

COMMUNICATING PARENT COMMUNITY AT PREVENTION MEETINGS IN NORWEGIAN SCHOOLS

Abstract

Parental cooperation has increasingly become a key component in alcohol prevention efforts in schools. Many prevention programmes actively utilize parent participation in order to strengthen the sense of community between parents, develop shared attitudes towards alcohol use, delay the beginning of alcohol use for adolescents, and limit alcohol usage by young people. Strengthening community is thus a core goal in prevention activities. This article analyses how community is developed and expressed in discussions during formal school meetings involving parents. The data used in the analysis consists of audio recordings of parent meetings in alcohol prevention programmes for 8th grade students at four separate schools in different regions of Norway. The analysis focuses on how personal pronouns are used in the conversations to signal inclusion or exclusion from the community. The article also discusses how different discursive expressions of community are used by meeting participants to position themselves as responsible parents, and the relevance of these meetings for social work.

Keywords:

Alcohol, community, parent meetings, prevention programme, discourse analysis.

Introduction

“It takes a village to raise a child” is a proverb often cited to motivate the involvement of parents in programmes that target the well-being of children. It contends that the safe upbringing of children requires more than just parents; it also requires a community of parents who are in dialogue with each other, as well as the involvement of other concerned adults. This has led to the development of preventive strategies in social work for engaging parents in developing shared values, norms and rules concerning young people’s alcohol consumption (Ferrer-Wreder et al., 2005).

The basis for this type of preventive strategy is well documented in research and shows that young people whose parents set clear limitations start drinking later and consume less alcohol (Van der Vorst et al., 2005; Koutakis et al., 2008). The sociologist James Coleman (1988) argued that the clear and effective regulation of young people presupposes the availability of places where parents meet and a close social network where parents can share information about their own and other people’s children. A number of Scandinavian studies highlight the importance of parent community for the regulation of adolescent alcohol consumption (Järvinen and Østergård, 2009; Demant and Sonne, 2010). At the same time, a number of studies have argued that informal communities as well as informal social control tend to disintegrate in modern society (Christie, 1982; Putnam, 2000). As a consequence of this the regulation of adolescent alcohol consumption risks becoming fragmented and based on the norms and decisions discussed between parents and children within each individual family (Demant and Ravn, 2012).

Organized parent meetings that aim to prevent alcohol consumption represent a response to this challenge. Central to most of these programs is the organization of discussions between parents, and between parents and youths, in order to develop shared norms and rules around alcohol use among young people. There is not much research on what goes on in these kinds of discussions and in particular, how parents in these discussions develop a common understanding and agreement between themselves. A systematic search of five research databases (Eric, Pubmed, Sage, Scopus and Web of Knowledge) with different combinations of the keywords yielded only a few closely related studies. Particularly relevant here is Rod’s (2010) analysis of the relationship between knowledge about effective prevention at such meetings and parents’ construction of a moral community through discussions at the meetings. He points out that parents’ concern for, and knowledge about their children’s

alcohol consumption discussed at this kind of meeting actually constitutes the parents as a moral community.

The aim of this study is to try to unlock some of the processes at work during the parental discussions at meetings held as part of alcohol prevention programmes for youths. Of particular interest is how some sense of a local, moral community of the kind Rod (2010) discussed is created in and through the discussions. To that end, the analytic approach utilised in this article entails a close examination of the discursive means through which parents express and negotiate common norms around adolescent alcohol use, because these are the primary resources available to parents at the meetings. This kind of analysis may not be common in social work research, but may add knowledge that can be important for social work practice as it indicate ways of organizing discussions in at least some kinds of preventive social work interventions. It can also contribute to a critical discussion about preventive programmes and practices.

Preventive programs, community and discourse

Parental cooperation has in recent years become increasingly important in alcohol prevention strategies for children and young people, including both preventive strategies aimed at particular problems concerning vulnerable children, young people and parents (Henggeler et al., 1998; Patterson et al., 2002), as well as universal strategies to reduce the risk of problem development (Spath et al. 2002; Koutakis et al., 2008). The universal strategies are mainly rooted in the school as an institutional framework. This implies that collaboration between schools and parents and conducting parent meetings are an essential part of this strategy. On the basis of this, many alcohol prevention programs have been developed for use in schools with parents' meetings as an essential component. In many countries, these programs constitute an important part of public policy to delay alcohol debut and reduce substance abuse problems (Ferrer-Wreder et al., 2005; Toland et al., 2007).

