

OSLOMET

Faiza Mehmood

Mobilization against Domestic Violence Amongst Women's Organizations in Norway

**Examining the mobilization and self-advocacy strategies
amongst minority women involved in domestic violence
advocacy in Norway**

Master's thesis in International Social Welfare and Health Policy

Oslo Metropolitan University

Faculty of Social Science

Abstract

The following thesis explores the different mobilization and self-advocacy strategies used by minority women involved in domestic violence advocacy in Norway. Using resource mobilization theory, the theory of political opportunity structures as well as an intersectional analysis, this thesis examines the different factors that influence their ability to mobilize and gain access to opportunities to further their advocacy efforts.

The analysis is based on semi-structured interviews with minority women activists based in Oslo Norway, with the aim of capturing their unique experiences and voices in the women's movement. The results suggest that minority women activists face multiple challenges when engaging in domestic violence advocacy due to the lack of stable funding, the lack of culturally and linguistically diverse services for minority women, and the negative framing of immigrant women within the Norwegian political landscape that excludes them from mainstream gender equality initiatives.

The results reflect the current situation of the Norwegian women's movement characterized by separate organizing between minority and majority women organizations due to having 'separate interests'. Further research is suggested on exploring framing processes regarding minority women for a more thorough analysis.

Acknowledgements

Completing this master's program has been a long-awaited journey for me and I am thankful to finally be at the end of my journey, despite the complexities that have occurred along the way. This thesis would have not been possible without the help of my support circle. I would like to thank my supervisor Rune Halvorsen for providing me with insight, support, and guidance along the way that has helped make this thesis possible. I would like to thank my peers for always being supportive and encouraging me to push forward in the midst of a pandemic and having a child at the same time. Lastly, I would like to thank my family both in Canada and in Norway for cheering me on and always being there to support me in anyway needed, I am grateful for you all.

List of Abbreviations

DV – Domestic violence

RM – Resource mobilization theory

VAW – Violence against women

Oslo Metropolitan University, Faculty of Social Science

Oslo 2022

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 State Feminism in Norway.....	7
1.2 Brief History of the VAW Movement in Norway	9
1.3 Minority Women’s Mobilization in Norway.....	10
1.4 Research Aims and Objectives.....	12
2. Theoretical Perspectives	
2.1 Resource Mobilization Theory.....	14
2.2 Political Opportunity Structures.....	16
2.3 Intersectionality.....	18
2.4 Concluding Comments.....	20
3. Methods	
3.1 Background and Preparation for the Study.....	21
3.2 Analysis of Data.....	23
3.3 Implications.....	24
4. Results	
4.1 Service Gaps as a Mobilizing Factor.....	26
4.2 Problems in Cooperation with Different Service Providers.....	28
4.3 Collaboration as a Mobilizing Strategy.....	32
4.4 Funding as a Key Resource.....	35
4.5 The Importance of Political Allies.....	38
4.6 The Significant of the Political Climate.....	41
5. Discussion	
5.1 The Importance of Funding.....	44
5.2 Collaboration.....	45
5.3 Political Opportunities.....	46
5.4 Political Climate and the Framing of Minority Women.....	46
5.5 Intersectional Identities of Minority Women.....	48
6. Conclusion	
6.1 The Myth of State Feminism?.....	50
6.2 Concluding Comments and Recommendations for Future Research.....	51
References.....	53
Attachment 1: Interview Guide.....	57
Attachment 2: Consent Form.....	62

1. Introduction

The Nordic countries have been renowned as world leaders in promoting gender equality through its policies and practices. This has been shaped by a strong women's movement, early female suffrage, and 'state feminism' resulting in generous family-oriented welfare policies aimed to increase women's participation in the workforce and political arena (Melby et al., 2008 as cited in Sumer, Halsaa & Rosneil, 2014). Family and childcare issues are framed as public issues in need of state intervention and as an extension of citizenship rights (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). As such, Norway consistently ranks at the top when it comes to gender equality measures. A significant factor into the establishment of the Nordic gender model is the role women's movements have played in advocating for reforms to challenge gender inequality. Norway has historically exhibited a strong women's movement with a close relationship with the State (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). As Halsaa et al (2011) adds, women's movements (both formal and informal) play a significant role in representing collective voice as a mechanism to address inequalities in society and advocate for change in state institutions, policies, social norms, and everyday life (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). This is exemplified by advocacy efforts to challenge the gendered division of labour and increase women's participation in the workforce through welfare policies such as institutionalized childcare.

However, increased immigration has resulted in questions being raised on how to reconcile multiculturalism with gender equality, which is often framed in Norway as having competing interests, especially in the area of violence against women (VAW). Mainstream women's organizations in Norway have had a strong history in VAW advocacy however, the extent to which minority women have been included in such efforts have been limited. There has been little research to date looking at the extent to which minority women fit into mainstream VAW advocacy efforts in Norway. Therefore, the following study seeks to examine how service providers from minority backgrounds are able to mobilize resources and gain opportunities to further their advocacy efforts in the VAW field, and what factors influence their ability to mobilize such resources and gain access to these opportunities.

1.1 State Feminism in Norway

The Nordic countries are touted as world leaders in the promotion of gender equality on a state level, exemplified by a long history of social democracy, a universalist approach to welfare practices, and egalitarian individualism (Sümer et al., 2014). Several decades of

women's movement activism, coupled by welfare state intervention targeting increased participation of women in employment and political arenas, and activism challenging traditional gender divisions of labour have contributed to the high ranking of Norway amongst gender equality indexes globally (Sümer et al., 2014). Norway displays most of the characteristics of the Nordic gender model, characterized by state-sponsored 'women friendly' welfare policies. The two most distinct displays of this are the move from the traditional male breadwinner role to the dual breadwinner role and the increased presence and participation of women in the decision-making arena (Siim & Skjeie, 2008).

Post WWII, the economic independence of women was seen as a priority by the Nordic countries (Haavind & Magusson, 2005b). The overall shortage of workers in the workforce in combination with political lobbying led to the push for women to seek paid employment, especially in the expanding service sector field (Haavind & Magusson, 2005a). Beginning in the 1950's maternity leave benefits with guaranteed job security was introduced in the Nordic countries, as governments saw it was their duty to provide economic support to working women with families (Haavind and Magusson, 2005a). However, the second wave of feminism in the 1970's and the establishment of the Women's Liberation Movement (WLM) highlighted the oppression of women in capitalist society, characterized by unequal pay and barriers to employment such as the lack of childcare options for women, which further pushed for more additional work-family policies in Norway (Haavind & Magusson, 2005a). Some of these policies included state-subsidized childcare and endorsement of the feminist ideal that men should play an equal part in childcare through expanding paternity leave for fathers (Nyhaagen, Predelli and Halsaa 2012, as cited in Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). The alliance between Nordic feminists with the state and the introduction of 'women friendly' policies at this time was known as 'state feminism'. Coined by Helga Hernes (1987), the term 'state feminism' is used to describe the interplay of feminization 'from below' with feminization from 'above', or the alliance between Nordic women and Nordic states in the promotion of gender equality policies and practices (Haavind & Magusson, 2005a). In other words, it is the combination of women's movement activism (from below) and the development of welfare policies targeting increased women's participation especially in the fields of employment and politics (from above) (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017), (Haavind & Magusson, 2005a).

From the 1980 onwards Norway witnessed a fragmentation with the women's movement as immigration increased and in the 2000's there was an increase in minority women's organizations in response to the lack of inclusion of minority women in the mainstream women's movement and feminist discourse (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). The issue of concern was if ethnic minorities (mainly from Muslim countries) could reconcile gender equality with cultural practices mainstream White feminists deemed as 'oppressive' (Siim & Skjeie, 2008). As such, efforts to reconcile different forms of discrimination due to race, ethnicity, religion, etc with gender discrimination has been a source of tension within women's movements (Sümer et al., 2014).

1.2 Brief History of The VAW Movement in Norway

As part of the agenda of the 1970's women's movement in Norway, violence against women (VAW) became a priority of addressing what was seen as private issues and re-framing them as a societal issue, where men's violence against women is caused by patriarchal societal structures and ideology (Øverlien, 2011). The first crisis telephone line in Norway was established in 1977 followed by the first state-funded shelter established in 1978 (Øverlien, 2011). The establishment of further shelters was a combination of mobilization of both the women's movement and alliances with political stake holders whose aim was to protect domestic violence victims and put them at the top of the agenda, and by 1986, 46 shelters were established in Norway (Jonassen, 2005). Like the rest of the Scandinavian countries, the government in Norway views it as its role to protect the well-being of its citizens (Kiamanesh & Hauge, 2019). A combination of both NGOs and government services work together to provide services to domestic violence victims with the main ones being NAV, child protection services, and shelters (Kiamanesh & Hauge, 2019).

However, despite Norway framing itself as a gender equal society, as argued by Eriksson & Pringle (2005), this cannot be said for violence against women by men especially in intimate/domestic relationships, the most common form of violence against women. Although Norway prides itself on its gender-inclusive policies, it compares comparatively to other countries when it comes to domestic violence figures, highlighting the fact that domestic violence still is a lived reality for many women in Norway (Kiamanesh & Hauge, 2019). In addition, due to the unstable financial situations of shelters, Jonassen (2005) notes that just a few more than the 46 shelters that were established in 1986 have been formed, based on local women's groups efforts entirely. This is especially concerning given that the

majority of shelter residents are from ethnic minority backgrounds (Kiamanesh & Hauge, 2019). The changing demographic of women accessing domestic violence services have brought attention to service gaps such as the need for more ethno/linguistic specific services as many women from immigrant backgrounds lack knowledge of the Norwegian welfare and law system, as well as psychological and emotional support. However, this again has been hindered by the unstable financial situations of shelters and the like (Jonassen, 2005).

1.3 Minority Women's Mobilization in Norway

Despite a generous welfare system that is dedicated to promoting gender equality, increased immigration in Norway has brought attention to issues regarding multiculturalism and the social inclusion of diverse groups. The balancing of the pursuit of a gender equality agenda and tolerance for ethnic and religious differences has become a common issue faced by the Scandinavian countries including Norway (Sümer et al., 2014)

The first minority women's organization in Norway, The Foreign Women's Group (FWG) (now known as MiRa) was established in the 1970's in response to the lack of representation of minority women's voices in the mainstream women's movement, which failed to recognize the role of racial, ethnic, and religious discrimination in the oppression of minority women (Salimi 2004; Rood 2007; Halsaa et al. 2008, as cited in Thun, 2012). The current landscape is characterized by separate organizing, where majority and minority organizations fail to see any cooperation (Thun, 2012).

The FEMCIT project "Gendered Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: The impact of contemporary women's movement", examined the differences women's movements have made to policies and practices within Europe. A part of this project was examining the differences between mobilization movements of majority and minority women's organizations in Norway (Sümer et al., 2014). Overall, they found that there was limited partnerships and dialogues between minority and majority women organizations, with the overarching assumption that minority women have "different interests" by majority women activists, which explains separate mobilization efforts between the two (Nyhaggen, Predelli & Halsaa 2012, as cited in Sumer et al., 2014). Some of these different interests were defined as having a "different family culture" "different oppression" and "different cultural expectations" defining how to live one's life (Nyhaggen, Predelli & Halsaa 2012, as cited in Sumer et al., 2014).

Furthermore, they found that this discourse was also echoed on a state level, where majority women's organizations were included in the 'ordinary' gender equality agenda whereas minority women's organizations were included in the 'extraordinary' or 'crisis' issues agenda concerning culturally deemed acts of violence against women (e.g. honour-based violence) (Sümer et al., 2014). Overall, this demonstrates how minority women are excluded by the mainstream women's movement agenda and are instead used to address violence against women issues that are framed as being embedded in cultural ideology specific to ethnic minorities.

Expanding on this, Thun's (2012) study examining the organization of minority and majority women's organizations in Norway highlights some of the important differences between their mobilization processes. Her analysis included interviews with both minority and majority women's organizations in Norway discussing representations of feminism and women's issues. Thun's analysis also supported the findings listed above that majority women organizations tended to exclude minority women from mainstream feminist and women's liberation discourse. Thun concludes that minority women are referred to as 'Others' and that women's issues' only pertain to White Norwegian women. Minority women are placed outside the realm of the Norwegian feminist agenda (Thun, 2012).

