
Framing Trust at the Street Level

An Empirical Interpretative Study of Distrust and Trust between
Frontline Public Sector Employees and Young Men with Minority
Ethnic Backgrounds in Denmark

Kevin Perry

Ph.D. Thesis, March 2012.

Institute for Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde University.

To, Rie, Oliver & Martha

Foreword

"I am a part of all that I have met"
(Alfred Tennyson)

I believe that exceptional life experiences and encountering significant others along the way through the journey of life challenge and change the values, beliefs, culture and direction that life takes. Without these significant others and life changing experiences, I would not be (literally) where and who I am today. This thesis is a consequence of all of these experiences and meaningful encounters and can be described as a result of lifelong learning. The motivation and commitment for contemplating, undertaking and completing this thesis comes from many different sources. Ultimately, it is a product of my own stubbornness and determination where agency plays a considerable part, however, without these outside influences it would have never come into being. The following brief biography outlines some of the exceptional experiences and persons who have shaped my life course, choices and self development.

Biography in Brief

I am a white 'middle-aged' English man who grew up in a working class family (four kids) in a deprived area in the North East of England. During my childhood, unemployment was high, my father, a self-learned JCB-excavator operator had long spells of unemployment. We moved often, by the time, I started secondary school I had attended four different primary schools. My childhood can best be described as chaotic, violent and growing up in a cold environment (both physically and emotionally). My father, a heavy drinker often became violent under the influence of alcohol. Drinking and violence was integral to the construction site culture – they worked hard and played hard. Often my mother was the target for his violence, other times it was me. My mother, a housewife, suffered from epilepsy and often had seizures. When I was around 12 years of age, my mother became disabled losing the ability to walk, which made life, even more difficult for her. During my teens, I started to truant from school and finally got caught up in bad company. I started to hang around with a group of older youths where drinking, fighting, and petty crime was the norm. At some point, social services and the police started to take an 'interest' in me. The local social service department assigned Mr Pick to my case. Evidently, Mr Pick and social services were considering removing me from home. Despite being present when he visited my parents, he never spoke to me, only about me. During the same period, Sergeant Robson a local police officer showed a genuine interest in my well-being. Often, he visited where we lived for a chat with me and to inquire about my well-being. Moreover, when we bumped into one another in town, he asked my business, if, he thought I was up to no-good he sent me home.

In the last year of secondary school education, Mr White the year head gave me an ultimatum – either leave school voluntarily or be expelled. I opted to leave voluntarily on the spot and left without any qualifications. Subsequently, I decided to join the army to get away from home and ‘the boys’. While attending the army selection centre they offered me a place in the Royal Green Jackets (RGJ), a light infantry regiment. This appealed to me because it was far away from home and my so-called friends. While in the process of enlisting, some petty offences caught up with me and I received a summons to attend the magistrate’s court. This posed a dilemma; if I received a custodial sentence the army would withdraw the job offer. That is exactly what Sergeant Robson told the magistrates when he turned up in court to give me a character reference. While I cannot recollect his exact words, I can remember the gist of his message. He told the magistrates they had the enormous responsibility of deciding my future. He explained that if they convicted me there was a high risk they would see my miserable face before them again. Luckily, they listened to Sergeant Robson and threw the case out of court giving me leave to join the army.

In the summer of 1981, at the age of 16, I left home to join the Royal Green Jackets in Winchester. I can remember it was a sunny day in May; my father drove me to the train station in Darlington and gave me £70 to see me on my way.

Upon arriving at Winchester train station, I could see two soldiers confidently swaggering up and down the platforms swinging their ‘swagger sticks’ (a symbol of rank). Boys around the same age as me were stepping off arriving trains and cautiously approaching the two burly looking men with matching uniforms, shiny bulled boots, green berets and both wearing moustaches. At the end of the platform closest to the station building, two groups of boys were assembling in ranks of three. When I plucked up the courage, I walked towards one of these pokerfaced men in green clothing with hair above the top lip, lost my nerve and kept walking. After passing the hardened warrior, I found a place in the shade, took some deep breathes and approached again. Corporal Barkworth asked my name, crossed me off his list and told me to join the ranks of the assembling mob. This was the beginning of twelve months of psychologically and physically intensive training at Peninsula Barracks in Winchester. This was the warm welcome to the world of men and masculinities, a world of bullying, beasting’s and beatings. When I first arrived at Peninsula Barracks, there were roughly 36 recruits or NIGS (new intake group) in each platoon divided into three sections. Two platoons made up the junior rifleman company: Calais and Salamanca. During the 12 months of gruelling training, for various reasons many recruits fell by the wayside, into disgrace, and never made it to the passing out parade (a graduation ceremony where the recruit finally earns the right to wear the converted green beret). During the next five years, I travelled the world with the 2nd Battalion the Royal Green Jackets serving in different countries and gaining much life experience. During this time, my battle partner Mike ‘Chig’ Morgan had a decisive influence on my personal development.

After serving 6 years with 2RGJ, I tried various occupations including unemployment, factory work, taxi driving, pizza delivery, door-to-door sales, working on the door in a nightclub, and eventually residential care with young people. It was while working at Aycliffe Young People’s Centre (A.Y.P.C.) in County Durham, as a residential-social worker, that I found my new career.

Starting originally as a relief worker to provide cover for staff sickness and holidays, I found working with young people both rewarding and challenging. After working at Aycliffe Young People's Centre (A.Y.P.C.) as a full-time relief worker for three years, I managed to challenge the system successfully by winning a place on a vocational course normally reserved for permanent staff. This vocational course entitled the Certificate in Working with Residential Adolescents was the outcome of a partnership between A.Y.P.C. and Durham University was my first step on the academic ladder. During the same period, I met my wife to be Rie, who, while taking a break from studying law in Denmark, was working voluntary at A.Y.P.C. - she has had an enormous impact on my life course and development in many ways.

While participating in the vocational course, which involved working with adolescents in residential and group settings, my practice teacher and mentor Louise Dare was highly influential to my training and intellectual development. Throughout my time at A.Y.P.C. some colleagues had an impact on both my practice and personal development, particularly Bayna Brown, Moira Fraser and Marion Franklin. After successfully completing the Certificate of Working with Residential Adolescents, I applied for a place on the Diploma in Social Work & Higher Education. The Diploma in Social Work (DipSW) was something that profoundly influenced my beliefs and values. The point of departure for this programme was in anti-oppressive and anti-discriminatory practice, which focused much on racism and social inequality. The emphasis was on tackling social injustice and discrimination in the community where empowerment and adopting a non-prejudicial approach is necessary, during this period, Jill Marshall, Peter Dickinson and Kate Johnson played a pivotal role. While undertaking the DipSW, Marion Franklin continued to be influential on my professional and personal development as we spent many hours sparring, studying and commuting together to and from New College Durham. In addition, while on placement at the Child Protection Team in Durham Social Services, Cecilia Elliot my practice teacher and Jim Crozier the team manager had an impact. After successfully completing the Diploma in Social Work, I moved to Denmark in June 1997 to start my life together with Rie.

When I first moved to Denmark, I experienced the rigmarole of obtaining a 'residents permit' (opholdstilladelse) from the 'Immigration Board' (Udlændingestyrelsen) – a process repeated every year for four years until I received a permanent residence permit. While waiting to start a B.A. Degree in European Social Work, I managed to get a couple of relief jobs: pedagogical assistant in an after school club & canteen assistant (dishwasher no. 2). The first job involved 'looking after' children aged from five to ten years of age and the second working in the SAS cafeteria at Copenhagen Airport washing dishes. In September the same year I started the B.A. in European Social Work, the first six months took place in Denmark which involved a four-month placement. I managed to get a placement at the 'Youth House' located on Amager Island, over the bridge from Copenhagen. This assignment involved undertaking a research project observing the interactions between the staff and the young people. This was a fascinating project where I adopted an overt participant observer role. The last part of the B.A. course took place at Portsmouth University where I wrote my dissertation on 'Discrimination, Gypsies, and Social Work'. After completing my dissertation, I headed back to Denmark where Rie was due to give

birth to our first child. After the birth of Oliver, I started attending the Social High School in Copenhagen to accredit my social work qualifications. During the evenings, I attended Danish classes in Copenhagen to learn Danish, which is probably the most difficult language in the world.

Getting my social work qualifications from England accredited to that of Danish 'socialrådgiver' enabled me to start applying for social work jobs. After applying for many jobs without success, finally I got invited to attend a job interview at a social service department at Nørrebro. At the job interview, the committee asked questions in Danish, and I answered in English. A couple of hours after the job interview they phoned, and to my surprise, offered me the job. My task was to investigate how other countries manage to get unemployed men with minority ethnic backgrounds into the labour market. However, my job at Nørrebro was fugacious, after ten weeks, they fired me because two of my colleagues decided my Danish was inadequate, therefore, could not cooperate with me. After a drawn-out process, I received compensation for discrimination. Since my first social work 'job' in Denmark, I have worked in five other local authorities in various social service posts. Mainly, I have worked with the concept of "*crime prevention*" within various SSP posts. The abbreviation SSP stands for cooperation between schools, social services and the police. During this time, I have worked in two 'crime prevention' projects working directly with young people suburbs around Copenhagen.

In 2002, we moved to Bornholm where shortly afterwards Martha our second child entered the world on a stormy day in February. During this period, I began to work in Rønne as the SSP Consultant working with young people and social problems in the local community. This job continued in the Regional Authority of Bornholm after the large local government amalgamation fell into place. Besides working full-time, from September 2001 to October 2005, I completed the Masters in Social Science with Aalborg University. My supervisor at the time, Keith had quite an impact on my way of thinking and professional development. Further, it was Keith that suggested pursuing a PhD degree. Eventually, I applied for one of three vacancies at Roskilde University and gained a place in the ICE project headed by Jon Sundbo where Lars became my supervisor. Lars has been influential throughout the PhD process, especially with regard to my developing an interest in the trust concept. Lastly, the experience of participant observation with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, in and around the two neighbourhoods where I collected data has been instrumental in changing my outlook on social and youth work intervention. During this time, I got the chance to observe firsthand and hear their accounts of the social reality of being the object of such intervention.

At the time of writing, I have lived in Denmark for fifteen years together with my wife, and we have two children. This brief biography gives a few snap shots of a few experiences and remarkable people that have had some influence on my outlook and course in life. Without all of these influences and experiences, this dissertation would not exist. Moreover, to some extent, all of these influences along with social and cultural characteristics undoubtedly have had some influence upon the choice of research question, the chosen method, and interpretation of the data at the centre of this dissertation.

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Problem Statement and Formulation	4
1.2 Background and Motivation	6
1.3 The Approach	7
1.4 Research Setting and Context	8
1.5 The People Involved – Interactants	13
1.6 Structure of the Thesis	14
CHAPTER 2: TRUST AS A CULTURAL FRAME	18
2.1 Aim of the thesis	19
2.2 Interpersonal Trust	22
2.3 Stages and Levels of Trust	24
2.4 Trust Continuum (or Not)	28
2.5 Low Trust/Low Distrust (Cell 1)	29
2.6 High Trust/Low Distrust (Cell 2)	30
2.7 Low Trust/High Distrust (Cell 3)	30

2.8	High Trust/High Distrust (Cell 4)	30
2.9	(Table) Integrating Trust and Distrust: Alternative Social Realities	31
2.10	Basis for Trusting Relations	33
2.11	Multi-dimensional Interpersonal Trust Framework	34
2.12	Deterrence-based vs. Calculus-based Trust (CBT)	35
2.13	Knowledge-based Trust (KBT)	41
2.14	Identification-based Trust (IBT)	42
2.15	Beyond the Dyadic Perspective on Trust	45
2.16	Towards a definition of trust as resource	49
2.17	The Concept of Frame and Trust in the Thesis	53
2.18	Located in a Wider Cultural and Structural Framework	55
2.19	Concluding Remarks	57
	CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	61
3.1	Chapter Structure	62
3.2	Interactant vs. Informant	62
3.3	Ethnography – The Research Strategy	64
3.4	Ethnography – Interpreting Cultures	67
3.5	Culture as a Repertoire or toolbox	68

3.6	Ethnography as Thick Description	69
3.7	Ethnographer as Research Instrument	70
3.8	Ethnographic Methods	71
3.9	Participant Observation	72
3.10	Interviews	75
3.11	Analysing the Data	77
3.12	Frame Analysis	80
3.13	The Components of Frame(s)	81
3.14	Critique of Frame Analysis	84
3.15	Ethical Considerations in Fieldwork	86
3.16	Harm to Participants – Confidentiality/Anonymity	88
3.17	Informed Consent	91
3.18	Privacy	94
3.19	Critique of Qualitative/Ethnographic Research	95
3.20	Reliability & Reliability in Ethnography	98
	CHAPTER 4: ENTERING THE FIELD	103
4.1	Chapter Structure	106
4.2	Gaining Access	107

4.3	Gaining Access – Experience from the Field	108
4.4	Trust Matters in Fieldwork	110
4.5	Significance of Research Roles	115
4.6	Impression Management	118
4.7	Group Encounters and Impression Management	119
4.8	Appearance & Attitude	123
4.9	Managing Impressions – Findings from the Field	125
4.10	Entering the Field - The Boys Club in Paradise Way	128
4.11	Testing Boundaries, Rites of Passage or Researcher Reactivity	128
4.12	The Wedgie – an act of intuition	135
4.13	The Service Station	138
4.14	Fieldwork Reflections	139
4.15	Trust Building through Gaming Encounters	142
4.16	Framing the Situation and Researcher	143
4.17	Concluding Remarks	146
	CHAPTER 5: CLASHING FRAMES	150
5.1	Chapter Structure	154
5.2	PART ONE: Governmental Distrust Frames	157

5.2.1	Political Context	157
5.2.3	Background to Political Context	158
5.2.4	Public Consent – Rallying the Troops	160
5.2.5	Policy Frame Analysis	163
5.2.6	“Ghettos”	163
5.2.7	‘Insiders’ vs. ‘Outsiders’	166
5.2.8	Reclaiming the “Ghettos” via Assimilation	169
5.2.9	‘Assimilating Bilingual Children’	170
5.2.10	Summary	173
5.3	PART TWO: Local Authority Institutionalised distrust	177
5.3.1	Doris & Tine	180
5.3.2	Anders	186
5.3.3	Margret & Aydin	188
5.3.4	Observation & Patrolling as Youth Work Practice	197
5.3.5	Dave & Adem	197
5.3.6	Aydin	201
5.3.7	Youth Worker – Interviews	205
5.3.8	Margret	208

5.3.9	Legislation	210
5.3.10	Dave	213
5.3.11	Adem	221
5.3.12	Bente	225
5.3.13	Summary & Discussion	234
5.4	PART THREE: Trust as a Cultural Frame	236
5.4.1	'The Super Snitch Patrol, the 'Cop and the Job Consultant'	238
5.4.2	Hassan & Maria	239
5.4.3	Asad and Kazim	240
5.4.4	'Above All Else, Do Not Snitch'	243
5.4.5	Salim	246
5.4.6	Injustice & Justice	248
5.4.7	Trust Framing: The Job Consultant & Cop	252
5.4.8	Trust Framing: The Cop contd.	256
5.4.9	Summary	261
5.5	PART FOUR: Negotiating Cultural Frames	264
5.5.1	Linda – Observations	266
5.5.2	Linda – Interview	276

5.5.3	Linda – Summary	282
5.5.4	Dennis	284
5.5.5	Summary	294
CHAPTER 6: Contribution and Implications		296
6.1	Chapter Structure	297
6.2	Government Construction of Distrust Frames	297
6.3	Local Authority Institutionalised Distrust Frames	299
6.4	Trust and Distrust as Cultural Frames	302
6.5	Negotiating Trust Frames	305
6.6	Stepping Back from the Street-Level – Wider Implications	307
6.7	Recommendations for Further Research	307
6.8	Recommendations for Practice	308
6.9	Contributions of Thesis	309
6.10	Limitations of Thesis	310
6.11	Conclusion	311
LITERATURE LIST		312
English Summary		325
Dansk Resumé		327

Acknowledgements

Writing this PhD thesis has been both a challenging and enlightening experience. The same can be said about the PhD process which involves entering the halls of academia, which presents a strange new social reality to negotiate. During this time, I have had the opportunity to spend time at, and to get to know a number of places and people that have come to play a prominent role in my personal and professional development. The first two places to mention are Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the people in these communities who interacted with me and put up with my curiosity. In addition, I would like to thank all professionals who endured my company and gaze for countless hours.

Another important place to mention is the sociology department at Uppsala University where I stayed for four months as a guest researcher. Keith and Mia, I would like to express my gratitude to you, for making my stay both enjoyable and enlightening. During this time, I met a number of people who showed interest and enthusiasm in my work, this is appreciated. In this connection I would like to acknowledge my PhD colleagues especially Clara, Anne-Sophie and Erik. While at Uppsala I was given the opportunity to visit other researchers and institutions to which I am grateful. During one such visit I met Björn Andersson at the Institute for Social Work at Gothenburg University who I want to thank for reading some of my early work and giving encouragement.

Roskilde University has been instrumental during the PhD years. I would especially like to thank Lars Fuglsang my supervisor for your encouragement and confident positive expectations in me and my work. Thanks for enlightening me with the trust concept and for the inspiring and challenging supervision sessions. In addition, thanks to Søren Jagd and Poul Bitsch Olsen for tips and inspiration along the way. Last but not least, I want to thank Luise Li Langergaard my friend and colleague for support and for critically reading some of my work – it means a lot to me.

Finally, Sorø, the place where my family and I live has played a prominent role during the writing process where many reflective hours of walking around the lake have helped thesis related difficulties. I am grateful to Morton and Susanne for providing me with a place to work along with lunch and lunch colleagues, whom I would like to, thank for including me in the social activity of 'frokost'. In addition, I want to take the opportunity to thank Camilla for reminding me just how valuable this work is, so thanks Camilla. Last but not least, I am extremely grateful to Rie, Oliver and Martha for always being supportive and understanding during the PhD challenge, it is something I appreciate immensely.

1

Introduction

“Trust is critical to the functioning of our society at all levels—interpersonal, small group, organisational, and societal—and is especially central to the practice of public relations. You can’t have credibility without it. And, trust appears to be the most central component to satisfactory relationships” (Rawlins 2007).

This study investigates the phenomenon of why young men with minority ethnic backgrounds distrust some public sector employees and trust others. The focus is on trust and distrust which can be understood as cultural resources – a valuable approach to researching trust and distrust largely under-represented in the trust literature. Adopting this approach implies that: *“culture influences action not by providing the ultimate values towards which action is oriented, but by shaping a repertoire or ‘tool kit’ of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct ‘strategies of action’”* (Swidler, 1986:273). In other words, this thesis adopts the view that culture provides knowledgeable actors with a repertoire or toolbox of habits, skills, and styles, which they can use to tackle or manage different situations in which they encounter. In addition, this implies, through learning and hands-on experience, knowledgeable actors can develop and expand their cultural repertoire or toolbox. Adopting this approach goes against the dominant model used to understand culture’s influence on action, which assumes that culture shapes action by supplying ultimate ends or values toward which action directs, thus making values the primary causal aspect of culture (Swidler, 1986). The continuing discussion about culture and action derive from two different traditions in sociology, of which both play a role towards current understanding of

culture within sociology (Turner, 2006). On the one side, the analytic tradition, which stems from Talcott Parsons adoption and adaption of Max Weber's means-end approach to action, approaches culture in terms of the way culture sets the ends of action (Swidler, 1986; Turner, 2006). Parsons argued that, within a means-ends framework, only sociology could account for the goals actors pursue (Swidler, 1986). Social systems, according to Parsons, exist to achieve their key values, and values account for why different actors arrive at different decisions even in similar situations (Swidler, 1986). Hence, according to this view, interests, norms and values shape action (Turner, 2006).

On the other side, the pragmatic tradition (i.e. George Herbert Mead and Herbert Blumer), completely reject the means-ends characterisation of action; instead, they argue that actors continuously make sense of and negotiate physical and social situations through improvisation as they emerge (Turner, 2006). Proponents of this tradition have developed a notion of 'culture-as-use' that advances the knowledgeable actor as the connection between culture and society (Turner, 2006). Following this tradition, knowledgeable actors in social situations draw on cultural resources when established institutional stability breaks down (ibid). Following Swidler (1986), culture is not a single cohesive entity which drives action in a consistent direction; rather it is something which provides resources for social actors to draw on in which to develop strategies of action, more like a toolbox which actors can select different tools from to create strategies. Knowledgeable actors acquire strategies of action from 'culture' which helps them make sense of their social world and to develop action in relation to achieving various goals (Swidler, 1986). Thus, the contemporary debate on culture's influence on action centres around two stances, that of culture in action and that of culture as thick environment i.e. norms, values and interests which push action (Turner, 2006). While the former emphasises that actors continually use culture to understand and solve practical and social situations in social life, the latter accentuates that shared language and preceding interpretations construct the social world for the actor (Turner, 2006).

The purpose of this in-depth study, based on nine months of ethnographic fieldwork, is to contribute towards understanding the micro-processes at play in distrust and trust building processes between public sector employees and young men from minority ethnic backgrounds an under-researched and often misunderstood area. Currently in Denmark, there is increasing

tension between the authorities and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in and around large suburban residential housing estates. A common source of conflict is often a lack of confidence or distrust in the authorities; therefore, winning the confidence of minority ethnic groups in these communities is essential to easing tensions, along with reducing civil unrest, antisocial behaviour, crime and unnecessary public spending. In addition, despite political and media focus on young men with minority ethnic backgrounds both at the national and local levels, there is hardly any literature to be found concerning the relationships between frontline professionals and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, there is a distinct research gap in relation to research which investigates trust or distrust processes between frontline professionals and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. While there is consensus in the literature that trust and trusting relationships are necessary in engaging young people in reactive and successful service delivery, there is a distinct gap in the literature which explores trust building processes between young people and professionals employed to engage them in reactive services.

In addition, while there have been a small number of qualitative studies investigating trust either as a primary or lesser concern, the majority of empirical research to-date concerning trust are survey or experiment based (Hardin 2006). Mostly, experimental studies involve individual-level trust usually involving dyadic interactions (Hardin 2006:42). Typically, this approach involves testing the susceptibility of participants to cooperate whereby trust is just a slight concern (Hardin 2006). Survey work usually involves investigating public opinion towards government and other agencies although some research does address interpersonal trust (Hardin 2006:42). These approaches are strongly criticised as limited to researching the trust concept (e.g. Hardin, 2006, Möllering, 2006), which implies a significant knowledge gap in the trust literature. In addition, interpretive approaches to studying trust and distrust, which take the point of departure in the perspectives of people engaged in trust or distrust relationships, are largely under-represented in the trust literature (Möllering, 2001, 2006). This lack of research implies a knowledge gap in the subjective micro-processes concerning trust and distrust experiences in real face-to-face relationships, which need to be understood in view of the context and history of interaction (ibid). Therefore, the knowledge generated from this interpretative study should provide new insights and inform social and youth work practice in relation to understanding the processes at play in

relation to trust and distrust. In addition, this study should contribute towards filling the gap in the literature on trust where interpretative approaches to studying trust are necessary (Möllering, 2006).

To contribute towards filling this knowledge gap, this study investigates the phenomenon of why young men with minority ethnic backgrounds distrust some public sector employees and trust others. Specifically it closely explores the relationships between key public sector employees and a group of young men with diverse minority ethnic backgrounds (namely Palestinian, Turkish and Somalian), in and around a suburban residential housing estate in Denmark. Primarily, the focus is on the relationship between the group, a team of youth workers, a job consultant and a police officer. The approach, attitude and actions of these employees' towards the young men, determine whether the relationships develop into distrusting or trusting, which has consequences for the success or failure of service delivery. Face-to-face encounters are the usual form of social interaction and the best way to experience others (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Face-to-face encounters allow a steady flow of inter-subjective communications, which is the basis of knowledge' in the given social context; but not limited to that context (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) or in this case knowledge of the other, which leads to distrust or trust.

1.1 Problem Statement and Formulation

The purpose of this in-depth study, based on nine months of ethnographic fieldwork is twofold. Firstly, the aim is to contribute towards understanding the micro-processes at play in distrust and trust building processes thereby contributing towards filling the knowledge gap in the literature. Secondly, by focusing on the micro-processes at play in distrust and trust between public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the aim is to inform practice at the interface of service encounters, thereby advancing knowledge to employees, managers, and educational institutions that train professionals. By focusing on trust and distrust which can be understood as cultural resources this leads me to the following problem formulation and two research questions: *How can trust be understood as a cultural resource and what are the implications for public sector employees who work with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in the community?*

1. How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications?
2. How can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

In order to address the problem formulation, the two research questions must be answered. To address the two research questions, I carried out ethnographic field research in two residential housing estates. In relation to analysing the data collated during fieldwork, Goffman's (1974a) Frame Analysis inspired me because it acts like an analytical elevator which connects the different levels of analysis, between the face-to-face levels at the ground floor and up to the societal level on the top floor. During the thesis, I use Goffman's (1974a) Frame Analysis in combination with literature from the field of trust and secondary literature to analyse a government policy document to identify how the policy names and frames people with minority ethnic backgrounds. The main aim of this is to locate local authorities and local authority actors in the wider cultural and structural context along with identifying the cultural tools used in this process. In addition, Goffman's (1974a) Frame Analysis is the chosen method to analyse presentational and operational (Van Maanen, 1979) data gathered during nine months of fieldwork in and around two residential housing estates in Denmark. During this part of the analysis, the aim is to examine how and why youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust along with the implications? The secondary goal is to identify any cultural tools drawn on during the framing process. The research questions raised in the thesis address how and why youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and the implications. In addition, the aim is to investigate why some frontline professionals can negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust. Trust matters in face-to-face service delivery especially in social and youth work. Without trust, it is difficult to establish the necessary trusting meaningful relations required to undertake planned intervention. Without trust in contexts of uncertainty, there is a high risk of service delivery failure, while trust and trusting relationships can never guarantee successful outcomes, without trust and trusting relationships there is a greater risk of failure.

1.2 Background and Motivation

While conducting field research in and around two residential housing estates, it struck me that trust, and trusting relations are critical both to gathering empirical data, and for others who work in the community such as social and youth workers in order to carry out their jobs successfully. It is necessary to point out, before going any further, that I have given all persons and places pseudonyms in an effort to protect them from any unintended harm, something discussed in-depth in chapter three. The original aim of the field research, in tune with the ICE¹ Project, was to observe how public sector employees include young people in service delivery development during the service encounter. With the strong emphasis on involving service users' in developing services in Denmark, the aim was to observe this in practice. The objective was to identify, record and map out practices concerning user involvement at the face-to-face level and then see how these ideas were fed up through the organisation. Primarily the key question concerned the practices and methods involved in these processes. In particular, I was interested in investigating which methods the professionals' employed to obtain input from the young people concerning improving and developing service delivery and provision. Thereafter, the plan was to determine what happened next to these ideas and how the system processed and subsequently utilised them.

However, it is extremely difficult to involve 'service users' in processes such as user-driven innovation when service users do not want to associate with employees who provide services because of suspicion and distrust. This became the new focus of my research. I became interested in finding out why the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds trust some public sector employees and distrust others. One of the perplexing situations, which caught my attention, was the relationships between some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, a team of youth workers, a job consultant and a cop. In this case, while the young men framed the youth workers in distrust and their relationships with them as distrusting, they framed the job consultant and the police officer in different variations of trust and their relationships with them as trusting. What I found intriguing with this situation is while the youth workers as part of their jobs should

¹ This study is part of the ICE Project at Roskilde University where the objective is to investigate interactive user-based innovation in services. Amongst others, one goal is to explore how the understanding of the needs of service users in private and public service organisations lead to innovations and how organisations implement these.

build trusting relationships with these young men, the job consultant and the cop are on the other end of the spectrum charged with sanctioning them for breaching the rules of society. Therefore, I began to wonder what was going on and what could explain this perplexing situation. As a former social and youth worker, it baffled me about why the young men would despise a team of youth workers dedicated to helping young people in the area while at the same time respected and trusted two other employees who work in a control function. Therefore, I changed the focus of my research to investigate this situation and the relationships from the perspectives of the social actor's involved.

1.3 The Approach

Apart from a government policy analysed in part one of chapter five, the data on which this thesis rests derive from nine months of ethnographic fieldwork between October 2009 and July 2010 among young men with diverse minority ethnic backgrounds, and public sector employees in and around two residential housing estates in Denmark. In this respect, this thesis provides backstage interpretative insights about the relationships between the two sides and from both perspectives. The main focus of this interpretative study is on how and why the two sides frame one another through using cultural tools from their repertoire and the implications for this. During the nine months of fieldwork, I used different ethnographic methods i.e. shadowing, observation, participant observation, interviews (informal and in-depth) fieldnotes and recording a research diary using "thick description" Geertz (1973).

Thick description is not only central to ethnography – "ethnography is thick description" (Geertz, 1973:06). Following Geertz (1973), it is not the methods or techniques applied during fieldwork, which define the research project as ethnography, rather the academic enterprise and rigour involved does. Thick description involves richly and meticulously accounting for the conceptual structures and social relationships encountered during fieldwork and illustrating the context (Geertz, 1973). Ethnography is not a predetermined *modus operandi* and is somewhat unstructured in approach (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Bryman, 2008). Unstructured means no prearranged frameworks of analysis, no hypotheses to be tested and no grand research design specified at the beginning of the project (ibid). In ethnography, the

researcher is the research instrument that through time in the field observes various sources of data and subsequently utilizes several techniques for investigating, verifying, or for bringing to light different perspectives on multifaceted matters and events (Wolcott, 1997). The emphasis is on investigating the character of particular social phenomena, (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Bryman, 2008). The researcher studies various aspects of the lives of people which includes finding out how they view and interpret the situations they experience (ibid). Often, as the research project progresses the initial questions and interests that inspired the study get adjusted and developed (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Wolcott (1997) points out that spending time in the setting not only allows the researcher to ask questions, but also the right questions. Hence, fieldwork studies normally get sharper and more purposeful towards the end where the researcher begins to strategically pursue answers (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007:03).

1.4 Research Setting and Context

During fieldwork, most of the research took place in and around two large residential housing estates, which, pseudonymously are to be known as Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard throughout the thesis. The fieldwork began in Paradise Way and ended in Sunset Boulevard. Nonetheless, while undertaking fieldwork in and around Sunset Boulevard, I made regular trips to Paradise Way in order to maintain relationships established there.

Both of these suburban housing estates share similar features in terms of history, physical structure and geographical location. For instance, both lie on the outskirts of once flourishing manufacturing towns, close to motorways and to once thriving industrial sectors. Main roads and some distance detach them from other residential areas and the town centres. There is a slight difference in the structural layout of both areas, a bird's eye view reveals the "L" shaped pattern of Paradise Way, whereas the larger of the two, Sunset Boulevard is in the shape of a double "H" design. A road running through the centre of the areas divides them into smaller blocks. On either side of the road, high rise apartment blocks zoom out of the ground formed into squares, bordered by flagged footpaths at the front and grass at the sides. These prefabricated concrete structures are home to about 2500 residents in Paradise Way and over 3000 in Sunset Boulevard. On the left-hand side of Paradise Way, apart from the blocks of apartments, there is a nursery

school, play areas for younger children equipped with climbing frames and slides, green, grassy areas suitable for relaxation and recreation and an after school club located in one of the apartment blocks for children aged up to twelve. The right-hand side of Paradise Way is of the same design as the left, with the exception of a neglected outside basket ball court, a row of derelict shops, a makeshift basement mosque and an impressive purpose built community centre. At the northern part of Paradise Way, lies a supermarket situated across the road to a service station. Sunset Boulevard is more spread out and most services like schools, nurseries and the youth club lie just over the border of the large 'A' roads which run around the outer-edges. Like Paradise Way, Sunset Boulevard has a community centre, which acts like gathering places for young and old. In Sunset Boulevard, there is a row of rundown shops, some units are vacant, and most have seen better days. There is a few thriving business left on the row, a hairdresser, a baker and the kiosk which sells everything from toilet paper to cigarettes. The kiosk located on the corner is just opposite to the job centre, which is in an apartment in one of the high-rise apartment blocks. Outside the kiosk on the corner is one of the places where many of the quarters young men gather to hangout, another hangout is the community centre, which lies some two hundred metres from the corner, one more is the basket ball court situated close to the community centre.

Background

Both Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard grew during a period of economic growth and industrial development initially triggered by a series of post-war American led economic programmes (Lind Larsen & Riis Larsen, 2007). These programmes injected much needed international currency into Denmark making the Danish Crown convertible into the dollar and other leading currencies (Lind Larsen & Riis Larsen, 2007). This economic upswing lasted until the early 1970's and had an enormous impact upon housing construction and Danish society on the whole (ibid). The "happy 60's" (de glade 60ere) saw similar housing projects springing up on the outer edges of industrial towns all over Denmark. During this period, Denmark found itself in a predicament; on the one hand, there was a commercial boom taking place demanding industrial expansion to fill orders (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980). On the other hand, there was an enormous gap in the national

workforce threatening to stop industrial development (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980). This workforce shortfall was the result of a combination of low-birth rates from the 1950's onwards and a general trend whereby Danish youth opted to pursue higher education instead of filling manufacturing vacancies (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980).

During this period, migration to Denmark from the Mediterranean and Middle East rose sharply (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980). At the time, Denmark's borders were open with no restrictions in place limiting who could work in Denmark or not (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980). According to Hansen & Henriksen (1980), it was relatively easy to obtain permission to work in Denmark:

"Foreigners could travel here as tourists, find a job offer and then go to the local police and get a work permit. Mainly it was one man's immigration, and, understood both by the guest workers and the Danish authorities that their visit would be relatively short" (Hansen & Henriksen, 1980:336).

This implies an assumption that the 'guest workers' would leave Denmark upon job completion. Evidently, the Danish authorities did not envisage that the 'guest workers' would settle in Denmark with their families. Many 'guest workers' moved into Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard and other housing estates located close to industrial towns throughout Denmark. Today many of the original 'guest workers' still live in Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard together with their families, including grandchildren.

From the 1990's onwards, Paradise Way, Sunset Boulevard and other residential housing estates received a steady stream of quota refugees from the former Yugoslavia, Lebanon (mainly stateless Palestinians), Somalia, Afghanistan and Iraq. According to Denmark's Statistics (2008), the number of immigrants and their descendants entering Denmark increased sharply from the 1980's onwards, in 2008, there were five times as many "non-western immigrants" than in 1980 (Denmark's Statistics, 2008:13). Today, people with minority ethnic backgrounds comprise over fifty per cent of the residents of Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard; this inhabitant demographic is similar to most other large social housing complexes in Denmark. In 2008, people with minority ethnic backgrounds accounted for 9.1 per cent of the population in Denmark, whereby the

majority of people originate from Turkey (Denmark's Statistics, 2008:13). According to Denmark's Statistics (2008) every fifth "immigrant descendant originates from Turkey" (2008:13).

Social Problems

Similar to the residents of other large social housing estates, the residents of Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard have their share of social problems. According to the local authority which provides and delivers public services to Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard, there are high levels of unemployment with over fifty per cent of residents receiving social security benefits. According to the local authority, many "resource-weak" families live in Paradise Way, most of which bear the label "new Danish" families – in other words, families with minority ethnic backgrounds. Further, thirty per cent of all residents are under the age of 18. From time to time, Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard similar to other urban areas experience crime such as vandalism against property, graffiti, and arson attacks against waste disposal containers or cars.

Bad Reputation – Political and Media Framing

"Today, we have 29 neighbourhoods in Denmark with huge challenges that fall under the heading ghetto. These are areas where a high proportion of residents are unemployed. Where relatively large numbers of residents are criminals and where many Danes with immigrant backgrounds live" (Danish Government, 2010:05).

Similar to many other social housing complexes, which are home to high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds, Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard have poor reputations. Politicians, aided by the mass media may worsen these poor reputations by labelling them as "ghettos" or "parallel societies", and the residents as worthless immigrant criminals (for example, see Danish Government, 2010:05). The Danish Government, in cooperation with the Danish Peoples Party (Dansk Folkeparti: DF), set the objective in 2010 to "get the ghetto's back to society" by launching its "Ghetto Back to Society" policy. According to this policy, a "ghetto" is a place where: 1) "A high proportion of residents are not connected to the labour market or educational system". 2) "High proportion of immigrants and descendants from non-western countries live"

and 3) a high proportion of residents are convicted of crime” (2010:05). This implies that “ghettos” are dangerous places where deviant, uneducated, unproductive, criminal immigrants and their children live. The emphasis on non-western immigrants (and their descendants) in the policy suggests that people with minority ethnic backgrounds are the problem because the policy largely views them as unemployed, uneducated criminals (I return to this policy in chapter five). When considering the criteria for defining a “ghetto” what is clear is this criterion identifies deprived areas where many of Denmark’s disadvantaged, socially excluded poor people live. “Ghetto’s” are places where many lower income, powerless people with limited life choices reside. Many of the same people experience a multitude of interrelated disadvantages in housing, education, employment, health and equal opportunities. When these disadvantages integrate with other forms of discrimination, for example, race and gender the extent of poverty becomes even more serious (Becker and Macpherson, 1988).

During the research phase, there was a lot of local political attention focused towards ‘Paradise Way’ and Sunset Boulevard. At the outset of the fieldwork, it was the run up to the local town council election. Two or three local politicians named Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard in one way or another in their election campaigns. The main theme was what to do with these places and the ‘troublemakers’ who live there. This can marginalise these residential housing estates and their residents further from mainstream society and the local community. During a television interview about Sunset Boulevard, a politician from the Danish Peoples Party said that Sunset Boulevard was a place where many of the residents lack parenting skills, practice female genital mutilation, and raise their male children to hate Danish Society and encourage crime. The following extract from my research diary is illustrative of this problem framing:

“... I mean there are many of their parents who just don’t have the parenting skills and its typical ... errrrr ... I think that its sick how these parents raise ... they take girls and cut off their sexual organs ... send them on rearing trips to their homelands and at the same time they raise their male children to hate Danish Society and encourage them to vandalise because it’s their area ... I mean if they have this attitude to life then it is extremely difficult to be a youth with another ethnic background” (Søren, Town Councillor and member of parliament for DPP).

The local TV station transmitted Søren’s views about people with minority ethnic backgrounds into the homes of many people in the region via television. While Søren’s views may be ridiculed by

some, received with anger by others, his views may influence how some members of the majority ethnic community begin to think about and frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds. There is a strong body of research which supports the idea that covering issues in the public domain influences public opinion significantly. Terkildsen & Schnell (1997) reinforce this idea and argue there is strong evidence that shows the media influences public opinion through three mechanisms: agenda setting, priming and framing. Agenda setting transpires through the process of the editor deciding which news to do; this influences the weight given to reported issues to citizens (Lyengar & Kinder, 1987; MacKuen, 1981; McCombs, 1981; in Terkildsen & Schnell, 1997:880). Priming transpires when the media elevate certain issues over others; this in turn, affects the evaluation of these issues by the recipient (ibid). Framing involves journalists putting a different spin or perspective on their version of the news. Factors such as available news space, ethical norms and personal values influence framing (Terkildsen et al., 1996; in Terkildsen & Schnell, 1997).

1.5 The People Involved – Interactants

Local Authority Actors

Prior to fieldwork, I negotiated access to the local authority via senior management who attached me to the SSP Team. During the first five weeks, I spent most of my time shadowing my contact person Maria, a Danish woman, while she went about her daily work. The SSP Team has a criminal preventative function in the local community where they use different methods including criminal preventative teaching' in schools with young people, attending parent meetings and through outreach' work in the local community. Throughout fieldwork, I regularly attended the SSP team's personal meetings and often they invited me to attend multidisciplinary meetings, which concerned crime prevention, in the local authority encatchment area. Apart from spending time shadowing Maria, I spent one day shadowing Aydin, who has Turkish heritage, while he carried out outreach' work at a large public gathering for young people. During fieldwork, I interviewed all members of the SSP team. In addition to the SSP Team, I built trusting relationships to several other professionals who I got to know through the fieldwork process including a team of youth

workers who work at the youth club, which lies across the road from Sunset Boulevard. It is necessary to mention that I met the manager of this youth club prior to starting my project. I interviewed her some months before entering the field as part of an exploration of the area to find out about the area and their work at the club. As a consequence of the interview, I already had access to the club prior to starting fieldwork – a place where I eventually invested many hours. During fieldwork, I observed interactions between the workers and young people as well as interviewing all full-time staff. The youth workers have two main functions in the community, the first involves running the youth club and the second undertaking ‘outreach’ work in and around Sunset Boulevard.

Young Men with Minority Ethnic Backgrounds

All of the young men who I interacted with during fieldwork and gained information from all have minority ethnic backgrounds, i.e. Palestinian, Turkish and Somalian and aged between 17 – 25 years of age. During fieldwork, I built up contact with these young men by hanging around and finally hanging out with them in the community centres, in the two neighbourhoods, playing table based activities, something which I discuss in detail in chapter four. In addition, in Sunset Boulevard, I regularly attended community food evenings in the community centre and participated in sporting activities together with the young men. In short, when I was not shadowing, observing or interviewing public sector employees then I was hanging out with the young men with minority backgrounds in and around the neighbourhoods.

1.6 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is a progressive one in which all chapters relate to each other. The empirical part of the thesis divides into five chronological and unifying sections: Entering the Field (chapter four), Governmental Construction of Distrust Frames (part one, chapter 5), Local Authority Institutionalised Distrust Frames (part two, chapter five), Distrust and Trust as a Cultural Frame (part three, chapter five), and Negotiating Cultural Frames (part four, chapter five). The purpose is to show how frames as a concept, can be used to investigate how knowledgeable actors use trust and distrust as cultural resources and what the implications are for public sector employees such

as researchers, social and youth workers. The thesis contributes at the theoretical level by discussing how the frame concept can be used in trust research as a bridging construct between interpersonal and institutional trust research.

The thesis is composed of six chapters.

Chapter Two: Trust as a Cultural Frame:

This chapter presents the trust concept and explores the main approaches to researching trust in the literature. This includes looking at and exploring the main typologies before moving on and exploring how trust can be studied as a process and a cultural frame. In this chapter, I introduce and present fundamental concepts and models of trust and distrust development which is basic tools for the analysis in the empirical sections. In addition, this chapter sketches out the contribution of this thesis in relation to the literature on trust.

Chapter Three: Methodology:

This chapter explains the choice of research strategy and methods used to collect data, which lie at the centre of this thesis. This chapter sets out and explains the methods used to analyse the data in the empirical sections along with a critical view of the main method of analysis. In addition, this chapter closely explores the ethical considerations involved when embarking upon field research. The chapter also discusses issues of reliability and validity in relation to this study.

Chapter Four: Entering the Field:

This chapter acts as a bridge between chapter two, chapter three and the field. Drawing heavily on Goffman (1959), this chapter outlines the dynamics and mechanisms at play when a researcher (outsider) first enters the field setting. This chapter presents a theoretical discussion about the importance of gaining access to a relevant setting in which to collect data. In addition, the chapter theoretically discusses the significance of trust in relation to the researcher entering the field. Establishing trust in the field is pivotal because, without it, there is a risk that the researcher only accesses frontstage areas of the interactants and settings, in some cases, a lack of trust can result in access denial and project failure. In this chapter, I discuss the significance of research roles and identity in fieldwork and the implications for the researcher. Following this I consider Goffman's (1959) concept of impression management along with its significance for the researcher entering a

group setting. During this chapter, I present empirical data, which illustrates how interactants test me as a researcher, and how I react to their behaviour, which helps to build trust. During this section, I discuss a number of ethical dilemmas, which I encountered, along with how I tackled them and my reflections. Through drawing on Goffman (1961b), the chapter ends by presenting my reflections about the steps taken to build trust as a researcher in the fieldwork situation. This chapter is pivotal because it helps the reader understand the context in which the research took place and the importance of establishing trust. In addition, this chapter addresses the distinct gap in the literature concerning building trust in fieldwork by taking into account and exploring how I as a researcher went about establishing basic trust.

Chapter Five: Clashing Frames:

This large empirical chapter consists of four interrelating and chronological sections, all of which contribute towards answering the problem formulation and the two research questions posited in chapter one. The first section reports finding one: Governmental Distrust Frames. This section analyses a key government policy to explore how the (previous) government frames people with minority ethnic backgrounds and the places where many residents who have minority ethnic backgrounds live. Exploring the previous government's attitude towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds is crucial in relation to understanding the attitudes and framing of people with minority ethnic backgrounds by a large proportion of the electorate, which includes local authority actors. The previous government held office for ten years and were strongly influential in setting the 'tact and tone' in the public debate concerning immigration, both prior to and during their terms in office. As shown in section two, some of the local authority actors encountered during fieldwork shares similar attitudes and framing of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds as the previous government. Exploring this policy document is also useful for identifying the cultural tools used to frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds by the previous government.

In the second section of the chapter, I report finding two: local authority institutionalised distrust frames. Through the use of operational and presentational data, this section explores the attitudes of some local authority actors towards a group of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and hang out in a local residential housing estate. The main focus of this chapter is on the relationship between a team of youth workers and the young men, which can be described best as highly distrustful. In addition, the section identifies some of the cultural

tools involved in this naming and framing behaviour by local authority actors along with some of the tools relied on to work with the young men, which ultimately have implications for trusting and distrusting. This section of the chapter answers the first research question partly.

In the third section of the chapter, I report finding three: trust and distrust as cultural frames or resources. The fieldwork data suggest that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds use trust and distrust as cultural frames (resources) to organise their relationships with public sector employees. During this process, they rely upon a number of cultural tools such as injustice and justice to create both distrust and trust frames around individual employees. The focus of this section is on the relationship between the young men, a team of youth workers, a police officer and a job consultant in and around Sunset Boulevard from the perspectives of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Combined with the previous section, this section of the chapter answers the first research question.

In the fourth section of the chapter, I report finding four: negotiating cultural frames. The last part of the chapter looks closer at the relationship between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the job consultant and the police officer to consider how they negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust. This section of the chapter addresses the second research question from the perspectives of the job consultant and the police officer which involves exploring both presentational and operational data collected during fieldwork. In other words, this chapter addresses the wider question about what public sector employees need to be aware of when entering residential housing areas in order to initiate, build and maintain trusting relationships with young men who have minority ethnic backgrounds.

Chapter Six: Conclusion & Contribution: The concluding chapter sets out the conclusions and implications for theory, research and practice and proposes some recommendations for practice based on the findings and conclusions of the study. This chapter outlines the overall contributions of the thesis along with the limitations and recommendations for future research. The chapter concludes by restating the problem formulation and positing the answers.

2

‘Trust as a Cultural Frame’

2.0 Introduction

Trust has been a significant subject matter in the academic literature for decades (e.g., Deutsch, 1958; Strickland, 1958; Rotter, 1967; Lindskold, 1978; Lewis & Weigert, 1985; Luhmann, 1979; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). While definitions of trust differ across scholarly disciplines (e.g., psychology, political science, economics, and sociology) and levels of analysis (e.g., interpersonal, institutional, etc.), there are many common features. Trust has become an important subject matter in sociological and organisational research. Most of the literature concerning trust attempts to define, measure, or predict the (pre)conditions for trust and trustworthiness (for instance, Gambetta & Hamill, 2005). Different approaches to trust can be distinguished within the literature focusing on different types of trust: Interpersonal trust (Rotter, 1967; 1971; 1980; Zand, 1972; McAllister, 1995; Six 2005; 2007; Ferrin et al. 2008), institutional trust (Luhmann, 1979; Giddens, 1990; 1994; Maguire & Philips, 2008), or institutional-based trust (Bachman & Inkpen, 2011), and trust as a process (e.g. Möllering, 2006; Khodyakov, 2007; Ferrin et. al., 2008).

Primarily, the literature on trust investigates the dyadic relationship (e.g. Rotter, 1967, 1980; Larzelere & Huston, (1980); Scott, 1980; Moorman et al., 1992; McAllister, 1995; Kramer 1996; Ross & Wieland, 1996; Sitkin & Stickel (1996); Zaheer et al., 1998; Malhotra & Murnighan,

2002; Bigne & Blesa, 2003; Six, 2005, 2007; Ferrin et al. 2008; Singh, 2008; Kawamata et al., 2010) between two persons at the interpersonal level: “A” (the truster) trusting “B” (the trustee). This relationship called interpersonal trust; similar to most research on trust, has largely been explored within organisational or interorganisational contexts. While research on interpersonal trust dominates the literature, it is only more recently that institutional trust has come into focus. There are only a few empirical studies of institutional trust (Maguire & Philips, 2008) and trust as a process to be found in the literature.

2.1 Aim of the Thesis

The purpose with this chapter is to outline the main approaches to trust in the literature including the main typologies and how trust can be studied as a process and a cultural frame. Contemporary trust researchers (e.g. Möllering 2006; Nootboom & Six, 2006; Khodyakov, 2007) argue that trust as a process is under-explored; therefore, one of the contributions of this thesis is to develop a process-based approach to trust (or distrust). Further, interpretative approaches to studying trust are largely under-represented in the literature. Möllering, in much of his work (e.g. 2001, 2006), identifies this critical gap in the empirical research on trust and subsequently calls for research that pays attention to the “*fine details of interpretation*” with the point of departure in the perspectives of people engaged in trust relations (Möllering, 2001). Möllering (2001) advocates ‘open-ended reflexive, flexible (Alvesson 1999) approaches’ for researching trust where the point of departure must be in the subjective “reality” of the truster. Möllering (2006) argues for and repeats his call for interpretative studies that investigate trust and distrust where such an approach should consider the following features:

- 1) Expositions of trust or distrust can only be understood in view of the context, history of interaction and in considering existing and future issues that the actors involved are aware of (Sabel, 1993; in Möllering, 2006). Researchers should adopt a process approach (Poole et al., 2000; Van de Ven and Poole, 2005; in Möllering, 2006) that aims to reflect both the trust-building process and any tangible expositions of trust or distrust (Möllering, 2006). Adopting a process approach requires getting close to people to gather vivid (qualitative) pictures of real trust experiences, understanding the contexts of the relationships under

consideration and taking into account the reflexivity not only in trust development as such but also in the research interaction itself. Lewicki et al. (2006) support this conclusion and encourage the use of qualitative techniques to investigate the dynamics and development of trust over time using diaries, narratives, in-depth interviews and case studies to reveal deep and innovative insights about the development of trust. Longitudinal and qualitative techniques are more likely to reveal insights into the development of facets and variation of trust in relationships along with the coexistence of trust and distrust in complex, interdependent relationships (Lewicki et al., 2006).

- 2) Trust is an individual phenomenon involving the understanding and idiosyncrasies of the actors involved (Giddens, 1991; Seligman, 1997; in Möllering, 2006). Therefore, researchers must adopt a sympathetic approach to provide rich descriptions of the experiences and interpretations of interactants (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Smith, 1995; in Möllering, 2006). Information richness seems to be a key feature of the interpretative approach where considerations about rich descriptions in each interview is more valuable than the sample size; and since such richness cannot be determined beforehand, a final decision about sample size should not be made before starting the data collection (Layder, 1998). Information-rich interviews are ones from which the researcher can gain valuable knowledge about the research topic, and learn much about issues of importance for the purpose of the interview. Consequently, recommendations about sample size in qualitative research are often vague: *"In interpretative studies, the size of the sample is no larger than that needed to gather the information of interest. Redundancy is to be avoided"* (Marlow, 2000:145). Following Kvale (1996), the answer to the frequent question, *"how many interview subjects do I need?"* simply is, *"interview as many subjects as necessary to find out what you need to know"* (1996:101). Möllering (2006) advocates qualitative methods to achieve such a delicate task and proposes the interview technique to stimulate interactants to communicate experiences where: *"the richer the picture that they generate the better"* (2006:153). Möllering (2006) maintains that one problem with adopting such an approach is to empathise with the interactants while assessing the reliability of their accounts. Further, in dyadic relationships researchers should explore

both sides to obtain different perspectives, which reflect the idiosyncrasies of trust experiences (Möllering, 2006).

3) Trust relationships and development processes do not exist in a vacuum; therefore, researchers must locate them in their wider context (Möllering, 2006). Therefore, empirical research must 'capture the embeddedness of the relationship' under investigation (Granovetter, 1985; Uzzi, 1997; Sydow, 1998; in Möllering, 2006). Möllering (2006) suggests this could be achieved through extended time studying the interactants, relationships and understanding these in the wider context before beginning to address trust (Huemer, 1998; in Möllering, 2006). This is similar to the approach adopted during the ethnographic fieldwork, where I spent nine months getting to know the interactants and exploring the relationships closely from both perspectives. In addition, to help locate the interactants and research in the wider context I analysed a government policy, along with some local media reports, this helps place the research both in the wider local context and into the wider cultural and structural context.

4) Trust research should be highly reliant on the interactants interpretations (Möllering, 2006), which raises a number of methodological issues (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000; Möllering, 2001; Möllering, 2006). For example, during interviews more than often, questions prompt interactants to disclose an interpretation, which can lead to a biased explanation (Fontana and Frey, 1994; Sitkin and Stickel, 1996; Huemer, 1998; in Möllering, 2006). This biased explanation becomes further distorted through the researcher's interpretation (Schwandt, 1994; Smith, 1995; in Möllering, 2006). Thus, researchers must recognise and reflect over the reflexivity of their work' (Steier, 1991; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Smith, 1995; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000; in Möllering, 2006). In addition, Möllering (2006) argues that researchers must consider their interaction with the individual when analysing their interpretation. This issue is crucial in trust research because interactant disclosure depends much on trust in the researcher (Fontana and Frey, 1994; in Möllering, 2006).

To live up to Möllering's challenge, researchers must conduct qualitative fieldwork where they critically consider their role as researcher. This means researchers must account for and reflect over their own trust building process in the field and subsequently report this in the written project. Therefore, another aim of this thesis is to contribute towards filling this gap in the literature. This thesis attempts to meet Möllering's challenge firstly by using a "highly ambitious" research strategy involving firsthand observation of 'trust relations' with the point of departure in the interactants own interpretation of their life-worlds. As outlined in the thesis introduction, the data at the heart of this thesis is the result of nine months of ethnographic fieldwork observing the relationship between frontline public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in contexts of uncertainty where trust is essential not only to their relationship, but to the success of service delivery. Secondly, the thesis takes into account and investigates the role of the researcher in the field and how I as a researcher went about establishing basic trust. Therefore, the contribution of this thesis is to contribute towards filling this gap in the literature while at the same time contributing towards developing an interpretive approach to trust research. Further, the aim is to contribute to existing empirical work on trust by exploring trusting as a complex relational practice occurring within particular socio-political contexts. In this thesis, trust is not to be seen as an entity brought about by social relations, but rather as a way to frame social relations which is dependent on reflexivity and sensemaking and which can take different forms.

2.2 Interpersonal Trust

Research on interpersonal trust focuses on the dyadic relationship between a truster and a trustee. Largely, there is consistency in the literature about defining trust as a "psychological condition" (Rousseau et al., 1998; Bachman & Inkpen, 2011) which enables people to take risks in the face of uncertainty and risk while acknowledging *vulnerability*. Most definitions of trust rely upon the notion of *positive expectations from the truster towards the benevolence of the trustee* (See Rotter, 1967; Luhmann, 1979; Barber 1983; Baier 1986; Giddens 1990; Boon & Holmes, 1991; McAllister, 1995; Mayer et al. 1995; Creed & Miles, 1996; Whitener et al. 1998; Rousseau et al., 1998). In essence, following these accounts the decision to trust is almost a natural or conditioned

response to trusting others. Two of the most influential and used definitions in the literature are illustrative:

“The willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer et al., 1995:712).

“Trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another” (Rousseau et al., 1998:395).

These definitions view trust as a mental condition which allows the trustor to cope with uncertainty and vulnerability based on a prediction of future behaviour. Vulnerability suggests that something terrible is at stake (Mayer et al., 1995) while at the same time gives the idea that distrust is the opposite of trust. This emphasis on vulnerability implies that people are somewhat passive bystanders when it comes to trusting others. While there can be occasions where people may take the “leap of faith” (Möllering, 2006) especially in interpersonal relations, there can be many others where people carefully calculate the pros and cons of entering into a ‘trusting’ relationship. Further, this view of trust ignores many social processes and power relations around trusting or distrusting decisions. Through viewing trust as a mental state these definitions exclude agency and the idea that the decision to trust is because of a multitude of various processes. Further, the definitions highlighted above suggest a somewhat static view of trust or trusting while placing trust and distrust at the opposite ends of the same continuum. Moreover, this static view of trust and distrust ignores the complex multidimensionality of relationships where both trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship (Lewicki et al., (1998); Lewicki, 2006). Lewicki et al. (1998) propose a definition of trust that reflects a more dynamic approach to trust, trusting and relationships. While arguing that both trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship, Lewicki et al. (1998) define trust in terms of “confident positive expectations regarding another's conduct” and distrust as the “confident negative expectations regarding another's conduct” (1998:439). Lewicki et al. (1998) maintain that the term “another's conduct” addresses the words, actions, and decisions of the other and how (s)he makes decisions (ibid). Further, they assert that

“both trust and distrust involve movements toward certainty: trust concerning expectations of things hoped for and distrust concerning expectations of things feared” (Lewicki et al., 1998:440).

2.3 Stages and Levels of Trust

There is a distinction in the literature between different stages and levels of trust. Jones & George (1998), drawing heavily on symbolic interactionism investigated how trust evolves over time in organisations and how it influences teamwork. According to Jones & George (1998): “Symbolic interactionism is based on two main assumptions that are pertinent to an analysis of trust: (1) people act in social situations based on the meanings that they have learned to associate with them, and (2) these meanings are acquired by interactions with other people so that a definition of the social situation is created over time. More specifically, in any particular encounter two (or more) parties mutually develop and negotiate a definition of the social situation” (1998:535). Incidentally, the third underpinning principle of symbolic interactionism, which Jones & George (1998) fail to mention (even though it figures in their analysis), involves the process of interpretation. According to Blumer (1969), this third premise of symbolic interactionism is necessary for the other two mentioned by Jones & George (1998).

Considering that Jones & George (1998) attempt to develop an interactionist evolutionary model of trust then the third principle is salient. Evidently, the third principle is at play during their paper, they just failed to mention it. This is evident in the following: “What one party says or does affect the other; the parties then adjust communication and behaviour patterns to match the unfolding, mutually determined definition of the social situation” (1998:535).

Following Blumer (1969), the third core principal of symbolic interactionism is central to differentiating symbolic interactionism from other approaches. In relation to the third principle, Blumer (1969) argues that without this assumption researchers fail to recognise that the use of meanings by a person in action involves an interpretative process. Blumer (1969) argues:

“While the meaning of things is formed in the context of social interaction and is derived by the person from that interaction, it is a mistake to think that the use of meaning by a person is but an

application of the meaning so derived. This mistake seriously mars the work of many scholars who otherwise follow the symbolic interactionist approach” (Blumer, 1969:05).

Blumer (1969) argues that the process of interpretation involves two distinct internalised social processes: Firstly, the actor identifies the focus of interaction and acknowledges the aspects which have meaning. Secondly, the actor processes the self communication (meanings) whereby (s)he selects, checks, suspends, regroupes and transforms the meanings in accordance with the situation (Blumer, 1969:05). Blumer (1969) goes on to argue that interpretation, therefore, *should not* be considered as just a routine application of accepted meanings. Rather, interpretation should be conceptualised as a shaping practice used to modify or change ‘meanings’ – in this connection meanings are resources for guiding and shaping events (see Blumer, 1969:05).

Jones & George (1998) maintain that parties develop new definitions of the social situation and the basis of social action changes:

“In the context of the evolution of trust, two or more parties are involved in creating a joint definition of the social situation. Each person brings its own set of interpretive schemes to the social situation. To the extent that they use or develop similar interpretive schemes to define the social situation, the parties will tend to agree on their perceptions of the level of trust present in the social situation, so adjustment to each other takes place” (1998: 535).

According to Jones & George (1998), the meshing of people’s values, attitudes, moods and emotions are critical for trust building (Jones & George, 1998). Trust is something that evolves over time, when people connect with others and interchange thoughts and feelings that organise the “exchange relationship” (1998:536). Jones & George (1998) conceptualize trust as something that develops and changes over time, and they distinguish between two distinct types of trust: conditional and unconditional (ibid). Following Jones & George (1998), distrust, conditional (calculus-based or weak trust) and unconditional (identification-based) trust are all part of the same intra- interpersonal continuum. Jones & George (1998) advance that there are three “distinct states” or variations of trust experience: (1) distrust, (2) conditional trust, and (3) unconditional trust (1998:537). Therefore, according to Jones & George’s (1998) interactionist,

evolutionary model – distrust is a variation of trust. Jones & George (1998) argue that their evolutionary model of trust variation is significantly different to other models of trust found in the literature in two ways. Firstly, they conceptualise distrust, conditional trust, and unconditional trust as three different variations of the same construct. Secondly, they argue that their model differs significantly to those developed by Shapiro et al. (1992) and Lewicki and Bunker (1996) who argue that different types of trust transpire through different kinds of factors (Jones & George, 1998:537). For example, Lewicki & Bunker (1996) who developed Shapiro et al.'s (1992) model argue that there are three variations of trust:

- (1) Calculus-based (envelopes deterrence-based), brought about through both negative and positive reinforcers.
- (2) Knowledge-based, transpires through frequent interaction and communication whereby a thorough knowledge of the other over a prolonged period allows for the predictability of conduct of the other.
- (3) Identification-based, transpires through intimate knowledge of the other and develops as both parties begin to share similar beliefs and understanding while being able to predict the needs, choices and preferences of the other (collective identity).

Jones & George (1998) contests Shapiro et al. (1992) and Lewicki & Bunker (1996) models for two reasons. Firstly, they claim that most people do not have the time or resources to engage in extensive information processing or gathering. Secondly, they argue that people are “unknowable”; therefore, it is difficult to identify fully and establish “complete empathy” with others (1998:537). Thus, Jones & George (1998) discount both Shapiro et al. (1992) and Lewicki & Bunker’s (1996) trust variations.

However, Jones & George’s (1998) argumentation concerning ‘time and resources to engage in ‘extensive’ information gathering’ is not conclusive. Erving Goffman throughout most of his work eloquently demonstrates that people constantly engage in information gathering during both focused and unfocused encounters. Moreover, with easy access and use of information technologies gathering information can be achieved with little effort. Further, Jones & George’s (1998) claim concerning people being “unknowable” is unfounded, and they do not provide any documentation to substantiate their claim.

According to Jones & George (1998), positive emotions create trust as individuals identify with the values and attitudes of the other (empathy). In this condition, individuals feel safe and believe that the other(s) will not harm or put them at risk through their actions and this transforms their desire to trust (Jones and George, 1998). On the contrary, negative emotions bestow distrust since individuals feel uneasy about the exchange relationship (ibid). Following Jones & George (1998) at the beginning of a social encounter people do not automatically assume the other is trustworthy; rather they pretend to suspend judgement (1998).

According to Jones & George (1998), and contradictory to McKnight (1998), at the first meeting individuals conditionally suspend the belief that the other may be untrustworthy. Actors temporarily act as if the other can be trusted, but only on condition that the other does not contravene the social rules. *This is the essence of conditional trust, acting as though the other is okay while sizing them up.* During the state of conditional trust, both individuals cooperate as long as there are no breaches of the social rules and both use the same interpretive schema (cultural frame) to define the situation (1998:536). Trust attitudes from one or both individuals during this condition are enough to initiate future interactions (ibid). On the other hand, unconditional trust only comes into play when both actors drop the pretence of suspending belief (Jones & George, 1998).

During this transformation, shared values organise the interaction and become the primary vehicle for experiencing trust (Jones & George, 1998). For a partnership to achieve unconditional trust, individuals must interact regularly in order to determine the values and outlook of the other (Butler, 1983; in Jones & George, 1998). When unconditional (identification-based) trust is at play, relationships grow in importance and get a shared identification (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; in Jones & George, 1998). Conditional trust can be viewed as a trial period where the individuals involved size one another up trying to determine if each other's values are compatible. Over time, if there are no violations to the social code and both actors have a shared understanding of the situation along with dropping any pretence, the relation transforms into one of stronger ties – unconditional trust and “something to strive for in critical social situations” (Jones & George, 1998:537). Williams (2001) argues that Jones & George's (1998) model, illustrates how affect can influence trust-related perceptions, beliefs and judgments. According to Williams (2001), understanding the combined impact of affect, perceived trustworthiness, and social group

membership on trust is crucial for organisations because affective responses to groups are an integral part of work experiences.

2.4 Trust Continuum (or Not)

Evidently, the dominant view of trust development in current research is that trust and distrust are at the opposite ends of an intra- or interpersonal continuum. The dominant conceptualisation of this continuum starts with distrust or deterrence-based trust (considered by some researchers as distrust) and works through various degrees of trust ending with either relational or identification-based trust (considered to be the strongest forms of trust). However, this view of trust development tends to see trust as progressing in different steps where individuals can advance, move backward or proceed directly to distrust. However, this view does not take into account that trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship at the same time. For example, Dietz & Hartog (2006), maintain that trust is not a “simple either/or matter”, and categories such as unconditional or conditional (Jones & George, 1998) or strong or weak (Barney and Hansen, 1994) trust are ineffective in capturing the subtleties (2006:563). Nonetheless, similar to Jones & George (1998), starting with distrust (deterrence-based) and ending with identification-based trust, Dietz & Hartog (2006) maintain that trust gathers in intensity along a continuum.

While there seems to be agreement between Jones & George (1998) & Dietz & Hartog (2006) concerning the idea that trust variations can be spread along a continuum, Lewicki, McAllister & Bies (1998) disagree strongly. Drawing heavily on Luhmann (1979), they argue that trust and distrust are different (but linked) and distinct. Simply distrust and trust are not opposite ends of the same dimension: “Our adaptation of Luhmann’s formulation is straightforward. Trust and distrust exist as two separate dimensions” (1998:445). Following Lewicki et al.’s (1998) argument, rather than being part of a continuum, trust and distrust are distinct, concurrent coexisting linked aspects within the same relationship, at the same time and within the same space. Lewicki et al. (1998) maintain that trust is not the opposite of distrust, and not opposite ends of a single distrust-trust continuum, rather, they exist as separate bipolar constructs (Burke et al., 1989; Watson & Tellegen, 1985; in Lewicki et al., 1998). According to Lewicki et al.’s (1998) model (figure 1 below) trust is the mechanism by which people negotiate the risks associated with

social complexity, while distrust represents the expectation of intentional harm from the other (ibid). In Lewicki et al.'s (1998) model, they symbolise trust as a vertical dimension ranging from low to high trust, with high-trust relationships. The horizontal dimension represents distrust and ranges from low to high distrust.

Within their model, Lewicki et al. (1998) identify four archetypal relationship conditions in their two-dimensional framework: (1) Low trust/low distrust (a low-key, casual relationship, normally with no grounds for confidence or concern where over time with increased interdependence understanding of the other develops quickly, giving rise to the establishment of either trust or distrust). (2) High trust/low distrust (only one actor has reason to be confident in the other and no reason to be suspicious. Positive experiences characterise this condition along with constant interaction and trust based on empathy and identification. (3) Low trust/high distrust (Involves one actor not having faith in the other and plenty of reasons for not trusting based on prior experience with the other. (4) High trust/high distrust (involves one person being extremely confident in the other in some respects but not in others. The following section provides an overview over Lewicki et al.'s (1998) archetypal relationship conditions or experiences:

2.5 Low Trust/Low Distrust (Cell 1)

This 'condition' or experience involves neither confidence wariness nor vigilance. Low trust involves: "no hope, no faith, no confidence, passivity and hesitance", and low distrust involves: "no fear, no scepticism, no cynicism, low monitoring and no vigilance" (1998:445). During this relationship experience collaborators most likely do not engage in any dynamics which require complex interdependency or risk assessments (Lewicki et al., 1998). Individuals linked together under this condition engage in casual relationships and deal with one another from an "arms-length" (1998:445). This seems like an apathetic, indifferent relationship or situation involving no fear or risk to the individuals involved. Moreover, during this situation, knowledge of the other swiftly develops which determines whether or not they are trustworthy (Lewicki et al., 1998). Perhaps, relations forming under this condition can develop into what Lewicki & Bunker (1996) refer to as knowledge-based trust. Knowledge-based trust has its roots in information as opposed to deterrence; it develops over time due to the history of interaction which enables individuals to

develop an expectation that the other will behave trustworthily (Rotter, 1971; Lindsold, 1978; in Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

2.6 High Trust/Low Distrust (Cell 2)

In high trust and low distrust situations, one actor has confidence in the other. Relationships share interdependence and security because of common goals. The grounding is in many positive experiences with the other, where positive experiences consolidate the relationship. Individuals often seek new ways to improve the relationship and their mutually beneficial interdependencies (Lewicki et al., 1998). This relationship involves frequent interaction, some monitoring and quick responses to manage and resolve 'tensions' (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; in Lewicki et al., 1998). Over time, the truster is likely to identify and empathise with the trustee (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; McAllister, 1995; in Lewicki et al., 1998). In addition, the truster verbalises this identification, understanding, appreciation, support and encouragement (ibid). When both parties can effectively understand and appreciate the others desires, wants and goals, this usually develops into identification-based trust (strong trust) (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

2.7 Low Trust/High Distrust (Cell 3)

High distrust and low trust involves one actor being and having valid reasons to be distrustful and vigilant. The basis is in overall negative experiences where each negative experience reinforces reasons to distrust. The actor monitors the actions of the other while reinforcing weaknesses and preparing to tackle breaches of trust (Lewicki et al., 1998). Interaction is cautious where communication is likely to be embedded with cynicism, sarcasm and put downs concerning the motives and intentions of the other (Lewicki et al., 1998). Therefore, in the long-term, interdependence is difficult to maintain.

2.8 High Trust/High Distrust (Cell 4)

While high trust/high distrust is the most common condition for “multiplex relationships in modern organisations” (Lewicki et al., 1998:447), the starting point for interpersonal relationships

can be in any of the prototypical conditions represented in cells 1 through 4 (ibid). Factors such as reputation (Stinchcombe & Heimer, 1985), previous relational understanding of (dis)trust (Larson, 1992), social similarities or differences (Zucker, 1986) personality (Rotter, 1971; Stack, 1988) and contextual factors (Shapiro, 1990; Zucker, 1986; in Lewicki et al., 1998) might affect the composition of the initial relationship. Lewicki et al.'s (1998) 'Table 1' is illustrated below:

2.9 Integrating Trust and Distrust: Alternative Social Realities

High Trust Characterised by Hope Faith Confidence Assurance Initiative	High-value congruence Interdependence promoted Opportunities' pursued	Trust but verify Relationships highly segmented Opportunities' pursued and down risks/vulnerabilities continually monitored
	2	4
Low Trust Characterised by No hope No faith No confidence Passivity Hesitance	Casual acquaintances Limited interdependence Bounded, arms-length transactions Professional courtesy	Undesirable eventualities expected and feared Harmful motives assumed Interdependence managed Pre-emption: best offense is a good defence Paranoia
	1	3
	Low Distrust Characterised by No fear Absence of scepticism Absence of cynicism Low monitoring No vigilance	High Distrust Characterised by Fear Scepticism Cynicism Wariness and Watchfulness Vigilance

Figure 1: Source: Lewicki et al., 1998.

In Lewicki et al.'s (1998) article, they define trust in terms of "confident positive expectations regarding another's conduct" (1998:439), and distrust in terms of "*confident negative expectations regarding another's conduct*" (ibid). "Confident positive expectations", according to them, involves the trusters tendency to believe in the best intentions of the other and a readiness to take action

on the basis of the others conduct, while “confident negative expectations” represents the trusters fear that the other has questionable intentions and at the same time a need for self preservation from the effects of the conduct of the other (1998:439). Lewicki et al. (1998) argue that both trust and distrust involve movements toward certainty whereby trust represents optimism (things hoped for), and distrust represents fear (things feared) (ibid). The term “another’s conduct” in Lewicki et al.’s (1998) research is all encompassing and covers: “the words, actions, and decisions (what another says and does and how he or she makes decisions)” (Lewicki et al. (1998:439). However, while Lewicki et al.’s (1998) model represents varying levels of both trust and distrust, their explanation that distrust concerns “expectations of things feared” (1998:439) does not consider these variations. For example, according to their Table 1 (figure 1 this chapter) low distrust involves “no fear, absence of scepticism, absence of cynicism, low monitoring and no vigilance” (1998:445), surely, this variation or characteristic of distrust involving “no fear” should be better reflected in their definition of distrust. This raises the question about why the literature consistently views distrust as “bad” and trust as “good”. The normative view of distrust across intellectual traditions is that distrust is “bad” and trust is “good” (Lewicki et al., 1998:440). Perhaps this view of distrust in the literature sometimes is misleading. In some circumstances distrust could be perceived as “good” and trust as “bad” – the old saying “a fool and his money are easily parted” springs to mind.

Lewicki et al. (1998) in their research argues that their conceptualisation of trust and distrust as separate but linked dimensions, corresponds better with earlier foundational research on trust (i.e. Deutsch, 1958; Mellinger, 1956; Read, 1962) than with the latest perspectives (e.g. Hosmer, 1995; Mayer et al., 1995). Moreover, they argue that their understanding of the relationship between trust and distrust marks a clear break with much of the current literature on trust. They maintain that current beliefs about relationships are fallible and call for a perspective on social relationships that allows for the coexistence of simultaneous trust and distrust.

Undoubtedly, Lewicki et al.’s (1998) model challenges the dominant logic in the current trust literature i.e. that distrust and trust are at opposite ends of an intra- interpersonal continuum. This conceptualisation of trust and distrust as simultaneous entities is crucial to developing future trust research. Further, Lewicki et al.'s (1998) claim that trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship is in tune with the data gathered during the ethnographic

fieldwork at the heart of this thesis. Essentially, (as discussed later) my research supports the notion that trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship at the same time and the same space. Therefore, I endorse Lewicki et al.'s (1998) argument that distrust and trust are simultaneous coexisting entities and not opposite ends of a single continuum.

What is more, Lewicki et al.'s (1998) article opens up for the idea that different variations of trust can coexist within the same relationship, at the same time and during the same period. For example, it could be possible for calculus-based, knowledge-based and identification-based trust to coexist simultaneously in the same relationship alongside different variations of distrust.

2.10 Basis for Trusting Relations

Furthermore, there is a debate in the literature which centres on the basis for 'trusting relationships'. "There are many types of relationship, and it can be assumed that the nature of trust and its development are not the same in all the types" (Lewicki, 2006:94). Lewicki (2006) distinguishes between professional and personal relationships: professional relationships focus on reaching goals outside the union while personal relationships focus on the individuals within them and demand emotions and social investment (Lewicki, 2006).

Trust is different from relationship-to-relationship, takes on different guises and can differ even in the same situation depending on features such as relationship history/development and communication in the immediate setting (Rousseau et al., 1998). The literature identifies a number of trust variations (or typologies) ranging from deterrence-based to identification-based trust. However, after reviewing the literature, I believe that Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) multidimensional model of interpersonal trust development offers the best explanation of trust development along with the three types of trust identified. Firstly, Lewicki & Bunkers framework is more in tune with the trust variations observed during the ethnographic fieldwork illuminated within the empirical data. Specifically their conceptualisation of calculus-based trust is essential to the data analysis. Secondly, the number of citations in the literature concerning Lewicki & Bunkers framework reflects its value and usefulness (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Kramer, 1999; Rousseau et al., 1998); McAllister et al., 2006). Thirdly, Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) model has proven reliable through recent empirical work for researching forms of interpersonal trust (McAllister et al. 2006).

While, McAllister et al. (2006) found areas for improvement in Lewicki and Bunkers (1995, 1996) framework, they found it effective, and highly recommend its use in empirical work. McAllister et al. (2006) found “strong support” for Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) model across three quantitative studies and concludes:

“Kurt Lewin (1951) is often credited as saying, ‘There’s nothing as practical as a good theory’. Good theories are those that explain, predict, and delight (Staw & Sutton, 1995), and we believe that Lewicki and Bunker’s developmental model of trust has the potential to do these things. Our conviction, given the fact that we have a good theory, is that there’s nothing as practical as good measures. We maintain that the measures of trust we have tested across three studies are pretty practical, and we recommend their use in empirical work” (McAllister et al., 2006:06).

The following section explores the variations of trust identified by Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) and compares them against variations of trust identified by Rousseau et al. (1998) and Dietz & Hartog (2006). In the following sections, I will detail each of these approaches, comparing and contrasting them in each section. Identifying variations of trust are essential for analysing the empirical data. This is of importance to the analysis of the data particularly in relation to determining how the interactants of the study frame/key trust. In this respect, it is relevant to determine if the interactants draw upon already established keyings or variations of trust.

