"Local social integration between utility, change and idealism"

Local integration of young adults with intellectual disabilities in the Co-operative Hjortshøj in Denmark

Anja Jørgensen*

Mia Arp Fallov*

AALBORG UNIVERSITET

*Associate Professor, Ph.D. Anja Jørgensen
Department of Sociology and Social Work
Aalborg University
Kroghstraede 5
9220 Aalborg East, Denmark

*Associate Professor, Ph.D. Mia Arp Fallov
Department of Sociology and Social Work
Aalborg University
Kroghstraede 7
9220 Aalborg East, Denmark

Introduction

On the general level this paper is about local social integration with a focal point on residence, settlement patterns and local (work) communities. In contemporary society, the urban social-geographical segregation (Andersen 2005) is intensified so that people who are socially comparable live more often in geographical proximity with each other. This development has caused a lot of social effects in society related to social inequality and social integration. Particularly for the socially vulnerable groups and people with functional limitations social-geographical segregation means that they are practically not living in middleclass and elite residential areas. The consequences are not only to a matter of a socioeconomic polarization, but also means diminishinglocal social interaction and meetings between different social groups in everyday life. But what is happening if local capacities try to change and influence this for the better? Is it possible and what does it require?

On the specific level this paper is about an unusual project of residential integration in Andelssamfundet (cooperative society) Hjortshøj (AiH)in Denmark. The initiative behind the project was taken in a partnership between residents of AiH and the Municipality of Aarhus, which is the second largest town in Denmark.

Andelssamfundet I Hjortshøj

The project is about local social integration of 16 young adults with intellectual disabilities through the creation of residential and occupational possibilities in the local community. The Municipality of Aarhus has financed 16 individual homes within the AiH and has

2

referred relevant residents for these homes. RealDania – a private foundation in the field of urban developing – has financed the architectural development of these homes as well as a research project and all communication and knowledge sharing of the project. The unusual components of the projects are primarily that it is the residents of AiH that took the initiative and in this sense "actively" invited a group of people that normally would not settle in an area like this. This invitation was given in a contemporary society where the most common discussion in this field is about social segregation and the so-called NotInMyBackYard (NIMBY)-syndrome. Through the past 10-15 years there have been a lot of neighbor-protests in residential areas where public authorities has established housing-project for different kind of vulnerable and exposed groups in society (Jørgensen 2006; Jørgensen og Mølholt 2007). As a counter reaction or reply to this development the residents of AiH launched the integration project under the headline WIMBY (Welcome In My Back-Yard).

From the very beginning the role of the neighbors has been crucial. This is both as initiators, fundraisers and as those who are responsible for the integration of the young adults in the the everyday life of the local community in AiH. Anja Jørgensen og Mia Arp Fallov, Aalborg University have followed this project from the day that the Municipality of Aarhus allocated money for the project and through the different phases of the project until it has existed for two years.

This paper is both about the conditions that creates and maintain such a project and it is about the individual and collective experiences of community related to local social integration.

The empirical material and methodology

Andelssamfundet i Hjortshøj (AiH) is located 15 kilometer North of Århus which is the 2nd largest town in Denmark. It was established as a housing cooperative in 1986 and the first houses where moved into in 1993. The aim was to create a community based on ecological principles while also emphasizing local community. Today, AIH has 300 inhabitants divided in eight dwelling-groups. The houses that constitute these different dwelling-groups

have been built at different points in time and represent a variety of architecture and type of dwelling. The first houses were owner-occupied dwellings, and later on came both rented housing and cooperative dwellings. Architecturally these range from detached family house, apartment buildings and terraced house. The residential-group no. 6 is situated right in the middle of AiH close to some of the first established residential-groups (no. 1 and 2) and on the other side the newest residential groups (no. 7 and 8).

Map

The empirical material of this study consists of semi-structured qualitative interviews with residents in AiH that has been conducted within two periods. The first round was conducted when residential-group 6 was under construction whereas the second round was conducted after the residential-group 6 has been in AiH for a year. This means 18 interviews with residents through two rounds of interviews. The informants are sampled so that they represent residents from all residential-groups.

Some informants are interviewed in both the first and second round. The informants are selected primarily to represent both residents who have been actively involved in developing the project about the integration of residential-group 6 and residents who have been less active. Furthermore, we have when possible sampled informants so there is a proliferation of gender, age and living arrangements and how long they have lived in AiH. Out of 14 informants we have 10 women and 5 men. The interviews were conducted either in residents 'own homes or in one of the residential-groups' meeting houses.

The interviews have focused on neighbor relationship to each other and to residential-group 6. Thematically, the informants were asked about their history of living and settlement associated with AIH and about their experiences of the area, their knowledge of and relationship with residential-group 6, their experience of the neighboring community, and about their everyday life. We have also participated in a number of coordination meetings with the project-partnership with participants from both Aarhus and the residents of AiH.

