

CHAPTER 5) DISCIPLINE AND ANIMATE – RESIDENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF INCORPORATION

In an early interview, and after a long pause and some muddled stalling on my part, I asked the person I was interviewing if their experiences of settling in Winnipeg were what they had expected:

INT: ... so did you ... I don't ... when you came ... when you were coming to Canada is this what you expected it would be like?

A: No. When I came to Canada I was thinking ... people when they come here they just used to come and sit. Because they say in Africa if you go overseas you just go and sit and get everything for free. But here, if you don't go to school, if you don't work it's really hard for you. It's not what I was expecting. [...] here, oh you have to get tired. [with laughter] (Winnipeg, r3)

After this I started asking if people's expectations matched their experiences in all of my interviews. The response was almost always no, and people would go on to share their narratives of the unexpected experiences they had encountered since becoming 'an immigrant'. People spoke about challenges with government services, with gaining employment or access to services, about interactions with neighbors and their own cultural communities, and in general having to work hard – harder than could have been expected – in building their new lives. In the proceeding chapter I examine the role of governments and local housing and community development organizations in terms of shaping and conditioning each case. In this chapter I turn to an analysis of how these spaces of incorporation are understood, experienced and evaluated by immigrant residents, building an analysis of these spaces of incorporation around their accounts of the hard work of becoming and being an 'immigrant'.

Interviews provided insight into resident perspectives on the institutions shaping and conditioning their lives, the spaces in which they live work and play, their understanding of the ways in which they are being disciplined by policies and programs, and the ways in which they

can engage with formal institutions and organizations. Additionally, these interviews provided insight into political behavior in terms of both formal and informal actions, and finally the ways in which residents are framing their own work, along with the role of states, non-profit organizations and their homes in their lives and in terms of their opportunities for participation and membership.

Immigrant residents in these case neighborhoods are in many ways conditioned by the spaces in which they find themselves, through their particular access to resources and information, and the ways in which institutions and organizations in each case discipline new residents towards particular actions and ways of engaging. However, these residents are also key primary users of space in each case, and as such their lived experiences are also the animating principle of each neighborhood (Lefebvre, [1974] 1991, 137). Additionally, their daily acts of cooperation and conflict are the political behaviors that play a large part of the production of these neighborhoods “socially and, in turn physically” (Martin, 2003; 361). As such in Section 1) I focus on resident understandings and evaluations of the policies, programs and organizations examined in the proceeding chapter in terms of the ways in which they are shaping and conditioning immigrant resident experiences. In Section 2) I focus on the use and actions of immigrant residents in each case, and on the types of negotiations and partnerships developing to produce the places that immigrant residents might need and want.

Section 1: DISCIPLINE

Looking at the Canadian and Danish case neighborhoods from the perspective of community development and housing organizations, as in the proceeding chapter, the most common role on offer to immigrant residents appears to be as clients. Resident responses in these cases affirm this analysis, as a strong majority of residents spoke about both state and non-state

programs and organizations primarily in terms of services provided. In both cases residents also reported use and availability of a wide variety of services. For residents who arrived as government sponsored refugees in Canada or asylum seekers in Denmark there was direct and fairly standardized government support and regulations. Those supports and regulations might include direct financial support, as well as access or assignment to both government and private sector housing, and additionally social service support in the form of councilors who could connect residents to additional resources, and help to guide people through various aspects of settlement. For those who arrived as privately sponsored refugees, or under other immigration classes support was less regular.

Spence and the West End importance of private services

Particularly in the Canadian case non-government-sponsored-refugee residents were more likely to rely on private supports, and family for early needs. Many described living with family members before finding their own accommodations, while others described the process of just knocking on doors when looking for a place to live. Others found their way through connections to longer-term Canadian residents made at churches and schools. Additionally, New Journey Housing (NJH) in particular came up in many interviews as an important resource when people were looking for housing. Several residents who arrived before NJH was founded even spoke about wishing that the organization had been around to help them.

Beyond just finding a home, various related social services were also generally provided through the private sector. These included services such as childcare and education, and even emergency services such as foodbanks. Additionally, private organizations and individuals were important in terms of information about these services. One resident's comments combined a

few of these elements as they described learning about foodbanks from a classmate:

...we were talking about how life was hard and etc etc, [as the conversation continues the classmates explained that] most of [her monthly budget] goes for food right and she said one way you can ... to alleviate that is to go to a food bank and use that. Yeah so that's how we learned about the food bank. [...] that helped out quite a bit to have that option. I mean sure I don't like having kraft dinner every time you know, [...] *but that's the difference between not having food and having food.* (Winnipeg, r4)

Along with private supports new immigrant residents also described interactions with governments and government agents, and it is interesting to note that the Canadian case was the only case where residents attributed private services to governments. Again while most residents had some knowledge of private services and community development organizations, those that had a knowledge of services such as grants from Neighborhood Renewal Corporations (NCR), often identified them as government programs. In at least one case a resident identified an entire NCR as a provincial government agency. There are a several possible interpretations of this conflation of private and public, but this confusion does lead to questions about the role of non-profits, and puts into question their ability to act as effective political counterweights to governments in the lives of residents.

uneven government services

Resident critiques of government services generally focused on the uneven nature of services and its impact on their access to resources and information. For example, residents spoke about interactions with larger umbrella government-run immigrant services agencies. As residents identified, these services are generally split to service specific immigration classes – provincial nominee, refugee, economic – and by time of immigration, for example with services for immigrant residents up-to and after three years of migration.¹

¹ Immigrant residents are eligible for citizenship after residing in Canada for three years, and so many settlement services are tagged to that time frame.

Residents also identified geographic variety in services. For example, and in keeping with a wider provincial government focus on neighborhoods, the province has recently started a neighborhood settlement program with councillors located in neighborhoods identified as having large immigrant resident populations. The program coordinator describes this as “an opportunity to do what is needed in the neighborhoods [...] to respond to the local needs” (Winnipeg, s5). Observations as the program was launching suggest several challenges and opportunities to this approach. There is limited support available in each neighborhood, with just one or two staff members serving the entire population regardless of need in the neighborhood. From the perspective of residents this translated into a sense of uneven services. As an example speaking with West End residents who were also support employees of the coordinating organization, they complained that settlement workers in their neighborhood did not seem to be organizing as many activities, or providing as many services as they had heard about in other neighborhoods. In conversation with settlement staff in the same neighborhood they acknowledged uneven service provision, but also pointed to the the high level of need in the area, and the idea that even though they were adding staff to the team, they still did not have enough staff to do the basics much-less extras.

Again related to these geographic imbalances, another resident whose home fell just outside of the boundary to be eligible for services from one of the NRC's (Neighborhood Renewal Corporations) asked:

A: So why aren't we part of it [...] especially if there's help for funding that you can do something, I want it too. But we're not in the catchment area so we're not qualified. We're not eligible. If ever we were eligible then we could do more programming.
[...]