2.11 Multi-dimensional Interpersonal Trust Framework

Adapting Shapiro et al.’s (1992) three-stage model (deterrence-based, knowledge-based and identification-based) of trust Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996), developed a multidimensional theoretical framework for comprehending the features of trust within interpersonal relationships along with the processes by which trust relationships transpire and evolve over time. Linking trust development to stages of relationship development, Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) identify three well-defined variations of trust which are the sequential basis for one another and demonstrate how trust develops over time: calculus-based, knowledge-based, and identification-based trust.

Following Lewicki & Bunker (1996), ‘calculus-based trust’ (CBT) is necessary during initial or early phases of new relationships. During this early stage of trust building where calculus-based

trust pays off, actors get a better knowledge of the other, gaining a better understanding of one another's needs, preferences and priorities. This can develop into the second phase of trust building, 'knowledge-based trust' (KBT). This trust variation involves knowing the other well enough to be able to 'predict' their future actions (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996:121). According to Lewicki & Bunker (1996) not all relationships develop knowledge-based trust on top of calculus-based trust; some consolidate just on a calculus level. Nonetheless, many relationships achieve knowledge-based trust because the getting-to-know-each-other is almost unavoidable. Some relationships can even develop into Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) third level of 'identification-based trust' which involves a deep knowledge and understanding of the other (1996:122).

Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) fosters Boon & Holmes (1991) definition of trust: "A state involving confident positive expectations about another's motives with respect to oneself in situations entailing risk" (Boon & Holmes, 1991:194; in Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:117). Lewicki & Bunker (1996) argues that this definition is fairly uncomplicated and includes most of the fundamentals of other definitions (ibid). According to Lewicki & Bunker (1996), this definition contains three components:

- (1) The individual's disposition towards trust.
- (2) Context
- (3) The history of the relationship (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:117).

2.12 Deterrence-based vs. Calculus-based Trust (CBT)

In Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) adaption of Shapiro et al.'s (1992) model deterrence based trust becomes 'calculus-based' trust (CBT). Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) rename deterrence-based trust to calculus-based trust arguing that it involves both the truster calculating the gains from trusting against the potential losses, and the trustee calculating potential rewards from the relationship (and sanctions). In essence, they argue that two underpinning mechanisms construct deterrence-based trust: the (possible) sanctions for breaching trust, and the (potential) rewards derived from preserving it. Deterrence-based or rather calculus-based trust involves both fear and anticipation. This implies two primary mechanisms at play to establish trust in this trust variation – punishment and reward. In this view, trust is a ongoing assessment involving weighing-up both the

pros and cons of creating and sustaining the relationship in contrast to the costs of dissolving it (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

“People invest resources for the purpose of building a reputation for honesty”

(Dasgupta, 1988:70).

The mechanisms working within this trust variation usually guarantee compliance (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). The rewards for being trustworthy (and trusting) ensure compliance while the “risk” to one's reputation for breaching it prevents opportunism (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Reputation matters in most areas of life where standing and a reputable name mean everything. Within this context, if a person breaches trust, the aggrieved party can swiftly alert networks that the person is untrustworthy (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). As they point out, even for shady people, having a trustworthy reputation is an invaluable resource that individuals need to keep (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Therefore, even if there are short term opportunities to be deceitful, these short term gains from dishonest acts must be balanced (in a calculus-based way) against gains in the long-run of maintaining an unimpeachable reputation (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

Although calculus-based trust may be driven both by the value of benefits and the costs of cheating, Lewicki & Bunker (1996) argue that the *deterrence elements are more likely to overshadow the reward elements*. Therefore, according to Lewicki & Bunker (1996), the effectiveness and sanctions of deterrence make the “trust calculus” effective (1996:120). For the threat of deterrence to be effective, Lewicki & Bunker (1996) state that the following conditions must exist:

- The potential loss of future interaction with the other must outweigh the potential yield.
- To succeed, deterrence requires monitoring the others behaviour.
- The ‘injured’ person must be willing to carry out sanctions against the untrustworthy other.

Lewicki & Bunker (1996) asserts that attitude toward risk influences both advantage and disadvantage calculations of CBT. Individual risk-attitudes affect both suspicion of the other and their own propensity to (potential) abuse. Lewicki & Bunker (1996) draw on “Chutes and Ladders” as an analogy to illustrate CBT as a development process: “In calculus-based trust, forward

progress is made by ladder climbing, in a slow, stepwise fashion; however, hitting a single event of inconsistency may “chute” the individuals back several steps – or , in the worst case, back to square one” (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:121).

Rousseau et al. (1998), during their extensive literature review distinguish between deterrence-based and calculus-based trust *and conclude that deterrence-based trust is distrust rather than a variation of trust*. When considering that Lewicki & Bunker (1996) incorporate deterrence-based into calculus-based trust it is confusing that Rousseau et al. (1998) distinguish between the two.

In comparison to Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) analysis and adaption of deterrence-based trust, Rousseau et al.’s (1998) interpretation differs significantly. According to Rousseau et al.’s (1998) analysis, there are no rewards for maintaining trust, only sanctions and force for breaching trust (Dietz & Hartog, 2006 adopt the same approach, outlined below). However, by doing so *they fail to recognise that deterrence-based trust is a difference between positive incentives and sanctions*. Positive incentives are a primary mechanism underlying deterrence-based trust. As Malhotra (2004) argues: “Deterrence-based trust rests on a consideration of the incentives that the other party faces: if incentives are aligned, or if the other party does not gain from exploiting the vulnerability of the trustor, then trust increases” (Malhotra, 2004:61).

During their interpretation of *deterrence-based* trust Rousseau et al. (1998) give two different judgements which add to the confusion. Initially, they speculate that deterrence may be closer to low levels of distrust, which implies that it could still be low level trust (1998:399). They then go on to conclude that deterrence is not trust and exclude it from their model of basic forms of trust (Figure 2 below). Rousseau et al. (1998) state: “Note that we conclude that deterrence is not trust and excludes it from the model” (1998:401). Nonetheless, in relation to the latter, it seems safe to conclude that according to Rousseau et al. (1998), deterrence-based trust is distrust rather than trust.

Dietz & Hartog (2006) take a similar approach to Rousseau et al. (1998) concerning deterrence-based trust. Drawing heavily on Rousseau et al. (1998), they focus only on the sanction mechanism of deterrence-based trust and conclude that it is distrust rather than trust. Dietz & Hartog (2006) state: “*The first degree, “deterrence-based trust” (Rousseau et al., 1998, p. 399), ... there is no positive expectation of goodwill and only through the threat of external sanctions and*

force is the expectation of compliance guaranteed; there is effectively no risk and no probabilities to consider. Rather than reflecting trust, it is a manifestation of distrust” (Dietz & Hartog, 2006:563).

Dietz & Hartog (2006) continue with calculus-based trust arguing that it cannot be considered as “real trust” since trust only transpires on the basis of a “strict cost-benefit analysis” where a strong suspicion of the other remains (the essence of deterrence-based trust) (2006:563).

Similar to Rousseau et al.'s (1998) interpretation of deterrence-based trust Dietz & Hartog's (2006) is questionable. Firstly, risk and probabilities clearly are pivotal to deterrence-based trust – Lewicki & Bunker (1996) clearly illustrate this. Secondly, inspired by Rousseau et al. (1998) they totally ignore the merit and reward aspects of deterrence-based trust. Thirdly, the question remains whether they realise that calculus-based trust is an adaption of deterrence-based trust since their point that trust only transpires on the basis of a “strict cost-benefit analysis” applies rather to Shapiro et al.'s (1992) version of deterrence-based trust. Similar to Rousseau et al. (1998), Dietz & Hartog (2006), distinguish between deterrence-based and calculus-based trust which seems unproductive when considering Lewicki & Bunkers work from 1995 & 1996. Calculus-based trust, according to Rousseau et al. (1998), is:

“Based on rational choice-characteristic of interactions based upon economic exchange. Trust emerges when the truster perceives that the trustee intends to perform an action that is beneficial. The perceived positive intentions in calculus-based trust derive not only from the existence of deterrence but also because of credible information regarding the intentions or competence of another (Barber, 1983)” (Rousseau et al., 1998:399).

Rousseau et al.'s (1998) interpretation of calculus-based trust can be split into two parts: deterrence and knowledge (of the other). This implies that in order for this variation of trust to develop then actor “A” must predict that “B” intends to do something beneficial for them. While there are deterrents in place to deter trust violations the main emphasis is on gaining knowledge of the other through word of mouth or written documentation concerning the reputation, competence or intentions of the other. For instance, credible information about the trustee may

be provided by previous employers regarding his or her reputation or competence. Such “proof sources” signal that the trustee’s claims of trustworthiness are true (Doney et al., 1998; in Rousseau et al., 1998). As in Lewicki & Bunker’s (1996) calculus-based trust, reputation matters, but wavers mostly in deterrence where networks can be easily notified in the case of any trust transgressions. Subtracting the deterrence component from Rousseau et al.’s (1998) calculus-based trust leaves the knowledge component which rests on a consideration of the intrinsic characteristics of the other and their predictability. This is an integral part of Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) knowledge-based trust where information is essential to the manifestation of trust which occurs when one has enough information about others to understand and to predict their likely behaviour (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

The ‘knowledge’ part of Rousseau et al.’s (1998) calculus-based trust seems to have a lot in common with Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) knowledge-based trust. When considering the two it is evident that the crux of the matter rests on an intimate knowledge of the other which enables the parties to ‘predict’ future behaviour. Therefore, they are not so different after all, so similar that this component of Rousseau et al.’s (1998) calculus-(calculative) trust without difficulty can be subsumed under knowledge-based trust. Hence, during this thesis I divide Rousseau et al.’s (1998) calculus-based trust into its two components. Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) calculus-based trust subsumes the deterrence component, while their knowledge-based trust subsumes the knowledge component.

When considering the above, it is reasonable to conclude that deterrence-based can, without difficulty, be incorporated into Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) calculus-based trust. Deterrence is crucial to calculus-based trust and overshadows the positive mechanism. After considering how Rousseau et al. (1998) and Dietz & Hartog (2006) interpret deterrence-based trust then it clearly it fits with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) calculus-based trust. The major difference between the different interpretations discussed above is while Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) examines both sides of the coin; Rousseau et al. (1998) and Dietz & Hartog (2006) only considers one side. This is a weakness in their review and gives an unbalanced view of deterrence-based trust. It is necessary to consider both dimensions of deterrence-based trust in any analysis or discussion otherwise it becomes extremely unbalanced. With regard to calculus-based trust, according to Rousseau et al. (1998) it transpires through deterrence and because of credible

knowledge regarding the intentions of the other. However, removing the deterrence component leaves something remarkably similar to Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) knowledge-based trust. According to Dietz & Hartog's (2006) interpretation then calculus-based trust is not "real trust" since trust only emerges after conducting a prudent cost-benefit analysis to evaluate the pros and cons of the forthcoming relationship. However, this is the basis for deterrence-based trust and their analysis belongs to deterrence-based trust rather than calculus-based trust.

Moreover, after reflecting over the above and in light of Lewicki et al.'s (1998) two dimensional model that convincingly argues that distrust and trust can coexist in the same relationship at the same time, I propose that calculus-based trust is both distrust and trust. This variation or trust experience can be viewed as an exploration phase of a relationship which involves both trust and distrust along with positive and negative reinforcers. Following Lewicki et al. (1998) trust and distrust are discrete but linked entities that coexist in the same relationship. Therefore, it seems reasonable to postulate that both trust and distrust underpin calculus-based (dis)trust. What is more, Lewicki et al.'s (1998) article opens up for the idea that different variations of trust can coexist within the same relationship, at the same time and during the same period. For example, it could be possible for calculus-based, knowledge-based and identification-based trust to coexist simultaneously in the same relationship alongside different variations of distrust. After considering both deterrence-based and calculus-based trust, I suggest that deterrence-based trust be subsumed under Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) variation of calculus-based trust forthwith. Henceforth, for the reasons discussed above and for the sake of brevity during the rest of this thesis I refer only to calculus-based trust, which envelopes deterrence-based, and this signifies that this variation of trust involves two basic mechanisms – positive and negative reinforcer's (even if the negative reinforcer prevails) and trust and distrust coexist in this variation.

To reiterate, in this thesis deterrence-based trust = calculus-based trust (a trust experience where trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship, at the same time and in the same context. Moreover, I divide Rousseau et al.'s (1998) calculus-based trust into the two components incorporating deterrence into Lewicki & Bunkers (1995, 1996) CBT, while subsuming the knowledge component into KBT, as outlined in the following section.

2.13 Knowledge-based Trust (KBT)

Knowledge-based trust (KBT) is the second form of trust outlined by Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) this variation relies on information rather than deterrence. Between CBT and KBT a frontier is crossed when suspicions recede and positive expectations increase based on confident knowledge about the other, including their motives, abilities and reliability (Dietz & Hartog, 2006). KBT involves the certainty of the other, knowing the other well enough to foresee their actions (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). This variety of trust develops over time, largely as a consequence of the history of interaction allowing the parties to develop a generalised expectation in relation to the behaviour of the other i.e. predictable and trustworthy (ibid). Shapiro et al. (1992) outline several dimensions of knowledge-based trust:

- Information contributes to the predictability of the other, contributing to trust.
- The more knowledge of the other, the more predictable behaviour becomes.
- Predictability enhances trust – even if the other is predictably untrustworthy since it is possible to predict the ways they are likely to breach trust.
- Repeated interaction is necessary to develop the knowledge required to accurately predict the behaviour of the other.
- Frequent communication and engagement (courting) are key processes.
- Frequent communication consists of exchanging ideas, wants, and needs while keeping the parties in constant contact.
- Lack of communication makes it difficult for the parties to think alike and to predict one another's behaviour.
- Engagement or 'courting' is critical to developing the relationship and involves 'interviewing', and observing the other function in social situations, experiencing them in varying, emotional states and learning how others react to this. (Source: Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:121).

Lewicki & Bunker (1996), use the following allegory to illustrate the dynamics of 'knowledge-based trust': *"Its development is more like "gardening" – tilling the soil year after year to understand it and knowing what will grow in the sandy and the moist sections, the shady and sunlit sections. This*

knowledge comes from experimenting with different plants over the years. In relationships, the parties cultivate their knowledge of each other by gathering data, seeing each other in different contexts, and noticing reactions to different situations” (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:122).

Malhotra (2004) eloquently sums up this variation of trust: *“Knowledge-based trust rests on a consideration of the intrinsic characteristics of the other party: if the other party is seen as being fair and having integrity, these attributions increase trust” (2004:61).* When compared to calculus-based trust, knowledge-based trust is a fundamentally different way of relationship building and testing. At this level, trust is not necessarily damaged by inconsistencies in performance providing adequate, plausible, trustworthy explanations follow to explain them (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Knowledge-based trust (KBT) is about getting to know the other and relies on an intimate knowledge of the other, knowing them well enough to foresee their actions. This intimate knowledge develops over time through repeated interaction that allows the parties to develop an expectation that the other will respect trust. Rousseau et al.'s (1998) calculative-based trust hinges considerably on the predictability of the other based on credible information and a key ingredient of knowledge-based trust. The essence of calculative-based trust is that trust emerges when the truster anticipates that the other intends to do something beneficial. Both knowledge-based and calculative-based trust rests on a consideration of the intrinsic characteristics of the other and their predictability.

2.14 Identification-based Trust (IBT)

“Identification-based trust thus permits a party to serve as the other's agent and substitute for the other in interpersonal transactions”

(Deutsch, 1949; in Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:122).

Identification-based trust (known as *“strong trust”* (Maguire & Phillips, 2008); *“relational-based trust”* (Rousseau et al., 1998) and *“affective trust”* (McAllister, 1995), the third variant of trust advanced by Lewicki & Bunker (1996) often follows calculus-based trust (Lewicki, 2006). While CBT is usually the early stage in developing more intimate personal relationships, it sometimes leads to identification-based trust on the basis of identifying with the intentions and desires of the other

(Lewicki, 2006). Identification-based trust transpires because the individuals involved can “effectively” understand, agree with, empathise, and embrace the values of the other ‘*because of the emotional connection between them*’ (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:119). Subsequently, this empathic (strong), relationship develops to the extent where each participant can effectively represent or substitute for the other in interpersonal matters (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:119). During instances of IBT, parties are confident that monitoring or regulation is unnecessary, and their interests are protected (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

While levels of identification and understanding of the other increase, both parties realise what it takes to maintain the trust with the other (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). “*A comes to learn what “really matters” to B and comes to place the same importance on those behaviours as A does*” (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:123). This process is what Lewicki & Bunker (1996) refer to as “*second-order learning*” (1996:123). Second-order learning, following Lewicki & Bunker (1996) involves both parties identifying, understanding, relating to and empathising with the important beliefs of the other, and reinforcing these through actual behaviour. This seems to be a prime example of walking the walk and talking the talk – or what Goffman (1959) calls a confirming consistency. If, on the other hand, there is no confirming consistency between what person A says and does, then person B knows that A is not worthy of trust. Lewicki & Bunker (1996) argue that many of the same activities that create and strengthen calculus-based and knowledge-based trust help to develop identification-based trust. Additional types of activities to strengthen identification-based trust include: developing a shared identity (a joint name, title, logo, etc.); Co-location (in the same building or area); establishing common goals and a commitment to shared values (Shapiro, Sheppard and Cheraskin, 1992; in Lewicki & Bunker 1996).

Rousseau et al. (1998) refer to this variation of (strong) trust as relational trust, which similar to knowledge-based and identification-based trust emerges through effective repeated interactions with the other. Rousseau et al. (1998) assert: “*reliability and dependability in previous interactions with the trustor give rise to positive expectations about the trustee's intentions*” (Rousseau et al., 1998:399). Thus, stronger variations of trust can appear as positive expectations are fulfilled and justified (Dietz & Hartog, 2006). This much stronger belief in the other person portrayed by relational trust is more personal and emotional in nature and comes about through the quality of the relationship over time (Dietz & Hartog, 2006:563). Emotions are essential to the

relationship because longer-term interaction leads to the formation of attachments (McAllister, 1995; in Rousseau et al., 1998). Rousseau et al. (1998), point out that because emotion and attachment is essential to this variation of trust then scholars often refer to it as “affective trust” (McAllister, 1995) or “identity-based trust” (Coleman, 1990; in Rousseau et al., 1998). However, Rousseau et al. (1998) argue that there is “a thin line between the existence of a good-faith relationship between parties and the emergence of a shared identity” (1998:400). On the one hand, they argue that while two parties can share resources and collaborate regularly they can still define the other as “one of them” instead of “one of us”. However, on the other hand, they suggest that individuals through repeated interactions can develop pooled resources, “shared information, status and concern” which respectively can lead to “psychological identity” (Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996; in Rousseau et al., 1998:400).

However, despite this very thin-line, through their discussion, Rousseau et al. (1998) conclude that: “identity-based trust is relational trust at its broadest” (1998:400). Through making this statement, this means that Rousseau et al. (1998) subsume identification-based trust into relational trust. This is questionable when considering the process they relate whereby through repeated interactions individuals develop a “psychological identity” since this involves many of the same processes that create and strengthen identification-based trust. While calculus-based trust (CBT) is usually the early stage in developing more intimate personal relationships, it often leads to identification-based trust on the basis of identifying with the intentions and desires of the other (Lewicki, 2006). Identification-based trust develops when the different parties begin to identify with and understand one another. As the relationship progresses through an intimate knowledge of the other they are able to foresee the needs of the other, along with their choices and preferences. An intimate bond with the other makes it possible to empathise, share a ‘collective identity’, and to respond in unison with the other(s). As Dietz & Hartog (2006) assert: “The overwhelming affection and complete unity of purpose described in “identification-based trust” is such that both parties assume a common identity, and each party can represent the other’s interests with their full confidence” (Dietz & Hartog, 2006:564). Similar to identification-based trust, relational trust derives from repeated interactions over time. Repeated interactions enable relational partners to gain a deep knowledge of the other and emotion enters into the relationship because of their attachment. The individuals involved gain valuable information from their

understanding of one another, and this forms the basis of relational trust (Rousseau et al., 1998). As the relationship progresses, attachments form, and positive experiences increase positive expectations concerning 'intentions' (Rousseau, et al., 1998). Both identification-based and relational trust rests on a consideration of the relationship between the individuals involved. Relational trust can be viewed as a crucial part of identification-based trust. Henceforth, relational trust is incorporated into identification-based trust the rest of the thesis.

2.15 Beyond the Dyadic Perspective on Trust

More recently, attempts have been made to extend the dyadic perspective where interpersonal trust has been distinguished from institutional or institutional based trust. For example, McKnight et al. (1998) talk about 'initial trust' which refers to encounters between people who have never met and have no prior experience or personal knowledge of the other (McKnight et al., 1998). McKnight et al., (1998) argue that initial trust involves: "an individual's disposition to trust or on institutional cues that enable one person to trust another without firsthand knowledge" (1998:474). This implies individuals initially trust others on the basis of disposition or because the interaction takes place within a stable institutional context. Bachmann (2002) argues that organisational members have legitimate reasons to trust because there are social rules in place governing conduct (2002). Bachmann (2002) states: "Their potential to sanction individuals (mis)behaviour is strong enough to direct individuals' decisions towards certain channels of acceptable behaviour" (2002:06).

Institutional trust can be understood both as trust based in institutional relations (Bachman, 2002) or as trust in institutions sometimes called system trust (Maguire & Philips, 2008; Luhmann 1979; Giddens, 1991; 1994). Institutional trust concerns: "an individual's expectation that some organized system will act with predictability and goodwill" (Maguire & Philips, 2008:372). Institution-based trust researchers claim that trust reflects the security one feels about a situation because of guarantees, safety nets, or other structures (Shapiro, 1987; Zucker, 1986). Zucker (1986) links institutional-based trust to formal societal structures and views it has one of three primary mechanisms of trust building in economic structures (the other two are process-based and characteristic-based) (Creed & Miles, 1996). Institutional trust can be defined as the conviction that future interactions will continue, based on explicit or implicit rules and norms

(Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, and Camerer, 1998). At this level, trust can be conceptualised as happening within and among institutions, and as the trust individuals place in those institutions (Lewicki, 2006). In their extensive literature review, Rousseau et al. (1998) distinguish between three basic forms of trust: calculative, relational, and institutional.

Following Rousseau et al.'s (1998) analysis it is clear that they consider institutional-based trust more as a device that supports or blocks trust development, rather than a variation of trust. "Institutional factors can act as broad supports for the critical mass of trust that sustains further risk taking and trust behaviour (e.g., Gulati, 1995; Ring & Van De Ven, 1992; Sitkin, 1995). These supports can exist at the organisational level, in the form of teamwork culture (Miles & Creed, 1995) and at the societal level, through such cultural supports as legal systems that protect individual rights and property (Fukuyama, 1995)" (Rousseau et al., 1998:400). This notion of institutional-based trust implies that it is something that props up or encourages trust development rather than being a trust variation.

Most of the literature that deals with institutional trust tends to share the view that institutions support and inspire trust. Bachmann & Inkpen (2011), for example, compare the role of institutions in trust development to that of third-party guarantors. Third-party guarantors are individuals known to and trusted by at least two other actors. At the face-to-face level, third-party guarantors sometimes play a vital role in trust development by acting as adjudicators thereby providing assurances about one or both of the other two parties. Bachmann & Inkpen (2011) assert:

"The third-party guarantor does his or her job in that he or she provides an overlap of both parties', i.e. the trustor's and the trustee's, explicit and tacit knowledge domains, and allows for judgements on the part of the (potential) trustor that would not be possible otherwise" (2011:284).

Therefore, according to Bachmann & Inkpen (2011), in the same way institutional structures can reduce the risk of misplaced trust by providing: "legal regulations, professional codes of conduct, corporate reputation, standards of employment contracts, and other formal and informal norms of behaviour" (2011:285). Therefore, from this viewpoint of institutional-based trust can be better considered as a device or a building block for supporting and developing trust rather than a trust

variation. However, using the metaphor of the third-party guarantor raises the question about what happens to trust development when the other parties lose faith in the guarantor? Contrary to the dominant view in the literature that institutions act in a similar manner to third-party guarantors or trust development conductors, Rousseau et al. (1998) show that some institutional factors can hinder trust development rather than promote it:

“Institutional controls can also undermine trust, particularly where legal mechanisms give rise to rigidity in responses to conflict and substitute high levels of formalization for more flexible conflict management” (Sitkin & Bies, 1994; in Rousseau et al., 1998:400).

The observations made during the ethnographical fieldwork phase of this study support the idea that some institutional factors can hinder trust development in institutions themselves rather than promote it. For example, the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds expressed trust in a couple of actors from individual institutions while expressing scepticism, cynicism and distrust towards the institutions they represent. Interestingly, some public sector interactants shared similar views to the young men about the Police (see chapter five).

More recently, some researchers have identified the importance of adopting the process approach for understanding trust (e.g. Nooteboom, 1996; Nooteboom et al., 1997; Nooteboom & Six 2003; Möllering 2006; Khodyakov 2007). The process perspective goes beyond the dyadic approach because instead of viewing people as “passive carriers of a process” it considers people as “active creators of processes” (Möllering, 2006:79). As Möllering (2006) argues, *“there is a ‘creative element’ in trust which is to a very large extent attributable to agency”* (2006:79). This implies that knowledgeable social actors play a vital role in initiating, shaping, sustaining and changing trust in the process of interacting and associating with others (Möllering, 2006:79). The process perspective maintains that competent social actors purposely engage in: *“extensive signalling, communication, interaction and interpretation in order to maintain the continuous process of trust constitution”* (Möllering, 2006:79). Khodyakov (2007) reflects the idea that trust is a continuous process in his definition:

“Trust is a process of constant imaginative anticipation of the reliability of the other party’s actions based on (1) the reputation of the partner and the actor, (2) the evaluation of current circumstances of action, (3) assumptions about the partner’s actions, and (4) the belief in the honesty and morality of the other side” (Khodyakov, 2007:126).

When defining trust, Khodyakov (2007) maintains that it is crucial to take into account the present, past and the future. Khodyakov (2007) argues that actors decide to trust others in the present, based on future expectations of potential rewards and the reputation of the other created in the past (Khodyakov, 2007). Following this argument, the same process should account for distrust decisions where social actors decide to distrust others in the present based on future expectations of potential harm and reputations created in the past.

This implies that trust is something that has to be worked at and is both the basis for and the effect of cooperation. Möllering (2007) definition of trust encapsulates the process perspective:

“trust is an ongoing process of building on reason, routine, and reflexivity, suspending irreducible social vulnerability and uncertainty as if they were favourably resolved, and maintaining thereby a state of favourable expectation toward the actions and intentions of more or less specific others” (Möllering, 2006:111; in Möllering 2007:04).

Möllering (2006) draws some of this research together by arguing that trust has three bases: 1) reason, 2) routine and 3) reflexivity. These three foundations of trust research all draw inspiration from the following corresponding perspectives: 1) rational choice, 2) neo-institutional theory and 3) the process perspective. In line with this, trust can be based in calculation of the others behaviour, on institutionalised routine (cf. institutional trust) and slowly developing cooperative processes. Möllering (2006) argument is that trust is not just reason but also routine and reflexivity and that context and sense-making is extremely relevant to trust-building. Trust is not an entity determined by social and economic factors; rather it is a reflexive and context-dependent activity. However, very little is known about trust as reflexivity and process from a contextual perspective. An exception is Flores and Solomon. Flores & Solomon (1998) try to

conceptualize trust as a process. They argue that trust is not a 'social substance, a medium or mysterious entity', rather it is a 'dynamic, "wilful", emotional, relationship involving responsibility' (1998:205).

According to Flores & Solomon (1998), trust like most emotional phenomena comes about because of and within relationships through both verbal and nonverbal communication (1998:217). According to them, simply being copresent individuals express trust through "gestures, looks, smiles, handshakes and touches" (Flores & Solomon, 1998:219). Non-verbal communication (including all forms of body language) or what Goffman (1959) calls 'small behaviours' are just as crucial to creating trust as spoken language (Flores and Solomon, 1998:222). Following Flores & Solomon (1998), through interaction and by forming relationships, one learns to trust by trusting, and that is how one gets accomplished at trusting (1998:212).

2.16 Towards a Definition of Trust as Resource

Flores and Solomon (1998) specifically discuss trust relations and how they evolve. What they do not consider, and what can strengthen this discussion, is how trust is an instituted resource for the actors. Following this, another way to express trust is to see it as a cultural resource that knowledgeable actors draw upon within a social context. This means that trust can be seen as a resource or repertoire, a resource that actors can draw from cultural repertoires and use to organise action (Swidler 1986; Mizrachi et al., 2007). Mizrachi et al. (2007) view trusters as "active, knowledgeable agents" accomplished in using different types of trust to fit shifting social contexts (2007). Drawing heavily on Swidler (1986) and her concept of "culture in action", Mizrachi et al. (2007) view culture as a repertoire of skills and practices utilised by knowledgeable actors in pursuit of goals rather than something that shapes their behaviour (2007). According to Mizrachi et al. (2007), while many studies recognise that actors play an active role in continually monitoring and assessing situations as well as the trustworthiness of other actors, they fall short. Following Mizrachi et al. (2007), rather than social actors just monitoring and assessing other actors and situations; they go further and actively determine which variation of trust to use in response to the situation and change these responses as and when required to meet changes in circumstances (Mizrachi et al., 2007). Thus, according to Mizrachi et al. (2007) doing trust requires broad social

skills, cultural knowledge, and awareness where both trusters and trustees assess situations, understand the broader social context, evaluate others viewpoints of their actions along with the nuances and gestures of trust performance.

Mizrachi et al. (2007), propose a new theoretical perspective on trust that they call “trust repertoires.” According to Mizrachi et al. (2007), three interrelated dimensions shape the practice of trust: 1) agency, 2) culture, and 3) power and the political. Agency involves the ability of social actors to select and implement strategies of trust in different social contexts, whereas culture as a collection of symbols and practices provides a toolbox from which social actors select different variations of trust. Power and political refer to the context that shapes both the trust variation and the meaning attached to it by the social actor (Mizrachi et al., 2007).

According to Swidler (1986), culture provides actors with a toolbox (repertoire) of habits, styles and skills which they use to make “strategies of action” (1986:273). Following Swidler (1986), during “settled periods”, culture alone influences behaviour by giving a repertoire of resources from which people choose different lines of action. However, Swidler (1986) suggests that people only use the tools culturally available to them. During settled periods, cultural resources differ and usually groups and individuals call upon these resources selectively, conveying different styles and ways of action in different situations (Swidler, 1986). Following Swidler (1986) a culture is not a united process which drives action in the same direction, rather, it is more like a toolbox (Hannerz, 1969) from which actor’s opt for different tools for creating different actions. Despite Individuals and groups having a set of tools at their disposal, there may be some they rarely use (Swidler, 1986). In unstable cultural periods, explicit ideologies directly affect actions, but structural opportunities for action determine, which, among competing ideologies remain in the long run (Swidler, 1986). According to this view, culture shapes action where knowledgeable actors use it skilfully and creatively deciding upon different courses of action to suit the situation. Actors use culture as a resource to direct action. However, during cross-cultural exchanges or encounters, problems often occur when actors from different cultures misunderstand the intentional and unintentional signs and symbols conveyed by the other. This phenomenon was evident during the ethnographic fieldwork phase of the study. Further, this view is in tune with Branzei et al. (2007), who found that: “trust-warranting signs” form attributions of trustworthiness to unfamiliar trustees in collectivist versus individualist cultures” (2007:61). According to them, it

is in signs that one sees trust and trustworthiness, and “sign reading” is a fundamental part of deciding whether to trust (Bacharach & Gambetta, 2001; in Branzei et al., 2007). Branzei et al. (2007) find that the effectiveness of dispositional and contextual signs varies systematically depending on trustors’ national culture. Within this context, both intentional and unintentional signs given off by trustees are more easily picked up and correctly interpreted by individuals who share similar cultural norms, values and expectations (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998; in Branzei et al. 2007). During same culture interchanges where “signs and attributional styles are aligned” initial trust decisions can be made more confidently (Branzei et al., 2007). However, in cross-cultural encounters the absence of “trust-warranting signs” often leads to misunderstandings and hinders trust (Aulakh, Kotabe, & Sahay, 1996; Das & Teng, 1998; in Branzei et al., 2007). Therefore, following this argument, it is paramount for actors, especially in cross-cultural encounters to be aware of the cultural signs and symbols to interpret them accurately. As I will argue later, trust could frame (or key) different types and variations of social relations to enable organised action.

Following this discussion, another way to express trust is therefore to see it as something that knowledgeable actor’s use to frame and to key social relations by drawing on social and cultural forms of trust within a social context. In other words, trust is a resource that social actors use to define relationships and enable organised action.

An illustrative example is the study of Mizrachi et al. of a Jordanian textile factory under changing conditions. Mizrachi et al undertook an ethnographic study over a two-year period studying the changing trust relations between Israeli and Jordanian managers within a multicultural and multilingual site – a Jordanian subsidiary of an Israeli Textile Factory called Globe Wear (see Mizrachi et al., 2007:148). During this period, the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict had a strong impact upon the research participants (2007). During their research Mizrachi et al. (2007) differentiate between calculative and normative trust, calculative trust transpires in restricted “impersonal and instrumental” interactions e.g. bureaucracies, whereas normative trust occurs in personal, informal, relationships like families and friendships (2007). During the first contact between the Israelis’ and Jordanian’s (1998 – 2000), Mizrachi et al., (2007) report that both parties approached the partnership with considerable distrust as they attempted to define the boundaries of their relationships (2007:152). During the period of normalization, the Jordanians demonstrated emotional-based normative trust towards the Israelis this transpired through the notion of

'hospitality' (2007:153). Both parties reinforced the normative trust by forming relaxed, warm relationships (ibid). According to Mizrachi et al. (2007), the Jordanians went to lengths to make the Israelis feel at home, inviting them out to eat in restaurants and home to family events. During these informal events, Mizrachi et al. (2007) observed that both parties were 'joking and teasing' one another (ibid). However, while the Jordanians were doing normative trust, the Israeli's were doing 'paternalistic calculative trust – trust on conditional terms (2007:154). This way of framing social relations as conditional trust relations can be seen in the interview text of one of the Israeli managers:

"When you work on the edge, there is no such thing as unconditional trust. We have only conditional trust ... based also on the principle of 'seeing is believing'" (Mizrachi et al., 2007:154).

According to Mizrachi et al. (2007), this 'evidence based' trust was a recurring theme in the Israeli rhetoric *"reflecting their vision of themselves as missionaries disseminating professional knowledge, rationality and progress"* (2007:154). During this period, Mizrachi et al. (2007) observed conflicting strategies at play between the two parties. In an attempt to gain some leeway from failing to meet strict Israeli performance standards, the Jordanians tried to expand the scope of trust by mixing the professional with the interpersonal spheres. However, the Israeli's responded by imposing strict professional boundaries.

The outbreak of the Palestinian Uprising in the autumn of 2000 profoundly influenced the general political climate surrounding Globe Wear in Jordan and hit the textile industry hard (2007:156). During this period, the types of trust displayed by both parties dramatically changed. Because of to the new conditions, the Israeli's had no choice but to delegate the responsibility for supervising, monitoring, and quality control to the Jordanians. The Israeli managers also had to adapt to a new role of facilitation and support as opposed to monitoring and control. During this period of responsibility change, both parties *"reshuffled their cultural tools and reversed their strategies"* – this included trust (2007:157). Under the new circumstance, the Israelis with a weakened position over production realized that calculative trust was no longer a viable option, therefore, adopted normative trust instead (2007:158). Mizrachi et al. (2007) research shows how individuals alternately and interchangeably apply different forms of trust which go beyond and

deviate from presupposed cultural developmental paths. Following Mizrachi et al. (2007), both trusters and trustees impose, demand, resist, and alter forms of trust and manipulate their bandwidth as and when required. Mizrachi et al. (2007) work illustrates that social actors select, create, and apply different forms of trust as part of their cultural repertoires. By applying forms of trust, actors draw boundaries around their social relationships. At the same time, actors' strategies are inextricably intertwined with the power structure and political context.

2.17 The Concept of Frame and Trust in the Thesis

While Mizrachi et al. (2007) show how trust is a constant reflexive process used to delineate boundaries around social relations; one could also, drawing on Goffman (1974), argue that trust is a strong social resource used by social actors to frame and key relationships. In this view, trust as a frame is not only used to organise social relations it is also a way to interpret and label social events which reflect institutionalised relationships. While Mizrachi et al. (2007) tend to portray social relations in a post-modern way (culture can be used in a free way), the concept of frame underlines that not all repertoires are available to social actors, which is also in line with Swidler's (1986) original analysis. Along these lines, frame provides a bridging construct (Floyd et al 2011) between an interpersonal-relational and institutional approach to trust as a resource. Lewicki & Brinsfield (2011) eloquently articulate the essence of Framing:

“Framing is a dynamic by which people selectively focus on shape, and organise the world around them. Framing is about making sense of a complex reality and defining it in terms that are meaningful to us. Frames act like a “figure”, in that they define a person, event, or process and separate it from the “ground” or background around it. Frames “impart meaning and significance to elements within the frame and set them apart from what is outside the frame” (Buechler, 2000:41; in Lewicki & Brinsfield, 2011:114).

This implies that framing is a term used to describe the mechanism by which individuals make sense and organise the world around them. Following Lewicki & Brinsfield (2011), actors use

frames as a resource to zoom in on certain aspects of processes, events and people to disentangle them from the rest of the scene.

Further, the process of framing is an individual, unconscious activity whereby every individual draws upon resources such as culture, prior experiences, needs and expectations to frame their experiences during social situations. This process is illustrated by the following example:

“Two people walk into a room full of people and see different things: one (the extrovert) sees a great party, the other (the introvert) sees a scary and intimidating unfriendly crowd” (Lewicki & Brinsfield, 2011:114).

The point is everyone entering a setting or encounter interprets or frames people, processes and events based on needs, expectations, cultural and life experiences. Moreover, frames progress as individuals develop through learning and life experiences: *“even with the same individual, frames can change depending on perspective, or can change over time” (Lewicki & Brinsfield, 2011:114).*

A frame is a mental construct that allows individuals to place, perceive, identify, and categorise the people, events, and situations they enter into and organise their everyday life experiences (Goffman, 1974). In other words, frames (framing) are mechanisms that people use to interpret, make sense and organise situations. Frames determine how individuals define and organise others and situations over time and provide a course of action. Culture shapes frames which creates memory traces that reflect an individual’s previous experience (Lewicki & Brinsfield, 2011). As Swidler (1986) argues:

“People do not build lines of action from scratch, choosing actions one at a time as efficient means to given ends. Instead, they construct chains of action beginning with at least some pre-fabricated links. Culture influences action through the shape and organisation of those links, not by determining the ends to which they are put” (Swidler, 1986:277).

Following Goffman (1974a) frames can be understood in terms of primary frameworks which can be keyed into different variations of the same frame. A primary framework (i.e. preconceived

ideas) is the basic component of a frame (Goffman, 1974a). Primary frameworks allow individuals to explain and interpret events (ibid). While there are rules organising some primary frameworks, most are largely unstructured and only provide a means of understanding (Goffman, 1974a). No matter the organisation, each primary framework, allows its user to locate, distinguish, identify, and attach labels to a multitude of manifest experiences (Goffman, 1974a).

Primary frames largely reflect the norms, values, culture and preconceived ideas of social groups and serve as frames of reference (Goffman, 1974a). However, there can be variations in preconceived ideas within the same social group especially over larger territories, which ultimately affect the frames produced (ibid). Individuals interpret events in terms of primary frameworks where the employed frame provides a method to describe the event. Following Goffman (1974a:08), framing is a way for individuals to understand and explain the situation or to figure out: *“what is it that’s going on here”* (discussed further in chapter three).

Frames connect directly to other cultural properties; therefore, when doing frame analysis researchers must be aware of the dynamic nature of culture, which includes norms, values and institutional aspects (Young, 2010). This is pertinent and helps to explain how and why certain frames surface and the ‘social, emotional, and cultural’ role they play (ibid). Often, other cultural aspects both drive and inhibit the production of certain frames (Berger, 1974); therefore, it is crucial to take them into consideration (Young, 2010). Following Young (2010), researchers should consider the following cultural aspects: *“meanings, beliefs, ideologies, practices, values, myths, and narratives that such producers are aware of and can access to construct frames”* (Young, 2010:55).

2.18 Located in a Wider Cultural and Structural Framework

In this thesis, knowledgeable actors use trust and distrust as a cultural frame to define others and clarify their relationships with them. Trust and distrust frames involve interpretation and provide a means for organising and defining relationships. Trust and distrust as cultural frames can be understood as a resource used to describe the process by which actors define others in everyday situations. This has implications for the data analysis in this thesis. During the analysis, if I interpret an interactant as constructing a primary trust frame around an individual or a group, this means

(s)he demonstrates confident positive expectations towards them. On the other hand, if I interpret an interactant as constructing a primary distrust frame around an individual or group this means (s)he shows confident negative expectations towards them.

Goffman (1974) uses the concept of 'key' to explain how: *"the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something quite else"* (1974:43). By this Goffman (1974) means that an already identified primary frame can be transformed into a variation of the same frame. In the case of this thesis, this means that trust can be keyed into a variant e.g. knowledge-based or identification-based trust. Primary frameworks can be transformed either into keys or fabrications (frames designed to mislead others), which could be thought of as secondary frameworks, although Goffman does not use this term. Following Goffman's concept of frame, I define trust and distrust as *cultural and social repertoires or resources used by actors in social encounters to frame and key social relations – frame being an institutionalised resource.*

Following Lewicki et al. (1998), trust in this thesis means *"confident positive expectations"* and distrust means *"confident negative expectations"* (1998:439). Firstly, this implies that there are many sides or dimensions to trust like calculus-based, knowledge-based or identification-based. Secondly, this means that knowledgeable social actors use the different sides of trust and distrust to frame (define) individuals and social relations depending on the context. Thirdly, this means that trust or distrust are not static rather they are dynamic mechanisms; tools with a repertoire of variations used by actors as and when required to fit the context.

This means that knowledgeable social actors are competent in their interactional repertoires; they are intuitive and responsive to subtle change during unfocused and focused encounters. Social actors draw upon a range of interactional repertoires that they use to negotiate their way through daily encounters. Fourthly, it means that actors draw on resources and practices that are available and accessible to them whereby they rely on resources that have a deeper meaning about people over time in the context. In other words, while being sensitive and reactive to changes in face-to-face displays, attitudes, behaviour and demeanour, nevertheless, social actors are entangled in structured or institutional configurations. The concept of frame expresses a dialectical relationship between social structure and social actors whereby social actors shape the environment and the environment shapes them. Berger & Luckmann (1966) reinforce this

view that can be applied to the frame concept: *“It is important to emphasise that the relationship between man, the producer, and the social world, his product, is and remains a dialectical one. That is man and his social world interacts with each other. The product acts back upon the producer”* (1966:78).

In relation to trust, this means: *“trust is a social construction: not simply “given” to trusters, but “made” by them as well”* (Child & Möllering, 2003:71).

The frame concept is both a ‘here and now’ resource and an institutionalised entity and provides a link between the interpersonal and the institutional levels. Consequently, it acts, as mentioned, as a ‘bridging construct’ (Floyd et al. 2011). Floyd et al. (2007) define a bridging construct as: *“A concept which combines different ideas and elements related to a specific phenomenon”* (2007:11). According to them, bridging constructs connect different streams of research that can be conceptually distinguished at different levels of analysis in a coherent and operational way (Floyd et al., 2011:03). The implication for trust is that instead of speaking of trust in terms of a resource that can be freely used, I view trust (and distrust) as a resource that can be used as a strategy in the situation by knowledgeable actors in its different institutionalised variations. This means that while knowledgeable social actors interchangeably use variations of trust, their practices can still be socially constrained.

2.19 Concluding Remarks

The literature on trust tends to focus on trust as an interpersonal dyadic relationship between a truster and a trustee; it is only recently that institutional trust has come into focus. However, we still know very little about the intertwining of interpersonal and institutional trust and trust as process. Evidently, the dominant view of trust development in contemporary research is that trust and distrust are at the opposite ends of an intra- or interpersonal continuum. The dominant conceptualisation of this continuum starts with distrust or deterrence-based trust (considered by some researchers as distrust) and works through various degrees of trust ending with either relational or identification-based trust (considered to be the strongest forms of trust). However, this sequential view of trust excludes the possibility of trust and distrust coexisting at the same

time and within the same relationship. However, recent work on trust argues that trust and distrust are fundamentally different. Indeed, Lewicki et al. (1998) challenge the trust continuum idea and open up for the idea that trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship at the same time. The data gathered during the research phase of this thesis endorses Lewicki et al.'s (1998) model. Therefore, while dismissing the idea that trust is a continuum, I endorse and embrace the conceptualisation that trust and distrust are distinct, linked entities that can coexist within the same relationship.

Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) identify three variations of trust in their multidimensional model: calculus-based, knowledge-based and identification-based trust. Calculus-based trust can be summarised as an initial stage in the trust building process and can involve just as many setbacks as there are gains. Calculus-based trust (CBT) is a dynamic change process grounded in two incentive mechanisms – sanctions and rewards. This trust variation involves an ongoing assessment where the different parties anticipate the pros and cons of creating, sustaining the relationship weighed up against the consequences of severing it. The dynamics surrounding this initial phase of trust building often are irrational, with trusters and trustees driven by different interests (Lewicki, 2006). While trusters are more likely to focus on possible risks, they simultaneously ascribe high initial trust to others as a risk anxiety management strategy (ibid). Placing trust in the other, despite the potential risks involved is both “irrational and necessary to develop that trust” (Lewicki, 2006:95). While trusters focus primarily on risk, trustees have their sights set on the pay offs’ resulting from the relationship (Lewicki, 2006). In high-reward relationships, trustees are more likely to contribute to the association by generating joint gains for the parties (Malhotra, 2004; Weber, Malhotra and Murnighan, 2006; in Lewicki, 2006). However, there is disagreement in the literature about deterrence-based trust. While Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996) focuses on two mechanisms of deterrence-based trust renaming it as calculus-based trust, others continue to focus only on the sanction mechanism and view it as distrust rather than trust (e.g. Rousseau et al. (1998); Dietz & Hartog, 2006). Knowledge-based trust, the second trust variation, involves intimate knowledge of the other, knowing them well enough to be able to anticipate future actions. Information and frequent communication are essential to this variation of trust which transpires over time through multiple interactions whereby the parties gain a thorough knowledge of the other. Through frequent interaction and communication, actors

develop expectancies towards the conduct of the other. The third trust variation, identification-based grows as both parties begin to share similar beliefs and understanding while being able to anticipate the needs, choices and preferences of the other (collective identity). Increased identification enables individuals not only to empathize and identify with the other, but also to act in unison and ultimately to act on behalf of the other. While trust based on calculus and knowledge still exists as foundations for identification-based trust, identification with the other's aims and needs prevails. Lewicki & Bunker (1996) demonstrates that trust simply does not increase in intensity over time, rather as the relationship develops so does the way in which the actors frame and key the relationship.

The different types of trust outlined above could all be subsumed under the broad headings of weak and strong trust. Weak trust involves all situations where individuals calculate or try to predict the behaviour of the other based on local conditions, social rules and motivation to trust. Strong trust, on the other hand, is where people take a leap of faith' (Giddens, 1991; Möllering, 2006) and take more risk based primarily on relations and identification processes (Maguire & Phillips, 2008) rather than calculation. While predicting the behaviour of the other are features of both types of trust, compassion and benevolence of the truster are essential to strong trust (Maguire & Philips, 2008). Moving from weak to strong trust symbolises a "leap of faith" (Giddens, 1991; Möllering, 2006) and is a move towards a stronger trust type.

The combination of the separate trust variations together with the possibility that they can all be at play at the same time in the same situation is a source of confusion amongst scholars (Rousseau et al., 1998). However, it is necessary to recognise that trust can vary in bandwidth (may occur to varying degrees between the same individuals) and can vary over the course of the relationship (Rousseau et al., 1998).

Recently, there have been some attempts to conceptualise trust as a process in the literature, for example, Mizrachi et al (2007). In their paper, inspired by Ann Swidler (1986), they consider trust as a repertoire used to organize social relations in a given context. This view of trust as a process which is similar to Möllering's (2006) concept of reflexive trust tends, however, to ignore the institutional aspects of trust which is contrary to both Swidler's (1986) and Möllering's (2006) original contributions. This thesis tries to solve the problem of interpersonal and institutional trust as process by making use of Goffman's (1974) concept of frame. Frame can be

viewed both as an institutional category and a resource that actors use to interpret and explain events. Following this, trust can be seen as a resource used to frame and key social relations. The frame concept is a bridging construct that bridges notions of trust as a free resource at the interpersonal and relational level and trust as an institutionalised resource in a social context. The overall contribution of the thesis, therefore, lies in an effort to develop a process based approach to trust that takes into account the intertwining of interpersonal and institutional aspects of trust. Another aim of the thesis is to contribute towards filling the gap in the literature while at the same time contributing towards developing an interpretive approach to trust research. Further, the aim is to contribute to existing empirical work on trust by exploring trusting as a complex relational practice occurring within specific socio-political contexts.

3

Methodology

“As interworked systems of construable signs, culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviours, institutions, or processes can be casually attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly—that is, thickly—described” (Geertz, 1973:14).

3.0 Introduction

The aims and objectives of my research project clearly pointed towards qualitative research methods while simultaneously excluding quantitative methods. While quantitative research methods are useful for collecting numerical data in relation to quantifying certain trends or demographic changes in 'society', mostly they approach the situation from a distance. The proposed research project required a method, which allowed close immersion into the settings in order to obtain firsthand in-depth data through observations, interactions, listening to and interviewing people about their experiences and interpretations of those experiences. Qualitative research methods provide resources to achieve in-depth understandings of a social setting, situation or problem from the perspectives of the people involved (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008). The research question usually determines the choice of research method. For instance, a concern about the frequencies and distribution of phenomena in a population would call for quantitative techniques. Silverman (2001) reinforces this conclusion:

“The choice between different research methods should depend upon what you are trying to find out. For instance, if you want to discover how people intend to vote, then a quantitative method, like a social survey, may seem the most appropriate choice. On the other hand, if you are concerned with exploring people’s life histories or everyday behaviour, then qualitative methods may be favoured” (Silverman, 2001:01).

3.1 Chapter Structure

In this chapter, I account for the research strategy and choice of methods used to collect data, which lie at the centre of this thesis. The structure of the chapter is as follows: I begin the chapter by introducing and presenting the term interactant by comparing it to ‘informant’ and the implications for using this distinction in the thesis. Next, I outline ‘ethnography’ the chosen research strategy along with locating it in the naturalistic research tradition while outlining my rationale for choosing this as a method for data collection. Following this I look at ethnography as a tool for exploring cultures (Geertz, 1973), and then at the notion of culture as a resource or toolbox, which people often rely on to tackle everyday issues (Swidler, 1986, 2001, & 2002). Next, I explore the idea of ethnography as “thick description” and explore what Geertz (1973) means by this term, which seems to be used frequently in the literature on ethnography. Next I present the ethnographic methods that I used to gather data during nine months of fieldwork. Following this, I present the methods employed to analyse the five empirical sections of the thesis. Following this I explore the ethical considerations of harm, confidentiality/anonymity, informed consent and privacy, which seem to be the key issues when undertaking qualitative research and to building trust in fieldwork settings. These aspects interlink and overlap somewhat and were essential to the trust building process with interactants in the settings. The chapter ends with exploring issues of reliability and validity in relation to this study.

3.2 Interactant vs. Informant

Before, discussing the chosen research strategy it is necessary to mention that throughout this thesis I use the term interactant to refer to all persons encountered during fieldwork. I use ‘interactant’ rather than ‘informant’ because I consider the informant term inadequate or

insufficient to explain the close relationships built up during fieldwork. I use the term indiscriminately to refer to all people who I interacted with, observed and interviewed during data collection. The informant tag seems to be used widely and uncritically by many researchers who find it sufficient to describe the relationship between the researcher and the researched. Pratt & Kim (2012), for example, after briefly discussing other tags used in quantitative research seem to find informant adequate to describe their relationships to the researched in their ethnographic study:

“The term ‘informant’ rather than subject (as in a lab study) or a ‘respondent’ (as in a survey) is not an accident, but speaks of the nature of the researcher to the researched. Informants, as the name describes, informs you. They are the cultural experts. You are not manipulating the conditions around them as you might for a ‘subject’; and ‘respondents’ are often limited to answering questions on the topics and concepts that you deem critical. In the lab and when giving surveys, you are the expert; and you have a fair amount of control over what your subjects do and the kinds of questions they answer” (2012:03).

Perhaps the informant tag is sufficient and appropriate to the relationships they formed in the field. However, in my view, the informant term implies a one way process where a person from the group or setting just ‘spills the beans’. Needless to say, after my recent fieldwork experience, the informant tag seems inadequate and inappropriate to use on people who I built trusting relationships within the settings through a process of interaction over an extended period. During fieldwork, I used principles learned through years of social work education and practice such as empowerment, empathy, anti-discriminatory and anti-oppressive practices, as tools to help build trusting relations with others. Such an approach involves active listening, signalling respect and including people in decision making processes. Relationship and trust building involves getting to know others through face-to-face interaction and letting them get to know you; therefore, I participated in storytelling and spoke openly to anyone who asked me about my past and experiences of living in Denmark.

During fieldwork, I experienced countless hours of interaction but not so much ‘informing’; rather it was more a two-way process of giving and receiving. For example, interviews carried out towards the end of the fieldwork can best be described as long in-depth conversations or discussions where most interactants appeared to be off-guard. At the end of interviews, before giving a debrief I gave interactants the chance to add extra information as well as the opportunity to ask me questions. Further, during fieldwork some interactants actively engaged me by offering advice, asking questions about how the study findings could be used and by offering interpretations of events unfolding in the area – this seems to go beyond informing.

Goffman uses the interactant term in some of his texts to refer to locals whom he encounters in the research settings; however, despite a lot of research, thus far I have not been able to establish where the term originates. In this thesis, the term interactant signifies the relationship built up with people through various interactions, over an extended period, during fieldwork, both public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Within this context, the term informant would not adequately describe this mutuality and closeness which eventually gave access to the backstage areas of peoples lived-experiences.

3.3 Ethnography – The Research Strategy

“... a technique ... of getting data ... by subjecting yourself, your own body and your personality and your social situation, to the set of contingencies that play upon a set of individuals so that you can physically and ecologically penetrate their circle of response to their social ... work, ... ethnic situation or whatever” (Goffman, 1974b:125).

In order to obtain quality and deep interpretative material and understanding, I chose ethnography, which involves using a combination of research techniques and producing a written product. Doing ethnography implies studying a situation in-depth and breadth. Ethnography, according to Goffman (1974b), involves the researcher immersing themselves into a setting, for about twelve months to experience the same unforeseen events firsthand as interactants, which allows the researcher to observe closely how people react to and interpret these events – their social reality. However, my fieldwork falls short of Goffman's (1974b) recommendations for a number of reasons. Firstly, I only spent nine months in the field, of which during this time I moved

between two different sights and between two different target groups (young men with minority ethnic backgrounds & public sector employees), and secondly, I did not reside in the setting, instead I left at the end of each field trip and drove home. However, after saying that, I invested almost all my waking hours on gathering data in and around the two settings and got to know and build trust with several interactants in both target groups, which resulted in gaining backstage access to their lives. Gaining access to in-depth and breadth data along with building trust must be a sign that I achieved both acceptance and immersion.

Following Goffman (1974b), fieldwork, using participant observation is a wholly personified activity where the researcher throws themselves into the setting in order to ascertain the point of view of other people. This means studying everyday activities in the context as they occur and understanding how people interpret these activities. The purpose of ethnography according to Goffman (1974b) is to achieve “deep familiarity” while simultaneously collating data on an accumulation of events: *“It’s deep familiarity that is the rationale ... that, plus getting material on a tissue of events ... that gives the justification and warrant for such an apparently loose thing as fieldwork”* (1974b:130). Good fieldwork, according to Goffman (1974b), involves being close to people in the setting – close enough to observe how they respond to what life throws at them. Good fieldwork goes beyond just observing and eavesdropping; the researcher must subject themselves to the same conditions of life: *“taking the same crap they’ve been taking”* (Goffman, 1974b:125), whilst picking up on their small behaviours as they react to situations (ibid).

Goffman trusted direct observation of social life and was sceptical about the exclusive reliance on interviews as a basis for sociological analysis. Goffman (1974b) clearly conveys this during a talk about method, later published from a covert recording after his death: *“I don’t give hardly any weight to what people say, but I try to triangulate what they’re saying with events”* (1974b:131). My recent experience of fieldwork reinforces Goffman’s (1974b) message, where at least one interactant attempted to deceive me during a recorded interview by giving a false impression, which is something I discuss in the second empirical section of chapter five.

This experience during fieldwork brought home both Goffman’s (1974b) and Van Maanen’s (1979) point about relying solely on interviews as a source of data. This is something I tackle during the data analysis by triangulating interview accounts with others and observations from the field. Therefore, this can be considered one of the strengths of using ethnographic methods; it

provides the researcher with a toolbox of methods in which the researcher can gather data from many different perspectives which can be used to triangulate what people say. In the case mentioned above, prior to interviewing the person in question I had spent at least four months in the setting experiencing life, conversing with many interactants and making observations. Therefore, I had some insight and understanding of the area and practice of the individual in question before conducting the interview. Nonetheless, the same person revealed himself during the interview, or rather he later gave an explanation which dispelled the impression that he attempted to create. Therefore, it is advantageous for researchers to have insight and understanding about the field and interactants under focus before carrying out interviews. By solely relying on interviews, it is easy for researchers to get deceived and/or to take no account of ambiguities and inconsistencies during interviews.

This reinforces the need for other methods to enhance and help interviews in the data gathering process. While interviews are one of the primary tools in ethnographic studies, they are only one of many in the researcher's toolbox. The best way to gain this deeper understanding of the setting and the interactants along with the cultural practices is to spend time in the setting together with interactants to catch things as they happen – experience the environment and gain interpretations of social life from interactants. This is the essence of naturalism and involves observing social behaviour as it happens in its natural social environment – ethnography.

The basis for the ethnographic approach is the long-term observation and in-depth interviews along with the establishment of interpersonal trust (Fadahunsi & Rosa, 2002). Inherently inductive by approach ethnography seeks to explore the social world through observation rather than through testing or confirming hypotheses (Padgett, 1998). Ethnography is naturalistic, favouring direct observation and interviewing over the decontextualising approach of scientific enquiry (Padgett, 1998). Naturalism requires researchers to study the social world in its natural state while limiting interference to a minimum (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

According to naturalism all data must be collected in the social world where they occur – far away from artificial surroundings such as laboratories. Research carried out in the social world must be conducted with sensitivity, showing respect for the setting and its inhabitants (ibid). The purpose of such research is to examine how people in the setting understand their actions, the actions of others and describe this along with the context and the outcome of the actions

(Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Naturalism requires a method to understand the actions of individuals by accessing the meanings that affect behaviour – here 'the value of ethnography as a social research method is crucial' for understanding social processes (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

During data collection, I used ethnography as a method to look for the basic socially established codes (primary frames) and cultural tools used to govern and regulate the social relations and interactions between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and public sector employees. The purpose of this was to examine how interactants understand their own actions and the actions of others and explain this along with the context and the outcome of the actions. I adopted a multi-method ethnographic approach, which included participant observation, in-depth interviews, media analysis observations and interviews. In much of his work, Goffman refers to ethnography as fieldwork and for brevity is something I adopt when referring to the data collection phase in the thesis.

3.4 Ethnography – Interpreting Cultures

“It is through culture patterns, ordered clusters of significant symbols that man makes sense of the events through which he lives. The study of culture, the accumulated totality of such patterns, is thus the study of the machinery individuals and groups of individuals employ to orient themselves in a world otherwise opaque” (Geertz, 1973:363).

Ethnography is also about interpreting cultures, and the ethnographic method is about creating the interpretation (Geertz, 1973:10). Geertz (1973) defines culture as, *“a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and their attitudes towards life” (1973:89)*. In other words, generations give and share culture to the next and between generations; people become socialised into culture. Transmitting culture involves passing on skills, ‘knowledge’ about values and norms in the context in which one becomes socialised through symbolic communication. This concerns passing on ‘patterns of meaning’ i.e. what is right or wrong, how to behave ‘correctly’, the rules of social interaction and how to use objects in the correct way. A continuous stream of communication at different levels

and via various media maintains and keeps culture in existence (e.g. face-to-face, social institutions, music, social media). Culture shapes attitudes, beliefs, values and the actions of people and can be seen as a worldview which connects the members of a context. Culture, according to Geertz (1973), is a context or a situation in which people live their lives and not a power or a driving force (1973). Geertz (1973) asserts, *“culture is not a power, something to which social events, behaviours, institutions, or processes can be casually attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly – that is, thickly – described”* (1973:14).

This implies there can be cultures within cultures or what researchers label as ‘sub-cultures’. In other words, culture is living in a family on a council housing estate, or living in an institution such as a prison, living on a council run reservation in a caravan as part of a Romany Gypsy Clan and living in a cardboard box under London Bridge as a member of the growing homeless community, or in whatever context one lives and negotiates life on a daily basis – culture is context and context produces culture. Geertz (1973) distinguishes between culture and social structure where he regards the two concepts as semi-independent “forces” (1973). Social structure refers to the *“economic, political and social relations among individuals and groups”* (1973:362) while culture refers to the system of meanings embedded in symbols.

3.5 Culture as a Repertoire or toolbox

As pointed out in chapter two, I subscribe to the idea that while culture affects individuals, individuals also influence culture, i.e. there is a continuous ping pong process between culture and the individual, which implies that culture continuously develops. Rather than viewing culture as something which totally overtakes the rationality of social actors, I agree with Swidler (1986, 2001, & 2002) who argues that culture is a resource that social actors use. Swidler (2001) asserts: *“To describe how culture works, we need new metaphors. We must think of culture less as a great stream in which we are all immersed, and more as a bag of tricks or an oddly assorted tool kit”* (Swidler, 2001:24). Following Swidler (1986), people know much more culture than they use, and when using cultural repertoires available to them (stories, signals, symbols and rituals etc.) there can be variations (Swidler, 2002). Second, individuals carry a lot of different, sometimes contradictory, or disconnected cultural tools in their repertoires (Swidler, 2002). People make

selections from their toolbox based on problems of action (ibid). Because they face many different kinds of problems with differing structures, they carry many, sometimes discordant, skills, capacities, and habits (Swidler, 2002). Through her work, Swidler shows that there are variations in the range and diversity of repertoires that people can select as strategies of action in different contexts. In addition, Swidler's work shows that while culture influences the actions of social actors, it does not totally dominate, rather actors use bits and pieces of culture in novel ways to tackle everyday situations, which shapes culture.

3.6 Ethnography as Thick Description

According to Geertz (1973) it is not the methods and techniques used to gather data that define ethnography, rather it is the "intellectual effort" involved (1973:06). Geertz (1973) asserts that ethnography is: "an elaborate venture in, to borrow a notion from Gilbert Ryle, "thick description" (1973:06). Thick description involves "thinking and reflecting" and the "thinking of thoughts" (ibid). To illustrate thick description Geertz (1973) includes an example from Gilbert Ryle:

"Consider ... two boys rapidly contracting the eyelids of their right eyes. In one, this is an involuntary twitch; in the other, a conspiratorial signal to a friend. The two movements are, as movements, identical; from an I-am-a-camera, "phenomenalistic" observation of them alone, one could not tell which was twitch and which was wink, or indeed whether both or either was twitch or wink. Yet the difference, however, unphotographable, between a twitch and a wink is vast; as anyone unfortunate enough to have had the first taken for the second knows. The winker is communicating, and indeed communicating in a quite precise and special way: (1) deliberately, (2) to someone in particular, (3) to impart a particular message, (4) according to a socially established code, and (5) without cognizance of the rest of the company. As Ryle points out, the winker has done two things, contracted his eyelids and winked, while the twitcher has done only one, contracted his eyelids. Contracting your eyelids on purpose when there exists a public code in which so doing counts as a conspiratorial signal is winking. That's all there is to it: a speck of behaviour, a fleck of culture and – voila'! – a gesture" (Geertz, 1973:06).

In relation to gestures, one must question the meaning or significance of them. Are they for example, *"ridicule or challenge, irony or anger, snobbery or pride, that, in their occurrence and through their agency, is getting said"* (Geertz, 1973:10). Thick description involves interpreting the meaning of actions. In the example above, one boy winks purposefully while the other twitches

involuntary, apparently two similar physical actions. However, there is no intention or meaning with the twitch, whereas the wink has meaning and is a socially established code. Therefore, in researching culture, ethnographers must report the winks and not the twitches. Thus, thick description involves the ethnographer picking out socially established code from the complex structures of inference and implication and determining their social ground and significance (Geertz, 1973). Therefore, according to Geertz (1973), thick description is not only central to ethnography – “ethnography is thick description” (1973:09-10). Moreover, “thick description” concerns the rich meticulous account of the field work experience where the ethnographer illustrates the ‘conceptual structures’ and social relationships while simultaneously putting them into context. Thus, following Geertz (1973), ethnography is about interpreting cultures, and the ethnographic method is about creating the interpretation (Geertz, 1973). During the empirical sections, especially in chapter four, I use thick description as a means of locating me as a researcher within the context. Richly describing the fieldwork experience and interactions is a valuable tool in setting the context of the fieldwork and in helping the reader to follow the fieldwork experience.

3.7 Ethnographer as Research Instrument

In ethnography, the researcher is the primary agent who through an extended period observes various sources of data and subsequently utilizes several tools for investigating, verifying, or for bringing to light different perspectives on multifaceted matters and events (Wolcott, 1997). The notion of the researcher as the main research instrument in ethnography is a prominent feature of the methodological literature (Cohen et al. 2000; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995; in MacPhail, 2004). Locating the self in the research technique allows the researcher to evaluate their own situation and role (Stanley and Wise, 1993). Reflexivity symbolizes the ethnographer in the social world under study whereby the researcher is the key resource in the data collection system (Hodgson, 2000:03). Further, reflexivity denotes the response to the researcher from interactants with the researcher’s response to them and the setting (Hodgson, 2000:03). Reflexivity in fieldwork involves the ethnographer critically examining the self in the data gathering and

interpretation processes (researcher accountability) along with power relations and politics (Jones et al. 1997; Falconer Al-Hindi & Kawabata 2002; in Sultana, 2007).

Data collated via ethnography is dependent upon the interpretations and assumptions of the researchers themselves (Geertz, 1973; Foley, 1992; Hammersley, 1992; MacPhail, 2004). Geertz (1973) asserts: “we begin with our own interpretations of what our informants are up to, and then systematise those ... anthropological writings are themselves interpretations, and second and third order ones to boot. (By definition, only a “native” makes first ones: it’s his culture)” (1973:15). Geertz (1973) argues that ethnographies are constructions, fictions, something created or fashioned by the ethnographer (1973:15). However, they are not false, or imaginary rather interpretations by the ethnographer and sometimes of other peoples interpretations interpreted by the ethnographer (Geertz, 1973). Needless-to-say, the same can be said about most research methods used to collect and analyse data in the social sciences, ultimately they depend on the efforts and interpretations of individual researchers.

3.8 Ethnographic Methods

Ethnography is not a predetermined modus operandi and is unstructured in approach (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Bryman, 2008). This means no prearranged frameworks of analysis, no hypotheses to be tested and no fancy research design specified at the beginning of the project (ibid). Moreover, drift tends to direct ethnographies rather than design (Van Maanen, 1979; in Pratt & Kim, 2012). Often drift supersedes the original study design, which seems to be a resource rather than a weakness where Pratt & Kim (2012) advise researchers to take advantage of "where the study takes you" (Pratt & Kim, 2012:01). Drift seems to be a valuable way of framing my fieldwork experience under the research gathering phase. As outlined in the introduction, I began in one place with one concern and ended in another some twenty miles away with a new focus. Perhaps, researchers should follow Pratt & Kim's (2012) advice by adopting a flexible approach when doing fieldwork; it may just result in an unforgettable journey with a broader and deeper understanding of the issues and challenges that people face on a daily basis. Needless-to-say, fieldwork requires a flexible approach taking the rough with the smooth learning from failures and ceasing opportunities as they arise. In ethnography, the researcher is

the research instrument that through an extended period observes various sources of data and subsequently utilizes several techniques for investigating, verifying, or for bringing to light different perspectives on multifaceted matters and events (Wolcott, 1997:158). In essence, all ethnographies differ in emphasis from ethnography to ethnography but all rely on three main methods for gathering data – observation, participant observation, and interviews (Prus, 1996:19).

3.9 Participant Observation

Emerson et al. (1995) argue that field researchers must engage in participant observation at the heart of key sites, immersing oneself into the worlds of others, which allows the researcher to see from the inside what interactants find meaningful and relevant (ibid). In tune with Goffman (1974b), Emerson et al. (1995), argue that this approach to collecting data involves being close to other people to experience how they respond to events as they unfold, and the contexts in which they occur. Thus, participant observation rules out field research as a passive, detached activity because it means being in proximity with others; therefore, interaction is inevitable. This means the mere presence of the researcher can have a direct bearing on the proceedings of the setting, “consequential presence” directly linked to “reactive effects”, the very presence of a researcher can influence the conduct of informants (Emerson, 1995). However, Emerson et al. (1995) consider the latter to be rather limited in scope since informants do not: “alter or disrupt their ongoing patterns of social interaction” (ibid). This suggests that the effect of the researcher on the behaviour of informants is fairly minimal. However, this probably varies from setting to setting and most probably depends much on the researcher’s approach to collecting data in the setting. I discuss issues around researcher reactivity further in chapter four, in relation to my experience of entering the field.

I adopted an overt participant observer role as the main method of data collection. However, it is necessary to note that sometimes participant observation drifts into pure observation and vice versa. Observation, according to Prus (1996) involves recording events observed through audio and visual senses along with collating any relevant documents obtainable from settings i.e. records, diaries, reports, policies etc. On occasions, during fieldwork I utilised observation-participation on a number of occasions rather than participant-observation per se. For

instance, when attending 'official' meetings between different public sector employees usually my role involved listening, observing interactions and taking notes – a fly on the wall with a notebook. Further, during fieldwork I shadowed a number of public sector employees while they carried out their jobs. Shadowing is a research method which involves a researcher closely following a member of an organisation (McDonald, 2005). In essence, shadowing involves accompanying the individual throughout their working time. During the course of the fieldwork, I shadowed two SSP workers and a job consultant over varying periods. Shadowing can be carried out over successive or non-consecutive days from anything from a single shift up to a whole month (McDonald, 2005).

Throughout the activity, the researcher asks questions clarifying certain happenings or probing working practices (MacDonald, 2005). Shadowing involves researchers recording detailed fieldnotes about observations, contents of conversations, answers to questions, the body language and moods of the person under observation (MacDonald, 2005). Consequently, this technique provides a direct, multidimensional picture of the role, approach, views and tasks of the person under observation, along with a comprehensive data collection (MacDonald, 2005).

Mainly, I used participant observation whilst hanging out in the community centres at the heart of the two neighbourhoods and a local youth club located on the outer edge of Sunset Boulevard. Participant observation, according to Prus (1996), adds an entirely different and critical aspect to the notion of observation. Participant observation goes beyond mere observation allowing the researcher to access the lived experiences of participants (1996). This firsthand experience allows for an empathic approach towards certain aspects of life in the setting (1996). Prus (1996) asserts that participant observation offers a more effective and interactive method to collect data as well as exclusive and informative material (1996). Further, participant observation generates unique opportunities to gain firsthand insights into the worldview and practices of the other through ongoing evaluation and interactions (Prus, 1996).

Hanging out in this study consisted of playing pool, table football, table tennis, backgammon, chess, Super Mario, basket ball, chatting, participating in sporting activities along with other social activities like attending social gatherings such as parties and communal meals in the community centre. Participating in activities together with the young men was an excellent method for building, social relations and trust. Participating in activities allowed me to get to know some of the young men and just as crucial allowed them to get to know me. This is necessary in

order for them to be able to size me up, make sense of my presence and define me, which clearly influences the outcome of the fieldwork. Moreover, using table based activities were a valuable tool for conversing about or following up on various themes and getting to know about the salient issues of the day in the lives of the young men. Throughout this period, I recorded detailed fieldnotes describing experiences and observations along with initial reflections. I wrote fieldnotes immediately after striking occurrences or as soon as possible thereafter. Sometimes I expanded basic fieldnotes into more detailed text upon reaching my car, normally parked within 15 minutes walking distance. Further, at the end of each field trip, or sometimes the following morning, I processed the fieldnotes into rich or thick description into my research diary.

Occasionally, it was possible to sit in the location and text myself notes and keywords via mobile telephone. Sitting and fiddling with my mobile phone fitted into the scene and did not produce any curiosity. I made a firm decision from the start not to try writing notes into my pocketbook while in the presence of the young men (unless by advance approval). Sitting with a note pad in hand recording events as they happen in the community centres is not an option. Such actions should be avoided, if the young men of the area suspected me of being a police agent/informant or just as worse, an undercover journalist they would have thrown me out of the neighbourhood. Some interactants openly expressed anger and frustration concerning negative stories printed in the local newspaper concerning the community – the (overt) journalist responsible for writing many such stories had his car burnt out during the research process. Whether, the unknown perpetrator specifically targeted the journalists car remains to be seen. Further, I changed strategies for observation and writing fieldnotes to suit the nature of the social setting and those present. For example, when meetings between public sector employees in conference rooms it was possible to sit with an open pocket book and write detailed minutes of the meetings. In addition, sometimes when conducting one-on-one interviews with young men who refused to allow the use of recording equipment, I used sheets of paper after receiving approval from the individuals involved, normally under the condition that I did not use their real name.

3.10 Interviews

Interviewing should be seen as part of the overall fieldwork process rather than an isolated exercise (Whyte, 1997). The extended open-ended interview is an effective method to gain insights into the life-situations of the inhabitants of settings (Prus, 1996). However, ethnographic interviews require *“extended levels of trust and openness”* (Prus, 1996:20). Whyte (1997) reinforces this conclusion and asserts that people in settings need time to get to know the researcher before embarking on interviews (1997). Ethnographic interviews involve rapport building and eliciting information – two distinct, necessary correlative practices (Spradley, 1979:78). Rapport, according to Spradley (1979), refers to basic trust between ethnographer and interactant allowing the free flow of information between them (1979).

The qualitative research interview is a conversation usually between two people about a matter of common interest. Subsequently the taped interview can be analysed mainly in relation to the experiences described by the person (Kvale 1996:29). The aim of the qualitative research interview is to understand aspects of the daily lives and worldview from the perspective of interactants (Kvale, 1996:27). In other words, the purpose of the interview is to open up the life worlds of interactants and their relationship to it. Thus, one of the main goals with the qualitative research interview is to describe and understand the key themes experienced by the interactants and how they make sense of them. The make-up of the research interview is rather like a normal conversation, although it entails a distinctive approach and the practice of questioning (Kvale, 1996:27). Normally, the qualitative research interview, aided by an interview guide focuses on certain themes and questions. Subsequently, the researcher transcribes the recorded interview where the written text and the recording are the data for the interpretation of meaning (Kvale 1996:27).

The interviews carried out in this study are a combination of ‘formal recorded’ semi-structured interviews which approach the interactant as a representative from a foreign culture and ‘unofficial unrecorded’ traditional ethnographic interviews. According to Kvale (1996), semi-structured interviews are neither highly structured questionnaires or open conversations. This means questions have to be open where the starting point is in the individual's experience of life, self-perception, which gives the interactant the possibility to lose themselves in their own

realities, so the given information is as natural as possible. This is similar to what Goffman (1961) describes as focused interaction where people can temporary and momentarily get lost in the moment and get deeply involved at the activity at hand. According to Prus (1996) interviews are a key method in relation to learning about the life-worlds of informants. Typically researchers who adopt an ethnographic approach develop research questions in the field while they conduct participant observation and learn more about interactants and the situations they encounter (ibid). In the early phase of the research process, I carried out some unstructured interviews with key public sector employees and four young people. These interviews, conversational in style, covered a number of themes concerning inclusion of young people in innovation processes, and the methods used to develop positive relationships with young people. After studying the collated data, I identified a number of outstanding reoccurring themes where one in particular seemed to bind the research together, the notion of trust. Therefore, as a consequence the study developed and narrowed down the focus to look specifically at questions relating to trust in the interaction between young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and public sector employees. Consequently, the interviews developed into a more semi-structured approach where trust became strategically pursued; however, they remained conversational in style.

I used a handheld digital voice recorder (DVR) to record all 'formal' interviews during fieldwork. Where possible, I wrote rough notes prior to the interviews describing the interview conditions. During the interviews, I noted keywords to follow-up on during the flow of the interview. After the interviews, I recorded basic notes concerning the mood of interactants and any other significant comments. The basis for semi-structured interviews is completing all the themes in the interview-guide, although not necessarily in the same order. The semi-structured interview gives the interviewer a lot of flexibility and a chance to follow-up on the stories told by the 'informants' (Kvale 1996). During the fieldwork, many of the young men were reluctant to be interviewed on tape; therefore, I had to use either sheets of paper or my field notebook, which lacks quality compared to recorded interviews.