In addition, discussions of what constitutes as feminism according to majority women organizations in Thun's analysis tended to exclude minority women, where one woman quoted argued that feminism is "on the basis of gender" and that "...in regard to class and in regard to ethnicity...To be a woman is more important than to be black" (Thun, 2012, p. 42). This illustrates that majority women organizations tend to view categories such as race, ethnicity, class, and so forth as separate and distinct from gender rather than interconnected, and unimportant or irrelevant when it comes to the oppression of women. Therefore, racial and ethnic discrimination was not seen as part of the agenda for the majority women organizations as they argued there were other organizations that addressed these concerns. Overall, Thun concludes that the exclusion of minority women from the mainstream feminist agenda coincides with colonial discourses of 'us vs them' or the Norwegians vs the immigrants (Thun, 2012). Overall, minority women's movement and mobilization efforts have been hindered by the exclusion of minority women's issues from the mainstream women's movement agenda.

1.4 Research Aim and Objectives

The objective of the following study is to explore the different self-organizational strategies used by minority women involved in domestic violence services in Norway. Using resource mobilization (RM) theory, political opportunity structures as well as an intersectional framework, the study aims to identify how these women are able to mobilize resources in their line of work in terms of their ability to gain access to resources, skills, members, etc and exploring the different opportunities (i.e. political) they have access to. Therefore, the research question is as follows: *What are the different processes and mechanisms that influence mobilization and self-advocacy strategies for women involved in domestic violence services in Norway?*

In doing so, the study aims to:

- 1) Identify the different ways minority women involved in domestic violence (DV) services mobilize resources and gain access to political opportunities to further their advocacy efforts
- 2) Examine what mechanisms influence their mobilization efforts
- 3) Analyze how minority women involved in DV services conceptualize their advocacy efforts

Currently, there is limited research looking at the mobilization efforts amongst organizations that are involved in domestic violence (DV) work, especially amongst minority women and in Norway in general. Therefore, it would be interesting to see if the framing of violence against women in minority groups as ‘crisis’ issues have any implications on resource allocation. For the purposes of this study, domestic violence (DV) (also known as intimate partner violence) will be examined as it is the most common form of violence experienced by women.

For the context of this study, the terms ‘women’s organization’s’ will be used to refer to the collective mobilization of women coming together on the basis of gender identity claims and issues. This includes both formal and informal mobilization groups of women ranging from well-established groups, NGOs to informal networks that are unfunded or organised through online means, whom overall interests for women’s rights.

The terms 'self- advocacy' and 'self-organization' will be used interchangeably. In contrast to voluntary/welfare organizations whose aims are to meet the needs of other people in need of help and assistance, self-organization refers to organized activities geared towards one own's self-interests and needs or people in a similar situation as oneself (Halvorsen, 2002). As noted by Halvorsen (2002), self-organized activities involve a certain degree of autonomy on behalf of the targeted group. Self-organized groups may include both "internal" and "external" activities, from service delivery and mobilization of members to addressing government and society for reform (Halvorsen, 2002). The key finding of self-advocacy/self-organization activities is the emphasis of empowerment through 'giving voice' to the disadvantaged group and involving them in the policy process (Halvorsen, 2002). In doing so, the aim is to help them control their own lives and narrative through the power of collective action (Halvorsen, 2002). Further, the term social movement will refer to Tarrow's (1994, p.3-4) definition which is "collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities." (Meyer & Staggenborg, 1996).

Lastly, the terms 'minority' and 'majority' will refer to my own terminology. Being a 'minority' in this context refers to groups of individuals that are non-white from ethnic backgrounds and are inferior in number in a given society and/or are less dominant in positions of authority. The term 'majority' will refer to groups of individuals that are white and are the dominant group in a given society, either in number and/or in terms of dominating elite structures in a given society. Lastly, borrowing from Thun's (2012) definition, the term 'majority' women's organization will refer to organizations in Norway that are predominantly white in membership. Minority women's organizations will be used to refer to organizations whose mission is to serve the interests of ethnic minority women.

2. Theoretical Perspectives

The following theoretical perspectives will be used to guide the study: Resource mobilization theory, political opportunity structures, and intersectionality. Resource mobilization and political opportunity structures is often used simultaneously in research examining social movements. Intersectionality framework will also be used in order to provide a more in-depth analysis of the socioeconomic and cultural factors that influence self-organization, an area in which resource mobilization theory has been criticized for ignoring.

2.1 Resource Mobilization Theory

Resource mobilization (RM) theory emerged in the 1970's in response to a wave of social movements happening around that time (civil rights movements, women's movement, etc). The theory is associated with McCarthy & Zald (1973) who raised attention to the organizational aspects of social movements (Somerville, 1997). Today, it is seen as one of the leading theories in social movement research. The theory proposes that the formation and mobilization of social movements is dependent on the resources available, opportunities to facilitate collective action, and group organization (Lee & Lee, 2013). In other words, grievances experienced by members in society can be alleviated with the necessary resources (Sen & Avci, 2016). RM theory emphasizes rational choice, where individuals weigh out the benefits and costs of membership. Together with both individual rational choice and the collective nature of organizations, grievances according to McCarthy and Zald (1987), can be defined and reduced by movement leaders (Somerville, 1997).

The main tenants of the model are the following. First, in order for social movements or organizations to be successful, they must have the ability to gather resources to produce programs and platforms that can mobilize support (Lee & Lee, 2013). Lee & Lee (2013) distinguish between both tangible and intangible resources. Tangible resources include materials goods such as money, equipment, labour, space, etc (Sen & Avci, 2016). Intangible resources consist of the human resources that form the basis of the movement as well as the means that allow the movement to grow including: organizational experience, leadership, etc (Lee & Lee, 2013). Secondly, RM theory states that the success of social movements depends on the ability of organizations with shared grievances to come together and mobilize members to its cause (Lee & Lee, 2013). Therefore, Lee & Lee (2013) state that the effectiveness of a movement rests on its ability to organize on a large scale and have access

to opportunity structures. Organizational planning includes calculating what tactics work the best to achieve movement goals, ranging from protest to lobbying (Lee & Lee, 2013).

In the case of “new social movements”, modern technologies (especially the internet) have significantly influenced the formation of social movements in recent times (Sen & Avci, 2016). Star (2000) stresses how the internet (via cell phones, chatrooms, social media, etc) has been a powerful tool to mobilize movements across national borders, particularly for marginalized groups that are excluded from mainstream media (Sen & Avci, 2016). This points to a new direction for which resource mobilization can be analysed with the advancement of technological resources. Particularly relevant to women’s movements across Europe, online networking and organization serve as a key resource to reach larger numbers of women, providing more channels for women’s activism (Knappe & Lang, 2014:362, as cited and Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017). This is because social media as a public platform allows for more opportunities for social activism regardless of hierarchal status (Sumer & Eslen-Ziya, 2017).

Thus, RM theory has become one of the main theories used to explain the formation and success of social movements and organizations. However, there are the following limitations. One of the main criticisms of RM theory is its over emphasis on the material aspect of social movements (Sen and Avci, 2016). Sen & Avci (2016) note that RM theory specifically puts emphasis on monetary resources as key however, many social movements have been born when funds were scarce. Secondly, Somerville (1997) states that RM theory focus on the institutional aspects overlooks the wider socio economic and cultural landscape that influence movements. Buechler (1993) argues that RM theory tends to downplay grievances, seeing control over resources as more important for social movements to flourish. For example, Buechler (1993) notes that in the case of the women’s movement, grievances that were developed in parent movements that sought to challenge patriarchal power on a radical scale played a significant role in the formation of the larger-scale women’s movement, which suggests that grievances play an equally important role as resource allocation in the formation of social movements. Buechler (1993) further argues that ideology plays an important aspect in the formation of social movements, where the women’s movement took their grievances and collective gender identity and imbedded it into feminist ideology (‘the person is political’). Therefore, ideology is a critical component in social

movements as it politicizes grievances and helps develop a collective identity to help mobilize resources for the cause.

Furthermore, the focus on organizational structure and resource allocation overlooks the role in which collective identity and diversity in membership play in social movements. Buechler (1993) argues that the mobilization of resources can only occur in a movement once members with a collective identity and shared grievances come together. In other words, collective identity becomes symbolically meaningful to the participants that precedes any cost benefit calculation of joining a movement. In terms of diversity, Buechler (1993) notes that in the case of the various women-led movements, not only is gender used as a basis to form collective identity, but race, class, culture, etc play a significant role in the formation of a collective identity to mobilize a movement. In summary, RM theory provides a good explanation to why social movements occur, but ignores important factors related to the wider socio-cultural and economic landscape in which an intersectional analysis can be helpful in providing a more thorough analysis for this study.

2.2 Political Opportunity Structure

In conjunction with RM theory, the concept of political opportunity structures is often used simultaneously with RM theory in the examination of social movements. Influenced by the social movements of the 1960's, the influence of the broader political system in creating opportunities for collective action started to get recognized (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, n.d.). The concept was first used by Peter Eisinger (1973) who used the term to describe the race riots in American cities during the 60's (Meyer & Staggenborg, 1996). He distinguishes between both 'open' and 'closed' political opportunity structures, stating that cities with 'open' structures are characterized by a government that responds to the needs of its citizens whereas 'closed' structures are characterized by an imbalance of power and limited government response (Meyer & Staggenborg, 1996). Cities with a mix of open and closed structures are more likely to have an emergence of protest whereas open structures are characterized by taking citizen's grievances into account into mainstream politics (Ramos, 2008).

In the United States, the works of Tilly (1978), McAdam (1982) and Tarrow (1983) expanded the concept by examining the link between institutional systems and social movements. In Europe, scholars such as Kriesi (1989), Kitschelt (1986), and Koopmans (1992) expanded knowledge of the links between new social movements and political

opportunity structures (McAdam et al., 1996). The early work of American scholars sought to explain the emergence of social movements on the basis of changes in the institutional or power structure in a given national political system, whereas European scholars sought to explain more cross-national differences in the structure, size and success of movements on the basis of the political characteristics of a given country (McAdam et al., 1996). Regardless, the underlying basis for both was to highlight that social movements are shaped by the political opportunities (or lack thereof) in the given country they emerge from (McAdam et al., 1996).

According to McAdam et al (1996) the specific dimensions of political structures that impact collective action are as follows:

1. The overall openness or closure of a political system
2. The stability of a broad set of elite structures that underline a political system
3. The presence of elite allies
4. The state's ability and capacity for suppression

To explain the emergence of a given social movement one must analyse the manner in which changes in one of more of these dimensions above result in the political system either being more receptive or vulnerable to backlash of collective action. McAdam et al (1996) also stress the importance of the form and timing in which collective action is structured by the opportunity available. In other words, the form of mobilization that will take place is dependent on the type of opportunity available and therefore, changes in the political environment give new possibilities for collective action as the timing and fate of movements being largely dependent by the opportunities given to the changemakers by the shifting institutional structure and the ideological disposition of those in power (McAdam, 1996)

Although the importance of the political environment plays a pivotal role in the emergence of social movements, the model has been criticized as lacking consensus over its definition due to its vagueness and therefore used by scholars to explain a wide variety of phenomena in a myriad of ways, and therefore may not adequately explain anything in the end (McAdam, 1996.). McAdam's (1996) article seeks to define the confusion around the terms, which he attributes one reason to the confusion is trying to incorporate the concept into the resource mobilization theory, in which it was argues that political opportunities constitute as one of the many resources used to aid in mobilization efforts (McAdam, 1996). However,

McAdam (1996) argues that this overly inclusive definition hinders the concept of analytical depth and thus is better to narrowly define both as being distinctive. Therefore, using McAdams et al (1996) four dimensions listed above will help provide a more precise way of measuring the concept in this study.

2.3 Intersectionality

Intersectionality emerged in the 1990s to address the ways in which one's social and political identities combine to create various forms of marginalization that mainstream feminist and anti-racist discourse failed to address (Ono, 2013). Kimberle Crenshaw coined the term intersectionality in the 1990's to particularly highlight the various forms of marginalization experienced by Black women and women of colour in America (Ono, 2013). Today intersectionality is used in various forms of emancipatory research especially when examining the social inequalities experienced by marginalized populations.