The interview material is transcribed and analyzed thematically. Our main focus has been on uncovering neighbor relations in AIH and resident's relation and reaction to residential group 6 and to follow this over time.

Local communities between social segregation and social integration -theoretical framing of residential project in AIH

Since the early days of the profession, sociologists have been aware of the difference between social relationships that are tied together by a specific purpose and social relations whose primary focus is the relationship itself. While the first type of social relation is associated with the modern urbanized society, the latter is usually associated with the pre-modern, tradition-bound and more rural communities (Tönnies 1885; Durkheim 1893). The early sociologists had many concerns about social relationships in modern society, as these were associated with monetary interaction and rationalization (Weber 1921; Simmel 1998/1903). Was it only profitable social relations that would survive? Would modern man evolve as a utility oriented and selfish individual to the extent that previously known social relations would disintegrate? Would new social bonds evolve in a society that is not rested on tradition and place-attachment? Later it has been discussed whether the distinction between traditional and modern has been beneficial to the understanding of our contemporary (Latour 2006) as modern society has been understood as just the combination of goal-oriented and activity sharing communities (Putnam 2000). Place as a scene for social relations with important social bonds has played an important role in this discussion. Most sociologists agree that (late) modern society is characterized by a reduced degree of place-attachment than was the case earlier. Increased mobility opportunities, changes in economic structures and consequent urbanization created through the 19th and 20th century waves of migrations from rural to urban areas and thereby lesser degree of place-attachment.

In the cities, a new type of social bonds emerged. These are not rested on tradition and historical ties to particular places, but unfolded as a quest for people that you socially and culturally identify with. Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess (1925) described such

Kommentar [MAF1]: uklart

settlement in the city as a conglomerate of different social and cultural worlds - in recent times this has been termed "social segregation" (Andersen 2005). In the socially differentiated and segregated cities social and cultural groups live geographically close to each other without mutual interaction. Settlements in traditional were characterized by social diversity while settlement in the modern metropolis tend to create socially and culturally homogeneous areas. The city as a whole is diverse but district-wise very different. Segregation is most evident at the periphery of the city were residential areas for the middle class, working class, the lower part of the middle class and the elite are situated. In the innermost parts of the city people are least attached to the place. These areas were termed "Zones in Transition" by Park & Burgess because most people stayed temporarily in these areas (Park and Burgess 1925). Later, it was pointed out that these zones in transition in urban Europe mostly are located in the urban periphery (Jørgensen 2010).

As a result of the changes in settlement patterns pessimism was expressed from the very beginning of urban sociology in the analysis of urban life. The core issue was the lack of long-lasting social relations, and community and mutual responsibility in urban environments (Simmel, 1998/1903; Tönnies, 1996/1887, Wirth, 1938). With the development of the human ecology perspective in 1925, Park and Burgess (1925) launched a more shared vision for the city and the urban community. They introduced a differentiated approach, suggesting the so-called concentric zone model, in which the city is seen as consisting of a large number of different sub-societies rather than one single environment.

Local communities

Kommentar [MAF2]: ??

The above outlined developments have in recent times led to a strong focus on local social inclusion and on local communities. On the one hand, the question of social-spatial segregation, and on the other hand, the issue of local social relations. Since Hans Thor Andersen in 2005 published his thesis "The city's changing social geography", there has in the Danish context been a strong research focus on social-spatial segregation and its significance when it comes to inequality, access to public services and economic growth (Olsen 2005; Christensen & Rasmussen 2008). This has also given rise to varies analyzes of the so-called neighborhood effects (Brooks-Gunn et al1993; Diez 2001; Hussain et.al 2013). These studies were rooted in the growing political interest in social spatial segregation that occurred during the 1990s, among other things, had materialized in the so-called "Urban Committee", which in the period from 1993-1998 was behind some of the analyzes of the problems that had arisen in many public housing estates in Denmark (SBI 1999). A more general social-spatial segregation was considered as one of the most fundamental reasons, which laid the groundwork for the next great research attention to general social-spatial segregation as discussed above.

On the other hand, there has also been an increasing focus on local communities and everyday life in neighborhoods and communities, whether they are case-oriented or interaction-oriented (Jørgensen 2006 Mazanti 2005 Naboskabet.dk). There have been different approaches to this theme. Some have been focused on exploring the importance and level of local communities in the face of post-modern sociological discussions about place attachment and mobility (Jorgensen 2006; Jorgensen 2010; Fallov, Jorgensen, Knudsen 2013) while others have been more concerned to revitalize local communities and strengthen and empower (empowerment) local actors as part of catalyzing social change through political awareness and participation "from below" (Andersen 2003; Fallov 2014).