Over the nine months of fieldwork, I recorded thirty six interviews, twenty eight with professionals and eight with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. In addition, four ethnographic interviews were undertaken with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds using paper and pen to record notes on sheets of paper. Despite having collected many interviews

over the nine months of fieldwork, I chose to focus only on a few (in combination with observations and artifacts from the field), during the analysis in order to provide a rich and in-depth interpretative study on the relationship between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and a few public sector employees in and around Sunset Boulevard.

All interviews undertaken during the fieldwork took place within the setting, either in a home, school, youth club, community centre or place of work; one interview took place in the street. Prior to interviews, I briefed all interactants about the aims and objectives of the study. The briefings dealt with concerns about confidentiality and informed about the objectives and design of the study. The briefings acted as an icebreaker helping interactants relax and lose themselves in their own realities. After completing interviews, I debriefed all interactants about what would happen next to the interviews and what to do if they changed their minds about participating in the study. As the research process progressed, it became clear there was concerns' relating to confidentiality along with a call to be shielded in anonymity concerning future output resulting from data collated in the course of this study.

3.11 Analysing the Data

The theoretical framework on which this study rests combines insights from various disciplines – namely sociology, anthropology, social work, youth work, policy sciences, and business & organisation studies. This melding uses a combination of the theoretical groundwork of the literature presented in chapter two, but draws on secondary insights throughout, which I account for locally in the ensuing chapters. Incorporating insights from the generic disciplines in this study are necessary to clarify, analyse and explain what is going on in the presented data. The data in this study consist of a government policy document, interview transcript and research diary excerpts and some artefacts (i.e. local authority documents and media stories) collected during fieldwork. I transcribed all data apart from the policy document, closely read them searching for the two primary codes of trust and distrust, along with framing which indicates either trusting or distrusting behaviour using Lewicki et al.'s (1998) work on trust and distrust, which proved extremely useful. Following this, I went through the data again using Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) Trust Development Model looking for features of calculus-based, knowledge-based and

identification-based trust. Finally, I went through the data again taking into account insights from the wider literature on trust and other insights from the traditions reported above.

In chapter four, I draw heavily on Goffman's (1959) impression management and somewhat on Luhmann's (1979) ideas around self presentation to help analyse the exploratory data presented. Throughout chapter four, I draw on fieldwork theory and practice along with secondary insights reported locally to help clarify the data along with some research dilemmas.

In chapter five, I make use of Goffman's (1974a) Frame Analysis as the analytical tool in which to analyse the data in the first three sections of the thesis. In the first part of chapter five, I critically analyse a public policy document by bringing together Frame Analysis with Lewicki et al.'s 1998 insights about distrust and trust in organisations. In addition, during the policy analysis, to help shed light on the data I draw on political and policy insights. During this part of the analysis, the aim is to identify and understand how the policy names and frames people with minority ethnic backgrounds and places where high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds reside. Frame Analysis provides a methodological approach for studying framing processes and opinion-making in public policy. This involves looking for reoccurring attitudes in the way political actors collectively present views of certain issues. This approach also illuminates ways in which political actors make sense of political and social realities in the public debate. Through calling attention to certain attitudes about social and political realities, framing mechanisms in public policy influences opinion-making of large segments of the population. Verloo (2005) defines a policy frame as:

“An organising principle that transforms fragmentary or incidental information into a structured and meaningful policy problem, in which a solution is implicitly or explicitly enclosed. Hence policy frames are not descriptions of reality, but specific constructions that give meaning to reality, and shape the understanding of reality” (Verloo, 2005:20).

This definition show the influence and power embedded in policy frames as organising principles and structured plans of action. These definitions imply that policies shape attitudes about social reality and influence how people begin to make sense of this new reality. Following Verloo (2005), policy frames have set formats connected to politics and policy making, which always contain

implicit or explicit representations of opinion connected to implicit or explicit prognosis and a call for action. In other words, policies are plans of action which contain the problem, what needs to be done, the desired outcome, and the agencies responsible for carrying out the action plan (Verloo, 2005).

During the policy analysis, I use the basic principles of Frame Analysis i.e. the primary frames used in the policy to name and frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds and to try and identify the cultural tools used during this framing process. I achieve this by identifying reoccurring themes and attitudes in the policy text and how the policy collectively presents views of certain issues. This approach also illuminates how political actors make sense of political and social realities in the public debate. Through calling attention to certain attitudes about social and political realities, framing mechanisms in public policy influences meaning-making of large segments of the population. Hence, during the policy analysis the aim is to understand both the framing and the cultural tools used to achieve this. This helps to locate the local authority into the wider political context while locating the attitudes of local authority actors into the wider cultural and structural context.

In sections two and three of chapter five, I bring principles from Frame Analysis and Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) Trust Development Model together along with insights from supplementary material to interpret the data concerning the relationships between young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and public sector employees in and around Sunset Boulevard. Goffman's (1974a) Frame Analysis is useful for illustrating how individuals make sense of their social experiences and relationships in relation to distrust and trust in their everyday lives. Goffman (1974a) studied how actors make sense of the question "what is it that's going on here" (1974a:08) in relation to everyday social encounters with other actors. Goffman (1974a) uses frames to explain how actors attribute meaning to reality and how they position themselves within it. Through frames, actors organise the social world and make sense and order out of a complex social reality. Frames allow actors to make sense of their role in this social reality and help guide them through everyday life.

In section four of chapter five, I use a pragmatic approach to analysing the data which concern how the job consultant and police officer negotiate cultural frames to initiate, build and maintain trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard. During

this section, I compare the operational and presentational data concerning these two employees against that presented in the previous section. In addition, as in the previous sections, I use secondary data to help provide insights into how the job consultants and police officers behaviour can be perceived as trustworthy by the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Adopting this approach acknowledges that the data presented in section four especially requires different insights from diverse literatures, in an effort to try and understand why people in the context consider these two public sector employees to be worthy of trust. The aim with section four is to try and understand why these two employees manage to negotiate cultural frames to gain and maintain trust where others fail.

3.12 Frame Analysis

The frame concept has its theoretical roots in the work of Bateson (1955) who used the term bracketing in the same sense Goffman (1974a) uses frames. In *Frame Analysis*, Goffman (1974a) expands upon the work of Bateson (1955) who proposed the term frame in his 1955 paper (see Goffman, 1974a:07). Bateson (1972) [1955] argues that frames are crucial to understand communicative moves because some events can be interpreted as serious and others as play. The process of discriminating between play and non-play is a secondary process:

“The discrimination between “play” and “nonplay”, like the discrimination between fantasy and nonfantasy, is certainly a function of secondary process or “ego”. Within the dream the dreamer is usually unaware that he is dreaming, and within “play” he must often be reminded that “This is Play” (Bateson, 1972:185).

This dream like state is similar to what Goffman (1961b) suggests about players been lost in games. In addition, what Bateson (1972) refers to as a secondary process, Goffman (1974a) refers to as the keying of a primary frames. Thus, according to Bateson (1972), framing events is necessary to determine whether or not play or non-play is transpiring.

Goffman (1974a) expands on Bateson’s definitions and describes the importance of frames in social interaction. The essence of frame analysis can be found on the front cover in the subtitle

of Goffman's (1974) book: *"an essay on the organisation of experience"*. Goffman (1974a) emphasises the object with Frame Analysis is to address the experience of individuals rather than the organisation of society. According to Goffman (1974a), the main purpose of Frame Analysis is to provide a framework for explaining how individuals organise and make sense of their experiences in the social world where the point of departure is in answering the question: *"what is it that's going on here?"* (Goffman, 1974a:08). The secondary goal of frame analysis is to identify some of the primary frames individuals produce to make sense of happenings that occur in everyday life and to understand them (Goffman, 1974a). Therefore, the aim of Frame Analysis is twofold and involves providing a framework to help explain how individuals organise and make sense of their social realities while identifying some of the primary social frames they use to make sense of relations and individuals at the face-to-face level of interaction.

Goffman (1974a) defines "frame analysis as an examination of the organization of experience", and subsequently defines a "frame" as a principal of organisation that defines a situation (1974a:11). Individuals use frames to analyse "strips" – random segments of interaction cut from the flow of ongoing activity. Strips are the empirical materials subjected to frame analysis (Manning, 1992). Frames make social interaction relevant where the most basic of which are primary frames, primary frames organise experiences into meaningful activities.

3.13 The Components of Frame(s)

"When the individual in our Western society recognises a particular event, he tends whatever else he does, to imply in this response (and in effect employ) one or more frameworks or schemata of interpretation of a kind that can be called primary"

(Goffman, 1974a:21).

Primary Frames

A primary framework (schemata of understanding i.e. preconceived ideas) is the basic component of a frame (at least in the Western hemisphere) (Goffman, 1974a). Primary frameworks allow individuals to explain and interpret events what otherwise might be considered meaningless (ibid). While there are rules organising some primary frameworks, most are largely unstructured and

only provide a means of understanding (Goffman, 1974a). No matter the organisation, each primary framework, allows its user to locate, distinguish, identify, and attach labels to a multitude of manifest experiences (ibid). Both participants and onlookers of the action unconsciously begin to use primary frameworks, organising and interpreting unfolding events (Goffman, 1974a). Primary frames largely reflect the norms, values, culture and preconceived ideas of social groups and serve as frames of reference (ibid). However, there can be variations in preconceived ideas within the same social group, especially over larger territories, which ultimately affect the primary frames of interpretation (ibid). This means that sometimes people who share similar beliefs may differ in relation to some assumptions (Goffman, 1974a).

Goffman (1974a) divides primary frames into the broad headings of natural and social: natural frames concern phenomena outside the influence of human agency, whereas social frames provide background understanding of events that transpire through human action (Goffman, 1974a). Goffman (1974a) notes there can be a number of social forces at play which affect human behaviour: agency, coercion, flattery or a controlling agency. Controlling agency can be understood in terms of *"guided doings"* which expose social actors to 'standards, social judgements based on honesty, efficiency, economy, safety, elegance, tactfulness and good taste' (Goffman, 1974a:22). Therefore, purpose and intent are crucial to the practice of applying social frames; the frame used depends on how participants and observers understand the situation (ibid). During any activity, a person is likely to use more than one primary frame although sometimes one frame is sufficient to answer the question *"what is it that's going on here?"* (Goffman, 1974a:25). Thus, Goffman (1974a) proposes that individuals interpret events in terms of primary frames, and the produced frame provides a method to understand and explain the event to which the producer applies the frame. Goffman (1974a) asserts that Frame Analysis is a common sense method of analysis where understanding the primary frame concept is the first step required for doing frame analysis.

Keying

The next concept required for understanding and doing frame analysis is the notion of "key" or "keying"; the process Bateson (1955) refers to as secondary, and crucial for frame analysis. Goffman (1974a) asserts, by key, he means *"the set of conventions by which a given activity, one*

already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something quite else” (1974a:43-44). In other words, how individuals adapt primary frames into new or different variations, like in this thesis, how interactants take the basic trust frame and convert it into different variations like knowledge-based or identity-based. Keying concerns the set of signals involved during a situation which allow people to decide whether the action is playful, practice or serious etc. Primary frameworks can be transformed either into keys (variations) or fabrications (frames designed to mislead others), which could be thought of as secondary frameworks, although Goffman (1974a) does not use this term. Both keys and fabrications involve the conversion of some part of an action already understandable in terms of a primary framework. During the second part of chapter five, I highlight fabrication in action whereby an interactant tried to deceive me during the interview frame by attempting to create a false impression of institutionalised social practice.

Thus, a strip of an already understandable activity such as a fight (primary frame) may be keyed or fabricated as play fighting or fight practice, which demonstrates how a meaningful primary frame can be reframed or keyed into something else, which is the essence of keying. According to Goffman (1974a), when a frame becomes keyed all participants become mutually aware that a change has occurred. Scheff (2005) argues that up until the point where Goffman introduces the notion of keying, framing is a solitary activity. Scheff (2005) asserts:

“The definition of key introduces an important new element. Before this point, framing is an individual activity. However, the definition of key concerns participants in the plural, so keying is not just individual but unavoidably social. To fulfil its function, a key must involve what Goffman elsewhere calls mutual focus of attention or mutual awareness. This kind of mutuality has also been referred to by others as intersubjectivity, shared awareness, or attunement” (Scheff, 2005:371).

This implies that while identifying primary frames is an individual activity, keying transforms it into a shared social understanding by people copresent. This implies when the keying of a primary frame transpires, at least people copresent have a shared understanding about what is taking place. However, Goffman (1974a) fails to explain what happens if people copresent use different

primary frames simultaneously to explain what is going on. What happens during a mutual experience if people copresent applies multiple primary frames and subsequently key them into variations? I suppose this would require effective communication from persons copresent if there should be a common understanding. Nonetheless, if persons copresent does not converse or confer, they will be left with unique understandings and perspectives about what transpired, which is the same situation before keying occurs. Therefore, not all keying can lead to a common or mutual understanding of a shared situation.

Keyings of primary frames vary in scope accordance to the degree of transformation they produce and can be understood in terms of distant or close (Goffman, 1974a). Goffman (1974a) uses the example of transforming a novel into a movie to illustrate the scope of keying, the scope of the keying of the original novel depends much on the freedom of the producer, strict limitations produce a close keying and liberty produces a distant framing. Just as, a novel can be transformed into a movie, a movie can be transformed into a novel, it is clear that transformations of frames can operate in both directions because any keying is reversible. Thus, keyings are subject to rekeying, which means there can be infinite keyings and re-keyings of primary frames.

Strip

Goffman (1974) uses the term “strip” to refer to random slice of ongoing activity, which includes both ‘real’ and fictive happenings from the perspective of those observing and interpreting these events. The function of a strip according to Goffman (1974) is to be: *“used only to refer to any raw batch of occurrences (or whatever status in reality) that one wants to draw attention to as a starting point of analysis”* (1974:10). Thus, according to the latter a strip could be compared to a film clip taken from a larger film reel to analyse, however, this implies that sometimes the observer is unaware of the antecedents and conclusions of the action.

3.14 Critique of Frame Analysis

Frame Analysis generated an enormous response (Benford and Snow 2000) when it became published. The Social Science Citation Index has more than 1,800 references, making Frame Analysis one of the leading titles in social science (Scheff 2005). Gamson (1975) finds the book’s

576 pages tedious to read, something I agree with, and offers sound advice to others who plan to read Frame Analysis:

“The best way to read Goffman I found is to plow through him slowly, savouring his exquisite examples, underlining the “good parts”. Rereading one’s underlining’s before setting the book aside allows one to appreciate his pearls and to clarify his argument without being distracted by the dross of his overly padded prose” (1975:603).

Gamson (1975), overall found Frame Analysis inadequately systematised and difficult to teach as a research method. Nonetheless, on the conceptual level, Gamson (1975) finds Goffman (1974a): *“still a master of the systematic and the interesting, whose combination is no easy task”* (ibid). Gamson (1975) goes on to strongly recommend Frame Analysis and states: *“No sociologist since Simmel has tied together so wide a range of apparently disconnected events and activities within a single framework”* (ibid).

However, critical responses to Frame Analysis are not difficult to find (Scheff 2005). Denzin & Keller (1981), for example, find Frame Analysis vague and limited to an interpretive social science, and the frames in Frame Analysis static with the concept of reality “illusiv and blurred” (1981:59). Most critique about Frame Analysis, like Denzin & Keller (1981) centre around the vagueness of the frame concept, Scheff (2005) is illustrative: “the key problem is that neither Goffman nor anyone else has clearly defined what is meant by a frame” (2005:368). However, one thing that Goffman cannot be criticised for, in any of his work is for having an elusive and blurred concept of reality – on the contrary. Frame Analysis should be considered as a development of Goffman’s earlier work and should be seen in that context. Anyone considering using Frame Analysis as proposed by Goffman (1974a) should study his earlier work, especially ‘The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life’ (1959) to understand and better appreciate Frame Analysis.

Clearly there are a number of short falls in relation to Goffman’s (1974a) Frame Analysis. I agree that the book itself is wearisome to study, and at first glance, the frame concept is illusive. In addition, I agree that Goffman’s (1974a) Frame Analysis lacks structure, which is one of the salient deficiencies; it lacks clear guidelines about how to do Frame Analysis. In addition, Goffman

(1974a) does not offer any clear guidelines in relation to which social theory is most useful or to which extent social theory should be applied in combination with Frame Analysis. Another initial concern is that Goffman's (1974) frame concept has infinite dimensions with endless keyings, re-keyings and reverses of re-keyings of primary frames, which seems endless. However, on reflection perhaps this uncertainty is an advantage because it reflects the complex and multidimensional social realities in which people live with endless possibilities of interpretation.

However, once the basic concepts of primary frames and keyings of primary frames become understood Frame Analysis provides a useful bridging concept between two levels of analysis - between culture and agency. Through using Frame Analysis, the ensuing analysis in this thesis locates social actors in the wider cultural and structural context which demonstrates its usefulness as a bridging concept. In addition, frame analysis shows the framing processes in political reality and how reported events in media reflect this constructed and framed reality. Once grasped the strengths of Frame Analysis far outweigh the criticisms, and I have found the basic principles of primary frames and keyings useful as tools for analysis.

3.15 Ethical Considerations in Fieldwork

There are a number of different ethical issues surrounding social research that are relevant to consider when undertaking qualitative inquiry. Things like ethical integrity and quality (Bryman 2008) affect the data collection and method of analysis. The ownership of data and conclusions (Miles and Huberman 1994) mainly concerns confidentiality specifically about access to the researchers original documents i.e. fieldnotes and analyses. In this respect, I took measures to make the data confidential, which means that no-one other than me saw the data. Moreover, I protect all documents on my computer with passwords and keep my field notebooks along with DVR (digital voice recorder) in a secure place. In addition, I used fictitious names of people and places from the beginning when recording data in my fieldwork research diary and when transcribing interview transcripts (or any other material). Further, I have changed some details in an effort to keep the anonymity of interactants in the thesis.

Miles & Huberman (1994) point out that another ethical issue involves the use and misuse of findings, which concerns the proper use of research findings with a number of questions for the

researcher to consider, for example, the degree of responsibility of the researcher to ensure the appropriate use of findings along with what action to take if improper use occurs. After considering this ethical issue, in practice it may be difficult to ensure the appropriate use of research findings because, as public property, most research findings can be accessed via libraries both physically and electronically (online), and as demonstrated below, can make it difficult to control how others use research findings. However, I will try to tackle any inappropriate uses if and when they come to light.

Padgett (1998) considers risks to the researcher as an ethical issue which can include emotional stress through the intense activity of encountering many people through the data collection phase or the anxiety caused through interviewing people about difficult issues. Occasionally researchers can be exposed to threats concerning physical safety or experience sexual innuendo or sexual come-ons. In these or other such situations, the ethical issue for the researcher “is not whether to do something, but what, how and when to do it” (Padgett, 1998:43), I discuss this further in chapter four, in relation to ethical dilemmas encountered and tackled during fieldwork. The most pertinent issue includes weighing the value of the potential knowledge gain against any possible harm of undertaking a study – particularly when it involves vulnerable individuals or groups. The harm or potential harm to participants or members of the same or similar groups is one of the central ethical considerations discussed in most of the literature concerning qualitative research methods (see Miles and Huberman 1994; Kvale 1996; Padgett 1998; Bryman 2004, 2008; Hammersley and Atkinson 2007; Berg 2009).

The above are decisive factors to consider when contemplating qualitative research, especially with regard for the well-being and respect for the people at the centre of research projects. What is more, practicing ethical fieldwork ethics is essential to building trust along with the successful collection of accurate data (Hosokawa, 2010:41). Hosokawa (2010) argues for better communication [informed consent] from those undertaking research to participants in an effort to avoid violations of privacy, exploitation, harm and negative consequences for future research (Hosokawa, 2010:09). Further, clear communication is essential to fieldwork ethics and positively contributes to the process of trust building (Hosokawa, 2010:10).

3.16 Harm to Participants – Confidentiality/Anonymity

What is obvious in the literature that deals with ethical issues is the requirement for researchers not to put participants at risk of harm as a consequence of their participation. Harm entails a number of aspects such as “physical harm; harm to participant’s development; loss of self-esteem; stress; and inducing subjects to perform reprehensible acts” (Bryman, 2008:118). The statement of ethical practice for the British Sociological Association clearly outlines some of these notions: “Sociologists have a responsibility to ensure that the physical, social and psychological well-being of research participants is not adversely affected by the research. They should strive to protect the rights of those they study, their interests, sensitivities and privacy, while recognising the difficulty of balancing potentially conflicting interests” (British Sociological Association 2002:02). Harm includes physical, psychological and social well-being which covers a broad spectrum. This requires researchers to think carefully about all aspects of the research project to ensure nothing untoward occurs to research participants, which may affect their physical, psychological and/or social well-being during and after the completion of the project. The aforementioned statement of ethical practice underscores this point: “Members should be aware that they have some responsibility for use to which their data may be put and for how the research is to be disseminated. Discharging that responsibility may on occasion be difficult, especially in situations of social conflict, competing social interests or where there is unanticipated misuse of research by third parties” (British Sociological Association 2002:02). Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) reinforce this point in their discussion concerning harm in ethnographic research. They point out sometimes research participants and members of the same groups can experience negative consequences from participating in research projects, both during and after research, especially when data becomes published.

However, unpublished data can also have negative consequences for both research participants and researchers alike. This is illustrative through the case of Wolf’s PhD thesis concerning the activities of a Canadian biker gang, which was available to the public via a university library. Subsequently, a member of the Calgary police force studied Wolf’s thesis, which resulted in a court appearance for a member of the biker gang, and a visit to the researcher from the same gang member along with some of his associates. Wolf (1991) explains: “*a few years ...*

after I had stopped riding with the Rebels, the Calgary police brought a member of the Rebels' Calgary chapter to court in an attempt to revoke his firearms acquisition certificate. A member of the Calgary police force claimed the status of 'expert witness' and acted as a witness for the crown prosecutor. When the lawyer for the defendant asked on what grounds the police officer could claim any knowledge of the Rebels, the officer was able to justify his eligibility as an expert witness by virtue of having read my thesis. The Calgary Rebel eventually won his case and retained his legal right to possess firearms; however, he came up to Edmonton to settle a score with me" (Wolf, 1991:220; in Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007:216).

Further, the consequences of undertaking research and publishing reports may have ramifications to larger groups of people. Troyna and Carrington (1989) highlight this issue and have criticised several studies for the use of research techniques, which they claim promote racism, for example, practices which involve 'informants' identifying characteristic traits of members of ethnic groups (in Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007:213). Margaret Meads study from 1928 illustrates this point all too well by stereotyping Samoans as sexually promiscuous. The consequences of Meads (1928) study became apparent several decades after it became published during research carried out amongst Samoan immigrants in the USA: *"Samoans have been distrustful of research on their community ever since Margaret Mead made them look sexually promiscuous ... these are Samoans who now live in the United States and are later generations of the group she studied; yet they still know about her book"* (Hosokawa, 2010:35).

This illustrates how the publication of study findings potentially can have negative consequences for future research initiatives. In addition, it shows how the end products of research potentially can have negative consequences for both participants and researchers along with future research with groups in society. These issues are more than relevant to this PhD thesis and have to be tackled within it in a sensitive and responsible way.

As highlighted above, I have done my utmost to protect the identity of all people that I interacted with and interviewed throughout the study and thesis. However, just because the researcher strives to maintain confidentiality, it does not mean that interactants do. This became clear one day prior to carrying out an interview with 'Bente'. Within this context, she expressed enthusiasm and anticipation in relation to the impending interview. Evidently, she and a close colleague had discussed his interview experience the day before. They had discussed some of the

questions raised during the interview and what this meant for their modus operandi (I return to this issue in chapter five). Therefore, it is difficult to know if any of the other interactants spoke to close colleagues or associates about 'the interview'. The ethical dilemma and challenge is to try and report the data in such a way that colleagues or associates of interactants cannot recognise them if they read the thesis. However, in small communities this may prove difficult. While many of the young men whom I interacted with in the two neighbourhoods seemed relaxed talking face-to-face, many refused to talk into a microphone because of a fear of the DVR falling into the wrong hands, which could have consequences. This reluctance to talk into a microphone out of fear of reprisal is not uncommon in fieldwork studies. Baez's (2002) experienced a similar situation while undertaking a study in a private university in the USA where an African-American professor out of fear for his position in the university refused to allow the interview to be audio-recorded (in Hammersley & Atkinson 2007). Moreover, the few young men in my study who agreed to audio-recorded interviews did not want to be named or identified in any way. Consequently, I have done everything to safeguard all interactants in anonymity that I interacted with and gained data from throughout the fieldwork study. However, no researcher can ever fully guarantee complete anonymity because dissimilar to quantitative research there is no "safety in numbers" (Padgett, 1998:38), because when people consent to participate in a qualitative research they lose anonymity since they become known to the researcher at least (ibid).

Nonetheless, issues around confidentiality must not be taken lightly as it could mean an interactant facing disciplinary action from their employer or getting excluded from colleagues/peer group for 'speaking out'. Padgett (1998) reinforces this view and underscores the need for all study participants to get full anonymity. Padgett (1998) argues:

"The guarantee of confidentiality should remain absolute. Every effort should be made to ensure that the identities of our respondents are never revealed. They should rest assured that the researcher will never link them to the information they provide during the study without their permission. Breaches of confidentiality—one of the utmost violations of trust—must be due where there are serious risks of harm to others" (Padgett 1998:38-39).

Padgett (1998) asserts there can be some circumstances where researchers have a responsibility to breach confidentiality, for example, in cases where there is a significant risk of harm to others or to the interactant (ibid). This could include things such as indications the person is contemplating suicide, or violence to others, or any other act, which could result in the harm of a person. Padgett (1998), continues and advises researchers there may be other circumstances where confidentiality may have to be breached, and in such circumstances, it is up to the researcher to act based on the nature of the ethical dilemma as and when they occur.

3.17 Informed Consent

In fieldwork, informed consent means informing people at the centre of research about how the research project relates to them (Hosokawa, 2010). For example, informing interactants about the general objectives of the study, along with any possible side affects' of participating (Kvale 1996). Informed consent involves giving relevant information to participants, which may affect their decision to participate in the study while ensuring they have processed and understood the information (Silverman 2001:201). Informed consent also concerns contemplating how much information should be given in advance and how much information can wait to the debriefing of the interview. Kvale (1996) points out that giving full information about 'design and purpose' rules out the risk of deceiving the study participants from the start. However, providing information about the study sometimes is a delicate balance between 'over-information' and leaving out certain aspects of the design that may be crucial to the participants. For example, some researchers withhold the aims and purposes of studies initially, with the intention of not leading the responses of participants in order to achieve their immediate response. However, in such cases any misleading information should be clarified in a debriefing after the study (Kvale 1996).

Within the context of field research, gaining informed consent sometimes can be disruptive and counterproductive to data collection, and easier said than done in practice (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). In addition, the researcher has little control over the research process and setting since it takes place in natural settings: *"They simply do not have the power to ensure that all participants are fully informed or that they freely consent to be involved"* (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007:211). Venkatesh's (2009) doctoral fieldwork experience illustrates this point, whereby at the

beginning of his Doctoral fieldwork became the prisoner of the Black Kings (crack-cocaine dealing gang) overnight on a housing project, during which, he points out that even though he identified himself as a researcher, gaining consent of those present was not always an option.

Doing covert research is at the other end of the range and goes against the principle of informed consent. Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) asserts:

“The most striking deviation from this principle ... is covert participant observation, where an ethnographer carries out research without most or perhaps even all, of the participants being aware that research is taking place” (2007:210).

However, lack of informed consent can be an emerging feature of overt research even in situations where the researcher has informed about her identity and the aims of the research. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) point out, often when people in the setting get to know the researcher they sometimes forget about what (s)he is doing there, which is one of the aims of the researcher, who actively pursues rapport building with locals to reduce researcher reactivity. This is an issue that I can relate to in my fieldwork experience where people in the setting got used to me hanging out. However, new people (new to me) entering the scene always inquired about my identity from others copresent (it was rare to be asked directly), which triggered a renegotiation of my access to the setting in question. Often, this involved the young men copresent informing about and vouching for me saying that I was “ok”, which means accepted. Depending on the circumstances, after shaking hands in the form of greeting, I followed up by telling about my background and research project. Thus, I had to renegotiate access often during fieldwork, which reminded people in the setting about my status and reason for being there. However, even though I attempted to be open about my status as a researcher, it is likely many interactants were totally unaware what doing participant observation involves. In this relation, I did not explicitly tell interactants that while copresent I was always pursuing research, which means anything they said or did could be written down and used later as data, which would have been counterproductive to catching action as it happens in its natural environment.

While Hosokawa (2010) argues the importance of undertaking overt research and informing people about the specifics of the project, she admits it can sometimes be necessary to

drop informed consent in order to gain access to closed “esoteric groups” (2010:32). In this respect, Hosokawa (2010) highlights Riecken and Shacters (1956) study of a cult which believed the end of the world was imminent; hence, if the researchers had informed about their real reason for joining the group, it is likely the closed community would have denied access (Hosokawa, 2010). However, while there may be valid reasons sometimes for adopting a covert role, the potential knowledge gain must be weighed against any possible harm of doing such research to the people involved. While recognising that formal informed-consent procedures are not feasible in most fieldwork settings, Hosokawa (2010) advocates an honest, overt approach when entering ethnic minority communities where researchers communicate research goals and ideas to residents informing about the purpose of the researcher’s presence in the community. This is a key point, because people in the given community know who the outsider is whether in a covert or overt role. Hosokawa (2010) argues *“ethnic members know who the outsider is, and a researcher coming in disguised or not disguised may have a difficult time getting to know people and building enough trust to get reliable data”* (2010:32-33). Hosokawa (2010) argues that when conducting fieldwork in minority ethnic communities, it is ok to be different from the group; however, honesty makes up for some of the difference and is essential to building trust. In this respect, Hosokawa (2010) argues that outlining the background, goals, and research interests are beneficial both to the researcher and to people in the community. This approach advanced by Hosokawa (2010) is similar to the strategy that I adopted at the start of fieldwork, and my fieldwork experience reinforces Hosokawa’s (2010) conclusion that honesty is a key component to the trust building process. My fieldwork experience leads me to believe, that adopting an open honest and consistent approach when conducting fieldwork is proactive to initiating the trust building process and is perhaps the best strategy for researchers attempting to do fieldwork in most settings.

When first entering the field, adopting an open honest approach was a deliberate strategy to repair damage caused to my standing in the local area and to initiate the trust building process. In brief, my contact person had informed a number of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds that ‘some guy would be shadowing her because he wanted to research crime in the area’, information the young men did not receive kindly. Luckily, she informed me about this potential problem in opportune time, giving me chance to prepare a strategy for tackling this issue.

When entering the field, my strategy involved explicitly telling everyone with whom I interacted about my research aims and objectives. In relation to this, I said my research concerned looking at how public sector employees include young people in innovation processes, which was the original research objective. Through my fieldwork experience, I learned that by telling the same consistent account (providing the unintentional communication confirms the intentional) for long enough, over time people in the setting begin to use it to define the researcher. I stuck with this explanation throughout fieldwork even though my objectives changed after about four months in the field. I continued using this account for explaining my presence when meeting new people in the setting because it became integral to my field identity, and something that many interactants used to define me when explaining my presence to others.

3.18 Privacy

Privacy is another ethical consideration and relates to issues concerning the extent of which breaches of privacy can be “condoned” (Bryman, 2008). According to Bryman (2008), the right to privacy is a principle cherished by most, and if breaches occur people consider them offensive. Privacy closely links to informed consent because in principle when consenting to participate in qualitative research individuals wavers their right to privacy (ibid). However, according to Bryman (2008), just by giving informed consent to participate in a research project does not mean people are duty bound to answer all of the research questions (ibid). Following Bryman (2008), people have the right to opt out of answering certain questions; however, this may not be so straightforward in practice because some interactants could get caught in the moment, forget the role of the researcher and reveal something, which may later cause anxiety or challenge the privacy principle. Covert research challenges both informed consent and privacy because those under investigation do not get the opportunity to decline invasions of their privacy (Bryman, 2008). Privacy as an ethical issue links directly to the other considerations of harm anonymity and confidentiality in the research process as discussed above.

3.19 Critique of Qualitative/Ethnographic Research

Some advocates of quantitative research traditions have called into question the use of qualitative methods for undertaking scientific research. There seems to be a presumption from quantitative camps that while qualitative methods can provide captivating results their only value is in providing a platform for undertaking scientific research, critics of qualitative research underscore that qualitative methods are not scientific (Kvale, 1998; Padgett, 1998; Bryman, 2008). In other words, there is an underlying assumption that qualitative research methods are somewhat limited, and their main value lies in locating social phenomenon, so 'real science' can take over and examine them properly. According to Bryman (2008), the main criticism of qualitative research centres on four basic arguments:

- 1) Qualitative methods are too subjective.
- 2) The results are difficult to replicate.
- 3) Often qualitative studies lack transparency.
- 4) Findings are not generalisable (Bryman, 2008).

Subjectivity criticisms revolve around the objections that qualitative studies rely too much on the researchers unmethodical views about what is crucial when undertaking research, and on the relationships between the researcher and the researched (Bryman, 2008). According to Bryman (2008), subjectivity criticisms arise because of the starting point of qualitative inquiry, which usually begins with a flexible, steady process of narrowing down research questions and problems – the exact opposite point of departure for quantitative research. Following Bryman (2008), often the reader of qualitative studies lack information concerning why the study focused on one area of research and not another.

The hard to replicate criticism relates much to the criticisms concerning subjectivity outlined above. According to Bryman (2008), there are a number of components relating to the replication issue, but they all seem to concentrate on subjectivity and especially against ethnography. The main criticism centres especially on the researcher as the instrument of research, which means the final product becomes a consequence of researcher subjectivity. In this respect, the argument centres on the individuality and uniqueness of individuals and how this

influences the final research product. The essence of the argument is during fieldwork researchers listen to interactants and follow happenings before deciding where to focus their research efforts and this drives the final product, thus, the basis of the final product is the subjective leanings of the researcher. In this respect, this means that any number of researchers could undertake research in the same context researching the same social phenomenon with the same people and create a unique product. Therefore, it is almost impossible for the research project to be replicated. Bryman (2008) points out that a number of interweaving factors come into play, which affect the final product such as age, sex, personality and the unstructured nature of qualitative data collection and analysis.

However, the same could be said about quantitative research, which does not take place, in an influence free space. In quantitative research studies, there can also be a number of subjective factors at work which affect the findings of quantitative analysis including issues such as researcher ambition, lack of funding, management and political pressures. The recent case from Denmark, known as the Penkowa case, which made news headlines around the world is illustrative. In brief, it became known that the leading Danish award winning brain researcher Milena Penkowa, employed as a professor at Copenhagen University at the time, had enormous discrepancies relating back to her doctoral research. These discrepancies came to light because three students could not reproduce Penkowa's methods and approached another professor, eventually, after a drawn-out inquiry information came to light which set Penkowa's original research in poor light along with misappropriation of research funds, Penkowa became fired and received a prison sentence. I discuss issues around replicability in relation to qualitative/ethnography research further under the heading of reliability vs. validity below.

Lack of transparency refers to the unstructured approach by some researchers who fail to show the methodological steps taken to reach the arrived at conclusions (Bryman, 2008). For instance, some researchers fail to explain why they selected some people to interview instead of others (ibid). In addition, Bryman (2008) argues that sometimes it is unclear how researchers conducted the analysis of the data at the centre of studies. In other words, some researchers do not outline the method of analysis employed in order to reach the final conclusions.

Another common criticism that advocates of quantitative traditions use against qualitative research is the issue of research generalisation (Bryman, 2008). To generalise is to argue that what

is the case in one place or time, will be the case in other places, or in another time (Payne & Williams, 2005). Some proponents from quantitative corners argue that it is problematic to transfer findings from small scale studies to other settings and as such can only be limited to the context in which research takes place (Bryman, 2008). Normally this commentary refers to studies with small numbers of individuals in organisations or local contexts (ibid). Bryman (2008), points out that not all commentators on the issue of generalisation agree with this view. Williams (2000) for example, advances that many qualitative researchers can make “moderatum generalisations” by linking their research to comparable research findings that looks at similar groups or social phenomena, in this way, such findings can be located within a wider range of recognisable features and therefore moderatum generalisations can be made. Payne & Williams (2005), explain that the point is moderatum generalisations are moderate and only resemble everyday generalisations of their lifeworld in their nature and range. Following Payne & Williams (2005) they are moderate in two senses:

“First, the scope of what is claimed is moderate. Thus they are not attempts to produce sweeping sociological statements that hold good over long periods of time, or across ranges of cultures. Second, they are moderately held, in the sense of a political or aesthetic view that is open to change” (2005:297).

Following Payne & Williams (2005), the second point is crucial because it leads such generalisations to take on a conceptual nature with propositions that might be confirmed or refuted through further research. For these reasons, Payne & Williams (2005) argue that moderatum generalisations can never lead to certain generalisations and are subject to empirical testing, which can reject, accept or modify them. Payne & Williams (2005) urge researchers not to leave moderatum generalisations up to the discretion of the reader; instead, researchers should consciously create them during the analysis. In addition, they state that moderatum generalisations do not provide an easy way around the issue of generalisation, *“rather researchers should aim at constructing externally valid and unambiguous generalisations, even when these take a moderated form”* (Payne & Williams, 2005:297).

Both quantitative and qualitative researchers need to consider these criticisms concerning qualitative research methods. Quantitative advocates could start by considering all of the issues concerning researcher subjectivity because that is something they have in common with qualitative researchers – they are human beings and as such vulnerable to both internal and external pressures and mistakes. Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, should strive to conduct valid reliable research showing all the steps on the way through the qualitative research project. Nonetheless, as a supporter of qualitative research it is necessary to underscore that qualitative research is not a numbers game; it is about understanding phenomena deeply, in ways that do not always need quantification, moreover, some phenomena cannot be explained through methods that apply strict measurement. Qualitative research, especially ethnography, which combines different methods, is the way forward in relation to gathering deep, meaningful information in order to shed light on social happenings and to open up the lived experiences of people. Moreover, during ethnographic fieldwork not all interviews and observations are the outcome of chance meetings, as in my fieldwork I selected individual interactants through purposive sampling, which allows the researcher to be selective with the target group. Purposive sampling involves focused, systematic selecting of individuals for their knowledge and experiences. That is to say, during fieldwork I carefully selected many of the interactants whom I interviewed, and on occasions observed because of their knowledge and not just through chance. In addition, purposive sampling in this thesis applies to the analysis carried out in this study, because I chose to focus on and provide a deep and meaningful interpretative analysis of just one of many cases encountered during fieldwork.

3.20 Reliability vs. Validity in Ethnography

Reliability demands in ethnographic research hinges on judgements of both external and internal design problems (Hansen, 1979; in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). External reliability concerns whether or not an independent researcher could enter the same or a similar environment and observe corresponding phenomena and/or create similar constructs as the original researcher (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). Internal reliability concerns whether or not a researcher could match a collection of already produced constructs in the same way as did the first researcher (ibid). Following LeCompte & Goetz (1982), researchers who choose ethnography face enormous problems

establishing the reliability of their work for various reasons, the main concern, however, seems to focus on the reporting practices of researchers. To approach external reliability researchers must be explicit about five areas when reporting findings: researcher status position, informant choices, social situations and conditions, analytic constructs and premises, methods of data collection and analysis (LeCompte & Goetz (1982:37).

The first issue, which researchers must explain, is the position or role they either occupied or adopted during fieldwork. This is critical to reliability because in many ways a second researcher cannot reproduce findings of the first because information flow is often dependent on group status, which can affect the flow of information from other group members (Wax, 1971; in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). For example, it could be difficult for an outsider trying to recreate research carried out by an insider of an institution or difficult for a researcher entering an organisation in one role trying to replicate the research of the first who held a different role or position.

The second issue relates closely to the first and concerns making clear which interactants provided information (ibid). Following LeCompte & Goetz (1982), identifying which social groups interactants come from is critical to reliability because different informants represent different constituents' and as such allow researchers to access some people and not others. In other words, hanging out with one social group could ease access to other people close to the group while excluding relations with people opposed to the group. This implies that by exclusively hanging out with one group, researchers may miss out on information about the life experiences of people in other groups and can create a partial perspective (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). In order to address threats to reliability posed by informant bias, researchers must describe those who provided information (ibid). Such portrayals should include personal aspects related to the researcher as well as to the interactant and others in the group. External reliability requires both careful depiction of the types of people who served as data sources and the process of selection used to select them (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982).

The third issue relating to external reliability of ethnographic data concerns the social situations and conditions under which researchers collect data (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). In relation to this LeCompte & Goetz (1982), argue interactants sometimes only reveal certain information under certain circumstances, which may affect the reliability of data. LeCompte &

Goetz (1982) draw on Ogbu's (1974) study of education in a minority ethnic district to illustrate this. Ogbu (1974) documents how parents change communicative behaviour in the teacher-parent encounter and how this is a strategy carefully planned prior to the meeting in relation to disclosing only certain information. Ogbu's (1974) experiences highlight the need for researchers to describe the social settings where data collection occurred. In addition, Ogbu's (1974) research shows that people sometimes discuss what to say to certain people, which they could easily do before an interview with a researcher. The fourth issue, which fieldworkers should address in relation to approaching external reliability, is what LeCompte & Goetz (1982:39) refer to as "analytic constructs and premises". According to them, if another researcher should be able to recreate a study then it is necessary to understand the underlying assumptions and meta-theories that cause certain terminology and methods of analysis. In order to tackle this issue, researchers must clearly outline underlying theoretical underpinnings in any written products resulting from research, along with assumptions, definitions, limitations and the researcher's relationship to these concepts. Outlining the theoretical premises and defining constructs that inform and influence the research facilitates the possibility of replication (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982).

The fifth and final issue, which LeCompte & Goetz (1982) link to external reliability of ethnographic studies concerns illuminating the methods of data collection and analysis. They point out that replicability is impossible without accurate identification and detailed description of the strategies used to collect and analyse data. Hence, researchers must clearly identify the methods used to collect and analyse data. This should be done in such a way that other researchers can use the original report as a framework by which to recreate the first study (e.g., Becker, Geer, & Hughes, 1968; Mehan, 1979; Ogbu, 1974; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968; Wolcott, 1973; in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982).

While reliability concerns issues around the replicability of research findings, validity concerns accuracy (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). Ascertaining validity involves determining the extent to which conclusions effectively match empirical reality and evaluating if researcher generated constructs represent the categories of human experience in the setting (Hansen, 1979; Pelto & Pelto, 1978; in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). External validity addresses the extent to which such representations can be justifiably compared to other social groups, while internal validity refers to the extent to which observations and measurements are accurate representations of

some reality (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). While ethnographic studies sometimes find it difficult to meet demands for reliability, their strength tends to be in meeting validity (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). This becomes apparent when comparing ethnography to survey studies, experimentation, and other quantitative research designs concerning to internal validity (Crain, 1977; Erickson, 1977; Reichardt & Cook, 1979; in LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). LeCompte & Goetz (1982) argues that the high internal validity claim for ethnographic generated data stems from the methods used during data collection and analysis (see Denzin, 1978, for comparison of research designs). First, the practice of collecting data for long periods in the site provides researchers with opportunities for continuous data analysis and comparison to improve constructs along with matching analytical categories to the social reality of people under focus. Second, because of time spent in the research setting, researchers are able to communicate interviews in less abstract terms and closer to the empirical categories of people in the environment as opposed to instruments used in quantitative research designs (ibid). Third, as opposed to quantitative researchers, fieldworkers conduct participant observation in natural settings, which reflects the reality of the life experiences of people, more accurately than in superficial settings. Finally, ethnographic research incorporates a process of researcher self-monitoring, termed disciplined subjectivity (Erickson, 1973), that exposes all phases of the research project to constant questioning and re-evaluation (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982).

This study tackles demands pertaining to reliability and validity by meticulously outlining all of the steps taken to collect data, and by identifying the individuals who contributed with information as closely as possible within an ethical framework. I discuss these steps clearly in this chapter and the next by showing how I gained access to an organisation and subsequently entered the field. During the ensuing chapters, within an ethical framework, I closely describe both contexts and people with whom I gained data. Additionally, during fieldwork and while analysing the data I use triangulation as a means of verifying the data. Triangulation involves using more than one technique to gather data in a study and by checking out observations with interview questions to determine observations (Bryman, 2008). During fieldwork, I used a multi-method approach which involved systematically collecting local authority and newspaper reports along with carrying out extensive interviews and observations through participating. In addition, I triangulated observations through the use of questions and occasionally checked what people said

by way of observations. In addition, during the analysis, I triangulate the given accounts with observations and other accounts to see if they match up. What is more, during fieldwork, I looked at the same relationship from the perspectives of two different sides, which I found invaluable in relation to validating the two different data sets.

4

‘Entering the Field’

“In order to see people off their guard, you must first win their trust” (Goffman, 1953:05).

4.0 Introduction

Trust matters in ethnographic fieldwork studies and is a key concept which threads the whole fieldwork experience together – without trust there is a high probability of fieldwork failure. The same can be said about social and youth work services designed to reach out to ‘hard to reach’ young people, without trust it is likely the intervention or service will fail. Closely linked to gaining and maintaining trust is the performance of the researcher (or practitioner) which can be subsumed under the heading of impression management – trust building and impression management go hand-in-hand. The impression projected by the researcher (or practitioner) significantly contributes to how people in the setting determine him or her. Gaining and maintaining trust as a researcher can be divided into distinct but interweaving, intertwining (almost) concurrent activities: impression management, establishing and managing roles, negotiating access, entering the field, participant observation/ethnographic interviews.

Through drawing on both theory and fieldwork practice, this chapter investigates these issues relating to the researcher entering and conducting fieldwork in a context of uncertainty. Almost all of the discussed issues in this chapter apply to frontline public sector employees such as social or youth workers who work in local communities where trust is essential to engaging in reactive and successful service delivery (Margolin, 1997; SEU, 2000; Smith, 2002; Hoggarth &

Smith, 2004; Henningsen, 2010). For researchers to negotiate and operate successfully in contexts of uncertainty and achieve operational objectives and goals, they must first win the trust of people in the setting (Goffman, 1953). Context of uncertainty in this thesis refers to conducting research in two stigmatised, deprived residential housing estates home to many disadvantaged and discriminated people which have a fair share of crime and civil strife. Further, uncertainty extends to the residents who are suspicious of outsiders entering the neighbourhoods. Entering these environments is challenging both for the researcher and the 'researched' where trust is a critical and ongoing issue. Trust is central to many aspects of the fieldwork project and in many respects trust is the key to its success. If the main purpose of fieldwork is to gather valuable data, then the researcher must obtain access to the backstage areas of people's lives where the most valuable material is to be found (Goffman, 1953). However, in order to gain access to backstage researchers must first gain access to frontstage and maintain access while gradually building up the trust required to entering the backstage areas of people's lives.

This chapter focuses on the interrelating and often simultaneous issues of negotiating access, entering the field, establishing and constructing roles, impression management and establishing trust in the field. Most of these stages interweave interrelate overlap and are all necessary for one another and trust is the yarn that weaves these features of fieldwork together. Fortune & Mair (2010) reinforce this idea:

"Although researchers may differ in their specific approaches to qualitative inquiry and ethnography, they face common issues and challenges. Therefore, issues such as establishing rapport and trust with study participants and acknowledging the impact the researcher can have on data collection require attention and careful negotiation" (Fortune & Mair, 2010).

Drawing heavily on Goffman, this chapter outlines the dynamics and mechanisms at play when a researcher (outsider) first enters the field setting. The process of entering the field is a crucial step in field research especially with regard to encountering, understanding and interpreting the interactional codes (social codex) at play within settings. Interactional codes, known also as social rules are unspoken rules and rituals which guide and organise interaction and actions of individuals in the context (Goffman, 1964). Following Goffman, social rules simultaneously manage and organise the structure of social interaction, mainly as institutionalised underlying

assumptions. Andersen (2000), drawing heavily on Goffman, argues that children learn the rules from an early age where the interactional code on the street mainly involves achieving and maintaining respect. Andersen (2000) argues:

“The child is confronted with the local hierarchy based on toughness and the premium placed on being a good fighter. As a means of survival, one often learns the value of having a “name”, a reputation for being willing and able to fight. To build such a reputation is to gain respect among peers” (Andersen, 2000:67).

Andersen (2000) goes on to point out that many young people find alternative ways to earn respect other than through the use of violence (e.g. education or sports). The key issue according to Andersen (2000) is that while institutional or cultural practices affect people to some extent, they do not fully control actions; it is all about how people adapt to the context that counts and this implies agency. However, Goffman (1981) warns that the unreflective regard to social rules can influence individuals to get stuck in a relentless pattern of behaviour and as a researcher is an essential aspect to consider. This implies that while interactional codes can have a significant impact on the actions of individuals there is still plenty of scope for agency and impression management. Nevertheless, it is during early phases of fieldwork, that these unspoken social rules are most visible and obvious. During the early steps of fieldwork, the interactional codes are more obvious than they are at later stages. The more time the researcher spends in the field, the more accustomed (s)he becomes to these underlying rules (Goffman, 1974b). Therefore, during the early phases of fieldwork it is necessary to record rich descriptions of observations concerning the cultural rules which govern and organise interaction.

During the early phases of fieldwork Goffman (1974b) advises researchers to: *“write [your fieldnotes] as lushly as you can, as loosely as you can, as long as you put yourself into it, where you say, “I felt that”* (Goffman, 1974b:131). Essentially, researchers must write extensive notes while the rules of interaction are still new and distinct, before they become routine and disappear from sight. Goffman (1974b) asserts: *“There is a freshness cycle when moving into the field. The first day you’ll see more than you’ll ever see again. And you’ll see things that you won’t see again”* (Goffman, 1974b:130). Over time, researchers become accustomed to the social rules which direct and organise social interaction in the scene; eventually this becomes taken-for-granted. The key point is, in the early phases of entering the field; researchers are more aware and sensitive to the

interactional codes at play. Therefore, researchers are able to observe the institutionalised social rules which interactants take for granted.

4.1 Chapter Structure

The structure of the chapter is as follows. First the chapter presents a theoretical discussion about the importance of gaining access to a relevant setting in which to collect data. A practical example of how I as a researcher negotiated access to the local authority, the first point of entry in the data collection process, accompanies this. In this respect, it is necessary to unearth the ups and downs of gaining access to organisations to explain the realities of undertaking a fieldwork study from scratch. While many studies give the impression that things went 'smoothly' and 'to plan', it is necessary to show that this is not always the case. Next the chapter theoretically discusses the significance of trust in relation to the researcher entering the field. Establishing trust in the field is just as vital to the research project as gaining access. Without trust, there is a risk that the researcher only accesses frontstage areas of the interactants and settings, in some cases, a lack of trust can result in access denial and project failure.

A theoretical discussion of the significance of research roles and identity in fieldwork and the implications for the researcher follows this. Next, I consider Goffman's concept of impression management along with its significance for the researcher entering a group setting. After that, the chapter presents findings from the field which illustrate how the interactants test me as a researcher and how I react to their behaviour, which helps to build trust. During this section, I use extracts from my research diary to illustrate how some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds made sense of my presence along with their framing of me to others. These examples show how the use of impression management contributed towards how the interactants framed and organised me in the setting. Next, the chapter discusses how I as a researcher use impression management to effect and different variations of trust interchangeably to approach the field. These variations of trust are highly dependent on institutionalised forms of trust-relations in the field, while they also leave room for agency and impression management. Through drawing on Goffman (1961b), the chapter ends by presenting my reflections about the steps that I took to build trust as a researcher in the fieldwork situation. I personally experienced and observed almost all actions and events reported and described in these empirical chapters, the

thick descriptions that I based my field notes on has helped me retrospectively to remember the first impressions from the field, and these notes form the basis of the description of this and the following empirical chapters.

4.2 Gaining Access

This section outlines the importance of gaining access to an organisation or setting in which to obtain relevant empirical data. Trust is the key to obtaining access since gatekeepers only allow entry if they have confident positive expectations about the researcher and their project. However, in order to gain trust and subsequent access researchers must make a trustworthy impression.

One of the first necessary steps in any fieldwork project is to identify a relevant, desirable setting in which to collect data (Whyte, 1997; Sampson and Thomas, 2003). However, gaining access to the identified setting is not something that researchers can take for granted and is one of the upmost but difficult manoeuvres in fieldwork (Bryman, 2004, 2008; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Gaining access to a field setting determines whether or not a research project can go ahead and implies that all field investigations begin with the problem of accessing a social setting. Moreover, if the aim of the researcher is to enter the field with a commitment to undertake overt research then consent from the principal gatekeeper in management is essential. This can easily be related to the fieldwork study behind this current thesis. Without permission and support from the director in charge of the schools and social service agency, it would not have been possible to overtly gain access to the organisation where the 'initial' strategy was to shadow and observe local authority employees going about their daily work. Therefore, it is imperative for researchers contemplating undertaking fieldwork to consider how best to go about gaining access to a 'desirable', relevant organisation or setting, since gaining access is not something that happens automatically. As Van Maanen and Kolb (1985) observe: *"gaining access to most organisations is not a matter to be taken lightly but one that involves some combination of strategic planning, hard work and dumb luck"* (1985:11).

4.3 Gaining Access – Experience from the Field

The latter part of Van Maanen & Kolb's (1985) statement seems to sum up nicely my experience of attempting to gain access to a relevant organisation in which to conduct fieldwork. While there was some strategic planning, hard work prevailed along with a good portion of 'dumb luck'. Gaining access to a relevant organisation took several months to achieve; this required a lot of communication with local authorities, which often led to a dead-end. This process compares to that of salespersons cold calling companies attempting to make an appointment to call by with the purpose of selling a product they do not necessarily want or need. Often it was hard getting passed the lower gatekeepers who often guarded access to the middle and higher gatekeepers.

Eventually, after months of cold calling resulting in only a couple of meetings, through drawing heavily on my personal network I entered into negotiations with a large local authority. Initially, this seemed like a promising prospect, but as time progressed the process did not. After some time, it emerged that the slow process was the outcome of the organisation negotiating a contract with a private company with similar research interests as I. For reasons unknown, this placed my project on hold and as such, I could not get the 'go ahead' to enter the field to begin collecting data. Evidently, I had to wait until the local authority, and the private company finished 'the negotiations'. This waiting around, waiting to get the green light to go was a source of concern since the PhD clock was ticking. At some point during this waiting around, the head of the social work department informed me, that I and my research project would be placed under the remit of the private company. Moreover, she told me that any subsequent communication to her should go through the director of the private company. Afterwards, the director of the private company informed me that "our" cooperation would require fulfilling some tasks for his company. Subsequently, it transpired that the director of the private company and the manager of the social work department were in wedlock. Essentially, my research project became a prawn in their 'negotiations' and it seemed to be getting sidelined. On reflection, at the time, I was beginning to wonder what I was getting myself into and worried whether or not I would be able to undertake original, independent research (one of the requirements of a PhD) in such a setup. In the meantime, as "dumb luck" would have it, a director from another local authority who had heard about my research project proposal (via my network) approached me. Subsequently, after sending

a synopsis of the proposed research, the top management from the social work department invited me to attend a meeting to discuss the proposal. This meeting (which had the feel of a job interview) seemed to go well. However, at the end of the meeting they requested a user-friendly version of the project description to mull over since the first was “too academic” and needed to be translated into “normal Danish”. Moreover, they wanted some additional information outlining the benefits of the research for the local authority – a “what’s in it for us” section. I quickly followed up the demand for a more applied research proposal outlining potential benefits for the local authority of the research. After about three weeks, I received an email from the Director of Schools and Social Services informing that I could start my research project from the 1st of October 2009. This email included the name of a SSP worker who initially would serve as my guide while I found my feet. Moreover, the initial plan was to shadow Maria (pseudonym) while she carried out ‘criminal preventative’ work in and around a large residential housing estate.

For researchers intending to undertake fieldwork in organisations, it is worth noting, that gaining access to an organisation via the top management can be problematic with respect to forming field relations with lower-level employees. Goffman (1974b) warns against this approach and recommends starting at the bottom and working up to the top of an organisation. Goffman (1974b) asserts:

“Then there is the affiliation issue. You can’t move down a social system, you can only move up. So, if you’ve got to be with a range of people, be with the lowest people first. The higher people will “understand,” later on, that you were “really” just studying them. But you can’t start at the top and move down because then the people at the bottom will know that all along you really were a fink” (Goffman, 1974b:130).

However, when attempting to conduct overt research in a public sector organisation gaining access from the bottom or even from the middle of the organisation is not always feasible since access needs to be cleared from those above. Therefore, gaining access to an organisation from the top of an organisation seems the most feasible. Then it is up to the individual researcher, through his or her actions to demonstrate to the lower-level employees that (s)he is not a ‘fink’. Broadhead and Fox’s (1990) fieldwork experience of studying outreach workers working with

substance abusers in the community reinforces Goffman's (1974b) argument. Broadhead & Fox's (1990) study, initiated by senior management, found that lower-level employees were suspicious of their presence and enquired about their identity and the legitimacy of their research. Initially the outreach workers suspected them as being management snitches assessing employee performance and reporting this back (1990).

Sampson and Thomas (2003) found negotiating access an ongoing project in itself while conducting research on-board cargo vessels where obtaining permission from the owners was only the first step in gaining access. The second step involved negotiating access with the key gatekeeper, the ship's Captain. However, gaining approval by the skipper was no guarantee of access to the rest of the ship. Sampson and Thomas (2003) assert:

"Whilst Captains are the main gatekeepers and grant access to staff, work spaces such as 'the bridge', and even the social side of shipboard life, negotiating access is something of a full-time occupation in a shipboard context ... Researchers are consequently engaged in a constant round of requests for access throughout the research process" (2003:173).

In essence, it is paramount for researchers contemplating fieldwork in diverse settings to be aware that gaining access means much more than getting past the initial gate keepers – in short it can be an ongoing process throughout the study, for some researchers it can be a daily event (Feldman et al. 2003).

4.4 Trust Matters in Fieldwork

"Once the ethnographer has gained entrée into the field site, he or she must find ways to appropriate the data by establishing trust and rapport with informants"

(Castellano, 2007:711).

This section explores the importance of building and maintaining trust within fieldwork settings and outlines why trust is essential for successful fieldwork. The point of departure for the section is in the literature that argues the importance of trust in field research before moving on and looking at some barriers that can hinder trust building. During this section, I use a real-life case found while conducting fieldwork to illustrate the implications of breaching confidentiality or what

can be considered as 'professional trust' and at the same time breaching one of the underlying cultural rules concerning snitching in the neighbourhoods. This case illustrates the importance of maintaining trust in settings and that locals are active agents rather than passive bystanders.

Two of the most critical components for conducting successful field work are gaining access to the fieldwork setting and establishing trust with individuals and groups (Adler & Adler 1988; Jorgensen 1989; Lofland & Lofland 1995; Coy 2001, in Mazzei & O'Brien, 2009). Perhaps, one of the most basic things ethnographers must consider when seeking out research participants is the importance of establishing sufficient rapport and trust (Bosworth et al. 2005; in Fortune & Mair, 2011). Trust is essential both to gaining and maintaining access to the field as well as gaining access to the backstage areas of the lived experiences of people. These are features of ethnography clearly identified in most text books on qualitative research methods or ethnography. Moreover, the issue of researchers establishing rapport and/or trust often appears in scholarly articles reporting the findings from various strands of qualitative enquiry. However, while many of these articles state that the researchers established or gained rapport and/or trust they often fail to disclose how (i.e. Adler & Adler, 1988; Yates, 2006).

The importance placed on building trust makes ethnographic studies time-consuming processes (Wigren 2007). Nonetheless, according to Wigren (2007) establishing trust promotes the status of the researcher from outsider to "almost insider" allowing for deeper intuitive interaction and dialogue between the ethnographer and the natives (Wigren 2007). However, even if the researcher manages to win the trust of people in the setting, unless already a "native" or have a long-term commitment to the area, I suspect the outsider status remains since the locals know once the 'project' is over the researcher will return to the outside. Moreover, establishing trust goes way beyond just spending time in a field setting and is dependent on a number of factors, some of which could make trust building difficult or even prevent it. European researchers undertaking research in former European colonies may find it difficult to establish trust (Edgerton 1965). Further, researchers attempting to obtain research in areas once or currently oppressed economically, politically or culturally may find it difficult to gain trust – especially if they are representatives of the 'former ruling class' (Edgerton 1965). The fieldwork experience at the heart of this study reinforces Edgerton's (1965) observations. On several occasions, I observed interactants openly expressing distrust towards the ethnic majority. In this context, as discussed

below, it seemed to be a distinct advantage as a researcher to be a 'foreigner'. Perhaps a researcher from the ethnic majority would have found difficulties in establishing trust with the people in this context.

Sometimes, prior exposure to researchers can be a problem in itself to establishing trust (see Hosokawa, 2010). Moreover, in some settings the attributes of the researcher i.e. age, sex, social background can either support or hinder trust building as does the performance of the researcher and how the locals perceive this (Mittiness & Barker, 2004). Not all researchers (or practitioners) are able to satisfy the locals they are worthy of trust and ultimately, if the locals frame the researcher (or practitioner) in distrust then (s)he is untrustworthy, and more than likely must leave the setting.

During the fieldwork, for breaking the underlying social rules forbidding people to snitch on members of the community, the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds framed a job consultant in high distrust by using the cultural tool of snitch (discussed further in chapter five). Snitch as a cultural tool normally gets used to sanction someone who gives information to the authorities about another community member; however, in this case the snitch label came into play because the job consultant gave information to her boyfriend who lives in a neighbouring community. This shows how this powerful cultural tool can be adapted and used in other circumstances as a strategy when required.

In brief, word got back to the young men about the job consultants indiscretions; they became outraged and saw this breach of confidentiality as snitching. Effectively, they harassed her by shouting "fucking snitch", "stikkervin" (snitching pig) and other obscenities if she tried to move around the neighbourhood. The persecution continued even when she limited her activities to the office located in an apartment block in Sunset Boulevard. Some of the young men would gather outside the apartment building staring up at the window, jeering if she showed her face. Others went a step further sending text messages advising her to leave the community for the sake of her health. Events culminated when someone trashed her car by puncturing the tyres and making scratches in the paint work. After this episode, the local authority withdrew her from the area with the possibility of transferring her to another district. While illustrating a case of unprofessional incompetence, this brief example illustrates the importance of trust in research settings; what happened to the job consultant could easily have happened to me if I had mismanaged the

impression given to the young men or acted in a way which gave the impression that I was a police informant and if I broke the basic social codex of snitching (or getting caught out). After all, being a snitch only becomes a problem if it becomes known that an individual is a snitch (or at least suspected of snitching).

Snitching (in Danish *stikkeri*) is a term widely used in the neighbourhoods to describe individuals who inform the authorities about the activities of other community members (or in this case rival groups). To be a snitch (*stikker*) puts a person in 'bad standing', not a pleasant place to be and essentially can eliminate them from social interaction and in some cases can lead to expulsion from the neighbourhood. Snitching (*stikkeri*) is not a local or national phenomenon it is worldwide (see Yates, 2004, 2006; Andersen, 2000) and is prevalent in most (marginalised) communities, institutions (e.g. prisons, armed forces, schools) and (criminal) gangs. Evidently, the term *stikkeri* in Denmark has strong links to the Second World War and the occupying Nazi forces whereby Nazi's or Nazi collaborators informed the Gestapo or the police about (suspected) members of the resistance. Therefore, the 'no snitching rule' is not a new phenomenon; it has its roots firmly embedded in contemporary social history.

Moreover, the example illustrated above demonstrates that people in settings are not passive actors; on the contrary they are active knowledgeable agents who use the resources at their disposal to tackle situations as they arise. Perhaps the case highlighted here is a little extreme; however, it does help to illustrate potential ramifications for people who violate trust. This case gives credence to Goffman (1953) who argues that to be allowed to interact with people requires the researcher to be able to interpret the interactional codes at play and have the ability to predict what is going to happen and respond appropriately.

Therefore, the key issue for researchers and social workers attempting to operate in such areas is to use the time it takes to understand and interpret the interactional codes at play in order to negotiate and maintain access in the setting. Further, social workers and other professionals are duty bound to report some happenings to their superiors or to the police, when working in such contexts it may be an idea to be innovative in order not to undermine the ability to operate. In some cases, if the social worker has a duty to report something, then perhaps it could be done in a manner which does not jeopardize their ability to work in the area. Clearly, establishing trust is essential for the researcher (and others) to be accepted in the setting and to

maintain access. Although extreme, the case highlighted above underscores this. The important point for researchers is to use the time it takes to learn and understand the interactional codes at play in the setting in order to negotiate them while building trust and just as critical, maintain access.

What is more, trust is essential for researchers (and practitioners) to reach the backstage areas of personal front. Without trust interactants do not reveal backstage areas and in some cases deny access to the setting itself. This was a key finding in Brewer & Magee's (1991) research about life inside the R.U.C. (Royal Ulster Constabulary). They found that interactants were more concerned about the trustworthiness of the researchers rather than the bones of the research project itself. The success of the research depends largely on the ability to develop personal and trusting relationships with interactants: *"ethnographic research is a person-based project and who you are matters to informants"* (MacPhail, 2004:228). When the researcher first enters the field, the people in the setting calculate whether or not the researcher can be exploited, what they can contribute and most of all, the extent to which they can be trusted (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). This is in accord with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model with calculus-based trust as the first phase of trust building at the start of new relationships. As outlined in chapter two, calculus-based trust is necessary during initial phases of new relationships. During this early stage of trust building if calculus-based trust pays off, actors can improve the relationship further by gaining a better knowledge of the other and their needs, preferences and priorities (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). This can develop into the second phase of trust building: knowledge-based trust (ibid). In the first phase of trust building, there is no history between the different parties, and they have no preceding *"reputations"* to subjugate (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). However, this initial phase still involves uncertainty and vulnerability where individuals are unsure about the direction of the relationship and about *"telling too much too quickly"* (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996:119).

Although the focus of Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model is on working relationships in organisations, their conceptualisation of calculus-based trust fits nicely with Hammersley & Atkinson's (2007) assertion concerning the calculative behaviour of interactants determining the trustworthiness of the researcher. Moreover, this conclusion fits with Goffman (1959) concerning the dynamics at play when a stranger (researcher) enters a group for the first

time. According to Goffman (1959), during the initial encounter, while the researcher (stranger) attempts to manage the given impression to the individuals copresent, they simultaneously observe him or her with the purpose of estimating their socio-economic status, self-image, and attitude towards them, competences, and trustworthiness (1959:13). What Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) and Goffman (1959) report are calculative, estimating behaviours concerning the trustworthiness of the researcher by people in research settings, which is in tune with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) calculus-based trust.

Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) finds that Goffman's management of 'personal front' is crucial in relation to creating a trustworthy reputation and hold that where identities have to be established, ethnographers must carefully consider impression management. At the same time, Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) advise researchers to avoid impressions that can restrict access to settings as much as possible and to focus on impressions that support access within the boundaries of research ethics. The impression given by the researcher while negotiating access and entering key sites determines whether (s)he becomes trusted or not and is critical to the future of the research project. Essentially, the researcher must decide which impression (s)he wants to project to diverse audiences within the various sites of the setting and manage these impressions appropriately (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). However, this is more easily said than done in practice due to the diverse categories of interactants and social contexts which the researcher will meet during fieldwork which require presenting different sides of the self.

4.5 Significance of Research Roles

The literature makes a distinction between research roles and impression management. While both refer to interactional issues, there is a difference between the two aspects of fieldwork. Research role usually refers to the generic social position the researcher adopts (i.e. insider/outsider/marginal member etc.) while impression-management refers to one's actions in the adopted role. In other words, the researcher must still manage the impressions given to the interactants in whatever role she adopts i.e. manage her or his interactions, forms of tact and the expressive communication given and given off. In addition, according to Bryman (2004), the term research role refers to the stance or approach that the participant observer adopts in the field

(e.g. full participant, participant-as-observer, etc). Bryman (2004) illustrates Gold's (1958) classification of participant observer roles which involves four different variants: complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant and complete observer (this is discussed briefly below).

Establishing a role in the field is essential to trust, integral to impression management and is particularly relevant to researcher identity. The role adopted by the researcher when entering the field is essential to the research process and to how it develops. The actions of the researcher do not make sense to members of the social setting until (s)he decides upon an acceptable role (Jacobs, 1974). The role constructed by the researcher relates directly to gaining, maintaining and renegotiating access to the setting and its members (Gray, 1980; Snow et al., 1986; Bryman, 2008).

The role adopted by the researcher when entering the site determines the research process and is imperative to *"the very fate of the research"* (Jacobs, 1974:222). According to Jacobs (1974) the conduct of the researcher does not make sense to members of the scene until (s)he decides upon an *"acceptable role"* (1974:222). The role is crucial to the validity and success of the project since it determines; who the researcher can have relations with, the available lines of inquiry, the meanings ascribed to these inquiries, information offered by interactants and the meanings attributed to those data (Jacobs, 1974). McCall & Simmons (1969) reinforce this conclusion:

"The role assumed by the observer largely determines where he can go, what he can do, whom he can interact with, what he can inquire about, what he can see and what he can be told. If he cannot freely define his own role, the observer must be careful to assume that role which is most strategic for obtaining information that is central to his scientific concerns" (McCall & Simmons, 1969; cited in Snow et al. 1986:378).

The role constructed by the researcher relates directly to gaining, maintaining and renegotiating access to the site and its members (Gray, 1980; Snow et al., 1986; Bryman, 2008). In addition, there is the question concerning researcher identity, whether or not the researcher discloses her identity as a researcher to the people in the setting – the overt vs. covert issue. Covert research is defined as: *"research situations where the real identity of the observer as a social researcher*

remains secret and entirely unknown to those with who he or she is in contact" (Bulmer, 1982:252). According to Bryman (2008), the advantages of adopting a covert role include ease of access and reduction in researcher reactivity since people in the setting are unaware of the researcher's true identity (Bryman, 2008). However, this is questionable, because when a new person enters a site, people react to the new person whether they know the person is a researcher or not. Evidently the disadvantages of adopting a covert role outweigh the advantages since this stance limits the range of methods at the researchers disposal, makes note taking extremely difficult and engaging in interviews impossible (Bryman, 2008). Further, adopting a covert role contravenes ethics in research since it involves lying (ibid). While one can agree with the last consideration concerning research ethics, the preceding points relating to note taking and conducting interviews are problematic. Firstly, researchers adopting an overt role face similar difficulties when taking fieldnotes. Perhaps, there may be some circumstances where adopting a covert role may make note taking easier, perhaps in the role of a journalist. In relation to making interviews impossible, Bryman (2008) must be referring to formal tape recorded interviews since ethnographic fieldwork often relies upon natural untapped everyday conversation.

Through adapting the frame of Gold's (1958) participant-as-observer role, I built upon it and constructed various roles to suit various scenes in the setting. In brief, the participant-as-observer role is an overt role where the locals in the area are aware of the researchers' status (1958). According to Gold (1958) members of the setting initially are wary of the researcher, but this improves over time as researchers establish basic trust (1958). The participant-as-observer role is just one of four "*master roles*" put forward by Gold (1958). However, Gold's (1958) typology criticised as "*naive*" and "*limited*" is especially problematic concerning his conceptualisation of the overt and covert issue (Bulmer, 1982; cited in Snow et al., 1986:378). In addition, Snow et al. (1986) criticise Gold's (1958) classification for been too one-dimensional since it only describes the roles in extremely broad terms: "*thereby leaving each role relatively empty, nondescript, and uncodified*" (1986:378). Snow et al. (1986) point out the two-dimensionality of roles and involve structurally (culturally determined) which determines the shape of roles and the derived dimension (1986). The latter concerns how the fieldworker constructs the role in the face of situational and personal constraints in the research setting (1986). Snow et al. (1986) contend that regardless of constraints, researchers have a lot of flexibility in defining their own role in the field

(ibid); this is in sharp contrast to Gold (1958) who prescribes certain behaviours to his “*master roles*”. Snow et al. (1986) maintain that while access to information can be hindered by the derived feature of roles, the success of the research project itself does not depend on the role, rather on how the researcher constructs and negotiates the role in the field (1986).

4.6 Impression Management

Erving Goffman (1959) in the ‘Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life’ developed useful concepts concerning the ‘front’ of actors (the part of a performance whereby a person attempts to define the situation to an audience) as well as the ‘back’ where actors reflect upon and practise their roles. Central to Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical approach is the concept of impression management. In the following, I argue that impression management, following Goffman (1959), is a way for the researcher both to enter and to gather data about trust-relations in a group. Impression management is a deliberate strategy of adopting a role, where, on the one hand, the social encounter is essential to discovering the role, but where reflections on that role “backstage” is also essential to the role adoption and for entering backstage regions of people’s lives.

Impression management involves people using communication intentionally and tactically to produce desired impressions to those present. These performances can have implications for the performers’ opportunity to achieve and maintain desired identities in a setting (Prus, 1996). Goffman (1959) argues, despite the desire for attempting to create a trustworthy impression, it is by influencing how the others define the situation that is crucial, if the researcher can affect how the others define him and the situation then, he gains some control over their behaviour towards himself. Goffman (1959) provides three strategies by which individuals entering groups can have an impact on defining the situation: “thoroughly calculating”, “calculating”, or well-designed” (1959:18). The first two instances indicate firsthand knowledge or insight into the others to be encountered. This may be achieved either through observation or background knowledge of similar groups or settings. In both instances, the outsider observes how to act or behave in the presence of the group and adjust their behaviour accordingly. The third approach suggests a talented experienced social chameleon comfortable in encountering others.

4.7 Group Encounters and Impression Management

“When an individual enters the presence of others, they commonly seek to acquire information about him or to bring into play information about him already possessed. They will be interested in his general socio-economic status, his conception of self, his attitude toward them, his competence, his trustworthiness, etc. Although some of this information seems to be sought almost as an end in itself, there are usually quite practical reasons for acquiring it. Information about the individual helps to define the situation, enabling others to know in advance what he will expect of them and what they may expect of him” (Goffman, 1959:13).

The encounter between outsiders and insiders is significant. When a researcher (or any other unknown person) enters a new or group situation the members check him or her out. During initial encounters, they gather as much information as possible about the individuals; status, self image, attitude towards them, social competence and trustworthiness. This initial assessment determines the outcome of the encounter and can either open for or eliminate subsequent encounters. Essentially, the impression that the individual gives to the others determines how they define him or her along with the situation. In Andersen’s (2000) ‘Code of the Street’ the interactional code is explicit in the presentation of the self:

“A person’s public bearing must send the unmistakable, if sometimes subtle, message that one is capable of violence, and possibly mayhem, when the situation requires it, that one can take care of oneself” (2000:72).

This public display of attitude transpires through both intentional and unintentional expressions, and designed to prevent aggression (Andersen, 2000). Moreover, during encounters, physical appearance, including transitory sign-vehicles such as clothes and jewellery contribute to how others view him or her (Andersen, 2000). In some contexts, temporary sign-vehicles can even determine if there will be following encounters: *“To be allowed to hang with certain prestigious crowds, a boy must wear different set of expensive clothes every day. Not to do so might make him appear socially deficient” (Andersen, 2000:74).* Although it is difficult to predict what will happen

during encounters, it is necessary for researchers to find ways in which they can affect defining the situation. The point is the researcher only has to enter a setting to make an impression and shape the proceedings. No matter what, in one way or another, some of the locals will react towards the researcher and begin to define him or her and the situation. Therefore, researchers must participate, as much as possible, in the process of definition. In this regard, it is wise to have one or two strategies in the research repertoire about how to influence defining the situation and the self before entering the field. The key point is that impression management can help the researcher establish trustworthiness in the field and by doing so understand trust-relations, because impression management is all about gaining trust in the field. The researcher must prove herself as a trustworthy person and during this process learn about the structure of trust in the field. The tricky point for a researcher studying trust and seeking to understand trust-relations is to operate at many different levels, not just interviewing people, but making a convincing performance throughout. This helps researchers to move beyond frontstage, to go behind the scenes and access the backstage areas. The paradox of impression management for the researcher is that (s)he cannot gain access to the backstage regions without a credible performance frontstage.

However, to make a trustworthy frontstage performance it is necessary for the researcher to have a clear understanding about the dynamics of impression management. Communication is essential to presenting trustworthy impressions and to defining the situation. Communication can be divided into intentional (giving) and unintentional (giving-off) (Goffman, 1959). While the intentional communication is straightforward and easy to manage and involves language, the unintentional transpires through nonverbal communication and is difficult to control (Goffman, 1959). In his discussion of *“expressive behaviour”*, Blumer (1936) gives a useful insight into what the unintentional communication (giving-off) involves:

“Expressive behaviour is presented through such features as quality of the voice—tone, pitch, volume — in facial set and movement, in the look of the eyes, in the rhythm, vigour, agitation of muscular movements, and in posture. These form the channels for the disclosure of feeling. It is through these that the individual, as we say, reveals himself as apart from what he says or does. Expressive behaviour is primarily a form of release, implying a background of tension. It tends to be

spontaneous and unwitting; as such, it usually appears as an accompaniment of intentional and consciously directed conduct” (Blumer, 1936:520).