Crenshaw argues that women of colour do not experience sexism and racism the same way White women do (Kapur et al., 2017). Various social and political identities such as gender, race, class, and so forth intersect together to produce social inequalities (Kapur et al., 2017). In other words, rather than seeing gender and race as separate categories, they must be viewed together to examine how they intersect to produce multiple forms of domination/marginalization. Davis (2008) further expands on the definition of intersectionality as the ‘‘interaction between gender, race, and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power’ (p. 68) (Ono, 2013).

Crenshaw particularly uses the intersectionality to highlight violence against women, where she argues that violence against women is not only due to patriarchy and sexism but is also shaped by other dimensions such as race and class (Crenshaw, 1991). She argues that contemporary feminist and anti-racist discourses fail to address how race and gender interact and intersect to shape how violence is experienced by women of colour (Crenshaw, 1991). For instance, Crenshaw notes that women of colour experience violence differently in that their racial and ethnic background, along with their class status and gender all intersect to produce multiple forms of inequalities that make them more vulnerable to domestic violence than their White counterparts (Crenshaw, 1991). For example, in addition to experiencing domestic violence women of colour are further burdened by other inequalities due to race and class such as being more prone to poverty, unemployment, discrimination in the job and

housing market, and often lack the language skills to obtain sustainable employment and access to social services to help them improve their social situations (Crenshaw, 1991). These added burdens create additional inequalities that further marginalizes them and makes them more vulnerable to domestic abuse compared to White women. Thus, their social identities as both women and of colour work intersect together to create multiple inequalities unique to women of colour. Therefore, Crenshaw argues that one must consider the various social and political categories that shape one's identity when considering how the social world is constructed and how one experiences the social world (Crenshaw, 1991).

However, Bowleg notes that intersectionality has some limitations. For instance, the focus on intersections of race and gender primarily of Black women can be seen as treating Black women as monolith and not taking into account within group differences such as sexual orientation which also is a contributing factor in producing marginalization (Bowleg, 2012). Further, because the theory acts as primarily an analytical framework and does not have a set methodology, it is hard to apply the theory empirically to be tested especially when doing quantitative research due to the lack of guidelines (e.g. no guidelines on what variables can be operationalized) (Bowleg, 2012). Therefore, intersectionality should be viewed as a general framework to examining multiple intersecting social and political identities (Bowleg, 2012).

Intersectionality is widely used in research to explain the differences in how women of colour experience domestic violence, as well as their experience with service providers and programs. Using an intersectional framework in this study will help to demonstrate if there are any significant differences in terms of how minority women in the VAW field are able to self-organize and mobilize resources within their fields, and what factors may influence the opportunities they get to advance their self-advocacy efforts. In addition, using an intersectional analysis in this study is critical to examining the differences in how the intersectional identities of minority women influence their ability to self-organize and mobilize resources, since they are widely excluded from mainstream women mobilization efforts. Lastly, as noted in the previous discussion, there is a lack of acknowledgment of how other forms of discrimination based on social identities specific to minority women work together to further oppress women of colour, in which majority "White" women activists rendered as "separate" to gender discrimination. Therefore, using an intersectional analysis is key to understanding how minority women's social identities interconnect and work together.

2.4 Concluding Comments

As discussed above, the lack of collaboration between minority and majority women's organizations, the overrepresentation of minority women accessing domestic violence services as well as the exclusion of minority women from the mainstream women's movement raises questions on why they are largely excluded from mainstream mobilization efforts and from the political agenda. Therefore, it is important to investigate how minority women currently are able to self-organize and mobilize resources to enhance their advocacy efforts in the domestic violence field, despite the challenges brought by the exclusionary environment. This study hopes to provide more insight into this contemporary issue that has largely been ignored on a mainstream level and add to the growing body of research concerning minority women's mobilization strategies. In doing so, the hope is to help empower and elevate the voices of minority women working in this critical field, allowing them to take control of their own narrative by sharing their experiences.

Using resource mobilization theory, this study hopes to examine more definitively the types of resources utilized by minority women organizations and what influences their ability to organize and self-advocate. In conjunction, this study also hopes to discover more on how the political landscape, relationship with political stakeholders, and government response influences their mobilization efforts. Due to the limited scope of this study, resource mobilization theory and political opportunity structures, both dominantly used in social movement research, will be used in this study. This is not to say that resource mobilization theory and political opportunity structures solely explain mobilization efforts, however they are two of the dominant theories used in social movement research and therefore can aid in explaining aspects of how social movements emerge.

Lastly, an intersectional analysis is critical in this study to examine how the social location and backgrounds of minority women may influence their ability to mobilize and self-advocate, as previous research shows differing opportunities when it comes to majority and minority women's mobilization. By examining more closely the role identity and social location plays in mobilization, this will help to draw more attention to an aspect not commonly examined in social movement research. More attention needs to be paid to how privilege associated with certain political and social identities can either enhance or render one disadvantaged when it comes to opportunities and resources for collective action.

3. Methods

The following chapter will discuss how the study was implemented. This includes a briefing of the participant selection, interview process, and implications that came up during the research process. It will also explain how the analysis was carried out and a description of the methods I have used to analyze the data.

3.1 Background and Preparation for the Study

Before conducting the main body of research, the interview guide, information letter, and consent form were prepared to be sent for NSD approval. The interview guide consisted of around 30 questions. The interview questions were broken down by theme first, and a list of foundational questions and prompts were created. The foundational questions were used as the main component for the interview whereas the prompts were used as a guide for further detail depending on the answers given by the participants. However, not all the interview questions were asked as most were answered by the participant during the conversation. Therefore, I went with the flow of the interview and asked the main foundational questions related to the research question and main components of the study.

After NSD approval was granted, the interview participants were contacted via email. A copy of the information letter and consent form was provided beforehand to the participants to give a brief background about the study and for them to sign their consent to participate in the interview. As the study is in collaboration with the EUROSHIP research group at OsloMet, three of the participants that were recruited were previously involved with EUROSHIP. The other participant was recruited via personal networking. A total of four interviews lasting around one hour each were conducted.

It is important to note that none of the organizations are exclusively VAW agencies; they were all non-profit organizations that had projects and/or programs that worked on domestic violence or worked indirectly on the issue. The participants that were recruited were women from minority backgrounds based in Oslo, Norway. Below is a breakdown of the participants and a description of their organizations. *Pseudo* names were given to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

Table 3.1. Description of Participants

Pseudo name of participant	Description of Organization
<p>1. <i>Katherine</i> Founder of organization and domestic violence advocate</p>	<p>Conducts investigative journalism showcasing stories relevant to immigrant and minorities in Norway including domestic violence (coded as <i>organization 1</i>)</p>
<p>2. <i>Yasmine</i> Program leader of women’s group within organization</p>	<p>Part of an international non-profit humanitarian organization with branches in different parts of Norway. The women’s group is catered to immigrant women that focuses on relevant topics including issues of domestic violence (coded as <i>organization 2</i>)</p>
<p>3. <i>Luciana</i> Founder and executive director of organization</p>	<p>Organization that connects survivors of human trafficking with professional support. Part of collaborative project tackling violence in intimate relationships (coded as <i>organization 3</i>)</p>
<p>4. <i>Nora</i> Assistant leader of the organization</p>	<p>Local organization that works specifically with women from immigrant and minority backgrounds with a focus on community participation and involvement. Works indirectly with issues regarding domestic violence brought up among program participants (coded as <i>organization 4</i>)</p>

Due to the corona situation, three of the interviews were held via zoom video call and one was conducted in-person. Interviewees were briefed in the beginning about the project and their rights regarding consent, right to withdrawal, confidentiality, and the use of sound recording. The interviews were sound recorded using the UiO *diktafon* app with consent from

the participants. Towards the end, the participants were asked if they had any policy documents or other information that would aid as a guide to the research. The policy documents were mainly used to provide context in preparation for the interviews, as well as provide more background information about the organization and their activities especially in regard to domestic violence advocacy. These included annual reports, articles, podcasts, and lists of collaborations/partnerships.

After conducting the interviews, the sound recordings were delivered from the *diktafon* app and sent to *nettskjema* and were reviewed with WiFi turned off as an extra privacy measure. The data was stored on a personal computer as outlined in the consent form with prior permission from NSD with secured passwords and encryption for security purposes. The interviews were then transcribed verbatim and during the transcription process, similarities and differences were noted down between the interviews. The transcripts varied in size from about 12-20 pages in length. The transcription process was extensive and comprised the most labour-intensive part of the interview process that required many revisions and going back to the sound recording to ensure the most accurate transcription process. To protect the confidentiality of the participants, no other sensitive information about them including age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc was collected as it was not relevant for the study. Data was stored on

3.2 Analysis of Data

To analyze the data, a thematic analysis was utilized. In qualitative research, a thematic analysis is "...a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" with the goal of finding repeated patterns of meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.79). A thematic analysis was used as it does not require any specific technical or theoretical framework for analysis and therefore provides a simple, flexible, and more streamlined way of analyzing data than other approaches (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The thematic analysis is guided by the main research question which, to reiterate, is "*What are the different processes and mechanisms that influence mobilization and self-advocacy strategies amongst women involved in domestic violence services in Norway?* More specifically, a theoretical thematic analysis was utilized as the analysis is guided by theoretical approaches (e.g. resource mobilization, political opportunity structures, intersectionality) and the research question and therefore coded accordingly (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

To make the process more streamlined, Braun & Clarke (2006) six steps for transcription were utilized which are the following: 1) familiarizing yourself with data 2) generating initial codes 3) searching for themes 4) reviewing themes 5) defining and naming themes and 6) producing the report. Using these steps, the next step of the analysis included re-reading the transcribed interviews, highlighting significant excerpts from the interviews and writing short key-word summaries. The excerpts were examined and coded into different categories and then combined into more general themes. The themes emerged through a process of going back and forth between the excerpts and interpreting the understandings of the participants using the theoretical perspectives at hand.

3.3 Implications

The following implications raised when conducting the data for the study. Firstly, one of the biggest implications was recruiting participants for the research study. A number of women organizations that worked on VAW issues were contacted via email first and followed up by phone without success. The lack of success of finding interviewees to participate is thought to be due to the language barrier as many of these organizations operate in Norwegian only. The second reason may be due to not having a personal connection/network which would have made it easier to recruit participants. Thirdly, it may also be that the organizations simply did not have the time as they had other important priorities to take care of. The participants who were recruited in the end were already involved in the EUROSHIP project previously and through limited personal networking.

The second implication came in the formulation of the interview questions. The question that could have been formulated better was the main foundational question regarding the mobilization of resources which stated “What are some key resources your organization needs in order for it to function effectively?”. Most of the participants struggled a bit to define what was meant by resources due to the broadness of what encompasses resources. As Sen & Avci (2016) note, a criticism of the theory is that it is so broad that it does not really specify what is meant by resources and that everything and anything can be regarded as a resource. Perhaps a more specific formulation of the question could have produced more richer descriptions.

Furthermore, some of the interviews could have been given a bit more structure or I could have asked more follow-up questions (“probes”) to produce more detailed results. As one of the organizations did not work directly with domestic violence but rather when

brought up by participants in the organization passively, it was hard to produce detailed answers regarding domestic violence advocacy. Perhaps recruiting another organization that worked more directly on the issue would have been more appropriate.

4. Results

The results presented below aim to answer the following research question and aims for the study. The following themes were found to be significant and relevant to the overall research question.

4.1. Service Gaps as a Mobilizing Factor

When asked the following question “*To start off, could you please tell me what your organization is about and how you got involved?*” all participants similarly stated that the purpose of starting up their organizations/programs was due to the lack of services for minority women within the Norwegian social system.