Delaying the age of alcohol debut is amongst the key objectives in all these programs. This is based on well-documented correlation between low debut age, high consumption of alcohol and high risk for developing substance abuse problems (Pedersen and Skrondal, 1998). It is also well documented that young people who receive alcohol from their parents have significantly higher consumption than other youths (Pedersen, 1991). Furthermore, we know that parents with restrictive norms with respect to their own children's alcohol use have a

significant influence on youths' actual alcohol use. Parents' attitudes and norms regarding young people's use of alcohol are therefore one of the most central subjects at these parents' meetings.

One such program used in Norway is the alcohol prevention program "Youth & Alcohol". Youth & Alcohol is a universal alcohol prevention program in school for youth in the 8th grade (age 13-14) and their parents and used all over Norway. Parents' cooperation in the program consists of two meetings, one in which only parents participate and one in which both parents and young people participate. Both meetings are organized in three parts. First, they start with an introduction, often by the teacher responsible for leading the meeting. Second, the meeting continues with group discussions amongst the participants based on specific issues. Finally, it ends with a summary of the discussions in a plenary session. The aim of both meetings is to formulate a set of shared norms on which both parents and young people agree. This aim is communicated to the parents, both in the invitation to the meetings, at the introduction given at the meetings and in the final summary of the discussions.

In the meetings the development of shared norms and values is supposed through the discussions between parents. This implies that parents primarily have to use discursive resources in order both to communicate their own norms, learning about other parents' norms, and to engage in critical discussions in order to develop some kind of consensus concerning norms. These discussions are organized within an institutional framework for an explicit purpose: achieving consensus around adolescent alcohol use and establishing a community to enforce these norms. Developing shared norms is thus not just a question of individual parents having the same norms but is tightly connected with the issue of belonging to a group of parents that collectively can enforce these norms. This implies that the development of a sense of belonging to a community of parents is central to the aims of the program and hence also for the parental discussions in the meetings. The meetings can thus be understood as a strategy to develop a moral community of parents who share two characteristics that are central to the way the term "community" often is used in preventive social work. Parents who are invited to the meetings are in a common situation in that they have children at the same age and in the same school, and as a consequence of how schools in Norway are organized it also means that they live in the same local communities (Ferrer Wreder 2005, s.228; Turunen 2009, p. 49).

Given that the parents basically can only position themselves and engage with others through the use of discursive means, it becomes especially important to look closer at the way the parent make use of their linguistic resources. Of particular interest is the use of pronouns although this may be thought to be quite incidental in this context. Pronouns actually carry tremendous weight in people's understanding of themselves and others and their relations. It is by the use of pronouns that speakers inform other participants about who is speaking and in what capacity (as a parent or as a professional for instance). The choice of pronoun also indicates who the interlocutors are and the relationship between the speaker and the other participants. Since this study examines expressions of community, it is especially interesting to study the use of the plural pronouns like "we" and "us". These pronouns can be used either to *include* or *exclude* people in a community, which is possible because the pronoun "we" can be used in varying ways (Hydén, 2001, 2012; Muhlhäusler and Harré, 1990; Sacks, 1992; Silverman 1998). For example, "we" sometimes includes only the person who speaks and what is represented (e.g., "we on our part"). Other utterances may include the speaker as well as the addressee (e.g., "we agree") and other participants who are present might also be included (e.g., "we who are present here") as well as include all individuals belonging to the same category (e.g., "we who are parents"). A further dimension of pronoun use is whether the use is explicit (e.g., "we who are parents") or implicit (e.g., "as things were when we were young"). It can also be accomplished through the use of different pronouns that widen the conversation to include the various positions (being "responsible" or "irresponsible"), roles ("father", "mother"), and relationships (between parents and children in the same type of environment) that participants may take up in relation to each other during the conversation (Muhlhäusler and Harré, 1990).

In sum, different uses of the pronouns "we" and "us" effectively communicates both the establishment of a (possible) community between parents, as well as who is to be included in or excluded from this community. With this in mind, the research question can be defined more precisely: how do the participants in these parent meetings use pronouns in their utterances to foster inclusion in, or exclusion from, the community?

