

# STUDENT WORK

Kind of work  
(portefolio. Home exam, project) **Research Project**

Study Programme **Global Knowledge**

Name of subject **Global Knowledge**

Main code **GK** Subject code **300**

Student exam number **Julius Nantungapa Simfukwe, Susan Nasilele, Christious Mwanza**

Hand in date **24th May, 2012**

Number of pages **40**

**Topic: Welfare Challenges among Asylum Seekers in Norway; a case study of Sogndal  
Kommune**

## Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Abstract .....	3
1.0 Introduction .....	4
1.1 Background Information .....	4
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	5
1.3 Tentative Research Questions .....	5
1.4 Purpose of the Study .....	6
2.0 Literature Review .....	6
2.1 Challenges Faced by Asylum Seekers .....	7
2.2 Analysis of Social Services and their Impact on Asylum Seekers .....	8
2.3 Coping Strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers .....	9
2.4 The legalities and procedure of Asylum Seeking in Norway .....	10
3.0 Research Design and Methodology .....	12
3.1 Scope of the Study .....	12
3.2 Target Population .....	13
3.3 Sample .....	13
3.4 Sampling Procedure .....	13
3.5 Data Collection .....	13
3.5.1 Research Instruments .....	13
3.6 Data Analysis Procedures .....	14
3.7 Ethical Considerations .....	14
3.8 The Strengths and Weakness .....	15
3.8.1 Strengths .....	15
3.8.2 Weaknesses .....	15
4.0 Results .....	15
4.1 Table 1: Results from the Asylum Seekers Interviews .....	15
4.2 Table 2: Results from the LOPEX Staff .....	19
5.0 Discussion .....	24

5.1 Challenges Faced by Asylum Seekers .....	24
5.2 Analysis of Social Services and their Impact on Asylum Seekers...	26
5.3 Coping Strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers .....	28
5.4 The Legalities and Procedure of Asylum Seekers in Norway .....	29
5.5 Conclusion .....	30
5.6 Recommendations .....	31
References .....	32
Appendices .....	33

## **ABSTRACT**

This research was an attempt to learn and understand the welfare challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Sogndal, Norway with a view to contribute to the knowledge base for future researchers, create tentative questions and hypothesis to the subject and for academic purposes. The specific objectives of the evaluation were: (1) To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway; (2) To analyse the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum seekers by the government; (3) To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum seekers other than services provided by the government; and, (3) To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum seeker being granted resident permit in Norway. This therefore meant that the research required a Literature review, Observations and Interviews, and meeting informants. These were undertaken. This called for professionalism and openness on the part of both the research team and respondents.

The research project used a qualitative management and operational research study methodology that engaged interview guides and Observation whose output was expected to provide anticipated results. The study for the research was focused on Sogndal Asylum Seeker Reception Centre and covered a period of 1 year from 2011 to 2012.

The study findings showed that there are some welfare challenges that the Asylum seekers face while waiting for the approval of the resident permit. The findings were presented in tabular form according to research objectives. They included Psychological trauma due to uncertainty responses from the UDI, lack of economic coping strategies such as acquisition of jobs before resident permit is given, social and cultural barriers due to a non interactive way of life and the difference in norms and values, numerous strict rules and regulations that limit their integration into society; and the de-motivation as a result of welfare bureaucracies in responding to their asylum application among others.

The research was a success in that it unearthed a lot of welfare challenges as evident in the report which are being faced by asylum seeker in Sogndal. The research report drew up a discussion and had made some recommendation that can help in assisting sort out some of the key challenges faced by asylum seekers. This then does not entail that our findings are final assessment of the subject under study, there can still be improved upon by future researchers provided the report is given due consideration.

## **1.0 Introduction**

### **1.1 Background Information**

Immigration is one facet of globalization which goes beyond national response to be effective. The act of foreigners passing or coming into a country for the purpose of permanent residence for many reasons that may include economic, political, family reunion, natural disaster, poverty or wish to change one's surroundings voluntarily is what refers to Immigration. Among immigrants, there are Asylum seekers who according to United Nations standards narrowly defined as a person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality, and is able to or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail him/herself of the protection of that country. Welfare on the other hand in broader perspectives can be viewed as the availability of resources and presence of conditions required for reasonably comfortable, healthy and secure living: therefore, the Government support for the poor and otherwise disadvantaged members of the society, usually through provision of free and/or subsidized goods and services which include education, food, clothing and good sanitation.

By and large, of the European Union approximately 495 million people, 18.5 million are non-European Union Nationals; this signifies just fewer than 3.8 per cent of the total population. Thus, while it falls to the individual countries to grant residence rights to immigrants and Asylum seekers, the European Union strives to set a continental standard governing and facilitating numerous procedures and conditions relevant to Asylum, legal and illegal immigration and integration (The Deligation of the European Commission to USA, September 2008).

According to the Norwegian Statistical Bureau, Norway has a population of 4, 989, 787; the number of immigrants is estimated at 73, 852 representing 1.5 per cent of the total population. In Sogn og Fjordane County 8 per cent of the total immigrants live there at an estimated number of 5, 908 (ssb.no: 2012). While in Sogndal an estimated population of Asylum seekers is at 180, the full capacity at which the local Municipality is able to accommodate through the implementing agent LOPEX. LOPEX is a contracted agent by the state mandated to give asylum seekers a place to live, housing, and bed. It provides

strategies that guide them through the Norwegian systems; their duties, obligations and their rights in line with the Asylum Policy.

Consequently, with the above information, it has been hypothesized that there are differences in eligibility for welfare rights experienced by people with varying citizenship statuses and their increasing exclusion and marginalization of Asylum seekers due to cultural differences and societal perceptions in trying to attain permanent residence in high modern cultures such as Norway.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

The major contentions in this study are the welfare challenges being faced by the Asylum seekers in Sogndal. This is shown by the fact that by non-empirical evidence, there are non-Norwegian residents within the vicinity of Sogndal. On average, a day hardly passes by without noticing one or two cases in this locality; giving a clear indication that Asylum seekers are in existence within the municipality.

Currently in the media, there are debates going on about where the children born of rejected Asylum Seekers belong; thus are they Norwegian Citizens by birth or be treated as aliens and subjected to deportation when such parents do not succeed with resident permits in Norway. Much is left to be desired as this is one of the current welfare challenges.

More importantly, the prime aim is to learn various programmes and policies that have been instituted to offset the challenges Asylum seekers encounter in this place.

### **1.3 Tentative Research Questions**

- i. To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway.
- ii. To analyse the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum seekers by the government.
- iii. To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum seekers other than services provided the government.
- iv. To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum seeker being granted Resident Permit in Norway.