The following excerpt from *Katherine* illustrates why she decided to start her own organization:

I kinda felt that the media was creating a narrative about immigrants in such a way that it gives a very narrow viewpoint of who we are. So the [organization’s name] is trying to give a larger picture but empower our own voices to write stories and also to investigate things and barriers that immigrants consistently face that somehow I feel like particularly in academic or in academia, that there’s not much research on in certain areas, and that frustrated me as a journalist because I was relying on the research here to kinda reinforce some of stories that I’ve been interviewing, but because that wasn’t even there, we were kind of doing the groundwork with investigative journalism that has to be done. So that is kind of what we’re about, so we’re like a group of people that want to tell collective stories but to gather evidence regarding systemic discrimination within various different bodies - (Katherine)

The above excerpt demonstrates that the reasoning that led her to starting up her organization (mobilization) was due to the lack of representation of immigrant voices, particularly in media and in research. She found it important as an advocacy strategy to do stories on topics impacting immigrants that lacked previous research, and therefore highlight the role of systemic discrimination in Norwegian society. For her, it was important to ‘give voice’ to immigrants to tell their own stories and experiences in their own words rather than mainstream media framing them in a particular way. This presented her an opportunity to mobilize and contribute to knowledge-production.

Similarly for the second organization, the reason for creating the women's group was due to witnessing a service gap for the women coming into the organization:

...why we decided to start this project was because we saw a lot of women coming into the [women's group] and women also coming to [the organization] who had questions about this topic...so this project is for us to be able to have the time and the resources to give them more information, follow them up. And then we wanted also to train our volunteers into how to give guidance to someone who's coming to you and talking about issue because it's not easy, or maybe not all of our volunteers would know how to deal with that in a situation like this, but also to know the different types of violence because it can come up in a conversation like 'Oh my, for example, my boyfriend or my husband or my wife, she doesn't let me have my money or she keeps my money' then they wouldn't like know that. They're talking about economical violence for example – (Yasmine)

The abstract above also illustrates that the reasoning for mobilization (creating the women's group) was due to witnessing an unmet need in their clients in terms of specifically needing information and resources regarding violence in intimate relationships. This provided them an opportunity to engage in domestic violence advocacy by creating a safe space for women to seek help and get information.

For *Luciana*, the lack of support for survivors of human trafficking and the motivation to bridge health professionals with survivors was the main motivating factor for starting up her organization:

...the survivors were not getting any type of adequate support because they come from many different countries, victims in Norway might be from all the other countries in the world. So we need different professionals that speak different languages. And I started making a plan of an organization that could tackle these issues – (Luciana)

On the other hand, *Nora's* details her mother's experience (the founder of the third organization) with the Norwegian welfare system and the barriers she faced:

So my mother came to Norway in 1996. She gave birth to six children in a welfare system she didn't know about. Whenever she tried to seek help from Norwegian Pakistanis, she told us that they were very arrogant that they didn't want her to help her. So she didn't know what kind of right she had... And in 2011 or 2012 when she lost her job. There was someone in the district [district name] told that you know the way you work like bridging...like building a bridge between isolated women who don't know a lot about the system and their rights in

Norway, I know there are a kind of method used in Denmark they are also working like that. You should actually be a leader of an organization in Norway... – (Nora)

The above excerpts show similarities between the other organizations where the initial motivating factor for mobilization was due to the lack of services for immigrant and minority women within the existing system. Therefore, this provided them the opportunity to mobilize and start their organization. Overall, this demonstrates that shared grievances and the lack thereof of resources i.e. lack of social services for immigrant and minority women, can be used as an opportunity to mobilize and create organizations/services to meet their unique needs that are not being met by mainstream services.

4.2. Problems in Cooperation with Different Service Providers

An interesting finding pointed out by three of the organizations was the use of other services/organizations as *resources* to provide their clients with help, since domestic violence advocacy involves a multi-disciplinary approach that relies on cooperation from different bodies within the welfare system (e.g. police, crisis center, etc). However, the following sub-themes emerged as implications when cooperating with these services: Lack of knowledge/resources, language barriers, and cultural (in)competency. The below excerpts will go into more detail regarding these sub-themes.

Using other Service Providers as Resources

When asked the following question “*Have there been any challenges you have faced when doing advocacy work?*” The follow answers provided below demonstrate issues the activists faced when cooperating with other service providers:

I think I see a lot of challenges when it comes to like, cooperating with different services. So I've had a lot of, not in the terms that they don't want to help, but more like getting in contact with the right person. So I think, for me, it was the police, who has been very difficult to get a hold of, which is like a very important service for that for us to contact and for the woman as well. And the crisis centre sometimes can be difficult to, you know, get the right help. And we've talked about this before with them as well. But it all comes down to like, what kind of resources they are getting to be able to also give help. And I think that's where the problem is, is that we were kind of dependent on them for a lot of the things right, so the police would help with the case, and then the crisis centre would help with maybe a lawyer and then a place to stay. And so because we cannot do anything, so we need like a good cooperation...and then we see that they don't have enough resources well, not the police, but like the crisis

centres don't have the resources, or maybe they don't have like, maybe, like a cultural language barrier or something there. And this is something I think we would need to work more on, like, with advocacy is like getting more resources for all these services that give help to these women, because that's what they're lacking also now – (Yasmine)

The above excerpt demonstrates the challenges faced by *Yasmine* when cooperating with other service providers within the welfare system. Since help for domestic violence victims requires a co-dependent relationship with other services providers, this can be challenging when they are ill-equipped with the *right resources* that cater to the needs of immigrant/minority women. Therefore, a challenge in terms of advocacy for *Yasmine* is expanding more resources for these service providers in order to provide appropriate help to the women.

Katherine also echoes the same sentiments in the below excerpt:

I think for me also when it comes to crime how does one actually in the court deal with these matter....and I'm talking you know on domestic violence and various different issues here...so I had this girl, a student from a Pakistani background and I did tell her to inform the police about her situation because I was afraid of honour killing being involved and um, unfortunately the last time I spoke to her she said the police can't help me they just don't have the resources and in doing so she went into hiding for a while basically and the police were saying maybe you should change your identity or something else, and you go and sit there and scratch your head thinking why should she be afraid and go into hiding? Shouldn't something be done about that? – (Katherine)

The above excerpt demonstrates how law enforcement i.e. police are ill-equipped with the *appropriate resources* to help women specifically from minority backgrounds. Overall, this demonstrates that although other service providers are used as an important resource by the activists in terms of advocacy, they are often ill-equipped with the appropriate resources needed to cater to the needs of minority women, which serves as a challenge.

Language Barriers

To expand in terms of what is meant by 'lack of resources', language barriers was specified by three of the organizations as a barrier that limited the scope of help for the victims. The below excerpt by *Katherine* demonstrates this issue:

I think like the language has always been such a thing. So I feel like that is also a thing that they should really consider is how do you relay information and get employed more people with, you know, who are multilingual. And we shouldn't limit by saying, 'oh they should learn Norwegian language' you know, we should be able to provide interpreters at all the stages of someone exiting domestic violence – (Katherine)

The below excerpt by *Yasmine* demonstrates how limited language services available to immigrant/minority women impacts their advocacy work:

I think there is not a lot of services. I've had situations where I've sent women to like an organization, for example, that's working with immigrant women, because I thought that they would maybe in a situation where we... I couldn't help. But when they went there, they were sent back because of the language. So I think like, there's not a lot of services in Norway, maybe who speak English, or organizations that are very fluent in English to help people who can't speak Norwegian. So a lot of the services or maybe like, organizations target towards women living in Norway for X many years. And while in [our organization], we are so used to working with people coming to Norway yesterday, or they've been here for 10 years. So I think in that sense, it's not enough organizations working like that...that's based on like my experience of like them, sending them back to us because they couldn't speak English – (Yasmine)

Furthermore, for *Luciana*, the language barrier not only affects the women in need but her ability to secure resources such as funding due to not being fluent in the native language. Therefore, this adds as an additional challenge in being able to secure resources needed for advocacy:

Well, there's always a challenge of language, I think that's the first one I can think of immediately, which is, I moved to this country, I'm still learning Norwegian, I can understand a lot of Norwegian and speak, but I can't have a fully professional conversation in Norwegian and applying for funding is the same thing. Most funding applications have to go in Norwegian and it's very difficult when our level is not so good...and so language barrier is always an issue – (Luciana)

Overall, the above extracts demonstrate how language can be a barrier for the activists in that it limits the scope of the help they can provide to their clients. To reiterate, dealing with domestic violence in a multi-system approach that requires collaboration with multiple service providers that are used as *resources*. Therefore, the language barrier does not affect the victims, but hinders the way in which they can mobilize resources to help them

effectively. Further, the lack of language availability (namely English) also may signify that current domestic violence services in Norway cater mainly to Norwegian-speaking women that have been here for longer periods of time. Therefore, activists in the field are limited in their mobilizing efforts in terms of their ability to provide thorough help for women from immigrant/minority backgrounds due to the lack of knowledge and resources available in different languages.

Cultural (In)competency

The lack of cultural competency was noted by the activists as a factor that hindered their advocacy efforts and ability to provide their clients with well-rounded help. When asked *“What are your general thoughts about the current environment and the different services that are available to minority women (in terms of DV services)?* Katherine pointed out how cultural incompetence can be an issue:

Very shitty communication and um, I think that when it comes to cultural competence and how do you bridge the trust between cultures, and the communication...they kind of blame you as a victim that you are the problem I feel like a lot of the cases have complete dismissal of someone's feelings, and we are trained to read underneath the words and you know, in between lines, so when they come across and saying things like ‘I understand how you feel’ I'm like no you absolutely do not... - (Katherine)

Yasmine also echoes similar sentiments in the excerpt below:

I think culture always is a bit tricky. That is something that can always be a problem. I think, even in (our organization) as well, like, I wouldn't understand someone from another culture. So maybe my suggestions wouldn't be applicable to their situation. And I've learned a lot from like, women telling me what can happen to them if they divorce them, or what can happen to them if they go back to their home country. So from there, I would learn also, okay, not only what's happening now in Norway, but also how they are perceived in the home country and all the pressures they have. And I think that's something that we are not very knowledgeable about, like in different organizations. I wouldn't say the big organizations don't have the resources, but maybe we need more knowledge about it – (Yasmine)

Luciana points out the importance of being culturally informed in order to not further stigmatize women coming forward for help from minority backgrounds:

...services need to be in more languages, and culturally sensitive to the different people who approach them. Because filing for divorce for a Pakistani person and filing for divorce for Norwegian person is very different. And culturally is also very different. And divorce is not seen as something positive. So we need to be aware of these things before we make judgments before we. like, I went to the crisis centre once with a woman and the worker that was there said immediately like if you don't, if we think that you are in a very dangerous | situation, and you don't agree to leave the household we are forced to call the police into. And she said this before she even knew the name of the woman. So of course, she was scared – (Luciana)

The above excerpts demonstrate how the lack of cultural competency, loosely defined as the ability to understand and interact with different cultures, can be a challenge when doing DV advocacy. Interestingly, *knowledge* in terms of cultural competency is defined as an important *resource* that should be considered when serving minority women. In line with The intersecting identities of minority women are not seen as a whole, but treated as different categories. Issues of “culture” and “race” are treated as distinct from “gender” oppression, rather than seen as being interconnected. Therefore, this not only hinders the ability for the activists to do their work, but also signifies how mainstream services exclude minority women from the mainstream VAW agenda.

4.3 Collaboration as a Mobilization Strategy

In order to combat the challenges faced by the activists in terms of the lack of resources and services available to minority women, collaboration with like-minded activists/organizations with similar goals/interests was seen as a key advocacy strategy to further mobilize and raise awareness regarding these issues. When asked to expand on her current collaboration with other DV organizations for minority women, *Yasmine* stated the following:

...We wanted to give information about violence in close relationships, but also talk about the experience of women when they are asking for help from different services, what the challenges are and what we can do to give you know, give them better services and give them the help that they actually need. Because I know that a lot of the women complain about that they are getting, like suggestions for things that they could do maybe based on something that they would take like for example, okay, well, we've had a lot of women from Iraq needing this so maybe you can do that and they felt like they weren't...they weren't getting the help tailored to their needs. But yeah, they were just getting like (bypassed), just based on like

what they think you would need as a woman from this culture and more than what you actually would need – (Yasmine)

Similarly, *Katherine* also highlights the importance of collaboration in the excerpt below:

So in terms of advocacy it's trying to bring light into this topic that has so many layers to it and to uncover and eventually I realized that I can't do this alone, that this is a topic that requires solutions and we wanted to tell people that they can go to these particular organizations for help...and both of them have expertise in the solutions that we provide that I feel like, having spoken to both of them that I feel confident that, if I were to send someone to them, that they would get the help they needed. So an elaborative plan of ours is to kind of document the stories and document how the public institutions works on a medium scale level in a sense that, you know there is no way to hide... and hopefully lead with this body of evidence and information that we can lobby for change in a collective way and in doing so we can make more changes within the policies and also to come up with services that either the organization can provide or other organizations can have the power to provide – (Katherine)

The above excerpts demonstrate how collaboration with other activists/organizations with a similar goal/cause can be used as an important strategy to further their advocacy efforts. Therefore, collaboration serves as an important advocacy strategy to lobby for change on a larger, policy level to address what needs to be done in order to effectively provide services to these women. In other words, *Katherine* signifies the power of collective action in creating a movement to lobby for change for better policies and services for minority women.

