Muslims are just waiting for the right moment to kill us."* (Mogens Camre in Hervik, 2006: 92). Also the former Prime Minister from The Socialdemocrats ('Socialdemokratitet'), who had been accused of leading a 'weak' and failed immigration and integration policy, followed the new neo-nationalistic discourse with statements that compared Muslims to rats: *"If you try to legislate your way out of these problems [Muslim organizations], it is a historical rule that rats always find new holes, if you cover up the old ones"* (Poul Nyrup Rasmussen in Hervik, 2006: 92). National elections and referendums can be seen as hallmarks of democracy. In the Danish example they have also been events where neo-nationalism and neo-racism have emerged (Hervik, 2006: 94).

Call for 'better integration'

The dichotomy of 'us' and 'them' that the neo-nationalistic discourse allowed, which focused on cultural and religious differences, created a strong political incentive for integrating 'them' into 'our' Danish society. The notion of cultural differences was something, and still is, embedded in the discourse on immigration and integration that plays out in a political struggle of values (Skovholm, 2005: 86).

Already in 1999, the government had launched a new integration where the purpose was to enable immigrants and refugees to become 'productive citizens' on equal terms with the Danes. Different initiatives were taken to improve language skills and employment possibilities for the immigrants and refugees already living in Denmark. At the same time, asylum laws were tightened and a geographical distribution of newly arrived refugees was introduced (Hervik, 2006: 101). With the integration act, refugees and others accepted into the country that entered through the official program of integration would receive far less welfare support than

Danes. Kirsten Hvenegård-Lassen (2002) identified the integration act as the first legitimizing act of the unequal treatment of certain groups of people in Denmark. Newcomers became second-class citizens, constituted in the economic differentiation between Danes and immigrants or refugees (Hervik, 2011: 70).

After the election in 2001 that focused on stricter immigration and asylum policies and criticism of a failed integration policy by the former Social democratic government, the government had to address the integration of the immigrants and refugees already living in Denmark. Several statements and stories on failed integration policies predominated the discourse on integration. Unemployment, crime, social fraud and poor language skills were some of the symbols on a failed integration policy. The liberal party Venstre subscribed to the idea thatgood integration equals employment, a came up with suggestions like economic support for municipalities who manage to get 'their' immigrants and refugees into employment (Jyllandsposten 2002). This was based on the imperative that refugees and immigrants must work, in order to 'prove' and fulfill their obligations towards the welfare state.
Also, at a local level, politicians accused each other for leading an inefficient integration policy. The Social Democrats who had the majority in Copenhagen, were accused of a failed integration policy (Ritzaus Bureau 2003). Integration policies, and the use of 'stick' and 'carrot' (Ritzaus Bureau 2004)[2], were debated among many different parties, where also the leftist parties opted for a stricter integration policy with a focus on 'rights and obligations' (Politiken 2001). The need for taking integration policies seriously, was among many other ideas, transformed into the suggestion for an 'integration mayor' in Copenhagen. Criticized for a failed integration policy, the Mayor of Copenhagen Jens Kramer Mikkelsen stated: *"By uniting integration at one place we signal that we want something whit this, and at the same time we create awareness about this area"* (Ritzaus Bureau 2004).

The increased focus on failed integration called out for 'Better integration' which consisted of

[2]'Stick and carrot' (pisk og gulerod) is used in Denmark as a metaphor for policies that either rewards people (give them carrot) for acting in accordance with certain policy or regulation or punishes them for not obeying (hurt them with the stick).

stricter regulations on welfare benefits, new programs and initiatives for improving language skills and employment possibilities for refugee and immigrants. A large number of integration projects and programs have been one of the responses to the discourse on failed integration policy, and an attempt address the problems of 'unintegrated' individuals. The Danish welfare system regard this group of social clients as particular problematic and difficult to integrate, and therefore in need of special attention and means of intervention (Olwig and Paerregaard, 2011: 22). Thus, the group became a category in the social system where special programs and projects were initiated to meet their special needs. Furthermore, social workers in many different social institutions like job centers and the family centres were trained in 'intercultural communication' and other skills in order to meet the clients with other ethnic backgrounds than Danish. Furthermore, many social institutions started recruiting staff with other ethnic backgrounds than Danish since it was believed to create an intercultural understanding among the professionals (Skovholm, 2005: 105). New logics based on 'cultural' or 'intercultural' knowledge became evident within the social service area. The politicization of 'cultural differences' in the public and political sphere also created an awareness among some professionals in the social service field who distanced themselves from labelling 'culture' as a the key factor in their work with ethnic minorities. This is based on the professional ideal 'to meet the individual not the culture' (Skovholm, 2005: 85).

Professionalization of the integration field

The critique that was posed against the integration policies, also affected the discourse on 'the integration field' in practice. On a municipal level, local Copenhagen politicians were in the beginning of the 2000's criticized for not taking the integration efforts seriously enough (Jyllandsposten 2004).

There has been a development towards a professionalization of the integration field, with several educations geared directly at jobs in the integration area. Positions like 'integration employee' and 'integration consultant' are normal in many social institutions. Places like the language school, the job centers, and elementary schools have become 'spaces of integration'.

‘Cultural encounters’ at Roskilde University (Cultural Encounters)[3], ‘Minority studies’ at Copenhagen University (Minority Studies)[4], ‘International social work’[5] at Metropol (International Social Work), are just some of the degrees that are possible to study, if one wants to enter the ‘integration business’.

Knowledge and expertise on minorities and ‘integration’ are collected and systematized in databases. On the website *www.integrationsviden.dk*, one can find experts on integration, news on integration, statistics etc. The website is divided into different themes connected to integration; ‘School and education’, ‘Employment’, ‘Democracy and participation’, ‘Family and health’ and ‘Newly arrived’. The purpose of the database is that staff working in the integration field can share knowledge, tools and experiences with each other. The database, *www.integrationsbarometer.dk*, collects statistics on different themes related to integration with the purpose of measuring and benchmarking the integration development in Denmark. To be able to measure the success or failure of integration, one has to measure up against already identified parameters. They measure ‘good integration’ based on nine objectives related to; education, employment, Danish language skills, citizenship, equal treatment, self-determination, social benefits, social marginalized residential and crime. The database is also a media for the government to make their priorities and objectives for good integration visible. The database focuses on integration research related to refugees and immigrants from non-western countries, since “studies show that this group of people faces the most difficulties in the integration process” (Integrationsbarometer).

Besides databases that collect and share information and knowledge on ‘integration’, the professionalization can also be seen in the many conferences and courses related to integration. The municipalities national organization, ‘Kommunernes Landsorganisation’, and

[3] ”(...) In relation to integration, you can apply for positions in integration projects that deal with refugees and immigrants at an international and national level”.

[4] ”(…) Der undervises i Metode og praksis i integrationsarbejde, Politisk radikalisering af minoriteter, Transnationale fællesskaber blandt minoriteter, Minoriteters organisering på internettet, Minoritetsperspektiver på globalisering, Velfærdsstat og minoritet, Muslimer i Europa (…)”.

[5] ” Den interkulturelle / internationale socialrådgiveruddannelses specifikke formål er at uddanne socialrådgivere til; (…) at udvikle interkulturel kompetence, at kunne arbejde med flygtninge og med etniske minoritetsgrupper i Danmark”.

the social board, ‘Socialstyrelsen’ invite leaders and staff in municipalities, partnerships and other people who work with refugees and immigrants to an annual integration conference (Integrationstræf). When leaders and staff within the integration field, do not go to conferences and share knowledge, experiences and tools for better integration, they celebrate good integration on different occasions. On the annual Integrations award, ‘Integrationsprisen’, people are celebrated for contributing to a better integration of refugees and immigrants. The categories are 'Best municipality', 'Best immigrant parent', 'Best workplace' and 'Best volunteer association' (Integrationsprisen).

Thus, a professionalization of the ‘integration field’ has occurred based on the establishment of an independent area with a large number of initiatives and projects. This Master thesis will examine two of the integration projects.

Philosophy of science

Introduction

This master thesis is inspired by post-structuralism, which I have chosen as my philosophy of science. I would like to emphasize that post-structuralistic field consists of many varied positions, of which only the characteristics that I find relevant to this current study have been outlined in the following section. The framework of post-structuralism allows for the study of processes of categorizations, identity constructions and becomings that are present in the two integration projects that I am working with. Furthermore, it entails a certain reflection upon my own position in the data collection, where I have interviewed refugee and immigrant women, and the staff of the two integration projects. These methodological considerations will be presented in the second chapter, 'methodology'. Some academics argue that post-structuralism is a meta -theoretical and abstract philosophy, and thus difficult to use in practice. Post-structuralism needs to be 'digested', rethought and transformed into useful analytical tools (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 60). One cannot simply take the ideas and thoughts of post-structuralism and follow a logical pattern of thoughts and end up with a set of inevitable analytical consequences. The researcher needs to reflect upon the ideas of post-structuralism in relation to her/his own empirical field. Thus, post-structuralism becomes a starting point for meta-theoretical reflection and the development of one's own analytical approach *inspired* by post-structuralism (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 61). Due to post-structuralisms character of being very philosophical and meta-theoretical, I will present the basic philosophical ideas and thoughts that it derives from.

Post-structuralism

Post-structuralism is founded on structuralism, which originates from France in the 1960's and formed by thinkers like Levi-Strauss, Barthes, Lacan, Derrida and Foucault. Some of the most prominent figures in the 'neo-structuralist' paradigm are Foucault and Derrida. Post-structuralism builds on top of structuralism by focusing on the language as a structural play with signs, however dismantling the idea of a governing center that controls the structures

(Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 148). Instead, the focus lies on linguistic and discursive patterns central to the production of subjectivity and identity. Derrida is placed within the post-structuralistic tradition since his focus lies on a deconstruction of the language, based on discourse analysis. Foucault, although sometimes discussed within other academic circles, is generally also placed within post-structuralism. His aim is to rethink processes of power and discipline, and how these affect the production of the subject (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 150). Thus, the key concepts found in post-structuralism is language, discourses, deconstruction, meaning and symbols.

Subjectivity

A new focus point for the post-structuralist thinkers are centered around 'the subject'. This new focus is based on a critique of the structuralist approach, who accordingly sees the individual as an autonomous, conscious and active subject; an individual bearer of meanings around which the social world develops (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 164). The post-structuralist thinkers argues against the traditional idea of the subject as a rational, integrated, consistent human being governed by intentions and creator of meanings. Thus, a new understanding of subjectivity is embraced (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 176). This thesis will aim to focus on the discursive context that creates expressions and forms of subjectivity. This is based on the assumption that subjects are unstable and contradictory and that identity construction is a process rather than a structure. How we speak and how other people address us or 'call upon' us, constitute the subjectivity of the individual. This draws on different discursive fields from which language emanates and in which the individual finds themselves. Depending on how an individual is addressed, different parts of subjectivity are activated. These may be called upon in different ways due to the different discourses available. Thus, the actions and thinking of an individual relies on the circulation between the subjectivities and the discourses that are available. This means that, depending on representation, language and discursive context, different forms of subjectivity are constituted (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 164). In my master's thesis I will reflect upon the discourses that are available for the staff of the integration projects and analyze which discourses are available for the women who are the

users of these integration projects. I will also investigate which subject positions the staff and the women internalize and how these are reflected by the alignment or the rejection of dominating discourses on integration?

Subjects positions are not developed in a sealed vacuum, but are influenced by the hegemonic discourses[6]. An example of a hegemonic discourse is the dualistic division of 'men' and 'women', which are rarely questioned as a legitimate division of normative categories[7]. Post-structuralists look upon dualism in a critical light, and emphasize that the dualism that people normally base their reflections upon are not objective reflections of the reality (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 64). Dichotomies are constructions that can be deconstructed and disrupted. Just like dichotomies build on polarity, a 'firstness' and a 'secondness'[8], it entails that something is percieved as being different or being something 'other' than the norm. This exclusion of something 'other' or someone different happens in the identity process in which different subject positions are either internalised or rejected (Ibid.). Thus, the subject is an effect of social and discursive processes, rather than the origin of these. The subject is not something pre-existing or definitive, it is "an outcome of a process of subjectivation" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 166). Post-structuralism entails an anti-essentialist approach to the individual since essentialism is perceived as a discursive tool to legitimize norms. One example is the essentialist conclusion that all persons with female body characteristics are less intelligent than men, which lies on quasi scientific biological studies, and legitimizes the power positions that men uphold in many western societies (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 64).

Unstable categories

Post-structuralism rejects the possibility of finding a *true* meaning about a phenomenon. All meaning is constantly changed and displaced, due to its reference to other meanings, which it either refers/confirms or opposes, in order to make itself understandable. It is by this point that

[6] A discourse becomes hegemonic when it is so accepted that it is not questioned and is perceived as normal.
[7] Feminist scholars have done this by deconstructing the categories 'men' and 'women', and opening up for different ways of 'doing' gender. See Butler (1990,1993), Søndergaard (2006) and Staunæs (2003,2004) for further reading.
[8] "Førstehed" and "andethed" on Danish.

it becomes possible to perceive cultural categories like gender and ethnicity as temporal and possibly changing (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 63). Categorizations exists through our repetition, but changes or disruption of these categories will change the reality that the categories postulate. In my research I am inspired by this idea of categories as ever changing, based on the way people articulate the categories either by linking their story to an already existing, well recognised, discourses or disrupt the hegenomic discourses of a certain category.

Different categories or identities such as 'women', 'project leader', 'social worker' are not simply given identities; they are constructed categories that entail certain narratives. These categories do not provide any basis for the expression of voices; rather it is through the voices that the identities are constructed. Categories and identities themselves are problematic since they fix and exclude. However, this does not mean that the use of 'categories' must be rejected, just that is becomes crucial to reflect upon the process of exclusion and avoid getting entangled in already established categories and definitions (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 188). More important than including everything is to have a balanced multiplicity in the perspectives that the empirical data offers. Furthermore, it is important to reflect upon how the different voices, which can be ascribed to certain individual subjects, are handled. A single interview can be interpreted so that the subject expresses multiple discursive constitutions. Thus, the ambiguity of every single interview must be emphasized since individuals are inconsistent and ambiguous. From an empirical point of view we have a two dimensional pluralism/exclusion problem; the question of which different categories, individuals and voices to include or exclude in the data collection process, and which discourses, narratives and reflections to include or exclude within the data collection in the interpretations of the interviews (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 189). In post-structuralistic research one can emphasize to be aware of the cautious process of working with categorization and representation, since the author roughly has the same significance as other voices in the research.

Discourse and power

Since subjects or meanings are not stable or can be understood as something concrete , the grand theories must be seen as possible discourses among many others. Thus, the different

theories must be seen as *suggestions* for possible analytical constructions, and not the only way of approaching the empirical data (Søndergaard in Haavind, 2007: 64).
The outcome of an interview depends on the context that it is produced in. What people say in interviews, writing or in their daily interactions, does not necessarily match their 'real' meanings and attitudes. It can be questioned whether people actually have definite un-ambivalent meanings and attitudes which can be expressed at all. The way language is used does not reflect the person's inner self, but presents a version or a perspective on the subjectivity. Thus, there is no one-to-one relationship between language and the phenomenon described. Neither feelings or values based on subjectivity, nor external factors are consistent (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 202).

Discourses and the production of subjects positions available within different discourses, are closely linked to the concept of power. Foucault's understanding of power breaks with more traditional understandings of power. Power does not constitute some sort of abstract phenomenon that can be studied in isolation. Due to its lack of essence power is not measurable. It exists only in social relations and when it is expressed in action. Power is not viewed as something that some 'have' over another based on influence, knowledge or charisma. This approach would lead to a view of power as something centralized, and thereby neglect the multifaceted character that power, according to Foucault, contains (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 225). Thus, power does not allow itself to be fixed or categorized. Power relationships must be analyzed based on the techniques and forms where they are expressed. It is in the practices, techniques and procedures that power is exercised.
Power is in principle everywhere and can be found in different micro contexts. Foucault does not define power or make any clear theory of it, since he regards as an open arrangement of practices and structures. In this context, the subject itself is contradicting, complex size, that is transformed and reproduced through social practice, in which power is expressed (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 227).

The exercise of power and the application of knowledge are closely linked to each other. When classifying, calibrating, categorizing, codifying social phenomenons, one will develop knowledge

about the area researched. Institutional control is based on knowledge, and thus, knowledge produces a basis for the exercise of power while the exercise of power produces knowledge (Ibid.). The same discourses can both be an instrument and an obstacle to power, since different forces pull in different directions within the discursive field.

My research is based on the two local integration projects, DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. In my interview strategy I have been aware of the linkage between knowledge about the target group and the exercise of power in the two integration projects. Moreover, I have tried to be open minded towards the way different patterns might change or oppose each other. By including a chapter that outlines the contextual framework, I will examine the political/public discourses on integration that links the overall political strategies of integration with the local integration projects. However, as we will see in the analysis, these contradict from each other in several aspects.

Methodology

Introduction

I will argue that post-structuralism often aims very high in it's philosophical scientific ideals, and if taken very literally, can be difficult to put into practice in the methodology. Despite this, I have found inspiration in the ideas and the philosophical grasps that post-structuralism provides. Contradicting more traditional philosophical and methodological perspectives on research, post-structuralism encourages the researcher to reflect critically upon the methodological implications that empirical data collection entails. The originality of post-structuralism in relation to empirical data collection does not lie primarily on questions of how to handle data. Also, the post-structuralist approach does not provide an exact guide on post-structuralist methodology, however some considerations can be outlined.