Whatever angle and purpose there is growing awareness of the local. An attention, which on the face of it may appear paradoxical when you consider that one of the most common features of the late modern society is the technological ability to be mobile and in contact and interaction over long geographical distances. Throughout 2001'erne there was a marked perception that access to transport, internet and other technology easily, quickly and at a

low cost could bring people in virtual or physical contact with each other, and that this postmodern condition would erode the importance of concrete locations and the idea of social relations tied to these (Giddens 1994, Castells 1997 Sennett 1999, Sassen 2000, Bauman 2002). Empirical studies in Denmark showed that place attachment and local orientation was still an important focal point for many people and that mobility and community is not opposing, but rather mutually constitutive (Jorgensen 2008; Fallov, Jorgensen & Knudsen 2013)

Social-spatial segregation

Forces of social-spatial segregation bring together people with similar social background in places. The part of the population who are not able to take care of themselves, are no longer socially integrated in a local community that they have historical or tradition based connections to. They are, as anyone else, settled among socially similar residents. This often means public housing with cheap rentals. Social segregation is not only a problem about the welfare state and increased general inequality; it is also a question of integration and opportunities for local social integration.

For the well-off and for those who are strongly attached to the labor market these problems are associated with the question of participation in local activities, associations, parent councils, parish councils, etc. Problems that there is a growing societal awareness of, but not problems, which are life threatening to the individual everyday life. For those who have a weak or non-existent connection to labor market and who are otherwise challenged, the consequences of social spatial segregation are different.

The conditions for entering the labor market are difficult for these groups. They typically live in residential areas with different public-driven local communities which gives meaning, security and comfort to everyday life, but which do not necessarily make them feel useful in a similar manner as integration on the labour market. Feelings of being useful and needed, and thus integrated, are closely connected in our contemporary society with

having a job or being part of a relationship that relies on a trade-off between mutual dependent individuals. Such exchange relationships are generally achieved through a job, but can of course be achieved otherwise in relations that are similar to a work relation.

Exchange relations - "strong" and "weak" ties

Mutual exchange relations were in the initial years of sociology coined as problematic and something that sociologists feared was associated with excessive individualization. Today it is considered to be a fundamental part of modern society that creates contentment for the individual, but also produces solidarity on a broader societal level. Among the classical sociologists it was Emile Durkheim, who first dealt with this relation. He introduced the distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity precisely in order to identify the importance of specialization and division of labor, as it creates solidarity and cohesion in modern society (Durkheim 1933/1964). Emile Durkheim was not interested in micro-processes. He was concerned with social cohesion in society at a general level and how it could be ensured considering the major societal changes that were consequences of the transition from the traditional feudal agricultural society to modern, industrialized and more democratic society in mid and late 1800s.

At the micro level, various sociologists perceived the exchange relationship as a very important but "weak" relation that stands in contrast to a very close and intense relationship. Thomas Scheff argues that one can distinguish between "secure relationships", "insulated relationships" and "engulfed relationships". Three different types of integration are linked to these so that the secure relationship can also be described as interdependence (mutual dependence), focusing on a balance between 'I' and 'we', the isolated relation of independence, which puts weight on 'I', and finally the immersive relation to integration, which emphasizes the 'we'. The thoughts behind Scheff's distinctions between secure, isolated and engulfed relationships carry a reminiscent of Emile Durkheim distinctions between the individual and the community. The individual's sense of community can be, respectively, strong and weak, like the community's control over individuals may be

respectively too strong and too weak. Durkheim's point is that both the weak and the strong relationship between the individual and the community can be unhealthy:

	Individual community spirit	Community control over the individual
Excessive	1) altruism, sacrifice, mainly concentrated on meeting the community's expectations	2) absent experience that individuals can make a difference with his or her actions
Too weak	3) Selfishness, concentrating on themselves, their own needs and preferences	4) Resolution. There is no common norms and values that the community is able to impose on individuals

Unlike Durkheim, Thomas Scheff emphasizes micro-components that are crucial to a secure relationship, too weak or too close. Durkheim was not interested in micro-processes, but was concerned about general social cohesion of society and how it can be ensured in a changing society as was the case in the 1800 century.

The above table can also be seen as a continuum where 'the individual's strong sense of community' (1), and 'the community's strong control over the individual' (2) are archetypal examples of the relationship between the individual and the community in the pre-modern societies. 'The individual's weak sense of community' (3) and 'the community's total lack of control over the individual (4) however, are archetypal examples of the relationship between the individual and the community in modern society.

Scheff suggests a further dimension to the discussion of different types of relationships by introducing the distinction between thematic orientation and relationship orientation. Thematic orientation conceals the fact that some relationships are characterized by different

objects in the individual's environment such as work, food, daily chores, money, characters and so on. Other relationships imply a focus on the thoughts and feelings that exist between the participants in the current relationship (Scheff, 1997: 79).

Robert Putnam has worked with two concepts that recall Scheffs distinction between relational orientation and thematic orientation. These are the concepts of bonding and bridging (Putnam 2000). Bonding refers to a defined community that is characterized by strong ties of the implicated individuals and a great sense of common identity. A bounded community is homogeneous and characterized by a high degree of solidarity and loyalty. The relationship-oriented community that must necessarily be defined by a focus on the thoughts and feelings that exist between individuals, can only be practiced in limited contexts. In addition, mutual loyalty, solidarity and identification should have good conditions in the relationship-oriented community.