Collaboration with Mainstream Organizations

When asked “*Apart from your other collaborations, has your organization worked with other mainstream women's organizations here in Norway?*”. The following excerpt by Katherine highlights her experiences working with other mainstream women's organizations:

I did try to, there were certain start-up organizations that reached out to me, but it's kind of to do with the value on our approaches are quite different and made it harder. And also, when I enter in any organization that is just White women, I find that very... I try to avoid it because I feel like they probably won't understand. And I don't feel like they will be open because I already had such a bad experience with (name of group) already that I just, you know, they'll have to show a certain way for me to trust them, to tell them why I'm different because they hold a position of power of... White women come here and hold a position of power. And when we come in, there's been so many stories of them stealing our ideas or trampling over us, and backstabbing goes and all sorts of things that happens, that it just kind of you know, it

takes a lot of courage to kind of reach out and hoping that they're not who you expect them, you know, because of what they've said....it was really hard to see how we align in our values and our approaches, and are they gonna overtake the project in a certain way? Or certain direction? That's, you know, I'm all for sharing and everything that I think is that if that dynamic of power structure is so embedded in the organization, say they want to help people, but then then I have a problem with that. And I would have to have a lot longer dialogue, to really build that trust with them... - (Katherine)

For *Katherine*, the power imbalance between White Norwegian women who hold positions of power and her minority status becomes an issue. Because they hold a position of power due to their majority status, she feels that their values and approaches do not align since there is no common 'understanding'. Therefore, she mistrusts how they will handle her narrative and misuse her position. This implies that her identity as a minority women may restrict the opportunities she takes to mobilize and collaborate with other organizations.

On one hand, *Yasmine* also points out limited collaboration with other mainstream organizations but for different reasons:

To be honest, I wouldn't say we collaborated a lot if I can, if it when it comes to like, [name of group] with the actual project with the...I wouldn't say the organization, I would look more for the expertise also. Okay, good. Have a lawyer come in. And talk to us about the topic. We've had like someone from the [name of organization] come in, they're a working group, it's actually for youth. And it's for negative social control and forced marriages. So we kind of invite them to talk about the topic and the work that they do. So whenever we invite someone, our main goal is just to get the people listening to get to know the organization and get to know like other places where they could go and ask for help – (Yasmine)

On the other hand, *Yasmine* states that she prefers to get expertise over than direct collaboration. When doing so, she stated she is careful to not further stigmatize the women by inferring that domestic violence is to be expected due to their "culture", but to equip them with the knowledge about resources that are available to them if needed.

For *Nora* and *Luciana*, collaboration with large, for-profit organizations were used as a means to expand their organizations and secure funding for new projects, such as working with IKEA to finance new positions and program outputs. However, it is important to note that none of the organizations stated that they collaborated with majority women

organizations, they either collaborated with minority women organizations or large, for-profit organizations as a means for mobilization and securing (mainly financial) resources.

4.4 Funding as a Key Resource

When asked “*What are some key resources your organization needs in order for it to function effectively?*” Funding was stated by all four organization as being a critical resource.

For *Nora*, funding goes hand in hand with close government collaboration:

So we actually need funding. So we get funded by Oslo municipality, around 50- 60% of our income are from Oslo municipality and the rest are like gift from private companies, or like private organizations...our goal is to have a financial model where our fundings are, like 50-50 from both of them. Because, you know, the politics...the policy of the government are changing, we want to actually make our economy stable, but I don't think that the government are going to shut down our economy, because we have transparency, and we are working very hard. We give results every year...because then the government sees that we are doing very well and they give us more money. So we have to make posts on social media to show our work so others can see it...the government support on the organization is very important right now, but I think to become a national or international organization in the level of a SOS barne byer and Red Cross and Save the Children I think, a wholesome funding from the from the three actors like the private and you have the volunteers and you have the government is very important – (Nora)

The excerpt above demonstrates how funding goes hand in hand with government collaboration. Since the majority of funding comes from government bodies (i.e. Oslo municipality) having a close relationship with the government with strong, transparency-driven results is key to securing funding. Funding is also an important in terms of organizational growth on a wider, national/international scale. Interestingly, the strive to show a positive face is in line with Thun’s (2014) findings that minority women organizations are hesitant to criticize the state due to fears of having their funding cut. Therefore, this may limit their advocacy role in order to fit a particular narrative to secure government resources.

For *Katherine* however, securing funding for human resources can be a challenge:

Definitely funding is a huge headache for us...the funding goes into the team, you know, to help me explore these topics...you know, funding plays a big part and human resources...

(the funding) they're project based. So this thing with funding From Oslo kommune...the problem with this funding or competing with other bigger organizations, is often they give it to the big ones. Now, we recently also put an application with [partner organization] as the main non-profit organization that's been running for more than two years. The problem is when you're collaborating with bigger organization is that you have to compromise...so I kind of thought that the original ideas is not there. But I kind of have to say yes. So I'm trying to use whatever resources that they have there to kind of continue on with this particular question...so we have to be creative, and how we get funding around it. But the thing is, with funding is that you're basically waiting around to get the money...so for me, it just kind of felt like, you know, people keep telling me like, oh, you need a Norwegian on board, you need someone who speaks fluent Norwegian, in order to in order to get the funding. And I get really pissed off that – (Katherine)

The above excerpts by *Katherine* demonstrate that funding as a resource plays a critical role in mobilization as it is the main foundation that stabilizes the organization and is used to fund other resources (i.e. human resources). The more the funding, the better the opportunities to mobilize and engage in advocacy work. In contrast, the lack thereof of funding can have the opposite effect. In particular, the presence of instable funding (i.e. project-based funding) coincides with competition with other organizations to secure funding and often bigger, more well-known organizations are granted funding. Therefore, this limits the opportunities for smaller organization to gather resources needed to mobilize and survive.

Another interesting finding was that it was suggested to *Katherine* that having a fluent-speaking Norwegian on board can be a way to secure funding. This can imply that her intersectional identity as a minority woman may hinder her opportunities to secure resources. This raises questions on how privilege and power associated with certain social identities can enhance or inhibit opportunities for mobilization.

Similarly, *Yasmine* also emphasizes the importance of funding as a key resource:

I think funding is the most important thing, of course, we need the competency. And I feel like we can find that if we, if we have the funding, that kind of goes hand in hand...And the more funding we have, the more time we can set aside to do the job and to follow up these women. So I think that is a big thing. And it's not always you can apply and you get funding, but maybe it will be 40% of what you applied. So you have to [adjust] just like how much you plan to do. So if you plan to maybe work three days a week, maybe you can only do like half

day a week. And it doesn't mean that we don't help the people who come in, it just means that we would have less time to follow them up the way we would if we had enough resources

Interviewer: And so is the funding more long-term? Or is it more project-based?

It's project based. And that's where most of the challenges come from because you apply for one calendar year. And most fundings, I would say, like 99% is for one calendar year. So you might be you might get an answer in January, or it might be in April, you don't know really know. And then from April, you can work to December, and then after that, you have to write the report for the year, the previous calendar year. So it's like project based which means sometimes, like with [the women's group] we have to sit and wait a little bit, because we don't have any money. So the funding isn't really consistent. And one year you can get like, for example, 300,000, maybe the next year would be 150,000. So you don't really know, it's difficult to plan”

Interviewer: So would you say the inconsistencies in funding affect your advocacy work in some ways?

Yeah, I think it does affect that a lot. Because usually, if we don't have the funding for this project, we would be you would... kind of focus on another project where you have the funding, and then your focus would be, you know, exactly. Yeah. So it depends on also, we have a lot of projects in [our organization] where we are...where we really we want to [develop]. Because it's so important for us. And we know, it's like a very sensitive project, for example, [the women's group]. So it's very important, I wouldn't just stop working, or stop giving help to these women, but I wouldn't have enough time to give as much help as I would like to – (Yasmine)

The above excerpts by *Yasmine* illustrate how funding is the main foundational resource needed to sustain the organization and its programs. More funding results in more mobilization and enhanced advocacy, whereas less funding results in the opposite. In particular, project-based funding becomes a challenge due to its precarious nature. Because it is short-term and can vary in amounts, this effects how much time and effort can be used on the women's program. In other words, the unstable-funding regime can limit the ability for the activists to carry out advocacy due to not being able to secure enough resources for a longer period of time. Therefore, they are forced to make adjustments to their work in order to accommodate, which results in less mobilization.

Furthermore, *Luciana* highlights the implications of funding in the excerpts below:

It's always tricky, because when we are applying for funding, most funding applications are project based or are for materials that they don't include salaries or operational costs. And, of course, that's what we need the most, we cannot make anything happen with us people...we have been entirely run by volunteers. I'm a volunteer myself...because we were selected for the start-up incubator program, that was very, very helpful, because that gives us some initial money that even though it's project based, even though cannot be used for salaries, or etc, can help us pay, for example, a website can help us pay for zoom accounts, because we started our work during COVID. So zoom was really important, we did everything online –
(Luciana)

In line with the other participants, the above excerpt demonstrates the implications of project-based funding in that it excludes other crucial resources need to run the organization, namely, human resources. Therefore, the organization rests on using volunteers as an essential *resource* to fill the human resource gap due to the lack of funding needed to secure working employees.

Luciana also points out that for newer organizations, securing funding is even harder due to not having the trust/reputation needed in order to be able to secure funding. However, the joint effort of volunteers and social media can be used to compensate for the lack of funding:

And what we I feel like we found a new currency, which is exchanging services. And so people would, we invited professionals to give a webinar for free. We said we cannot pay you we don't have anything to give in return. But we think it's really important to raise awareness about these issues. And we thought it would be interesting for you to share about your work within human trafficking or mental health...so for me, that was pretty special, because it shows that even without money, we can do a lot. And we can reach a lot of people. And technology plays a very important role in there – (Luciana)

The above excerpt demonstrates how mobilization can still occur even with the lack of financial resources by through innovative means of service exchange and technology. In this case, mental health professionals provide free webinars in exchange for exposure which is aided by technology (via social media) to be able to reach a wider audience-

4.5 The Importance of Political Allies

A theme that emerged that went hand in hand with funding was the importance of political collaboration to help further their agenda and securing funding. Especially for *Nora*, collaboration with the government was key for her organization:

...We are growing very fast. And are operating very, very, closely with the government and my mother is also a politician. So she has a huge network or we have like transparency and we also get invited to a hold presentation about [our organization], a lot of people know about us and we are a lot in the media...and the way we get more attention, and we the way we build our reputation is that every year we increase our results, so we trying to get better and better...another reason people are collaborating with us is that we have access to a group like, the government have issues to reach out to because they don't have like, trust to the government, they are more interested to people who looks more similar to them – (Nora)

For *Nora*, close government collaboration serves as an important strategy for mobilization in terms of organizational growth. Having a government that is 'open' to collaboration serves as an interactive relationship where her organization acts as a means for the government to reach isolated communities whilst providing her with the exposure and funds to grow her organization. Therefore, this signifies that 'open' government structures that are receptive and having political allies is a key means to creating opportunities for mobilization and growth.

