

# Self-determination

Unsafe Societies,  
Group Pressure and  
Demands (from friends)

Risks  
factors



Reduced freedom and  
Self-Determination





## Norway

In Norway the municipalities are responsible for helping and supporting persons with intellectual disabilities in developing their individual plan.

Based on registrations of persons receiving support from the municipality (administrative prevalence), there are 21.000 persons (0,45) with intellectual disabilities in Norway.  
Reason to account for about 80.000

In Norway there is no one with an intellectual disability who lives in an institution, everyone live their lives in the community (community living).

80% lives in group homes (2010) with an average of 8 apartments. In 1994 the average was less than 4.



## Citizen-controlled personal assistant CPA (BPA)

Norway has a system for direct founding called "Citizen-controlled personal assistance.

Persons who have significant needs over long time, are entitled to active it on demand.

Those who do,

- becomes employers and have to follow all rules and regulations as an employer (f x ***The Working Environment Act***) that among other things regulate and limit the right to fire an employee.
- the municipality can also be in charge

In 2012 the number of persons who had CPA was 2892, few of them are persons with intellectual disabilities. .

It is estimated that 14.500 that meets the criteria for applying.



## *Background* information

Norway closed down all institutions for persons with intellectual disabilities in a five-year period from **1991-1995**.

One of the objectives of the reform was to strengthen both the person's self-determination and position of citizenship.

Research on living conditions within the institutions, revealed a weak position of citizenship and self-determination.



## From the survey on living condition

A survey was conducted in 1989, 1994, 2001 and 2010 (Tøssebro et al).

One of the themes in the survey is self-determination.

In 1994 the survey showed a strengthened position compared with 1989, but did not increase in 2001.



## Interviews of persons with IDD - findings

In 2010 we conducted interviews on some of the same questions included in the survey, and asked persons with intellectual disabilities themselves (Ellingsen & Kittelsaa).

Some of the findings indicate that the conditions in their services have changed with respect of their influences, but with a clear need of support in handling economy.

Some of the informants stated that friends have a stronger influence and weekends their self-determination more than parents and staff by demanding favors or loyalty.



## More findings

Most of the informants makes their decisions after consulting others, and states that they avoid risky situations and situations that other think of as unsafe.

On questions about going out in the evening, pubs etc., more of them says that “I don’t dear to do that!”.

Almost everyone reports experiences with being bullied.



## Un-Equal terms

Some of the conclusions in the article is, that

- the justice system,
- the police and
- court,

is failing to secure the safety and rights of people with intellectual disabilities.

That is hindering participation and equal opportunities, resulting in decreased self-determination by people with intellectual disabilities.

Many have experienced bullying by mates in school, and responds on treats by retrieving from regular social situations.



## A follow up

In 2014 we did a follow up and asked police officers, judges and care providers about

- crime and victimization
- crime prevention
- Related to persons with intellectual disabilities

»Not yet published

## Two strategies of not being involved?

When episodes of disturbance and crime is reported

Persons who are known having an intellectual disability is more likely to be return back home to his/hers resident then being “helped” by the justice system.

Persons who do not have a diagnosis, but have sever cognitive difficulties, are viewed as a difficult case are more likely left by themselves and also not helped by the justice system.

## Injustices in a state of rule

Lack of police intervention, crime prevention  
and other efforts from the justice system,

brings uncertainty, bullying, hate crime

that results in a disciplining conformity, self-  
restraint and decreased self-determination.

## Contact information

e,mail

[Karl.e.ellingsen@hist.no](mailto:Karl.e.ellingsen@hist.no)

Web site

[Naku.no](http://Naku.no)