Bridging represents that the community is characterized by weaker ties that build bridges between different people without strong common interests such as labor. The bridging community is oriented towards creating links between different groups and thereby also creating contact between people of different social origin and position. Scheffs thematic relation falls on the micro level fruitful in line with bridging, since the subject-oriented community is a community that unites people who do not necessarily stand in a personal relationship with each other. Thus we must assume that the thematic-oriented community in close relationships may be bridging, but in turn also produce a weaker community. But which is the best then? There is no simple answer to this question.

The quality of bonding relations is related to the degree to which they fulfill individual need for emotional closeness, while the thematic bridging community is about being in contact with people in society at a greater social distance to gain a certain advantage, in search of particular kinds of utility or knowledge. The sociologist Mark Granovetter became known for his analysis that highlighted advantages of the so-called weak ties (Granovetter 1973). Weak bonds, which are comparable to but also mutually complement

to Scheffs thematic relationships and Putnam bridging communities. They do not exist in bonding relations and in certain territories. Granovetter acknowledge that bonding relations and strong ties between people who know each other are important, but he also points out that the relationships that we perceive as weak, actually have some strengths, which should not be underestimated. The strength of a relationship, is according to Granovetter determined by a combination of time, emotional intensity, confidence and mutual trust and reciprocal services exchanged in the relationship (Granovetter 1973: 1361). Based on these criteria weak relationships are weak if there is a shortage of these factors.However, weak relations have the strength to build bridges to the surrounding society in the outside world and thus provide contacts, networks and knowledge of the world beyond their friendship circles (Granovetter 1973: 1371).

When we assess the quality of communities, we can base it on the above highlighted issues of mutual identification, power relations, intensity, mutual trust and understanding. We can thus assess the individual's position in relation to the community, and we can investigate the weak and strong ties, and we can determine if a community is bonding or bridging. The secure relation is according to Scheff characterized by individuals that identify with each other, and understand each other rather than reject each other because these also imply symmetrical power relations (Scheff, 1997: 76). In all kinds of social relationships people involved constantly assess their relationship. Social situations assessed by the involved parts can, according to Scheff, be practiced in three ideal-typical ways: 1) being formed / established, 2) being maintained, 3) being degraded and damaged. The secure relationship may be threatened by either being too loose or too tight. If a relationship becomes too loose, then it becomes an isolated relation. This type of relationship is characterized by mutual misunderstandings, failed attempts of mutual understanding and outright rejections.

Another type of threat posed by secure relationships is the engulfed relationship. The engulfed relationship is characterized by the one part in a relationship becoming subordinate to the other, at the cost of personal desires, needs, feelings and beliefs being suppressed. This means that one part in such a relationship is leading and dominant and gets development opportunities, while the other part is dominated and forced to reject parts

of his/her own self. Such relationships result in alienation of both the dominant and the dominated (Scheff, 1997: 77).

The secure relationship that is characterized by reciprocity, identification, understanding and power symmetry, clarifying and deepening of the situation, as the sociologist Coleman has termed closure (Coleman, 1988). The concept of closure conceals the fact that all parts involved in a community have relationships to each other. Closure is a condition for the creation of standards and ensured penalties. These mutual relationships will ensure that involved persons comply with their obligations, just as this reciprocity is the reason why they can increase expectations towards each other, and agree and adapt to get more and more obligations (Coleman 1988: 105ff.). Coleman's point is that closure is a type of social relation that produces social capital for the implicated individuals. This means that a continuous relationship in as conceptualized by Scheff sense is possible in communities where all parts have a relationship to each other and where there is a situation of closure.

Ecological and social idealism - of justification.

In addition to different types of community and motives for community, it is also important to take into account that human actions, whether individual or collective, is influenced by the overall value-based orientations, that for example may have the character of social and ecological idealism. Luc Boltanski and Laurant Thévenot (2006) are some of the contemporary sociologists who have dealt extensively with justification of actions in late modern society and have developed a theory of justification social dynamics. They identify six value regimes or worlds important to understanding the motives of actions and their justifications (Thøgersen 2011):

1) The civil world. The highest value is to be a good citizen and work for the common good.

2) The home and the family world. Parents and ancestors have the highest esteem and status.

3) Inspiration world is the poets' and painters' world. Highest esteem given to geniuses, people without an intension has divine powers.

4) Fame world. Fame and movie star world. The highest good is to be known by others.

4) The industrial production world. The highest grades are efficiency, operability, workability and reliability.

5) The market world is where goods from the industrial world are traded on a market. The highest value is when a product has a high monetary value, to earn money and be "a winner".

