Multicultural Violence Work at Shelters in Finland

A Feminist Postcolonial Perspective

Annika Aalto

SIMV19 Master's Thesis in

Social Studies of Gender

Major: Social Work

Graduate School

Faculty of Social Sciences

Spring Term 2016

Supervisor: Malinda Andersson

Abstract

The aim of this master's thesis is to explore multicultural violence work at shelters in Finland from a feminist postcolonial perspective. The main interest of this study is to analyse the shelter workers' ways of speaking about multicultural clients, on their own position and on their working methods. The study is based on four semi-structured interviews with shelter workers and on six observations of the shelter workers' client-case meetings in two different shelters that are analysed with discourse analytical approach. The study shows that the shelter workers' most dominant discourse on the multicultural violence work was culturising and emphasising the need to educate the clients about gender equality and tolerance. There were also two counter-discourses identified: one emphasising universalism and equal treatment and another emphasising intersectional and individual approach to the work. These discourses were contesting each other in the observed meetings. The shelter workers showed awkwardness and avoidance to discuss their own position and racism among the workers.

Keywords: violence work, multicultural social work, culturisation, postcolonial theory, discourse analysis

Tiivistelmä

Tämän pro gradu -tutkielman tavoiteena on tarkastella suomalaisissa turvakodeissa tehtävää monikulttuurista väkivaltatyötä feministisestä jälkikoloniaalisesta perspektiivistä. Tutkielmassa analysoidaan turvakotityöntekijöiden tapoja puhua monikulttuurisista asiakkaista, omista positioistaan ja käyttämistään työmenetelmistä. Tutkielma pohjautuu neljään puolistrukturoituun haastatteluun turvakodin työntekijöiden kanssa ja kuuteen turvakodin työntekijöiden asiakastapauskokousten havainnointiin kahdessa eri turvakodissa. Tutkimusmateriaali on analysoitu soveltaen diskurssianalyyttistä lähestymistapaa. Tutkimus osoittaa, että turvakotityöntekijöiden kaikkein hallitsevin puhetapa monikulttuurisesta väkivaltatyöstä oli kulttuuristava ja painotti asiakkaiden valistamista sukupuolten tasa-arvosta ja suvaitsevaisuudesta. Myös kaksi vastadiskurssia identifioitiin: ensimmäinen painotti universalismia ja yhtäläistä kohtelua ja toinen intersektionaalista ja yksilöllistä lähestymistapaa työhön. Havainnoiduissa kokouksissa nämä diskurssit kilpailivat keskenään. Turvakotityöntekijät välttelivät ja kokivat omasta asemastaan ja työntekijöiden rasismista puhumisen kiusalliseksi.

Asiasanat: väkivaltatyö, monikulttuurinen sosiaalityö, kulttuuristaminen, jälkikoloniaalinen teoria, diskurssianalyysi

Contents

Introduction

As the amount of asylum seekers began to rise substantially in the end of the summer 2015 in Europe, the discourse of protecting white European girls and women from Muslim men's violence and sexual harassment became more common. In Finland, this discourse has been very dominant both in social media and traditional media. For example, the deputy chief of police in Helsinki stated in an interview with The Telegraph that street harassment has been an unknown phenomenon in Finland before the arrival of 32 000 refugees in 2015 (Orange 2016, Jan 8). Also, there are street patrolling groups called 'Soldiers of Odin' in various cities of Finland that claim to protect especially ethnic Finnish women and girls since, according to them, the streets are not safe anymore (e.g. Rosendahl & Forsell 2016, Jan 13). All this caused a lot of public discussion on gender equality and gendered violence in Finland and even demonstrations demanding that women's bodies should not be used for justifying anti-immigration and racist values.

This public discussion on "violent" and "uncivilised" Others versus "non-violent" and "civilised" Us is a textbook example of culturisation of gendered violence. The violence is presented as something inherent to the culture of Others, in this case in the cultures of Middle East, whereas the violence of Us, white Western people, is only actions of mentally ill individuals and does not have anything to do with culture or social structures (e.g. Keskinen 2011; Sokoloff & Dupont 2005; Tuori 2009). However, this can be contested by a recent survey of FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2014) that showed that 71 % of Finnish women have been harassed and 47 % have experienced some kind of physical violence during their lives, which makes Finland one of the most dangerous countries in the EU for women. Even more recently, Amnesty International's annual report (2016) on the human rights situation in the world

was criticising Finland for not fulfilling the requirements of the Istanbul Convention on preventing violence against women and domestic violence that entered in force in 2015 in Finland.

This recent and on-going debate on human rights and gendered violence shows that there is still a long path to admitting that violence of ethnic Finns can be as cultural as the violence of other ethnicities. It has also shown that Finland is not an outsider of Western countries' colonial order that entails presenting non-Western people and cultures as uncivilised, even barbaric (see McClintock 1995). The Nordic countries' self-image is relying so strongly on the gender equality discourse that it is common to use it in the debates on refugees, immigration and gendered violence to construct the Other (Keskinen 2011, 153).

While there is already considerable amount of research conducted on how some ethnic groups' cultures and gendered violence is culturised in media (e.g. Keskinen 2009; Korteweg & Yurdakul 2010; Thapar-Bjökert 2009), the actual multicultural social and violence work done in the welfare state setting is a lot less studied (Keskinen 2011, 154). Social workers, among other welfare professionals, are those who work in between the welfare state, its policies and the clients. They are in the key position in enabling and/or complicating the migrant clients' participation in the society and access to equal rights. (Eliassi 2015, 555.) Thus, it is very important to study how these professionals are dealing with the questions of gendered violence and culture in the case of multicultural clients. In this study, I am using the term 'multicultural client' to refer not only to people with migrant backgrounds but also so-called old minorities, as the Roma and Russians, in Finland[1].

---

[1] See elaborated discussion on the terms and concepts in the methodology chapter.

The aim of this master's thesis is to explore multicultural violence work at shelters [2] in Finland from a feminist postcolonial perspective. My research question is: w*hat discourses can be identified in shelter workers' speeches on a) multicultural clients and the violence they have experienced, and b) the shelter worker's own position and their working methods?*

---

[2] I find the English term 'women's shelter' a bit misleading in my study context since my data also contains discussions on male client cases as most of the shelters in Finland accept male clients too. Also, the Finnish term for women's shelter is gender-neutral 'turvakoti,' which direct translation would be 'safety home.'

Background

This study is located in two shelters in Finland and to contextualise the study, I am presenting a short review on the current violence work and shelter situation in Finland. There are currently 19 shelters in Finland that are state-funded. Most of them are run by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) but there are also some run by the public sector (municipalities and health care districts). These 19 shelters have in total 114 family places for shelter clients. (THL 2015.) A 'family place' refers to the adult client and their possible children. According to the recommendation of the Council of Europe, there should be one family place per 10 000 of the country's population (Kelly 2008, 28). In Finland's case, this would mean 550 family places, the population being 5,5 million. In other words, Finland has only 0,21 family places per 10 000 people. The situation has gotten slightly worse from 2007, when the ratio was 0,24:10 000 according to a study on the shelters in Finland (Laine 2010, 195). The poor shelter situation in Finland is pointed out in Amnesty International's (2016, 158) annual report on the human rights situation of 160 countries and territories in 2015, as follows:

> *In April, Finland ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), which entered into force in Finland in August. Despite ratification, there was neither an action plan nor any dedicated budget for the effective implementation of the Convention. Services for women who have experienced violence remained inadequate and under-resourced. Finland fell short of the shelter requirements and recommendations in the Istanbul Convention, and despite the national shelter network becoming state-funded and coordinated, the number of shelters and accessibility for disabled people was insufficient. There were no walk-in services, no long-term support services for survivors of violence, nor a 24/7 helpline for victims of gender-based violence.*

The most important international agreement on women's human rights is the United Nation's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discriminations Against Women 1979 (CEDAW). Finland ratified this convention in 1986, but since then Finland has continuously gotten notes of complaints from the CEDAW-committee for insufficient actions for preventing violence against women. The complaints have considered insufficient legislation, insufficient amount of shelters, insufficient funding and human resources for violence work and lack of coordination in violence work. In the spring of 2016, the state of Finland should submit a report to the CEDAW-comittee on how these areas of violence work are improved. (Ojuri & Laitinen 2015, 8; CEDAW 2014.)

In April 2016, NYTKIS ry – The Coalition of Finnish Women's Associations (2016) submitted the CEDAW-committee a shadow report on the questions that they had asked the Finnish state to answer. The report was made in cooperation with 13 different human rights, LGBTI rights and women's rights NGOs. In the report, it is emphasised that there is a serious lack in resourcing, researching and training of the authorities in the multicultural violence work and the situation is worsening since the increased amount of refugees. It is pointed out that there is no new research conducted on the prevalence of violence against migrant women since 2007 and not any research on the subject among the LGBTI people and Sámi women. (*Ibid.*, 7–8.)

Previous Research

Postcolonial Perspectives on the Nordic Welfare State

In comparison to other Western countries, the welfare authorities (such as social workers) have a very central role as the first contacts for the migrants who arrive to the Nordic countries (Ranta-Tyrkkö 2011, 36). Researchers Diana Mulinari, Suvi Keskinen, Sari Irni and Salla Tuori (2009) are writing about postcolonialism in relation to Nordic welfare states and gender. They claim that whereas in colonial era it was important to export Western "civilisation," in the present Nordic welfare context it has taken the form of teaching migrants about gender equality. In the gender equality discourse, the migrant men are portrayed as inevitably patriarchal and dominant in contrast to the passive victim position of migrant women. (Mulinari *et al*. 2009, 23–24.) European countries in general, and especially the Nordic countries, construct their self-image strongly on the idea of a high level of gender equality (e.g. Tuori 2009, 203). The gender equality, for example, in the labour market of these countries is at a decent level between the women and men of ethnic majority, but the inequalities between migrant and ethnic majority women are vast. In this sense, the Nordic countries have been criticised for their false "women-friendliness." (Siim & Borchorst 2010, 133–137, 140.)

However, in the integration policies in Denmark and Finland, it has been seen important to teach migrants about the Nordic gender equality (e.g. Siim & Borchorst 2010, 146; Tuori 2009, 119; Vuori 2009), which is rather contradictory against these inequalities created by discrimination in the labour market. Birte Siim and Anette Borchorst (2010, 143) have analysed documents on Danish social policies of integration and found that migrant women are displayed as an oppressed group because of possibly arranged and forced marriages, and thus, they are "in need of gender equality." Similarly, Tuori (2009, 119) has analysed

texts produced by a Finnish multicultural women's NGO, and she claims that the Finnish people are presented to be more equal than the migrants in the texts; one suggested way to promote integration to the society is equality training.

Jaana Vuori (2009) has analysed 24 guidebooks and brochures on immigration to Finland that the Finnish Ministry of Labour had published on their website. The guides were written either to the migrants to educate them about Finland or to the welfare state authorities who are working with the migrants. Vuori was especially interested in how gender issues and ethnicity were discussed in these texts. The main findings were that the questions of gender were almost only discussed in relation to gender equality. In this discourse, the ethnic Finns are portrayed as people who have already achieved gender equality but migrants have gender equality problems. Thus, these problems are 'Theirs' – not 'Ours,' and the core of the problem is how to make migrants become able to enjoy these same fruits of gender equality. Apart from gender equality, other forms of equality were not widely covered. For example, racism was completely bypassed. Also, the gender equality issues were strongly constructed as migrant women's issues but paradoxically migrant women were not portrayed as possible "active agents" but as "students of equality" (*Ibid.*, 399).

Suruchi Thapar-Bjökert (2009) has conducted a discourse analysis on the media representation of honour-related violence in Sweden and the UK. She states that there were common themes in the representations: firstly, presenting the cultures in an essentialising way that they are neatly clear-cut from each other; secondly, presenting the cultures of Others as traditional, patriarchal and barbaric; and thirdly, presenting the violence deriving from the Other people's cultures, whereas the violence of white people is presented in an individualising way. Similarly, Keskinen (2009) has analysed the public debates on honour-related violence in the Nordic countries and points out that honour-related violence has become a bigger issue in the Nordic countries than, for instance, in the UK. She argues that there are three interconnected reasons for that. The Nordic countries

tend to emphasise that they do not have a similar kind of history of colonialism than many other European countries and thus, it is more difficult to see and admit that racism is a factor that affects processes and people also in the Nordic countries. More importantly, the national self-image in the Nordic countries is strongly built on being homogenous and a gender-equal society. The idea of homogeneity hinders seeing the intersecting effects of gender, ethnicity and class, and the idea of equality creates hierarchical divisions between "civilised" majority and "patriarchal" minorities.

Multicultural Violence and Social Work

There is not much research conducted on violence work with multicultural clients in Finland. I have found only one researcher, Suvi Keskinen (2011), who has studied this by interviewing different kinds of authorities (e.g. social workers, police officers, shelter workers and NGO-workers) and analysed what kind of discourses they use when talking about these clients and gendered violence in general. She found two main ways to speak: firstly, 'culturalist speech,' in which culture is seen as an all-inclusive explanation for the client's experiences and actions; and secondly, 'universalist speech,' where it was emphasised that all the clients should get the same service and the possible differences between clients are not important. She also found a discourse that was emphasising individual and multiple differences: the evaluation of the clients' situation should not be reduced to culture nor the cultural factors should be bypassed, but instead the focus should be on the interaction with the clients and hearing what they are saying.

However, there are some studies conducted on multicultural social work that are relevant to my topic. For example, Merja Anis (2005) has studied Finnish child welfare social workers and their multicultural clients by interviewing and observing their client-worker meetings. She was interested in how they were talking about culture and what roles and tasks it gets in the client-social worker

interaction. She identified three different ways of talking about culture: firstly, culture as "a means of explaining the ordinary," which means that the social workers were using the Finnish/Western way of child rearing as the 'normal' or 'ordinary' way; secondly, culture as "a difficulty," where culture is used as a reason for any problems in the interaction between the client and the social worker; and thirdly, culture as "a methodical tool," where social workers create an equal dialogue with the client by asking "culture questions" in order to find out if something is a cultural or personal way of doing things.

When it comes to analysis on cultural competence in multicultural social work, I have not found any research on it in a Finnish context, even though it is taught as a working method in Finnish universities and universities of applied sciences. Barzoo Eliassi (2015) has interviewed social workers in Sweden about how they are framing the social problems of their migrant clients. His main finding was that the social workers were culturising the clients and their problems. Eliassi claims that the problems are explained to originate from the clients' cultures that are causing clashes with the Swedish culture. Thus, the culture is a "deficiency" for the clients, but at the same time social workers are using the culture as a tool to make the clients more intelligible to the workers. This way the culture is a "necessity" for social workers to be culturally competent. He found out that the social workers were eager to use cultural competence as a tool to work "effectively" with the clients but they were uncomfortable to discuss the power relations and history of dominance related to non-European cultures.

Cultural Competence in Social Work

Cultural competence model is a "working tool" applied in the field of social and health care, such as social work, counselling and nursing in work with multicultural clients. It has become established as the main working model in multicultural social work in the past decades. (Sakamoto 2007, 107.) Cultural competence is usually divided into three primary areas: firstly, to have awareness of the worker's own background such as values, biases and assumptions; secondly, to have knowledge of other cultures and understand the clients' different world-views; and thirdly, to have skills to apply this knowledge in a sensitive manner to the client work. (Sue & Sue 2012, 47–49.)