Firstly, the aim of avoiding a definite approach on theoretical and interpretive level before conducting the empirical data collection. Secondly, the insistence on research as something that should be aware of the ambiguities, differences and divergences of things that might show in the research. And thirdly, the question of authority, that lies implicit in the role of the researcher, who ascribes a specific phenomenon to a certain definite, and thereby legitimized meaning, which then again upholds the researchers authority (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000: 185).

Regarding the data collection questions of inclusion and exclusion becomes important, since the researcher must consider who to include and who to exclude when conducting interviews. In the following chapter I will reflect upon some of these methodological considerations that have shaped my data collection, and thus my master's thesis.

Cases

From the beginning of the research phase, it was the field of *integration* that caught my interest. One of the reason for my interest in this field was that I myself was employed as a student assistant in the 'integration field' on a mentor program for refugee and immigrant women. Through my work, my study and my own interest, I had been made aware of the scope

of the integration field. I wanted to do research on the 'micro level' in order to to analyze the practices of integration work. Furthermore, I wanted the integration projects to have a gender perspective which made me look for integration projects, cases, that targeted refugee and immigrant women, since I knew this was often how the projects had a gender angle - by having a focus on women. Through my own network I knew of a number of projects in the Copenhagen area, which I started to contact. However, initially I found that the position as a 'researcher' gave me some hardship entering the field. In the initial phase of my data collection, I started to contact different integration projects for women to establish a relationship and a way for me gain access to interviewees. I contacted one project at a time through email to explain the content and the purpose of the research. If I had not heard from them after a week, I called them to follow up. One project was to busy to help me in my data collection, and two project gave me the reply that they did not give access to their project or target group, since they wanted to protect the women from too many interruptions in their daily life. Here, my position as a 'researcher' was perceived as a threat to the stability of the women's daily lives, and thus I was denied access to the projects. Based on these experiences, I changed tactics and tried to appear less threatening by simply showing up and present myself at their doorstep. Here, I found that my physical appearance of just being there made a difference. I tried to make the category 'researcher' less threatening, by addressing the project leaders, whom I spoke to, as those I wanted to interview about their perspectives on integration and their project. Right before I left, I mentioned the possibility of interviewing a few of the women from the project, which was received positively and as 'something we will figure out'. Thus, I had gained access to two integration projects that both targeted refugee and immigrant women, which could function as my cases.

The aim is not to do a comparative study of the two cases, rather to gain access to the integration field working with immigrant and refugee women. The two projects, DIVIDA and MultiKvinder, have many similarities in their activities and their target groups also have many similarities. Both projects are also physical places (houses), where the women in their target groups can come and participate in the daily activities. Both projects have Danish classes, counseling, social activities and classes on the Danish society. The women who participate in

MultiKvinder's different activities are older than the women from DIVIDA, where many have young children. DIVIDA has a daycare, so that the women coming for Danish classes or other activities can have their children taken care of during the day. I will present a brief overview of the two cases.

MultiKvinder

MultiKvinder (MultiWomen) is an independent association where the overall purpose is to improve the conditions and the well-being for women with refugee and immigrant backgrounds, and via the women, also their families (MultiKvinder). The association is economically supported by Copenhagen municipality, where they receive funding that secures the basic activities in the house. They also receive §18 funding from Copenhagen municipality, giving to projects based on voluntarism, for the project 'Venindenetværket'[9]. The Social Ministry allocates some funding and the project leader applies for funding from private funds for new projects.

The target group and their daily users are primarily women with refugee and immigrant background in the age of 35-65. However, the project 'Venindenetværket' addresses young women in the age 18-30. A majority of the women are Muslim. MultiKvinder is located in a house in Bispebjerg, Copenhagen, and have two big rooms for activities, a kitchen, three offices for the project leader, the social worker and the nurse. From Monday to Friday a range of different activities take place in the house for women with refugee or immigrant background. The activities are only for women, but men are not forbidden in the house. MultiKvinder offers counseling with a social worker that can offer guidance on issues related to education and employment, job center, social cases, economic issues, family related or personal problems. MultiKvinder also offers counseling with a nurse, who can guide the women on issues related to sickness, medicine, doctor visits and health. An interpreter assists important conversations. Every Monday MultiKvinder has a 'society café' where different themes, based on the suggestions of the women, are discussed. The themes could be: children development, healthy food, society conditions, art and culture. In the café there are interpreters on Arabic and

[9] 'The Girlfriend Network': a project aimed at young newly arrived family reunified women, with a focus on social activities and network with volunteers.

Farsi/Dari. MultiKvinder also arrange social activities and excursion for the women. MultiKvinder offers Danish classes two days a week, divided on two levels. The classes are organized based on the need and level of the participants; however, the classes are mainly for women with limited Danish language skills. Gymnastics and yoga are offered four times a week. The project leader and staff describe the activities as part of a *holistic approach* towards their target group, which is something that will be discussed in the analysis.

DIVIDA

DIVIDA ('Integrationshuset DIVIDA') is an independent association funded on the same basis as MultiKvinder. DIVIDA is a house with many different activities for women in the age of 18-45, their small children in the age of 0-3 and girls in the age of 8-18, primarily with other ethnic background than Danish. The main target group are the women between 18 and 40, who for different reasons cannot participate in the established public offers, for example due to maternity, lack of residence permit, sickness etc. A majority of the women come from non-western countries, and many of them are Muslims. Most of the women, often family reunified, lack Danish skills, and basic knowledge about the Danish society and systems. Some are newly arrived, others, have been here several years but have, due to several maternity periods, only received little education in a language school. They only have female employees and the activities are only for women.

DIVIDA has a 'course group', for women and their small children. The women can bring their children to the class or can have them in the playgroup in DIVIDA. The course group has classes four times a week, which focus on Danish language lessons based on the different levels of the participants. The course group also have theme days, where different subjects like culture, health, the political system, and other society related issues. Teachers from outside often facilitate the theme days. DIVIDA has a great focus on themes related to mother and child, and organize mother/child theme days with subject like parenting, children's development, information about nurseries and kindergartens. Once a month they have a 'pedagogical day', where the women can ask questions related to their children. Every second week there are swimming/water aerobics in an indoor swimming pool only for women. Besides these activities,

the course group also do excursion out of the house to a varied number of places; education institutions, workplaces, childcare institution, cultural places. DIVIDA also has a counselor, who can guide the women on issues related to the public system, knowledge about rights and obligations in the Danish society, knowledge about education and work possibilities, cases on residency permit, and issues related to family. The counseling is individual and the purpose is to 'support the woman to clarify her targets, personal as well as professional, and progress in relation to these targets. A support for the woman to integrate in the Danish society, both as a woman and as mother.'

Interview

The semi-structured interview is characterised by having a number of themes that the interviewer wants debated, but being open minded towards how the conversation develops during the interview.

This openness allows the interviewer to follow interesting stories and change the order of the questions that she or he have prepared (Kvale, 2007: 129). The interview is based on the meeting between two or more people with different meanings, expectations and interests. Data produced in the interview is a result of this meeting, and thereby both the researcher and the interviewee's views on 'different plausible understandings of the world' (Järvinen, 2005: 29). Before conducting the interview I decided which themes that I wanted discussed. I had one interview guide for the staff of the integration projects and one for the women who were the users of the integration activities. The themes were: reasons/aims of the integration projects, empowerment and rights, inclusion and exclusion, gender perspectives, and employment. Although the interview guides for the staff and the users were very different (see appendix), they rested on the same themes that I wanted discussed.

From the beginning of my research I was interested in both talking to the women and the project leaders or staff of the projects. Inspired by the post-structuralist tradition I wanted to include different actors in the data production in order to enable several meanings and perspectives to be part of the analysis.

The form of the interview

By the project leaders, I was encouraged to keep interviews with the women at a maximum length of 30 minutes, since the women might 'loose concentration if the interviews are too long'. Beforehand, I agreed with the project leaders and the social worker, that the interviews with them would take around one hour. In two of the interviews the time frame exceeded, in accordance with the interviewee. So in practice the length of the interviews varied from the initial time frame. I conducted interviews with three members of the staff in the projects: the projects leader from MultiKvinder (1 hour and 9 minutes), the project leader from DIVIDA (38 minutes) and the social worker from MultiKvinder (1 hour and 14 minutes).
Later on I conducted interviews with two women from the projects: one women from MultiKvinder(16 minutes) and one women from DIVIDA (30 minutes). I found it more difficult to arrange meetings with the women, and a couple of times they either had cancelled to someone from the staff or were sick. All the interviews were recorded on a voice recorder, at the discretion of the interviewee.

The transcription from oral to written structured the interview conversations in a form that helped the researcher to analyze the empirical data. The structure eases the overview and transcription is in itself the beginning of an analysis. How much and how to approach transcription relies on the purpose of the research and the character of the material and also is often a question of resources since transcription is a time consuming task (Kvale, 1997: 170). I decided not to transcribe the interviews from the start to the end, but instead transcribe the quotations that were analytically interesting to my analysis. However, since it is difficult in the process to separate I ended up transcribing more than I have used in the analysis. The process of transcribing has been important, since listening to the interviews have been an important part of the analysis process. The fact that the two immigrant women, whom I interviewed, had very limited Danish skills made the transcription a challenge. I tried to preserve the language used by the interviewees in the transcription process. This also included grammatical mistakes. However, this has entailed some problems in the analysis where the Danish quotations have been translated into English.

In order for the reader who understands Danish to read the correct quote on Danish, I have placed all the quotations in the footnotes. I have tried to translate the quote as correctly into English as possible. However, some places where the meanings have been too difficult to understand, I have put the translation of the meaning in brackets: [].

Ethical considerations

Within social scientific research it is important to remember to use informed consent when conducting interviews. Informed consent means that the interviewee is informed about the general purpose and the design of the research project. Informed consent also means that the researcher must ensure that the informants participate voluntarily and that she or he can choose to withdraw his or her participation in the data collection at any point (Kvale, 1997: 118). However, this aim is easier said than done. In the beginning of each interview I started out by presenting myself as a university student and explaining the purpose of the interview and my projects. However, this was more difficult to do in the interviews with the two women who were the users of the integration projects. Both, due to their limited Danish skills and due to my own presumptions, categorized them as 'women with non or little education'. I explained the projects purpose to them in non academic phrases, and ensured that they understood the basics motivation for the project. Furthermore, I told them that if there were any questions they didn't want to answer or they didn't understand they could tell me during the interview. An important aspect when conducting interviews is to be aware of confidentiality. If personal information is shared in the interview there is a need to consider anonymizing the names of the interviewees. This is especially important if the research will be publicised and there is a chance that the informants will be recognised in the data material. In such a case, the informants must have agreed to this and signed a written agreement that regards this. The important matter is to ensure the information and agreement of the interviewees about their privacy (Kvale, 1997: 120). Since I wasn't sure whether or not to publicise my master's thesis at the time when i conducted interviews, I told the women that I was going to anonymize their names. However, I did not tell the project leaders and the social worker the same. Since they all were interviewed based on their professional position, I found it most natural not to ask them if they wanted to

be anonymized.

I have decided not only to anonymize the interviewees names but to anonymize the names of the integration projects. I have done this based on ethical considerations. From the beginning of the research I have been aware that my study might include critical perspectives on the integration projects. Since, I don't want to betray the trust I have been giving when being 'let in' by the projects leaders, I find it ethically correct to anonymize the names of the interviewees and the projects.

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

In the following section I will present the theoretical framework for my analysis. I have been inspired by Barbara Cruikshank (1999) who offers a theoretical perspective on the subjectivity processes and how power on a micro level influence these processes. She looks at technologies of empowerment as modes of constituting and regulating people, that is to govern the very subjects who's problems they seek to solve (Cruikshank, 1999: 2). Her research focuses on the socio-economic category 'the poor', and she analyzes how different empowerment projects are set up to teach 'the poor' how to develop themselves and become real citizens. Cruikshank's research is in an American context, where she takes the social-political and racial categories into consideration. I find her research relevant in a Danish context as there are parallels between her research on a certain social category 'the poor' and my research on another social category 'the unintegrated'. In her research, is the target group defined by intersecting categories like class, ethnicity and gender. The projects that I use for empirical date, does the same. My master's thesis focus on the 'unintegrated women' and I will use some of the theoretical perspectives of Cruikshank to analyze whether the staff of the integration project use the strategies of empowerment and self development towards their target group; the 'unintegrated women'. Processes of subjectivity in relation to power on a micro level are also a focus point for Nanna Mik-Meyer and Margarata Järvinen's (2003) research on the meeting between the client and the professional in the modern welfare state. Their research constitute an interesting theoretical perspective on the social work, where certain institutional identities are created in the interaction between the client and the professional (Mik-Meyer & Järvinen, 2003: 11). Since I am interested in analysing which subject position that the professional staff of the two integration projects present as available for these women, Mik-Meyer and Järvinen's research will be relevant for my theoretical framework.

When analysing identity processes and the influence of subtle power, I find that different intersecting identity categories plays an important role in these processes. Gender, ethnicity, age and class (education level), have all been categories that have played a role during the

interviews i have conducted with the staff and the women in the two integration projects. Thus, I am inspired by some of the theoretical perspectives provided in 'intersectionality' theory. Lykke (2008) and Søndergaard's (2006) will be of inspiration since they both uses intersecting categories in their research. The term intersectionality will be explained further below in this chapter. Jacobsen and Stenvoll (2010) and Andreassen (2007) will be used since their specific research on Muslim minority women is relevant for my area of research. Thus, I will use in their theoretical perspectives in the analysis.

Subjects and empowerment

The political struggles, after the second world war, have contained different binaries such as participation versus exclusion, equality versus difference, the political versus the social, freedom versus domination, power versus powerlessness and autonomy versus dependency among others. These terms divide freedom and agency from domination and repression, and subjectivity from subjection (Cruikshank, 1999: 23). Just as these binaries can be contested, so can citizen/subject. Cruikshank is mostly interested in how the citizen/subject is established within the welfare state and social reforms. Based on the assumption that power is not something that is external to being a citizen or a subject and that the human is the subject to and the subject of government, she suggest that a welfare recipient is not the antithesis of being an active citizen (Ibid.).

Citizens are both subjected to power and in their own right to act within the welfare state. Citizens will undoubtedly be forced to act within a specific bureaucratic system, but still has the possibility to resist in different ways. Many welfare programs are voluntary, and are based the welfare recipients own interest, which again is based on the professional employees opinion of this matter. Thus the welfare recipient is both subjected to and the subject of a welfare discourse (Ibid.).

Cruikshank argues that there are numerous projects, strategies and campaigns with the aim of making democratic citizens. Strategies for making citizens are often subtle and not expressly political (Cruikshank, 1999: 25). Her own research focuses on how a group of people categorized as 'the poor', are made the target group of different social interventions formed as

projects for this group of people. Within this group of people also lies intersecting categorizations based on race and class, since most of the beneficiaries of these projects where Afro-American from the lower working class (Cruishank, 1999: 14). Her studies focus on the welfare projects for this group of people and how different empowerment strategies had the purpose of internalising values of empowerment.

Empowerment strategies

Terms like empowerment, coaching, self-realization and partnerships are used to make the project attractive for the citizens. One of the ways to empower the citizens is to have dialogue-based initiatives as the basis for new projects, where the aim is to avoid welfare institutions imposing goals and values on people (Mik-Meyer & Villadsen, 2013: 1). A widely spread conviction on policy level and in the public debate is that welfare institutions and projects that target different social groups must avoid 'clientilisation' and 'learned helplessness'. Therefore, many projects have a focus on empowerment processes and active citizenship. It is exactly these types of projects, where the aim is to liberate people, that power is most subtle (Mik-Meyer & Villadsen, 2013: 28).

In her studies, Cruikshank also reflects upon the role of the professional in ‘the empowerment projects’. The interests of the poor are maintained by those working with the poor, the professionals in the social area. Professionals act upon the interests of those they try to help, and thus, they become those who represents the poor and those who know the poor - they instrumentalise the voice and needs of others (Cruikshank, 1999: 38). To say that one knows what is best for a group of people, Cruikshank's example 'the poor', can be viewed as a claim of power.

Other people, like politicians, can also claim to act upon the interests of 'the poor', and thereby claim power. If social programs are not voluntary for the ‘beneficiaries’, then those in power can not claim to represent the interests of those they should be serving.

Bio power

Welfare can be described as a form of government that is both coercive and voluntary. It is a way of organizing power based on welfare, bureaucracy and administration. These can be described as modes of government that work upon the capacities of citizens to act on their own behalf. Thus, getting people to govern themselves (Cruikshank, 1999: 39).

Michel Foucault calls this form of power, 'bio power'. Bio power exists in liberal democracies, where human needs and welfare of the citizens are turned into the terrain of government. It is the life itself that becomes governable. The body can be governed by putting people into jail by force when they have broken the legislation but also the very soul of people (Ibid.). Bio power, Foucault wrote "brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of the transformation of human life" (Foucault, 1980: 143). Based on administration and regulation of the needs of the citizens, it ensures the good of all society. Thus, constituting the needs and interests of the people to fulfill their human potential is a mode of governing people. The education, health and welfare of people constitutes a governable field, where problems can be met with different solutions. The problem of poverty can be solved if the problem is transformed into a set possible actions (Cruikshank, 1999: 40). This is closely linked to the knowledge about the group of people whom the problem is linked to, for example 'the poor'. Foucault says that 'knowledge is power' and with knowledge about 'the poor' government or other agents can come up with different action plans from which they can intervene.

