“Stuck in their skin”?: Challenges of ethnic identity construction among children and youth of mixed race heritage in Norway

Mari Rysst, professor, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences

Abstract

This article, based in social anthropology, discusses challenges of ethnic identity construction among children and youth of immigrant origin in Norway, particularly those of mixed race. Norway has, compared to the US, a short history of people immigrating with colored skin. Norwegian official policy has, since the second World War, underlined that “we are all equal”, “have the same worth”, regardless of gender, sexuality and skin color. A color-blind ideology has been an ideal. Today, second and third generation immigrants speak Norwegian fluently, have good jobs in radio and TV, but still experience to be classified as ‘foreigners’ because of their appearance. The article shows that the cultural schema/model of Norwegian identity includes white skin color only, which children of mixed race may experience as particularly challenging. This is because they have one foot in white identity, the other in a colored one, and may feel “white” on the inside but be labelled as ‘foreigner’ (“black”) by others.The article discusses these questions: How do children and young people of mixed race origins, experience ethnic identity construction in light of the categories of ‘Norwegian’ and ‘foreigner’? How is this to be understood? The overall conclusion is that mixed race children and youth may experience being “stuck in their skin” stronger than those having two parents of immigrant origin, because they also identify with the parent of white, ethnic Norwegian identity. I also conclude that Norway is an “underdeveloped” country regarding racial reflexivity, and obviously needs more research on how white privilege results in “making up people” through racial hierarchical categories, understood as resistance strategies to white majority power and color-blind ideology.

Introduction

Norway has, compared to the US, a short history of people immigrating with dark skins and foreign looks, but has, like many other European countries, experienced ethnically and racially diverse immigration since the late 1960s. This short Norwegian immigration history means that the country is far less experienced with problems of race compared to countries like the US. As such, Norway and the other Scandinavian countries are presently confronted with problems well known on the American continent, such as various forms of discrimination based on race and ethnicity. Moreover, problems connected to mixed race, or multiracial/ethnic identities, are not on the political or research agenda. This is confirmed and taken as point of departure by the Norwegian researcher Tony Sandset (2019), who argues

that “part of the reason why mixed race studies is not a focus in the Nordic region is that the *issue of race here has a very complex and repressed discourse around it*” [1]. As far as I am informed, Sandset’s work is the most encompassing on mixed race in Norway, in which he underlines how race is implicitly, not explicitly debated, as in the US. One illustration of this difference between the two countries is the categories used in their census systems.

The Norwegian census is based on own, parents and grandparents’ country of birth, while in the US racial categories are applied. The Norwegian census primarily highlights three overarching categories: *immigrants* (persons born abroad with two foreign-born parents and four foreign born grand-parents); *Norwegian-born to immigrant parents* (persons born in Norway with two foreign-born parents and four foreign born grand-parents) and “*the rest of the population*” [2] More precisely, the census is organized by thirty so called basic codes, and the first two above mentioned categories are among these. According to Statistics Norway, [3] the twenty-eight other codes are seldom used in statistics and analysis, and most often lumped together and mentioned as *one* third category, the above mentioned “the rest of the population”. The vast majority of people of this third category include people born in Norway, with both parents and grandparents also born in Norway. The category makes up 77 percent of the population of Norway (3.9 million people),[4] and the majority of these people are classified as *Norwegian* or *ethnic Norwegian* by themselves and others (but, as mentioned, *not* by the census). People having one ethnic Norwegian parent and one parent born in another country, are categorized into other basic codes than the one above, but as these detailed codes are seldom used in descriptions or analysis, they are, as mentioned, lumped together with ethnic Norwegians in the category “the rest of the population”. [5] In other words, people of mixed race origins, being lumped together, are invisible in the most often used category “*the rest of the population*”. Sandset illustrates my point:

> *In 2000, the US census included a category that was reserved for subjective ethnic identification and the same option was included in the UK in 2011. The Nordic region does not provide this option. To my mind, this lack of such a category is revealing. First, it is apparent that "monoracial/ethnic" identity thinking is still the norm from an official standpoint. Second, the very "production" of a mixed ethnic category is not present in the official discourse. Seen in this light, it is not surprising that the field of critical mixed race studies has not come fully into its own in the Nordic countries.* [6]

This may be read as a political attempt of color-blind ideology: ethnic/racial origins are "hidden", it is the country of birth, not race, that matters. I argue that there exists a gap in how the census categorizes people with mixed racialized ethnicities, that is as "invisible", and how the mixed race children and young people in this study experience their ethnic identity constructions. I aim to bring forth racial consciousness among racially mixed people in Norway today, by applying a critical perspective on Norwegian 'color-blind' integration ideology. This ideology reflects the reluctance to talk about race, which is illustrated by our census system. I will argue that this reluctance to talk about race is reflected in the gap between emic and etic categories of race/ethnicity/nationhood.

Today, immigrants and their Norwegian-born children constitute 17.7 percent of the total population of Norway,[7] which are roughly five million people (5 328 212) in January 2019.[8]A majority of all immigrants in Norway live in the capital of Oslo, which is also the municipality with the highest proportion of immigrants in its population. A growing city of 681 067 inhabitants,[9] Oslo was, in 2018, home to 222 843 immigrants and persons born in Norway whose parents were born abroad, making up 33.1 % of the capital's population. [10] The single largest nationalities represented in the immigrant population in January 2018 are Pakistanis (22 891), Poles (16 405), Somalis (15 608) and Swedes (12 523). [11] This situation

makes parts of the city of Oslo very ethnically and racially diverse, and challenges the stereotypical notion of Norway as a homogenous country.[12]

Pakistanis make up the biggest number of labour migrants, but refugees from African and Asian countries have arrived in vast numbers from the 1990'ies. That means that people with various skin colors and phenotypes are seen everywhere in Norway, but people with various skin colors most prominently in Oslo. Today, second and third generation immigrants speak Norwegian fluently, many have good jobs in radio and TV, but still experience to be classified by others as 'foreigners' because of their appearance. In other words, as I will discuss in this article, the cultural schema/model of Norwegian identity appears to include white skin color only, which children of particularly mixed race heritage may experience as frustrating and challenging because they probably have one foot in a white identity and the other in a colored one.

'Norwegian' and 'foreigner' are emic classificatory concepts used in all parts of Norway, [13] "emic" referring to concepts people use in everyday conversations. Being an anthropologist and following an anthropological methodology taking emic concepts as point of departure, I will discuss how children and young people relate to the categories of 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner,' and how their understanding challenge their construction of ethnic/racial identity. More precisely, I ask: How do children and young people of mixed race origin experience ethnic identity construction in light of the categories 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner', and how is this to be understood?

Fundamental Norwegian values and whiteness

Norway and the other Scandinavian countries are known as welfare states, which emphasize state regulations regarding employment, income distribution and social welfare systems. Since the Second World War, nation-building in Norway has focused on welfare,

equality and equity.[14]According to some researchers[15] the Norwegian conceptualisation of equality is a cultural value with two connotations: equality as equity and equality as sameness. Anthropological research documented as far back as 1954 that the Norwegian idea of equality was ambivalent.[16] On the one hand, equality exists as a moral value and ideology, while on the other hand, social differences and hierarchies exist.[17] Equality as equity and equality as sameness are, however, fundamental official values in Norway, being, consciously or not, parts of children's and families' socialization contexts of racial ethnicities and identity constructions. All families living in Norway, irrespective of ethnic origin, are confronted with these Norwegian values in one way or other, depending on social context, such as kindergarten and schools. Children are taught that "we are all equal" and "have the same worth", regardless of gender, sexuality and skin color. People from non-western countries immigrated to this 'climate' of equality thinking in Norway, representing the opposite of equality as sameness, at least in terms of physical appearance. As a result, the Norwegian welfare state has advocated equality as equity, gender equity and anti-racist policies for more than fifty years.