During encounters, or what Goffman also calls “copresence” or “focused interaction”, the others present assess the trustworthiness of the person by checking for coherence between the intentional and unintentional communication (Goffman, 1959). Performances where there are discrepancies between verbal and nonverbal communication are not convincing, and the individual’s trustworthiness becomes an issue.

To illustrate this point Goffman (1959) presents a case from his ethnographic study from the Shetlands Islands. Goffman (1959) observes:

“One crofter’s wife, in serving native dishes to a visitor from the mainland of Britain, would listen with a polite smile to his polite claims of liking what he was eating; at the same time she would take note of the rapidity with which the visitor lifted his fork or spoon to his mouth, the eagerness with which he passed food into his mouth, and the gusto expressed in chewing the food, using these signs as a check on the stated feelings of the eater. The same woman, in order to discover what one acquaintance (A) ‘actually’ thought of another acquaintance (B), would wait until B was in the presence of (A) but engaged in conversation with still another person (C). She would then covertly examine the facial expressions of (A) as he regarded (B) in conversation with (C). Not being in conversation with (B), and not being directly observed by him, (A) would sometimes relax usual constraints and tactful deceptions, and freely express what he was ‘actually’ feeling about (B). This Shetlander, in short, would observe the unobserved observer” (Goffman, 1959:19).

Goffman’s (1959) case demonstrates the importance of consistency between the (giving) intentional and (giving off) unintentional communication during interaction. These insights by Goffman (1959) demonstrate how I as a researcher needed to beware of my unintentional expressive behaviour during encounters with all interactants in the field, both young and old. The implication is straightforward and necessary for all researchers (and anyone else) negotiating encounters in the field – be consistent with unintentional communication both when observing and interacting with people because people at the site are constantly monitoring communicative

traffic. Moreover, as a researcher (or other) when entering a new social group and/or location then it is likely that all eyes will be on you, even if you are unaware of it, because as Goffman (1959) demonstrates, when in proximity with others, you can be under surveillance without knowing. Experience from social work practice and the recent fieldwork inform me, that to be under observation the site or group does not have to be “new”. As an outsider, as soon as you enter the community people know you are there. The recent fieldwork reinforces this conclusion along with the idea that to be under consideration does not mean people have to be in proximity. People in the setting knew, for example, when the police was operating in the area, or that the job consultant was in her office. Word travels fast in the neighbourhood especially with the aid of modern technology.

Therefore, it is necessary for researchers, youth & social workers during focused or unfocused encounters to consider the impression seriously that they want to present to people and whether their expressive behaviour reinforces the desired impression. For example, if the goal as a youth worker is to create a positive trustworthy impression with the purpose of building trustworthy relations to a group of young men in a neighbourhood then there has to be a confirming consistency between intentions and actions – between giving and giving off. If, however, there is no confirming consistency between stated aims and performance this conveys the opposite message and becomes a trust problem. I observed this trust problem in Sunset Boulevard between the young men and a team of local authority youth workers. These workers, employed to undertake outreach work with the young men through building trustworthy relations projected an impression contrary to their aims and goals (discussed in the next chapter).

What the researcher and others must remember when encountering people either in proximity or from a distance is that actions are significant since they affect the interpretation of the situation. The key message is that actions speak louder than words, and when your unintentional expressive language speaks then it better backup what is coming out of your mouth. Impression management, however, is not straight forward. While the group tries to figure out the person encountering them, the individual attempts to size them up while simultaneously trying to make a favourable impression. The individual adapts her actions to suit the situation, bluffing the way through the encounter by misinforming those present with the purpose of making a trustworthy impression (Goffman, 1959). Interaction is unpredictable, often circumstances force

people to respond and improvise adapting their role or performance with the purpose of creating a favourable impression. The person's self-identity is crucial to the exhibited behaviour. According to Goffman (1961), there are many sides to the self and people choose to display different features of themselves to different people on different occasions (1961). In this sense, people are aware of the impressions they give to others copresent. People try to control the given impression by displaying certain attributes they expect others appreciate – this is what Goffman calls impression management (examples of impression management from fieldwork follow below).

4.8 Appearance & Attitude

Central to impression management are two distinctive forms of stimuli which inform observers about the performer: appearance and attitude (Goffman, 1959). The appearance of the performer refers to stimuli that tell about the social status or transitory state i.e. engaging in work (e.g. uniform), formal social events (e.g. wedding) or recreational (ibid). Attitude or the conduct of the performer refers to the stimuli which inform observers about what to expect from her during the approaching situation (1959). Goffman (1959) distinguishes two types of conduct:

“A haughty, aggressive manner may give the impression that the performer expects to be the one who will initiate the verbal interaction and direct its course. A meek, apologetic approach may give the impression that the performer expects to follow the lead of others, or at least that he can be led to do so” (Goffman, 1959:35).

Although Goffman (1959) does not recommend adopting any of the two examples illustrated above, this shows the importance of attitude on people copresent. Appearance and attitude are vital to impression management and it is necessary to consider both before, and during fieldwork. The researcher can adapt some aspects of both attitude and appearance before entering the field; these can be modified further under the fieldwork. What is relevant to remember is that researchers move around in the field setting from site-to-site and as such meet different audiences. Therefore, there should be a fit between appearance, attitude, the projected

impression and context – just as there must be a confirming consistency between giving and giving off, there should be a confirming consistency between appearance, attitude and the projected impression. Appearance and attitude interrelate to one another where there should be a confirming consistency between the two.

Goffman's (1959) examples of attitude could have implications for the researcher entering the field. The high and mighty aggressive type in most situations should be avoided; however, there may be situations where adopting such an approach could be advantageous to gain status or to save face (as illustrated below) if required. However, the meek, apologetic approach may be more appropriate in fieldwork where the researcher needs to blend into the environment observing in a low-key participant role having limited impact on the field.

Appearance and attitude were two factors that I took into account long before entering the field, I knew, at some point, I would have to start negotiating access to local authorities, and I know that first impressions matter. Therefore, I started to rehearse and finely tune my formal Danish language at home with my wife, essentially rehearsing for a job interview. Moreover, in anticipation of going out into some of the neighbourhoods to collect data, I started to grow my hair, which was relatively short at the time. There were two reasons for growing my hair; firstly, there was a war (still is) going on between some elements from the CBG's (criminal bike gangs) and what are referred to as "immigrant" gangs in DK, since many members of CBG's have shaven heads or short hair – I did not want to be mistaken for one of them. Secondly, I wanted to look less aggressive and try to look more approachable, which would be important during fieldwork. Moreover, I considered clothes and tried to figure out the style that I should wear in the field. However, from previous experience of working some of the neighbourhoods I had a pretty fair idea about how to look and present.

Additionally, I read Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) and considered what they had to say about entering the field. So while, waiting to gain access to an organisation I was growing my hair in anticipation to going out into the 'field' and at the same time mulling over how to present myself to local authority gatekeepers and beyond. Goffman (1959) asserts that people (observers observing the observer) co-present require a "confirming consistency" between attitude and appearance during the performance. During this encounter, performers continually provide definitions of themselves to the audience who simultaneously assess their performance (Goffman,

1959). The audience assess the consistency between the different aspects of self presentation (personal front) to determine if the presentation accepted. The audience decides if the impression given by the actor is “true or false, genuine or spurious, valid or phony” (Goffman, 1959:66). During the performance, audiences focus on aspects that are difficult to manipulate, this allows for a reliability check (Goffman, 1959). A misrepresented presentation discredits the actor and deems them unworthy of future interaction or trust (ibid). However, if the audience believe the performance along with the suggested definition then the individual is worthy of trust. However, for the researcher, this confirming consistency can be problematic because they must also act as a researcher as well, somehow interrupting the consistency. A good way to deal with this is to remind the interactants frequently about the research role.

4.9 Managing Impressions – Findings from the Field

During the fieldwork, through adopting a participant-as-observer role I presented different sides of myself to different people on different occasions in an attempt to make trustworthy impressions. The construction of a working identity may be facilitated in some circumstances if the ethnographer can exploit relevant skills or knowledge, and in some contexts construct ‘different selves’ according to the impression that she wants to make (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). This was essential to gaining and maintaining access to the field where access sometimes had to be negotiated on a daily basis.

While negotiating access to the local authority, the first point of entry, I presented a professional self-image. This presentation included emphasising professional experience in social work with young people and highlighting academic credentials. All of which helped to justify and legitimise the research project. During this presentation, I wore smart casual clothes and carried a laptop computer bag to add to the professional image. Personal appearance is indispensable to impression management and necessary for the researcher to consider before entering the field (Andersen, 2000; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Presenting this professional image gave status and trustworthiness with the top management. Goodall (1989) reinforces this point and says that the impression one makes with gatekeepers is crucial in gaining entry into an organisation.

Personal appearance and impression management are vital to gaining access and acceptance in social settings (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

When meeting the SSP team for the first time, I dressed down wearing more casual clothes and left the laptop bag at home. My intention was to present as a PhD student wanting to learn about their work and how they include young people in innovation processes. However, during this process I had to adjust my presentation to accommodate information they already knew about me. It turned out that they had read an article in the SSP Magazine where I featured. This interview featured some of my views concerning the local authority fusion in Denmark and what this would mean for SSP work - this turned out in my favour since they shared similar views. This interview coupled to my previous work experience and presentation of self seemed to make a favourable impression. When meeting employees outside of the SSP team I just presented myself as a student from the University of Roskilde and informed about the aims and objectives of my research. It was only if pressed for more information that I revealed any information about my work experience. However, it is worth noting that not all public sector employees encountered asked for further information concerning my background or role. Perhaps most local authority workers get used to having students around from various forms of education or training; therefore, 'students' seem to be readily accepted.

When entering the two neighbourhoods I presented myself as a PhD student from Roskilde University and told about my project in Danish. However, most of the young men and some of their parents reacted to me by speaking English. Being English and being foreign was a distinct advantage to conducting research in the neighbourhoods. This presentation, like the other instances of impression management, sketched out above, required no pretence or acting, only emphasising other sides of the self. During this presentation, I emphasised my foreignness and I made it routine to greet people in my native English language instead of Danish. Often I greeted people by saying hello, good morning, how are things, or alright mate. Usually, a handshake accompanied the verbal greeting – a confirming consistency that reinforced the verbal.

Moreover, I adopted an open, honest approach telling candidly about why I was in their neighbourhood, about myself, where I come from, my background, my family and the town where I live. When conversing with interactants, I tried my best to answer all questions to the best of my ability. Often interactants in the neighbourhoods asked my point of view about living in Denmark

as a foreigner and about the Danish People's Party (a party known for its strong anti-immigrant/foreigner stance). I answered all these questions promptly, straightforwardly and genuinely. Perhaps my natural reaction to these questions helped to build rapport with the interactants in the neighbourhoods. Perhaps these similar views helped to enhance trust development based on identification and understanding. When communicating with people in the neighbourhoods I often switched language to suit the situation. While many interactants preferred to communicate in English with me, others preferred Danish. Essentially, language helped to strengthen the projected impression and gave a confirming consistency in two ways. Firstly, when I speak Danish, it is with a decidedly 'foreign' accent. Secondly, switching between English and Danish during conversations gave further credence to my story. This seemed to be a distinct advantage when conducting participant observation in settings frequented by ethnic minority groups. Furthermore, being English seemed to be an advantage in both neighbourhoods as opposed to being Danish. A few young men with minority ethnic backgrounds interacted with during fieldwork expressed distrust towards Danish people and high distrust towards the Danish Peoples Party. Moreover, a few interactants referred to the notion of the 'multicultural society' and associated this with England and America. My research diary is illustrative:

"I want justice, you know Kevin, want to be treated like everyone else ... I want to be treated like the blacks are in England or in America ... there they have multi ethnic societies ... in America, they have a black president ... Obama" (Ali: Research Diary, January 2010).

During this extract, Ali (pseudonym) uses underlying cultural values around justice and fairness to understand his social reality and future desires. As the fieldwork progressed, I found that ideas around justice and injustice are powerful cultural tools, which the young men use to understand their social reality and to organise and frame relationships in either trust or distrust. I will discuss this further in chapter five, along with how notions of injustice are powerful cultural tools to trigger collective social action.

Furthermore, perhaps my professional experience of working with children and young people for many years coupled to prior learning contributed to the acceptance of my presence in the two neighbourhoods. Fundamentally, I relied on principals from anti-oppressive and anti-

discriminatory practice learned during my social work education. This way of approaching people with respect and being non-judgemental (while challenging institutional forms of discrimination and oppression) seems like a good method of building rapport and trust.

4.10 Entering the Field – The Boys Club in Paradise Way

When I first entered the neighbourhoods² the young men did not know me or the reason for my presence. Although, the young men of Paradise Way had at least heard about me from Maria the SSP worker who I was to initially shadow. Unfortunately, Maria told the young men that I was going to be shadowing and observing her carrying out her work because I was researching crime. According to Maria, they reacted angrily towards this information saying: “Fucking Bastard thinks we are all criminals here”. Although Maria's telling was not at all accurate concerning my research aims and objectives, it still set me in a negative light before I had even entered the field. During the early phase of the fieldwork, Maria invited me to attend the boys club (a brand new initiative) to meet most of the older boys and young men of Paradise Way together. The idea with the boys club from the perspective of the local authority was that it would open once a week, every Tuesday evening between the hours of 16:00 – 22:00 in the apartment used by the SSP Team as their office. Jeanette, one of Maria's colleagues who helped with the club said during an interview that they had promised the young men of Paradise Way that they would open up one Saturday evening in December and organise a ‘function’. According to Maria, the aim of the club was twofold. Firstly, it was to get the lads of the streets once a week to reduce crime and tension in the area. Secondly, it was to give Maria and two of her colleagues the opportunity to create contact and to build relations with the lads.

4.11 Testing Boundaries, Rites of Passage or Researcher Reactivity

The following is a thick description of entering the field and includes my reflections and immediate observations during one of several fieldtrips. This comprehensive narrative includes both the setting and the context in which the observations take place. This narrative illustrates how during

² The point of Departure for the fieldwork was Paradise Way in early October 2009, in January 2010, I moved onto the second neighbourhood Sunset Boulevard where I stayed until the end of June 2010.

an early encounter with interactants I as a researcher faced and had to deal with a series of research dilemmas. Further, the narrative illustrates how this initial meeting with the interactants helped me as a researcher to understand some the key symbols and interactional codes and build trust in the field. Using thick description helps the reader to understand the context in which the observations take place and the dynamics at play when the researcher enters a new setting.

On Tuesday the 6th of October 2009 I pulled up into a parking space behind a row of garages located at the beginning of Paradise Way at around five o' clock. After locking my car, I began to walk the 600 metres or so to the block of flats where the SSP Office is to be found on the fourth floor. There were a couple of people on the path between the apartment block and the car park walking towards me, a woman walking hand-in-hand with a small child and a middle-aged man walking just behind them with a cigarette in one hand and a bag of groceries in the other. From a distance, the drying bed sheets hung out to dry from the balconies of the tall buildings gave the impression of a fleet of tall ships sailing in the distance. After a couple of minutes, I reached the block of flats, the approximate location of the SSP Office. Up close the tall building stretches widely over a lot of ground and includes eight entryways. All of which are identical which make it difficult for newcomers to navigate. The eye-catching sign on the wall warned passersby that they were now under the surveillance of CCTV. Looking up revealed a variety of satellite dishes positioned in different angles. Halfway down the building some youths gathered around one of the entryways; they stared at me as I approached. They were all wearing similar clothing, baggy jeans, parka jackets, and baseball caps. I told them that I was trying to find the SSP Office. One of the youths pointed into the entryway: "Yeah in there, up the stairs on the fourth floor to the left", he said.

I thanked him and walked through the group and the smoke from their cigarettes hanging thickly in the air. In the entrance, there was a row of mail boxes which had seen better days, some of which were missing doors. There was a horrible stench of stale tobacco and urine in the air with tell tale signs of recent urine sprayed on the wall, steam wafting towards the ceiling and the warm liquid accumulating into a yellow puddle on the floor below. Pieces of paper, unwanted or undelivered junk mail and cigarette butts accompanied the yellow puddle on the floor. Graffiti

sprayed on the wall advertised for “2Pac”, “Fifty Cent” and “Niggas with Attitude” along with the declaration “we are niggaz and we live here”.

Beyond the row of mail boxes, a stairwell divided this part of the building into two halves – each half with doors to two apartments. Placed outside the apartment doors were coarse mats, on top of which footwear of various sizes deposited neatly. The shouts and shrieks cascading down the stairwell left me in no doubt that I had arrived at the right place. I began to climb the dimly lit staircase leading up to the fourth floor, every step bringing the shouts and shrieks from above closer. On reaching the 4th floor, immediately it was evident that none of the apartments had shoes placed outside. The door of the 2nd apartment on the left was ajar, the sound of laughing and shrieking bellowed out. There was a strong smell of tobacco and freshly prepared food whiffing out onto the landing. When I was just about to enter, a boy came running towards me, running down the long corridor heading out of the apartment. Two other youths of about the same age pursued the first while shouting obscenities. The first boy shouted: “watch out”, as he pushed past me before disappearing down the stairs with the two others closely on his heels.

Regaining my composure, I entered the normally spacious apartment used for administrative purposes. The apartment seemed to be buzzing with excitement in the air, it is difficult to explain, but it felt like the suspense one experiences while waiting for an important event to begin. The apartment was heaving with teenage boys and young men from the neighbourhood occupying all of the available seats and some of the floor. The apartment, constructed in the shape of an “L”, featured a large sitting room furnished with a dining table and chairs, a couple of sofas and a wide screen TV. From this room, there was access to the balcony which served as the designated smoking area. To the right of the main sitting room there was a slightly smaller room furnished with two smaller tables and chairs. This room housed a computer where it was possible to surf the net and play online games. To the right of the smaller room, in the lower case of the “L” was the kitchen complete with all the trimmings. Up from the kitchen going back towards the main door was a bathroom and over from that the office where staff completed administration.

As I walked down the corridor, I observed Maria sitting together with two other women (Jeanette & Sara) and six young men at the dining table in the main room engaged in various table based games. Three younger boys stood hovering close by observing the activities. Behind them,

out on the balcony a group sits huddled together puffing out smoke. On and around the sofas in front of the TV several youths sit watching the match, shouting encouragement to their players and abuse to the opposing team. Maria sees me and waves the other two women look up and do the same before going back to their focused interaction of playing, cards, backgammon and chatting. I continue down the corridor walking towards the kitchen. Looking into the smaller activity room, I notice a young man sitting at the computer engaged in playing "Counter-Strike" surrounded by a gaggle of spectators, all of which giving unappreciated advice about how to play the game. I leave the room with the virtual warrior and enter the kitchen; there were pans on the oven with the remains of recently prepared food. Three youths stand at the open window engaged in hurling insults from the open window down to the group below: "fucking child molester, come up here and say that", "fucking queer", "your mothers a whore". The trio, totally engaged in their action do not see that I was observing them. Suddenly, some youths that I had already met in the community centre entered the kitchen: "hi William" "hi Fred" "hello Kevin". They greeted me with handshakes, 'High-fives' and smiles while they surrounded me all talking at the same time and demanding attention.

All of a sudden, one of the youths who had been hanging around the entryway to the building downstairs burst into the kitchen setting about the trio stood at the window, slapping their heads and faces while commanding them to shut their "fucking mouths". Just as abruptly as the action started it stopped with the youth marching out of the kitchen. This was swift and bold justice in action. The attitude and tone between the boys is hard here. To my amazement, the group of teenagers gathered around me did not bat an eyelid; it was though this was not something out of the ordinary. The youths gathered around me seemed especially excited and eager to have contact. There was a lot of hustle and bustle going on and they all spoke over each other commanding attention, it seemed to be developing into a 'look at me', 'see me' and acknowledge me' struggle. Perhaps the logic behind this behaviour of shouting the loudest and using offensive language concerned gaining acceptance, approval, and attention. Perhaps it concerned 'trying out' behaviour designed to test my attitude towards them. During this encounter the lads began to talk offensively about one another: "Him there, he is a child molester ... he has no lining in his trouser pocket and gets small children to stick their hand in to get sweets

... all they get is his cock” said one boy pointing towards the other. “Don’t listen to him he’s a retard” said his counterpart before slapping the first boy over the head.

At this point, Maria the SSP worker entered the kitchen greeting everyone warmly: “Hi how’s it going”?

Simultaneously, ‘Abdullah’, a youth of about fifteen years of age, lowering his voice, said to me:

“Do you know why we come here”?

“Tell me”, I said

“Because she is very beautiful (indicating Maria with his eyes) ... she has big tits ... a big arse ... and she likes cock” he continued.

The other boys, encouraged by Abdullah’s comments, started to make similar remarks. This awkward situation gave me the first research dilemma that evening. Should I, (A) just listen passively to these sexist comments as naturally occurring behaviour in the scene, and by ignoring them coupled with non-objection signal that I agree? Or (B), should I, respond to the behaviour and by doing so influence the behaviour of the interactants in the research setting and perhaps alienate myself from future interaction?

Such a situation requires the researcher to think on his or her feet, I chose the second strategy and calmly said to the boys that I thought their comments were defamatory and did not want to hear anymore such remarks. Perhaps my reaction goes against the non-judgemental approach that I set for myself at the start of the fieldwork and recommended by Spradley (1979) and Prus (1996). Perhaps, I had not left my ‘external morals and principles’ at the gates of Paradise Way as advised by Prus (1996) who argues that researchers who cannot do so and begin to *“moralise, challenge, or otherwise impose outsider viewpoints”* are not suited to *“be well received”* by the ethnographic other (1996:195). Perhaps if, I had read Prus (1996) before entering the field then it may have slightly influenced my course of action, or not. However, after that is said, I did keep composure during the interaction and as such was in control as recommended by Prus (1996). On reflection, in that situation, I do not think that reading Prus (1996) would have changed anything, since my response to their institutionalised sexism was an institutionalised reaction in itself ingrained in me through three years of social work education in England and many years of

social work practice. Throughout, the social work education, while been trained to adopt a non-judgemental approach, the education schooled us in anti-oppressive and anti-discriminatory practice which teaches social workers to challenge institutional forms of oppression and discrimination (for more see Thompson, 1993). Therefore, when entering the field it obviously was difficult for me to leave all of my values along with my social worker mask at the gate.

After my friendly, polite rebuff, I signalled the end of the encounter by walking out of the kitchen closely followed by the boys. I entered the room where the virtual warrior was still combating virtual terrorists in cyberspace. I approached him and asked how the current conflict was progressing; without looking away from the computer screen, he said that his side was losing. I stood observing the counter-terrorism operation together with all the others copresent for some twenty minutes or so. Apart from the occasional explosion or bursts of machine fire coming from the computer loud speakers an eerie silence fell over the room.

Suddenly raised voices and the sound of scuffling from the corridor broke the relative quietness. What is more, I could clearly hear the voice of a women loudly asking for help: "Can someone help". I stood riveted to the spot waiting for and expecting one or both of her colleagues to rush to her aid. Clearly anxious, she starts to scream for help but still help does not appear. Immediately, I leave the small activity room where "Counter-Strike" is still entertaining the crowd. Entering the corridor, I see two teenagers involved in a fierce fight observed from a distance by four or five younger boys. When I arrive in the corridor, the woman (Jeanette) stops shouting for help – she looks expectantly at me to do something.

The group of younger boys were watching me with anticipation and expectation (a confident positive expectation perhaps) their eyes felt heavy on me. Suddenly, the second research dilemma of the evening is upon me – to intervene or not to intervene. While this research dilemma was taking place, the two teenagers were knocking the crap out of each other. After a slight research dilemma hesitation, I leap into action pushing the apparent primary aggressor back into the kitchen away from the other lad.

"Don't touch me ... get your hands off you queer", he snarled.

"Stop that crap, calm down and I will", I replied calmly.

Unexpectedly, two of the young men who had been sitting together with Maria and the other worker enter the kitchen. They grab hold of 'Absi' pinned him against the wall and slapped his face and said something to him in Arabic. This had an immediate effect and Absi walked away, into the main sitting room. The gathered crowd dispersed leaving the worker and me in the kitchen: "would you like a cup of coffee" Jeanette asked without referring to the incident.

While I sat in the kitchen drinking coffee, I reflected over the incident that had just occurred. Clearly my actions went beyond the research role. This was a real dilemma; on the one hand, I could have let the events progress until someone else intervened. On the other, not to intervene would have been wrong especially if one of the boys received serious injuries while I stood by just waiting. Unfortunately, there is not so much in the text books concerning qualitative research about how to deal with such incidents. However, Padgett (1998) gives sound advice about how to deal with observed on-the-spot tricky situations: "The ethical issue for qualitative researchers in these situations is not whether to do something, but what, how and when to do it" (1998:42). Padgett (1998) says that researchers should weigh-up the initial impulses to jump in and do something against all foreseeable consequences. This is solid advice, which is all well and good, but sometimes, as was the situation unfolding in front of me, the researcher only has seconds in which to evaluate the here and now of intervening calculated against all foreseeable consequences. Ultimately, it is difficult to give another researcher advice about what to do in a similar situation because each situation is different and all kinds of things can go wrong. When in a fieldwork setting, it is up to the individual researcher to determine how to react to unfolding events. However, it is imperative to remember that ultimately you could be held accountable for your actions at a later date.

While I sat and contemplated my own part in the incident, I wondered why the two workers sitting close by had not heard the cries for help from their colleague. Moreover, I wondered why none of the workers spoke to either of the fighting teenagers afterwards. Perhaps there was a strategy where the young men resolved their own conflicts in the club for boys. Once the fight was over, it was all as if nothing had happened, the lads and workers just carried on regardless.

4.12 The Wedgie – an act of intuition

After finishing the coffee, I visited the bathroom to write fieldnotes in my pocketbook. After, emerging from the bathroom, I went into the main activity, some of the boys sat on the sofas made room for me and signalled to me to join them. Looking around I see that this assembly comprises three groups: the little shites (youngest boys, bullied, teased and chastised by all the others); the wannabes (aged 14 – 16 years aspiring to become young men); and the young men sitting at the table with Maria (aged 16 – 25 years, looked-up-to by the others). While I am sitting contemplating the social structure of the group I can feel that something is in the air, I feel highly visible and experience as though all eyes are on me. All those sitting on the sofas are the older teenagers aspiring to sit at the table.

All of the teenagers sitting on the sofas begin to bombard me with a series of questions. Fast and furious probing questions attempting to find out about me as a person, about my social status, religion, position, sexual orientation, marital status, reason for being there and trustworthiness:

“Where are you from?” “Are you Jewish?” “Are you going to live here?” “Are you going to work here?” “What are you doing here?” “Do you have a car?” “Are you gay?” “Do you like women?” “Do you have a girlfriend?” “Are you married?” “How many children do you have?” “How old are you?” “Where do you live?” “Which football team do you support”? (Research Diary, Oct. 2009).

Goffman (1959) observes that the people in the setting gather information to evaluate the competence, attitude and the trustworthiness of the person before them. This is central to what happens next and for any future encounters, the acquired knowledge defines both the situation and the individual – she is what they say she is. For instance, if the group determine the individual as a fink then she is a fink in their eyes and treated accordingly. Perhaps, this is also part of the ‘calculus’ behaviour which is the basis of Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) calculus-based trust. During this crossfire of questions the wannabes covered a lot of topics, but ultimately they were assessing me as a person, measuring me up against others that they know or stereotypes to see if they can count on me being trustworthy or not.

All of a sudden, amid question time a projectile hits me on the left side of my head. The questions stop and all eyes are on me. I look around and see that the guy from the fight ‘Absi’ is

smirking, he is standing close to the table where the young men are sitting. I ask him if he is responsible for throwing the missile (a chilli nut) he only sniggers and looks towards the young men for approval. Absi begins to laugh, he laughs loud, some of the little shites and wannabes start laughing too. The young men however, do not; some of them shake their heads as if in disbelief.

Encouraged by the laughter from the little shites and the wannabes Absi aged 16 years seemed to grow in stature. He positioned his arms out to his sides with the purpose of making his physique look wider. This stance gave the impression that a rolled up carpet could be placed under each arm. Absi seemed to relish in the approval gained from the little shites and the wannabes. Dressed wearing an oversized baseball cap with the peak positioned over his left eye, a hoodie (sweatshirt with hood), sagging jeans revealing much of his underwear, Absi looked directly at me and began to swagger slowly in my direction. Essentially, Absi was trying to convey the message to everyone in the room (including me) that he is 'wide' (broader than what he actually is) and streetwise (rough, tough and hard to bluff). Perhaps this is what Andersen (2000) means when he talks about a person's attitude sending the message that 'one is capable of violence and can take care of oneself'. According to Andersen (2000), this public display conveyed through both intentional and unintentional communication is designed normally to prevent aggression.

All eyes were on Absi, and he knew it, he was playing to the gallery, this was an *opportunity* for him to make an impression to the crowd and perhaps increase his status. Something was about to happen; Absi knew it, the audience knew it (apart from the three women, who seemed oblivious to the unfolding events), and I knew it. After slowly crossing the few metres of carpeted area, Absi stopped walking when he reached the couch where I was sitting. He turned and faced me with his back toward the wall. The crowd were silent; all focused on the performance on centre stage. Absi stood briefly by my side, while he figured out the finer details of his performance. Meanwhile, I was still sitting on the couch feeling uneasy, not knowing what was about to happen and not knowing how to react when it did. Suddenly, Absi got onto the arm of the couch on his knees; perched in a precarious position he held his arms out in front of him as though holding onto something and started to thrust his hips rapidly backwards and forwards while shouting: "this is the best fucking position ever for those with a colossal cock". This performance, taking place only inches from my face made me feel uncomfortable, and I started to

wonder how it would end. How would Absi close the performance, what would be the grand fanarli, the ultimate closing finishing technique? While in such a situation time goes awfully fast and there is not much time to think before you act sometimes instinct kicks and you react.

My reaction was instantaneous it was instinctive something similar to that described by Clifford Geertz in notes from the 'Balinese Cockfight'. In his precarious position, Absi was easy to pull down. By grabbing the hood of his sweatshirt, pulling it forward while simultaneously grabbing the elastic of his visible underwear and pulling it towards his head, it was easy to implement a procedure known as a wedgie. Wedgies do not involve physical pain only short term discomfort and slight embarrassment where briefly one loses composure.

Much to the amusement of the public, Absi let out a high pitch squeal, jumped up onto his feet took a couple of awkward steps forward while adjusting his clothing, turned towards me and said: "hmmm you are ok". He exited the main activity room and headed out onto the balcony for a smoke. The boys sitting closest to me shook my hand and gave 'High fives'. The young men sitting at the table together with Maria nodded approvingly; two or three gave the thumbs up sign. So in a moment I had shot through the third research dilemma of the evening. However, the problem is that things happened so fast that I did not see the wedgie coming myself until it was happening then it was too late to turn back – it needed to be seen through to the end.

Immediately one of the young men signal to me to go over to the table where they were all sitting: "Heyyy can you teach me better English, he asks. "I am not a teacher but we can make a deal to speak English when we meet", I reply. He nods approvingly, and said "cool, that's a deal" and immediately asks "are you strong?" How are you supposed to respond to such a question as a researcher? I respond by saying "HmMMM I used to be".

Instantaneously, he places his arm on the table with an outstretched hand and says "come on" motioning me to put my hand in his for a bout of arm wrestling. All eyes in the vicinity are now focused upon this sporting event. I place my arm firmly against his and grasp his hand. Our eyes meet; we are in a state of what Goffman calls focused interaction. "Are you ready", he asked. I nod my head and say "yes". The bout of arm wrestling begins; he is strong but not strong enough. I win him first with the left and then with the right arm.

"Do you train", he asked

“No not at the moment, but I used to”, I replied

“Want to train with me sometime”, he asked

“Yes that would be great”, I replied

One of the other young men sitting at the table, who I later found out was called ‘Ahmad’ said

“Heyyyy you are Ok and welcome here anytime”.

4.13 The Service Station

Ahmad said that he was just popping out to get some ‘smokes’ and asked if I would be sticking around for a while, since he would like to talk some more on his return. Ceasing the opportunity to take a break from the apartment and to get to know Ahmad a bit better, I asked if I could accompany him to the service station. Absi overheard the conversation and stated that he was also going to the service station to get some food and swaggered over to the doorway “come on” he commanded. On reaching the top of the stairs, there was a whiff of sulphur in the air from recently set off fireworks. Outside, I could hear the sound of whizzing, screeching and exploding as persons unknown set off more. Outside the apartment, two teenagers stood lighting and throwing fireworks at the parked cars (it was hard for me not to confront them about their behaviour) the two boys knew them and exchanged greetings. Albert stood talking to the firework throwing youths for a while, Ahmad and I continued walking towards the service station. After a short while, with fireworks at his heels, Absi caught up with Ahmad and me “they’re stupid” he said. Absi entered the service station approached the counter and ordered a hotdog while Ahmad bought some cigarettes. We left the service station when the cashier handed Absi his hotdog and headed back towards the apartment talking as we walked. “You know they call me the little gangster around here”, Absi said. “No I hadn’t heard that” I replied. “Yeah ... some people are scared of me” he continued. “I can’t understand why ... you seem like a nice bloke to me” I responded. “Do you think so” he replied questionably. “Yes I think so” was my confirming response. Absi went on to say that there had been a lot of activity around him and his family recently involving social workers, teachers and SSP workers. When we reached the mouth of the apartment block it was quiet, the firework throwers had moved on, we climbed the steps back up to the boys club to

continue talking. The evening at the boys club ended with an unexpected bang because the firework duo returned and threw fireworks into the SSP apartment, as a consequence, the club closed ahead of schedule. Unfortunately, the boys club had a brief existence opening only on one more occasion after this eventful night. The local authority shut down the club abruptly and withdrew the SSP employees from the area after persons unknown broke into the SSP apartment one weekend damaging some of the inventory, painting graffiti on the walls and because one of the boys sent Maria the SSP worker a number of threatening text messages via mobile telephone.

4.14 Fieldwork Reflections

Since that eventful night at the apartment, I have had a long-time to think and reflect over what happened between Absi and me. Even though Absi suffered no physical pain he probably suffered short-term discomfort both during and after the wedgie incident. Even though, Absi never spoke of the event it is likely that it was a source of embarrassment to him at the time (and maybe later), therefore, I must have breached some research ethics. However, on reflection I do not know what else I could have done in the situation. Nobody knows what Absi would have done next while perched on the arm of the sofa inches from my face. Moreover, it is difficult to know what would have happened if I had just sat passive on the sofa. Besides, the wedgie had a positive impact on building a relationship both to Absi and the group. Perhaps the sudden, positive contact to the group concerned my overall performance during the course of the evening. A discussion outlined below in the following section leads me to believe that some of the older youths had been observing how I reacted to things all evening. Ultimately, my overall performance throughout the evening was a solid foundation towards the process of building trust with this tightly-knit group.

As outlined earlier in the chapter, Goffman (1953) provides some useful advice about how to go about building trust in fieldwork settings, he notes that to be allowed to interact with the 'locals' researchers must understand the social rules which govern the happenings in the setting and have the ability to predict what is going to happen next, thus responding appropriately. Perhaps I read, interpreted and understood the rules in the setting well enough to predict what was going to happen next and responded appropriately – this would explain the approval that I received from the young men sat at the table and Absi himself. However, this goes against

Goffman's (1953) second piece of advice which concerns practicing continuous 'tact and care' while interacting with locals. Goffman (1953) maintains:

"To participate in interaction without causing others to feel embarrassed and ill at ease requires that one exercise, almost unthinkingly, constant tact and care concerning the feelings of others; to exercise this discretion it is necessary to perceive correctly the indications others give of what they are feeling" (1953:06-07).

However, Goffman's (1953) advice clashes somewhat in this case and implies sometimes by understanding the social rules, predicting the next move and by responding appropriately the researcher can cause embarrassment to someone in the scene.

Goffman (1953) goes on to argue that breaking the local interactional codes could exclude the researcher from participation and the setting. However, after my entrée, the young men did ask me back to Paradise Way and Absi and I built up a positive relationship, therefore, in that context my actions must have been within the local interactional framework. Luhmann (1979) offers a convincing explanation about how my actions can have contributed towards starting the trust making process. Luhmann (1979) argues that: "trust is the generalised expectation that the other will ... [keep up] his personality – or rather, in keeping with the personality which he has presented and made socially visible. He who stands by what he has allowed to be known about himself, whether consciously or unconsciously, is worthy of trust" (Luhmann, 1979:39). According to Luhmann (1979), fundamentally trust involves the general expectation that the potential trustee acts consistently (Luhmann, 1979:39). This means the actions of the other are crucial to the process of trust giving and building; behavioural consistency of the other is the essence of trust giving (Luhmann, 1979). As outlined above by Luhmann (1979), in order to be worthy of trust the other must act consistent from encounter to encounter – (s)he must wear the same mask. Luhmann's (1979) articulation above concerning 'standing by what he has allowed to be known about 'himself' either consciously or unconsciously is remarkably similar to what Goffman (1959) advances in 'The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life'.

Drawing heavily on Goffman (1959), Luhmann (1979) asserts that during every encounter trust is always in the air where actors attempt to present themselves in a trustworthy way, either

consciously or unconsciously, the given impression of the self is essential to trust giving decisions. Luhmann (1979) contends that during the encounter every actor experiences the other through a simultaneous process – each actor makes sense of the situation attempting to fit in by ‘gauging’ their behaviour in accordance to the situation and in harmony with the others (1979).

However, in order to participate in the trust process, Luhmann (1979) argues that it is paramount for actors to participate in social life or at least to show who they are to others in the social environment. According to Luhmann (1979), this is necessary to allow people the opportunity to learn and test the other. Perhaps this helps to shed more light on my experience at the apartment that eventful night in October 2009 since I certainly did participate. Luhmann (1979) continues to argue that in order to gain trust the individual or in my case the researcher must present him or herself as a social identity. Moreover, he maintains that people who remain aloof or present as being unapproachable are not in a position to win trust since they are not available for scrutiny (1979:62). Luhmann (1979) continues:

“Whoever wants to win trust must take part in social life and be in a position to build the expectations of others into his own self-presentation. This is the basic rule. . . The path to trust is by way of entering into expectations of others in a very general loose, way: one can fulfil them better than expected, or in a different way” (1979:62).

According to Luhmann (1979) to launch the trust building process requires the researcher to participate in encounters in the setting showing who (s)he is as a person. To establish trust requires the researcher to wear the same mask in subsequent encounters – a confirming consistency. This has implications for researchers and for others who work face-to-face with people. Fundamentally, to initiate trust building, it is necessary to participate in the setting showing who you are as a person – remaining aloof or presenting as unapproachable does not allow the other to learn and test you.

4.15 Trust Building through Gaming Encounters

Throughout the ethnographic fieldwork, I invested a lot of time ‘hanging around’ and ‘hanging out’, mostly in the community centres in the neighbourhoods. ‘Hanging around’ is a common strategy employed by researchers attempting to gain access to groups and often involves loitering in a place until getting noticed or progressively become included into the group (Bryman, 2004). ‘Hanging around’ can be thought of as a purposeful networking strategy designed to build up relations with people in the setting with the intention of ‘hanging out’. The difference between the two is significant, ‘hanging around’ involves observation and ‘hanging out’ involves participant observation.

In Paradise Way, I had the advantage that I had already met quite a few of the young men of the neighbourhood, so ‘hanging around’ soon became ‘hanging out’. Moreover, another advantage of hanging around the community centres was the table-based games (e.g. backgammon, chess, table football and tennis, pool and computer games). Table-based games provide a perfect context in which to interact with both acquaintances and strangers. The games-room culture is such that players can challenge both known and unknown others “want to play the winner” or the other can legitimately ask to play the winner without breaking the interactional rules. Playing table-based games gave me an excellent opportunity as a researcher to participate along with getting to know the young men, and for them to learn about me (Essential components to the trust building process according to Goffman (1953) and Luhmann (1979)).

Initially, I believed that playing games would help to build interpersonal relationships and basic trust, however, participating in gaming, even as a spectator to gaming encounters went beyond my immediate expectations. Not only was gaming an exemplary method for creating trust and building interpersonal relations, it was an appropriate method for facilitating discussions and ethnographic interviews with interactants. It is necessary to recognise, that both under the fieldwork, and upon reflecting on the fieldwork experience afterwards, while knowing that gaming had been beneficial to building trust and for facilitating interviews, I could not explain why. However, after considering both Goffman (1953) and Luhmann (1979) I can see that participation is an essential part of building interpersonal trust and gaming is a fun method for facilitating participation. Impression management is essential to gaming, where it is necessary as a researcher

to be consistent in your approach to the interactants – a confirming consistency is critical to the trust building process. Moreover, Goffman (1961b) illustrates the ease by which people can adopt a common frame for the interpretation of events while simultaneously explaining the dynamics of gaming encounters. According to Goffman (1961b), games are excellent mediums for bringing people together from diverse backgrounds and breaking down social barriers, at least for the endurance of the game (Goffman, 1961b). Perhaps games can momentarily bridge some social gaps usually more evident in social life outside of the game.

4.16 Framing the Situation and Researcher

Commensurate with Goffman (1959), throughout the fieldwork the young men of the neighbourhoods gathered information about me through observing both my intentional and unintentional communication looking for coherence, and at least on one occasion carried out a background check (calculative trust). As Goffman (1959) observes this information gathering process assesses the value, attitude and the trustworthiness of the person before them. This is significant to the progressing encounter and shapes any future encounters. Following Goffman, after the group has defined both the situation and researcher, rightly or wrongly the researcher is what they say (s)he is. If the group decide that the researcher is a fink, then (s)he is a fink in their eyes and treated accordingly.

When entering most of the sites within the setting people checked me out and sized me up. In essence, they were checking my status, background, reason for being there, sexual and religious orientations and crucially trustworthiness. Ultimately, how the researcher responds to such a mutual investigation paves the way for the rest of the research project. On a number of occasions, I observed firsthand how the young men made sense of my presence and how they defined me using trust as a cultural resource. The following section provides some examples of this behaviour.

During a visit to Paradise Way, on the 26th of October 2009, it was fascinating to observe how some of the young men defined me to others in tune with my own presentation of self. On this cold, overcast October day, I was standing outside the entrance to a building talking to a group of youths huddled around a hookah (water pipe). While we talked, two youths approached

the group. Upon reaching the scene, a strong smell of marihuana suddenly filled the air. One of the youths drew cautiously on a joint (a marihuana cigarette) while at the same time eying me cautiously. After slowly allowing the smoke to escape his lips, he coolly asked the others about me in Arabic. My research diary entry is illustrative:

[Two new youths (unknown) approach while we are talking – one of them smoking a joint, the smell of marihuana fills the air. They eye me cautiously and ask the others about me in Arabic. Omar, one of the dominant members of the group smiles at me, and says loudly in Danish, “Don’t worry about Kevin, he is not dangerous, he is just a student, he is not SSP ... and won’t do anything”. After Omar’s words, handshakes are exchanged along with brief eye contact and epigrammatic smiles].

This brief excerpt illustrates how Omar framed me in a number of ways: 1) student, 2) non-SSP, and 3) non-threatening since he calculated that it was not my job to snitch or to do anything about the youths smoking marihuana. On reflection, I was glad to be defined as a non-threatening to the lads – after Omar presented me the way he did the two new youths appeared to relax. If, on the other hand, Omar had defined me in a threatening way, the situation could have ended quite differently. Essentially, through a combination of his (limited) knowledge of me and a straightforward calculation, Omar could quickly work out that it was not in my best interest to snitch on the marihuana smoking youths. Hence, this could be described as a variation of calculus/knowledge-based trust. Essentially, Omar expressed that I could be trusted in that situation based largely on my social identity as a student. Moreover, through his interpretation of the situation he distinguishes between me and the SSP – he trusts the student but not the SSP workers. This implies that based on his limited knowledge of me in my role of the student, he could foresee that I would not snitch to the police.

In Sunset Boulevard, some of the young men defined me in different ways. To some I was an author or a writer, not too far removed from the presentation of self as ‘outlandish student’ which I presented when entering the neighbourhood. To some of the others I was an outsider to mainstream society, a foreigner in Denmark just like them. This way of defining me was something that I heard on a number of occasions while in Sunset Boulevard. My research diary from April 2010 is illustrative:

[While watching the game play, a group of Somalian youths entered the C.C. through the side door to my right. Through a quick sideward's glance, I could see that Ali (pseudonym) was with them. I had met Ali outside the sports hall at the Inter-school Football Tournament some weeks ago. Ali waved at me and said hello, I returned the greeting with "hello mate", then quickly turned my gaze away and back toward the giant TV screen and pretended to watch the escapades of Luigi and Mario. Meanwhile, I acted as if I paid no attention to the group of young Somalian men who have just entered the building. However, in earshot of them, I could hear that they were curious and asked Ali about me: "Who is that?", "What's he doing here?" In a clear voice, Ali answered "that's Kevin he's a nigga from England, he's an English nigga ... he is ok ... he's a nigga just like us he's ok". They seemed satisfied with Ali's statement and headed towards the kitchen area. However, I used some time reflecting over Ali's interpretation and words chosen to define me. What did he mean by I was a nigga from England and a nigga just like them?]

As reflected immediately above, I used a lot of time reflecting over Ali's choice of words to define me to the others. Eventually, I came to the conclusion that his definition was both positive and endorsing. Firstly, some of the young men that I have met in the two neighbourhoods despite their ethical background often refer to themselves and their friends as 'niggaz' (spelt this way when on sprayed on walls). Moreover, he emphasised that I was English mentioning this twice and said that I was just like them. Finally, he said two times that I am 'ok' which, is a recommendation in the neighbourhood. Therefore, my understanding of Ali's presentation of me is that I am a foreigner, an outsider to the mainstream Danish society, just like them, therefore, ok. I interpret this as a variation of both knowledge and identification-based trust. Essentially, before that day in the community centre, I had only met Ali once before, at a interschool football tournament. However, during the first encounter we had a long verbal exchange about what it is like to live in Denmark as an outsider. Despite that, I am white, and Ali is black we shared a number of experiences, and there were elements where we identified and empathised with one another. Further, during the first encounter Ali said that he had visited London on a number of occasions to visit his brother. In this connection, Ali talked positively about his experience of visiting his brother in London, and talked about moving there in the future.

As briefly mentioned above, during encounters, an abundance of information is available through "sign-vehicles" (Goffman, 1959:32). Sign-vehicles are telling, unique, intimate features of individuals which distinguish them wherever they go. Goffman (1959) asserts that sign-vehicles include features such as "insignia of office or rank; clothing; sex, age, and ethnic characteristics; size and looks; posture; speech patterns; facial expressions, bodily gestures" (ibid). While some sign-vehicles like skin colour are endless, others such as facial expression are transitory and can

vary from one moment to the next (1959:34). While some key facts may be concealed during the encounter, some are outside the time and place of the interaction (Goffman, 1959). Thus, the “true” or “real” attitudes, beliefs, and emotions of the individual can only be discovered indirectly (ibid). However, some permanent sign-vehicles such as the colour of skin or speech patterns cannot be concealed. During the encounter, individuals present assess all the conveyed information and utilise experience from other encounters to match the newcomer to persons already known or more importantly apply untested stereotypes (Goffman, 1959). During this initial encounter, insiders can rely on the information given (verbal) by the outsider or confirm any documentary evidence provided. The latter was experienced during fieldwork and illustrates this point:

[That's really interesting Ahmad [pseudonym], tell me how do you decide who you can trust and who you can't? He turns and looks straight in my eyes and says: "Take you for example Kevin, when you first started coming here we didn't trust you, we didn't know you, you could have been anyone ... can you remember when we had been playing pool for a while you asked me if I wanted to talk one day and you gave me your visit card"? "Well, we have been checking you out from the start ... checking your reactions ... seeing how you react to stuff that we talk about ... ha ha (laughs) when you gave me your visit card I checked you out on the net and could see that you are who you say you are ... that's how I know that you are ok" [Source: Research diary, April 2010].

4.17 Concluding Remarks

This research diary extract gives a unique backstage view of the underlying mechanisms at work when some of the young men decide who they can and cannot trust. It demonstrates a number of behind-the-scene aspects which takes trust to uncover. Clearly, when I first entered the field, the young men did not know or trust me. While they sized me up making sense of my presence and trying to organise me through applying cultural frames, they tolerated my presence. Nonetheless, unbeknown to me, Ahmad (pseudonym) and the other young men of Paradise Way had been sizing me up from the first encounter. After seven months of hanging out in the neighbourhoods, Ahmad revealed the backstage processes of how they had been observing my reactions when we talked and when they talked about “things”. They observed and monitored my physical and facial reactions, checking for consistency between what I said and did (verbal and nonverbal communication). Secondly, they monitored and observed my reactions when they talked about

“stuff” (referring to smoking pot and former criminal activities). Thirdly, they used modern technology to check out my credentials. If my credentials did not check out and if I had shown too much interest when they were talking about “things” or if my face had given me away during our encounters then they would have excluded me from any further interaction. I was totally oblivious to these two processes quietly taking place in the background, and still would have been if Ahmad had not explained about them to me. This is just one example of how the young men of the neighbourhoods actively use trust as a resource to determine others. Trust in the neighbourhoods determines who can or cannot participate in social life; in this sense trust is power.

This implies knowledgeable social actors using a repertoire of tools to assess the trustworthiness of the stranger entering their midst. It was surprising to learn that from the first encounter Ahmad and the others initiated their own research project, gathering information on me – the researcher became the researched. They met me the same way they meet all other strangers entering into their domain – with trust frames. The young men of the neighbourhoods are competent, skilled actors in the art of trust framing. They use trust interchangeably as a cultural frame or resource, a repertoire to define and organise people and relationships.

Trust frames determine the level of interaction between individuals and delineate inclusion and exclusion interaction boundaries. Trust also frames reputation and trust variation afforded to individuals, in this sense, trust is power. Perhaps without knowing the backstage mechanisms at work I would have probably interpreted this situation or experience as what Georg Simmel referred to as the ‘as-if’ element of trust and what Möllering (2001, 2006) refers to as suspension (Möllering, 2006). Trust as suspension, according to Möllering (2006), can be envisaged: *“as the mental process of leaping – enabled by suspension – across the gorge of the unknowable from the land of interpretation into the land of expectation”* (2001:414). However, this leap of faith is not a leap of blind faith as in closing one’s eyes and hoping for the best when taking the leap, rather it is the result of interpretation, coming as far as one can through interpretation then leaping into the unknown. Möllering (2001) asserts: *“interpretation and suspension always combine. In other words, the leap of trust cannot be made from nowhere nor from anywhere, but needs to be made from one of the places where interpretation leads us but whose suitability cannot be entirely certain”* (2001:414).

After considering the processes used by Ahmad and his friends, I find that Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) calculus-based trust provides a more plausible explanation because while they may have suspended judgement about me, they were actively sizing me up and checking me out, which does not leave too much to faith. As discussed in chapter two, calculus-based trust is a situation or experience where both trust and distrust coexist, and where actors at the early stage of a relationship size each other up and check each other out, weighing up the pros and cons of the association. Calculus-based trust (distrust) explains this situation better because the process and tools used by the lads clearly goes past what Möllering (2001, 2006) calls 'suspension'. What Ahmad explained shows an ongoing process of checking for a confirming consistency between given and given off communication as well as checking out my credentials. This shows knowledgeable actors using cultural tools from their repertoire and outside the box thinking by using the internet to check my credentials and background.

Throughout the fieldwork, I encountered cultural tools and framing of individuals through using trust and distrust to organise people and relationships on a number of occasions. After a number of months in the field it became clear to me that trust and distrust are primary frames used by the young men to organise their relationships with others. This became especially visible during early encounters with new people or when new people entered the scene where I was already there. After considering my experience of fieldwork both trust and distrust matter because they are primary frames used by people in the neighbourhoods to define others and organise relationships. Without trust, there is a strong possibility that ethnographic fieldwork would have failed in the neighbourhoods. Further, without trust and a confirming consistency in my conduct as a researcher I would not have made it past frontstage. The conduct of the researcher is critical to gaining and maintaining trust in the fieldwork situation. Trust and impression management go hand-in-hand since the impression projected by the researcher significantly contributes to how people in the setting determine him or her.

Evidently, using impression management to present different sides of the self in different situations is a way to gain access to backstage regions and uncover trust-relations in field settings. Throughout the fieldwork, through consistently presenting the same self to the same people I was able to establish a basic form of trust. To a large extent, trust was conditional based on a

'confirmed consistency' in my performance, and an acceptance of the given impression. In at least one case, the young men of the neighbourhood reinforced trust by checking out my credentials. Throughout the fieldwork, I observed different cultural tools at work to frame people in variations of trust or distrust (discussed further in chapter five). In addition, I observed these tools at play when the young men talked about me to others while making sense of why I was in the neighbourhoods. This illustrates both room for agency and institutionalised variations of trust, i.e. negative stereotyping, strong identity-based trust which poses a barrier to more flexible variations of trust. When considering these institutionalised trust frames, perhaps it would have been difficult for me to perform with 'confirming consistency' in this setting as a researcher if I were homosexual, Jewish or both. Within this fieldwork context, it would be difficult for openly homosexual or Jewish researchers to negotiate the field and to reach the backstage areas of the setting. Likewise, a 'female' researcher would not of being able to visit certain areas of the site and not made backstage. However, being 'male' excluded me from gaining backstage access to women in the setting and other backstage areas that a 'female' researcher could have reached.

5

‘Clashing Frames’

How can trust be understood as a cultural resource and what are the implications for public sector employees who work with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in the community?

How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications?

How can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

5.0 Introduction

In the previous chapter, through drawing on both theory and fieldwork practice, I investigated issues relating to entering and conducting fieldwork in a context of uncertainty. I presented some key issues relating to entering the field as a researcher and the importance of establishing and maintaining trust. The last chapter demonstrates that trust is essential to researchers and others such as youth and social workers who operate in similar contexts, the case of the job consultant, unfortunately, illustrates this all too well. In order to operate successfully and achieve operational objectives and goals researchers, social and youth workers must win the trust of the people in the setting. Further, in the last chapter I presented Goffman's (1959) concept of impression management a key element and necessary to creating and maintaining trust relations where a confirming consistency between the intentional and unintentional communication is essential.

Impression management is necessary for researchers, youth and social workers who want to gain and maintain the trust of the people they cooperate with in the community. As with ethnographic fieldwork, without winning and maintaining the trust of people in the setting there is a risk that youth and social services will fail. Through drawing primarily on “operational” and “presentational data”³ (Van Maanen 1979) gathered during fieldwork, this chapter addresses the questions: How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications, and how can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust? Addressing these empirical question help to answer the problem formulation set at the beginning of the thesis: How can trust be understood as a cultural resource and what are the implications for public sector employees who work with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in the community?

There is one exception to the included data because I include a governmental policy document gathered two months after leaving the field. I have purposely selected this policy because it targets people with minority ethnic backgrounds and the places where many residents with minority ethnic backgrounds live. Including this is crucial because it locates the local authority and its actors in the wider cultural and structural landscape, while illustrating the previous governments framing of people with minority ethnic backgrounds, which is evident in many of its policies regarding immigration and integration. This is crucial to later parts of the chapter where I study attitudes and relationships between local authority employees, and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in so-called “ghettos”. As discussed earlier, many aspects affect the frames that producers use to make sense of and to present images of their social reality. This means that frames or framing change along with the understanding and development of the frame producer. In this chapter, I present four key interrelating findings: 1) Governmental Construction of Distrust Frames. 2) Local Authority Institutionalised Distrust Frames. 3) Trust and Distrust as Cultural Frames. 4) Negotiating Cultural Frames.

The starting point for this chapter is in analysing the governmental policy document before moving onto exploring the relationship between local authority actors and the young

³ Operational data refer to data collected through observing ‘naturally’ occurring happenings, while presentational data refers to data collected in situations (interviews) where interactants potentially can control the impression that they give to the researcher (Van Maanen, 1979). Mostly there is agreement between the operational and presentational data gathered during the ethnographic fieldwork with respect to the key findings outlined in the introduction. In other words, the data gathered through both observations and interviews reinforce one another.

men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Throughout this chapter, I use basic principles from Goffman's (1974a) 'Frame Analysis' as an analytical tool to analyse the text. In this respect, I will identify primary frames and keyings of primary frames, which I will refer to as a variation or a secondary frame in the text. Throughout the analysis, I attempt to identify incidences of what Goffman (1974a) refers to as 'Breaking Frame' and 'Fabrication'. According to Goffman (1974a), frames both inform and control activities allowing participants (and often onlookers) to make sense of the situation. For example, an organised boxing match can be considered as a frame. Boxing matches have a set of rules and regulations which both influence and inform the participants about how to participate. In addition, the same rules guide and inform the onlookers about what is going on and what to expect. However, if one or both participants (or onlookers) do something unexpected, such as dancing instead of boxing when the bell is rang that would be an instance of breaking frame. The same can be said about the interview situation, which can be considered as a frame governed by a set of often unspoken rules and expectations; if an interactant attempts to change the direction of the interview, this can be considered an example of breaking frame.

Fabrications, according to Goffman (1974a) include many different variations and situations both during and after frames, which can create a false impression of what is going on, or what occurred during the frame. In the framework of an interview, this involves frame producers giving false or misleading information in an attempt to mislead the researchers understanding about an event or situation. Throughout the analysis, Goffman's (1974a:08) question behind Frame Analysis: "*what is it that is going on here*" is the basis for identifying primary frames and keyings of primary frames. In addition, the secondary aim of the analysis is to identify the cultural tools employed to create frames around others by the frame producers.

The main focus of the chapter is on the relationships between young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and various public sector employees whom they encounter in and around Sunset Boulevard. The chapter explores these relationships from both the perspectives of the young men and the individual employees. Through drawing primarily on Lewicki & Bunker (1996) and secondary literature reported locally, the chapter demonstrates how different variations of trust are available in the field and how the young men use them interchangeably to draw boundaries around social relations and to obtain group-based (collective) goals. In addition, the

chapter identifies and explores some of the cultural repertoires employed by both local authority actors and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds.

As outlined in chapter two, there are a number of different variations of trust to be found in the literature ranging from calculus-based (weak) to identification-based (strong) trust. After reviewing the literature, I concluded that Lewicki & Bunker's (1995, 1996) adaption of Shapiro et al.'s (1992) model offers the best explanation concerning trust variations and fits with the data gathered during the fieldwork. Therefore, I support Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) model since it offers a more crucial part of an explanation concerning the variations of trust observed during the fieldwork. Lewicki & Bunker (1996) argues there are three variations of trust at play during relationship development: calculus-based, knowledge-based and identification-based.

Calculus-based trust involves a two-way ongoing assessment where the different parties anticipate the pros and cons of creating, sustaining the relationship weighed up against the consequences of severing it. The dynamics surrounding this initial phase of trust building often are irrational, with trusters and trustees driven by different interests (Lewicki, 2006). As discussed in chapter two, I suggest that calculus-based trust is a situation or experience where both trust and distrust can coexist simultaneously. During calculus-based trust, while trusters are more likely to focus on potential risk they simultaneously ascribe high initial trust to trustees as a risk anxiety management strategy, which is an irrational but necessary step towards developing trust (Lewicki, 2006). While trusters focus primarily on risk, trustees have their sights set on the pay offs' resulting from the relationship (Lewicki, 2006).

Knowledge-based trust refers to the confidence in another's predictability, and involves getting to know the other and relies on an intimate knowledge, knowing them well enough to foresee their actions. Identification-based trust refers to a strong variation of trust which involves identifying with the intentions and desires of the other (Lewicki, 2006). Identification-based trust develops when the different parties begin to identify with and understand one another. Rather than viewing trust as a continuum⁴, the dominant logic of the trust literature (see Jones & George (1998) and Dietz & Hartog 2006 in chapter two), I see trust as a cultural frame that knowledgeable

⁴ The dominant logic in the current trust literature is that distrust is the exact opposite of trust. According to this argument a continuum runs between distrust>>>&<<<Trust with different steps leading from weak to strong trust. However, this static view of trust excludes the idea that both trust and distrust can coexist within the same relationship. The continuum concept views trust as a progression along this continuum where the trustee could take a step back into distrust.

actors interchangeably use and key to organise relationships. Moreover, I assume Lewicki et al.'s (1998) argument that both trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship, during the same time and space. I argue that different variations of trust can coexist in the same relationship alongside distrust. Therefore, I define trust as a cultural and social repertoire used by actors in social encounters to frame and key social relations – frames of trust being an institutionalised resource. By institutionalised resource, I mean habitual patterns of actions that social actors often draw upon as a reflex, to approach or deal with everyday issues. Norms and sanctions affect these habitual patterns of behaviour (Abercrombie et al., 1994) that relate directly with roles in society (Levin, 2008). It is appropriate to mention I subscribe to the idea that social actors, through social experience and learning can develop and expand these cultural and social repertoires, something illustrated in the final section of this chapter. This implies a dialectical process between social structure and human agency whereby social structure can influence the actions of individuals, and likewise the actions of individuals can affect social structures.

Defining trust as a cultural and social repertoire implies that distrust is also a cultural and social repertoire used by actors in social encounters in a similar way. Further, following Lewicki et al. (1998) trust in this thesis means “*confident positive expectations*” and distrust means “*confident negative expectations*” (Lewicki et al. 1998:439). I adopt these two definitions because they accommodate the idea that both trust and distrust can coexist concurrently; this is in tune with the process perspective on trust. This means that there are many dimensions to trust (and distrust) like calculus-based, knowledge-based or identification-based. Moreover, this means that knowledgeable social actors use the different sides of trust and distrust to frame (define) social relations depending on the interactional history, circumstances and context. This views trust as dynamic rather than static as portrayed by much of the trust literature. In my view, trust is a complex, multilevel process that involves a host of social and cognitive processes, which we do not fully comprehend – yet.

5.1 Chapter Structure

The structure of the chapter is as follows: In section one, I present finding one: Governmental construction of distrust frames through framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds as

unemployed, deviant outsiders. Section one analyses the previous government's policy document: *"Getting the Ghettos Back to Society – A Confrontation with Parallel Societies in Denmark"*.

Exploring the previous government's attitude towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds is crucial to understanding the attitudes and framing of ethnic minorities by a large proportion of the electorate. The previous government held office for ten years and were strongly influential in setting the 'tact and tone' in the public debate concerning immigration, both prior to and during their terms in office. This attitude towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds is in evidence in the previous government's policies concerning immigration. These policies have consequences both for people with minority ethnic backgrounds and the local authorities that operationalise and administer government policies. Undoubtedly, the previous government's attitude and framing of people with minority ethnic backgrounds aired via the mass media has wider ramifications to how a large proportion of the ethnic majority view and frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds.

As shown later, the attitude towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds, immigration and integration by the previous government and their support party is something a large proportion of the electorate more than likely accept as common-sense, which was necessary for the right-of-center coalition election victory in 2001. This implies an accepted institutionalised perspective rooted firmly in Danish culture. Further, exploring this document helps to locate the local authority and its actors within the wider cultural and structural context while simultaneously identifying the framing of people with minority ethnic backgrounds. As shown later, some of the local authority actors encountered during fieldwork shares similar attitudes and framing of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds as the previous government. Exploring this policy document is also useful for identifying the cultural tools used to frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds by the previous government.

Next, in the second section of the chapter, I report finding two: local authority institutionalised distrust frames. This section explores the attitudes of local authority actors towards young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and how they construct high distrust frames around them. In addition, the section identifies some of the cultural tools involved in this naming and framing behaviour by local authority actors along with some of the tools relied on to work with the young men, which ultimately have implications for trusting and distrusting. The

fieldwork data illustrate how combinations of cultural and structural frames influence the framing of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds by local authority actors. This attitude located in the wider cultural and structural context shapes the distrust frames created by local authority actors around the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds.

In this section, I use both operational and presentational data to substantiate this attitude – operational data includes artefacts from the field such as media reports and local authority documents. During the fieldwork, I systematically collated media reports in relation to the two residential housing estates where fieldwork took place (Paradise Way & Sunset Boulevard). In addition, I systematically gathered local authority policy documents relating to both neighbourhoods and SSP work – I translated all of these documents and entered them into my research diary. I use extracts from these documents to illustrate how some local authority actors publicly create distrust frames around young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard (detrimental to building and repairing trust). Including this data adds another dimension to understanding the relationship between local authority actors and the young men as institutionalised rather than individual practices. In addition, drawing on such data demonstrates the direct link between local authority practice and government policy. Primarily, the data imply a deep underlying attitude of suspicion and deviance towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who must be saved from their “negative social inheritance” in order to be included in Danish society – their ultimate deliverance.

In the third section of the chapter, I report finding three: trust and distrust as cultural frames or resources. The fieldwork data suggest that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from both neighbourhoods use trust and distrust as cultural frames (resources) to organise their relationships with public sector employees. During this process, they rely upon a number of cultural tools such as injustice and justice to create both distrust and trust frames around individual employees. The focus of this section is on the relationship between the young men, a team of youth workers, a police officer and a job consultant in and around Sunset Boulevard. The data show that while the young men distrust the youth workers dubbed the super snitch patrol, who they claim collaborate closely with the police, they still have confident positive expectations towards one team member. In addition, the data show that trust is available to other

public sector employees in Sunset Boulevard, because while the young men distrust the youth workers they still trust a job consultant and a police officer.

In the fourth section of the chapter, I report finding four: negotiating cultural frames – thinking outside of the cultural toolbox. The last part of the chapter looks closer at the relationship between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the job consultant and the police officer to consider how they negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust. Drawing on presentational and operational data along with secondary, theoretical insights reported locally, this section closely explores the relationship between the young men and these two professionals. In other words, this chapter addresses the wider question about what public sector employees need to be aware of when entering such settings in order to initiate, build and maintain trusting relationships, which could make the difference between success and failure in service delivery. The chapter ends with a discussion concerning the implications for practice of these findings and concludes by answering the research questions.

5.2 Part One: Governmental Distrust Frames

The following section briefly explores the previous government's attitude towards and framing of people with minority ethnic backgrounds by exploring one of its key policy documents. The aim is to understand both the 'framing' and the cultural tools used to achieve this. This helps locate the local authority into the wider political context while locating the attitudes of local authority actors into the wider cultural and structural context. The point of departure for this section is in outlining briefly the political context and background for the creation of this policy. This is crucial to understanding both the development of this and other immigration and integration policies and the rhetoric surrounding them under the last right-of-center government (Bale 2008).

5.2.1 Political Context

Denmark is a multiparty representative democracy with a constitutional monarchy (Ministry of Education, 2008). Traditionally, the political competition is between the bourgeois parties on the right and the Social Democratic parties on the left (Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). The oldest

right-wing parties in Denmark are the Liberals (Venstre), and the Conservatives (Konservative) (Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). The third right-wing party is the Social-Liberal Party (Det Radikale Venstre), a centre-right party with some centre-left ideologies regarding issues such as defence (ibid). Historically, the Social Liberals have a long tradition of supporting the Liberals and Conservatives (ibid). However, from time-to-time they defect to support the Social Democrats which can have a significant impact on the balance of power. When the Social Democrats have led governments in Denmark it has been largely due to the Social Liberals 'defecting' from the bourgeois camp (which was the case in the 2011 election). The newest and smallest centre-right party is the Liberal Alliance who holds nine seats in Parliament. On the far right, the Danish People's Party who split from the Progress Party (no longer represented in parliament) in 1995 supports the Liberal Party in most of its policies. On the left side, supporting the Social Democrats is the Socialist People's Party (Socialistisk Folkeparti); and The Red-Green Alliance (Enhedslisten), a communist/socialist party (and currently the Social Liberal Party).

5.2.3 Background to Political Context

The years following the First World War and up to 1929 saw a succession of alternating Social Democrat and Liberal minority cabinets (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). However, in 1929, a coalition between the Social-Liberal Party and the Social Democrats won office and held it until 1940 (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). Following the Second World War, Social Democrats held office either individually or through collaboration with other parties until 1982 where Poul Schülter led a Liberal- Conservative minority government into office (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). During this period, immigration became a political issue in Denmark (Hamburger 1989; in Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). In 1983, a broad majority in parliament passed a new immigration law giving more rights to foreigners which amongst other things made it harder to extradite them from Denmark, while giving from greater opportunities for family unification (Brøcker 1990; in Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). According to Green-Pedersen & Odmalm (2008), this fuelled the debate in Denmark concerning the 'liberal' attitude towards immigration and strengthened the critical voices from the (radical) right-wing. During the same period, increasing numbers of refugees from the Middle East arrived in Denmark triggering an emotional public debate, which eventually led to

a tougher attitude towards immigrants in Denmark (Jensen 2000; in Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). This involved revising and eventually amending regulations tightening conditions for asylum seekers in Denmark (Brøcker 1990; in Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). The growing number of immigrants and refugees throughout the 1990s fuelled support for anti-immigrant attitudes (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). During this period, the Liberal and Conservative Parties radically changed their attitude towards integration and immigration (Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). This became apparent during a debate in 1994 concerning Bosnian asylum-seekers where the right-wing opposition opposed the granting of refugee status by proposing temporary residence permits instead, which meant repatriation for Bosnians after the war (Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). Despite the government's proposal surviving the vote, the debate showed that right-wing parties had changed their position, and discarded previous consensus about immigration (Jensen 2000; in Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008). In 1995, the Danish People's Party emerged from the fractured Progress Party under the leadership of Pia Kjærsgaard and focused almost exclusively on immigration issues (ibid). In 1998, the DPP firmly established itself in Danish politics by winning 7.4 per cent of the vote (ibid). According to Green-Pedersen & Odmalm (2008), after the 1998 election, under the leadership of Anders Fogh Rasmussen, the new party chairperson, the Liberal Party turned their attention towards immigrants as a potential source for votes. Green-Pedersen & Odmalm (2008) argue:

“The pattern of confrontation between the government and the right-wing opposition was sharpened further after the 1998 election. The Liberals, under their former leader, Uffe Ellemann Jensen, had been reluctant to focus on immigration issues, but the new leader, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, realized that immigration could become a central point in the strategy of the Liberals to win government power” (2008:373).

Green-Pedersen & Odmalm (2008) observe a significant change in the Liberal Party Programme concerning immigration and immigrants under Fogh Rasmussen; for example, in 1995 the issue concerned the right of immigrants to preserve their cultural heritage. However, under Fogh Rasmussen the focus changed from rights to demands about which cultural and economic demands Danish society should expect from immigrants. This implies that, under Fogh

Rasmussen's leadership, an ideological change took place moving the Liberal Party position on immigration much closer to the DPP's anti-immigration stance. This became obvious during the run up to the 2001 elections where immigration became the central issue (Andersen, 2003).

For the first time in 72 years, the Liberal and Conservative Parties won enough parliamentary seats between them to make a coalition government without having to rely on support from the Social-Liberal Party (Andersen, 2003). Instead, they came to power with the support of the Danish Peoples Party (DPP) who almost doubled its number of parliamentary seats growing from 13 in 1998 to 22 in 2001. This and the politicising of immigration and integration were the key factors in bringing a minority right-of-center coalition government into office (Andersen, 2003).

5.2.4 Public Consent – Rallying the Troops

However, this move into government by the right-of-center coalition did not happen suddenly, it happened through the approval of the majority of the electorate. This implies a significant shift in thinking and voting behaviour of the electorate who gave their approval for change at the ballot box. Harvey (2005) shows that when new right governments gain power in democratic, capitalist countries, they do so by building a bridge of political consent across a broad spectrum of the electorate prior to the election, which seems to be the case in 2001 Denmark. Andersen (2003) reinforces this point:

“Immigration did not suddenly emerge as an issue in the 2001 election. Unlike in the 1980s when immigration was a ‘flash issue’ that attracted high but short-lived attention, immigration had become permanently salient among Danish voters in the 1990s. In the 1998 election, it was already among the most important issues mentioned, especially among right-wing populists but also among supporters of ‘immigration-friendly’ parties (Andersen, 1999). This unusually high salience of immigration in Danish politics does not reflect a particularly high immigrant population: including descendants born in Denmark, the proportion of immigrants increased from 4.4% in 1991 to 7.4% in 2001, of which only 2.1 and 4.1%, respectively, were of non-western origin (Denmark’s

Statistics, 2001). By comparative standards, such figures are not large, and cannot, as such, explain the high salience of immigration in Danish electoral politics” (Andersen, 2003:188).

Andersen (2003) argues that while the high salience of immigration on the run up to the 2001 election cannot be explained by a high immigrant population in Denmark, it can be explained by other factors such as; the absence of other problems; negative media reporting about immigration; and the presence of two “populist” right-wing parties. According to Andersen (2003), this accumulated into a proper party political immigration competition between the two “populist” right-wing parties, the Liberals and Conservatives.

Harvey (2005), drawing on Gramsci (1971) asserts that gaining consent amongst such a wide spectrum of voters transpires mainly by rooting political ideas firmly into the common-sense mindsets of people. According to Harvey (2005), the basis for common-sense consent lies in traditional routine institutionalised regional or national practices. Strong cultural values can be mobilised to ‘rally the troops’ such as ‘*belief in God and country*’ or fears about attacks from foreigners from abroad or within. Following Harvey (2005), political leaders exert political slogans (cover strategies) to win ‘common-sense consent’; one such strategy involves using the word ‘freedom’, a powerful stimulus for gaining the common-sense understanding of people. Powerful cultural values such as freedom have a trigger function that political elites can squeeze to ‘rally the troops’, which ‘justifies almost everything’ (2005:669). There are plenty of examples to be found about how ‘freedom’ (and other values) plays a key role in the political manifestos of political parties and their slogans. An example from the DPP’s website is illustrative:

“Your Country, your choice – The aim of the Danish People’s Party is to maintain Denmark’s independence, to ensure the freedom of the Danish people in their own country and to preserve and strengthen democracy and the monarchy” (www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Principprogram).

This political slogan solicits the majority ethnic population by reminding them that Denmark is their country where they have the right to remain free. In addition to ‘freedom’, this slogan relies on the cultural values of independence, democracy and the monarchy in an attempt to appeal to, and win the common-sense understanding of likely voters. The message seems straightforward; to

maintain independence, freedom and strengthen democracy and the monarchy in Denmark, support the DPP. However, according to Gramsci (1971), to understand political consent better; one must strip the cultural shell away to reach the political meaning:

“Political questions become ‘insoluble’ when disguised as cultural ones. In seeking to understand the construction of political consent, we must learn to extract political meanings from their cultural integuments” (Gramsci, 1971; in Harvey, 2005:676).

Hence, after stripping the cultural framework away from the political slogan illustrated above, one interpretation could be: ‘Denmark is a country for Danes; the purpose of the DPP is to maintain the status quo by opposing immigration and change while strengthening Danish culture’. However, this is only a rough attempt to verify Gramsci’s (1971) position and should be seen in this light. To win the consent and common-sense understanding of the population requires utilising different means to communicate powerful ideological influences (Harvey, 2005). Gramsci (1971) uses the term hegemony to describe the process of achieving domination of one class over others through political and ideological means. Whilst political power and compulsion are always necessary, ideology in gaining the acceptance of ‘dominated classes’ is probably more critical. The approval of the dominated classes succeeds through ideological domination via social institutions such as the family, places of learning, places of worship, and places of leisure and many others. For that reason, according to Gramsci (1971), ideology attains and maintains hegemony in affluent societies. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that when the right-of-center government came into office in 2001 supported by the DPP, it was on the basis of a long campaign which involved winning the hearts and mindsets of the electorate to obtain a common-sense understanding of their principles and ideology.

The combination of the Liberal, Conservative and DPP collaboration, known as the VKO (VKO = letters allocated to them on the ballot sheet) government, continued after the elections held on February 8th 2005 where they remained in office until the new government took over on the 3rd of October 2011. While the previous government were in office, they implemented a series of policies designed to limit the influx of immigrants to Denmark (for examples see Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). In 2010, one year before been narrowly defeated by a Social Democrat led

coalition the former Danish Government publicly launched its policy document entitled: 'Getting the Ghettos Back to Society – A Confrontation with Parallel Societies in Denmark'.

5.2.5 Policy Frame Analysis

"Today, we have 29 neighbourhoods in Denmark with huge challenges that fall under the heading of ghetto. These are areas where a high proportion of residents are unemployed. Where relatively large numbers of residents are criminals and where many Danes with immigrant backgrounds live"

(Danish Government, 2010:05).

This policy focuses on immigration by targeting the places where high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds live – so-called "ghettos". Up to this point, only parts of the policy have come into play mainly due to the recession and the recent change in government in October 2011. Nonetheless, this policy document is significant since it played a prominent role in the public debate about immigration. The policy document can be interpreted as framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds and the places they live as a "public problem", which the mass media transmitted. This framing can have impacted on how members of the majority ethnic population think about and frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds, and the residential housing estates where many residents have minority ethnic backgrounds. In addition, in light of the recent election result in Denmark where the coalition led by the Social Democrats narrowly won the election by five seats, it seems likely that a large proportion of the electorate in Denmark support this, and similar policies implemented by the previous government.