It is also based on the knowledge about a certain group of people that categories of whom should be seen as problematic are constructed (Mik-Meyer & Villadsen, 2013: 14). In the case of this thesis the 'unintegrated' are that group of people.

Social science plays an important role in this matter by studying and categorizing the group that needs welfare programs. For a social problem to be solved, it must be *known*. The knowledge that is produced must be measurable, calculable and specific knowledge for it to be the basis for governmental solutions (Cruikshank, 2009: 40). According to Foucault new forms of government is recognized by the *"new methods of power whose operation is not ensured by*

right but by technique, not by law but by normalization, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatus" (Foucault, 1980 :89). Cruikshank argues that instead of repressing subjectivity or excluding participation, bio power operates to invest in the citizens with a number of goals and self-understandings. This gives the citizens an incentive for participating voluntarily in projects and institutions set up to 'help' them. The power relations are thus more complex. Welfare recipients are not controlled or excluded by governing institutions as much as they are constituted and empowered to take action over their own life (Cruikshank, 1999: 41).

Empowerment

The political logic and techniques of empowerment have been developed through social programs and reforms. A method of constituting citizens out of subjects and developing their full potential as human beings by maximizing their political participation (Cruikshank, 1999: 67). There are different political approaches to empowerment, but a common aim is to act upon others by getting them to act in their own interest. Cruikshank argues *"(...) the object of empowerment is to act upon another persons interests and desires in order to conduct their actions towards an appropriate end; thus "empowerment" is itself a power relationship and one deserving of careful scrutiny"* (Cruikshank, 1999: 69).

It is the capacities of the 'powerless' that empowerment programs seek to develop in order for them to maximize their motivation, interest, action and political and economic participation. Thus, power works by soliciting active participation of the 'powerless' group, such as 'the poor', 'the battered women' or 'the homeless people'. This is done through projects and programs at a local level, where the aim is the transformation into self-sufficient, active, participatory and productive citizens (Ibid.).

Three parts are viewed as the basis for empowerment; consciousness, knowledge, action. This connotes the transformation from powerless to full citizenship. However, Cruikshank argues differently since she thinks that the 'powerless' do not exist as such prior to the application of technologies of citizenship; the 'powerless' are the object and the outcome of the will to empower. She finds that the will to empower is neither clearly voluntary nor clearly repressive.

Her focus is on empowerment relations and how they intervene. Empowerment is based on knowledge and expertise, both by the social scientists who study and create knowledge about the 'powerless' and by the 'powerless' themselves who are seen as the 'real' experts on their situation (Cruikshank, 1999: 72). Empowerment is a “democratically unaccountable exercise of power” since it is often based on one party trying to empower another. Relations of empowerment are, therefore, both coercive and voluntary and the same time.

‘To create a client’

It is the relationship between the social institutions and the ‘problem identities’ that certain groups of people are given, that is in focus of Nanna Mik-Meyer and Margaretha Järvinen anthology ‘To create a client’ (2003). The social institutions are the ‘people-processing organizations’ where people are connected to different welfare state institutions that are set up to help, clarify, treat or provide care for people with social problems (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 10). Mik-Meyer and Järvinen present another perspective on clientilization than the one usually meet in the literature on social work. Clientilization are not just about how the people are pacified and made dependent on the social welfare system. It is more about the processes of categorization and positioning that happens in the meeting between the welfare system and the ‘problem identities’ (Ibid.). In the case of this thesis, the problem identities are the ‘unintegrated women’, who are the target group of the two integration projects that I have used as cases for my empirical data collection. The two integration projects are not part of the system in the same way as many other welfare institutions are, since they are private and not directly part of the municipal or state. The significance of this fact will be discussed in the analysis section.

Inspired by the anthology ‘To create a client’, I will emphazise that the analysis of these specific integration projects are connected to certain problem identities Further, I suggest that *all* people are forced into a specific client position when they encounter the welfare institutions. People are not just helpless clients in institutionalized practises, but are able to act and negotiate within these institutions (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 11). However, since my focus is how these ‘institutions’, the integration projects, create and affect certain subject

positions for these women, and how these women reflect upon these positions, I will look at the projects from a critical perspective.

Institutions and identities

Mik-Meyer and Järvinen describe how some persons or groups are considered problematic or, at least, problem affected. These people are long-term unemployed, homeless, drug addicts, alcoholics and other 'difficult' citizens. All of these problem identities are created in specific institutional contexts, where the categorizations not only say something about the individuals, it is also institutional identities formed by the help, control and treatment programs set up (Ibid.). The problem identity 'long-term unemployed' is anchored in a number of initiatives (jobcenters, courses on job seeking etc.) set up to help this problem identity out of it's situation. This thesis will rely on the hypothesis that there is a problem identity connected to ethnicity that can be categorized as 'unintegrated'. This problem identity is, as I will invstigate further in the analysis section, also linked to other problem identities such as 'victim' and 'un-employed'.

Within the last 20-25 years there has been an increased focus on the individual development. While the social workers during the 1980's discussed living conditions and social marginalization, today's focus lies on the clients motivation, flexibility, self-development and individual responsibility. The individualisation of the problem-identity leads to a focus on personal change and development. The solutions to these 'identity problems' are those that fits within the system of social work. Thus, the social workers find problems that they are able to solve with the logic of social work (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 12). This mean that the client must adjust to the change and development models that the institution works with. Within this perspective, the institutional practises can survive for a long time if the clients want to define and pursue their 'individual life projects' in accordance with the social workers professional understandings. The logic of social work is based on idea 'help to self-help'. The client must learn how to manage and help herself through programs and courses set up by the social workers. Otherwise, social work can be accused of creating dependent clients (Ibid.).
For every social field there exists a specific identity constructions that the clients are expected

to internalize. These constructions are based on certain ideas about how problems can be explained and how clients should perceive their own problems and solutions. Thus, it is in the meeting with the staff of the welfare institutions that the problem of the client is categorized and that possible solutions to this problem are presented to the client (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 14). A welfare institution is not just a neutral part, but always represents and reflects certain discourses found in the society.

One can argue that social work takes form as individually focused development work. Many welfare institutions base their social work on the assumption that it is the individual and his/her personality, attitude and resources that needs to be changed and developed (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 19). This can create conflict between the social worker and the client, due to different objectives. This is linked to the fact that social workers in welfare institutions operate with two different objectives; they must diagnose and control the clients, and at the same time support and help them. Furthermore, the problem of individual treatment is made difficult by the standardization that the categories rely on. The ideal of equal treatment of all clients in the system collides with the ideal of taking the individual situation into account (Ibid.). The fact that the social worker meets the individual with certain ideas about the institutional problem-identity that the person is categorized as, makes it difficult to comply with the professional ideal to 'see the whole person'. Thus, Mik-Meyer and Järvinen describe this as an illusion (Ibid.). Foregoing assumptions based on generalized knowledge about the specific problem-identity creates certain possible solutions for the client linked to the institutionalized practises. The 'client' is still used in some social institutions, especially in the psychosocial field, but many other social institutions have changed the word to other terminologies like 'user', 'citizen' or 'resident' if it is a social institution where people live (Mik-Meyer and Järvinen, 2003: 22). I will reflect upon these categories inthe analysis section, based on the categories used by the staff of the two integration projects.

Intersectionality

Although it will not be my main focus, perspectives of intersectionality provides an extra dimension to my analysis. Intersectionality is closely connected to theories of power. Nina Lykke's (2008) book named 'Gender Research- a guide to feministic theory, methodology and writings' has inspired me to include a intersectional perspective in this paper. Furthermore, I have found inspiration in different articles that center around the analysis of different intersecting categories. Christine M. Jacobsen and Dag Stenvoll's article on 'Muslim women and foreign prostitutes: victim discourse, subjectivity, and governance.', links gender and ethnicity to the power framework.

The intersectional dimension in this thesis should be understood in the way, where the interviewees reflect upon their position related to their membership-categories like 'women', 'other ethnic background than danish' this will be included in the analysis.

Intersectionality in gender research

Many gender researchers emphasize how the category 'gender' can not be analyzed alone, but must be seen connected to other categories like 'class', 'race', 'ethnicity', 'sexuality', etc. The idea is that gender can only be understood fully in it's interaction with other social categories. Many gender researchers would argue that power relations and identity constructions, based on gender, interact with other power relations and identity constructions, that are based on ethnicity, class ect... (Lykke, 2008: 103).

The concept of 'intersectionality' gained ground in the feministic debate in the beginning of the 1990's. Due to the American feminist law professor Kimberlé Crenshaw's famous article 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color' (Crenshaw, 1991) intersectionality became an independent area within gender research and many Scandinavian and international feminists engaged in intersectional gender research (Lykke, 2008: 105). No matter ones approach to intersectionality, most gender researchers agree that the intersectional interplay between power relations and identity categories is centered around transformation processes, and thus not only that different categories are 'added' to each other. Thus, the different categories influence and transforms each other in a

complex way.

Another important point, presented by several gender researchers, is that different power relations and identity constructions lie within *different logics.* That could be economic, political, cultural and psychological logics (Lykke, 2008: 106). In my thesis, I argue that some of these logics can be detected in the public and political discourses. These are presented in the contextual framework and are subsequently put into play in the analysis, whenever the informants reflect upon these logics.

According to Lykke (2008), intersectionality can be understood as a discursive nodal point, from where different intersecting perspective can be used in various feminists debates.

Victim-subject

Victim discourse can be traced back to around 1900's antislavery discourse, where solidarity with “helpless, nonwhite bodies” in the colonies were used to legitimize emancipatory claims of Victorian feminists, without colonialism or ideas of British superiority as such being challenged. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, antislavery campaigns were the main focus, later on it became the empowerment of 'the black', 'the native Americans', 'the poor' etc., however all with the same aim of giving voice to marginalized groups, where the voice is allegedly “untainted” by power. A means of constructing authenticity and legitimacy within liberal-democratic politics, are the individual personal victim stories (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010: 270).

Some individuals are more frequently positioned as victims than others. Intersectional categories like age, gender, ethnicity, religion, and sexuality make people unequally eligible for victimhood status and have an effect on the way in which they respond to such stratification and negotiate their position as victim (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010: 274).

Victim discourse may serve to divide 'marked' groups as different from the norm and as people in a permanent victimhood. Thus, victimhood can become a lasting condition, a pathology or identity if reconfirmed over and over again (Lamb 1999). The individual victim becomes a “victim-subject” and may be expected to act and behave in a certain way according to the norm for victim behavior.

According to Jacobsen and Stenvoll, Danish public victim discourse on refugee and immigrant women, especially Muslims, are constructed based on the idea that the women who need 'our' help and protection from 'the male oppression' in order to become emancipated and equal. However,there are other categories, the victim category, nevertheless, which represents a nodal point in contemporary Danish public discourse on refugee and immigrant women, and alternative accounts are constituted in relation to this dominant one (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010: 275).

Representations of Muslim minority women

The victim discourse on Muslim women positions the state and its institutions as neutral tools for dealing with the issues and problems regarding this group. This is based on the assumption that the root of the problems of these women are to be found in their 'backward cultures' (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010: 282).

In public-political discourse certain subject positions are presented: victims, survivors, helpers, villains etc. Dividing people into these categories, constitutes the 'us' and 'them', civilized and barbaric, autonomous and oppressed and liberal and illiberal (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010: 273). Thus, the dichotomy can be summed up as 'unmarked' freely choosing individuals opposed to 'marked' people driven by a collective culture. For these women, becoming an “autonomy-subject” means becoming integrated or assimilated into the imagined national culture.

According to Rikke Andreassen, who has written a Ph.D. on Muslim women in the Danish media scape, certain representations keep being reproduced. 'The oppressed Muslim women' is an image that is strongly overrepresented in the Danish media. When stories on ethnic minority women are being told in the Danish media, it is primarily in relation to themes like domestic violence, marriage practices and honor killings. Thus, the news media mainly present the women as victims. Victims of violence, the Danish legislation, culture and Islam (Andreassen, 2007: 28). Stories about women who have left their violent husband and now fear being deported back to their country of origin, have been present ever since the 1980's. Women, first victim of domestic violence and then risk of deportation, are then placed in the role of 'double

victims'. The women in these types of stories often have few statements, and only statements regarding the situation as a 'Muslim female victim', but not other statements related to the context (Andreassen, 2007: 32). Often, 'experts', like anthropologists or sociologist and politicians who have an opinion about the matter, are invited to share their analysis. Thus, the women are often described by other experts, who then consolidate the image of 'the ethnic minority women' as a uniform group who are overrepresented in the crisis centers because of their religion and culture. In the Danish news media, minority women are someone experts talk about rather than talk to (Andreassen, 2007: 41). In the media coverage of stories related to ethnic minority women, the underrepresentation of these women and the lack of the minority women's own voices, is the cause of an objectification. This means that the women are viewed as objects rather than subjects (Ibid.).

Victim discourse structures the issue in terms of how 'we' can help 'them'. Helpers and those categorized as 'in need of help' stand in a hierarchical and asymmetrical relationship to each other. The 'helpers' are persons and groups such as politicians, police, social workers, concerned citizens, and NGO's (most of which are less non-governmental than semi-governmental, receiving substantial funding from the state). This legitimizes intervention and directing help towards the people in need. The identification of victims may be read as a governance practice that divides
populations and through which those identified as possible victims are subjected to disciplinary, bio-political, and/or sovereign intervention (Stenvoll and Jacobsen, 2010: 279).

Positioning the researcher

Dorte Marie Søndergaard (2006) uses positioning theory in her study of codes and constructions among university students in Danish academia. When looking at the codes and identity construction she bases her analysis on intersections of different categories like 'gender', 'ethnicity', 'class' etc. The self exists through it's relations to other people. The constituting powers which the individual must develop themselves in a mutual process with shapes and provides a number of subject positions for the individual to 'take over' (Søndergaard, 2006: 38). The concept of positioning is reflects the reciprocity between the individual and society, in which changing positions are offered to the individual. Who the individual 'is' can vary over time as well as between different arenas, depending on which discursive practises and positions the individual is offered and can gain access to.

Taking a non-essentialistic approach to the individual is through a discursive processes that the individual finds their subject position. Not as the sole possible position, but as one out of many subject positions that are a part of a positioning project that changes over time (Søndergaard, 2008: 39). Thus, a positioning project can contain a combination of different positions and allow for diverse positions to interact and effect each other (Ibid.).

Søndergaard argues that it is the contradictions in these negotiations of subject position that are analytically interesting. It is important to notice that the discrepancy is not necessarily bound to lie in between action and articulation, but just as easily can lie between different sets of actions and discursive practices (Søndergaard, 2006: 45).

The researchers position in 'the field'

Drawing on post-structural feminist research *"the researcher must be aware of the ongoing positioning and how we constantly negotiate possible subject positions that imply power relations"* (Spanger, 2012: 153). Subject positions like 'white young academic middle class women', 'refugee/immigrant lower class woman participating in an integration project' or

'white middle class project leader/gatekeeper[10] representing the integration project' are not neutral descriptions of the researcher and the researched. Grounded in categories of gender, sexuality, race, class, and age that affect the complex power relations between the researcher, the studied subjects and eventually the gatekeeper. Thus, it becomes interesting to analyze how difference, sameness and power relations are constituted through the different categories of gender, race and class as premises for producing empirical data material (Spanger, 2012: 155). In this section I will reflect upon some of the intersecting categories that were in play to shape the subject positions, in which the interviewees and me were placed.

Several methodological feminist studies have argued that the same gender of the researcher and the studied subjects is an advantage in an interview situation or during fieldwork. This is based on the idea that the category of woman establishes a common understanding (Archer, 2002 in Spanger, 2012: 155). During the empirical data collection, I found that my membership of the categories 'young' and 'women' was an advantage. Since both of the projects where I did my research were places only for women, I found that my membership of the category 'young woman' was not perceived as a threat to the women in the projects, neither by the women themselves nor by the 'gatekeepers', the projects leaders. From the beginning of the data collection, it has been the perspectives of the project leaders and/or staff *and* the women in the target group of whom my interest has laid. In the end I carried out five interviews; two project leaders, one social worker, and two women[11], who participated in the activities of DIVIDA or MultiKvinder. Originally I planned to carry out one or two more interview with the women, however this was hindered by sickness of the women I had arranged interviews with.

During my empirical data collection I found myself positioned based on different intersecting categories. Inspired by feminist post-structural thinking, I see social relations, and thus the relations established in an interview situation, based on intersections of multiple categories like gender, race and class (Lykke, 2008: 106). I will give a few examples on how different categories

[10] A gatekeeper is a persons who can help you access informants because he or she knows the informants.
[11] The term 'the women', were used by the project leaders and the social worker to describe the women participating in the activities in DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. I will use the term throughout the thesis in the same way, except for places where other categories like 'citizen', 'mother' or 'refugee' are used by the interviewees.

came into play in the interaction between the interviewee and me as the interviewer. The way in which the researcher and the interviewees perform race, gender and class in the interviews imply 'difference' as well as 'sameness' that reflect power relations created during the interaction between the researcher and the interviewees (Archer, 2002 in Spanger, 2012:153).

Exemplified through an interview with a woman from the integration project MultiKvinder, I will show how performances, drawing on intersecting categories, constituted the 'difference' between the researcher and the researched. Afterwards, I will present an opposite example, and show how 'sameness' was constituted in the end of an interview with one of the project leaders.