Against this backdrop of equality thinking, it is perhaps not surprising that the notion and ideal of being color-blind, understood as "a set of ideologies and discourses that uphold contemporary racial inequality by denying either its presence or its significance", [18] has found support in liberal and leftist political parties in Norway and throughout Scandinavia. [19] To be color-blind implies that race "does not exist", that all look the "same", and thus are "equal". The former leader of the socialist party in Norway, Kristin Halvorsen, expressed in 2011, after a visit to an ethnic diverse suburb of Oslo, Holmlia, that "the young people here belong to a color-blind generation more interested in each other as individuals". [20] By 'color-blind' she means that the young people don't care about racial origins, they are "blind" to different skin colors and their implications. However, research in Scandinavia and elsewhere clearly indicates that color-blind policy may result in increased racism, not the opposite. [21] The

Swedish researchers Tobias Hubinette and Carina Tigervall argue, for instance, that in spite of Sweden and the whole of Scandinavia fronting a color-blind official policy, "where colour-blind is the norm, and where race as a concept and category has been made completely irrelevant and obsolete", [22] the "discrimination against migrants and minorities is widespread in practically every different area of Swedish society".[23] They are inspired by critical whiteness theory, for instance Ruth Frankenberg, who writes:

> *In the same way that both men's and women's lives are shaped by their gender, and that both heterosexual and lesbian women's experiences in the world are marked by their sexuality, white people and people of color live racially structured lives*.[24]

Frankenberg has been an important opponent of color-blind ideology, regarding which the Norwegian situation resembles that of Sweden: The concept of 'race' has seldom been found in newspapers or scientific articles.[25] To my knowledge, this is because 'race, translated into Norwegian *rase*, is believed to give too strong associations with the Holocaust of the second World War, combined with the biological "fact" that the human species are *one* race. Sandset writes:

> *The Nordic countries condemned the atrocities of the Holocaust and supported the establishment of the UN and in particular the UN declaration of Human Rights and the UN Declaration on Race. Therefore, the discourse shifted from seeing mankind as divided by races to a discourse focusing on the concept of ethnicity.* [26]

In line with the above, in 2011 the then minister of Family and Gender issues, Tora Aasland, attended a session held by the UN convention on race and discrimination. The UN representatives expressed that they "found it interesting" that Norway deliberately chose not to use the concept of "race", when most other countries did. Aasland told the committee that the Norwegian politicians didn't want to categorize people by using that concept.[27] However, this climate may now be changing. The prominent Norwegian anthropologist Thomas Hylland

Eriksen wrote recently in the Norwegian intellectual newspaper, *Morgenbladet,* an article with the title "We must talk about race".[28] His argument is that without a concept of race, we are unable to combat racism. A few weeks later, *Morgenbladet* had a special issue on "white privileges", and writes in the editorial having this heading, "Know your privileges":

> *The new racism debate is held with concepts like "whiteness" and "blackness", and rejects what previously has been "correct" anti-racism. We have always wanted to look beyond colour: to be colour-blind. The ideal has been the dream of Martin Luther King that people in the future should be judged not "by the colour of their skin, but by the content of their character".*[29]

"The new racism" debate referred to above, is one that applies racial categories (white, black) and rejects color-blind ideology as the 'correct' anti-racism strategy. The editorial thus supports the claim by Hubinette and Tigervall above, that the Scandinavian countries represent a color-blind official policy.[30] The concepts of race, ethnicity and nationhood will be further discussed in another section.

The methods and data

Anthropological methodology is open-ended and inductive, it is often 'emic' or 'experience-near', in that concepts used by the informants are taken as point of departure for understanding their life-worlds. Furthermore, most anthropologists, including myself, position their research within social constructivism and the interpretative paradigm. As such, we search for meaning and understanding, rather than facts and explanations.[31]Anthropologists don't have 'hypotheses' to test out, and their practices differ from other disciplines in that data are written down in notebooks and not formally coded and categorized before the actual analysis and interpretation takes place.[32] Anthropological methodology has at its core participant observation over a longer period of time, in combination with informal interviews

and conversations. In this article, emic concepts such as 'foreigner' and 'Norwegian', are taken as point of departure for the interpretation in order to grasp "the native's point of view" [33], that is, the insider's perspective. The researcher's job is to interpret how the informants' understand relevant emic concepts, in this case 'ethnicity', 'race', 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner', and implications there-of.

The data material in this article draws on two sources. The first is from fieldwork in and around a local primary school in a place I have called "Dal", a pseudonym, in a suburb east of Oslo. In this suburb, ethnic Norwegians constitute a minority. In 2019, the place has approximately 49,500 inhabitants, and immigrants and their Norwegian-born children make up a majority of this population.[34]

The school where I did fieldwork caters to students ages ten through sixteen. In 2010-2011, when the fieldwork was done, there were approximately 460 students in the school living in families coming from sixteen to eighteen different countries (information from the local school administration). Ethnic Norwegians constituted a minority, while Pakistanis were the most numerous. Other countries represented included Turkey, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Morocco, Somalia, Gambia, Nigeria and Vietnam. I did long-term participant observation on consumption and integration in that school with students in the 5th and 6th Forms, [35] with a follow up study of two months' fieldwork two years later, when the children were thirteen years old. These teens constitute the primary informants from Dal in this article. I conducted informal group interviews with nine children, seven girls and two boys. Among these, only Pernille is an undisputed ethnic Norwegian, and David the only one with mixed race heritage, having an ethnic Norwegian mother and African father. As such, David is the only mixed race child and therefore the one I focus on. He is dark-skinned with other African phenotype, particularly his black, curly hair. All the other children, except Pernille, have two parents of foreign origin. Three interviews were done when the children were in the 8th Form and two

when they had started the 9th Form. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed by myself. All the names used in this article are pseudonyms to ensure the children's anonymity.

Youth participate in several social contexts every day, and I observed and partly participated in some of these. I was present in the learning context in class, in which the children relate to the teachers and their peers, as well as in their peer contexts in and around school. In the interviews, we spoke about the broader contexts of their friendships and leisure time activities, but less about their families.

The second source of data is from a newly published Norwegian book, with the title *Third Culture Kids. Growing up between two cultures*.[36] The book includes 29 narratives of experiences of growing up in Norway, from young people of immigrant origin, three of which have mixed heritage and another two mixed race kids. The book's editor, Aon Raza Naqvi, wanted to present how young people of immigrant origin describe their experience of identity construction growing up in Norway. The aim of the book is to expand the existing narratives of young people of immigrant origin to include positive thinking about the present and the future. It is presented in the young people's own words about how they experience their past, present and future lives in Norway. These narratives enrich and support the impression from the racial atmosphere at Dal school. In common for the 29 narratives appears to be an experience of being classified as 'foreigner', even though most of the 29 writers are born and raised in Norway. And those of mixed race experience the same, just because of their phenotype.

The data material has in both cases been approached through simple thematic analysis: I have searched for expressions on categorization, discrimination and identity construction in particular. Consequently, the section "Discussion" is organized along three themes: "Where are you actually from"; "On being half, not whole"; "Norwegian and foreigner".

Ethical considerations

At Dal school, the parents were informed of the project through a meeting and a letter. The parents of all the children included in this article gave written permission. The children themselves also wanted to participate. Both parents and children were informed that they were free to withdraw participation at any time, and that all names were pseudonyms. The themes of discussion, being ethnicity, skin color and identity, may be understood as sensitive, which I have been aware of and consequently anonymized the informants as much as possible without losing essential information. As such, children that belong to quite numerous ethnic groups in the area, such as Pakistanis, Turks and Moroccans, are kept intact, while regarding the two individual boys presented, Kofi and David, their national origin is a pseudonym that resembles their original background. However, some years have passed since I did the fieldwork and I don't see any ethical problems in how the children are presented. In addition, the Norwegian Centre for (ethical) Research Data (*Norsk senter for forskningsdata, NSD),* approved of the project before I started fieldwork.

The narratives in the book, *Third Culture Kids*, are already published with original names, and thus free to use in research. However, I contacted the editor and got his permission to use the narratives as data in a scientific article. In the following, I first present my theoretical framework, and then I discuss the empirical findings and narratives in the last sections.