5.2.6 "Ghettos"

In Denmark, similar to some other western countries, the "ghetto" label denotes the residential housing areas where high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds live. According to the policy under review, these "ghettos" are not part of Danish society because they are "physically, socially, culturally and economically" cut off (2010:37). In Denmark, for a residential housing estate to 'qualify' as a "ghetto", two out of three of the following criteria must be met:

- A) "1,000 residents or more, where the proportion of immigrants and descendants from non-western countries exceeds 50 percent" (2010:37).
- B) "Percentage of 18-64 year old's not connected to the labour market or education institutions exceeds 40 per cent (calculated as the average over the past four years)" (ibid).
- C) "Number of convictions for breaching the Penal Code exceeds 270 people per 10,000 residents (calculated as an average over the past four years)" (2010:37).

First and foremost, this policy frames "ghettos" as hard-to-reach places, remote and isolated from Danish society in almost every aspect. In this imagery, "ghettos" are remote, foreign deviant settlements situated on the outer edges of Danish society. The definition criterion of framing "ghettos" can be interpreted as prejudicial against people with minority ethnic backgrounds. In addition, throughout the policy it refers to people with minority ethnic backgrounds as "immigrants and their descendants" even though many of the same people have grown up in Denmark and hold Danish citizenship. In addition, it is striking how the policy shows its target is people who originate from "non-western" countries and their children. Defining "ghettos" through using people with "non-western backgrounds" in this policy could be interpreted as discriminatory and a means to further isolate and socially exclude them from mainstream society.

Part (A) of the "ghetto" definition directly identifies "non-western immigrants and their descendants" (2010:37) as one of the primary reasons for applying the "ghetto" frame around these particular residential housing estates. Parts (B) and (C), on the other hand, are more subtle by only indirectly implicating people with minority ethnic backgrounds in the "ghetto" definition. All the same this definition can be interpreted as framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds in something, which I interpret as high distrust frames.

After considering Lewicki et al. (1998), I define a high distrust frame as a situation or experience where the frame producer is highly sceptical and wary of the other. In addition, this means the frame producer advocates vigilance, wariness and watchfulness against the distrusted other while they reinforce any weaknesses and prepare to tackle breaches of trust. In other words, the frame producer has strong negative expectations towards the other party and keeps a watchful eye on them while they prepare for possible confrontation. Hence, throughout the thesis when referring to high distrust frames or high distrust framing this is what I am referring to.

The introduction of the policy document frames residential housing areas where high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds live as deplorable, deviant places remote from Danish society. According to the policy, these are places where ‘hordes of unemployed, uneducated, criminal immigrants’ live. When analysing this policy, it becomes clear the frame producers tend to frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust frames. When considering the political background and context for this policy, it is my interpretation that the rationale behind this high distrust framing derives from a mix of both neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideology, which can be subsumed under the heading of New Right⁵ thinking. Neo-liberals, for example, claim individuals intrinsically are selfish, and only act out of self interest; as a consequence, they want something for nothing. It is from this assumption that neo-liberals develop their theory of the Welfare State, which automatically produces idleness, scroungers and deviants’ (Fitzgerald, 1993). Following this doctrine, the Welfare State destroys individual determination because it curbs competitive edge, which is necessary for society to function – as ‘the free market order’ (Fitzgerald, 1993). In other words, following neo-liberal thinking, the Welfare State creates unproductive, idle, good-for-nothing layabouts who only take from society without giving anything in return.

When analysing this document, it becomes apparent the architects behind the policy rely on ‘New Right’ thinking. The discussion about the political context contributes towards explaining the use of neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideas as tools for constructing high distrust frames around people with minority ethnic backgrounds. For the frame producers perhaps, this attitude

⁵ In the 1970’s, a distinctive conservative tradition emerged in the form of the New Right, whose ideology gained impetus in the 80’s under Regan in the USA and in the UK under Thatcher (Heywood, 1994; Harvey, 2005). Scandinavian countries embraced many New Right policies (Harvey, 2005), especially in Denmark, under Anders Fogh Rasmussen from 2001 – 2009. The main explanations offered for the transition to New Right regimes can be found in the increased cost of ‘welfare’ and an unwillingness to pay more tax by the electorate (MacGregor, 1998). In addition, the notion of ‘welfare dependency’ gained momentum, claiming that the culture and values of ‘ordinary people’ are different from long-term recipients of welfare. These are likely to abuse the system, forget the work ethic and a sense of responsibility for their situation (Murray, 1984). The New Right comprise of two separate and possibly conflicting traditions: economic liberalism and social conservatism (Heywood, 1994). Economic liberalism, often seen as the dominant theme within the New Right, draws heavily upon classical liberalism; it advocates minimizing state control and proclaims the virtues of private enterprise, the free market and individual responsibility (ibid). Neo-liberals promote uncompromising individualism, which conflicts, with welfare provision. While the New Right has wished to minimise state influence in economic life, it has advocated the creation of a strong state in relation to public order, social morality and defence (ibid). Neo-conservatives draw attention to the perceived breakdown of order and social stability resulting from the spread of ‘liberal’ values. They highlight the dangers inherent in moral and cultural diversity, propose that traditional values be strengthened, and argue for a restoration of authority and social control (Heywood, 1994).

towards “immigrants” and immigration is second nature – institutionalised behaviour. This implies a deeper underlying phenomenon in Danish culture, which a large proportion of the ethnic majority accepts as common-sense when framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Some of the data presented in the next section of the chapter supports this conclusion.

Through defining “ghettos” and people with minority ethnic backgrounds in this manner can be interpreted as the government constructing high distrust frames both around the residential housing estates and people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds in this manner sends the unmistakable message that the (previous) government has confident negative expectations towards their future actions. This implies the previous government and perhaps a large proportion of the electorate fear that people with minority ethnic backgrounds have malicious intentions towards Danish culture, therefore, must be monitored and managed.

5.2.7 ‘Insiders’ vs. ‘Outsiders’

High distrust framing is visible throughout this policy and starts with the introduction:

“For generations in Denmark, we have built up a safe, prosperous and free society. The crucial binding has been and remains our values: The freedom to be different, equal opportunities for men and women, responsibility for the common good, democracy, respect for the laws of society, a basic trust that we want the best for each other. It is strong values that hold Denmark together, and we should not sacrifice these, but today there are places [Ghettos] in Denmark where Danish values no longer are sustainable, where the rules applicable to the rest of society no longer have the same effect. Such conditions exist today in parts of the neighbourhoods we call ghettos. It is these conditions that we must do away with” (2010:05).

Using ideology and values in this way can be interpreted as a cultural tool used for stigmatising the places where the majority of residents has minority ethnic backgrounds. Using cultural values in this way demarcates a clear division between Danes and non-Danes, between the insiders and outsiders. As mentioned above, this distinction of newcomers is commensurate with discussions

around ideology where establishing 'norms' is a mechanism in maintaining social order and managing conflict (see discussion below with Hall, 1986 & Thompson, 1993). Bringing values into play introduce powerful ideology, which pejoratively frames non-Danes as unbelonging and threatening to Danish society. This seems contradictory since 'freedom to be different' is one of the underlying values outlined in the policy document.

Furthermore, this policy subsumes all people with non-western minority ethnic backgrounds as a homogeneous group and thereby constructs one class of people – the subordinate class. MacGregor (1999), drawing on Murray (1984) in her analysis of neo-Liberalism captures this conclusion eloquently:

“The underdog became reconstructed as the underclass, a dangerous group of undeserving poor responsible for society’s ills, especially lone mothers and the children of lone mothers— young men, especially young black men” (Murray, 1984; in MacGregor, 1999:104).

Reconstructing a subordinate class points out who belongs and who does not belong to Danish society – in other words drawing boundaries around the other. This distinction between Danish and non-western values is a form of 'Othering' normally associated with traditional societies (Rawls & David, 2006).

According to Rawls & David (2006), in traditional societies, the boundary between members of the society and the “Other” was a crucial distinction between insider and outsider. 'Othering' created and maintained social cohesion within the social group; however, it required an easily identifiable other for it to work – someone who could be identified as *'one of them and not one of us'* (Rawls & David, 2006). The concept of belonging is relevant because it is necessary to demarcating insiders and outsiders in relation to the community where the notions of belonging and unbelonging have become a dominant discourse in the public debate (Christensen, 2009). Strong notions of *'them and us'* demarcations define both old and new social divisions and communities while simultaneously defining groups of people outside these communities (Andreassen, 2005; Siim, 2007; in Christensen, 2009). Christensen (2009) argues:

“There is no doubt ethnicity is currently the most striking marker of belonging in the Nordic countries, and it is abundantly clear that arguments and underlying perceptions about ethnicity are constructed in close interplay with other categories, such as gender and sexuality” (Christensen, 2009:22).

Rawls & David (2006) warn against ‘Othering’ and eloquently argue that it is destructive to trust and trust building:

“In this dance between self and ‘Other’ it is essential that no one be “Othered”. Mutual orientation and trust have become essential to interaction. It is a process of overcoming difference through reciprocity, rather than creating difference through exclusion . . . “Othering” destroys this foundation of trust whenever it occurs ... when people are systematically excluded, or rendered in subordinate roles, they are forced to erect boundaries of their own to create protected situations that offer them the possibility of mutual reciprocity and trust within those boundaries. In such cases, loyalty groups that define themselves in terms of who is excluded are likely to spring up and have at least a temporary life” (Rawls, 2000; in Rawls & David, 2006:470-471).

This implies that trust is a process of mutual giving and taking to overcome fundamental differences between diverse groups. Othering, on the other hand, is a one way trust destroying process of social exclusion which leads stigmatised ‘Others’ to raise ‘defences’ to make safe spaces in which they can experience reciprocity and trust. Rawls & David’s (2006) argument helps to shed light on the situation in Denmark surrounding the practice of ‘Othering’ people with minority ethnic backgrounds and their homes. This implies that ‘Othering’ can have significant implications for intercultural relationships and is detrimental both to trusting and the government's policy of “integration”. The implication is, by ‘Othering’ people with minority ethnic backgrounds, the policy of ‘reclaiming’ the “ghettos” is self-defeating and drives an even bigger wedge between the ethnic majority and people with minority ethnic backgrounds.

5.2.8 Reclaiming the “Ghettos” via Assimilation

The policy document continues by stating that “parallel societies” will not be accepted in Denmark and changes are to be implemented to reclaim areas where Danish values have “disappeared” (2010:05). In order to actualise the policy, the previous government promise six areas of change:

- A) Reduce the number of public housing by demolishing and selling “homes” (2010:06).
- B) Change the physical “fortress” nature of “ghettos” by making them more attractive and integral parts of the surrounding community (ibid).
- C) Control the composition of “ghetto” populations: The government has delegated additional powers to local authorities and housing associations to control who can move into the “ghettos”. The aim is to assimilate undesirable residents to other areas of Denmark. The policy document states: *“The goal is to avoid a high concentration of immigrants, their descendants and residents without jobs”* (ibid).
- D) Children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds must *improve themselves* by learning to read and write Danish, complete a secondary education and gain employment (ibid).
- E) Residents who receive “public assistance” must get a job or begin job training (ibid).
- F) A strong police reaction and measures in response to social fraud to help restore respect for the law of the land, make areas safe and more attractive to repopulate the areas (ibid).

The policy points out that the composition of residents in “ghettos” is predominately people with minority ethnic backgrounds and as such skew compared to the rest of society:

“Today, more than six out of ten residents in the 29 ghettos are immigrants or descendants from non-western countries – this is not acceptable. No area must have a predominance of immigrants and descendants from non-western countries – speaking Danish must be the norm” (2010:15).

This implies that the Danish model of integration is an assimilationist model, which requires everyone to speak the same official language and go through a common school curriculum. It is crucial to note that the mass media comprehensively reported this policy document within a political climate of antagonism towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds; as a

consequence, the public debate on immigration has become racialised. In this current political climate, people with minority ethnic backgrounds or rather “Muslims⁶” have become the buzz word for malevolent responses towards immigration.

The policy maintains, in 2009, more than four out of ten residents in the “ghettos” were either unemployed or not in job training, which is three times higher than the national average. Drawing on, what could be interpreted as New Right thinking, the policy states: *“The Government will not accept areas where it is the norm that one depends on the state. It should be the norm that one goes to work and supports oneself”* (2010:15). Evidently, getting the “ghettos” back to Danish society requires two strategic processes:

- 1) Restrict the influx of unemployed residents, “newcomers, refugees and immigrants from non-western countries” (2010:15).
- 2) Attract resourceful residents to the residential areas (2010:15).

It is striking how the language in the policy document changes when it mentions *“resourceful residents”*, when this class of persons appears in the text, *“ghettos”* transform from deplorable into *“residential areas”*. This reinforces the idea that the term “ghetto” only applies to areas where high numbers of people with minority ethnic backgrounds live – therefore “ghetto” is a racialised term.

5.2.9 ‘Assimilating Bilingual Children’

According to the policy, children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds constitute a high proportion of the “ghetto” population (2010:06), therefore, are another target of the policy. For example, children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds *“must improve themselves”* by learning to read and write Danish, complete a secondary education and gain employment (2010:06). This suggests that children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds are subordinate and not up to the same level as Danish children and young people,

⁶ As well as a tendency towards placing all people with minority ethnic backgrounds together as a homogeneous group in Denmark, there is another tendency towards stereotyping this ‘homogeneous group’ as Muslim, despite cultural and religious diversity.

while implying a lack of ambition in relation to education and the labour market. Following the policy, the aim of targeting children with minority ethnic backgrounds is twofold: better integration and regaining sovereignty over these deviant areas because: *“when children and young people grow up in segregated neighbourhoods and parallel societies, it prevents their integration and affects their future”* (2010:06).

The policy implies that attending the same school as high numbers of children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds is harmful for educational development. Under the pretext of helping *“immigrant children to improve”* their education, the government proposes a policy of school assimilation. In other words, the plan is to distribute children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds around local authority school districts to establish a *“more appropriate representation of [bilingual] students”* (2010:22). According to the policy, distributing *bilingual (tosprogede) pupils* across school districts will benefit the entire community since pupils will benefit from the stronger learning environment (2010:22). This implies that too many children with minority ethnic backgrounds in one school are detrimental to learning. The term bilingual (tosprogede) bears a stigma in Denmark where it often appears in the public debate to negatively frame children with minority ethnic backgrounds – *“tosprogede”* is synonymous with immigration and problems.

During fieldwork, in line with government ideology, the local authority in focus was in the process of implementing the policy of school assimilation of children with minority ethnic backgrounds around the local authority school district. The story appeared on the front page of the local newspaper, under the headline: *“Better Distribution of ‘Bilingual’s (tosprogede)”*, the following is an excerpt of the featured article. The reporter’s remarks or spin appears between squares [] while the local councillors alleged comments appear between quotation marks:

[The Child and Youth Committee plans to distribute the local authorities ‘bilingual children’ better in schools and nurseries, than it does today. [Brian – Liberal Party Politician] sees it as a victory for his own and his party’s point of view. *When bilinguals are clumped together in schools and nurseries, it is bad for integration, language development and probably a lot of other things.* That is how it is in a lot of the local authority institutions, but it must change according to the politicians from the Child and Youth Committee who have told civil servants to find out how it can work in practice].

[Brian] “It is a key issue that has finally been taken seriously. We made the suggestion about distributing the bilinguals better back in September 2006, well about 3 years ago, but it was shot down in flames at the time, but now we have asked the local authorities civil servants to propose how we can realise the idea in practice”. [Source: Research Diary: February 2010].

This short extract illustrates the interplay between structure and social actor and how government ideology dissimilates to local authority level and operates at the interface of service delivery. Moreover, this excerpt illustrates how both the journalist and the local town councillor refer to children with minority ethnic backgrounds by the term *bilingual*. This illustrates the stigma attached to “*tosprogede*” in the public debate. This report in the local newspaper publicly constructs a negative frame around children who speak more than one language. The message in the article is unambiguous; too many children with minority ethnic backgrounds in the same school are detrimental to integration, language development and “*probably a lot of other things*”. This not only implies that children with minority ethnic backgrounds are subordinate, but too many in the same space are profoundly destructive. According to Brian, the local authority councillor, assimilating children with minority ethnic backgrounds will contribute to a better learning environment. This places a public high distrust frame around children with minority ethnic backgrounds and implies the local authority has confident negative expectations towards them. The politician’s opinion is thought-provoking and implies that attitudes towards minority ethnic children have changed markedly in the local council over three years.

The policy document continues and informs that local authorities have additional powers to deal with children who have “*severe behavioural or adjustment problems*”. However, the policy does not define what it means to have severe behavioural or adjustment problems. However, young people aged between 12 – 17 years with such problems can be placed on a Youth Order. The aim of the additional powers is to give a “*fast and consistent response to offenders for their actions*” (ibid). The policy suggests that a Youth Order could include things like cleaning up after vandalism or imposing a curfew to control the offender’s movements (2010:24). In addition, the local authority can punish the parents of offenders for not living up to their ‘*parental responsibility*’. As such, parents can be ordered to force their children to comply with Youth Orders. Parents who do not comply with parental orders can face fines of up to DKK 7,500 for each destructive act their child is responsible for and/or every time their child fails to comply with the

Youth Order (2010:24). In addition to the fines, parents can be ordered to attend “*parental training*” (2010:24). This implies that the state requires local authorities to take over the parenting roles and responsibilities for some children and young people with minority ethnic backgrounds who suffer the stigma “*serious behavioural or adjustment problems*” – in effect, state sanctioned paternalism. This gives hard pressed local authorities a new role of social policing and parenting in the so-called “ghettos”.

5.2.10 Summary

Following my analysis, this policy can be interpreted as using both cultural values and political ideas as tools to construct high distrust frames around residential housing estates where the majority of residents have minority ethnic backgrounds. Through its strategic use of cultural values and subtle use of language, it transforms residential areas into “ghettos” – these residential areas become the geographical ‘other’. At the same time, the policy can be interpreted as constructing high distrust frames around people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Following the policy the majority of people who live in “ghettos” are unambitious, unproductive, criminal immigrants’ – the new subordinate class. The emphasis on “*non-western immigrants and their descendants*” implies that people with minority ethnic backgrounds are the problem – outsiders attacking Danish values from the margins of society. In this sense immigration has become racialised in Denmark. The definition criterion of framing “ghettos” is strongly prejudicial against people with minority ethnic backgrounds and stigmatises them.

Reviewing the policy document leads me to believe that framing people with non-western minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust is an institutionalised behaviour, likewise is the cultural tools used in this process. This conclusion contributes somewhat to answering the question set at the beginning of the chapter. ‘Othering’ socially excludes people with minority ethnic backgrounds from social participation while destroying trust; this drives ‘others’ to establish trust sanctuaries. Following Rawls & David (2006), ‘Othering’ is a destructive process that creates distrust rather than trust between groups. This can have serious consequences both to intercultural relations and to the policy of “*integration*” in Denmark. This suggests that the government’s anti-immigration policies over the past ten years have intensified distrust between

Danes and people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Finally, this policy document advances both assimilation and paternalistic policies to *“get the ghettos back to society”* which most probably has the opposite effect. Some of the data gathered during fieldwork supports this conclusion where many interactants with minority ethnic backgrounds expressed anger and distrust towards Danes and the previous government (in office at the time).

This distrust and contempt towards the former government and the DPP is something which unites the accounts given by the employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Many of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds spoke openly about their contempt towards the government and Danish Peoples Party in the neighbourhoods. However, I never experienced employees with minority ethnic backgrounds speaking publicly about the government and DPP while in the presence of Danish colleagues. Nonetheless, even though not part of the interview design, some employees with minority ethnic backgrounds used the interview opportunity to demonstrate this resentment. After reflecting over this behaviour, I consider it to be intentional and not merely a reflex. This comes close to what Goffman (1974a) refers to as *“breaking frame”*. Breaking frame involves changing the events in the frame (interview) into another direction: *“When an individual participates in a definition of the situation, circumstances can cause him suddenly to let go of the grasp the frame has upon him, even though the activity itself may continue”* (1974a:349). Following Goffman’s (1974a) explanation, frame breaking involves individual agency triggered by the situation which causes the individual to break frame. My interpretation of what occurred during some of the interviews is that some of the interactants deliberately ‘broke frame’ during the interview to change the events as a way of reclaiming power and influence. For example while discussing hopes and dreams of some of the young men from Sunset Boulevard, Adem a youth worker with minority ethnic background, began to talk about his own anger about legislation, which had impacted upon him, and his hopes and dreams:

“It is and the boys can’t be bloody arsed with politicians anymore they have lost faith in them because the Danish Peoples Party spoil everything for these boys they come with all possible stupid rules and continue to tighten up on immigrants and foreigners of course these boys just can’t feel at home and there are special rules for them ... there are special rules for Danes and there are certain rules if you are an immigrant ... if you are an immigrant you can’t get married to someone from abroad I have

experienced that myself and it has been a problem for me ... I had to put 60,000 Danish Crowns into the bank before I could get married to someone from abroad ... and that really hit me hard because I have grown up here in Denmark ... I have served my conscription ... I have been in the Danish military and have worked for the state in the local authority and tried to do something good for the Danish society ... and then they come with a special rule for me ... that I can't get married before I am 24 years old ... I have to have 60,000 in the bank ... and then you have 7 years anyway where you have to be careful ... and after seven years then maybe you can get your money back ... if the state agrees you can have it back ... if they acknowledge that she has become integrated ... so these rules also break the boys errr errrr way of thinking they say 'no I can't be bloody bothered' well when you have heard Pia Kjaersgaard [DPP leader] talking about immigration policy ... even I react to it when I see it on television ... every time something comes on TV about Dansk Folkeparti ... I turn it off because I don't want to listen to it ... I get really angry and just think about these immigrant boys if they read something or see something about this and their teenage heads are already filled up with all sorts of questions and problems, confusion and then comes that racist errr ... well maybe not directly racist ... but some of them are racists in the Danish People's Party you have to honestly acknowledge that ... so that breaks a lot of the boys errr what can you say ... possibility to integrate into Danish society ... then they can only be bothered to go round with immigrants because they know that those immigrant boys that they go round with think just like them ... they have the same feelings that they are not acceptable or accepted in Denmark" (Interview: Adem).

During this account, Adem spoke passionately and deeply about his encounter with the immigration law implemented by the previous and continued by the current government, concerning 'Family Reunification'. According to the government, the aim of the legislation is to *prevent arranged marriages in the best interest of young people* aged less than 24 years of age, something which could be interpreted as state sanctioned paternalism. Following Adem's own interpretation of this legislation there is one rule for people with minority ethnic backgrounds and another for Danes. However, in this case the legislation has affected a number of ethnic Danes whereby they face the same strict restrictions if they propose to marry a non-Danish citizen, especially if they come from outside the EU. It is necessary to note different restrictions apply to persons from different regions: Nordic country nationals have the right to enter, reside, study and work in Denmark without a visa, residence or work permit. Likewise, family members can accompany EU and EEA nationals (spouse, registered partner or cohabiting partner, children under 21 years of age or a family member who is dependent on the EU / EEA citizen) for 3 months. If the

purpose of the visit is to seek employment, family members can stay for 6 months (Source: www.nyidanmark.dk). For those who wish to marry someone from non-Nordic or EU countries, to mention just a few, some of the following rules apply:

- 1) Both parties must have reached 24 years of age before a non-resident can move to Denmark to cohabit with their spouse.
- 2) The couple's accumulated ties to Denmark must be stronger than the country of origin (this does not apply to people who have lived in Denmark for more than 28 years or whom acquired Danish citizenship as young children).
- 3) There is a minimum income requirement of twice the welfare benefit rate which the Danish spouse must prove (s)he can provide for the couple. However, the applicant must not have received welfare benefits for one year prior to the application or have outstanding debts to the authorities.
- 4) Couples must document they have a suitable place to live which accommodates at least two people, with at least 20 m² (217 ft²) per person.
- 5) The foreign partner must pass a Danish language and knowledge exam.
- 6) The foreign partner must have obtained 60 points, if both spouses are over 24 years. However, in situations where one or both partners are less than 24 years 120 points must be achieved.
- 7) When the younger spouse is at least 23 ½ years, they may submit an application for family reunification on the basis of completion of 60 points. The Immigration Service can review the case, but cannot issue a permit before both are 24 years of age and the number of required points achieved. Points can be achieved on the basis of different criteria including work experience, language skills and completed education. In addition, applicants who decide to go ahead and apply to get their partner to Denmark must pay eight thousand (8000) Danish Crowns for the privilege of applying. Likewise, the couple must pay one thousand, seven hundred and seventy five Danish Crowns if they wish to extend the temporary resident permit in relation to family reunification. The immigration service's charge a fee of 770 Danish Crowns for decision appeals a decision, or requests to reopen an application.

Adem's account implies that he and other young men with minority ethnic backgrounds have lost faith in politicians because of the actions of the DPP. His explanation implies young men with minority ethnic backgrounds cannot feel safe in Denmark because of the tightening legislation, which targets people with minority ethnic backgrounds. My interpretation of Adem's account is he feels betrayed by the Danish government and unfairly treated. This transpires as he explains about the run in with the immigration policy and contrasts this with being a citizen in Denmark, serving queen and country and holding down a full-time job. The sense of betrayal and injustice is visible during this part of his account. In addition, Adem's own interpretation implies the perception of feeling unwelcome in Denmark acts like an adhesive bonding young men with minority ethnic backgrounds closer together as opposed to integrating them into society. Seen in this light, the restrictive legislation seems counterproductive to ideas around integration and even assimilation.

Some European and international organisations have serious concerns that this legislation is in breach of human rights legislation (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-12366676>). An expert in European Legislation, Professor Margot Horspool, says that the restrictions on marrying foreigners *"almost certainly break European Union law in respect of discrimination as to ethnic origin, and possibly as to age" (ibid), and may breach EU legal protection of "the right to family life" (op cit)*. This legislation exemplifies how the government intrudes in the private sphere of Danish citizens, from both ethnic majority and minority ethnic backgrounds that have the common desire to marry a non-Danish citizen. The government decides the age a citizen or resident can marry a foreigner; the nationality and level of education of the potential spouse; the suitability of accommodation; and decide what additional costs are appropriate for the privilege of applying to bring ones future spouse to Denmark.

5.3 Part Two: Local Authority Institutionalised distrust

"Frames are organising principles that are socially shared and persistent over time, that work symbolically to meaningfully structure the social world" (Reese, 2001).

From the perspective of local authority actors, located in the wider cultural and structural context, this part of section one explores the tenuous relationship between the local authority and young

men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in Sunset Boulevard. The section closely explores local authority representative attitudes and how they create high distrust frames around the young men. In addition, this section looks at how these attitudes transpire into daily social practice.

In line with the policy outlined above, the fieldwork data consistently shows a dominant negative attitude towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds with few exceptions, which suggests this, is an institutionalised phenomenon. In addition, during fieldwork, most of the local authority interactants framed the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust, which reinforces the idea that this is an institutionalised happening. Institutionalisation implies the process whereby social practices become habitual and repetitive (Abercrombie et al., 1994). In other words, some aspects of the social order become widely accepted and organised (Levin, 2008). Institutionalisation signifies the process whereby institutions influence social actors and social actors through changes in social practice modify existing institutions and create new variations (Abercrombie et al., 1994).

In relation to this thesis, this means the attitude towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and ways of framing them over time have become accepted normal daily practice; however, this attitude could change over time. Reese (2001) argues over time frames become shared organising principles that people use to give meaning to and to organise the social world. This implies an intimate relationship between frames and other cultural resources. Therefore, when doing Frame Analysis, it is crucial for researchers to be aware of and deal with the diverse range of culture (Young, 2010). Following Young (2010), researchers must consider norms, values, ideologies, practices, myths and narratives that frame producers are aware of and can access to create frames along with the institutional context, in which they appear, to explain how and why certain frames transpire. These must be considered because often the cultural resources available to frame producers constrain frame production, which is particularly relevant to this study. In the case of the youth workers, for example, there can be any number of interweaving cultural and institutional factors, which predispose some frame construction and exclude others in the context. The same can be proposed in relation to how framing manifests into their social practice. When considering the youth workers, potentially they can be susceptible to any number of institutional influences such as education, legislation, union rules, peer pressure,

management pressure and institutional rules & practices. In addition, many cultural resources such as ideology, values, myths or other popular beliefs in society which they accept and take for granted as common-sense can affect their frame construction. This coincides with Dominelli (1988) who argues that the social worker–client relationship does not take place in a vacuum since popular beliefs in wider society influence practitioners. This implies that norms and values in professional practice are largely a reflection of majority thinking. This seems to be the case of the local authority actors in question who share a common understanding of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds of Sunset Boulevard as deviant others. In addition, there seems to be an over reliance on neo-liberal thinking to construct high distrust frames around the same group of young men which reinforces this idea.

Following this discussion, I suspect the attitude towards young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and frequent deprived residential housing estates is not exclusive and unique to actors of this local authority. I have experienced similar attitudes towards young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in other Danish, local authority's. Perhaps this attitude is part of deeper underlying norms and values embedded in the structure of Danish culture towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Maybe this attitude reflects and maintains this dominant view of people with minority ethnic backgrounds which is a key component of power relations and social injustice.

Set in this wider cultural and structural context, the local authority representative's distrustful attitudes towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and frequent Sunset Boulevard can be described as institutionalised paternalistic distrust. Largely, this transpires through the idea that the young men are primitive deviants, in need of close monitoring and control, to save them to from their deviant ways so that they can join mainstream Danish society. Some local authority actors see 'joining' Danish society as deliverance itself for out of control deviants'. This view of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds can be linked to the wider political context and through the uncritical use of self reinforcing "pseudo theory" such as "Social Inheritance" (Ejrnæs, 2008:141).

Paternalism involves interference with a person's independence or self-determination on the basis that intervention is in 'his or her own best interest' (Clark, 1996; in Clark, 1998). To behave paternalistically means to intervene on the grounds of someone's interests without his or

her fully informed consent (Clark, 1996; in Clark, 1998). The fieldwork data suggest that a commonly shared opinion amongst local authority employees is that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and hang out in Sunset Boulevard are deviants who must be saved from their “negative social inheritance” in order to be integrated into Danish society. However, these efforts and measures to ‘integrate’ these young men with minority ethnic backgrounds into Danish society often take place without their informed consent. Most encounters between local authority actors in and around the neighbourhoods are not always through choice or acceptance by the young men. Furthermore, the fieldwork data strongly suggest that local authority actors create high distrust frames around these young men and their relationships with them and this attitude and the nature of framing the young men can be found at all layers of this local authority.

I observed this paternalistic attitude firsthand during the ‘kick-off’ conference in November 2009, the launching pad for the local authority’s prestigious integration project. During this important gathering, leading figures from the local authority identified young men and teenagers who reside in and hang out in Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard as the target for criminal preventative measures as part of integrating them into Danish society. The aim of this seminar was twofold: 1) Inform about the aims and objectives of the four year project. 2) Brain storming in relation to operationalising crime prevention in the two neighbourhoods. It is pertinent to note that all participants of this gathering were either local authority middle managers or frontline workers. The local authority organisers of the conference did not think it necessary to include partners from outside agencies, the residential housing estates, and more importantly “service users”. I observed this lack of ‘service user’ inclusion throughout fieldwork where local authority actors exclude, rather than include the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. This reinforces the principles behind paternalism, acting on behalf of someone without his or her informed consent.

5.3.1 Doris & Tine

During the ‘kick-off’ seminar, both the Director of schools and social services [Doris] and the integrations project manager [Tine] stated on a number of occasions that the young men of these

two neighbourhoods are the subject of criminal preventative efforts because of the necessity to break the cycle of “*negative social inheritance*”. My research diary from the 20th of November 2009 is illustrative:

[Doris, (area director) kicked off the ‘kick-off’ seminar by stating the target for the integration project is the young men of both [Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard] in an attempt to break the cycle of negative social inheritance. According to Director Doris, these “trouble makers” have inherited their problems from their parents and grandparents and this negative cycle of inheritance must stop. Throughout the conference, project manager Tine also referred to the target group in light of the theory of “negative social inheritance” reinforcing the idea that it applies exclusively to ethnic minority groups. For example, she said that many of the young men from ethnic minority families leave school without qualifications and “we must break this negative social inheritance”. This focus on ethnic minority families and negative social inheritance features also in the project description handed out at the conference. Under the heading “vision” the document states: “The Local Authority wishes New-Danish (nydanske) children and young people to break with the negative social inheritance and be included in Danish society”] (Source: Fieldwork Research Diary, November 2009).

Both the given and given off (written) communication around this seminar implies that the target group for the local authority’s intervention is deviant and outside mainstream society – outside Danish society. Additionally, during the “kick-off” conference there was an over reliance on the theory of “*Social Inheritance*” (“*Social Arv*”: also known as: “negative intergenerational transmission” or “social legacy”). This dubious theory involves the idea that children inherit deviance from their parents and spread it to their children (where this pattern of deviance generation continues through future generations). This is problematic for a number of reasons: Firstly, it implies that children of non-Danish families are inferior since they inherit the ‘fundamental social flaws’ of their parents. Secondly, “*Social Inheritance*” fails to take into account oppression and discrimination at all levels in society, which might explain the marginalisation and disadvantaged positions of people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Thirdly, “*Social Inheritance*” excludes agency, i.e. the ability to think and act for oneself, and fourthly, there is a serious flaw in the influential theory of “*Social Inheritance*” (Ejrnæs, 1999; Ejrnæs 2006; Birch & Ejrnæs, 2006; Ejrnæs 2007 and 2008; Iovanni & Pringle, 2008).

The origin of Social Inheritance lies in a PhD thesis chapter by the Swedish Child Psychiatrist Gustav Jonsson entitled: "The Extended Theory of Social Inheritance" (Ejrnæs, 2008a). This paved the way for a popular book published in 1969: *The Social Inheritance (Det sociala arvet)*. The underpinning assumptions of Jonsson's (1967, 1969) theory can be summarised under the four following suppositions:

- (1) Through a combination of genetic and social inheritance people inherit deviance/crime from their parents.
- (2) Deviance reproduces deviance.
- (3) Deviance grows in prevalence from generation to generation.
- (4) Deviance grows in severity from generation to generation (Jonsson 1967:222-225; in Ejrnæs, 2008a).

Some researchers in Denmark have criticised Jonsson's theory of "Social Inheritance" as lacking both empirical and theoretical evidence (Nørrung, 2004; Ejrnæs, 1999, 2006, 2007, 2008) and as being socially deterministic (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008). Iovanni & Pringle (2008) argue:

"The concept of social arv is immensely powerful in the dominant public, academic and policy discourses around social disadvantage. This can be contrasted with discourses in other countries. In Sweden, too, social arv is used explicitly though perhaps not to the same extent as in Denmark even though its origins as a social science concept lie largely in the works of the Swede Gustav Jonsson. In the UK, the explicit use of the concept "social inheritance" in official documentation would be regarded as wholly unacceptable on the grounds that it implies a degree of social determinism not supported by social science" (Iovanni & Pringle, 2008:20-21).

This implies that the practice of applying this dubious theory to social practices is universal in Denmark and dominates social research, policy and practice. Ejrnæs (2008a) eloquently outlines this social inheritance triangle:

“Social inheritance is used in political arguments, in research on child and adolescent development, and in professional considerations by practitioners to intervene in social problems. It mutually affects these three factors together; politicians allocate funds to researchers to investigate the “social inheritance” and practitioners work to “break the social inheritance”. Researchers deliver findings about “social inheritance” this influences practitioners to use the concept as professional concept and leads politicians to legitimise political initiatives to “break the social inheritance” (Ejrnæs, 2008a:06).

This implies that discourses on “Social Inheritance” are highly influential in relation to the direction research takes, the initiation of projects by politicians, and last but not least how practitioners meet and deal with children and their parents. Following Ejrnæs (2008a), the social inheritance discourse is powerful and can lead practitioners to stigmatise children as losers. The significance of the social inheritance discourse is that researchers and politicians construct and reshape it and practitioners subsequently consciously and unconsciously apply it as a means of assessing children and their parents (Ejrnæs, 2008a).

Further, practitioners apply the logic of social inheritance in their dealings with colleagues and interdisciplinary partners; this legitimises the underlying principles behind social inheritance while reinforcing its use as a professional concept. The use of “Social Inheritance” in Denmark has serious implications for both social research and social work practice. Ejrnæs (2008) illustrates this:

“Politicians, unfortunately, have commissioned much research on child development and have dictated the research theme ‘social inheritance’. Researchers have uncritically maintained social inheritance in the mistaken Jonsson sense as “heritage problems” that partly legitimises a concept that can be used on anything that affects child development. The result is that scientists have contributed to a vague and ambiguous concept and passed it on to practitioners as a professional, scientific concept for use in work on child development. Thus, politicians and scientists have helped to maintain a concept that is vague and ambiguous, i.e. pseudo-academic that stigmatises and demonizes children and individualises problems that hinder recognition and respect within educational work. Finally, the researchers allowed the emergence of a new myth about how to

eliminate inequality in society" (Ejrnæs, 2008a:13). The over reliance of "Social Inheritance" in Denmark implies that it is an institutionalised practice and as such is a cultural tool heavily relied on by childcare and youth professionals to frame children and young people whom they encounter through their work. Generations of researchers, politicians and professionals uncritically pass this questionable theory to the next. This suggests a systematic top-down and bottom-up practice that continuously maintains, legitimises and reinforces itself. As such "Social Inheritance" has become accepted daily practice and achieved commonsense status in Denmark amongst many researchers, politicians and practitioners. In addition, "Social Inheritance" can be viewed as a cultural resource relied on habitually by professionals to work with vulnerable groups in society.

Fairclough (2002) reinforces the argument that ideologies rooted in discourse are most effective when they become accepted daily practice or 'norms' (ibid). Hence, ideologies are of immense importance in relation to maintaining, recreating, and transforming power relations in society. Ideologies maintain power relations in society by making them legitimate and user friendly. Thus, by incorporating ideologies into the daily lives of people, over time they achieve 'commonsense' status in social practice and maintain power relations. Further, this implies that some 'researchers' have uncritically and unquestionably jumped through hoops to appease political masters and raises serious questions about the reliability and validity of some social research that unquestionably views "Social Inheritance" as certain 'truth'. Moreover, this suggests that the application of the theory of "Social Inheritance" is discriminatory, oppressive practice that *stigmatises* children and their families. Perhaps, applying the principles of "Social Inheritance" is part of the problem of creating social inequalities in society, as opposed to being part of the solution of eradicating them.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to underscore and acknowledge that professionals in local authorities can only use the tools they have at their disposal. In this matter, "Social Inheritance" is a deeply embedded institutionalised cultural tool handed to practitioners from researchers and as such carries a lot of weight. "Social Inheritance" is a central component of the socialisation process for many childcare professionals during their training/education in Denmark. Therefore, "Social Inheritance" can be considered to be a central tool in the cultural toolbox of professionals used to explain and organise social problems and models of intervention. In this respect, "Social Inheritance" is appealing because it seems to have explanatory power with regards to certain

groups of people in society. Hence, it is appropriate to underscore that practitioners use principals from “Social Inheritance” because they have a strong desire to help people and make a positive difference in society – not because they intend to stigmatise and discriminate. Perhaps it is time for schools dedicated to teaching childcare professionals in Denmark to evaluate the professional toolbox and revise “Social Inheritance”.

The ideology behind paternalistic principles and “Social Inheritance” concerns maintaining and reinforcing social cleavages in society which is essential to maintaining power structures and relations. According to Thompson (1993), ideology and power go hand-in-hand whereby ideology the power of ideas functions as a mechanism to maintain power relations in society. Hall (1986) argues: *“ideology helps to maintain social order because it is part and parcel of the power relations in society – it influences how power works and how conflict is expressed and managed”* (Hall, 1986:06; in Thompson, 1993:25). Ideology works in different ways and relies on a number of ideological mechanisms such as establishing ‘norms’ (Thompson, 1993). Thompson (1993) argues that ideology establishes what is normal and what is abnormal, hence, ideology defines deviance.

Through applying the theory of social inheritance, the local authority in focus, define the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds as abnormal, deviant and as such legitimise the use of discriminatory and oppressive practices. Discriminatory practice involve the unjust or unequal treatment of individuals who belong to vulnerable, powerless groups in society, oppressive practice often ignores rights, therefore, denying citizenship (Thompson, 1993).

This institutionalised paternalistic distrust, the leitmotif of the local authority’s policy, reflects a view of themselves as missionaries – missionaries who must reach out to the deviants in these residential housing estates to convert them into upright, decent individuals – worthy to be included into Danish Society. This attitude that views the young men of these two neighbourhoods as deviant can be found at all levels of the organisation – from politicians down to middle management and to frontline employees. During the fieldwork, this attitude was particularly noticeable in the local public debate amongst councillor candidates, on the run up to the local town council elections in the autumn of 2009. Some councillor candidates made this attitude towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard known publicly to potential voters via the local media.

5.3.2 Anders

As Anders, a local town councillor and MP representing ⁷Liberal Alliance, stated during a TV interview when talking specifically about the local authority's new integration project in relation to the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds of Sunset Boulevard:

"We are now using 23 Million Crowns in cooperation with the Minister for Integration in a large preventative project ... all thirty errr ... have been identified and we know who they all are ... they will be followed individually every single one of them ... there are individual plans made ... and it must be that way, they must be part of society, that is the solution" [Town councillor: Source: Research Diary November 2009].

Anders framing of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and their relationship to Danish society corresponds to the high distrust frames used in the policy reviewed above. When broken down into utterances, it is possible to see how Anders publically constructs a high distrust frame around at least thirty young men of Sunset Boulevard:

- 1) *We are now using 23 Million Kroner in cooperation with the Minister for Integration in a large preventative project.* Firstly, during his TV appearance Anders failed to mention that the "integration project" also covers 'Paradise Way' and runs over four years. Therefore, spending 23 Million Kroner (around 2 Million GBP) on "30 troublemakers" in one district sounds like a lot of money. It is essential, however, to remember the context in which he makes his statement: it is election time and he wants to give the impression that he in cooperation with the government that he represents is doing something about 'these deviants'.
- 2) *'All 30 have been identified and we know who they all are':* this is where the suspicion in this distrust frame starts to emerge. This utterance suggests that a great deal of watchfulness and vigilance have taken place in order to identify these 'deviants', all part of a strong defence and principal components of distrust according to Lewicki et al. (1998). To identify and register thirty young men as deviants takes a lot of behind the scenes

⁷ The point of departure for this party was as opposition to the influence of the Danish People's Party in Danish politics. In 2007, the party emerged prior to the election under the name 'New Alliance' where they won five seats in parliament. However, after the 2007 election they changed their position and adopted classical and economic liberalism and moved towards the centre-right changing their name in August 2008.

multiagency intelligence gathering. However, to compile a list of suspects seems to go against the presumption of innocence principle which considers a person innocent until proven guilty. Moreover, this practice of compiling lists or databases of suspects goes against the principles set out in the Danish Personal Data Protection Legislation (Persondataloven). Amongst other things, under Paragraph 27 (§27), the police must not pass on information leading to the identity of reported suspects or those charged with offences before the case appears before the court. Moreover, under the data protection act, anyone on such a list has the right to: a) see the information, b) be informed that data collection is taking place, c) delete and/or make changes to any incorrect information.

- 3) *'They will be followed individually every single one of them, there are individual plans made'*: This reinforces the suspicion in the distrust frame and injects fear, scepticism, and cynicism along with more vigilance, wariness and watchfulness into the frame. "They will be followed" sounds ominous, threatening, controlling and extremely oppressive, maybe something more commonly associated with totalitarian societies. Moreover, when put into perspective following at least 30 young men around Sunset Boulevard twenty four hours a day, seven days a week does not seem doable and would quickly deplete the twenty three Million DKK. In addition, when considering that this statement was made on local TV, this further adds to the stigmatisation of Sunset Boulevard as a place where deviant criminals who require constant surveillance live.
- 4) *'They must be part of society that is the solution'*: The final part of this utterance is embedded with ideology which places the young men of Sunset Boulevard outside the norms of Danish society which seems bizarre when considering that crime and civil disobedience is not exclusive to people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Similar to the language used in the government policy document outlined above and in the communication given and given off at the kick-off seminar, this public utterance placing the young men outside of society legitimates the use of oppressive methods. This is much in tune with Thompson (1993) when he argues that ideology is the power of ideas which functions as a device to define what is normal and abnormal in society. Therefore, by stating *'they must be part of society'* places these young men both outside the 'norms' of Danish society and paves the way for oppressive methods. One is left wondering how closely following thirty young men around Sunset Boulevard is going to achieve the solution of inaugurating, integrating or even assimilating these young men into Danish society.

5.3.3 Margret & Aydin

During a newspaper interview, Margret a town councillor representing the Social Democrats while making comments about problems in Sunset Boulevard publicly constructed a similar frame to the one above created by Anders. Similar to Anders, Margret's opinion about the young men and Sunset Boulevard carries a lot of weight in the local public debate. However, in contrast to Anders, Margret has a dual role in the local authority and towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, hence more power. Margret's dual role involves two prominent positions:

- 1) Chairperson⁸ of the Committee⁹ for Labour and Integration.
- 2) Manager (gatekeeper) of the local youth club and for the youth work team known suspiciously by the teenagers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds as the 'super snitch patrol'.

In the role of committee chairperson, Margret has some influence on the local authority's efforts and measures concerning the labour market and integration of "immigrants" into the local community. In addition, as the spokesperson for the Committee on Labour and Integration, Margret has an impact on the public debate concerning integration and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in the local authority. As the manager of the Youth Club, Margret has a powerful gatekeeper function concerning the inclusion and exclusion rules, this includes the rules regulating behaviour for both young people and staff within the club. In other words, she has influence and discretionary power concerning who can or cannot use the club along with grounds for exclusion. Additionally, she has some influence with regard to the modus operandi of staff within the confines of the club, and when they undertake outreach work in the local community. It is worth mentioning that Margret is highly visible as a manager, and regularly

⁸ "Although constitutionally only first among equals", the chairperson plays a crucial role in establishing the relationship between the elected council and the local authority department (Daniel & Wheeler, 1989:33). Facilitating the committee's business is only part of the chairperson's responsibilities, for just as the council delegates to a committee, the committee delegates to the chairperson and director. In practice, the committee is too cumbersome to oversee the operation of a department; hence cooperation between committee chair and director achieves this (Daniel & Wheeler, 1989).

⁹ "If the council meeting is the 'theatre' of local government, then its day-to-day workshop is the committee" (Daniel & Wheeler, 1989:30). While many decisions taken by the committee have to be formally ratified by the full council before taking effect, for practical purposes it is the committee who make decisions (Daniel & Wheeler, 1989).

visits the club when not scheduled to be there; this is something I observed on a number of occasions during fieldwork. In addition, she participates in both planned and spontaneous 'outreach' activities, which includes attending 'callouts' triggered by fire-raising in Sunset Boulevard (discussed further below). However, while Margret plays a central role both in the club and on the streets it is necessary to acknowledge that her employees also have discretionary power at the face-to-face level of service delivery, there is a rich body of literature on the decisive role that frontline employees play in the implementation of services and policy. This level often referred to as the street-level of bureaucracy in the literature shows amongst other things how the self-interests, values and norms of frontline employees often affect the implementation of policy and service delivery through discretionary powers (e.g. Lipsky, 1980, 1984; Scott, 1997; Hasenfeld, 2000; Keiser, 1999; Keiser et al. 2002; Riccucci, 2005).

In addition, Margret in partnership with her team has the responsibility to conduct 'outreach work' with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard where the goal is to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour. However, if Margret and her team's efforts are to make an impact on crime or antisocial behaviour research shows this requires trust and trusting relationships between Margret, her team and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and hang out in Sunset Boulevard. There is a wealth of research, which documents the critical role that trust and trusting relationships play in the successful delivery of social and youth work services. Much of which shows developing trusting relationships between frontline employees and 'service users' is crucial to engaging in reactive and successful service delivery and takes time to develop (Hoggarth & Smith, 2004; Davies, 2010). Building rapport and trusting relationships are essential to successful outreach and detached youth work (The International Network of Social Street Workers, 2009; Andersson, 2011). Trust and trusting relationships more than often are a must for young people to acquire the courage to try new activities, develop new relationships and seek and accept support; put simply, youth workers have to win the trust of young people before they can implement successful service delivery (Davies & Merton, 2009). Gibson (2011) reinforces this point and argues that the goal of outreach work is to *"create trust and respect that will lead to further contact with social service institutions"* (2011:13). Valentine & Wright-DeAguero (1996) findings support this conclusion, during their study, they found that the first encounter between outreach workers and 'service users' was crucial in

determining whether the relationship progressed beyond the initial meeting (1996). Klitgaard (2009) advises street workers to adopt an honest approach towards young people when undertaking outreach work in the local community, this is necessary to build positive trustworthy relations, which must be achieved if young people should consider alternatives to hanging around the street.

According to Klitgaard (2009), outreach workers must win the young person's confidence to gain access to enter backstage areas of their life. Gaining young people's trust can take several weeks or months, and it takes often even longer to inspire a young person "to change" (ibid). It is only when young people become motivated that measures succeed in helping them to move in the "desired direction" (Klitgaard, 2009). Apart from the paternalistic aspects evident in Klitgaard's approach, she identifies the paramountcy of winning the trust of young people, which needs to be achieved before workers can begin to work together with young people to tackle any social issues as well as working towards organisational goals and objectives, which seem to be intrinsically related.

This implies adopting an ethical approach is essential to building trusting relationships with young people. Building trusting relationships with young people is prerequisite to gaining access to the backstage areas of their lives, which is paramount to gaining acceptance to cooperate with them. In addition, building trust takes time as does motivating the young person to work towards alternatives to spending life on the street, which essentially requires the outreach worker to maintain the trusting relationship which requires time and patience, otherwise its back to square one. Perhaps Solomon & Flores (2001) account of "trusting" is a useful way of framing the above accounts, which seem to mix dimensions of trust and trustworthiness together. Perhaps, their idea of trusting is valuable in shedding more light on the explanations above and helpful for framing other accounts in this thesis, and in other work, which mixes dimensions of trust and trustworthiness together:

"Trusting is something that we individually do; it is something we make, we create, we build, we maintain, we sustain with our promises, our commitments, our emotions, and our sense of our own integrity. Trust is an option, a choice. It is an active part of our lives, not something that has to be there from the beginning, or that can be taken for granted. It involves skills and commitment, not

just good luck or mutual understanding . . . trust is not merely reliability, predictability, or what is sometimes understood as trustworthiness. It is always the relationship within which trust is based, and which trust itself helps create” (Solomon & Flores, 2001:05).

This implies that trusting is an active micro-process experience, something which individuals negotiate at the face-to-face level through agency and through using multiple competences. Trust is the basis for the relationship, and the relationship is the basis for trust, which takes talent, and investment to maintain. Therefore, once achieved trusting should not be taken for granted, rather just like the relationship trust and trusting needs to be worked at to maintain and sustain.

The idea that developing trusting relationships with young people as necessary to engaging them in reactive and successful service delivery, and that it takes time to develop is an idea that most of the professional interactants shared during fieldwork. For example, Aydin an experienced SSP worker with minority ethnic background explained that trust is the key for working with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard for a couple of reasons:

- 1) Without trust, the young men will have nothing to do with professionals.
- 2) Trust must be achieved to reach the backstage areas of the young men’s lives to obtain the information needed to help them.

“if you look at them I work with on a daily basis ... errrrr it is only possible for these young men to open up if they trust you ... errrrrr sometimes it takes time before they open up ... but it is something you have to work towards ... you have to be together with them ... and show them that you keep your word ... so that they can see that you are actually there for their sakes ... and that’s what is important ... errrrr and if they do not trust you ... if you deceive them ... with these boys ... if you do not keep your word ... they lose confidence in you ... and that means they will have nothing to do with you ... and you cannot work with them or ... start any new initiatives with them in the area in relation to their daily lives ... if they lose confidence in you, it gets really difficult because many of them errrrr are characterised by finding it difficult to trust other people so it is difficult to ... trust adults who all of a sudden come from the outside and should do things for them ... well that is difficult ... also with distrust right because if you have experienced an unfortunate episode ... with an adult ... it could be a pedagogue, it could be a teacher or whatever ... so then it is really difficult to get through to them as a person who comes from the outside ... someone completely foreign ... but, but you

can get over that ... you get over that by been together with the boys and frequent the same places and show yourself help some of their friends ... so they hear about who you are ... it is then that relations begin to develop so then trust becomes a bit easier if they have heard about you from their friends and those they know that we are trustworthy and that we keep our word then trust is quickly established ... so it is very, very important ... it's the core ..." (Aydin)

Following Aydin's account, trust is an active process involving time investment together with the young men in the local context showing them and the local community the 'real' self. During Aydin's explanation dimensions of trust and trustworthiness mix together, perhaps, Aydin's account can best be described as talking about "trusting" as advanced by Solomon & Flores (2001). Part of this process according to Aydin requires spending time with young people while simultaneously demonstrating integrity (keeping one's word) and benevolence (demonstrating compassion towards them), which can also be achieved through helping other young people in the community, this boosts standing and reputation. Ideas around benevolence, integrity and demonstrating goodwill are dimensions or antecedents of trustworthiness found in much of the current literature on trust. For example, the one-dimensional psychological perspective has identified a broad range of antecedents contributing to trust development. In this respect, one of the most influential and cited models of trust is Mayer et al.'s (1995) 'Integrative Model of Organisational Trust', which advances: *"Trust for a trustee will be a function of the trustee's perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity and of the trustor's propensity to trust"* (1995:720).

According to Mayer et al. (1995), ability, benevolence, and integrity are essential to trust, and each may vary independently of the others, which means they do not all have to be present for trust to transpire. The basis for Mayer et al. (1995) model is on the perceived trustworthiness of the other party (based on assessments of their ability, benevolence and integrity), the individual's disposition to trust, and affect felt toward the trustee all contribute to the level of trust in interpersonal relationships. However, where Aydin's and Mayer's (1995) model differ is that Aydin's explanation reinforces the idea that trust(ing) is a process that must be worked at in the local environment through a process of interaction. Aydin's account demonstrates that individuals need to work hard to both win and maintain trust, which is contrary to one-dimensional psychological approaches, which view trust as a mental state allowing individuals to cope with uncertainty and vulnerability, which assumes that actors apply indicators of trust more

or less automatically. As pointed out in chapter two, this view of trust is rather limited because they are one-dimensional and ignore many social processes and power relations around trusting or distrusting decisions and exclude agency.

According to Aydin's account, positive stories in the local community through word of mouth assist the trust building process. This is more in tune with Luhmann (1979) who argues that to launch the trust building process one must participate and show oneself. In addition, this fits with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) second phase of the trust development process KBT (knowledge-based trust). The basis of KBT is in the predictability of the other, knowing the other well enough to foresee their actions. KBT develops over time, because of a history of interaction which allows interactants to develop generalized expectancies of the other (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Following Aydin's account, keeping one's word is crucial to the trust building process between professionals and the young men of the neighbourhoods. This is a determining factor to how the relationship develops. Deceiving young people, promising too much, breaking promises or going back on one's word is enough to derail the relationship and destroy trust. If a professional does not keep their word, this is enough to stop or radically change the relationship. This implies that the relationships and trust(ing) between professionals and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds often is fragile. This can have serious practice implications for professionals who work with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, because if the young men lose confident positive expectations in the professional, interaction is no longer desired with them. This can also prevent the same professional starting new initiatives in the area. Aydin's argument illustrates the importance of trust and trusting relationships between professionals and the young people they seek to engage within the scope of their work.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that building trusting relationships with the young men of Sunset Boulevard is essential if Margret and her team are to have success with outreach work in the area where the goal is to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour. However, as demonstrated below in the following extract, perhaps Margret's dual role can sometimes affect and conflict with trust building with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in and around Sunset Boulevard.

The context of the article involves Margret in the role of Chairperson of the Committee for Labour and Integration talking about what can be done to tackle problems in Sunset

Boulevard. Similarly, this frame illustrates an underlying distrustful attitude towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds of Sunset Boulevard. Margret's point of departure to tackling the social problems in Sunset Boulevard is to bring in more police officers. According to the article, when commenting on what can be done with the "troublemakers" in the absence of the desired police officers, the chairperson for C.L.I. states:

[They should be taken by the scruff of the neck and be supervised one-to-one 24 hours a day. I know that it will be expensive, but it is about keeping the younger ones in the 'grey zone' away from the older ones that they look up to and get inspired by. Of course, it has to be combined with far better advice to their parents and by placing greater demands on them (parents). Because at the end of the day, it is their responsibility to look after their children, says [Margret] [Source: Research Diary December, 2009].

Margret, a member of the Danish Social Democrats, relies on similar ideology to Anders from the Liberal Alliance discussed above. According, to Margret, the "troublemakers" should be closely monitored twenty four hours a day, kept away from the 'younger ones' while placing 'greater' demands on parents. Margret suggests segregating the target group from younger members of the local community while closely controlling them, twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. Similar to Anders, Margret, clearly and publicly displays high distrust towards the young men of Sunset Boulevard. She clearly demonstrates this by her desire for additional police officers rather than additional social or youth workers. However, in the absence of the desired police officers these young men should be taken by the 'scruff of the neck and guarded twenty four hours a day'. Hence, Margret publicly demonstrates confident negative expectations regarding the future conduct of the young men. As Lewicki (2006b) points out, while trust induces confident positive expectations towards the other along with a demonstrated readiness to take a risk, distrust, brings about fear and actions to guard against harmful conduct of the other party (Lewicki, 2006b). In the newspaper article, Margret illustrates to the local community that she wants more police on the streets to confront the "troublemakers". However, in the absence of additional police officers, she advocates coercive tactics to monitor and control the 'troublemakers' twenty four hours a day – essentially ignoring their rights as citizens. The question remains: who, in the absence of the additional police officers, should implement the coercive tactics advocated by Margret? No matter what, the message in Margret's public declaration is unambiguous and can have serious

implications in relation to Margret's other role in the community as manager of the Youth Club and the youth workers charged with undertaking outreach work with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in the area. In other words, what the local newspaper prints about what Margret has supposed to have said matters to her and her teams standing in the local community, which can influence attitudes towards her and her team, especially those who they should reach through outreach work. In this respect, the newspaper article can affect both trust and distrust processes in the local community.

Unsurprisingly, many of the young men both in Paradise Way and Sunset Boulevard follow the local media and discuss the reported happenings. This was evident while hanging out in the community centres. On a couple of occasions, I observed discussions taking place around media reports. Occasionally, some of the volunteers at the community centre in Sunset Boulevard participated in these discussions. For example, during a visit to the community centre in Sunset Boulevard one day in April 2010 I walked in on a dialogue between one of the community centre volunteers and some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds concerning the reported cause to a series of fires in the area. The dialogue centred on a claim that the fires were the result of the "failed arrest" of a local man. In other words, the journalist speculated about whether or not the failed arrest attempt triggered the series of fires. The following excerpt from my research diary is illustrative:

*[Today I arrived at the community centre in Sunset Boulevard at 11:30. There were quite a few people in the place, there must be a mother and toddler group going on since there are a few mothers with small children coming and going. In the main activity room I met *Christel sitting together with some of the lads around today's edition of the local paper. As usual, I was greeted warmly and offered a cup of coffee. I took up the kind offer of coffee, grabbed a chair and pulled it over to the table with the others. It seems that Christel and the young men were mid in discussion concerning the weekend's events reported in the paper. The article reports how a shed and a car were burnt out on Saturday evening. According to the paper, maybe an unsuccessful attempt to arrest a local man could have caused the arson attacks. It seemed that they were discussing the reported cause of the destruction where neither Christel nor the young men could understand the arson attacks – the lads sitting around the table distanced themselves from such acts and said that it's bad for the neighbourhood's reputation. According to *Aadil then the newspapers claim is pure bullshit because if the guy got away from the police then him and his friends would be partying and not burning*

things out. One of the other guys suggested that it's probably an insurance job since it was an old banger that could not drive anyway] (Source: Research Diary: April, 2010).

The young men of the neighbourhoods are knowledgeable actors who keep up-to-par about local happenings and especially those reported in the media, so such media reports can have implications for the reputation, perception and reception of local social actors in the neighbourhood including Margret. This is crucial for all social actors attempting to present a certain image. What is necessary to remember, is that whatever the newspaper quotes the interviewee as saying is the stuff that either confirms or refutes the desired impression. Perhaps Margret's perspective presented above in the newspaper is a business as usual attitude usually given to the general public. Perhaps Margret did not intend the young men of Sunset Boulevard to receive this unambiguous message. This could be the case because Margret is conscious about the impression she omits to the young men, and attempts to create a trustworthy image when interacting with them. This became apparent during an interview with her nearly one year prior to the newspaper article publication. The interview with Margret on this occasion was prior to entering the fieldwork; she spoke about impressions and roles towards the end of the interview while speaking about working in Sunset Boulevard. The following interview extract is illustrative of Margret's desire to appear trustworthy to the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds:

*"... .. well when we stand down there talking to the youths and they are bloody angry with the police and they have thrown bottles and set fire to containers ... then it's important for me ... that the police don't just come over to me and address me like we are close friends and I have taken this issue up with them that it's important to have some very clear roles because when we are down there we must not appear to be close friends there was a police officer who came over to one of my workers and said 'we are driving back to the station now, if there is anything else with these lot then **'just phone us right'** [emphasis] ... he exposed my worker and me it takes many **many many** [emphasis] hours of effort working with these youths they [young men] should not get the impression that he [employee] would just ring to the police if they say something or other so it requires that you really can manage the roles and that they trust [police] that of course we cooperate but well I am not your informer right? (Interview: Margret).*

Throughout the interview, Margret said she, her employees and the police have a close working relationship. However, she obviously does not want to give that impression to the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and hang out in Sunset Boulevard. This implies that Margret is aware of the social codex in Sunset Boulevard and that appearing to be “close friends” with the police can negatively affect her, and her employees standing in the area.

5.3.4 Observation & Patrolling as Youth Work Practice

With few exceptions, most of the local authority frontline employees encountered during fieldwork shared a similar ‘paternalistic control attitude’ towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds to that of their leaders. This was apparent throughout the field research and explicit in both observations and interviews. This part of the chapter illustrates how this attitude transpires into the daily practice of some of the frontline employees. Drawing on both operational and presentational data this section presents two observed practice situations and subsequently some examples from the interview transcripts. This ‘paternalistic attitude’ transpired during an interdisciplinary meeting between the youth workers and the ‘official’ SSP team in January 2010. The purpose of this meeting was to strengthen cooperation between the two teams. I observed this paternalistic attitude while the meeting participants were sitting around relaxing waiting for the meeting to commence.

5.3.5 Dave & Adem

While sitting around the ‘meeting’ table drinking coffee, eating Danish pastries and engaging in chitchat Dave and Adem spoke excitedly about an upcoming public demonstration against the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip. According to Dave and Adem a lot of “known” (identified) youths from Sunset Boulevard would attend. Therefore, Dave and Adem were planning to attend the event with the sole purpose of keeping a lookout for any “known” youths. Dave and Adem told eagerly about how they planned to observe and record in detail the movements and actions of the “known” youths, just in case of trouble. This can be viewed as a pre-emptive measure, the implementation of distrust frames and an instance of what Foucault (1977) refers to as

'Panopticism'. Essentially, Dave and Adem intended to attend an authorised public assembly with the purpose of observing the movements and actions of certain individuals – just in case of trouble. This reinforces the high distrust frames created around these “known” stigmatised youths from Sunset Boulevard. As highlighted in chapter two, high distrust involves the confident negative expectation (and fears) concerning the future malevolent motives of others. This demands a strong defence where vigilance, watchfulness and pre-emption are the best offence (Lewicki et al., 1998). In addition, Dave and Adem surveillance operation seems much in tune with Foucault's (1977) ideas about disciplinary power.

Foucault (1977) illustrates a change from brutal disciplinary to subtle, effective control societies over a period of 300 years, where ideas around observation are central to his account. Disciplinary power, which is subtle by nature, seeks to secretly and quietly condition the population to accept domination unquestionably, which includes paying taxes. Foucault (1977) asserts: *“The chief function of the disciplinary power is to train, rather than to select and to levy; or, no doubt, to train in order to levy and select all the more”* (1977:170). Disciplinary power inconspicuously divides and conquers the population through a process of differentiation in order to exploit them as resources: *“discipline makes individuals; it is the specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise”* (1977:170). At the centre of Foucault's (1977) account of the dominance of disciplinary power, and the creation of a docile population is the architectural design of Jeremy Bentham's panopticon, an institutional design allowing observers to observe and study inmates continuously without been observed themselves; unable to observe the observers, the observed develop an impersonal and anonymous relationship with power. Thus, unable to know if they are under constant observation the observed begin to behave as though they are and discipline becomes self-regulatory. The panopticon, however, extends beyond the confines of institutions and must be understood as a way of defining power relations in everyday life (Foucault, 1977). Following Foucault (1977), the panopticon is flexible in its application and can be applied in any situation when dealing with a: *“multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behaviour must be imposed, the panoptic schema may be used”* (1977:205). Foucault's (1977) analysis goes on to explore different outcomes of the extension of the disciplinary institutions, where panopticism is key. During Foucault's (1977) analysis, he outlines the role of panopticism within civil society where one

emphasis concerns the extended role of the police reaching beyond controlling social disorder and crime to infiltrating every minute detail of life. Foucault (1977) goes on to argue that structurally modern society can be viewed as disciplinary, stretching from enclosed institutions outwards to an endless system of panopticism - where observation and self-regulation maintains power relations. Therefore, Dave and Adem's planned surveillance operation can be considered an instance of Panopticism.

While Dave and Adem enthusiastically told about their up and coming mission, I observed how the other participants listened in awe. There was excitement and apprehension in the air in relation to their forthcoming mission to observe the identified other. While the meeting participants talked about observing and recording, I sat back and carried out my own observations while carefully recording the proceedings in my field notebook. While doing so, I wondered if those present fully understood the principles behind SSP and 'criminal preventative work' (within a local authority context). What was unfolding was something that one might normally associate with the police or counter-intelligence and security agencies. According to the local authorities own objectives for SSP cooperation from 2004 it is to:

1. To ensure the best possible conditions of life for children and young people and their well-being – in a good network without crime and substance misuse.
2. To build up, apply and maintain a local network that has a criminal preventative impact on the daily lives of children and young people.
3. To create the conditions for criminal preventative measures. (Organisation of SSP Cooperation Memorandum: 2004).

According to a local authority memorandum from 2007 concerning the role of Youth Clubs and outreach work, the idea behind Youth Clubs undertaking outreach work is to ensure: *"As many young people as possible join clubs, so they can create positive relationships to other young people in new networks, while meeting supportive adults in a balanced constructive, forward looking dialogue"* (Local Authority Memorandum (2007) on Leisure and Youth Clubs). This implies the main aims of undertaking outreach from youth clubs in this local authority is to:

1. Create a symbolic bridge between the institutions and young people.
2. Convert young people into youth club members.
3. Support young people in creating new 'positive relationships' and networks.
4. Provide an opportunity for young people to meet 'supportive' adults.

According to this document, outreach work involves professionals building positive contacts to young people in the community, encouraging them to join youth clubs to facilitate connecting to positive networks and supportive, professional adults. While Dave and Adem's surveillance operation do not appear in concert with the overall objectives set out in the local authority memorandums, which could be interpreted as a fundamental practice change, it fits with the ideology advanced by both Anders and Margret, and the government policy, which advocates extra vigilance and control. This implies institutionalised rather than new practice in accord with the structure and cultural values and norms. Moreover, Dave's proposed course of action is commensurate with the distrust frames discussed above where monitoring is a key component – 'vigilance', wariness and watchfulness'. Further, during the surveillance operation briefing, none of the attending social/youth professionals questioned or objected to Dave & Adem's proposed course of action. On the contrary, Maria said she would tag along to help the guys watch the proceedings at the rally, which strengthens the idea that this is normal, accepted, 'commonsense' practice amongst these frontline employees.

After the discussion concerning the public rally, the conversation moved onto discussing individual young men from Sunset Boulevard and their current situations. Evidently, these professionals have in-depth information between them concerning the persons mentioned. During this talk, the professionals discussed one youth's father at length along with his failings as a father. There was consensus around the table that the boy's father lacked adequate parenting skills. At 12:25, twenty five minutes later than scheduled, John the 'official' SSP Team manager clapped his hands [clap-clap], raised his voice and said *"okay let's get started"*. John, the most senior local authority representative present directs the youth workers to start the meeting by telling about new developments in the area. Dave kicked off the meeting by informing the others that they

have decided to do something about the abuse they meet if they venture into Sunset Boulevard. Dave said that many of the older youths who they encounter are hostile and shout obscenities at them like *'fucking snitches'* or *'fuck off snitches'* and call them the super snitch patrol (I will return to this phenomenon in the next section of this chapter).

5.3.6 Aydin

I experienced and observed this monitoring/controlling practice outlined above firsthand one cold winter day in February 2010 while shadowing Aydin an experienced SSP worker from the (official) SSP team while he went about his daily work. It is crucial to point out, that prior to this day; I had been attempting to gain access to observe other SSP workers going about their daily business without success. Up until this time, I only had full access to shadow Maria from the official SSP team and had done so until the management had shut down SSP operations in Paradise Way.

Despite having full access to the team's staff and interdisciplinary meetings, and access to carryout interviews, for reasons unknown, the team leader John fobbed me off on a number of occasions and attempted to divert my attentions elsewhere. It was an intriguing situation because most of the SSP workers said shadowing them was not a problem, it just needed to be cleared by John first. Perhaps John did not trust me and thought that I was a senior management fink. This can be related to some of the points made in chapter four about gaining access. For instance, Goffman (1974b) warns against accessing an organisation via the top because it can cause affiliation problems with lower level employees. Moreover, this situation seems a little similar to that experienced by Sampson and Thomas (2003) who found that despite having gained approval for access from two senior gatekeepers, negotiating access was an ongoing process. In my situation, it was as though it was ok to talk to the official SSP Team and ask questions about practice but, it was not ok to observe them in practice. However, after a lot of persistence John finally gave permission for me to shadow Aydin while he worked at a large public event.

The plan was to shadow Aydin while he carried out 'outreach work' (*opsøgende arbejde*) at the Local Authority's Inter-school Football Tournament where hundreds of young people from all over the local authority encatchment area would gather. The aim of shadowing Aydin was to observe the interactions between him and the young people that he encountered during the day.

While driving to meet Aydin at the sports hall where this indoor football tournament was to take place, I wondered about Aydin's role and what it might involve at such a large gathering of young people.

Upon arriving at the sports hall, I found Aydin standing outside the main entrance talking to Bente and Adem, two members of the youth work team. It transpired that the trio had arranged to cooperate throughout the day – they would communicate with one another in times of trouble and exchange information. We exchanged greetings, shook hands and began to engage in small talk about the weather, which apparently was one of Denmark's coldest winters in fifteen years. Once the two youth workers finished their cigarettes they went into the sports hall. This gave me the opportunity to ask Aydin about his role at the inter-school football tournament. The following is an excerpt from my research diary which illustrates the ensuing dialogue around his role at the start of the day:

Can you tell me what your role is here today? (KP)

"Yes it's to stop trouble ... there has been quite a bit of trouble in the past with fights between players and spectators ... there have been occasions where some of the young people have thrown things at the players ... some of the youths that come to watch only come to cause trouble" (Aydin)

How do you stop trouble? (KP)

"I know all of the troublemakers so when I see them I go over and say hi, so they know that I know that they are here and vice versa ... if they begin to cause trouble I talk with them ... if they continue I escort them out of the hall ... sometimes I drive them home to their parents" (Aydin) [Source: Research Diary, February 2010].

While framing his role at the inter-school football tournament Aydin primarily focuses on "trouble" or rather on the idea of stopping trouble. In this frame, he views his role as one of social 'crowd' control to stop trouble, a far cry from the notion of outreach work. Aydin clearly has confident negative expectations concerning the behaviour of some of the young participants based on prior experience. What is more, he creates a distrust frame around some of the young people by stating '*some of the youths only attend to cause trouble*'. In relation to preventing or

stopping trouble, Aydin relies on a combination of methods: monitoring/patrolling, physical presence, dialogue, confrontation and exclusion. Firstly, Aydin said he knows the ‘troublemakers’, and when he sees them, he approaches and says hi. This mild form of pre-emptive social control functions as a deterrent informing would-be-troublemakers they are both seen and under surveillance.

Perhaps, this is in tune with Foucault’s (1977) ‘Panopticism’, but in this case, the watcher is not anonymous, and the observed know the identity and office of the observer and sometimes can see if the observer is watching. However, on this day of the football tournament there are many watchers within the confines of the crowded sports hall, so it is not possible for the observed to be certain that the watchers are not observing them, which may be enough to cause self-regulating behaviour. Despite these subtle differences, by informing the observed of their presence, the watchers have a preventative effect. If the pre-emptive strike does not have the desired effect and young people begin to create ‘trouble’, then Aydin through a combination of physical presence and dialogue will try and talk down or resolve the trouble. If dialogue and physical presence fails then Aydin physically removes the ‘troublemakers’ from the sports hall, and in some cases drives the troublemaker home to his parents. This implies Aydin's role at the inter-school football tournament (and similar events) involves a more ‘preventative social policing’ role than an outreach role.

After discussing Aydin’s role, we entered the sports hall where he proceeded to show me around the crowded building. Aydin led me through the heaving masses of young people pointing out the hotspots where trouble usually occurs on such occasions. While walking around, I noted that the two youth workers had found a strategic position in which to observe the area for trouble and troublemakers. While patrolling the sports hall looking for trouble and troublemakers Aydin introduced me to a group of boys: “Heeey, this is Kevin he is English and used to play for Manchester United”, “really”, asks one of the youths – “well he is English, replies the SSP worker with a smile. [Source: Research Diary, February 2010]. Aydin repeated this introduction a couple of times while he negotiated a path through the masses of young people gathered in the sports hall. While following the man wearing a black jacket bearing the SSP logo around the sports hall, it struck me that he seemed well-liked and respected by both young people and adults. After many years of working in this role of SSP worker he knew how to perform in the crowd – he certainly did

not lack confidence or enthusiasm. While patrolling around the sports hall, Aydin signalled to all around him that he felt comfortable, confident and wanted to be there – he smiled, had open body language and greeted people with a firm handshake.

Furthermore, while shadowing Aydin, it became increasingly apparent that the majority of his focused interactions were with ‘male’ teenagers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. In other words, even though the majority of young people in the sports hall had white majority ethnic heritage, Aydin only approached ‘males’ with minority ethnic heritage to say “hi”. This leads me to believe that Aydin purposely targeted ‘males’ with minority ethnic heritage as possible or identified sources of trouble. The notes recorded in my research diary illustrate this observation:

[Despite the participation of many Danish boys and girls today, the vast majority of [Aydin’s] interactions are with boys and male adolescents with minority ethnic backgrounds. The interaction between Aydin and the young people is warm and courteous. Aydin can be described as accomplished in signalling that he feels comfortable, confident, wants to be there and likes interacting with the young people. This, without a doubt, makes an enormous difference to the relationship. However, no matter how talented he is at signalling positive intentions, this is clearly an exercise of social control in a public place. Aydin’s patrolling concerns showing physical presence, this is social policing by a frontline youth worker employed to work with young people in a caring, not a controlling way] (Source: Research Diary, February 2010).

Clearly, Aydin was not policing the event on his own since there were teachers from all of the schools present. What is more, the two youth workers present were undertaking exactly the same task as Aydin – this became apparent through the conversations during the regular ‘smoke’ breaks. The smoke breaks acted like information exchanges where the frontline employees enthusiastically shared their gathered snippets of intelligence.

Participating in the smoke breaks gave the opportunity to get a better insight into the monitoring activities of the professionals present. Between them, they knew which “known” youths were or were not present, who had attended the sports hall and who had not. Moreover, they knew which youths were hanging out together along with their last known whereabouts inside the sports hall.

In addition, participating in the smoke break gave the opportunity to overhear the shared scepticism, cynicism and suspicion concerning certain named individuals either because they were present or not at the sports hall that day. While standing outside the sports hall on that cold day in February listening to the suspicion and scepticism in the air about named individuals, I began to wonder about how it is possible for youth workers to build up a positive contact with stigmatised young people while enforcing public order. The following extract from my research diary is illustrative of my observations and reflections:

[Every now and again Aydin goes outside for a cigarette – during these nicotine breaks we meet the two others [youth workers] and other adults occupied in a similar policing role. They exchange information concerning any concerns and fears about potential trouble ahead. They know whom has and has not been there along with who is there and who they are with ... they even know which clothes they are wearing, that is amazing, considering that there must be around five – six hundred people here, most of which teenagers. During the nicotine break, the adults exchange detailed information along with ‘opinions’ about the infamous few that have appeared and the no-shows today. So far it seems that there have not been any public order breaches. It seems absurd that, on the one hand, these employees have to build up positive contact with young people, particularly those considered ‘trouble makers’ and, on the other hand, they have to patrol the place informing the same kids that ‘hey’ we are watching you] (Source: Research Diary, February 2010).