Data and analysis

The data for this study was collected in the autumn of 2009 at meetings held for parents at four Norwegian schools. These schools share some common features. First, they all conducted

their parent meetings a part of the Norwegian program “Youth and Alcohol” (www.ungeogrus.no). The four schools are located in different regions: one school is in a municipal center in Northern Norway (A), one school is in a rural district in Central Norway (B) and two schools are in Oslo, one of which is located in East Oslo (C) and one in West Oslo (D). Although the program is available across all of Norway, it is the local municipalities that can decide to make participation in the program compulsory. All of the analyzed schools in this study had participated in the program for some time, which varied in length from anywhere between three to seven years.

Outside of the common features of the programme, each school decides how to organize the discussion in the meetings, which led to some variation across the four schools in this study. As mentioned above, the aim of the meetings is to formulate a set of common attitudes regarding alcohol use that both parents and adolescents agree upon. In this article the focus is just on the discussions between the parents, and specifically on the ways they establish and negotiate a sense of community among themselves.

The data consists of audio recordings of one group discussion between parents at each school, and from the discussions summarizing the group discussions, field notes from observations of the meetings, and documents used in meetings such as invitations, introductions, pre-formulated topics of discussion, and meeting minutes. A letter about the study sent before the meeting informed parents; consent to audio recording was obtained at the beginning of the meetings. The field notes and the documents all provide a supplement to this analysis. In this study, there is no data about parents who do not participate in the meetings beyond the ways they are described by parents who participate.

The recordings of the meetings were transcribed verbatim. For some exchanges transcription was difficult as several conversations took place simultaneously; however, the advantage of using audio recordings from the meetings is that they provide data from the conversations as they flow between the meeting participants in real time and they also enable a close analysis of the utterances as they occur in the conversations (Silverman, 2006). The data in this study was analyzed in several steps. The focus on how pronouns are used in utterances was analyzed using the verbatim transcripts from the meetings with a focus on the question of how a sense of community is established, expressed and negotiated in the meetings. When reading the transcripts utterances containing the plural pronouns “we” and “us” were noted. Based on

this analysis different patterns in these utterances and conversation interactions were identified, allowing an analysis of whether systematic changes in the ways plural pronouns are used during these meetings could be observed.

Establishing community

The analysis of utterances positioning some kind of sense of community is based on the context of the discussions, particularly as they relate to the objective of formulating shared norms regarding youth and the consumption of alcohol. Development of community is demonstrated by conversations that begin with phrases such as “in our home” and conclude with “we who are here”, indicating a shift from one family as a frame of reference to a community consisting of all parents present in the classroom as the dominant frame of reference.

The analysis identified a number of ways the parents constructed communities. First, participants at the meetings establish communities such as “our own family”, “we who participate at the meeting”, “we who share common opinions”, or “we who are parents in the same village”. Second, these communities are often used to construct a relation between different communities, such as “we who participate at the meeting” in opposition to “those who never come”, thus positioning inclusion and exclusion. The examples in the following are chosen because they are representative of the conversations that took place across the meetings and demonstrate important variation.

At the start of the parent meetings there are many examples of utterances that begin with the phrase “in our home” An example of this occurred at the start of a discussion about the appropriate age for children to be introduced to alcohol that took place between six parents at the school in the Northern Norwegian municipal center. The question asked in the group was: “when should young people be allowed to taste their first alcoholic drink?” A father started the discussion in the following way:

Example 1.

Father: not in our home ...
we think that they should be ...
they must be 18 years old ...

really
as a starting point

In this example the father is clear about defining his sense of belonging: he is addressing the other participants as a representative of his family and home. He does this both by stating “in our home” and then by using the collective noun “we” (“we think”) and thus pointing out that it is not his personal view that he is expressing, but rather the family’s. In doing this he is presenting his and his family’s view as his first input to the discussion. At the beginning of a group discussion between five mothers at a different school – in the socially well off West Oslo – alcohol habits there were described as follows:

Example 2.