Theoretical framework

Race, ethnicity and nationalism

Although "skin color" is a fact, is something observable, the meaning and understanding of it is a social construction that varies with time and place. The prominent researchers of race theory, Michael Omi and Howard Winant, define 'race' in opposition to 'race' as essence and

'race' as illusion, as a "concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies".[37] In line with this, Robert Miles and Malcolm Brown argue that in Europe, North America and Australasia, the idea of race is usually used to differentiate collectivities distinguished by skin color, as either "black" or "white", but never "big-eared" or "small-eared". That is, it is the color of the skin that is used as signification mark, not ears, legs or arms. They argue that "the fact that only certain physical characteristics are signified to define races in specific circumstances indicates that we are investigating not a given, natural division of the world's population, but the application of historically and culturally specific meanings to the totality of human physiological variation".[38] In other words, Robert Miles and Malcolm Brown point to how race is socially constructed over time and place, and underline the importance of skin color and other phenotype such as eye color, hair texture, lips and nose. When I use 'skin color', it denotes not only skin color, but also associated physical characteristics such as those just mentioned.

My next theme of discussion is how 'race' is connected to 'ethnicity', which is both an emic category of description and an analytic concept.[39] Regarding the last, Eriksen writes: "For ethnicity to come about, the groups must have a minimum of contact with each other, and they must entertain ideas of each other as being *culturally* different from themselves". [40] As such, ethnicity in his definition is an analytic concept that denotes an aspect about a relationship between groups that both consider themselves *culturally* different from each other. This definition does not include physical appearance or racial traits. I argue that this is not the understanding shared by Norwegians and people of immigrant origin in Norway today, because the emic understanding of *ethnic* groups appears to be differentiated on both cultural and "racial" characteristics. One of Sandset's informants answer this on the question "do you feel that ethnicity also reflects appearances?":

Yes, most certainly, I feel that even though it might not be totally legitimate to say so, that perhaps this goes more into race teaching. Yet it's not totally that either, it's something about the visible that's tied up with the term ethnicity (Mike, 26 years old, Norwegian mother, father from the Ivory Coast). [41]

Mike's understanding is emic, and, I propose, shared by most lay people in Norway. However, as previously mentioned, "race" has not been much applied in Norway, not even in Eriksen's well-known work on ethnicity and nationalism.[42] However, as we saw earlier, his attitude has now changed to argue for the importance of taking the concept of race and race relations seriously, not only ethnicity. This is because of increased discrimination related to skin color in Norway, and where skin color, including other phenotypical characteristics appear to be *the* marker of ethnic identity among people, as the data material will show. As such, in the Norwegian public context, it appears that race relations and ethnicity overlap to such an extent that clear distinctions are impossible. It thus becomes necessary for the researcher to find useful analytic (etic) approaches in order to grasp the emic understanding of race and ethnicity in analysis of ethnic/racial identity. The work of Reginald Daniel is one fruitful approach. He argues that the notion of ethnicity experienced as culture, the "culturalization" of ethnicity, is different from the experience of racial or geno-phenotypical and ancestral differentiation, the "racialization" of ethnicity. [43] In other words, ethnicity encompasses both culture and race, and I suggest it is the social context that activates more of ethnicity as culture or of race. In line with this, Sandset suggests that "race and ethnicity are better seen as two sides of the same coin or as part of a continuum, rather than two different concepts". [44] It is my position that race, culture and ethnicity are intertwined and socially constructed, as I will show.

Finally, some words must be said regarding the concept of nationalism, which is closely connected to ethnicity. Anthropological studies on nationalism did not appear before

the 1980ies, as anthropologists normally studied small, local communities, not nation-states.[45] However, anthropologists interested in nation-states and nationalism found interesting congruence between theories of nationalism and anthropological perspectives on ethnicity.[46] According to Eriksen, there are three similarities that stand out. Firstly, "both studies of ethnicity and of nationalism underline that ethnic or national identities are constructions, they are not 'natural'".[47] Secondly, the link between a particular identity and the "culture" it seeks to reify, is not a one-to-one relationship, they are both social constructions. Thirdly, "according to nationalism, the political organization should be ethnic in character, in that it represents the interests of a particular ethnic group". Also, according to Eriksen, "anthropologists who have written about nationalism have generally seen it as a variant of ethnicity". [48] Eriksen, informed by the works by Ernest Gellner (1983) and Benedict Anderson (1991) defines nation-state as "a state dominated by an ethnic group, whose markers of identity (such as language or religion), are frequently embedded in its official symbolism and legislation".[49] I am, however, aware that this definition is not well suited for all nation states, but is relevant for Norway and the other Nordic countries. Related to Norway and Norwegian identity, "Norwegian" is the label for the ethnic group that dominates Norway as a nation-state. Consequently, for the purpose of this article, "ethnic" and "national" identity is used interchangeably. This implies that people having parents born for instance in Pakistan, are described as having Pakistani ethnic background, and thus Pakistanis in Norway is an ethnic group.

Cultural schemas/models and human motives

Psychological anthropology, in this case schema theory, have a theoretical framework that focuses on motivation, and how values are internalized and incorporated as cognitive schemas with motivational force.[50] The ontological premise is that human cognitive processes work in a

certain way, that the brain works through associative networks of neurons, so called connectionism. The connections between neurons are strengthened through activity, and weakened by the opposite. “Neurons that fire together wire together”.[51] Human experiences are represented in the brain as clusters of associative neurons, which are called cognitive schemas (schema theory). Cultural schemas are those schemas that are shared by two or more people, these are also called cultural models[52] and are defined by Roy D’Andrade as «a cognitive schema that is intersubjectively shared by a cultural group».[53] Of relevance for this article, is the presumption that internalized values are cognitive schemas: “What we mean when we say that cultural beliefs and values are internalized is that they are literally built into associative networks”. [54]

The networks in *cultural* schemas/models have many common associations, based on common shared experiences and cultural transmissions.[55] The concept of internalization is central in schema theory, and implies a process of connecting values and cognitive schemas. According to Quinn et. al (2018), internalization happens by two processes: firstly, repetitive experiences by participation in common practices in families, schools and elsewhere, and secondly by cultural transmission of ideas and values over time. [56]

Some anthropologists argue for the need to expand conceptualizations of how internalization happens by going beyond thoughts, emotions and motivation, and also include bodily experiences. This implies expanding schema theory to explicitly include incorporation of culture. Paul Connerton writes about ‘incorporation’ of culture as internalization “gone deep”.[57] Concepts applied are ‘embodiment’, ‘enactment’, ‘extended mind’ or ‘embodied habitus’.[58] The theme of incorporation of culture is important, and research in the field is often connected to Pierre Bourdieu (1977). Research shows that previous experiences are embodied, [59] and Bourdieu’s concept *habitus* has been widely applied to cover this. It is defined as "dispositions laid down in each agent by his earliest upbringing".[60] Internalized cognitive

schemas are 'dispositions', which influence people to act, consciously or not «it is history turned into nature». [61] It is also of relevance for this article that deeply internalized cultural schemas, or 'embodied experience' acquired over time, are, according to Quinn et. al. (2018), hard to change: «the earliest learned behavior of children…… is likely to be not just motivating but also especially durable, reflected in its resistance to change». [62] As such, cultural models motivate actions, here also understood as opinions and talk. I suggest that what parents, professionals, and peers in the wider society express and do about immigrants, skin colors and ethnicities are laid down in children as dispositions of habitus.[63] In other words, that children, youth and adults have internalized cultural models on immigrants, ethnicities and skin color that motivate actions, for instance construction of social classification systems.

In line with this, the category 'Norwegian' is definitely a cultural model, it is «intersubjectively shared by a cultural group", [64] but the interesting part is how different people in families, kindergartens, health clinics, schools, media and social media, understand the meaning of the categories 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner'. People share the cultural models of 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner', but their associative networks are not identical and probably vary according to previous experiences and cultural transmissions in families and elsewhere.