#### **1.4 Purpose of the Study**

- i. The study will be a partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of a one year study of Welfare Norway and Global Knowledge as sanctioned by Høgskulen i Sogn og Fjordane University College.
- ii. To learn about the welfare challenges faced by the Asylum seekers in Norway particularly Sogndal.
- iii. To contribute to the knowledge base for future researchers and to create tentative questions and hypotheses on how best these welfare challenges among Asylum seekers can be addressed

#### **2.0 Literature Review**

According to Goldin et al (2011:193, 209), migrants generally move from their country of origin to other countries in quest to improve their welfare, wellbeing and livelihoods while their expectations are at least partially fulfilled. The Immigrants and those born in Norway to immigrant parents constitute 600 900 persons or 12.2 per cent of Norway's population. Broken down by region, 287 000 have a European background, 210 000 persons have a background from Asia, 74 000 from Africa, 19 000 from Latin-America and 11 000 from North America and Oceania. Consequently, between 1990 and 2009, a total of 420 000 non-Nordic citizens immigrated to Norway and were granted residence here broken down as, 26 per cent came as refugees, 26 per cent were labour immigrants and 11 per cent were granted residence in order to undertake education and 23 per cent came to Norway due to family reunification with someone already in Norway, and 16 per cent granted residence because they had established a family. Nevertheless, the number of immigrants residing in Norway varies with the government's immigration policy, labour market needs and shifting global crises (ssb.no 2012).

The literature intends to review the challenges faced by asylum seekers in Sogndal. Norway according to the objectives of the study as Goldin (Ibid) argues that the experience of migration is not without its downsides, but migrants are often vulnerable to abuse and illness. Particularly migrants such as those trafficked or asylum seekers who travel through perilous journeys to reach their destination.



## 2.1 Challenges Faced by Asylum Seekers

The challenges faced by Asylum seekers have wider implications for social work at local and international level. This can also be seen on the current efforts being made by European Union to regulate reception conditions for Asylum seekers applicable to Norway. Brekke & Vevstad (2007) asserts that although Norway is not a European Union member, in many ways a reception system for Asylum seekers is comparable with systems in member state countries with regard to the directives' Article on involvement. The practice of Norwegian regulations and practice is ahead of their European neighbours.

Berg et al (2005) observes that asylum seekers in reception centres indicate that there is experience of uncertainty, powerlessness and gradual disqualification despite service providers organizing various activity programmes, empowerment and integration related activities in the centres which address challenges in life such as problems relating to discrimination, exclusion, xenophobia and marginalization of asylum seekers. Brekke (2004) argues that despite reception centres contributing to a growth in social client numbers, they fail to promote independence and self sufficiency among the asylum seekers. Godwin et al (2011; 47-57) asserts that challenges among other things include depression, stress, anxiety and labour faced by asylum seekers in foreign land such as working without pay or for the purpose of fringe benefits like housing, food, clothing, passage or other essentials.

Additionally, Brekke (2004: 47) argues that waiting for asylum application may promote passivity and ambivalence among residents - linked to the ambivalence embedded in Asylum Policies of the reception countries – that it is difficult to work with the empowerment of Asylum seekers within a framework of restrictive asylum policy, primarily concerned with “securing the quality of what is offered does not become attraction in itself.” Cushner et al (1996) insinuates that in adjusting to life and work within cultures other than their own, people experience emotional reactions due to displacement and unfamiliarity due to anxiety. A disconfirmed expectation of experiences in another culture poses a problem of belonging and hence limits interaction in another culture due to one's status as an outsider. Experiences of confrontation with one's prejudices as they discover that previously held beliefs may not be accurate as they interact with other cultures. The communication and language barriers are the most obvious problems that must be overcome in the crossing of cultural boundaries.

Such challenges may therefore, implicate and be experienced by the migrants and their communities by limiting the opportunities available for the second and third generation.

## **2.2 Analysis of Social Services and their Impact on Asylum Seekers**

Goldin et al (2011: 197, 202) provides that most migrants move to relatively more developed countries in order to access higher incomes, better infrastructure and public services such as Education, Health, Housing and Food which positively improve their livelihood as compared to their home countries. In Norway for instance, the immigrant population was made up of immigrants from many countries and autonomous regions. However, living conditions vary with age, gender, level of education and social background. The living conditions of immigrants are additionally affected by factors such as country of origin, their reason for immigrating to Norway, age at immigration and length of stay in Norway (ssb.no 2012).

To secure housing is probably the most basic need for an asylum seeker or a refugee. The housing has to be well placed to establish links between different agencies that help people sustain their tenancies and provide or coordinate other kinds of support. John Perry in one of his articles illustrates that securing accommodation and support services for asylum seekers and aiding their integration through community based initiatives are key elements and should be the Government's integration strategy. He further highlights four major themes as: Accommodation with the aim to minimize the risk of homelessness, Support services to meet their needs by local authorities and government departments through adequate funds to allow wider and permanent solutions. Community integration be at the centre stage for the purpose of linking personal integration measures towards promoting community cohesion, Partnerships as most asylum seekers or refugees are keen to be involved in influencing and providing support services that could lead to more culturally – sensitive services, more related to people's needs (John Perry: September 2005). Therefore, it is imperative that when an asylum seeker becomes an accepted refugee as the critical stage at which housing and support options need to be available and the different local agencies need to be in effective liaison with each other.

Additionally, Health services have a duty to serve the needs of the local population, including asylum seekers who equally have the right to free primary and secondary health care although there are restrictions on access to various types of support for different groups. It is mandatory that asylum seekers are sent to initial accommodation centres

where a primary health assessment is carried out to assess any immediate health needs. Nevertheless, entitlements to health and social care for asylum seekers and refugees are complex and dependant on their stage in the asylum process (Sophie Haroon: 2008).

Cushner et al (1996) further adds that people living and working across cultures often take part in various types of educational activities, even though they do not label their efforts as such. Consequently, by working with host colleagues, they frequently transfer skills so that hosts can follow through on jointly developed activities after the sojourners return home. However the case, Goldin et al (2011: 202) stresses that the welfare outcomes experienced by immigrants are to a certain extent conditional upon their circumstances and background thus, those who move for economic reasons to societies with accessible public services are likely to benefit the most. This is nonetheless not the case by most asylum seekers.