The interview took place at MultiKvinder's house in Bispebjerg, were the woman had come for counseling with the social worker, Eva. Right before the counseling, Mette presented me to Sahar and asked if she would have the time and energy for being interviewed after her counseling. Mette, made it very clear to her, that if after the counseling she did not have the energy for the interview after all, it was of course fine. After the counseling, Sahar and me went into the office of the nurse, to speak in privacy. Sahar was not very good at Danish - a fact that I had been made aware of by the gatekeeper and project leader, Mette, right before the interview. Thus, the interview was influenced by her limited Danish vocabulary, and compared to the other interviews her answers were much more simplistic and therefore less 'informative'. Many of my questions were answered with more or less the same sentence. Nevertheless, it was the one interview where I *felt* the power imbalance immediately, when I was positioned as belonging to the category 'university student', a category based on my position as a 'middle class ethnic Dane', whom had the possibilities of taking a longer education growing up in Denmark. In the end of the interview, the women ask me what I am doing[12], *"If I am a student? "*. I answer her that I am studying global refugee studies and that am about to finish my studies. She asks with admiration *"At the university?"* and I answer *"Yes"* to which she commend *"That is good, that is really great, you are very clever"*. I am positioned in a superior

[12] I had informed the women about the purpose of my research in the beginning of the interview, but her lack of Danish skills, must have hindered her from understanding my background. In retrospect, an interpreteur could have been useful.

category as ‘university student’, which places her in an inferior position due to the category ‘social benefit recipient’ that I, earlier in the interview, had categorized her as, based on my need for this kind of information (and maybe my own need for categorizing). Although, replying to her comment with a *”Thank you, that is nice of you to say”*, the situation makes me a bit uncomfortable since I feel the differences between us materialized in her wording. Being categorized as *good* and *clever,* based on my status as a ‘university student’, can be linked to the category ‘resourceful’, something Sahar during the interview is positioned as *not* being due to the ‘lack of resources’; language and education. Furthermore, a central part of Sahar’s narrative focuses on her health problems, when she for instance says:*“I have really many problems in my back, I have asthma, I have really many problems in my body*”[13] (Sahar, 1:20). Positioning Sahar as ‘not resourceful’ with narratives of her health problems and her limited Danish language skills, I unconsciously place her chances of having an education as something that would not be possible now, but *‘in the future’:*

Me: *“Do you have any dreams for what you want to do in the future?”*
Sahar*: ”Yes, of course, I would like to study and I would like to be a pedagogue assistant”*
Me: *”Yes, yes, in the future”.* [14] (Sahar, 13:22).

These subject positions affected my own position in the empirical data collection. When I was positioned as superior due to my status as belonging to the category ‘university student’, I immediately felt the power imbalance. Based on ethical considerations I tried to explain the aim of the project once again, but in a very simplistic manner since I had categorized her as very limited in her Danish skills. The language barrier had an effect on my research in the way that I did not get as fulfilling explanations as I would have been able to if I had used an interpreter. Furthermore, the way I categorize her, as less resourceful (than me), makes me neglect her chances of having an education right now due to her health problems and her lacking Danish

[13] ”Jeg har rigtig mange problemer i ryggen, jeg har astma, jeg har rigtig mange problemer i kroppen”. My translation.
[14] Mig: ”Har du nogle drømme for hvad du gerne vil i fremtiden?”
Sahar: ”Ja selvfølgelig, jeg vil gerne læse og jeg vil gerne være pædagogmedhjælper.”
Mig: ”Jaja, i fremtiden?”. My translation.

skills. The position as superior resulted in a situation where I felt that I could comment on her chances of having an education. This is also based on a my own moral, since I do not want to disappoint her by telling her that she can take a pedagogue assistant education right now, when I do not find that realistic.

Another situation where I am positioned by the interviewee is when I interview the project leader of MultiKvinder, Mette. In the end of the interview, I finish the interview by thanking her for taking the time for me. She replies:

"Well, if I do not bother talking to someone like you about these things, well I mean you are the next generation who will work within this field, maybe write about it and deal with it, and when you ask about that thing about affecting the politicians, this is just as an important part of affecting the public agenda"[15] (Mette, 1:08:18).

Describing me as being part of the *next generation* Mette draws on the 'age' category and places me in the subject position 'young academic', a learning and prosperous young academic. Furthermore, I am positioned as someone *who will work within this field* ('the integration field') reflecting 'sameness' of our positions, since this is the field that Mette is representing. Sameness already constituted by our similar memberships of the categories 'white', 'university educated', 'middle class woman', and now the same 'profession'. She gives agency to her position as an expert with knowledge about 'the field', from where she shares her knowledge with me. At the same time she argues that *this is just as important a part of affecting the public agenda,* and thereby positions me in an influential role where she acknowledges my research. Thus, both her and me are positioned as someone with *knowledge* about the field of integration, and thereby influence.
This positioning of our sameness meant that my position in the field, somehow was connected to my future role as part of the 'integration field'. Throughout my research I was very much

[15] "Altså hvis jeg ikke gider at fortælle sådan en som dig om de her ting, altså jeg mener du er jo den næste generation der kommer ud og arbejder med det her felt, måske skriver om det og beskæftiger dig med det, og når du spørger om det der med at påvirke politikere, det her jo en ligeså vigtig del af at påvirke den offentlige mening.". My translation.

aware of how critical I could be towards this field, which I was already 'a part of' due to my job and the field I knew I wanted to work within. This was also the reason for me not to chose the integration project that I was working with. I wanted to be able to be critical, something which I believed would be easier if I choose two projects that I wasn't connected to beforehand. In the situation where Mette positioned me as part of her professional field, and reflect the sameness of our subject position, I felt uneasy since I knew I would have some critical perspectives towards MultiKvinder, and thus be more loyal to my position as 'university student' than 'employed in the integration field'.

These two examples show how my research was affected by the way that I was positioned in the field. I have chosen to anonymize the two projects, the women and the staff, due to ethical considerations. Something that I was made aware of during my empirical data collection, when I was positioned as someone from 'their' field of work, thus 'one of them'. Moreover, I have reflected upon my own position as a university student due to the way the informant, Sahar, positioned me. This has affected the outcome, since both of the women from the integration projects, due to my status as university student/researcher, presented the projects from a very positive perspective. The interaction between me as a researcher and my informant have thereby produced the data that will be the the basis for my analysis.

Analytical framework

The analysis is based on the interactionist analysis approach inspired by Järvinen and Mik-Meyer (2005). The focus lies on the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee, where the interviewer is described as 'co-producer' of the empirical data collected in the research.

This analysis is based on the idea that categories, meanings and practices could have been different – that these do not have ontological given basis (Hvenegård-Lassen, 2007: 162).

Following the post-structuralist tradition, the interviewee's *self* is perceived as a process, not static, but open for negotiation through interaction. This perspective contradicts the naturalistic approach, where individuals are seen as containers of information about their 'true

meanings and feelings', which can be exposed by the researcher. The interactionist approach to the research field is based on an idea that the meaning of a phenomenon is created in the interaction between people or between people and thing. 'Meaning' is a phenomenon based on relations and situations, since it is always based on a contextual framework (Mik-Meyer, 2005: 10).

In an interview situation the interviewee positions herself and other characters related to the narrative, in that way she finds most suitable. Thus, 'descriptive performances', take place and the interviewee will often try to present her 'preferable self'. During the interviews with the women who where the users of MultiKvinder and DIVIDA, I experienced how they wanted to present the projects at its best, which meant that they both described the projects in very positive sentences. However, it is not only the interviewee who performs, during the interview. Also the interviewer must perform as a serious, reasonable speaking partner who represents the research field in a good way (Järvinen, 2005: 30). It was important for me to be prepared before the interviews and act professional, especially when conducting interviews with the staff of the two projects.

A central concept within interactionist methodology is to look at the categorization of membership, which is constituted in social interaction. The interviewee and interviewer are not just individual participants, they are also positioned as belonging to different social categories. Categorization takes place in every interview since it is an important part of the identity construction that both the interviewee and the interviewer make of each other (Järvinen, 2005: 32).

As described in the section above called 'Positioning the researcher in the data collection', I have reflected upon my own position in the field and how this has effected my research.

Within interactionist analysis of interviews, it is important not only to focus on 'what' the interviewee (and the interviewer herself) discuss, but just as much 'how' they speak about it. The focus lies on the narrative practices, which is based on the interviewees' social and cultural resources and the regime in which the narrative is produced. The interactionist approach to analysis of interviews is based on a constructivist understanding of the language. This means

that the language both reflects and constructs the social reality, thus description becomes inscription (Järvinen, 2005: 39). Constructivist interactionism questions whether there should be a meaning 'behind' the subject that research can reveal. Meaning is seen as a process rather than something fixed, and can thus only be identified through processes of identification and categorization developed in social interaction. Thus, I will, in my analysis, look for these identification processes by seeing which subject positions that the interviewees place themselves and others in. This is furthermore done by looking for categorization process; how do my interviewee categorize themselves and others. The 'others' are interesting since it is often stories on other people that is the basis for the story of oneself. By either representing 'sameness' or 'otherness', other persons actions and articulations becomes important in one's identity process.

Meaning is studied as a social phenomenon situated in a specific social and cultural context, not an individual phenomenon captured in a stable subject (Ibid.). Thus, the information produced in an interview will always depend on cultural understanding and discourses. To articulate an accepted interpretation is to articulate an already available discourse or understanding of reality (Järvinen, 2005: 44). In the analysis I will look for discourses that I believe to already have been detected in the public and political discourse on integration, and analyze how these are reflected upon, and used when they categorize themselves based on different subject positions.

Analysis Part I - 'The Staff'

Introduction

In the analysis I would like to examine which different subject positions the staff present as available to the refugee and immigrant women. Moreover, I will analyse how the women internalize and negotiate these positions. Thus, I have divided the analysis into two parts. In the first part I will use the interviews with the staff and the employees as the empirical data material for analyzing my research question. In the second part I will use the interviews with the users from DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. This allows me to analyze my research question from two different perspective, which will lead to a more nuanced analysis.

'Soft empowerment'

I will argue that the two integration projects fit into Cruikshanks (1999) categorization of empowerment, although I will characterize the method as a 'soft empowerment'- a thesis that I will outline later in this section. Empowerment is articulated as a method for the integration projects, however in a conflicting matter. One of the employees starts out by distancing their approach from empowerment. When being asked about empowerment and whether MultiKvinder is based on ideas of empowerment, Eva distanced MultiKvinder from the way other social institutions do empowerment, thus positioning MultiKvinder as those who have interpreted the word and the methodology of empowerment is the 'correct' way:

"That is really a misused word, well not misused, I just think that there are many misinterpretations of what empowerment means. I think that it is empowerment when a woman comes and asks me for help with something. Where others would say 'it is empowerment if she does it herself"[16] (Eva, 6:46).

[16] "Det er jo sådan et rigtig rigtig misbrugt ord, eller ikke misbrugt, jeg synes bare der er mange sådan fejlfortolkninger af hvad empowerment er. Jeg synes at det er empowerment at en kvinde kommer og spørger mig om hjælp til noget. Hvor andre ville synes jamen det er empowerment hvis hun gør det selv.". My translation.

Following the idea of help to self-help that lies within a classical social worker discourse (see 'Contextualising the field of integration'), she portrayed MultiKvinder as a project that uses a different approach regarding empowerment, compared with other projects. She contradicts the approach where people ought to do things for themselves, without asking for help. This critique is based on the pedagogically method that MultiKvinder uses, where the women are supported, listened to and acknowledged for their actions. She explains their approach based on her experience with the target group:

"And there, one can say that there is a fine line between when it is empowerment to ask one of our users to do things themselves and when it would be an abuse to ask her to do it"[17]. (Eva, 7:01)

Eva takes up the role as 'social worker' when she uses the category 'users' about the women, whom she, during the interview, mostly refers to as 'the women'. This reflects a more institutional categorization, which lies within social work, but in general does not apply in DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. She categorizes the 'users' as a group that the staff should be careful not to be abusive towards by demanding too much from them. Thus, she is being protective to them and takes up the role as 'helper' in the social institution. She reflects her role in the projects as a 'service provider', a role that, according to Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), is often found in social work. However, this role is balancing with the deciding and clarifying role that the social worker is placed in when she decides whether the user is capable of doing something herself or not.

"But I think that we work with empowerment since we do not help the women with the things that they can do for themselves. But of course it is us who decide when we think one thing and

[17] "(...) Og der kan man sige at det er en hårfin grænse for hvornår det empowerment at bede en af vores brugere at gøre tingene selv og hvornår det vil være et overgreb at bede hende om at gøre det". My translation.

when we thinks another [that they are capable of doing something themselves without help]"[18] (Eva, 10:16).

It is *us,* meaning the staff, *who decide.* Thus, it is the staff who decide when the women are capable of doing something themselves and when they need help from the staff. She describes the staff of MultiKvinder, as those with the decision power, and thereby placing the women in an inferior position, since they do not have the capacity for deciding when they need help and when they do not. This relationship between the women and the staff can be analysed through the lenses of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), since the women are placed in the role as clients, and are encouraged to follow the decision of the staff in regards to the capability of doing something herself. This can be viewed as a form of control, based on the idea of protecting the client from failures. Mette reflected upon the difficult balance between 'helping out' and becoming too caring:

"I do not think empowerment is to say 'do it yourself, solve it yourself'. It is definitely to help out where it is needed, but it is of course really important not to overtake and become too caring" [19] (Mette, 11:21).

The two dimensional and contradicting role as 'controller' and 'helper' that, according to Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), characterizes the role of staff in many social institutions, are different in the two cases I have used. The focus is shifted, so that the issue articulated by Mette reveals the balance between being a 'helper' and being too carrying. Thus, she reflects the traditional critique of the social institutions for creating dependent clients.

[18] "Men jeg synes at vi arbejder med empowerment i og med at vi ikke gør de ting for kvinderne som de kan gøre selv. Men det er jo selvfølgelig os der vurderer hvornår vi synes det ene og hvornår vi synes det andet.". My interpretation.

[19] "Jeg synes ikke empowerment bare er at sige gør det selv klar det selv. Det er helt bestemt at give en hånd der hvor der er brug for det, men selvfølgelig er det utroligt vigtigt ikke at gå ind og overtage og blive alt for omsorgsfuld.". My translation.

Empowerment is linked to the knowledge that the women develop by participating in the teaching in the integration projects:*"So it is this with filling knowledge on them, filling health on them and filling danish on them"*[20] (Eva, 42:39). *Them*, the women, are placed in the position of 'integration objects', for the integration projects to fill them up with knowledge, health and language. Something they *lack* due to their position as 'unintegrated'. Most of the women are newly arrived, although others have been in Denmark for many years. Nevertheless, they *all* are described as lacking knowledge about the language, the system and the society. This idea,, based on the theory of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen(2003), can be analysed as a problem identity, where the women are perceived as problematic due to their lack of knowledge about the society and their lack of Danish language skills - their situation as 'unintegrated individuals'. Thus, the aim of the projects is to provide the women with they require and make them 'whole human beings'. Thus, the project can be categorized as an empowerment project (Cruikshank, 1999), since the aim of the staff is to make them capable of managing their own lives - something which is believed to be the case if they are provided with knowledge about their rights, consciousness about their own lives, and the strength to act independently: *"To help the women with the knowledge and what they need for them to make good choices in their lives"*[21] (Mette, 11:40). It is not specified what the *good* choices are, but it should be based on information and knowledge:

"(...) in fact, it is a support for the women just to KNOW what there is [of possibilities], it is not sure they will make use of it, but they become stronger by KNOWING that there is someone out there if things goes wrong or something"[22](Tine, 14:36).

The knowledge about a number of possibilities that the women have in the danish society, make them *strong* and thus, empowered. Thus, I will characterize the integration projects as

[20] "Så det er det her med at fylde viden på dem, fylde sundhed på dem og fylde dansk på dem". My translation.
[21] "At hjælpe kvinderne med den viden og det de skal bruge for selv at tage de gode valg i deres liv." My translation.
[22] "(...) faktisk så er det meget tit en støtte for kvinderne bare at VIDE hvad der findes, det er ikke sikkert at de gør brug af det, men de bliver stærke af at VIDE at der er nogen derude hvis det går galt eller sådan noget". My translation.

empowerment project, based on 'soft empowerment'. By 'soft empowerment', I mean that they do not push any of the women into something she is not ready for, or have any demands towards the women. They see 'the small' development steps as a success. Mette described that when women start coming to MultiKvinder twice a week instead of once a week, they see it as a big success. Thus, a very *soft* approach to the women. This is due to the strong role as 'helpers' that the staff adopt when they are very protective towards the women . Seen through the theoretical perspective of Cruikshank (1999), empowerment is created through the process of 'consciousness, knowledge and action'. It is very much in the integration houses, MultiKvinder and DIVIDA, that the women become conscious about their own wishes and dreams (see next analysis part 'the development story'). A central step to this consciousness is the knowledge that the women are presented with in the teaching. This provides them with the chance to take action, which is exemplified through different 'development stories'.

'The development story'

Based on the 'soft empowerment' that the integration projects pursue a number of stories and examples on the women's development are presented by the staff. The social worker Eva told a story about a woman who breaks out of a violent marriage after 26 years. Eva said that she did it based on the support and knowledge she received from MultiKvinder (among others) because she now had the *"trust for making some individual decisions and know that there are someone who helps me if something goes wrong"* (Eva, 17:15)[23]. The development story is framed by a starting point based on the woman's appearance: *"And I don't know what she looks like, she was grey, she was sad, she was depressed, she felt like shit, it wasn't difficult to see"*[24] (Eva, 16:02). Eva described how the women later on came to the conclusion that she wanted to leave the husband and move into a crisis shelter. Some time after, the woman comes back to MultiKvinder: *"And now she comes here, she has been here a couple of times afterwards, and*

[23] "Tillid til at tage nogle selvstændige beslutninger og vide at der er nogle der hjælper mig hvis der er noget der går galt.". My translation.

