

Presentation title:

Vulnerable areas in Oslo

Speaker: Annica Allvin (Norwegian Police University College, Norway)

Co-authors: Manne Gerell (Malmö University, Sweden), Torbjørn Skardhamar (University of Oslo, Norway)

In the last decade, Sweden has seen a large increase in gang violence strongly linked to vulnerable neighborhoods (Sturup et al., 2018; Sturup et al., 2019, Gerell et al., 2021). This has fueled concern over vulnerable neighborhoods across the Nordic countries. In Norway and Denmark for instance, a recurring public debate is how to avoid getting “Swedish conditions” and its implications for gang violence, and more broadly, ethnic segregation (Gerell et al., 2022; Lokland & Nilsson, 2018; Johansson, 2018; Lie, 2019). As a result, a larger focus has been given to the spatial separation of different social groups and geographical crime analysis within the police. Each year, the Danish government lists neighborhoods considered vulnerable. In 2022 they listed 20 with 12 deemed to have greater problems (The Danish Ministry of Interior and Housing, 2021). In Sweden, the police biannually release a list of vulnerable neighborhoods with the latest containing 61, with 19 labelled particularly vulnerable. In Norway though there is no official list but since 2017 the City of Oslo use a cross-agency method to lift areas with greater physical and social vulnerabilities. They do not however follow a structured approach to identify vulnerable areas, and crime and crime prevention is not mentioned when identifying them (The City of Oslo, 2016). In the present study we analyze what could be perceived as vulnerable neighborhoods in Oslo using the methods applied in Sweden (Guldåker et al., 2021) and Denmark (Danish government, 2017). In doing so, we identify the differences that exist between the two methods and what neighborhoods might be considered as vulnerable in Oslo when using them. To further build on our understanding of vulnerable neighborhoods, we also analyze whether there are differences in crime levels between areas identified with both methods, and what neighborhoods might be identified as vulnerable based on crime as opposed to demographic and socioeconomic variables.