A: [...] and we're also in need. everyone needs support, everyone needs community

[...] [organization name] granted us some money to do a parent child programming, but we need to find a place still. So it's so hard. But if you have a certain association, if you have a place then you could do programming there.(Winnipeg, r7)

This resident's understanding of these organizations, and the desire to expand the network of NRCs is not described through any great deficiency in their neighborhood, but instead through a wish to do even more than they are already doing, and seeing NRCs, or similar organizations, as a potential opportunity to reach their goals. This is in spite of the fact that these were organizations originally design as resources for neighborhoods in greatest need.

Residents also identified a gendered characteristic to services, and specifically that services often appeared to be directed towards women as mothers. One impact of this, reported by both residents and organizational staff, was new conflicts within households of female and male couples. From an organizational perspective, staff at one housing non-profit in the city talked about the financial conflict they had observed between couples when, for example, child tax benefits might go to mothers who have not previously been involved in household finances. These conflicts also appeared to arise when child benefits paid to mothers represented a substantial percent of the household's income.

One resident – a father – spoke about his own perceptions of the gendered aspect of services admonishing: “...if men don't have a role in childbearing in Canada, we do have a role in other countries, like Asia and Africa. We have a role to play.” In a conversation about the general lack of support for immigrant residents to learn about what it means to be Canadian, to act in Canadian society he went on “and also there is less support on the side of the men,” (Winnipeg, r6) continuing to speak about his own experiences and relationship:

[...] she was getting too much information from school about how she is supposed to be free. And for me, I got none of how to become a Canadian man. You see, now so this one is changing too fast to become a fast paced Canadian girl, and you, you are

left to still think like you are in the Congo, right you see. So the way they put pressure on women at school to have their freedom, and they should tell also the men the same thing about. Because what I have learned I've learned from my fellow guys at school. I haven't learned from the social workers or the councillors.
(Winnipeg, r6)

In observing various programs, and particularly government-sponsored settlement programs, there was a sense of this focus on mothers. For example there might be warm up questions such as introduce yourself, and let us know how many children you have, or cooking classes focused on quick after school snacks for children. However, this information is mixed in with workshops that might also introduce new immigrant residents to education or job training opportunities in the city. While childcare should certainly not be promoted exclusively as women's work, this focus does seem to assume, encourage and attract a particular type of participant, mothers with small children.

Finally, in interviews with wives and husbands, particularly those with young children, wives often reported the use or knowledge of more services, along with more engagement in communities. While this is perhaps not surprising, and there are myriad studies that have examined the high rates of participation of women in organizing around home and family (see Williams, 2004; Wright, 2004), it still appears that the content and design of programs are heightening this divide rather than creating spaces for men to contribute and participate.

imagined access to ongoing support

Many of the private and public services described above are officially designed as short-term supports with limits in terms of time from migration, or number of contacts. However, unofficially residents often spoke about more long-term contact with organizations and programs, or about the lasting impact of these services. Often these longer term relationships were more informal or personal, directly between service providers and their former clients. Others have

described these relationships through the importance of weak ties (Walton-Roberts, 2008) where service providers may not be a part of a resident's close social circle, but are important in connecting clients to further services, providing informal cultural interpretation, and serving as an ongoing line of communication as new issues arise in the lives of residents. As an example, one resident, a single parent who had been in the country just over three years spoke about having contemplated moving from Winnipeg to join friends in other cities where job prospects appeared to be stronger:

[...] but I try to think about it, and say how can I move with the kids, and a single parent? If I got there and I find it hard whose going to help me? But here, even though they stop helping me at social assistance, whenever I get a problem, because they know me, my name, my file is there, they're going to help me. And what if I move out where I don't know anyone? That's why I say no. I stay here and look for a job. Maybe one day I will get the good job. (Winnipeg, r3)

Here the importance of ongoing support outweighs the increased probability of stable employment.

For others they have relied on connections made through initial private settlement services and programs, or family members. This is particularly true in terms of building future social circles, and increasing access to resources. Particularly for people who entered under private refugee status, or family reunification the connection made through the organizations or individuals who sponsored them had lasting impacts in terms of housing, education, access to other services, and even aspects of everyday life or the culture of the city and province. One resident told a common story about the importance of having been introduced to a church by their sponsor when they first arrived, and then having the church become a place where they could connect with long-term residents and gain access to new information:

A:... I think its really important to you know, to, to communicate with Canadians or

people who knows about this country well enough to give a suggestions, so it's really important. And for example, yeah for example, when somebody dies in our community they don't speak English, and the first thing they will do is call the church. Even like middle of the night like 1 or 2 am.

[...]

A: And I think the church is more like our friends, and uhhh a friends who can help yeah.

[...]

INT: That's great. How did you find your church?

A: Oh you know when I first came I, one of my sponsor group because she knows that we are Christian right, that I am Christian. So she said “Do you want to go to this church?” And yeah I attend that church, and it was really great. Yeah they help me a lot. (Winnipeg, r1)

However, these early connections were not always as helpful as one resident described:

Like I'm so lucky to have all my family here beside one of my brother. Uhm but em, and then when I say that – and I'm sure you immediately kind of thought the same way – that people thinks that I had all sort of supports, which is wrong. Like I tell you it's a majority of people who come here a while ago, the majority of them don't know nothing at the moment of this person comes. Ok so like my sister had knowledge of everything where to get your ID, your things like that right. By the time I came and we went to do those things she didn't know nothing. *Because things change, rules change, and the way things function change, places change.* (Winnipeg, r5)

Various staff at housing and immigration organizations also noted the difficulty of uneven information and care new immigrant residents received from family members or other private individuals. Staff were particularly worried about incorrect information being disseminated within cultural communities, or from non-immigrant to immigrant residents.

wanting to participate and contribute

The largest critique of services in the Canadian case were not about general quality or specific programs, but focused on the need for services that supported deeper resident engagement, participation, control, or self-sufficiency. For example the resident above who spoke about wanting an NRC in their neighborhood not to have staff do work for them, but to support and help in the coordination of the ongoing work of neighbors.

Others saw existing service as problematic and described them as designed with dependency in mind. From the somewhat elite perspective of residents who were heavily involved in neighborhood and community development initiatives the structure and function of NRCs and other community development organizations actually represented a hinderance to residents creating community around their shared experience as neighbors. As one resident put it:

A: I find that there are so many not-for-profit and agencies supporting almost every aspect of your life, that you don't, no longer rely on your neighbor. So uhh I need a cup of sugar, so there is a cupboard or place where you go buy sugar by the cup, [...]. In my country you would go and knock the neighbor, "Hey can I have a cup of sugar and return it tomorrow." Right so you have more contact with your neighbors. And here no, everybody... you don't need to go anywhere. So uhm the first thing, anything happens to you the first thing, "So you have an organization or an association that helps you?" That's the first thing any social worker will ask you. Why are you asking me that, I came here for help. Like "Do you, are you involved with any church, are you involved with any, like do you have other supports around you?" Nobody talks "Do you have neighbors." That doesn't exist here. So because that doesn't exist you have to force people to have block parties otherwise they don't get together. They are not natural. Somebody has to give you two hundred dollars so you can buy sausage or whatever to have a BBQ, otherwise that doesn't happen naturally.