5.3.7 Youth Worker – Interviews

This part of the section presents some examples of paternalistic attitudes that appear in the interview transcripts of the team of youth workers dubbed the ‘super snitch patrol’. In addition, these examples illustrate how some interactants use ‘New Right’ (neo-liberal/neo-conservative) thinking as a tool to frame the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust, while exploring how this transpires into daily practice. I focus on the transcripts of these workers because their overall frontstage performance strongly influences their reputation and standing with the young men of Sunset Boulevard. In other words, their actions in the public sphere strongly influence how the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame them.

Goffman (1959) argues that upholding team reputation is a team effort; if one member of the team publicly loses face then other members become tainted by association:

“There are colleague groupings ... whose members are so closely identified in the eyes of other people that the good reputation of one practitioner depends on the good conduct of the others. If one member is exposed and causes a scandal then all lose some public repute” (1959:164).

However, in this case, Goffman's (1959) observations only partially explain the situation. According to Goffman (1959), the reputation of one team member depends on the conduct of the others; this is not the case here. During the fieldwork, it became apparent that the young men of Sunset Boulevard are highly suspicious of all of the youth workers except one. This reinforces the idea that as knowledgeable actors the young men use trust and distrust as a cultural frame to organise relationships with individual professionals based on overall performance. Exploring how the youth workers make sense of their world and rationalise what they do, helps shed light on this issue.

Following Van Maanen (1979), and Goffman (1959, 1974a), the interview potentially is a situation where interactants can mislead or manipulate the situation to create a favourable impression of the self. As mentioned briefly above, Van Maanen (1979) distinguishes between ‘operational’ and ‘presentational’ data, operational data refers to the sporadic strip of action observed as they occur while presentational data refer to situations where interactants potentially can give a manufactured image. Van Maanen (1979) asserts:

“In short, operational data deal with observed activity (behaviour per se) and presentational data deal with the appearances put forth by informants as these activities are talked about and otherwise symbolically projected within the research setting” (1979:542).

Van Maanen (1979) makes it clear that it is not always possible for researchers to observe or corroborate what interactants say, which sometimes can apply to observable behaviours described by others i.e. grasping its contextual meaning. Drawing on Geertz (1973), he explains:

“Often one only sees (and, hence, understands) what is happening after having been first told what to look for. A wink, a blink, or nod is not merely a fleck of behaviour to be described without ambiguity but is rather a potential sign that must be read as to what is signified” (Van Maanen, 1979:543).

After considering Goffman's (1959) impression management thesis presented in chapter four, his ideas around fabrication (1974a), and Van Maanen's (1979) conclusions concerning presentational data, in an attempt to corroborate the individual accounts during the analysis wherever possible I try to triangulate what the interactants say with events or accounts given by other interactants.

This section takes its point of departure in the interview transcript of Margret the head of the youth club and youth work team. All the interviews with Margret and her employees took place at the youth club which borders Sunset Boulevard. The club functions both as a drop-in-centre for young people up to the age of 18 and as a base to work from to undertake outreach work. During the fieldwork, the club began a new pilot project entitled the "*Bad Boyz Club*" where selected young men with minority ethnic backgrounds aged 18 years upwards can socialise in the clubs premises once a week under the guidance of Adem – a youth worker with minority ethnic background. During this section, I use secondary literature to clarify some of the institutional and cultural tools identified in the interview accounts.

5.3.8 Margret

Margret¹⁰ an educated pedagogue has many years experience as youth club manager and outreach youth worker in and around Sunset Boulevard. At the youth club which borders Sunset Boulevard, Margret has the responsibility for around ten employees: five full-time workers, students doing practice training and three police officers who work on a part-time basis. Through Margret's combined role, she often has contact with young people from Sunset Boulevard either in the youth club or on the streets. During the fieldwork in Sunset Boulevard, many of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds expressed dislike and distrust towards Margret. Some interactants rationalised this dislike and distrust of Margret in terms of unjust, deceitful action and her close relationship with the police (I will return to this later). The section takes its point of departure in an excerpt from Margret's interview transcript where she makes sense of her world and what she and her employees do:

¹⁰ As discussed above, Margret is also a town councillor.

“We have two main tasks out here ... one of them is to run the youth club ... everyone between ten and eighteen can come in free of charge ... errrr but the main task uurrmmm [throat clearing] is what is called ‘street work’ [emphasis] ... we are five full-time workers ... that’s four workers plus me that turn out [rykke ud] errmmm on the street and that can be eeehhmmmm [throat clearing] in connection to activities in the town ... town parties or discotheques or such things you know ... like in Roskilde they have fest week ... so we go out on the street ... it can also be when schools have a football tournament ... then we just call by ... sometimes we hear things through the jungle drums [jungletrommer] that something is going to happen ... then we show up and walk round, and talk to them ... we are neither police officers or anything else, we are pedagogues and our tool is having the gift of the gab ... that’s talking ... errrrmmm ... errr for example there have been a lot of container fires in [Sunset Boulevard] and stones thrown at the fire brigade and the police ... so we have a deal that if there is a fire alarm from [Sunset Boulevard] ... the fire brigade phone us ... AND its pissing funny when we drive down there [raised voice]... because it’s a joke ... the fire brigade are parked behind the police at the entrance of [Sunset Boulevard] ... waiting for us ... then us pedagogues come chuffing along in our old car and drive in first [raised voice] and begin to talk to the youths and then the police and the fire brigade can follow us in and then take care of their jobs ... putting out the fires that the youths have started right ... but it ... prevents that they throw bottles etc. ... then they drive in and put out the fire which takes 15 minutes but we might be standing out there for maybe three hours and talk to them heehhh’ [cough] errmmm and that bloody that requires good patience ... because it’s not something that they pick up so quickly ... but it means something to us that we can go out there and show the youths that they can trust us ... and they can also trust that now and again that I will be a bloody bitch [møgkælling] and that’s both good and bad ... it’s very important for me that all the workers out here know that we are not the youths friends ... errr but we are adults that they can trust ... because if you think that ... it’s my hypothesis ... if you think that you as a SSP worker should go down there and be friends ... with the youths ... forget it ” (Interview: Margret).

According to Margret’s account, the youth work team has two main responsibilities; running the youth club (mainly open during the day) and doing “street work” (outreach work). During her account, Margret places more emphasis on the role that she calls “street work”. Street work according to Margret involves attending both planned and impromptu public gatherings. Attending planned events includes dropping by happenings such as town festivals, school football tournaments, and discotheques and talking to people, while attending unplanned events involves responding to received information “that something is going to happen” or to requests for

assistance from the police/fire service. According to Margret, her and her employees are pedagogues, not police officers where their primary method involves talking – “*having the gift of the gab*”. However, during her account, Margret describes a function that perhaps goes beyond “*having the gift of the gab*” and seems more like an escort duty rather than street work where they accompany the police and the fire brigade into Sunset Boulevard in order for them to operate safely. While the police and the fire brigade go about their business, Margret and the team talk to the youths present. However, perhaps this sends the signal to those observing the spectacle of the pedagogues ‘*chuffing along in their old car*’ closely followed by the police and the fire service that they are just different departments of the same task force.

During Margret’s account, she relies on underlying professional beliefs concerning ‘professional boundaries/distance/objectivity’ when talking about how the relationship between the SSP workers and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds should be. According to Margret, it is essential that her employees know they are not friends with the youths. This relates to ideas around professional distance or detachment whereby workers should remain aloof in order to maintain ‘professional objectivity’ (Green et al., 2006). Margret states that her employees should be adults the young men can trust. However, perhaps adopting ‘professional distance’ is not the best method to gain the trust of the young men of the neighbourhoods.

The purpose of such professional distance is to allow the ‘professional’ to distance oneself from ‘subjective feeling, attitudes and beliefs’. However, a number of social work traditions have criticised this ‘expert role’ that involves workers distancing themselves from ‘service-users’ as counterproductive to ethical practice (Fook, 1993; in Green et al., 2006) and for creating unnecessary boundaries and unrealistic expectations (Green et al., 2006). Moreover, remaining aloof and distant is not productive towards initiating the trust building process. As pointed out in chapter four, it is paramount for actors to participate in social life or at least to show who they are to others in the social environment (Luhmann, 1979). In addition, Luhmann (1979) argues that people who remain aloof or distant are not in a position to win ‘trust’ since they are not available for scrutiny (1979).

Therefore, the ‘professional distance’ approach advocated by Margret can be counterproductive towards the trust building process. Hence, in relation to building trust to the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds of Sunset Boulevard, ‘professional distance’ can be

regarded as an inappropriate cultural tool. Nonetheless, Margret's account implies she believes she is doing the right thing where accompanying the police into Sunset Boulevard and talking to some of the young men demonstrates they are trustworthy adults. However, Margret's account implies that she is not entirely distant to the young men because they can 'trust' that sometimes she is a bloody bitch. This implies, through many interactions, some of the young men have gained a thorough knowledge of Margret and can expect she will perform in a certain way in some situations – distrust based on knowledge of Margret. This is in tune with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) second phase of the trust development process KBT (knowledge-based trust). The basis of KBT is in the predictability of the other, knowing the other well enough to foresee their actions. KBT develops over time, because of a history of interaction which allows interactants to develop generalized expectancies of the other (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). During the interview, I failed to ask Margret to define the term 'bloody bitch' (møgkælling); nevertheless, I asked her about in which way she could be a 'bloody bitch'. Margret's response implies that being a 'bloody bitch' involves passing any information concerning the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and crime immediately to the police. The following interview excerpt is illustrative:

"... ermmm ... well a bloody bitch in the way that I am employed by the local authority and sometimes I have to report some things they do not agree with errrr some things that they don't want me to go further with it can also be in connection with the SSP cooperation with the police ... I talk to the police they are my co-operational partners [samarbejdspartner] errr and I don't cover for them if I know that the youths have committed crime and the police ask then I don't lie or try to conceal any crime I would never dream of doing that" (Interview: Margret).

Margret's response outlines a dilemma that many public sector employees who work with young people experience on a regular basis – the dilemma between 'confidentiality' and 'the duty to report'. In other words, protecting personal information about the young people and their families gained through the job and balancing this against the duty to report certain information or conditions to social services (or under certain circumstances to the police).

5.3.9 Legislation

The objective with the rules concerning confidentiality is to build trust between citizens and public sector representatives (Social Ministry, 2005). The rules concerning confidentiality and

information sharing provide the framework for cooperation between 'service users' and public sector professionals (ibid). The intention behind the rules concerning professional secrecy is an attempt to ensure that professionals who work directly with children, young people and their families only exchange necessary confidential information to their colleagues if it is necessary (Social Ministry, 2005). In other words, professionals may only exchange certain information with other professionals about the person or their family if it is necessary for them to complete work with them. These rules apply even in cases where parents, young people, and children give their consent for professionals to discuss their case with other professionals (ibid). During inter or cross disciplinary meetings where named persons are to be discussed, professionals should attempt to obtain their permission beforehand – however, this is not a duty it is a recommendation. The rules concerning confidentiality only apply to confidential information and not general information (Social Ministry, 2005).

In relation to the duty to report, all public sector employees in Denmark have a legal duty to report any received information or firsthand knowledge that implies a child or young person is in "serious difficulties" (store vanskeligheder) to social services (Social Ministry, 2005). In other words, if a public sector employee receives information or firsthand knowledge that a child or young person is in 'great difficulties', it is their individual duty to report this to social services (as opposed to the police). According to the guidance, in such cases, a referral to social services will never be contrary to the rules about confidentiality (Social Ministry, 2005). In other words, if a public sector employee receives information or firsthand knowledge that a child or young person is in 'great difficulties' affecting their wellbeing they shall report this to social services. However, when reporting such information to social services, professionals must inform parents and the young person (depending on age and maturity) about the referral (ibid). The only exception to this rule is cases where professionals believe that informing parents may further harm the child or young person (i.e. in cases where there is suspicion of violence or sexual abuse) (Social Ministry, 2005).

In some cases, this could mean having to breach confidentiality to a child or young person, which under such circumstances can be justified. However, the regulations and guidance does not acknowledge the inherent power relationship between professionals and children/young people. All professionals who work with children and young people must be aware of, and take power

relations into account when considering breaching confidentiality. Breaching confidentiality should be a last resort, and where possible, the worker should include the young person in the decision making process by explaining their concerns and rationale for breaching confidentiality. This is important out of respect to the child or young person in question (depending on age and level of maturity) who has decided to place their trust in a 'significant' adult by disclosing sensitive, personal and more than often painful information. In addition, this is crucial if there should be any chance of maintaining a trusting relationship.

Under Penal Code Paragraph (§141), public sector employees do not have a duty to report crimes to the police; however, it is an offence for employees not to do everything in their power to prevent a serious crime occurring if they have such knowledge - this includes informing the police. In addition, if an employee finds out that a person has committed a crime and is likely to commit the same crime again they have a duty to report it to the police – this duty includes the local authority.

The rules are complex with different pieces of legislation governing this area. The rules become even more complicated and fuzzy for frontline workers such as Margret and her employees involved in 'interdisciplinary criminal preventative' cooperation – known as SSP cooperation. During such inter and cross disciplinary cooperation, actors are exempt from the general rules concerning parental consent and can exchange information with other professionals without the consent of parents. However, this information may only be exchanged if it is of importance to the criminal preventative work with others in the cooperation (Social Ministry, 2005). In other words, the police may not use any of the exchanged information to investigate or clear up criminal cases. The legislation is clear: *"... an authority may disclose information about individuals to the police and other authorities involved in the cooperation [but] such information obtained in these forms of cooperation cannot be disclosed for the investigation of criminal cases"* (The Administration of Justice Act: Chapter Eleven: Paragraph 115b – (Retsplejeloven).

However, despite the complex and sometimes contradictory pieces of legislation, Margret's practice of passing on all information to the police adds to her and the youth work team's standing in Sunset Boulevard. Most of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds refer to Margret and her team as the 'super snitch patrol', which says a lot about how the young men perceive Margret and her team. It is likely that the snitch reputation discourages many young

people from Sunset Boulevard in confiding in them, which seems counterproductive to their objectives. This should give Margret and her team food for thought about their modus operandi and any other youth workers who operate in a similar fashion. After considering the rules and comparing this to what I know about the youth workers practice of passing on all information to the police this reputation is justified. Passing on all information to the police can violate some of the rules outlined above. In most cases, Margret and her employees have a duty to disclose information to the social service department, rather than the police. It is only in cases where they have information that a person is likely to commit the same offence again; or are planning to commit a serious offence where they have a duty to inform the police directly. Perhaps Margret and her team have misinterpreted the rules thereby creating their own institution. No matter what, their practice clashes with the social codex of the young men of Sunset Boulevard where snitching is one of the worst offences (discussed in the next section). Therefore, the youth workers practice is counterproductive and damaging to trust with the young men. Reporting crime to the police is at odds with building and maintaining confidentiality and trusting relationships. Considering that the youth workers have a long history of close collaboration with the police, often experienced and observed by the young men, and then it should not be a surprise to the youth workers that the young men perceive them as police spies, and distrust them.

5.3.10 Dave

At the time of interviewing Dave, an educated pedagogue with majority ethnic background, had worked at the youth club for almost three years. Dave, who has many years of youth club experience, shares a similar worldview to Margret when accounting for his work in the institution situated just over the road from Sunset Boulevard. Similar to Margret, the young men of Sunset Boulevard expressed disdain and distrust towards Dave and for similar reasons. When talking about his work, Dave said it involves two functions – working in the club and conducting outreach work. According to Dave, when the club is empty or few young people show up they switch over to outreach mode, jump into the car and drive into town. During Dave's explanation, he maintains the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard have misunderstood their role and what they do. In Dave's worldview, the young men mistake them (youth workers)

for the 'official' SSP team which is undeserving since they call them the 'super snitch patrol'. This is a crucial point, because there are two teams in the local authority who bear the SSP logo on their clothing. However, I suspect this cynical labelling of these workers goes way beyond the logo on their clothing – its more to do with what they do and how they do it. During fieldwork in Sunset Boulevard most interactants were not aware of the 'official' SSP team since they never come into the area. Moreover, when interactants in Sunset Boulevard refer to SSP or the 'super snitch patrol' they clearly indicate employees from the youth club over the road either by pointing or through naming the club. Therefore, according to interactants from Sunset Boulevard, contrary to Dave's explanation, the team he represents is the team commonly known as the super snitch patrol, but there is the probability that young people who have contact to the 'official' SSP team use the same catchy slogan on them - word travels fast on the street. Experience from fieldwork reveals that Dave's team earned this reputation because the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds believe they collaborate too closely with the police. As a consequence of the name calling, Dave revealed the youth work team have decided to remove the SSP logo from their jackets, so it only says 'street work'. Nonetheless, I guess removing three letters from their clothing will not be enough to get rid of the super snitch patrol reputation earned through their modus operandi in and around Sunset Boulevard; actions speak louder than words, or in this case three letters. In addition, the super snitch patrol tag seems to be deeply embedded in the culture of the young men who reside and hang around Sunset Boulevard. Removing the SSP logo from their jackets will not take away all the history of interaction which led to the team's reputation. Therefore, I suspect, even without the SSP logo, the young men from Sunset Boulevard will continue to frame them in the same way.

Similarly to Margret, Dave explained that outreach work involves patrolling public spaces such as the shopping centre, library, town centre, football matches and concerts and other public places where young people gather. During Dave's account he revealed another function of the team which includes patrolling bars in the town looking for underage drinkers and confronting people who sell alcohol to those underage. If the bartenders do not comply with 'requests' to stop selling alcohol Dave or his colleagues phone the police and report the incident. In other words, Dave and the team take on a parental or policing role where they patrol 'public houses' in an attempt to reduce the number of underage drinkers in the town. While this well meaning initiative

possibly can prevent some unfortunate episodes for some young people, maybe it gives the impression to many revellers that the youth work team are indeed a social police force. If this is the case, it only adds to their reputation of being in bed with the police.

According to Dave, the object with outreach work is to help young people that *“possibly need help to move on”*. However, according to Dave’s explanation the youth workers can only help certain young people. Some young people are out of reach of the outreach workers and are a job for the police. This is evident in Dave’s account where he places a high distrust frame around the young men who stand on the corner in Sunset Boulevard. Dave explained that they cannot do anything with *“those tough boys who stand down there on the corner ... we can’t do anything with them that is a job for the police”*. While Dave and his team have given up on the corner boys of Sunset Boulevard, the strategy is to save the younger boys from the older boys in the area (in tune with ideas about social inheritance).

Following Dave, the youth workers use two simultaneous methods to help the younger boys of Sunset Boulevard, both of which involve passing on information. The first method involves Dave and his colleagues informing the younger boys in Sunset Boulevard about who to avoid. In other words, Dave and his colleagues divulge the names of “deviant” youths to avoid to the younger boys, and tell them to stay clear of them. This practice could be considered unethical and may breach the rules concerning confidentiality outlined above. Perhaps the idea of naming whom to avoid is in tune with principles from “Social Inheritance” where avoiding contaminated youths will prevent the spread of crime and deviancy to the next generation. In addition, perhaps this method is counterproductive to the youth workers mission to save the younger boys. For instance, this method may be perceived as snitching by the younger boys who from an early age learn about the social code and what it means to snitch. In addition, there is always the possibility that word gets back to the older boys that the youth workers speak badly about them behind their backs, which can only have a detrimental effect. Further, telling the younger boys to avoid the older boys, who sometimes hang around the corner, may have the opposite effect. The second method outlined by Dave in his account involves passing on information to the police that can help them in their enquiries. During Dave’s explanation, he said that if a young person confides in him and if it is information that he ‘knows’ must be given to the police he says to the young person in question *“now you need to know that I have to report this”*. The result of Dave’s revelation and subsequent

reporting to the police is that the young person involved becomes angry with Dave for some time. The rationale behind Dave's action is that when a young person speaks with him in confidence, they do so because they want him to do something with the information. The following excerpt is illustrative:

"Errrr it's to create contact with the young people that maybe need help to move on errrr often there are arson attacks errr those tough boys who stand down there on the corner [Sunset Boulevard] ... we can't do anything with them that's a job for the police ... errmmm but we can get hold of those that are younger ... we can talk to them and tell them that it is not smart to be seen with him, him or him ... and then they don't get aligned to certain individuals ... and we say that to them and it's a good way to do it and at the same time, another thing that I will definitely continue with errrr if they come and tell me something something that I know I have to go further with and they should not be in doubt that I will do it [i.e. give the information to the police] and I say it to them 'now you need to know that I have to report this' they may well get angry with me for some weeks or so but they understand the point errrrrr and if they say something or other ... still anyway they want something to happen" (Interview: Dave).

During the interview, I asked Dave to explain the procedure about what happens when a young person asks to speak in confidence. Following Dave's explanation, if a young person approaches and asks to talk in confidence they go into a room that allows privacy where the encounter transpires. After the young person has disclosed, if Dave decides the communication contains reportable information he only then informs the young person about his duty to report. In Dave's account, it is clear he only informs the young person about his duty to inform after they have disclosed something in confidence. According to Dave, there is no need to inform young people in advance about the duty to report because they already know about that. In addition, according to Dave's worldview, young people disclose information because they want something to happen; however, that is pure speculation on Dave's behalf. This raises a serious practice issue concerning informed consent of young people who decide to talk in confidence with Dave. First and foremost, when a child or a young person decides to disclose or discuss information with a 'professional' they do so because they have confident positive expectations towards the adult in question. If Dave does not ensure that the young person is aware of his duty to report, it is probable that they assume the conversation is in confidence. The practice of informing the young person about the duty to report after they have disclosed certain information is a violation of trust

and can be considered unethical. Banks (2010) strengthens this idea about the nature of confidentiality in youth work:

“Confidentiality is essentially about trust. It is usually associated with entrusting someone with a secret. Since the nature of a secret is that it is hidden, and only a few people know about it, then confidentiality is about trusting someone not to reveal this information ... it is often linked with the idea of privacy and the rights of those making use of professional services to determine who should have information about them, especially information they have given to professionals for a particular purpose” (Clark and McGhee, 2008; Cordess, 2001; Tyler, 2001; in Banks, 2010:157).

In England, the statement of ethical conduct in youth work published by the National Youth Agency includes an ethical standard that states youth workers should handle young people with respect, which involves:

“explaining the nature and limits of confidentiality and recognising that confidential information clearly entrusted for one purpose should not be used for another purpose without the agreement of the young person – except where there is clear evidence of danger to the young person, worker, other persons or the community” (Banks, 2010:157).

This unethical practice by Dave and other colleagues (as illustrated later) can only add to and strengthen their reputation as police collaborators in the local community while further distancing them from the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Dave’s account implies primarily the youth workers carry out ‘outreach’ work in Sunset Boulevard when responding to the fire alarm. In other words, they only venture into Sunset Boulevard when they accompany the police and the fire brigade. As illustrated later, this fits with accounts from the young men from Sunset Boulevard who say they only ever see the youth workers on the street if they are together with the police, which must confirm their belief that the youth workers and police closely collaborate. Following Dave’s explanation, they always carry out outreach work in Sunset Boulevard when they get “called out” to attend fires. During the interview, Dave drew my attention to the fact that when attending fires in Sunset Boulevard the youth workers normal practice is not to stand near the

police or fire officers, instead they stand close to children drawn in to witness the unfolding events on centrestage. However, while giving this presentation I noted that his unintentional communication did not support his intentional, there was no confirming consistency. In other words, Dave's body language gave the distinct impression he was deceiving me. Dave tried to give me the impression that he and the other youth workers are not closely aligned with the police. This is what Goffman (1974a) refers to as 'reworking of a primary frame' or 'fabrication' of a primary frame. Fabrications come into play when frame producers give false or misleading information, which led others to make a false understanding about an activity. Goffman (1974a) asserts:

"Fabrications can be classified in many ways for the purposes of analysis. They can be ordered according to how long they last or the number of persons contained by them. They can be ordered according to the materials that are manipulated. Thus a motive can be made to deceive, as an intent, a gesture, a show of resolve or a show of lack of it, a statement, an artefact, a personal identify, a setting and it's gathering, a conversation ... an happenstance ... a Trojan horse ... the classification and analysis I propose is one based upon the end served by the fabrication" (Goffman, 1974a:86).

This means a frame becomes fabricated when the producer communicates it in such a way that misleads others about what is happening in the frame (1974a:83). Goffman (1974a) identifies two types of fabrications: benign fabrications and exploitative fabrications. Following Goffman (1974a), benign fabrications do not hurt or injure the deceived party; rather they involve humour and fun. Exploitative fabrications, on the other hand, enter the frame solely for the benefit of the fabricator, which can be direct (e.g. a confidence trickster), or indirect, as in giving false or misleading information.

After considering, Goffman (1974a), and the interview situation with Dave in relation to the strip of the interview where he attempts to mislead my understanding of how they work while attending fires in Sunset Boulevard. My interpretation of the situation is that Dave tried to deceive me for the sake of his self presentation; he wanted to present an image which symbolised closeness to young people rather than the police. Therefore, this can be considered an example of

an exploitative fabrication. Later during the interview, while lost in his lifeworld, Dave exposed this deception by revealing that he does stand talking to the police in Sunset Boulevard. Dave's colleague's state clearly in their accounts below that standing close to the police while attending fires in Sunset Boulevard is their modus operandi.

During Dave's account, he constructs a distrust frame around the police and the group of young men who sometimes stand on the corner outside the kiosk of Sunset Boulevard. According to Dave, if the police did their jobs properly the youths from the corner would no longer be at liberty. During this explanation, Dave directly associates the "youths from the corner" to the fires in Sunset Boulevard. This implies that Dave suspects and assumes the youths who sometimes hang out on the corner are guilty of lighting the fires. During this explanation, Dave expresses both ambivalence and anger towards the police because they have not removed the group from the area. During Dave's explanation, he washes his hands of any responsibility towards the young men who sometimes stand on the corner outside the kiosk in Sunset Boulevard and firmly places blame with the police for shoddy detective work:

"Yeah if there's a fire they phone us then we drive down there errrrr we don't stand close to the police or the firemen ... we stand close to the children who come to look ... well there's something fascinating about fire right ... it draws people in ... so we stand there and small talk they are sick and tired of it ... all of them that live over there ... but nothing ever happens ... well ... and again it's the police ... that should do something right they should carry out a proper investigation ... the place is full of video cameras and ... they should bloody do something ... right it can't be possible to set fire to something without the cameras catching them they should do some detective work to get rid of them from the area ... they have to do something to get them away from the area so just get rid of those 15 – 20 youths that hang around outside the kiosk" (Interview: Dave).

However, this attitude towards this group of young men from the corner of Sunset Boulevard does not seem to be isolated to Dave. While talking about the target group for their work in the area, Dave began to explain about the new initiative at the institution whereby young men aged 18 and over can attend the so-called "Bad Boyz Club" to participate in social activities once a week. During Dave's explanation, however, it became apparent that the new initiative is only available to a select few. In other words, the "Bad Boyz Club" is only available to those considered acceptable

and not those considered unacceptable. This implies that Margret, possibly in collaboration with the youth workers, have made a moral judgement that the young men who stand on the corner outside the kiosk in Sunset Boulevard are not worthy of this new initiative and must be excluded – as such this is an institutionalised attitude.

Following Dave’s explanation, the new initiative is only available to those not suspected of setting fires in Sunset Boulevard. This implies a shared institutionalised framing of the group of young men who reside in Sunset Boulevard. In addition, apart from the blatant discriminatory practice involved, this measure excludes the target group of the local authority's integration project from the base of the employees charged with working with them, which seems counterproductive:

“Yeah but we are currently running some special activities out here well besides those 15 – 20 youths who hang around the kiosk they are not allowed here ... well we are open one evening a week... but it’s not for the tough boys as they are called ... they are not allowed ... it’s for the other ones ... the ones who don’t destroy everything out there for everyone else ... they are allowed to come here one evening every week and it’s [Adem] who runs it” (Interview: Dave).

In the interview after talking about the “Bad Boyz Club”, Dave admitted that he does not trust the police in relation to their efforts in Sunset Boulevard. During Dave’s explanation, he revealed that sometimes he does stand talking to the police while in Sunset Boulevard. In this respect, he said that the last time he and a colleague attended a fire in Sunset Boulevard he stood talking to a police officer about their efforts down there. In addition, Dave spoke about the recent arson attack on their base where they gave information to the police about their suspicions, but nothing happened. Perhaps this explains some of Dave's cynicism and anger towards the police:

“well they say they do a lot out there but I don’t know about their boss at the station whether or not he is an obstacle to the work out there or whether it’s the police officers dragging their feet because they could well we had an arson attack here at the club where an investigation group came and took photos and the like and we have never heard anything since ... nothing we served two names to the police on a plate where they could have made arrests ... but nothing ever happened errrrr and we actually wonder about that ... we actually spoke about it yesterday yesterday we were down there attending another arson attack I was standing down there talking to the police officer he

shrugged his shoulders and he said 'we can't do anything ... we are not allowed' ... well if it had been at the time when I was a lad then they would have had us out in the woods and given us a couple of slaps right?" (Interview: Dave).

During Dave's explanation, he asserts that the police are ineffective at 'sorting out' the group of young men from Sunset Boulevard. To make his point about inadequate policing, Dave makes use of hearsay about 'one of them' who got arrested with one kilo of hash and released shortly afterwards. In addition, similar to Margret, Dave desires a tougher approach and more police to tackle the 'tough boys' who sometimes hang around the corner outside the kiosk in Sunset Boulevard. Following Dave's account the police should implement visitation zones (an area that gives the police a freehand to search anyone, including bags or vehicle at will) while prohibiting the young men from gathering in groups. In other words, Dave desires a detachment of police officers to patrol Sunset Boulevard who have the powers to stop and search anyone at will and arrest anyone assembled in a group. Dave's desired solution for Sunset Boulevard is just to continue arresting the young men until they get sick and tired of doing crime and hanging around the corner together:

"Well ... if you want to hear my honest opinion then then the police are not good at sorting them out errrrrr they always say that it's about resources if it was up to me then they should make a 'visitation zone' out there ... errrrrr and have it so they are not allowed to hang out in groups ... and every time they do then they should be arrested I think that would have an effect because they would soon get tired of that ... every time they get involved in something then they should be arrested otherwise nothing happens down there I heard recently that one of them was arrested down there with a kilo of hash ... he got arrested but was out within two hours it's just a waste of time ... I just shook my head when I heard it's a joke I can't see the difference between Christiania or Copenhagen or out here ... well we should have double the amount of police out here or they should double what they do out there to make any impact ... that's what I think" (Interview: Dave).

5.3.11 Adem

Adem, an experienced youth worker with minority ethnic background has worked in the youth club across the road from Sunset Boulevard for several years. Adem is native to Sunset Boulevard

where he has lived most of his life. During fieldwork, many interactants said that Adem is 'fair and just' and as such is trustworthy. Without help from his colleagues, Adem runs the so-called "Bad Boyz Club" for some of the young men aged 18+ from the area in the youth club premises once a week.

In a similar account about the outreach function, Adem explained that outreach work involves patrolling trouble spots like the town centre and the train station which implies the youth workers have to be in places where trouble potentially can occur. In addition, Adem said that outreach work involves being visible in public places like cafes where young people in need can seek them out. During Adem's account, he explained that they do not spend much time in Sunset Boulevard because he believes it is not fair to disturb the young people in their home turf. Contrary to his colleagues, Adem frames Sunset Boulevard as a place where the young men live rather than a place that requires a strong police presence and close supervision:

"Errmmm we don't spend so much time in [Sunset Boulevard] ... because I don't think it's right that we go into their home turf all the time and disturb them ... it is their neighbourhood it's where they live they should be allowed to play ball without someone from the local authority coming over and saying ... 'what are you doing here and blah blah blah' ... they need more peace so I prefer to spend more time in the town centre or ... well there is a lot of trouble up there with thieves ... and youths who sit up at the station and drink ... so it's always really cool when we can get out onto the streets ... well we don't really need to go to the young ... we can sit in a cafe somewhere and they come to us ..." (Interview: Adem).

Similar to the accounts reported above, the conflict between 'confidentiality' and 'the duty to report' is evident in Adem's interview transcript. However, during the interview Adem links the duty to report together with his team's implementation of this duty directly to building trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. During the interview with Adem, I got the impression that he did not entirely agree with some of the practices of his colleagues. This transpired during his explanation about what trust means to him in his work. Adem began to explain that trust is a two way process then paused for thought (my interpretation). After a few seconds, in contrast to Dave's explanation, Adem said it should be required of them as employees to inform young people about their duty to report before speaking with them. During Adem's explanation, he said that they should "try and remind" young people before they start talking,

about their duty to report certain information to the 'authorities'. Adem's explanation or statement gave me the impression that he connected this issue directly to building trust with the young men of Sunset Boulevard. During Adem's account, he began to say that some of the young men of the area consider the youth workers as a way of facing trouble. In other words, if they have "*done something stupid and think they are going to get busted*", they go to the club and talk to the workers because they know the workers will accompany them to the police station.

However, mid under Adem's explanation he pauses to reflect (my interpretation) for about thirty seconds. After the short pause, slightly moved Adem admitted that the young men of Sunset Boulevard no longer see them as a way of tackling trouble. In the interview, Adem recognises that their relationship with the young men of Sunset Boulevard has changed for the worst over the last couple of years, particularly in relation to his Danish colleagues. According to Adem's account, the young men of Sunset Boulevard no longer trust them. Adem states that this change in attitude towards them relate directly to mistakes by the police (perhaps this relates to what Margret said before). Adem interprets this change in attitude towards them as a variation of scapegoating because 'someone needs to take the blame'. During Adem's account, an ideological conflict takes place concerning the issue of trust between the young men of the neighbourhood, his colleagues, himself and the duty to report. During part of the text, Adem focuses on the issue of reporting what the young men tell him to the police. His statement implies that he does not entirely agree with the practice of reporting what the young men tell him in confidence to the police, at least in the first instance. Adem's account implies he views the practice of reporting information to the police problematic to the relationship between them and the young men of Sunset Boulevard. In addition, Adem's account implies that contrary to institutionalised practice at the club, he attempts to help the young men of the neighbourhood and does not always provide information directly to the police. Perhaps, this helps Adem to maintain his reputation of being fair and just with the young men of the neighbourhood.

Later during the interview, Adem disclosed an incident which might explain his keenness concerning the practice of reporting information to the police. During this explanation, Adem said this experience caused him to lose confidence in his colleagues:

“... yeah a young person came up and told me something errrr in confidence ... errr very much in confidence he said he trusted me and had confidence in me that’s why he came he had been in some trouble ... and was worried that it would really affect him ... so he came and told me who was involved that it was him and him that had done it then I told my colleagues and then the day after I was informed that they had sent a letter to the police about it and then the youth that came up and told me about it was dragged in by the police and questioned that destroyed the trust he had in me ... of course I had to react to the information ... but first I had to speak to the youth and hear his opinion about it and what he said instead of going direct to the police I lost confidence in my colleagues because they had reacted to something that I told them without including me that makes it a bit confusing for me right ... I said it and of course we had to react to it but ... try just to wait ... protect that youth because if it looks like it’s him that is a snitch and has informed on his friends ... it’s him that has told everything ... it won’t be much fun for him ... he will get beaten up ... it will give him a load of problems then we managed to save it in the way that the police wouldn’t ask him directly about some things ... so we managed to save that situation a bit” (Interview: Adem).

During the interview, Adem explained that many young men with minority ethnic heritage from Sunset Boulevard have confident negative expectations towards his Danish colleagues. At the time of the interview, Adem said it was easier for him with his minority ethnic background to communicate with the young men than it was for his Danish colleagues. Moreover, according to Adem’s account the young men from Sunset Boulevard prefer to keep a distance to his Danish colleagues – a situation that has worsened over the past couple of years. Adem’s statement is in tune with my fieldwork observations where interactants spoke negatively about the Danish youth workers. The following extract of Adem’s account illustrates what I interpret as an ideological conflict taking place within the text. Further, the extract illustrates Adem’s statement concerning the negative attitude towards his Danish colleagues:

“hmmm well it was that way in the last one and a half years ... or more like two years ... it has been a bit different ... they they have lost a lot of confidence in us we have had some horrible episodes with ... the police they have done some stupid things and someone has to take the blame ... and that’s us ... we are trying to rebuild trust with the young people ... but it’s difficult ... well they should know that they can trust us ... they should know ... but they do not trust us at the moment but there are many of those boys especially the Muslim boys ... they trust me a lot ... they know they can tell me something

without me having to go further with it ... of course I will help them as much as I can ... but it does not have to be the police that we contact directly ... that means a lot but trust is difficult ... because if they lose confidence in you ... you have to work really hard to win trust again and that is what we are trying to do just now with the older boys [Bad Boyz Club] and these boys know that if there is a fire in [Sunset Boulevard] if it's a Friday evening and we are here then I take a walk down there together with two of the older boys then we can go over to the boys and talk about everything ... because there are three immigrants that come and talk with them ... then they can talk ... but again when my Danish colleagues are there, they keep a distance ... it's just got worse and worse the past two years" (Interview: Adem).

While talking about ways to build trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds of Sunset Boulevard, Adem said they should show a concern for the boys' welfare. During his explanation, Adem questioned the team's practice of only attending Sunset Boulevard in times of trouble; he said the practice is wrong, and they should also be there in times of peace too. In addition, Adem said attending fires makes them visible together with the police to the young men who gather to observe the unfolding action. Following Adem's explanation the young men only focus on negative things at the moment; therefore, it is paramount for them to show that they care about the wellbeing of the young men:

"Well you can try and show an interest in these boys it's not always that we do ... I also think it is wrong that they only go into Sunset Boulevard when there is a fire we should also be there when there are good times ... they gather when there is a fire ... they gather around because it is fun and exciting ... and see us there with the police and those boys at the moment only focus on negative things if you say negative twenty times then you become negative so these boys you have to show them that you are interested in them, listen to them and help them ... and save their arse you could say ... and try to help them out of problems of course within the rules if he has committed a robbery then of course it has to be reported to the police but it's just about how you do it ... you can go directly to the police by yourself or you could talk to the youth and say 'don't you think we should go to the police'? ... so you have to show you are interested in them and that you want to do something good... .. then I think trust will come" (Interview: Adem).

5.3.12 Bente

The interview with Bente, an educated pedagogue and experienced youth worker with majority ethnic background took place a couple of days after the interview with Adem. Similar to the interview with Adem, the interview with Bente took place at the youth club, the base of the youth

workers. During fieldwork, many interactants said they distrusted Bente along with her other Danish colleagues because they consider them snitches (police informants). Upon reaching the youth club on the day of the interview, I met Bente at the entrance of the club having a smoke; she seemed enthused and excited about the forthcoming interview: My interview notes are illustrative:

[Upon arriving at the club, Bente seemed charged with energy and expressed that she felt extremely excited and thrilled about the interview today. Bente informed me that she had been speaking to Adem who had spoken enthusiastically about the interview experience the previous day. Further, Bente said as a result of their subsequent discussion they talked about their practice with the young men of Sunset Boulevard. As a result, they agreed to approach [Margret] their manager and other colleagues at the next staff meeting to discuss their practice with the young men of Sunset Boulevard. Bente continued to say: "we are here more for the police than we are for the young people". When we sat down in the 'interview' room she began to talk about the situation at the club and how her and Adem were going to fix it.] (Source: Interview Notes: Bente: 2010).

This excerpt from my interview notes illustrates and reinforces that research does not take place in a vacuum and sometimes interactants discuss the interview experience, and maybe even the questions and responses. This raises the question about how much such discussions affect the responses of individuals waiting to be interviewed especially in team environments. In relation to the interview with Bente, it seems that her discussion with Adem gave her confident positive expectations in relation to the impending interview, but it could quite have easily gone the other way. Moreover, I can never know the extent to which Adem and Bente's discussion influenced any of her explanations to the questions. What Bente said during the pre-interview briefing (and repeated later during the recorded interview) was in tune with Adem's account above. Moreover, in this case it seems that the interview had unexpected consequences for the interactants involved.

During the digitally recorded interview, it became apparent on a couple of occasions that Bente and Adem had discussed and reflected over his interview experience. For example, as soon as the interview briefing was over and Bente gave her consent to start recording she made a statement that implied she and Adem had reflected over the situation between them and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard. In addition, the same

utterance implied that Bente and Adem had discussed the situation at length and had reached a conclusion about why the relationship between them (youth workers) and the young men from Sunset Boulevard had deteriorated. The following excerpt from the interview transcript is illustrative:

“Can you just tell me today’s date” (KP)

“Yeah the [digit] of May right” (Bente)

“Yes that’s right ... can you just tell me about what you was just saying”? (KP)

“Yeah [Dave] has worked here for three years ... and when you do outreach work with [Dave] he always goes over to the police ... we never worked that way ... [long sigh] so then I got a lot of ... I thought it was wrong and I took it up lots of times at our personnel meeting where I said that we don’t work that way and that [Adem] and me didn’t like it at all ... so therefore I really understand after what [Adem] said that you two had talked about, that our young people feel that way ... I really can ...” (Bente).

This excerpt indicates that Bente and Adem had discussed his interview experience at length. This can be interpreted as the interview acting as a catalyst setting in motion a critical discussion between the two interactants about their relationship with the young men along with their *modus operandi*. Therefore, as a researcher it is crucial to be aware that sometimes interactants might discuss interviews at length, which might have an impact on the data collected from small communities. In addition, this implies that sometimes the interview situation could be exploited where individuals collaborate to mislead researchers and/or to set agendas. Another example which illustrates that the two interactants had discussed the contents of the interview transpired when Bente began to explain about the circumstances under which they undertake ‘outreach’ work in Sunset Boulevard:

“... it’s true ... we only ever go into [Sunset Boulevard] when there’s a fire ... we don’t go there otherwise ... they are irritated with us at the moment, that means that we can’t approach them and we only drive over there when the police turn out ... and that’s wrong ... we should go over there in other ways too ... but if you ask me then [Adem] should be there every time ... at the moment ... that’s the way we should work ... we have to work in a way that rebuilds trust with them that should come into the club ... but they

don't come here anymore because they don't trust us ... so we will have to work over there together with [Adem] ... that's just the way it is ... that's not the opinion of my colleagues ... it is my opinion but we are the old sweats here [Bente + Adem] ... well ... in the olden days we could walk over there and talk with them ... you could talk about anything ... but at the moment there are only two that I can get near to ... the rest push me away ... and it's completely true, we are not policemen and we shouldn't stand with the police when we are over there and that's what we do at the moment ... we do ..." (Interview: Bente).

During Bente's explanation, in tune with the accounts above, she confirmed that they only go into Sunset Boulevard when there is a fire; otherwise, they stay clear of the place. Following Bente's account the young men have stopped coming to the youth club; therefore, they should do outreach work in Sunset Boulevard to try and restore trust. During Bente's explanation, she admits that when they attend fires in Sunset Boulevard they stick to the police. This is consistent with Adem's account but contrary to the impression given by Dave who attempted to give the impression of distance to the police during his interview. While talking about outreach work, Bente explained that she could detect a change in attitude towards them from the young men in Sunset Boulevard. In the "old days" it was possible to walk into Sunset Boulevard, approach the young lads and begin the process of relationship building. During Bente's explanation, she proposes that Adem and his assistant from the "Bad Boyz Club" should represent their interests in Sunset Boulevard. In addition, Bente's account confirms that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds have lost confidence in the Danish workers:

"Well it's right ... we only go over there when we receive a call that there has been trouble or there is a fire ... it was never like that before ... in the old days we walked down there and got really close to the young errrr and was on the street and talked with them and had a ... errrr relation with them ... we don't do that at the moment ... because ... we can't get anywhere near them that stand down outside the kiosk ... that means we stay at home [i.e. in the youth club] emmm so therefore my thought is that we have to work really, really, really hard out there to save it ... but at the same time I would say ... it's going to be difficult ... I actually think that we should give them space to stand down there ... and we should consider ... that it should be [Adem] and the one in activation ... [helper from Bad Boyz Club], perhaps he should be involved ... because I think it would be like putting a match to the fire by sending [names of two Danish colleagues] over there just now ... we need to get in another way ... it should be something about that they come here when they have a problem or we meet an individual on the street and regain his trust

through that way ... but if we go down there, me and [names of Danish colleagues] then we will 'light the fire'" (Interview: Bente).

During the interview, Bente seemed to be experiencing an ideological struggle. On the one hand, she acknowledges that their actions as a team contribute towards the change in the relationship; on the other hand, she struggles with this idea. During the interview, Bente 'broke frame' and asked if the young men from Sunset Boulevard said they are suspicious of her and the other youth workers, to which I replied:

"Well the young men are very suspicious and have told me a couple of times that they only ever see you over there is when there is trouble and often you stand talking to the police, and that's one reason why they think you are too close to the police" (KP).

"Then it's difficult ... it is I think if you ask me ... completely truthful from my heart then I think if it hadn't of been that then they would have found another excuse ... because I just think they are unreachable at the moment they live their own just now ... errrr and have everything called hash sale ... so it's completely outrageous that they blame us ... so I think it's just an excuse and it would have been something else ... but it has given me the thought that we shouldn't work that way anymore ... it has" (Interview: Bente).

During Bente's explanation, despite acknowledging that the practice of attending Sunset Boulevard together with the police contributes negatively towards their reputation and relationship with the young men, she still points the finger at the young men and constructs a new distrust frame around them. Following Bente's explanation, the young men's reported suspicion of them is a smokescreen designed to keep them at bay because they are busy selling drugs. However, at the same time the realisation that they only attend Sunset Boulevard together with the police is something which influences Bente and something she acknowledges must change.

Similar to Dave, as the interview proceeds, Bente continues to construct distrust frames around the young men who sometimes gather on the corner outside the kiosk in Sunset Boulevard. While explaining about the reaction that she and some of her colleagues experience from some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, she frames them as out of reach, pistol packing, adult haters who are a matter for the police. In this respect, Bente's proposed solution is not so different to Dave's: the police should simply drive down to the kiosk: *"take all*

the shit [young men] and put it into the van and drive all the shit away". Bente's remarks came while she was talking about a conversation with one of the police officers employed at the youth club.

Following Bente's account, in bygone days the young men received them positively where it was possible to walk into Sunset Boulevard as opposed to driving in with the police. However, these days' things have changed, where according to Bente the problem lies with the young men who sometimes stand on the corner. Similar to Dave, Bente views their role in Sunset Boulevard as a rescue mission to liberate the younger boys from the clutches of the older youths. Following this interpretation, the youth workers consider themselves as missionaries who must save the younger boys from the deviant older youths who are beyond redemption. According to Bente's explanation their job involves a struggle to get the younger boys away from the corner boys, up into the sanctuary of the youth club to save them. Following Bente's account, it is too late for the corner boys who are too far gone and a concern for the police. During Bente's account, she admits they stay away from Sunset Boulevard because they are afraid – afraid to get shot. The following excerpt is illustrative:

"Yeah they used to receive us in a good way errrr and we walked around freely down there ... I think that it has something to do with that group that are there just now ... errrrmm I mean that they are out of reach ... we can't reach them errrrr they have pistols errrrmm ... they hate all adults even their own brothers ... I mean that ... therefore ... if you ask me it is... precisely that group who stand down there ... they are a job for the police and we must look after all the little ones ... and that's what we do ... errrr when we go out we still go out into Sunset Boulevard ... so when we go out we get hold of the little ones who come in our club ... because them in front of the kiosk down there pull our small boys away from us ... do you understand what I mean ... emmmm and we try to get hold of them again and get them up here to us ... right because we can reach them ... but them who stand outside the ... errrr errr kiosk ... they are older so somewhere or other I mean they are a job for the police and I mean that the reason why we are not down there just now is because we have to look after ourselves ... I don't want to be shot down there ... no I don't want that ... and often when we have been down there at work ... weapons and all sorts of things have been fired ... so actually the police should go down there ... not us " (Interview: Bente).

While subsequently talking about the purpose of doing outreach work, Bente explained that her purpose with the work has always been to help young people. However, during her explanation she admitted that their practice at the club had changed from a helping role to one of control, which primarily involves making sure that young people behave themselves and not cause trouble:

“For me ... it is ... about helping the young ... but it has not been that way for a while ... and it’s something that I realised some time ago ... what I realised is that when we go out doing outreach work ... is that we only go out to make sure that there is no trouble, that there should not be any arson attacks and that they should behave themselves ... but that is not my purpose with it ... my purpose with it is to be there with the young and to help them ... but I think that purpose has gone ... and that’s what I think ... because we are not there for the sake of the young anymore ... we are here for the sake of troubles in the town and that’s not what outreach work is about ...” (Interview: Bente).

During the interview, Bente shared a similar attitude towards the local police and their efforts in Sunset Boulevard as Dave. However, dissimilar to Dave, Bente explained she trusts three police officers. Following Bente’s account, overall she distrusts the local police because a senior officer is extremely friendly with some of the boys from the corner of Sunset Boulevard. To make this point, Bente used the same account as Dave (with slight variations) about the young man with minority ethnic background arrested with a large amount of hash and released shortly afterwards. In this connection, Bente’s statement implies she considers he received preferential treatment when compared to a Danish youth arrested on a similar charge because he spent two months in solitary confinement. Hence, in relation to Bente's worldview this is unfair and unreasonable. In addition, Bente’s anger seems to be grounded in poor communication from the police. Following Bente’s statement, they work hard to provide information to the police but rarely hear anything in return, which is a key source of frustration. In relation to the three police officers, Bente explained that she trusts them first and foremost because they are colleagues and work together, which suggests knowledge-based trust. During Bente’s explanation, she frames the police officers as pedagogues rather than police officers. Bente spoke passionately about how the relationship between the youth workers and the police had worsened compared to bygone days. However, what is striking in Bente’s account is that the three ‘pedagogue’ police officers rely heavily on her for information about what is going on in Sunset Boulevard, which can have implications for the rules concerning confidentiality. The following interview excerpt is illustrative:

“Do you trust the police”? (KP)

“... .. no but I trust the three officers that are here ... but I don’t trust the police” (Bente)

“What’s the difference”? (KP)

“... they have a boss out there that manages it completely wrong and time after time I get frustrated with him ... often we get young people visiting here ... that say [name – boss of local police] they can just phone him and he will sort things out and time after time it frustrates me ... and I really want to go up there and scream in his face emmmm I think that we work and work and work and we never get anything from them ... errrr they ... get a lot from us errrr we have three officers who work here ... they always phone me when they need to know this and that and then they need to know something else ... but nothing ever comes from their direction ... emmm and I think that [name] destroys a lot out here I think it is frustrating ... that a youth gets lifted from here [club] with 90 grams of hash and with coke and I don’t know what else ... and is back here after one hour ... and I know a young Danish man that sat here having a telephone conversation that sounded a lot about hash ... he got lifted and ended up in isolation for two months ...” (Bente).

So why do you trust the three police officers?

“Because that errrr well firstly they are my colleagues and we work together ...” (Bente)

“In what way do they work in the club”? (KP)

“They are pedagogues just like me ... when they are here it is very important that they are pedagogues and not policemen ... errrmmm ...” (Bente)

“Ok so they have some shifts out here” (KP)

“Yeah amongst other things every Monday evening there are two police officers” (Bente)

“Do they carryout outreach work”? (KP)

“No ... they are not allowed that’s one thing and we talk often ... they think that I am very good at observing and that’s one reason why they always phone me and another is because I know a lot of people and I tell them if I know something and its therefore I have told them that I want something back in return I get frustrated because we never hear how the case is going ... if you had just errrmmm ‘if you arrest him then please be nice and say it to us’ because there should also be something the other way and I think that it is something that they have began to do better ... especially those three police officers ... but the others then I don’t think so I can tell you that at some point we worked really good together with the police ... Thursday, Friday and Saturday evenings we were constantly out with

five police officers in the evenings and worked the whole night and such things and we really got a lot it went really really good and when it was at its best they changed it” (Bente).

Bente’s account raises a number of questions in relation to practice at this youth work institution: For example, is it realistic that police officers who work on a part-time basis at this institution can forget all about their full-time occupations, and which signal does having police officers employed at the club send to young men who sometimes are at odds with the police? Towards the end of the interview, Bente disclosed she believes they began to change their modus operandi at the club and on the streets when Dave began to work there. An event which Bente associates with their worsening relationship with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard:

“I think that we made a really big ... errrr ... change when [Dave] started here because he worked completely differently ... Dave really likes ... power ... errrrmm ... and errrr [Margret] has not managed to say to him [clap clap clap she slaps her wrist to symbolise wrist slapping] ... where we others we errrr we must do some things ... I have often done some things that I really didn’t want to do ... because it’s not that way I want to work ... errrr and I have really felt bad about it ...” (Interview: Bente, May, 2010).

Bente’s interpretation implies that the practice at the youth club changed radically once Dave began to work there. According to her, Dave worked entirely different compared to their established practices at the youth club. In addition, Bente’s account implies she believes Margret should have stepped in to stop Dave’s influence over their daily practice. In addition, her statement implies despite not agreeing with Dave’s way of working, she and possibly other colleagues went along with it and adapted their modus operandi. If this is the case, and the modus operandi of the youth workers changed when Dave began working at the institution, this demonstrates how an actor can impact on already established cultural norms. If this is the case, a change in the way the team began to work with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard could have been enough to change the relationship from trusting to distrusting. This implies that consistency in behaviour is essential for maintaining trust. In addition, this implies that once the team implemented new habitual patterns of behaviour they were no longer able to negotiate and overcome the cultural frames in the neighbourhood. On the contrary,

these new cultural norms clashed with the cultural values and norms of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. This explanation fits with the data presented later in the chapter, which strongly suggests that the youth workers modus operandi is counterproductive to trust and to building trusting relationships.

5.3.13 Summary & Discussion

This section presents valuable insights, which contribute towards, answering the research question posited at the beginning of the chapter: How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications?

The short answer to the first part of the question is: the youth workers frame the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust and do so because it is an institutionalised contextualised cultural resource. The following summary and discussion expands this answer along with outlining some of the implications.

Through drawing on different data sources, this section has closely explored the attitudes and framing of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard, from the perspectives of local authority actors. In addition, during this section I identified some of the tools that the professionals draw upon from their cultural repertoire within the context of working with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds (“Social Inheritance”, professional distance, exclusion and snitching). I discussed some of the implications of using these tools in relation to trust and distrust. Overall, the identified cultural tools employed by professionals in focus are more conducive to distrust than trust, in this matter, they are counterproductive to trust and trusting.

In the second part of this section, the data imply that paternalistic attitudes and distrust frames transpire in the daily practice of frontline employees. With few exceptions, most of the local authority frontline employees encountered during fieldwork share a similar ‘paternalistic control attitude’ towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. This was evident throughout the field research and explicit in both observations and interviews. This section

presents two observed examples of the 'paternalistic attitude' at work in two different practice situations: (1) the interdisciplinary meeting between the youth workers and the 'official' SSP team. (2) Patrolling the inter-school football tournament. Both of these observed examples imply a deeply ingrained culture of observation (panopticism) and control in the practice of the youth workers which involves social policing rather than outreach work. Both examples imply employees construct distrust frames around young men from Sunset Boulevard, and participate in social policing activities at public events with the purpose of preventing and reporting trouble. These practices reinforce the distrustful attitudes and framing of the young men. As discussed in chapter two, high distrust involves paranoia where one or both parties expect undesirable eventualities; hence the best offence is the best defence and includes pre-emptive strikes, vigilance, wariness and watchfulness (Lewicki & Bunker, 1998). Further, the observation and patrolling activities carried out by these youth workers are much in tune with Foucault's (1977) Panopticism.

In addition, the monitoring action highlighted in these examples fits the ideology advanced by the government policy document reviewed above and that advanced by local authority leaders. During the interdisciplinary meeting, the professionals copresent listened in awe, endorsed and encouraged the surveillance operation. Overall, this strongly implies an institutionalised practice whereby youth workers employed to reach out to young people in need have accepted a social policing role that involves wariness, watchfulness and control. The interviews presented in this section reinforce the fieldwork observations and confirm how the youth workers frame the young men in distrust. In addition, exploring these interview transcripts provide backstage views of these attitudes and framing of the young men and how this unfolds in practice. The interview transcripts of the workers provide a valuable insight about how they make sense of their social world and the cultural tools they uncritically apply to subsist. The interviews of the youth workers provide a confirming consistency to the observations illustrated above. Despite minor discrepancies, there is consistency in the accounts concerning the attitudes and framing of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. In addition, the interviews reveal consistency about how the youth workers account for what they do. These accounts reveal backstage attitudes and practice, which have a direct bearing on the relationship between the youth workers and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside and hang out in Sunset Boulevard. These accounts indicate there is a direct relationship between how employees frame the 'unacceptable' boys who sometimes

stand on the corner and how they receive and manage them, like excluding them from the “*Bad Boyz Club*”. There is consistency when the workers account for their outreach role, one of the core tasks of the team. Following the accounts, outreach work includes attending and monitoring planned and spontaneous public events and spaces being vigilant, watchful and wary. In addition, ‘outreach work’ includes accompanying the police and the fire brigade into Sunset Boulevard. During the interviews, two workers began to question this institutionalised practice, especially about publicly working closely with the police while in the residential housing estate of Sunset Boulevard.

All of the accounts indicate that reporting information directly to the police is central to the practice of the youth workers, where only one employee offered any resistance to this institutionalised practice. This practice of reporting all received information opens up a larger discussion concerning the conflict between confidentiality and the duty to report certain information. During this section, various practice issues come to light which give cause for concern, for example, the possible violations of confidentiality. As discussed above, a series of sometimes contradictory legislation governs this area where it can be difficult to navigate. However, despite the complex and sometimes contradictory rules, the practice of passing on all information to the police adds negatively to the youth work team’s reputation and is counterproductive to building trust with young men who sometimes are in a clinch with the law. During the analysis, I found that the youth workers in question are more than likely in breach of the regulations concerning the duty to report and confidentiality. In addition, this practice goes directly against the social code in the area where many people consider it snitching and as such a hostile act. Finally, the practice of employing police officers at the club as part-time ‘pedagogues’ sends an unambiguous message to the local community that the institution is a joint local authority and police operation.

5.4 Part Three: Trust as a Cultural Frame

From the perspectives of some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the aim of this section is to examine their relationships with various public sector employees. The main focus is on the relationship between them and the youth workers known as the super snitch patrol, a

police officer and a job consultant. Through drawing on both operational and presentational data, this section explores how the young men use trust and distrust as a cultural frame to organise these relationships. The term cultural frame means a repertoire of skills and practices that knowledgeable social actors can draw upon in pursuit of goals (Swidler, 1986).

The term knowledgeable social actor implies that individuals actively determine which variation of trust or distrust to use in response to the situation and change these responses as and when required to meet changes in circumstances (Mizrachi et al., 2007). Following Swidler (1986) a culture is not a united process which drives action in the same direction, rather, it is more like a toolbox (Hannerz, 1969) from which actor's opt for different tools for creating different actions. Despite Individuals and groups having a set of tools at their disposal, there may be some they rarely use (Swidler, 1986). In this view, culture is a toolbox (repertoire) of habits, styles and skills which social actors use to make "strategies of action" (Swidler, 1986:273). Mizrachi et al.'s (2007) notion of trust repertoires is helpful in understanding the dynamics at play when people situated in unequal power structures and relations select trust variations and strategies. This is significant in the relationship between the public sector employees and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in this study where a number of underlying power relations interact, intertwine, interconnect and mutually constitute one another (e.g. ethnicity, religion class, age, gender, sexuality). According to Mizrachi et al. (2007) their framework takes the dimension of power into account whereby trust and control reciprocally connect. Following their argument, the more trust and freedom bestowed in the trustee, the less control the trusters has, and vice versa. In other words, trust and control go hand-in-hand, as trust develops there is less need for control in the relationship. As discussed in chapter two, Mizrachi et al. (2007) identify three ways trust strategies can be located in unequal power structures and political contexts.

- (1) The choice of strategy depends on available resources such as: "*symbolic and material resources, professional knowledge and skills, and social position in familial, organisational, and communal settings*" (2007:147). While these dynamics can sometimes hinder the actors' range of repertoire, they can give cultural tools that increase the actor's flexibility in negotiation (ibid).

- (2) Variations of trust and trust strategies convey political meanings and consequences. Most trust strategies reinforce the status quo and reflect existing social boundaries.
- (3) The relationship between trust and control develops and transpires in the local context where Mizrahi et al. (2007) view trust and control as possible mechanisms for absorbing uncertainty and reducing risk.

Using the term frame in the thesis implies that culture, trust and distrust are not static and tools available to actors develop over time in harmony with learning from new experiences, which includes education. In addition, the term frame implies that trust as a primary frame can be keyed into different trust variations. In this thesis, knowledgeable actors use trust as a cultural frame to define and to clarify their relationship with others. Trust frames involve interpretation and provide a means for organising and defining relationships. Trust and distrust as cultural frames can be understood as a resource used to describe the process by which actors determine others in everyday situations.

5.4.1 'The Super Snitch Patrol, the Cop and the Job Consultant'

As outlined in the previous section, from the perspectives of the youth workers the relationship between them and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard can best be described as tenuous and hostile at worst. Following the accounts of the youth workers, the dominant view of the young men is that they are dangerous deviants out of their reach and a problem for the police. This section looks at how some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame their relationships to the youth workers ('super snitch patrol'), a job consultant and a police officer. In other words, this section looks at the relationship from the other side of the coin. The section ends by taking a closer look at the relationship between the job consultant and the police officer from both the perspectives of the young men and the respective public sector employees to shed more light on how they are able to negotiate the cultural frames.

5.4.2 Hassan & Maria

Surprisingly, I heard about the super snitch patrol (youth workers) on my first day of fieldwork in Paradise Way, some twenty miles away from their base and the area where they work. At the time, Maria and I were returning to the local authority car in order to drive back to the SSP Office in 'Big Town' after some 'sight-seeing'. As we were approaching the car, a man called out: "Heyyyyy what's the local authority doing here"? (Source: Fieldwork Research Diary, October, 2009). This initiated an encounter between Maria, a local young entrepreneur Hassan and me (I eventually got to know Hassan better during the course of the fieldwork). During the initial encounter, Hassan asked what a representative from the local authority was doing in the area and what the letters SSP stood for on Marias Jacket. After Maria had explained about her job, the SSP apartment/boys club and the SSP abbreviation, Hassan with a smile on his face and a gleam in his eye said that he had heard about SSP from some of his friends in Sunset Boulevard.

Hassan explained that the word on the street is that SSP workers are not to be trusted seeing as they are in bed with the police. Maria responded to Hassan's remarks in a friendly courteous manner, but at the same time understandably played them down while standing in the street. However, in the privacy of the car, while driving back to the office she confirmed that there was truth in Hassan's account. The following extract from my research diary is illustrative:

[Oh but [Sunset Boulevard] ... "it's much worse there than here, they are crazy over there ... [laugh] ... did you know they call the SSP workers the Super Snitch Patrol [Stikker]"? Maria laughed and said she had heard that rumour before. Maria later explained that some of the young people in Sunset Boulevard have lost confidence in some of the local SSP workers because they give too much information to the police. According to Maria, many young people simply don't trust SSP workers in Sunset Boulevard and turn their backs to them. (Source: Fieldwork Research Diary, October, 2009).

This short extract illustrates how Hassan frames the relationship between the SSP workers and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard in terms of distrust. This excerpt is useful for a number of reasons: (1) it reinforces that impressions and reputation matters to trusting and demonstrates how easily reputation spreads between different areas. (2) It highlights the young men's confusion between the SSP team and the youth work team. (3) It

implies the SSP team are aware of the trust problem between the young men of Sunset Boulevard and the youth workers, which gives credence to Hassan's utterance.

At the time, I did not consider that Hassan's or Maria's subsequent remarks related to my research project; therefore, I did not pursue the matter. However, I recorded these observations in my field notebook, and the same night transferred the fieldnotes into my electronic research diary. While recording this encounter, I did not see its importance and considered dropping it, because as mentioned, it did not seem relevant to my project aims and goals at the outset of fieldwork. However, since it was such a thought-provoking idea to me as a former SSP worker, I recorded the notes into my electronic diary. This reinforces Goffman's (1974b) argument about the importance for researchers to record detailed fieldnotes, especially during the early days of entering the field. While recording this encounter, I had doubts about the substance of Hassan's account. On the one hand, it was difficult for me to grasp the idea that young people would label youth workers, who they often turn to in times of difficulties, as police informers. On the other hand, I struggled with the idea that youth workers who must build trusting relationships with young people to have success in helping them, and in achieving organisational goals would violate confidentiality by providing information to the police, unless it concerned serious crime or significant risk of harm to people. Nonetheless, Maria supported Hassan's account.

5.4.3 Asad and Kazim

"SSP [raised voice emphasis on the P] . . . we only ever see them here together with the police when there's trouble" (Source: Fieldwork Research Diary, January, 2010).

I entered the community centre in Sunset Boulevard one Friday evening in January 2010 with the purpose of determining its suitability as a site for future data collection. Upon walking through the first set of double doors, I observed many young men with minority ethnic backgrounds engaged in various table based activities, the place danced with life and energy. Upon getting through the second set of double doors, I got the impression that all eyes were on me – my ethnicity combined with outsider status made me visible. I approached what appeared to be a service area (a gap in some shutters), bought a cup of coffee and went to sit down. However, before my bottom made contact the seat of the chair, a young man approached, held out his hand in the way of greeting and introduced himself. Asad a young man aged twenty two years of Palestinian descent worked

at the community centre. He said he had observed me enter the building and subtly enquired about my reason for being there. During the focused encounter, it became apparent that Asad, in a friendly and relaxed way, was sizing me up. Despite the subtle difference, the process reminded me somewhat of that experienced in Paradise Way when first entering the field. After a while, Asad seemed satisfied with my account and said that it was his turn to serve beverages from behind the kitchen counter. As he stood up to leave, he turned and invited me to join him in the kitchen. I accepted his offer and said I would join him after visiting the WC. After a short while, I found Asad talking to another young man of similar age and ethnicity in the kitchen. Immediately, the young man reached out his hand as a greeting and introduced himself as Kazim. Kazim said that he and Asad are best friends and offered to take me around the community centre and introduce me to some of his other friends. During the walkabout, Kazim seemed to know everyone and received respect from fellow interactants. After some sightseeing and introductions, we joined Asad in the kitchen. While stood drinking tea, Kazim and Asad seemed curious about me as a person and my research project. Kazim asked a question about my research, which led to an animated exchange:

“Which local authority employees are you looking at?” (Kazim)

“My aim is to observe social workers, SSP workers and others who work with young people” (KP)

“SSP [raised voice emphasis on the P] . . . we only ever see them around here together with the police when there’s trouble” (Asad).

“SSP workers ... we hate them” (Kazim)

“Can you tell me why you hate SSP workers?” (KP)

“They spy for the police and they are grumpy” [sur] (Kazim)

“Yeah we call them the Super Snitch Patrol” (Asad)

“They spy for the police well apart from [Adem] he is ok” (Kazim)

“Can you give me an example” (KP)

“They are really bossy and impolite ... I used to go to the youth club over there ... [name of institution] ... the adults there are not nice ... they are unjust and they talk down to you ... it’s like you shouldn’t be there” (Kazim)

“One of my friends was in trouble, so I asked [Margret] for some advice ... a couple of days later the police came to my house to ask questions ... I told them nothing ... anyway my friend got arrested ... she went behind my back to the police, that made me feel really bad ... I lost all confidence in her she is a snitch and I want nothing more to do with her” (Asad)

“Ok ... but you are talking about the youth club workers, not the SSP workers, the SSP workers have an office in [Big Town]” (KP)

“Yeah but they are all the same” (Asad)

During the brief exchange in the kitchen, Asad and Kazim spoke passionately about their feelings towards the youth workers based across the road. My interpretation is that they feel disappointed, angry and betrayed by their actions. This emotional response might be seen in relationships that once have been close. Perhaps, this is the case because both Adem and Bente described a worsening of their relationship with the young men over recent years. This might partly contribute towards explaining this emotional response and sense of betrayal.

Asad’s statement about only seeing the youth workers in Sunset Boulevard during times of trouble in the company of the police is consistent with the youth worker accounts. During the kitchen encounter, Kazim expresses hatred towards all bar one of the youth workers which suggests anger and intense dislike towards the Danish youth workers. Rempel & Burris (2005), in their ‘Integrative Theory of Love and Hate’, identify that the literature usually views hate as the converse of love. The word hate embraces the essence of passionate experiential conditions between people almost as often as does love (Rempel & Burris, 2005). During their work, Rempel & Burris (2005) conclude there are significant differences of opinion regarding the nature of hate. However, after their review of the literature they subscribe to the idea that hate is a motive linked to devaluing the other along with negative intentions towards them.

While expanding on the matter, Kazim gave two reasons for his strong dislike of the youth workers: (1) they are police spies; (2) they are grumpy. When providing an example, Kazim talks

about an experience of visiting the youth club where in his view the staff acted condescendingly towards him, unjust and made him feel unwelcome.

During the encounter, Asad endorsed and reinforced Kazim's claim that the youth workers are police collaborators. Asad's statement referring to the youth workers as the super snitch patrol confirms Hassan's remarks above. In addition, Asad disclosed an example where he approached Margret and asked for advice with the goal of helping one of his friends. Subsequently, the police visited Asad's house to question him and later arrested his friend.

This could have had serious ramifications for Asad because it was him who revealed the name of his friend to Margret. Snitching in this sense goes beyond reporting someone to the authorities, it involves betraying the trust of your friends and neighbours. In addition, it involves exposing yourself, and the people closest to you to danger (Yates, 2006). Consequently, based on this experience of Margret Asad defines her as a snitch and wants nothing more to do with her – she is excluded from interaction. This is in tune, with Maria's account where she said the young men have turned their backs on some of the local SSP workers in Sunset Boulevard because they report too much information to the police. Asad's explanation is consistent with Margret's attitude concerning reporting information to the police outlined above. Therefore, the basis of Asad's and Kazim's distrust of the youth workers is knowledge of them through experience of interaction. Therefore, the relationship between these young men (who share similar views to others whom I interacted with) and the youth workers can be described best as knowledge-based distrust (KBDT). In other words, over time involving a series of interactions Asad and Kazim have learned they can have confident negative expectations towards these workers whose behaviour is predictable.

5.4.4 'Above All Else, Do Not Snitch'

This discussion concerning snitching relates directly to the case and discussion in chapter four and underscores the serious implications of this act. While snitching can be viewed as part of the social codex by the young minority ethnic men of Sunset Boulevard, it can also be viewed as an effective cultural tool for organising relationships with others. Defining another person as a snitch places a high distrust frame around them. As discussed in the previous chapter, this can have serious consequences such as excluding people from interaction or in extreme cases, like the job

consultant, forcing them out of the community. In most communities, people stigmatised as snitches face dangerous consequences if they do not leave (and sometimes even if they do). In the case of the youth workers, they cannot simply withdraw. Their outpost lies on the border of Sunset Boulevard where sometimes they 'must' accompany the police into the area where they meet a hostile reception. This was clear during the interdisciplinary meeting where Dave reported that many of the older youths are hostile towards them and shout obscenities. In addition, this hostility towards the youth workers is evident in the interview transcripts of all the employees apart from Margret. In Bente's account, she stated in bygone days the young men received them positively where it was possible to walk into Sunset Boulevard as opposed to driving in with the police. However, the dynamics of the relationship have changed. Hence, currently they stay away from Sunset Boulevard unless they go along with the police, because they are afraid. During the fieldwork, person(s) unknown set fire to the youth workers base which more than likely can be linked to their snitch reputation. Fortunately, only limited damage to the main entrance of the youth club occurred.

There is plenty of research to be found that underscores the serious nature and implications attached to the act of snitching. Yates (2006) in his ethnographic research on a marginalised council estate in England found that 'grassing' (snitching) and 'grass' were terms widely used by young people on the council estate to describe individuals who inform the authorities about the behaviour of other members of their community. Social researchers have identified the 'not grassing' culture as a significant problem to the performance and success for both social control and public service agents in marginalised communities, in Britain (Yates, 2006).

During his fieldwork, Yates (2006) found a strong culture of not informing the authorities about the activities of other residents. One of Yates interactants explained:

"There is a culture here on the Estate, where people don't want to be seen, or are afraid to be seen as a grass. If you're a grass or if you are seen as a grass . . . well people see that as a risk really . . . it's somewhere a lot of people don't want to go" (Yates, 2006:199).

Yates (2006) found the verbal 'not grassing' maxim could be compared to a 'sacred norm of street etiquette' (Jacobs, 1998; in Yates, 2006:200) and this was evident in the youth cultures on the council estate. In other words, the young people who lived in the council estate adhered to a culture of not giving information to the authorities. Yates (2006) found that the young people in his study used the term to mean perceived or existing relationships with either the police or other agencies who undertake social control. Yates (2006) asserts that the 'grass' stigma signifies untrustworthiness which potentially can have negative consequences for the individual involved and possibly their family, which can include both physical and social risks (Yates, 2006). This is much in tune with the findings of Wieder (1975) in his ethnographic research in a half-way house, an institution that bridges the gap between prisons and community.

Wieder (1975) identified six maxims of the 'Convict Code' of which snitching plays a leading part. During his fieldwork, interactants explained to Wieder they had "*learned the code much earlier than their prison experiences, as hypes on the street*" (1975:144). This implies interplay between the institution and the individual where the "Convict Code" exists in another variation on the street where snitching still plays a crucial role as a powerful cultural tool.

Wieder (1975) found that convicts enforced the system through applying labels or social-type names to those members of the group considered as deviating from the code. Group members considered snitching to be morally reprehensible and viewed it as an action against them as a group (ibid). Apart from its principle use as a tool for preventing members of the community informing the authorities on other community members, members use it to organise their own role in the community and social relations with others (Wieder, 1975). Wieder (1975) found that snitching has a permanency attached to it whereby members of the community spread the word about someone labelled a snitch throughout the community and beyond. At the very least, this means that individuals labelled snitches cannot operate with others (ibid). This is much in tune with the situation in Sunset Boulevard where the youth workers cannot operate safely without the police because they bear the snitch stigma.

I experienced on a number of occasions how interactants spoke negatively about the youth workers as a team, but often added, as if a reflex 'Adem is ok'. This indicates that while there is a high distrust towards the team as a whole, the young men still trust one team member. This

implies that both trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship. I heard a similar account one evening in February 2010 while interviewing Salim prior to attending his birthday celebrations.

5.4.5 Salim

On the evening of the gathering, Salim a twenty five year old man of Palestinian heritage had invited me to arrive one hour before the other guests, so we could talk in peace before the festivities began. Upon entering Salim's apartment, it seemed that he expected many guests that evening – there was an abundance of food and drink. Salim explained that his wife and mother, who had just left, were responsible for preparing the food. On this night, it was to be a gathering of men and some guests would be travelling long distance to attend. Salim offered me a beer and we stood in the kitchen engaging in small talk, while conversing he seemed relaxed and in joyous humour. I asked him why the young men dislike the youth workers; he shrugged his shoulders, and while laughing said *"where should I start my friend"*. Salim said there could be many reasons why the 'boys' dislike the youth workers since there is 'a lot of water under the bridge'. However, he explained that most of the bad feelings towards them can be attributed to their *"unjust"* actions. Salim said that Margret and the other Danish workers at the youth club are both *"horrible and unjust"*. While expanding on his explanation, Salim said the Danish workers speak abruptly to the young men and often treat them unjustly. According to Salim, when the Danish youth workers enforce rules at the club the penalty usually outweighs the crime. For example, he said he witnessed one of his friends been barred from the club for three months for having his feet on the table. This sanction is out of proportion to the offence according to Salim. During his explanation, Salim said he agrees it is necessary to enforce rules, but when doing so the penalty should be proportionate to the crime. According to Salim's morale code his friend would have *"learned the lesson"* with a fair sanction. A fair sanction, according to Salim would have been to exclude him for three weeks instead of three months. According to him, giving unjust sanctions achieves nothing but bitterness and anger. Salim went on to say because of this (perceived) unjust act; he and all of his friends became angry, left the club and never went back. According to Salim, the young men of Sunset Boulevard look out for one another and especially in times of trouble they stick together. Salim's statement implies the young minority ethnic men of Sunset Boulevard adhere to a cult of honour and loyalty. They trust that if someone outside the group offends one member all take

offence – a bit similar to the three musketeers who live by the pledge “*all for one, one for all*”. This group identification and loyalty that Salim spoke about are the stuff that Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) identification-based trust derives. Group based trust linked to group membership develops as individuals identify with the goals adopted and supported by the group (Kramer and Brewer, 1986; Kramer, 1993; in Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

As outlined in chapter two, a number of activities strengthen identification-based trust, even though these are based on business models they are useful here: (1) developing a common identity [this group are tightly-knit, share some family ties, most have grown up together in Sunset Boulevard]. (2) Co-location in the same building or neighbourhood: [most of the young men live in the same quarter of the neighbourhood]. (3) Creating joint products or goals: [this tightly-knit group while not producing ‘products’ work together towards common identified goals and against common identified foes. In addition, they are extremely loyal towards each other and back each other up in common actions as and when required]. (4) Committing to commonly shared values, to the same objectives and can substitute for each other in external transactions: [as outlined above, the young men share a common social codex which includes the idea about snitching]. In addition, most of the young men could probably stand in for absent members when required during external dealings. As outlined in chapter two, during identification-based trust, group members can be sure their interests are safeguarded.