Reflected appraisals, identity and multiple selves

An interesting approach in studies of ethnic/racial identities, is based in symbolic interactionism and applies the concept "reflected appraisals", informed by Charles Cooley's approach of "the looking glass self". [65] This is "a process in which identity is negotiated between the individual and the larger society", [66] and "reflected appraisal" is "how individuals *think* they appear to others". [67] In an identity formation process, the individuals first imagine how they appear to others. Then they imagine others' judgment of that appearance. This results in a self-concept, informed by how they believe others to see them,

that is, the self develops out of the reflected appraisals of others. Nikki Khanna conceptualizes racial identity in two ways: first, as "a 'public' identity (the ways people label themselves to others), and second, as an 'internalized' identity (the race or races with which individuals most strongly identify). [68] Khanna's project is to examine how reflected appraisals shape people's racial identities, and how the one-drop-rule influences various dimensions of racial identity. She also underlines that reflected appraisals vary according to the observer, if that person is black or white. [69]

Du Bois' theory of Double Consciousness, being a phenomenological description of the self-formation of racialized subjects, partly overlaps and enriches the theory of reflected appraisals by highlighting the importance of the lack of recognition for the racialized subject. The theory consists of three main elements: the veil (that separates the races, that is, the color line), twoness (the racialized takes the position of two different worlds, the colored and the White), and second sight (the racialized can see himself through the revelation of the other world, and also understand the dehumanization and oppression from the white world). [70]

According to Lena Näre, the concept of 'migrancy' as a social space has much in common with how children and youth experience ethnic identity internally and externally. This concept is understood as "the socially constructed subjectivity of 'migrant,' or 'foreigner,' which is inscribed on certain bodies by the larger society in general". [71] Näre writes that "its subjectivity is very seldom, if ever, embraced by migrants themselves", [72] which, I believe, points to the relevance of the process of 'reflected appraisals' in understanding ethnic/racial identity construction.

As indicated above, Khanna argues that ethnic/racial identity may have various labels depending on context, which resonates with the identity works of for instance anthropologist Henrietta Moore. Her theory of subject positions implies that a single subject can no longer be equated with a single individual. Each individual is a multiply constituted subject and "take[s]

up multiple subject positions within a range of discourses and social practices". [73] In line with this, psychologist Catherine Ewing explains:

> *...in all cultures people can be observed to project multiple, inconsistent self-representations that are context-dependent and may shift rapidly. At any particular moment a person usually experiences his or her articulated self as a symbolic, timeless whole, but this self may quickly be displaced by another, quite different "self", which is based on a different definition of the situation*. [74]

This theoretical stance allows the study of intra-cultural variation and the construction of ethnic identities, particularly among foreign-born and their children. I believe that ethnic identity construction of persons having 'one foot in two cultures' is particularly challenging because the subjectivity is grounded in the parents' cultural values, or mixed cultural values, and in values in the country they now are living in. As such, cultural values from the 'old' and 'new' country may not be commensurable, often resulting in fluid, hybrid identities. [75]

Notions of hybridity, 'third culture kids', and 'third space'

Hybridity means a cultural blending and reinvention. Recent research views children of immigrants as creative *bricoleurs* who combine different cultural expressions into something new, becoming competent navigators of culture. [76] As such, youth mix cultural styles, values, and trends into *hybrids*, often related to consumer goods; for instance, ways of dressing.

The concept 'third culture kids' (TCK) is sometimes used to describe children living in two or more cultures: "They (TCK) are spending, or have spent, at least part of their childhood in at least one country and culture other than their own". [77]As far back as the 1950'ies, Ruth Hill Useem coined the term to describe children of missionaries, diplomats, and militaries, who followed their parents to stay abroad, often in many different countries during their childhoods. [78] The origin of the concept was thus not intended for children of

refugees or migrant workers who left their homeland for not intending to return. Still, the concept grasps what children of immigrant and mixed origin may experience, namely challenges of ethnic identity construction when they identify with two or more countries of origin. Obviously, the editor and contributors in the Norwegian book "Third Culture Kids", identify with the concept. However, in an interesting article by Ruth Van Reken and Paulette Bethel (2005), they introduce the concept Cross Culture Kids (CCK) in order to distinguish between different kinds of cross cultural experience. This is coined as an overarching 'model' that includes 'Traditional TCKs', 'Children of bi/multicultural parents', 'Children of immigrants', 'Children of refugees, 'Children of minorities', 'International adoptees' and 'Domestic TCKs'. A CCK is a "person who has lived in – or meaningfully interacted with – two or more cultural environments for a significant period of time during developmental years". [79] This definition surely includes the informants of this article, and CCKs is a term I prefer over TCKs. Interestingly, Van Reken and Bethel argue that "TCKs appear to be the same externally as their fellow citizens, but internally they have as different a world view and life experiences as any true immigrant would have. Who others expect them to be is not who they are". [80] This is not so with many of the other CCK's, who often experience that they internally don't see themselves in the same manner as others define them based on race or culture. [81] However, in both cases, the individual experiences a mismatch between public identity and internalized identity, [82] that is, between the inner and outer identity experiences. Traditional TCKs are often categorized as the same as the majority, while many CCKs, such as mixed race kids in this article, are categorized as minority because of their appearance. That is, they are classified as minority by the outer world, but not, as mentioned, by the census system which classified them among ethnic Norwegians in the category "the rest of the population".[83]

Olga Nieuwenhuys argues that the post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha's notion of 'the third space,' which is an "in-between space of culture," is "seminal for understanding the dynamics of identity negotiation in minority communities". [84] The vast majority of children in Dal, and the young people in Naqvi's book, were born in Norway to one or two foreign-born parents and are therefore often understood as having "one foot in two cultures," or living in a space between two cultures. [85] I argue that these children and young people are 'cross cultural kids', as they participate in and negotiate ethnic identity construction in a 'third space.'

Social classification and "making up people"

Social classification occurs all over the world and organizes people based on culturally relevant characteristics. Social categories are socially constructed and may be understood to reflect power hierarchies. As such, the interesting issue, as formulated by Ghorashi, Alghasi and Eriksen (2009), is "*which* categories we use and *how* we use them". [86] How people classify their social world tells us something about dominating cultural values in their relevant social contexts. The categories, however, are not something "natural"; they are social constructions that change with time, place, and context. [87] Most importantly, the categories we use reflect internalized values or cultural schemas/models.

Professor of philosophy, Ian Hacking, has, in a well-known and thought provoking text, discussed the theme of "making up people" through classification and categories. He is inspired by Michel Foucault's analysis of homosexuality as a new, constructed category of the 20th Century, and of how and why new categories emerge. He writes:

> *Dynamic nominalism remains an intriguing doctrine, arguing that numerous kinds of human beings and human acts come into being hand in hand with our invention of the categories labeling them.* [88]

In connection with his arguments, he asks two questions, and answers them positively: “Is making up people intimately linked to control? Is making up people of recent origin?” I read his postulations to imply that social categories are made up by people in power, which makes his work relevant in analysis of racial categories. For instance, the cultural models of ‘Norwegian’ and ‘foreigner’, with their associative networks, may be understood as new, “made up” categories in Norway, made up “hand in hand” with immigration from non-western countries. However, it is not obvious “who” invented these categories, or who invent social categories in general. In addition to structuring a universe, they may be read as resistance strategies, following Foucault’s postulation of “where there is power, there is resistance”. [89] I will return to this later.

Discussion

“But where are you actually from?”

As already mentioned, ethnic Norwegian children were in a minority situation in Dal school, and also among the children I got to know from 5th to 9th Form, where only Pernille were classified as such. The atmosphere at the school was very multicultural, in the sense that ways of dressing, hairstyles and smells were different than at schools having a majority of ethnic Norwegians. The adults working there conceptualized the children as ‘color-blind’, and the children themselves said in interviews that they didn't care about skin colors in their school. However, there was a mismatch between what adults and children *said* on direct questions about interest in racial differences and actual practices. For instance, the children were aware of the various ethnicities at their school, illustrated by their social classification system. The categories were ‘Norwegian’, ‘foreigner’, ‘brown’, ‘black’, ‘white’, ‘Muslim’ and ‘Christian’. These were hierarchically organized regarding skin color: ‘white’, ‘brown’, and ‘black’, but somewhat unclear regarding religion. Most importantly, the categories “Norwegian” and

"foreigner" are overarching cultural models with motivational force, and these models have race, as skin color and phenotype, in their associative networks.