INT: And part of that is because people sort of ...

A: I think that there is a lot of money here that the government puts into the neighborhoods right, so that helps support people, but at the same time helps to make them individualistic, [...] So why would I go to my neighbor, or why would I go to my friends, or why would I go to my sister, or. So what I see all these organizations they – it's government money or fundraising, mostly government money that comes in to all these organizations to support people, or to help people to get out of poverty. But at the same time, what they are doing is putting more individualism into the community. [...] if there is one organization, or somebody getting paid a salary to help you why would I go to my neighbor? Why would I build community? And you are so isolated. And then 'oh we need to tell them what a community is' ohh OK let's do a block party, let's do a feast, let's celebrate this, let's like, all those things happening and we are building community woohoo. So I find that strange. I find it kind of, it's contradictory. (Winnipeg, r8)

Even for residents participating primarily as clients there was a similar critique about

wanting programs and services to support efforts to act and participate rather than prolonging dependency. This sentiment was captured by one resident discussing the impression that governments were simply supporting and encouraging residents to “come and sit” rather than work or contribute. When I asked how they thought government supports might be improved they replied:

[...] to me it would ... the ways was to support those who want to to go to school for two years or three years, and work. And then those who can't study who can't speak English then sometime some of them in their country they have professional. They have stuff they've been doing. Then they look into that area. These people cannot speak English, but they can do something. Maybe someone was a driver, was a mechanic, was ... they're trained stuff they've been doing back home. Some they are farmers, some people have something they have been doing, and they look into that they see what can we do for these people, even if they can't speak good English, but we train them for a short time so that they go into their field and work. Do what they have been doing, at least contribute to the development of the country rather than staying home for five years because they can't speak English.

[...]

Someone whose a mechanic, these cars they are the same cars even back home. They are the same. This person can repair this car even if he does not speak English. It's just training him that's how we do things. Six months he's able to do. To me, they could train people to work. Those who can go to the university support those. Who can do a short course onto their field they help them. (Winnipeg, r9)

And so while residents often spoke about this desire for greater self-sufficiency or independence, they did not necessarily do so in individualistic terms. Instead residents generally spoke about the importance of being able to take care of family members from different generations, they spoke about their desire to contribute and to give back to the programs, organizations, and institutions that had helped them along the way. Specifically including government as well as private organizations. One simple, but striking example came from the resident quoted above about using food bank services. As part of their narrative they went on to say “...yeah so that's how we

learned about the food bank. And *of course* later when we had more stable employment we started making contributions” (Winnipeg, r4). This idea that “making contributions” would simply be a given was a sentiment echoed by a majority of residents who saw an opportunity to give back, to help others and build community as a key and often missing piece of government policies and programs.

mortgages and home ownership

A key aspect of policy in Canada and Manitoba has been a push towards homeownership, and in the Canadian case, more so than any other, single family homeownership was seen as an important goal for almost all residents interviewed. This was the case not simply for residents with stable finances, or who had been in Winnipeg for a longer amount of time, but for new residents and those with the least means. In all of these cases debt in the form of a mortgage was something that people spoke about in more or less conscious ways. Several residents who were learning English-as-an-additional language used the words mortgage and homeownership interchangeably describing a mortgage as something to work towards, at the other extreme was this exchange between spouses as they described their home to me:

A: Yeah we ...

B: ... bought the house

A: Yeah we bought it, but then we have lots of debt that we have to pay.

B: The bank bought it for us.

A: Bank bought for us. [with laughter]

B: We like the bank.

(Winnipeg, r10 & Winnipeg, r4)

For other residents this idea of debt being part of owning a home was also described as part of the experience of Canada. One resident describes their experience of trying to buy a house soon after arriving in Winnipeg saying:

... everyone that we know, my cousins they were buying, buying, buying, buying a

house. So we thought that it's easy. Also I remember when we were five months here, because we are living at my aunt's house instead of renting an apartment. We wanted to buy a house so we went to the bank, but then the bank didn't approve us because we don't have credit history, and we're here for five months, and we don't have credit card at that time because from back home having a credit card isn't a good thing that you shouldn't accumulate credits. And we said "we got cash", and the bank said "your cash doesn't mean anything you should have a credit history before you'll be approved a mortgage." And then my husband and I were saying "oh it's different here. In Canada you should have credit." (Winnipeg, r7)

While a strong majority of residents prioritized homeownership few did so with reference primarily to its fiscal aspects. One resident who had immigrated from Europe spoke about the importance of their home in terms of a retirement fund, but for the others the value of their house, or potential house, was tied up much more in questions of security, family, affect and attachment to place. In narratives about the decision to purchase a house residents would speak about the challenges of renting that drove them towards homeownership: too many rules, inattentive landlords, problematic neighbors. They would also speak about the desire to have someplace where they could stay for the long term, where children would have room to play, where they could work on projects, hobbies, or potentially start businesses, and where parents would have room to come and stay. In all of this there was something unique about housing that made people seek out homeownership above other kinds of financial investments or choices for themselves and their families. In conversation with one resident we started talking about their goal to purchase the house in which they were living. When I asked why buying the house was so important they replied with a mix of fiscal and familial explanation, and further connected homeownership to feelings of belonging in the country:

Well I'm a newcomer, well I don't consider myself a newcomer anymore, but as a newcomer, or as someone who has nothing, who had no asset in Canada, I think having a home makes you feel like you have asset. Like ok, I have done what I was supposed to. I have learned the language, I have worked, I pay tax, uhm I do care about the country, but what do I have in the country right? Ok I have applied for

citizen, I became citizen, well the last thing you need is a home to feel home right. [...] Now if you ask me about something else, for example a car, I'd say no I'm not buying. So yeah it's not the same. (Winnipeg, r5)

summary

Immigrant residents identified the importance of private resources in the Canadian case neighborhood, including both formal and informal services and networks. Additionally, some residents, and particularly those with limited resources or social networks, described the ways in which informal relationships with service providers were often important in terms of feelings of security and ongoing support. Residents in this case also identified the importance of government services. The greatest critique around public services was the uneven nature of service delivery particularly in terms of the ways in which services are divided by class of entry, through an uneven geography of service promoted by the neighborhood focus of many provincial programs, and perceived gendered divisions in terms of level and quality of services. The other main critique was in terms of a desire for services that supported greater self-sufficiency, and allowed residents to engage both independently, and in terms of collective actions with neighbors and community members. Finally, the Canadian case was unique in terms of the overwhelming focus of residents on homeownership, and particularly the ways in which residents would conflate the notion of mortgages and homeownership. However, while immigrant residents in this study were attentive to the idea of a house as an asset or investment, there was a greater focus on questions of stability, community, and feelings of belonging in resident narratives around owning their own homes.