While asylum seekers may enjoy their stay in foreign countries to find peace, one factor affecting their entitlement to benefits is the immigration status. For instance there are circumstances such as age, who you live with, sick or disabled and the National Insurance contributions you have paid; hence most asylum seekers are excluded from most benefits. Therefore, to claim social benefits they must meet all conditions of entitlement unless in circumstances of incapacity benefit, contribution-based jobseekers allowance and bereavement allowances. In this case, an asylum seeker can only claim for income support, income-based job seekers allowance, housing benefit, council tax benefit and social fund (ROAP April 2001). Goldin et al (2011: 202) concludes on this basis that, it is these factors that indicate the high influx of migrants to developed countries because such benefits serve as an attraction to others.

### **2.3 Coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers**

According to Crawley et al (2011: 5-6), despite the demand for labour markets, there are other strategies that asylum seekers resort to in coping with their cases of destitution, survival and livelihood as they have limited to no chances of getting employed. Khawaja et al (2008) argues that, in response to the extreme difficulties experienced by asylum seekers throughout the pre-migration period, asylum seekers are able to identify several strategies that allowed them to cope such as the use of religion, social support networks,

reframing and focusing on the future. Crawley (Ibid) further implores that Churches appear to provide an important source of support for many of those living in destitution.

Khawaja et al (2008) describes the list of coping strategies as first and most commonly identified coping strategy is the use of religion during times of difficulty as they would pray either to have strength to continue or for the situation to improve. The second coping strategy employed by other asylum seekers was utilization of social support networks during times of difficulty; they discuss problems and receive material support from their social networks which include a broad range of individuals such as friends, family and neighbours. While they further argue that the third coping strategy employed is a cognitive process of reframing of the situation thus their personal evaluation of their difficulties allowing them to cope during hard times i.e. adaptation through inner strength and facing any challenge that arose; and normalization of the experience and becoming resigned to whatever the future held hence living with difficulties and adopt the attitude that everyone is in the same situation and there was nothing that could be done about it. The fourth coping strategy also alludes to a cognitive nature; the authors argue that articulating wishes and aspirations for future is what asylum seekers in the present study describe as their three major wishes that they had throughout their time in home countries such as war and suffering to end, able to continue daily life projects and continue their education and a desire for their children to continue their education.

On the other hand, Crawley et al (2011) reiterates that, some relationships are overtly transactional, with destitute asylum seekers providing childcare, cooking and housework; and sometimes sex in exchange for meals, cash, shelter or other daily necessities. This result in both men and female forming sexual relationships with local people as part of their livelihood strategy, but these relationships are sometimes disempowering. Evidently, both men and women involved in commercial sex work as a surviving strategy end up physically abused sexually exploited or manipulated or forced to stay against their will (Ibid). Therefore, all asylum seekers know that it is illegal for them to work but often have no choice but to engage into illegal work to survive their destitution state.

#### **2.4 The Legalities and Procedures of Asylum Seeking in Norway**

Norwegian Organization Asylum Seekers Report (2010) provides that Application for asylum at the police station is the first step under the Police Foreign Unit which is responsible for the registration of asylum seekers. They take their fingerprints and ask about their identity and travel route to Norway. They are obliged to submit their passport and other identity documents to the police. Upon completion, an asylum seeker is sent to the arrival reception centre to stay during the first days but later moved to another transit reception centre within the region of Oslo, or directly to an ordinary asylum reception centre. Staff at the reception centre provides information about their rights and obligations at the reception centre upon arrival.

The tuberculosis test is compulsory and takes place at the health outpost at the arrival reception. Tests regarding other diseases such as HIV and hepatitis are voluntary but recommended. Information and counselling is then done by the Norwegian Organization for Asylum Seekers (NOAS), an organization that advocates for the rights of asylum seekers in Norway; they therefore, provide information to asylum seekers at arrival in reception centres. It is at this stage that an overview of the asylum process and their rights and obligations is given in a language they understand, to prepare them to present their application for asylum to Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI).

The most important stage of the asylum process is the interview by UDI, a state agency, which determines their entitlements to a residence permit. The interview lasts between three and five hours by a sworn professional translator. The age examination is a factor considered for all applicants during the interview. The age is important in relation to rights and obligations in society which determines suitability to admission. After the interview, they are moved into another asylum reception with a free service while they await UDI's decision. Nevertheless, they are not entitled to economic support when they choose to live privately. If UDI ascertains that their life and freedom are in danger in their home country because of race, nationality, religion, membership of a special social group, political endeavours or because of the security situation in their country, they will be granted asylum in Norway, but only on the condition that no one in their home country can protect them. They may be granted asylum on humanitarian grounds in instances where their children have a serious health condition. If UDI ascertains that one's life will not be put at

risk under such circumstances, the application for asylum on humanitarian grounds will be turned down.

Therefore, after some weeks or months they are transferred to a municipality. They attend courses to learn the Norwegian language and the Norwegian way of life, including important rules and laws of the country with the goal to enhance chances of acquiring work in order to be self-sufficient. If economically independent, they may choose to settle where they would like. On the other hand, they may either return to their home country or lodge a complaint if application is rejected with a lawyer provided for free within a period of three weeks from time of rejection. Further, they have to return to their home country if the case complaint is rejected for the second time. However, if there is no reason to change the decision, the case is forwarded to another state agency - the Immigration Appeals Board (UNE) - which can either reverse or maintain the decision. They can also complain to a court of law, but this entails huge costs and the chances for overturning the decision in their favour are usually very unlikely.

When their application for asylum is finally turned down, they may choose to return to their home country voluntarily through the International Organization for Migration (IOM) or be escorted by the police back to their home country. In voluntary return a grace period of three weeks is given to travel back to home country and the police or IOM helps to arrange the travel arrangements. In forced return, police escort them to their home country after the three weeks grace period elapses and are helped with all necessary travel documents and tickets.

### **3.0 Research Design and Methodology**

The research captured the data by using Qualitative Method. This was in order to capture all the represented behavioural routines, experiences and various conditions that affect these usual routines or natural settings. According to Berg et al (2012:15) many of such elements are directly observable and as such may be viewed as objectively measurable data; certain elements of symbolism, meanings, or understanding usually require consideration of individual's perceptions and subjective apprehension.

The data was obtained through different sources which included articles, books, reports and interview guides. This was a case study of Asylum Seekers in Sogndal Community.

### **3.1 Scope of the Study**

The study covered a period of 2011 to 2012.

### **3.2 Target Population**

The Research targeted Immigration State Agent-LOPEX Staff and Asylum Seekers in Sogndal.

### **3.3 Sample**

The sample size consisted of respondents from the Immigration State Agent-LOPEX Staff, (3) and (1) Asylum Seeker officially organized by LOPEX (both male and female) living in Sogndal. Others, 10 were interviewed informally through Practice Placements and Social Events; and 1 interview failed due to the respondents' unwillingness to avail themselves. It was taking an average of two (2) hours for each interview.