However, this working model is problematic if it is observed more closely. Izumi Sakamoto (2007, 108) claims that the biggest problem is that the model is presented as "overwhelmingly apolitical." For her, the model is lacking analysis of power, which allows oppression such as "racism, sexism, ageism, homophobia, Islamaphobia, ableism" (*Ibid.*). This also related to the assumption that social workers are culturally neutral, White and middle-class, which means that also workers who do not fit into these categories are forced to adopt this kind of identity and way of knowing in order to be competent in the profession (*Ibid.*; Yan 2005, 18–19). Thus, because of this assumption of whiteness, Sakamoto (2007, 109) points out that the social work profession is maintaining and reinforcing the colonial dynamic of oppressing and Othering people from different cultures and classes. At the same time, it is demanding the workers to reach the standards of the hegemonic class and "requiring the existence of a group that does not meet them," meaning the clients that they are "helping" (*Ibid.*). She proposes a decolonisation of the professional knowledge base to solve this problem. Instead of the dominance of Eurocentric way of thinking, other ways of knowing should be accepted both for workers and clients. (*Ibid.*, 110.)

Gordon Pon (2009, 59) argues that since there is no analysis of power, the cultural competence model is 'new racism': it is essentialising cultures and Othering non-white people "without using racialist language." New racism is difficult to recognise as racism because it is based on culture instead of biology. Since the cultural competence model explains the differences between people deriving from their cultures, it justifies racism and links races into nations – thus, it defines who belong and who do not into the nations. This is also connected to the idea of "clashing cultures" of the modern, gender-equal West and the backward, patriarchal East. Thus, he argues that the idea of the "culturally competent" social worker should be abandoned and instead have a focus on continuous self-reflection regarding colonialism and racism. (*Ibid.*, 60–62.)

All of these presented previous studies on the migration policies, guide books and brochures published by public authorities, media representation and public discussion of migrant people, and multicultural social work bring up the finding that the migrants and their problems are easily reduced to their culture and the cultures are seen very homogenous and clear-cut. Finnish research is lacking analysis on cultural competence in social work and there is no previous research that focuses solely in the shelter workers' multicultural violence work in Finland. Thus, with this study, I want to bring a new angle to the research and discussion in the field, as I am studying not only the shelter workers' discourses on their multicultural clients but also their reflections on themselves and on their working methods in multicultural violence work.

Methodology

Terms and Concepts Used in the Study

> *The language we use to mark out difference between indigenous and immigrant peoples is highly salient and words such as 'foreigner', 'stranger', 'alien', 'immigrant', or 'settler' carry specific connotations in different contexts. Language in use reflects particular theories, values, political ideologies and popular thinking of the day and should therefore properly be the subject of constant review and clarification. It is necessary to analyse the terms in which reality is constructed because the selection of particular concepts reflects what it is we are choosing to take into account and what we are choosing to conceal or omitting to consider. (Soydan & Williams 1998, 3.)*

In this study, I am using the concepts 'multiculturalism' and 'multicultural client' even though they are not explicit and trouble-free. Multiculturalism is a contested term, but used widely in both research and public discussions. However, often it is not clarified how it is understood in the context. Multiculturalism can be divided into three most common uses of the term (Huttunen *et al*. 2005, 20–21; Tuori 2009, 18–19). Firstly, multiculturalism can be understood as a space with people from various cultural backgrounds. These spaces could be, for instance, a town, university or nation-state, which means that in this sense there are hardly any places that are monocultural. Secondly, multiculturalism can refer to principles of acknowledging cultural differences. Thirdly, it is a political vision of a society where different cultural communities live together and how it should be organised the best possible way. The term can be criticised for presupposing that cultures are unchanging, clear-cut, separate entities that do not blend with each other. (Huttunen *et al*. 2005, 25–28.)

I have chosen to use the term multicultural client in this study because I am not only interested in migrants and their offspring born in Finland, but also in so-called old Finnish minorities such as the Sámi, Roma, Tatars, Jews and Russians. These are minorities who have lived in Finland or have migrated to Finland prior to the 1920s (Tuori 2009, 29). Using the term 'ethnic minority' can have a minoritising effect on these people and can be seen as implying that some people are "more" ethnic than others (e.g. Huttunen *et al*. 2005, 118–119; Tuori 2009, 20). However, in some contexts in this study it is relevant to refer to these minorities and thus, I prefer to use the terms 'diasporic' and 'migrant' (see also Keskinen 2011, 154), but when referencing to other studies, I am using the concepts used in them. I have chosen to use the term 'client' because my research interest is not only in women but also men, even though the majority of the clients in the Finnish shelters are female (Ojuri & Laitinen 2015, 13) and this was the case during my fieldwork in the shelters, too. However, also male client cases were discussed in my research data and if the gender of the client is not relevant in the analysis, I do not bring it up in order to protect the clients' identity[3]. Thus, I find the term client more appropriate in this context.

The term 'multicultural client' does not directly have the same problems connected with it as presented above, but it does not take away the fact that writing about multicultural clients (who are mostly women) conjures up an image of "migrant-looking-woman," or "average Third World woman" as Mohanty (2003, 22) has named it: an "ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domestic, family-oriented, victimized, etc." woman. However, as Tuori (2009, 58) reminds, there is incoherence in research when it comes to the categorisations and the actual people, since they do not match because singular categories do not capture the realities of people's lives.

---

[3] See more detailed discussion in the section of ethical considerations of this chapter.

There are many violence concepts that are related to my research topic, such as gendered violence, violence against women, intimate partner violence, violence in close relationships, culturally justified violence, honour-related violence, etc. These concepts have slightly different meanings and some of them can be organised horizontally. For instance, intimate partner violence can be understood as a subcategory of violence against women, which in turn can be a subcategory for gendered violence. I am using mostly the term 'gendered violence' in this study when I am discussing violence in general. The prefix 'gendered' means that the violence is often used to maintain structurally unequal power and gender relations and that the motives of violence intersects with gender, culture, sexuality, age, class and ethnicity (Keskinen 2010, 243–245).

When I am referring to more specific violence, I am using varying terms. I find that there are pros and cons in these concepts. For instance, domestic violence takes into account also the possible children in the family, who also suffer from the violence, even if it is "only" between the parents. Moreover, it can be used as a concept for discussing so-called honour-related violence where the perpetrator is not necessarily the partner, but for instance, a family relative. But at the same time, the gender aspects are faded away from the term and the family can be understood violent as a system instead of seeing that there are violent individual(s) in the family (Hearn 1998, 29).

Social Constructionism and Discourse Analysis

My theoretical and methodological approach to this study is social constructionism and discourse analysis, which usually go hand-in-hand (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 4). According to social constructionism, the social reality is constructed in social and verbal interaction. There are various approaches within social constructionism but according to Vivien Burr (1995, 2–5), they all share four premises: firstly, a critical stance towards taken-for-granted

knowledge, which means that one's knowledge of the world should not considered as an objective truth; secondly, one's understanding of the world is historically and culturally relative, which means that knowledge is changing over time and space and people do not have fixed characteristics; thirdly, knowledge is created in social processes in which people create 'common' truths and compete about what is false; and fourthly, knowledge and social action are linked so that different understandings of the world lead to different actions and thus, the social construction of the knowledge also has consequences.

Discourse analysis approaches are commonly based in social constructionism and the different approaches (such as discourse theory, discursive psychology and critical discourse analysis) have different emphases (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 2–4). One of the central ideas of discourse analysis is that language is part of social action and thus, the research focus is on how language is used to create meanings to the social world and what meanings these are. In other words, discourse analysis is not interested in the structure of the language itself. Also, the time and context of the action are important in the analysis: the micro level of language use in the particular situation is combined with the macro level of broader societal and historical situation. The central concept of the discourse analysis is 'discourse,' which originates from the French word 'discours' that means 'speech,' 'talking' and 'oral presentation.' Nowadays, it has many definitions in different contexts, but oftentimes it is described to refer to a relatively established way of using the language in a certain situation or field. (Pietikäinen & Mäntynen 2009, 15–19.)

In this study, I am inspired by discursive psychology approach, and especially, Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell's (1987) work in discursive psychology. Discursive psychology is interested in psychological phenomena, such as categorisations, identities and prejudices in everyday interaction. The difference from cognitive psychology is that these phenomena are not analysed as inner mental processes but as discursive actions from a social constructionist

perspective: people do not have stable and coherent identities and they often contradict themselves in their speech and actions. (*Ibid.,* 38.) Discursive psychology is interested in these variations in texts and talks. The aim is not to categorise people or to find out if a discourse is true or false but to analyse how these categories are constructed or how discourses are constructed to seem true or false. The interest is also in how the discourses are used to legitimate and maintain unequal power relations. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 107–108.) Thus, discourse analysis is also an analysis on power. Discourses are created in social interaction and they can be corresponding or competing and trying to reach hegemonic, unquestioned status. In the analysis, it is important to pay attention to the different identities and positions the discourses are giving to their speaker and the speaker's objects: the speaker constructs its objects via discourses[4]. (Jokinen & Juhila & Suoninen 1993, 17–19, 86–88.)

The Fieldwork and Ethical Considerations

To gather data for my research, I contacted two shelters in Finland that have a substantial amount of multicultural clients. I approached them first with a phone call to the directors of the shelters and explained briefly what I am interested in studying and whether it was possible to come do fieldwork at the shelters. I proposed to interview the shelter workers and to observe the workers' meetings where they are discussing the client cases. I told the directors that I am interested in how the workers are doing violence work with multicultural client cases, not in the clients themselves. Both of the directors were interested in my study, so they promised to ask the shelter workers if they would like me there, too.

In conducting and assessing social work research, the research ethics are very central due to the research field's sensitive topics and subjects. Research ethics should always be considered context-bound, and ethical solutions cannot be

---

[4] See further discussion on power and discourse in the theory chapter.

strictly fixed to a predetermined set of codes. (Rauhala & Virokannas 2011, 237–238.) However, there are some ethical guidelines that should always be taken into consideration. TENK – The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (2009, 5) divides the ethical principles in social sciences research into three areas: firstly, respecting the autonomy of research subjects; secondly, avoiding harm; and thirdly, privacy and data protection.

The autonomy principle means that the research participation should be voluntary and based on informed consent. Also, the research subjects in studies based on interviews and observations must be informed on: the topic of the study, the method of collecting the data, the voluntary nature of the participation, why the study is conducted, how the research data is handled and stored, and how the results are published. (*Ibid*., 5–8.) Before starting the fieldwork, I sent both shelter directors a letter via e-mail where I presented my study and the directors forwarded the email to their workers and discussed it in their meeting. In the letter I explained: my research topic, the purpose of the study, my methods of collecting data, the voluntary nature of the participation, and data confidentiality of the study (see Appendix 1). I also visited both shelters to present my research and myself before starting the actual fieldwork; at one I met only the director of the shelter and at another I met all the workers who were currently in shift. At both shelters, the directors confirmed to me that the shelter workers consented to participate in the observations before I started the fieldwork.

However, the shelter directors were gatekeepers (see also Eliassi 2015, 559) and the key persons to give information to the workers, which made me worry about the workers' genuine possibility to refuse their participation in the study. I started the fieldwork in both shelters by observing a workers' meeting and in the beginning of it I presented myself and told them that the participation is voluntary and if they do not want to participate, I can exclude their speech from my field notes. No one asked to be excluded, but probably because of the hectic nature of their work and/or the amount of different students conducting fieldwork at the

shelters, not all workers seemed to pay much of attention what I was asking. After the meetings, I conducted interviews with workers who were interested in participating. With the interviews, I felt more comfortable with the issue of consent since my interviewees were actively proposing to be interviewed and before the interview, they signed a written consent form where I explained: my research topic, the purpose of the study, my method of collecting data, the voluntary nature of the participation, the disposal of the recordings and transcriptions after completing the study, and the anonymity and data confidentiality of the study (see Appendix 2).

The principle of avoiding harm means that the research subjects must be treated respectfully during the interaction with the subjects and the results must be presented in a respectful way in the publication. However, this principle does not prevent publishing research findings that may be unpleasing to the subjects, especially when the research is handling the use of power and the functioning of social institutions. (TENK 2009, 8–10.) In the interviews, I was asking the shelter workers questions about: their thoughts on multicultural violence work, their working methods, their self-reflections on power relations with the clients, and racism at the shelters (see Appendix 3). I considered that most of the questions were rather general and related to the interviewees' position as workers in public services, but a couple of them were more personal and some interviewees showed discomfort[5] to answer them. In these cases, I did not make additional questions on the topic in order to avoid pressuring the interviewees. My study concerns use of power in social institutions and I am aware that, for instance, the discussion on racism at the shelters might be undesirable for some of the participants in the study. However, the aim of my analysis is not to categorise people (e.g. as 'racists') but to identify the discursive practices how categorisations are made in the speeches of the shelter workers (see Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 107–108).

---

[5] See more discussion in the analysis chapter.

The privacy principle means that both the research data should be protected, stored, and disposed, and the research results should be published in a manner that the research subjects' privacy is ensured. Also, the research data with identifiers should be disposed immediately after completing the study, if not agreed differently with the research subjects. (TENK 2009, 10–13.) During the research process, I have been storing the research data out of reach of anyone else and after completing this study, I will dispose all the data as I have promised the participants. In this report, I am not specifying the shelters and their location in order to protect the anonymity of the shelter workers and the clients. For the same reason, I have minimised the identifiable information given on the workers and the clients. Pirkko-Liisa Rauhala and Elina Virokannas (2011, 239) point out that in the social work research, there are oftentimes third parties of the study (such as clients and their children, family, friends, etc.) whose privacy should also be protected. As I participated in the workers' client case meetings, I got a lot of information on the current shelter clients' lives and thus, I promised confidentiality about the sensitive information of the clients at both shelters. At one I made it orally and at another in writing. The shelter clients were not aware of my fieldwork at the shelters and thus, I am quoting the meeting conversations limitedly in this study in order to protect the clients' anonymity.

Beth Humphries and Marion Martin (2000, 71–74) criticise these traditional (Western) codes of ethics because they are presented as universally applicable, objective, and impartial, and because they lack analysis on power relations. They present the researchers as gender-neutral, autonomous actors and the research subjects as passive and dependent. The assumption is that the researcher is privileged with monolithic power over the research subjects that are always powerless and vulnerable. However, there is power in all social relations and it is multifaceted: for instance, the power relations connected to gender, age, race and class do not disappear when one takes the position of a researcher, and as Foucault famously stated "where there is power, there is resistance" (1990/1978, 95). Humphries and Martin (2000, 79) press for a principle of partiality to be a

core of progressive codes of ethics: all research should acknowledge that it is situated and partial because there are no value-free and neutral researchers. Donna Haraway (1998, 581–583) calls this idea of an objective researcher studying the subjects from above as a "god trick" and proposes that the only objective and ethical way to do science is to situate and embody one's knowledge.

My role at the shelters and my relation to the workers varied from being a young social work student (whereas the workers were older and already graduated), to a colleague working in the field of social services (in a higher position in the hierarchy of professions in the social welfare field[6]), and finally, to a researcher who is studying the shelters from the "outside." This way I experienced that also the power relations varied depending on the role I was in or as my role was taken. Potter and Wetherell (1987, 165) state that the role of interviewer is never neutral because the interviewees' answers depend on how the questions are asked. As my interviews were semi-structured, I was mainly sticking to my interview guide's question formatting and order, but in order to conduct the interviews in a flowing manner, I sometimes followed some topical trajectories and also both presented some additional and advanced questions and explained my questions in more detail if needed. During the observations, I was not actively taking part in the meetings because I wanted to minimise the effect of my presence on their speech. However, sometimes the workers would ask me questions about social services and income support that the municipalities offer, since they knew that I also work as a social worker in the public sector. In these cases, I answered the questions but otherwise stuck to my role as a researcher, even though sometimes it felt difficult not to comment when the workers were wondering about something I would know the answer to. I experienced these moments as ethically problematic since my answers would have helped the shelter workers to get the same information faster and easier.

---

[6] See the discussion on the educational backgrounds of the shelter workers in the following section of this chapter.