Thévenot and Boltanski do not envision that these regimes are comprehensive. They points, for example to what they call the social rudiments of a so-called green world. The highest value in the green world is to live and consume in sustainable ways. These worlds has a universality and serve as anchors for critical arguments and justification of actions (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006; 26).

When you have to understand how the integration of residential group 6 has worked in practice it is important to know and understand the neighbors' justification regimes / worlds. The green world plays a central role as does the civilian world and to some extent the market world besides maybe minor aspects of other worlds.

Summary - residential group 6 and AIH - sociologically interesting focal points

Housing group 6 is established in a community based on a combination of green values, civil society values as well as production, trade and utilitarian values. However, there are a series of differentiations and variations to this. There have been shown to be differences between the elderly and the young in Hjortshoej with regards to how much weight they put on their common values. This concerns internally social relations and the expectations and wishes they have for the future, but it is also present when it comes to prioritization between the life in AIH and the life that is lived outside AIH. Social life in Hjørtshøj is

intense - people know each other meet each-other in many different contexts. The question is whether it from time to time becomes too intense? And what is the role of respectively the thematic and relations-oriented communities in relation to the maintenance of a Scheff's continuous relationship?

Can residential group 6 be seen as a form of resistance to social segregation and the trends to cities developing as conglomerates of socially and culturally homogenous environments? Can you, in other words, use the example of Hjortshoej to learn about how and with what consequences we can work with communities and neighborhood as the focal point for integration of citizens who would otherwise be in danger of living isolated in their neighborhoods? In this context it is relevant to ask what role relationship and utility play and how the relationship between "strong" and "weak" ties develop in this specific context.

Based on interviews conducted with neighbors to housing group 6 over 3 years we will illustrate what happened with the project and the neighborhood, but also try to glean what we can learn from this project in a broader context with regards to integration.

Conclusion: Local social integration in Hjortshøj

Over the last 10-12 years there has been increasing focus on how local communities can be the focal point for social integration of different vulnerable groups in society. Thus, there has been a number of initiatives to integrate various vulnerable groups in so-called ordinary residential areas (Jørgensen 2006, Jorgensen and Mølholt 2007). Whether these projects were conducted and initiated by public authorities, voluntary organizations or in this case by a residential area, they are focused on mobilizing social relations in the community that are below the bodies and organizations of the welfare state on the one hand, and under the voluntary organizations on the other. What is special about this integration effort is firstly that it rests on the needs of both parts in the relationship, and that both parts give and receive help not only in the figurative and symbolic sense, but in terms of concrete and tangible benefits and return. Secondly, the projects is particular because it

was initiated, planned and implemented by the municipality of Aarhus in partnership with the neighbors. This has meant that a key role was played by neighbors and neighboring communities.

Hjortshoej project is special because it initially assumed that the 16 adults with intellectual disabilities who have moved into the residential area, should play an active, necessary role in the existing local community. Precisely this point seems to be crucial when comparing to to other integration attempts. It is crucial in relation to the neighbors' sympathy and goodwill in relation to the establishment of the project, but it is also an essential element behind a sustained everyday interaction between neighbors and the residential group 6. Through bread sales, Hjortshoej Festival etc. regular contact and exchanges are ensured which constitute a first step towards neighborhood and local social inclusion opposed to peaceful coexistence. This is contrary to integration activities where no interaction takes place and where reciprocal relations are not required or profitable for both parties.

Manypreviously known local integration initiatives taken by public authorities and / or by voluntary organizations have not relied on the same expectations for services and on reciprocal relations between the newly arrived and "indigenous" neighbors. These initiatives are not characterized by any particular expectations for neighbor engagement (Jorgensen and Mølholt 2007). Themore or less unspoken hope underlining such initiatives has been that interaction and community would arise automatically out of such projects. Often, however, this did not happen. Projects have often been established under intense neighbor protests that over time have become a kind of peaceful coexistence (Jørgensen 2008, Jorgensen and Mølholt 2007). The "indigenous" neighbors, usually have learned to know one another in these protest process, but it has rarely led to significant social integration between the disadvantaged, who have moved into so-called ordinary residential areas and those who lived there beforehand(Jorgensen 2006).

VVarious quarters have for several years argued for the activation of local communities in carrying out various social and welfare tasks. There are political tendencies to mobilize community as part of the remedy a hard-pressed and sometimes overloaded public

assistance system (Fallov 2005). The question that arises is whether Hjortshøj example can be transferred and be subject to more extensive learning for both public and voluntary organizations working with this type of community-based initiatives?

In addition to utility-exchange aspect of the residential group 6, mentioned above, the success behind this integration effort also lies in that the project contributes to an identity for area residents, since the project enable them to contribute to the integration of people who normally would not find the way to settle in places like Cooperative Society in Hjortshoej. With different approaches and based on different life situations, it succeeds in creating a common identity around residential group 6 and the integration of the 16 young adults with intellectual disabilities who live there. The identity is rooted in a shared vision of sustainability and social responsibility, which at first is a result of the individual neighbors orientation and preferences, but in the next phase also acts as a "moral" base or superstructure, as the orientation for the evaluation of how and to what extent an integration project should be a part of everyday life in the area. The overall value-based orientation is a little different for the various age groups, which are often closely related to the number of years that people have been living in the area.