Nørrebro public ubiquity

Even more so than the Canadian case, government services were prominent, and in fact almost ubiquitous, in the narratives of residents in the Danish case. In an early interview I found

a resident anticipating my question about specific government services saying:

A: [...] and not just going off on a complete tangent, but this is like the hugest thing about Denmark is that the, the governments, and the local municipalities support people. No matter what your idea is or what your belief is. No matter what you kind of need, the city or the *kommune* [municipal government] will be there to help you. It's totally different from any other place I've ever been.

INT: That's totally not a tangent. That's totally my next question.
(Copenhagen, r2)

Residents described a wide variety of services provided through the Danish government and the Copenhagen Kommune. For residents who arrived as asylum seekers housing, settlement and counseling was available through the Social Service Ministry geared towards residents with greater needs including those experiencing homelessness, job loss, and those with physical and mental health problems. Other immigrant residents spoke about the *kommune* in terms of its programs in health care, childcare, activities for younger youth, some services around finding housing, various types of education including Danish language classes, and even the possibility of applying directly to the *kommune* for project funding. Residents spoke about these funds supporting smaller projects and outings for groups as varied as an anarchist squat, and an African women's group.

Services were also a mix of short and long term often with the possibility to transition between service types as your needs changed. One resident explained the transition for residents who arrived as asylum seekers saying:

A: [...] but even if you don't have somebody to connect – the families, or friends or something like that – there is a social workers is going to help you. Even though if you don't know the language, maybe if you speak English so they can they can *hjæp* you, help you ... usually when you are new in the country. But when you are three four years so, it's your own, you have to do it. And this is good I think.

INT: And so after like you say, when you've been here for three years, or four years, or ten years, what if you're trying to find something new, or if there's still something

that you're trying to find.

A: There is a social workers who you can contact [...] [in] the *kommune*. You can go and ask them what you want to do, otherwise you can go to the school they have *vejlder* [advisors]. (Copenhagen, r1)

The universalist aspects of much of Danish social welfare means that in many cases immigrant residents are able to take advantage of many of the same services as Danish-born residents and citizens. Interviewed immigrant residents generally had positive experiences of these shared services, their availability and administration. In conversation with one couple – one member was from Eastern Europe, and the other was from West Asia – they had both been talking about recent negative encounters they had had with Danes, and lamenting what they perceived as changing attitudes, but both lit up as they began talking about the work of the Copenhagen Kommune. “They do a lot of good things” (Copenhagen, r3) one began. As they continued to speak about the services they also discussed what they perceived as the quality of services, describing feelings of trust in government agencies, and then going on to compare experiences with governments in their own countries. The first member of the couple spoke about the corruption in their country, and the idea that everything was under the table and all about money, and that was the point where the second member interjected “But imagine how bad it could be in places like Afghanistan or, or Iraq!” (Copenhagen, r4) They went on to discuss experiences of government corruption and violence, again contrasting this to positive experiences with government services in Denmark.

isolation within the welfare state

While many spoke highly of general welfare services, resident evaluations of services specifically for immigrant residents were less positive. In spite of the universalist principles

underlying much of the Danish welfare state, certain services for immigrant and non-immigrant residents are divided by design, and immigrant residents have to make their way to a different office for many general interactions with the *kommune*. Additionally, immigrant residents who I spoke with complained of excessive bureaucracy, and a sense that offices were difficult to access, for example with limited hours and long wait times. One resident who had been in Denmark just under six months spoke with passion about these still fresh experiences:

They say that everybody from the EU is free to move, but in practice it's not so. You need so many things, documents, so waste of time. And not only waste of time, but almost it's impossible because their services are open around noon for three, four hours. But you are either working, or you are either a student. So exactly at the time you are busy so you should say to leave the college, to leave the, your work to go there. But if you're not there, you won't be legal. So it's it's something like catch-22. No matter you choose you are in some difficult situation, so that choice is almost impossible (Copenhagen, r5)

Early in an interview one resident from a Western country put it more bluntly while describing the evolution of their impressions of the Danish welfare state:

A: I was very romantically seduced by it until, until you find out who it's for, and it's like you know, this welfare's for a specific set of people, and anyone who doesn't fit that criteria just really isn't given easy access to it.

INT: Who are you, like who are you more and more thinking is that like specific set of people?

A: Oh ethnic Danes. I mean just people who are ethnically Danish.
(Copenhagen, r6)

private connections to public services

While there are a wide range of public services available to both Danish and foreign born residents, in interviews immigrant residents noted the importance of informal information in accessing these services. Residents often described Danish social networks as both incredibly tight and difficult to penetrate. Many also noted that these social networks were not just about personal

relationships, but also became important in terms of access to material and specifically economic opportunities. In other words the informal connections made through social networks allow residents to access resources in the formal sectors.

The importance of social connections is evident in terms of housing. In cooperative housing vacancies are often filled through internally-generated wait lists, and in privately owned or rented properties other owners or tenants will be more likely to put about a vacancy among friends before posting it publicly. Even when you can find a residence to purchase or rent, several residents described a situation where agents were reluctant to rent or sell to them because of the perception that they would not be in Denmark for long.

Throughout my interviews I was surprised both at how often direct personal relationships were the key in terms of residents finding housing, and by how regular or predictable the relationships were between where residents had migrated from and how long they had been in Copenhagen and Nørrebro, and what type of housing they had found. The general trend was that residents with the highest levels of social capital were in cooperative housing. These included migrants from North America or Western Europe who moved to Denmark with pre-existing social networks, or residents that had lived in Denmark for a significant amount of time, or migrated when they were quite young. On the other hand residents with perhaps smaller social networks, but more direct access to government support, for example those who came as successful asylum seekers were dominant in the non-profit housing sector, and finally those residents who fall somewhere in between were residents of the private rental sector. These were often newer migrants from for example Eastern Europe, whose moves are less regulated than asylum seekers, but who also many not arrive with pre-existing social connections in Denmark and Copenhagen.

community development organizations replacing the informal networks

The ways in which residents describe the work of the *helhedsplaner* in non-profit housing sites suggest that these programs are doing much of the same work as informal social networks in terms of linking residents to, and helping them navigate formal resources and institutions. As I discussed in Chapter 4), the *helhedsplaner* are a set of social service and community development programs within select non-profit housing sites across Denmark where residents are considered in need of assistance based on high levels of non-Western residents and their descendents, as well as unemployed residents, and residents with criminal records. The program was initiated by the Venstre Party-led government as part of a larger integration program predicated on concerns over the so-called separate society of immigrant residents. In spite of their origins in negatively framed policy, these new programs are described by residents in Nørrebro in a positive light. For engaged residents these projects are bringing new resources into their homes as well as opening new connections to institutions in the rest of Copenhagen. One resident who had been in Denmark for over a decade spoke about how *helhedsplan* staff had helped with educational options they had not known about, or had been reticent to attempt to access in the past. Staff helped to navigate application and registration processes, as well as providing ongoing support during the course:

I come many times [to the *helhedsplan* office] because I was so shy. It was me and twenty Danish people, and I had never been in this experience. And I speak Danish, but not like this. I was always worried that the teacher would call on me. [...] the *helhedsplan* brought opportunities [...] I did not like this way of living before, just sitting about all day. (Copenhagen, r7)

Many residents identified the importance of these opportunities to participate both inside and outside of their housing areas as a key aspect of the *helhedsplaner* programs. Another key aspect for residents was the importance of information and ongoing support. In an afternoon in

the offices at Mimerskvarter or Café Nora – the women's space at the Mjølneparken program – residents might stop in for a chat and coffee, or they might come by with letters from the *kommune*, utility bills, and various forms needing help with translation from Danish. In other cases they might be looking for more specific information, and suggestions, or waiting to meet with education and employment councilors.

There are a handful of other organizations in Copenhagen and Nørrebro that also focus on the combination of connection and information. One interesting program is Bydelsmødre (Community Mothers). This program started as one of the shorter-term projects funded as part of the Venstre-led government's integration policy, but is now an independent program attached to a large non-profit organization, and funded primarily through private foundations.

Bydelsmødre brings together more established immigrant women, and women with immigrant backgrounds to act as information resources for women in their neighborhoods who have migrated more recently. The program works both within and between housing estates, with core programs focused on particular areas, but with opportunities for women from different areas – and indeed from different parts of the country – to come together. For the *bydelsmødre* many described much of the work as things they were doing anyways, but they appreciated the opportunity to meet other women, to get some additional training and information, and during the period when the program was better funded to earn a small stipend for their work.

the importance of internal & micro-local change

Governments in Denmark promoted programs such as the *helhedsplaner* or Bydelsmødre through narratives around immigrant residents isolating themselves and refusing to integrate. Organizational staff talk about the success of their work in terms of immigrant residents being

more present in the city, joining or starting social clubs, entering education programs or gaining employment. For residents, however, the success of the programs were often defined more through internal changes and activities within their housing estates. Second generation and one-and-a-half generation young adults involved with a local magazine project for example described the importance of being able to re-represent their home. One participant stated “[...] they call it a ghetto, but I don't see it as that, it's not perfect, but when I see and hear about ghettos in the US or Italy it's not that” (Copenhagen, r8). Another went on to contrast the treatment of their home with other areas saying “In those Danish ghettos – where it is all just Danish people – people, or kids are also doing drugs etc, but they don't report on that” (Copenhagen, r9). Finally, we spoke about the work of the magazine and the importance for these young residents of telling the positive stories. The magazine covers issues of resident democracy, has reviews of films, interviews with local artisans, internal news and events, and one magazine featured a report about a trip the editors took to Palestine and Israel visiting the towns and villages of their parents and friends parents, a trip funded through award from the estate's management company.

Another example of these internal changes and narratives came from a resident who volunteered to coordinate an employment program for younger youth, providing positions working in maintenance around the housing area. This resident also spoke about the success of that project in terms of internal developments, describing the evolution of the youth by saying: “At first they were shy because it's not a good job. But all these jobs are needed in the *samfund* [society], and it is better than sitting and having nothing to do, or no money” (Copenhagen, r10). This resident went on to describe the youth taking more pride in the work, gaining outside contracts for events, and in terms of the other residents this coordinator described that there did appear to be less litter in the area, people were talking about the program, and saying “Why

make difficult for them, if the people doing the cleaning may be your child” (Copenhagen, r10).

Finally, residents are becoming more involved in the tenant democracy of their own housing areas with *helhedsplaner* staff working to coordinate with tenant boards at Mimerskvarter and Mjølneparken, along with other housing sites. Particularly because of Mjølneparken's high profile, staff at the non-profit company that manages the area have been willing to engage with the plan and residents, and have supported the work with special meetings between management company leadership and residents, and a willingness to finance extra programs and projects.

attachment in spite of high costs of incorporation

Much of Danish integration policy in the 2000s was predicated on the idea that immigrant residents were living in separate, parallel societies from so called ethnic-Danes. Based on immigrant resident narratives this is not entirely false, however, and in keeping with other research (Banting, 2000; Bolt, Özüekren and Phillips, 2010) it is non-immigrant institutions that appear to be producing and maintaining these separate societies. Some of the factors identified by residents as having kept them separate from mainstreamed Danish society include social and resident (*borger*) services provided separately for immigrant and non-immigrant residents, and the closed nature of much of Danish culture, what has been described by others as the everyday nationalism of Denmark (Koefoed and Simonsen, 2007; Koefoed and Simonsen, 2012). Another contradiction to government frames is the idea that it is only, or primarily, those who have migrated from the so-called non-Western countries who are living parallel to Danish society. Through interviews and more informal interactions throughout my research in Denmark I observed that residents who had immigrated from all parts of the world shared a sense of the difficulty of making their way deep into Danish society.

In spite of these difficulties, in a majority of interviews, and to a stronger degree than in

the other two case neighborhoods, residents expressed some combination of gratitude and wonder for the level and type of services available from government agencies in general, and the Copenhagen Kommune in particular. Even in critiques there was an ambivalent or even apologetic tone. After talking to one resident from a Western country about the difficulties they had encountered, I asked if there were little things that they would change, that could have made things easier:

That's a tough one. It is what it is, and it's a culture that exists, and I'm coming into it. So on one level it's like, yeah I mean sure like having the welcome mat rolled out, and like tell me everything I'm supposed to do, but should they have to do that? I don't know.(Copenhagen, r11)

Another resident described the situation by saying:

[...] you can definitely see that it's maybe a bit harder maybe to integrate [...] like at a national level you can see it in like Denmark is both this really nice society, and it's kind of like the more people that come in it is sort of gets a bit more diluted in a way, and which ... and which is like ... which is totally cool, but this idea of like a strong social structure, it relies on like the fact that you can, you're ... you're enclosing this group and then everything outside is outside and it's not a part of it. (Copenhagen, r2)

Another resident described this feeling of ambivalence from Danes, and the difficulty in integrating by saying:

Oh Denmark is unbelievable country. I mean it's so diverse. Uhh as I said there's an abundance of crafty people, nasty people, awful people; on the other hand there's really great number of unbelievable people in terms of being so nice, so good, so so eager to help you, the others, believing in sharing and everything. So like there's two Denmark's, one nasty and one beautiful. (Copenhagen, r5)

summary

Governments – and particularly the municipal government of Copenhagen – play an important role in the lives of immigrant residents in this case. The universalist design of many social welfare programs in the city and neighborhood mean that immigrant residents have access

to many of the same services as Danish-born, or citizen residents. However, services for immigrant residents are increasingly separated by design, and residents are less satisfied with those separate services as compared to universally accessible resources. Additionally, immigrant residents described the importance of informal networks and information in terms of gaining access to formal resources including housing, and about the high costs or difficulty of entering into these networks and relationships with ethnic-Danish or long-time residents. Community development organizations, such as the *helhedsplaner* in non-profit housing sites, are doing some of the work of connecting residents to the types of information and access otherwise gained through informal networks. Taken together these conditions have led to a greater separation and filtering of immigrant residents both from Danish-born residents and from each other. While there is nothing *a priori* problematic with people living apart, the differential service and access have the potential to lead to differences in terms of access to resources and services, and opportunities for participation and membership. As an example, as I continued with my interviews of immigrant residents in Nørrebro it slowly dawned on me that while governments, and particularly the Copenhagen municipal government was a dominant theme in my conversations with a large majority of residents. The one exception to this pattern was in conversation with long-term residents of non-profit housing (*alemenebolig*) areas. Instead – and as I discuss below this is in common with the US case – these residents were more likely to cite families, co-patriots, and private organizations in terms of social welfare and community development in their neighborhood, and area.

Olneyville

In the US case resident evaluations of services were split on the one hand with residents expressing real attachment, and even ownership over certain services, and on the other with a

detachment that ranged from people simply not knowing about resources through to residents vehemently declaring that they had received no help since migrating. Additionally, almost no residents mentioned attachment to, or even awareness of government services.

police as the sole public service

Police were the one public service that residents referenced unprompted in interviews and observations. The emergence of police as the sole named government service is notable because while crime was mentioned by many residents in general descriptions of the Canadian case, the police were not mentioned to any great extent in either of the other cases. And police are somewhat ubiquitous in the neighborhood. Patrol cars often stationed at entry points to the neighborhood, and state police patrolling along a least one major road in the neighborhood. Residents were also divided in their discussions over the police. In some cases residents expressed support and appreciation of the work of police, while in others there was avoidance and even hostility towards the police or their work. However, for other residents, and particularly for those who might be, or might be perceived as undocumented or irregular migrants, there was a greater sense of apprehension over the police. Particularly during the period in the mid-2000s while state police were actively collaborating with ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and using routine traffic stops to check status.

Through these actions the police presence in Olneyville was a very material extension or re-territorialization of the boarder in to the everyday scale. Even after the police had stopped officially cooperating with ICE, residents still reported being targeted by police. In terms of traffic stops, an ONA (Olneyville Neighborhood Association) organizer related the testimony that one of their members – an undocumented resident currently ineligible for a RI drivers license –

made in front of a state commission. The member told the commission their story of being picked up by police for driving without a license, and so having to get a friend to drive them around, to get to work or pick up children, and trying to pay the friend a bit for their help. This member also reported that they would see the original ticketing police officer waiting day after day outside of the resident's house waiting to catch them driving.

Some organizations and residents responded to police actions and presence in the neighborhood by developing strategies for working around issues of safety in community and separate from the police. For example the first ONA member meeting that I attended was a discussion of domestic violence and community-based strategies to support victims without necessarily involving police. Still other residents looked at the situation as an opportunity. During one action committee meeting for another Olneyville-based organization residents spoke about potential action to combat perceived increases in crime in the area. One of the options was a neighborhood watch program that would need to coordinate with the police. In the meeting residents and staff discussed the importance of distinguishing between different police forces, but also the potential for involvement in these types of programs to count towards potential citizenship, or legal residents claims for participants.

private participation

In terms of private services, resident accounts corroborate findings in the proceeding chapter with high levels of engagement in private community development organizations.

Particularly for residents who had taken on leadership positions in organizations there was a real sense of agency and ownership. Even for the residents who were less directly engaged there was still a willingness to participate by using services, but also coming to and participating in additional meetings about the organization or related political actions, and coming out to events.

One resident who had taken up a leadership position described:

Yeah in my case, I have like seventy or eighty percent of my family is living here in the US, so, but there are several guys who are alone here. They're just going to their jobs coming back home and that's their life. And [organization name] is like, they can find friends here, they can relax, or they can talk, they can, you know they can find love here [with laughter]. That's why I'm still here.

this resident leader continued to speak about the office space of the organization saying:

[...] and you know to mention that we built this place, because it was wide open. We just, everything was volunteer volunteer. So the students build this place. They bought the materials and they build the walls, they install electricity, they build that back room, and they painted. You know with zero money. That's the love they have for [organization name]. (Providence, r3)

And the physical spaces of several smaller organizations in Olneyville reflect this deeper engagement with staff workplaces marginalized in favor of open gathering spaces. Additionally, these are multi-use spaces where a volunteer's child might be playing in the office while staff and volunteers stuff envelopes, and where holiday parties and meetings regularly take place.

When residents described why they had become involved in the organizations two main themes emerged: first reciprocity and second the focus of these organizations on what the community needs. Residents described not wanting to leave organizations that had done so much for them, and one mother talked about wanting to give back to the people that hand given her so much, and also wanting to be a good example for her daughter. On the other had residents described very pragmatic reasons for wanting to participate. At a meeting to organize a political action at the state capital advocating for new state legislation around drivers licenses for undocumented resident, most of the dozen or so people at the meeting identified themselves as residents without affiliation. These residents had come out to a meeting on a rainy Sunday afternoon because a friend had encouraged them to do so, and because they or members of their family were being affected by not being able to get drivers licenses.

community engagement if not full participation

This deep participation is not as evident in larger organization such as OHC (Onlyville Housing Corporation), where programs are increasingly developing away from direct resident input. However, events organized by OHC's community building program are bringing together diverse groups of residents. One example, drawn from field notes was the first in a series of OHC-organized 2011 summer concerts held in the late afternoons in a large public park. The concert featured the What Cheer? Brigade a large brass and percussion band with members that include a number of RISD (Rhode Island School of Design) and Brown University graduates, artists, arts educators and non-profit workers. At the start of the concert the crowd looked like a typical What Cheer show: a kid with a mohawk, a boy in a dress, cultural workers with their kids, band members' families, and younger adults from the rapidly gentrifying Armory park neighborhood. However, as the concert continued the crowd also changed, and by the end there were more Black families, both African and African American as well as Latino youth, and at least one Asian family who came out to stand and watch from their porch across the street from the park.