On the other hand, the below excerpt by Katherine highlights the challenges of political collaboration:

For me, my strategy is that I would like to build on enough work that people know about us. Because I think it's such a big risk if you have an idea, and then approaching them and that they you know, either they think like it's just idea driven, there's no evidence based, or they kind of ignore it. I'd rather build up as much of the evidence as possible, and then come in with that and say, 'Look, this is the preliminary results that we have from what we've done so far. I want you to push this in Parliament'. And that will be a stage that will come later, I think. Definitely it is. It is necessary because they're the policy makers, but I feel like in this country particularly you need to do so much work before knocking on their doors to have them see it as a problem and a challenge and make an effort to come in with your solution and sometimes I get frustrated by that point, because it's like, if you had given us the money I'm sure we could have done this And it was such a long time, because there's not much funding out there and similar criteria around it" – (Katherine)

The excerpt by Katherine above demonstrates that although she sees the value in having close political ties, she also highlights the challenges of establishing these relationships. For her, the bureaucracy and expectations attached to securing funding can serve as a challenge to establishing a secure relationship. Therefore, she feels that a lot of effort and evidence-based

work needs to be done in order to be considered by policy makers, which has implications on securing resources (funding). This is in line with the move towards professionalization within the Norwegian welfare system in terms of higher accountability, reporting, and evidence-based claims, which has made it difficult for women's organizations that lack stability and secure funding (Thun, 2014). Therefore, this hinders their political opportunity to contribute to expertise and knowledge claims.

Furthermore, Yasmine also notes that close political collaboration is important in the excerpt below:

We try to always, when we want to raise awareness about an issue where we think there needs to be put in a lot more resources, and help. We tend to, like, go to media, and we write like, *kronikk* write a text and a story. And then you send it to like, different media outlets. And some of them, maybe some will say yes. And so we try to go to this route. But we have actually a lot of meetings with politicians. And the more we've been growing lately, the more meetings we have, so I would say almost, maybe on average, monthly, we have a meeting with a politician. And we also had the Prime Minister come in a few months back, and he actually visited like a women's group that we have. And this is our way to show like, okay, what is the work that we're doing and why we're doing it, and then where we see weaknesses that has to be improved. And that's usually taken, like at the top level, so sometimes I might be involved, our general secretary would be the one pushing for like our... because we tell her and then she can tell them the issues that we're seeing. And then suggestions on what we can do to make it better for them – (Yasmine)

Interviewer: So you would say working with politicians helps increase more awareness about the issues raised in your organization?

I think it helps like increase. Yeah, more awareness in that they also need to give more funding, and then this funding will create more resources to help with this issue. Like we can see, for example, that okay, we see that the crisis centre maybe it's like funding that's making them less available for or not be able to give a lot of help to the woman who need shelter, and then you will see that and they can talk about their own issues, of course, but we mainly talk about what we see here and what we think that needs to be done, or the areas that they need to focus on – (Yasmine)

In line with political opportunity structures, the presence of political allies opens doors for opportunities to do critical advocacy work, in terms of pushing their agenda and raising awareness of the barriers faced by minority women within the system. In other words,

political collaboration serves as a key measure to not only secure more resources (i.e. funding), but as an important advocacy tool to raise awareness of the issues they are seeing on a policy-level and push for change. It also serves as a mobilization tool to use the larger-scale exposure to increase awareness about their organization. Social media is particularly used as a *resource* to do advocacy campaigns to reach a wider audience.

Interestingly for the third organization, *Luciana* states that her organization tries to avoid having any political associations:

We don't want to be associated with any political party or with any government. Because our work is exactly to go beyond governments. Because what happens now is that a survivor depends on the resources available in the country where they are rescued. And we don't want that to happen. So the way we want to be involved politically, is that if we get support from the government of Norway, they understand that all that money is not going to be used only infrequently in Norway, but it's going to be used in countries where they don't have anything – (Luciana)

The above excerpt demonstrates how having political associations depends on the organization's mission. In this case, the presence of political allies is not as relevant due to the transglobal nature of their work. However, *Luciana* also pointed out that establishing *trust* between the organization and the government in order to secure financial resources can be difficult for newer organizations that have not had the time to establish a reputation. Therefore, the presence of political allies in enhancing mobilization may be more relevant for more established organizations.

4.6 The Significance of the Political Climate

Another theme that was found to be significant was how the greater political climate/environment influenced the opportunities the activists had access to in terms of advocacy. When asked “*In what ways do you think the political climate in Norway has influenced your advocacy work?*”. For *Katherine*, the political climate hindered her opportunities for advocacy:

It definitely hindered it in certain ways, because I know, like, they recalled the funding from the [name of funding] which the legal aid for women, that was recalled, and from the state the FRP party...so they were already fueling this narrative that particularly immigrant woman, in a certain state, that it just, it makes us sort of useless and worthless. They were putting labels on us. And I just feel like...a lot of the gender equality and diversity talking about is towards

White woman, you know, and how do we uplift more White women into powerful positions in the private sector. But when it comes with the work that we're trying to do, I feel that there's a lack of funding in it in such a way. And there's a lack of measurement of impact....and also just like this general dismissiveness of minority women, we kind of are the marginalized, vulnerable group of people who are difficult to deal with and so much resources are needed to put into it – (Katherine)

The above excerpt by *Katherine* demonstrates how the political climate in Norway has hindered her opportunities to mobilize and carry out advocacy work. The problematic framing of minority women as 'Others' rendering them as vulnerable and marginalized, is echoed in the overall political climate, particularly by right-wing parties in Norway. For *Katherine*, Norway's gender equality agenda is reserved for White Women and minority women are excluded from the agenda. Along with funding cuts, the problematic framing of minority women within the political climate in Norway hinders the opportunities for advocacy and mobilization.

The below excerpts demonstrate *Yasmine*'s point of view regarding how the political climate in Norway influences her opportunities to do advocacy:

I don't think it makes it harder for sure. But I think also, there's not a lot of importance put to it. So they're kind of like open 'like oh yeah, we need to talk about this issue' but really, it's not really that highlighted in the society. So you see, like a few campaigns here and there, but in the way it's highlighted also can be perceived sometimes be perceived for wrong. Because you only think about Muslim women with, you know, immigrant background and these are the victims. And then you have their husbands or their brothers. So yeah, you kind have this thinking in Norway when you think about violence in close relationships. But in reality, there's not a lot of information about who can be subjected to that. And it can be anyone it can be a man or woman, a young girl or boy. So I think that like the Norway, or the Norwegian population has, like their biases on who the victim is. Yeah...I feel like they do take it seriously. But it's not given enough attention. But I think that it's very open, and it's very well perceived, and a lot of people see the importance of doing this advocacy, but maybe more information about like, you know, the consequences for women but also men to attend, and try to go away from this like poor immigrant woman and think more like in the know in Norway as a whole and how they can help different people – (Yasmine)

When asked if changes in the politics (i.e. government) had any impact on advocacy:

I think in many ways, like, when the political...you can see that it's more like on the right side in Norway, they prioritize a lot of how can I say this? They kind of prioritize, they put a lot of priority on your background, your foreign background. And because...they put a priority on people, you know, integrating into Norwegian society when they come to Norway, which is fine. But then the requirements they have to meet are very difficult. So these can also affect, for example, you know, if women can leave their partner, because there's a lot of requirements for you to be able to stay in Norway, and stuff like that. So I think the more and let's say, the more, you know, not immigrant friendly the government is the more work we have to do also in this field, like, yeah, give them more awareness of what happens to these women, when are in this situation, they want to leave and they don't have anyone and but the focus on the government might be that okay, she has an immigrant background and then she, you know, people have to live in our way. And our focus would be to show all the different ways and how it can affect the person in this situation and how these requirements can also put them in a worse place as well – (Yasmine)

The above excerpts by *Yasmine* illustrate how the greater political environment in Norway tends to stigmatize minority women as victims of violence. Again, the problematic framing of 'the poor immigrant women' emerges as an issue that activists must engage in critical advocacy to challenge this particular framing. She also points out that violence against minority women is not given enough attention. Therefore, this serves as a challenge in terms of advocacy to destigmatize the problematic framing of minority women in Norwegian society.

Further, violence against minority women is not seen as an overall, systemic gender issue (i.e. systemic patriarchy) but is framed in Norwegian society as an issue of 'integration'. In addition to the stringent immigration requirements, this serves as a particular advocacy challenge for activists. In terms of political opportunity structures, the more 'right wing' and less 'immigrant-friendly' the government is, the more 'closed' it is for opportunities to emerge for mobilization. Therefore, having a more conservative, exclusionary political environment towards immigrants, the emphasis on integration, along with the stigmatization of who the victim is in Norway limits the opportunities they have to mobilize. This serves as a challenge to address these issues within a more hostile environment.

5. Discussion

The following section will discuss in more detail the meanings and implications of the results stated above in relation to the research question and aims of the thesis. The results have aimed to uncover how minority women activists working in the field of domestic violence are able to mobilize resources, what types of opportunities they have access to mobilize, and what factors influence their ability to mobilize and advocate within the field. The headings presented below will highlight the most important findings.

5.1 The Importance of Funding

Perhaps the most important resource that was emphasized by all four organizations was funding. All four organizations emphasized funding as the foundational resource needed to operate the organization, where more funding allowed for more mobilization and opportunities to expand their organization, and the lack thereof had the opposite effect. Specifically, all the organizations pointed out challenges regarding project-based funding, as the vast majority of state funding they received has been short-term. Thun (2014) points out that state funding has been a critical part of state feminism due to its role in encouraging grass-root mobilization since the early 80's. However, according to Skjeie (2013), the decline in funding is one of the reasons why there is less mobilization amongst women's organizations Norway presently (Thun, 2014). Women's organizations overall receive less funding however, minority women organizations are further marginalized in this matter due to not having enough resources to secure numbers needed to qualify for state support (Thun, 2014).

The move towards project-based funding has been a part of neo-liberal reforms in the Norwegian welfare system (Thun, 2014). The new public governance model under these reforms has shifted state funding from long-term to project-based in order to shift economic responsibility to civil society, which has resulted in more bureaucratic measures of reporting and documentation to ensure funds are spend as intended (Thun, 2014). As shown in the results above, these bureaucratic measures can be challenging for smaller organizations with limited resources (i.e. paid staff), and due to stiff competition for funding, larger, more established organizations tend to be granted funding the most. Therefore, this has implications on grass-roots organizations to perform critical advocacy when competing with larger organizations.

Furthermore, the instability of project-based funding hinders the ability for activists to fully engage in advocacy work, and therefore are forced to make adjustments in order to survive financially. As demonstrated above, some of these measures included spending less time working on domestic violence programs, having to adjust their ideas in order to fit a particular narrative to secure funding, and having to find newer, more innovative ways to finance the organization. In the case of *Luciana* (organization 3), a move towards becoming a hybrid organization by partnering with for-profit organizations/corporations has been a strategy to create more revenue streams.

A particularly interesting finding concerning the third organization was the use of technology and social media as an important resource for mobilization despite the lack of material (financial) resources. According to Sen & Avci (2016), in the case of new social movements modern technologies have been a critical resource to engage in social activism and online networking, allowing for mobilization across national borders particularly for marginalized groups. *Luciana* characterized this as a service-exchange model, where she reached out to mental health professionals via social media to deliver webinars on various topics during the COVID pandemic. In exchange for their knowledge input, they were provided with more exposure in the field. This goes to show that mobilization can still occur with limited financial resources. This is in line with Sen & Avci (2016) criticisms of RM theory in that it over emphasizes the material aspects of movements and neglects the importance of shared grievances and ideology in playing a critical role in mobilization when material resources are scarce.

Therefore, more attention should be brought towards how technology can enhance mobilization for organizations with limited financial means. Overall, funding plays a crucial role in mobilization where more funding allows for more opportunities for mobilization. However, the implications of short-term, project-based funding has negative effects on the ability for the activists to engage in critical advocacy. Furthermore, as the results demonstrate, organizations are now shifting towards having hybrid revenue streams finding new, innovative ways to combat the precariousness of state-sponsored funding.

5.2. Collaboration

Resource mobilization (RM) theory states that mobilization/movements occur when organizations with shared grievances come together to address a need that is not being met by putting together resources (Lee & Lee, 2013). The results demonstrate that collaboration with

similar organizations working with minority women was used as a key strategy to further their advocacy efforts by using the power of collective action to form to build a strong base for advocacy. However, the collaboration did not extend to mainstream majority women's organizations which supports previous literature on separate mobilization of minority and majority women organizations due to not having 'common interests'. Interestingly, some of the activists have been moving towards working with well-known for-profit organizations as a means to diversify their funding streams to combat the instability of state funding. Overall, collaboration served as a strategy for mobilization and self-advocacy.