### **3.4 Sampling Procedure**

- (a) **Stratified Sampling Method:** for the people ranging from 15 to 35 years old in the Asylum seekers Community in Sogndal. This was done in order to observe which age group has mostly migrated to Norway, Sogndal. The method was borrowed from Berg (2012: 51) who states that a stratified sample is used whenever researchers need to ensure that a certain sample of the identified population under examination is represented in the sample.
  
- (b) **Judgmental (purposive) sampling:** was used for the Immigration State Agent-LOPEX Staff because the researchers felt it would ensure the most needed data was collected. According to Hagan 2006 in Berg (2012: 52) purposeful samples are selected after field investigations on some group in order to ensure that certain types of individuals or persons displaying certain attributes are included in the study.

### **3.5 Data Collection**

The Data used was from primary and secondary sources.

### **3.5.1 Research Instruments**

#### **a) Interview guide**

An interview guide contains the themes as well as their sequences in the interview. The guide can either be an overview of the themes that should be covered or it can be detailed with specific questions (Kvale, 2001). When developing the interview guide several aspects were evaluated. Firstly, the structure of the questions, it was attempted to create questions that would encourage the informant to give detailed answers and secondly the order of the questions to make it easy for the interviewee.

#### **b) Observation**

This method was embedded in our interviewing process through group interaction where certain behaviours and characteristics were being noted. It was borrowed from Connelly et al (1990) who suggests that qualitative inquiry relies more on appearance, truthfulness and putting research results into use. Whilst observing and experiencing as a participant, the researchers retained a level of objectivity in order to understand, analyse and explain the social world under study.

### **3.6 Data Analysis Procedures**

Babbie (2007) argues that data analysis is the non-numerical assessment of observations made through participant observation, content analysis, in-depth interviews and other qualitative research techniques. It is from this definition that the following procedures were derived:

1. Interviews were conducted by way of asking in-depth questions using the interview guides and responses were noted by researchers.
2. Data consolidation approach was used through harmonizing the responses recorded by the researchers for the purpose of presentation.
3. Data was presented in a Tabular form.
4. Comparing the Data collected by objective and Literature review compiled to draw a discussion.



### **3.7 Ethical Consideration**

According to Miles et al (1994), findings suggest that researchers within utilitarian view - often a traditional “scientific” stance- address the recruitment of respondents via informed consent, conduct fieldwork so as to avoid harm to others, and extend this stance through protection of confidentiality in reports. Therefore, recruitment must emphasize reciprocity to both the researchers and researched to gain, hence field work must avoid wronging others, and reports must be just, fair and honest. The researchers adopted the following as an ethical consideration:

1. The data that was collected will be kept in confidence, privacy and anonymity of the source of data.
2. It was considered that questions related to religion, personal details, ethnic backgrounds and political affiliations will not be asked.

### **3.8 The Strengths and Weaknesses**

#### **3.8.1 Strengths**

1. Literature readily available
2. Target group was available
3. Time was adequate to collect data and compile the report
4. Enough man power for easy working during research project and easy supervision

#### **3.8.2 Weaknesses**

1. The target group’s inability to express themselves fully in English language which was used during research interviews.
2. The number of respondents was limited.
3. The inability of respondents to understand the questions.
4. Insufficient willingness of respondents to answer questions.

### **4.0 Results**

The findings have been presented in tabular form and outlines information systematically according to objectives, questions and responses. This desires to give a simpler form of the flow of information. Table one gives responses from Asylum Seekers and Table two present results from LOPEX staff.

4.1 Table 1: Results from the Asylum Seekers Interviews

S/N	OBJECTIVES	INTERVIEW QUESTION	RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES
1	To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway	What were your expectations when coming here; political, economic and social?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expect safety and a secured life from their respective home countries; and to be accepted as refugees by the Norwegian government.</li> <li>• Have good education, find a job and be self-reliant.</li> <li>• Provided with housing, food, clothing, education and good health.</li> </ul>
		What problems are you facing living in a foreign land?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to live in a foreign country due to cultural differences and ways of life.</li> <li>• Climate is harsh compared to their countries of origin.</li> <li>• When the response takes long to come from the application made to UDI, they experience psychological effects due to uncertainty.</li> </ul>
		How is your social interaction among; yourselves, community members and LOPEX Staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared houses of up to 8 people and sleep 2 persons in each room. The houses have living rooms for cooking and watching television, free internet and stay closely according to their nationality.</li> <li>• The people in the community are good, individuals live freely but there is a component of silence in them and it takes</li> </ul>

			<p>time to break through them and interact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship with LOPEX Staff is formal, good and aimed at providing them with services.</li> </ul>
		<p>How do you want these problems to be addressed at; individual, government, community or any other level?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response from the UDI on resident permit needs to be fastened because it causes stress.</li> <li>• The government needs to review the timeframe for responses on asylum seekers Resident Permit.</li> <li>• Community members need to be open, welcoming and accommodative of other cultures through interactions and media awareness.</li> </ul>
2	<p>To analyze the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum Seekers by the Government</p>	<p>How is your general upkeep?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exposure to good life than was experienced in home countries as many of them interact well amongst themselves and this extends to asylum seekers from other countries as they share and live in same the houses.</li> </ul>
		<p>Mention the type of support you receive from the state; economic, education, health, social and political?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enough funds for food, clothes, rent and medical treatment is provided.</li> <li>• Everybody has 250 credit hours to learn Norwegian language taking 10 to 12 months to complete.</li> <li>• Housing is provided and they</li> </ul>