If Gorashi et. al. (2009) are correct in that what is interesting in social classification, are "*which* categories we use and *how* we use them", [90] the Dal children's classification system illustrates their interest in skin color, ethnicities, and religion, not color-blindness. Moreover, their classification system reflects values in their surroundings, and that they have internalized the cultural models of 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner' with ethnicities that include skin color. In other words, racialization of ethnicity is in the forefront, not culturalization. This is illustrated in the conversation between Nasreen and Saira, two girls whose families are from Pakistan:

> *Mari: I suppose you often get the question: where are you from?*
>
> *Nasreen: They see it on how we look! But people can mix whether we come from India, Bangladesh, Pakistan…People can see whether you are Norwegian by the way you dress, they dress in "short" clothes…*
>
> *Saira: Because we don't have different skin color (the nationalities just mentioned).*
>
> *Mari: But what do you think yourself, you are born in Norway, go to a Norwegian school…*
>
> *Nasreen: I say I am Norwegian-Pakistani (and Saira agrees).*
>
> *Mari: Would you be pleased if somebody classified you as Norwegian?*
>
> *Nasreen and Saira: No.*
>
> *Nasreen: Well, I am Norwegian, but not* ***ethnic*** *Norwegian…*
>
> *Saira: We live in Norway, and have a Norwegian passport…*

First and foremost, their public identities as Norwegian-Pakistani, reflect that they think others think they are not ethnic Norwegian because of how they look, that is, their phenotypes. The process of reflected appraisals has informed them of never being able to pass

as “ethnic” Norwegians. Their internalized identities are as Pakistanis, but also as Norwegian in some formal contexts (they have a Norwegian passport, are born in Norway). Nasreen and Saira also illustrate the theme of multiple identities: they experience having one Norwegian and one Pakistani identity as well as the hybrid Norwegian-Pakistani. It is worth noting that they mention *two* ‘Norwegian’ categories: ‘Norwegian’ and ‘*ethnic* Norwegian.’ They may experience themselves as ‘Norwegian’ in some social contexts, but never ‘ethnic Norwegian.’ In order to be labelled ‘ethnic Norwegian’ they believe they should be more fair skinned. They know they will not pass as ethnic Norwegians because of their racial characteristics: dark hair and eyes, brownish skin. As such, the cultural models of ‘Norwegian’ and ‘*ethnic* Norwegian’ are not identical, but overlap. I suggest their associate networks share some neurons but differ on one important point: whiteness. White skin is a prerequisite in the cultural model of ‘ethnic Norwegian’, at least among these girls, but not necessarily in the cultural model of ‘Norwegian’. However, it is highly contextual whether the cultural model of ‘Norwegian’ includes white skin or not, because the category ‘Norwegian’ of their social classification system obviously includes whiteness.

Tanita Saranya Landgraf of Thai, Slovak and German origin, growing up in Sollia, a small village in the Norwegian countryside, writes that people outside the village always asks a second question, “yes, but where are you actually from?” when she tells them she grew up in Sollia. That question was particularly common when she moved from Sollia to a bigger town. Tanita writes:

> *It was not enough to say I was from Sollia, because they can actually see that my origin is not from a tiny Norwegian village, not even when I spoke dialect. And then I start on my second repetitive answer: “Really? You mean because of how I look? My dad is from Germany and Slovakia, and my mum from Thailand.” When I have given*

them this answer, they get a contented and almost relieved expression in their eyes. Because then they were right, because they knew that I was not actually Norwegian.[91]

Tanita adds that she has had no unpleasant experiences concerning her identity, but repetitive experiences telling her that she doesn't look like the ordinary, or ethnic, Norwegian. Obviously, she experiences a mismatch between her internal identity and that imposed by others, [92] in other words, the veil of the double consciousness structured her experience.[93] It appears that while she was living in Sollia, her internalized identity was as Norwegian, and also her public identity. However, as she grew older and moved away from the village, reflected appraisals probably shaped her public identity more into 'foreigner' than 'Norwegian'. These experiences were more frequent in bigger places outside Sollia. It appears from what she writes, that it is almost impossible to escape the question "But where are you actually from", indicating a strong cultural phenomenon in Norway of ethnic social classification and of how strongly whiteness is included in the associative network of the cultural model of (ethnic) Norwegian. This also comes forth in other research in Norway, for instance in a master thesis in social anthropology. It has the title "'Where are you from?', a sentence repetitiously expressed by her informants. [94] The phenomenon is also discussed in an article by the Icelandic researchers Kristin Loftsdottir and Sanna Mortudottir (forthcoming this journal), having the same title as the MA thesis: "Where are you from?". This question also resonates with the contents of Kim Thanh Ngo's narrative. He has an ethnic Norwegian mother and Vietnamese father, and writes:

> *It seems as if it is very important for some ethnic Norwegians to know which country you are from, so they can classify you. Chinaman, yellow, japs or ching chong. I think that to pester southeast Asians is the most accepted racism. I hear quite a lot about that because I am mixed, people can pat my shoulder and say: "but Kim, you are Norwegian!".* [95]

I read Kim to experience that ethnic Norwegians are very preoccupied with social classification based on racial characteristics, that is, the racialization of ethnicity. One result of this is his experience of much racism towards people of southeast Asian origin in his surroundings, and that the bullies try to please him by saying he is "Norwegian" when he shows dislike of what they are doing.

I suggest that the cultural models of Norwegian and foreigner motivate the outcome of reflected appraisals: the mixed race kids above all show a mismatch between internalized identity and public identity, where racialization of ethnicity, that is skin color and phenotype, have the last word. Two of the elements of double consciousness are apparent: the veil and twoness: the colorline structures how the informants experience themselves as both Norwegian and foreigner depending on social context.[96]

"On being half, not whole"

When it comes to the boys at Dal, most of them were born and raised in Norway, for instance Kofi and David. Both of Kofi's parents are from Ghana, while David's mother is ethnic Norwegian and his father from Kenya. David had only visited his relatives in Kenya three times during his lifetime. This means that he, similarly to Kofi and the girls above, did not know what it was like to grow up outside Norway. Kofi said he views himself as Ghanaian because his parents are from that country, that is, his public identity and the internalized one appears to match, while David said "I think of myself as Norwegian, although I feel that I am from another country and like to say I am from another country. I like to say that I am from Kenya. I am 'half,' but some people think I am 'whole,' from another country; but most people think I am 'half,' and when people ask I say I am 'half.'" His utterance, "but some people think I am 'whole'", illustrates how skin color is a marker of ethnic identity from others, not necessarily the person himself, as the quote from Näre pointed to earlier in this

text. [97] David also said he preferred to say he "was from another country" although he "thought of himself as Norwegian". In other words, David's public identity is shaped by reflected appraisals of not being Norwegian, which is part of his internalized identity. The veil and twoness of the double consciousness are apparent. [98] Obviously, David is a cross cultural kid (CCK) navigating his ethnic/racial identity construction in a third space, and often experiencing a mismatch between internal identity and that imposed by external people.

Another narrative on mixed ethnic origin is from Sandeep Singh. He has an Indian Sikh origin and is married to an ethnic Norwegian woman. He presents himself as "first and foremost father of two mixed race kids", and writes this poem:

Dear my mixed race kid
There had to be a collusion of two
worlds to give you life
In spite of all the strength you inhabit
Others will define you
before you have the chance yourself
Some circles will have the opinion that you have too hard edges
Squares will argue that you are not edgy enough
They call you half one thing
half something else
Then it is not easy to experience wholeness

Forget those who bake you in a baking diagram
You are not statistics
You are not mathematics
You are music
An original mix of two styles
but an independent creation
The purists' enemy: an innovation
You are synonymous with progress
and in my ears you are the remix of our time
The perfect example of the improbable
meeting of two universes

The rhythm of a Sikh-warrior and
the roar of an unbendable North-Norwegian
Formed by Hoshiarpuri-earth and
strengthened by Haalogaland sea

You are a strong fucking banger
But not everyone will understand your wrapping

Too beige for brown, too black for white

The lungs the city needs
The technology even the most
cynical corporations see money

It is not easy, a known frog once sang
But stay green
and become a stronger fucking banger [99]

Some lines catch my attention more than others. Sandeep writes: "They call you half one thing, half something else. Then it is not easy to experience wholeness", indicating challenges of ethnic identity construction. If children and youth of mixed racial origins may experience a lack of "wholeness" related to ethnic identity constructions, this may appear to challenge Ewing's postulation of "wholeness" mentioned previously. Ewing argues that a person usually experiences some sense of "wholeness", despite the fact that people from the outside may experience a person's actions as contrasting identities. [100] However, I suggest that Ewing's postulation of identity "wholeness" does not take *ethnic/racial* identity into consideration, she writes about multiple identities of *gender*. As such, she may be read to write mostly about what Khanna (2010) calls 'public identity, which, I suggest, is more easily changed than the internalized identity in early socialisation. I understand racial/ethnic identity, the internalized identity, to be part of habitus, and thus, according to Quinn et. al., hard to change. [101] If my interpretation is correct, the experience of lack of wholeness that Sandeep believes is a reality for mixed race kids, does not conflict with the sense of wholeness Ewing points to. This is because the two experiences refer to different levels of internalization. His lines may be understood as an illustration of mismatch between internal and external identity constructions, or of public and internalized racial identity.