During Salim’s account, the idea of ‘unjust’ dominated his explanation in relation to the Danish youth club workers he later relied on the notion of ‘justice’ to help frame other public sector employees as trustworthy. Likewise, many minority ethnic men encountered during the fieldwork relied on words like ‘unjust’ and ‘just’ often linked to trust/trustworthiness to organise people and relationships. This implies that notions around justice and fairness are meaningful to the decision making process of minority ethnic men when deciding who to trust or distrust. Perhaps this indicates that ideas around injustice and fairness are amongst the primary cultural tools that these men rely on to organise the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of people. This implies that if actors decide that an individual or group of persons act unjustly they get labelled as untrustworthy and vice versa.

According to Salim, ‘unjust’ behaviour is normal practice towards the young men of the neighbourhood at the club over the road which adds negatively to the untrustworthy reputation

of the youth workers. In addition, he emphasised that unjust behaviour can be attributed solely to the Danish workers at the club. According to him, that is the rationale behind Adem being responsible for running the “Bad Boyz Club” – otherwise none of the boys would attend. During the fieldwork, I heard similar explanations to this effect from other interactants and observed firsthand that Adem was the only member of staff present on “Bad Boyz” evenings. Nevertheless, I wondered if Salim considered all majority ethnic Danes who provide public services unjust. Salim gave three reasons why the young men of Sunset Boulevard trust Adem: fairness, foreign and native. According to Salim’s explanation, Adem is a ‘just and fair man’ who listens more than he speaks, he is foreign like the boy’s and is from Sunset Boulevard, which fits with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) notion of trust based on identification.

5.4.6 Injustice & Justice

While Salim’s account cannot be verified, it is in accord with Kazim’s statement above, particularly in relation to how he frames the performance of the youth workers as unjust. Being unjust, according to Salim involves the youth workers sanctioning young people unreasonably i.e. the penalty outweighing the crime. According to Salim’s account if the penalty is not in proportion to the crime then resentment and anger arise. This explanation is in tune with Foucault (1977) where he articulates:

“The prison also produces delinquents by imposing violent constraints on its inmates; it is supposed to apply the law, and to teach respect for it; but all its functioning operates in the form of an abuse of power. The arbitrary power of administration: ‘The feeling of injustice that a prisoner has is one of the causes that may make his character untameable. When he sees himself exposed in this way to suffering, which the law has neither ordered nor envisaged, he becomes habitually angry against everything around him; he sees every agent of authority as an executioner; he no longer thinks that he was guilty: he accuses justice itself” (Bigot Prémeneu; in Foucault, 1977:266).

While the prison is a far cry from the youth club which borders Sunset Boulevard, Foucault’s (1977) message is still useful: Injustice is an underlying cause to both anger and resentment

towards the system and its agents and suggests a clear link between anger and injustice. Perhaps this can help explain some of bitterness and hatred expressed by Kazim during his statement along with that expressed by other interactants in Sunset Boulevard towards the youth workers.

On the flip side of the coin, researchers who investigate justice in organisations have found a phenomenon they identify as the “fairness heuristic” (see Lind, 2001; Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, & de Vera Park, 1993). According to Lind (2001), two basic processes or assumptions underpin his ‘Fairness Heuristic Theory’:

“Fairness judgements are assumed to serve as a proxy for interpersonal trust in guiding decisions about whether to behave in a cooperative fashion to social situations, and 2) people are assumed to use a variety of cognitive shortcuts to ensure that they have a fairness judgement available when they need to make decisions about engaging in cooperative behaviour” (2001:56).

Lind (2001) suggests that people use overall impressions of fair treatment as a substitute for interpersonal trust. According to his theory, people draw on their impressions of fair treatment as they process the requests, demands, and future obligations placed upon them through daily interactions (Lind, 2001). Lind (2001) maintains:

“People use fairness judgements in much the same way that they would refer to feelings of trust—if they had an independent basis for forming trust—to decide how to react to demands in a long-standing personal relationship” (2001:65). Lind (2001) suggests that through the process of socialisation and especially through learning about potential losses and paybacks of keeping company with and identifying with others people tends to use impressions of fairness to handle both investment and participation in relationships which corresponds to their perceived level of fairness.

Lind (2001), through his theory attempts to explain why “justice judgements” have a significant impact on attitudes and behaviours of individuals in organisations and other social contexts. According to Lind (2001), justice judgments link directly to relationships and interweave with issues of *inclusion and belonging*. This links directly to arguments presented in the first

section of the chapter by Rawls & David (2006) concerning 'Othering'. As Rawls & David (2006) argue:

"It is essential that no one be "Othered". Mutual orientation and trust have become essential to interaction. It is a process of overcoming difference through reciprocity, rather than creating difference through exclusion" (2006:470).

In other words, a sense of belonging and inclusion influence perceptions of fairness, which is conducive to the trust building process, whereas, acts of exclusion evoke a sense of not belonging while promoting perceptions of injustice which induce distrust. Following Lind (2001), in organisational contexts research shows (Greenberg, 1994; Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler & Smith, 1997) that positive justice judgements enhance organisational commitment; loyalty; trust in co-workers and positive attitudes toward organisational policies and actions (2001:58). Justice judgements affect both mindset and behaviours where the strongest impact pertains to the acceptance of group or organisational authority (Lind, 2001). For example, a number of studies show that people who perceive they have received fair treatment are more willing to act and respect authority decisions (Huo et al., 1996; Konovsky & Folger, 1991; Lind et al., 1993; Tyler & Smith, 1997; in Lind 2001). However, people who perceive they have received unfair treatment are more likely to engage in negative behaviours ranging from selfish to anti-social (Lind, 2001). For example, Folger et al. (1998) establish a link between perspectives of unfair treatment and assaults in the working environment (Lind, 2001). People often react more strongly to the fairness of the treatment they receive than to the favourability of the outcomes attached to various actions (Lind, 2001). Following Lind (2001), people often behave in accordance with their fairness judgements even when they clearly perceive no outcome benefits – even if this incurs cost.

Evidence from research supports the view that fairness judgments can serve as a substitute for trust. Van den Bos et al. (1998) in two studies found procedural justice manipulations had stronger effects on the evaluation of an authority's decisions when the perceiver had little empirical information concerning the trustworthiness of the authority than when the perceiver knew the authority to be either trustworthy or untrustworthy (Lind, 2001). Lind's (2001) theory suggests that as individuals begin to establish relationships justice judgements need to be

established early. This implies that fairness judgments occur with the first exchange of relevant information which influences the individual's perception of fairness. In addition, the individual relies often on the first presenting relevant justice information (e.g. outcome distributions, procedures or interpersonal handling), to guide their primary perception as either fair or unfair. Thus, positive justice judgements enhance collaborative and pro-social actions, whereas negative justice judgments lead to negative, antisocial behaviours.

Nevertheless, there is another aspect of injustice to be considered which implies that injustice can be employed by individuals as a tool to mobilise collective social action. While acknowledging the link between the emotion of anger and the perception of injustice, Miller (2001) in his comprehensive analysis of the literature on injustice shows how injustice can be used as a strategy for rallying the troops. Following Miller (2001), anger and injustice mutually constitute one another:

“On the one hand, the perception of injustice can lead to anger. For example, people report that their most common response to injustice is anger (Clayton, 1992; Mikula, 1986). On the other hand, the arousal of anger can lead to the perception of injustice” (2001:534).

Miller (2001) argues that injustices have a *“transcendent property”*, whereby it is more acceptable to respond to a cry of injustice than to something which is simply insulting, even when both offences elicit comparable outrage. To identify an insult as injustice transforms it from a personal matter to an impersonal matter of principle (Frankena, 1963; Gamson, 1968; Kelsen, 1943; in Miller, 2001). In other words, the cry of injustice transforms the personal into the public (Pitkin, 1981; in Miller, 2001). It also implies a strategy for action (Capek, 1993; in Miller, 2001). As Miller (2001) concludes, a personal injury labelled an injustice becomes a shared injustice, and settling a score becomes a defence of honour and integrity of the whole community.

Therefore, framing individuals, groups or institutions as unjust can be interpreted as a cultural tool used to trigger collective social action against identified others. Framing individuals or groups in injustice can be interpreted as constructing high distrust frames around individuals or groups. On the other hand, using notions of justice can be interpreted as a way of framing people in trust and trustworthiness. Seen in this light, I interpret injustice (unjust) and justice (just) as primary cultural tools to frame individuals or institutions either in distrust or trust by the young

men. During the fieldwork, it became clear that there were some public sector employees with majority ethnic backgrounds that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds trust. In the next part of the section, I explore how the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds talk about, and frame two professionals with majority ethnic backgrounds and compare this to the literature on trust.

5.4.7 Trust Framing: The Job Consultant & Cop

Salim seemed relaxed while standing in the kitchen sipping beer and mulling over things concerning the young men of the neighbourhood and public sector workers. At the time, it was my impression that he enjoyed chatting about things in Sunset Boulevard and seemed to thrive reflecting over the topic. While conversing in the kitchen, I wondered if Salim could be prejudiced towards public sector employees with majority ethnic backgrounds. Therefore, I asked him if all Danish local authority employees are unjust in their dealings with the young minority ethnic men in Sunset Boulevard. The following extract from my research diary is illustrative:

So tell me, [Salim] are all Danish local authority employees unjust in their dealings with the boy's? (KP)

"Naaaa I don't think so ... I don't really know ... it's mostly them from the club and some of those grumpy bastards from the housing association haha [laughs]" (Salim)

Ok ... can you tell me which Danish workers that you consider to be fair or just? (KP)

"... .. [he rolls his eyes upwards and looks towards the ceiling, after approx twenty seconds answers] haha [laughs] I can only think of two ... [Linda] she is a sagsbehandler ... what's that in English? (Salim)

A social worker or a case manager (KP)

"Yeah she is just [fair] and the boy's like her ... I like her and you can trust her" (Salim)

Why is she trustworthy? (KP)

"Because she treats you with respect ... she speaks with you and not down to you" (Salim)

Anything else? (KP)

*"Yeah she listens to you ... and you can see that she cares about you ... you can see that in her face"
(Salim)*

How can you see that? (KP)

"Haha ... I don't know ... you just can ... you can see it and you can feel it" (Salim)

You said that you can think of two Danish employees ... who is the other one? (KP)

"Hmmm the other one I think is just [fair] is [Dennis] and he's a cop [strisser] hahaha [laughs] (Salim)

Ok ... in what way is [Dennis] just? (KP)

"Hmmm he is fair ... he listens to you and meets you with respect ... even if you are in the wrong" (Salim)

Anything else? (KP)

"Yeah he dares to come here and talks with the boys ... he is the only cop who dares to come down here and talk with the boy's ... the others are rude and racists haha [laughs] ... they provoke you ... with [Dennis] you know where you have him and you can trust him ... if he says something he does it (Salim)

Can you give me an example? (KP)

"... yeah if he says he will bust you for doing something next time he catches you then you know he will ... if he says he will do something he does it ... he is a man of his word" (Salim)

Interestingly, while talking about which Danish employees he considers being 'just' or 'fair', Salim links trust to the notion of fairness. This reinforces the link between fairness and trust advanced by Lind (2001) in his 'Fairness Heuristic Theory'. However, in this case Salim does not substitute interpersonal trust with fairness as advanced by Lind (2001); rather he combines the two. Perhaps in this case, this is because of the history of interaction between him and the two actors in question. During Salim's statement, he associates 'grumpiness' to the idea of being unjust and listening and communicating on an equal footing to being just. When considering Danish public sector employees who are just, Salim gave the names [Linda] (who turned out to be a job consultant, who I later shadowed for three days and interviewed) and [Dennis] a police officer (who I observed interacting with the young men on a couple of occasions and interviewed).

According to Salim's explanation, he considers Linda trustworthy because she is fair, treats people with respect and communicates on an 'equal' footing. In addition, after a prompt, Salim adds that Linda signals that she 'cares' which relates to ideas such as benevolence, integrity, goodwill and compassion which some researchers consider as belonging to the broad heading of 'strong' trust (Maguire & Philips, 2008). In their study of a merger between two financial institutions, Maguire & Philips (2008) define trust as: *"the expectation that some other will act with predictability and benevolence"*, which according to them is the basis of strong trust (2008:374). Strong trust involves a 'leap of faith' (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Möllering, 2006) based on expectations of benevolence or goodwill of the other party. The leap of faith is a move towards a deeper attitude of trust which bears the imprint of 'other-orientation' or 'collectivity-orientation' (Maguire & Phillips, 2008:374). This variation of trust is what Mizrachi et al. (2007), refer to as normative and maintain that it occurs in *"informal, emotionally charged personal relationships, such as friendships, families, and communities"* (2007:145). However, in this case Salim is talking about a job consultant employed by the local authority. Salim's explanation for trusting Linda fits therefore with notions of strong trust rather than what weak trust, which most of the literature suggests should be the case between a 'service user' and a service provider.

During fieldwork other interactants organised their relationships with both Linda the job consultant and Dennis the 'cop' through applying similar frames as Salim. For instance, one day in March 2010, while standing outside the community centre talking with Omar (recently released from prison) about his future work prospects a car drove past and the woman driver [Linda] waved. This triggered a dialogue between Omar and me concerning Linda. The following extract from my research diary illustrates this brief exchange:

"Look there's my contact person [he points at a car driving down the road from right to left heading past the community centre] ... do you know what a contact person is"? (Omar)

[As the car drives past the woman driver waves ... Omar waves enthusiastically back]

Yes, I know what you mean, what is she like? (KP)

"She is ok ... she has helped me a lot ... her name is [Linda] (Omar)

Oh right ... I have met her in a couple of weeks I am going to spend some time with her to see how she works with young people (KP)

“Cool ... you will like her she is really good to talk to and treats people fair ... not like some of the others” (Omar)

In what way is she fair? (KP)

“... .. she listens to you and gives you a chance ... she doesn't just take your money if you don't turn up haha [laughs]” (Omar)

Ok that sounds fair (KP)

How has she helped you? (KP)

“errrr she helped me to get sorted out when I came out of prison she is the one who helped me get a place on the bricklayer course” (Omar)

Excellent (KP)

“When you have problems you can always phone her then we make a deal to meet” (Omar)

She sounds reliable (KP)

“Yeah ... you know you can trust her” (Omar)

How do you know you can trust her? (KP)

“You just do she keeps her word and you know that her heart is in the right place ... you can see that she likes you” (Omar)

How can you see that? (KP)

“... .. she smiles and shows she cares about you ... she phoned me on my birthday and congratulated me ... she reminds me of my mother” (Omar)

Similar to Salim, fairness comes into the frame when Omar talks about Linda the job consultant. While some of the young men of the neighbourhood may seem uncertain about Linda's given job title, they are certain about the impression she gives and gives off. In this respect, the explanations of the young men consistently imply that Linda pays attention (listens), meets them with respect, is caring, fair, and trustworthy. During Omar's explanation, he links getting released from prison with receiving support from Linda which 'helped him to move on with his life'. This implies, through experience, Omar has learned that Linda keeps her word, is reliable, cares, therefore, is worthy of trust. Following Omar's explanation, he frames her as fair because with Linda, unlike some of the others she gives people a chance. In addition, according to Omar's explanation Linda is worthy of trust because she keeps her word and signals that she likes people. According to Omar, Linda reminds him of his mother which in this connection implies strong trust. These explanations outlined here are much in tune with work by Six (2005, 2007) & Six & Sorge (2008). For example, according to Six (2005) benevolence involves how others perceive the individual in terms of magnanimity.

5.4.8 Framing the Cop contd.

When talking about the police officer, Salim frames him in fairness which is in tune with the justice framing. It is necessary to point out that during the interview with Salim, while trying to make sense of the word 'just' I asked if he meant 'fair', which may have influenced the introduction of the word 'fair' on his behalf; however, they pertain to the same thing. Following Salim's statement, Dennis the police officer listens (similar to what he said about Adem & Linda) and meets people with respect even when they are at fault, which implies consistent behaviour on his behalf and makes his actions predictable. In addition, Salim explained that Dennis dares to go into Sunset Boulevard and talk to the boys, which perhaps is a bit unusual in the neighbourhood. Perhaps this perceived daring behaviour adds to Dennis reputation and respect. Perhaps this is what some researchers mean by taking the leap of faith or what Möllering (2006) refers to as suspension. Suspension, according to Möllering (2006) is the process which enables actors to handle uncertainty and vulnerability. Möllering (2006) argues that suspension is the essence of trust, because trust as the positive expectation of others can only come about through combining reason, routine and reflexivity with suspension. Perhaps, Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) knowledge-

based trust offers a satisfactory explanation whereby Dennis has built up knowledge of the young men over an extended period; therefore, he can predict how they will receive him in the area. There could be many explanations, however, having met Dennis I would put more weight on the latter since during an interview he gave the impression that he is decidedly calculating during policing and does not seem to leave anything to chance.

During fieldwork, I only ever observed the police driving around Sunset Boulevard. However, I observed Dennis interacting with the young men on a number of occasions during a sporting activity. My observations at the time left me with the impression that the majority of the young men respect and trust him. In addition, Salim said, with Dennis, people know what to expect from him because he keeps his word, this implies that Dennis behaves consistently which adds to his predictability. Salim's interpretation of Dennis fits with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) knowledge-based trust somewhat where predictability is a key feature. As discussed in chapter two, knowledge-based trust relies on information rather than deterrence. However, during Salim's explanation he gave the example that if Dennis says he will bust someone for doing the same thing twice this involves a degree of deterrence, but again this prediction based on experience of Dennis. This implies the variation of trust that Salim (and others) frame Dennis in is a variation which involves knowledge and some deterrence – a combination of calculus-based and knowledge-based trust. According, to Lewicki & Bunker (1996), calculus-based trust is necessary during early phases of new relationships. However, when CBT pays off, actors get a better knowledge of the others needs, preferences and priorities. This can develop into the second phase of trust building, 'knowledge-based trust' (KBT). This involves knowing the other well enough to be able to 'predict' their future actions (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). This suggests that KBT with a hint of CBT coexist within this relationship. Perhaps in this case, Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model falls short and requires modification.

Similarly, one day in April 2010 while observing/participating in a discussion, in the community centre, a police car drove past which triggered an automatic response from the lads sitting around the table. In unison, they gave 'the finger' towards the passing car while shouting obscenities. According to the lads present, the police only drive past the community centre as an act of provocation. During an exchange between the young men sat around the table Ibrahim said: *"all police are bastards they don't give a fuck about us"*. This seemed like a good opportunity to

ask the lads about [Dennis], the police officer whom I had observed them interact with on more than one occasion. The following extract from my research diary is illustrative:

So are all police bastards? (KP)

"They are fucking pigs ..." (Ibrahim)

"They are racist bastards who hate us" (Aadil)

Ok ... but what about [Dennis]? (KP)

*"... .. yeah ... he is **Ok** [ok means trustworthy]"* (Ibrahim)

So why is he ok? (KP)

"He is just [fair] ... keeps his word and you can count on him" (Aadil)

What do you mean by just? (KP)

"He treats us with respect and is fair" (Muhammad)

In what way is he fair? (KP)

"He is not like the others ... he speaks politely to us and explains things" (Ibrahim)

Ok ... anything else? (KP)

"Yeah he likes us you can see it in his eyes" (Muhammad)

"When he meets us he smiles and shakes hands ... he is a good man" (Aadil)

"Yeah but he can be hard sometimes haha [laughs]" (Ibrahim)

How? (KP)

"If you don't keep your promise then he gets mad" (Ibrahim)

What happens then? (KP)

“He tells you off or gives you a fine” (Ibrahim)

This framing of Dennis during the group encounter has many similarities to those illustrated above. Notions of justice and injustice play a significant role in deciding between which public sector employees are trustworthy or not. According to this account, while other police officers are ‘bastards’ Dennis is ok because he keeps his word, is reliable, meets the young men with respect and speaks politely – all the signs of fairness. Similar to Salim’s account, this implies that the young minority ethnic men frame their relationship with Dennis in a variation of trust which primarily involves predictability, with a hint of deterrence. This reinforces the idea that the relationship between Dennis and the young minority ethnic men can best be described as a mix between knowledge-based and calculus-based trust. In addition, this account implies that Dennis is successful in his communication and impression management when interacting with the young men.

The above narratives concerning the naming and framing of Linda and Dennis are in tune with the literature on management which deal with factors that contribute towards trustworthiness perceptions. Although this literature concerns the relationship between managers and employees, it reinforces the statements above as factors which arise through interaction, therefore, are useful to shed light on the explanations given by the young men above about why they consider Linda and Dennis worthy of trust. For example, Whitener et al. (1998) developed a typology of five broad categories of managerial trustworthy behaviour: 1) behavioural consistency; 2) Behavioural integrity; 3) Sharing and delegation of control; 4) Communication (accuracy, explanations and openness); and 5) demonstration of concern (Whitener et al., 1998:516).

Behavioural consistency, according to Whitener et al. (1998) concerns reliability and predictability of the other (similar to knowledge-based trust), considered by many trust researchers as necessary to building trust (e.g. Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1978; Jennings, 1971; Johnson et al., 1982; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994, in Whitener et al., 1998). According to Whitener et al. (1998), consistent behaviour over time and across situations allows employees to predict the future performance of managers, which in turn increases confidence in expectations towards them (Whitener et al., 1998). Whitener et al. (1998) argue that consistent, positive behaviour promotes and reinforces the level of trust in the relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In relation

to the data presented above, behavioural consistency easily fits to the statements made about both Linda and Dennis. For example, Omar stated in his statement that Linda keeps her word, and Aadil said the same about Dennis.

Behavioural integrity involves walking the walk and talking the talk (Goffman's, 1959 confirming consistency). According to Whitener, et al. (1998), through observations, employees evaluate the moral character, honesty and integrity of managers by matching what they say and what they do and thereby making inferences about their trustworthiness. Dasgupta (1988) identified two behaviours central to judgements about integrity: telling the truth and keeping promises (in Whitener, et al., 1998). Despite similarities, behavioural consistency and behavioural integrity are distinct dimensions, while both indicate consistency which promotes perceptions of trustworthiness, behavioural consistency reflects reliability or predictability based on past actions while behavioural integrity refers to the ongoing assessment of consistency between what the other says and does (Whitener, et al., 1998). Behavioural integrity is another aspect of trustworthiness perceptions, which easily fits to the accounts given by the young men about Linda and Dennis. For example, Salim said that Dennis is a man of his word because if he says he will do something he does; Omar said something similar about Linda: "she keeps her word and you know her heart is in the right place".

Sharing and delegation control (which can be related to involving young people in the decision making process in this case) are key components of trustworthy behaviour, which involves including employees in decision making and delegating control, (Whitener, et al., 1998). Following Whitener et al. (1998), involving employees in decision making processes influences the development of trust. Unfortunately, I did not observe much involvement of young people in decision making processes throughout my fieldwork, therefore, not able to comment on this component.

Following Whitener et al. (1998), communication researchers identify three factors that influence perceptions of trustworthiness: (1) accurate information, (2) explanations about decisions, and (3) openness. Accuracy of information has the strongest relationship to trust building when compared with the other aspects (Whitener et al., 1998). Employees see managers as trustworthy when their communication is accurate and informative (ibid). Managers who take the time to explain their decisions carefully are likely to be perceived as trustworthy. Open

communication, in which managers exchange thoughts and ideas directly with employees, enhance perceptions of trust (Butler, 1991; Farris, Senner, & Butterfield, 1973; Gabarro, 1978; Hart, Capps, Cangemi, & Caillouet, 1986; in Whitener, et al., 1998). This is another aspect of trustworthiness perceptions, which fits the accounts given above by the young men about both Linda and Dennis. For example, Salim remarked that Linda's communicates on an equal footing and Ibrahim said that Dennis explains things.

Demonstrating concerns, according to Whitener et al. (1998), involves actions which show benevolence (Mayer et al., 1995) and concern for the welfare of others (McAllister, 1995; Mishra, 1996). Following Whitener et al. (1998), demonstrating the concern for others is a key component, which contributes towards perceptions of trustworthiness. Whitener et al. (1998) separate this feature into three actions: (1) showing compassion and empathy for others needs and interests, (2) acting in a manner that protects others interests, and (3) refraining from exploiting others for the benefit of one's own interests (Whitener, et al., 1998). According to Whitener et al. (1998), such actions can cause others to perceive people demonstrating such actions as loyal and benevolent. This category, said to contribute towards perceptions of trustworthiness applies especially to the statements made about Linda, there seems to be a consensus amongst the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds that Linda demonstrates that she genuinely cares about them.

5.4.9 Summary

This section presents backstage insights into how the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds consider the youth workers based at the youth club across the road. This contributes towards answering the research question posited at the beginning of the chapter: How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications?

The short answer to the second part of the question is: the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame the youth workers in distrust because of an intimate knowledge of them and their modus operandi. This variation of distrust can best be described as knowledge-based distrust, because the young men predict how they will behave and react to certain situations. In

other words, through multiple interactions and dealings with these employees they can predict with some confidence that the Danish members of the team will act in a way they consider as unjust and distrustful. Nevertheless, while the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds have high knowledge-based distrust in the Danish youth workers, they demonstrate confident positive expectations towards one team member with whom they share a common understanding, similar background, and sense of belonging. In addition, he identifies and empathises with their desires, wants and values and can serve as an advocate on their behalf in dealings with the local authority. Hence, this can best be described as identification-based trust. This indicates that both trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship at the same time.

From the perspectives of some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, this section has closely examined their relationships with identified public sector employees who they have a history of interaction with, in and around Sunset Boulevard. There is a confirming consistency between the data presented in this section and that presented in the previous. The explanations of the young men are consistent with those given by the youth workers who give a similar version of hostility and distrust, which perhaps is unresolvable. The data suggest in bygone days the young men and youth workers have had an amicable relationship. However, through a history of interaction over an extended period the data strongly indicates the association has developed from amicable to one of mutual distrust, shrouded in scepticism, cynicism, wariness and watchfulness – all the signs of high distrust according to Lewicki et al. (1998). The data suggest that similar to trust, distrust can transpire through a long process of interaction within a context. During this section, I identified some of the tools that the young men use to organise and frame identified public sector employees. The young men use these tools to frame the professionals either in distrust or trust. This framing process involves applying labels such as snitch, unjust, just, fair, and cares.

Applying the labels of snitch and unjust tended to frame the youth workers in distrust while simultaneously triggering collective action against them. The data and fieldwork observations imply that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds share similar primary frames of interpretation in relation to the youth workers, the job consultant and the police officer which implies a mutual or shared understanding and can best be described as an institutionalised contextualised cultural resource.

The relationship with the youth workers from the perspective of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds can best be described as knowledge-based distrust, the basis for this is in the predictability of these workers because of a history of interaction and firsthand experience of their *modus operandi*. On the other hand, the data indicates a positive regard towards three other public sector employees because the young men find them to be just, fair, respectful and caring. The first instance from Paradise Way demonstrates how the reputation of the youth workers spreads to other parts of the local authority, some twenty miles away, which reinforces Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) argument that reputation matters in trust building. This clearly has implications for other local authority employees who bear the SSP logo on their clothes or through job title. This can make a considerable difference to how young men with minority ethnic backgrounds receive SSP workers when encountering them through their work. In addition, it could mean that young men meet SSP workers starting up new initiatives in the area with distrust from the start, rather than openness.

In the second example, the data strongly imply that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame the youth workers in high distrust by applying the secondary frames of snitch and injustice. In addition, the data reveal that the essence of this framing is in feelings of anger, disappointment and betrayal and the belief that the youth workers conduct is unjust. This is obvious in the excerpt where the interactant applies the snitch frame to the manager for the alleged breach of trust and frames her snitch. It may be coincidence that the police visited the interactant and then arrested his friend. However, the suspicion is enough to create a high distrust frame around the youth club manager by labelling her a snitch, which demonstrates the inherent power of the snitch label. Defining another person as a snitch places a high distrust frame around them while simultaneously initiating collective action against them (the same applies to using the injustice frame). When analysing the data, it becomes clear that injustice is an essential cultural tool in relation to creating distrust frames around people. Ideas about injustice and justice dominated the third account in relation to defining the relationship towards different public sector employees. Overall, the data imply that cultural tools are powerful devices for framing people in different variations of distrust or trust. This seems close to Lind's (2001) 'Fairness Heuristic Theory' whereby justice or 'just actions' are crucial to developing trust. Following the accounts in this section, injustice involves harsh treatment by the youth workers towards the young men where

sanctions often outweigh the offence. This interpretation involves the view that handing out unjust sanctions promotes bitterness and anger which is counterproductive to trust and trusting. This interpretation given by the interactants is in tune with the secondary literature reported in this section. In addition, the third account indicates that the young men of Sunset Boulevard belong to a tightly-knit group who look out for one another, which is in tune with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) identification-based trust. The data indicate that in the relationship between the youth workers and the young men, a situation of both trust and distrust coexists. The third account reinforces this idea where the interactant frames one team member in trust which can be interpreted as trust based in identification (IBT). During this explanation, the interactant relies on notions of fairness, belonging and foreignness to support the team member's trustworthiness. The final part of this section illustrates how the young men interchangeably use variations of the primary trust frame to define and organise their relationships with the job consultant and police officer, again notions of justice play a pivotal role. Overall the data indicates that interactants use a variation of 'strong' trust to frame the job consultant, which involves ideas such as demonstrating benevolence, integrity and compassion. This seems to correspond to a combination between Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) knowledge-based and identification-based trust. When framing the police officer, the data indicate that the young men rely on a variation of trust which corresponds to something in-between knowledge-based and calculus-based trust. The above discussion concerning the naming and framing of Linda and Dennis by the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds leads me to the following question: how can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

5.5 Part Four: Negotiating Cultural Frames

How can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

The data presented above strongly indicate that trust is available to professionals who work with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard. However, it also suggests that in order to win trust and build trusting relationships professionals must negotiate the cultural frames at work in the area. Hence, the heading negotiating cultural frames reflects this aspect and

implies that winning trust and building trusting relationships requires effort, consistency and conscious reflection. During the analysis, it became clear that notions of injustice and justice are primary cultural tools used to frame relationships to various public sector employees by the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. When analysing the data in the previous chapter what becomes clear is that trust and trusting relationships between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and public sector employees are fragile and slippery, difficult to catch and when caught can be difficult to keep hold of. Distrust, on the other hand, seems more like a driving force holding people together and when established seems difficult to breach and shake off. Perhaps seen in this light distrust is an easier choice because it requires less effort to attain and maintain. The case between the young men and the youth workers clearly indicate the slipperiness of trust and the robustness of distrust. This case illustrates how frames become counteracted by other frames from the other side as coping strategies in the local context. On the other hand, the data strongly suggest that the young men adopted a trusting strategy towards the job consultant and the police officer because they perceive them and their overall performance as just and as such worthy of trust. This implies that the job consultant and the police officer are able to negotiate the cultural frames used by the young men to organise and frame others as either worthy of trust or distrust.

This section addresses the above research question by drawing on operational and presentational data collected during fieldwork and through using secondary literature reported throughout the section. In other words, this section addresses the wider question about what public sector employees need to be aware of when entering such settings to initiate, build and maintain trusting relationships. This could make the difference between success and failure in service delivery. The starting point of this section is with my initial observations of Linda followed by analysing relevant extracts from her interview transcript that shed light on the question. Following this, I assume a similar approach to explore observations and interview data in relation to Dennis. The overall aim of this section is to try and understand what these two professionals do to negotiate the cultural frames at play in Sunset Boulevard to attain and maintain trust.

5.5.1 Linda – Observations

Linda a local authority employed job consultant has worked in Sunset Boulevard for three years. According to Linda's job description, her job involves administrating the rules pertaining to unemployment & the labour market in relation to the 'citizens' on her caseload along with getting the same 'citizens' either into education or employment – essentially out of the local authority's cashbox and into another. As highlighted above, during fieldwork many young men with minority ethnic backgrounds framed Linda in what the literature considers being a strong variation of trust because, amongst other reasons, she is just, reliable, respectful, listens, an effective communicator and shows the young men that she cares about them.

The first time I met Linda was in the community centre one day in February 2010. On the day, I arrived at the community centre around noon where I planned to spend some hours 'hanging around' and 'hanging out' playing board games with any takers with the purpose of developing new contacts and working on relationships already started. On entering the community centre, there were shrieks of laughter in the air accompanied with the sound of 'ping-pong' coming from the games area. I could see Kazim in full-swing playing table tennis with or rather against a Danish woman who I had not seen before. Following notes from my research diary, the gaming encounter between the two appeared to be both relaxed and enthusiastic. While observing the match, I noted that Kazim appeared to be in his element and seemed to be savouring every moment, at the same time I noted that the woman appeared to feel at ease and extremely talented with a table tennis paddle.

While standing watching the game, I got the impression that Kazim and the woman who I later found out was Linda appeared to be close friends or at least on particularly favourable terms. While the match was in full swing, Asad called me over to join him, Helena and Brigitte (two Danish members of staff) for coffee. While sitting drinking coffee, the sound of 'ping-pong' generated by the small air-filled celluloid ball impacting on the table and paddles became silent. Kazan and Linda still laughing joined us at the table: *"Hi Kevin, have you met Linda"* he said, *"no not yet"* was my response. Linda held her hand out towards me to initiate a handshake and said *"hi, Linda, lovely to meet you"* (sometimes, during brief introductions Danish people have a tendency just to say "Hi" and just their name). Following my fieldnotes, during the brief

interaction I observed that Linda had given appropriate eye contact and a firm handshake, which I interpreted as signalling confidence and trustworthiness. The following excerpt from my research diary is illustrative:

[Upon reaching the table, I observed the ping pong duo looked physically exerted and [Kazim] soaked through with sweat. He dried his sweaty hands off on the back of his jeans and we exchanged handshakes. He asked me if I had met [Linda], to which I replied not yet. [Linda] smiled and held out her hand towards me, we shook hands, and while doing so she said 'Hi Linda, it's lovely to meet you'. My impression was that she meant it, and I felt like she was pleased to meet me, she had a good firm handshake and gave good eye contact during the introduction/meeting. For some reason, I have the idea that a good firm handshake says a lot about a person, if when shaking hands someone just clasps the ends of your fingers or gives a weak handshake that always leaves me with the impression that they are untrustworthy [perhaps this says something about my own norms and values]. During the greeting, [Linda] looked into my eyes while the brief but firm handshake took place, which added to my impression that she is worthy of trust. [Kazim] and [Linda] sat down at the table and [Asad] poured them both coffees, [Linda] said that she couldn't stay long because she had to get back to the office. I took the opportunity to ask her which office, to which she replied the job centre office and pointed over towards the blocks of flats situated on the other side of the row of shops (close to the kiosk). I was quite taken back when she told me that she is employed by the local authority as a job consultant. She asked me what I was doing here, to which I took the opportunity to tell her about my project, she said it sounded really exciting and that she would be interested to hear more about it another day when she had more time. I asked her if it would be ok to visit her in her office to hear about her job and what it entails to which she agreed. We exchanged contact details; I gave [Linda] one of my RUC visit cards (which I always have on my person since they have many uses while doing fieldwork), she apologised for not having any cards on her person because she had only popped over for a game of T.T. with [Kazim] so we borrowed a pen and paper from Asad to write down her phone number (this seemed like a good strategy to remind people of my researcher role). She drank her coffee, smiled at us all sitting at the table, said 'tak for kaffen' and 'vi snakkes vid' before leaving the C.C., which means thanks for the coffee and 'we'll talk further', then she left. The brief meeting with [Linda] left me with a positive impression, just her way of being instilled confidence in her, there was something about her; she just knew how to be around people and how to give a positive trustworthy impression. She managed through her communication to signal to people that she liked them and give the impression that she meant it. I remarked to the others that she seemed like a nice person, where there seemed to be consensus around the table that yes she actually is nice and comes over to the C.C. regularly to meet some of the boys

because of her job, and now and again she comes over to just play table tennis, something she is really good at. But so far has not been good enough to beat Asad, the reigning C.C. – T.T. champion!] (Source: Research Diary: February, 2010).

This excerpt illustrates and implies a number of things, one of which is that first impressions matter towards initiating the trust building process where both the intentional and unintentional communication play a vital part. During the brief encounter, both Linda's given and given off contributed towards my positive attitude towards her. In addition, she confirmed my positive impression with a firm handshake, all signals according to my belief system which give the impression she meant what she was communicating, therefore, my first (and lasting) impression was positive. This public display which I perceived as signalling trustworthiness transpired through both intentional and unintentional expressions, and there was a confirming consistency between the given and given off communication. However, it is necessary to point out that my positive impression of Linda, which I perceived as trustworthiness is a product of my own cultural norms and values and someone else may have made another interpretation. Throughout my early life in working class England I grew up with the idea that a firm handshake is the sign of trustworthiness, something reinforced during my army service. Upon reflection, a firm handshake seems to be the best strategy when meeting people in working class environments, but may be inappropriate in other settings. In addition, it is necessary to remember to consider cultural differences when making generalisations about trustworthiness based on handshakes and other non-verbal communication. For example, while evidence suggests that many people in the west seem to prefer handshakes that are firm rather than weak, in other cultures such as African gentler handshakes seem to be preferred (Wainwright & Thompson, 2009). In addition, there may be other reasons or explanations such as self confidence or lack of, power relations or religious convictions, which may affect the greeting ritual between strangers (or known acquaintances).

As described below, I shadowed and observed Linda over three days while she went about her daily work, this brief period of shadowing/observation revealed consistent performance comparable to those illustrated in the telling excerpt above.

The idea that first impressions matter is something which became strengthened throughout the fieldwork experience of meeting many different social actors, not all of which were positive. In this respect, especially after a negative encounter with a gatekeeper in the reception

of the local authority's social service department, it struck me that how public sector employees meet/receive 'service users' is fundamental in relation to how the meeting progresses. How the employee meets people reflects upon them and on the organisation either positively or negatively and can set the tact and tone for future encounters.

Research in the field of body language reinforces the idea that first impressions matter during early or stranger encounters, and that nonverbal body language plays a crucial role to the perceived impression. Wainwright & Thompson (2009), assert that in the first few minutes of an encounter, particularly encounters with strangers, people rely heavily on body language for evaluating the other person. According to Wainwright & Thompson (2009), people depend much on non-verbal clues during the opening stages of encounters because the given information mainly concerns small talk and general information. According to them, during early encounters people suspend judgement on the other until this information becomes processed.

This sounds close to ideas presented in chapter four concerning Goffman's (1959) Impression Management. However, Wainwright & Thompson (2009) do not acknowledge or mention Goffman's (1959) well-known work. As discussed in chapter four, impression management involves people using communication intentionally and tactically to produce desired impressions to those present, which implies a direct relationship between the transmitted information and its perception by those in proximity. These performances can have implications for the performers' opportunity to achieve and maintain desired identities in a setting (Prus, 1996). Goffman (1959) argues, despite the desire for attempting to create a trustworthy impression, it is by influencing how the others define the situation that is crucial, if the individual can affect how the others define him or her and the situation then, (s)he gains some control over their behaviour towards him or herself. This reinforces the idea that to initiate trusting behaviour from others; the person who wants to win trust must send unambiguous overall communication to those present in such a way that this communication becomes understood in terms of goodwill and trustworthiness.

Henslin (1968) in his well-known study, 'Trust and the Cab Driver' reinforces Goffman's (1959) ideas around self-definition and what this means in relation to initiating trusting behaviour. Henslin's (1968) account of how taxi drivers interpret trustworthiness matches the situation outlined above with Linda whereby one key component of the trust initiating process is how

strangers present themselves along with their self-definition. Henslin (1968) studied what trust means for the cab driver and what determines whether or not cab drivers pick up stranger-fares. The notion of self-definition plays a crucial role in Henslin's (1968) study whereby he uses it as the determiner for both trust and distrust. Henslin (1968) argues:

“Actors are continually offering definitions of themselves to audiences. The audience by ‘checking the fit of the parts’ of the actor determines whether it will accept or reject the offered definition. Where an actor has offered a definition of himself and the audience is willing to interact with the actor on the basis of that definition, we are saying trust exists. Where the audience, on the other hand, does not accept the definition of the actor and is not willing to interact with the actor on the basis of his proffered definition, the situation is characterised by distrust” (1968:139-140).

Henslin (1968) found that taxi drivers consider a number of aspects when deciding who to pick up as passengers, which include the setting and circumstances of the pickup, passenger characteristics and behaviour (1968). Henslin (1968) found that these variables correlate with positive or negative expectations towards the wannabe passenger which lead to the constitution and dependence on stereotypes held by the taxi driver which, in turn when examined for consistency with a presented self-definition, lead to either trust or distrust.

In other words, all of the other factors revolve around the self presentation/definition advanced by the wannabe passenger, the one who wants to win the trust of the other. The overall self presentation/definition, which the stranger, communicates to the driver become the determining factor in relation to initiating trusting or distrusting decisions and how the driver interprets these signals as to how the relationship develops. In other words, the bottom line in relation to initiating trusting or distrusting relations in first time encounters is down to how the receiver/perceiver of the given and given off communication receives/perceives it at the time, in the context. Following Henslin (1968), this is crucial because it influences immensely how the receiver/perceiver meets/receives the sender of the information.

This can easily be related to the situation with Linda in the community centre that day in February or to others whom I interacted with during fieldwork. If I had received signals or communication which I perceived to be negative from Linda during that initial encounter, then I would not have invested time and energy building on the initial interaction. However, things are

not so straightforward during interaction, Goffman (1959), points out reading and perceiving the other is not a one-dimensional process, rather it is a dyadic process. While I was reading and perceiving Linda's overall communication (self presentation/definition), it is probable she was simultaneously evaluating me and my self-presentation/definition looking for authenticity and a confirming consistency between the given and the given off communication. It is necessary to understand that trusting and distrusting are complex, multi-level, dynamic processes, which do not, fit neatly into the roles of trusters and trustees like a lot of the trust literature advances. Henslin (1968) concludes that often we need to make decisions whether to trust or distrust based on the self-definitions presented to us by others, and this first impression often determines what happens next. When reflecting over my observations and experience of Linda and with many others whom I interacted with during fieldwork, then Henslin's (1968) definition and conclusion gives meaning to trusting and distrusting decisions during initial or early encounters. Following Henslin's (1968) definition, social actors intentionally give definitions of themselves to the audience, who in turn check out the person and evaluate them and their overall performance.

Depending on how person(s) copresent interpret the overall performance, including given and given off information they decide whether or not they want anything else to do with the performer. Following the above discussion, this means that consenting to trust or not, or at least to initiate the process of trusting depends much on the self presentation/definition of the other.

This is in tune with Beckert (2005) who argues that people do not make trust decisions purely on face value, rather decisions to trust the other comes about because of the overall self-presentation/definition of the other. In addition, in his explanation Beckert (2005) points out that when deciding to trust the other the receiver/perceiver of the information, which more than often concerns both parties, take the 'leap of faith' or rather adopt the 'will to believe' attitude in order to give trust. Beckert (2005) argues:

"Because self-presentation contains no unambiguous sign for trustworthiness, the trust-giver's decision-making is not based on rational calculation. Ultimately, for the trust-giver, William James's "will to believe" is required if the cooperative exchange is to be realized. "There are, then, cases where a fact cannot come at all unless a preliminary faith exists in its coming. And where faith in a fact can help create the fact" (James 1897: 25). It is in this deliberate act that the creative

element of trust exists. Self-presentations play a bigger role ... they not only have the function of producing the impression of trustworthiness, but also offer a common definition of the situation that prejudices the trust-giver's action" (Beckert, 2005:20). Following Beckert (2005), when deciding to trust others, ultimately individuals take a chance, or perhaps suspend judgement (Möllering, 2006) because even though individuals give and give off signals that can be perceived as trustworthy, there is no guarantee that the person turns out to be worthy of trust. Beckert (2005) in his paper identifies William James as particularly useful for understanding this aspect of trust. William James encapsulates the attitude of the trust-giver as the *"will to believe"* (Beckert, 2005:18): *"Wherever a desired result is achieved by the co-operation of many independent persons, its existence as a fact is a pure consequence of the precursive faith in one another of those immediately concerned"* (James 1897: 22; in Beckert, 2005:18).

Beckert (2005) goes on to interpret the function of trust as: *"the social mechanism that expresses the shutdown of the latent uncertainty of the trust-giver: trust works as a tranquilizer in social relations enabling the trust-giver to remain calm despite the uncontrollable freedom of action of the trust-taker"* (2005:18).

This implies that the decision to trust is an action that goes beyond interpreting the overall communication, reason and reckoning and is an action difficult to explain in terms of logic. While I agree that deciding to trust someone involves taking a walk into the unknown, I disagree with Beckert's (2005) idea that trust acts like a tranquilizer; it implies that once people swallow the trust pill they enter into a twilight state forgetting about everyday skills and competence they carry with them in their cultural toolbox. Just because two individuals decide to trust one another, does not mean they lose the ability to think and act, which presumably they did prior to initiating trusting behaviour. While I agree that making a decision to trust involves an element of the 'will to believe' attitude or 'the leap of faith' that some researchers talk about, the data presented in chapter four and the ensuing sections strongly indicate that the young men with minority backgrounds use all the cultural tools at their disposal to decide who is worthy of trust or not. In addition, the data strongly suggests that knowledgeable actors constantly monitor relationships with others and change strategies to tackle changing situations. In chapter four, the data show that, in stranger

encounters, these tools include observing the newcomer's body language, facial expressions (reactions) and carrying out background checks on the internet, which does not leave too much to chance. This suggests the 'will to believe' attitude or the 'leap of faith' are the outcome of experience/understanding of interacting with others in the social world in combination with the overall self presentation/definition of actors in the context; hence the 'leap of faith' or the 'will to believe' are semi-rational choices, rather than a complete blind leap into something. As Goffman (1959) argues, when the stranger enters the presence of others there is a wealth of telling information available through sign-vehicles to those present. In addition, individuals copresent use all of their experience to interpret the sign-vehicles, including both intentional and unintentional communication. Hence, when people decide to take that leap of faith, more than often, they do so from a fairly stable platform. In other words, knowledgeable social actors rely upon a host of cultural tools from their repertoire to determine if to launch the trust building process with others.

During fieldwork, I received permission from Linda's senior manager and Linda's agreement to shadow her over the course of a working week; however, this changed into three working days because one of Linda's children became ill during the agreed week. Prior to shadowing, Linda gained consent from those with whom she had appointments with for me to tag along and said if anything else came up we would just take it from there. In addition, we made an agreement concerning confidentiality and about the nature of shadowing. The verbal agreement based on trust involved me agreeing not to record (write down) or report any sensitive or personal information that came to light during shadowing concerning 'service users'.

As mentioned above, Linda's place of work is in an apartment/office (once shared with the job consultant labelled snitch and hounded out of the area as illustrated in chapter four) located in an apartment building, in Sunset Boulevard. Linda's place of work functions as a place to conduct meetings and administration and a launching pad for her to work out in the community. Linda's role as a job consultant involves administering the rules pertaining to unemployed people allocated to her caseload. In principle, Linda's job involves a control function where she has discretionary powers to sanction people who do not follow the rules – the sanction involves various levels of benefit loss.

At the time of shadowing, Linda was one of a few local authority job consultants involved in a new initiative aimed specifically at getting people with minority ethnic backgrounds into the

labour market or the educational system. As another local authority interactant during fieldwork told me, the main aim of the job consultant function, is simply to get the unemployed out of the local authority cashbox and into any other. Linda did not articulate her job in those terms; rather she framed it in terms of helping citizens get into the labour market or education system.

Over the course of three days, I observed Linda interact with five young and three older people with minority ethnic backgrounds during different types of meeting and locations. During these observations, I observed consistent and similar performance to that reported above in relation to how she interacted with citizens. For example, on the second day of shadowing, I observed Linda while she visited two young men with minority ethnic backgrounds forced to attend one of the so-called activation centres (places where “job seeking” people must attend four hours per day on weekdays in order to be eligible to receive unemployment benefit). The aim of this visit concerned both control and support, firstly to see if the young men had made an appearance, and secondly to provide support about an ongoing issue.

When we pulled into the car park in Linda’s car at the activation centre, which looked more like a rundown disused factory, a young man stood at the entrance of the building waving. While in the process, of parking the car, grabbing her bag and a couple of files off the back seat, Linda began to wave enthusiastically back in the direction of the young man still waving enthusiastically outside the centre of activation.

During his process, Linda began to tell a little about the young man’s story and from what she said gave the impression she genuinely cared about his welfare, which is in tune with what some of the young men said about Linda. We left the car and walked over to where the young man was waiting, upon reaching him; she smiled and greeted him warmly. By greeting him warmly, I mean she greeted him in a similar fashion to how she greeted me the first time we met, outlined in my observations above. She began by saying: “Hi [his name],” followed by the words: “it’s lovely to see you, and it is great that you made it here today”. The young man responded to this greeting positively by shaking her hand, smiled and said “it is lovely to see you too Linda”. He then turned around and walked inside and led us to where the other young man sat at a computer working on his facebook profile.

Upon reaching the second young man, Linda repeated the same pattern of greeting: smile, instigate handshake, cheerful greeting and positive reinforcer. During all of my experiences with

Linda, I began to see the latter greeting emerging as a pattern, which combined with her overall self-presentation seemed to have a positive effect on all interactants whom she greeted. During the encounter, Linda addressed an issue with one of the young men because he had failed to attend the activation centre on a couple of occasions. After, listening to the young man's explanation, with a smile and open body language, she said empathetically while she could understand his explanation, it was still his responsibility to either show up at the centre or at least to phone her and explain why he was unable to attend. Otherwise, he would lose money on days of non-attendance henceforth. After this brief exchange, one of the young men asked Linda how her former colleague was doing, which triggered the following exchange:

Heey Linda how's [name of former job consultant]? (Ali)

She is OK (Linda)

Is she in Prison (laughs)? (Ali)

No she is at home (Linda)

Is she wearing a foot-link (laughs)? (Muhammad)

[At this point in the exchange, Linda drops the smile and adopts an assertive stance]

If you are going to speak about my former colleague I would appreciate that you do it in a respectful way (Linda).

[The two young men smile at each other, then to Linda and apologise, Linda regains her composure, smiles and the exchange ends positively].

When referring to my fieldnotes, I recorded it was obvious the two young men respected and liked Linda, my interpretation of the situation was they wanted to interact with her but lacked the social skills or competencies to engage in dialogue she might consider appropriate at the time. In addition, what became apparent was challenging the young men's slur on her former colleague did not seem to damage their relationship. On the contrary, Linda defended a former colleague which showed loyalty and is something the young men know all too well and can relate to. The interaction between Linda and the two young men ended positively, they shook hands, exchanged farewells and she said with a smile just before walking out of the door, we'll talk further (vi snakkes vid). Perhaps, the translation of "vi snakkes vid" as 'we'll talk further' needs some

explanation, in Danish it tends to be a standard expression used as a farewell when parting company, perhaps a more appropriate translation would be 'catch you later' or 'talk soon'. Overall, my interactions and observations of Linda are consistent with how the young men frame her in justice and fairness and as a caring, compassionate person. My observations of Linda add a confirming consistency to the accounts above. In relation to the confrontation, as in chapter four, Luhmann (1979) offers a plausible explanation. By confronting the young men about their behaviour and by defending her former colleague, perhaps Linda lived up to the young men's expectations and maintained her integrity: "*[S]he who stands by what [s]he has allowed to be known about [her]self, whether consciously or unconsciously, is worthy of trust*" (Luhmann, 1979:39). In addition, Luhmann (1979) argues it is necessary for actors to join in social life or at least to show who they are to others in the social environment. According to Luhmann (1979), this is necessary to allow people the opportunity to learn and test the other. In the observation outlined above, Linda showed who she is by defending her former colleague and at the same time that she is loyal, this is in tune with Luhmann (1979) when he asserts in order to gain trust the individual must present him or herself as a social identity by participating in social interaction.

5.5.2 Linda – Interview

Through many interactions with Linda, especially during the shadowing/observation period, it became clear that her attitude and framing of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds was different to how the Danish youth workers name and frame the same young men. This became apparent almost straight away, because after spending time with the youth workers listening to how they name and frame the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in terms of deviance and framing them in distrust, hearing Linda frame the young men as 'citizens in need of help' made a striking contrast. This is apparent in the following interview excerpt when Linda responds to a prompt to talk about her job:

"My job is I am a job consultant that means I am employed to we have twenty citizens to help who have foreign backgrounds ... they live in different apartment blocks around here ... and I have to ... make a goal orientated effort with these twenty citizens ... this year most of them are young people ... actually over half of our citizens are young people ... and my job is to help them ... get them into work or

education in the long run ... but we have to make a plan of action [handleplan] for them in relation to helping them take one step at a time ... some of them need help for example to get out of substance addiction” (Interview: Linda).

Perhaps Linda’s background prior to becoming a job consultant contributes to explaining this contrast in naming and framing the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Linda explained prior to starting as a job consultant, she had worked at Danish Red Cross for many years together with young people with minority ethnic backgrounds. During this time, Linda specialised as a teacher working with children and young people assessed to have learning difficulties in centres managed by Danish Red Cross for asylum seekers.

During the interview, Linda emphasised that the local authority employ job consultants because of their perceived abilities to meet/receive and communicate with people, rather than because of formal qualifications. In addition, what becomes clear in Linda’s interview transcript is her practice or *modus operandi* often goes beyond the structural restrictions of her job, which suggests flexibility and out of the box thinking. Out of the box thinking or thinking outside the box, known also as thinking beyond the box, refers to thinking alternatively, unconventionally, or from a new perspective. What I interpret as outside the box thinking is visible on a number of occasions throughout Linda’s interview transcript. The first instance of outside the box thinking transpires while Linda reflects about her job:

“Well it’s a job with broad horizons because ... even though in principal I should only help them find a job or complete an education ... there are just so many other things I help with ... we get so close to the families ... there is a reason why they stand over there in front of the kiosk and there is a reason why they ... haven’t got a clue what happens when they smoke hash [marihuana] ... they just think it’s something to do and that they can control it ... but I use a lot of time talking to them about it ... someone has to ... I tell them about the consequences and about how dopey you can get and how unmotivated it makes you ... one of them sat there and said ‘god it’s just how I am’ ... what ... well ... it was just there that it occurred to him that he had an addiction ... they don’t know ... they are not informed about it ... about how it influences your brain” (Interview: Linda).

Linda’s account suggests that sometimes her actions goes beyond her job consultant responsibility and on occasions she takes on a substance abuse counsellor role, which can explain partly why some of the young men have the impression that Linda cares about them. This is in tune with the

principle of demonstrating concern in Whitener et al.'s (1998) typology of trustworthy behaviour and research advanced by Bijlsma & Van de Bunt (2003). Bijlsma & Van de Bunt (2003), somewhat in parallel with Whitener et al. (1998), identified six types of managerial actions related to perceptions of trustworthy actions of which support and guidance (similar to demonstrating concern) is one action thought to increase perceptions of trustworthiness. In their study Bijlsma & Van de Bunt (2003), found that supportive behaviour is conduct that most interviewees directly related to trustworthiness in their manager. Respondents often explained trust in their manager by stating that (s)he supported them in matters salient to them. Interviewees explained a lack of trust in the same way. In addition, they found that a lack of care was an interpretation frequently associated with complaints of distant behaviour, which according to Luhmann (1979) is of no use to initiating the trust building process.

In addition, during the interview it became clear that Linda does not restrict her working hours or job function to the people assigned to her caseload where according to her explanation she is open to everyone in the area who asks for help, this demonstrates a flexible, open, interactive approach to working in the community. The following interview excerpt where Linda explains in-depth about her job is illustrative:

“Well ... firstly the difference between us and case managers who sit up at the local authority is we only have twenty citizens to work with and that is normally divided between two colleagues ... right ... that means we have the time to engage with people ... we have time to seek them out and time to accompany them ... and more importantly time to listen ... all those many talks that you have ... especially with the young ... yeah but ... we have time for ... there are so many that come here and I also work with some citizens outside my target group [Laughs] because so many come here and ask for help ... well I do ... because I think that it's really important to work with the whole group instead of ... 'you are chosen and you're not' ... well that's probably because I am the way I am hahahaha [laughs] ... but I think that it's because I have also worked as a teacher in a special teaching function where I have worked especially with those that have a bit of a hard life ... I think I have a built in scanner that goes beep beep hahaha [laugh] ... him there ... he is really interesting ... I could not dream of ... if someone came here and asked for help ... I could not say 'I don't really have time for that' ... sometimes I do say ... let's have a quick chat now but we need to find another time to talk more ... so let's make an appointment ... but I could never dream about saying 'you're not in my target group ... so I can't help' ... and I have noticed that it gives a good response around here so errr ... it's so positive ... they know that I have helped them in many ways ... driven them here and there and helped them to formulate different applications and letters and stuff ... but they also know that I am not a push over ... I set limits ... if I really am pushed for time or if they are rude I tell them ... I say speak nicely to me ... I speak respectful to you so make sure you speak

that way to me ... so it's not as though I am just a doormat and just sit and listen to them ... but sometimes I can be a bit motherly as they say ... 'here comes mother' ..." (Interview, Linda).

Following Linda's interpretation, having a small caseload gives time to meet citizens actively which means seeking them out, accompanying them to various appointments and more importantly listening to them. Linda's account reveals an open inclusive approach to working in the area where listening and dialogue are primary tools. This inclusive approach transpires while she talks about been available to people outside of her caseload. As Linda explains she considers it necessary to work with the whole group and not just the few assigned to her caseload, this is something which, I interpret as outside the box thinking or at least beyond her job function thinking. According to Linda's explanation, this open flexible, inclusive approach, within limits set by Linda, seems to be received positively in the area. I believe that the approach that Linda talks about, which is something observed during fieldwork, is a crucial part of how she builds trusting relationships with people in Sunset Boulevard. Linda's approach can be compared to an approach known as "collaborative enterprise" in the literature on business practice.

Adler, Heckscher & Prusak (2011) identify a number of practices which they deem necessary to creating a culture of trust and teamwork in collaborative communities, which helps shed light on why Linda's untraditional practice may be useful to building trust. Collaborative communities relate directly to ideas around "social capital" as advanced by Putnam (1993, 1995, and 2000). "Social Capital" is a term advanced to illustrate the webs of groups and associations based on reciprocity and trust which promote community cooperation by Robert Putnam. According to Putnam (1995, 2000), in the USA, one of the most critical issues for the future, is the flagging social capital and how to turn it around by reinstating civic engagement and trust. Putnam's theory of social capital calls attention to the crucial social function of strong, positive relations among citizens. These relations are the basis for all organised collaborative effort, including collaborative endeavours of all kinds. As Putnam (1995, 2000) argues, building collaborative communities must start with advancing and stimulating social capital.

According to Adler et al. (2011), the underlying principle of collaborative communities rests on encouraging employees to use their unique talents in community projects and a shared mission, which not only encourage innovation and flexibility but also value and growth (Adler et al., 2011). Adler et al. (2011) identify the following key principles as advantageous to promoting a

culture of trust and teamwork: 1) defining and building a shared purpose; 2) cultivating an ethic of contribution; 3) developing processes that allow people to work together in flexible but disciplined projects; 4) creating an infrastructure which values and rewards collaboration. I consider the second principle particularly useful in relation to explaining why Linda's practice can be useful to enhancing trust and trustworthiness.

According to Adler et al. (2011), the collaborative approach spurns the notion of merely "doing a good job," unless that actually makes a contribution to the common community. Adler et al. (2011) argue:

"An ethic of contribution means going beyond one's formal responsibilities to solve broader problems, not just applying greater effort. It also rejects the strong individualism of the market model and instead emphasizes working within the group (rather than trying to gain individual control or responsibility) and eliciting the best contributions from each member for the common good" (Adler et al., 2011:06).

Hence, the ethic of contribution principle involves employees working towards solving wider issues in the community as opposed to just doing their jobs, which requires new thinking and looking beyond their job function and responsibilities. In addition, this approach advocates solidarity which moves away from the individualistic practices advanced by the dominant logic of the market model. This seems to be the approach that Linda uses and has found successful when working in the local community with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, rather than just doing her job, she works to support the entire community in any way she can.

The ethic of contribution principle is particularly useful to enhancing trust and collaboration because it derives from observations from community members about an ability and willingness to further the shared community purpose (Adler et al., 2011). In relation to Linda, if people in the local community ascertain she is willing and able to help members of the community this might explain partly why she seems to be regarded as trustworthy.

During the interview, I asked Linda to explain what is crucial when building trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Following Linda's account, one of the most salient aspects of trust building is promise keeping, keeping one's word, regardless of the promise (i.e. both positive and negative consequences). Following Linda's account if she makes an appointment with one of the young men it is paramount to keep it; however, there can be exceptional

circumstances where she needs to cancel, in such cases, it is necessary to call and provide a satisfactory explanation. This is in tune, with Whitener et al.'s (1998) notion of behavioural integrity outlined above where telling the truth and keeping promises are key behavioural precursors to ascriptions of integrity and central to how others perceive trustworthiness (e.g., Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1978; Giffin, 1967; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Mayer et al., 1995; Ring & Van de Ven, 1992; in Whitener et al., 1998). Several studies on trust support ideas around honesty and keeping one's word in relation to trust building (e.g. Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998; Whitener et al. 1998; Bijlsma & Van de Bunt, 2003). In addition, keeping promises is an issue which the literature on justice deals with and considers fundamental to trust. For example, Miller 2001, reports that violations of promises and agreements in research involving laypersons are the most commonly reported incidents of everyday injustice. However, when the wrongdoer's feedback goes beyond mere explanation and includes an apology, this action is likely to reduce inconvenience/annoyance (Bobocel & Farrell 1996; in Miller, 2001). The expression of regret takes the pain out of wrongdoing because it declares the importance of the other and acknowledges unfair treatment (Heider, 1958; in Miller, 2001).

In addition, in relation to building trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, Linda explained it is crucial to meet them where they are, both in terms of approach (something which I interpret as a non-judgemental approach) and literally in terms of location. Being non-judgemental involves a tolerant approach to meeting others, where not judging behaviour and approaching people with an open-mind seems to be considered a cornerstone of the value base of social work and something valued by service users. For example, Beresford et al. (2008) in their 'Service User Case Study of the Importance of the Social Worker's Relationship and Humanity', found that adopting a non-judgmental approach was something service users found valuable in building positive relationships with their social worker. The following interview excerpt is illustrative of what I interpret as a non-judgemental approach by Linda towards the young men:

"And meeting them there where they are right ... well we sit and listen about their prejudices ... errr ok ... or about their criminal records or ... smoking hash ... errr we meet them there where they are and that's where the starting point is ... right ... and we go forward from there ... and that is important because the young men we have in our hands have met a lot of suspicion earlier right ... so meeting them where they are and starting from there is important right" (Interview, Linda).

In relation to location, Linda said she uses a lot of time in the community centre, in Sunset Boulevard, because it is useful for building relationships, showing another side of the self, cooperation and for finding out what is going on in the community. In addition, Linda explained it is necessary for people wherever they are to feel they belong and part of the community and as such, they have a responsibility to the community. This mindset advanced by Linda seems to be in tune with the ethos of collaborative communities and social capital outlined above (Adler et al., 2011). Additionally, Linda's explanation implies that using table tennis is an excellent way of communicating with the young men on another level, which is in tune with my fieldwork experience, outlined in chapter four. The following excerpt is illustrative:

"I use a lot of time in the community centre a lot of time ... errmmm ... they know they can bump into me there if they want I also play table tennis ... there are some girls there every Thursday who I play with it's a good way to find out what's going on out here [laughs] well also it's important in relation to our cooperation errrr generally there where you are you have to feel that you are part of it you have to feel a responsibility for it and you shall feel that you belong there so it's important that 'my citizens' over thirty can also meet me there when we are talking about the young it's important to meet them where they are right, be there so they can see that we are not just local authority employees ... errrr that we are actually people ... and a bit different right ... and like to do something different and because the boys have seen that I play table tennis with the girls sometimes they say ... 'errrr are you going to come over later for a match' if I have time I do it ... because it's good for our relationships ... so errr and you talk differently when you stand hitting a ball over a net together" (Interview, Linda).

5.5.3 Linda – Summary

The data presented in relation to Linda's attitude; framing of the young men and her modus operandi are in harmony with the explanations given by the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds highlighted in the previous section. The data presented here helps explain why the young men with minority backgrounds judge Linda as being worthy of trust. When considering the operational and presentational data pertaining to Linda, it becomes clear that a pragmatic approach is necessary in order to try and understand why the young men find Linda worthy of trust. Goffman's (1959) impression management helps shed valuable light on first time encounters

and the importance of a confirming consistency between given and given off communication and how people in proximity receive and perceive this information. During initial encounters, Goffman (1959) argues it is crucial for stranger(s) to attempt to define the situation because it gives some control over the situation and how the others define and behave towards them. This is something which Henslin (1968) reinforces through his noteworthy contribution towards helping explain decisions to trust during initial encounters with strangers. In addition, Henslin's (1968) study reinforces the idea that both actors in the stranger encounter are crucial to what happens next in relation to trusting or distrusting decisions. Both social actors convey signals through intentional and unintentional communication, process the information and then decide how to proceed based on the overall self-presentation/definition within the context. This is the crucial point; decisions on whether to initiate trust/trusting relations depend all on how the information becomes received/perceived and interpreted. Following the above discussion, this means that consenting to trust or not, or at least to initiate the process of trusting depends much on the self presentation/definition of the other. These aspects of impression management help explain how Linda's overall self presentation/definition can be perceived as signals of trustworthiness by others and relate much to my observations of Linda, both in relation to my initial encounter with her and observations of her interacting with others. Undoubtedly, impression management is an essential component to initiating, winning and maintaining trust and trusting relations with others, without the confirming consistency between the given and given off communication then initiating trust and trusting relationships become unlikely.

In addition, Luhmann (1979) helps shed light on why Linda may be perceived as trustworthy by the young men; Linda lived up to their expectations by showing who she is and what she stands for by showing loyalty towards her former colleague. What is more, Linda's practise is in tune with ideas advanced by Whitener et al. (1998), especially around their principle of demonstrating concern and with what Bijlsma & Van de Bunt (2003) refer to as support and guidance, actions thought to increase perceptions of trustworthiness. While observing and interviewing Linda it became clear she thinks outside of the box in a number of ways, for instance, she adopts a collaborative approach towards the people in the community by being available in a number of ways. For example, her ethos is to work with the whole group and not just those assigned to her caseload, and she does not turn people away who ask for help, which is in contrast

to the practice of the youth workers who exclude some of the young men from the youth club. This suggests that an inclusive as opposed to an excluding approach seems more conducive to building and sustaining trusting relationships. This thinking outside the box behaviour contributes towards her trustworthiness in Sunset Boulevard. In addition, and just as crucial, Linda is visible, accessible and available to members of the community centre and takes on all challengers at table tennis, which gives both young and old of the chance to see another side of Linda, she is not just a local authority employee, she is a human being just like them. In addition, this sends the clear signal to all who meet her in the community centre that she trusts them which according to some researchers promotes perceptions of trustworthiness. For example, Six (2007) states: *“To enhance the stability of their normative frames, individuals can act in a re-affirmative manner, i.e., they can act in a trustworthy manner and the best way to do that is by acting in a trusting manner (Zand 1997; in Six, 2007). In other words, the actions of individuals will give off positive relational signals”* (Six, 2007:293-294). The salient point for trust to transpire is that the receiver of the signals must interpret them as positive. Researchers in the field of trust argue that relational signals play a significant role in the trust building process (Bacharach and Gambetta, 2001; Hardin, 2002; Weber et al., 2005; Beckert, 2005; Six, 2005, 2007; Six & Sorge, 2008). Therefore, in order for social/youth workers & others to negotiate cultural frames to build and maintain trust they must think beyond the confines of their cultural repertoire, beyond their role and function. They must actively spend time in areas that service users frequent adopting an open, honest non-judgemental approach showing and signalling to people in the area they care and have their best interests at heart.

5.5.4 Dennis

During fieldwork, I observed Dennis interacting with the young men on a couple of occasions and got the chance to interview him. Dennis, an experienced policeman with majority ethnic background, during the course of his work, sometimes patrols in and around Sunset Boulevard. In addition, during his shift in partnership with other police officers often gets dispatched to Sunset Boulevard to deal with various police tasks, which often brings him into contact and sometimes in conflict with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who live in the area. During fieldwork, many interactants said Dennis is fair and 'just' and as such is trustworthy. Overall the data in the last section indicate that the basis of the young men's trust in Dennis rests on

predictability about his future conduct, which is in tune with Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) knowledge-based trust. Following the accounts in the previous section, the young men consider Dennis to be worthy of trust because he dare go alone into Sunset Boulevard to interact with them; he is just (fair), polite, meets them with respect, keeps his word and signals that he likes them – hence he is just and predictable.

I first encountered Dennis one evening in April 2010 while attending circuit training with some of the young men from Sunset Boulevard. At the time of the encounter, I was not aware that Dennis was a police officer, despite a couple of hints from two younger teenagers present. My first and lasting impression of Dennis, similar to Linda, is he is an effective communicator and shows mastery of nonverbal and verbal communication. In tune with Goffman's (1959) impression management, there is a confirming consistency between information he gives and gives off. My observations of him during the encounters between him and the lads at circuit training over the next couple of weeks gave me this lasting impression. My research diary is illustrative of my first encounter and observations of Dennis:

[While we were getting ready to start training this evening, a new participant entered the gym I had never seen him before, he certainly stood out from the crowd because of his ethnicity ... he was Danish. At first I thought he must be one of the trainer's friends, because so far the only Danes attending the activity have been Brian the instructor and his assistant Johannes. Whoever he is they greeted him with a lot of respect, all of the lads present apart from two where more or less queuing up to shake his hand and pay their respect. Two of the boys started to make negative remarks, which sounded something like fuck off cop, get out of here ... but I cannot be certain. However, the Danish man approached them in a cool, calm, collective manner, smiled and offered his hand. Observing his approach was like watching calmness in motion, this guy could stop a raging bull in its tracks ... his body language signals that he is in control and at the same time signals calmness. In turn, they both took his hand exchanged greetings and seemed to change their attitude immediately towards him! Strange behaviour, I wonder who he is, maybe he is a negotiator, someone used to dealing with conflict, a business coach perhaps ... during fieldwork, this is the first time that I have observed an interaction between the lads from Sunset Boulevard and a Danish man. I have observed some encounters between some of the lads and Danish women staff at the C.C. but no Danish men frequent the place. Whoever he is, he has a physical presence ... the way he reacted to the two lads making negative remarks was fascinating to see, he just approached them in a refined and collective way ... they could have told him to piss off ... along with giving the finger ... but they did not and after this

handshake they seemed to flourish, what a transformation. After the almost fan club behaviour of the lads towards the Danish bloke, Brian cracked the whip and started us off with running around the gym] (Source: Research Diary: April 2010).

Over the next few weeks, I built up contact with Dennis while participating in circuit training twice a week, and one day after training he asked me about whom I was and what I was doing exercising with the lads from Sunset Boulevard. After telling about my research aims and objectives, Dennis said my research sounded intriguing and something worthwhile. Therefore, I seized the opportunity and asked him if he would participate in an interview. At first, Dennis was hesitant about participating and said his boss would be negative about the thought of him participating in an interview, however, after discussing issues around confidentiality and anonymity he agreed to take part.

The interview with Dennis took place in his home, an apartment that he shares together with his wife and three children. On the evening of the interview, Dennis invited me to come and dine with him and his family. The following takes its point of departure in Dennis's account where he tells about his experience prior to joining the police service. The following strip of the interview is revealing in relation to Dennis's expertise in both nonverbal and verbal communication:

"Ok ... emmmm can you tell me about your background for the work that you do"? (KP)

*"Yeah ...well as you know I work for the police now and I started errrrr [information about place] ... in this area here you can say there errrr ... I worked the door [nightclub security] for many years ... before I joined the police ... emmmm and I have when I worked on the door ... errrr at the time I began to really observe peoples body language ... I thought that it was really interesting ... and I didn't do so much errrr I haven't fought so much with people ... well not as much as other doorman have ... errrr it was pleasant to errrr talk with people and to use one's body language and get people to do things with the help of body language ... and with the help of talking errrr and I also thought it was fun with some errrrr
... errrr macho men among errrr the gangs ... the gangs and the way that they behaved ... and the way that they reacted towards someone that wanted to talk instead of fight I think that was fascinating ... and ... and I have more or less unconsciously and a bit consciously taken it into errrrr in my police work"*
(Interview, Dennis).

"Can you give me an example about how body language is useful"? (KP)

“Yeah errrrmm if I had for example back then ... if I had to throw someone out of the discotheque ... then ... so I could have with the help of body language ... by stretching forward an open palm and saying just come with me ... I noticed that people often accompanied me without trouble ... in contrast to showing them a finger and pointing at them and ordering ‘you come with me’ or ‘you out now’ ... that escalated any conflict ... well it’s something that I have used a lot ... and people they are errrr ... they sort of understand ... it’s like they accept it more when you use open palms and then they follow you that’s something that I errrr I must have found out ... I got the idea from somewhere or other I just can’t errrr it’s something that I have learnt some of it myself and have also read a bit about it in books somewhere I like to read about such things errrrmm somewhere or other I have read... .. errrr when beggars sit with open palms [he demonstrates the open palm gesture] and it’s a bit ... it’s a bit innocent ... well that’s one example of how you can use it” (Dennis)

“Ok so body language is important in the meeting with others” (KP)

“And facial expression ... that means a lot I think in my work back then and now of course ... it is a bit the same now ... the uniform gives with being a police officer that gives ... well people have a definite view about police officers right ... sometimes being a police officer has advantages in some situations and disadvantages in others it’s ... for example with some citizens in [Sunset Boulevard] that don’t know me ... then it can be a disadvantage ...” (Dennis)

How? (KP)

“... .. they have errrrmm errrrr ... many of them can have a a stereotyped image that police officers are annoyed or irritated with them beforehand and don’t like them and it’s the uniform that they see not the person ... and they view me as someone that comes to fine or arrest them and sometimes I do that ... but errrr other times errrr you can avoid conflicts ... and I rather would that’s where body language is important” (Dennis).

Dennis’s account implies he plays an active role in continuously monitoring and assessing situations and, therefore, makes active choices about how to tackle them. The strip of interview transcript above is telling and tells the story about how Dennis as a young man working the doors of nightclubs through experience and observation learnt about body language, and how others reacted differently to the signals he conveyed to them. In addition, it tells how he learned the art of using non-verbal in combination with verbal communication as a resource to reduce friction and physical confrontation. Dennis’s explanation suggests he found experimenting with body language fascinating and through experimentation discovered others reacted and responded

differently to his self presentation. Nonetheless, Dennis's account shows that using his own body language as a resource to reduce physical confrontation were not something that he decided to do from scratch since he states he got the idea about playing with body language from somewhere or other, which suggests the inspiration came from elsewhere. This is in tune with Swidler (1986) who argues:

"People do not build lines of action from scratch, choosing actions one at a time as efficient means to given ends. Instead, they construct chains of action beginning with at least some pre-fabricated links. Culture influences action through the shape and organization of those links, not by determining the ends to which they are put" (Swidler, 1986:277).

Following Swidler (1986), Dennis's strategy of employing non-verbal communication as a resource to reduce physical confrontations is an action influenced by culture. Nonetheless, in this case, Dennis as a knowledgeable actor made a conscious, reflective choice. Through agency, Dennis decided to experiment with non-verbal communication, which suggests both out of the box thinking and expanding his cultural toolbox through individual initiative, rather than culture. Through experimenting, Dennis found non-verbal communication an effective strategy in curbing physical confrontation; therefore, he implemented it into his cultural repertoire, something which became a valuable tool in his cultural toolbox when he became a police officer. Dennis's account implies that he began to achieve some success in peacefully solving conflict as a doorman through the effective use of both given and given off communication, a resource which became a permanent part of his inventory, a valuable cultural resource now available to him as a police officer. According to Pease & Pease (2005), using open palms is a sign which originates from 'ancient times' and indicates that a person is not bearing arms. Using open palms usually is a body gesture used unconsciously to communicate openness and integrity and one which triggers 'intuitive' feelings that the sender is telling the truth (Pease & Pease, 2005). The palm facing up gesture is a submissive, non-threatening gesture and mostly receivers of such gestures feel non-pressured and non-threatened (Pease & Pease, 2005), which may help explain why Dennis found some success using the open palm gesture in combination with his overall self presentation to solve conflict peacefully. In addition, Dennis's explanation implies that sometimes the effective

use of body language is a cultural resource which can be used to overcome the barrier of wearing the police uniform in the meeting with diverse citizens.