Mother: in our home it is
it is
I drink wine when I want a glass of wine
not every day, because it is inconvenient when I am up at five thirty to get to
work
but otherwise in social relationships with friends and at family parties and such
we enjoy wine
yes
and with good food and on festive occasions

This mother initially states her position on alcohol norms by presenting not her personal views but the views of her family: “in our home”. The key point to be noted in both Example 1 and 2 is the frame of reference of the utterance: the parents participate as representatives of their own individual families. In other words, they refer to conversations, attitudes, and experience within their own family. While the pronouns “us” and “we” in this context might refer to slightly different family relationships, the data does not provide any systematic information about the different family constellations, but they probably consist of relationships between two parents and possibly adult family friends who constitute the common “we” in the statements above. The context of the utterance is also important because it is a group conversation in which only adults are involved, suggesting that the “we” relates to the adults present.

The only expression alternating with “in our home” as a frame of reference is when “I, on my part” is used, as in Example 3 consisting of two utterances from a mother at a school in West Oslo.

Example 3.

Mother: I do not know what the rest of you think ...

Mother: I think it is quite common that ...

The mother’s two utterances are examples of typical introductions to voicing an opinion. The utterances at the beginning of these meetings either refer to each adult individual, or to a community of parents in the family. There are two noteworthy aspects to these utterances. First, they express recognition of the unique circumstances surrounding the parent meetings by positioning her utterance as part of an ongoing discussion: “I do not know what the rest of you think”. She positions herself as an individual (“I”) against a group, the “you” in the phrase “the rest of you”. In suggesting her own views she also positions herself as “I” (“I think”) and not as a representative of her family as in Examples 1 and 2. By demonstrating that she as an individual does not know what the other participants think about these issues she also positions herself as being unsure of what might be considered normal and acceptable norms in the parental group. Second, developing a stronger community between parents is a fundamental goal in these meetings and the mother’s positioning can also be understood as an expression of an adaptation to the perceived objective of the parent meeting. Thus her utterances also indicate a frame of reference for the individual participant in which certain individually-held attitudes and values are emphasized, while also balancing awareness that they are participating in conversations in order to develop consensus around the topic at hand.

All the utterances at the start of the group discussions present the parents as relating to their social contexts as they pertain to the prevention of adolescent alcohol consumption. In the data there are no examples of utterances referring to a collective frame of reference that is external to the individual or family at the beginning of the meetings. For instance, none of the participants relate a sense of a community such as “we in our neighborhood think”, “we, here, in the same village”, “we as members of the same sports club”, “we who share the same

religion”, or “we who meet children and youth daily through our work”. The lack of this kind of reference highlights the absence of a common, collective frame of reference at the beginning of these meetings, thus indicating reluctance among the parents to position themselves as representatives of extra-family community. This might also point to a possible privatization of alcohol-related norms.

Over the course of the meetings, the frame of reference for parental utterances evolved to refer to “we who are present here at the meeting”. The participants both establish and express a belonging to the community of those parents who are present by the use of phrases such as this. In Example 4 a father and teacher at the final plenary meeting discuss whether it is acceptable to contact other parents in order to discuss the behavior of their children.

Example 4.

Teacher: the common ground is the cooperation between parents
and you have decided that if it is so....
then you'll tell them

Father: yes we agreed to that
but you never know how you will react when you are in that situation
because it is a very stressful situation
and not all parents are present here
so it is ...
but it is true - we agree that whatever we will tell

The father is giving voice for the general consensus among those parents present by stating that it is acceptable to contact other parents about their children. In doing this he is expressing a moral community between the parents present, but he at the same excludes the absent parents from this community.

In sum, the various ways parents position themselves at the beginning of the meeting is characterized by many reservations, a lot of uncertainty, and different strategies to adapt to the opinions of what participants think is common on the part of the other parents. There are no examples in the data in which individually held opinions are unequivocally conveyed at the beginning of the meetings while more inclusive expressions of community and belonging develop later on in the discussions.

Negotiating consensus

The expressions of community remain inextricably linked to the objective of formulating common positions about youth alcohol consumption, and the evolving dynamics of the conversations thus reflects the process of creating and formulating consensus. Sometimes this agreement is achieved through immediate agreements, but more often through adaptation and formulation of a compromise among participants. For instance, in the rural school in Central Norway, the following conversation sequence took place between three of the parents in a group discussion:

Example 5.