Empirical Data and Sample

I wanted to collect my research data in two separate shelters because I was interested in seeing if there are significant differences in their way of doing violence work and speaking about the multicultural clients. These two shelters are run by different state-funded NGOs and have different historical backgrounds and different emphases in their theoretical view on violence work (feminism and child welfare). My data consists of six observations of the workers' meetings (three at one shelter and three at another) and of four semi-structured interviews (two at one and two at another). Discourse analysis does not require a big sample, for instance, Potter and Wetherell (1987, 161) consider that ten interviews can give already "as much valid information as several hundred responses to a structured opinion poll" because the interest is in the "language use rather than the people generating the language and because a large number of linguistic patterns are likely to emerge from a few people." However, this does not exclude the possibility that if I had a bigger or more diverse sample, more or varied discourses could have emerged from the data.

The interviews took 30–45 minutes and were recorded and transcribed afterwards in Finnish. The quotes I am using in the analysis part are later translated into English and the original quotes in Finnish are attached in the appendices of this study (see Appendix 4). All of the interviewees were women, white, and native Finnish speakers; the youngest was in her late 20s and the oldest in her early 60s. The work experience in the shelter was varying from less than one year to over 15 years and was in correlation with the worker's age. The workers most often had a bachelor's degree in social services from universities of applied sciences ('sosionomi' in Finnish) or equivalent to that if they have graduated before the 1990s when the network of universities of applied sciences was founded in Finland. One of the workers had a master's degree in social work and three of the

four interviewees had supplemental/additional educations, too[7]. This kind of educational background was common among all the shelter workers in both shelters as the minimum requirement is to have a bachelor's degree in social services.

The workers meetings were two hours long at one shelter and approximately one hour at another shelter. The amount of participating workers varied from three to five, the average being four workers. In two out of six meetings there was also a male worker present, otherwise the meetings were only among female workers. At one shelter, all the workers in the observed meetings were white and native Finnish speakers and at another shelter, approximately half of the workers were non-native Finnish speakers and some of them were non-white. Both of the shelters are operated by three-shift work system, which means that only the workers in the day shift were participating in the meetings that I observed.

The workers were always discussing the cases of the clients currently staying in the shelters. The amount of cases varied from eight to eleven in the meetings, the average being 9 cases. I only made notes on the client cases with some kind of multicultural background. For instance, if the client is an ethnic Finn, but the partner (or other family member who is relevant in the client's situation) has a multicultural background, I included the case in my study. The amount of multicultural client cases varied from four to nine in the meetings, the average being six cases. However, there were same client cases discussed multiple times in my data since some of them stayed at the shelter over my fieldwork period. This continuation of the same client cases also gave me a possibility to analyse

---

[7] In contrary to many other Nordic countries, e.g. Sweden, the requirement to be a licensed social worker in Finland is a master's degree in social work, i.e. a bachelor's degree is not enough. However, the Swedish bachelor's degree in social work ('socionom' in Swedish) is more academic whereas the one in Finland is more vocational. This means that most of the participants of this study are not social workers, but in general I am talking about social work since they are working in the field of social work.

how the shelter workers' way of speaking about the clients changed over the time they stayed at the shelters.

I decided not to record the meetings in order to avoid collecting any sensitive data on the clients, as the workers would use their names and discuss their lives in detail, and because the clients were not aware of my research. Instead, I made notes of the discussions that I thought were relevant for my study. The downside of this is that I could not always write everything down word-for-word and I could not return to the situation by listening to the record to make sure I caught everything that is relevant (*cf.* Potter & Wetherell 1987, 163). I wrote the notes in Finnish to my notebook and later typed them up directly into English on my computer. As the conversation quotes are not always word-for-word, I do not think it is relevant to attach my notes in original form.

I chose these two types of data collection in order to gather more comprehensive data that would have been possible with only one of the methods. As Potter and Wetherell (1987, 162) state, "collecting documents from many sources, recording interactions, and then combining this with more directive interviewing, it is possible to build up a much fuller idea of the way participants' linguistic practices are organized compared to one source alone." The difference between these two types of data is that during the meeting observations I have not been in an active role in producing speech on my research topic whereas in the interviews, I have made the participants reflect and analyse their work and experiences. This way the observation material represents the shelter's everyday practice. The talk on multicultural client work is more conscious during the interviews and more spontaneous during the observations. (See also Anis 2005, 7.) However, the level of spontaneity can be contested since the participants knew my area of interest in the meetings. In the analysis, these two sets of data are not quoted in the same proportions for two reasons: firstly, the observation data does not answer my research questions as directly as the interview data; and secondly, in many cases I cannot quote the whole conversation I wrote up while observing because there are

detailed descriptions of clients' situations and thus, there could be a risk of identification.

Analysing the Data

Since discourse analysis is focusing on the language use, the transcriptions of the interviews and the observation notes on the workers' meetings should be made as accurately as possible (see Potter & Wetherell 1987, 166). However, as I am translating my material from Finnish to English, the level of accuracy is lower than it would be without translations. Finnish and English belong to different language families and thus, they do not have much in common, which forced me balance between translating word-for-word (when it would not make much sense) or translating the content and the idea (which makes it more prone for subjective interpretations).

I started the (active) data analysis process by reading the interview transcriptions and the observation notes multiple times and then comparing them to each other to find similarities and differences between them. After this, I started to colour-code words and expressions that were common in the data and then organised these into themes, such as gender equality, culturisation, emancipation, universalism, cultural competence, clashing cultures, etc. Finally, I was looking into different discourses on the clients, the violence, and the shelter workers' reflections on their work. (See Potter & Wetherell 1987, 167–169.) These will be presented in the analysis chapter. I was using the previous research (presented in the previous chapter) as help to analyse and name the themes and also to compare my findings with them. The previous research is very much relying on the same type of data collection and analysis methods as this study, which makes it easy to compare.

Theory

Postcolonial Approach

My theoretical approach to this study can be defined as postcolonial and intersectional. The main interest of postcolonial theory is how the histories of colonialism have, and are still, shaping the contemporary world. Postcolonial analysis is interested on the one hand in specific colonial histories and their legacies. On the other hand, it is interested in the creation of Otherness and racial differences but also centres and peripheries. Postcolonial theory is not a uniform and clear-cut approach. On the contrary, there are multiple perspectives that are called postcolonial. (Tuori 2009, 63.) The historical roots of the theory are in the imperial projects of European countries. As the contact between Europeans and non-Europeans expanded through European colonialism, these violent encounters needed a justification from the Europeans' side. The justification was found from the idea of inferiority of the colonised people, which was backed up by "scientific research" on human races. (Loomba 1998, 58–62; McClintock 1995.) The dichotomous division between the West and 'the Rest' was created, as it is known nowadays. Edward Saïd (1978) is one of the most famous postcolonial theoreticians who pointed out how this binary opposition between Western and Eastern people and cultures was formed and reformed in discourses: for example, rational-irrational, civilised-uncivilised, masculine-feminine, developing-static.

Anne McClintock's (1995) research is an example of postcolonial analysis that is interested in a specific colonial history and its legacies. She has analysed how race and the idea of humanity's degeneration were invented in the 19th century's imperial Britain. Originally, the term 'race' referred not only to biological features, but also social. In the mainland, the Jews, Irish, working class, prostitutes, criminals and homosexuals were thought to be 'racial deviants':

"atavistic throwbacks to a primitive moment in human prehistory, surviving ominously in the heart of the modern, imperial metropolis" (*Ibid.,* 43). The black people in the colonies were seen as 'gender deviants' because they were considered promiscuous. Together these people were called as 'degenerate classes.' Poverty and other social problems were seen as biological and contagious, so social classes were called races instead of social groups. McClintock claims that the construction of these degenerate classes "as departures from normal human type" was necessary for the self-definition of the classes in power as progressed and normal (*Ibid.*, 46). Especially women's sexuality was controlled in order to protect the "imperial race." This construction also legitimised the state to intervene in both public and private life in the colonies and in the mainland (*Ibid.*, 46–48).

The kind of postcolonial approach I am especially applying to this study has its roots in critical feminist thinking. Chandra Talpade Mohanty's (2003) writings are interested in how the Otherness is constructed in the case of racialised women. She criticises Western feminism for contributing to the production and presentation of "Third World woman" as a singular and monolithic subject by taking 'woman' as a category of analysis, assuming that "all women, across classes and cultures, are somehow socially constituted as a homogenous group […] on the basis of a shared oppression" (*Ibid.*, 22). For Mohanty, when Western feminists are assuming this shared oppression in the Third World, she calls it a "colonialist move": Western women are subjects and Third World women objects (*Ibid.*, 39). According to Mohanty, the category of "oppressed woman" originates from the idea of gender difference, whereas in the category of "the oppressed Third World woman," there is added "Third World difference," which refers to the assumed "underdevelopment" of the Third World and contains a paternalising attitude towards these women:

Third World women as a group or category are automatically and necessarily defined as religious (read: not progressive), family-oriented (read: traditional), legally unsophisticated (read: they are still not conscious of their lights [sic]), illiterate (read: ignorant), domestic (read: backward), and sometimes revolutionary (read: their country is in a state of war; they must fight!). This is how the "Third World difference" is produced. (Ibid., 40.)

This is related to what Mohanty calls 'ethnocentric universality': "[l]egal, economic, religious, and familial structures are treated as phenomena to be judged by Western standards." Thus, she points out that the singular and privileged First world is enabled and sustained by this discourse on the Third World (*Ibid.*, 40–42).

However, postcolonial theory has received critique, too. One of them is that it leads to a dichotomous and static presentation of the West and the East, even though it is trying to fight against this (Tuori 2009, 71). Also, the name of the theory has been criticised: Anne McClintock (1995, 10–11) criticises the term postcolonialism because the term itself contains an idea of linear development, which is very Eurocentric conception. According to her, the term implies that there were epochs of pre-colonialism, colonialism and then post-colonialism. Also, it emphasises the importance of European colonialism to its colonised countries and categorises all colonised countries by European countries into the same as if the experience had been the same for all the countries. Moreover, the term is not accurate in the sense that colonialism is not over in the world. (*Ibid.*)

Finland has been traditionally positioned as an outsider of the European imperial history: it has not been a colonial power in the same sense as the UK or France. Sometimes it is also claimed that actually Finland was colonised first by Sweden and later by Russia. However, there is no certainty if Finland really existed before the Swedish rule; Finland was one of the Sweden's counties during the years

1155–1809. On the other hand, Finland was a lot less developed area than the rest of Sweden, and Sweden had a civilising mission in Finland as it brought Christianity to Finland. Russia ruled Finland during the years 1809–1917 and that was the time of the rise of Finnish nationalism and fights for independency, which can be seen typical for colonised countries, but at the same time, Finland was more developed economically and in its social structure than Russia. (Lehtonen & Löytty 2007, 107–109.)

Postcolonial theory has traditionally been considered awkward in a Finnish context for the above-mentioned reasons and it has not been widely applied in Finnish research. However, there are various reasons why postcolonial theory is a valid tool to analyse Finnish society. For instance, Finland has (along with Norway, Sweden and Russia) colonised the Sámi people in the Sápmi area in Lapland. Also, Finland is part of the colonial order culturally and economically, and even by its migration movements. There were mass emigrations from Finland from the end of 19th century till the 1960's because Finnish economy relied on exporting raw materials and that could not employ everyone. Finnish people formed diasporas especially in Sweden and in the USA. From the 1990's onwards Finland become an immigration country, mainly because of people migrating from the areas suffering from the colonial power of the West. (Lehtonen & Löytty 2007, 106; Tuori 2009, 16, 64–65.)

As the amount of migrants has substantially risen in the past decades in Finland, the amount of research applying postcolonial theories also has risen recently, especially in studies related to multiculturalism (e.g. Huttunen *et al*. 2005; Keskinen 2009 & 2011; Ranta-Tyrkkö 2011; Tuori 2009; Vuori 2009; Vuorela 2009). As Tuori (2009, 68) puts it, postcolonial perspective in a Finnish context offers tools "to trace more concretely where the different figures of 'migrant', 'African' or 'Arab' come from and what exactly is mobilised in multicultural encounters. […] Postcolonial thinking is therefore one way of analysing how racialization in multicultural encounters today can be understood as a legacy of

(colonial) pasts." Ulla Vuorela (2009) uses the concept of 'colonial complicity' to describe the relationship with colonialism that is typical in the Nordic countries. Instead of understanding colonialism as a massive conquest, it can happen in "small events." Also, 'complicity' refers to the way the Nordic countries have taken part in maintaining colonial relations without perceiving it as such. As I am studying the multicultural violence work at shelters and how the shelter workers are speaking about the clients, I find the postcolonial approach helpful in understanding the broader perspective and historical backgrounds of these speeches and of the subject positioning of the clients.

Intersectional Approach

I am also applying intersectional theory in my analysis. Intersectionality refers to different axes of power and multiple differences, and it is used to show how no single category alone (such as race, gender, class, age, sexuality, etc.) can be used to explain a person's situation since these categories are always intersecting. (Tuori 2009, 57.) Kimberlé Crenshaw was the first scholar who called this concept of different intersecting social categories as intersectionality in 1989, but the approach itself has a longer history before it was named. Intersectional analysis was needed to point out the "triple oppression" of black women who are not only oppressed because of their sex but also because of their skin colour and class status as members of the working class. (Yuval-Davis 2006, 194–195; 2011, 156.) Crenshaw (1991, 1242) writes about violence against women of colour in the US context and points out that the experience of violence is not the same as it is for white people: it is not only shaped by the gender, but also by race and class.

Intersectional theory is widely applied in the analyses of gendered violence. Natalie Sokoloff and Ida Dupont (2005) claim that traditionally feminists have underlined the common experiences of battered women when discussing domestic violence, because it was seen that to end women's abuse a strong feminist movement was needed. They point out that according to traditional feminist

perspective, domestic violence derives (mainly) from "socially constructed and culturally approved gender inequality" (*Ibid.,* 42–43). Sokoloff and Dupont want to challenge this thinking because there are different definitions for violence in different cultures and also because there is domestic violence in lesbian relationships, too. They emphasise that there are many other factors (e.g. gender, class, race, and sexual orientation) in experiencing violence and these factors intersect with each other. (*Ibid.*, 43.)

Many scholars (e.g. Keskinen 2011; Korteweg & Yurdakul 2010; Sokoloff & Dupont 2005; Yuval-Davis 1997) stress the importance of an intersectional approach to gendered violence in ethnic minority and diasporic groups, because of the risk of seeing the violence as a part of (specific) cultures. Sokoloff and Dupont (2005, 47) argue that the violence is neither only about culture nor patriarchy, but "how patriarchy operates differently in different cultures." They emphasise that the violence against women in ethnic minorities "must be understood in the context of White supremacy, patriarchy, colonialism, and economic exploitation of marginalized communities, not as if such violence is inherent in the culture." Also, Mohanty criticises the common feminist assumption on universal gendered violence against women, which defines women as victims and men as perpetrators and thus, societies divided into powerless and powerful groups of people. She points out that the "[m]ale violence must be theorized and interpreted within specific societies in order both to understand it better and to organize effectively to change it." (*Ibid.*, 24.)

Despite the high rate of violence against women in Finland (see Amnesty International 2016; FRA 2014), it is seldom acknowledged that violence in ethnic Finnish families is a cultural and structural, but rather understood as an individual issue. However, violence in multicultural families is usually constructed as cultural and thus, a question of gender equality. (e.g. Tuori 2009, 133–135.) This phenomenon, the presentation of the gendered violence among some groups as only a cultural matter, and not seeing the other factors (for example economical

situation or structural racism), is called culturalisation. Then the culture is seen as an all-inclusive model to explain the social problems and lifestyles of people from different cultures. Then other factors, such as social, economical, and structural factors, are bypassed when explaining people's situations. Ethnic groups are also seen as homogenous and their cultures as static and clear-cut. (Keskinen 2011, 158.) Thus, this culturalised speech reinforces the juxtaposing of the East and the West.