5.2 Political Opportunities

State support for voluntary organizations has been a Norwegian tradition for many years as a part of furthering its egalitarian social agenda (Thun, 2014). Overall, the majority of the organizations highlighted the importance of political allies in providing more opportunities to secure necessary resources needed to mobilize and perform advocacy. However, larger, more established organizations tend to have an edge when it comes to having political ties. As demonstrated by *Katherine* and *Luciana*, whose organizations are relatively new, in order to receive any political attention and secure state funding, a lot of time and effort must be put in for reputation building and gathering evidence-based claims. In conjunction with the stiff competition for state funding, grass-roots organizations tend to be left out of the political sphere. This is in line with Thun's (2014) findings that minority women organizations tend to have a low presence in policy-making due to not having enough resources (i.e. paid staff) to work on making knowledge-based claims. Nevertheless, having close political ties served as an important advocacy tool to raise awareness about the issues facing minority women within the field on a wider, policy-level and to secure state funding. However, for some of the organizations, due to the challenges of forming these relationships especially for smaller, newly established organizations, the shift to becoming independent of these relationships is becoming more pronounced.

5.3 Political Climate and the Framing of Minority Women

An interesting finding that was pointed out by the organizations was the role of the overall political climate in Norway in facilitating opportunities for mobilization. According to the theory of political opportunity structures, both the presence of political elites, the overall openness of a political system and the state's positive response to the movement create opportunities for mobilization (McAdam et al., 1996). As shown in the results above,

although the organizations recognized the importance of political allies, they pointed out how the problematic framing of immigrant women as victims of violence can have implications on their advocacy work. As stated above, women's organizations in Norway are separated into two camps: mainstream, majority women's organizations are placed under the overall gender equality agenda whereas minority women's organizations are placed under the 'crisis' gender equality agenda (Sumer et al., 2014). Referring to Goffman's (1974) work, frames refer to interpretation schema that allow individuals to identify, label, and perceive occurrences in the world out there and within their immediate realm (Benford & Snow, 2000). As pointed out by Siim & Skjeie (2008), issues of multiculturalism and integration have become apart of the gender equality agenda targeting minorities, adopted under the 'crisis' frame in order to tackle issues on honour-based violence, FGM, etc amongst immigrant groups particularly of Muslim backgrounds. Despite this however, such issues have not been addressed under the broader state agenda of violence in intimate relationships (Siim & Skjeie, 2008). Minority women have largely been excluded from public policy apart from contributing to 'minority' issues under the crisis frame (Siim & Skjeie, 2008).

The results above seem to support these findings. The activists stated that a challenge in terms of advocacy for them is the problematic framing of immigrant women as poor, often from Muslim backgrounds who come from inherently 'violent' cultures. This problematic framing has been supported by the policy discourses and separation of minority women's issues under the 'crisis' gender equality agenda. In other words, violence against women from minority backgrounds is seen as a result of cultural practices that oppress women whereas violence against women from majority backgrounds is framed as an overall gender issue embedded in patriarchal structures (Thun., 2014). This particular framing of minority women treats categories of gender, culture, and race as distinct rather than being interconnected. As pointed out by one activist, gender-equality related policies are reserved for to uplift White Norwegian women into positions of power at the dismissal of minority women who are rendered as difficult to deal with and are heavy resource-users. Further, another activist pointed out that political parties especially on the right side of Norway are pre-occupied with integration measures aimed at targeting 'crisis' cultural practices as they are seen as a threat to Norwegian egalitarianism. However, there is a lack of recognition of how such policies together with negative framing of minority women creates dichotomies of 'us' vs 'them', where minority women are seen as 'Others' that are placed outside of Norwegian society. These policies can also further harm women who are victims of DV by

creating a hostile environment, making them less likely to report instances of DV. Therefore, the less ‘open’ the political landscape is, (i.e. more right-wing and ‘less immigrant friendly’) the more advocacy work is needed to be done by the activists to challenge these assumptions. However, this can be difficult for them to advocate and mobilize under such circumstances due to the exclusionary environment.

5.4 Intersectional Identities of Minority Women

Closely related to the above discussion is how the negative framing of minority women not only marginalizes them on a policy level, but also on the ground-level as well. As pointed out by the activists, services providers (e.g. police, crisis centres, etc) are not only limited in the number of resources they have, but are ill-equipped to deal with minority women specifically in terms of language and cultural competency. Brought to attention by Crenshaw (1991), minority women who are victims of violence experience violence differently than White women due to their intersecting identities as both a woman and being a minority. They not only face gender oppression, but are compounded by class and racial oppression (e.g. low-income, racism, lack of employment opportunities, etc) that makes their experience of violence different than White women (Crenshaw, 1991). In addition, Crenshaw (1991) argues that language barriers faced by minority women works to marginalize them further as victims of violence as there are limited resources that cater to their needs and that their experience of violence is shaped by other marginalizing factors including limited educational and employment opportunities. As one activist pointed out “...is understanding that their challenges go beyond that situation, that violence situation like they are already minorities, they are already at higher risk for violence in general, for discrimination, in general, less access to work...so we need to be aware of the disadvantages that these people have already. Before the situation of violence”. Therefore, it is important to consider how all the other disadvantages associated with minority women’s social identities can further marginalize them compared to White women. However, since service providers are not fully-equipped with the ability to deal with all of the disadvantages associated with their identities, this serves as a challenge for the activists to be able to fully provide their clients well-rounded treatment. Further,

In addition, as pointed out by one activist, their minority status also can marginalize them within the field in terms of their ability to secure resources and opportunities. As discussed in the results above, it was suggested to one of them that having a White

Norwegian ally on board may help them to secure more funding, which goes to demonstrate how the social identities of the minority women activists may serve to limit their access to resources. They also pointed out that they felt that the current gender equality agenda serves to uplift White Norwegian women, where in one instance it was noted that when they mentioned that Norway has not achieved gender equality publicly, they were refuted and ‘gas-lighted’. This demonstrates how power associated with certain social identities can serve to marginalize minority women from having equal access to opportunities needed for mobilization.

6. Conclusion

6.1 The Myth of State Feminism?

Is 'state feminism' an accurate description of the Norwegian women's movement today? As argued in the literature, it is in fact not an accurate description largely due to the fragmentation of the women's movement characterized by separate mobilizing (Sümer et al., 2014). State feminism was traditionally used to describe the alliance between the feminist movement in terms of mobilization for gender-equality from 'below' and 'integration from above' in terms of manifesting their concerns into public policy (Siim & Skjeie, 2008). However, as Siim & Skjeie (2008) argue, the dilemma of multiculturalism coinciding with state feminism has resulted in separating issues of 'gender equality' into 'majority' and 'minority' concerns, where majority viewpoints promote exclusive Whiteness in key political arenas. In other words, state feminism today is challenged by both the division within the feminist movement and the exclusion of ethnic minorities in key political arenas (Siim & Skjeie, 2008). Siim & Skjeie (2008) characterizes this phenomenon as a 'gender equality paradox' characterized by the inclusion of women from ethnic majority backgrounds at the exclusion of women from minority backgrounds in decision-making processes, apart from 'crisis' prevention schemes. As demonstrated in the results above, the activists tended to either only collaborate with minority organizations or with larger, for-profit organizations and not mainstream majority women organizations as, one activist pointed, that they would not understand their concerns. They preferred to instead work with other minority organizations working on DV as a mobilization measure to raise awareness collectively, or with larger for-profit organizations as a means to secure more financial resources. The lack of collaboration between minority and majority women organizations continues to shape Norway's divided gender equality agenda. The lack of stable funding, services that are linguistically inclusive and culturally sensitive, along with the negative framing of minority women and their exclusion from policy processes highlights both the implications of limping state support from 'above' and the barriers to mobilization from 'below'. The particularly negative framing of immigrant women within DV is masked underneath a state integration agenda aimed to get rid of 'culturally' oppressive practices that are seen as a threat to Norwegian egalitarianism and its women-friendly regime. This can imply that 'state feminism' is preoccupied with the concerns of White Norwegian women only.

6.2 Concluding Comments and Recommendations for Future Research

This thesis sought to answer the following research question: “*What are the different processes and mechanisms that influence mobilization and self-advocacy strategies for women involved in domestic violence services in Norway?*”. In doing so, the thesis aimed to identify the different ways minority women involved in DV advocacy are able to mobilize resources and gain opportunities to further their advocacy efforts, what mechanisms influence their mobilization efforts, and analyze how they conceptualize their advocacy efforts. The results suggests that minority women activists in the field face a spectrum of challenges that impact their ability to effectively advocate. The need for more stable funding, services that are ethno-linguistic inclusive as well as more opportunities for activists to engage in policy-making and knowledge-based claims are required for effective mobilization amongst minority women organizations.

In terms of the theoretical perspectives, resource mobilization (RM) theory, political opportunity structures, and intersectionality proved to be helpful in the analysis but with limitations. Resource mobilization was helpful in identifying the importance of resources for mobilization, namely, tangible (material) resources. However, its overly inclusive definition of what can be considered as a resource, and in some definitions, this also includes political opportunities, leads to it lacking analytical depth which reflected in the interview questions. The interview questions regarding resource mobilization could have been formulated to be more specific to generate more detailed answers, however, it was difficult given there was no set rules on what can and cannot be considered a resource according to the theory. In addition, the theory of political opportunity structures is also similarly criticized for being overly inclusive and lacking analytical depth, however, McAdam et al (1996) steps of analysis helped to more concisely use the theory, which proved to be helpful when examining the political opportunities available to the activists. Lastly, an intersectional analysis proved to be useful to fill in the gaps that RM theory and political opportunities structures fail to address by looking at how the various social identities of minority women can marginalize them in the field, however, it was only used as a framework for analysis.

In terms of future research, more research is needed on framing processes which proved to be an important finding pointed out by the participants. In the analysis of social movements, RM theory and political opportunity structures together with framing is used to provide a cohesive analysis in the study of social movements. However, due to the limited

scope of this thesis it was not possible to include a detailed frame analysis. Therefore, more research looking into how the negative framing of minority women in Norwegian society and stereotyping as victims of domestic violence can affect how minority women organizations are able to mobilize despite this exclusionary environment.

References

- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual review of sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>
- Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality-an important theoretical framework for public health. *Am J Public Health*, 102(7), 1267-1273. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300750>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Buechler, S. M. (1993). Beyond Resource Mobilization? Emerging Trends in Social Movement Theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 217-235.
<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.oslomet.no/stable/4120699>
- Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. (1996). (D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511803987>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Eriksson, M., & Pringle, K. (2005). Introduction Nordic issues and dilemmas. In M. Eriksson, K. Pringle, M. Hester, & S. Keskinen (Eds.), *Tackling men's violence in families* (1 ed., pp. 1-12). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9qgq9j.6>
- EUROSHIP – Closing Gaps in Social Citizenship (euroship-research.eu)
- Haavind, H., & Magusson, E. (2005). Feminism, Psychology and Identity Transformations in the Nordic Countries. *Feminism & Psychology*, 15(2), 236-247.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353505051731>
- Haavind, H., & Magusson, E. (2005). The Nordic Countries - Welfare Paradises for Women and Children? *Feminism & Psychology*, 15(2), 227-235.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353505051730>
- Halvorsen, R. (2002). *The Paradox of Self Organisation among Disadvantaged People: A study of marginal citizenship* [Fakultet for samfunnsvitenskap og teknologiledelse].
- Jonassen, W. (2005). Marching on the spot? Dealing with violence against women in Norway. In M. Eriksson, M. Hester, S. Keskinen, & K. Pringle (Eds.), *Tackling men's*