[24] "Og jeg ved simpelthen ikke hvad hun ligner, hun var grå hun var trist hun var deprimeret hun havde det ad helvede til, det var ikke svært at se." My translation.

she looks like.. she has become beautiful, she shines, she is just so happy."[25](Eva, 16:35). The woman is categorized as *beautiful* and *happy*, thus she has transformed. Due to the trust and knowledge the woman had received from MultiKvinder she has had the courage to break out of a violent marriage. The story draws on the existing public discourse of refugee and immigrant women as oppressed and victims of male oppression, as Jacobsen and Stenvoll describe. Moreover, it legitimizes the project and it's activities since the story functions as a success story, where an oppressed, *depressed* and *sad* woman is turned into a *beautiful* and *happy* woman - a 'survivor' in accordance with Jacobsen and Stenvoll's different categories of roles that Muslim refugee and immigrant women can position themselves in. Following the ideas of empowerment, the woman is informed about her rights, gain knowledge about the institutions and persons that can help her. Based on this knowledge and the trust she has in MultiKvinder, she makes an individual empowered decision, and is freed from her violent marriage. In the story, MultiKvinder is positioned as 'the helper', a role that can be located in several other stories found in the public-political discourse on female Muslim victims. This position can help the staff to legitimize the existence of the project when maneuvering in the public and political arena, where the discourses of female Muslim victims can be used to gain economic and political support.

The 'development' of the women are also described as an adjustment to the danish society. The leader of DIVIDA describes the adjustment to daycare institutions as one of the key purposes of the play group. On a question regarding a good integration process Tine replies:

"(...) and then when the children slip into the institution environment without the pedagogues noticing that it is a child with another ethnic background" [26] (Tine, 16:01).

[25] "Og nu kommer hun så her, hun har været her nogle gange siden, og hun ligner jo bare.. hun er blevet smuk, hun stråler, hun er simpelthen så glad." My translation.

[26] (..) og så når børnene glider ind i institutionsmiljøet uden at pædagogerne har kunne mærke at det er er et barn med anden etnisk baggrund"

The ‘differencing’ mark *another ethnic background,* is removed, and thus, the child is categorized as easy to integrate into the kindergarten due to his/her adjustment to the danish childcare institutions that have taken place in DIVIDA. Teaching the children *” how you sing ‘Lille Peter edderkop’ and sit and eat your lunchbox etc.”*[27] (Tine, 17:50), adjust the refugee and immigrant women’s children into the behaviour of the danish kindergarten. Thus, the children are also positioned as ‘objects of integration’, who need to learn new social codes that are presented to them in Denmark. Tine presents the risk that exists if these children do not receive any period of adjustment. They can become the children who are categorized as ‘problem children’ in the kindergarten, which can continue into the danish school system

“And in fact there was not anything wrong with them (...) they just were not danish in language and culture, they did not understand what happened so they became noisy or scared”[28] (Tine, 17:50).

Tine, thus, reflects upon the negative discourse on teenage boys with another ethnic background other than danish, who are often categorized as ‘problematic’ and ‘troublesome’. The intersecting categories based on ethnicity and gender ‘second-generation immigrant male’ are, in the public and political view, linked with crime and violence. From the theoretical perspectives of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), DIVIDA aim at removing the problem identity for the children of the refugee and immigrant women who otherwise would be categorized as ‘problematic’ due to their lack of danish culture and language.

Tine describes how the women change their goals and wishes for themselves by being in DIVIDA:

[27] “hvordan man synger lille Peter edderkop og sætter sig hen og spiser madpakke osv.”

[28] “ Og i virkeligheden var der ikke noget galt med dem (...) de var bare ikke danske i sprog og kultur, de forstod ikke hvad der foregik og så bliver de larmende eller bange”. My translation.

"When the women start here, they come to a so called pre interview and there we ask them 'what are your future plans, what do you feel like [doing] yourself?', and there are often not that many answers since the woman replies 'well I just want to be a mom'.[29] (Tine, 09:50).

The women are positioned as primarily seeing themselves as 'mothers', without dreams and plans related to their own personal development, for instance regarding education and employment. This is explained by Tine due to the collective and family orientated culture that 'the women' come from:

"Those societies they come from think in another way, they have what we call a collective mindset, where you, at least not the women have any reason for having any goals and dreams for themselves because they have to partake in a family-related context"[30] (Tine, 10:08).

Tine categorizes the women based on a differentiating mindset based on the categories 'ethnicity' and 'gender', where the way women have their personal dreams and goals are set aside for a family structure that favours a *'collective mindset',* not an individual. This is due to her *different* ethnic background, where they mainly perceive the women's role centered around being a mother. The individual focus is then presented to the women in their meeting with DIVIDA; what are *your* goals and dreams? She describes the personal development of the woman:

"When they have been here some time then they can, then they have learned that there are some possibilities, because even though you are a mother, you can be a good mother and have

[29] "Når kvinderne kommer her så kommer de til en såkaldt før samtale, og der spørger vi 'hvad har du af tanker, hvad har du lyst til selv?' og det er meget ofte at der ikke er så mange svar på det for kvinderne siger , 'jamen jeg skal bare være mor'." My translation.

[30] De samfund de kommer fra tænker de på en anden måde, de tænker det vi kalder kollektiv tankegang, hvor man ikke, kvinderne i hvert fald tit og ofte ikke har nogen grund til at have nogle mål og drømme for dem selv for de skal indgå i en familiemæssig sammenhæng". My translation.

your child in daycare institution and develop yourself with some other things also and that is built up slowly based on what there are for possibilities and rights"[31] (Tine, 10:09).

Thus, when the women have been in DIVIDA for some time, they have received valuable information about their rights and possibilities, and begin to have dreams and goals for themselves besides being a good mother. They have been adjusted to the danish child care system where a woman is not regarded as a bad mother if she hands her baby over to some pedagogues while she goes to school or work. This means that they can *develop themselves* while still being a good mother, which is a new concept for them, according to Tine. She described how the women come to another interview when they have been there for a while or have ended the course group:

"There it is often that some hopes and dreams have come, or plans for them. And that is also based on that they gradually dare to go to the doctor or take the bus by themselves and talk to the neighbour. So in that way they become self reliant"[32] (Tine, 10:46).

The transformation from not having any dreams in the beginning of the process to not seeing it as a contrast to be a good mother and follow your own goals, is based on the development the woman experience in DIVIDA. Seen through the institutional framework that Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003) provide, the staff of the projects take up the role as someone who can help *clarify* the possibilities that these women have. In order for the women to engage in the Danish society, which is one of the aims of the integration projects, they have to be informed in order to make individual decisions.

[31] "Når de har været her noget tid så kan de, så får de lært at der er nogle muligheder, for at selvom du er mor kan du godt være en god mor og have dit barn i institution og selv udvikle dig med nogle andre ting også, og det bliver bygget op langsomt her gennem hvad der er muligheder og rettigheder ikke mindst ". My translation.

[32] "Der er det tit at der er kommet nogle håb eller drømme, eller planer for dem. Og det er også ud fra at de efterhånden godt tør selv at tage til lægen eller tage bussen selv og snakke med naboen. Så på den måde bliver de selvhjulpne.". My translation.

In order to help, transform and 'move' the client, it is important to the social institutions that the the client is willing to change herself, and undergo a transformation away from her 'problem identity'.

'An integration space'

The integration process of both the mother and her child can be viewed as a part of the 'holistic' approach that DIVIDA ascribes to. DIVIDA's playgroup functions as a room for 'practice' before 'real institution life'. The understanding of danish institution life is also important for the women to understand according to Tine:

"The mothers become familiar with how you small talk, what it is that the pedagogues expect of you and what you can expect of the pedagogues. When you ask 'how has little Aisha slept or eaten' it is not because we want to control and turn her into the municipality because of mistreatment of the baby, and that is essential because there are many who are really afraid of the system and municipalities and who are used to that if someone interferes, it is negative"[33] (Tine, 7:38).

Played out in a safe environment, the women can learn how to act and behave when 'released' into the 'real' society. As Tine says *"We make them completely secure and safe [before] we throw them out of the nest"* (Tine, 28:34)[34]. This positions the project DIVIDA, and thereby the staff, as 'the parent' who takes care of their children and teaches them language, social codes and the system, positioning the women in a role of an 'infantile' who must learn. The project functions as a mini-society where the women can learn how *to do* 'motherhood' in Denmark.

[33] "Mødrene bliver bekendt med hvordan man smalltalker, hvad er det at pædagogerne forventer af dig som mor og hvad kan du forvente af pædagogerne. Når man spørger 'hvordan har lille Aisha sovet eller spist så er det ikke fordi vi vil kontrollere og melde hende til kommunen for dårlig pasning, og det er meget væsentligt for der er mange der er rigtig bange for system og kommuner og vant til at hvis der er nogle der blander sig så er det negativt."

[34] "Vi gør dem fuldstændig trygge og sikre når [før] vi smider dem ud af reden ". My translation.

MultiKvinder and DIVIDA function as closed spaces where the women can be integrated into the danish society in a safe environment. Thus, they teach the women about social and cultural codes in Denmark:

"If you sign up to be a part of the course group as we call it, then you're obliged to come four days a week, Monday to Thursday, Friday it's up to you. You must cancel if you can't come and you must be on time, that is our requirement. There is not total entirely compliance because it is very difficult when it is voluntarily and it is people with small children. And as told, we don't have any sanctions but we keep teaching it"[35] (Tine, 28:50).

Although, DIVIDA doesn't have any sanction, they still try to teach and prepare the women for the cultural norms in Denmark, for instance being on time. Tine tells how it is part of the women's education to learn about the danish mentality:

"If they should be ready for...we are very punctual in Denmark, you really have to arrive on time and things like that. When they have to move on to language school, there they will be sanctioned economically if they aren't there on time everyday, so we actually prepare them on… also the danish mentality, that if you have committed to something, then you are committed to do it, then you can not just say 'well it was voluntary and so what', so the entire way to think, that is also what we need to teach in to have some idea of what kind of a society you have ended in"[36] (Tine, 30:01).

[35] "Hvis du melder dig til at komme og være en del af kursusgruppen som vi kalder det, så har du forpligtet dig til at komme fire dage om ugen, mandag til torsdag, fredag må du selv om det. Du skal melde afbud hvis du ikke kommer og du skal komme til tiden, det er det der er vores krav. De bliver ikke helt overholdt for det er meget svært når nur det er frivilligt og det er folk med små børn. Og som sagt vi har ingen santioner, men vi bliver ved med at undervise i det.". My translation.

[36] "Hvis de skal være klar til..Vi er jo meget punktlige i Danmark, man kommer virkelig til tiden og sådan noget. Bare det når de skal videre på sprogskolen, så bliver de jo sanktioneret på økonomien hvis ikke de kommer hver dag til tiden, så vi forbereder dem faktisk på.. også den danske mentalitet at når du har committed dig til noget så har du committed dig til det så kan du ikke bare sige jamen det var jo frivilligt og hvad så, så hele den der måde at tænke på , det er jo også den der skal undervises i for at have begreb om hvad for et samfund du er havnet i". My translation.

Tine reflects upon one of the aspects of Danish culture, 'being on time', and categorizes this as an important thing to teach the women, since they should be prepared for the 'danish mentality' and avoid culture clash. Thus, constituting the women as 'integration objects', who needs to learn the 'danish mentality' of punctuality and committedness. DIVIDA could be seen as a 'closed' space where these norms and cultural codes are taught to the women with refugee or immigrant background. Based on Mik-Meyers and Järvinens (2003) theoretical ideas, teaching the "Danish" values of 'punctuality' and 'committedness' can be seen as an institutional practice where the women internalize new values and norms in order to change from 'un-integrated' to 'integrated'. The aim of the project is to prepare the women for the society outside DIVIDA, where sanctions -economic or social- can be conducted.

Mette also described the way norms and cultural codes are often central to the social activities in MultiKvinder:

"We eat together and 'hygger os' [have a cosy time], so we also have something social together and there is a lot of learning in that, well there are a lot of different cultures in the house, it is not like everybody has the same eating culture, there is a difference, do you get food for the elderly, who eats first (...) well there is a lot of - i wouldn't say parenting [opdrage]- but at least - because we don't parent anyone- but it is a really good basis for going in and talking about behaviour and culture and also that many danes for instance take amiss if you, for example, take the last [food] before their noses" [37](Mette, 36:57).

Using the stereotypical danish concept of *hygge,* she subscribes to the learning of danish culture. Although she distances herself and the projects from parenting the women, she tells

[37] "Vi spiser sammen og hygger os, så vi har også noget socialt og det er der også utroligt meget læring i, altså der er jo mange forskellige kulturer her i huset her, altså det er jo ikke sådan at alle har den samme spisekultur, der er forskel på henter man mad til dem der er ældre, hvem spiser først (...), altså der jo rigtig meget –jeg vil ikke sige opdragelse – men i hvert fald –fordi vi opdrager ikke nogen her – men det er et rigtig godt grundlag for at gå ind og snakke om adfærd og kultur og også at mange danskere tager det ilde op hvis man for eksempel tager det sidste for næsen af dem". My translation.

how the staff talk to the women about how cultural behaviour and norms clash with the danish society and where they avoid being misinterpreted:

"(...) and maybe get to talk to the women about, well, there you really go wrong in the danish society, that is why you are met such prejudiced if you have that and that behaviour. Well, maybe the women doesn't even know it themselves"[38] (Mette, 39:24).

Knowledge about how their cultural behaviour can be the reason for why *they* are misinterpreted is perceived as a way of helping the women out of their cultural misbehaviour. This reflects the individualised focus on the problem, that Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003) describes. The responsibility for changing the things that lead to the problem identity is placed on the individual, who must avoid acting in an 'un-integrated' fashion.

Victim position

The staff of the two integration projects links 'the women' to the category 'victim' in different statements. When the project leader of DIVIDA Tine described their target group she sayed: *"So it is mostly the isolated women we have"*[39] (Tine, 2:31). Categorizing the women as 'isolated' places them in a victim-subject position, where they are isolated and marginalized from society. The socialworker Eva from MultiKvinder also describes their target group as isolated:

"Those women who come here with their children wouldn't have had any other places to go, so they would have been so isolated. And that isolation leads to so many other social problems like, well yeah they are isolated, but it often also leads to all sort of illnesses, and it can lead to economic, more economic problems"[40](Eva, 17:02).

---

[38] "(...) og måske få snakket med kvinderne om jamen der, der går du altså meget meget galt i det danske samfund, det er derfor at du egentlig bliver mødt så fordomsfuldt hvis du har den og den adfærd. Altså måske er kvinderne slet ikke klar over det selv.". My translation.

[39] "Så det er meget de isolerede kvinder vi har med at gøre". My translation.

[40] "De kvinder der kommer her med deres børn de ville ikke have andre steder at gå hen, så de ville have været så isolerede. Og den isolation den fører jo rigtig mange sociale problemer med sig som, ja de er isolerede, men det fører også tit til alle mulige sygdomme kan det føre til, og det kan føre til økonomiske, til yderligere økonomiske problemer"

Afterwards Eva links these differentiated problems that the women have to the holistic approach that MultiKvinder has; they have a nurse, a socialworker and a therapist. Thus, she links the women's problems to the solutions that MultiKvinder can provide. According to Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), this builds on a logic of social institutions where they only detect problems, within the institution, where they can come up with solutions.

The women are described with adjectives like 'weak' and 'marginalized': *"(...) and it is really hard when you work with such unhappy and weak women"*[41] (Mette, 1:06:03). This constitutes the staff as the 'helpers' who help the women out of their situation as weak by empowering them. Thus, the dichotomy 'weak' and 'strong' is used to describe what the women are and what the projects want to empower them to become. As Stenvoll and Jacobsen (2010) describe, victim discourse structures an asymmetrical power relationship between the 'helpers' and those categorized as 'in need of help'. The victim position that the women are placed in legitimizes interventions in their life from the two integration projects. Although the projects are voluntary, and no 'hard' power is exercised over the women, I will argue that this is where power becomes most subtle.
Mette takes up the role as the 'helper' of the women, when she describes how they use volunteers:

"There are also some people who come here and want to volunteer because they in fact d not like immigrants, and they would like to educate them a little, teach them how to stand up in the bus [give their seat to elderly people], and teach them how you shouldn't talk too loudly on your cellphone (...) That type of volunteers I don't want over my doorstep"[42] (Mette, 43:34).

[41] "(...) og det er virkelig hårdt når man arbejder med så ulykkelige og svage kvinder". My translation.
[42] "Der er også nogle der kommer her og gerne vil være frivillige fordi de i virkeligheden ikke bryder sig særlig meget om indvandrere og i virkeligheden gerne vil opdrage lidt på dem, lære dem at rejse sig op i bussen og lære dem at man ikke skal snakke for højt i mobil tlf. I øvrigt når man kører i bus og går på offentlige steder osv.osv.osv. Den slags frivillige vil jeg jo ikke have ind over min dørtærskel". My translation.

She protects the 'weak' women from these types of volunteers, and criticizes the integration projects that are very open minded about which volunteers they take in: *"I experience that some of our partners will take anybody [danish expression: revl og krat] as volunteers and I can wonder why they aren't more critical, since we deal with such weak people (...)."*[43] (Mette, 44:10). She portrayed the partners as 'irresponsible', since they fail to protect the 'weak' women from bad volunteers. She sees it as her and MultiKvinder's task to protect the women from people who don't subscribe to the same recognition approach as they do. Thus, MultiKvinder is very protective towards the women and that the project is an isolated 'society within the society' where the women are protected from people and institutions who subscribe to a negative discourse on immigrants and refugees.