Discourses and Power

Power is a very central concept in postcolonial and intersectional theories (see Tuori 2009, 61) but also in discourse analysis, which is both a theory and a method (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 3–4). I am inspired by the French philosopher Michel Foucault's (1994/1977) conceptualisation of power, but in this study, I am not following any strict Foucauldian model. Foucault's thoughts on discourses, power and subjects have been very central in discourse analysis. He has divided three types of power: firstly, legal power (over someone, e.g. social workers deciding on income support); secondly, power as productive (of subjects, e.g. production of a Muslim migrant as a character; and thirdly, power as knowledge (as expertise, e.g. shelter workers defining the violence). He stated:

> *If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, it also traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (Ibid., 120)*

I also find some of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's (1985) concepts of discourse theory useful in my study. They claim that discourses are always designating positions for people to occupy, which they call 'subject positions' (*Ibid.,* 115). For example, in the shelter context, there are positions of 'shelter workers' and 'shelter clients' and these subject positions determinate how people are expected to act. The subject positions are also offered identities in the discourses and these identities are always constructed relationally. For example, 'shelter client' can be linked to victimhood, powerlessness and passivity and it is contrasted with 'shelter worker' that can be linked to sovereignty, power and activity. These linking identities are called 'chains of equivalence.' (*Ibid*., 127.) Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips (2002, 50) give an example of investigating these chains of equivalence in the context of social space:

> *The West stands in opposition to the rest of the world which is not automatically accepted as civilises and democratic, but rather defined as 'barbaric' and 'coloured'. Analysis of the 'Other' which is always created together with the creation of 'Us' can give some idea of what a given discourse about ourselves excludes and what social consequences this exclusion.*

Nation, Gender and Multiculturalism

The Western project to build nation-states started in the 16th century. The method to create nation-states was to overcome ethnic boundaries between people in order to have one "superethnos" (for example *the* Finns) inside one country's borders. However, Gerd Baumann (1999) argues that most nation-states failed in this project because when including some ethnic groups, they excluded others, and at the same time privileged some while marginalised others. This division created minorities, which, according to Baumann, is the main problem in succeeding in multiculturalism. (*Ibid.,* 31–32.)

Nira Yuval-Davis (1997) claims that the basis for nationalism lies on the concept of the nation-state. The idea of the nation-state is that within one country's boundaries live only people who identify themselves to only one nation. In reality, this is hardly ever the case since there are always people living in countries that are not identified or do not identify themselves as members of "the hegemonic nation." Still the fiction of nation-states is strong and it naturalises the hegemonic nation's status and puts minorities in the position where they are "deviants from the 'normal'." Yuval-Davis argues that this is the link between nationalism and racism. (*Ibid.,* 11.)

Multiculturalism is an ideology and policy born in the late 20th century when Western societies started to emphasise migrants' own cultures and nation's diversity instead of assimilation and unity. The main idea of multiculturalism is that diversity is promoted by treating all cultural groups equally. (Baumann 1999, 31–32.) From the late 1980s onwards multiculturalism has been criticised because it is thought to make societies less solidary (Anttonen & Häikiö & Stefánsson & Sipilä 2012, 9). Honour-related violence, forced marriages and the debate on Muslim women's headscarves have been interpreted as evidence of ethnic groups' disintegration and this has affected the discourse of the "crisis of multiculturalism" in Western societies (Keskinen 2012, 261–262).

Helma Lutz (1997) argues that in Europe, there is an on-going shift from 'Eurocentrism' into 'Europism,' a term created by Philomena Essed. Lutz defines Eurocentrism as "the old discourse of European superiority and domination over the South" and Europism as "the defensive discourse of constructing a 'pure Europe' as a symbolic continent whose territory is cleansed of foreign and 'uncivilised elements'." Migrants who have different ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds are defined as Others in the construction of "pure" and "civilised" Europe. The embodiment of this Other is Muslim women who are seen as

"handicapped by their culture of origin." (Lutz 1997, 95–97; also Keskinen 2009, 258.)

Yuval-Davis (1997) connects women's bodies to nation-building because they are both biological and cultural (re)producers of nation. Women do not only give birth to new members of the nation but also raise the children, and socialise them into society by teaching the language and the norms. Since women's bodies carry the collectivity's identity and future destination, their bodies become also bearers of honour. This leads to the common conception of "proper" clothing and behaviour for women. The rules of properness signify the boundaries of the collectivity. When women act against this, for instance by committing adultery, they bring shame on their male family members and the whole community. This can be sometimes seen as justification for violence against women. (*Ibid*., 26, 45–46.)

Welfare State, Universalism and Diversity

Universalism is both a contested theoretical concept and social policy principle. As a concept, it refers to community, nation, similarity, and inclusiveness. Its opposites are, for instance, residualism and particularism, but also difference and diversity. As a policy principle, it means that all people have access to welfare services (such as health care, social care and education) and to welfare benefits (such as income support, housing allowance and pension) regardless of their position in the labour market, income or place of residence. Universalism as a policy principle is argued to reduce poverty and gender inequality and it is most often connected to the Nordic Welfare model and social democratic politics. Usually the Swedish basic pension system from 1914 is thought to be the first universal system in the world, and universalism became the country's conscious goal in the 1930s as part of the Swedish social democratic 'folkhemmet' ('people's home') ideology. Also other Nordic countries started to develop

universal welfare systems from the 1930–1940s onwards. (Anttonen *et al*. 2012, 3; Anttonen & Sipilä 2010, 104, 110–133.)

Universalism has been criticised by feminist scholars. For instance, Helga Hernes (1987, 140) was among the first ones to claim that universalism is a gendered construction that is concentrated on the citizens as (male) workers, who provide for the family whereas women have traditionally been seen as "citizen mothers." Nevertheless, she also claims that the Nordic welfare model is the most woman-friendly system there is because it allows women to combine the roles of being workers and mothers (*Ibid.,* 15). Similarly, Kirsi Juhila (2006, 107) points out that in the Nordic welfare state the prototype of a universal citizen is often understood as a white, heterosexual, middle-aged working man and anyone who differs from this prototype is seen as inadequate.

From the 1990s onwards, social and cultural diversity (e.g. in forms of multiculturalism and individualism) has been seen as a major challenge for the legitimacy and sustainability of universal policies in the Nordic welfare states. Universal practices can lead to unequal and unjust outcomes in a diverse society as universalism is based on difference-blindness. (Anttonen *et al*. 2012, 9.) In a social work context, the ethical starting point in the work is the equal treatment of the clients. This means that the clients should not be treated differently or discriminated based on, for instance, their age, gender, skin colour or ethnicity. However, following this ethical principle straightforwardly can lead to the homogenisation of the clients and blindness to differences that matter. Then, paradoxically, following the principle of equal treatment leads to unequal service; equal treatment does not equal to similar treatment. (Juhila 2006, 109–111.)

Analysis

The shelter workers are speaking about their multicultural clients and the violence they have experienced in many ways both in the meetings that I was observing and in the interviews. In the following sections, I present the discourses that I identified from my research data. These discourses are not clear-cut but very much mixed, contradicting and contested both within the same interview and in the workers' meetings. In discursive psychology, the variation and self-contradiction are seen as a sign of the use of multiple discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 122). Even though the fieldwork of this study was conducted in two separate shelters run by two different organisations with differing emphases on client work, there were not any striking differences in what discourses the workers were using.

Educating the Clients

The most common way to relate to the multicultural clients and to the violence work was to portray them as "students": they need to be guided and educated about "the Finnish way" of doing things by the shelter workers (see also Vuori 2009). The clients' position is to learn about gender equality and tolerance towards differences – to turn from a childlike client into an independent citizen. In other words, to become more "modern." The workers' role is to be a good example and modernise the clients by teaching them about women's rights in Finland. This kind of attitude can be called a 'civilising mission,' which refers to the idea of Western people's moral and intelligence superiority that was employed to legitimate the colonial rule (McClintock 1995, 34–36; Ranta-Tyrkkö 2011, 27–28).

The shelter workers do not necessary think that the gendered violence *per se* is very different between the multicultural and ethnic Finnish clients, but that the violence derives from the presupposed gender inequality in their relationships. In this following quote, I asked the interviewee if she thinks there is any difference in the violence experiences between the shelter's multicultural clients and ethnic Finnish clients:

> *[…] for example, if you think about those Muslims, there's a lot of this kind of keeping [women] as maids and that type of subordination. Often, even though I wouldn't want to generalise any culture or religion or such, but one can see that, for example, in the Roma[8] culture even brute violence is quite common and the woman is lower than the man. That's maybe the common thread between immigrants and the Roma, that the woman is seen lower than the man and that's used to justify the violence.[a]*

The brute violence is culturalised here to be part of the Roma culture, which makes it seem that the brute violence among the ethnic Finns has nothing to do with culture. Domestic violence among ethnic minorities is easily culturalised: it is explained to derive from religion (especially Islam) and a patriarchal, oppressive culture, whereas domestic violence among majority groups in Western countries is interpreted to arise from individuals' psychological problems and it is not as often related to structural problems such as gender inequality or patriarchy. In fact, the "Western" culture is deculturised: "[t]he powerful are depicted as having no culture, other than the universal culture of civilization" (Sokoloff & Dupont 2005, 46–47). Even if culture is used to justify the violence in some cases, as the interviewees tell that the clients' violent partners have said, "this is part of our culture," presenting the violence deriving solely from the Other's gender-

---

[8] In my study data, 'the Roma' was always referring to the Roma people who have lived in Finland for over 500 years – they are so-called old minority. They have Finnish citizenship and speak Romani, Finnish and/or Swedish. There are also Roma people who have rather recently come from Romania and Bulgaria, but they are outside of almost all public services in Finland and thus, hardly ever clients in shelters.

unequal culture is creating "hierarchal divisions between the 'equal majority' and 'patriarchal minorities'" (Keskinen 2009, 269).

> *The forms of violence are more or less the same. But what differs, is that the immigrant doesn't know about the Finnish way of dealing with violence, domestic violence, child rearing and discipline violence. They don't know about women's position, what rights they have. […] What their rights and responsibilities are. In that sense, we need to give them this Finnish basic information a lot that we don't have to give to ethnic Finns[9].* [b]

This interviewee in the quote above is answering to the same questions as the earlier one. As previous research shows (e.g. Eliassi 2015; Keskinen 2011; Siim & Borchorst 2010; Tuori 2009; Vuori 2009), the discourse of migrants needing "equality training" and being "less equal" is very common within social workers and within the public sector in general in the Nordic countries. The shelter workers are linking gender inequality especially to clients who have migrated from the Middle East or Africa and who are Muslims. Also naming these people as 'immigrants' is used in a racialising way, since it only refers to non-white, non-Western clients. The clients' male partners, especially Muslim men, are portrayed to be more controlling than ethnic Finnish men and keeping their partners outside of the society by treating them as "maids," as the interviewee in the first quote put it (see also Tuori 2009, 128). Here another shelter worker describes her experiences on the differences of the violence among ethnic Finnish and multicultural clients:

---

[9] The interviewees are calling the ethnic Finns 'kantasuomalaiset' (kanta = stem, base; suomalaiset = Finns). I find 'ethnic Finns' the closest translation but the Finnish term means something more than just ethnicity: it has an inclusive idea that migrants and their children can also be(come) Finns – they can be called 'uussuomalaiset' (new Finns), as opposite to the old (stem/base) Finns.

My experience is that there's probably more controlling. More controlling and setting rules and women are thought to need to be controlled. A Finnish relationship, basic Finnish relationship, is often more equal, a woman has right to her own life. I experience that the control is often very comprehensive. [c]

In this gender equality speech, all the Finns are assumed to be gender-equal and thus, the violence is not understood to derive from unequal gender relations in the relationship, but individual problems. This speech creates a dichotomy of passive victims and active survivors. The female multicultural clients are described to not resist the violence, but accept it as a part of normal life, whereas Finnish clients are depicted as actively analysing their experiences "like engineers," as one of the interviewees put it. This also relates to the idea of a strong, independent Finnish woman, which is in a very central position in the historical stories of Finnish gender equality and the Finnish nation. For example, it is often emphasised that Finland was the first country in Europe and second in the world giving women the right to vote. (See also Keskinen 2011, 157; Mulinari *et al.* 2009, 23–24.) In this following quote, the interviewee is explaining how the violence work differs between the multicultural and ethnic Finnish clients:

[…] There's a certain kind of naivety towards that situation that Finns don't have. They [the Finns] are very aware of what's happening and "this is wrong and I have been enduring this and why I have endured this," that maybe they have a little bit more analytical attitude towards their situation, whereas these immigrant women have it more like, "well, this is like this now and I don't really know even myself why it's like this." [d]

In this culturalising speech, the shelter workers are constructing dichotomous hierarchies between 'Us' Finns and 'Them' (im)migrants. As clients, migrants are passive, naïve, childlike, unequal, and traditional, whereas Finnish clients are active, analytical, equal, independent, and modern. In colonial discourses, these

binary oppositions were (and are still) crucial for portraying white Western people as superiors and legitimising the exercise of power over the Other (Loomba 1998, 47; Saïd 1978). An evolutionary model is applied in constructing 'traditional' as less developed, where as 'modern' signifies progress. The time and place are also linked to each other: the modernity is located in the West and the Third World is still living in pre-modern time. (McClintock 1995.) Thus, the Western/Finnish woman becomes an ideal and norm of the "right kind" of femininity towards which the Other women are mirrored (Tuori 2009, 126). The role of the women who have migrated from these "traditional" countries to Finland is to disentangle themselves from the "traditional" habits. Only then, the Other women have a possibility to become modern. However, the interviewees experience that the shelter period is often too short for the multicultural clients to teach them about gender equality:

> *We can't instruct the whole scale to her at all, that she would leave from here the way that she would have understood everything and would understand the Finnish way of living and the Finnish value of women and the equality of parenthood and all this.* [e]

In the interviews, it was common that the shelter workers are describing how they have to be like mothers to the multicultural clients, because they are not taking the responsibility of their own lives nor the lives of their children. This is considered as a difference to ethnic Finnish clients. Both during the interviews and the meetings, it is discussed that multicultural clients do not understand that they cannot stay in the shelter for too long, and that they should find a new apartment (if they are not able to go back home, and mostly they are not). The multicultural clients are claimed to just "hang out" and "get free food" at the shelter and that the mothers do not understand that the shelter is not a suitable environment for the children to stay for weeks.

Sometimes it happens that you have to be really motherly, set boundaries to those people. They're sometimes feeling limitless here and that's not fun at all. And I could think that with an ethnic Finn that would not, well it might happen, but somehow all the Finns that have been here, they've been like that they come here and then they're already quickly wanting to go away, which is not typical at all in this [multicultural] clientele. [g]

This motherly approach is paternalising and portraying the multicultural clients as adult children who need shepherding. Similarly, in the colonial context, the colonised people were portrayed as childlike subjects who were not capable of self-government, which justified the power of white male empire officers (Mohanty 2003, 59–60). In the shelter context, the multicultural client gets the position of an adult child who does not understand to move away from home and become independent and thus, the shelter workers have to take the position of a mother who needs to kick the offspring away from the nest. The ethnic Finnish clients are positioned as independent adults who do not need any parenting. Yuval-Davis (1997, 45) claims that the figure of a woman, and especially of a mother, is in many cultures the symbol of spirit of the collectivity. For instance, in a Finnish context, the shape of Finland on the map resembles a woman who has a head, a hand raised up (and also had another hand until the area was lost for Russia in 1944), and a dress. This national personification is called Maiden of Finland (Suomi-neito). In paintings, she is blonde, blue-eyed and in her mid-twenties, and in one of the most famous ones (*Hyökkäys/Attack* by Edward Isto, 1899) defending the legal autonomy of Finland from Russia. Similarly, in Sweden, there is Mother Svea (Moder Svea), which has often been depicted as a mother or older sister of the Maiden of Finland.