Mother 1: for my part, public parties are OK after the age of confirmation

Father: yes

Mother 1: that's my limit

Mother 2: yes that's mine too

Father: and that was normal when we were young, too

Mother 1: yes after we were confirmed

Under consideration here by the participants is an agreed age threshold at which youth can attend parties where they will likely also consume alcohol. The discussion occurs between three of the parents who all grew up in this village and in the utterances there are references to a shared tradition: “when we were young”. These utterances indicate that participants share several social experiences beyond the fact that they are parents of children in the same school class, and provide one of the few examples in the data where it is possible to identify a collective frame of reference. This corroborates other studies that have shown that such collective frames of reference still have greater significance in rural communities than in urban areas (Demant and Sonne, 2010).

The last utterance in Example 5 indicates that these parents live in a village where a Christian confirmation is still understood as a rite of passage after which introduction to alcohol takes place. In the example the parents present themselves both as members of a “we” and as individual “I’s”. When the parents justify the age of introducing alcohol to young people they

present their argument as an individual attitude (“I”, “mine”). But it is important to note that the individual “I’s” are based on their experiences as members of the village Christian community and are not an expression of private views. The “we” the parents refer to is confirmed in the conversation through a perceived common history and a shared position.

The common “we” in the example includes the three parents as well as the other parents who have grown up in this village. However, it also *excludes* two of the parents present in the group discussion that are from another part of the country. The two parents are neither members of this community nor do they confirm the consensus of the opinions expressed by the others. This exclusion creates a problem in the group because the group discussion is organized as an attempt to have participants reach a mutual consensus. By excluding some participants, the group does not succeed in accomplishing the stated goals and they fail to make compromises regarding the appropriate age to introduce adolescents to alcohol. To this point, at the end of the conversation, the father of an immigrant family gives up attempting to achieve a consensus, and makes his family’s position clear:

Example 6.

Father: but on the other hand and in itself
I don’t want that ...
that my kids should start drinking alcohol at all
to put it that way ...
yes so I don’t know if I will let them try it either

This father’s strategy is to reduce the problems of disagreement by trying to delimit it and making it clear that this is an attitude that is “on the other hand” and “in itself”. As such it expresses acceptance that this attitude has no chance of becoming valid as a commonly held consensus for the group. That is, he positions himself outside the group thus excluding himself from the community the other participants define themselves as members of.

A group conversation at the school in East Oslo provides another useful example of an effort by participants to achieve a shared agreement on alcohol norms. The first subject discussed in this group was when young people should come home at night. Most parents agreed that 9 p.m. was acceptable. However, one mother disagreed and said 6 p.m. was more acceptable. This created a problem in the group that they had to try to solve. The discussion about this

issue lasted for almost 10 minutes. In Example 7, Mother 1 argues for 6 p.m. as an acceptable time, while Mother 2 and Father 2 favor 9 p.m.

Example 7.

- Mother 1:** no in the neighbourhood, there she can go ...
she can go out for an hour or so ...
but ...
other places ...
no
- Father 2:** no our children are not allowed to hang around at the shopping center
- Mother 2:** no no
but in general
at least on the football field where they meet the girls and boys
then it's OK
- Mother 1:** and when they are at handball and stuff like that, that's fine for me,
but I thought that maybe they go to the city center and things like that
- Father 2:** No... I understand...

Through this conversation the problem of arriving at a common curfew is finally resolved and the compromise achieved is that there are various curfews that differ depending on where the children are going. The participants do hold different attitudes in relation to the problem that needs to be solved. In view of this, the notion of “different places” becomes a resource to solve the problem: a distinction between hanging out at the shopping center or city center is contrasted with hanging out at the football field. This distinction gives the parents the possibility to resolve their disagreement by talking themselves out of disagreement and thus establish themselves as a community of parents that are able to collectively enforce this norm.

The Others

In the discussion no we/they formulations based on local affiliation, ethnicity, or gender, were found. The only we/they distinction used in the discussions was between “we who are here” and “parents not present”. Parents who do not attend the meeting are positioned as “the others”. This is found in all the group discussions and occurs independently of whether or not

there are many or few parents that do not participate in the meetings. The one difference occurred when only a few parents attended the meetings. The lack of participation was then characterized as a case of problematic democracy. This indicates that the parents involved in this discussion were concerned that they would be a minority making the decisions for many, something they suspected would diminish the likelihood that the agreements would be valid across all members of the extended community. The suggested solution to this problem was practical and pragmatic, entailing writing minutes to be sent to everyone who was not in attendance.