In the public media discourse, Muslim women are often portrayed as victims of the patriarchal family structure or the system that ought to protect them (Andreassen, 2007). A discourse that DIVIDA and MultiKvinder reaffirm when they tell different stories where the women are placed in the victim-subject position. Mette tells a story about an Afghan women who has been denied asylum. She tells how the woman has been a prostitute in Kabul. But throughout the asylum process it has been male police officers and male interpreters, why she doesn't tell the truth about her case. Later on she told of some female nurses and interpreters about the truth, when she meets them in the refugee system:

"(...) But in the refugee council, they say 'well she is full of lies, she has told totally different stories in the first and second interview', so there I think that a good integration process could start with that they try not only to interview these people who come [to Denmark] to find mistakes in their stories, but to actually have an interest in having their full story openly put forward. And that isn't the case when you put two men to interview a newly arrived really miserable Afghan woman"[44]*.* (Mette, 22:50).

---

[43] "Jeg oplever at nogle af nogle samarbejdspartnere tager revl og krat som frivillige og jeg kan undre mig utroligt meget over at man ikke er lidt mere kritisk fordi man har med så svage mennesker at gøre (...)". My translation.

[44] "(...) Men i flygtningenævnet der siger man 'nå men hun er fuld af løgn, hun har fortalt helt forskellige historier til første og andet interview, altså der tænker jeg jo også at en god integrationsproces kan jo starte med at man

The story of the womn who has been denied asylum tells the story of a miserable woman who has been met unfair in the danish asylum system. This positions her in the role of double 'victim', as described by Andreassen (2007). Firstly as a woman who is forced into prostitution in Afghanistan, and hereafter as a victim in the danish asylum system, due to lack of gender sensitive. The role of the category 'gender' plays a central role in this story, since the lack of cultural and gender awareness leads to a situation where the woman is interviewed by male police officers and male interpreters.

The story links to the general victimization of Muslim women, who according to Stenvoll and Jacobsen (2010), are categorized as victims of male oppression. These presentations of women who are victims of male 'villains' are also reflected upon in the two integration projects:

"If you are part of family reunification from Afghanistan, then you have not come to Denmark with a refugee status, but you have fled, it is just another way of fleeing, well often it can be a man that you have met online that you never actually met and do not really like, or perhaps, you do not know. It can also be the case that he has written that he had a house and car, and then you arrive he did not have all those thing he had promised, not because it should be a trade but..We have many examples of women who come up here to get married to a man who has not lived up to all the things he promised when they wrote together, and who are not nice to these women either" (Mette, 24:09)[45].

---

lige som prøver ikke bare at interviewe de her mennesker der kommer for at finde fejl i deres historier men for faktisk at interessere sig for at få deres fulde historie åbent og redeligt frem. Og det gør man jo ikke når man sætter to mænd til at interviewe en nyankommen og virkelig ulykkelig afghansk kvinde". My translation.

[45] "Hvis man nu er familiesammenført fra Afghanistan så er man jo ikke kommet til Danmark med flygtningestatus men man jo flygtet det er jo bare en måde at flygte ud af det land på, altså ofte kan det jo være en mand man har mødt på nettet som man aldrig rigtig har mødt og ikke bryder sig specielt meget om måske, det ved man jo ikke vel. Det kan også være at han har skrevet at han havde et hus og en bil , og når man så kommer så havde han det overhovedet ikke alt det han havde lovet, ikke fordi det skal være en handel men..vi har mange eksempler på kvinder der er kommet op for at blive gift med en mand der ikke har levet akt det han har lovet sa de skrevet sammen, og som heller ikke søde mod de her kvinder, de bliver faktisk behandlet rigtigt skidt.". My translation.

The women who experience these types of marriages, are double victims, since they, according to Mette are *de facto* refugees, although their residence permit is based on family reunification. Secondly, they are victims of false promises made by a man, whom they might now even knew before they came to Denmark. A man who might now even treat them nicely. Thus, the women are placed in a position where they need protection from male oppression in order to become emancipated and equal. For Muslim women, becoming an "autonomy-subject" means becoming integrated or assimilated into the imagined national culture, and according to the discourse is the oppression bound up with their 'backwards culture' (Jacobsen and Stenvoll, 2010).

Employment = integration

The staff of the two integration projects reflected upon their position and practices in relation to other social institutions, especially the jobcenters. In example, Mette states:

"It does not make sense to talk about rights when you feel that the jobcenter violates you all the time and related to the jobcenter we do not have that many rights, you must align and do exactly what those young girls - yeah sorry but there are some women who could be the women's daughters- and sit there and must know all about the women's life and possess a power position so they can take the women's cash benefits if they do not align. It is so terrible, they do not feel seen and recognized."[46] (Mette, 18:13).

The project leader, Mette, positions the jobcenter as 'the villain' where *young girls* have the power to influence the women's lives in a negative way. Positioned as *young* the employees at the jobcenter are deprived of their qualifications based on the 'age' category that constitute them as less capable of doing a good job as social workers. The fact that they actually possess authority so they can take the women's cash benefits from them if they *do not align,* are

[46] "Det giver jo slet ikke mening at snakke om rettigheder når man føler at jobcenter krænker en hele tiden og i forhold til jobcentret har vi jo ikke særlig mange rettigheder, der skal man jo bare rette ind og gøre præcis hvad de der unge piger – ja undskyld men der sidder nogle der kunne være kvindernes døtre – og sidder og skal vide alt om kvindernes liv og har en magtposition så de kan tage kvindernes kontankthjælp hvis ikke de retter ind. Det er jo helt forfærdeligt, de føler sig jo ikke set og anerkendt". My translation.

described as something *terrible.* A clear contradiction is outlined since the jobcenter does not see or recognize the women - the essential method for MultiKvinder. Eva, the social worker, confirms this perception of the jobcenter:

"You can be sanctioned, you can be faced with things you do not understand, you must go to places you do not, where you are not welcomed in the way that is so important when you have so many scars on your soul. To be embraced with warmth, and love and human surplus and you feel welcome - that is so important for this group"[47] (Eva, 37:06)

MultiKvinder positions themselves as contradicting the jobcenters and the very employment orientated integration projects. In the terminology of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), their institutional practises differ from other social institutions, like the jobcenter, where the role as the 'controller' is strong - something which is not the case for these two projects since they are based on voluntarism. Thus, the two different institutional logics are outline and presented as contradicting. Mette described their lack of employment focus as a problem since they experience that there is better funding opportunities for these type of projects:

"So, that is something that I experience, everything that is employment oriented, everything that is social economic, social economic company, everything that has an element of force"[48] (Mette, 1:07:01).

She reflected upon the available discourse that good integration is equal to employment. Something that she criticizes since she describes it negatively as something with an element of *force,* sharply contradicting MultiKvinder's *voluntary* approach. The leader of DIVIDA supports this view, when being asked about economic funding: *"(...) and then when you can put*

[47] "Man kan blive santioneret, man kan blive stillet overfor ting man ikke forstår, man kommer ud steder man ikke, hvor man ikke bliver taget imod på den måde som også er så vigtig når man har så mange ar på sjælen. At man bliver taget imod med varme, og kærlighed og overskud og man føler sig velkommen – det er så vigtigt for den her gruppe. "

[48] "Så det oplever jeg helt klart, alt hvad der er arbejdsmarkedsrettet, alt hvad der er social økonomi, social økonomisk virksomhed, alt hvad der har sådan et element af tvang. My translation.

something more in prospect regarding education or employment"[49] (Tine, 32:25)". Measurable goals, such as employment and education, garner funding , which confirms the discourse on good integration is equal to employment. The social worker, Eva, also reflected upon this discourse: *"Good integration, I believe, is put together with being employed and being breadwinning and shows that you are not coming here with bad intentions"*[50] (Eva, 1:11:08). She presents a public discourse on immigrants and refugees as someone who comes *here,* meaning Denmark or other western countries, with *bad intention,* meaning taking advantage of the public welfare system. She positions the immigrants and refugees as 'strangers' who need to prove themselves worthy, of being part of the danish society. This is based on a perception in the political discourse and in the danish culture:

"And there is also something in the danish culture, that thing with that you must, and that I agree with that if you can work then you must work, I do not disagree with that, on the contrary. The thing I just find frustrating is that there become, there is such a myth about this group that they don't want to work, and I just know that is not true"[51] (Eva, 1:11:42).

The *myth* she describes that exists in the public discourse is based on an assumption that 'us', the danes, have a cultural understanding of the welfare system, as a place where one contributes by paying taxes, and if you are able to work then you must, to contribute to the common good. 'Them' the immigrants who don't want to work, are within this discourse perceived as someone who doesn't want to work, and thereby do not contribute to the common welfare. Thus, constituting an 'us' and 'them' dichotomy. Mette also reflected upon the same discourse, placing it in the political landscape: *"But there is such a suspicion in the political movements at the moment I think, as if it is there exists some kind of spite against*

[49] "(...) og så når det er ligesom om man kan stille noget mere til udsigt med uddannelse eller arbejde". My translation.

[50] "God integration, tror jeg, bliver sammenholdt med at være i arbejde og være selvforsørgende og vise at man ikke kommer her med forkerte intentioner.". My translation.

[51] "Og så ligger der også noget i dansk kultur, det der med at man, og det er jeg i øvrigt fuldstændig enig i at hvis man kan arbejde så skal man også arbejde, det er jeg slet ikke modstander af, tværtimod. Det jeg bare synes bliver frustrationen der er at der bliver, der er sådan en eller anden myte om at den her gruppe vil ikke arbejde, og det ved jeg bare ikke er rigtig.". My translation.

doing something, and they only come here to withdraw money"[52] (Mette, 1:08:05). Eva criticizes this discourse based on her own experience, thus positioning herself as an 'expert' on this group. She distanced herself from this discourse by describing the problems related to employment for the women based on her knowledge:

"I know that it is not true [that they doesn't want to work], but it is true that more or less not one of them believes that it is possible or that they have the competencies or resources or abilities it takes and therefore I think that there is a whole other problem and that is also why I am such an opponent of all that whip, meaning force"[53] (Eva, 01:12:03).

She contradicts the assumption that they do not want to work, and explains it with lack of *belief* in one's own abilities, resources and competencies. Thus, the soft empowerment approach that MultiKvinder uses, is implicitly presented as the ideal solution for facing the problem of the women's lack of belief in themselves. Contradicting MultiKvinder's recognising approach to the women, the public discourse and methods of the jobcenter is categorised, thus they are linked to punishment by the synonyms 'whip' and 'force'. Both Mette and Eva, describe the problems of employment as something that also lies with those who should employ the women:*"There is no one who wants to hire someone who has that many other problems and feels so bad"*[54] (Mette, 50:51). Now, positioning those who hire as the 'villains', they take away the individual blame that is normally places on the women in the discourse on immigrants and refugees.

"It is not like we don't think employment is important. It is not like I think 'oh no these women, no they should just sit and be stroked on their back for the rest of their lives'. I think that everyone who comes here in principle should go out and work if they are at all able to. The case

[52] "Men der ligger sådan en mistænkeliggørelse i de politiske strømninger lige nu synes jeg, som om der er sådan et eller andet trods mod at ville noget og her kommer de bare for at hæve penge". My translation.

[53] "Jeg ved at det passer ikke, men det der er rigtigt det er at der er stort set ikke en eneste af dem der har troen på at det kan lade sig gøre eller at de kan eller de har de kompetencer, eller ressourcer eller evner der skal til og derfor synes jeg at det er et helt andet problem og det er også derfor at jeg er meget modstander af alt det der pisk, altså tvang" My translation.

[54] "Der er da ikke nogle der vil ansætte nogle der har så mange andre problemer og har det så dårligt". My translation.

is, however, that if they get to the point where the women they feel that they were able to do it, then who would hire them?" [55] (Mette, 49:58).

She thereby, abandons the individualised approach to the client, and places some of 'the blame' for the womens unemployment outside them, contradicting the public and political discourse that often places the fault of unemployment with the individual. The voluntarism of the institutional practice becomes essential since, the staff's social work isn't bound up by any type of force or 'whip'. Thus, they can distance themselves from other social institutions where the role as the 'helper' and the 'controller' goes hand in hand.

"When a women comes with pain in her entire body, I could easily say 'nonsense, it is just because they are too fat and too lazy, you just need to start doing some exercise and loose weight and get yourself together'. That is how the entire society meets her. That is not what we do here" (Mette, 4:35)[56].

Mette reflects upon the discourse of immigrants and refugees as being 'unwilling to integrate' and positions MultiKvinder as a group who contradict the *entire society* and its negative approach towards these women. The society is framed as those who categorize the woman as *fat* and *lazy* due to her physical problems. MultiKvinder opposes this by taking up the role of caretaker for this group of women: *"All must feel that they are seen and heard, recognized and met where they are"* (Mette, 6:13)[57]. The social worker Eva supports this perspective on the public discourse, when talking about the employment: *"Right now there is not much sympathy for this target group and I think it lies in the population that 'they should be punished because*

[55] "Vi tænker ikke 'ikke beskæftigelse'. Det er ikke sådan at jeg tænker at kvinderne her 'uha nej kvinderne her nej de skal bare sidde og blive aet på ryggen resten af deres liv'. Jeg synes da at alle dem der kommer her i princippet skal ud og arbejde hvis de overhovedet kan. Sagen er bare den at hvis de endelig selv kom derhen hvor de tænkte det kunne de godt de der kvinder, hvem ville ansætte dem? ". My translation.

[56] "Når der kommer en kvinde som har ondt i hele kroppen og sådan noget, så kunne jeg jo godt sige 'ej pjat med dig, det er jo bare fordi du er for tyk og for doven og du kan bare se at komme i gang med at lave noget gymnastik og tabe dig og tage dig sammen'. Det er sådan hele samfundet møder hende. Det er ikke det vi gør her." My translation.

[57] "Alle skal føle sig set og hørt, anerkendt og mødt der hvor de er". My translation.

they do not bother' [to work]" (Eva, 1:09:50)[58]. Eva opposes the negative public discourse that centers around the woman's unwillingness to find jobs, to integrate. Where the public places the 'blaim' on the women's laziness, Eva places the fault another place: *"We are actually sitting here with some women who really bother [to work], but they can not on those terms."*[59]. Eva positions *those terms* as something set up by someone else other than the women, thus bouncing 'the blame' back at something outside the women.

Furthermore, not all employment are categorized as good employment. Tine told of how some of the women from DIVIDA have become employed in private daycare, which she does not see as 'good' job since it slows down the integration-process:

" (...) so they sit at home with their own child and maybe another, and then they are in fact just as isolated and back where they came from in the situation, but they have made their own money of course [said in a negative attitude]. Thinking about the integration process we believe it is a catastrophe"[60] (Tine, 24:55).

Tine describe this type of job in private daycare as a *catastrophe*, based on her view that that kind of job stops the integration process. She thereby distances herself and DIVIDA from the 'jobcenter logic' that finding a job and becoming self-supporting is the most important part of integration. Thus, 'private daycare' is categorized as a 'bad job' when thinking of integration in a holistic way. The leader of MultiKvinder, Mette, also reflects upon bad jobs:

"If you have been a subject to torture and have had every bone in you foot destroyed, and your foot hurts every time you take a step, then a cantine job might not be what lies first when you

[58] "Lige nu er der ikke stor sympati for den her målgruppe hvad det angår og jeg tror det ligger sådan lidt i befolkningen lige nu at 'de skal straffes fordi de ikke gider[at arbejde]'". My translation.

[59] "Vi sidder jo faktisk her og ser en gruppe rigtig svage kvinder der gider SÅ godt, men de KAN ikke på de præmisser". My translation.

[60] "(...) så sidder de derhjemme med deres eget barn og et andet måske, og så de faktisk ligeså isolerede og tilbage hvor de kom fra, i situationen, men de har tjent deres egne penge jo. Rent integrationsmæssigt synes vi at det er en katastrofe". My translation.

look at your life in the future, and maybe should such a woman actually just be allowed to receive a pension"[61] (Mette, 32:21).

Mette described how the typical service job that many of these women can be employed in, due to their lack of education, does not fit with their mental and physical condition. Thus, she also distance herself and MultiKvinder from the rationale of 'employment above all else'. Furthermore, she states that maybe some women should just be 'granted' a pension, and thereby be 'left alone' outside the jobcenter system, although this is a discourse with limited support in the political landscape. Mette describes how these women fear and have anxiety related to the jobcenter. She tells a story about when the Minister of employment, Mette Frederiksen, visited MultiKvinder where a dramatic incident took place: Mette and the rest of the staff had prepared the Minister on the talk with the women, telling her that it was a good idea to take it slow and not *discuss* employment with the women since it induces anxiety for the women, but *"(..) she did not listen at all"*. When she entered the room where the women sat, she stood up and leaned over the table with both her hands placed on the table and said:

"What is it that I hear about you, that you don't want to work, what is that? Well, I can look at you - and she says with this uncharming Jutlandic accent- I can look at you and see that you are young beautiful women, what would be wrong for you to go out and work?"[62] (Mette, 34:24).