- violence in families* (1 ed., pp. 83-100). Bristol University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9qgq9j.11>
- Kapur, S., Zajicek, A., & Hunt, V. (2017). Immigration Provisions in the Violence Against Women Act: Implications for Asian Indian Marriage Migrants. *Journal of women, politics & policy*, 38(4), 456-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2016.1268872>
- Kaufmann, E. P., & Kaufmann, E. P. (2004). *Rethinking Ethnicity : Majority Groups and Dominant Minorities*. Taylor & Francis Group.
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/hioa/detail.action?docID=200381>
- Kiamanesh, P., & Hauge, M.-I. (2019). “We are not weak, we just experience domestic violence”—Immigrant women's experiences of encounters with service providers as a result of domestic violence. *Child & Family Social Work*, 24(2), 301-308.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12615>
- Lee, A.-R., & Lee, H.-C. (2013). The Women's Movement in South Korea Revisited. *Asian affairs, an American review (New York)*, 40(2), 43-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2013.788412>
- McAdam, D. (1996). Conceptual origins, current problems, future direction. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (pp. 23-40). Cambridge University Press. [https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511803987.003](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511803987.003)
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1996). Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes – toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge University Press.
[https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511803987.002](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511803987.002)
- Meyer, D. S., & Staggenborg, S. (1996). Movements, Countermovements, and the Structure of Political Opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(6), 1628-1660.
<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.oslomet.no/stable/2782114>
- Nyhagen Predelli, L. (2012). Recognising place, space and nation in researching women's movements: FEMCIT. *Women's studies international forum*, 35(3), 141-143.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2012.03.011>

- Ono, E. (2013). Violence Against Racially Minoritized Women: Implications for Social Work. *Affilia*, 28(4), 458-467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109913505044>
- Øverlien, C. (2011). Abused women with children or children of abused women? A study of conflicting perspectives at women's refuges in Norway. *Child & Family Social Work*, 16(1), 71-80. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2010.00715.x>
- Salem, S. (2018). Intersectionality and its discontents: Intersectionality as traveling theory. *The European journal of women's studies*, 25(4), 403-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506816643999>
- Sen, A., & Avci, Ö. (2016). WHY SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OCCUR: THEORIES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS [Article]. *Journal of Knowledge Economy & Knowledge Management*, 11(1), 125-130. <https://login.ezproxy.oslomet.no/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=117325101&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Siim, B., & Skjeie, H. (2008). Tracks, intersections and dead ends: Multicultural challenges to state feminism in Denmark and Norway. *Ethnicities*, 8(3), 322-344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796808092446>
- Somerville, J. (1997). SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY, WOMEN AND THE QUESTION OF INTERESTS. *Sociology (Oxford)*, 31(4), 673-695. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038597031004003>
- Sumer, S., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2017). New waves for old rights? Women's mobilization and bodily rights in Turkey and Norway. *The European journal of women's studies*, 24(1), 23-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506815619878>
- Sümer, S., Halsaa, B., & Roseneil, S. (2014). Gendered Citizenship in a Multidimensional Perspective: The Challenges Facing Norway within the Nordic Model. *NORA : Nordic journal of women's studies*, 22(4), 283-298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2014.964769>
- Thun, C. (2012). "Norwegian Women Got Gender Equality Through Their Mothers' Milk, But Anti-racism Is Another Story"-An Analysis of Power and Resistance in Norwegian Feminist Discourse. *NORA : Nordic journal of women's studies*, 20(1), 37-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2011.596162>
- Thun, C. (2014). Women-friendly Funding? Conditions for Women's Organizations to Engage in Critical Advocacy in Norway. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 22(2), 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2013.866158>

Walby, S., Armstrong, J., & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory. *Sociology (Oxford)*, 46(2), 224-240.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511416164>

Attachment 1 – Interview Guide

TOPIC GUIDE: Domestic Violence Advocacy

Start off interview by introducing myself, what the research study is about, consent and confidentiality, etc

Topic 1 : Introduction and general overview of the organisation activities

Foundational Questions	Prompts
1. To start off, could you please tell me what your organization is about?	<p>What are some examples of what your organization does?</p> <p>Could you give me a brief outline of how it was set up?</p> <p>Are there more activities you do in addition?</p>
2. How did you become involved in the organization?	<p>What is your role in the organization? Could you give me some examples of what you do in your job role?</p> <p>What motivated you to get involved in this organization?</p> <p>How long have you been with the organization?</p>
<p>3. I'm interested in learning more about how your organization works with issues regarding domestic violence.</p> <p>4. Could you elaborate more on your experience doing advocacy on domestic violence?</p> <p>5. What are you satisfied (or not) satisfied with so far in terms of the work being done on domestic violence by your organization and as a whole?</p>	<p>What are some examples of the work you or your organization does in that field (domestic violence)?</p> <p>What has been some successful strategies?</p> <p>If so, what are they?</p>

6. Have there been any challenges you have faced when doing advocacy work?	
--	--

2. Topic: Resource Mobilization and Strategies

Foundational Questions	Prompts
<p>Moving on, I would like to know more about how your organization runs.</p> <p>7. In your own opinion, what does your organization need in order for it to function effectively?</p> <p>8. What are the key resources your organization needs in order for it to function effectively?</p> <p>9. Specifically, what resources do you need in order to effectively carry out your advocacy work?</p> <p>10. How does the type of resources you gain access to affect your advocacy work?</p>	<p>How does your organization go about gathering these resources? (this can be anything including people, money, materials, etc)</p>
<p>Let us talk about how you fund your activities.</p> <p>11. Could you tell me more about how your organization funds itself?</p>	<p>Where does the funding come from (e.g. municipal, national level, private grants etc)?</p> <p>How would you describe your organization's funding structure? E.g. long-term or project-based</p> <p>Is the funding consistent?</p> <p>Have there been any challenges doing so?</p> <p>What kind of funding is available (how do they have to frame the applications for funding)?</p> <p>How important do you think networking is for your organization? For example, online</p>

	networking or attending conferences, meetings with politicians, civil servants, etc
<p>Now, can we talk about the members/users?</p> <p>12. What are some examples of outreach activities you or your organization does to reach people?</p> <p>13. Has it changed over time how you work to reach more people?</p> <p>14. How does your organization go about recruiting members?</p> <p>15. In what ways are your members involved in the organization?</p> <p>16. Lastly, how does your organization categorize itself? (e.g. self-help group, advocacy organization, etc)</p>	<p>What has been some of the most successful outreach strategies so far?</p> <p>What are some challenges you face when doing outreach?</p> <p>If so what are they?</p> <p>How active is your organization regarding social media outreach?</p> <p>For example, are they just receivers of the services you provide or do you actively engage them in the work that you do? (Active or passive participants?)</p>

Topic 3: Political Opportunities

Foundational Questions	Prompts
17. Has your organization worked with other mainstream women's organizations here in Norway?	If so, how has that experience been like?
18. In what ways does your organization have ties to political members or stake holders?	<p>How has that experience been like?</p> <p>What do these relationships look like? (for example are they relationships with the city, ministry, national level, directorate etc)</p>

<p>19. In what ways do you think the political climate in Norway has influenced your advocacy work?</p> <p>20. Have any other events or movements impacted your advocacy work?</p> <p>21. Have changes in political power or policies influenced your organization's work?</p>	<p>How open (or closed) do you think political members are to working with your organization?</p> <p>How open or closed do you think the political climate is when it comes to social issues you are concerned with?</p>
--	--

Topic 4: Minority Women Focus

Foundational Questions	Prompts
<p>22. In what ways does your organization work with issues regarding racism or other forms of discrimination?</p> <p>23. How important is it for your organization to focus on minority women issues?</p> <p>24. What are your general thoughts about the current environment and the different services that are available to minority women?</p> <p>25. Is there anything you wish there should be more attention drawn to?</p> <p>26. What do you think are important things to consider when providing services to women from minority backgrounds?</p>	<p>Why do you think this is so?</p> <p>In terms of domestic violence services?</p>

--	--

Topic 5: Ending Interview

Foundational Questions	Prompts
27. Is there anything you would like to add?	
28. Do you have any other questions?	
29. Can I call you later if I discover I have forgot to ask you about something?	
30. Is there any additional documents, information, or policy docs that you are able to share with me?	

Thank you for assisting me. If you want to add something later, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Invitation to take part in the research project

Mobilization Against Domestic Violence Strategies Amongst Women's Organizations in Norway

This is an inquiry about participation in a research project where the main purpose is to examine the different ways in which women's organizations in Norway self-organize and mobilize resources to combat domestic violence against minority women. In this letter we will give you information about the purpose of the project and what your participation will involve.

Purpose of the project

The purpose of study is to explore the experiences of women's organizations that are involved in domestic violence advocacy in Norway. The study aims to explore how minority women that are apart of these organizations mobilize resources and to also identify the different opportunities they have access to that help advance their advocacy efforts. The aim is to interview around 4-6 management personnel from different women's organizations in Norway.

The study is a part of a Master Thesis project at Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet) for the International Social Welfare and Health Policy Program.

Who is responsible for the research project?

Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet) is the institution responsible for the project.

Faiza Mehmood (Master student in International Social Welfare and Health Policy) will be the lead investigator.

Professor Rune Halvorsen is the supervisor for the master thesis project

Why are you being asked to participate?

I am interested in talking with management personnel from women's organizations involved in domestic violence work, mainly situated in Oslo. I am interested in learning more about the unique experiences of minority women and how they are able to self-organize and mobilize resources to aid in their advocacy efforts. There is little research to date looking at the experiences of minority women in terms of self-organization therefore, this study will give an opportunity to add to the current body of research that is lacking.

The participants will be recruited through referrals and from my own social network of organizations I am familiar with.

What does participation involve for you?

If you choose to be a part of this project, this will involve you being asked a series of interview questions that will be recorded electronically (sound only). The purpose is to learn as much as possible about your work. I will be taking notes as well during the interview (conversation). The interview will be taken online via zoom video call or in person (if the situation allows). It will take approx. 1 hour.

Participation is voluntary

Participation in the project is voluntary. If you chose to participate, you can withdraw your consent at any time without giving a reason. All information about you will then be made anonymous. There will be no negative consequences for you if you chose not to participate or later decide to withdraw.

Your personal privacy – how we will store and use your personal data

I will only use your contact details and information about you for the purpose(s) specified in this information letter. I will process your personal data confidentially and in accordance with data protection legislation (the General Data Protection Regulation and Personal Data Act).

All signed consent forms as well as contact details are confidential information that will be handled with great care and under no circumstances be made accessible to persons who are not involved in the preparation and undertaking of the interviews. Only I, Faiza Mehmood, will have access to your personal data.

The recordings and transcripts of the conversations will be used to write a MA thesis.

All information will be anonymized. All participants will be given pseudo names in place of their real ones to ensure confidentiality when reporting the results. No other personal information about you will be used. The interviewees will not be recognizable in any way. I will not publish any information that directly or indirectly can identify you. For instance, I will not mention any names, names of places you have lived or your age. The same applies to any third person you might mention during the interview.

Consent forms and contact details will be stored separately from the interviews and protected by digital firewalls. Personal data will be encrypted. Similarly, I will treat each set of interview notes, recordings and transcripts from interviewees as strictly confidential information and store them safely and protect them by digital firewalls.

What will happen to your personal data at the end of the research project?

The project is scheduled to end June 2022. At the end of the project all your personal information and data collected about you including files, interview recordings, and transcripts will be deleted (no later than by the end of June 2022).

Your rights

So long as you can be identified in the collected data, you have the right to:

- access the personal data that is being processed about you
- request that your personal data is deleted
- request that incorrect personal data about you is corrected/rectified
- receive a copy of your personal data, and
- send a complaint to the Data Protection Officer at OsloMet or The Norwegian Data Protection Authority (NSD) in Bergen regarding the processing of your personal data

What gives us the right to process your personal data?

We will process your personal data based on your consent.

Based on an agreement with Oslo Metropolitan University, NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data has assessed that the processing of personal data in this project is in accordance with data protection legislation.

Where can I find out more?

If you have questions about the project, or want to exercise your rights, please contact:

- Faiza Mehmood (master's student) – email: s340001@oslomet.no
- Professor Rune Halvorsen (supervisor) - email: rune.halvorsen@oslomet.no
- OsloMet's Data Protection Officer: Mrs Ingrid Jacobsen, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University P.O. Box 4, St. Olavs Plass 0130 Oslo, Norway – Tel: +47 67 23 50 50, or
- NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS by email: (personverntjenester@nsd.no) or by telephone: +47 53 21 15 00.

Yours sincerely,

Rune Halvorsen
Project Leader/ supervisor

Faiza Mehmood
Student

Consent form

I have received and understood information about the project Mobilization against domestic violence Strategies Amongst Women's Organizations in Norway and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I give consent:

- to participate in an interview

I give consent for my personal data to be processed until the end date of the project (no later than by the end June 2022).

(Signed by participant, date)