The figure of the "right kind" of a woman is independent, like the Maiden of Finland. This is also what the shelter workers want the multicultural clients to become. The shelter workers' civilising and modernising mission comes up in their way of speaking about being an example of an educated and independent

woman/mother to the multicultural clients. In this following quote, I asked the interviewee about how she thinks her position (e.g. class, ethnicity) affects the client relationship. She explains that even though she has children, she is educated and can go to work and through her example she wants to encourage the female clients to do the same. As the interviewee is a middle-aged ethnic Finnish woman, I read this the way that she takes a motherly position towards the (most often) younger clients. However, she also acknowledges that her model of encouraging might not be suitable for all the clients:

> *Of course it affects because I bring the Finnish perspective, how most Finns, especially women, are educated and can go to work. It comes up from my way of being and speaking and perhaps also in how I encourage to learn Finnish, to apply to school. [...] But I still think that I don't do this work from up to down. I hope I don't. Clients would experience that. I have some knowledge that they could benefit from and they choose if they want to use it, if it's fitting for them. But it's encouraging to survive. I have a family, but I have studied, I can go to work and this is possible in Finland.* [f]

When asking the shelter workers about racism in the shelters, all of the interviewees are denying the possibility of racism from the workers' side. However, the racism between the multicultural clients is explained as a common problem. Allan Pred (2000, 95–96) discusses racism in a Swedish context and claims that emphasising extraordinary and widely media-covered racist hate crimes while silencing everyday racist experiences enables "people to regard racism as typical of somewhere else, of some place or space other than their own, of some other community […] other than their own." Similarly, Eliassi (2015, 559) found that the Swedish social workers he interviewed considered that racism is something that occurs outside of the social services.

If a client complains about a worker being a racist towards them, it is often regarded that the client just did not like to hear or do what the worker told them to. This way, the worker implies that the client's experience of racism cannot be real because it is just a feeling. I read this as understanding racism mainly as "scientific"/biological racism rather than cultural racism, which refers to stereotyping and Othering practises and to obscuring power differences (Pred 2000, 72).

> *[…] I don't think that any worker would be with a person and be racist. It's a person's own feeling. For some reason, we have had to say things that s/he[10] hasn't liked and they experienced them as racism. But we don't have anyone in our team that I'd think, "now we have this kind of a family, this worker couldn't work with them." One couldn't work here.* [h]

Racism is understood as an unchanging property that some people have or do not have, instead of seeing that racism can also take place in certain, (unconscious) actions or ways of speaking (Pred 2000, 72; Tuori 2009, 97). In the following quote, the worker is culturalising the Roma as an inherently racist group of people, which paradoxically is a culturally racist statement. A recent Finnish survey research (Ombudsman for Minorities 2014) on the experiences on discrimination showed that 68,7 % of Finnish Roma have experienced discrimination in some area of life (e.g. work life, housing) within the past year, which is the highest rate among any ethnic group in Finland. The worker, however, distances herself from racism by taking the position of an outsider and observer of the racism between the clients at the shelter. The choice of using the personal pronoun "we" instead of "I" emphasises that this is an opinion that is commonly shared in the shelter, or at least it is wanted to present so.

---

[10] The third person pronoun (s/he = hän) is non-gender-specific in Finnish. The quotes, where it is obvious that the interviewees are referring to a female person, are translated using female pronouns.

We have noticed that the Roma people, they have a lot of racism, they're quite racist. And then, this is a bit surprising, for example, we have had two times that kind of Indian clients, that were like "black person, I absolutely don't want..." So yeah, it has been interesting to follow that some people have that racism. And when there is that, it's very strong, like childish disgust towards others.[i]

Racism between the clients is considered as child-like and when I asked how the workers deal with racism among the clients, the proposed solution was teaching them about tolerance and going through the shelters' rules together with the clients. Following Laclau and Mouffe's (1985, 127) idea of chains of equivalence, identities are always constructed relationally. Since the clients are positioned as child-like, the shelter workers get the opposite position as mother-like, whose task is to teach about tolerance, equality, independency, and the "right way" of being a Finnish woman. In this educative discourse, the clients get the subject positions as students and children, who need to be educated on gender equality, tolerance, and the 'modern' way of being a woman and mother. Similarly, the workers become teachers and mothers, who are educating and guiding the clients on the path to civilisation and modernisation.

Emphasising Equal Service

The educative discourse was resisted by denying the importance of culture in the shelter work and by emphasising the equal treatment of all the clients. Keskinen (2011, 161–164) has identified a similar discourse in her study on different welfare authorities' violence work and she named it 'universalist discourse.' In her data, almost all the interviewees were using this discourse and especially the shelter workers emphasised it, but in my data it was mainly outspoken by one shelter worker. In this speech, the shelter worker focuses on how all the clients are

in the shelter because of the violence and the violence is a phenomenon that exists everywhere in the world:

> *Violence is always such a universal phenomenon, there's exactly same kind of dominance in Finnish people's relationships. Of course the culture has significance for example in how a person is raised and through that what kind of worldview and a conception of human relationships s/he'll develop, but here we are because of violence and in that violence work the culture doesn't really matter.* [j]

The shelter worker admits that the cultural background can have some importance in how a person sees the world and acts in relationships, but it is not essential at the shelter. Nor is the culture, class or ethnicity of the "victim" or the perpetrator of the violence. The worker's professional mission is to treat everyone similarly and thus, no one is getting "special treatment," which usually has a negative connotation. This similarity is understood as equality (see also Juhila 2006, 109–111). This speech can be a response to the culturalising discourse and to the dichotomous divisions of the multicultural clients and ethnic Finnish clients in the shelters. Emphasising the similarities can be a way to distance oneself from the possibility to be called racist. Also, the possible existence of racism is completely denied at the shelter: "at least personally I wouldn't be working here if there was any racism or prejudices towards people here." This non-existence of racism is validated with the argument of the shelter's rule of treating everyone equally:

> *At least here we have departed from the point that our clients are all equal and everyone needs the same help. I don't think there's a need for any special treatment, it's just facing the person and proceeding with her/his things, it's the same for everyone.* [k]

This speech entails a double effect that Keskinen (2011, 162–163) calls 'the paradox of universalism.' A withdrawal from explaining the clients' situation being only a cultural matter and instead emphasising equal rights is a positive approach to the work. However, the other side of coin is that the universalist approach prevents the evaluation of relevant differences of the clients' life situations and positions. These could be, for instance, the clients' proficiency of Finnish, experiences of discrimination and racism and knowledge of the welfare system. This approach is visible in the shelters daily practice when the workers are discussing the need for interpreters for the clients. These discussions happened with many clients who do not speak Finnish fluently. Some workers were not willing to get an interpreter even when the clients' wish for an interpreter was known because the clients were expected to have the same service as everyone else. In this excerpt, the workers are discussing if they should order an interpreter for a Russian client:

- *We could book a meeting for her already tomorrow.*
- *Does she need a Russian interpreter?*
- *She speaks very good Finnish. She would manage well.*
- *But she has asked for an interpreter. It's her wish.*
- *Can we get a Russian interpreter so fast? There are quite many interpreters.*
- *Let's just have the meeting in Finnish.*
- *No, we should ask her first.*
- *Okay, so what should we discuss with her tomorrow then?*

Since the universalist approach to violence work denies the relevance of cultural differences, the idea of using specific working methods with multicultural clients is seen as unnecessary because everyone should be met as they are, not as a representative of their culture. Also, the violence work itself is understood as giving everyone the same information on violence (e.g. what is it and what kind of forms it can take), the welfare system, and the legislation (especially related to

crimes). Cultural competence is understood solely as cultural sensitivity and knowledge about cultures: one should know about "the other cultures" in order to avoid hurting anyone. This kind of understanding of cultural competence has been criticised to essentialise cultures and lacking analysis on power relations (e.g. Pon 2009; Sakamoto 2007). In the following quote, I asked the shelter worker if she thinks that violence work with multicultural clients require some specific skills:

> *Well, of course one has to have some kind of sensitivity towards that culture and that culture's demands and like that, but I can't somehow, for example, name any specific skills in myself. Somehow I just think that I'm meeting a person as a person. And I'm not necessary thinking about that culture so much when I'm dealing with violence. I give that person information, like, "well, according to the Finnish law it is like this." But of course one has to understand and know about those other cultures a little bit not to hurt someone or something.* [1]

The universalist discourse emphasising the equal and similar treatment of the clients is not only considering the clients' social background and position irrelevant but also the workers' (see also Keskinen 2011, 163). The strong faith in following the rules, giving everyone the same service, and treating everyone equally leads to thinking that also the client-worker relationship is power-equal. When I asked the interviewee if she thinks whether her position affects the client relationship somehow, she understood the question as being above someone in the social hierarchy and did not engage in reflecting on her position:

> *No, I don't have that kind of feeling. No, I don't have. I think, that I don't feel in anyway that I'd be above someone or like that. Since I have done this work, in general worked in the social service field, I have always thought that I take a person as a person, it's very important to me. I never think so with any other person either that, like. I just don't think the world like that way. I don't know.* [m]

I read this reluctance to reflect on the shelter worker's own position, similarly as the possibility of racism at the shelter, as awkwardness to question the ideal of universalism as a good practice that guarantees equality to everyone. As Keskinen (2011, 163) points out "what is understood as universal practices is actually a result of specific histories and that ideas of what counts as good practices have been defined by certain actors." Similarly, Eliassi (2015, 557) claims "dominant groups tend to universalize their particular cultures and experiences into a universal objectivity and impose themselves as the normative point of comparison for judgment and evaluation of identities and cultural differences." Thus, what seem to be good practices from a white Finnish perspective might not seem good at all from other positions. Actually, the universal practices are particularities that gained hegemonic status in the society and they are embedded in cultural ideas and perceptions. Anttonen *et al.* (2012, 9) and Juhila (2006, 109–111) also remind that even though the core idea of universalism is the equal treatment of people, it does not require similar services to everyone – quite the contrary, giving similar services can lead to inequality.

Recognising the Multiple Differences

There is also another counter-discourse to both the universalist and educative discourse, which however, is not as dominant and established than the other two. As Foucault (1998/1976, 100) states, discourses are not just divided into dominant and dominated or accepted and excluded, but there is always "a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies." In this discourse, the clients' ethnicity or migratory background is thought to be relevant but not an all-embracing quality in the client's situation and in the violence work. This way of approaching the clients and the work is stressing the importance of intersecting divisions (such as gender, age, education, class, lifestyles, etc.) in the clients' situations and also their right to define the content of the violence work at the shelter. This kind of individual-intersectional discourse was outspoken mainly

by one interviewed shelter worker, but also mentioned by other interviewees. In the following quote, I asked the shelter worker if the ethnic Finns and the multicultural clients differ somehow as client groups:

In that sense our ethnic Finns are different that some can, that they master this society more often. That they can do more. They have native Finnish language skills and a conception of the benefit jungle[11] and they have more often a work place and for example the landlords are not discriminating them because of their name or looks. That way maybe they are not needed to help in so many things, it's enough to tell them that it would be good or this way it would be good and they do it by themselves. But then other clients we are helping sometimes hands-on and we function as kind of advocates. But then of course one has to remember that there's so much variation within these minorities because their life stories both in the departure country and now here vary a lot.[n]

In this quote, the shelter worker is reminding that the multicultural clients are very heterogeneous and should not be thought of as one homogeneous group that is something opposite to Finnish clients. Their situation is not only evaluated based on their ethnicity or country of origin but also their level of Finnish, knowledge of the welfare system and their position in Finland as possibly racialised and discriminated people are taken into consideration. Also, in the interview, it is pointed out that sometimes a migrant client can have more in common with a Finnish client than a client from the same country if, for instance, one is from countryside and does not have much of education whereas another is from a bigger city and has a degree. This way the shelter worker wants to challenge the dichotomous division between Us and Them, the West and the Rest. Also, the culturising discourse of Middle-Eastern (especially Muslim) people as inherently gender-unequal is contested. In the following quote, the interviewee is describing

---

[11] The welfare benefit system is often referred as a 'benefit jungle' ('tukiviidakko' in Finnish) because there is many different kinds of social benefits that are granted from separate institutions and thus, it is oftentimes confusing for the clients and even the welfare workers themselves.

her experiences of violence work related to so-called honour-related violence with migrant clients from the Middle East:

> *In the stories they tell, a story is a bit wrong word, but how they life has been, how it has been in the home country and how it has changed when coming here, there comes up this kind of respect of women and wives, that's common in their culture, that woman's task is to be a good mother and wife and it's for them, and the man takes care of the subsistence, that's equality for them. The work is shared and it's a matter of honour to be a good partner. I think that's equality because things are taken care of together and the other doesn't feel that they're abused or oppressed. Unfortunately, the situation sometimes changes in Finland. The arrangement changes if the man doesn't get a job and if the [extended] family isn't here to support them, they're facing racism and discrimination. I'm not saying that it's been charmed and lovely in their own home country, but what they're telling about their culture and what's the position of women, it's not oppressed in general.* °

The shelter worker emphasises the importance of the social structures both in the departure country and in Finland in understanding how the clients' lives are shaped and the violence that happens under these circumstances. Anna Korteweg and Gökçe Yurdakul (2010, 4) claim that "honour-related violence is a form of violence against women that is shaped within the intersections of the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious, ethnic and class dynamics of the immigrant-receiving country, and the specific positioning of immigrant communities within this context." Also Yuval-Davis (1997, 46) underlines the importance of the context of migration in understanding honour-related violence: if migrants as individuals and/or as a collectivity are feeling threatened in a new country and culture, "the cultural traditions and the (re)invention of cultural traditions are often used as ways of legitimizing the control and oppression of women."

Instead of starting to teach about gender equality or the "Finnish way" of doing things, the shelter worker wants to make the clients think about their violence experiences without taking the position of an expert. On the contrary, the shelter worker emphasises that the clients know the best about their own lives. The plan for the violence work during the shelter period is done together with the client and if the client is not willing to open up, it is respected and not considered as a cultural problem that needs to be changed. As it comes up in various interviews and during the meeting observations, many shelter workers experience that it is difficult to get some clients to open up and discuss their experiences. This is connected especially to clients from Asian countries and "the Asian culture" is seen as a difficulty in the violence work (see Anis 2005, 13). In the following quote, the shelter worker describes her way of doing violence work with multicultural clients:

> *I'm not the person who goes to tell them [multicultural clients] that they are doing something wrong or it's in their culture and they have to change. My working method is that I help them to think how it feels and could it be different and if it was, what would the relationship be like. And maybe I start off from [asking], what function has the violence had and how important is that function in the relationship. I always have that kind of idealistic feeling that it would be so lovely if those women left this shelter the way that their model of relationship had changed somehow. That they wouldn't then seek a new man and continue the same again.*

[...]

It always depends on how you can connect with that person and if that person wants to have a connection to us helpers, if one can call as such. But I don't think, at least related to violence, that now I need to work somehow differently [with the multicultural clients]. Already because you don't know how much that person wants to process their situation. It can be that some have it like "now I have gotten away and now I just want to continue with my life. That I don't want to brood those things that have happened." So this way with our crisis work, sometimes you just can't do it because the person doesn't want to deal with them [the experiences]. Sometimes the crisis work is just that you offer a roof over the head and offer a place where it's peaceful and safe and where there's food served. It depends so much on what the person has had the most lack of and what s/he then needs the most. But then some have a very big need to talk and open up. It depends so much on the person. [P]

Also Keskinen (2011, 164–167) identified similar kind of individual discourse in her study on violence work and welfare authorities, but in her data the interviewees are not bringing up the social structural aspects and intersecting categories that shape the lives and situations of the clients. Also, in her data, this kind of discourse was not as established as the dominant discourses of culturisation and universalism. As Keskinen (2011, 167) points out, there is a pitfall in individualisation of the clients' situation because also the culture has a role in how the violence is experienced and thus, the violence should be "seen in its historically specific context that is a result of social, cultural, political, and economic processes." However, as Eliassi (2015, 568) reminds, the "over-reliance on culture to explain the behavior of immigrant clients tend to exclude other important factors such as poverty, unemployment, housing conditions, social isolation, and ethnic discrimination when interventions are formulated and determined in relation to a problematic social situation." In other words, in the

violence work, the shelter workers should in an ideal situation take the differences that matter into the consideration: these can be, for instance, the clients' individual subjectivity and experiences but also their social relations to the society, (dis)identification to the diasporic community, their position in the labour market, etc. (Keskinen 2011, 167).