One woman fainted, two women had a break down, but her attitude was *'they are just making a fuss, because they don't want to work'*. Through this story Mette Frederiksen is positioned as representing the 'integration=employment' discourse. Her harsh approach to the women, that leads to the fainting and breakdowns, represents the way that MultiKvinder see the job/employment discourse and the institutional practises conducted by the jobcenters. In the

[61] "Hvis man nu har været under tortur og fået smadret hver eneste knogle i sin fod og det gør ondt hver gang man tager et skridt , så er et kantine job måske ikke altid det der ligger først når man sådan ser sit liv ude i fremtiden, og måske skulle sådan en vinde egentligt bare have lov til at få en pension". My translation.

[62] "Hvad er det jeg hører med jer, at I ikke gider at arbejde, hvad er det for noget med jer? jeg kan da se på jer –og så siger hun det med det der ucharmerende jyske sprog-'jeg kan da se på jer at I er unge smukke kvinder hvad skulle der være galt for at gå på arbejdsmarkedet for jer". My translation.

story, Mette Frederiksen categorises the women as ‘young’ and ‘beautiful’, which is based on the categories ‘age’ and ‘physical appearance’, and frames these characteristics as positive indicators for ones possibilities for entering the employment market. With this categorization, she is portrayed as rather superficial, basing her view of ‘job readiness’ on physical appearance and age, and not ‘deeper’ mental issues like post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

Summing up

The development stories that the staff tell about the women are based on an idea of them as victims. Victims of male oppression, victims of the system, and also victims due to their refugee background. This is exemplified through the stories about the female asylum seekers, about women who have been tortured and women who are in violent marriages. The development stories thus, function as success stories where the women have undergone as transformation and have become empowered. This legitimizes the projects existence, since these women have developed in the acknowledging environment that the projects offer. The two projects can be categorized as empowerment projects, since the aim of the projects is to fill the women with knowledge about their rights and possibilities in order to make them independent. However, there is fine balance between helping the women and helping too much. The protective approach that the employees have towards the women leads to a very critical view on other social institutions integration practices. The critique is directed at the jobcenter where young and inexperienced social workers force the women into different job programs, where their individual needs aren’t acknowledged and practices of the ‘whip’ method are used. This means that the women’s social benefits can be taken away from them if the women don’t comply with the plan of the social workers. Furthermore, they distance themselves from the negative discourses on immigrants and refugees that one can find in the public/political sphere. An approach that contradicts their own empowerment method where acknowledgement is central. They also question whether or not someone would hire the women, and thereby insinuate a racist tendency in the job market. The antipati culminates when one of the project leaders tell the story about the visit from the employment minister Mette Frederiksen, who verbally attacks the women when she tells them that there are nothing wrong, and for them to

go and find a job. She represent a political discourse, where employment are seen as the most important integration parameter.

Analysis Part II - 'The Women'

This partt of the analysis is based on the interviews I conducted with the women, who are the users of the two integration projects. I will analyze their perspectives and positions based on my theoretical framework. The chapter is built up thematically like the first part of the analysis. As described in the 'Methodology', most of my empirical data is gathered from the staff of the integration project. Thus, the second analysis part shorter than the first part.

Integration object

Seen through the lenses of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003), I argue that the women who participate in the integration projects are categorized as 'integration objects', since the aim of the staff is to pass knowledge and Danish skills on to them. The project is built up around the target groups position as 'un-integrated' marginalized women. Cruikshank (1999) described how projects aimed at empowering people, are built up around knowledge since this enables the people to act for themselves and have power over their own lives. However, knowledge is not neutral and the counseling and teaching in the integration project is based upon different empowerment ideals that the projects have for the women. The courses are centered around rights and possibilities that the women have in Denmark, thus an empowerment project. Positioned as an 'integration object', Mariam internalizes some of the objects and values of 'good integration'. Her object is to have an education, be a good mom and be an active part of the society. All objectives that reflect the public and political discourse on 'good integration'. Mariam states:

"I would like to study, of course take good care of my children, I don't want to only be at home and take care of my children, it is very stressful if you do that for a long time, if you are only at home taking care of your children. I would like to study and become a pedagogue, I would like to be an active part of the society not just stay at home"[63] (Mariam, 22:37).

[63] "Jeg vil gerne studere, selvfølgelig passe mine børn godt, jeg vil gerne studere , jeg gider ikke bare gå hjemme og passe mine børn, det meget stresset hvis du gør det lang tid hvis du kun hjemme hjemme og passe børn. Jeg vil gerne studere og være en pædagog, jeg vil gerne være aktiv i samfundet ikke kun hjemme". My translation.

Describing the 'stay at home mother' role as 'just' and 'only' reflects her perception of this role as 'not good enough' to do as a woman in Denmark. She reflects the empowerment process that she has experienced at DIVIDA by describing what she wants to do with her *own* individual life. Thus, integration objects like 'engaging in the society' is something that she internalizes. I find this interesting since it reflects the projects correlation with the public and political discourses on 'good integration'. The success of the integration projects based on the womenare's capability of developing themselves in the integration process and end up with empowered goals for their lives in Denmark.
Mariam tells me about her own personal development in DIVIDA:

"The first one and half years I only stayed at home, and I could not read or understand Danish, so I was very shy and I was very, closed myself indoor, because I could not speak to other people, and now I can, so. It is much – laughs- a plus for me to come to DIVIDA"[64] (Mariam, 12:55).

Mariam describes her development from the subject position as 'isolated newly arrived immigrant woman' without the ability to communicate with other people due to her lack of Danish skills. She presents DIVIDA as one of the reasons for that, and with the role as the 'helper' in her development story.
"When I started here I could not talk, and I was very shy. (…) and some who say 'now you are so open'" [65](Mariam, 11:23). She uses the statements from other women in the project, to reaffirm her position as someone who have undergone a transition, thus she have 'developed' through the project. As Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003) state, is todays social work centered around the clients willingness and engagement in developing herself. This is based on their openness about their personal inner *self* - their feelings, situation. In booth DIVIDA and MultiKvinder, it is the close and personal relationship with the staff that is essential for the

[64] "Det første 1,5 år jeg var kun hjemme, og jeg kunne ikke læse og heller ikke forstå dansk, så jeg var meget genert og var meget, lukkede mig indenfor, fordi jeg kunne ikke snakke med andre mennesker, og nu jeg kan godt så. Det er meget –griner lidt- plus for mig at komme i DIVIDA". My translation.
[65] "Da jeg startede her jeg kunne ikke snakke, og jeg var meget genert. (…) og nogle der siger 'nu du er så åben'". My translation.

women. They trust and rely on the staff and this is essential for the self-development that Mariam describes for herself:

"There is a big difference in myself, how one must act in a situation, if my husband gets angry, or should I take care of children if Im having any problems with my husband (…) so there is a big difference in me. And also Tine says, I'm become good at it."[66]. (Mariam, 24:03)

Thus, it is not only the other women who recognize this, it is also recognized by the staff. The recognizing approach is something that is described as very important by the staff in order for the women to feel safe and acknowledged in their development process.
Mariam also tells how she has changed her direction based on the guidance she has received in DIVIDA. Originally, she wanted to educate herself as a cosmetologist but she changed her mind due to the information and guidance:

"When I arrived in Denmark I wanted to become a cosmetologist, but in DIVIDA, I know many places and I hear about many things so afterwards I decided that pedagogue is a good way for me and for my children too"[67] (Mariam, 8:50).

Thus, DIVIDA have shaped Mariam's goals and interests in Denmark, and have influenced her thoughts on employment what a 'good' job is for her and her children. Reflecting on the interests of her children in relation to her choice of education, she positions herself as a good 'mother'. It is based on the conversations with the counselor, Susanne, that she became aware of her own 'path':

[66] "Der er en stor forskel i mig selv, hvordan skal man handle i en situation, hvis min mand bliver sur, eller hvordan skal passe på børn hvis jeg har nogle problemer med min mand (..) så der er en stor forskel i mig selv. Og også siger Tine(pædagogisk leder), jeg bliver god til det". My translation.
[67] "Da jeg kom i Danmark jeg ville gerne være kosmetolog, men i DIVIDA, jeg kender mane steder og jeg hører om mange ting så bagefter jeg besluttede at pædagog er god måde for mig og mine børn også.". My translation.

"(...) I [don't] know so much about the danish society, where to search [for a job], how can I find a job, what is good for me. An after the talk with Susanne I am very clear, I must go that way, that is good for me, my children and my family"[68] (Mariam, 8:14).

Mariam also described the development through her child, who also has experienced a development by participating in the playground in DIVIDA:

"(...) and my daughters, they did not go to day nursery. They were here in the playgroup in DIVIDA. And when they started in kindergarten it was very easy for me. It was the first day and my daughters say okay mom 'bye bye'"[69]. (Mariam, 16:02).

Mariam laughs and I laugh as well. She ascribes the easy adjustment to kindergarten that her daughter, and thereby herself, have experienced to the playgroup in DIVIDA.
Learning the codes and the system are an important part of this:
"She was very happy. Because she knows the system. I must be here, and mom must leave".[70] (Mariam, 17:41). Her daughters encounter with the danish kindergarten as a place where she can decode *the system,* and knows the procedures for how to act when being delivered to the kindergarten, is experienced as positive for the mother and as an integration success to the staff as described in the previous chapter. Thus, the daughter is also positioned as someone who has developed and learned the system by coming in DIVIDA.

Victim position

Jacobsen and Stenvoll (2010) describe how Muslim women in Denmark often are categorized in the generalized role of victims. This position is often linked to their inferior position as an 'oppressed Muslim women' who are the victims of religious/cultural practices. One of the

[68] "(...) jeg kender [ikke] så meget til danske samfund, hvor skal man søge, hvordan kan jeg få arbejde, hvad er god for mig. Og efter snakken med Susanne jeg er meget klar, jeg skal gå den vej, den er god for mig, mine børn og min familie."
[69] "Og øh mine døtre de ikke gik i vuggestuen. De var her i legestuen, DIVIDA. Og da de startede i børnehave det var meget nemt for mig. Det var kun første dag og min datter siger okay mor 'bye bye'". My translation.
[70] "Hun var meget glad. Fordi hun kender systemet, jeg skal være her og mor skal gå.". My translation.

women from DIVIDA reflects upon this discourse when she both reaffirms and refutes it. After she told me that she stayed inside the house for the first one and a half years she was in Denmark, she tells me that she was very dependent on her husband:

"Before I came here I couldn't, I was very shy, I couldn't talk outside..my Danish was not so good and I was very shy if I talk and say something wrong, then what? Always I say to my husband 'you should come with me, you should come with me', he says 'no that should you [go yourself]' " (12:05, Mariam)[71].

Thus, she categorized herself as very dependent on her husband, and the one who wanted to take the husband with her everywhere she goes. Her husband is positioned as the one who says that she needs to be independent from him and be able to move around herself. As described in the analysis part I, the husbands are described in contradicting terms, since they are both perceived as 'friends and foes'. They are typically divided into two categories; those who 'drop off' their wifes and encourage them to go to the Danish courses ect… and to become more capable of managing their own lives in Denmark. Then their are those who fit into the category 'oppressing ethnic minority men', who either violate their wives physically or mentally. Mariam places her husband as someone who belongs in the first category, who encourages her to go out on her own, and is positive towards the integration project. Later on however, he falls into the other category when she tells me that her husband has threatened her with 'sending her back to Pakistan'. She saids:

"I had really many problems with my husband, and DIVIDA helps me with it, and I am not so shy to talk to them because they always help and it is personal. (...) and is was a very big help for me , because I was really depressed and stressed, I don't know what to do, should I get divorced

[71] "Før jeg kom her jeg kunne ikke, jeg var meget genert, jeg kunne ikke snakke udenfor fordi ..øh, mit dansk var ikke så godt og jeg var meget genert hvis jeg snakker og snakker forkert hvad så? Altid siger til min mand du skal med mig, du skal komme med mig, og du skal komme med mig, han siger nej det det skal du". My translation.

or should I stay with my husband (...) but now it goes very fine. They go and talk to my husband sometimes." (Mariam, 13:45)[72].

"Because when I had problems with my husband and he, he wanted to send me back to my homecountry but I don't want that and, yes then. I talked to them and now I know how, which way to go, if something have happened to me or there is something"(Mariam, 20:57)[73]

In this position, her role is the victim-subject, since she is threatened by her husband and is dependent on their marriage in order to stay in Denmark. This is due to her status as family reunificated, where the resident permit is dependent on marital cohabitation with the man that she is family reunified with. If she divorces the husband within the first seven years, she can risk losing her residence permit. However, the authorities are obligated to take physical violence in the marriage into consideration in the decision[74]. Mariam does not tell me anything about physical violence so I do not not know if this is the case or not, but her stories about threats, depression and stress tangents mental oppression. Thus, she fits into the generalized category 'Muslim oppressed women', that Jacobsen and Stenvoll (2010) describes. Furthermore, she can be categorized as as double victim, since she is both a victim to her husband's threats and the danish immigration laws.

Another category of victim that appears in the interview with the women must be seen through the lenses of Mik-Meyer and Järvinen (2003). The social institutions create people who act like clients in order to fit into the categories and solutions that social institutions have for them. Both DIVIDA and MultiKvinder are volunteer projects, but they have different offerings that can

[72] "Jeg havde rigtigt meget problemer med min mand, og DIVIDA hjælper mig med det, og jeg ikke så genert at snakke med dem fordi, de altid hjælper og der er personligt. (...) og det var en rigtig rigtig stor hjælp for mig, fordi jeg var meget meget deprimeret og stresset, jeg kender slet ikke, hvad skal jeg?, skal jeg skilles eller skal jeg blive med min mand. (...) Men nu det går rigtig fint nu. De går så snak med min mand nogle gange.". My translation.
[73] "Fordi da jeg havde problemer med min mand og han, han vil gerne sende mig tilbage til min hjemland, men jeg gider ikke og, ja, så. Jeg snakkede med dem og nu jeg kender hvordan, hvilen vej skal gå, hvis der noget sket med mig eller hvis der er et eller andet". My translation.
[74] http://www.danner.dk/viden-om-vold/fakta-om-vold/etniske-kvinder-paa-krisecenter/. Retrieved on 20.08.2014.

resemble some of the social institutions that are not volunteer - the job center where it is decided which type of initiatives that should be offered/forced the client and the medical examination whichcan be determined whether or not you are able to work or not due to physical or mental problems. Many of the women, especially in MultiKvinder where they are older, are outside employment. Thus, some of them have met and been a client of different social institutions over the years, and have internalized this role.

When I interviewed Sahar, a woman from MultiKvinder, she portrayed herself as very limited in her possibilities due to her several diseases: *"I have many problems in my back, I have asthma, I have really many problems in the body"*[75] (Sahar, 1:20). The many issues she had with her health make me categorize her as a 'victim' of illness. A role that can be analysed as something she has been categorized as and thus also internalised in the social work related to health and employment. Thus, I also categorized her as a 'health client'.

She described how she isn't alone with these type of problems, thus making it a problem of the group, not just her own problem: *"There are many people who come here, they [are] mentally ill, they [receive] really much help"*[76] (Sahar, 3:10). By stating that they receive much help, she acknowledges the work of MultiKvinder and the staff. Something she confirms when she praises the staff and mention their names during the interview. When she talks about one of the employees of MultiKvinder she says: *"I am only happy here, she understands people very well"*[77]*.* Placing MultiKvinder as the 'only place she is happy', she positions MultiKvinder as a 'good' and 'understanding' place, where they understand the problems of the women and their situations. This is based on their understanding of the woman's illness and personal problems: *"They [are] very much happy and very much sweet, they understand those who are ill. But not so much other places."*[78] (Sahar, 08:04). Thus, she also positions MultiKvinder as 'better' than other places where social institutions don't understand their problems in the same way as in

[75] "Jeg har rigtig mange problemer i ryggen, jeg har astma, jeg har rigtig mange problemer i kroppen". My translation.

[76] "Der mange mennesker der kommer her, de [er] psykisk syge, de [får] rigtig meget hjælp". My translation.

[77] "Jeg glad kun her, hun forstår rigtig meget mennesker". My translation.

[78] "De rigtig meget glad og rigtig meget sød, de forstår dem der er syge. Men andre steder ikke så meget". My translation.

MultiKvinder. She exemplifies this by describing the how the group also understands the problems of each other:

Sahar: "Just like Mariam is she is called, [she has] really many problems in her body, all the body, but they come here and all in the group they understand"
Interviewer: "They understand their situation and their problems?"
Sahar: "Yes very much. She is happy now"[79] (Sahar, 10:24).

Mariam also refers to another social institutions in relation to her own situation and future, when she states that the jobcentres are a difficult entrance to employment: *"(...) It is very difficult to go to the job center and find a job. But there is also another thing, I have heard that the pedagogues, it is easier, a little easier to find a job."*[80] (Mariam, 25:41). Mariam reflect upon her chances of finding a job if she educates herself as a pedagogue, which she assess as 'a little easier'. Thus, empowered and the ability to make decisions for her own individual future, she is marked as a women who has internalized some of the empowering capabilities in her position as 'integration object'. She thereby transforms her position from 'unintegrated immigrant woman' to 'empowered integrating immigrant woman', which makes her a success for the integration project DIVIDA.