For the oldest neighbors in AIH, both in terms of actual age, and when it comes to number of years as a resident of AIH, it applies that they feel stronger linked to some of the visions that originally lay behind the residential area than the young. The oldest has apparently also other interpretations of the content and implications of these visions than younger neighbors in AIH. Ecology and sustainability play a crucial role for both young and old in AIH, but when it comes to the construction of houses and choice of building materials there are clear differences. The newest homes are built more ecologically pragmatic in relation to insulation, building material, etc. These homes are pretty much alike the types of houses that can be found in other new residential areas around the major cities in the country. Many of the original houses in AIH are made of mud with soil toilets and a very different and unconventional architectural expression than the newer houses in AIH.

These variations of the visions behind AIH have no direct impact on the integration of residential group 6 but play a roleanyway. Although there are differences in the approach to organic and environmental values between the young and the elderly residents both groups prioritize pragmatism over ideology, which means that they sometimes must compromise on principles.

The residents express that the different approaches and the dialogues that the project create about the ideological principles in itself are essential to the dynamic interaction that all residents have highlighted as a quality in interviews. The cooperative Society is characterized by diverse and "imperfect" aesthetic and ideological expressions that support the social inclusion of the neighboring community. Therefore, the dynamic dialogue about these differences and bodily experiences make an indirect impact on the integration of residents of residential group 6, as these dimensions also impact on the social interactions in the area.

It is different when, it comes to the vision of creating a community where the cost of housing is at a level that allows equal distribution of time used in the labor market and used as an active citizen in the community. Several of the older residents still referto this vision, while none of the younger do. While the young families, we have interviewed over the two years we have followed the project, often consist of two full-time working parents with children, the elderly families consist of one or two adults, where one or both are working reduced hours often with children living with their parents or children on their way to leave home. Where young residents do not see it as an opportunity or something desirable to be part-time on the labor-market, for the older residents it is associated with a conscious idea or vision of working life should not take up too much time of life. This is both to ensure time for free and creative expression, and to create and maintain a vibrant community that creates activity and community. In contrast, areas and neighborhoods marked by "sleep-town mentality" where people spend most of the time away from the area do not have specific activities or tasks that call for joint action and joint activity. Young residents are proud of the residential project and identify with the project and with social and integration ideas behind the project.

The young residents' time constraints mean that they prefer to help with the integration task of residential group 6 by just being interested neighbors. They are very community-conscious and would love to get involved and make a difference through voluntary associations and organizations, but have no spare time in their current life situation to realize this. Common to both young and old neighbors is that they feel that it gives more identity and meaning to their local area and thus strengthen their own sense of identity as socially responsible citizens in society. Precisely this active desire to contribute and be socially responsible is a very important reason behind the success of the project.

The older neighbors do not disregard the younger neighbors' priorities and overall life situation, but perceive the internal differences and changes in AIH, as part of the more general social changes that have taken place from the early years in the 1980s until today. They are also aware that new generations have their own version of ecology, sustainability and local social relationships and are happy that young people at all support and identify with the area. This ensures cooperative society's long-term survival. The differences between the young and the "old" become a strength rather than a problem. To see strength in the diversity of engagement and activities are also crucial for the outcome of the second type of distinction that characterizes AIH; the difference between owners and tenants. The general picture is that both owners and tenants feel committed to and as part of the AiH. Yet the picture is that the owners feel more responsible. Some of the tenants are single mothers who do not necessarily have the same opportunities to put just as many hours in the neighboring community activities, while other tenants have been awarded their housing by housing authority and therefore do not necessarily feel the same kind of commitment.

Residents have different levels of participation and commitment degrees, and there is widespread acceptance of the need to residents in some periods withdraws. Precisely this emergent and dynamic form of the neighboring community is an important quality for success of the project, as there is always some excess mode. In many projects run by volunteers depends on the project's longevity and success of individuals continued commitment. In contrast, in AIH we find emphasis on concepts related to dynamics and spaciousness which makes it possible to maintain the community's mutual obligations

without compromising on individual freedom and consideration for individual life situations. AiH is in its diversity characterized both by the necessary closure that ensures the proximity and relations orientation that supports social responsibility, but the emergent character of the community ensures that there are room for newcomers and a sustained energy for new initiatives.