			<p>are able to organise social interaction events.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are allowed to vote if a positive response is given for their resident permit by UDI and their rights are observed.</li> </ul>
		How adequate are these services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No problem cited because all the basic services including internet are provided.</li> </ul>
		Has this support improved your livelihood in anyways?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Life would improve if a positive answer is given that can result into a positive change, but while in the camp their fate is unknown.</li> <li>• The stay in Norway is better than where they are coming from due to conflicts in their home countries.</li> </ul>
		How would you suggest to the state to improve the support rendered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need for positive answers from UDI so that they are integrated into the society, able to work and become self reliant unlike depending on the government.</li> </ul>
3	To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers other than services provided by the Government	Do you have any other means of survival to supplement your livings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no other source of income or means of survival without a work permit which can only be granted if a positive response is given on resident permit by UDI.</li> </ul>
		In awaiting Resident Permit approval, what activities do you engage in?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing in relation to working other than social activities such as church, sport or organized</li> </ul>

			events.
		Do you have any professional skill which you are able to use freely? How are you utilizing it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those that have do not use them because they are not allowed without a work or resident permit.</li> <li>• They are not being utilized in any ways.</li> </ul>
		Is there anything you feel the state can do to help you become self-reliant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main thing is to have their resident permits processed on time; for now there is uncertainty.</li> </ul>
		Is it satisfactory for you to continue living in this manner? Explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not okay, the environment creates hopelessness as they depend on the government for their livelihood.</li> </ul>
4	To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum Seeker being granted Resident Permit in Norway	How long have you been in Norway?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have been in Norway with different number of years ranging from a few months to close to 2 and more years.</li> </ul>
		Have you been given the resident permit?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They were all awaiting for resident permits.</li> </ul>
		If denied the resident permit, what would you do next?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make a second appeal and those awaiting their final request would volunteer to return if safety is assured.</li> </ul>
		What requirements do you need to have your resident permit granted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Credible identity such as a passport or school certified documents that can be clarified.</li> </ul>
		Are you allowed to participate in any other activities i.e. political, economic or social before a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are limited to participate economically and politically because of non-approval of resident permits, but the social</li> </ul>

		resident permit is granted?	activities are allowed such as recreation.
--	--	-----------------------------	--

**4.2 Table 2: Results from the LOPEX Staff**

S/N	OBJECTIVES	INTERVIEW QUESTION	RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES
1	To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway	What is the mission and implementation strategies of this your organization?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To give asylum seekers a place to live, a house and a bed.</li> <li>• Guiding them through the Norwegian systems, their duties, obligations and their rights.</li> <li>• To partner with other institutions in meeting the needs and services offered to Asylum Seekers in line with the Asylum Policy.</li> </ul>
		What challenges do you think are faced by Asylum Seekers and is there any strategic plan in place to address these challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher expectations of the Norwegian Systems i.e. welfare, richness in health, education, democracy of which are not fulfilled.</li> <li>• A lot of rules that restrict them to get their expectations i.e. single mothers have high expectations due to mother/child benefits.</li> <li>• Reintegration into Sogndal Community (a small place) is a problem; if a wrong is done by one, blame is focused at group level unlike at individual level, visibility is high and contact with Norwegians outside the</li> </ul>

			<p>camp becomes a big challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Way of raising children is difficult because they become a state trophy.</li> <li>• Fjora Introduction sessions are a challenge because they are mandatory and if they miss, their allowance is deducted.</li> <li>• Reviews are done with other camps on challenges faced in camps.</li> <li>• Corporate with other stakeholders to address the challenges asylum seekers face.</li> </ul>
		<p>What challenges do you face with Asylum Seekers?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They seem de-motivated to wake up and come to the office due to delays in approval of their permit; many leaving in the camp have been waiting for a long time and are frustrated.</li> </ul>
<p>2</p>	<p>To analyse the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum Seekers by the Government</p>	<p>What social services do you provide for Asylum Seekers upon arrival and during their stay?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon arrival from a transit camp in Oslo where they undergo medicals, they undertake medicals once more in Sogndal and treatment is given i.e. psychological problems, HIV, TB. STIs are free and paid for by UDI and during their stay they pay for other illnesses.</li> <li>• Children asylum seekers start school after a week at kindergartens with 5 days in</li> </ul>

			<p>school and in same classes with Norwegian children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult Normal applicants have a right to 250 credit hours to language courses and are not allowed to go to school and the Dublin applicants completely have no right to school.</li> <li>• Low/minimum standard houses are provided with common area accommodating 6-8 maximum persons and stay according to their ethnics.</li> </ul>
		<p>Are there any restrictions in terms of access to other basic services like health, education?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only restriction is that they do not have the right to social benefits and in a case where one finds a job, they have to forgo the asylum seeker allowance, and when a job is lost they are reinstated in asylum seeker conditions.</li> </ul>
		<p>From your own experiences, have you observed any positive responses from the Asylum seekers towards social services you provide them with; social, economic, and political?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3, 000NOK allowance per month which they remain with is not enough as asylum seekers have more expectations than in reality.</li> <li>• They are happy to get school places for their children as single mothers; they are safe and protected with stability being key and appreciate taking problems to the office and receiving positive responses.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has not been any positive response about rent, paying medicals and other services required.</li> <li>• The major focus is on return to their home country for those rejected; UDI provides trainings to strengthen possibility of getting a job in their country.</li> </ul>
3	To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers other than services provided by the Government	Do you allow the Asylum seekers to be employed as part of their means of survival?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are only allowed to work voluntarily just to keep them busy while awaiting the response from the UDI for resident permits.</li> </ul>
		What are their expectations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be kept occupied and participate in activities such as helping to clean the streets of Sogndal for free.</li> </ul>
		Are there any legal implications if one is employed before or after resident permit is given?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If they have a working permit, they have chance to work but with implications of losing the funds from the government once employed. Their resident permit does not entail work permit but after 2 years they lose government asylum allowance.</li> </ul>
4	To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum Seeker being granted	What is the eligibility for one to be granted resident permit as an Asylum seeker in Norway?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification documents such as Passport and evidence proving they need Religious and/or political protection</li> </ul>
		How long does it take for a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The UDI regulates 8 to 10</li> </ul>

Resident Permit in Norway	resident permit to be granted?	<p>months with a 6 months period for scrutiny during the first intake hence 16 months is maximum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some cases have had waited for 2 years.</li> </ul>
	In the last 12 months, how many have been granted permit in Sogndal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None have been granted.</li> </ul>
	If completely denied, what is the probationary period given before they are deported to their home countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is different based on the country of origin, but three weeks is the given; the faster the process, the faster the deportation with determination of the home country.</li> </ul>
	Are there any legal bodies that advocate for their right to stay in Norway after final resident permit is denied?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Norwegian Organization for Asylum Seekers (NOAS) and SEIF which provides lawyers for those completely denied resident permits.</li> </ul>
	Are there any changes you would suggest to improve the current system for Asylum Seekers resident permits approval?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need for more resources to carry out asylum seekers activities within smaller places like Sogndal.</li> <li>• Reduce time for processing the resident permits for the purpose of settling in and rendering relief for asylum seekers.</li> </ul>

## 5.0 Discussion

The main aim of the study was to investigate and establish the welfare challenges among asylum seekers in Sogndal, Norway. The project also wanted to analyze the types of social services the state provides, learn the coping strategies at the disposal of asylum seekers and

ascertain the legalities and procedures of seeking a resident permit. The discussion flows according to objectives and their specific findings.