Summing up

The two women that I have conducted interviews with reaffirm some of the subject positions provided by the staff. The position as 'integration objects' is characterized by the social clients willingness to change and develop *themselves*. One of the women told her development story that starts as a victim of her husband's threats, her lacking language skills and knowledge about

[79] Sahar: "Ligesom Mariam hun hedder, rigtig mange problemer i kroppen, det hele kroppen, men de kommer her og de alle sammen i gruppen de forstår"
Interviewer: "De forstår deres situation og deres problemer?"
Sahar:"Ja rigtig meget. Hun glad nu.". My translation.
[80] "Jeg har hørt mange historier om jobcentret. Det er meget svært at gå i jobcentret og få et job… Men også på en anden ting, jeg har hørt at pædagogerne, det er nemmere, lidt nemmere at få job". My translation.

the Danish society to an empowered woman, who knows about her rights in Denmark and is able to manage her own life due to her improved language skills. Thus, I argue that she has internalized the aim of the project, which is to empower the women into being independent. She also reflects upon the public and political discourse of 'good integration' when she articulated her goals: education, being a good mother, being an active part of the society and get a job.

The other woman, whom during the interview I categorized as a 'victim of illness', and a woman shaped by her meeting with the health system, does not fit into the category 'empowered'. And then again, she does in some degree, when she stated that she would like to educate herself and become a pedagogue assistant. Due to her many physical health problems and her poor language skills, this goal is by me, the interviewer, perceived as a goal that belongs 'in the future'. Both of the women categorize the staff as 'the helpers' when they are described as positive, acknowledging, and understanding. Thus, the two integration houses are perceived as 'happy places'

Discussion

As I have concluded in the two analysis parts that certain subject positions are available to the women in the two integration projects; 'integration object', 'victim subject' and 'empowered'. Furthermore, are the staff positioned as 'the helpers', which is exemplified through their affirmative integration practices. I would like to discuss my findings in order to locate the discrepancies and contradictions in my analysis.

As described in the analysis the staff of the two integration projects are very critical towards the job centers and the political discourses surrounding integration. They do this when they refer to a general public discourse where the women are perceived as 'unwilling to work', 'unwilling to integrate', 'fat', 'lazy' and 'someone who just wants to receive the social benefits'. They categorize other social institutions, like the job centers, as places with negative integration practices that use 'stick' and 'force'. This contradicts their own practice of acknowledgement and soft empowerment. Thus, they oppose the classic client/professional relationship where the professional both has the role as 'helper' and 'controller', a contradicting and difficult role in the social institutions. By positioning their own integration practices in contradiction to others, they portray their as the 'best practice'. This divides the integration field into two categories: 'the good' and 'the bad' integration practitioners. This image of their own projects as 'good' is quite understandable since is legitimizes their practices and their existence.

On the one hand it can be seen as positive that the women are acknowledged and supported in an environment where they get time and space for integrating themselves without punishment. The staff of the two projects try to keep and respect the women's personal boundaries and limits, when they help to care for them. They don't push the women into courses or projects that they don't want and all participation is voluntary. The acknowledgement is so 'deep' that some of the women portray the staff as their Danish 'friends' just as much as they are professionals to them. This is quite contradictory to many other social institutions that the women will meet. One can see DIVIDA and MultiKvinder as places that function as 'free spaces' where the women can be themselves and meet other women who share some of the same premises as themselves, in example being new in Denmark or having difficulties with the danish

language. The affirmative and holistic approach that the staff has towards the women empowers them and prepares them to meet the negative discourses on refugees and immigrants that they can encounter in Danish society.

I will characterize the empowerment practice as 'soft empowerment', since the staff see the small development steps as a success. However, this is still within the development framework where the women, the 'integration object', are seen as willing to develop and change in order to move away from the problem identity 'unintegrated'. So I will argue that although the projects have their own practice they are still is grounded in the premise of self-development that lies within the social work discourse. The idea of help to self-help is still the aim, although I will question whether the staff are helping the women *too* much, a question that one of the projects leaders also reflect upon.

Whereas the job centers have a direct power over the women, for example the ability to impose 'economic sanctions', I will argue that the integration project practices rely on a more subtle form of power. The courses, teaching and individual guidance that the women receive in the integration houses develop and transform their goals and aims. Thus, transform *them*. Just like other types of social work, the extent to which the projects impact the women is contingent upon the openness and willingness of the women to develop and learn.

Furthermore, it can be discussed how the staff's antipathy towards other social institutions, the politicians and the job market affect the woman's perspectives on the surrounding society. For most of the women who come to MultiKvinder and DIVIDA, these places are their first meeting with danish social institution. Thus, after the women have ended the course that they participated in, they will meet other institutions, like the language school or the jobcentres, which employ other integration practices. It might be a shock to them when they realize that not all social workers are so caring, protective and affirming as those in DIVIDA and MultiKvinder. They might also experience the negative discourse on immigrants and refugees that not only exists in the political sphere but also penetrates different levels of the society and institutions. Something which they have been spared from in the safe and closed integration

space that MultiKvinder and DIVIDA offers. It can be argued that the staff overachieve in their role as the 'helpers' based on the projects 'soft' integration practices. The staff criticize the politicians, the job centers and the public and political discourse on refugees and immigrants. Hence, I will argue, an 'us' and 'them' dichotomy is created. 'Us' refers to the staff and the women in opposition to 'them', the surrounding society. One of the women reflected upon the public/political discourse on good integration when she told her development story that ends up with goals about education, employment and active citizenship. I found this to be relevant since she is 'doing' integration object, when she internalizes the objectives that can be detected in the political and public discourse defining good integration. Although the the two integration projects distance themselves from other social institutions' integration practices they still subscribe to some of same objectives; education, employment and good language skills. Thus, the difference is more a matter of methodology than objectives. However, these objectives can, in some cases, also be decisive since some of the women with different mental and health problems can face many difficulties in achieving the goals and aims that are presented to them. This presents a difficult balance for the staff in neither neglecting the women's ambitions and goals nor setting up unrealistic expectations.

The staff of the two integration projects emphasize how they respect the women's cultural and ethnic backgrounds in their integration practices. They celebrate Newroz (Kurdish new years) and Eid just like celebrate Christmas and 'Fastelavn'. They make food from all over the world and have a room for prayer. The staff present these events and practices as gestures to the women, and a symbol of them showing respect for their different cultures. Thus, these projects distance themselves from assimilating practices, where different cultures are seen as the problem. However, I will argue that there is a general risk of assimilation when the category 'ethnicity' is linked to the problem-identity. Seeing 'ethnicity' as the problem will entail an assimilating approach towards the person with refugee or immigrant background. When people are categorized within different social institutions, I see a risk of an essentialist approached towards the individual. Although the ideal is to meet every individual and not a representative of a certain group of people, neither social institutions nor social workers are always ideal. If

people are placed within the same category solely based on their belonging to the member category ‘other ethnic background’ than danish, one can risk making generalizations based on this category.

Conclusion

I would like to emphasize that this thesis has not aimed to make normative claims about these two integration projects. My aim was to explore the field of integration and analyze how different subject positions were made available for the refugee and immigrant women and how some of these women reflected upon these positions themselves. I have wanted to analyze how categorizations of people can affect their self-understanding and how these people can risk being unified as one group based on their problem identity. The field of integration has been the overall framework and the field of social work has been where I have examined 'integration practices'. My aim is not to conclude any general tendencies, since this would go against my post-structuralist approach. However, I would like to conclude on some of the interesting perspectives in the field of integration with which this thesis have provided me, and hopefully the reader as well.

The staff of the two integration projects, DIVIDA and MultiKvinder, have a very affirmative approach to the users of the integration projects; refugee and immigrants women. Both projects are voluntary, which is very important for the staff since they portray their own work in contradiction to different social institutions who uses 'stick' and 'force'. Thus, they categorize their own approach to integration as a best practice, which legitimizes their existence.

I will categorize the DIVIDA and MultiKvinder as empowerment projects since they try to 'fill' the women with knowledge and language in order for them to become independent. This can be seen through the development stories that are based on an idea of the women as victims. They are positioned as victims of male oppression and victims of the system. The development stories, function as success stories where the women have undergone as transformation and have moved away from the victim subject identity and have become empowered. Thus, again legitimizing the integration projects and their integration practices.

The places function as closed integration spaces, where the women are prepared for their new life in Denmark. However, I will argue that there might be a shock awaiting the women upon their encounter with Danish society, where not all social institutions have the same affirmative

and caring approach. Thus, the two integration centers can, with their very affirmative approach, risk becoming too caring and overdo their role as the 'helpers'.
Furthermore, the staff distance themselves from the negative discourse on immigrants and refugees that one can find in the public/political sphere and criticizes the single-minded focus on employment in the field of integration. Thus, a general antipathy against the world outside DIVIDA and MultiKvinder is present.

The women reflect upon some of the subject positions presented by the employees. They internalize some of the integration objectives that can be found in the public and political discourses on 'good integration'; education, job and being an active part of society. Their personal development stories support the projects' aim of creating independent women. Thus, I will argue that the featured woman has internalized the aim of the project, which is to empower the women into being independent women. Thus, she performs the role of 'integration object'. This is based on the victim subject position that they also subscribe to, when they are categorized as 'victim of male oppression' and 'victim of sickness'. The women places themselves in a position where they are willing to develop within the integration projects. This is very much ascribed to the affirmative and understanding integration practices that the two projects subscribe to.

Future Studies

The thesis analyzed how certain subject positions were presented and negotiated by the staff and the women in two integration projects in Copenhagen. Reflections about the public and political discourses on integration were also discussed and an antipathy against other social institutions methodologies was detected.

It would be interesting to follow up on the critique of the job centers presented by the staff of the two integration projects. One could examine the experiences of the refugee and immigrant women who are clients in the job centers and analyze how they are categorized and 'developed' within this social institution. A focus on institutions where the client/social worker relationship is characterized by the possibility of economic sanctions could be interesting. This could include a more thorough analysis of the 'employment is equal to integration' discourse and the political regulations within this area.

Further research could also focus on the women's lives after they have participated in the integration projects; how do they manage 'on their own', do they succeed in the projects and their own integration objectives; to educate themselves, find a job or become active citizens in Danish society?

References

Books

Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2000), *Reflexive Methodology - New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, 2.edition, SAGE Publications, London.

Andreassen, R. (2007), *Der er et yndigt land- medier, minoriteter og danskhed*, Tiderne Skifter.

Andreassen, R. (2009), 'Ligestlling som redskab til at kritisere etniske minoriteter' in *Stuerent? - Dansk Folkeparti, populisme, antimuslims retorik of offermytologi*, Jessen, A., 1.edition, Frydenlund.

Cruikshank, B. (1999), *The Will To Empower - democratic citizens and other subjects*, Cornell University Press, United States.

Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, Gordon, C. (edt.), Pantheon Books, New York

Hervik, P., (2006), 'The Emergence of Neo-nationalism in Denmark, 1992-2001' in *Neo-nationalism in Europe & beyond – perspectives from Social Anthropology*, A. Gingrich & M. Banks, Berghahn Books, New York.

Hervik, P., (2011), *The Annoying Difference – The Emergence of Danish Neo-Nationalism, Neo-racism, and Populism in the Post-1989 World*", Berghahn Books, New York.

Hvenegård-Lassen, K., (2007), 'Viljen til Valg -Kommunalt integrationsarbejde i Sverige og Danmark' in *Migration och Tilhörighet – Inklusion- och exklusionsprocesser i Skandinavien*, Alsmark, G., Kallehave, T. & Moldenhawer, B., Makadam Förlag.

Kvale, S., (2007), *Interview - En introduktion til det kvalitative forskningsinterview*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, København.

Lykke, N. (2008), *Kønsforskning - En guide til feministisk teori, metodologi og skrift*, Forlaget Samfundslitteratur, København.

Mik-Meyer, N. & Järvinen, M. (2003), *At skabe en klient*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, København.

Mik-Meyer, N. & Järvinen, M. (2005), *Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv- interview, observationer og dokumenter*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, København.

Olwig, K. F. & Paerregaard, K. (2011), *The Question of Integration – Immigration, Exclusion and the Danish Welfare State*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Skovholm, J., Hvenegaard-Lassen, K. & Magnussen, D. (2005), *Et spørgsmål om kultur? - Rundt*

om mødet mellem den professionelle og etniske minoriteter, publised by Danish Refugee Council, Special-Trykkeriet.

Søndergaard, D.M. (2006), *Tegnet på kroppen - Køn: Koder og konstruktioner blandt unge voksne i akademia*, Museum Tusculanums Forlag, Københavns Universitet, 3.edition.

Søndergaard, D.M. (2007), 'Destabiliserende diskursanalyse: veje ind i poststrukturalistisk inspireret empirisk forskning' in *Kjønn og Fotolkende Metode- Metodiske muligheder i kvalitativ forskning*, Haavind, H., Gyldendal Akademisk, Oslo.

Articles & Research Papers

Crenshaw, K. W. (1991), *Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color* in Stanford Law Review, Vol.43.
Retrieved May 5, 2014, from
http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1229039?uid=3737880&uid=2134&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21104686843457

Jacobsen, C. & Stenvoll, D. (2010), Muslim women and foreign prostitutes: victim discourse, subjectivity, and governance in Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society 17.3 (2010): 270-294.
Retrieved June 6, 2014, from http://muse.jhu.edu/>

Jyllands-Posten 2002, Nedergaard, Tina: Debat: Job er en sikker vej til integration, 13.04.2002.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from
http://apps.infomedia.dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/Ms3E/ShowArticle.aspx?outputFormat=Full&Duid=Y2676496

Jyllands-Posten, Westh, Asger: V-kritik af integration i *København*, 15.01.2004.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from http://jyllands-posten.dk/indland/kbh/ECE3408839/v-kritik-af-integration-i-koebenhavn/

Larsen, N.B., (2006), *Magt og praksis - en kritisk konstruktion af et bourdieusk analyseperspektiv på integrationsarbejde*, Research Paper no.1/06, Roskilde University.
Retrieved May 10, 2014, from http://dspace.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/1672/1/1.pdf

Politiken 2001, Kramer Mikkelsen, Lars: *Integration: Noget for noget*, 21.04.2001.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from
http://apps.infomedia.dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/Ms3E/ShowArticle.aspx?outputFormat=Full&Duid=Y0735193

Ritzaus Bureau 2003: *Lokal kritik af S-integrationspolitik*, 20.08.2003.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from
http://apps.infomedia.dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/Ms3E/ShowArticle.aspx?outputFormat=Full&Duid=e00b3410

Ritzaus Bureau 2004: *SF bruger både stok og gulerod*, 23.02.2004.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from
http://apps.infomedia.dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/Ms3E/ShowArticle.aspx?outputFormat=Full&Duid=e017881b

Ritzaus Bureau 2004: *København vil have borgmester for integration*, 13.01.2004.
Retrieved September 23, 2014, from
http://apps.infomedia.dk.zorac.aub.aau.dk/Ms3E/ShowArticle.aspx?outputFormat=Full&Duid=e014dc50

Spanger, M. (2012), *You see how good-looking Lee Ann is!" Establishing field relations through gendered and racialised bodily practices*, Vol.3, Nr. 2.
Retrieved July 16, 2014, from http://ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/qual/article/view/7306

Websites

Cultural Encounters, Retrieved June 23, 2014, from
http://www.ruc.dk/en/education/subjects-at-roskildeuniversity/cultural-encounters/career-and-compentencies/

Intercultural Socialworker, Retrieved June 23, 2014, from
http://www.phmetropol.dk//~/media/Files/Uddannelser/Socialraadgiver/Studieordninger/II_studieordning_2008-01_revideret_2011_10.ashx

Integrationsbarometer, Retrieved June 27, 2014, from http://integrationsbarometer.dk/det-nationale-integrationsbarometer

Integrationstræf, Retrieved June 27, 2014, from
http://www.kl.dk/Dokumenter/Arrangementer/2014/09/Integrationstraf/

Integrationsprisen, Retrieved June 27, 2014, from http://www.kl.dk/Beskaftigelse-og-integration1/Skal-din-kommune-have-arets-Integrationsprisid135600/?n=0&section=132442

Minority Studies, Retrieved June 23, 2014, from
http://hum.ku.dk/uddannelser/aktuelle_studieordninger/minoritetsstudier/minoritetsstudier_kat_2008_2011_2014.pdf

Appendix 1: Interview Guide – The Staff

Can you describe the reason for starting up MultiKvinder/ DIVIDA?)

Who are your target group?

Can you describe the holistic approach that your work is based on?

Is it a part of your methodology to work with empowerment and if yes, how?

- *How do you work with the womens confidence and independence?*

How do you use affirmation in your work with the women?

Are then women marginalized, if yes, how?

- *Which challanges do you observe, in relation to getting the women from DIVIDA/MultiKvinder included in the Danish society?*

In which degree is a part of your work to inform the women about their rights?

How would you describe a good integration process?

Which activities do you have and which purposes does these serve?

Are there any regulations or rules that the women have to follow when they have signed up for a courses or is everything voluntary?

Which role does it play that MultiKvinder/DIVIDA only is a place for women?

Which focus areas do you believe is the most important in relation to your target group?

Which types of economic support basis do these women have and how is this a challenge in relation to their integration process?

In which degree is your work with the women employment orientated?

- *Why is it very employment orientated/ why is it not?*

Which challenges do you observe in relation to getting the women into the Danish labor market?

Appendix 2: Interview Guide – The Women

What is your name?

- *How old are you?*
- *Are you married and do you have any children?*

When did you come to Denmark and from where?

What do you do in your everyday life at the moment?

What did you do before you started in DIVIDA/MultiKvinder?

For how long have been coming to DIVIDA/FAKT?

Who told you about the place?

What have you gained by participating in the courses?

Have you become better at Danish by coming here?

Have you expanded your network by coming?

Have you used the guidance (social worker) that is offered here?

What have the result of the guidance been?

What are your dreams for the future?

Have you been in the job center and how was your experience with them?

What does the word 'integration' mean to you?