Similar to Linda the job consultant, during the interview, when referring to the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds Dennis names and frames them either as citizens and/or young people. In addition, he frames policing in Sunset Boulevard as an activity which centres on making citizens feel secure while sending the message to wrongdoers their behaviour is unacceptable. This is evident in the following interview excerpt where Dennis talks about the purpose of his work in Sunset Boulevard.

"... .. The purpose for my work well it is to errrr to make people ... the citizens feel secure ... and often to send the message to those citizens causing problems to other citizens that their behaviour is unacceptable which in [name of place] is often young people that cause problems for other citizens for example sometimes a group of young people stand and take space in an entrance and some other people daren't walk past ... so we go and explain to them that it is bothering other citizens or it could be going to attend the scene of a fire in the neighbourhood there is a lot of them at the moment ... so it could be that I have to be there and make sure that the young people don't throw stones at the fire-fighters ... or it could be patrolling to make sure that the traffic regulations are kept ... or that the errrr law concerning narcotics is kept ... so that people don't have too much errrr and many of these young people have troubles and live ... in a troubled area ... so ... often there are drugs in the area and there are often traffic violations involving young people and some young people have something to do with these fires right ... so much of my approach to them is a bit negative ... errrrr yeah" (Dennis).

During the interview, I asked Dennis about how he and his colleagues meet/receive the young men with minority backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard during face-to-face encounters. Following Dennis's account, the meeting between police officers and citizens depends much on the agenda and frame of mind of the individual police officer during the encounter. This implies the meeting between some police officers and citizens almost can be determined in advance of the encounter. This idea is much in tune with ideas around discretionary powers advanced by Lipsky, (1980). According to Lipsky (1980), the decisions of low-level employees, the routines they create, and the devices they develop to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out. The following interview excerpt is illustrative:

“... well it’s different ... police officers are different ... and one officer he can maybe errrr be interested in finding drugs on people errrrr it could be his thing he thinks that his purpose [his motivation] with policing is to rid the world of drugs so it could be he thinks that at all costs he should just try and find something on them and charge them if he can and he can have that motivation with all people he meets ... some officers are by the book men who charge people for everything and anything errrr so citizens who come driving along not wearing seatbelts or have left their driving license at home or if their light is broken get charged for breaking the traffic regulations where others ... like me are a bit more like ... ‘oh dear me, tut tut, that could happen to anyone ... remember to sort it out’ and some officers suggest that sometimes a warning can be more educational than a fine ... so and I can maybe ... have a day, just like other colleagues ... where I have had a nasty experience or something horrendous ... something which affects the way I meet people on that day compared to other days” (Dennis).

During Dennis’s account, he implies that police officers tend to deal with minor infringements of the law differently, which illustrates discretionary powers at play. Dennis’s explanation implies that police officers tend to approach citizens somewhat differently, and behaviour can range from ‘by the book’ to more lenient approaches whereby first time offenders get off with a warning. In this respect, Dennis’s explanation seems to be in harmony with the data presented in the previous section which depict him as being fair and just. While exploring the issue further with Dennis, I asked him if it is reasonable to say that the meeting between police officers and the young men from Sunset Boulevard can be markedly different from officer-to-officer. During Dennis’s explanation, he reveals that attitude/temperament plays a crucial role in the meeting between police officers and the young men from Sunset Boulevard, which could explain why some of the young men indicate that some police officers who they encounter are unjust. In addition, his statement implies that sometimes over time, through reoccurring interactions between some police officers and some of the young men that hateful relationships can develop. The following interview excerpt is illustrative:

“Yeah ... from colleague to colleague ... yeah it can happen ... there are some who are quick tempered ... and don’t see them as there are some that errrrr just want to get the police work finished and just lock them up and have a really negative view of the young people because all the time when they meet them ... it is negative what they say errrrr and it has been a bit of a tendency to and be more and more negative towards them as time goes by the newer you are then maybe the more tolerant you are

... .. and eventually when you get called out again and again then I think people's tolerance gets less and less ... so I think that many of the older colleagues have a shorter fuse in relation to the young people with ethnic backgrounds and some of them are errrrr them that you meet again and again ... so sometimes a relationship arises errrr ... a relationship of hate then ...it becomes difficult ... I think that I have a reasonably good relationship to the young people out there errrr and I don't turn a blind eye to things ... but errrrr I I feel that sometimes that I don't react so hard to some things compared to others maybe" (Dennis)

Perhaps you are more tolerant than some of your colleagues (KP)

"... .. well I definitely I don't let the young people feel that ... if they park illegally they get fined sometimes ... but they can also get a warning ... errrr and if they stand there and get really annoyed at me and ... shout and stuff ... then I don't let them know that it affects me personally ... I don't get annoyed or shout back at them ... where other colleagues can maybe take it personally that Mustafa has parked just there where he isn't allowed in front of a sign errrr where I am a bit more ... 'you can't do that, you have to understand that there are some rules and then you could get a fine for parking there' and when I give them a fine I say ' here you go ... and if you think that it's wrong then you are welcome to complain about it ... and my number is' and treat them well in that way ... errrrr ... sometimes they say they will complain whether they do they don't normally but it's like you have shown them that you are not annoyed with them personally [this reinforces the idea that it's about how you meet people that counts] and you have explained to them that it's therefore ... where some colleagues might say 'that's because you are so stupid, you should have parked your car somewhere else'" (Dennis).

Dennis's explanation reinforces the accounts given by the young men in the previous section about his normal practice (i.e. he talks with them and explains things). In addition, Dennis's account reinforces the idea that how public sector employees meet/receive citizens matters in relation to how the relationship develops. Similar to Linda's account, Dennis points out during his account that he is not a walk over or an easy touch but at the same time he treats people with respect and dignity which is something which adds to his reputation is Sunset Boulevard as a fair and just police officer – predictable and trustworthy.

During the interview, I asked Dennis to explain how he uses body language when confronted by an irate citizen. Dennis's interpretation implies that he continuously monitors the situation and both consciously and unconsciously uses body language to effect during encounters. This suggests that during encounters Dennis continuously makes active choices adapting and changing his body language and facial expressions to manage the encounter. Dennis explains that sometimes it is necessary to change strategy and adopt a threatening stance, as opposed to a non-threatening, which implies the deliberate use of both given and given off communication. This implies that not all body language is unintentional as much of the literature on the matter suggests. According to Dennis, when he discovered the effect body language can have on encounters he began to use his non-verbal communication intentionally:

"Yeah I use open palms if appropriate I really think a lot about my body language in relation to others and some of the things I have started to do unconsciously also here and now when I sit and talk to you ... I use my hands a lot ... I do emmmm ... yeah so I really use body language a lot ... but also my face and make sure that I don't screw my eyes together ... and ... and sometimes errrrrr it all depends on what is going on ... errrrrr because in other situations then I maybe think about that now maybe it's a good idea to be threatening errrrrr because just to show that I am not standing there for fun ... there I can lower my chin a bit ... I think about it a lot also during the time when I was a doorman ... I really noticed how people reacted to a man that stood there all raised up with the shoulders back you have to be really open to ... and dare to ask questions and have a bit of fun with but if I just sort of sink a little bit down ... and lower my chin and that then you become a little more closed and ready to attack and it's just like that people get a bit more respect ... and sometimes I use that in some situations and it's gradually become a bit unintentionally [becomes automatic] ... well to start with it was unconscious then I began to discover these things then I started to use them a bit more intentionally" (Dennis).

Towards the end of the interview, I asked Dennis about what he does to build trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in Sunset Boulevard. Following Dennis, making an effort to follow up on agreements and honesty is crucial to the trust building process, which seems in tune with Whitener et al.'s (1998) typology of five broad categories of trustworthy behaviour outlined above. Following Dennis's explanation, sometimes one of the young men ask him about certain legislation and the consequences of breaching it for his social reality, for instance, what it means to have endorsements on his driving license. According to Dennis, if he cannot answer the

question on the spot he adopts an open honest approach and makes a point in emphasising that he is not proficient in the legislation but at the same time emphasises that he would like to find out the information for the individual and makes an agreement about when he will convey the information. This implies, through his conduct, Dennis demonstrates to the young men that he is human and as such not perfect because of his limited knowledge of the law. In addition, this indicates that Dennis shows integrity along with a caring respectful approach to the young men in Sunset Boulevard even to those who have committed misdemeanours. The crucial point is that Dennis interacts with the young men treating them with dignity and respect even though they might have committed minor offences. In addition, as highlighted above, Dennis does not take the actions of the young men personally; therefore, he can take a step back from the offence and maintain his usual imperturbable, calm and collective approach maintaining the impression that he has presented to them many times before. Dennis's account is much in tune with the accounts given about him by the young men presented above, which implies a confirming consistency. This helps to explain why some of the young men view Dennis as being fair and just and as someone who takes time to explain things to them. The following excerpt is illustrative:

"emmmmm yeah ... well amongst other things with these young people ... some of them ask me about things ... errrrr ... about something or other ... it could be about a rule from the traffic legislation for example ... and I am not an expert in all Danish legislation ... you cant ... errrrr ... so I really make an effort ... it could be he has a couple of clips [endorsements] on his driving license and he asks 'how many endorsements does it take before you lose your license' ... and I say 'do you know what' ... I am not completely sure about this ... that the offense you got fined gives you an endorsement on your driving license or not ... emmmmm but I would like to find out for you and will let you know by Monday' or another time when I know that I am at work ... errrrr then I really emphasise that I don't know ... and I am honest about it because ... if I just say 'yeah that's an endorsement ... and that's ... errrr you only have one more penalty point left and then you will lose your license' ... if I had said it to him and he finds out later that it's not true then he will be disappointed and will not trust me ... errrr and I think that he will lose respect in me ... errrrr and of course he won't trust me ... because he would feel ... errrr he would view it as if I had told him a lie ... it is that you are honest ... I would rather let all the doors be open and say 'do you know what ... I will check it out and get back to you rather than give false information you can say" (Dennis).

5.5.5 Summary

Exploring the data pertaining to Dennis, helps to explain why some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard consider Dennis as trustworthy. The data concerning Dennis presented in this section strongly suggest that he, as a knowledgeable actor, as part of his repertoire uses impression management and given/given off communication effectively. The data strongly imply that Dennis is much aware of and in control of the verbal and nonverbal communication that he conveys to citizens, which is much in tune with Goffman (1959). In addition, the data imply that Dennis's approach to citizens is relatively calm and composed, which is a deliberate strategy to disarm irate citizens sometimes. In addition, the data suggest that Dennis through his communication skills can present a non annoyed self presentation/definition to irate citizens whereby he signals that he does not take their actions personally, something which helps build a trustworthy image. Through comparing the data pertaining to Linda and Dennis, it is possible to see some similarities. For example, they both think outside their cultural toolboxes in relation to approaching their jobs and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. Both actors go beyond their prescribed roles in the community, in a number of ways. For example, Dennis uses his own time to attend circuit training together with the lads from Sunset Boulevard, similar to Linda, this provides the young men with another insight of Dennis, which is in tune with Luhmann's (1979) ideas around participating in the community to initiate and eventually win trust. In addition, both Linda and Dennis agree that it is paramount to keep one's word, no matter what, in order to build trust. Something, which is striking, is that when naming and framing the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds both Linda and Dennis frame the young men more as young citizens rather than deviants or troublemakers – something which perhaps shapes their encounters with the young men.

The data presented in this section answers the research question: How can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

The short answer to this question is, social, and youth workers can negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds by thinking outside of, or by expanding their cultural toolbox repertoire. In addition, if the aim is to create and

maintain trust then it is necessary for social and youth workers to communicate and signal trustworthiness to their target group in a similar fashion to the job consultant and police officer.

6

Conclusions & Implications

Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusions and implications for theory, research and practice along with the limitations of this study. This study focuses on the phenomenon of distrust and trust between public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in a local community setting. The focus is on trust and distrust which can be understood as cultural resources, which means that culture provides knowledgeable actors with a repertoire or toolbox of habits, skills, and styles, which they can select to use to tackle or manage different situations in which they encounter. The main goal of the study was to contribute towards understanding the micro-processes at play in distrust and trust building processes, between public sector employees and young men from minority ethnic backgrounds. The aim of this is to contribute towards filling the knowledge gap in the subjective micro-processes concerning trust and distrust experiences in real face-to-face relationships. In addition, another goal was to contribute towards bridging the gap in the literatures concerning distrust and trust building processes. Most scholarly research on trust transpires through experiments and surveys, which either research trust in artificial environments or from a distance (Hardin, 2006; Möllering, 2006). In addition, most research on

trust takes place within, or between organisations, which denotes a gap in the knowledge concerning trust in community settings. I embarked on this research journey in order to contribute towards filling these gaps by providing new insights, which may inform social and youth work practice about the processes at play concerning trust and distrust. In addition, this study contributes towards filling the gap in the literature on trust where interpretative approaches to studying trust and distrust are necessary (Möllering, 2006).

To contribute towards filling this knowledge gap, this study closely investigates the phenomenon of why young men with minority ethnic backgrounds distrust some public sector employees and trust others from the perspectives of the young men and identified employees. The main findings from the study are: a) governmental construction of distrust frames; b) local authority institutionalised distrust frames; c) trust and distrust as cultural frames; and d) negotiating cultural frames.

6.1 Chapter Structure

The following chapter consists of ten sections. The first five sections set out the conclusions and implications for theory, research and practice of the findings. Next the chapter looks at recommendations for practice based on the findings and conclusions of the study. Following this, I outline the overall contributions of the thesis along with the limitations and recommendations for future research. The chapter concludes by restating the problem formulation and positing the answers.

6.2 Governmental Construction of Distrust Frames

Through combining the principles of Frame Analysis together with insights from the trust literature and Rawls and David (2006), the policy analysis contributes towards understanding how government policies can construct distrust frames around certain groups in society and its implications. While there is a long history of academic interest in the phenomenon of problem framing at the policy-making level, there is a gap in the literature about the role government policies can play towards trust and distrust development between ethnic majority and diverse

minority ethnic groups in society. This study contributes towards filling this gap, while at the same time, identifying an area which requires more research to explore how immigration policies impact on trust and distrust between ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups in society. This analysis provides evidence that distrust framing plays a crucial role in policy implementation. How some local authority actors named and framed young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, was much in tune with the distrust frames advanced in government policy. The analysis showed how this transpires both at the organisational (dissemination of bilingual children) and the face-to-face levels (youth workers) of service delivery and provision. In addition, analysing the government policy may help explain some of the attitudes and framing of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds by some local authority actors. Additionally, it may help shed light on why some local authority actors call for hard-handed tactics against some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds.

The policy is not explicitly directed against persons with minority ethnic backgrounds; rather its focus is on immigration and on assimilating people with minority ethnic backgrounds into the wider society. Nonetheless, during the analysis, I found the architect's behind the policy tended to frame people with minority ethnic backgrounds along with places where high numbers of residents have minority ethnic backgrounds by drawing on New Right ideology (i.e. ignorant, non-productive, criminal immigrants). The analysis found the criteria of framing "ghettos" to be prejudicial against people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Defining "ghettos" by the number of people with minority ethnic backgrounds could be interpreted as discriminatory. In this sense immigration has become racialised in Denmark. This framing demarcates social boundaries between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups, while simultaneously reinforcing distinct social divisions between the privileged and underprivileged. Framing residential areas where people live, call home and raise children in this way can reinforce class divisions in society and local communities. This sends the message to 'acceptable citizens' to stay away from the uncultivated "ghettos", at least until the government reclaims them. The "ghettos" must be reclaimed through a process of re-cultivation; cultivating these wild areas through limiting the number of unemployed "immigrants and their descendants", extra policing and controls, re-sowing the seeds of Danish cultural values to recolonise and repopulate the "ghettos" restoring them back into areas of residential housing. This strategy intrinsically interlinks to the power

structure, political project and conditions of the time, but could be interpreted as sending a message to people with minority ethnic backgrounds that they are a problem and not accepted in Denmark.

Through drawing on Rawls & David (2006), the main conclusion of analysing this policy is that framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds as the 'other' and in distrust can have serious implications for intercultural relations in Denmark. As discussed above, the policy of 'Othering' people with minority ethnic backgrounds may exclude them from participating in mainstream society, while at the same time, strengthening their resistance to integrating into Danish society and solidarity with one another, which seems counterproductive to integration policies in Denmark. The process of 'Othering' may have the implication of polarizing society by driving a social wedge between the ethnic majority and minority ethnic groups. As social cleavages widen between ethnic groups in society, trust becomes difficult at best and shattered at worst. This suggests that the government's anti-immigration policies over the past ten years have intensified distrust between Danes and people with minority ethnic backgrounds.

This policy document illustrates how the government delegated additional administrative responsibilities and workloads onto local authorities in matters concerning immigration and integration. Over a ten year period, the previous government implemented several such policies in relation to immigration and integration which must have had an impact on the attitudes of employees towards people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Reviewing the policy document leads me to believe that framing people with minority ethnic backgrounds in distrust is a widely accepted behaviour, likewise the New Right ideas used in this process.

6.3 Local Authority Institutionalised Distrust Frames

During the second section of the analysis, I consider the attitudes of local authority actors towards the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard. The data suggest that key local authority actors frame the young men in distrust through drawing on a combination of institutional and cultural tools. This supports the idea that wider cultural values and norms are at play in their daily practice which connects them to the wider structural and cultural context. This suggests that cultural norms and values can influence the way social actors think about and

interact with their social reality. With few exceptions, most of the local authority interactants shared a similar understanding of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds as their political leaders and applied similar cultural tools in their framing of the young men. This was evident throughout the field research and explicit in both observations and interviews. The exceptions were the job consultant and police officer, who named and framed the young men as young citizens rather than problems. The data suggest that how employees frame citizens or groups of citizens is crucial because it points toward and legitimises certain approaches and not others, thus shaping the direction of future action. Framing processes shaped how implementation unfolded by opening up some doors for action while simultaneously closing off others, setting parameters within which decision making unfolded, and shaping the allocation of resources such as access to the club. Thus, defining some of the young men as out of reach or problems excluded them from youth services and made them the target of monitoring from a distance instead.

In addition, the data suggest that cultural and institutional norms and values can be a barrier to building trusting relationships between some local authority actors and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. In the case of the youth work team, mostly these beliefs seem to be shared, because they affect the delivery and provision of youth services in the area. For example, these shared beliefs emerge into their practice by the differential treatment of the young men who sometimes hang around the corner by systematically excluding them from the 'Bad Boyz Club'. This shared practice knowledge provides team members with a framework for interpreting events in the area and for justifying their actions, which becomes the means for service delivery and provision. In other words, the shared beliefs in the team largely become institutions which determine how they choose to do business. This supports the idea introduced at the beginning of the section that social work, or in this case, youth work does not take place in a vacuum where popular beliefs influence 'worker--service-user' relationships (Dominelli, 1988).

In the two examples reported in this section, I observed what I interpret as a 'paternalistic attitude' at work in two different social practice situations: (1) the interdisciplinary meeting between the youth workers and the 'official' SSP teams. (2) Patrolling the inter-school football tournament. Both of these observed examples show a deeply ingrained control and monitoring role in the practice of the youth workers which involves social policing rather than outreach work.

Both examples show employees construct distrust frames around young men with minority ethnic backgrounds from Sunset Boulevard, and participate in social policing activities at public events with the purpose of preventing and reporting trouble. These social practices reinforce the distrustful attitudes and framing of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds.

In addition, the monitoring action highlighted in these examples draws on ideology advanced by the government and local authority leaders. During the interdisciplinary meeting, the professionals copresent listened in awe, endorsed and encouraged the surveillance operation. Overall, this suggests that contextual input from policy to practice was a key mechanism whereby youth workers more or less accept a social policing role that involves wariness, watchfulness and control. The interviews presented in this section reinforce the fieldwork observations and confirm how the youth workers largely adopted and even developed the policy discourse into concrete actions.

During this section, I identified some of the cultural and institutional tools that professionals draw upon from their repertoire within the context of working with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds (“Social Inheritance”, ‘New Right-thinking’, professional distance, exclusion and snitching). I discussed some of the implications of using these tools in relation to trust and distrust. Overall, these tools have crucial consequences to relationships with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and seem more conducive to generating distrust than trust. All the public sector interactants encountered during fieldwork were doing their best to solve operational problems with the material and cultural resources at their disposal in the context. This is in tune with Swidler’s (1986) interpretation of culture as a toolbox consisting of symbols, rituals, and worldviews which people may mix and use interchangeably as strategies to solve individual problems within the given context. In this view, culture is not deterministic; rather it provides cultural tools that can be used to develop strategies of action to meet individual challenges. Despite Individuals and groups having a set of tools at their disposal, there may be some they rarely use (Swidler, 1986). In this view, culture is a toolbox (repertoire) of habits, styles and skills which social actors use to make “strategies of action” (Swidler, 1986:273). Professionals draw upon these tools because they believe them to be the right tools for the job, in the circumstances and the given context. During the fieldwork period, some local authority actors drew on certain political discourses when framing the young men, which was more productive for

distrust rather than trust. Hence there is a relationship between contextual input (from government) and framing of micro-relations. This analysis suggests that the cultural repertoire of frontline employees sometimes lack tools or strategies to use to create trust/trusting relations with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. The data in this section suggest that despite the youth workers claim that trust building is fundamental to their work, cultural and institutional norms got in the way of building trusting relationships, something which perhaps is now unsolvable.

The second section contributes toward answering the research question posited at the beginning of the chapter: How and why do youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame one another in distrust and what are the implications?

The short answer to the first part of the question is: the youth workers frame the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in high distrust and do so because it is an institutionalised contextualised cultural resource.

6.4 Trust and Distrust as Cultural Frames

The third section presents backstage insights into how the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds consider the youth workers based at the youth club across the road. These accounts give a confirming consistency to those given by the youth workers; overall, the data from both groups tell a tale of mutual suspicion and distrust. The data presented in the third section illustrate how as knowledgeable actors (i.e. competent actors who use different variations of distrust and trust to frame relationships as part of their cultural repertoire), the young men interchangeably use both distrust and trust as a cultural resource to frame their relationships with the identified public sector actors. This is in tune with Mizrachi et al. (2007) study somewhat who show how as knowledgeable actors interactants in their study interchangeably relied on different variations of trust as strategies to demarcate social relations with former enemies to suit changing political situations. However, in their study they only consider trust as a resource to demarcate social relations and not distrust.

The data show that in bygone days the youth workers and the young men once had an amicable relationship. However, through a series of perceived hostile encounters with the youth workers, the young men excluded them from interaction. The data show the association developed from amicable to one of mutual distrust, shrouded in scepticism, cynicism, wariness and watchfulness – all the signs of high distrust according to Lewicki et al. (1998). This implies, similar to trust, distrust transpires through a history of interaction within a given context. In a roundabout way, this analysis supports ideas advanced by some contemporary researchers about the importance of adopting the process approach for understanding trust (e.g. Lewicki & Bunker (1995, 1996; Nooteboom, 1996; Nooteboom et al., 1997; Nooteboom & Six 2003; Möllering 2006; Khodyakov 2007). As discussed in chapter two, the process perspective goes beyond the dyadic approach by viewing social actors as “active creators of processes” rather than mere “passive carriers of a process” (Möllering, 2006:79).

In the case between the youth workers and the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the data suggest the young men actively chose distrust as a strategy towards the youth workers because of their history of interaction. In other words, over a long period, through a process of interaction with the youth workers, the young men built up an intimate knowledge of the workers and their modus operandi and decided that distrust was the best strategy to tackle the Danish youth workers. This study supports Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model which argues that different stages of trust transpire through a process of interaction. However, in this case the same can be said about distrust because, through a process of interaction over an extended time, the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds gained knowledge about the workers which causes them to believe that the workers will behave in a way they consider being unjust which corresponds to distrustful. This is much in tune with the principles of Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) concept of knowledge-based trust, however, in this case it is distrust based on knowledge built up through a process of interaction.

There is, however, a gap in research which adopts the process view of both trust and distrust, a valuable approach which requires much more focus and research. While this study supports the process approach to studying trust, it calls into question approaches to trust/trusting which adopt a static view of trust i.e. approaches which view trust as a mental condition which enables trusters to cope with uncertainty and vulnerability. As discussed in chapter two, to adopt

Möllerings (2006) terminology, the emphasis on vulnerability implies that people are just 'passive carriers of a process' rather than 'active creators of processes' (2006:79). Further, this view of trust ignores many social processes and power relations around trusting or distrusting decisions. Moreover, this static view of trust and distrust ignores the complex multidimensionality of relationships where both trust and distrust can coexist in the same relationship (Lewicki et al., (1998); Lewicki, 2006).

During this section, I identified some of the tools that the young men use to organise and frame identified public sector employees. The young men use these tools to frame the professionals either in distrust or trust. This framing process involves applying labels such as snitch, unjust, just, fair, and cares. The labels of 'snitch' and 'unjust' frame the youth workers in distrust while simultaneously triggering collective action against them. The data and fieldwork observations show that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds share similar primary frames of interpretation in relation to the youth workers, the job consultant and the police officer which implies a mutual or shared understanding and can best be described as an institutionalised contextualised cultural resource. This shared framing in relation to the police officer and the job consultant show that trust is available but perhaps requires a different approach, which may involve thinking outside the cultural toolbox.

The relationship with the youth workers from the perspective of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds can best be described as knowledge-based distrust, the basis of which is predictability. This means, as knowledgeable actors, the young men change their behaviour towards the workers expected actions in future dealings. In addition, these shared understandings and expectations of the workers suggest that members spread the word about their reputation throughout the community. This means the young men learn from each other within the context of the local area about what to expect if they meet certain public sector employees and disseminate this information to others in their network, whom in turn pass this information on to others and so on. The example given at the start of the third section implies that talk about unjust or distrustful deeds travels far – in this case some twenty miles. This means that even if the local authority decided to relocate this team of youth workers their reputation could make a fresh start demanding, since those meeting these workers 'know' about them and which tools to use when dealing with them.

When analysing the data in the third section, it becomes clear that the young men only use a handful of cultural tools (e.g. just, cares, unjust & snitch) when framing the public sector employees and their relationships with them. This could mean a couple of things, either they have a relatively limited toolbox; or the selected tools have proven to be the most effective as a strategy to respond to perceived unjust actions. The data show that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame the youth workers in distrust by using the cultural tools of snitch and unjust (injustice). The analysis revealed these as powerful trigger devices that can be pressed to initiate collective action against identified targets. In addition, the data reveal that the basis for this framing is in feelings of anger, disappointment, betrayal and the belief that the youth workers conduct is unjust.

6.5 Negotiating Cultural Frames

The fourth and final empirical section closely explores the practice and attitude of the job consultant and the police officer to explore how they negotiate the cultural frames used by the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds to organise relationships with others. This section addresses and answers the research question posited at the beginning of the section: How can social and youth workers negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust?

The short answer to this question is, social, and youth workers can negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds by thinking outside of, and/or by expanding their cultural toolbox repertoire. Essentially, to initiate, win and maintain trust/trusting relationships with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in community settings public sector employees must think beyond their cultural, institutional norms and values along with their *modus operandi*.

In section three, the data indicate that trust and distrust are both available to public sector employees. However, the data suggest that the bottom line or the determining factor which decides whether or not the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds find public sector employees trustworthy or distrustful is how they perceive and interpret their individual, overall

performance/modus operandi. In other words, despite the job function of the different workers involved, the young men judge them by their performance and deeds in terms of just or unjust actions and what counts is how the receiver of the overall presentation interprets it.

The data suggest that some outside the box thinking is necessary for public sector employees to negotiate cultural frames at play, which requires a critical, inclusive approach to working with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. As highlighted during section four, the job consultant and the police officer thought beyond the confines of their institutionalised roles and adopted non-judgemental collaborative approaches to win and maintain the trust of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. In addition, the data generated through observations and interviews indicates that the job consultant and police officer are both effective communicators which seem to pave the way to initiating, building and maintaining trust with the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in and around Sunset Boulevard. In this respect, they are both effective at conveying communication, which the young men perceive as trustworthy this is decisive in initiating, building and maintaining trust. In addition, the data suggest that both the job consultant and police officer name and frame the young men in terms of young citizens as opposed to deviant and problems. This framing seems to transpire in their practice when they encounter some of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds through their work and supports the idea that how employees frame citizens or groups of citizens is crucial because it points toward and legitimises certain approaches and not others, thus shaping the direction of future action. This seems to make a difference to their hands-on approach to working with the young men in Sunset Boulevard where their approach seems to be non-judgmental.

This contrasts to the data presented in section two of this chapter which shows the approach of the youth workers involves naming and framing the young men in terms of deviance, and their practice involves staying clear of the young men (e.g. excluding them from the 'Bad Boyz Club' and staying close to the police on the streets). Therefore, with this approach it is impossible for the youth workers to initiate and build trust with the young men of Sunset Boulevard when they keep them at a distance and remain aloof. In addition, their practice of giving all information to the police is counterproductive to trust and more productive to distrust.

When considering the data presented in this section, the two actors demonstrate what I interpret as out of the box thinking and behaviour. In addition, the data reveal that both actors

used communication effectively which seems in tune with Goffman's (1959) impression management and with the process approach to understanding trust where "extensive signalling, communication, interaction and interpretation [is necessary] in order to maintain the continuous process of trust constitution" (Möllering, 2006:79).

6.6 Stepping back from the Street-Level – Wider Implications

When considering sections two and three, stepping back from the street-level accounts, one can see a larger story of tension, conflict; suspicion and distrustful relations emerging which perhaps are irresolvable in the case presented above. This case should provide food for thought to many public sector employees where building trusting relations is paramount to achieving successful service delivery. In addition, local authority managers should take a closer look at how they utilise frontline employees in the community especially if the goal is to create meaningful trusting relations because some methods can be counterproductive to this aim. This unfolding story of antagonism illustrates a difficult challenge to public sector employees worldwide, who work in similar contexts under similar conditions where building trusting relationships is critical to successful service delivery.

6.7 Recommendations for Further Research

In the trust literature there is a tendency to distinguish between interpersonal and institutional-based trust. This study shows that distrust and trust is something that happens at the micro level in the encounter between people in a given context through a history of interaction. However, this meeting between people does not take place in vacuum; powerful structural and cultural resources can affect this meeting and undermine the process of building trust. This is clearly shown in the data, especially how local authority actors draw on dominant cultural and political discourses in framing the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in distrust. This illustrates how wider cultural and structural forces connect to the micro-level face-to-face encounter. This thesis shows how different sides use cultural tools to frame and organise their relationships with the 'other' in either distrust or trust. These frames become counteracted by other frames from the

other side as strategies in the local context. It is in this sense that trust can be understood as a cultural resource – it is a strategy used to respond to unfolding events and to organise relationships with others in the local context. The implication of this is we need studies of trust that combines an institutional and an interpersonal approach. We need more focus on the institutional powers that lead to the erosion of trust at the micro-level. This indicates the need for research which takes into account structural and cultural dimensions of power and prejudice which actors rely on to frame others, which can be counterproductive to trust and trusting.

During the analysis, while analysing the data in relation to distrust and trust, I have relied mostly on insights from organisational and management literature such as Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model, based on trust in work relations. Using a model based on trust in business relationships, however, indicates a gap in the social and youth work literature concerning trust development between professionals and service-users. In this respect, the social and youth work literature is not useful. While there are plenty of references to be found stating how valuable trust is, or ‘high trusting’ relationships when working with young people, there is not much to be found about how to establish high trusting’ relationships. Therefore, more research is necessary which looks closely at the relationship and trust building processes between professionals and young people in general. In addition, I suggest that further interpretative studies be carried out at the face-to-face level of interaction, which look at relationships from the perspectives of all those involved, to provide rich accounts of trust and distrust trying to catch trust and distrust developments in relationships as they develop.

6.8 Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings, analysis and conclusions of this study and within a process perspective framework on trust building, I suggest a number of recommendations which could be useful for practitioners to negotiate cultural frames to initiate, build and maintain trust/trusting relations with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in community settings. Within a process perspective framework, it is crucial to remember that trust is an ongoing process which requires effort and is something which takes place over time through a process of face-to-face interaction within a given context with others.

So how can this study help practitioners negotiate cultural frames to initiate, build and maintain trust/trusting relationships with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds? For one thing, where possible and appropriate, practitioners could spend time in the context to learn about the social codes at play and the tools used to frame individuals and relationships in terms of trust/trusting and distrust/distrusting, by doing so, it may be possible to make some strategies to negotiate cultural frames. In addition, critically reflecting over ones (and colleagues) attitude, framing and approach towards young men with minority ethnic backgrounds along with the modus operandi and considering how this overall performance might impact on perceptions of trustworthiness could be valuable practice. Additionally, the data suggest that adopting an honest, non-judgemental, inclusive approach while keeping one's word and conveying a confirming consistency through both given and given off communication can be useful to trust building. In addition, being visible and participating in some community activities can be helpful to building and maintaining trusting relations, for instance, in community centres. While this is in tune with the findings of the study, it is also in tune with Luhmann (1979) and ideas around self-presentation and Lewicki & Bunkers (1996) trust development model where participating in social interaction, in the setting, is necessary to initiating and building trust.

6.9 Contributions of the Thesis

In addition to the contributions outlined above, this thesis contributes towards filling gaps in the knowledge and literature in a number of ways. Firstly, this study provides an in-depth qualitative fieldwork study which critically considers the role of the researcher in relation to the trust building process in the research gathering process. This means that I account for and reflect over how I as a researcher built trust with interactants to reach backstage areas of their lives during fieldwork. Therefore, another contribution of this thesis is in helping to fill the gap in the literature concerning trust building in qualitative field research. In addition, this study highlights the value of utilising table based games as a medium for building trusting relationships and as a method for undertaking ethnographic interviews with young people. Additionally, this thesis provides an in-depth analysis of firsthand observations of 'distrust and trust relations' with the point of departure in the interactants own interpretation of their experiences. What is more, this study researches these relationships from the perspectives of both sides of the relationship, which provides a

contribution to the literature on trust where there is a lack of such studies. At the same time, this study enriches frame analysis by illustrating how framing processes play out at the street-level of service delivery and provision. This research also contributes towards filling the gap in the youth and social work literature on trust between professionals and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, while at the same time contributing towards developing an interpretive approach to trust research. Further, the thesis contributes towards existing empirical work on trust by exploring trusting and distrusting as a complex relational practice occurring within particular socio-political contexts. In this thesis, trust is not to be seen as an entity brought about by social relations, but rather as a way to frame social relations which is dependent on reflexivity and sensemaking and which can take different forms.

6.10 Limitations of the Thesis

This study gives in-depth insights into the distrusting and trusting relationships between a group of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and a number of identified professionals within a given context. Therefore, this study can only give a glimpse of what was happening between those social actors, at that period, in that context based on a history of social interaction. For that reason, one cannot make any significant generalisations based on a single fieldwork study.

However, it is reasonable to say that the findings of this study can be indicative of what may be occurring between other public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in similar contexts in Denmark, especially where employees use similar methods to those presented in this thesis. As shown in this study, local authority employees use similar cultural and structural tools to organise and frame their relationships with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds. This leads me to believe this behaviour is an underlying phenomenon embedded in Danish culture; therefore, not something isolated to actors from just one local authority. However, to corroborate this requires more research.

As underscored above, out of consideration for the interactants with whom I built up trust over an extended period, all informants and sights are anonymous. Hence, ethical considerations are on par with reliability and validity. Therefore, identical research with these interactants in those places cannot be repeated unless by chance. However, after saying that, identifying people

and places is no guarantee to study replication, as LeCompte & Goetz (1982) point out it is impossible to freeze time in a social setting. Additionally, ethnographic research by nature is a personal endeavour whereby the researcher uses him or herself as a tool to negotiate the field and build trusting relationships with others, therefore, as such, it is difficult to replicate. However, having said that, an individual or team of researchers could carry out a similar research project in a similar area in Denmark with public sector employees who use a similar *modus operandi* as the workers who appear in this thesis with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and find similar results.

6.11 Conclusion

In the sections above, I present four key findings from the study, together these findings answer the problem formulation set at the start of the thesis along with the research questions, namely the youth workers and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds frame each other in high distrust and do so because this is a contextualised institutionalised behaviour. The data imply that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds have adapted distrust as a strategy towards the Danish youth workers because of their attitude and framing of them along with their *modus operandi* (e.g. professional distance, exclusion, snitching, control & monitoring) in the local community. In this sense, trust and distrust can be understood as cultural resources, used as strategies in the environment by knowledgeable actors to respond to unfolding events and frame relationships with others. During the analysis, it became clear that notions of injustice and justice are primary cultural tools used to frame relationships to various public sector employees by the young men. These become key concepts in understanding how some public sector employees manage to negotiate cultural frames in the area. As discussed above, the short answer to the second research question is: social, and youth workers can negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds by thinking outside of, and/or by expanding their cultural toolbox repertoire. Essentially, to initiate, win and maintain trust/trusting relationships with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in community settings public sector employees must think beyond their cultural, institutional norms and values along with their *modus operandi*.

Literature List

- Abercrombie, N. et al (1994): 'The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology': Published by Penguin Books.
- Adobor, H. (2005): 'Trust as Sensemaking: The Microdynamics of Trust in Interfirm Alliances': *Journal of Business Research*: Vol. 58: Pages 330 – 337.
- Adler, P.A. & Adler, P. (1988): 'Intense Loyalty in Organizations: A Case Study of College Athletics': *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 33: No. 3: Pages: 401 – 417.
- Adler, P., Heckscher, C. & Prusak, L. (2011): 'Building a Collaborative Enterprise – Four Keys to Creating a Culture of Trust and Teamwork: *Harvard Business Review*: July-August 2011: Pages: 3-9.
- Agar, M. (1990): 'Text and Fieldwork: Exploring the Excluded Middle': *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 19:1 (April 1990): Pages 73 – 88.
- Andersen, E. (2000): 'Code of the Street': Norton: New York, USA.
- Andersen, J.G. (2003): 'The Danish general election 2001': *Electoral Studies*: Vol. 22(1): Pages 186–193.
- Andersson, B. (2011): 'Finding ways to the hard to reach—considerations on the content and concept of outreach work': *European Journal of Social Work*: Pages: 1 – 16.
- Angrosino, M.V. (2005): 'Recontextualizing Observation – Ethnography, Pedagogy, and the Prospects for a Progressive Political Agenda: In: *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*: Third Edition: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.): Published by Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks: California.
- Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. (1994): 'Ethnography and Participation Observation': In: *Handbook of Qualitative Research*: Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.): Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bachmann, R. (2002): 'Trust and Power as Means of Coordinating the Internal Relations of The Organisation: A Conceptual Framework': SOM Research Report: University of Groningen, Holland.
- Bale, T. (2008): 'Turning round the telescope. Centre-right parties and immigration and integration policy in Europe': *Journal of European Public Policy* Vol. 15: No.3: Pages 315–330.
- Banks, S. (2010): 'Ethical Issues in Youth Work' (Second Edition): Routledge: London & New York.
- Barney, J. B., & Hansen, M.H. (1994): 'Trustworthiness as a Source of Competitive Advantage': *Strategic Management Journal*: Vol. 15: Special Issue: Competitive Organizational Behaviour: Pages: 175-190.
- Barber, B. (1983): 'The Logic and Limits of Trust': Rutgers University Press: New Jersey, USA.
- Barry, C.A. (1999): 'Using reflexivity to optimize teamwork in qualitative research': *Qualitative*

Health Research: Vol. 9: Pages: 26 – 44.

Batsleer, J. & Davies, B. (2010): 'What is Youth Work': Learning Matters: Poole, England.

Bateson, G. (1972): 'Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution and Epistemology': The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, USA.

Beckert, J. (2005): 'Trust and the Performative Construction of Markets': MPIfG Discussion Paper 05/8 Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung Köln Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies Cologne.

Becker, S. & MacPherson, S. (eds.) (1988): 'Public Issues Private Pain': In: Poverty Social Work and Social Policy: Insight/Care Matters Books: London, England.

Benford, R. D. & Snow, D.A. (2000): 'Framing Processes and Social Movements – An Overview and Assessment': Annual Review of Sociology: Vol. 26: Pages: 11-39.

Berg, R. & Kjær, U. (2007): 'Lokalt Politisk Lederskab': Syddansk Universitetsforlag: Odense, Denmark.

Berger, P. & Luckmann (1966): 'The Social Construction of Reality': A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge: Published by Penguin Books, USA.

Berk, R.A. & Adams J.M. (1970): 'Establishing Rapport with Deviant Groups': Social Problems: Vol. 18, No.1: Pages 102 – 117.

Beresford, P., Croft, S., & Adshead, L. (2008): 'We Don't See Her as a Social Worker' - A Service User Case Study of the Importance of the Social Worker's Relationship and Humanity': British Journal of Social Work: Vol. 38: Pages: 1388–1407.

Bijlsma, K.M. & Van de Bunt, G.G. (2003): 'Antecedents of trust in managers: a "bottom up" approach': Personnel Review: Vol. 32: No. 5: Pages: 638-644.

Birch, Tina og Ejrnæs, Morten (2006): Social arv i pædagogisk arbejde – et relevant fagligt begreb eller en skadelig myte? BUPL, Nordjylland.

Bloomberg, L.D. & Volpe, M. (2008): 'Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation': Sage: California, USA.

Blum Malley, S & Hawkins, A. (2008): 'Translating Cultures: Ethnographic Writing in the Composition Classroom': Accessed 25TH Aug. 2011: <www.sbm.questionthequids.org>.

Blumer, H. (1936): 'Social Attitudes and Nonsymbolic Interaction': Journal of Educational Sociology: Vol. 9: No. 9: Pages 515-523.

Bosworth, M, et al. (2005): 'Doing prison research: Views from inside': Qualitative Inquiry: Vol. 11: Pages 249 - 264.

Brewer, J. & Magee, K. (1991): 'Inside the RUC: Routine Policing in a Divided Society': Clarendon Press: Oxford, England.

- Broadhead, R.S. and Fox, K.J. (1990): 'Takin' it to the Streets': *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 19: No. 3: Pages 322 – 348.
- Brownie, J & Howson, A. (2005): 'Leaps of Faith and MMR: An Empirical Study of Trust': *Sociology*: Vol. 39: No. 2: Pages 221 – 239.
- Bruyn, S. (1966): 'The Human Perspective: The Methodology of Participant Observation': Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bryman, A. (2004): 'Social Research Methods': Second Edition: Oxford University Press: New York.
- Bryman, A. (2008): 'Social Research Methods': Third Edition: Oxford University Press: New York.
- Bulmer, M. (1982): 'When is a Disguise Justified – Alternatives to Covert Participant Observation': *Qualitative Sociology*: Vol. 5: No. 4: December 1982: Pages 251 – 264.
- Castellano, U. (2007): 'Becoming a Non-expert and Other Strategies for Managing Fieldwork Dilemmas in the Criminal Justice System': *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 36: Pages 704 – 730.
- Child, J., & Möllering, G. (2003): 'Contextual confidence and active trust development in the Chinese business environment': *Organization Science*: Vol. 14(1): Pages: 69 – 80.
- Christensen, A.D. (2009): 'Belonging and Unbelonging from an Intersectional Perspective': *Gender Technology and Development*: Vol. 13: No. 21: Pages 21 – 41.
- Clark, C. (1998): 'Self-determination and Paternalism in Community Care: Practice and Prospects': *Br. J. Social Wk.* Vol. 28: 387 - 402
- Creed, W.E.D. & Miles, R.E. (1996): 'A Conceptual Framework Linking Organisational Forms, Managerial Philosophies, and the Opportunity Costs of Controls': In R.M. Kramer and T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*: Sage: London, England.
- Coleman, J.S. (1990) 'Foundations of Social Science Theory': Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Coy, P. (2001): 'Shared risks and research dilemmas on a Peace Brigades International Team in Sri Lanka': *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 30: Pages 575 – 606.
- Danish Government (2010): 'Getting the Ghettos Back to Society – A Confrontation with Parallel Societies in Denmark': Rosendahls – Schultz Distribution: Albertslund, Denmark.
- Daniel, P. & Wheeler, J. (1989): 'Social Work and Local Politics': BASW: Macmillan Education Ltd: Basingstoke, England.
- Danmarks Statistik (2008): 'Indvandrere i Danmark 2008': København Ø, Denmark.
- Davies, B. (2010): 'What do we mean by Youth Work?': In: 'What is Youth Work?' [Eds. Batsleer, J. & Davies, B.]: Learning Matters: Poole, England.

- Davies, B. & Merton, B. (2009): 'Squaring the Circle': Findings of A 'Modest Inquiry' Into the State of Youth Work Practice in a Changing Policy Environment: De Montfort University: Leicester, England.
- Dasgupta, P. (1988): 'Trust as a Commodity'. In D. Gambetta Ed. Trust – Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations: Pages: 49 – 72: Basil Blackwell: Oxford, UK.
- Denzin, N. (1970): 'The Research Act': Published by Aldine: Chicago: USA.
- Dietz, G. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2006): 'Measuring Trust Inside Organisations': Personnel Review: Vol. 35, No. 5, 2006: Pages 557 – 588.
- Dominelli, L. (1988): 'Anti-Racist Social Work': Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, England.
- Edgerton, R. B. (1965): 'Some Dimensions of Disillusionment in Culture Contact': Southwestern Journal of Anthropology: Vol. 21: No. 3: Pages 231 – 243.
- Ejrnæs, M., Gabrielsen, G. og Nørrung, P. (2006a): *Social opdrift – social arv*, 2. udgave, 2. oplag, Akademisk Forlag.
- Ejrnæs, M. (2006c): Social arv – resultater, fortolkning og formidling. I: Ejrnæs, M., Gabrielsen, G. og Nørrung, P.: *Social opdrift – social arv*, 2. udgave, Akademisk Forlag.
- Ejrnæs, M. (2006d): Social arv – et begreb, der skader både forskning og pædagogik. Vera – Tidsskrift for pædagoger, no. 37, 2006.
- Ejrnæs, M. (2008): Pædagoger, forskere og diskursen om social arv: Tidsskrift for Socialpædagogik nr. 21, 2008.
- Emerson, R.M. et al (1995): 'Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes': The University of Chicago: USA.
- Feldman, M.S. et al. (2003): 'Gaining Access': Oxford: Altamira Press: Lanham, New York, USA.
- Ferrin, D.L. et al. (2008): 'It Takes Two to Tango: An Interdependence Analysis of the Spiralling of Perceived Trustworthiness and Cooperation in Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations: Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes: Vol. 107: Pages 161 – 178.
- Fitzgerald, T. (1993): 'The New Right and The Family': In: Social Policy & Social Welfare: Loney, M., Boswell, D., & Clarke, J. (Eds.): Open University Press: Buckingham, England.
- Flores, F. & Solomon, R.C. (1998): 'Creating Trust': Business Ethics Quarterly: Vol. 8: No. 2: Pages: 205-232.
- Floyd, S.W. et al., (2011): 'Processes and Practices of Strategizing and Organising: Review, Development, and the Role of Bridging and Umbrella Constructs': Journal of Management Studies.
- Fonow, M.M. & Cook, J.A. (Eds.) (1991): 'Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research': Bloomington: Indiana University Press: USA.
- Fortune, D. & Mair, H. (2011): 'Notes from the Sports Club: Confessional Tales of Two Researchers': Journal of Contemporary Ethnography: Vol. 40 (4): Pages 457 – 484.

- Foucault, M. (1977) [1991]: 'Discipline and Punish – The Birth of the Prison': Penguin Books: London, England.
- Gamson, W.A. (1975): 'Review of Frame Analysis - An Essay on the Organization of Experience': *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 4: No. 6: Pages 603 – 607.
- Garbarino, E. & Johnson, M.S. (1999): 'The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships': *Journal of Marketing*: Vol. 63: Pages 70 – 80.
- Geertz, C. (1973): 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture': In the *Interpretation of Cultures*: Basic Books: New York.
- Ghoshal, S. & Bartlett, C.A. (1997): 'The Individualised Cooperation: Great Companies are defined by Purpose, Process and People': Harper Perennial: New York, USA.
- Giddens, A. (1990): 'The Consequences of Modernity': Polity Press: Cambridge, England.
- Giddens, A. (1991): 'Modernity and Self-Identity – Self and Society in the Late Modern Age': Polity Press: Cambridge, England.
- Giddens, A. (2006): 'Sociology' – Fifth Edition: Polity Press: Cambridge, England.
- Jones, G. & George, J. (1998): 'The Experience and Evolution of Trust: Implications for Cooperation and Teamwork': *Academy of Management Review*: Vol. 23: No. 3: Pages 531-546.
- Gibson, K. (2011): 'Street Kids, Homeless Youth, Outreach, and Policing New York's Streets': New York University Press: New York, USA.
- Giulianotti, R. (1995): 'Participant Observation and Research into Football Hooliganism: Reflections on the Problems of Entrée and Everyday Risks': *Sociology of Sport Journal*: Vol. 12: Pages 1 – 20.
- Goffman, E. (1953): 'Communication Conduct in an Island Community': Dissertation submitted to the University of Chicago in December 1953.
- Goffman, E. (1959): 'The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life': Doubleday Anchor Books: New York, USA.
- Goffman, E. (1961a): 'Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other Inmates': Published by Doubleday Anchor Books: New York, USA.
- Goffman, E. (1961b) [1986]: 'Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction': Macmillan Publishing Company [First Edition – Fifteenth Printing]: New York, USA.
- Goffman, E. (1963) [1990]: 'Stigma – Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity': Penguin, UK.
- Goffman, E. (1964): 'The Neglected Situation': *American Anthropologist*: Vol. 66, No. 6: Part 2: The Ethnography of Communication: Pages 133-136.
- Goffman, E. (1966): 'Behaviour in Public Places – Notes on the Social Organisation of Gatherings': The Free Press: New York, USA.

- Goffman, E. (1974a): 'Frame Analysis – An Essay on the Organisation of Experience': North Eastern University Press: New England, USA.
- Goffman, E. (1974b): 'On Fieldwork': Transcribed by Lofland, L.H. (1989): *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 18: No. 2: Pages 123 – 132.
- Goffman, E. (1981): 'Forms of Talk': Penn (University of Pennsylvania Press): Philadelphia: USA.
- Gold, R.L. (1958): 'Roles in Sociological Field Observations': *Social Force*: Vol.36: No.3: Pages 217 – 223.
- Goodall, H.L. (1989): 'Access, Entry, and First Encounters – Everything Counts': In *Ethnography in Organisations*: Schwartzman, H. B. (Ed): Sage Publications: California, USA.
- Gray, P.S. (1980): 'Exchange and Access in Field Work': *Urban Life*: Vol. 9: No.3: Pages 309 – 331.
- Green, R. et al. (2006): 'Professional Distance and Social Work: Stretching the Elastic': *Australian Social Work*: Vol. 59: No. 4: Pages 449 – 461.
- Green-Pedersen, C. & Odmalm, P. (2008): 'Going different ways? Right-wing parties and the immigrant issue in Denmark and Sweden': *Journal of European Public Policy*: Vol.15: No 3: Pages 367–381.
- Hall, S. (1986): 'Managing Conflict, Producing Consent': Open University: Unit 21 of D102, Social Sciences: A Foundation Course. In Thompson (1993).
- Hansen, S.V. & Henriksen, I. (1980): 'Velfærdsstaten 1940 – 78': Gyldendal: Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007): 'Ethnography – Principles in Practice': Third Edition: Routledge: London & New York (Third Edition reprinted in 2009).
- Hardin, R. (2002): 'Trust and Trustworthiness': Russell Sage Foundation: New York, USA.
- Hardin, R. (2006): 'Trust': Polity: Cambridge, England.
- Harvey, D. (2005): 'A Brief History of Neoliberalism': Oxford University Press: New York, USA.
- Hasenfeld, J.F. (2000): 'Organisational Forms as Moral Practices – The Case of Welfare Departments': *Social Service Review*: Vol. 74 (3): Pages: 329 – 351.
- Henslin, J. M. (1968): 'Trust and the Cab Driver': In *Sociology and Everyday Life*: [Ed. Truzzi M.] Prentice Hall: New Jersey, USA.
- Heywood, A. (1994): 'Political Ideas and Concepts': The Macmillan Press: London, England.
- Henningsen, E. (2010): 'The Romantic Ethic in Outreach Work': *Sociétés et jeunesses en difficulté* [Online], Numéro hors série | 2010, Online since 02 avril 2010, Connection on 26 avril 2010. URL : <http://sejed.revues.org/index6615.html>.

- Hoggarth, L. & Smith, D.I. (2004): 'Understanding the Impact of Connexions on Young People at Risk': (DFES Research Report #607) London: DFES.
- Hosokawa, F. (2010): 'Building Trust: Doing Research to Understand Ethnic Communities': Lexington Books: Plymouth, UK.
- Iovanni, L. & Pringle, K. (2008): 'Denmark National Report on Law and Policy Addressing Men's Practices': FoSo Arbejdspapir/Working paper Series Nr. 5, 2008: Aalborg University.
- Jacobs, J.B. (1974): 'Participant Observation in Prison': *Urban Life and Culture*: Vol. 3: No. 2: Pages 221 – 240.
- Jonsson, G. (1967): 'Delinquent boys, their parents' and grandparents': *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, Vol. 43, 1967 Supplementum 195.
- Keiser, L.R. (1999): 'State Bureaucratic Discretion and the Administration of Social Welfare Programs – The Case of Social Security Disability': *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*: Vol. 9 (1): Pages: 87 – 107.
- Keiser, L.R. et al. (2002): 'Lipstick and Logarithms – Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative Bureaucracy': *American Political Science Review*: Vol. 96 (3): Pages 553 – 564.
- Khodyakov, D. (2007): 'Trust as a Process – A Three-Dimensional Process': *Sociology*: Vol. 41: No. 1
- Klitgaard, G. (2009): 'Handbook on Streetwork': Published in cooperation with the Youth House: Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Kvale, S. (1996): 'Interviews – An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing': Sage: California, USA.
- Lane, C. (1998): 'Introduction: Theories and issues in the study of trust': In C. Lane & R. Bachman (Eds.), *Trust within and between organizations, conceptual issues and empirical applications*: Oxford: Oxford University Press: Pages 1 – 30.
- Larsen, N.B. (2009): 'Institutional Nationalism and Orientalised Others in Parental Education': In [Eds. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S., Irni and Mulinari, D.] *Complying with Colonialism – Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*: Ashgate Publishing Limited: Farnham, England.
- Lind-Larsen, M. L. & Riis-Larsen, T.(2007): 'I Medgang og Modgang – Dansk Byggeri og Den Danske Velfærdsstat 1945 – 2007: Copenhagen Business School: Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Layder, D. (1998): 'Sociological Practice – Linking Theory and Social Research': Sage: London, England.
- Levin, J. (2006): 'Sociological Snapshots 5: Seeing Social Structure and Change in Everyday Life': Pine Forge Press: An Imprint of Sage Publications: California, USA.
- Lind, E.A. (2001): 'Fairness Heuristic Theory: Justice Judgements as Pivotal Cognitions in Organisational Relations': In (Eds. Greenberg, J. & Cropanzano, R.) 'Advances in Organisational Justice': Stanford University Press: Stanford, California, USA.

LeCompte, M.D., & Goetz, J.P. (1982): 'Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research': *Review of Educational Research*: Vol. 52. Pages: 31 – 60.

Lewicki, R.J. & Bunker, B.B. (1996): *Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relationships*: In [Eds. Kramer, R.M. & Tyler, T.R.] *'Trust in Organisations – Frontiers of Theory and Research'*: Sage Publications.

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J. & Bies, R.J. (1998): 'Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities': *The Academy of Management Review*: Vol. 23, No. 3: Pages: 438-458.

Lewicki, R.J. (2006a): 'Trust, Trust Development, and Trust Repair': In: *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, 2nd Edition: Editors: Deutsch, M., Coleman, P & Marcus, E.C.

Lewicki, R.J. (2006b): 'Trust & Distrust': In [Eds. Schneider, A.K., & Honeymoon, C.] *The Negotiators Fieldbook – The Desk Reference for the Experienced Negotiator*: ABA: Washington, USA.

Lewicki, R.J. & Brinsfield, C. (2011): 'Framing Trust –Trust as a Heuristic': In Donohue, W. A., Rogan, R. R., & Kaufman, S. *Framing in negotiation: State of the art*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985): 'Trust as a social reality': *Social Forces*: Vol. 63: Pages 967 – 984.

Lofland, J. & Lofland, L.H. (1995): *'Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis'*: 3rd ed. Belmont, Wadsworth Publishing Co. California, USA.

Luhmann, N. (1979): 'Trust and Power': John Wiley: New York, USA. (Ed.) *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*: Basil Blackwell: New York, USA.

Luhmann, N. (1988): 'Familiarity, Confidence, Trust – Problems and Alternatives': In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust*: Basil Blackwell: New York: USA.

McAllister, D. J. (1995): 'Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations': *Academy of Management Journal*: Vol. 38: Pages 24–59.

McAllister, D.J. (1997): 'The Second Face of Trust – Reflections on the Dark Side of Interpersonal Trust in Organisations': *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*: Vol. 6: Pages 87 – 111.

McCall, G.J. & Simmons (1969): *'Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader'*: Reading: MA: Addison-Wesley.

McDonald, S. (2005): 'Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research: *Qualitative Research*: Vol. 5(4): Pages: 455 - 473.

MacGregor, S. (1998): 'Taxing and spending the people's money': In: *Social Issues and Party Politics*: H. Jones and S. MacGregor (Eds.): Routledge: England.

McLeod E. & Bywaters, P. (2002): 'Ill-Health': In Davies, M (Ed.) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Work*: Blackwell Publishing: Oxford, England.

MacPhail, A. (2004): 'Athlete and Researcher: Undertaking and Pursuing an Ethnographic Study in a Sports Club': *Qualitative Research*: Vol.4: Pages: 227 – 245.

- Maguire, S. & Phillips, N. (2008): 'Citibankers at Citigroup: A Study of the Loss of Institutional Trust after a Merger': *Journal of Management Studies*: Vol. 45: No. 2: Pages: 372-401.
- Manning, P. (1992): 'Erving Goffman and Modern Sociology': Published by Stanford University Press: Stanford, California, USA.
- Marlow, C. (2000): 'Research Methods for Generalist Social Work' (3rd Edition): Brooks/Cole Publishing: Pacific Grove, California, USA.
- Margolin, L. (1997): 'Under the Cover of Kindness' – The Invention of Social Work': University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville and London.
- Mayer, R.C. et al. (1995): 'An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust': *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20: No. 3: Pages: 709-734.
- Mazzei, J., & O'Brien, E.E. (2009): 'You Got It, So When Do You Flaunt It?': Building Rapport, Intersectionality, and the Strategic Deployment of Gender in the Field': *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*: Vol. 38: Pages: 358 – 383.
- Miles, B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994): 'Qualitative Data Analysis – An Extended Sourcebook': Second Edition: Sage: California, USA.
- Ministry of Education (2008): 'The Danish Democracy Cannon': Published by the Danish Ministry of Education.
- Mittness, L.S. & Barker, J.C. (2004): 'Collaborative and team research': In (Eds. Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F., & Silverman, D.): *Qualitative Research practice*: Pages 276 – 294: Sage, London, UK.
- Mizrachi, N. et al., (2007): 'Repertoires of Trust: The Practice of Trust in a Multinational Organisation amid Political Conflict': *American Sociological Review*: Vol. 72: Pages: 143-165.
- Möllerling, G. (2001): 'The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation, and Suspension': *Sociology*: Vol. 35: No. 2: Pages 403 – 420.
- Möllerling, G. et al. (2004): 'Introduction: Understanding Organisational Trust – Foundations, Constellations and Issues of Operationalisation': *Journal of Managerial Psychology*: Vol. 19: No. 6: Pages 556 – 570.
- Möllerling, G. (2006): 'Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity': Emerald Group Publishing: Bingley, UK.
- Murray, C. (1984): 'Losing Ground': Basic Books: New York, USA.
- Nooteboom, B. (2002): 'Trust: Forms, foundations, functions, failures and figures': Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, England.
- Nooteboom, B. (2006): 'Essay written for the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, as background to the 2006 Innovation Lecture on trust and innovation': www.bartnooteboom.nl
- Ogbu, J. U. (1974): 'The Next Generation – An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighbourhood'. Academic Press: New York, USA.

- Payne, G., & Williams, M. (2005): 'Generalisation in Qualitative': *Sociology*: Vol. 39(2): Pages: 295-314.
- Pease, A. & Pease, B. (2005): 'The Definitive Book of Body Language': Orion Books: London, England.
- Putnam, R. (2000): 'Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community': Simon & Schuster: New York, USA.
- Putnam, R. (1995): 'Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital': *Journal of Democracy*: Vol. 6: No. 1: Pages: 65-78.
- Putnam, R. (1993): 'Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy': Princeton University Press: New Jersey, USA.
- Prus, R. (1996): 'Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research' – 'Intersubjectivity and the Study of Human Lived Experience': State University of New York Press: Albany, New York.
- Rawls, A.W. & David, G. (2005): 'Accountably Other - Trust, Reciprocity and Exclusion in a Context of Situated Practice': *Human Studies*: Vol. 28, No.: 4: Pages: 469-497.
- Rawlins, B. (2007): 'Measuring the relationship between organizational transparency and trust': Proceedings of the Tenth International Public Relations Research Conference. Miami, March 8-10.
- Rein, M., & Schön D. (1994): 'Frame Reflection – Toward the resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies': Basic Books: New York, USA.
- Rein, M., & Schön, D.A. (1996): 'Frame-critical policy analysis and frame-reflective policy practice': *Knowledge and Policy* Vol. 9: Pages 85-104.
- Reinharz, R. (1992): 'Feminist Methods in Social Research': Oxford University Press: New York: USA.
- Rempel, J.K. & Burriss, C.T. (2005): 'Let Me Count the Ways – An Integrative Theory of Love and Hate': *Personal Relations*: Vol. 12: Pages: 297 – 313.
- Riccucci, N.M. (2005): 'How Management Matters': Georgetown University Press, USA.
- Robertson, D. (1993): 'The Penguin Dictionary of Politics': Penguin Books: Middlesex, England.
- Rousseau et al. (1998): 'Not so Different After All – A Cross Discipline View of Trust': *Academy of Management Review*: Vol. 23: No. 3: Pages 393 – 404.
- Rousseau, D.M. & Fried, Y. (2001): 'Location, Location, Location – Contextualising Organisational Research': *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*: Vol. 22: Pages 1 – 13.
- Sabel, C.F. (1993): 'Studied trust: Building new forms of cooperation in a volatile economy': In: Swedberg, R. (ed.) *Explorations in Economic Sociology*. Russell Sage Foundation New York, USA.

- Sampson, H. & Thomas, M. (2003): 'Lone Researchers at Sea: Gender, Risk and Responsibility': *Qualitative Research*: Vol. 3 (2): Pages: 165 – 189.
- Scheff, T. (2005): 'The Structure of Context: Deciphering Frame Analysis': *Sociological Theory*: Vol. 23: No. 4: Pages 368 – 385.
- Scholten, P. (2011): 'Framing Immigrant Integration Dutch Research-Policy Dialogues in Comparative Perspective': Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam, Holland.
- Schneider, A. L. & Ingram, H. (1993): 'Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy': *The American Political Science Review*: Vol. 87 (2): Pages: 334-347.
- Schneider, A. L. & Ingram, H. (1997): 'Policy design for democracy': University of Kansas Press: Kansas, USA.
- Scott, P.G. (1997): 'Assessing Determinants of Bureaucratic Discretion – An Experiment in Street-Level Decision Making': *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*: Vol. 7 (1): Pages: 35 – 57.
- Shapiro, S.P. (1987): 'The Social Control of Impersonal Trust': *American Journal of Sociology*: Vol. 93: No. 3: Pages: 623-658.
- Silverman, D. (2000): 'Doing Qualitative Research': 'A Practical Handbook': Sage Publications: London (Reprinted in 2001, 2002).
- Six, F. (2005): 'The Trouble with Trust – The Dynamics of Interpersonal Trust Building': Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, England.
- Six, F. (2007): 'Building interpersonal trust within organizations - a relational signalling perspective': *J. Manage Governance*: Vol. 11: Pages: 285–309.
- Six, F. & Sorge, A. (2008): 'Creating a High-Trust Organization: An Exploration into Organizational Policies that Stimulate Interpersonal Trust Building': *Journal of Management Studies*: Vol: 45:5: Pages 857-884.
- Snow, D.A., et al. (1986): 'Fieldwork Roles and Informational Yield: A Comparison of Alternative Settings and Roles': *Urban Life*: Vol. 14, No. 4.
- Solomon, R.C. & Flores, F. (2001): 'Building Trust – In Business, Politics, Relationships, and Life': Oxford University Press: New York, USA.
- Spradley, J. (1979): 'The Ethnographic Interview: Published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.: New York, USA.
- Sultana, F. (2007): 'Reflexivity, Positionality and Participatory Ethics: Negotiating Fieldwork Dilemmas in International Research': *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*: No. 6 (3): Pages 374 – 385.
- Swidler, A. (1986): 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies': *American Sociological Review*: Vol. 51: Pages: 273-286.

- Swidler, A. (2001): 'Talk of Love – How Culture Matters': University of Chicago: Chicago, USA.
- Swidler, A. (2002): 'Cultural Repertoires and Cultural Logics – Can they be Reconciled?' In: Newsletter of the Sociology of Culture Section of the American Sociological Association (Winter): Vol. 14. No. 1: Pages: 6 – 8.
- Sztompka, P. (1996): 'Trust and Emerging Democracy – Lessons from Poland': International Sociology: Vol.11: No. 1: Pages 37 – 62.
- Terkildsen, N. & Schnell, F. (1997): How Media Frames Move Public Opinion - An Analysis of the Women's Movement: Political Research Quarterly: Vol. 50: Pages: 879-900.
- Thompson, N. (1993): 'Anti-Discriminatory Practice': Macmillan Press: Basingstoke, England.
- Turner, B. S. (2006): 'The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology': Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, England.
- Van de Bos, K. et al. (1998): 'When do we need procedural fairness? The role of trust in authority': Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Vol. 75: Pages: 1449 – 1458.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979): 'The Fact of Fiction in Organizational Ethnography': Administrative Science Quarterly: Vol. 24: No. 4: Qualitative Methodology: Pages: 539 – 550.
- Van Maanen, J. and Kolb, D. (1985): 'The Professional Apprentice: Observations on Fieldwork Roles in Two Organisational Settings': Research in the Sociology of Organisations: Vol. 4: Pages 1 – 33.
- Verloo, M. (2005): 'Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Europe – A Critical Frame Analysis Approach': The Greek Review of Social Research: Vol. 117: Pages: 11-34.
- Wainwright, G., & Thompson R., (2009): 'Body Language': Teach Yourself: Abington, UK.
- Weber, L. (1998): 'On Constructing Trust: Temporality, Self-Disclosure, and Perspective-Taking: International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy: Vol. 18, No. (1): Pages 07-26.
- Whitener et al. (1998): 'Managers as Initiators of Trust - An Exchange Relationship Framework for Understanding Managerial Trustworthy Behaviour': The Academy of Management Review: Vol. 23: No. 3: Pages: 513-530.
- Whyte, F.W. (1993): 'Street Corner Society': 'The Social Structure of an Italian Slum': Fourth Edition: The University of Chicago Press: USA.
- Whyte, F.W. (1997): 'Creative Problem Solving in the Field': 'Reflections on a Career': Altamira Press: Walnut Creek, USA.
- Wieder, D.L. (1975): 'Telling the Code': In [Ed. Turner, R.] 'Ethnomethodology': Penguin Education: Victoria, Australia.
- Williams, M. (2000): 'Interpretivism and Generalization': Sociology: Vol. 34(2): Pages: 209–24.
- Williams, M. (2001): 'In Whom We Trust: Group Membership as an Affective Context for Trust Development': The Academy of Management Review: Vol. 26, No. 3: Pages: 377-396.

Wigren, C. (2007): 'Assessing the Quality of Qualitative Research in Entrepreneurship': In Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship (Neergaard, H & Ulhøi, J.P. Eds): Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK. Pages: 383 – 405.

Wolcott, H.F. (1990): 'Making a Study "More Ethnographic"': Journal of Contemporary Ethnography: Vol. 19:1 (April 1990): Pages 44 – 72.

Wolcott, H.F. (1997): 'Ethnographic Research in Education': Reprinted from Complementary Methods for Research in Education: Edited by Jaeger, R.M. (1997): The American Educational Research Association.

Yates, J. (2006): 'You Just Don't Grass': Youth, Crime and 'Grassing' in a Working Class Community': Youth Justice Vol. 6 (3): Pages 195 – 210.

Zaheer, A. et al. 1998 Does Trust Matter? Exploring the effects of inter-organisational and Interpersonal Trust on Performance: Organizational Science: Vol. 9: Pages 141 – 159.

Zand, D. E. (1972): 'Trust and managerial problem solving': Administrative Science Quarterly: Vol. 17: Pages 229–239.

Zand, D. E. (1997): 'The leadership triad, knowledge, trust and power': Oxford University Press: New York, USA.

Zucker, L. G. (1986): 'Production of trust': Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840–1920. Research in Organizational Behaviour: Vol. 8: Pages 53–111.

English Summary

This thesis deals with the phenomenon of distrust and trust between young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and public sector employees at the face-to-face level of interaction. The focus is on trust and distrust which can be understood as cultural resources – a valuable approach to researching trust and distrust largely under-represented in the trust literature. A common source of conflict is often a lack of confidence or distrust in the authorities; therefore, winning the confidence of minority ethnic groups in these communities is essential to easing tensions, along with reducing civil unrest, antisocial behaviour, crime and unnecessary public spending.

The purpose of this in-depth study, based on nine months of ethnographic fieldwork in and around two residential housing estates, is to contribute towards understanding the micro-processes at play in distrust and trust building processes between public sector employees and young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, an under-researched and often misunderstood area. The central focus is on the relationship between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, a team of youth workers, a job consultant and a police officer. This study explores the relationships from the perspectives of some of the young men and the aforementioned professionals, thus exploring the relationship from both sides of the coin. The thesis draws primarily on data gathered during fieldwork i.e. in-depth and ethnographic interviews, observations and artefacts such as media and local authority reports. In addition to the empirical material, the study explores a key governmental policy to investigate how the (previous) government names and frames people with minority ethnic backgrounds. Analysing this policy helps to locate the fieldwork and interactants into the wider cultural and structural context, while at the same time, contributes towards explaining why some local authority actors use certain frames and not others when talking about the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds.

A number of research questions have guided the process which revolves around the experiences of the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds and the aforementioned professionals. The problem formulation is: How can trust (and distrust) be understood as a cultural resource and what are the implications for public sector employees who work with young men with minority ethnic backgrounds in the community?

The thesis offers a discussion of the theoretical framework, methodological and ethical considerations along with issues pertaining to reliability and validity. Thereafter follow five analytical sections, the first of which offers a unique insight into the dynamics and mechanisms at play when a researcher (outsider) first enters a field setting. Amongst other methodological issues, this chapter presents a theoretical discussion about the significance of trust in relation to the researcher entering the field. Subsequently, the thesis reports finding one: Governmental Distrust Frames, which derives from analysing the aforementioned key government policy document. Next the thesis reports finding two: local authority institutionalised distrust frames. Through focusing on the ethnographic, this section explores the attitudes of some local authority actors towards a group of young men with minority ethnic backgrounds who reside in and hang out in a local residential housing estate. The main focus of this chapter is on the relationship between a team of youth workers and the young men, which can be described best as highly distrustful. Following this, the thesis reports finding three: trust and distrust as cultural frames or resources. The fieldwork data suggest that the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds use trust and distrust as cultural frames (resources) to organise their relationships with public sector employees. During this process, they rely upon a number of cultural tools such as injustice and justice to create both distrust and trust frames around individual employees. The last analytical chapter reports finding four: negotiating cultural frames. The last part of the chapter looks closer at the relationship between the young men with minority ethnic backgrounds, the job consultant and the police officer to consider how they negotiate cultural frames to achieve and maintain trust.

The final chapter sets out the conclusions and implications for theory, research and practice and proposes some recommendations for practice based on the findings and conclusions of the study. This chapter outlines the overall contributions of the thesis along with the limitations and recommendations for future research.

Dansk Resumé

Denne afhandling beskæftiger sig med fænomenet tillid og mistillid i forholdet mellem unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig og offentlige ansatte baseret på situationer med ansigt-til-ansigt interaktion. Afhandlingens fokus er at anskue tillid og mistillid som kulturelle ressourcer – en værdifuld tilgang til forskningen, som i høj grad er underrepræsenteret i tillidslitteraturen. En fælles kilde til konfliktsituationer er ofte den manglende tillid til myndighederne. Derfor er det at vinde tillid hos etniske minoritetsgrupper afgørende for at mindske spændinger, reducere uroligheder, mindske antisocial adfærd, mindske kriminalitet og dermed medvirke til at begrænse unødvendige offentlige udgifter.

Formålet med denne dybdegående undersøgelse, baseret på ni måneders etnografisk feltarbejde i og omkring to boligområder, er at bidrage til forståelsen af de mikro-processer, der opstår i relationerne mellem offentlige ansatte og unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig, et lidet udforsket og ofte misforstået område. Det centrale fokus er på forholdet mellem de unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig, et team af opsøgende klubmedarbejdere, en jobkonsulent og en politibetjent. Denne undersøgelse udforsker både forholdet set fra nogle af de unge mænds perspektiv og de førnævnte professionelles perspektiv, således at relationen undersøges fra begge synsvinkler. Afhandlingen trækker primært på data indsamlet gennem feltarbejde, dvs. dybdegående og etnografiske interviews, observationer og artefakter, såsom medier og de lokale myndigheders rapporter. Ud over det empiriske materiale, udforsker undersøgelsen en central regeringspolitik med henblik på at undersøge, hvordan den (tidligere) regering italesætter og rammesætter personer med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig. Analysen af denne politik bidrager til at sætte rammerne for feltarbejdet og at sætte det i en bredere kulturel og strukturel sammenhæng, og bidrager samtidig til at forklare, hvorfor nogle kommuneaktører bruger bestemte rammer og formuleringer, når de taler om de unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig.

En række forsknings-spørgsmål har sat rammen for feltarbejdet, der processuelt har kredset om de erfaringer, som de unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end dansk og de førnævnte professionelle har gjort sig. Problemformuleringen er: Hvordan kan tillid (og mistillid) forstås som en kulturel ressource, og hvad er konsekvenserne for de offentlige medarbejdere, der arbejder med unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig i lokalesamfundet?

Afhandlingen tilbyder indledningsvis en diskussion af den teoretiske ramme, de metodiske og etiske overvejelser sammen med spørgsmål, der omhandler pålidelighed og validitet. Derefter følger fem analytiske afsnit, hvoraf det første giver et unikt indblik i de dynamikker og mekanismer, der er på spil, når en forsker (outsider) indtræder i et feltarbejde. Blandt flere metodiske spørgsmål, præsenterer dette kapitel en teoretisk diskussion af betydningen af tillid set i forhold til forskeren i felten. Efterfølgende sætter afhandlingen fokus på første forskningsresultat: En "statslig mistillidsramme", der findes på baggrund af en analyse af førnævnte regeringspolitik. Dernæst bevæger afhandlingen sig over i at beskrive andet forskningsresultat: En "kommunal institutionaliseret mistillidsramme". Gennem etnografisk fokus udforsker denne sektion holdninger hos nogle kommunale aktører sat i forhold til en gruppe unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig, der bor i og hænger ud i et lokalt boligområde. Hovedfokus i dette kapitel er forholdet mellem et team af unge medarbejdere og de unge mænd, der kan bedst beskrives som meget mistænksomme. Efterfølgende peger afhandlingen på forskningsresultat nummer tre: Tillid og mistillid som kulturelle rammer eller ressourcer. De etnografiske data viser at de unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig bruger tillid og mistillid som kulturelle rammer (ressourcer) til at organisere deres relationer med de offentlige ansatte. I løbet af processen benytter de en række "kulturelle værktøjer" såsom uretfærdighed og retfærdighed til at skabe både mistillidsrammer og tillidsrammer i forhold til den enkelte medarbejder.

Det sidste analytiske kapitel sætter fokus på det fjerde og sidste forskningsresultat: At forhandle kulturelle rammer. Den sidste del af kapitlet ser nærmere på forholdet mellem de unge mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end vestlig og job konsulenten samt politibetjenten med henblik på at undersøge, hvordan de forhandler kulturelle rammer for at opnå og opretholde tillid. Det afsluttende kapitel indeholder konklusionerne og konsekvenserne for teori, forskning og praksis set i relation til de fire observationer og foreslår nogle anbefalinger til praksis, baseret på de resultater og konklusioner af undersøgelsen. Dette kapitel beskriver de samlede bidrag fra afhandlingen set i forhold til begrænsninger og anbefalinger til fremtidig forskning.