Turning for a moment back to the initial discussions about the difference between the local communities in rural and urban environment and looks at the interview material, it is worth dwelling on the unique combination of place-related experiences gathered in Hjortshøj. There are strong references to the traditional agricultural society where people with very different social backgrounds lived close and maintained a local community both practically and socially. Several interviewees also refer to the cooperative movement and the ideas of shared responsibility and shared risk originating from there. At the same time, there are also strong urban preferences for tolerance and diversity, and as values which do not necessarily require interference and common guidelines but which are naturally present and which have to be accommodated. These orientations are not exclusive to either the younger or older residential groups but are present around all residential groups in different compositions in different individuals. Together, these two orientations participation, commitment, responsibility and freedom, tolerance, each in its own way are important for residential group 6 on the one hand integrated in a community and on the other hand also experienced enough space.

It brings the question of the importance of target-group forward - in this case young adults with intellectual disabiliteis. It is mentioned several times during the interview material that "heart warming" and "immediacy" have played a role in the interpersonal meetings. The challenge will be to extend the integration to not only integrate residential group 6 in the existing neighborhood watch to go one step further to establish real we-relationships where the new residents do not just accept their otherness but also some one has a real relation to . The underlying investigation can not form the basis to discuss the possibility of this, or to examine the full significance of categories importance of openness. The material does

provide a solid basis to emphasize the value orientations about tolerance and inclusiveness has had a positive effect on the integration project's success

The question is whether the experience of Cooperative Society in Hjortshoej can be transfered to other groups need to be better integrated into the community? On this issue highlights several interviewed neighbors that successful integration is closely linked to one specific group, but it is very important that the problems of the people of such integration projects, have a character who can be accommodated in and partly lifted of neighborhood. Strong addictions or serious psychological problems assessed by several neighbors which types of problems that cannot easily be lifted by a neighborhood. The main source is to strike the right balance between newcomers with social integration needs and neighbors to reach success. The combination of certain types of problems / disabilities, thorough and individual visitation will ensure that neighborhoods / neighbors are "paired" with the groups and the types of issues that they are able to accommodate to.

Conclusively can it be said that the success behind Hjortshoej project primarily sustained by:

-to initiative was taken in a partnership between the City of Aarhus and the neighbors

-that there is a mutual exchange ratio

-that there is a common value-based, but also pragmatic orientation towards lifting the integration tasks locally

-that there are strong key people in the area that provides a strong and systematic link between the professional framing of the mentally disabled in the area and the nearness

-that there is an activity team, whose work is mainly focused on facilitating local integration

- The area contains the fertile balance between close neighbors integration and great spaciousness and tolerance for social diversity

Need for more information

Hjortshøj project can teach us many things, but it also raises new questions that should be explored; it is first and foremost a systematic overview of the experience gained from the integration of "neighborhood foreign groups", whether initiated by the government, NGOs or independent residential areas, as in the present case. We miss an overview over similar projects that includes a systematic approach in relation to the target audience, type of area, promoters and objectives. Such an overview will hopefully be able to contribute insights to the differentiated possibilities and limitations of local social inclusion, linked to the specific differences that surround such attempts. Local Areas and neighborhoods are different social, historical, cultural and groups who may benefit from local social integration on the other hand also very different in terms of needs and abilities. Thus there is no "one-size-that-fits-all", but must be developed different models to seize on and exploit these differences in the most constructive and fruitful manner.

It is also important to have knowledge of the more invasive role to play in the exchange relationship local integration experiments. Relationship has been an important focal point for Hjortshøj project and the idea that the people who need to be integrated have to feel that they contribute to essential activities and tasks. How can this idea be developed in practice?

If we want local integration projects to become more than just peaceful coexistence, then it is necessary to find activities that create and maintain social interactions between "indigenous" neighbors and those who need integration. Here employment components, such as those in in Hjortshøj may be central, but it may also be other kinds of activities that have the potential to catalyze social interaction and community.

However, we know too little about the types of activities and how they have worked in different contexts.

Literature

Andersen et al. (2003): "Introduction. Empowerment in the urban space. " The Andersen et al. (Ed.):

Empowerment in the urban space. Copenhagen: Routledge

Andersen, Hans Thor (2005): The city's changing social geography. Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel.

Bauman, Zygmunt (1993): Postmodern Ethics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2002): Community. Copenhagen: Routledge.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2006): The liquid modernity. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel Publishers.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2003): Community. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel Publishers.

Boltanski, Luc & Laurant Thévenot (2006): On the Justification: Economies of worth. Princeton, New

Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. et al. (1999): The Weight of the World, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ, Klebanov PK, Sealand N. (1993): Do neigborhoods inflytande child and

adolescent development? American Journal of Sociology 99 (2): 353-395

Buttimer, A. (1980): "Home, reach and the sense of place" in The Human Experience of Space and

Place, eds. A. Buttimer & D. Seamon, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 166-187.

Castells, Manuel (1997): The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume II, The Power

of Identity. Oxford: Blackwell.

Christensen, Anders Bøggild & Tove Rasmussen (2008): Social polarization in the Municipality of Aarhus

Christensen, Gunvor (2003): Looking for a local community, Building and Urban Pittsburg.