Talking For and Against

The shelters have workers' meetings called 'reports' ('raportti' in Finnish) where they are sharing the information on the situations of the current clients and making plans for further work with them. During these meetings previously presented different ways of speaking about the clients are visible and they are contesting each other. As Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 47) state, "no discourse can be fully established, it is always in conflict with other discourses that define reality differently and set other guidelines for social action." In this following conversation excerpt, the workers are discussing a case of a female Thai client. The client has not been talking much about her violence experience and has said to one worker that she does not want to tell her story to many people (as in the shelter all the workers work with all the clients):

- *She needs conversation help to handle her experiences.*
- *She doesn't want to talk to everyone about her private matters.*
- *Maybe we should decrease the contact with the shelter workers then.*
- *We had this similar kind of client before… This woman from Asia. Small, lovely girl, like a fairy…*
- *The Asian women keep everything to themselves. The culture and traditions say differently what they should bear and take [than here in Finland].*
- *Then she'll get back to home and realise that she should've spoken to someone.*

- *But it's so clear what she wants: to break up [with the partner] and not to talk about it.*
- *Would it help to have an interpreter in the meeting with her?*
- *The third part in the conversation from her own culture could have an impact on what she wants to speak.*
- *It can be that speaking isn't fitting [method to deal with violence experience] to everyone.*

In this excerpt, the shelter workers are disagreeing if the client should be made to open up about her experiences. From the universalist perspective, all the clients are provided with conversation help at the shelter and also expected to take the help, since it is considered essential for them to process their possibly very traumatic experiences. However, as the shelter workers bring it up both in the interviews and in the meetings, they have difficulties with some multicultural clients opening up. One reason for this is considered to be their culture, like in this conversation, the shelter worker is claiming that the Asian culture and traditions are the reason why the client has experiences of violence and does not want to talk about it. The whole continent is reduced to have one culture where women do not defend themselves nor complain about their situation. Thus, the Asian women are depicted as passive victims and their culture as trapping them to these victim positions. As Anis (2005, 16–17) points out, "[i]f 'culture' is used as an explanation for difficulties, ethnic groups might be categorized as entities having certain problems. Therefore, it is important for social workers to assess both individual and cultural elements in each client's situation." In this conversation, there is, however, also resistance for the culturising speech. One shelter worker is proposing that maybe the reason for her behaviour is not the client's culture but her individual characteristics – maybe conversation help is not the right method for processing her experiences. There are also other situations where the clients' ways of behaving are culturised and/or considered difficult. For example, in this following excerpt the workers have offered the client some second-hand baby clothes that the shelter has gotten as charity. The clothes are stored on the cellar

floor, which is not a very pleasant looking place and the client did not want to take the offered clothes:

- *Muslim women don't usually take used clothes.*
- *Our [Muslim] clients don't want them.*
- *They're so demanding.*
- *Well, I wouldn't necessarily take them either.*
- *It's so good that we have had some Finnish clients so we have gotten rid of some clothes.*

Some workers interpreted the client's refusal to take the clothes as the client being difficult and demanding, even though the client has the right to say no to help that she does not want. The Muslim clients are constructed as opposite to Finnish clients, who are willing to receive help and to wear second-hand clothing. However, one of the (ethnic Finnish) workers tries to defend the clients by saying that she would not necessarily want to take those clothes either – it is not a cultural question. In the following excerpt, the client has been in the shelter for 1,5 months now and the workers are getting frustrated that she is not leaving:

- *She doesn't get anything done.*
- *She has an interesting way to deal with this.*
- *I wonder if it's her persona?*
- *I wonder if something bad has happened to her with authorities?*
- *Women don't always understand that kids don't like it here [in the shelter for too long].*
- *She has always the same style: "If you don't find me an apartment, I will go to live in a tent, there it's safe at least."*
- *She is a bit difficult.*

[A week later]

- *She's been here for too long. And what can we do about it?*
- *Why doesn't she understand that she can't be in the shelter anymore? For god's sake, there are other families needing support!*

The shelter clients are helped to find a new apartment in the (most common) case they are not able to return to their home after the shelter period. The shelter workers seem to consider one month to be a normal limit for the shelter period. In this client case, the client had not shown up to the appointments with a shelter worker so that they could make housing applications together. The workers seem to have a presupposition that difficulties in the cooperation with the multicultural clients are usually based on cultural differences but now they are wondering if it could instead be something about her persona or bad experiences with authorities. However, the shelter workers are not discussing if their approach is suitable or what could they do differently.

In one interview, while discussing cultural competence and cultural sensitivity, the shelter worker started to discuss the way of talking and joking when the workers are discussing the client cases. She feels that the dominant discourse on the multicultural clients is "stereotypical," which I read as she is resisting the culturalising speech:

> *Every now and then our work team's way of talking about immigrants and their sense of humour annoys me. Sometimes it's so, such stereotypical. At times I try to speak against it, but then I'm just a killjoy. Mostly I'm quiet or I realise only afterwards that how stupid thing I happened to laugh at.* [q]

The interviewee wants to talk against the jokes that are portraying their clients in a stereotypical way, but is afraid to spoil the good mood by pointing them out. Since both in the interviews and in the meetings the culturising speech is the most

dominant, it is difficult to contest it, especially if the culturising is veiled in humour. During the meetings, the workers were jokingly saying things on the clients that are meant harmless but are nevertheless culturising, stereotyping and exoticising, such as "apparently she has this African concept of time, 'soon'," "maybe it's her Asian efficiency," or as in the first example conversation excerpt "this woman from Asia. Small, lovely girl, like a fairy…" In the following excerpt, the workers were discussing language skills of one Indian client, who is not speaking much Finnish even though the workers think the client's Finnish is good:

- *I can speak Indian.*
- *Well, say something.*
- *Ni hao. [The worker presses her hands together and bows]*
   [The workers are laughing]

The worker proposes that she can speak "Indian," even though there is no such language, as there are dozens of separate languages spoken in India. Her reply is a formal greeting in Chinese. These kinds of jokes are meant innocently, but actually they are presenting people and their cultures in a stereotyping and essentialising way and thus, the jokes are culturally racist (see Pon 2009; Pred 2000, 66). The joke is not resisted by any worker at the meeting. However, as the interviewee stated, it can be difficult to go against the dominant way of speaking and making jokes in a group, because it is considered as being a "killjoy" or a "tight-ass," as the interviewee also described the uncomfortable position of pointing out the culturising speech.

Avoiding Discussion on Power Relations

One of my research questions in this study is how the shelter workers are reflecting on their own position related to the multicultural clients. It was common that when I asked the interviewees to reflect on their position (for instance, as a white middle-class shelter worker) when working with multicultural clients, they were not very eager to engage in discussion on possible power differences and sometimes had trouble understanding my question. It was often understood as if I mean if they "feel superior" in relation to their clients. In many interviews, I opened up my question a little bit more by giving examples, but the shelter workers seemed uncomfortable discussing the topic.

Eliassi (2015, 568) found a similar tendency in his study on Swedish social workers: "[a]lthough the social workers demonstrated openness toward learning about the cultures of immigrants, they omitted to discuss cultural differences in the light of unequal power relations and history of dominance where non-European cultures are often stigmatized and pathologized for lacking modernity, enlightenment, rationality, and democratic values." In my view, this reluctance is a sign of the uncomfortableness of admitting and/or questioning the worker's own privileged position, but also a sign of how little the topic is discussed in the social work education. As Ranta-Tyrkkö (2011, 34) points out, colonialism and power inequalities are topics that the Finnish social work education are rarely, if ever, covered. This is consistent with my personal experience of having a bachelor's degree in social work from a Finnish university.

However, one of the interviewees, who was also emphasising an individual and intersectional approach to the client work, was considering that her relationship with the clients is not power-equal and she also might take the role of a "motherly guide" towards the clients sometimes. The worker wants to resist this kind of authoritative role and is striving for a dialogical client relationship where the

client's knowledge is as valid as the worker's. The worker experiences that, for her, it is important to share her power through empowerment:

> *I would say that sometimes it affects. But when I notice that, for example, the client somehow experiences that I was somehow above her/him or that I was some authority, or I was some motherly guide, then I try to get out of that role very fast with different means. I find particularly the empowering of women very important and to be like a mirror to the women, that if I could share something from my power to them, it's through that mirroring, that "you're as capable as me."* [r]

Empowerment is a very central term in the social and health care field but also in (black) feminism (Tuori 2009, 167). It is a contested term that can refer to gaining inner power (e.g. strength) in the form of raised consciousness and knowledge and capacity to take care of oneself, or it can be understood as power over someone (e.g. domination). Also, it can refer to empowering oneself or to empower someone else. Empowerment has been criticised to be impossible if it is understood as empowering someone else: "it implies a power relation over another, and therefore contradicts the whole idea of empowerment" (*Ibid.,* 169). In this interview context, the shelter worker understands empowering as sharing her power by raising the client's consciousness of their capabilities and as being an example of a powerful person. However, I do not read this as being an example of the "right kind" of a Finn or a woman (which is common in the culturising speech), as the worker also emphasises the strength some clients get from Islam and from their big families in the same context when she was discussing empowerment.

Similar to Eliassi (2015) and Keskinen's (2011) studies, the shelter workers were not eager to discuss racism among the workers. In all the interviews, it was denied because of its impossibility in shelter work. The understanding of racism seems to be restricted to biological racism within the studied shelters. Tuori (2009, 165)

points out that both in Finnish multicultural politics and research racism is hardly ever mentioned. Instead, the emphasis is on "positive" things such as tolerance, cultural competence and promoting good ethnic relations. Also Satu Ranta-Tyrkkö (2011, 33) states that because the colonial complicity is denied in Finland, it is difficult to recognise racism as part of social structures and thus, it is thought of as individual cases and as a form of "bad behaviour" (see also Pred 2000). Foucault (1998/1978, 27) has stated that 'silence' both as things that are "forbidden to name" or that "one declines to say", are "an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses." Thus, silence can operate as a tool to establish and sustain power and exclusion.

Conclusion

The overall aim of this master's thesis was to explore multicultural violence work at shelters in Finland from a feminist postcolonial perspective, and particularly to identify the discourses the shelter workers are drawing upon when talking about multicultural clients, the violence they have experienced, the workers' own position and working methods. To answer the research questions, I conducted four semi-structured interviews and six observations of shelter workers' client case meetings in two separate shelters with culturally diverse clienteles. The data was analysed by using discourse analytical approach. I identified one main way of speaking, 'educative discourse' and two counter-discourses, 'universalist' and 'individual-intersectional.' The individual-intersectional discourse was both resisting the educative and the universalist discourse. These discourses were mixed, contradicting, and contested both within the same interviews and also in the observed client case meetings. The interviewees, especially the ones applying the educative and universalist discourse, were not eager to discuss their own position in relation to the multicultural clients from a power perspective. They also denied the possibility of racism among the shelter workers.

In the educative discourse, the shelter workers positioned the clients as students who need to be educated on gender equality, tolerance towards others, and the Finnish way of being a woman and mother. Thus, the workers get the opposite subject position as teachers. The workers were also describing their relation to the clients as motherly, which gives the clients the position of children. The multicultural clients' cultures were essentialised to be inherently gender-unequal, traditional, and especially the female clients were thought to be in need of modernising. In a colonial context, this is called a civilising mission, and as the previous postcolonial studies in the Nordic countries show, the civilising mission in the contemporary Nordic welfare state takes the form of educating Others on gender equality (Mulinari *et al*. 2009, 23–24). As many postcolonial scholars (e.g. McClintock 1995; Mohanty 2003; Saïd 1978) have pointed out, the West

legitimises its domination and civilising mission by constructing the East with terms such as backwards, traditional, barbaric, uncivilised, religious and irrational. Thus, the West creates its self-definition as everything opposite of this: modern, civilised, enlightened and rational. When social workers and other welfare authorities are culturising the clients' social problems as deriving from Their traditional and gender-unequal cultures, and thus, positioning themselves as having the mission to educate and civilise the clients, they take part in the construction of a dichotomous division between Us and the Others (e.g. Eliassi 2015; Keskinen 2011; Tuori 2009; Ranta-Tyrkkö 2011).

The universalist discourse emphasises equal service and the similar needs of all clients. The client's cultural background is seen as irrelevant for the violence work and the discourse is resisting the culturising discourse. However, Keskinen (2011, 162–163) has stated that there is a paradox in this discourse: even the differences that matter are not considered and thus, in the end the clients do not get the equal service since their individual and multiple differences are not acknowledged. Also, the possibility of racism and unequal power relations are denied based on the equal treatment principle. The individual-intersectional discourse was the least applied and established in the research data. It was resisting both the educative and universalist discourses and it was stressing the importance of considering individual, cultural and structural factors in the clients' situation. Also, the clients' own understanding of their situation was emphasised: the worker's role is not to educate the clients but empower them – support them to find and use their own resources. It is also acknowledged that the relationship between the worker and the client is not power-equal and thus, the workers need to reflect on their own position and actions. The equality principle is very central in social work, but as Juhila (2006, 109–111) points out, equal service does not require similar service. On the contrary, to do ethically high-quality social work, the individual needs and differences, structural factors and also the (dis)identification with the cultural group has to taken into consideration (see Keskinen 2011, 167).

In my data, all the interviewees denied the existence of racism within the shelter workers. However, the clients were often described as being racist and in need of tolerance education. The racism was understood mainly as biological and as something that happens outside of the social services (see Eliassi 2015, 559). If racism and power relations are not discussed as part of multicultural social work, it is impossible to deconstruct these structures. This directly affects the service multicultural clients get at social services. (See Tuori 2009, 165.) The principles of treating everyone equally, having an intersectional approach to the clients' situations, challenging negative discrimination, and recognising diversity are in the core ethics of social work (IFSW, 2012). Thus, I propose that the education of the professionals in the field of social services in Finland should bring more perspectives on the colonial complicity of the Nordic welfare state, power relations in the client-worker relationship, and cultural racism when discussing cultural competence in social work.

My results are in line with previous studies, especially with Anis (2005), Eliassi (2015) and Keskinen's (2009) research on multicultural client work. All of these studies applied discourse analysis as a method and, at least to some extent, intersectional and postcolonial approaches as theories. These studies did not cover so much the workers' reflections on their working methods or positions as this study did. Especially cultural competence is a hardly covered topic in a Finnish research context. Thus, there is a need to study power relations and working methods in multicultural client work in future research. Also, there is a need for research on the multicultural social work from the clients' perspectives and experiences.

References

Amnesty International (2016) Amnesty International Report 2015/16. The State of the World's Human Rights. Online: https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/pol10/2552/2016/en/ (Accessed 16 March 2016).

Anis, Merja (2005) Talking about culture in social work encounters: immigrant families and child welfare in Finland. European Journal of Social Work: 8 (1), 3–19. DOI: 10.1080/1369145042000331341.

Anttonen, Anneli & Häikiö, Liisa & Stefánsson, Kolbeinn & Sipilä, Jorma (2012) Universalism and the challenge of diversity. In: Anneli Anttonen, Liisa Häikiö and Kolbeinn Stefánsson (eds.) Welfare State, Universalism and Diversity. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Anttonen, Anneli & Sipilä, Jorma (2010) Universalismi Britannian ja Pohjoismaiden sosiaalipolitiikassa (Universalism in British and Nordic Social Policy). Janus: 18 (2), 104–120.