Two of the other lines in Sandeep's poem, "But not everybody will understand your wrapping. Too beige for brown, too black for white", point to an experience of dominating social categories of being brown, black or white. As such, the lines may be understood to

imply that mixed race kids don't fit into any of the existing categories of 'brown', 'black', 'white', or 'Norwegian'. In the terminology of anthropologist Mary Douglas (1966), these categories may be understood as "clean" categories, and, accordingly, if you don't fit into any of these, you are "matter out of place", or "dirt". [102] In this light, it makes sense that mixed race kids are classified into the category of 'foreigner', as were David and the others in this study. When the skin color is not white but somewhat colored, or your appearance has other racial characteristics, such as South East Asian's narrow eyes, you are classified as 'foreigner' by others. The process of reflected appraisals thus shapes the internalized identity as 'foreigner' too, again the veil and twoness of the double consciousness are apparent. [103]

Mona Berntsen, with a mother from Morocco and an ethnic Norwegian father, grew up outside Oslo in a place dominated by white people. She supports Sandeep's experiences of dominant classification categories. She didn't think of herself as different from the others until she was told so by other kids, although very gently, she writes. As such, she illustrates very well the issue of mismatch between internal and external identity classification,[104] or between public and internalized identity, and the structural aspect of the veil. [105] Her internalized identity is in line with the majority children, but not recognized as such. As she grew older, she experienced what she writes as an "identity crisis":

> *I got an identity crisis, probably like many others of mixed origin; never "enough white", never enough Norwegian, never enough black or enough African. I was never colour – or culturally enough. Not enough Christian, not enough Muslim.* [106]

Interestingly, Mona, like Sandeep, draws attention to what she experiences as the relevant, dominant social categories of classification: 'white', 'Norwegian', 'black', 'African', 'Christian' and 'Muslim'. These categories are very much in line with the Dal children's

social classification system. As such, it is likely that these are found in other parts of Norway as well, and point to dominating values in this country today.

"Norwegian" or "foreigner"

The experiences of the above children and youth of immigrant and mixed race origin, first and foremost illustrate the dominance and motivating force of the cultural model 'Norwegian' (ethnic Norwegian) and how white skin color and white phenotype is part of its associative network. This category and the others in their social classification system, made be understood as being "made up" in an atmosphere of white privilege. This situation resonates with what Richard Dyer writes: "As long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people". [107] I contend that Norwegian society today is permeated by implications of white privilege, some situation Norwegian intellectuals, but hardly politicians, are beginning to take seriously. Norwegian politicians has sported "color-blind racism" as an anti-rascism strategy. In this light, the children and youth's emic classificatory categories may be read as resistance strategies to white power and color-blind ideology. They construct their categories in a third space and construct public identities in opposition to the majority whiteness and color-blind official policy. In light of the theory of double consciousness, the third element of 'second sight' is here apparent: they experience oppression structured by the veil and the white society.[108]

The children and youth tend to use the prefix 'ethnic' to mark a clearer distinction to the category of 'foreigner', which surely is a cultural model without whiteness in its associative network. The prefix also makes a distinction to the category 'Norwegian' when people try to label them as such. Recently the term 'Norwegian-Norwegian' has entered the discourse, as a substitute for "ethnic" Norwegian, also introduced by young people of

immigrant origin, not by politicians or people in position. Introduction of such terms may indicate that young people of immigrant or mixed race origin don't aspire to be classified among the white majority population, because they know that is a "lost case". They feel as 'foreigners' and are classified as such because of their appearance, that is, the process of reflected appraisals shapes their internalized identities and public identities as foreigners. This is highlighted by the fact that British and Swedes, both numerous immigrant populations in Norway, are not categorized as 'foreigners', but as 'British' and 'Swedes' respectively. I suggest this is because of their white skin and general phenotype. They could easily pass as Norwegian if you met them on the street. As such, this experience of a relationship between colored skin/ foreign-ness and whiteness/ Norwegian-ness has been internalized and become part of the girls' and boys' habitus. I suggest that this is the case for all informants in this article, whether they like it or not.

David said it is 'cool' that the students at Dal represent so many 'cultures.' In his everyday life contexts, he navigates and negotiates various cultural values by hanging out with peers having both non-Norwegian and ethnic Norwegian parents. However, an experience of belonging appears more connected to hanging out with children of immigrants, that is with youth having public identities as foreigners. This may be because possible ethnic Norwegian friends are few in his area, and that children of immigrants look more similar to himself. Again the issue of skin color appears relevant. Beverly Daniel Tatum (2003)[109] argues that it is a necessary step in young people's identity construction to hang out and seek belonging among those with the same racialized ethnic origin. As such, Kofi and David and other children at Dal, appear to support her claim of youth seeking belonging with others they define as 'similar' regarding phenotype and ethnic identity. [110] This was also something that came forth in the narratives from the older youth in the book *Third Culture Kids* (2019). If

they had the option, they chose friends with ethnic minority origin, not ethnic Norwegians, because the first were experienced as more similar to themselves.

The Dal boys' emphasis of non-Norwegian public identity may be because they are resigned about ever achieving the identity label 'Norwegian' from others because of their dark skin. Previous research has illustrated the importance of whiteness for successful Nordic identity labelling, [111] which the girls and boys support by how they understand, through their associative networks, the cultural model 'Norwegian' (and ethnic Norwegian). They have experienced, through reflected appraisals, that their appearances hinder them in passing as (ethnic) Norwegians, and because they know that, they construct hybrid ethnic public identities in a third space marking them off from majority Norwegians. [112] The boys sported a hip hop style and most importantly, spoke so called "kebab-Norwegian", a socio-dialect with grammatical errors and a distinctive intonation. [113] This was a local gendered boys' dialect, as it was not that widespread among the girls.

The hybrid ethnic identity constructions make it possible for girls and boys to act out different ethnic identities according to social context. The children with both parents from abroad, like Kofi, probably act out the ethnic identity from the parents' homeland at home, while this may not be that obvious for those with mixed race identities. David probably felt more 'Norwegian' than 'foreigner' at home with his ethnic Norwegian mother and two older white, half-siblings (same mother, different fathers). As mentioned, he said he thought of himself as "Norwegian", but "felt he was from another country, and liked to say he was from another country", probably as a result of reflected appraisals and the veil. As these examples indicate, I suggest the expression "stuck in your skin" is particularly relevant and experienced by David and others with mixed race origin, because they may identify with their white parent as much as with their colored one. But also the children and youth of immigrant origin included in this article may experience being "stuck in their skin", and as a consequence did

not appear to sport an identity as 'Norwegians' but as 'foreigners'. This conversation with Melek of Turkish and Hadia of Moroccan heritage supports this interpretation:

Mari: What do you think about having a Norwegian identity? I know that at this school you classify yourself as 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner.' How do you think about yourself?

Hadia: I think that I am foreigner!

Melek: So do I, even though I am born in Norway.

Mari: Do think that's ok, do you like it that way, your appearance (fair skinned) is after all not obviously foreign?

(Both of them laugh).

Hadia: But I like it…

Mari: You like saying that you are a foreigner?

Hadia: Yes, but it is so common here, it's not something I like or not, it's common, yes. I can say I am a foreigner everywhere in Norway, sort of.

Mari: You too?(I address Melek)

Melek: Yes, it's very common, normal, I don't reflect about it, I just say I am a foreigner, sort of, that I come from Turkey.

Mari: I understand from what you say here, that it's not important for you to be classified and labeled Norwegian?