Given that the absent participants were mentioned frequently, it is important to ask how those who do not attend the meeting are described and what meaning this has for the community expressed amongst parents at the meeting. An utterance from a mother in the school in Northern Norway illustrates this point (Example 8).

Example 8.

Mother: but today I would have thought that if all the parents had shown up there
would be standing room only here
some parents will not show up
and they will never show up either

As this example illustrates, the characteristics of those who do not come are seldom described explicitly, but are described as those parents who “will not show up” and “never will show up”. Sometimes the characteristics are more concrete and the participants speculate that they may be “shy” or they may feel “insecure” at such meetings. In no discussions are religion and ethnicity used as a way to describe the parents that are absent, “the others”, although in interviews teachers in East Oslo suggested that parents with a Muslim background generally do not attend the meetings.

This way of describing those who do not come is significant for delineating a border between “we who are here” and “those who never come” and thus including and excluding parents in the community that is supposed to enforce certain alcohol-related norms. Additionally, the descriptions of “*those* who will not come” implicitly attributes credit to “*we* who participate”. This is also very important for positioning and self-presentation for parents participating at the meeting.

Discussion

The analysis of the parental discussions at the program meetings at four Norwegian schools shows that the parents tend not to use a community outside the meeting as a frame of reference for their opinions; various strategies are used to formulate common rules for the youth; and those who attend the meeting constitute a special parent category in contrast with those who do not attend. Shared frames of references, shared understandings and attending the meetings thus emerge as important aspects of establishing and negotiating the parental communities that are supposed to enforce alcohol norms for youths. As a consequence of this, certain parents are positioned to be included in these communities while others are excluded or exclude themselves.

It is important to notice that the data used is limited to the discussions at the meetings. It is thus not possible to draw any conclusions about whether these expressions of community are carried over to other situations outside the meetings; nor whether the established communities will continue to exist over time. There is a general lack of research about this issue.

The expressions of community in the discussions can be seen as a unifying activity to construct and present what could be called “the responsible parents”. In the conversations, “responsible parents” attend the meetings and those who do not are characterized as “irresponsible”. The fact that some parents do not participate due to various practical or other legitimate reasons is not brought into consideration. The responsible parent’s self-presentation is organized around attempts to establish a community with others who also express community as a core value for responsible upbringing. Participation communicates messages to the parents in attendance of caring for one another’s children (Rod, 2010) and suggests that responsibility and community represent two inseparable core values that are developed and expressed at these meetings. This is something that is also expressed clearly when future contact between the parents is discussed. Parents who participated expressed that it was acceptable, and indeed desirable, to contact other parents with questions about your own children or their children. This may concern practical issues such as verifying plans for staying overnight or discussing rumors about young people drinking alcohol. However, those present at the meeting express uncertainty about contacting those parents who do not attend the meetings, which further underlines the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility constructed among parents at these meetings.

Neglected in the discussions is an opportunity for parents to talk about their own failures, problems, and irresponsible behavior. Uncertainties and dilemmas are communicated implicitly, but not stated explicitly. This does not mean that the meetings help to generate a flawless image of the participants, but it does mean that these meetings are integral for formulating a shared standard for how responsible parents behave.

What can be gained from analyzing micro aspects of interaction between people compared to interviews with participants or effect studies based on surveys is that it becomes possible to describe in detail the ways parents propose, negotiate and revise their norms concerning their children's alcohol consumption. Through this analysis it becomes clear that one of the central challenges of the programme is to establish shared, common norms that not only include the parents that are present, but also the absent parents, "the others". The analysis clearly showed that parents in their discussion had a strong tendency to position themselves in opposition to the absent parents. Dealing with this opposition is even more important if those parents not present are parents with fewer cultural and economic resources, thus making these parents more vulnerable facing their teenagers on their own. This opposition between the participants and "the others" provides a basis for a critical discussion of what possibilities and limitations such universal prevention programs may have as a contribution to social work. Such preventive strategy can be understood as a resource to make contact and establish common standards between parents who will attend parent meetings at school. It may also contribute to social inequalities and to further exclusion of parents who for various reasons do not attend. The strategy thus may challenge the core values of community social work where the central claim is to mobilize vulnerable groups and contribute to increased inclusion and social justice (Hugman and Bartolomei 2014). There are thus reasons to ask critical questions about whether universal prevention program in school contributes to this. Our study here do not give that answer, but we highlight some challenges within social work practice and issues where there is a need for more research.