Baumann, Gerd (1999) The Multicultural Riddle. Rethinking National, Ethnic, and Religious Identities. New York & London: Routledge.

Burr, Vivien (1995) An Introduction to Social Constructionism. London: Sage.

CEDAW (2014) Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Concluding observations on the seventh periodic report of Finland 2014.

Crenshaw, Kimberle (1993) 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color'. Stanford Law Review: 43 (6), 1241–1299. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039 (Accessed 4 February 2016).

Eliassi, Barzoo (2015) Constructing cultural Otherness within the Swedish welfare state: The cases of social workers in Sweden. Qualitative Social Work: 14 (4), 554–571. DOI: 10.1177/1473325014559091.

Foucault, Michel (1994/1977) Truth and Power. In: James Faubion (ed.) Michel Foucault. Power. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Third volume. New York: The New Press, 111–133.

Foucault, Michel (1998/1978) The History of Sexuality: 1. The Will to Knowledge. London: Penguin Books.

FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2014) Violence against Women: an EU-Survey. Main Results. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Online: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results_en.pdf (Accessed 4 February 2016).

Haraway, Donna (1998) 'Situated Knowledges'. Feminist Studies, 14 (3), 575–599. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3178066 (Accessed 14 May 2016).

Hearn, Jeff (1998) Violences of Men. How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women. London: Sage.

Hernes, Helga (1987) Welfare State and Woman Power: Essays in State Feminism. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Humphries, Beth & Martin, Marion (2000) Disrupting Ethics in Social Sciences. In: Beth Humphries (ed.) Research in Social Care & Social Welfare. Issues and Debates for Practice. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 69–85.

Huttunen, Laura & Löytty, Olli & Rastas, Anna (2005) Suomalainen monikulttuurisuus (Finnish Multiculturalism [my translation]). In: Anna Rastas, Laura Huttunen and Olli Löytty (eds.) Suomalainen vieraskirja. Kuinka käsitellä monikulttuurisuutta. (Finnish guest book. How to deal with multiculturalism [my translation]). Tampere: Vastapaino, 16–40.

IFSW – International Federation of Social Workers (2012) Statement of Ethical Principles. Online: http://ifsw.org/policies/statement-of-ethical-principles/ (Accessed 14 May 2016).

Jokinen, Arja & Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993) Diskursiivinen maailma. Teoreettiset lähtökohdat ja analyyttiset käsitteet (Discursive World. Theoretical Starting Points and Analytical Concepts [my translation]). In: Arja Jokinen, Kirsi Juhila and Eero Suoninen (eds.) Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset (The ABC of Discourse Analysis [my translation]). Tampere: Vastapaino, 17–47.

Juhila, Kirsi (2006) Sosiaalityöntekijöinä ja asiakkaina. Sosiaalityön yhteiskunnalliset tehtävät ja paikat (As Social Workers and Clients. The Societal Assignments and Positions of Social Work [my translation]). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2002) Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. London: Sage.

Kelly, Liz (2008) Combating Violence Against Women: Minimum Standards for Support Services. Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Online: http://www.coe.int/t/dg2/equality/domesticviolencecampaign/Source/EG-VAW-CONF(2007)Study%20rev.en.pdf (Accessed 16 March 2016).

Keskinen, Suvi (2009) 'Honour-Related Violence' and Nordic Nation-Building. In: Suvi Keskinen, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni & Diana Mulinari (eds.) Complying with Colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region. Aldershot: Ashgate, 257–272.

Keskinen, Suvi (2010) Sukupuolistunut väkivalta (Gendered Violence [my translation]). In: Tuija Saaresmaa, Leena-Maija Rossi & Tuula Juvonen (eds.) Käsikirja sukupuoleen (Guide to Gender [my translation]). Tampere: Vastapaino, 243–254.

Keskinen, Suvi (2011) Troublesome Differences – Dealing with Gendered Violence, Ethnicity, and 'Race' in the Finnish Welfare State. Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention: 12, 153–172. DOI:10.1080/14043858.2011.622075.

Korteweg, Anna & Yurdakul, Gökçe (2010) Religion, Culture and the Politicization of Honour-Related Violence. United Nations Programme Paper Number 12 October 2010. Online: http://www.eui.eu/Documents/RSCAS/Research/MWG/201011/11-10-KortewegAndYurdakul.pdf (Accessed 6 May 2016).

Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal (1985) Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. London: Verso.

Laine, Terhi (2010) Turvakodit Suomessa (Shelters in Finland [my translation]). Yhteiskuntapolitiikka: 75 (2), 194–202. Online: http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe201209117708 (Accessed 20 March 2016).

Lehtonen, Mikko & Löytty, Olli (2007) Suomiko toista maata? (Otherworldly Finland? [my translation]). In: Joel Kuortti, Mikko Lehtonen and Olli Löytty (eds.) Kolonialismin jäljet. Keskustat, periferiat ja Suomi (Traces of Colonialism. Centres, peripheries and Finland. [my translation]). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Loomba, Ania (1998) Colonialism/ Postcolonialism. London: Routlegde.

Lutz, Helma (1997) The Limits of European-ness. Immigrant women in Fortress Europe. Feminist Review: 57, 93–111. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1395803 (Accessed 2 February 2016).

McClintock, Anne (1995) Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context. London: Routledge.

Mulinari, Diana & Keskinen, Suvi & Irni, Sari & Tuori, Salla (2009) Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Nordic Models of Welfare and Gender. In: Suvi Keskinen, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari (eds.) Complying with Colonialism. Gender Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region. Aldershot: Ashgate, 16–46.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade (2003) Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity. Duke University Press.

NYTKIS ry (Naisjärjestöt Yhteistyössä – Kvinnoorganisationer I Samarbete – The Coalition of Finnish Women's Associations) (2016) Written information from Finnish NGOs' on the CEDAW Committee's concluding observations 10 March 2014. Online: http://nytkis.org/doc/FinlandCEDAWNGOsFinal2016April.pdf (Accessed 5 May 2016).

Ojuri, Auli & Laitinen, Merja (2015) Turvakoti työnä. Selvitys Ensi- ja turvakotien liiton jäsenyhdistysten turvakotityön sisällöistä ja vaikutuksista. (Shelter as a Work. A Report on the Contents and Efficacy of the Shelter Work in the Member Associations of the Federation of Mother and Child Homes and Shelters [my translation]). Ensi- ja turvakotien liitto ry (The Federation of Mother and Child Homes and Shelters). Online: http://www.e-julkaisu.fi/ensi_ja_turvakotien_liitto/turvakoti_tyona/ (Accessed 13 April 2016).

Ombudsman for Minorities (2014) Being Different in Everyday Life – Survey on Roma's Experiences of Discrimination. Summary. Online: http://www.syrjinta.fi/documents/10181/10850/54366_romanitutkimus_tiivistelma_eng_final.pdf/555a7857-41b2-48f2-848b-224c5a32f665 (Accessed 30 April 2016).

Orange, Richard (2016, Jan 8) Unprecedented Sex Harrasment in Helsinki at New Year, Finnish Police Report. The Telegraph. Online: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/finland/12088332/Unprecedented-sex-harassment-in-Helsinki-at-New-Year-Finnish-police-report.html (Accessed 20 March 2016).

Pietikäinen, Sari & Mäntynen, Anne (2009) Kurssi kohti diskurssia (Course towards Discourse [my translation]). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Pon, Gordon (2009) Cultural competency as new racism: An ontology of forgetting. Journal of Progressive Human Services: 20 (1), 59–71. DOI:10.1080/1042823090271173.

Potter, Jonathan & Wetherell, Margaret (1987) Discourse and Social Psychology. Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour. London: Sage.

Pred, Allan (2000) Even in Sweden. Racisms, Racialized Spaces, and the Popular Geographical Imagination. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ranta-Tyrkkö, Satu (2011) High time for postcolonial analysis in social work. Nordic Social Work Research: 1 (1), 25–41.
DOI:10.1080/2156857X.2011.562032.

Rauhala, Pirkko-Liisa & Virokannas, Elina (2011) Sosiaalityön tutkimuksen etiikka, opettaminen ja tietoarvo (The Ethics, Teaching and Knowledge Value of Social Work Research [my translation]). In: Aini Pehkonen and Marja Väänänen-Fomin (eds.) Sosiaalityön arvot ja etiikka (The Values and Ethics of Social Work [my translation]). Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 235–255.

Rosendahl, Jussi & Forsell, Tuomas (2016, Jan 13) Anti-immigrant 'Soldiers of Odin' raise concern in Finland. Reuters. Online: http://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-finland-idUSKCN0UR20G20160113 (Accessed 30 April 2016).

Saïd, Edward (1978) Orientalism. London: Routledge.

Sakamoto, Izumi (2007) An Anti-Oppressive Approach to Cultural Competence. Canadian Social Work Review: 24 (1), 105–118. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41669865 (Accessed 12 May 2016).

Siim, Birte & Borchorst, Anette (2010) The Multicultural Challenge to the Danish Welfare State: Tensions between Gender Equality and Diversity. In: Janet Fink and Åsa Lundqvist (eds.) Changing Relations of Welfare. Family, gender and migration in Britain and Scandinavia. Surrey: Ashgate, 133–154.

Sokoloff, Natalie & Dupont, Ida (2005) Domestic Violence at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender. Challenges and Contributions to Understanding Violence Against Marginalized Women in Diverse Communities. Violence Against Women: 11 (1), 38–64. DOI:10.1177/1077801204271476.

Soydan, Haluk & Williams, Charlotte (1998) Exploring concepts. In: Charlotte Williams, Haluk Soydan and Mark R. D. Johnson (eds.) Social Work and Minorities. European Perspectives. London: Routledge, 3–19.

Sue, Derald Wing & Sue, David (2012) Counseling the Culturally Diverse: Theory and Practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

TENK (Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta – Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity) (2009) Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review. Helsinki. Online: http://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/ethicalprinciples.pdf (Accessed 13 May 2016).

Thapar-Björkert, Suruchi (2009) Conversations across Borders: Men and Honour Related Violence in U.K. and Sweden. Norma – Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies: 4 (1), 46–65.

THL (Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitos – National Institute for Health and Welfare) (2015) Valtion rahoitusta saavat turvakodit päätetty (The Shelters Receiving State-Funding Have Been Selected [my translation]). Online: https://www.thl.fi/fi/-/valtion-rahoitusta-saavat-turvakodit-paatetty (Accessed 16 March 2016).

Tuori, Salla (2009) The Politics of Multicultural Encounters: Feminist Postcolonial Perspective. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Vuori, Jaana (2009) Guiding Migrants to the Realm of Gender Equality. In: Suvi Keskinen, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari (eds.) Complying with Colonialism. Gender Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region. Aldershot: Ashgate, 378–409.

Vuorela, Ulla (2009) Colonial Complicity: The 'Postcolonial' in a Nordic Context. In: Suvi Keskinen, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni and Diana Mulinari (eds.) Complying with Colonialism. Gender Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region. Aldershot: Ashgate, 48–74.

Yan, Miu Chung (2005) How Cultural Awareness Works: An Empirical Examination of the Interaction between Social Workers and Their Clients. Canadian Social Work Review: 22 (1), 5–29. Online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41669820 (Accessed 12 May 2016).

Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997) Gender & nation. London: Sage.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (2006) Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. European Journal of Women's Studies: 13 (3), 193–209.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Letter to the Shelters

Translated into English:

I am doing my Master's thesis in Social Work at Lund University during the spring of 2016. I am interested in the violence work with multicultural clients in shelters. I am especially interested in how violence workers are defining the violence the clients have experienced and how the violence experiences of multicultural clients are differing from the violence ethnic Finns have experienced. As a background for this study there is the idea of cultural competence that is considered an important work model with multicultural clients in the field of welfare and health care. I would also like to research what the violence workers think about this work model.

To gather my study's data I would like to interview approximately five shelter's instructors and participate as an observer in workers' meetings on client cases. The participation in the study is completely voluntary and participants have the right to ask for more information or opt out of the research at any time. The research data is confidential: I will not share it with third parties and I do not store or reveal the identities of the participants.

My Master's thesis course lasts from mid-January until mid-May. Thus, I have planned to gather the data during February and March so that there is enough time left for the analysis and writing of the study. I will gladly share the completed thesis with the shelter that participated in the study.

For more information:
B.Soc.Sc. Annika Aalto, [email, phone number]

Supervisor: Ph.D. Malinda Andersson, [email]

The Original in Finnish:

Teen sosiaalityön pro gradu -tutkielmaa (Master's thesis) Lundin yliopistoon Ruotsiin keväällä 2016. Olen kiinnostunut turvakotien sosiaaliohjaajien tekemästä väkivaltatyöstä monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden parissa. Minua kiinnostaa erityisesti se, miten väkivaltatyöntekijät määrittelevät asiakkaiden kohtaamaa väkivaltaa ja miten monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden väkivaltakokemukset eroavat Suomen kantaväestön väkivallasta. Tutkimuksen taustalla on ajatus kulttuurisesta kompetenssista, jonka ajatellaan olevan tärkeä työmalli sosiaali- ja terveysalan työssä monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden parissa. Haluaisin myös tutkia, mitä väkivaltatyöntekijät ajattelevat tästä työmallista.

Tutkimukseni aineiston keräämiseksi haluaisin haastatella noin viittä turvakodin ohjaajaa ja osallistua havainnoitsijan roolissa työntekijöiden yhteisiin kokouksiin, joissa käsitellään asiakastapauksia. Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on täysin vapaaehtoista ja osallistujilla on oikeus kysyä lisätietoja tai kieltäytyä tutkimuksesta missä tahansa tutkimuksen vaiheessa. Tutkimustiedot ovat luottamuksellisia: en luovuta niitä ulkopuolisille, enkä säilytä tai paljasta tutkimukseen osallistuvien henkilötietoja.

Pro gradu -kurssini kestää tammikuun puolesta välistä toukokuun puoleen väliin saakka. Täten olen suunnitellut, että tutkimuksen aineiston keruu olisi hyvä suorittaa helmi-maaliskuun aikana, jolloin aineiston analyysiin ja tutkielman kirjoittamiseen jää tarpeeksi aikaa. Jaan valmiin tutkielmani mielelläni tutkimukseen osallistuneen turvakodin käyttöön.

Lisätietoja:
VTK Annika Aalto, [sähköpostiosoite, puhelinnumero]
Ohjaaja: Ph.D. Malinda Andersson, [sähköpostiosoite]

Appendix 2: Consent Form

Translated into English:

The research data, collected by interviews, is part of my Master's thesis in Social Work at Lund University where I am looking at shelters' multicultural violence work.

The interviews are completely anonymous and the participants cannot be identified from the research report. The data collected by interviews will be handled strictly confidentially and will be used only in this research. The interview recordings and the interview transcriptions will be destroyed immediately after completing the research. The research report will be published electronically in the database of Lund University.

I give my consent to use the interview for the above-mentioned Master's thesis at Lund University with the above-mentioned terms. The participation in the study is voluntary and I can ask for more information or opt out of the interview at any time.

_____

Signature and printed name

The Original in Finnish:

Haastatteluin kerätty tutkimusaineisto on osa Lundin yliopistossa tehtävää sosiaalityön pro gradu (Master's Thesis) –tutkielmaa, jossa tarkastellaan turvakotien monikulttuurista väkivaltatyötä.

Haastattelut ovat täysin anonyymeja eikä haastateltavia voi tunnistaa tutkimusraportista. Haastatteluissa kerättyä aineistoa käsitellään ehdottoman luottamuksellisesti ja käytetään vain tässä tutkimuksessa. Haastatteluäänitteet sekä äänitteiden kirjalliset tallenteet tuhotaan välittömästi tutkimuksen valmistuttua. Tutkimusraportti julkaistaan sähköisenä Lundin yliopiston tietokannassa.