Both: No.

Mari: And what about David? Would you say he is Norwegian or foreigner?

Melek: Both, he is both really….I really think he is the same as us, because even though we experience ourselves as foreigners, we are Norwegian as well. We are born and raised here, so we are used to this culture, and when we go to Turkey or Morocco, we experience a difference between us and the people living there. They look upon us as more Norwegian than Turkish, I think.

As comes forth in this conversation, racial characteristics are vital: they don't think they will be classified as Norwegian by others, and appear not to aspire that either. This is the result of reflected appraisals and point to ethnicity as racialization. Still, they consider both David and themselves as 'Norwegian' in some social contexts, for instance when visiting their countries of origin, because they are born, raised and live in Norway. The twoness of double consciousness is obviously experienced.[114] In those contexts, culturalization of ethnicity is more prominent than racialization. However, David, who has lived in Norway all his life, with a white mother, is generally classified both as Norwegian *and* foreigner, probably because of his dark skin colour and other African phenotype. As we have seen, his public identity as foreigner and his internalized identity as both Norwegian and foreigner have been shaped by reflected appraisals.

Conclusion

In the introduction I posed this question: How do children and young people of mixed race origin experience ethnic identity construction in light of the categories 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner', and how is this to be understood? I have argued that these children and youth experience challenges of ethnic identity construction because of a mismatch and ambiguity between the internalized identity and the public one, brought on by reflected appraisals. These appraisals are influenced by internalized, cultural models of 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner' which have motivational force. These cultural models also inform the children's social classification system. Furthermore, it has been shown that the children and young people reflect understandings of ethnicity where racialization dominates over culturalization, that is, race is a more prevalent dimension of ethnicity than culture is. As such, it can be argued that a "one drop rule" [115] also appears relevant in Norway regarding racial and ethnic classification and identity construction. The material suggests that the Norwegian society does "talk" about

race, and that ethnicity studies ought to define 'ethnicity' not only in cultural terms, [116] but also include race in order to make emic and etic concepts of ethnicity more tuned to each other. The point has been to show how ethnicity used in Norway usually includes race, and that color-blindness is an illusion.

The dominant categories of (ethnic) 'Norwegian' and 'foreigner' clearly show the overall dominance of whiteness, illustrated by the fact that children and youth of mixed ethnic Norwegian and non-western origin, who are born and raised in Norway, are categorized as 'foreigner' because of their colored skin and 'foreign' phenotype. At least among the children and young people of this article, it appears that whiteness as part of 'Norwegian identity' is deeply incorporated, part of habitus, and thus may be difficult, but not impossible to change. The overall conclusion is that mixed race children and youth in Norway may experience being "stuck in their skin" stronger than those having two parents of immigrant origin, because they also identify with the parent of white, ethnic Norwegian identity.

It is concluded that Norway is an "underdeveloped" country regarding racial reflexivity, and obviously needs more research on how white privilege results in "making up people" through racial hierarchical categories, also understood as resistance strategies to white majority power and color-blind ideology. Most importantly, the article indicates that research on mixed race identities in Norway is scarce and needs to be put on academic and political agendas. The work of Du Bois, such as the theory of Double Consciousness, in combination with perspectives of psychological anthropology, critical mixed race and race theory, would make an interesting and necessary contribution to mixed race studies in Norway and the Nordic countries.

Notes:

[1] Sandset 2019:13, my emphasis
[2] Dzamarija 2014:5
[3] Dzamarija 2014:5
[4] Dzamarija 2014:15
[5] Dzamarija 2014:15
[6] Sandset 2019:25
[7] Dzamarija 2014:15
[8] Statistics Norway, a
[9] Statistics Norway, b
[10] Oslo Kommune 2019, a
[11] Oslo Kommune 2019, b
[12] Seeberg 2003:25
[13] Rysst 2008; Rysst 2017; Prieur 2002
[14] Lien, Lidén &Vike 2001
[15] Barnes 1954; Gullestad 2001; Lien et. al. 2001
[16] Barnes 1954
[17] Barnes 1954; Lien, Lidén & Vike 2001
[18] Burke 2017; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Wise 2010; Frankenberg 1993; Tatum 2003
[19] Hubinette & Tigervall 2009
[20] Aftenposten, 2011
[21] Pollock 2004; Wise 2010; Hubinette & Tigervall 2009; Prieur 2002
[22] Hubinette & Tigervall 2009: 335
[23] Hubinette & Tigervall 2009: 335
[24] Frankenberg 1993:1
[25] Sandset 2019
[26] Hubinette & Tigervall 2009: 335
[27] Johansen 2011
[28] Eriksen 2019
[29] Morgenbladet 2019: 3, my translation
[30] see also Sandset 2019
[31] Holy 1984
[32] Okely 2012
[33] Geertz 1983
[34] Oslo Kommune 2019, c
[35] Rysst 2013, 2014
[36] Naqvi 2019
[37] Omi & Winant 1994: 55
[38] Miles & Malcolm 2003:89
[39] Eriksen 1992
[40] Eriksen 1992:12, my emphasis
[41] Sandset 2019: 126
[42] Eriksen 1992
[43] Daniel 2002: XV
[44] Sandset 2019: 175
[45] Eriksen 1992
[46] Eriksen 1992: 100
[47] Eriksen 1992:100

[48] Eriksen 1992:101
[49] Eriksen 1992: 99
[50] D'Andrade & Strauss 1992
[51] Quinn, Sirota, Stromberg 2018: 294
[52] Quinn et. al. 2018: 295
[53] D'Andrade 1990: 809
[54] Westen, in Quinn et. al. 2018: 295
[55] Quinn et. al. 2018: 294-304
[56] Quinn et. al. 2018: 299-305
[57] Connerton 1989
[58] Quinn et al. 2018: 295
[59] Connerton 1989; Bourdieu 1977
[60] Bourdieu 1977: 81
[61] Bourdieu 1977:78
[62] Quinn et.al. 2018:310
[63] Bourdieu 1977; D'Andrade & Strauss 1992; Bonilla-Silva, Goar, Embrick, 2006; Cui 2010
[64] D'Andrade 1990: 809
[65] Cooley 1902
[66] Khanna 2010:97
[67] Khanna 2010:97
[68] Khanna 2010:97
[69] Khanna 2010
[70] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015:235
[71] Näre 2013:604
[72] Näre 2013: 605
[73] Moore 1994: 55
[74] Ewing 1990: 251
[75]Moinian 2009: 33
[76] Jacobsen 2002: 32; Vassenden 2011
[77] Pollock & Van Reken 2009

[78] Van Reken & Bethel 2005
[79] Van Reken & Bethel 2005: 3
[80] Van Reken & Bethel 2005:8
[81] Van Reken & Bethel 2005:8
[82] Khanna 2010
[83] Dzamarija 2014:5
[84] Nieuwenhuys 2013: 3
[85] Back 2002: 446
[86] Ghorashi et. al. 2009: 11

[87] Ghorashi et. al. 2009:11
[88] Hacking 1985: 170
[89] Foucault 1978
[90] Ghorashi et. al. 2009: 11
[91] Landgraf, in Naqvi 2019: 79
[92] Van Reken & Bethel 2005
[93] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[94] Christophersen 2012
[95] Ngo, in Naqvi 2019:103

[96] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[97] Näre 2013
[98] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[99] Singh, in Naqui 2019: 25, translated by article author
[100] Ewing 1990
[101] Quinn et. al. 2018: 310
[102] Douglas 1966; see also Loftsdottir & Mortudottir, forthcoming this journal
[103] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[104] Van Reken & Bethel 2005
[105] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[106] Berntsen, in Naqvi 2019: 185
[107] Dyer 1997:1
[108] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[109] Beverly Daniel Tatum, 2003
[110] Rysst 2014
[111] Hubinette & Tigervall 2009; Prieur 2002
[112] Nieuwenhuys 2013
[113] Rysst 2017
[114] Du Bois in Itzigsohn & Brown 2015
[115] Khanna 2010
[116] Eriksen 1992

Bibliography

Aftenposten, 2011. https://www.aftenposten.no/norge/i/Rj08/Ikke-helt-fargeblinde Accessed 12. September 2019

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.