This concert was a particularly diverse event, but in general OHC's community work regularly brings together neighbors as well as residents from other parts of the city to use the spaces of the neighborhood together. Even after the concert ended at least a hundred people milled around the park, with children playing in the park and various clusters of adults making potentially new and interesting connections. In many ways the spaces create through these events are “meeting places where people can come together and connect through engaging in activities together” (Sandercock, 2009: 9). What Leone Sandercock describes as an intercultural approach to incorporation. Additionally, as I discuss in further detail below bringing these residents

together and enabling these interactions is not just about the social, but could also play an important role in producing necessary geographies for more – or more explicitly – political actions.

limited resources and divided participation

As much as the work of these organizations is valued, they are still private service providers, and as I discuss in Chapter 4), organizations in the US are quite underfunded as compared to organizations in the Danish case, or even the Canadian case. This limited funding is evident in the fact that organizations are not generally able to provide much in the way of material support to their clients. Additionally, the engagement of residents is primarily voluntary, with few opportunities to move in to paid or more stable positions. One immigrant resident described moving through a handful of organizations all in temporary and part-time positions, and while this resident wanted to continue to do this kind of work they worried they might need to take a break in part because of the challenges of the work, and in part because of the need to secure paid employment.

Another outcome of the heavy reliance on private services is that access to services is quite uneven. Services are occurring in community rather than in public, and community is always closed off in some ways with demarcations between “us” and “them.” In the case of Olneyville the starkest division between immigrant residents is between residents who have emigrated from Latin America and other immigrant residents. While services, and community organizing and building often occurs in bilingual Spanish-English spaces, residents with other language backgrounds are not as well served, and so not as well incorporated in events, services and actions. It becomes easy to forget that while a majority of immigrant residents in the neighborhood have come from Latin America there is a growing African and Asian population in

the neighborhood whose residents are not being brought as seamlessly into community building processes as compared to new Latin American immigrant residents.

The result of these divisions appears to be that residents in general have limited knowledge of the full range of services and organizations in the neighborhood. Further, their perspective is connected to their own positionality both in terms of national origins, and in terms of the organizations with which they first come in contact. As I mentioned in Chapter 4), there is a certain amount of overlap and competition between organizations in Olneyville, and it was not uncommon for a resident to be intimately familiar with one organization, but know little to nothing about another organization in the neighborhood working on similar issues.

These divisions appear to have led to an unclear picture for residents of the state of the neighborhood, particularly in terms of what might be propelling change in Olneyville. For some this means that the state of the neighborhood is related to quite intimate scales, for example one resident described the quality of the entire neighborhood going down, and then explaining this perception through the presence of new neighbors. “The problem is sometimes because many people who who live in the, across the street, before they using drugs, the police came and very often on weekends” (Providence, r2). Others expressed a general sense that the neighborhood was improving, for example citing a reduction in vacant or boarded up homes, but going on to say that they were really not sure why the change was happening. Finally, in a reverse of the Canadian case, at least one resident attributed the change exclusively to private individuals, people like their son who were buying homes and fixing them up. This resident went on to credit a single private individual as the developer on several larger OHC projects.

summary

Residents are heavily reliant on private resources and services in the US case, with the police being the only public service that came up voluntarily in interviews or observations. There was also a high level of participation and agency for residents involved with smaller organizations. This engagement was described primarily through material need, personal relationships and the desire to give back. For larger organizations while there was less direct participation residents were still engaged through programming that facilitated mutual use and encounters for a diverse group of residents. The reliance on private organizations has also led to limited resources, and a tendency for organizations to work as communities rather than publics. Meaning that many residents are left out of the more deeply engaged work. In Olneyville there is a split between residents who have immigrated from Latin American countries and those from other parts of the world, with the latter less well engaged in much of the community development work in the neighborhood. Housing was also seldom discussed independently in this case, and instead was wrapped up in more general conversations about scarcity and economic need.

This section examined the ways in which the organizations and services available to residents in these neighborhoods are playing an important role in shaping membership experiences and opportunities. Residents are not, however, simply disciplined by these conditions. Instead, resident actions, encounters and negotiations are also animating the spaces in which they live, and contributing to the negotiations over spaces of incorporation. The next section looks at those actions, examining the scope and variety of residents' everyday use and engagement in these neighborhoods, and beginning to think about how these actions could or should feedback into more general political deliberations and negotiations over spaces of incorporation.

Section 2: ANIMATE

In addition to any participation within formal organizations, many residents are actively engaged in 1) informal neighboring acts, actions through loose and tight networks in their neighborhoods, 2) use of city spaces, and 3) working within families, ethnic or national communities, and religious communities.

Neighboring Acts

Many residents are taking their own homes as a starting point for acts of spatial care, repairing facades, and planting gardens, calling the city to report disorder. Other neighboring acts are more social including befriending neighbors, greeting new residents in the neighborhood, and coming together to procure new resources for neighborhood activities. Finally, residents are not just gaining information for themselves, but also sharing information and resources with neighbors who might be dealing with similar situations. While these might seem like generic activities the important details are within the variations between cases, as well as the differential ability for immigrant residents to engage in these everyday activities.

Residents in the Canadian case were the most likely to speak about neighboring acts that were directly related to spatial care. However – and in common with some aspects of social acts – residents described the situation where they felt limited in terms of the actions available to them because they were not Canadian. While speaking about keeping the street clean one resident spoke about the differences in the ways that they and a neighbor dealt with dog walkers in the area who didn't pick up after their dogs, they described that while they would call the city anonymously while their neighbor would simply follow people home with droppings and throw it their yard, continuing:

[...] he cut the grass, he sweep the street, because he want to, he wants our neighbor, our area to look nice. So yeah he just go and he is not scared, I think I am too scared

to do that. [...] yeah [with laughter] *he is Canadian I have to be brave like him.* (Winnipeg, r1)

In terms of social neighboring acts, particularly for residents who were more established in Canada, the mix of residents in their neighborhoods was considered both a positive feature, and something that was a cause of socializing in the neighborhood. Residents might describe their neighborhoods as simply a mix of Canadian and immigrant residents, but also often would use more fine grain descriptions including Mennonite, Filipino, South American, Aboriginal, families with kids.

In contrast, in the US case there was a much greater tendency for residents to speak about actually avoiding engaging in neighboring acts whether spatial, social or in terms of information exchanges. Residents in the US case were most likely to speak primarily about connections through extended families, and cultural communities, that might not be spatial, or that might explicitly involve them traveling to other parts of the city or region. This went along with often negative assessments of their neighbors.

The Danish case was a mix with residents in different housing types, or with different backgrounds describing quite distinct situations. For residents of the non-profit housing sector (*alemebolig*) there was generally a sense first of conversations and mixing within the sites, also experiencing these as places where they could preserve and mix cultures. One young adult who moved to Denmark as a child commented that they felt at home in their area as compared to the rest of the city “on these streets that I know, speaking Urdu” But also continued “... I don't feel at home in Pakistan” (Copenhagen, r12). In common with several young adults this resident spoke about building a new mixed culture that included Danish culture, the culture of their parents, and their friends' parents. From the perspective of older immigrant residents from South and

West Asia in particular they also described this hybridity. In one conversation a resident spoke about their own identity explaining that they were most definitely not Danish, and when I asked about their teenaged son they responded wistfully “He is half-Danish” (Copenhagen, r13).