### **5.1 Challenges Faced by Asylum Seekers**

The findings from asylum seekers indicated that they expect safety and a secured life from their respective home countries; be accepted as refugees by the Norwegian government in order to have good education, find a job, be self-reliant and be provided with housing, food, clothing, education and good health while waiting to be granted refugee status. Goldin et al (2011) provides that most migrants move to relatively more developed countries in order to access higher incomes, better infrastructure and public services such as Education, Health, Housing and Food which positively improve their livelihood as compared to their home countries. The state immigration agent LOPEX a service provider indicated that their mission is to give asylum seekers a place to live, housing, bed and by providing strategies which guide them through the Norwegian systems; their duties, obligations and their rights, by partnering with other institutions in meeting the needs and services offered to Asylum Seekers in line with the Asylum Policy. The social and health services challenges are less experienced because the state caters for them as confessed by respondents.

According to Brekke (2004) waiting for asylum application may promote passivity and ambivalence among residents - linked to the ambivalence embedded in Asylum Policies of the reception countries – that is difficult to work with the empowerment of Asylum seekers within a framework of restrictive asylum policy, primarily concerned with “securing the quality of what is offered does not become an attraction in itself.” The results suggested that the higher expectations among asylum seekers of the Norwegian system are not fulfilled due to state restrictions on social benefits, mandatory Fjora introduction sessions and negative community members’ perceptions that generalises a wrong done by an individual and raising a child in a culture that treats them as state trophy poses a challenge. Brekke & Vevstad (2007) argues that although Norway is not a European Union member, in many ways a reception system for Asylum seekers is comparable to member state countries with regard to the directives’ Article on involvement, the practice of Norwegian regulations that are ahead of their European neighbours.

The results indicated that it is difficult to live in a foreign country due to cultural differences and ways of life with a harsh climate as compared to their countries of origin. The people in the community were good, individuals lived freely, but there was a component of silence in them and it takes time to break through them and interact. Cushner et al (1996) insinuates that in adjusting to life and work within cultures other than their own, people experience emotional reactions due to displacement and unfamiliarity due to anxiety. Disconfirmed expectations of experiences in another culture belonging for not feeling that they belong and are accepted hence, limited interaction in another culture due to their status of an outsider. Experiences of confrontation with one's prejudices as they discover that previously held beliefs may not be accurate as they interact with other cultures, communication and language barrier which are the most obvious problem that must be overcome in the crossing of cultural boundaries.

While Goldin et al (2011) asserts that challenges among other things, include depression, stress, anxiety and labour faced by asylum seekers in foreign land such as working without pay or for the purpose of fringe benefits. The informants further expressed a concern on the response taking long to come from the application made to UDI which made them experience psychological effects due to uncertainty. They seem de-motivated to wake up and go to the office due to delays in approval of their permit; many leaving in the camp have been waiting for a long time and are frustrated. To this, Berg et al (2005) observes that asylum seekers in reception centres indicated there is experience of uncertainty, powerlessness and gradual disqualification despite service providers organizing various activity programmes, empowerment and integration related activities in the centres to address challenges in life such as problems relating to discrimination, social exclusion, xenophobia and marginalization of asylum seekers.

Every person wishes for a safe and secured environment but society does not always provide for a perfect environment. Most prominently when asylum seekers are resettled, they usually have psychological effects or trauma in trying to adapt to the new environment; the new ways of livings as well as ways of doing entirely everything different in their lives. This is evidently revealed in literature and observable reality of the study.

## 5.2 Analysis of Social Services and their Impact on Asylum Seekers

To secure housing is probably the most basic need for an asylum seeker or a refugee, but it has to be well placed for easy establishment of links between different agencies that help people sustain their tenancies and providing or coordinating other kinds of support. The findings indicated that upon arrival from a transit camp in Oslo where they undergo medicals, medicals are repeated once more in Sogndal and treatment is given if diagnosed with diseases such as HIV/AIDS, TB, STIs for free and are paid for by UDI while asylum seekers pay for other illnesses. Children asylum seekers start school after a week of arrival at kindergartens with Norwegian children while Adult Normal applicants have a right to 250 credit hours to language courses and are not allowed to go to formal school and the Dublin applicants (applicants that have been rejected a resident permit from another European country and have come to seek asylum in Norway) have no right to school at all. Housing is provided with common area accommodating 6-8 people's maximum and stay according to their ethnics. John Perry (2005) illustrates that securing accommodation and support services for asylum seekers and aiding their integration through community based initiatives are key elements and should be the Government's integration strategy.

The results suggested that enough funds for food, clothes, rent and medical treatment is provided. Health services have a duty to serve the needs of the local population, including asylum seekers who equally have the right to free primary and secondary health care although there are restrictions on access to various types of support for different groups. It is mandatory that asylum seekers are sent to initial accommodation centres where a primary health assessment is carried out to assess any immediate health needs. while on the other hand some informants indicated that the 3, 000NOK allowance per month which remains is not enough as asylum seekers have more expectations than in reality and that there has been negative responses/complaints about rentals, medicals and other services required for their daily lives. Goldin et al (2011) reiterates that the welfare outcomes experienced by immigrants are to a certain extent conditional upon their circumstances and background thus, those who move for economic reasons to societies with accessible public services are likely to benefit the most.

While asylum seekers may enjoy their stay in foreign countries to find peace, one factor affecting their entitlement to benefits is the immigration status. Results suggested that the

only restriction is that they do not have the right to social benefits and in a case where one finds a job, they have to forgo the asylum seeker allowance, and when a job is lost they are reinstated in asylum seeker conditions. Cushner et al (1996) contends that people living and working across cultures take part in various types of educational activities. They transfer skills to hosts who can follow through on jointly developed activities after the sojourners return home. Therefore, to claim social benefits they must meet all conditions of entitlement unless in circumstances of incapacity benefit, contribution-based jobseekers allowance and bereavement allowances. In this case, an asylum seeker can only claim for income support, income-based job seekers allowance, housing benefit, council tax benefit and social fund.

### **5.3 Coping Strategies at the disposal of Asylum Seekers**

The extreme difficulties experienced by asylum seekers throughout the pre-migration period enable them to identify several strategies that allow them to cope such as the use of religion, social support networks, reframing and focusing on the future.

The findings indicated that there are no other sources of income or means of survival without a work permit which can only be granted if a positive response is given on resident permit and asylum seekers are only allowed to work voluntarily just to keep them busy while awaiting the response from the UDI for resident permits. According to Crawley et al (2011), despite the demand for labour markets, there are other strategies that asylum seekers resort to in coping with their cases of destitution, survival and livelihood as they have limited to no chances of getting employed. This affirms to their engagement in nothing related to working other than social activities such as church which provides important source for many living in destitution, sport or organized events. Results also indicated that to be kept occupied they are required to participate in activities such as helping to clean the streets of Sogndal for free.