Literature

Christie N (1982) *Hvor tett et samfunn*. [How tightly knit a society] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Coleman J (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (S1): 95-120.

Demant J and Sonne A (2010) Boomerang effekten! - sociale netværks betydning for forhandlinger om alkohol. I: *Unge, rusmidler og sociale netværk*, [The boomerang effect! - Social Network significance of negotiations on alcohol. In: *Young, drugs and social Network*] (ed Pedersen M U and Kolind T). Aarhus: Universitetsforlag. 84-108.

Demant J and Ravn S (2012) Communicating trust between parents and children: A case study of adolescent's alcohol use. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 28 (3): 325-347.

Ferrer-Wreder L, Stattin H, Lorente C, Tubmann J G and Adamson L (2005). *Successful Prevention and Youth Development Programs: Across Borders*. Stockholm: Gothia.

Henggeler S W, Schoenwald, S K, Borduin C M, Rowland M D and Cunningham P B (1998) *Multisystemic treatment of antisocial behavior in children and adolescents*. New York: The Guilford Press

Hugman, R. and Bartolomei, L. (2014) The ethics of participation in community work practice. In: Larsen, A. K., Sewpaul, V. and Hole, G. H. (ed.) *Participation in Community Work. International perspectives*. New York: Routledge

Hydén L C (2001) Who!? Identity in Institutional Contexts. In: Seltzer M. Kullberg C, Olesen, S P & Rostila, I (Ed.), *Listening to the Welfare State* (pp. 213-240). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hydén L C and Nilsson E (2013) Couples with dementia: Positioning the "we". *Dementia*. First published as doi: 10.1177/1471301213506923.

Järvinen M and Østergaard J (2009) Governing Adolescent Drinking. *Youth & Society*, Volume 40 Number 3, 377-402.

Koutakis N, Stattin H and Kerr M (2008) Reducing Youth Alcohol Drinking Through a Parent-Targeted Intervention: The Örebro Prevention Program. *Addiction*, vol. 103: 1629-1637.

Muhlhäusler P and Harré R (1990) *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Patterson G R, Reid J B and Eddy J M (2002) A Brief History of the Oregon Model. In Reid J

- B, Patterson G R and Snyder J (eds.) *Antisocial Behavior in Children and Adolescents. A Developmental Analysis and Model for Intervention*. Washington DC, American Psychological Association: 3-25.
- Pedersen W (1991): Drugs in adolescent world. A longitudinal study of adolescent drug use socialization. University of Oslo
- Pedersen W and Skrondal A (1998): Alcohol consumption debut: Predictors and consequences. *J Stud Alcohol*;59(1):32-42
- Putnam R D (2000) *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Rod M H (2010) *Forebyggelsens momenter. En antropologisk analyse af evidens og etik i tiltag rettet imod unges brug af alkohol*. [Prevention moments. An anthropological analysis of evidence and ethics in strategies towards young people's use of alcohol]. PhD Thesis, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Sacks H (1992) *Lectures on Conversation. Vol. 1 and 2*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Silverman D (1998) *Harvey Sacks. Social Science and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Silverman D (2006) *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Third Edition. Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage Publication.
- Spoth R L, Redmond C, Trudeau L and Shin C (2002) Longitudinal substance initiation outcomes for a universal intervention combining family and school programs. *Psychology of Addict Behave*, vol. 16: 129-134.
- Tolan P, Szapocnik J and Sambrano S, ed, (2007). *Preventing Youth Substance Abuse. Science-Based Programs for Children and Adolescents*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Turunen P (2009) Nordic community work in transition – a change towards diversity and reflexivity. In: Strand Hutchinson G (ed.) *Community work in the Nordic countries – new trends*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Van der Vorst H, Engels C M, Meeus W, Dekovic M and van Leeuwe J (2005) The role of alcohol-specific socialization in adolescent´ drinking behavior. *Addiction*, vol. 100: 1464-1476.

www.ungeogrus.no.