The gradual characteristic of Danish incorporation is also important in the context of a more general discussions about social acts of neighboring because of the ways in which different residents perceive and experience their access to long-term and ethnic Danish residents. For some residents who move from countries other than the other Nordic countries, Western Europe and North America even in the second generations there is still some reticence in socialization with long-term and ethnic Danish residents. A group of immigrant residents who had all lived in Denmark for over ten years described interaction with ethnic Danish residents saying: “they are hard to get to know, except when you work with them, then they are OK. Or when they are drunk” (Copenhagen, r14). These residents went on to tell the story of an extended interaction with Danish strangers during an outdoor festival in a park. They told me how they had spent an afternoon talking and telling stories, and finally exchanging contact information. But the story ended with them calling and never hearing back from the Danes they had met that afternoon. Throughout the conversation there was laughter, but at the end a long silence.

These personal experiences are also important because of the ways in which they contrast with the experiences of Western European, North American immigrant residents, and particularly white immigrant residents from these countries. While there was still a sense of distance from Danish residents, they described the situation as one where a flood gate would eventually open. As one resident from North America who had been in Denmark for just under two years described:

... but even the people that I've become really close with, they were really closed off at the beginning [...] but after a little while, maybe you build a little bit of trust maybe, and then it's like the flood gates. As soon as you're friends you're like best friends forever [...] (Copenhagen, r2)

Spatial Use

In addition to particular actions taken by immigrant residents, people are also engaging with the spaces in which they find themselves through more general spatial use. A strong majority of residents spoke about the convenience of their neighborhoods in terms of having everything they needed. This in spite of the fact that many residents commuted sometimes great distances for work and school. There was still a sense, particularly in terms of spaces like parks and other green or recreational spaces, that proximity was an important factor in terms of resident access to and use of these spaces. While there were a few exceptions, with some residents citing travel to recreation sites across or outside of the city, it was more common for residents to talk about resources outside of their neighborhood – both across the city and outside of the city – in aspirational terms as places they wished they could go to if they had the time or resources, or in a handful of cases as a place specifically not for them.

One more aspect of use that needs to be better explored is the question of negotiated experiences in space. While there is a literature on conflicts over for example public space, and development regulation (Kohn, 2004; Gale, 2005; Lung-Aman, 2013), there has been less written about the ways in which people with very different perceptions and uses of space negotiate, compromise, share or balance their and differing or even oppositional uses. As an example a new public park space Superkilen that opened in Nørrebro in 2012, and runs across several city blocks in the neighborhood. The park

features biking and walking paths, playgrounds, adult exerciser equipment, and also design features meant to represent the diversity of the neighborhood. These design features include a bus shelter from Kazakhstan, swings from Iraq, and palm trees from China.



Figure 2: Superkilen Palm Trees January 2013

In interviews with residents the Superkilen park came up several times but often in

oppositional ways, residents described the park variously with surprise that people were using exercise equipment, as the worst public space in Denmark, a good place to meet friends and drink in the evening, and as a quiet respite from a crowded apartment, a place to think. Much community development work, whether focused on community building or community organizing, is centered around the idea of things in common, shared values, interests, and spaces for example. However, examples such as Supekilen suggest the need, and provide an opportunity for more attention to the negotiations that take place, particularly in homes spaces such as neighborhoods, over conflicting uses and perceptions of space.

Families and Communities

Residents in each case also spoke about the importance of extended families, cultural and religious communities, and general interest groups such as sports clubs in terms of their settlement and their engagement in the neighborhood. The role of families, ethnic or national and religious communities, and particularly interest groups are for the most part under explored in much community development research. However, these institutions are more or less implicitly factored into social policies and programs including social welfare, housing, and multicultural integration policies.

As I have described throughout, extended families and cultural communities play an important role for many of the immigrant residents I interviewed. These were sites for material resources, information, comfort and support. However, not all residents have access to these resources either because they have migrated without their family, are from communities with only a small population in their new city or in some cases because they choose to actively avoid these groups. In my interviews single mothers were most likely to explicitly describe avoiding their

cultural communities. In at least one case a mother felt that members of her community would not be a good influence on her children, because, for example, few spoke English. For other women they spoke about avoiding their cultural communities because of concerns over gossip, and judgment. This is also in common with findings from an evaluation done by the Rainbow Resource Centre in Winnipeg interviewing residents who were members of both LBTTQ* and immigrant communities. One respondent in that study described their situation by saying:

I am stressed out and can't sleep at night. The people around me especially the culture is not accepting, fear, gossip or being talk of the community. I am struggling inside. That's why I went to Rainbow Resource Centre for counseling over this crisis. (Rainbow Resource Centre, 2012: 9)

Especially in the Canadian case where there is a heavy formal reliance on groups organized around ethnic, racial and national-origin categories, it is important to examine who is served or not served by the reliance on formalized definitions of difference, and to do stronger work understanding the intersectional experiences within and between these groups (Dhamoon, 2009). In addition to understanding divisions within well recognized groups there is also a need to understand the role of interest groups, including religious organizations, in bringing residents together. Sports teams, and food clubs for example, were two groups that came up in interviews, that are seldom discussed in the literature around incorporation and membership.

The Informal in Relation to the Formal

While residents are taking on a wide variety of activities within their neighborhoods and various communities, this work is seldom picked up by staff in formal organizations or government agencies. While at least one non-profit staff person in Providence described their frustration at not being able to keep track of and engage independent community leaders, a large

majority of staff were simply silent on work outside of their own formal sphere. One example that was particularly surprising for me was the presence of a fifteen year-old group run for and by African women in the Mjøneparken non-profit housing site. The organization has over a hundred women and girls involved, pre-dates the *helhedsplan*, and is run primarily through the volunteer efforts of women from the neighborhood, some of whom are also volunteers in *helhedsplan* programs. And yet no staff in Mjøneparken ever mentioned this group or the women working to organize it. This lack of attention or acknowledgment of these types of informal, or at least outsider organizing is part of a larger trend of underestimation of immigrant residents on the part of staff in many organizations.

CONCLUSIONS

The conditions described in each case in Chapter 4) are influencing the opportunities for participation and membership. Residents in each case are limited in their ability to engage in negotiations over spaces of incorporation through the resources made available, and the types of participation promoted or tolerated in each case. In addition to structural relationships and the ways in which public policies and government programs discipline residents, the role of cultural incorporation and the relationships within and between immigrant residents and non-immigrant residents are also disciplining immigrant residents' behaviors. In spite of limitations, immigrant residents in all cases are creating their own opportunities through neighboring acts, varied spatial uses, and informal organizing. These are all behaviors, actions and means of animating space that need to be addressed in greater detail in community development, urban geography and incorporation research.