The respondents revealed that the professional qualifications that they possess from their home countries are not used because they are not allowed to do so without a work or resident permit, if they have a working permit; they have chance to work but with implications of losing the funds from the government once employed. Their resident permit does not entail work permit but after 2 years they lose government pays for asylum

seekers. Such situations leave them with no to little options and therefore, engage into other difficulty but illegal coping strategies. Crawley et al (2011) reiterates that, some relationships are overtly transactional, with destitute asylum seekers providing childcare, cooking and housework; and sometimes sex in exchange for meals, cash, shelter or other daily necessities. This result in both men and female forming sexual relationships with local people as part of their livelihood strategy, but these relationships are sometimes disempowering. Therefore, all asylum seekers know that it is illegal for them to work but often have no choice but to engage into illegal work to survive their destitution state.

Despite all the basic needs being provided to asylum seekers, the lack of utility of their professional skills acquired from their home country still comes out as a challenges and barrier towards their personal development. They end up living a life of free labour as if they were not professionally trained. Of course one of their expectations as they come to host countries such as Norway is to feel economically stable by way of getting or be instated in various jobs which do not get to happen before a resident permit. Consequently, such always leaves them with unsecured life and very limited hope for the future.

#### **5.4 The Legalities and Procedure of Asylum Seeking in Norway**

The results suggested that asylum seekers have been in Norway with different number of years ranging from a few months to close to 2 and more years but were still waiting for resident permits. Results obtained also indicated that Identification documents such as Passport and evidence proving that they need Religious and/or political protection were the minimum eligibility standard to make an application for asylum. The literature according to NOAS states that an Application for asylum at the police station where their fingerprints are taken and asked about their identity and travel route to Norway is done. Therefore, they are all obliged to submit their passport and other identity documents to the police.

Responses indicated that The UDI regulates 8 to 10 months with a 6 months period for scrutiny during the first intake hence 16 months is maximum period for the asylum seekers to await resident permits although some cases have had waited for 2 years or more. Those that have been denied on first application make a second appeal and those awaiting their final request would volunteer to return if safety is assured; with no one granted on second appeal in history. The literature however argues that the most important stage of asylum

process is the interview by UDI to determine their entitlement to residence permit which lasts between three and five hours with a sworn professional translator in secrecy during interview and after the interview, they are moved into another asylum reception with free services while they await UDI's decision. UDI ascertains that their life and freedom are in danger in their home country because of either race, nationality, religion, membership of a special social group, political endeavours or because of the security situation in their country, they will be granted asylum in Norway, but only on conditions that no one in their home country can protect them. They may be granted asylum on humanitarian grounds in instances where their children have a serious health condition. If granted after some weeks or months they are transferred to a municipality where they attend courses to learn the Norwegian language and the Norwegian way of life, including important rules and laws of the country with the goal to enhance chances of acquiring work in order to be self-sufficient.

According to the obtained results, asylum seekers are limited to participate economically and politically because of non-approval of resident permits, but however, social activities are allowed such as recreation while in the municipality asylum reception camps. Literature revealed that they are not entitled to economic support when they choose to live privately. If UDI ascertains that one's life will not be put at risk under such circumstances, the application for asylum on humanitarian grounds will be turned down. If economically independent, they may choose to settle where they would like.

Findings revealed that cases are treated differently based on the country of origin, but three weeks is given and the faster the process, the faster the deportation with determinant of the country and the Norwegian Organization for Asylum Seekers (NOAS) and SEIF provide lawyers for those completely denied resident permits. This relates to the obtaining literature that an asylum seeker may either return to their home country or lodge a complaint if application is rejected with a lawyer provided for free within a period of three weeks from time of rejection. Nevertheless Immigration Appeals Board (UNE) is the highest body to make the final decision and can either reverse or maintain the decision.



## **5.5 Conclusion**

The research was a success in that it unearthed a lot of welfare challenges as evident in the report which are being faced by asylum seeker in Sogndal. This means that concerted effort by various stakeholders needs to be enhanced and strengthened if these vise are to be improved upon. However the Norwegian government through UDI, is doing a recommendable job in trying to offset these imbalances, but the major problem lies with bureaucracy coupled with caseloads of asylum seekers anticipating to be permanently resettled.

In conclusion some challenges that prominently came out were Psychological trauma due to uncertainty responses from the UDI, lack of economic coping strategies such as acquisition of jobs before resident permit is given, social and cultural barriers due to a non-interactive way of life and the difference in norms and values, numerous strict rules and regulations that limit their integration into society; and the de-motivation as a result of welfare bureaucracies among others.

Norway is a welfare state and has adopted the concept of Universalism which entails that all welfare services should be available for all human beings as a matter of Right. The existence of Universalism has brought about uniform access to services regardless of one's nationality, but in reality this does not apply to foreign nationals in general. This is usually according to needs and is not restricted by individual ability to pay by general contributions through taxes and national insurance. The problem of asylum seekers to finally be resettled and given resident permit has continued to pose a problem due to the bureaucratic system in policy implementation. Uncertainty towards full integration has continued to cause anxiety and trauma among asylum seekers because once rejected, they risk losing the benefits they enjoy as an asylum seeker as well as deportation to their countries of origin. As manifested during our research project, there is still a gap between the locals and foreigners in quest to services provided.

## **5.6 Recommendations**

The following are recommendations that the researchers came up with emanating from the study.

1. The Norwegian government needs to decentralize some of the functions done by the UDI to Municipal level in order to speed up the process of Asylum Seeking.
2. The Norwegian government needs to revise the monthly allowances for asylum seekers to affordable levels in order to match with the high cost of living in Norway.
3. The State needs to integrate and make use of the asylum seekers expertise in various professions because some have very good education background.
4. There is need for the State to intensify the security border controls so that genuine cases are allowed for asylum seekers unlike those that come for mere livelihood.
5. The State through her implementing partners needs to strengthen its relationship with the Church in order to enhance and provide spiritual counseling to asylum seekers.

## REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (2007). *The Practice of Social Research*. California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Berg B and Sveaass N. (2005). *Det hainnle om å leve. Tiltak for å bedre Psykisk helse for beboere i asylmottak*. SINTEF-IFIMINKKVTS.
- Brekke J.P and Vevstad V. (2007). *Reception Conditions for Asylum Seekers in Norway and the European Union*. Oslo: ISF.
- Brekke, J. P. (2004). *While we are waiting. Uncertainty and empowerment among Asylum Seekers in Sweden*. Oslo: ISF.
- Bruce L Berg and Howard Lune. (2012). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Connelly and Claudinin. (1990). *Ethnography, Observational Research and Narrative Inquiry*. Colorado: Colorado State University.
- Crawley Heaven, Joanne Hemmings and Neil Prince. (February 2011). *Coping with Destitution: Survival and livelihood strategies of refused asylum seekers living in the UK*. Swansea: Centre for Migration Policy Research (CMPR) Swansea University.
- Cushner Kenneth, Richard W. Brislin. (1996). *Intercultural Interactions*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Goldin Ian, Geoffrey Cameron, Meera Balarajan. (2011). *Exceptional People: How migration shaped our world and will define our Future*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Khawaja Nigar G, White Katherine M, Schweitzer Robert and Greenslade Jaimi H. (2008). Difficulties and coping strategies of Sudanese Refugees: a qualitative approach. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 489-512.
- Mathew B Miles and Michael Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- The Deligation of the European Commission to USA. (September 2008). The EU and Immigration: Opportunities and Challenges. *EU Focus*, 1 - 8.
- ssb.no 2012: [http://www.ssb.no/innvandring\\_en/](http://www.ssb.no/innvandring_en/)

John Perry: September 2005; Joseph Rowntree Foundation

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/guide-housing-and-support-services-asylum-seekers-and-refugees>

Sophie Haroon Dr: 2008 [http://www.fph.org.uk/uploads/bs\\_asylum\\_seeker\\_health.pdf](http://www.fph.org.uk/uploads/bs_asylum_seeker_health.pdf)  
<http://www.noas.org/news>

ROAP April 2001; <http://www.rightsnet.org.uk/pdfs/roap-benefits.pdf>

## Appendices

### Appendix I

#### **Interview Guide 1:**

#### **Target: Asylum Seekers**

**Objective one:** *To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway.*

1. What were your expectations when coming here;
  - Political?
  - Economic?
  - Social?
2. What problems are you facing living in a foreign land?
3. How is your social interaction among;
  - Yourselves?
  - Community members?
  - LOPEX Staff?
4. How do you want these problems to be addressed at;
  - Individual?
  - Government?
  - Community?
  - Others?

**Objective two:** *To analyze the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum seekers by the government.*

1. How is your general upkeep?
2. Mention the type of support you receive from the state;
  - Economic?
  - Education?
  - Health?
  - Social?
  - Political?
3. How adequate are these services?

4. Has this support improved your livelihood in anyways?
5. How would you suggest to the state to improve the support rendered?

**Objective Three:** *To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum seekers other than services provided the government.*

1. Do you have any other means of survival to supplement your livings?
2. In awaiting Resident Permit approval, what activities do you engage in?
3. Do you have any professional skill which you are able to use freely? How are you utilizing it?
4. Is there anything you feel the state can do to help you become self reliant?
5. Is it satisfactory for you to continue living in this manner? explain

**Objective Four:** *To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum seeker being granted Resident Permit in Norway.*

1. How long have you being in Norway?
2. Have you been given the resident permit?
3. If denied the resident permit, what would you do next?
4. What requirements do you need to have your resident permit granted?
5. Are you allowed to participate in any other activities i.e. political, economic or social before a resident permit is granted?

## **Appendix II**

### **Interview Guide 2:**

#### **Target: LOPEX Staff**

**Objective one:** *To outline the challenges faced by Asylum Seekers in Norway.*

1. What is the mission and implementation strategies of this your organization?
2. What challenges do you think are faced by Asylum seekers and is there any strategic plan in place to address these challenges?
3. What challenges do you face with Asylum seekers?

**Objective two:** *To analyze the types of social services provided and determine their impact on Asylum seekers by the government.*

1. What social services do you provide for Asylum seekers upon arrival and during their stay?
2. Are there any restrictions in terms of access to other basic services like health, education?
3. From your own experiences, have you observed any positive responses from the Asylum seekers towards social services you provide them with?

**Objective three:** *To learn other coping strategies at the disposal of Asylum seekers other than services provided the government.*

1. Do you allow the Asylum seekers to be employed as part of their means of survival? What are their expectations?
2. Are there any legal implications if one is employed before or after resident permit is given?

**Objective Four:** *To ascertain the legalities and procedures of an Asylum seeker being granted Resident Permit in Norway.*

1. What is the eligibility for one to be granted resident permit as an Asylum seeker in Norway?
2. How long does it take for a resident permit to be granted?
3. In the last 12 months, how many have been granted permit in Sogndal?
4. If completely denied, what is the probationary period given before they are deported to their home countries?

5. Are there any legal bodies that advocate for their right to stay in Norway after final resident permit is denied?
6. Are there any changes you would suggest to improve the current system for Asylum seekers resident permits approval?

**Appendix III****LETTER OF INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT**

Our names are Susan Nasilele, Christious Mwanza and Julius Simfukwe, and we are in our final semester doing Global Knowledge at Sogn og Fjordane University College. In May of our final semester we are required to submit a research report. This is a piece of original research that we have worked on with a department supervisor. We would like to do our research on the Welfare Challenges that Asylum Seekers face, and we are working with Gunnar Onarheim on this project. We would like to interview both Asylum Seekers and the Staff that are closely monitoring their activities for our study, and that is why we are asking for your help.

For our research, we would like to interview some of the above participants between March and April. We will also be taking notes while interviewing the participants. We may join in discussions and group exercises if any. As researchers, you are subject to professional secrecy and the acquired data will be kept in confidence.

Participation is voluntary, and the consent may be withdrawn by the participant at any time during the research project without having to state a reason. If you are agreeing to share some of the welfare challenges that are being faced by Asylum Seekers, you can indicate this by signing below.

If you do not consent, you will be interviewed however; if you consent then you will be interviewed. The information obtained will be confidential and for academic purposes only.

**Do you have any questions you want to ask us?**

**Susan Nasilele - 96962634**

.....

**Christious Mwanza - 46595669**

**Assistant Professor**

**Julius Simfukwe – 46595662**

**Gunnar Onarheim**

**Supervisor**

**Email: [gunnar.onarheim@hisf.no](mailto:gunnar.onarheim@hisf.no)**



The project is not subject to notification to the Norwegian Social Science Data Service (NSD) since data will not be registered or kept over time.

I have received written information about the student research project, and I therefore wish to;

**Tick in the box**

I consent to be interviewed

I do not consent to be interviewed

Your Name: -----

Your Signature: -----

Date: -----