Back, Les. The Fact of Hybridity: Youth, Ethnicity, and Racism. In Goldberg, David T. and Solomos, John. (Eds.). *A Companion to Ethnic and Racial Studies.* Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

Barnes, John. Class and Committees on a Norwegian Island Parish. *Human Relations*, no. 7, 1, 1954: 39-58.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, Goar, Carla, Embrick, David. When Whites Flock Together: The Social Psychology of White Habitus. *Critical Sociology*, 32, no.2-3, 2006.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. *Racism without Racists*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Burke, Meghan. "Colorblind Racism: Identities, Ideologies, and Shifting Subjectivities." *Sociological Perspectives*, 600, no.5, 2017: 857-865.

Christophersen, Maria. Where are you from? MA thesis, University of Oslo, 2012.

Cooley, Charles H. *Human Nature and Social Order*. New York: Scribner's, 1902.

Connerton, Paul. *How societies remember.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Cui, Dan. Capital, distinction, and racialized habitus: immigrant youth in the educational field. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18, no.9, 2015:1154-1169.

Daniel, Reginald, Kina, Laura, Dariots, Wei Ming, Fojas, Camilla. "Emerging Paradigms in Critical Race Studies." *Journal of Critical Race Studies*, 2014.

Daniel, Reginald. *More Than Black? Multiracial Identity and the New Racial Order.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.

D'Andrade, Roy. Cultural Cognition. In Posner, Michael I. (ed.) *Foundations of Cognitive Science*, p. 795-830. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990.

D'Andrade, Roy and Strauss, Claudia. *Human Motives and Cultural models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Dyer, Richard. *White.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Dzamarija, Minja Tea. «Oversikt over personer med ulik grad av innvandringsbakgrunn.» *Statistics Norway*, Report 14, 2014.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. «We must talk about race". *Morgenbladet*, 26/3, 2019. https://morgenbladet.no/boker/2019/03/vi-ma-snakke-om-rase

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. London: Pluto Press, 1992.

Ewing, Catherine. The illusion of wholeness. *Ethos*, 18, 1990: 251-278.

Frankenberg, Ruth. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness.* Minneappolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Book, 1978.

Geertz, Clifford. From the Native's Point of View: On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding. In Geertz, Clifford. *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basle. 1983.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Ghorashi Halleh, Eriksen, Thomas and Alghasi, Sharam. Introduction. In Ghorashi Halleh, Eriksen, Thomas and Alghasi, Sharam (eds.) *Paradoxes of Cultural Recognition.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Gullestad, Marianne. Likhetens grenser. In Lien, Marianne, Liden, Hilde and Halvard Vike, (eds.): *Likhetens paradokser*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2001.

Hacking, Ian. Making Up People. In Thomas Heller, Morton Sosna and David Wellbery (eds.) *Reconstructing Individualism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985.

Holy, Ladislav. Theory, methodology and the research process. In Ellen, Roy, *Ethnographic research.* London: Academic Press, 1984.

Hubinette, Tobias and Tigervall, Carina. To be Non-white in a Colour-Blind Society. *Journal of Intercultural Studies,* 30, no.4, 2009: 335-353.

Itzigsohn, Jose and Brown, Karida. Sociology and the theory of double Consciousness. W.E.B. Du Bois's Phenomenology of Racialized Subjectivity. *Du Bois Review*, 12, no.2, 2015:231-248.

Jacobsen, Christine. *Tilhørighetens mange former.* Oslo: Unipax, 2002.

Johansen, Sissel. "What is wrong about using the word 'race'?". *Vårt Land,* 2011. *http://www.verdidebatt.no/innlegg/129448-hva-er-galt-med-a-bruke-ordet-rase.* Accessed 17. September 2019.

Khanna, Nikki. «If you're half black, you're just black": Reflected Appraisals and the Persistence of the One-Drop Rule. *The sociological quarterly*, 51, 2010: 96-121.

Lien, Marianne, Liden, Hilde and Halvard Vike (eds.) *Likhetens paradokser.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2001.

Loftsdottir, Kristin and Mortudottir, Sanna. "'Where are you from?' Racism and the Normalization of Whiteness in Iceland." *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies*, forthcoming

Miles, Robert and Malcolm Brown. *Racism.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Moinian, Farzaneh. «I'm just me! Children talking beyond ethnic and religious identities." *Childhood,* 16, no.1, 2009: 31-48.

Moore, Henrietta. *A Passion for Difference*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

Morgenbladet. «Know your privileges". *Morgenbladet*, 9/8, 2019. https://morgenbladet.no/aktuelt/2019/08/kjenn-dine-privilegier

Naqvi, Aon Raza. (ed.). *Third Culture Kids*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2019.

Näre, Lena. Migrancy, Gender and Social Class in Domestic Labour and Social Care in Italy: An Intersectional analysis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39, no.4, 2013: 601-623.

Nieuwenhuys, Olga. Theorizing childhood(s): Why we need postcolonial perspectives. *Childhood,*. 20, no.1, 2013: 3-8.

Okely, Judith. *Anthropological Practice. Fieldwork and the ethnographic method*. London: Berg, 2012.

Omi, Michael and Winant, Howard. *Racial Formation in the United States: from the 1960s to 1990s.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

Oslo Kommune, a, 2019. https://www.oslo.kommune.no/politikk-og-administrasjon/statistikk/befolkning/folkemengde-og-endringer/#gref . Accessed 12. September 2019.

Oslo Kommune, b, 2019. https://www.oslo.kommune.no/politikk-og-administrasjon/statistikk/befolkning/landbakgrunn Accessed 12.September 2019.

Oslo Kommune, c, 2019. http://statistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no/webview/index.jsp?catalog=http%3A%2F%2Fstatistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no%3A80%2Fobj%2FfCatalog%2FCatalog51&submode=catalog&mode=documentation&top=yes . Accessed 12.September 2019.

Prieur, Annick. 'Fargens betydning. Om rasisme og konstruksjon av etniske identiteter', *Sosiologi idag*, 32, no. 4, 2002: 59-82.

Pollock, Mica. *Colormute.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, (2004.

Pollock, David, and Van Reken, Ruth. *Third Culture Kids. Growing up among worlds*. London: Intercultural Press, 2009.

Quinn, Naomi, Sirota Karen Gainer and Peter Stromberg. "Conclusion". In Quinn, Naomi. (ed.) *Advances in Culture Theory from Psychological Anthropology*. New York: Palgrave macmillan, 2018.

Rysst, Mari. *I want to be me. I want to be kul*. PhD thesis, University of Oslo, 2008.

Rysst, Mari. "The Social Importance of Consumption for Inclusion and Exclusion among children in a multi-ethnic suburb of Oslo". *Nordic Journal of Migration Research,* 3, no.1, 2013:19-26.

Rysst, Mari. "Friendship and gender identity among girls in a multicultural setting in Oslo." *Childhood*, http://chd.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/09/12/0907568214549081. 2014.

Rysst, Mari. ""Always a Foreigner?" Ethnic Identity Construction and Belonging Among Youth of Immigrant Origin in Norway". In Herold, Mariella and Rina Contini (eds.), *Living in Two Homes: Integration, Identity and Education of Transnational Migrants in a Globalized World.* Emerald Group Publishing, 2017.

Sandset, Tony. *Color that Matters*. London: Routledge, 2019.

Seeberg, Marie Louise. *Dealing with Difference: Two classrooms, two countries.* PhD thesis, University of Bergen, 2003.

Statistics Norway, a, Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre, 5. March 2019. https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef . Accessed 12. September 2019.

Statistics Norway, b, https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/folkemengde/aar-per-1-januar. Accessed 12. September 2019.

Tatum, Beverly Daniel. *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York: Basic Books, 2003.

Van Reken, Ruth and Bethel, Paulette. "Third Culture Kids: Prototypes for Understanding Other Cross-Cultural Kids". *Intercultural Management Quarterly*, 2005.

Vassenden, Anders. «Hvorfor en sosiologi om norskhet må holde norskheter fra hverandre.» *Sosiologi i dag,* 41, no. 3-4, 2011:156-183.

Wise, Tim. *Colorblind.* San Francisco: City Light Books/Open Media Series, 2010.