Coleman, James (1988): "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital". In the American Journal of

Sociology, Vol. 94

Diez Roux A. (2001): Investigating neigborhood and area effect on health. American Journal of Public

Health 9 (11): 1783-1789.

Durkheim, Emile (1933/1964): The Divison of Labor in Society. New York: The Free Press

Elias, Norbert & Scotson, John L. (1994): The Established and the Outsiders. London: Sage.

Fallov, Mia Arp (2010): "Community capacity building as the route to inclusion in neighborhood

regeneration? ", International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 789-804.

Fallov, Mia A. (2015): "Places and affective space in community work" in Social work in a

Changing World, eds. M. A. Nissen & M. Harder, Academic Publishers, Copenhagen.

Fallov, Mia Arp (2011): "The social capital-local community-neighborhood configuration. Strategies

for building bonding and bridging relations in neighborhood regeneration ", Sociological Workings, [Online], vol. 2011, no. 32nd

Fallov, Mia Arp (2005): Speaking the Language of Capacity: Neighbourhood Regeneration and Social

Exclusion in Denmark and England. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis

Fallov, Mia Arp, Anja Jorgensen, Lisbeth B. Knudsen (2013): "Mobile forms of belonging."

Mobilities, 8 (4): 467-486.

Giddens, Anthony 1990. The Consequences of Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Granovetter, Mark S. (1973): "The Strength of Weak Ties". In the American Journal of Sociology, 78,

1360-1380

Hussain, M. Azhar, Jens Bonke & Martin D. Munk (2013): "Money Marries Money: Intergenerational

Top Income Mobility and assortative mating in Denmark ". Working Paper Department of Political Science Aalborg University ISSN: 1396: 3,503th

Jensen, O.B. (2006): "'Face Work', Flow and the City: Simmel, Goffman, and Mobility in the Contemporary City" Mobilities, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 143rd

Juul, Jonas Schytz, Lars Andersen, Lars Olsen, Niels Ploug (2012): The Danish class society.

Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Jorgensen, Anja (2006): When the district finds itself. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press

Jorgensen, Anja & Anne Kirstine Mølholt (2007): Conditions for Community - the mentally ill

residential areas. Service Agency.

Jorgensen, Anja (2008): Local communities in the post-modern city. Danish Sociology vol.

19, no. 3, November.

Jorgensen, Anja (2010): "The Sense of Belonging in New Urban Zones in Transition."
Current

Sociology, 58 (3): 3-23.

Jorgensen, A., Fallov, M. Arp, Knudsen LB, Jørgens Jorgensen, A., Arp Fallov, M. &
Knudsen, L. B. (2011):

"Local community, mobility and Belonging" English Journal of Geoinformatics and Land
Management, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 22-35.

Latour, Bruno (2006): We have never been modern. Copenhagen: Routledge.

Mazanti, Birgitte (2005): This self-selected community - the qualified neighborhood

Centre for Strategic Urban Research Working paper

Mazanti, B. (2002): Stories from somewhere.

Naboskabet.dk - http://www.rso.dk/portfolio/naboskabet/

Olsen, Lars (2005): The split Denmark. Copenhagen: Gyldendal Publishers.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess (1925): The City - Suggestions for Investigation of
Human

Behavior in the Urban Environment. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Putnam, Robert D. (2000): Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American
Community. New

York: Simon & Schuster.

Sassen, Saskia (2000): "New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium," The British

Journal of Sociology 51 (1): 143-59

SBI (1999): 'Urban Committee 1993-98'. Copenhagen: Danish Building Research Institute.

Scheff, Thomas J. (1997): Emotions, the social bond, and human reality - part / whole analysis.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Schutz, Alfred (1975): Everyday Life sociology. Copenhagen: Routledge

Schutz, Alfred (1976/1964): Collected Papers II Studies in Social Theory. The Hauge: Martinus

Nijhoff

Sennett, Richard (1998): The Corrosion of Character. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Simmel, Georg (1998/1903): "The Metropolis and Mental Life" How is society possible?

Gyldendal, Copenhagen.

Simonsen, K. (2008): "Place as Encounters: Practice, Conjunction and Co-existence" in Mobility and

Place - enacting Northern European peripheries, eds. JO Bærenholdt & B. Granås, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 13-25.

Thøgersen, Nina (2011): Garbage The Utopia - on new forms of community, safety regimes and

hverdagsdystopier. Thesis in Sociology, Aalborg University.

Tönnies, Ferdinand (1895): Community and Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft). London:

Transaction Publishers.

van Eijk, G. (2012): "Good Neighbours in Bath Neighbourhoods: Narratives of Dissociation and

Practices of Neighbouring in a 'Problem' Place ", Urban Studies, vol. 49, no. 14, pp. 3009-3026.

Wacquant, Loïc (2010): Designing urban seclusion in the 21st Century, Perspecta, no. 43: 164-176.

Weber, Max (1921): Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der Verstehenden Soziologie. Tübingen:

Mohr Siebeck