Annan suostumukseni haastattelun käyttöön yllämainitussa Lundin yliopiston pro gradu -tutkimuksessa edellä mainituin ehdoin. Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on vapaaehtoista ja voin halutessani kysyä lisätietoja tai keskeyttää haastattelun missä tahansa vaiheessa.

_____
Allekirjoitus ja nimenselvennys

Appendix 3: Interview Questions

<u>Translated into English:</u>

Background questions:

- Age
- Education
- Work experience in general, at the shelter, and with multicultural clients

Violence work with multicultural clients:

- How the clients end up to the shelter? Are there 'typical' stories?

- What kind of violence work is provided to the client in the shelter?
- Does the violence of multicultural clients differ from the violence of ethnic Finnish clients? How? Can you give an example?
- What do you think are the reasons behind gendered violence?
- What are the possibilities and challenges in multicultural client work?

Cultural competence:

- How the shelter takes the different demands and habits (e.g. diet, clothing, housing arraignments) of multicultural client into account? Is there a limit?
- Does the violence work with multicultural clients demand some specific skills and knowledge?
- What kind of multicultural client training is given to the workers? Is cultural competence model applied at the shelter? How?
- What do you think about the possible power inequality between the workers and the multicultural clients? Do you think your position (class, ethnicity, etc.) affects the client work? How?
- Have you experienced racism at the shelter among the clients and/or workers?

The Original in Finnish:

Taustakysymykset:

- Ikä
- Koulutus
- Työkokemus yleisesti, turvakodissa ja monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden kanssa

Väkivaltatyö monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden kanssa:

- Millaisissa tilanteissa asiakkaat hakeutuvat turvakotiin? Onko olemassa
  tyypillistä tarinaa?
- Millaista väkivaltatyötä asiakkaille tarjotaan?
- Eroaako monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden väkivaltakokemukset
  kantasuomalaisten väkivallasta? Miten? Esimeriksi?
- Mitä ajattelet, mistä sukupuolistunut väkivalta johtuu?
- Mitkä ovat monikulttuurisen väkivaltatyön vaikeudet ja mahdollisuudet?

Kulttuurinen kompetenssi:

- Miten turvakoti ottaa huomioon monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden erilaiset
  tavat ja vaatimukset (kuten ruokavalio, vaatetus, sijoittaminen huoneisiin)?
  Meneekö jossain raja?
- Vaatiiko väkivaltatyö monikulttuuristen asiakkaiden kanssa jotain
  erityistaitoja ja -tietoja?
- Millaista koulutusta turvakoti tarjoaa työntekijöille monikulttuuriseen
  työhön? Puhutaanko turvakodissa kulttuurisesta kompetenssista?
- Miten ajattelet kantasuomalaisen työntekijän ja monikulttuurisen
  asiakkaan välisistä valtasuhteista? Ajatteletko, että sinun asemasi (luokka,
  etnisyys) vaikuttaa asiakastyöhön? Miten?
- Oletko kohdannut rasismia turvakodissa asiakkaiden ja / tai työntekijöiden
  keskuudessa? Miten siihen puututaan?

Appendix 4: Used Quotes in the Original Language

[a] […] esimerkiksi, jos ajattelee niinku noita muslimeita, niin että paljon sellaista
palvelijana pitämistä ja vähän sen tyyppistä alistamista. Usein, vaikkei haluais
sillai yleistää mitään kulttuuriakaan tai uskontoa tai tällein, niin kyllä niin sillein
pystyy näkee sellaisia, et esimerkiksi romanikulttuurissa on aika yleistä sellainen

raakakin väkivalta ja nainen on alempi kuin mies. Että se on ehkä näissä maahanmuuttajien ja romanien yhteinen tekijä, et nainen nähdään alempana kuin mies ja sillä sitten perustellaan se väkivalta.

[b] Ne väkivallan muodot ovat suunnilleen samoja. Mutta se, mikä siinä eroaa, kun on maahanmuuttaja, niin ei tiedä suomalaisesta tavasta, miten täällä suhtaudutaan väkivaltaan ja perheväkivaltaan ja lasten kasvatukseen ja siinä olevaan kuritusväkivaltaan. Niin, se on ehkä, ja he ei tiedä naisen asemaa, mitkä oikeudet heillä on. […] Mutta, mitkä ovat heidän oikeutensa ja velvollisuutensa. Siinä mielessä semmoista suomalaista perustietoa joutuu hirveesti antamaan, mitä ei joudu kantasuomalaisille niinkään paljoa antamaan.

[c] Mun käsitys on, että varmaan voi olla enemmän sellaista kontrollointia. Et enemmän sellaista, et valvotaan ja et asetetaan sääntöjä ja et nainen on enemmänkin sellainen, et sitä pitää hallita. Suomalainen parisuhde, ihan perussuomalainen suhde on usein tasa-arvoisempi, naisellakin on oikeus omaan elämään. Mut monesti siihen törmää, et se kontrollointi on tosi kattavaa.

[d] […] on nähtävissä sellaista tietynlaista naiiviutta sitä tilannetta kohtaan, mitä taas suomalaisilla ei oo, et ne on hyvin tietoisia siitä, et mitä on tapahtumassa ja et tämä on väärin ja olen tätä kestänyt ja miksi olen kestänyt, et ehkä heillä on vähän analyyttisempi suhtautuminen siihen omaan tilanteeseensa, kun sitten näillä maahanmuuttajanaisilla on ehkä vaan enemmän sellainen, että no, tällaista tää nyt sitten vaan on enkä mä oikeen itekään tiedä miks tää on tämmöistä.

[e] Koko skaalaa me ei millään pystytä informoidaan hänelle, et hän lähtis täältä kaiken ymmärtäneenä ja ymmärtäis suomalaisen tavan elää ja suomalaisen naisen arvon ja vanhemmuuden tasa-arvon ja kaiken tällaisen.

[f] Totta kai se vaikuttaa, koska mä tuon tän suomalaisuuden, että miten suurin osa suomalaisista, ja varsinkin naisista on koulutettuja ja voi käydä töissä, niin

tuleehan se tässä mun olemisessa ja puheessa ja varmaan myös siinä, että kannustamisessa, että kannattaa opetella suomen kieli, kannattaa hakeutua koulutukseen. […] Mutta mä silti itse koen, että mä en tee tätä työtä ylhäältä alaspäin. Toivottavasti en. Asiakkaatkin sen kokee. Mulla on jotakin tietoa, mistä he saattavat hyötyä ja he itse valitsevat käyttävätkö he mun antamaa tietoa, onko se heille sopivaa. Mutta että ehkä se on myös kannustamista selviytymiseen. Minulla on perhe, mutta mä olen opiskellut ja mä voin käydä töissä ja tää on Suomessa mahdollista.

[g] Joskus tulee sellaisia, et sun täytyy olla todella sellasen äidillisen, laittaa rajat niille ihmisille, et niillä on välillä sellainen rajaton olo täällä ja se ei oo kivaa ollenkaan. Ja mä voisin kuvitella, että jonkun kantasuomalaisen kanssa sellaista ei, niin tai voihan olla et sellainen vois tulla, mut tuntuu siltä, että jotenkin kaikki suomalaiset, jotka meillä on ollut täällä, on semmosia, et ne tulee tänne ja sitten jo ne kipinkapin haluaa täältä pois, mikä ei sitten tässä asiakaskunnassa oo mitenkään tyypillistä.

[h] […] mä en usko, että se työntekijä olisi, työntekijän tavoitteena olisi olla jonkun ihmisen kanssa ja olla rasistinen. Se on sen ihmisen oma tunne. Jostakin syystä on jouduttu sanomaan sellaisia asioita, mistä hän ei ole pitänyt ja on kokenut ne asiat jotenkin rasistisina. Mutta ei meidän porukassa ole kyl ketään semmosta, joka esim et tulis mieleen, et nyt täällä on tällainen perhe, et tota työntekijää ei voi, et toi on nyt jäävätty tästä. Ei täällä vois olla.

[i] On esimerkiksi huomattu, että noi romanit, niillä on paljon rasismia, ne on aika rasistisia. Ja sitten, se vähän yllättää, et on esimerkiksi ollut kaks kertaa sellainen intialainen asiakas, niin nekin oli "musta ihminen, siis mä en missään nimessä halua tuota", niin että joo, on mielenkiintoista ollut kyllä seurata, että sitä joillakin on sitä rasismia. Ja sitten kun sitä on, niin se on tosi voimakasta, et ihan kuin lapsen tasolla olevaa yököystä toisesta.

[j] Väkivalta on aina sellainen yleismaailmallinen ilmiö, et ihan samanlaista hallitsemista on suomalaistenkin parisuhteissa. Toki sillä kulttuurilla on merkitystä siinä, miten ihminen vaikka kasvatetaan ja sitä kautta millainen maailmankuva ja kuva ihmissuhteista hänelle kehittyy, mut täällä ollaan väkivallan takia ja siinä väkivaltatyössä ei oo kulttuurilla kovinkaan merkitystä.

[k] Meillä on ainakin täällä lähdetty siitä, että meidän asiakkaat on kaikki saman arvoisia ja kaikki tarvitseekin sen saman avun, et ei siinä mun mielestä mitään erityiskohtelua, sehän on se ihmisen kohtaaminen ja hänen asioissaan eteneminen, se on kaikille sama.

[l] No toki semmoinen joku sensitiivisyys siihen kulttuuriinkin pitää olla ja sen kulttuurin vaatimuksiin ja tällaisiin, mutta emmä jotenki osaa, esimerkiksi itestäni nimetä mitään erityistaitoja. Jotenkin mä vaan ajattelen, että kohtaa ihmisen ihmisenä. Ja emmä välttämättä sitä kulttuuria siinä kauheesti ajattele, kun mä jotain väkivaltaa käsittelen. Sit mä annan sille ihmiselle tietoa, että no, Suomen lain mukaan on näin. Mutta totta kai pitää vähän ymmärtää ja tietää niistä muista kulttuureista, ettei ihan loukkaa toista tai muuta.

[m] Ei mulla kyllä sellainen olo oo. Ei mulla semmoinen oo. Musta tuntuu, että emmä mitenkään tunne, että mä oisin kenenkään yläpuolella tai silleen. Siitä lähtien, kun mä oon tätä työtä tehnyt, ylipäätään sosiaalialan työtä tehnyt, niin mä oon aina ajatellut, että ottaa ihmisen ihmisenä, se on mulle tosi tärkee. Emmä ikinä kenenkään muunkaan ihmisen kohdalla ajattele mitenkään, että sillein. Ehkä mä vaan en ajattele maailmaa niin. En tiedä.

[n] Sen verran meidän kantasuomalaiset eroo, et jotkut, et pystyy, et niillä on useammin hallussa tää yhteiskunta, et he pystyy tekemään enemmän. Heillä on suomen äidinkielentaito ja käsitys tukiviidakosta ja heillä on useammin työpaikka eikä esimerkiks vuokranantajat syrji heitä nimen tai ulkonäön takii. Et sitten heitä ei tarvi ehkä niin monissa asioissa auttaa, et heille riittää ku sanoo, et näin ois

hyvä tai näin ois hyvä, niin he tekee ite. Mut muita asiakkaita me autetaan joskus ihan kädestä pitäen ja toimitaan sellaisia asianajajina. Mut sit totta kai pitää muistaa et näissä vähemmistöissä on niin paljon hajontaa et koska heiän elämäntarinat niin lähtömaassa kuin nyt täällä eroaa keskenään tosi paljon.

º Sieltä niitten kertomissaan tarinoissa, tarina on vähän huono sana, mutta mimmoista heidän elämänsä on ollut, millaista se on ehkä ollut kotimaassa ja tänne tullessa se on muuttunut, niin kyl sieltä nousee tämmöistä naisen kunnioitusta ja vaimon kunnioitusta, että mikä on heidän kulttuurissa monessa, että naisen tehtävä on olla hyvä äiti ja vaimo ja se on semmoinen heille, ja mies hoitaa elatuksen, niin se on heille tasa-arvoa. Työt jaetaan ja se on kunnia-asia olla hyvä puoliso. Kyl mä katon, että se on tasa-arvoa, koska asiat on yhteistuumin hoidettu ja että toinen ei koe, että on jotenkin hyväksikäytetty tai alistettu. Ikävä kyllä tilanteet sitten saattaa joskus muuttua Suomessa. Se asetelma muuttuu, jos mies ei saa töitä ja jos se suku ei ole täällä tukemassa heitä ja he kohtaa rasismia ja syrjintää. En mä sano, että heillä on ollut auvosta ja ihanaa omassa kotimaassaan, mutta se mitä he kertoo siitä heidän kulttuuristaan ja mikä on naisen asema, ei se kyl alistettu noin yleisesti ottaen ole.

ᵖ Mä en oo se ihminen joka menee sanomaan niille, et ne tekee jotain väärin tai se on heidän kulttuurissa ja heidän täytyy muuttuu. Mun työskentelytapa on se, että autan heitä miettimään, et miltä se tuntuu ja voisko se olla toisin ja jos se olis toisin, niin millaista se vois olla se parisuhde. Ja ehkä lähen myös siitä, että mikä funktio sillä väkivallalla on ollut ja sitä kautta onko se funktio miten tärkeä siihen parisuhteeseen. Mulla on aina sellainen idealistinen olo, et ois kauheen kiva, jos ne naiset lähtis täältä turvakodista sillä tavalla, et heidän parisuhdemalli olis jollain tavalla muuttunut, ettei he sitten taas etsi uutta miestä ja jatka sitä samaa.

[…]

Et se aina riippuu siitä, et miten siihen ihmiseen saa yhteyden ja haluaako se ihminen saada yhteyden meihin auttajiin, jos niin nyt voi meitä kutsua. Mut en mä ainakaan sen väkivallan suhteen henkilökohtaisesti ajattele, et nyt pitää työskennellä jotenkin eri tavalla. Ja just senkin takia, et ei tiedä et kuinka paljon se ihminen haluaa sitä tilannettaan työstää. Voi olla jollakin sellainen, et nyt mä oon päässyt karkuun ja nyt mä vaan haluan jatkaa mun elämää. Et mä en halua enää märehtiä niitä asioita, mitä on tapahtunut. Että, sillä lailla sitä meidän kriisityötä, sitä ei joskus vaan voi tehdä, koska ihminen ei vaan halua niitä käsitellä. Et joskus se kriisityö on vaan sitä, et tarjoo katon pään päälle ja tarjoaa paikan, jossa on rauhallista ja turvallista ja jossa on ruoka tarjolla. Et se niin riippuu siitä, missä ihmisellä on ollut puutetta eniten ja sitä se sitten täällä eniten kaipaa. Mut sitten taas joillakin on tosi iso tarve keskustella ja avautua. Se tosi paljon riippuu ihmisestä.

[q] Välillä mua ärsyttää meidän työporukan tapa puhua maahanmuuttajista ja, et se huumori. Joskus se on niin, sellasta stereotyyppistä. Mä yritän sanoa toisinaan vastaan, mut sit mä oon vaan ilonpilaaja. Yleensä oon hiljaa tai tajuan vasta jälkikäteen, et kuinka tyhmälle jutulle tuli naurettua.

[r] Mä sanoisin, et varmaan joskus se vaikuttaa. Mut sillon ku mä huomaan, niin että se, et esimerkiksi asiakas jotenkin kokee, että mä olisin jotenkin ylempänä kuin hän tai että mä olisin joku auktoriteetti, tai mä olisin joku äidillinen ohjaaja, niin mä kyllä hyvin nopeasti pyrin ulos siitä roolista erilaisilla keinoilla. Mä on koen, että mun työssä on tosi tärkeenä nimenomaan se naisten voimaannuttaminen ja olla naisille sellaisen peilinä, et jos jotakin siitä minun vallasta mä voisin jakaa heille, niin sen peilauksen kautta, että sä olet aivan yhtä kykeneväinen kuin minäkin.